



Annual Report

HMP Wandsworth

1 June 2015 to 31 May 2016

CONTENTS

1.	STATUTORY ROLE OF THE INDEPENDENT MONITORING BOARD	3
2.	DIVERSITY AND EQUALITY STATEMENT	3
3.	DESCRIPTION OF THE PRISON	3
4.	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
5.	EQUALITY AND INCLUSION	7
6.	LEARNING AND SKILLS	8
7.	PRIMARY HEALTHCARE	9
8.	MENTAL HEALTH	10
9.	SAFER CUSTODY	12
10.	PURPOSEFUL ACTIVITY	13
11.	RESETTLEMENT	14
12.	SEGREGATION	156
13.	RESIDENTIAL SERVICES	17
14.	RECEPTION, FIRST NIGHT AND INDUCTION	21
15.	SECURITY	22
16.	VISITS	23
17.	SUBSTANCE MISUSE SERVICES	23
18.	GYM	25
19.	CHAPLAINCY	25
20.	WORK OF THE INDEPENDENT MONITORING BOARD	266
21.	LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	29

1. STATUTORY ROLE OF THE INDEPENDENT MONITORING BOARD

The Prisons Act 1952 and the Immigration and Asylum Act 1999 require every prison to be monitored by an independent Board appointed by the Justice Secretary from members of the community in which the prison is situated. The Board is specifically charged to:

1. satisfy itself as to the humane and just treatment of those held in custody within that establishment, and as to the range and adequacy of the programmes preparing them for release;
2. inform the Secretary of State, or any official to whom she/he has delegated authority, where it judges appropriate, of any concern it has;
3. report annually to the Secretary of State for Justice 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, every part of the prison and also to the prison's records.

2. DIVERSITY AND EQUALITY STATEMENT

The Independent Monitoring Board of HMP Wandsworth is committed to treating everyone with respect and fairness, regardless of race, colour, ethnicity, religion, belief, national origin, gender, age, marital status, sexual orientation or disability.

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PRISON

3.1 HMP Wandsworth was a Local male prison which primarily served the courts in south London. One third of the prisoners were on remand. Although a Category B prison, the majority of the sentenced prisoners were Category C. The prison had a very high annual turnover of prisoners, exceeding 12,000 per annum. At any one time there was a mix of prisoners including sentenced prisoners serving longer than a year. Some prisoners were serving Indeterminate Sentences for Public Protection (IPP) or were Lifers. Around 40% of the population were foreign national prisoners, of whom some were due for extradition and some were immigration detainees.

3.2 The prison was built in 1851 and the residential areas remained in the original Victorian buildings. The main prison, known as Heathfield, housed over 1,200 prisoners on five wings. In addition Trinity housed around 380 Category C prisoners in a separate building of three wings. Vulnerable Prisoners were housed in a separated section on one of the Heathfield wings.

3.3 In April the prison was the third most overcrowded prison (by 169%) in England and Wales with an Operational Capacity of 1,596 but Certified Normal Accommodation of only 943. The majority of prisoners shared cells which were extremely cramped.

3.4 On the 18 May 2016 it was announced that the prison was to become one of the six autonomous reform prisons.

4. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- The overall shortage of staff, which was outwith the control of the prison, affected almost every aspect of prison life. Despite strenuous efforts to mitigate the effects (detached duty staff, Payment Plus/overtime, recruitment of new officers, tackling staff absences) and a comprehensive exercise to rationalise and prioritise functions, the core problem of insufficient staff remained. Regime disruptions and shut-downs occurred throughout the year. Short term measures such as redeploying staff to deal with a function in crisis simply created a new crisis elsewhere. Lower priority services, such as library services, frequently lost their allocated officer time to higher priority functions. Backlogs were successfully reduced only to reappear later. The lack of officer continuity meant providing any pastoral care was extremely difficult. Overall the prison did not consistently provide a safe, decent and humane environment. This report details the effects of inadequate staffing levels as follows:
 - Equality officers unavailable to carry out essential monitoring duties (5.6);
 - low attendance levels and shortened Education and Work sessions (6.3 and 10.1);
 - cancelled prison healthcare clinic appointments (7.3), longer clinic waiting lists (7.5), cancelled hospital out-patient appointments (7.7) and unsafe pharmacy queues and delays in accessing medication (7.9);
 - no therapeutic activities and limited access to exercise, showers and association in the Addison mental healthcare in-patient unit (8.7);
 - use of force statistics not collected for six months (12.14);
 - restricted residential activity and the complete cessation of the Personal Officer scheme (13.1);
 - repeated backlogs in processing property and delays in prisoners accessing their property (13.12);
 - low library attendances (13.26);
 - the first night in custody service lacked care and discipline (14.1);
 - delays in sending prisoners to court and subsequent complaints from court judges (14.2);
 - severely reduced induction provision with many new prisoners receiving no induction at all (14.6);
 - frequent cancellations of the abstinence-based Structured Drug Treatment Programme (17.10) and Alcoholics Anonymous sessions (17.14);
 - two of the four gyms remaining closed (18.1).
- Incentivising prisoners to go to classes or to work continued to be a major challenge. (6.3 and 10.5).
- Extensive delays to repairs and replacement had major implications for the running of the prison services: unrepaired cells remained out of use, sometimes for months; and there were long delays in the replacement of broken windows, cell door observation panels, in-cell equipment and furniture. In the kitchens key pieces of equipment were out of action for much of the reporting year (7.11, 8.7, 12.1, 13.3, 13.23).
- Mental health service provision was not equivalent to the services provided outside (8.2, 8.8).

- There continued to be unacceptable delays in transferring prisoners to secure psychiatric hospital beds; as highlighted in previous annual reports the transfer process needs urgent review otherwise prisoners with severe and enduring mental illness who require a transfer may continue to wait many months in prison untreated (8.9).
- There were four deaths in custody during the reporting year compared to nine in the previous year (9.2).
- Assessment Care and Custody Team record keeping still required improvement and post closure documents were not always completed, daily monitoring by duty governors did not always happen and there was insufficient staff training (9.3).
- Poor administration of both the Governors' adjudication process and the Independent Adjudicator process led to too many cases being dismissed (12.11).
- During the year the regime on Trinity became much closer to that expected of a Category C establishment (13.7 - 13.8).
- First Night prisoners' experience was poor and sometimes unsafe. They were often put on other wings because E wing was full up with established prisoners. In some instances newly arrived prisoners undergoing alcohol detoxification were not placed on E wing (14.5).
- Induction sessions were frequently cancelled and Vulnerable Prisoners (VP) missed induction as they were moved directly to the VP wing (14.6).
- Prisoners being discharged after 4.00pm often had difficulties in accessing their money and valuables (14.7).
- An increasing number of drones were spotted carrying drugs and mobile phones onto the prison; this was a major security threat (15.4, 17.3).
- There were 2191 total applications to the Board in the reporting year, a rise of 10% on the previous year (20.2).

Questions for the Minister's Response

- Do you accept the Board's analysis that staffing levels are inadequate and require urgent action (5.6, 6.3, 7.3, 7.4, 7.5, 7.7, 7.9, 8.7, 10.1, 12.14, 13.1, 13.12, 13.26, 14.1, 14.2, 14.6, 17.10, 17.14, 18.1)?
- What progress has been made regarding the review of the transfer of severely mentally ill prisoners to secure psychiatric hospitals (8.9)?

Questions for the National Offender Management Service

What is being done to:

- ensure mental healthcare provision in prison is equivalent to that provided outside (8.2, 8.8)?
- ensure that prison contracts for maintenance, repair and replacement deliver timely services (7.11, 8.7, 12.1, 13.3, 13.23)?
- prevent drones entering the prison (15.14, 17.3)?

Questions for the Governor's Response

What is being done to:

- improve attendance levels at education and work sessions (6.3, 10.5)?
- raise the standard of Assessment Care and Custody Team record keeping, improve monitoring and increase training provision (9.3)?
- reduce the number of adjudications dismissed for procedural or administrative reasons (12.11)?
- increase the number of prisoners attending the Heathfield library (13.26)?
- improve prisoners' experience of their first night in prison (14.5)?
- ensure all new prisoners receive a full induction programme (14.6)?
- ensure that all discharged prisoners are given their money and valuables immediately upon release (14.7)?

5. EQUALITY AND INCLUSION

5.1 At the end of the reporting year the total prisoner population was 1,600 of which 679 were foreign nationals compared with 728 last year. The largest number were Polish (141), followed by Romanians (80), Albanians (57), and Lithuanians (49). In all, 73 nationalities were represented. 70% of the total prison population was of black and minority ethnicity.

5.2 An Equalities officer liaised with four prisoner representatives of foreign nationals every two months. This group included one representative from Poland and one from Kosovo. There were regular visits to the prison by the Wandsworth Refugee Network.

5.3 Out of a total of 74 prisoners with disabilities 10 were wheelchair users housed in cells on the first floor of C wing in Heathfield. There was also one adapted cell in Trinity.

5.4 There were 203 prisoners over fifty with 42 over the age of sixty.

5.5 There were 21 immigration service detainees with a further 29 serving a sentence. Home Office personnel held a surgery for these detainees every week.

5.6 The progress made in one year after the establishment of the current Equalities team was impressive. The Equalities unit consisted of a governor (part time) supported by a manager, an administrator and two officers. The effectiveness of the team was hugely compromised by officers being withdrawn for other duties throughout the day, and in one week in May no officers were available at all. Monitoring all activities in the prison is key to maintaining equality; the Board would like to have seen an increase in officers permanently attached to the Equalities unit.

5.7 There were nine prisoner Equalities Representatives on the wings and a monthly forum addressed the disadvantages of race, disability, age and nationality. A bi-monthly meeting chaired by the Head of Equalities was attended by representatives of all prison departments to address awareness over the whole range of issues. Specific focus groups gave information in confidence.

5.8 Personal Emergency Evacuation Plans were a priority and all officers on the wings were aware they had to work through detailed questionnaires in consultation with prisoners. The Board noted that satisfactory exercises with disabled prisoners had taken place.

5.9 The Equalities Monitoring Tool of the National Offender Management Service had shown the need for collecting better data to record age/disability/ethnicity/religion and sex orientation. The Equalities unit recognised that more data needed to be collected on segregation and use of force and adjudications.

5.10 At the end of the reporting year there were two identified transsexual prisoners at the prison. The Head of Equalities and the administrator had developed a draft policy for Wandsworth following a visit to HMP Isle of Wight, where there was more experience with transsexual prisoners.

5.11 No discrimination was found on racial grounds in the administration of Incentive and Earned Privilege levels, nor in the use of force. However, the Equalities unit was gathering more feedback from prisoners on the outcomes of their complaints and the Zahid Mubarak Trust was looking in detail at the process for dealing with Discrimination Incident Report Forms (DIRFs). A Greenwich University project was also looking at the complaints system with regard to young prisoners who were black and/or Muslim. It was also analysing questionnaires about first night experiences.

5.12 *Ensuring Equality for HMP Wandsworth*, a detailed framework for equal treatment for prisoners, staff and visitors within the Equalities Act 2010, had been produced by the Head of Equalities and signed off by the regional manager.

5.13 The Board reported under the property section its concerns about compensation payments to prisoners. It also noted that the Head of Equalities was carrying out a review with the litigation department into large payments made to prisoners with special needs.

5.14 A draft *Memorandum of Understanding for provision of care in the prison by Wandsworth Social Services* had been completed but not signed off.

5.15 The Board was particularly concerned by the inadequate treatment of prisoners with mental health issues; see more detail in the Mental Health section of this report.

6. LEARNING AND SKILLS

6.1 The year was difficult with staff shortages, subsequent cancelled freeflows and too many prisoners failing to turn up to classes and workshops in which they were enrolled.

6.2 There was a wide range of classes available, both short and longer term and vocational and creative. However, with its very large churn, over 675 Foreign Nationals, nearly 70 young adult offenders (18-20 year olds) and a large proportion of unsentenced and remand prisoners, the educational needs of the population were diverse and meeting them was a challenge.

6.3 Recruitment figures over the year averaged well over 100% of the target. However attendance levels were of concern being only between 50-60% of target with afternoon figures consistently lower. Figures in July, August and November of 34%, 44% and 36% were particularly bad, mainly the result of regime problems and subsequent freeflow cancellations. Prioritisation of freeflow led to considerably less cancellations in the New Year but there were still major problems as afternoon freeflow was often delayed as a result of late afternoon roll. Incentivising prisoners to go to classes continued to be a major challenge both morning and afternoon.

6.4 The Education Department screened new arrivals for their educational needs at Induction. However, the system had not been failsafe and prisoners had often moved off E wing before having their education profile completed. At the beginning of the reporting year prisoners' educational requirements were not routinely put onto either their sentence plans by Offender Management Unit (OMU) staff nor into their resettlement plans by Community Rehabilitation Company (CRC) staff. The Board was pleased to note that that coordination between the departments had improved, resulting in this no longer being an issue.

6.5 The OFSTED report in March 2015 flagged up that support for tutors through continuous professional development activities was weak. In August, the education provider, Novus, drafted in an advanced practitioner to help teachers who needed support.

6.6 The numbers of prisoners who were illiterate and innumerate was a concern. There was a major push throughout the year to increase basic English and Maths skills by increasing the literacy and numeracy content of courses and workshops. There was a good range of English for Speakers of Other Languages courses. Three sessions a week of English and Maths were provided specifically for young adult offenders in Heathfield.

6.7 After the national shutdown the Prison Information Communication Technology Academy course restarted in August providing three Microsoft and five Cisco courses. Textiles continued to provide employment to prisoners, but these were disproportionately foreign nationals.

6.8 The Trinity Business Suite opened in the summer providing a number of Business Studies courses. However, attendance was disappointing and the suite was closed for a period while more suitable courses were developed.

6.9 Radio Wannu continued to be a success story with 12 prisoners receiving Koestler Awards including one for the '*You fight, we get banged up*' campaign. Governor's Question Time was re-introduced and Resettlement and Offender Management Surgeries were also popular. Feedback from an audience survey in December showed that over 70% of prisoners listened to Radio Wannu.

7. PRIMARY HEALTHCARE

7.1 Healthcare services were provided by a consortium of providers; namely, St George's Healthcare University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (physical health services and substance misuse services), the South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust (mental health services and substance misuse services), NHS Dentist, and Pitman & Risner (opticians' services).

7.2 The four main problems facing the primary healthcare service in order of importance were: lack of officers to escort prisoners to clinics and hospital and the consequent effects, nurse vacancy levels, poor healthcare facilities and delays in carrying out repairs to medical facilities and associated cells.

7.3 Primary care services (nurse and GP clinics) were provided in clinics in the Heathfield Health Centre on B2, on C1 for vulnerable and disabled prisoners and on the Trinity unit. All other clinics were housed on the Magdalen Health Centre. Due to a lack of officers to supervise clinics and collect/return prisoners, 11% of clinics were cancelled in both in January and May and 30% of clinics were cancelled in December. In addition many hours of clinic time were lost per month due to prisoners being brought late to clinic.

7.4 The Did Not Attend (DNA) rates at prison clinics averaged around 21% over the five month period January to May. DNAs occurred for a mixture of reasons: officers being unavailable to unlock and escort prisoners to the clinics, prisoners did not always receive an appointments slip informing them they had an appointment, or they forgot/refused to attend or were unavailable because they were on a legal or social visit or were at court.

7.5 During May waiting times to see a GP, a nurse or a dentist were four weeks, three weeks and around six weeks respectively. In the three months March to May the longest average clinic waiting times were: smoking cessation clinic - 26 weeks, sexual health clinic - 21 weeks, podiatry clinic - 17 weeks and opticians' clinic - 17 weeks. Towards the end of the reporting year a No Smoking Initiative was launched which will greatly reduce waiting times. In addition, the number of sexual health clinics was doubled which will reduce the long waiting periods to a more acceptable level.

7.6 The proportion of new and transferred prisoners screened during the week of their arrival was very low at some points of the year but was much improved by the year end (38% in March, 41% in April, and 72% in May). This was largely the result of providing two officers to collect/return prisoners.

7.7 For the second half of the reporting year 52 scheduled hospital appointments were cancelled (an average of 2 a week) because there was no officer escort available.

7.8 Vacancy levels for primary care nurses were the worst they had been for several years running at over 50%. There was an active on-going recruitment programme in place: some posts were replaced by posts at a higher level which were better paid and hopefully more attractive; pharmacy technicians replaced some nursing posts; two advanced nurse practitioner's posts were advertised; a skills mix review resulted in two Monday-Friday nursing posts being created and existing agency nurses were encouraged to work on a regular full time basis

7.9 The central pharmacy and the pharmacy hatches on the wings did not always have sufficient officer supervision to operate safely. Inconsistencies in the regime meant that pharmacy opening times were not always adhered to. The result was that sometimes prisoners received their medications late.

7.10 The existing prison healthcare facilities were substandard. Some of the clinic rooms were extremely small and unfit for purpose. Providing an increased number of suitable clinic rooms across the prison and a larger waiting room in the Magdalen Health Centre would allow more healthcare services to be provided in-house and reduce the number of hospital outpatient appointments needed.

7.11 The six bedded Jones in-patient unit provided nursing care to prisoners who were physically unwell but did not need to be admitted to hospital. Nursing shortages had resulted in a high use of agency nurses. One cell was out of order for six months, awaiting repair by Carillion, the facilities management agent. There were frequent complaints from prisoners about the limited amount of time they were unlocked.

7.12 A simplified complaints form was produced and made available on all wings. In the eight months September to April there were 25 formal complaints. Most were regarding clinical treatment and half related to nursing services. 21 (84%) of all formal complaints were answered within 25 days.

8. MENTAL HEALTH

8.1 The South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust provided both primary and secondary mental health services to the prison.

8.2 There were serious failings in the in-patient mental health service; these were partly due to the low number of officers on the Addison unit. There was no prison psychology service equivalent to the community programme Improving Access to Psychological Therapies. Otherwise mental health services provided in the prison were adequate.

8.3 The number of clinics that ran in the Magdalen Health Centre was restricted due to the limited waiting area. Consequently the consultants who ran the Old Age clinic (Cognitive Impairment and Dementia) and the Neuro-Developmental clinic (Autism, Asperger's

Syndrome and Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder) were forced to carry out initial assessments on the wings.

8.4 The Primary Mental Health team dealt with prisoners on the wings who had mild to moderate mental illness. The team received an average of eight referrals a day through the year, with 96% being seen within 48 hours (delays were generally caused by prisoners being unavailable). Vacancy levels in the team improved; at year end there was only one vacancy out of three posts, which was filled by an experienced agency nurse.

8.5 The volunteer-provided psychotherapy counselling service continued to offer 16 weekly counselling sessions to up to 30 prisoners at a time. The waiting list was around three months.

8.6 The In-Reach team provided secondary care mental health services to those prisoners on the wings who had 'a severe and enduring mental illness'. At year end all six posts in the In-Reach team were filled. Within the team a new post, Critical Time Intervention nurse, was created. The post was intended to encourage prisoners nearing release to engage with community mental health services by offering support, advice, liaison with health/welfare services, as well as some follow-up support post release. Provisional data appeared to show a decrease in DNA rates for Community Mental Health Team appointments post release.

8.7 The most seriously ill prisoners were admitted to the Addison unit, a 12 bedded in-patient mental health facility. The unit was isolated from the rest of the residential accommodation and housed in unsuitable premises. About 55% of Addison patients were eventually transferred to a secure psychiatric hospital; the remainder were stabilised and transferred back to the wings with ongoing support from In-Reach if appropriate. Addison prisoners appeared more incoherent, distressed, aggressive and destructive than in previous years. Cells were frequently smashed up and remained unrepaired by Carillion for very long periods of time (during May, five to six of the 12 cells were out of action). Consequently there were usually three severely mentally ill prisoners waiting to be admitted and at times the waiting list was up to six. Due to insufficient numbers of officers supporting the unit, prisoners were frequently not unlocked on a daily basis for exercise, showers or association. In March a high risk prisoner requiring three officers to unlock him was not unlocked for over four days and in April prisoners were only unlocked on alternate days. In addition, the daily programme of structured therapeutic activities did not run at all. Clinical staff, despite behaving in a commendably caring manner, were restricted in their ability to provide a therapeutic environment to these seriously mentally ill prisoners. In general the Board felt that the Addison Unit was not fit for purpose.

8.8 Under the Mental Health Act a prison psychiatric unit cannot forcibly treat a mentally ill prisoner. Up to half of Addison patients refused medication thereby prolonging their distress and delaying their recovery. A patient with a similar mental illness detained in a psychiatric hospital would not be left untreated.

8.9 For the most severely mentally ill prisoners who need to be placed in a secure psychiatric hospital, the transfer should be as speedy as possible. In the reporting year there continued to be delays in transferring prisoners; this appeared to be largely attributable to poor communications between the hospitals and the prison, and a shortage of low and

medium secure hospital beds. As highlighted in previous Annual Reports, the national system for transfer from a prison to a secure psychiatric hospital needs urgent review, otherwise prisoners with severe and enduring mental illness who require a transfer may continue to wait many months in prison untreated.

9. SAFER CUSTODY

9.1 In September the National Offender Management Service (NOMS) carried out a Safer Custody audit which was rated as 'Limited'. Particular areas of concern were: training in ACCT documentation, ACCT documentation recording, Cell Sharing Risk Assessment (CSRA), Safer Custody meeting attendance and availability of Listeners. In the May audit the rating had improved to 'Moderate' but there were still concerns about Safer Custody meeting attendances, completion of CSRA documents, ACCT documentation, and recording of Next of Kin details.

9.2 There were four deaths in custody in the reporting year (three were self-inflicted by hanging, one was due to natural causes). This compared to nine deaths in custody in the previous year. The Prison and Probation Ombudsman reports continued to highlight the inappropriate use of restraints when sick prisoners were moved to hospital.

9.3 Some 660 new Assessment, Care in Custody Teamwork (ACCT) documents were opened in the reporting year compared with 630 in the previous year. No particular pattern could be identified, but they were most frequent on E wing, where new receptions were housed. ACCT record keeping still required improvement and post closure documents were not always completed. Duty governors were supposed to check five ACCTs folders each day, but this did not always happen. Unfortunately men were regularly placed on the Segregation unit who were on an open ACCT; this usually had occurred because it was inappropriate to house them elsewhere. There was insufficient staff training in the ACCT processes – only 5% of officers working in Reception were trained during the year.

9.4 During the year a national model, the Violence Diagnostic Tool (VDT), was adopted for the reporting of violent incidents. Data collected under the new VDT system did not appear to be at all robust. For example, the number of violent incidents recorded in the reporting year was stated to be 404 compared with 991 in the previous 12 months, but this seems highly unlikely. Similarly there was a recognised discrepancy between the VDT figures and the number of adjudications for assaults, etc. The Board believed the problems with the VDT system needed urgent attention.

9.5 Wandsworth had been selected as a pilot site for the Custodial Violence Management Model which included some psychology support. Unfortunately the pilot did not start because staff could not be released for the four day training.

9.6 There were 257 incidents of self harm in the reporting year compared to 206 in the previous year. The most common form of self harm was cutting. East European men had the highest incidence.

9.7 The Complex Cases meetings, run by a member of the Safer Custody team, took place regularly. In-Reach always attended but attendance by wing staff was sporadic. Towards the end of the reporting year duty governors had made more effort to attend.

Information on agreed actions was conveyed to the wings by the In-Reach staff. The meetings remain a valuable planning mechanism for vulnerable prisoners.

9.8 There were adequate numbers of trained Listeners. The problems with failure to unlock Listeners at night persisted. It was difficult to assess how frequently this happened as no record of requests for a Listener was kept by wing staff and the Listeners only got to know if they were informed by prisoners themselves.

10. PURPOSEFUL ACTIVITY

10.1 Disruptions to the regime and insufficient staff contributed to poor attendance figures across activities. Problems peaked in November when 19 freeflows were cancelled out of a scheduled 38. It was decided that the new staffing profile would prioritise freeflow and it would only be cancelled in exceptional circumstances. Implemented in January, the new profile had many positive effects on the regime but over the subsequent months, education and work attendance figures, although higher than the end of 2015, continued to fluctuate.

10.2 In the autumn an Activities Hub was opened two days a week on Trinity, as part of the plan to develop Trinity as a more efficient resettlement facility. It worked well, giving Trinity prisoners much easier access to information and help.

10.3 There continued to be a broad range of work and purposeful activity, with opportunities for over 70% of the prison population. The new dry lining workshop was ready at the end of May, creating an additional 20 places. Bicycle repair was suspended for a month while the dry lining space was prepared in the recycling workshop, but resumed in April. More emphasis was placed on basic numeracy and literacy skills. For example, level 3 became required for employment in the Motorbike workshop, and those wishing to be Wing workers had to complete a foundation British Institute of Cleaning Services course for which they had to be able to read before being accepted on the waiting list.

10.4 In January it was announced that all prisoners in Trinity had to be employed and on arrival would have two weeks in which to find a job, or face a sanction under the Incentives and Earned Privileges scheme (IEP). This directive did not have a major impact as in March there were still 88 unemployed Trinity prisoners of whom 65 were Category C or D.

10.5 There was regular discussion at the monthly Quality Improvement Group meetings about the consistently low attendance figures for work and purposeful activity. Even taking into account the high number of cancelled freeflows, general attendance figures were frequently around 60% and education attendance figures were even lower. The Key Performance Targets, based on motorbikes, textiles, contract services and bicycle repair attendances, regularly exceeded their target of 80%. However, these were untypical of attendance levels generally. Engagement was lower in the afternoons than mornings; this was partly the result of freeflow often being up to an hour late. Although IEPs were supposed to be used as a sanction against non-attendance at work, very few were actually issued.

10.6 In December the responsibility for allocating work was rationalised so that all jobs, including wing workers, were assigned through the Activities Hub. There were still significant delays in jobs being filled but the new system was an improvement.

11. RESETTLEMENT

Offender Management

11.1 In the previous year's report the Board reported backlogs in categorisations (both initial and review), sentence calculations, transfers, Offender Assessment Systems (OASys) plans and Home Detention Curfew (HDC) approvals due to the number of Offender Supervisors being cut from 11 to 8. There were improvements in the year.

11.2 At the end of the reporting period there were 12 Offender Supervisors. The posts were not ring fenced but there was a lower level of redeployment so there were fewer staff shortages in the Offender Management Unit (OMU).

Sentence Calculations

11.3 The target for completing calculations was 5-10 working days from being sentenced. The number of outstanding sentence calculations varied throughout the year. It was almost 300 in summer 2015. By the end of the reporting year there was no backlog.

Categorisation

11.4 The target time for initial categorisation was four days from receiving the relevant information, which should mean three weeks from sentencing. Factors such as licence recall, public protection issues and obtaining information from external sources could all contribute to delays. The categorisation backlog number varied through the year and from January to March had decreased to under 100 for initial categorisations but by 11 May 2016 the number had increased to 143.

11.5 Any prisoner sentenced to four years or more should be re-categorised on a yearly basis; if serving their final two years, the frequency changes to every six months. Although low for the majority of the reporting period, by 11 May the backlog had increased to 140.

11.6 Ongoing staff shortages and redeployment meant that the categorisation and re-categorisation backlogs did not disappear. Temporary increases in staff to tackle the backlogs were not a permanent solution. However, a renewed focus on reducing backlogs did result in substantial decreases for January to March while the increase in the backlogs in mid April and May could be attributable to the departure of a member of staff and the vacancy which was created while a replacement was recruited and trained.

Offender Assessment System

11.7 The target for this assessment was 8 weeks from being sentenced for high risk prisoners, and 12 weeks for both medium and low risk. Prisoners serving less than one year did not have an assessment. The exception was any high risk prisoner given a short sentence. These prisoners were allocated an Offender Supervisor to ensure adequate arrangements were in place prior to release. The sentence plan was reviewed annually.

11.8 At the end of the last reporting year the OASys backlog was over 230. The backlog at the end of this reporting year for initial OASys assessments had decreased to an average of 135. Overdue reviews had decreased from an average of 75 to an average of 45. OMU staff trained to complete OASys had been set a target of two assessments a month. The intention was to clear both backlogs within six months.

Home Detention Curfew

11.9 The number of prisoners eligible for Home Detention Curfew (HDC) varied from week to week. Efforts were made to ensure that prisoners understood the difference between when they were eligible and when they might expect to be released on HDC; at year end the difference was between two and four weeks.

Lifers, Indeterminate Sentence for Public Protection and Release on Temporary Licence

11.10 At the end of the current reporting period there were 29 Lifers (a decrease of 10 from last year) and 17 Indeterminate Sentence for Public Protection prisoners (an increase of 3 from the previous year). No prisoners were released on temporary licence.

Public Protection and Rehabilitation

11.11 At the end of the reporting year there were 290 prisoners under Multi Agency Public Protection Arrangements. This was 28 more than the previous year. At the end of the reporting period there were 212 prisoners who were assessed on OASys as very high risk or high risk of harm to others. The number of convicted sex offenders was 56.

Reducing Reoffending

11.12 The Community Rehabilitation Company (CRC) for the prison was taken over by MTCnovo in February 2015 with Penrose continuing to be contracted to provide the Through the Gate resettlement programme. Services in the prison included drawing up a resettlement plan and signposting prisoners to appropriate support services for accommodation; education, training and employment; and finance, benefits and debt. On average, over the reporting year the CRC succeeded in assessing the needs of 93% of prisoners within five days of their initial entrance screening. However, the CRC only managed to review the resettlement plans of 69% of prisoners at the 12 week point before their release date. (The target for both measures was 90%) This second figure was not informative as it did not take into account those prisoners who were transferred or deported. The Board was concerned at the lack of robust reporting measures.

11.13 St Mungo's had been providing a service for prisoners at risk of homelessness on release on a temporary basis since 2015 when it replaced the St Giles service. A permanent contract was agreed in February 2016. Despite repeated requests no performance data was made available. The Board was highly concerned that the prison did not appear to be able to monitor this service.

11.14 A needs analysis of all prisoners was conducted by the prison in February 2016. It was based on questions about the prisoners' experiences of the 7 Pathways to reduce reoffending (i.e. accommodation; education, training and employment; health; drugs and alcohol; finance, benefit and debt; children and families; attitudes, thinking and behaviour). By the end of May the results of this needs analysis were still not available.

11.15 Veterans in Custody, a research project, which helps UK veteran prisoners access services such as housing, mental health, employment, etc, on release, had been successfully running for a year and was recently evaluated. The caseload ran at around 15 prisoners. Although there were officers interested in becoming involved, there was no

protected officer time for this project. Funding had been obtained from the Military Large Covenant Fund to roll out the project to three other London prisons.

12. SEGREGATION

12.1 There were 13 residential cells and 2 Special cells in the Segregation Unit. The unit operated on average at over 90% capacity, although in the last months of the reporting year it was 100%. This was due to the high number of unusable cells caused by vandalism to the cell fabric or contents. Following the appointment of Carillion as facilities management agent, it took much longer to bring cells back into use.

12.2 There was a noticeable increase in the number of prisoners refusing to return to the wings on grounds of their safety.

12.3 The number of long stay prisoners continued to be a problem as too often other prisons refused to accept them directly from the unit.

12.4 Lower staffing levels meant that Board members had to speak to prisoners through the doors on too many occasions rather than face-to-face. This reduced effective interaction.

12.5 The staff acted highly professionally, remaining calm and good humoured whilst dealing with some extremely aggressive and difficult prisoners.

12.6 Good Order and Discipline (GOOD) reviews were not as effective as in the previous year when a designated governor handled the weekly review meeting. In this reporting year there was no such continuity and management of prisoners' exit plans were poorer as a result. Too often the governor chairing the review was not aware of previously agreed actions; this often led to delays in moving the prisoner out of the unit. The Board believes that more regular attendance from other departments such as Healthcare, Security and Offender Management would have improved the process of returning prisoners back to the wings or securing a suitable transfer.

12.7 The Special Cell was used 24 times during the year (of which five instances related to the same prisoner); this compared to only 13 in the previous year.

Adjudications

12.8 Governor adjudications continued to be held six days a week and remained extremely high at over 3,700 for the year. Adjudications were heard from 9.30am to 12.00 noon, but often cases were still outstanding at the end of the morning and were adjourned to another day. This was inefficient as prisoners had to be brought down to the unit by an officer a second time.

12.9 Fines were rarely levied when cell furniture was damaged. Furthermore, there were numerous occasions when the money was not collected. The prison raised only 15 obligation orders in the 12 month period November 2014 – November 2015; this figure was one of the lowest amongst prisons of a comparable size. The value of the 15 orders was £1,200, but only £413 was collected. The number was less than half that of the previous year.

12.10 Independent adjudications (under a District Judge) started to be held weekly rather than fortnightly due to having doubled to over 1,200 in the reporting year. There was a sharp increase in the number of hearings due to mobile phone and drug finds.

12.11 The Board remained concerned about the poor administration of adjudications which reduced their effectiveness. The process was perceived by many officers as a tick box exercise. For prisoners it was not perceived as a punishment, but as a game, and too often prisoners refused to attend. The following failings support these views: no one person checked that all paperwork was in order before proceedings commenced; conduct reports were often missing; mobile phones were not sent to forensics promptly for analysis prior to adjudication; CCTV was often not available in time because Security insisted that a governor must sign an authorisation request which was often forgotten; there was a failure to test substances; staff did not complete paperwork inside the time scale despite being on shift; wing staff failed to distribute paperwork to the prisoner within the 48 hour time limit of being issued; prisoners were often brought down to the adjudication late or not at all as wing staff did not see this duty as a priority.

12.12 In the case of Independent Adjudications the reporting officer failed to attend in 80% of cases heard. This was a key reason for 30% of cases having to be dismissed and 40% adjourned. There was an urgent need to change staff attitudes to bring about an improvement in the process. This deficiency has been highlighted repeatedly in the Board's previous annual reports without perceived improvement.

12.13 Adjudication standards meetings have now started to be held bi-monthly. The management structure appears to be in place for this with a view to addressing the issues highlighted above and reducing the number of adjudications being adjourned or dismissed.

Use of Force

12.14 Due to staff shortages no statistics were available for the first half of the reporting year, but the second half showed a similar number of incidents to the previous year. There was an increased number of assaults and refusals to obey orders, but a reduction in the number of fights among prisoners. The Board was concerned that crucial management information was not available, due to staff shortages.

12.15 The number of young adult offenders involved in incidents was comparable to the previous year at around 15%. The number of Muslims involved in incidents was disproportionately high (33%) when compared with their numbers in the prison population (25%).

13. RESIDENTIAL SERVICES

Wing Accommodation - Heathfield

13.1 The impact of staff shortages on prisoners continued to be of very serious concern to the Board. The difficulties with the recruitment and retention of staff had an adverse effect on the regime throughout the reporting year. New profiles were introduced at the beginning of 2016 which improved the predictability of the regime but the cross deployment of staff had a negative effect on staff/prisoner relationships. As result, the Personal Officer scheme was still not in evidence.

13.2 The counting of prisoners (the roll) was frequently late, particularly at lunchtime. This delayed the unlocking of prisoners for afternoon Activities and Education and meant that they missed out on valuable purposeful activity time.

13.3 There were very long delays in the replacement of broken external windows and observations panels in cell doors. In-cell equipment, including the provision of kettles and televisions and furniture, was similarly slow to be supplied. The length of time taken by the facilities management agent, Carillion, to undertake these works had implications for prisoners and staff alike because of the risk of injury to both. Similarly, the painting and repairs of Heathfield offices and staff rest rooms was well overdue.

13.4 A new policy for Prisoner Consultation and Council Meetings was introduced in April 2016 and the first Prison Council meeting was held in May. The format was well defined and was communicated to all prisoners through Radio Wanno. Monthly wing meetings were not held regularly during the reporting year. This left prisoners without a forum to discuss their issues and concerns with wing staff.

13.5 In November 2015 there was a full lock down security search which resulted in the finding of an alarming quantity of illicit items and a vast amount of excess kit. Since then, Accommodation Fabric Checks were carried out regularly on every wing. In addition, Decency Check statistics were introduced in November which provided information on a range of attendances at, for example, Induction, Library, and the Gym.

13.6 There was still poor information on the wings about Activities and Education sessions available for prisoners. White boards with up to date vacancies had been promised for some time but failed to materialise. Much of the signage on the wings was out of date or needed replacing.

Wing Accommodation - Trinity

13.7 The previous year's report had said that the regime on the Trinity unit was not what was expected on a unit designated as Category C. There were significant improvements during the course of the reporting year which were made possible by the increasing proportion of prisoners who were Category C. In November only two-thirds of prisoners were Category C, even though there were significant numbers of suitable Category C prisoners on Heathfield. Concerted efforts were made to move all Category C prisoners who were in the last 18 months of their sentence to Trinity. Towards the end of the reporting year the proportion varied between 80% and 85% with the remainder being on remand and no Category B prisoners.

13.8 At the end of the period 82% of prisoners were in employment and more than half the population was full time. One entire wing and two landings of a second wing housed full-time workers who were allowed association in the evenings. In general the regime on Trinity had become much closer to that expected of a Category C establishment.

13.9 There was an improvement in the assistance available to prisoners on Trinity. Weekly clinics for property and offender management issues were started which helped address the most common concerns of prisoners. An administrative officer was allocated to work on Trinity who considerably improved the handling of prisoner applications. In addition,

peer to peer surgeries were run to support new prisoners who had missed out on a proper induction when entering the prison.

13.10 In the second half of the reporting year the wing governor held monthly prisoner consultation meetings. These were well run and provided a forum for constructive discussions about issues of concern.

13.11 In August 2015 there was a major incident when prisoners on G wing (Trinity unit) refused to return to their cells after Social and Domestic and took over the wing. (See the Security section for further detail). There were also regular finds of illegal items as well as considerable individual prisoner frustration over property and other matters. Despite this the Board felt that, on the whole, the unit was reasonably clean, the atmosphere relaxed and the regime regular and predictable.

Property

13.12 The Board was disappointed that the redirection of incoming parcels for processing directly by the Property department did not result in the benefits expected. The redesign of the checking flow system using X-ray appeared to be delivering real efficiencies, but over the last months of the reporting year there was a continuous backlog of parcels waiting to be processed, with regular counts showing at least forty. The main cause seemed to be lack of trained staff.

13.13 A concerted effort to find property thought to have been lost resulted in 60 bags being found, but unfortunately Serco (responsible for transporting both prisoners and their property between establishments) would only agree to deliver a certain number of bags per day to other prisons. This meant that prisoners who had moved to other prisons or who were no longer in prison remained uncertain for some time about where their property was.

13.14 In the reporting year there were 227 applications to the Board about property inside the prison, and 106 applications about property in other prisons. In many cases the prisoner had previously made an application to the prison but shortage of staff had left it unresolved.

13.15 Although well publicised to prisoners, there was confusion about what property could be sent in by relatives, and there were many occasions when parcels were returned to sender as the relevant governor had not given permission for the parcels to be sent in.

13.16 There was a huge cost to the prison estate for compensation to staff for injury and legal costs and to prisoners for lost property and other infringements. In the year to March 2016 compensation and damages to prisoners involving litigation amounted to £207,764. In addition, the NOMS incurred Treasury Solicitor charges of £194,196, so the total cost was £401,960. The prison also paid separate amounts for compensation awards under £5,000; according to available figures this amounted to £18,647 of which just over £14,000 was for lost property. Given the fiscal constraints facing the prison and wider public sector, the Board found this regrettable and hoped that the system and processes could be tightened so as to reduce the number of claims in future.

Mail/Censors

13.17 The biggest change during the year was the redirection of parcels processing to the Property department. This freed up the Mail and Censors section to concentrate on the

checking of letters, recorded delivery mail and legal correspondence. These Officer Support Grades (OSGs) were also responsible for delivering checked mail to the wings and taking money sent in to the cashiers for depositing in prisoners' accounts, as well as the distribution of newspapers and food trolleys from the kitchens to the wings.

13.18 The Board was impressed with the way in which backlogs which built up over weekends were usually cleared by the Tuesday of each week despite a general shortage of staff. No extra staff were brought in to deal with Christmas mail, but this was cleared by Christmas eve because of extra hours worked.

13.19 On average 50 recorded delivery letters were dealt with every day. Some money was sent in by Postal Order, which was a considerable extra expense for prisoners' families. The Board would like to see a system of electronic transfer introduced as soon as possible.

13.20 In the previous year's report the Board highlighted the way Royal Mail was handling registered mail for prisoners, and the lengthy attempts to get individual letters scanned at the gate. Unfortunately, despite efforts by the prison, nothing had changed in the reporting year and these letters continued to be delivered in bulk to the gate. This meant that mail was discovered that should have gone elsewhere, and some letters that were purportedly delivered to the prison seemingly were not.

13.21 During the winter the Board became concerned about the volume of undelivered internal wing mail stacking up in the mail room. In particular, it was often taking a week for Board replies to prisoners' applications to be delivered to some of the wings. In March things improved when administration wing staff were allocated to collect the mail every day.

Prisoners' Money

13.22 The largely manual system for recording money in prisoners' spending, private and savings accounts continued to work adequately. However, the Board found that there was a lack of consistency in the interpretation of rules regarding transfer of money between spending and savings accounts, and this may have disadvantaged some prisoners. The provision of advice and support for prisoners in dealing with financial matters external to the prison was poor. The Board welcomed the news that an electronic funds transfer system was being trialled in some establishments and looked forward to the outcome of this trial.

Kitchen and Food

13.23 The operations of the kitchen were seriously affected by the delays in the repair and replacement of equipment. Carillion was unable to provide a timely and appropriate repair service and as a result key pieces of equipment were out of action for much of the reporting year. Poor management of the equipment replacement process meant that a brand new oven was left outdoors for almost two weeks, resulting in weather damage before it had even been installed.

13.24 The timely delivery of food trolleys to wings and of their return to the kitchen was seriously disrupted as a result of the re-profiling of this task to OSGs. Despite being made aware of this problem for some time, the responsible Governor had not been able to rectify it.

13.25 The Board was concerned that some key procedures were not being followed as they should have been; there was strong evidence to suggest that food refusal was not being recorded systematically, and that prisoners serving food on wings were not receiving the requisite food hygiene training.

Library

13.26 The Board was disappointed that there has been little or no improvement in library access on Heathfield. Although the main library was used regularly for group activities, such as literacy development and creative writing, general access for prisoners was extremely poor as a result of a lack of officers to escort prisoners there and back. A Tuesday evening library session on Heathfield had operated regularly throughout the reporting period to provide access to working prisoners, but this was not a formally profiled activity and was facilitated by a Governor in his own time. The Board believed that this session should become a formalised part of the weekly regime.

13.27 From November, an additional staff member in the library managed the Shannon Trust's 'Turning Pages' (formerly Toe by Toe) reading programme which is delivered by trained prisoner mentors across the prison. Although the officers assigned to support the programme rarely had time to get involved, the programme nevertheless went well.

13.28 The library on Trinity was open on weekday mornings and afternoons and the regime allowed prisoners to visit without an officer escort. This had resulted in significantly higher levels of attendance on Trinity compared with Heathfield.

14. RECEPTION, FIRST NIGHT AND INDUCTION

14.1 An internal prison review ('From Bus to Bed') of the journey from arrival through first night in custody to Induction, which has a major impact on offender behaviour and mental health, had mixed findings. Many of the problems documented below were caused by the staff reprofiling, inexperienced staff and the lack of officer continuity. Consequently there was insufficient understanding of the workings of E wing and the way it differed from other wings. Whilst the overall experience was largely safe and decent, the Board considered that substantial improvements were needed.

14.2 In November there was a change in shift patterns as a result of a change in officer job profiles. This initially resulted in court times being missed. In the last few months of the reporting year there was some improvement due to new ways of working and redeployment of staff. However court judges continued to complain about the high levels of prisoner no-shows. There was a 10-15% reduction in the number of prisoners going out to court each day due to the increased use of video link.

14.3 Serco continued to be responsible for collecting prisoners from court. There were a high number of vans arriving just before the cut off time of 7.30pm. This made it difficult for staff to process offenders efficiently. Towards the end of the reporting year Serco did agree to collect prisoners earlier where possible and some vans began to arrive at 3.30pm.

14.4 The installation of a new body scanning portal in Reception made it more difficult for prisoners to smuggle in items, and reduced the need for body searches by officers. The Board welcomed this development, both on grounds of efficiency, and because the process was more decent than the intimate searching that had previously taken place.

14.5 The overall First Night experience was poor; there was a general lack of care and discipline. A contributory factor was the struggle to find bed spaces for first night prisoners because the E wing was already full. Improvement towards the end of the reporting period, with a drop in the percentage of prisoners not located on E wing for their first night from 40% to 23%, was not sustained. This was because of the number of established prisoners that had been placed on E wing. These experienced prisoners sometimes preyed on the newcomers, particularly first timers. At times first nighters were kept in a holding cell until 11.00pm or later before a cell could be found. They did not always get their first night entitlements such as a pin phone number to enable them to make a phone call to their family. In some instances newly arrived prisoners on alcohol detoxification were placed on wings which had little experience of monitoring such cases.

14.6

14.7 The Induction process for all incoming prisoners was not working well due to insufficient staff and lack of time and between July and October it was virtually non-existent. From January to May up to 35% of new arrivals did not receive induction. The individual computer based programme in many different languages was re-created in December, together with a live presentation done by prison orderlies in a classroom setting if there were sufficient staff to supervise. A new forty page induction booklet was also produced but needed to be provided in other languages if it was to be effective for the large foreign national population. There was a continuing problem with Vulnerable Prisoners (VP) accessing induction as at Reception they were moved directly to the VP wing, bypassing E wing. Similarly with Category C prisoners who were sent straight to Trinity from Reception; however prison orderlies had been recently appointed on Trinity to support induction.

14.8 Prisoners being discharged from the prison after 4.00pm often had difficulties in accessing their money and valuables. There was an urgent need for a new system to be introduced to deal with these situations.

15. SECURITY

15.1 In the 12 month period from February 2015 to January 2016, incident reports relating to prisoner to prisoner assaults numbered 133.

15.2 In the reporting year intelligence-led cell searches by officers produced: 129 mobile phones, 154 phone chargers, 12 simcards, a digibox (satellite receiver), 27 individual finds of cannabis, 135 finds of spice and 2 finds of steroids. In addition, separate dog searches produced: 82 phones, 64 phone chargers, 422 grams of cannabis and 55.5 litres of hooch.

15.3 The prison population included members from 54 different gangs, most of them belonging to one particular local gang. Gang related issues were manageable and were at a similar level to last year.

15.4 Drones carrying drugs and mobile phones were a major security threat to the prison. An increasing number of drones were being spotted flying into the prison. By the end of the reporting year at least two drones a week were being spotted, commonly between 1.30am and 4.30 am. The Board was aware that the prison and the police were looking at ways of stopping drone deliveries, but believed that this problem should be given greater priority.

15.5 In August 2015 prisoners on G wing (Trinity unit) refused to return to their cells after Social and Domestic and took over the wing. Major structural damage ensued. and the Tornado team was called in after negotiations between staff and prisoners failed. The Tornado team entered the wing about seven hours after the incident started and the prisoners returned to their cells almost immediately. 12 major perpetrators were transferred out the same evening. There had been some intimations of trouble pending on Trinity but there was no clear trigger for the incident other than dissatisfaction about the restricted regime. There were no injuries and staff were felt to have acted in an efficient and professional manner.

15.6 In September 2015 a video appeared on YouTube showing a large number of prisoners in a cell within a Victorian prison. It transpired, as a result of identifying the prisoners involved, that this party had taken place on B wing and had been with the full knowledge of some of the officers on the wing. The video, which had been recorded using an illicit mobile phone, showed prisoners drinking, smoking and singing loudly to music being played in the cell. Many of the prisoners involved were transferred to other prisons and initially six members of staff were suspended. The full investigation into the circumstances surrounding this incident was not concluded until May 2016 which in itself is thoroughly unsatisfactory. Two officers were dismissed for gross misconduct and the remaining staff were either demoted or given final warnings.

15.7 In November a major security operation, instigated by the Governor, took place. It was carried out over three days by an external dedicated search team consisting of 72 officers and eight dog handlers who searched prisoners, cells and prison staff. As a result of various finds prisoners were placed on report but unfortunately, due to problems administering the adjudication process, some charges were out of time. Staff searches recovered various items and 30 prison staff received a warning letter.

16. VISITS

16.1 The visits booking process substantially improved over the reporting year, although telephone bookings had gone back to an organisation in the West Midlands, so for most of the year prison staff dealt with email bookings only. At year end there was no email backlog.

16.2 The booking of legal visits was working well with legal visit rooms almost fully used.

16.3 The highly popular and successful family day visits continued to be run six times a year.

16.4 There were some delays in prisoners getting approval for their visitor lists due to lack of staff processing time.

17. SUBSTANCE MISUSE SERVICES

17.1 Clinical services were provided by the St George's University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust and the South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust. The substance recovery services (SRS) were provided by the Rehabilitation of Addicted Prisoners Trust.

17.2 Over a quarter of the prison's population were identified as 'dependent', i.e. had previously been receiving NHS treatment for substance misuse (SM); these prisoners were offered clinical treatment and SRS when they arrived in the prison.

17.3 Illegal drugs appeared to be much more readily available. This was certainly due, in part, to the increasing number of drones coming into the prison. More prisoners were displaying the effects of taking new psychoactive substances (NPS); no prisoners had, as yet, died from taking NPS. Suspicion drug testing (as opposed to mandatory random drug testing) had not happened at all in the first 11 months of the reporting year, although eleven suspicion tests were carried out in May.

17.4 Dependent SM prisoners were identified at their First Night assessment and treatment started straight away. All SM prisoners were followed up within 24 hours by SM nurses and SRS.

17.5 D wing (total capacity: 250 prisoners) housed most dependent SM prisoners but also held a large body of non SM prisoners. In May there were 100 prisoners on D wing and 27 prisoners on E wing receiving opiate substitute treatment (Methadone and Subutex); there were also 17 other prisoners scattered across the prison receiving opiate substitutes. This made delivering SRS and clinical care more challenging. Ideally all dependent SM prisoners would be housed on one wing.

17.6 The SM nursing vacancy level was slightly less acute than that for primary care nurses in the prison, but with a 50% vacancy rate the SM service was still very dependent on obtaining regular experienced agency nurses.

17.7 The same addiction consultant started to run the twice weekly D wing Addiction Clinic, the 5 Day Review Clinic and the 28 Day Review Clinic. This enabled a more consistent, evidence-based approach to be taken, particularly towards the prescribing of opiate substitutes.

17.8 SRS case managers had a caseload of 450-500 dependent SM prisoners at any one time and were providing an average of 133 initial assessments and 91 in-depth assessments per month. They were meeting all their activity targets. Commendably in May 53 prisoners treated by SRS went on to access community SM services on their release.

17.9 The SRS ran a four week motivational support course, 'Stepping Stones', on D wing. A shorter one week version was run on other wings for prisoners with less than six weeks to serve. The Stepping Stones course had, on average per month, 21 starters and 16 graduates. This was an increase on the previous year. The course was popular and had a waiting list of five to six weeks.

17.10 In addition the SRS ran a rolling, six month, abstinence-based Structured Drug Treatment Programme (SDTP) for 23 participants located on K1. The frequent unavailability of the two dedicated officers caused the 90 hour programme to shut down over a third of the time; this had serious consequences for prisoners on the SDTP programme as a good attendance record was necessary to successfully graduate.

17.11 Provision of rooms for SRS group work was adequate but there were insufficient rooms for 1:1 meetings so confidential conversations with a prisoner sometimes had to take place outside their cell door; this was inappropriate.

17.12 A regular meeting for clinically complex cases had restarted; membership included the addiction consultant, the head SM nurse, the head of SRS and the Critical Time Intervention nurse from the In-Reach mental health team.

17.13 D wing prisoners were able to attend the dedicated gym attached to D wing up to three times a week; this was a marked improvement to the previous year when attendances were sometimes restricted to one hour a week.

17.14 Volunteers from Alcoholics Anonymous continued to run weekly evening groups on K1 (for prisoners on the SDTP programme) as well as on D wing and on Trinity – attendance was 15-20 prisoners a session. Regrettably there were a high number of cancellations and delayed sessions due to a lack of officers available to unlock. From June to December, out of a total of 106 sessions, 23% were cancelled and 22% occurred 15 minutes or more after the scheduled start time.

18. GYM

18.1 Staffing levels continued to adversely affect gym attendance with only two gyms out of the four, which included the Astroturf, in use. The latter was only opened for football on the rare occasion extra staff were available.

18.2 The redeployment of the six to seven Physical Education Instructors to cover sickness, major incidents and annual leave, continued to reduce delivery of gym sessions for prisoners which resulted in them getting the minimum of one hour a week and no educational or vocational skills courses. Priority was given to prisoners on Trinity who were in full time work, and those who had addiction problems. Sessions for the Vulnerable Prisoners (VPs), held at weekends or evenings, were more often than not cancelled because of staffing problems. Over the last six weeks of the reporting year the VPs' session was eventually changed to a different time, which appeared to result in less cancellations.

19. CHAPLAINCY

19.1 The prison population was distributed across the major religions in a similar pattern to the previous year, namely 30% Roman Catholic, 25% Muslim and 20% Anglican. The high attendance at the weekly Roman Catholic and Muslim and Anglican services continued.

19.2 The Chaplaincy team ensured all newly arrived prisoners were visited by a member of the team and were regular attenders at ACCTs reviews, GOOD reviews and complex cases meetings.

19.3 The Money Management course and the Sycamore Tree programme, both championed by the Chaplaincy, ran throughout the year. Members of the Chaplaincy team took responsibility for collecting and returning prisoners so the classes were not disrupted by the shortage of officers to unlock. The Money Management course was held on four Wednesday mornings for a group of 10-12 men. It was repeated every six weeks alternating between Trinity and Heathfield. The Sycamore Tree programme, an accredited restorative justice programme which helped prisoners to look at the impact of their offending on others,

was held on six Monday mornings for a group of 20 men and was repeated four times during the year.

19.4 Towards the end of the reporting year, due to vacancies in the team, the Chaplaincy was somewhat stretched.

20. WORK OF THE INDEPENDENT MONITORING BOARD

20.1 Board members had worked well together in the course of the year. Meetings of the Board were held every month, starting with a half-hour training session on a wide variety of subjects including Education, ACCT documentation, Induction, Radio Wanno, and the Segregation Unit. The Board was represented at the IMB Annual Conference and IMB London area chairs' meetings. Whenever possible, the Board had attended inquests at the Coroner's Court. A Board member attended the weekly GOOD reviews. The Annual Team Performance Review was held in November.

Board Statistics

Recommended Complement of Board Members	20
Number of Board members at the start of the reporting period	18
Number of Board members at the end of the reporting period	15
Number of new members joining within the reporting period	2
Number of members leaving within reporting period	5
Total number of Board meetings during reporting period	12

IMB Members Visits to Wandsworth 1 June 2015 to 31 May 2016

Name	Board	Rota	Applications	Other	Total
Barker, Elizabeth	10	29	21	7	67
Deaton, David	10	14	5	28	57
Essex, Nina	12	16	22	19	69
Fitzpatrick, Bronwen	11	23	14	3	51
Forrester, Graham	12	19	18	7	56
Gomersall, Lydia	11	28	21	12	72
Hall, Paul (5)	1	0	0	1	2
Harris, Tricia	8	18	9	2	37
Jones, Peter (2)	2	5	2	1	10
Keeling, Ursula (1)	2	0	6	1	9
Lamunu, Pauline (4)	3	1	3	2	9
Nyasamo, Enna	8	18	37	4	67
Phylactou, Chrystalla (2)	4	3	4	1	12
Salem, Tony	9	20	19	10	58
Shepherdson, Matthew	10	13	7	25	55
Stallibrass, Julia	12	18	25	18	73
Torrance, Sarah (3)	8	2	6	2	18
Travis, Mike (2)	5	8	4	2	19
Watkins, Rick	12	19	29	8	68
Weguelin, Vanessa	11	15	14	11	51
Total	161	269	266	164	860

(1) Left Board July 2015

(2) Left Board December 2015

(3) Left Board March 2016

(4) Joined Board April 2016

(5) Joined Board May 2016

IMB Applications

Code	Subject	2015-16	2014-15	2013-14	2012-13	2011-12
A	Accommodation	194	151	167	53	75
B	Adjudications	14	7	9	2	Under L
C	Equality & Diversity (inc religion)	87	99	74	34	31
D	Education/employment/training/IEP	76	106	112	48	46
E 1	Family/visits (inc mail & phone)	193	159	121	41	90
E 2	Finance/pay	111	105	80	67	50
F	Food/kitchen related	29	15	44	10	Under A
G	Health related	199	179	159	132	226
H 1	Property (within current establishment)	227	161	188	78	119
H 2	Property (external)	106	132	73	37	
H 3	Canteen	82	82	72	23	20
I	Sentence related	401	389	233	71	104
J	Staff/prisoner concerns	131	120	114	42	52
K	Transfers	92	91	63	32	63
L	Miscellaneous	69	70	61	21	54
	Total number of IMB Applications	2011	1866	1570	691	930
	IMB Confidential Access	180	118	71	58	72

20.2 There were 2,011 applications plus a further 180 confidential access applications to the Board in the reporting year. This totalled 2,191 compared with 1,984 for the previous year, representing an 10% rise in the number of applications overall. It was the third year in a row that totals had risen. The number of applications received by the Board was the highest in at least the last ten years.

20.3 Ten categories showed an increase. The most noticeable increase was in applications relating to property within Wandsworth (an increase of 41%), though overall the increase in all applications concerning property was only 14%. Applications concerning wing accommodation increased by 28%. The Board also remained concerned about the number of sentence related applications which was also the highest category for the two preceding years as well.

21. LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ACCT	Assessment Care in Custody Teamwork
CRSA	Cell Risk Sharing Assessment
CRC	Community Rehabilitation Company
DNA	Did not attend
GOOD	Good Order and Discipline
GP	General Practitioner
HDC	Home Detention Curfew
IEP	Incentives and Earned Privileges scheme
NOMS	National Offender Management Service
OASys	Offender Assessment System
OMU	Offender Management Unit
OSG	Officer Support Grade
SDTP	Structural Drug Treatment Programme
SM	Substance Misuse
SRS	Substance Recovery Services
VP	Vulnerable Prisoner
VDT	Violence Diagnostic Tool