



# **Annual Report of the Independent Monitoring Board at**

## **HMP/YOI Kirklevington Grange**

**For reporting year  
1 January 2020 – 31 December 2020**

**Published July 2021**



**Contents**

<b>Introductory sections 1 – 3</b>	<b>Page</b>
1. Statutory role of the IMB	3
2. Description of the establishment	3
3. Executive summary	4
<b>Evidence sections 4 – 7</b>	
4. Safety	8
5. Fair and humane treatment	11
6. Health and wellbeing	17
7. Progression and resettlement	20
<b>The work of the IMB</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Applications to the IMB</b>	<b>27</b>

## **Introductory sections 1 - 3**

### **1. Statutory role of the IMB**

The Prison Act 1952 requires every prison to be monitored by an independent Board, appointed by the Secretary of State from members of the community in which the prison is situated.

Under the National Monitoring Framework agreed with ministers, the Board is required 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 authority has been delegated 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.

The Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (OPCAT) is an international human rights treaty designed to strengthen protection for people deprived of their liberty. The protocol recognises that such people are particularly vulnerable and aims to prevent their ill-treatment through establishing a system of visits or inspections to all places of detention. OPCAT requires that States designate a National Preventive Mechanism to carry out visits to places of detention, to monitor the treatment of and conditions for detainees and to make recommendations for the prevention of ill-treatment. The Independent Monitoring Board (IMB) is part of the United Kingdom's National Preventive Mechanism.

### **2. Description of the establishment**

HMP/YOI Kirklevington Grange is a category D open prison, located in the village of Kirklevington, North Yorkshire, catering for adult male prisoners and young male offenders. The operational capacity was 283 at the beginning of the reporting year, but generally operated slightly below this figure. Before the end of the year, the operating capacity fell to 163 owing to the decommission of three units (see section 5.1).

Prisoners are accommodated within the main building and in four units located within the grounds. Only one of these units was purpose built – the others were originally oil platform accommodation units. Owing to the age of the original building and the units, there were considerable maintenance issues and costs to ensure continued suitability for prisoner accommodation.

The grounds are open, which gives the prisoners a pleasant atmosphere for their leisure and work. The whole of the estate is surrounded by a high fence, giving assurance to the nearby local community and prison staff.

There is a building set aside for education and job seeking, together with a library. There is also a multi-faith room. The medical centre sits alongside this.

The visitors centre is attractive to prisoners and families, being child friendly, and has its own cafeteria and shop.

Within the grounds there is a metalwork shop, joiners' shop, etcetera, and the grounds are utilised for extensive gardening. Limitations to the capacity of the electrical supply prevents any extension of use of further equipment in the workshops or externally, and there was limited use of these facilities during the COVID lockdowns. In normal times, produce from these enterprises is sold in an outside shop attached to an outside cafe, sitting alongside a carwash and valeting facility. All of these facilities are used and appreciated by the community and are also educational, helping towards resettlement and reintegration-focused opportunities for the prisoners.

### **3. Executive summary**

#### **3.1 Background to the report**

The COVID-19 outbreak has had a significant impact on the Board's ability to gather information and discuss the contents of this annual report. The Board has therefore tried to cover as much ground as it can in these difficult circumstances, but inevitably there is less detail and supporting evidence than usual. Ministers are aware of these constraints. Regular information is being collected specifically on the prison's response to the pandemic, and that is being collated nationally.

This report represents the findings of the IMB at HMP/YOI Kirklevington Grange for the calendar year 2020. Evidence was gathered from scrutiny of prison records, rota visits, attendance at prison meetings and conversation both with prisoners and staff.

As in other establishments, due to the COVID-19 situation, it has been a very difficult year. The Governor, officers and staff are to be congratulated on the way they performed during the year, and their immediate response to the changing situations. No deaths recorded and only seven confirmed COVID cases, none being hospitalised, and no serious incidents, is a tribute to their work ethic.

An overall view of the prison showed that it continued to be a well-run operation, and as a result the majority of prisoners had a positive experience during their stay. This was reflected in the number of written applications received by the Board during the reporting year, which was, again, exceptionally low. These facts were supported by

the monitoring activity via the rota reports and informal observations throughout the year.

The interim Acting Governor, who arrived in Kirklevington during 2019, was appointed Governor during 2020, and a new deputy governor was appointed in February 2020.

To support the prison's status, a comprehensive delivery plan operated, improving the prisoners' surroundings, living environment and preparation for release. The plan was reviewed and updated on a regular basis throughout the year, with the support and input of staff, prisoners and contractors.

The prison continued its close relationship with other prisons, particularly HMP Holme House, which helped to create a better understanding between establishments and was beneficial to prisoners on transfer.

As records showed, there were a few reported incidents of discrimination, but when discovered they were swiftly dealt with.

There was a marked improvement in healthcare facilities over the reporting year, with reduced waiting times for appointments, although there were still some concerns, illicit drugs being still an issue within the prison, but this was carefully monitored, with frequent checks and searches carried out.

Education played a big part in prisoners' rehabilitation in normal times.

The majority of the accommodation is old, and there is a lack of financial investment to keep up reasonable standards.

Boredom was an issue for prisoners at the weekend, with many requests for additional television channels.

## **3.2 Main judgements**

### **How safe is the prison?**

It is evident from the statistics shown in the report that Kirklevington was a safe place both for staff and prisoners. There was only one report of bullying reported in the whole year.

### **How fairly and humanely are prisoners treated?**

In the exit reviews completed during the year, a high percentage of prisoners said that they had been well cared for during their sentence and that staff were generally helpful and communicative with them.

## **How well are prisoners' health and wellbeing needs met?**

There was a change of healthcare provider during the year but this did not affect prisoners' welfare. Waiting times for all services were comparable, if not better, than those found outside. There was a reduction in the number of applications submitted last year for health reasons showing progress on last year.

## **How well are prisoners progressed towards successful resettlement?**

The majority of prisoners were supportive of their sentence planning and reported that their offender manager maintained contact with them. It was a difficult year, owing to COVID-19, and it was a challenge to prepare prisoners for release. However, overall it was a success and 'through-the-gate' services were much appreciated by the prisoners.

### **3.3 Main areas for development**

The COVID-19 pandemic has had a significant impact in all areas of the prison, for staff and prisoners. During 2021, the Board will be monitoring the implementation of the Kirklevington Grange 'roadmap', developed by the Governor and staff, which will determine the way forward as restrictions are lifted.

#### ***TO THE MINISTER***

The estate of Kirklevington is still in need of substantial maintenance, and this has been evidenced by the fact of three units being taken out of use, resulting in an operational capacity of only 163 prisoners, a reduction of 120.

When will capital funding be released for replacement blocks and infrastructure works?

#### ***TO THE PRISON SERVICE***

Although an improvement on last year, prisoner property during transfer was still being mislaid or even lost. It is appreciated that HMPPS nationally is aware of this and is looking for a solution. Can the process be resolved with some urgency?

### **3.4 Progress since the last report.**

The situation of prisoners transferring with their property has improved but is still an issue.

The Board is pleased that the concern raised in last year's annual report regarding K unit was acted on in a business case from the Governor to the prison group director, to close the unit, as it did not provide the decent standards we accept.

Within the reporting year, D and E units were also closed due to nationally identified fire retention issues with these types of building.

A considerable investment was made in the main building heating system and in replacing both boilers. In addition, major maintenance money has been allocated for an upgrade of the cold-water mains system.

The gym roof was repaired, and the floor replaced.

The television system was upgraded throughout the site, giving better reception and more programmes.

## Evidence sections 4 – 7

### 4. Safety

#### 4.1 Reception and induction

During 2020, there were 235 receptions into the prison from various establishments, and there were no complaints regarding transportation.

On arrival, each prisoner was given an initial induction, which was followed up in more detail the next day. New arrivals were generally housed in the main block, but since the COVID-19 outbreak they were housed in M unit, specially built temporary accommodation where they could be isolated from the rest of the establishment for 14 days.

The prison continued to have an active Listener programme, supported by the Samaritans, and listeners were visible to prisoners at all times.

Exit interviews indicated that:

- 97% said they were treated well in reception
- 21% said they had issues with property
- 98% said the induction programme was satisfactory.
- 

INTELLIGENCE REPORTS BY CATEGORY 2020			
Threat area	2020	2019	Variation
Absconds	9	22	-59%
Breach of ROTL	50	59	-15%
Drugs	308	419	-26%
Mobile phones	119	133	-10%
Other illicit articles	72	41	+75%
Serious and organised crime	48	45	+7%
Violence	78	85	-8%
Safer custody	59	286	-79%
Order and stability	628	655	-4%
Public protection	76	2	+3800%
Race relations/extremism	12	9	+33%

Domestic abuse	0	32	–
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1459</b>	<b>1788</b>	<b>–18%</b>

#### **4.2 Suicide and self-harm, deaths in custody**

During 2020, there were seven assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) plans raised concerning prisoner welfare. All were regarding potential for self-harm, and in one case a threat of suicide. This compares with 14 in the previous year.

The establishment had a group of prisoners who acted as Listeners, to provide support to fellow prisoners, and any prisoner at risk of self-harm was provided with intensive support via the opening of an ACCT document. The support provided was found to be very effective and compassionate. Timely and suitable arrangements were made if there were any incidents.

As a result of an effective ACCT procedure operating in the prison, there was only one recorded instance of self-harm, the same number as the previous year, and there were no suicides.

There were no deaths in custody.

#### **4.3 Violence and violence reduction, self-isolation**

There were three assaults recorded, all involving prisoners, one described as serious. There were no recorded acts of violence on staff.

There were 13 challenge, support and intervention plan (CSIP) referrals, compared with 12 in 2019.

There were no records of any of the prisoners self-isolating.

#### **4.4 Vulnerable prisoners, safeguarding**

There were no facilities to safeguard vulnerable prisoners, but, if an incident occurred, they were transferred to a suitable establishment. Generally, prisoners of this nature are identified at their existing prison and are not transferred to Kirklevington Grange.

#### **4.5 Use of force**

There was one instance of use of force in 2020.

#### **4.6 Substance misuse**

The frequency of substance misuse is measured by three types of testing: random, risk assessment and suspicion testing. Results for the reporting year:

- 142 random tests, of which 11 were positive (7.7%)
- 93 risk assessment tests, of which seven were positive (7.5%)
- 20 suspicion tests, of which three were positive (15.0%).

During 2020, the following items were found in the prison:

- 75 drugs finds
- 33 mobile phones
- 1 weapon
- 10 sources of alcohol.

During the reporting period: January, February, March, October, November and December 2020 the following mandatory drug tests were conducted:

	RANDOM TESTS	RISK ASSESSMENT TESTS	SUSPICION TESTS	MANDATORY DRUG TESTS
NUMBER CONDUCTED	142	93	20	255
POSITIVE RESULTS	11	7	3	21
% POSITIVE RESULTS	7.74%	7.52%	15%	8.23%
2019 % POSITIVE RESULTS	3.68%	9.24%	17.65%	6.18%

**N.B. Random testing figures relate to the period during which testing took place (January to March 2020). Random testing was suspended during the pandemic and has not been resumed. All other forms of testing have continued to take place throughout the pandemic.**

## **5. Fair and humane treatment**

### **5.1 Accommodation, clothing, food**

The establishment had experienced major changes regarding the 12 units of accommodation in 2020, and at the end of the year had an operational capacity of 163 (down from 283 on 1 January 2020). During the year, the on-site operational capacity was reduced to facilitate the closure of three separate units which had either structural or fire safety issues identified.

Following the reduction in overall capacity, a cell certificate schedule, dated 17 November 2020, was available to detail the accommodation and certify its fitness for use. Each prisoner had a key to their room; many of the rooms had their own individual bathroom facilities.

The amount of accommodation available was increased during the year, initially with the temporary provision of 'Bunkabin' modules, sited in a separate area within the site. This was as a response to the COVID-19 pandemic and allowed for the potential to isolate any prisoners with symptoms from the general population, to prevent the spread of infection. Each 'Bunkabin' was a self-contained unit with its own sanitary facilities, arranged in a courtyard-type configuration with an outside area containing seating. This accommodation was also used to 'reverse cohort' prisoners who were new to the establishment, and was ideal as it was separate from the rest of the prison, where inductions could be conducted. At the end of 2020, the 'Bunkabin' modules were awaiting work to be carried out to make them more winter ready.

Older prisoners (over 55) were grouped together in the accommodation whenever possible, and at the end of 2020 were housed in H unit, providing flat access and a quiet space.

The establishment had reasonable levels of cleanliness in the accommodation and communal spaces, with enhanced cleaning regimes implemented to reduce the spread of infection. As the pandemic situation progressed through the year, all persons, staff and prisoners, were required to wear face coverings in shared areas.

The sanitary facilities in the A/B/C area were refurbished during the year, which was essential due to the heavy use of the facilities. One unit in the main older accommodation block did not have its own facilities, which therefore required the adjacent unit to share its facilities, placing a strain on the facilities and also on the relationships of some of the men in the units.

In their exit interviews, 84% of prisoners said that it was easy to maintain personal cleanliness.

The eradication of bedbugs in the establishment proved to be ongoing and problematic but any incidence was tackled effectively, with a defined protocol.

There were, again, ongoing issues regarding prisoners' in-room television reception, which was poor. Additional television channels were made available during the year, to help prisoners with boredom resulting from fewer work and training opportunities,

along with reduced family visits, release on temporary licence (ROTL) and other activities normally provided in the establishment.

The fabric of many parts of the establishment continued to give rise to concern and resulted in a reduced occupancy at the end of the year due to the closure of accommodation units. Some progress was made during the year, with the replacement of The Grange roof, a new gym floor, a new heating boiler, a heating management system and refurbishment of the bathroom facilities on one of the units. The buildings that make up the establishment, however, continued to show their age, and the equipment and utilities serving them caused problems, including heating failures and lack of water for a time, due to the corrosion of old pipes.

There were four applications received by the Board relating to accommodation during 2020.

The establishment had a popular external coffee shop, open to the public, which, along with being valued by the local community, was used for vocational training and work opportunities for the prisoners. In this extraordinary year, the coffee shop was either shut or operating on a 'take-out' basis only for large periods, which was disappointing for all, but unavoidable. The internal coffee shop provided meals for prisoners and staff, in addition to training and work opportunities for men; however, much of the normal offering was reduced and provided as a take-out service only because of the extraordinary circumstances.

The kitchens had a five-star food hygiene rating, following inspection in May 2019, with good levels of food hygiene, safety and structural compliance, and high levels of confidence in management. No further inspection was carried out by the local authority in 2020.

The catering staff were skilled at providing specialist diets for medical and religious requirements, and also made special arrangements for Ramadan and the celebration of cultures, including Black History Month; however, due to the necessary COVID-19 restrictions, these could not be delivered in the normal way during the year and in some cases were scaled back. Additional food such as cakes, drinks and dried fruit and nuts were supplied during the restrictions, to enhance the offering to the men. Following feedback from the prisoners, healthy eating packs including vegetables and eggs were added to menu options.

The kitchens were found to operate to a high standard, both in organisation and hygiene, and with suitable portion control. The food was accepted by most prisoners to be of a good quality, with much of the menu being freshly prepared on site. Only 2% of all stage 1 and 1a complaints dealt with by the establishment related to food. In their exit reviews, 80% of prisoners said that, overall, they were satisfied with food quality.

There were no applications made to the Board in relation to food and the kitchens in 2020.

## **5.2 Segregation, special accommodation**

The establishment does not have a segregation unit. There are two holding cells available, which were used as a temporary measure, usually prior to prisoners being returned to closed conditions (see section 7.3). The holding cells were used typically for only a few hours while waiting for transport provision; however, the unit was very occasionally used overnight when the timing for transfer was late in the day and the receiving prison could not accept incoming prisoners. As a result of COVID-19, a safety assessment was conducted with health and safety and the regional safety team, to ensure that appropriate protocols were in place, and as a result Perspex was added to the gates of the holding rooms.

## **5.3 Staff/prisoner relationships, key workers**

Staff had a good knowledge of prisoners, and communication appeared, on the whole, to be positive and effective. Each prisoner was allocated a personal officer shortly after arrival.

During the pandemic, staff dealt with prisoners' frustrations with the changes in routine and lack of opportunities caused by the restrictions in an honest and timely manner, to prevent rumour and speculation.

In their exit reviews, 82% of prisoners said that their personal officer had maintained contact with them, 95% said that staff had helped with their queries and 87% said that staff had treated them with respect.

The final stage of the digital prisons project, which involved the provision of in-room digital access, was discontinued; however, the prisoners still benefit from in-room telephones and access to digital kiosks sited around the establishment. Additional telephone credit was provided during the pandemic, to help prisoners maintain communication with their family and friends.

A bookable 'Purple Visits' system for video calling friends and family was introduced during the year due to travel and visiting restrictions. The system did have issues, however, and many of the prisoners chose not to use the system.

WayOut TV was introduced as one of the television channels, with increasing use to advertise job vacancies, and provide important information and support.

## **5.4 Equality and diversity**

The prison continued to promote equality and inclusion under the 2010 Equality Act within the provision of a single equality plan. The prisoners had equality representatives, who met staff at regular intervals, as and when required, to discuss prisoner–staff issues. These meetings, together with regular prisoner focus groups, ensured that prisoners' requests were heard and acted upon, and were well received and appreciated both by prisoners and staff.

In their exit reviews, 100% of prisoners said that different groups of people got on well at the establishment.

<b>Ethnicity breakdown*</b>	<b>Average % of population 2020</b>
Asian/Asian British: Indian	1.62
Asian/Asian British: Pakistani	4.04
Black/Black British: Any other background	0.39
Black/Black British: Caribbean	0.53
Code missing	0.17
Mixed: White and Black Caribbean	0.88
Other: Any other background	0.17
White: Any other background	1.10
White: Eng./Welsh/Scot./N. Irish/British	86.40
White: Gypsy or Irish Traveller	4.17
White: Irish	0.53

\*Based on a 10-month data set for 2020

The prison operated a robust system of consultation and review relating to equality and diversity, including a prisoner consultative committee, which was normally held monthly. Various groups were in existence, such as for older prisoners (over 55) and veterans.

There was a regular meeting of the single equality action team, and discrimination incident report forms submitted were independently reviewed before being signed off.

Events such as Black History Month could not go ahead in the previously delivered way because of the pandemic, but efforts were still made to mark this with, for example, a poster display which the prisoners could read while they were collecting their meals.

## **5.5 Faith and pastoral support**

The chaplaincy continued to represent all faiths, with a message of 'we are here for you, faith or no faith'. The provision covered Church of England, Muslim, Free Church, Roman Catholic, Sikh, Buddhist, Pagan, Hindu, Jehovah Witness and Mormon faiths.

Group worship was impacted in line with national and local restrictions at times, and normal annual events were either restricted or unable to go ahead.

The chaplaincy team was well respected and valued by the prisoners.

## 5.6 Incentives and earned privileges (IEP)

As trusted prisoners, all individuals on arrival were on the highest available level of IEP (enhanced/gold).

There is a national incentives policy framework, which was issued in July 2019, and each establishment's local policy must fully comply with the policy framework. Kirklevington Grange had a reward and progression strategy, dated April 2018, which was in effect during the year.

The establishment operated with an approach that was different to that traditionally found in a closed prison, and prisoners were expected to adhere to the highest standards of behaviour and engagement.

In addition to the normal private money that prisoners could spend on a weekly basis on goods, telephone calls, the coffee shop and catalogue orders, those who worked outside the establishment could apply for an additional sum to be added to their spends account.

If a prisoner failed to meet the high standards of behaviour, and following three recorded negative entries over a three-month period, a case conference would be called with 48 hours' notice, giving the prisoner the opportunity to provide a written submission or attend in person. Prisoners had the opportunity to follow a defined appeals procedure if they were unhappy with the case conference decision.

## 5.7 Complaints

There were 181 formal complaints (161 stage1 and 20 stage 1A) submitted to the prison during 2020. The largest number of complaints related to offender management/offender assessment system (OASys) and property issues.

Subject of complaint	No.	%
Bullying	1	0.55
Canteen	2	1.1
Education	1	0.55
Finance/cash	10	5.52
Food	4	2.21
Letters/censors	2	1.1
OASys/offender management	30	16.57
Other	29	16.11
Property	30	16.57
Residential	25	13.81

Security	19	10.55
Staff	10	5.52
Visits	1	0.55
Work	17	9.44

There were 90 complaints made regarding issues which occurred at other establishments prior to their arrival at Kirklevington Grange. Of these, 74 related to issues with property.

It is pleasing to note that only 11% of complaints were escalated to stage 1A by the complainant.

## **5.8 Property**

Prisoners' property being either damaged, lost or delayed on arrival from other establishments was an issue on transfer to Kirklevington Grange. One prisoner had his belongings delayed by several months, which is clearly unacceptable. Chasing up property can be a time-consuming and frustrating task. This was recognised to be an issue throughout the estate, and work to address this via a national property framework consultation was under way in 2020, with the Board participating as a stakeholder.

This issue was reflected in the high numbers of stage 1 and 1A complaints relating to property dealt with by the establishment, with 82% of formal complaints submitted regarding other establishments related to property.

In their exit reviews, 21% of prisoners said that they had had issues with property on arrival.

The Board dealt with three applications relating to loss/delay of property. Two of these related to property during transfer or in another establishment.

## **6. Health and wellbeing**

### **6.1 Physical healthcare**

Healthcare was provided by G4S initially, and was a 'satellite' of HMP Holme House, but services were taken over by Spectrum in April.

Pharmacy services are still associated with HMP Holme House, as are mental health services, but in September Kirklevington began an association with HMP Deerbolt for other services.

Staff complement:

- 1 × full-time clinical manager
- 1 × full-time band 5 nurse
- 1 × full-time pharmacy technician
- 1 × band 4 associate practitioner.

Care providers:

- GP and pharmacy: Spectrum Health
- Dentistry: Hardwick Dental Practice
- Mental health: Tees, Esk and Wear Valley NHS Foundation Trust
- Optician: Henderson Opticians.

As with all departments, COVID-19 affected healthcare services, but staff coped remarkably well and there were only seven prisoners diagnosed positive, with none sent to hospital and no recorded deaths.

Healthcare requirements differ from most prisons due to Kirklevington's categorisation as an open prison. New arrivals were seen once they had been located to M unit, and the first reception screen was carried out within 24 hours of arrival. Prisoners could make appointments via the digital kiosks; paper applications were accepted from those on M unit. This was explained to prisoners during the first reception screen.

Waiting times for the past 12 months were impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic. Initially, healthcare was carried out on the units. Clinics resumed in the healthcare centre in October and many consultations were carried out by telephone. Medication collection moved from the healthcare centre to the methadone administration room. Collection is only by appointment.

Waiting times:

- GP appointments: same week
- Nurse appointments: same day or the next day
- Dentist appointments: urgent patients only
- Podiatry appointments: urgent patients only
- Optician appointments: urgent patients only
- Physiotherapist appointments: telephone consultations only.

Routine hospital appointments were cancelled by prisoners for many reasons and could result in ongoing health problems. Examples provided include:

- The day did not suit them
- They were afraid to attend because of COVID-19
- They were due to be released.

Chronic conditions were managed by the designated long-term conditions nurse, who visited the prison regularly to review these prisoners. Palliative care patients were sent back to closed conditions and treated by a 24-hour healthcare team. The establishment could not accept some prisoners with severe physical disabilities or those using a wheelchair, given its layout.

There was one GP session per week, supplemented by two nurse prescriber sessions, either two mornings or one full day. These sessions were supplemented by additional specific clinics for vaccinations, sexual health, weekly 'well man' sessions, monthly diabetic/asthma assessments and mental health.

Exit interviews indicated that 84% of prisoners said healthcare met their needs.

## **6.2 Mental healthcare**

Prisoners could self-refer through healthcare if they were feeling anxious or depressed. A routine assessment for prisoners requiring psychiatric inpatient care was normally seen within four days by the community psychiatric nurse for an initial routine assessment. Prisoners in crisis were seen within 24 hours. Prisoners had access to a psychiatrist for treatment, and the average waiting time was nine weeks. There was no specific therapist at the establishment; therapeutic work was delivered by community psychiatric nurses and psychologists who were qualified in trauma-informed care and dialectical behavioural therapy. Any prisoner requiring psychiatric inpatient care would be transferred to HMP Holme House, to be supported until transfer to hospital; the waiting time varied as it was dependent on the hospital/ward and bed management.

Psychiatry clinics were carried out as and when needed. The waiting time to see the psychiatric nurse was two weeks or dependent upon the frequency of nurse visits. 'Rethink therapies' had no waiting list; patients were assessed in the next clinic session, which took place every Thursday. All mental health patients were referred to outside services if further needs were identified.

The mental health team had a neurodevelopment pathway, to support individuals with learning difficulties/autistic spectrum disorders, including access to a speech and language therapist. The team issued prisoners who were self-isolating with self-help material which included distraction packs.

## **6.3 Social care**

There was no prisoner on the waiting list for a social care assessment. If there was a requirement, a simple adaptation could be made; however, if there were complex

needs, the patient would need to transfer back to closed conditions with 24-hour healthcare provision. Social care needs were met and funded by Stockton Borough Council.

#### **6.4 Exercise, time out of cell, gym**

The prisoners had access to the gym prior to the pandemic, with a wide range of training and exercise programmes and in-cell activities via WayOut TV and Way2learn, which offered entertainment and learning programmes. Group activities were affected by the COVID-19 restrictions.

#### **6.5 Drug rehabilitation**

Substance misuse, and the provision of support, remained a priority for the prison. The drug and alcohol recovery team (DART) offered an induction session for all new prisoners on arrival at the prison.

Assessments were completed for those who chose to engage with the service. The screening, assessment and treatment for drug and alcohol misuse looked at the wide range of substance use and any other related physical and mental health needs.

Engagement was on a voluntary basis, unless there was a clinical need, such as the prescription of methadone as part of opiate substitution therapy. A care plan was put in place with the prisoner and reviewed on a regular basis. The care and treatment that the prison provides was the same as they would receive in the community. During the past 12 months, 72 active transfers were made to the DART team when prisoners arrived, and there were 21 referrals after arrival at Kirklevington Grange. On release from prison, the team made a referral to support services, with an appointment made for the day the prisoner was released, so that treatment could continue uninterrupted. The DART telephoned and checked the prisoner had kept their appointment with the drug and alcohol service.

In a DART exit interview, 38% of prisoners said that the DART work was helpful, with 55% being non-applicable.

#### **6.6 Soft skills**

Soft skills were integrated into training and learning programmes. There was a wide range of training and learning opportunities available. The curriculum was developed by Novus (formerly the Learning, Training, Employment Group) to include skills such as teamwork, problem solving, effective communication, empathy and creativity.

The prison's community and mentoring courses focused on the development of soft skills and transferable skills. Undertaking hobbies and activities during the pandemic was challenging due to the restrictions which limited group activity and the sharing of activities. This included the book club supported by the library and the prison reading group. Distraction packs and Shannon Trust packs were available. The prison provided art resources, competitions and hobby craft materials. All prisoners had the opportunity to engage in recreational activities. During the summer, a New York run

was participated in both by staff and prisoners to raise money for the NHS. The prisoners were encouraged to put forward their ideas for any activities they wished to organise.

## **7. Progression and resettlement**

### **7.1 Education, library**

The prison encouraged prisoners to continue with their education – the core subjects being a level 2 qualification in English and mathematics – and facilitated prisoners to attend local colleges and universities, to gain further qualifications up to degree level.

Novus held responsibility for academic education within the establishment. New courses implemented in 2020 included social enterprise and community innovation. When prisoners arrived, their prior educational achievement was reviewed and a personal learning plan agreed.

The national lockdown in March 2020 resulted in the cessation of all face-to-face education. Novus staff worked from home, producing in-cell distraction packs which were selected from a weekly menu and distributed to prisoners on request. No assessment or follow-up was provided. Care was taken to ensure that all packs were 'dyslexia friendly', to support those with learning difficulties.

Novus staff returned on site in August but were not allowed access to the main prison buildings, and prisoners were not allowed to enter the education building under COVID-19 secure measures.

All new receptions arriving during lockdown received mathematics and English assessment papers to complete if they had not completed an assessment prior to being transferred to Kirklevington.

With no movement between buildings, the pick-up and drop-off of learning materials was difficult and some items were lost/misplaced/not returned. However, staff were diligent in providing additional written feedback. Educators attempted to support prisoners by telephone but often they were not in their cells when called, so this had limited success.

A COVID-19 annual delivery plan was implemented in September, set to be reviewed every two months. This was to ensure that it reflected changes to the exceptional delivery model stages and regime changes.

The self-assessment review was completed for 2019/2020.

When outside education resumed in October, there were 10 prisoners attending college/university in the community. Within the prison, educators were still unable to conduct face-to-face learning.

As successful education is greatly enhanced by the development of personal relationships, especially for those previously disengaged, it has been an extremely

difficult period for the education department. Lower-level learners have been the most disadvantaged, and motivation has suffered, with a higher level of withdrawal from education than seen previously or than is desirable.

An exit survey conducted with 56 prisoners during 2020 (none were carried out during May, June and July due to staff absence relating to the COVID-19 lockdown) demonstrated that 63% were satisfied that education provision had met their needs.

The prison library is a small but welcoming space and library staff worked hard to access materials requested by prisoners.

The senior librarian was shielding and working from home throughout the period from March to December. Just one part-time librarian remained working on site between lockdowns.

Due to COVID-19 restrictions, staff working from the 'new directions centre', where the library is located, were not allowed to access the main prison buildings. Publicising the library resources, and collecting and dispatching requested materials became more difficult. Prisoners appeared to take books not intended for them and items became separated, so delays and frustrations occurred, reducing library usage significantly. In January 2020, 91% of prisoners were enrolled in the library; following lockdown closure and the inability to visit the library due to COVID-19 restrictions, this had fallen to 71% in December 2020.

Despite the restrictions, the library staff continued to provide a regular service and satisfaction rates were high.

## 7.2 Vocational training, work

The prison itself provided training opportunities in horticulture, catering, hospitality, welding, woodwork skills, car valeting and recycling. A food safety and cleaning qualification associated with the Waste Management Industry Training and Advisory Board (WAMITAB) was also available through Novus, although the accreditation for this was suspended due to COVID-19. The welding and joinery workshops were also closed due to staffing and COVID issues from 23 March.

The following table represents the work/training situation throughout 2020.

	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec
Prisoners in internal employment	131	133	123	49	49	64	73	94	95	95	98	81
Prisoners in community work	53	54	60	0	0	0	0	2	4	26	26	29
Prisoners in paid/outside employment	81	81	71	0	0	0	0	16	15	21	21	19
Prisoners in outside college	5	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	8	7
Prisoners released	21	15	24	21	24	22	20	15	18	14	15	12
Prisoners with employment/training places on release	2	3	5	1	1	3	9	6	8	3	2	3

Reducing reoffending staff continued to work very hard in maintaining contact with existing and potential new employers, to provide future work opportunities for prisoners. As restrictions were eased, additional work was created for prison-based task forces, in managing the grounds around the prison. The number employed in prison/community work fell from 24 to 12. Many jobs were lost during lockdown, especially in the hospitality sector; hours were reduced in other areas, to four hours per fortnight in one case, and one prisoner was furloughed by his employer.

There was some return to paid work in August. Prisoners working outside the prison were housed separately in one unit, to prevent any potential for the spread of infection. As ROTL resumed, four prisoners returned to work and another to an additional work trial which had been arranged prior to lockdown. All employers were risk assessed for health and safety (as normal) but additional COVID-19 risk assessments were carried out. This, and many changes in the regime due to changing guidance, created considerable additional work for staff at a time of unprecedented absence. The prison coped admirably during this very difficult period.

There were 3,276 ROTL events agreed during the year, with only two failures.

By September, the job team had resumed support by telephone.

A new initiative with a small local charity, 'Little Sprouts', engaged prisoners in producing meals one day each week in the prison kitchen, for distribution to disadvantaged families and individuals locally.

In an exit survey, 52% of prisoners said that their community placement had been helpful (36% not applicable); 48% stated that they had been helped to find employment (31% not applicable); and 14% said that they had been helped to find a college placement (64% not applicable).

### 7.3 Offender management, progression

The resettlement of prisoners is the major focus of the prison. Many prisoners arrived with incomplete OASys assessments, and this was a priority for offender management unit staff. In an exit survey, 81% of prisoners said that they had been able to contribute to the sentence planning process, and 82% that their offender manager had maintained contact with them. The vast majority believed that they had made positive changes which they could maintain on release.

Only 74 prisoners were returned to closed conditions during 2020. The table below shows the reasons for this.

Reason for return	Number of prisoners
Drug finds	14
Risk assessment	8
Mobile phone	7

Intelligence	18
Breach of ROTL	1
Mandatory drug failure	6
Non-conformance with regime	4
Potential further charges	2
Own protection	2
Non-compliance	4
Suspect assault	1
Hooch finds	1
Breach of restraining order	1
Under the influence of substance	4
Health reasons	1
	74

#### **7.4 Family contact**

There is a pleasant, well-furnished and -equipped visits room, and the atmosphere is calm and supportive of positive meetings.

COVID-19 restrictions deterred or prevented family visits through much of 2020 and attendance, when permitted, was low. Monitored video calls (Purple Visits) were implemented but this was frustrated by very poor information technology infrastructure and many failed contacts, so uptake declined.

Prison staff continued to respond sensitively and appropriately to incoming calls from families worried about the mental health of prisoners, and support was offered when required.

Additional telephone credits were allocated to the prisoners for extended outside contact, together with other initiatives to maintain family ties during lockdown period.

#### **7.5 Resettlement planning**

Primarily, the prison placed significant emphasis on its resettlement role, preparing prisoners to move on in the community on release, and employed a range of strategies to achieve this goal.

At three months prior to release, 'through-the-gate' staff supported prisoners through the 'heading home' project. Routes to Work supported those over 30 years of age and Pathways the younger prisoners. In November, 47 prisoners were participating in these programmes. They also provided external support for writing CVs and finding work placements. The prison also worked with other agencies, including Nacro.

Through-the-gate work was disrupted during the second national lockdown, when staff were largely working from home and had only telephone contact with prisoners.

Domestic ROTL, community visits and supervised outside visits resumed briefly in October, only to cease with the second lockdown.

A number of resettlement day releases, home visits, took place in September and October, following the relaxation of the first COVID-19 lockdown. ROTL release also increased for other purposes during this period, such as paid and unpaid employment.

During 2020, 113 prisoners were assessed for home detention curfew (HDC), of whom 93 were approved, 10 were ineligible, five were unsuitable, one opted out, one was postponed and three were rejected. Seventeen prisoners were released on parole, and 11 prisoners were released on the early release scheme.

There was a small increase in applications to the Board relating to ROTL/HDC (nine in 2019, 14 in 2020), mainly relating to the suspension of ROTL due to COVID-19 restrictions, preventing prisoners from demonstrating progress to their forthcoming parole boards.

In an exit survey conducted with 56 prisoners, 32% said that they would be employed on release, 11% that they would be self-employed, 11% that they would be retired and 46 % expected to be unemployed.

Throughout 2020, all prisoners left the establishment with accommodation. The homelessness prevention priority team provided short-term lets and hotel accommodation when necessary, as some hostels were unavailable due to COVID-19 restrictions. All prisoners had a bank account open on release, although, as a result of a change of HSBC bank policy, prisoners were unable to obtain a bank card before their release, at a time when banks were often declining access to their branches. This was a stumbling block for those serving longer sentences and unfamiliar with online applications.

## 8. The work of the IMB

Communications have not been easy, due to lockdown, and with the Board only being able to carry out remote monitoring for the greater part of the year, cooperation from the prison to keep us informed was more than acceptable. Daily briefings were accessible by 'dial in', as were most meetings (security etcetera), and there were two written updates each day, sent out by email.

- One member left the Board during 2020, leaving us with nine members, which is the recommended number.
- A rota timetable was produced quarterly, each member being allocated a rota week to carry out a monitoring visit in that week, as well as having a specialist area to look at in more detail. Two visits per week were made by alternative members.
- Full on-site monitoring was carried out from 1 January until 13 March and then again from 1 September until 31 December. Owing to the pandemic, a risk assessment was made on going into the prison, and it was decided by the Board, and in talks with the Governor, to monitor remotely for the intervening period.
- During this period, regular contact was kept with the Governor/officers and we were able to attend the morning briefings by telecom, keeping updated and being able to raise matters. Two bulletins per day were issued throughout the year by the prison.
- There were very few written applications received; the Board clerk notified the member on duty if any applications had been submitted, and they would come into the prison to deal with them. The majority of applications received were 'on the hoof'; these were dealt with in the same way as for written applications, and logged in a book for reference.
- An 'area visited sheet' was completed during each monitoring visit; this ensured that all areas were visited and monitored over a period of time.
- A rota report was completed by the member on duty and circulated to all Board members, the Board clerk and the Governor, highlighting any questions to the Governor which required a response. The Governor would receive details of any questions, with responses given out at Board meetings.
- Board members attended prison meetings when they could, which included Governor morning briefings, and minutes of all meetings were available to the Board.
- Board meetings were held on the first Thursday of the month, and the Governor or a representative attended. During the lockdown period, these were held remotely by teleconference.
- The pandemic had a marked effect on how we monitored activities. This was not easy, but we had cooperation from prison staff through teleconference and telephone contact.
- From April to the end of the year, Board meetings were held by teleconference except for one face-to-face meeting in November, but regular contact was made by emails and telephone.

- The annual team performance review was undertaken in October; information from this was collated and training needs were identified.
- New Board members were provided with a mentor and accompanied different members on their rota visits until they were deemed to be competent. A written review was also conducted with new members three to four months after appointment, highlighting any areas of concern and included additional training needs if necessary.

The gender breakdown of Board members at the beginning of the year was:

Chairperson	Male
Vice chair	Female
Board Development Officer	Male
Member × 5	Female
Member × 2	Male

10% of members were Black, Asian, & Minority Ethnic (BAME)

### **Board statistics**

Recommended complement of Board members	9
Number of Board members at the start of the reporting period	10
Number of Board members at the end of the reporting period	9
Total number of visits to the establishment	119
Total number of segregation reviews attended	N/A

## Applications to the IMB

<b>Code</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Previous reporting year</b>	<b>Current reporting year</b>
A	Accommodation, including laundry, clothing, ablutions	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>
B	Discipline, including adjudications, IEP, sanctions	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>
C	Equality	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
D	Purposeful activity, including education, work, training, library, regime, time out of cell	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>
E1	Letters, visits, telephones, public protection restrictions	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>
E2	Finance, including pay, private monies, spends	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>
F	Food and kitchens	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>
G	Health, including physical, mental, social care	<b>7</b>	<b>10</b>
H1	Property within this establishment	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
H2	Property during transfer or in another establishment or location	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>
H3	Canteen, facility list, catalogue(s)	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
I	Sentence management, including HDC, ROTL, parole, release dates, recategorization	<b>14</b>	<b>9</b>
J	Staff/prisoner concerns, including bullying	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>
K	Transfers	<b>2</b>	
L	Miscellaneous, including complaints system	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>
	Total number of applications	<b>44</b>	<b>50</b>



This publication is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. To view this licence, visit [nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3](https://nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3)

Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

This publication is available at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications>