



**ANNUAL REPORT
OF THE
INDEPENDENT MONITORING BOARD
FOR HMP GLOUCESTER**

1 December 2010 - 30 November 2011

SECTION 1	Table of Contents	
SECTION 2	Statutory role of the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB)	page 3
SECTION 3	IMB Gloucester's Diversity Statement	page 3
SECTION 4	Description of HMP Gloucester	page 4
SECTION 5	Executive Summary	
	5.1 Particular issues requiring a response - Policy	page 5
	5.2 Particular issues requiring a response - Operations	page 7
	5.3 Particular issues requiring a response - Secretariat	page 7
	5.4 Particular issues of concern or excellence not requiring a response	page 8
	5.5 Overall judgement	page 9
SECTION 6	Areas that must be reported on	
	6.1 Equality	page 10
	6.2 Learning & Skills	page 10
	6.3 Healthcare & Mental Health	page 12
	6.4 Safer Custody	page 16
	6.5 Segregation, Vulnerable Prisoner & Young Offender Units	page 17
SECTION 7	Other areas on which the Board has matters to report	
	7.1 Accommodation	page 20
	7.2 Catering & Kitchens	page 21
	7.3 Chaplaincy	page 22
	7.4 Effects of Financial Climate	page 22
	7.5 Physical Education	page 24
	7.6 Offender Management Unit	page 25
	7.7 Regimes	page 26
	7.8 Restorative Justice	page 27
	7.9 Visits	page 28
SECTION 8	The work of the Independent Monitoring Board	page 28
SECTION 9	Glossary of Abbreviations	page 31
APPENDICES	A Private & Public Sector Partners	page 32
	B Board Statistics	page 35
	C Analysis of Prisoners' Applications	page 36

SECTION 2 Statutory role of the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB)

The Prisons Act 1952 and the Immigration and Asylum Act 1999 require every prison and Immigration Removal Centre (IRC) to be monitored by an independent Board appointed by the Secretary of State for Justice from members of the community in which the prison or centre is situated.

The Board is specifically charged to:

- satisfy itself as to the humane and just treatment of those held in custody within its prison and the range and adequacy of the programmes preparing them for release.
- inform promptly the Secretary of State, or any official to whom he has delegated authority as it judges appropriate, any concern it has.
- report annually to the Secretary of State on how well the prison has met the standards and requirements placed on it and what impact these have on those in its custody.

To enable the Board to carry out these duties effectively its members have right of access to every prisoner and every part of the prison and also to the prison's records.

SECTION 3 IMB Gloucester's Diversity Statement

3.1 The IMB at HMP Gloucester is committed to view the diversity of individuals and groups within society in a way that can increase mutual understanding and encourage positive interaction. It is particularly mindful of differences of age, disability, gender, marital status, nationality, race, religion and sexuality and of features that can affect people of many backgrounds such as drug and alcohol addiction, mental ill-health and educational problems.

3.2 This inclusive approach to diversity influences the Board's recruitment and Board development practices. Through it, the Board seeks to increase its range of skills and to foster members' awareness of the wide-ranging needs and perspectives of prisoners and staff alike.

3.3 All members of the IMB at HMP Gloucester aim to do their work in a way that encourages easy communication with all prisoners, staff and visitors, regardless of background and status. Through such communication, the Board monitors whether, in those people's experience, the prison is run fairly and individual dealings with prisoners are routinely characterized by even-handedness and respect. When this is not the case the Board alerts those who are responsible for rectifying matters, from senior management up to, if necessary, the relevant Minister.

SECTION 4 Description of HMP Gloucester

4.1 Gloucester Prison is situated on an inner-city site and, partially, has Listed Building status. It was established in the 18th Century, was rebuilt in the Victorian era, and gained an additional accommodation wing and an administration block in the 1960s and 1980s respectively. It is a Category B (closed) establishment for adult male prisoners, intended to hold mainly those remanded or recently convicted. Young Offenders (YOs) from 18 to 20 years of age are also accommodated, but do not have a separate wing, and routinely share a landing with Vulnerable Prisoners (VPs) when the Vulnerable Prisoner Unit (VPU) is full. The certified normal (i.e. ideal) capacity for the establishment is 225 but it has an operational capacity of 321. The prison is established to serve the Crown Courts of Gloucester and Hereford together with the associated Magistrates' courts. In practice, prisoners come to HMP Gloucester from a far wider area.

4.2 The prison has three main wings (A, B and C), each having 3 accommodation floors. A and B wings are situated in the Victorian part of the prison and are in the style of the period. Cells in A and B wings have toilet and washing facilities within them and normally accommodate 2 prisoners, although originally designed for single occupation. A large room, formerly the chapel, is situated between the 2 wings and has been converted to provide facilities for prisoner induction, basic learning skills assessments, group work and meetings.

4.3 A wing is the induction wing and has been modified to accommodate the Integrated Drug Treatment Strategy (IDTS).

4.4 The ground floor of B wing is devoted to a small Segregation Unit and to a VPU, which often has overspill onto B2 landing upstairs where YOs are also housed.

4.5 C wing has the more modern (1960s) accommodation. It mainly holds prisoners who agree to voluntary testing for drugs. This wing has single cells without integral sanitation. There is a night sanitation system which regulates access to toilets.

4.6 A kitchen is situated adjacent to A and B wings. Prisoners from these wings collect their meals from the kitchen and eat in their cells. The food for C wing is transported to a servery in the wing, where there is a communal dining room.

4.7 The separate, two-storey Healthcare Centre, equipped by the 2gether Foundation NHS Trust, has an assessment and treatment unit, including inpatient facilities upstairs and outpatient facilities downstairs, with a hot food servery for inpatients.

4.8 Learning and Skills is based in a self-contained building on 2 floors. Elsewhere, there is an Enterprise Centre (prison workshop) offering a limited number of job opportunities, and an Offender Management Unit (OMU) on the upper floor.

4.9 The prison has a gymnasium comprising 2 rooms with exercise machines. There are 3 exercise yards and the main exercise yard is used for basket ball and volley ball games.

4.10 A new chapel, incorporating a multi-faith room and office, has been provided by converting the former main storeroom. A part-time coordinating Muslim Chaplain leads the Chaplaincy Team which provides for all faiths and religions.

4.11 The interior of the prison estate has no grassed or cultivated areas, and contains a number of portacabins, which are used as offices. Alongside the former Gate-house, against the prison wall, there is a counselling and group suite, a learning and skills suite, and a rest room and fitness suite for staff.

4.12 A modern block incorporating the entrance to the prison contains an administrative section, a section for visits with a separate internal entrance, and a reception complex.

4.13 Outside the security wall, the former governor's residence (Glevum House) now contains office accommodation and conference rooms that are mainly used for in-service training.

4.14 Also outside the main wall, there is a well-equipped Visitors' Centre situated in the former Gate-house. It is run by the Castle Gate Family Support Trust.

4.15 A police liaison unit is attached to the prison to cooperate on joint security operations and advise on specific issues.

4.16 In addition to the main provider partnerships mentioned above, Gloucester Prison management utilises the expertise, advice, and services of a number of organisations, in both the public and private sectors and these are detailed in Appendix A, together with a brief indication of what is provided.

SECTION 5 Executive Summary

This report covers the period from 1 December 2010 to 30 November 2011. Inevitably during the period between the latter date and the submission of the report, situations changed. So that this report is self-contained, any developments during that interim period will be covered if appropriate in next year's report.

5.1 Particular issues requiring a response - Policy

5.1.1 **Accommodation:** The Board notes with pleasure that considerable efforts have been made to improve the more easily dealt with aspects of sub-standard prisoner accommodation (e.g. renewal of recesses containing communal toilet and showering facilities; installation of up to date fire precautions, very extensive interior repainting). It also notes a more effective – but not maximised – use of space in the former Chapel. [See Sections 7.1.3, 7.1.7.] However, longstanding basic problems remain.

- **In-Cell Toilets:** Prisoners on A and B Wings are housed in cells that contain their toilets and have to eat their meals on trays there, separated from the toilet by a curtain. In Victorian times, the cells were considered of appropriate size to house a single prisoner. In the 21st century, they typically contain two. Last year the Prisons Minister responded to the situation by pointing out that “no suitable dining area is available for use by A and B Wing prisoners”; that “provided...prisoners follow basic hygiene practices, the risk of infection from eating food in the same room as the lavatory is minimal”; and that the privacy curtains were “extensively designed and developed over an 18 month period”, with the design “intended to meet the decency agenda – to conform to the

requirements of Prison Service Order 1900". The Minister's comments explain the situation, but in the Board's view they do not justify it. A decency standard that takes no account of the smells and noises emanating from a toilet in a shared cell some 4 metres by 2 metres (13 feet by 6 feet 6 ins) in which 2 men eat and spend the majority of hours in a day is a standard that is set too low. (See Section 7.1.5.)

- **C Wing:** The most recent report of HMCIP stated the need bluntly: "all prisoners should have 24-hour access to toilet facilities". The current night sanitation arrangements (see Section 7.1.4) provide access of a kind, but when an interim situation has become longstanding, it becomes unacceptable. While the Prisons Minister recognised (letter 26 April 2011), "...that the replacement or refurbishment of C Wing would provide the best solution", the Board remains unaware of any agreement to do so within an acceptable timeframe (see also Section 7.1.1). It therefore continues to register its dissatisfaction with the situation.
- **Facilities for Interventions:** The Board remains concerned at the continuing inadequacies of the main Learning and Skills suite, the facilities for work with Vulnerable Prisoners and the failure to enhance workshop facilities – all matters highlighted by the IMB, OFSTED and HMCIP over several years (see Section 6.2.12). The issue is not simply one of facilities, but of ready physical access. It is unacceptable that when so much has been done about disability access in public spaces in general so little has been done within the prison, an environment which – unlike many public spaces – provides few alternatives. (See Section 7.1.2.)
- **Physical Activities:** Despite the excellent management of existing facilities, the scope for physical activities remains inadequate for a prison that is still required to cater for Young Offenders and whose population very largely consists of men in their 20s and 30s. (See Section 7.1.6.)

5.1.2 Severe Personality Disorder: The Board continues to be concerned at the difficulties experienced in placing prisoners with severe mental health issues in an appropriate secure environment. (See Section 6.5.3.)

5.1.3 Effects of the Financial Climate: The need at Gloucester for significant capital expenditure is well established and it is disappointing to see the potential of the prison – and of imprisonment - not being fully realised as a result (see Section 7.4.1). Lack of cohesion between the timings of changes to Prison Service staffing structures and changes to the operating budget have made the impact of budget reductions unduly difficult to manage and may well have led to some unanticipated adverse side effects. (See Section 7.4.4.)

5.1.4 Work of the Independent Monitoring Board: Especially at a time of considerable changes within prisons and financial pressures on what they are able to provide, the Board is concerned that the funding of IMBs (and the associated scheme for refunding members' legitimate expenses) should take fully into account that the Board will, if anything, need to increase its vigilance in order to fulfil its core legal function of "satisfying itself as to the humane and just treatment of those held in custody within its prison and the adequacy of programmes preparing them for release". It is particularly

mindful of the above average expenses involved in monitoring in a rural area and the need to ensure that ability to afford the money to serve does not become a consideration in applications for Board membership. (See Sections 8.4 and 8.5.)

5.2 Particular issues requiring a response - Operations

5.2.1 Activities: There were an undue number of occasions when programmed activities did not take place and, even if they had, it would still be the case that the range and quality of activities need improving. The Board is concerned that both those aspects need significant improvement. (See Section 7.7.4.)

5.2.2 Catering: Despite the assertion, in response to last year's report, that "any attempt to identify local prices using local suppliers would introduce complications into budget allocation", the Board is unconvinced that, under a government that is committed to more decision-making at local level, arrangements could not be made that would allow catering officers to take full advantage of shopping round locally to obtain best value on a wider range of items. (See Section 7.2.4.)

5.2.3 Offender Management Unit: The OMU is responsible for key areas of the prison's work and the Board is gravely concerned at the adverse impact on the OMU's performance of staff shortages, both within the prison and elsewhere. It would highlight, externally, delays at the Licence Recall Centre at Croydon that have led to frequent difficulties in obtaining necessary documentation and reports that recall arrangements have rarely run to time. Locally, it would highlight the extensive failure of the Probation Service to provide its contracted hours. (See Section 7.6.5.)

5.2.4 Vulnerable Prisoners and Segregation Unit: While recognising some outstanding work is done in the Segregation Unit, the Board continues to be dissatisfied with the lack of separate VP and Segregation Units and believes that the present arrangements are inconsistent with the Prison Service's fairness and respect agenda. (See Section 6.5.1.)

5.2.5 Young Offenders: The undesirability of the arrangements for YOs has frequently been brought to the attention of both the Minister and the Prison Service. Their being accommodated on B2 opposite the overflow VP cells; the difficulties for staff having to deal with 3 distinct populations and regimes on one landing (VPs and YOs on B2 and ordinary adult prisoners on B3); and the lack of a proper range of appropriate facilities for this age group are all issues that do not change from year to year. (See Section 6.5.10.) While the Board appreciates that the Green Paper (to which attention was drawn in the response to its last report) contains key proposals to address the particular issues of dealing with young adult offenders, these strategic initiatives have done little to deal with the particular problems outlined above. The response last year that a change would "not make the best and most flexible use of the accommodation" is persuasive if the only concern is logistics. It is unpersuasive if the focus is on enabling imprisonment of these young people to achieve its aim of rehabilitation. (See Section 6.5.11.)

5.3 Particular issues requiring a response - Secretariat

There are no particular issues that the Board wishes to bring to the Secretariat's attention.

5.4 Particular issues of concern or excellence not requiring a response

All issues of concern are included in Sections 5.1 and 5.2 above.

The Board is aware of much good work throughout the prison. It draws special attention to the following matters:

- The extremely effective transition from one Governor to another at the end of October ensured that no momentum was lost in the continuing task of maintaining – and where possible enhancing – standards. It reflected well on both of them.
- As in a local prison prisoners working in the kitchens change frequently, it is greatly to the credit of the Catering Department that an Inspection by Gloucestershire County Council resulted in 5 stars being awarded in recognition of the quality of food preparation and storage. (See Section 7.2.1.)
- Within the Learning and Skills area, the Library staff deserve credit for encouraging reading with such effectiveness – even though there were gaps in personnel – that the prison won the national ‘Six Book Challenge’. (See Section 6.2.8.) A range of other staff contributed successfully towards prisoners’ achieving several awards in the annual Koestler competitions. (See Section 6.2.11.)
- The continual increase in the range and standard of overall medical care available at a time of organisational flux reflects very well on all those concerned. External recognition came, for example, in a second member of staff, the team leader for treatment of Substance Misuse, being appointed a Queen’s Nurse (out of a total of about 200 nationally); in the Clinical Services Manager being shortlisted for a Butler Trust Prison Award; and in an external report noting that HMP Gloucester was “...further forward with alcohol services than many other prisons” and that its “level of commitment...to an effective (drug) treatment system and willingness to work at partnerships is noteworthy in comparison to other prisons”. (See Section 6.3.2.)
- The commitment and imagination shown by the Physical Education team in expanding its programme, despite very limited out of door facilities, were rewarded by high satisfaction levels among prisoners. Of particular note were the three Family Days that it organised. (See Section 7.5.6.)
- The work forging partnerships within Gloucestershire for the delivery of Restorative Justice led to the prison’s project leader being shortlisted for a Butler Trust Prison Award.
- The often-unremarked but invaluable support given by Listeners and Insiders, backed by Samaritans, is important in helping to ensure ‘safer custody’ in a busy local prison, often receiving new prisoners into very unfamiliar surroundings. (See Section 6.4.7.)

- Though the staff working in the Segregation Unit are used to having to deal with difficult situations, this year their patience, tenacity and forbearance have been outstanding in dealing with two long-stay and very difficult prisoners, who from time to time were involved in assaults on staff and in dirty protests.

5.5. Overall Judgement

5.5.1 This has been a challenging year for HMP Gloucester. Some of the challenges have been common to the Prison Service as a whole - structural changes affecting staffing, a plethora of policy initiatives and significant budget cuts – though individual circumstances at HMP Gloucester have meant that the impact has been particularly heavy at times. Such circumstances include having had on payroll a large number of senior staff in a disappearing grade, the loss of much experience in a short time through various early severance schemes, an unusual incidence of long-term sickness (including of several key staff), and the inherent problems of managing old premises with manifold limitations.

5.5.2 In facing these challenges, the prison has been fortunate that it has benefited, as for several years past, from generally good staff-prisoner relationships and a management and workforce that has tried to work together professionally. There have been some slippages (as formally reflected in the reduced grading), though by and large those slippages have been in matters readily corrected. However, against those elements have to be set the range of achievements that have gained external recognition, the various initiatives taken forward when it must have been tempting at times to let heads drop, and the unspectacular day to day interactions between staff and prisoners that determine the tone of a prison. In those important matters HMP Gloucester scores well. Yet it is undoubtedly being held back.

5.5.3 What holds it back above all is the lack of adequate investment. The Board realises that to point to the need for greater investment in the present economic climate may seem unrealistic, but there is a highly practical reason for doing so. The Direct Resource Expenditure on HMP Gloucester for 2010-11 was roughly £9 million and not far short of £12 million when overall expenditure (including centrally borne costs) was taken into account. The comparable costs per prisoner were just over £32,000 (in Direct Resources) and some £52,000 (in Overall Costs). This huge expenditure provides for the containment of prisoners (sometimes referred to as 'warehousing'), but only in living accommodation which in several aspects is demeaning and in a wider prison environment where the facilities currently offer disappointingly little opportunity to work towards rehabilitation. If the prison is to provide the best possible return on public expenditure, it needs to be enabled to shift its emphasis and increase those opportunities. Over much of the year, preliminary work has been undertaken on a possible way of adapting the role of HMP Gloucester to allow such changes to occur. If that (or some other scheme to achieve the same aim) were to be brought to fulfilment, though undoubtedly there would be substantial start up costs, the money provided year by year for HMP Gloucester might no longer be largely repetitive expenditure on imprisonment, often followed by re-offending, but a worthwhile investment in rehabilitation. A successful outcome there would benefit society both financially and socially.

SECTION 6 Areas that must be reported on

6.1 Equality

6.1.1 Staff with special responsibilities operate a variety of monitoring programmes and initiatives which focus on the key issues to provide fairness and equality within a diverse establishment. The Equalities Officer ensures Equalities Information appropriate to HMP Gloucester is distributed to all prisoners during induction. Any issues concerning Race, Disability or Age disclosed on admission are referred by Reception Staff to the relevant department and actively pursued. Equality training for all staff through the "Challenge It Change It" programme is frequently available. An annual Black History Month, to raise awareness, is organised with quizzes and special menus (see also Section 7.2.1).

6.1.2 PSI 32/2011 has allowed HMP Gloucester more flexibility in the way the Equality Action Plan is managed. The Equality Action team led by the Deputy Governor has reviewed the purpose, aim, and membership of the group and has ensured a clear and positive lead on the operational management of equality.

6.1.3 Wing managers are now responsible for dealing with Discrimination Incident Report Forms (DIRFs) which have replaced Racial Incident Forms (RIFs). This empowerment has emphasised their responsibilities and refocused awareness. The DIRFs are quality controlled on completion by the Equality Officer. The number of DIRFs has decreased in comparison with the RIFs despite covering a wider spectrum of diversity. There have been 21 DIRFs since the inception of the new system in mid-April 2011 to the end of November 2011.

6.1.4 Efforts have been made to ensure prisoners with mobility difficulties are not discriminated against because of access and hand rails have been fitted where possible. (See also Section 7.1.2 which refers to building problems and mobility issues in more detail.)

6.1.5 The United Kingdom Border Agency (UKBA) involvement in dealing with Foreign National issues continues to concern the Board with particular reference to deportation information being published in English only. The Criminal Casework Directorate (part of UKBA) no longer deals with Foreign National remand prisoners and long remands can immediately become deportation issues once sentenced. The Equality Officer works hard to try and overcome these difficulties as far as possible. All foreign nationals are offered legal aid with immigration specialist solicitors, and, the Board is informed, there are no issues arising over access to legal assistance.

6.2 Learning and Skills

6.2.1 The past year has been one of significant change in management structures. The post of Head of Interventions was created in anticipation of the retirement of the Head of Learning and Skills and areas previously managed separately under the respective titles of Regimes and Training and Education have been combined under one post holder with two FTE (full time equivalent) administrators. Specialist support is scheduled to be available from the Head of L&S at HMP Leyhill who will have responsibility for a cluster group which includes Gloucester. The Allocation Board set up in 2010 is now part of a refocused Activity Board with representation from all

departments. Its aim is to ensure that the learning programme of each prisoner is more individualized and cohesive.

6.2.2 Unfortunately, there have been some staffing difficulties which have impeded the rate of progress, most notably the struggle Tribal has had to deliver on its contract for the year, with only one worker (or relief) being available for many months.

Administrative pressures have also continued with an overall increase in the demand for data from the prison and this has resulted in Action for Employment (A4E) recruiting an additional part-time administrator to provide cover where necessary but funding for this post was provided for 2011 only. The move, early in the year, of the in-house senior A4E Manager from Gloucester to Exeter has put additional pressures on the A4E team.

6.2.3 Against this mixed background, the Board is pleased to be able to report several areas of progress, sometimes very substantial (one of the most marked, Physical Education, is reported separately in section 7.5).

6.2.4 Since the last HMCIP report noted weakness in relation to both the literacy and numeracy programmes, there has been just over a 6% improvement during the year in access to them. Moreover, during the academic year 2010-2011, a total of 1,149 qualifications were gained by 643 learners across the various assessment levels from 'Pre-Entry' to Level 2, an average of 1.7 per learner. A4E met all internal targets set as well as those of the Skills Funding Agency (SFA), and HMP Gloucester.

6.2.5 4 Gym orderlies gained NVQ Level 2 in Business Administration and 10 prisoners NVQ Level 1 in Health and Safety. (See also Section 7.5.5). However, it is disappointing to note that two new courses planned for September 2011 and leading to National Vocational Qualifications in laundry and library work have not yet been introduced. The course on Driving Awareness resulted in a commendable achievement rate of 91.8% (which would have been even higher had 3 prisoners not left the prison before the course ended).

6.2.6 Rota reports have consistently recorded prisoners' praise for the Art, Pottery, and Cookery classes and throughout the prison the interaction between tutors and prisoners is noted as excellent.

6.2.7 The 'Toe by Toe' help with reading scheme introduced last year has, this year, thanks to external funding obtained by the Shannon Trust, been uniquely able to offer small financial incentives to prisoners. As a local prison in which most prisoners stay for only short periods, Gloucester offers for the most part only a first step on the learning ladder. However, the scheme has been promoted well and prisoners have been encouraged to join. For a period, there was a staffing difficulty with only one officer available for a maximum of 3 hours a week, but latterly the position has been eased by the appointment of another officer to provide cover for his periods of leave or night duty.

6.2.8 Associated work to improve and encourage prisoner literacy is carried out in the prison Library. A particular success this year was the "Six Book Challenge" scheme that led to over 200 prisoners achieving success, a figure that made HMP Gloucester the leading prison in the country. The prize was the provision of a one day Creative Writing workshop and this was run on 9 October by Marcus Moore and Sara-Jane Arbury. The Library Service is provided by the Gloucestershire County Council and, though the prison library's budget was maintained for the year, there have been gaps in the

provision of a library assistant because of council's budgetary pressures. In addition to library closures (see also Section 7.7.4) this has meant that the 'Family Time' initiative, which involved prisoners producing illustrated booklets for their families, has remained on hold since mid 2009.

6.2.9 Other work by the Library resulted in awards of poetry books given to 10 prisoners with 3 receiving cash gifts as a result of the successful completion of a Library Survey in April.

6.2.10 In addition to work focused particularly on the needs of prisoners with comparatively limited literacy skills, work has gone on nearer the other end of the spectrum. Of particular note has been the Diversity course set up in response to requests from prisoners to learn more about different beliefs, cultures and value systems. This last year has seen its availability extended to prisoners within the Vulnerable Prisoner Unit and its success can, to an extent, be measured by overall achievements during the last academic year coming out at 73.47% against a target figure of 62%.

6.2.11 National recognition of other work of particularly high quality has been achieved as a result of the Koestler Awards scheme which culminates in the Annual Koestler Exhibition in London of "Art by Offenders and Secure Patients". This year prisoners at HMP Gloucester gained 5 Highly Commended certificates, 2 Bronze Awards, 1 Silver Award and 1 Gold Award.

6.2.12 Overall, in several ways the picture of what is being achieved in this area is encouraging with clear signs of how dedication and initiatives by staff at all levels have enabled progress to be made in difficult circumstances. However, the Board continues to be aware of issues that need attention; some of them have been mentioned in earlier paragraphs. There are others that are equally – and sometimes more – important. The work in the Enterprise Workshop on the renovation of bicycles that go to the underprivileged at home and abroad continues to be outstanding, but it is worrying that often the workshop has been underused, largely because of complex staffing issues (though there is presently promise of their resolution) and that, when government policy emphasizes the importance of fitting prisoners for meaningful employment on release, HMP Gloucester has only a single workshop. It is unsatisfactory that, largely because of staffing issues, courses available to vulnerable prisoners are restricted and often conducted in a restricted and under equipped general circulation area. It is unsatisfactory, too, that the main Learning and Skills area is cramped and has inadequate disability access. The Board recognizes that solving many of these problems means spending money, but if the government's policy goals as laid out by the Justice Secretary are to be achieved it is money that needs to be spent.

6.3 Healthcare and Mental Health

6.3.1 On the 1st May 2011 IDTS and prison healthcare was transferred to the Specialist Mental Health Trust, 2gether NHS Foundation Trust. The 2gether Trust was already responsible for In-Reach, the Secondary Mental Health Team at the prison. This was in line with the HMCIP recommendation following a visit in August 2010. The integration of In-Reach into one mental health team providing both primary and secondary mental health services took place in October 2011. The consultative paper proposed that the Community Psychiatric Nurses (CPNs), formally working with In-Reach, be ring fenced

to work with secondary mental health work within the Mental Health Team. There have been changes to key staff due to the reorganisation. Consequently, the Board is concerned that the good practice and excellent work by In-Reach, remarked on in the Board's last report and again this year (see 6.3.17-19), is continued under the new arrangement.

6.3.2 The Board is pleased to report that a second member of the Healthcare Team, the team leader for Substance Misuse, has been awarded the title "Queen's Nurse" in addition to the Clinical Service Manager for Offender Health (formerly titled Head of Service). To have two Queen's Nurses in the same establishment is exceptional; there are less than 200 in the whole country. In addition, the Clinical Service Manager for Offender Health has been short listed for a Butler Trust prison award. A report, dated September 2011, commissioned by Gloucester Drug and Alcohol Team (DAAT) summarised its findings: "The level of commitment from management and staff at HMP Gloucester to an effective treatment system and their willingness to work at partnerships is noteworthy in comparison to other prisons".

6.3.3 The difficulties with staff shortages, which have featured in previous Board reports, have again been evident during the report year. The principal difficulty this time has been the number of staff on long and short term sick leave; this has not been easy to accommodate. For example, in October 2011, the team was short of one Registered Mental Health Nurse (RMHN), one IDTS Nurse and four Healthcare Assistants. This has meant that team leaders have had to divert to general clinical work in order to maintain targets.

6.3.4 It is therefore praiseworthy that the overall picture of Healthcare Standards as measured through Prison Health Performance and Quality Indicators (PHPQI), has continued to show a high standard of performance – 28 Green and 3 Amber ratings in May 2011. In one amber rating, healthcare environment, there has been considerable improvement and the rating for Hepatitis B was affected by staff shortages, but later returned to green rating. The General Health Assessment requirement to be within 48 hours for a green rating was not always adhered to on account of staffing difficulties.

6.3.5 The conversion of the 3 bed cell in the Assessment and Treatment Unit to a suite for day care support and group activity, through a Kings Fund award, has finally been completed, and made a considerable difference to the facilities available.

6.3.6 The Board is pleased to report that the considerable problems with Dentistry provision, described in last year's report, have been resolved. The dental room has been refurbished and air conditioning installed, making a much better working environment – so reported to the Board by the dentist. Applications to the Board concerning dentistry have diminished considerably. An analysis of those received refers to delay in repeat or secondary treatment – PHPQI had shown 64 waiting but these had been seen and awaiting further treatment. As a consequence, waiting lists were split into urgent and ongoing treatment and the backlog reduced.

6.3.7 The development of the Pharmacy Service has been hindered by the fact that the present pharmacist does not work from the pharmacy where the medicines are dispensed. A new pharmacist appointment, which would remedy the situation, has been delayed awaiting security clearance.

6.3.8 The introduction by the Patient Advice Liaison Service (PALS) of the 4 Cs (Comments, Complaints, Compliments and Concerns) process was a welcome expansion of the service which gives a simple, clear, pathway for prisoners to utilise. In the 1st quarter of the year there was 1 complaint, 1 compliment and 4 concerns – the latter predominately about medication. This is not unexpected considering the change of prescriber and the prison healthcare preference for non-opiate medication (as mentioned in the Board's last report). Separately analysed, the In-Reach team received 8 compliments and no complaints. A visiting TB specialist nurse praised the nursing staff for care given to a patient, who echoed that the staff had been "very helpful".

6.3.9 The number of clinics provided has increased over the year and, in October 2011, evening groups for Alcohol Anonymous and Narcotics Anonymous were introduced. The range of other clinics includes: Older Prisoners; Coronary Vascular; Diabetes; Epilepsy; Korsakoff psychosis; Veterans; and Alcohol.

6.3.10 As noted in last year's report, the number of alcohol referrals has seen a significant increase, and the numbers of detoxification reflect a continuing escalation from 2010 (an average over the first six months of 2011 of 26 per month against 21 per month in 2010). This may be attributed to a scarcity of heroin on the street.

6.3.11 An implemented alcohol treatment pathway includes detailed intervention on the first night in custody and the first full day of custody. This encompasses a full medical and nursing assessment and initial care plan to include a prescribing regime and referral to alcohol support services. It is followed by access to psychosocial and clinical interventions which include referral to external specialities and long term prescribing. This amounts to a substantial improvement in provision, considering that two years ago there was little of substance due to lack of recognition and funding. The DAAT report (September 2011 see above 6.3.2) commented: "...HMP Gloucester is already further forward with alcohol services than many other prisons."

6.3.12 Nurses trained in prescribing have implemented medication reviews and 1st night prescribing for Alcohol Detoxification. This has had a positive effect on GP workload with a knock-on beneficial effect on service to prisoners. In addition, the development of Nurse prescribing, including IDTS 1st night prescribing, has reduced expenditure. The poor performance of GEOAmev, the new contractor for prison transfers, has adversely affected these well serviced procedures by the lateness of reception to HMP Gloucester requiring staff to be processing new prisoners past midnight.

6.3.13 A Reception Pathway for older prisoners (50+) provides assessment of needs for assistance with personal care, any special dietary requirements, medication and other more detailed care instructions necessary to ensure optimal wellbeing while in prison. In addition, immediate needs for first night– e.g. ground floor location, emergency considerations, equipment needed, and the risk of falls – are considered and, where necessary, are communicated to staff. Remedial work is carried out in the gymnasium, incorporating healthcare staff and gymnasium trainers.

6.3.14 The substance misuse service is provided by the Counselling, Advice, Referral and Throughcare System (CARATS) team and the Integrated Drug Treatment System scheme (IDTS). Broadly, the CARATS team provides the prison psychosocial substance misuse service, focussing on comprehensive assessment and review, and ongoing case management. The team arranges effective Throughcare and direct

delivery of psychosocial, therapeutic and other interventions. It has an average caseload of 120. IDTS provides the prison substance misuse clinical services, managed within Healthcare and largely focused on clinical management of substance dependency through substitute and withdrawal prescribing. CARATS and IDTS teams are relatively well integrated, effective and well regarded – the 28 day group work programme is co-delivered. These services are not delivered in isolation, but rely on the input from both Primary Healthcare and from prison staff (4 out of the 9 CARATS team are prison staff).

6.3.15 A prisoner survey (albeit of a small, 37, sample) gave positive feedback on both clinical and CARATS services. CARATS also has good links with the main Drug Interventions Programme (DIP), particularly Gloucestershire's. First appointments on release run at 86%, high in relation to other prisons. The DAAT report (September 2011 see above 6.3.2) concludes that "... the substance misuse treatment system at HMP Gloucester is of a high standard".

6.3.16 As a local prison, with mainly short stay prisoners (only 7% of all prisoners are likely to be at HMP Gloucester for over 6 months), the immediate emphasis is on stabilisation and effective continuity of care back to the community or to other prisons. The figures, based on the average of January 2010 to June 2011, show 528 stabilisations (the moderating and control of withdrawal symptoms for a given period of time) per year, 218 detoxifications per year and 343 maintenance (maintained on substitute opiate medication) per year. The opportunities for promoting and supporting recovery and abstinence would be enhanced by the creation of a Drug Recovery Wing., though given the pressure on space within the prison this may not be a priority.

6.3.17 The Primary Mental Health team has continued to have a high demand for its services. In July, it was noted that the waiting list was 14 and that the target of being seen in two weeks was not feasible. It took up to four weeks. Nevertheless the team has increased the number of clinics during the year - from 6 clinics in January up to 11 in June 2011.

6.3.18 Provision of Secondary Mental Health (severe mental illness plus learning disabilities) supplied by the In-Reach team up to integration (see 6.3.1) has continued to score 90 % in the audit of its Care Programme Approach (CPA). Referrals for the year to August 2011 were 352 and an average caseload of 25. The referrals were screened within 3 working days, often sooner. The links with IDTS, CARATS, OMU and external agencies, including the court diversion team, were maintained and put to good use with some very difficult cases during the year. Considerable persistence was needed to get a particular prisoner into the right therapeutic environment. As last year, there were again instances where the practice of keeping contact, as appropriate, with released patients enabled a speedy handling of cases because of the detailed knowledge held.

6.3.19 The well established Safer Custody Group has continued to be a valuable resource, recognised outside the prison. The lead Mental Health organiser has been invited to make a presentation on the group's work and significance for the prison population to the South West Offender Forum. A vital part in maintaining the group effectiveness has been the access to an external doctor to facilitate group supervision. (See also section 6.4).

6.3.20 The Health Promotion Action Group (HPAG) has sought to build the physical, mental and social health of prisoners (and staff, where appropriate) as part of a whole

prison approach in line with PSO 3200 (Health Promoting Prisons: a shared approach). The group has included representatives from all major departments of the prison, including Healthcare, representatives of the Primary Care Trust, Mental Health Services, Physical Education, Safer Custody, Catering; and the Prisoner Consultative Committee. The group is chaired by the Head of Reducing Re-Offending. 5 areas have been identified for assessment and intervention: mental health promotion and well-being; smoking cessation; healthy eating nutrition; healthy lifestyles (including sex and relationships); drug and other substance misuse.

6.3.21 Although there has been progress in the above fields – e.g. smoking cessation has been awarded funds and has met its targets; a staff well-being day has taken place and a similar day is proposed for prisoners - there has been apparent duplication with other groups taking place in the prison. This has inhibited the progress of the HPAG. In June 2011, the newly appointed head of Reducing Re-offending set out a clear pathway for the HPAG. It would be concerned, not with strategic matters, but focus on the day to day operational delivery of the target areas within the prison, and then report via the chair to the Reducing Re-offending Strategy Group. The Board expects these changes to provide greater clarity and impetus for targeting health promotion.

6.4 Safer Custody

6.4.1 The Violence Reduction and Safer Custody Management Team meets monthly under the chairmanship of the Governor and includes senior staff from all areas, a Listener, and representatives from the Samaritans and GEOAmey (Escort provider).

6.4.2 The team considers reports on violence reduction, aspects of safer custody and there is a constant review of the Continuous Improvement Plan. This plan is the framework enabling closer monitoring and is an important part in ensuring that the prison's Suicide and Self Harm Policy is fully implemented.

6.4.3 The Safer Custody Support Group (SCS) meets every week and VPs meet every two weeks. The SCS Groups provide peer group support and are optional, but staff can refer prisoners as part of the care map process within ACCT procedures. They provide prisoners with coping strategies. (See also Section 6.3.19).

6.4.4 The anti-bullying programme has been updated and this is used as a tool to monitor identified bullies. Within this programme there is a Victim Support Document which is used to support vulnerable victims.

6.4.5 The incidence of self harming is now on average 7 per month (the most common self-harm being cutting and scratching), a decrease on last year's average figure of 11.

6.4.6 Two prisoners are trained to be part of the Induction process (Insiders) and work on A Wing (the Induction Wing) to help new prisoners integrate. They are also available to the VPU. Their role is to deal with immediate routine issues and also to give new prisoners an insight into the manner in which equality issues are resolved within the prison, using a briefing prepared by the Equalities Officer.

6.4.7 The Samaritans train suitable prisoners to act as 'Listeners'. They are available day and night to listen and talk to prisoners needing support whether on the wings, in the special-equipped Listeners' Suite, in Healthcare or the VPU. A Listener gives an oral report to the Violence Reduction and Safer Custody Management meetings and two Listeners work permanently in Reception. The prison currently has seven trained Listeners but recognises the need for further suitable prisoners to be trained. The prison also recognises the invaluable help given by the Samaritans via a direct line facility and in training and debriefing Listeners.

6.4.8 ACCT records are reviewed on every rota by Board members and IMB attendance at reviews has increased, though is not invariable. There has been some welcome improvement in the attendance of appropriate staff.

6.4.9 A new ACCT training programme has been instigated across the establishment since April. Care-map training is part of this initiative and is resulting in an overall improvement in the ACCT documents. This was recognised in the recent audit where a Green/Amber score was given. An interactive ACCT guide is available on the intranet for all staff.

6.4.10 In November 2011, after a period of only occasional meetings, it was decided that the Prisoner Consultative Committee would meet on a monthly basis, attended by staff from the Wings, Healthcare, Finance, Kitchen, OMU, Gymnasium together with prisoner representatives from the three wings. There is a new Chairman, all aspects of prison life are now considered, and prisoners listened to attentively.

6.4.11 Three deaths in custody have occurred during the period covered by this report (1st December 2010 to 30th November 2011). No inquests have taken place although one report has been received from the Prison Probation Ombudsman (PPO) about the one death from natural causes in hospital. The prison is still waiting for the final PPO reports for the remaining two incidents. The long outstanding inquests dating from April 2005 and April 2008 are to be held in February 2012 and the Board is pleased to note that the prison will be contacting the families concerned via the Families Liaison Officer (FLO) to offer support after a particularly long and stressful interval for all concerned.

6.5 Segregation, Vulnerable Prisoner and Young Offender Units.

6.5.1 As noted in previous reports the Segregation Unit and the VPU are staffed by the same officers and are both housed on the first floor of B Wing (B1) with only a security door and metal partition between them. There is a similar joint staffing arrangement on the second floor (B2) where, on one side of the landing, those VPs for whom there is insufficient accommodation on B1 are housed, and on the other side, in facing cells, is the main area for YOs. The staff on B2 are also responsible for adult prisoners on the third floor (B3). Because of considerable overlaps in the arrangements for the various groups of prisoners on B1 and B2, this section covers all three groups. The issues of concern are, in essence, very similar to those raised in previous reports and, if for that reason now spelt out more briefly, are certainly no less serious.

6.5.2 The Segregation Unit has only 4 cells which are rather dark and gloomy. There is still no dedicated shower or telephone or exercise yard, so segregated prisoners only have access to these facilities when VPs are on exercise or locked up and staff can be spared from VP supervision.

6.5.3 In its last report the Board expressed its concern over the amount of time a small number of prisoners remained in segregation. These prisoners are often (officially) described as having “personality disorders”. In the past year, 2 of the available cells in the unit were continually occupied by long-term very difficult prisoners because it proved impossible for them to return to normal location for any length of time. Board members attended reviews where a careful programme of re-integration into a normal wing was prepared, only for the programme to be thwarted by the prisoner becoming violent when returned. In one case, serious injury was caused to a member of Healthcare. In another, though the prisoner was eventually moved to another prison, it was not before he had assaulted every member of the Segregation Unit staff.

6.5.4 The Board has throughout been impressed by the patience, tenacity and forbearance of the staff in contact with these prisoners, even when (as on several occasions during the year) they have been on ‘dirty protest. In calmer moments the same prisoners have frequently praised their treatment in the Unit. However, the Board has found it difficult to understand, discounting necessary time awaiting court appearances, why these prisoners remained so long in this small local prison, despite considerable efforts by the prison management to move them, including representations to the Deputy Director (Custody). The Board was informed in one case that a move could not be arranged to an appropriate prison because the prisoner involved was undergoing a long process of detoxification. As drug use is prevalent throughout the estate, the Board wonders why the necessary expertise is not universally available. The present arrangements seem unfair both to staff and to prisoners.

6.5.5 Board involvement in Segregation reviews continues to be patchy (see Appendix B for statistics). Reviews are not held at fixed times and on several occasions have been re-arranged at very short notice, making IMB attendance very difficult, if not impossible.

6.5.6 The Segregation Standardisation and Tariff meeting takes place quarterly and has become what is known elsewhere in the prison service as the SMARG (Segregation Monitoring and Review Group). It focuses on adjudication statistics and segregation data, which enables senior staff to monitor consistency in the adjudication process and review the use of segregation. Though the meeting has been well-chaired and business-like and of late has been more fully attended by very senior staff, for a variety of reasons there have continued to be errors in the statistical data presented. However, the Board is pleased to note that recent meetings have given attention to issues raised by prisoners.

6.5.7 The VPs on B2 away from the main VPU continue to suffer disadvantages and have to accept a yet more limited regime than would otherwise be the case. They have fewer opportunities to be out of their cells and sometimes complain about lack of association. They also have fewer opportunities to have contact with specialist staff on B1. Moreover, the Board is disappointed to note that the practice of marking VPs’ cell cards with a red line crept back towards the end of the reporting year, thus enabling YO’s and other prisoners out and about on the wing to identify where VPs are located. There were several occasions during the summer when VPs were reported to have been

subjected to shouting and taunts by YOs and the practice of card-marking does nothing to make such behaviour less frequent.

6.5.8 It is not only those VPs on B2 that are disadvantaged. Those in the main VPU also have a more limited regime and more limited facilities than other prisoners. There is still only one phone on B1, a situation which leads to frequent comments to the IMB about phone access. Though it is good that education classes (art, IT etc) now take place regularly in the VPU, the environment is often quite noisy and not conducive to learning, because other interactions with individual prisoners are taking place in the same area at the same time.

6.5.9 There has been on-going confusion about the organisation of the Vulnerable Prisoner review. Until early 2010, it took place on a weekly basis, with each prisoner having his VP status reviewed each month, with the opportunity to discuss any issues or problems. In 2010 this system was replaced by reviews for prisoners on B2 landing only, ie for those not accommodated on the main VPU and without regular access to trained VPU staff. During 2011 these reviews became more and more erratic and there was been confusion amongst staff about their status and whether or not they should be conducted as segregation reviews. There often was no governor available to conduct the reviews as scheduled and so they rarely took place at the time listed in the prison weekly bulletin. Sometimes they took place without IMB presence even when the IMB member on duty was in the prison and ready to attend.

6.5.10 The Board recognises the complexities of the management of B1 and appreciates the quality of the work done by the staff, particularly in the light of the long-term, very difficult prisoners in the Segregation Unit during the year. Prisoners in the VPU nearly always speak very positively about wing staff and, when asked, praise the way they have been treated. However, there have been issues over staffing the VPU and several occasions when staff from other areas had to be drafted in, putting considerable strain on the one experienced officer on duty. In addition, during the year the number of officers on duty at weekends was reduced from 3 to 2. This reduction can cause extra problems in managing both the VPU and the Segregation Units, for example if VPs are out on exercise and there are prisoners in the Segregation Unit requiring a two-man unlock. The Board continues to be dissatisfied with the lack of separate VP and Segregation Units and believes that the present arrangements are inconsistent with the Prison Service's fairness and respect agenda.

6.5.11 For most of the year there have been between 12 and 16 YOs accommodated on B2 wing, opposite the overflow VP cells. There are obvious difficulties for the staff having to deal with 3 distinct populations and regimes on one landing (VPs and YOs on B2 and ordinary adult prisoners on B3). As stated in many previous reports, the Board continues to have concerns about YOs being in HMP Gloucester. As a minimum, they clearly should not be sharing a landing with VPs. In the Board's view this is an inappropriate location for YOs whose needs are different from those of other prisoners. HMP Gloucester is not able to provide the appropriate facilities for this age group, particularly as there is far too little purposeful activity on offer. This means they are likely to get the wrong idea about what being in prison means and assume that it is normal to lie in bed and watch TV for much of the time. This lack of activity can also lead to disruptive behaviour when they emerge from their cells and there have been a number of incidents of fighting. The Government's strategy for "Breaking the Cycle" recognises that young adult offenders are particularly vulnerable, a vulnerability that shows in persistently high

levels of reoffending. Their experience at Gloucester is not - perhaps, given the facilities available, cannot be – sufficiently geared to their rehabilitation.

SECTION 7 Other areas on which the Board has matters to report

7.1 Accommodation

7.1.1 The Board again cannot report any real progress with the number of issues it has outlined over the years. There have been considerable efforts to ameliorate the appearance of the estate which the Board welcomes, and there have been improvements, detailed below, which have enhanced the day to day living conditions to some extent. However, these are no substitute for the radical refurbishment of the prison which, from the Prison Minister's comprehensive letter dated 26th April 2011, appears to be further away than ever. The plan to provide new accommodation to replace C Wing has been effectively shelved.

7.1.2 In response to last year's report the Prisons Minister acknowledged that the reception area "is not ideally located on the first floor", but stated that there were no current plans to change the situation, a retreat from previously stated aspirations. The Board agrees that the reception staff are at pains to mitigate the problems of mobility, but there are problems elsewhere with only one chairlift available, in the Healthcare Centre; with the movement constraints in the L&S block where most of the activity areas and classrooms are upstairs where the corridor is too narrow to allow a wheelchair to be readily manoeuvred; and potentially for any YO with mobility difficulties who needed to be moved from accommodation on B2 to necessary appointments and activities. (See also Section 6.1.4.) As such, this hardly meets the standards of equality that should exist in a prison which is duty bound to take in whoever the Courts, at short notice, send to custody.

7.1.3 Considerable work has been done to the recesses in C Wing (a "huge improvement" reported by a Board member) which were in a very poor condition, and improvements made to the fire precautions. The general look of the wing has been markedly enhanced. However the fundamental problems with the fabric of the wing remain. Frequent applications of paint only peel and stain after a short time – piping outside the staff office is an example. The ceiling of the shower room is peeling extensively, the whole room is damp and mouldy and would seem a potential breeding ground for unhealthy organisms – all this despite the best efforts of the works department.

7.1.4 The Board agrees with the Minister that "...it remains the case that the replacement or full refurbishment of C Wing would provide the best solution in terms of delivering sanitation facilities..." and the more cogent, previously reported statement of the now-retired Governor that "Night san must go". The most recent report by Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons (HMCIP), on an inspection in August 2010, stated that "all prisoners should have 24-hour access to toilet facilities". Although the regime for access to toilet facilities at night has been made more flexible, it remains dependant on the system working. However, the Board recorded a failure in this system for 2 hours in July. It may have been caused by a prisoner's action, but this does not alter the basic inherent problem that the system cannot guarantee access to such facilities when needed.

7.1.5 The Board reiterates its concern that prisoners on A and B Wings have to eat their meals in cells that contain their toilets. The provision of a screen, even the officially sanctioned screen, in a cramped cell originally designed for single occupancy is not adequate to mitigate the problem. The Board is concerned that the issue receives scant acknowledgement, considering that these arrangements are inconsistent with the Government and Prison Service's longstanding decency agenda.

7.1.6 Accommodating YOs in a small local prison with no green space and limited facilities continues to be problematic, despite the efforts of staff to compensate, particularly through enhanced gymnasium opportunities. Although efforts have been made to reduce the numbers, the inherent difficulties of having YOs and VPs on the same landing of B Wing have continued to be apparent. (See also Sections 6.5.7 and 6.5.10).

7.1.7 The temporary chapel accommodation, necessary after serious problems in the roof of the original chapel, has now been deemed permanent (see Section 7.3.1). The original chapel building which provided easily the largest room space in the prison, has, following the extensive repairs, been converted to give much needed facilities for prisoner induction, basic learning skills assessments, careers and information advice, housing advice, discharge boards, and workshops. The Board welcomes this initiative, but remains concerned that the use of this space is not being maximised. (See also Section 6.2.12).

7.1.8 While recognising the limitation of the physical layout of the prison and much excellent work of staff in the Segregation Unit and VPU, the Board continues to be concerned that B1 Wing contains both the units on the same landing, separated by a door. The regime of the VPU is necessarily affected as prisoners in the Segregation share the same shower and telephone facilities. In addition the adjudication room is within the segregation area and there are times when the staff office situated in the VPU is closed and prisoners necessarily locked in their cell because of staff's requirement to be dealing with adjudications, or dealing with prisoners in the Segregation Unit. Staff pressures and stress in B1 were recorded in members' reports during the year. (See also Sections 6.5.4 and 6.5.10).

7.2 Catering and Kitchens

7.2.1 The Catering Manager and his staff continue to work hard to produce menus that cater for all dietary requirements, maintain as good a range of choices as possible within the imposed constraints, and follow good practices in food preparation and storage. In March 2011 the kitchen was inspected by Gloucestershire County Council and awarded five stars – the highest grade. Appropriate menus are planned and special meals produced for all major festivals, including Black History Month.

7.2.2 In consequence of all this professionalism and mindful of the financial constraints now being placed upon the Prison and other public services, prisoners often express their appreciation of the standard of the food compared to that they have experienced in other prisons. Very few adverse comments are received through applications to the Board or in other ways. More typical was the comment of one prisoner that the food was "Gloucester's finest".

7.2.3 Against these positive features have to be set some worrying developments. Replacing the hot lunchtime meal with baguettes and soup and ending weekend cooked

breakfasts in several respects are regarded as retrograde steps. In a prison where most men have to eat their meals in a shared cell in close proximity to their curtained off toilet, a further reduction in the quality of mealtimes is hard to defend. The changes do not produce any significant savings in the costs of ingredients (the savings are almost entirely in staffing) and the Board is, therefore, concerned that any future reductions in the funding of ingredients might well reduce the quality and/or quantity of prisoners' food.

7.2.4 This risk has to be seen against the background of rising prices of basic commodities and a catering budget cut of £16,000. Balancing the catering budget is a major problem for the Catering Manager. It is therefore all the more regrettable that prisons now have little opportunity to shop around for better value at local level, given the restraints of the contract with 3663, which drew adverse comments in last year's report.

7.3 Chaplaincy

7.3.1 The temporary chapel, used following the serious damage found in the roof of the original chapel, has been made permanent, with the agreement of the Chaplaincy. It is of sufficient size for its congregation and has been equipped with good facilities for Muslim attendees. There are usually around 20 Muslim prisoners in the prison at any one time, although not all of them are practising. In mid-2011 the chaplains moved out of their rather cramped office inside the chapel into a more spacious office next door (the former induction room). This has provided space for storage of materials and has made it easier to hold confidential discussions and meetings when required.

7.3.2 For much of the year the Chaplaincy has again been operating on temporary arrangements after the Anglican chaplain left at Easter. Although a new Anglican chaplain has been recruited, there have been lengthy delays in getting CTC security clearance. Mormon and Buddhist chaplains are also awaiting clearance. Sikh and Jehovah's Witness chaplains are now available after getting CTC clearance.

7.3.3 Occasional issues have arisen relating to getting prisoners to services on time and comments have been made that this depends on which officers are on duty. Female chaplains have sometimes felt unable to stay in the chapel area alone due to the lack of adequate security alarms.

7.3.4 In November, the chaplaincy team helped organise Gloucester Cathedral's annual Prisons Week service and supported the display of the Forgiveness Project exhibition there.

7.4 Effects of the Financial Climate

7.4.1 It has become a common theme in the Board's Annual Reports to state that recurring financial constraints have restricted what can be achieved at HMP Gloucester in pursuit of successive governments' goals of ensuring fairness and respect for people in custody and – now with fresh emphasis - significant purposeful activity for all. The issues concerning residential accommodation are well-known (see Sections 7.1.3, 7.1.4, 7.1.9) but some conditions become no more acceptable simply because of financial circumstances. The pursuit of purposeful activity is greatly circumscribed by the facilities available: a restricted site, a single workshop and limiting Learning and Skills

accommodation (see 7.1.2). If policy is to become reality, capital expenditure at Gloucester is essential.

7.4.2 The Board also has concerns about the results of constraints on the prison's operating budget. It pointed out last year that the prison's operating budget was set on the assumption that all the changes needed for the implementation in 2014 of a slimmer management structure would be made during 2010. It concluded then that there was a lack of realism in the assumption, but the impact of that flaw has, sadly, continued into the present reporting year. The reason is that, as staffing costs are by far the largest element of the prison's expenditure and as, until a few months ago, there was no mechanism for substantially reducing them, other aspects of the prison's expenditure had to be cut. Even now, since the gradual implementation of a national voluntary early retirement scheme, the prison still has to meet the costs (albeit reducing) of an obsolescent higher grade.

7.4.3 In the financial period during which most of the IMB's reporting year falls, there has been a further 3% cut in the prison's budget, whilst staff yearly increments (built into salary scales) have added some 2% to the salary bill. Furthermore, the prison is too small to make the comparatively 'easy' savings that can be implemented through economies of scale. (These start, the Board understands, when a prison population reaches 500 or so).

7.4.4 In these difficult financial circumstances, savings at Gloucester have sometimes been made through slowing the replacement of staff, thus increasing the pressure on those remaining (see Sections 6.5.10 & 7.1.8). It speaks well for the staff and their representatives that they have been remarkably supportive of flexibility and pragmatism as a means of getting the work done. Their professional commitment, however, cannot hide some of the consequences of unduly stretched staffing. When there are big holes to fill in the staff daily detail, training commitments are likely to suffer and prisoner activities are likely to be cut (see also Section 7.7). Though cause and effect cannot readily be established, it is tempting to see the extended absence of several staff through stress as indicative, at least in part, of hard-to-bear work pressures. When there is a surge of applications to the IMB from prisoners relating to slow responses from applications made through the prison systems (see Appendix C) or on matters that, at other times, might well have been dealt with routinely by wing staff, it is at least possible that these features are indicative of staff with too much to do (see Section 8.8).

7.4.5 The Board is aware that sometimes the reduction of centrally imposed targets for prisons to meet is presented as an indication of central awareness of the need to give prisons more flexibility in fixing priorities in difficult financial circumstances. This may well be the intention, but if instead of targets there are Performance Indicators that have to be achieved and data that still has to be collected to satisfy higher authority, the realities may be different from the declared intention.

7.4.6 In sum, the Board is concerned that, while the Secretary of State's policy intentions as initially presented raised great hopes for a more effective use of prison, the present funding arrangements are unlikely to improve the effectiveness of HMP Gloucester and may even be inadequate to maintain some of the existing positive aspects.

7.5 Physical Education

7.5.1 The improved level of staffing and high level of leadership within the Physical Education Department have resulted in a greatly enhanced facility and regime available to prisoners.

7.5.2 36% of the users of the gym were between 18 and 40 years of age, with 43% being between 21 and 30. A detailed survey of prisoners has been undertaken which was completed by 42% of the prison population. Of these, 93.5% used the gym on average between 3 and 4 sessions per week. 95% said they used a gym when not in prison.

7.5.3 53% of respondents said that the facilities were excellent with a further 41% rating them as good. 100% said that the gym was a safe location and 98.5% thought that the staff gave good advice.

7.5.4 Comments within the survey included: "the cleanest gym in 36 prisons"; "In the 3 years that I have served here, the gym is so much better"; "I have lost 3 stone"; "the gym has helped my diabetes"; "The beginners sections have helped to give me confidence and am using the gym more often"; "I have lost 6 stone now and have reduced my weight to 18stone 5lbs".

7.5.5 4 Gym orderlies and 10 prisoners achieved a range of NVQ qualifications. (See Section 6.2.5).

7.5.6 In a novel initiative, three events took place which were classed as family days and prisoners were able to take their children into the gym and share in various activities/games that the staff had arranged. One prisoner even did a sponsored run on the running machine to raise funds for a family day.

7.5.7 Bearing in mind that approximately 80% of all prisoners at Gloucester are under 40 years of age, there are still limitations in the size of the accommodation. It is especially disappointing to find that the exercise yard surface area is still unsuitable for ball games, such as football. As reported last year, use is restricted to volleyball, basketball, kwik cricket and soft tennis.

7.5.8 The Department initiated staff fitness sessions during some lunch hour periods and although these were well attended at first, as is often the case for fitness regimes, interest quickly waned. However, in order to continue to maintain awareness, a wellbeing day was arranged when various health checks were offered, including blood pressure, cholesterol, diabetes, weight and BMI Index measurements. This was successful and much appreciated by the staff.

7.5.9 All told, the Board is greatly impressed with the activities of the staff within the Physical Education Department and their resourcefulness and imagination in developing facilities for prisoners.

7.6 Offender Management Unit

7.6.1 The Reducing Reoffending Strategy Group has been relaunched during the year with new terms of reference focused on determining the strategy, delivery processes and priorities for reducing reoffending. This multi-disciplinary group meets quarterly and has developed a strategy for 2011-12 based on the "7 Pathways" model (the 7 Pathways being Education, Training and Employment; Finance, Benefit and Debt; Drugs and Alcohol; Attitudes, Thinking and Behaviour; Accommodation; Children and Families; and Mental and Physical Health). A research study and needs analysis was conducted in 2010-11 and highlighted employment as being the highest area of need, with 39% of those surveyed being deemed to have a serious need in this area. The finance, benefit and debt pathway emerged as the second highest need area with 31% of those surveyed having a serious need.

7.6.2 A "Drop-in" Centre started weekly in November, based in the Old Chapel and giving advice on accommodation and benefits issues. This is proving a success and is relatively easy for prisoners to access as the Old Chapel is located on the landings between A and B wings. Limited funding has been available to equip the Old Chapel and there have been some complaints about lack of confidentiality due to the screening being ineffective for holding individual discussions. However improvements are gradually being made and it would seem to make sense to maximise the use of this very large space inside the prison.

7.6.3 Finding accommodation for prisoners on release continues to be difficult despite the best efforts of OMU staff, particularly as the funding available to support individual cases is very limited. Prisoners who end up having nowhere suitable to go on release are inevitably very vulnerable and liable to return to prison within a short time. As a result of the policy to retain those prisoners with short sentences and to take back those local prisoners to be released shortly the number leaving the prison is increasing.

7.6.4 Within the prison the number of lifers has reduced - under 5 for most of the year - as they are now moved on as soon as possible, usually to a Category C prison, rather than waiting for a space at a specific prison.

7.6.5 Licence recall numbers have remained high at around 20% of the prison population at any one time - for example there were 60 in September 2011. Prisoners often arrive back in prison not understanding why they have been recalled and the aim is for an offender supervisor to see them quickly to help with answering basic questions. The centre in Croydon which provides the management for the licence recall population appears to be understaffed to deal with the numbers involved and HMP Gloucester is experiencing ongoing difficulties in getting the relevant documentation through for individual cases. This leads to considerable frustration for the recalled prisoners who are in limbo while their exact status is clarified and they wait to find out what is going to happen to them next. It was reported that licence recall arrangements rarely run to time.

7.6.6 Progress has been made on making arrangements for releases on temporary licence with six occurring during the period covered by this report and attempts are being made to find new ways of getting some outside work for category D prisoners, for example through the Timebank /Fair Shares organisation. However, there have been various setbacks, such as lack of staff time to do the risk assessments.

7.6.7 The OMU has moved to a system of case administration rather than having officers working on individual areas such as licence recalls, lifers, public protection etc. The case administration officers now work as a team and divide out new receptions. This is proving more efficient and enables cover in the absence of individual staff.

7.6.8 The contract with the Gloucestershire Probation Trust has proved very problematic this year, with target hours not being met (see Section 7.7.1) and key issues such as the provision of cover during periods of sick leave not being addressed. It has also turned out to be expensive for tasks such as administrative work and cleaning. For part of the year there have been only 2 offender supervisors in post instead of four, due to staff sickness. This has led to a considerable backlog. Not all staff have been fully trained in the OASys (Offender Assessment) system and at the end of the year around 40 prisoners were waiting for their assessments to be completed. The OASys quality assurance is the one area where OMU is not meeting Key Performance Targets.

7.7 Regimes and activities

7.7.1 The Board is concerned to note that in the second quarter of the Financial Year 2010/11 the Ministry of Justice's Performance Rating for HMP Gloucester fell from 3 (Good) to 2 (Overall Performance of Concern). Reasons were long term sickness, classroom attendance not meeting an 80% achievement rate (see also Section 6.2.), and failures in Offender Management where only 150 out of 400 contracted hours were provided by the Probation Service.

7.7.2 The target for the average weekly hours of purposeful activity for prisoners at HMP Gloucester remains at 20 hours per week as set by the Deputy Director (Custody) (DD(C)). This target was the result of a reduction in 2008 when the Prison Service introduced a more restrictive 'Core Day' to deal with previous budget cuts. The Board regarded it as rather too low then and subsequent experience has strengthened that view, notwithstanding the continuing constraints of premises, the Core Day, and an even more severe financial climate.

7.7.3 For the period of this report the target was narrowly met when taking the overall yearly average (20.04 hours), but there were 25 weeks, almost half of the year, when this target was not achieved. This is a considerable increase over last year's reported figure of 8 weeks. The situation was particularly serious over the summer months from the end of June 2011 to mid October 2011, when a figure of less than 20 hours of purposeful activities for prisoners was reported for sixteen consecutive weeks. A prison lock-down of a day and a half in July, in addition to staff briefings, training and meetings, annual leave and Bank Holidays, clearly contributed to this poor performance.

7.7.4 The regime monitoring statistics for the report year showed that the Enterprise Centre was closed for 95 days (58 days in 2009/10); Learning and Skills for 28 days (19 days in 2009/10); Gymnasium for 17 days (13 days in 2009/10); and the British Institute of Cleaning Science (BICS) Scheme tutor was unavailable on 15 days (11 days in 2009/10). Furthermore, in addition to the 28 days closure of Learning and Skills when the Library was not available to prisoners, it was closed for 13 days due to staff shortages (see also Section 6.2.8) and on 2 occasions when escorts for prisoners to visit the Library were not available.

7.7.5 Rota reports during the year have included comments from VPs who said they were bored, from YOs who commented that “there was nothing to do in Gloucester” and from other prisoners in general about the lack of useful activity. In other words, whether one looks at the prison’s statistics or prisoners’ own interpretation of the situation it is clear that the prison is nowhere near fulfilling the Secretary of State’s intention of prisons not ‘warehousing’ prisoners but involving them heavily in worthwhile activity.

7.7.6 The situation described is far from new, though it has differed in severity from time to time because of particular local circumstances. There is a history of reports during the last decade by Her Majesty’s Chief Inspectors of Prisons highlighting the problems. They have variously stated that “quality of activities is not good enough”, that “much of the work available was menial and low skill”, that “levels of purposeful activity were woeful” and “even the... [places] available were of poor quality.”

7.7.7 The Board would suggest that the persistence of the difficulties even during a period when in one year the prison won the national ‘Most Improved Prison Award’, implies that to solve them is highly unlikely to be simply a matter of local management decisions. It is not unmindful of the size of the challenge in righting the situation: local prisons pose particular problems in providing good quality activity programmes (not least because of the comparatively short period that many prisoners spend there) and the government is set on reducing public spending. However, the reality is that provision at HMP Gloucester of an appropriate number of quality activities in range, in hours and in prisoner places will need appropriate resourcing.

7.8 Restorative Justice

7.8.1 A Restorative Gloucestershire Community Project is now co-ordinating RJ work in the county and running a pilot in the Cirencester and Cotswolds area. A joint venture by the Courts, HMP Gloucester, Police, Probation and the Youth Offending Team, it is funded by central Government, with specialist support from Restorative Solutions, a non-profit making organisation. The Head of OMU at HMP Gloucester currently chairs the Working Party for the project and other elements within the prison continue to be closely involved. The success in setting this up is due in large measure to the original HMP Gloucester initiative. The prison has also assisted in the development of similar schemes in HMP Channings Wood and HMP Swansea.

7.8.2 A change of coordinator in July 2011, combined with the lack of available volunteers during the summer holiday period, slowed progress within the Gloucester area itself. However, work picked up in the autumn with 7 victim visits in the first 3 weeks of October, and a rate of 15 to 20 assessments carried out monthly.

7.8.3 There is a core of 8 volunteers for work during the prison’s operating hours and 10 further volunteers who are able to work outside these hours. One of the volunteers has become a registered practitioner and received her diploma at the House of Commons, recognition of her contribution to Restorative Justice and her efforts within the local community.

7.9 Visits

7.9.1 On behalf of the prison the Visitors' Centre, set up in 2003, is run by a member of the Probation Service working on a part time basis. The post itself involves liaison with the prison and the processing of visitor details as well as interacting with family visitors. The accommodation provides a friendly waiting area with facilities and information available for those making domestic visits to prisoners.

7.9.2 The Castle Gate Trust, also located in the Centre, and also set up in 2003, undertakes outreach work for the children of offenders from within the county. This work is carried out in schools and provides support on emotional and educational problems. Maintaining the family unit and reducing re-offending in the longer term are its major objectives. Two key workers and the Trust manager, all on a part-time basis, are currently employed by the Trust, and volunteers also run the children's play area and the snack bar within the prison's Visits Area. Funding, with Children in Need as the major source, runs out in March 2012 and, given the current financial climate, the future of the Trust and its work in the community is by no means guaranteed.

7.9.3 The Visits Area within the prison remains well organised and welcoming but changes to the funding of the drug dog facility during the financial year have meant that dogs have been used on searches of visitors only very intermittently. Early on, the Board raised its concerns about the changes and there was some movement but, as yet, future policy is unclear.

Section 8 The work of the Independent Monitoring Board

8.1 The prescribed membership of the Board is 11, though at the end of the reporting year the membership stood at 12. As last year, these numbers do not reflect the many membership changes occurring within the reporting period. Five members left: three for employment reasons, one because of family issues and one after more than two decades of service. Of these resignations, only one was anticipated and therefore for several months the work of the Board relied heavily on a handful of members with two delaying their planned departure into early 2012 so that 4 newly-recruited members would be sufficiently confident to start undertaking the full range of responsibilities.

8.2 In recruiting new members, the Board was concerned to make the vacancies known as widely as possible. For that reason, as well as relying on the invaluable regular help of Volunteer Bureaux and local newspapers, it contacted associations and societies catering for particular ethnic minorities in the area and, for the first time, successfully enlisted the help of BBC local radio. By arranging the recruitment campaign to follow closely on the publication of the Annual Report, it obtained significant media coverage over an extended period. Thanks to the interest shown by BBC Radio Gloucestershire, as well as coverage in news bulletins and trails, it benefited from a series of interviews run over a week in a regular magazine-style programme. Feedback suggests that, in this way, there was a general improvement in public awareness of the work of the IMB as well as alerting prospective members to current opportunities.

8.3 At a time of considerable change within the prison system, the Board gave priority, not only to keep up to date through its weekly rota visits and monitoring of internal meetings, but also through training sessions addressed by key members of staff (for example, by the Head of the Offender Management Unit, the Head of Residence

and by the Health and Safety Officer). It also benefited from the attendance of three members at a nationally-organised Foundation Course.

8.4 The Board's concern about its ability to monitor as thoroughly as possible the many changes within the prison was intensified by their extent, by the Board's membership difficulties and by uncertainties about funding. There were two aspects to those uncertainties. The first related to the overall funding. The indicative budget at the start of the financial year involved a cut of about 17% on top of the 11% or so inflicted the previous year. For various reasons spelt out to the Secretariat shortly afterwards, even with the Board's best efforts, this was unlikely to be sufficient if the Board was to do its work adequately. Though there was no immediate budgetary relief, the Board was grateful for the Secretariat's understanding and, at a later stage, some easing.

8.5 The second concern related to the Ministry of Justice's initial intentions about meeting Board members' certified expenses. Though members did not wish to make any profit – and, indeed, often members choose not to claim for all expenditure incurred – they objected to any changes that would leave members out of pocket while helping the government fulfil its statutory obligations and also to changes that would deter the recruitment of members lacking the personal means to subsidise their involvement. On 10 May 2011, the Board wrote to the Minister expressing these concerns more fully. The eventual outcome, after much lobbying nationally, led to an outcome far fairer than the Ministry's initial intentions, though the Secretariat and the National Council described it as “far from ideal...but the fairest option,, among those offered [by the Ministry of Justice]”. Those who will lose out from the changes may have difficulty in seeing them as consistent with the words Ministers so frequently utter about the value they place on members' service.

8.6 The Board has been aware during the year of the impact of budget cuts on the support provided by the Secretariat. During it, roughly half the Secretariat's staff have been involved in the voluntary early departure scheme and inevitably routine day to day support has not been either what they would have wished or the IMB could reasonably have expected. However, the Board understands the difficulties under which the Secretariat staff are working and appreciates warmly their invaluable support over major concerns relating to membership and finance.

8.7 The Board is also mindful of the pressures on the prison staff on whose day-to-day cooperation its members so much rely. Strains within the administrative staffing led, for a while, to more limited secretarial support than usual and the Board is grateful to the Clerk concerned for never doing less than her best, to the Prison Governor of the time for acknowledging the difficulties and organising some restructuring to enable normal levels of support to be returned and to its new Clerk for all the administrative skills she is bringing to her work.

8.8 In handling prisoners' applications, the Board is heavily reliant on the cooperation of the full range of prison staff. Aware that that cooperation is more likely to be forthcoming if staff understand what the Board is about, for several years it has sent a summary of its Annual Report by e-mail to all staff and made a copy of the full report available on the intranet. It has also benefited from an annual invitation from the Governor to address a full staff briefing. This year, though the total number of applications has been slightly down, the numbers in the latter months of the reporting year increased significantly, perhaps reflecting the increased pressures on prison staff

through (amongst other factors) restructuring, early retirement of many of the longer-serving staff, and uncertainties about the future. It is greatly to their credit that, despite the extra time pressures that Board enquiries place on staff, for the most part enquiries were met with complete professionalism and on occasion with a degree of helpfulness that went well beyond that imposed by duty.

8.9 Though the work of IMB members is at times taxing and very frustrating - facets that are reflected elsewhere in this report - there is another side to the picture. When, thanks to the cooperation of staff, the Board's monitoring results in a useful change, and when prisoners register genuine relief at a difficulty resolved or, at least, satisfaction that they understand an unpalatable situation more fully, members feel their contributions are worthwhile. At such times they consider that they have in some small way contributed to providing fairness and respect for people in custody – the aim of every Independent Monitoring Board and not least that at HMP Gloucester.

SECTION 9 Glossary of abbreviations

AA	Alcoholics Anonymous
A4E	Action for Employment
ACCT	Assessment, Care in Custody and Teamwork records
BICS	British Institute of Cleaning Science
BMI	Body Mass Index
CARATS	Counselling, Assessment, Referral, Advice & Throughcare Scheme
CPA	Care Programme Approach
CPN	Community Psychiatric Nurse
CTC	Counter Terrorist Check
DAAT	Drug and Alcohol Team
DD(C)	Deputy Director (Custody)
DIP	Drug Interventions Programme
DIRF	Discrimination Incident Report Form
EO	Equalities Officer
FLO	Families Liaison Officer
GP	General Practitioner
HPAG	Health Promotion Action Group
HMCIP	Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons
IAG	Information Advice and Guidance
IDTS	Integrated Drug Treatment Strategy
IMB	Independent Monitoring Board
KPT	Key Performance Target
NA	Narcotics Anonymous
NOMS	National Offender Manager Service
NVQ	National Vocational Qualification
OASys	Offender Assessment System
OMU	Offender Management Unit
PALS	Patient Advice Liaison Service
PCC	Prisoners' Consultative Committee
PHPQI	Prison Health Performance and Quality Indicator
PPO	Prison Probation Ombudsman
RJ	Restorative Justice
RMHN	Registered Mental Health Nurse
ROTL	Release On Temporary Licence
SDP	Short Duration Programme
SFA	Skills Funding Agency
SMARG	Segregation Monitoring and Review Group
UKBA	United Kingdom Borders Agency
VP	Vulnerable Prisoner
VPU	Vulnerable Prisoner Unit
YO	Young Offender

APPENDIX A: Public and Private Sector Partners

ORGANISATION	PROVISION
Action for Education (A4E)	Numeracy, literacy, art, cookery, desktop publishing(DTP), drama, employment skills, healthy living, music, pottery classes
Age Concern	Advice and guidance for prisoners over 50
Alcoholics Anonymous	Referrals
Avon and Wiltshire Partnership	Drug treatment and intervention for drug users
Blue Sky Development and Regeneration	Employment for ex-prisoners
Castle Gate Family Support Centre	Support for families through sentence and in preparation for release
Changing Tunes	Engaging prisoners through music
Church of England (Bishop John Went)	Pastoral Support
Clinks (prison-community links)	Improving links between prisons and the voluntary and community-based sector
Combat Stress	Assistance for Ex Service personnel
Cruse Bereavement Care	Private interviews for prisoners who have requested assistance
Drug Interventions Programme (DIP) Team	Support for prisoners post-release
Equality South West	Advice and guidance to staff and prisoners on Diversity
Fair Shares Partnership	Allows prisoners to earn points which their families can redeem within the local community or donate to Victim Support
GAPS	Housing Advice
GEOAmev	Escort provision
Gloucester City Housing	Advice worker specializing in housing under 25s
Gloucestershire Action for Refugees and Asylum Seekers (GARAS)	Advice and support for foreign national prisoners and prison staff working with them
Gloucester and District Citizens' Advice Bureau	Part of pre-release intervention. Provides debt advice service to prisoners and families (appointment only)
Gloucestershire Probation Trust	Working with prisoners to reduce re-offending
Gloucestershire Race Equality Council (GlosREC)	Representative attends REAT meetings periodically and assists with the impact assessment programme
Gloucester Mosques	Support to prisoners and families
Holy Trinity Church	Support to prisoners and taking services
Homecare Optician Services	Optician service
House of the Open Door	Monthly Chaplaincy Service

APPENDIX A: Public and Private Sector Partners

IAG – Connexions Gloucestershire	Information, advice and guidance to prisoners aged 20+ to maximise chances for work, education or training
Job Centre Plus	Surgeries at induction, on request. All prisoners seen at discharge board to book fresh appointments where necessary
Jole Rider	Project to refurbish bicycles for supply to third world countries
Leonardo's	Support to prisoners whilst in prison and upon release with driving skills and associated paperwork
NACRO	Guidance to staff and prisoners on issues for older prisoners
Narcotics Anonymous	Referrals
N/Ergy	Provision of NVQs
New Dawn	Offender Support
Nextstep (Gloucester)	Advice on jobs and training
Patient Advice and Liaison Service (PALS)	Information, advice and support on health care matters.
Prison Fellowship	Assistance in provision of pastoral care
Prison Visitors	Available to prisoners who do not have family visits
Prolific Offending Team	A multi-disciplinary approach working with prolific offenders
Restorative Gloucestershire	A Restorative Justice project working with prisoners on the effects of their offending within the community
Restorative Solutions	A specialist organisation providing RJ support
Salvation Army	Music for services and prisoner and family support
Samaritans	Training of prisoners as listeners to offer peer support to persons in crisis
Shannon Trust	Sponsorship of the Toe by Toe scheme, and support to prisoners and co-ordinator
Shelter	Advice and assistance to prisoners with housing problems
St Marks, Cheltenham	Chaplaincy Services
The Big Word	Telephone Translation Services

APPENDIX A: Public and Private Sector Partners

The Haven	Family Support centre for Homeless
The Vaughan Centre	Homeless Centre
Tribal	Information and Guidance and basic skills training
University of Gloucestershire	Placements and research within the prison
2gether NHS Foundation Trust	Provision of Prison Healthcare services and IDTS

There are also numerous individual volunteers who attend the prison to offer their time to help address the prisoners' needs, working particularly with the Chaplaincy and the Castlegate Family Support Centre.

APPENDIX B: Board Statistics

Recommended Complement of Board Members	11
Number of Board members at the start of the reporting period	13
Number of Board members at the end of the reporting period	11
Number of new members joining within the reporting period	4
Number of members leaving within reporting period	6
Number of attendances at meetings other than Board meetings	57
Total number of visits to the prison/IRC (including all meetings)	406
Total number of applications received	238
Total number of segregation reviews held	90
Total number of segregation reviews attended	28

APPENDIX C: Prisoners' Applications to the Board

Code	Subject	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11
A	Accommodation	2	4	5	13
B	Adjudications	1	3	2	1
C	Diversity related	8	4	1	5
D	Education/employment/training	8	3	7	13
E	Family/visits	7	17	13	17
F	Food/kitchen related	6	4	3	3
G	Health related	34	19	40	36
H	Property	50	37	59	34
I	Sentence related	18	4	17	30
J	Staff/prisoner/related	44	50	9	49
K	Transfers	21	20	38	19
L	Miscellaneous	51	39	90	18
	Total number of applications	250	204	284	238