

# Annual Report of the Independent Monitoring Board at HMP Wayland

**For the reporting year  
1 June 2020 – 31 May 2021**

Published November 2021

## **Contents**

### **Introductory Sections 1 – 3**

|                                     | Page |
|-------------------------------------|------|
| 1. Statutory role of the IMB        | 3    |
| 2. Description of the establishment | 3    |
| 3. Executive summary                | 5    |

### **Evidence sections 4 – 7**

|                                 |    |
|---------------------------------|----|
| 4. Safety                       | 10 |
| 5. Fair and humane treatment    | 15 |
| 6. Health and wellbeing         | 23 |
| 7. Progression and resettlement | 27 |

|                     |    |
|---------------------|----|
| The work of the IMB | 35 |
|---------------------|----|

|                         |    |
|-------------------------|----|
| Applications to the IMB | 36 |
|-------------------------|----|

## **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 Wayland is a category C male training prison.

The prison is 13.2 miles from the nearest railway station and three miles from the nearest bus stop, which can make visiting both difficult and expensive, as only around 15% of the prisoners are from Norfolk and Suffolk, almost all the rest being from London and the south-east of England.

The prison's certified normal accommodation is, currently, 914. At the start of the reporting year, the capacity was 1,003 but, following a fire inspection of the prison, two units, F and H wings, whose unacceptable condition this Board had raised previously with no result, were declared unsafe and are now in the process of demolition.

The original prison, built over 35 years ago, comprises:

- four, large H-blocks, mainly single cells with an integral toilet and washbasin, but with communal shower rooms

- a further, smaller, two-storey unit
- the segregation unit (locally named the reintegration unit)
- the healthcare unit,
- a kitchen
- the gym
- a large workshop/activity complex
- the prison's reception and visiting areas
- the main administration and entry building.

There have since been four expansions with now, as well as the original units above, and after the closure of F and H wings:

- five short-life, ready-to-use units of 60 prisoners each, all cells double, with full integral sanitation, including showers
- an individually designed two-wing accommodation unit of 95 single cells, all with integral sanitation
- a first night centre
- a second kitchen
- a large education centre
- a further administration building.

All of this has resulted in a very spread-out site.

The Board is pleased to record that work has now started on the long-anticipated construction of a new robust, segregation unit, which is scheduled to open by the end of 2021.

The older buildings continue to have problems with their leaking flat roofs, resulting in puddles in the corridors, cells and other places. These problematic flat roofs have seen repairs, but more work is likely to be needed, especially as the cell construction in these buildings includes poor window design and inward-opening doors, which are easy to barricade and potentially a source of difficulty for staff making an emergency entry. The Prison Service has now agreed to refurbish these cells with more modern anti-barricade doors, windows and furniture. The Board welcomes that move, although it regrets that the work will take some considerable time.

There have also been continuing severe problems with the fabric and construction of the newer builds. A refurbishment programme has taken place but the design and construction of these units will mean that further work will be an ongoing requirement; they are already beyond their original design life.

As the prison is expected to expand further, in addition to replacing the accommodation lost by the demolition of F and H wings, there will be a need to review whether expansion will be needed for the central administration and support areas, such as the reception unit, and the visits, faith and training areas, all of which were under pressure when the prison's population was at its previous certified normal accommodation of 1,003.

### **3. Executive summary**

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

Life in Wayland during the whole of the reporting year has been dominated by the Covid-19 pandemic, which has directly impoverished the regime. Prisoners have frequently been locked up for up to 22 hours a day, with occasionally less than two hours for exercise, showers and domestic activity. No employment has been taking place, other than work in wing cleaning, kitchens, the DHL packing shop, waste management and a small personal protective equipment (PPE) workshop. The unlock situation eased a bit at the end of the reporting year and also for a short time in the late summer of 2020, when face-to-face visits were allowed, although with limitations. However, during the whole of this year there have been no industrial workshops or training courses open (except those noted above), virtually no education and only remote use of the library.

Wayland has, however, been fortunate to have had a low number of positive Covid-19 cases and only one pandemic-related death, so far, in the prisoner population, bearing in mind the cramped conditions that the prisoners live under. This was despite there being occasional spikes in infections from prisoners from HMP Norwich and elsewhere, and brought in from the community, the local area having a high level at one time from an outbreak at a food factory.

Nevertheless, the lockdown has reportedly had a bad effect on some prisoners' mental health, particularly in the early stages, although this has been much less than feared. Although, due to the increased demands on their services, the mental health team may have missed the potential signs it is perhaps significant to record that there has been no increase in formal diagnoses of depression, although the number said to have 'low mood' has increased, although there has been an increase in, thankfully mostly minor, self-harming and in the number of assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) documents opened. At the end of our reporting year, with restrictions easing, with personal visits resuming, a little longer time out of cells and a little gym time, the Board trusts that prisoners' mental health issues can be given more of the attention that they need.

The Board, however, is increasingly concerned that any improvement in the treatment of prisoners, as the world, and the Prison Service, comes out of the pandemic, will be threatened by two serious issues. First, the already low staffing numbers are threatening the recovery. Second, a very high proportion of prison officers have almost no experience of the challenging management of prisoners outside of a tightly controlled pandemic-restricted environment.

The Board has been informed that the number of prison officer grade staff available for duty is often as low as two-thirds of the agreed staffing profile, although some of this lack is due to the need to temporarily promote junior staff to supervisory positions, as well as to pandemic effects. Nevertheless, it is the case that the total

agreed staffing level is short by 28 band 3 (prison officer) staff. Even if, however, the staff numbers are brought up to the current agreed level, it is the Board's view, from its monitoring observations, that this is significantly fewer than would be needed to create a properly profiled organisation, committed to the rehabilitation of its prisoners. Prisoners are not in the equivalent of an Amazon warehouse, just waiting for workers to move them to the delivery vans, they are complex human beings with more than averagely complex needs. As such, there needs to be an adequate number of staff, adequately trained, to deliver on the Prison Service's commitment to rehabilitation, as well as security. In the Board's view, therefore, the Prison Service should not only review the total number of staff available in Wayland, but also ensure that they are adequately trained to carry out their demanding roles, and that their pay is such as will ensure their retention.

### **3.2 Main judgements**

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

During this year of lockdown, prisoners have undoubtedly been safer due to their restricted movements and the smaller number of prisoners able to associate during exercise or domestic duties, compared with pre-pandemic opportunities. However, there have still been assaults, prisoner on prisoner, and for a time in the early lockdown times, prisoner assaults on other prisoners, and on staff, increased, although a significant number of the latter were triggered, it seemed, by the inevitable potential for conflict during return to cell. However, the number of assaults slowly declined as the pandemic restrictions took hold. In addition, as experience of the lockdown was gained, both by staff and prisoners, there was more acceptance of the restrictions, and the latter part of the reporting year saw significant reductions in all types of assaults.

Alongside this, the number of self-isolating prisoners also reduced; many, perhaps, because there were fewer opportunities to acquire drugs, and therefore debts, which reduced reversion to self-isolation.

However, assaults are, by their nature, extreme events and although it is useful to be aware of these clear indicators of a lack of safety, their lesser frequency, or absence, perhaps should not be taken as an indicator that all is well. Prisoners may feel unsafe, even if they do not feel they are exposed to such extreme events. A low level of threats to ensure compliance over small things, such as holding drugs or hooch for others if cell searches are suspected, can still result in prisoners feeling unsafe. In our recent survey of prisoners' attitudes and views, we asked three questions which bore directly on the issue of safety:

1. Did you feel safe after your arrival?
2. Do you feel safe NOW?
3. How many other prisoners do you feel you can REALLY trust at Wayland?

The answers were revealing:

1. Exactly a third said that they did not feel safe on arrival.
2. This fell to 22% feeling unsafe (after an average stay of 18 months), which is still a significant minority who felt unsafe.
3. However, 40% admitted trusting nobody in the prisoner population, and the average number who admitted trusting some other prisoners was only three.

If safety is an absence of a fear of direct threat and harmful actions by others, then Wayland is not a safe prison for around one in five of its prisoners. If, however, safety is defined as a state where prisoners can feel safe in the company of others and have the opportunity to get on with their personal lives without a constant low-level anxiety of what might happen to them, then Wayland still has a way to go to be a safe prison for almost all prisoners.

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

Despite the challenges of Covid-19, staff have made consistent efforts to manage prisoners in a fair and humane fashion in their daily interactions. When possible during the pandemic, prisoner forums have been received well, and positively, and were a significant factor in the prison community's continued acceptance of the restrictions of the lockdown. Other initiatives, such as weekly 'coffee mornings' for life-sentenced prisoners and those serving an indeterminate sentence for public protection, where they could easily interact with staff at all levels, were welcomed and well attended when possible. Communication with prisoners has been uniformly very well received, with 80% of respondents in our survey agreeing that communication over the pandemic and other issues had been good.

We are also able to say, from Board members' observations and discussions with prisoners, that staff have shown consistent fairness towards prisoners, and a willingness to try to help them, in their daily interactions, despite the challenge of many being very new to the job and hard-pressed by the constant unlocking and relocking driven by the pandemic lockdown requirements.

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

Although the Board has a professional relationship with the head of healthcare, we have found it difficult to get much of an evidenced view on how the health and wellbeing of prisoners has been met. For the second year, unlike the Board's previous experience, we have been excluded from attending any healthcare meetings outwith the prison, although we are hopeful that, as this issue has now been escalated, the NHS commissioner will be more sympathetic to our attendance. Additionally, due to the pandemic, there have been no in-prison meetings. We have, therefore, been largely reliant on those prisoners we have managed to speak to, information from discussions with healthcare staff, and the results of a few questions in our prisoner survey.

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

It would not be too far off the mark to say that, in this reporting year, the only progression of prisoners towards their resettlement will have been their own self-determination, as the prison, under the effect of the pandemic, has been able to do very little with a few prisoners, and almost nothing with most to address their rehabilitative needs effectively, a situation we describe in detail in many sections of this report.

Of course, as we have been informed, and as we have observed, the necessary restrictions under the pandemic management policies have been the main source of this failure, but, as we have stated above, it is also our observation that the prison is woefully understaffed, not only by there being insufficient officers actually in post, which might be covered in time by recruitment, but also because, in the Board's view, the staffing profile needs a radical overhaul. If Wayland is to become an effective training prison which identifies prisoners' resettlement needs accurately, provides responses to those needs and ensures that their resettlement plans are positive and supported, it needs an increase in the number not just of staff, but of trained staff who are equipped to deliver the regime which underpins the plans, responses and support, at an individual prisoner level on a daily basis.

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

#### **TO THE MINISTER**

The Board understands that the per diem allowance of prison catering has remained at £2.02 for many years. It is the Board's view that an increase per diem would create greater prisoner satisfaction with a fundamental aspect of the prison's care for its prisoners and thereby encourage their positive response to the regime as a whole (see section 5.1).

We draw to the minister's attention, as required under our remit, our surprise at our understanding that there has been no research, actioned or contemplated, into the effect on rehabilitation and reoffending of the virtual cessation of programmed courses, vocational and employment training, and education for more than a year to date (see section 7.3).

The Board urges the minister to charge the public sector successors to the community rehabilitation companies with ensuring that, for all prisoners, there is effective planning for, and confirmed accommodation upon, their release (see section 7.5).

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

The Board believes, from its monitoring responsibilities, that Wayland is significantly short of staff, not just in numbers but, importantly, in experience and training in responding adequately to the many complex needs of its prisoners. The Board believes that this situation needs urgent action (see sections 3.1 and 4.2).

The Board hopes, in addressing the scourge of drugs and intoxicants in prison, that innovative use of modern technology, including the use of targeted sobriety testing or

tagging, and an enlargement of official ways of sourcing permitted items, could be researched as a policy initiative by the Prison Service and so recommends (see section 4.6).

The Board believes that a comprehensive refurbishment programme is necessary in the new-build wings, in order to prevent a continuing deterioration in the living conditions of prisoners, and looks forward to confirmation that such a programme will be commenced in the coming year (see section 5.1).

Based on our findings that a large majority of prisoners express a willingness to talk to staff about their problems, the Board urges the Prison Service to ensure that properly profiled key working, including time for training and supervision in this key prison officering skill, is included in the review of staff that we are calling for in this report (see section 5.3).

Through our discussions with prisoners, our reviews of the prison complaints procedures and their management, and the results of our recent survey, the Board suggests to the Prison Service that a less tight timetable for responses would decrease delays in replies and increase the acceptance of replies which have had time to investigate the complaint properly. Relying on interim replies is seen as a brush-off by most prisoners (see section 5.7).

As our monitoring has revealed a significant likelihood that cell clearance certification procedures have not always been duly followed, the Board believes that the importance of managing an accurate and timely cell clearance certificate needs reinforcement on a national basis (see section 5.8).

The Board requests that if healthcare contractors' contracts do not include a requirement to permit the Board's sight of contract documents, excluding only financial and patient confidentiality issues, they are revised to do so (see section 6.1).

With regard to contingency planning, the Board believes that the lesson from the current pandemic is for the Prison Service to plan, on a national basis, for the maintenance of its core remit of enabling prisoners' rehabilitation, and so avoid the current position of almost complete failure to address rehabilitative needs for more than the first year of the pandemic (see section 7.1).

The Board believes that, despite the challenges, there should be a serious attempt to identify those with the greatest need for resettlement assistance and do what is possible to provide this and so recommends to the Prison Service (see section 7.3).

In the Board's view, the expected benefit of 'Purple Visits' has not been fully realised due, prisoners have informed us, to the conditions imposed on relatives. It therefore urges the Prison Service to review these arrangements to find consumer-acceptable alternatives to face-to-face social and family visits (see section 7.4).

## **TO THE GOVERNOR**

The Board believes, from its observations, discussions with staff and prisoners, and its recent survey, that an increasingly experienced prisoner community is meeting an increasingly inexperienced staff community, with obvious implications for prisoner management. The Board believes that this change, alone, requires focused training for new staff as they develop their skills, and urges the Governor to seek such staffing and re-establish the funding that will allow this training to take place (see section 4.4).

The Board's findings that 35% of the prisoner community respondents felt that they could trust no other prisoner and of those who could trust others, an average of only three others suggests that there is an urgent need for more detailed research, and a strategic response then identified, to this situation (see section 4. Introduction).

The Board has been surprised to discover how few prisoners had had cell acceptance forms provided on their reception. Proper procedural implementation of this requirement would underline the prison's acceptance of this practical demonstration of decency. The Board asks that an operational review be held into this identified failure in decency management (see section 5.1).

The Board's findings that almost 60% of survey respondents declared that they did not normally receive weekly bedding changes was disappointing, and a worse finding than previously found, when the response was evenly split. The Board draws the Governor's attention to this finding and hopes that measures will be put in place to achieve a weekly bedding change as a matter of routine for all prisoners (see section 5.1).

From respondents' answers to other questions we posed, and from how prisoners describe to Members their disappointment if staff do not live up to the standards they expect, the Board believes that there is a bedrock of views in which prisoners see staff as people who they want to trust. The Board hopes that this insight is built upon to provide more effective staff training (see section 5.3).

This year, the Board has discovered that 'did not attend' for healthcare are much lower than last year's, and hopes that strategies will be developed so that these lower numbers are maintained after lockdown is eased (see section 6.1).

With an average of only half the education packs delivered to cells being returned, the Board hopes that the Governor can remedy this situation and ensure that operational and educational arrangements are brought into harmony in future, to avoid this significant waste of resources (see section 7.1).

The Board has been disappointed at the apparent inability to use pandemic-safe resources, such as the 'Streetworks' course, in the current operational response to the pandemic, and trusts that decisions can be taken, at both local and national levels, to plan for greater activity provision in future such emergencies (see section 7.2).

## Evidence sections 4 – 11

### 4 SAFETY

#### Introduction

The Board tried to gain insights into the safety concerns of prisoners through targeted questions in our recent survey. We asked if this was their first time in prison, and 29% said that it was. This is a significant drop from the previous survey, when the 'first-timers' made up 42%. Thus, an increasingly experienced prisoner community is meeting an increasingly inexperienced staff community, with obvious implications for prisoner management. The Board believes that this change, alone, requires focused training for new staff as they develop their skills, and so recommends to the Governor.

We asked two more direct questions on feelings of personal safety, on arrival and at the time when the respondents were completing the survey. As might be expected, the responses more or less tracked the proportion of first-timers, with 33% reporting that they did not feel safe on arrival. Although, by the time the survey was completed, the proportion reporting not feeling safe had reduced to 22%, this still is, in the Board's view, a much higher proportion than would indicate a safe prison, whatever other tests might be used to determine that level of safety. In addition, as the average time spent at Wayland by the respondents at the time of completing the survey was 18 months, this seems to indicate a deep-seated fear for their safety by a substantial proportion of prisoners. Furthermore, we have reported elsewhere in this report (see section 5.3) that the number of prisoners that respondents felt able to trust was as low as zero for 35%, and only three as an average across all other respondents. These figures, the Board believes, should receive attention, with perhaps more detailed research, and a strategic response identified. The Board so recommends to the Governor.

#### 4.1 Reception and induction

The exigencies of the management of receptions during the pandemic have meant that the recently opened first night centre has been redesignated as a specialist enhanced unit, and one of the larger (60-bed) units, M wing, has been identified to be the induction/reverse cohort unit. All receptions, most of which are from the nearest local prison, HMP Norwich, have been held in this unit until a fortnight's quarantine has been successfully passed. For much of the year, little actual induction has been managed during this period, mainly due to the absence of specialist staff and also to the sheer inevitability that there has been virtually no regime into which prisoners need induction. Although some induction information was available on the prison's intranet system, to which all prisoners have access, the Board hopes that this area is improved as the prison moves to the next stages and also that more innovative ways of delivering induction are pursued for future pandemic or other emergency management.

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

We have seen the number of self-harm incidents rise in the daily briefings, but these numbers are often the result of serial self-harmers. There was a total of 57 incidents in March, 28 in April and 53 in May. Although these figures are lower than they were

at the start of the lockdown, they still represent an increase on the pre-lockdown regime. Even so, the figures are somewhat lower than many had anticipated as a result of a lockdown.

The Board recognises that more than a few prisoners have found it difficult to cope with the personal frustrations caused by the lockdown, some views on which have been communicated to us through the national 0800 application line. Some of those frustrations have been because prisoners cannot get their 'diversions of choice' in drugs and cannot deal with the emotions they are feeling either about themselves or their situations. For some, self-harming is not only a release from their inner tensions, but also a demonstration that they need help, although, perhaps perversely, they often refuse that help when it is offered. For some self-harmers, as the literature says, it is a coping mechanism. The Board believes that the Prison Service response should offer greater emotional and personal contact, through a reinvigorated key working initiative, in a way which would be acceptable to prisoners who see such actions as their only recourse. It is, however, yet another indicator that the Prison Service is woefully short of staff, not just in numbers but, importantly, in experience and training in dealing with complex cases. The Board has addressed its concerns in a recommendation to the Prison Service.

### **ACCTs**

It was widely expected, both among Board members and also from discussions with staff, that there would be a rise in ACCTs. This did not really materialise. In the seven months from June to December 2020, the total was 263, with a monthly average of 37 opened cases. Then, for the five months between January and May 2021, there was a slight drop, with opened cases totalling 170 and therefore a monthly average of 34. Within those averages, there were spikes of such actions. The Board is pleased, however, that these numbers are, apparently, low, when compared with other similar category C prisons. An examination of the ACCT records indicated that the main issues raised in staff discussions with prisoners were their safety and debt, frequently leading to cases of isolation in addition to self-harm. The Board member whose special interest is ACCTs also had concerns that there was some evidence of poor management administration of the ACCT process with only sketchy observations sometimes recorded which were likely to be less than helpful to following staff. This was raised with the Governor, who revealed that a revised ACCT form and process was due to be released, which would address these admitted difficulties. The Board looks forward to this improvement and trusts that sufficient time and training will accompany its roll-out.

There have been two deaths in custody over the last 12 months, one reportedly from natural causes and the other Covid-19 linked. We await the reports from the coroner.

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

Although there has been a significant reduction in the number of prisoner-on-prisoner incidents, from 257 to 118 this year, this is not an unexpected drop as the opportunities for prisoners to assault each other and avoid detection have been very much reduced due to the lockdown and its effect of severely limiting the number of prisoners out together at any one time. Unfortunately, at the same time there has only been a small reduction in the number of incidents against staff, from 126 to 116,

although, thankfully, the severity of attacks on staff has been much less as the pandemic lockdown became the new normal. The reductions in numbers and severity are to be welcomed, both in themselves and in, hopefully, resetting a standard of behaviour among prisoners, both towards other prisoners and also towards staff. The violence reduction team is always active in the prison, and although this year's circumstances have been unusual, we would like to think that, as the prison returns to a more open regime, these reductions will continue.

In the report for last year, we strongly voiced our concern about the treatment that self-isolating prisoners experienced, and expressed dismay at the lack of a promised national strategy to manage the problem that such prisoners pose not only to Wayland, but also to every prison in the country. A Prison Service estimate of the extent of the challenge was around 1.5% of the prison population; this is very close to Wayland's experience. During the lockdown, the actual number of self-isolators reduced to around half that number. This was probably due to the fact that transfers have slowed, so there have been fewer opportunities for predators to gain access to new victims, and also the major disruption to what might be called 'in-prison supply lines' for drugs – the common thread behind many self-isolators, often because they can no longer pay their drug debts, or have them paid. The issue is therefore likely to affect fewer prisoners in the current response to Covid-19, but the problem has not gone away; as soon as the prison opens up to the next stage of relaxation, and after, the Board anticipates the challenge returning in higher numbers.

The point, therefore, of raising this subject yet again is that the promised national strategy has not been seen this year, and we bleakly forecast that it is unlikely to do so next year. Yet this is precisely the time when the pressures of 'normal' strategic, as opposed to tactical, prison management are fewer, so that such challenges could receive some considered strategic thinking. We therefore recommend to the Prison Service that a target date for the development of such a strategic response to the challenge of self-isolating prisoners is publicly announced, in the belief that such a public deadline would have the result of delivering on the previously promised national policy.

On the positive side, however, the Board can report that Wayland has not forgotten these prisoners, and all are seen on a twice-weekly welfare check by the relevant wing senior officer; at least, therefore, those in Wayland have the assurance that their basic needs are recognised.

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

Our inability to deal with prisoners on a face-to-face basis for much of the year has severely impacted on our being able to provide information within this report on a sound basis for essentially personal and potentially delicate issues.

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

The use of force management in Wayland has been improved during the past year. There is now a weekly review meeting of every incident for immediate learning points, and a monthly in-depth statistical and trends meeting. The Board attends

these meetings when possible and has been encouraged by the obvious care taken by the prison over the management of the use of force. During earlier stages of the lockdown, use of force increased significantly as prisoners challenged the effect on them of the management response to the pandemic. As acceptance of the situation increased, so the use of force declined and, at the end of the reporting year, the number and severity of such incidents have significantly reduced. It is worth reporting that a large number of such uses of force have been limited to the 'guiding holds' approach, rather than a full imposition of control and restraint techniques.

#### **4.6 Substance misuse**

Access to drugs during lockdown was severely restricted, at least in the early stages. Demand was, of course, high from habitual users, which both pushed the 'landing price' up and encouraged innovative ways of importing drugs of all kinds into the establishment. Popular was the simple 'throw-over', where even if the low success rate for end-user delivery was low, the returns were still high enough to keep up the attempts.

Fortunately, the searching procedures at Wayland have intercepted, in all likelihood, most of these attempts, but the fact that such efforts have been made indicates that it has been a successful approach on occasions or in other places, as it is virtually impossible to open every such item on reception. Nevertheless, the Board is pleased to note that a number of receptions from other prisons have been found to be in possession of illegal substances thanks to the new body-scanning equipment, which uses the same technology as is now used in airport security screening. This machine allows more in-depth scanning and has resulted in a larger number of positive interceptions of contraband, such as drugs and mobile phones concealed within body cavities, than was possible before. A new Rapiscan X-ray machine has also been purchased, which gives a more accurate X-ray scan of parcels being sent into the prison for prisoners, no matter by what delivery route, thus avoiding more destructive methods of investigation of suspect items. Other new equipment has also been effective in combating attempts to import new psychoactive substances (NPS), such as 'spice', through written correspondence, and all social correspondence is searched by sniffer dogs for contraband and thereafter photocopied to close this importation avenue. The local police have assisted in some of the perimeter counter-drug importation patrols, and also the searching of visitors in the new external search hut. With regard to direct importation attempts made by social visitors to the prison, plans have been drawn up for a partnership between the prison, local authority and police for an external 'drug detection lobby' outside the main prison entrance, with the use of the prison's drug-detection dogs, which, it is hoped, will further reduce the supply of drugs attempted to be brought in through social visits, which intelligence indicates has historically sometimes been successful. The Board suggests that, as well as improving detection procedures, an expansion of official ways of obtaining all permitted items and the denial of other ways of supply or delivery of such items is likely to interrupt this avenue of supply severely, and the Board therefore recommends to the Prison Service that such a policy be considered.

That illegal substances are still being imported has been revealed by internal intelligence, in that the Board has been informed that the fact that the landing-price of spice had dropped some way through the year appears to indicate that NPS were either getting through, or being made locally from toxic substances, available by

distillation in the prison, in larger amounts than the demand required, hence a drop in price.

One effect, however, of the lockdown, and the greater difficulty of accessing drugs as contact between large groups of prisoners has been severely restricted, has been to change the scale of the illegal brewing of alcohol. Although we reported last year that 'hooch' was a significant factor in substance misuse, during lockdown at every level the instances of prisoners being found under the influence of alcohol increased dramatically, alongside the increased discovery of hooch in cells. In one day, 47 litres were discovered; although that amount is extreme, unfortunately, large quantities of hooch are often discovered. It should be understood that in many cases this hooch is not some weak alcohol product but frequently powerfully alcoholic, sometimes much higher proof than in a bottle of standard spirits. The use of specially trained dogs has ensured a steady confiscation of such substances but, it seems, the time needed for the mixtures to reach an effective alcohol level is less than the time available for the IBAD ('illicit brewed alcohol dog') to be worked to find it. The amount of evidence bags of hooch in the adjudication room, however, is proof that at least a high level of interception is possible.

The effect on prisoners who have drunk such stuff is, obviously, socially disastrous in a closed environment where aggression is always beneath the surface, doubly so when the lockdown circumstances mean that physical distance from such intoxication-fuelled aggression is much more difficult. Of course, the attractions of hooch at a time when there are few other distractions from the four walls of the cell are obvious, and the Board hopes that the Prison Service will develop further strategies to ensure that at least legal distractions are improved and available in preparation for any future pandemics, or even the extended continuation of the current one.

The Board also hopes that the innovative use of modern technology, including, perhaps, the use of targeted sobriety testing or tagging, could be researched as a policy initiative by the Prison Service.

## **5 FAIR AND HUMANE TREATMENT**

### **Introduction**

The Board is, of course, very well aware of the tremendous challenge that the pandemic has presented, not just to Wayland but the Prison Service as a whole, and we understand that this has caused significant difficulties over which local management, and indeed the higher management of the Service, has had little control. Nevertheless, the Board believes that, despite the challenges, it should be possible to maintain the little things which show a prevailing attitude towards prisoners that demonstrates care and respect: answers given when they are promised, questions actually answered and not casually dismissed, a commitment to ensure that basic rehabilitative opportunities are in place for all prisoners which allow, indeed encourage, them to plan realistically for their futures, and a concern that all prisoners are given the time to bring their individual issues to staff in an

atmosphere and expectation that they will be taken seriously and that considered help will be forthcoming.

However, we must report as we have found, which is that, all too frequently, the markers of a caring approach that we identified above have not been comprehensively demonstrated. It is the Board's view that there are too few staff declared as the complement necessary to manage the prison effectively, and that, other than the barest mandatory training, no substantial and focused staff training has been done. In fact, the decision to close the central prison officer training facility has meant that the overworked supervisory staff have had to take additional responsibility for the detailed mentoring training of all new entrant officers.

The results of these two lacks, we believe from our observations and discussions, is a demoralised junior staff, a high junior staff resignation rate and a prisoner community which is not being managed in ways which might positively affect their behaviour after release.

It is against that regrettable background that we report on the fair and humane treatment of prisoners for the year 2020/21.

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

Due to the pandemic restrictions on the Board's ability to monitor consistently and effectively many areas of the prison's treatment of its prisoners, we asked prisoners, halfway through the year, to respond to a very comprehensive survey of their views on the conditions of their imprisonment. The return rate of some 30% encourages us to take note of the results of that survey. We refer to our findings in the appropriate sections below, as well as elsewhere in this report.

#### **Cleanliness and decency**

With less movement around the prison during the pandemic restrictions, the general areas of the prison are much cleaner most of the time, with detritus outside cells being cleaned up quickly. Cell cleanliness, however, has suffered through prisoners being locked up for long periods. There have been arrangements for cell cleaning time in the two hours (only one hour for a large part of the year) for 'domestic' activity. Responses to the recent survey indicated that, although respondents agreed by a very large margin that there had been sufficient time for exercise, the adequacy of the time available for domestic activity only satisfied half of respondents. It is also the Board's ad hoc impression, supported, we accept, by fewer opportunities to visit, that cell cleanliness is at a generally lower standard than before the pandemic.

In this regard, although 65% of respondents reported that access to cleaning materials was acceptable, 35% said that they had difficulty in obtaining these items. Additionally, in response to a question which asked if their cell was clean when they arrived in the prison, only 21% agreed that it was, and 78% said that it was not.

Although cleanliness may be in the eye of the beholder, it is also instructive that when asked if a cell acceptance certificate had been given to them on being allocated to their cell, 72% said that it had not. This high claimed lack of such a basic starting point for cell cleanliness is likely to reflect a lack of ownership by wing staff of the basics in their wing, caused, most likely, by the general lack of staff, leading to

little continuity of staff shifts on any particular wing. Board members have frequently been told versions of: 'Sorry, can't help you – it's not my wing' or 'only on here today', when basic questions have been asked of wing staff. Continuity of staff is such an important factor in consistent prisoner treatment that we trust that it will receive the support it requires from senior leadership and the general Prison Service.

We report these results as we believe that the prison's decency agenda is viewed by prisoners through the prism not of what is told them, but what they experience. It is the Board's view that this very personal interface between the prisoner and his accommodation falls short of what a decency agenda would expect.

We do appreciate, however, that efforts have been made to improve cell conditions, and also the very welcome commitment by the prison group director, following the Board's contact with him over this issue, which is leading to a substantial increase in anti-barricade doors in the old buildings. This, coupled with improved cell windows and better whitewood furniture, means that the proportion of cells properly equipped will increase. However, much more needs to be done, and proper attention just to the cell acceptance routines would underline the importance of this practical demonstration of decency. We so recommend to the Governor.

### **Building fabric**

We regret to report that the demise of the facilities management contractor, Carillion, exposed considerable failings in the prison's facilities management at both macro and micro levels. The Board hoped that the new management by the government-owned company Gov Facility Services Limited (GFSL) would be a marked improvement on the old, and for a time it seemed that it would be. However, once again, there were problems with heating in the prison during the winter months, perhaps not as bad as in the previous year but still unacceptable. Repairs to the badly leaking sections of the flat roofs of the old buildings were carried out and more work is due later in 2021. However, the only sensible solution, if expensive in the short term, of creating pitched roofs over the old flat ones to solve the problem of penetrating rainwater, was not taken forward, to the Board's regret.

The new buildings also remain a source of problems which are tackled piecemeal as they arise, it appears. The Board understands that these buildings were, originally, to be temporary and suggests that as, as seems likely, they are now regarded as permanent structures, they should undergo a comprehensive refurbishment programme to provide consistently acceptable conditions for prisons; we so recommend to the Prison Service.

The Board can report, however, that two other units, whose very poor condition the Board has noted for some years, have now been decanted of prisoners and are in the process of demolition and site clearance, with replacement new buildings being planned. The Board welcomes this move.

### **Clothing**

Wayland prisoners are allowed to wear their own clothes, so the issue of prison clothing is not an issue of note. What is important, however, if one accepts that

'clothing' should also include bed-clothes, is that the Board's survey asked if clean bedding was issued weekly (as required). The Board discovered with regret that this basic decency standard was reported as achieved by only 44% of the sample, with 56% stating that it was not. This was a slightly worse finding than previously, when the response was evenly split. The Board draws the Governor's attention to this finding and hopes that measures will be put in place to achieve a weekly bedding change as a matter of routine for all prisoners.

## **Food**

Meal provision has undergone little change during the pandemic. Staff have worked with prisoner assistance to provide meals regularly and to the tight timetable required by the truncated regime arrangements. In addition, wing staff have managed to shepherd prisoners to and from the serveries in as Covid-19-responsive a way as possible, as has been seen by Board members on the occasions when we have observed these routines. However, whether as a consequence of greater attention being paid to the officially provided food during the pandemic (rather than the 'self-cook' approach with canteen-purchased items, which was common before and not possible this year), prisoners' responses for dissatisfaction with food, when the scores for 'OK for a prison' and 'poor' were added together, rose from 80% in the 2019 survey to 90% in the recent one. When both surveys are taken together, however, they give a view of prison food which is not complimentary and which is probably indicative of the very low per capita per diem allowance of £2.02. This is considerably less than the median spend per patient meal in the NHS (Report of the independent review of NHS hospital food – October 2020). The Board would encourage the minister to consider if an increase per diem might create greater satisfaction with the food and thereby add to the positive response of prisoners to the regime as a whole. It will be interesting to discover if this new distribution of responses is repeated when 'normal service' is resumed, whether or not such an increase as we are calling for is provided.

### **5.2 Segregation and special accommodation**

The Board was obviously unable to visit in the early stages of the first lockdown and then again for a short time later in the current year, but we were kept informed of the prisoners in segregation, particularly those who were being held there for extended periods a few for more than 100 days, although proper external authority had been provided for these decisions. When we were able to resume visiting, the prisoners we questioned, for the most part, accepted that they would have an extended time prior to any transfer. We were disturbed, however, that those prisoners were often the ones who had assaulted staff, and even admitted to us that they had done so only to secure a transfer. While all the requisite steps had been taken to lawfully extend their period of segregation, the Board discussed with senior management whether, although we had been informed that transfers were few and far between due to the pandemic, there might be an unspoken reason for transfer delay; to deter other prisoners from making similar assaults with a similar purpose if they realised they had to spend about three to four months in segregation before any move. We were assured that there was no ulterior motive. Even if this was not a deliberate policy, however, the number of prisoners committing such offences for such a reason did markedly decline to none in the latter part of the reporting year.

With reference to the segregation unit as a building, the Board has, for many years, drawn ministers' attention to the need to provide an alternative to the current building. So, it is with pleasure that we can report that a new segregation unit is, at last, being built and we trust that this new building, and a commensurate increase in staff, will allow effective work to be undertaken with prisoners who find themselves held in this new unit in 2022.

In the current building, there are no special accommodation cells.

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

#### **Staff/prisoner relationships**

After security, the most fundamental task of a prison must be the rehabilitation of its prisoners. The grudging obedience of prisoners to a prison's requirements is one thing, their willing cooperation in achieving personal change in their lives is another; that willingness depends critically on the relationship that staff have with them and the relationship that they have with staff. For this reason, the Board, in its monitoring of the prison, pays close attention to the evidence of the quality of the relationships between prisoners and staff. We can report that, despite the inexperience of many staff, there is a willingness to try to create the sort of relationship that supports prisoners, despite the considerable pressures that the pandemic has brought on all in Wayland's community. However, from our contacts with prisoners and from the responses to our survey, the Board believes that these new staff need much more support themselves, through training, supervision and the time to do their jobs, instead of always being harried, and hurrying, to do the next basic job. A good and effective relationship with prisoners requires time, time that is in short supply, both because of the pandemic but also because of low staff numbers.

We asked two questions in our survey which we felt went to the heart of the issue of relationships in a prison: first, we asked prisoners how many other prisoners could they really trust in Wayland, and, secondly, whether they felt that they could generally trust the staff at Wayland.

The responses to the question on trusting other prisoners (not just 'being friendly with them') were an indication of just how much isolation most prisoners suffer, even in the midst of a prison of almost 1,000 prisoners. The modal number for trust in others was zero; even for those who put down a positive number, the average (therefore excluding those who responded 'none') was only three. We believe that this is an important response; prisoners need relationships – they are not getting this need met through other prisoners, so are they getting this human need through staff? The response to the second question was both mixed and disappointing.

We had asked exactly those two questions in the previous survey and, while the responses for trusting other prisoners were broadly identical in both, those for trusting staff had declined. In the previous survey, the response had been 44% trusting staff and 56% not doing so. In the current one, the percentage who trusted staff had reduced to 36%, and not trusting them had increased to 64%. Disappointing though this result is, it could be said to be the result of the pandemic, which has severely reduced the opportunities for time with prisoners on their problems and their sentence progression, or even of a statistical quirk. The

challenge to these views, however, comes in the similarity of the free-form responses we asked for from those who said they did not trust staff, both across the survey and between the two surveys. The most frequent reason given for not trusting staff was: 'They don't do what they say, or promise to do, or they say one thing and do another'

There were some comments, however, in both survey responses which perhaps show the depth of disappointment felt by some prisoners who do not see staff actions as being up to the standard expected: 'some are lazy and two-faced', 'they don't care like they used to' and 'they lie'. However, even these comments demonstrate, even if in an unappealing way, that there is a consistent view in which prisoners see staff as people who they want to trust.

Surely effective staff training could build on the simple truths in these responses? We so recommend to the Governor.

### **Key working**

In common with, we suspect, many other prisons, key working, as it was meant to be managed, fell victim to the pandemic lockdown and to the large drop in staff following the need to shield, vulnerability absence and sickness, including Covid-19. All prisoners on the old-build wings had been allocated a key worker, with custody managers tasked to quality assure key working, and which was to have been overseen by the Head of Offender Management Delivery.

For much of the year, these intentions have not been possible, and key working was restricted to the highly vulnerable who, it was felt, would benefit most from the few staff, or minimal time, to carry out key working.

In the Board's survey, we asked three key questions – the first being: 'How often have you spoken with your key worker about your progress or life after release?'

The responses were: 'Never' – 44%, 'Rarely' – 22%, 'Sometimes' – 19% and 'Often' – 15%. We did not ask how satisfactory the meetings had been but it shows, we believe, remarkable persistence on the part of some staff to make, however short, time to see the prisoners. This is backed up by another question we asked as a check on the first: 'When did you last see your key worker?' Although the response of 'Never' was close to the response to the first question, at 37%, the frequency of staff actually seeing them (which, admittedly, might reflect the happenstance of staff detailing) was more encouraging. The modal number of weeks since a respondent had, in fact, seen his key worker was one, but the average of most of the rest was nine, with 20% responding that they had last seen them more than six months previously.

Then, to try to test the acceptability of the scheme, we asked how many had asked to see their key worker; 57% responded that they had asked. We believe that this illustrates, even in the current straits, that a majority of prisoners do value the work, however fleetingly done, that key workers manage to achieve. This augurs well for the future, when sufficient staff are available for, and the regime permits, a full resumption of key working. For this important prison officering skill, we would

recommend that the Prison Service includes the need for increased training and, importantly, supervision time, to support key working, when the review of staff that we are calling for in this report is carried out.

#### **5.4 Equality and diversity**

The pandemic and consequent restrictions upon Board members and their contact with prisoners has meant that it has been harder to monitor incidents of individual discrimination. From reviewing the applications received, and contact made via the 0800 national freephone number, there have been occasional claims by a small number of prisoners of discriminatory behaviour. However, further investigation has been unable to substantiate these claims. There have been few such complaints received by the Board over the year, with equality issues making up just over 3% of the total applications.

As of January 2021, the prison had a black, Asian and minority ethnic (BAME) population of 33% and, overall, it appears the treatment of all prisoners is equitable. The prison and its staff have been keen to celebrate and recognise diversity, as indicated by activities within the prison, such as a Black Lives Matter event, planned to take place six monthly, and Black History Month and festivals such as Eid are marked. Diversity and inclusion meetings are attended by senior staff and prisoner representatives, and there is a drive to recruit more prisoner representatives to this.

Use of force within the prison has varied across the year, with Covid-19 restrictions likely to have contributed to there being seven months of no use of force being reported (see also section 4.5). However, there have been months when between 16% and 30% of prisoners on whom force was used have been from the black, Asian and minority ethnic (BAME) community, with two months when 44% of incidents were against BAME prisoners. This apparent disproportionate number of use of force incidents among BAME prisoners, however, was reflective of the behaviour of just two prisoners and it is important to record that the number of complaints on any subject submitted to the prison by BAME prisoners matches their proportion in the overall prison population.

The Board believes that it would help if there were more BAME staff, but with a local recruitment policy it is difficult for the prison to address the lack of such staff within Wayland as the prison is located within a county with a 95% white population and workforce.

The Governor, however, has been keen to ensure that all protected characteristics are discussed openly at staff and community levels, and that particular groups who are worked with looked at, with any identified need for improvement made. For example, acknowledgement has been made of the difficulties in declaring gay sexuality in a strongly male category C prison, and a forum for gay and bisexual men has been planned, with an aim of raising awareness of this issue, on the digital platform. Approximately 6% of the prison population is identified as gay or bisexual. Overall, there is a broad range of information and events relating to protected characteristics shared on the content hub for prisoners, together with awareness raising for staff.

#### **5.5 Faith and pastoral support**

The chaplaincy has been tirelessly active in visiting prisoners in their cells during times when group worship or meetings were not possible. From comments made to us when we have called on the chaplaincy to discuss a prisoner's concerns raised with us, there have been no occasions when they have not been able to contribute from their obvious knowledge of that prisoner.

## **5.6 Incentives schemes (IP)**

The organisational arrangements for the management of the IEP system during the pandemic have meant that the system has not really been operating as intended for much of the past year, with only egregious offenders being reduced in level for a period. However, the Board has some concerns that not always has the procedural justice element of the application of the system been followed when we have followed up the, admittedly rare, complaints from prisoners specifically concerning the IEP system. For that reason, we did not include a question about views of the system in the recent survey, but the Board will be monitoring the implementation of the revised system when it is sensible to do so in the year to come.

## **5.7 Complaints**

The Board receives frequent detailed statistical data from the prison complaints office and has been impressed that a very high percentage, often in the high 80%<sup>s</sup> and frequently in the high 90%<sup>s</sup>, of complaints are responded to within the mandated timescales. However, it is also the case that a significant percentage, often up to 20%, of those responses are interim and, as might be expected, these are the more challenging complaints which often then go on to become Board applications. When we review these challenging complaints after a Board application, we often see what seems to us to be a less than thorough investigation into what has been alleged. The Board suspects that the tight mandated deadlines for a response might work against such thoroughness for the more complex cases. We are sure that prisoners would appreciate a higher-quality response at the cost of an extended deadline, and perhaps this possibility could be investigated nationally, which we recommend the Prison Service considers.

## **5.8 Property**

Once again, property applications have topped the number of Board applications, which we are sure is likely to be same for many IMBs. At the start of the year, such complaints came in in their usual proportion of around 30% of all complaints; then, as transfers tailed off, these complaints also declined. However, as soon as transfers became a little more frequent, complaints about property rose again, mostly about other establishments. The figure for the reporting year, 24%, is close to the pre-pandemic level of 27%, and this is also reflected in the prison complaints data. The Board has noted, however, that a disturbing feature in the detail of a proportion of those complaints is where the prisoner has been removed from his cell without warning, and property has been left in his cell to be packed by staff. This rarely travels with such transfers, and it seems, from the absence of evidence to the contrary, that the requirements for careful logging of property are not always followed. Property therefore goes missing from unlocked and vacated cells or in the discharge process, and becomes the subject of complaint and litigation. It also seems the case that some transport contractor staff are more zealous at policing the amount they are willing to take on a transfer, even though they may have room in the

transport; more than the 'standard' three bags has been often refused, being left behind to 'follow on', so prisoners tell us, which, very frequently, raises more complaints and litigation. The Board believes that the importance of an accurate and timely cell clearance certificate needs reinforcement on a national basis.

Our recent survey asked respondents if all their property had been transferred with them; 43% said that it had not, and, of these prisoners, 60% informed us that they had still not received all their property. With the average time at Wayland since reception for the survey respondents being 18 months, it is clear that there is still much wrong with the whole property management system.

We are, however, aware of the revised policy framework for the management of property, and although we do not believe it goes far enough – for example, to mandate easily available technology – if staff follow the procedures outlined, then property complaints should show a dramatic drop in our next report. We look forward to such a drop in the workload of the Board, and also of hard-pressed reception and other staff. However, as we believe that the new policy framework should be allowed time to be bedded into operational routines, we have refrained from making any recommendations in this section, despite our views that, in this area of service, much needs improvement.

That property is an important issue should not need be emphasised, but we will quote from our previous report, in which we concluded with a view which we still hold: 'Take (a prisoner's property) away and more than clothing, family pictures, or an X-Box Console is lost, taken away is also any feeling of being respected as a person of value to the authorities'. We trust we shall not have to repeat that view in our next report.

## **6 HEALTH AND WELLBEING**

### **6.1 Healthcare: general**

The good relationship between the operational and healthcare sectors of the prison has continued during the pandemic, although since the beginning of this reporting year the prison has been at various levels of lockdown due to Covid-19 generally, and spikes in infections particularly. This has inevitably altered the way that healthcare services could be managed. Routine face-to-face consultations were stopped for those who tested positive for Covid-19, which meant that about a third of the prisoners could not access clinics, although urgent cases were still seen. Nurses saw patients, and medications were delivered, at the cell doors rather than centrally. This was not appreciated by a number of prisoners, who saw it as a breach of patient confidentiality as prison staff had to be present or very nearby. Prisoners were escorted to the healthcare unit, which had a positive effect on the number of 'did not attends' (DNAs) over the previous year, when prisoners could, effectively, choose whether to attend or not; escorting prisoners at least meant that they had to declare a refusal to attend to staff, rather than just not turn up. In terms of healthcare staffing, we are pleased to report that, at the end of the reporting year, the healthcare unit is fully staffed, with one full-time GP and occasional locums, a long-term conditions nurse and a nurse practitioner. Physiotherapy is working to 80% capacity and the

psychiatrist now has a concentrated work pattern, seeing patients over two full days a week.

### **Missed appointments**

In our report for 2019/20, we reported as follows:

'In previous Annual Reports, the Board has registered its concern at the number of missed healthcare appointments, these are both disruptive of the healthcare staff's efforts and expensive in wasted resources. These are unacceptable figures and represent not only a serious waste of resources but also opportunities not able to be taken to improve prisoners' health'.

We are glad to report that the figures have been much improved upon now, as the table below shows.

#### **MISSED HEALTHCARE APPOINTMENTS (11 MONTHS)**

| <b><i>HEALTHCARE SPECIALISM</i></b> | <b><i>% FAILED 2019/20</i></b> | <b><i>% FAILED 2020/21</i></b> |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| DENTISTRY                           | 55%                            | 15%                            |
| NURSE                               | 28%                            | 11%                            |
| GP SURGERY                          | 24%                            | 14%                            |

Nevertheless, these percentages are still too high to be acceptable, especially as for a period, as we have noted, nurse appointments were held at the cell door, which obviously would reduce DNAs. The Board will therefore keep this important monitoring consideration in mind during the next reporting year, and trusts that efforts will be made to ensure that this year's lower number of DNAs is at least maintained, if not further improved.

### **Recent Board survey results**

In our recent survey of prisoners' views on their conditions of imprisonment, we included two questions on prisoners' interactions with healthcare staff, which attempted to make up for our lack of knowledge of such complaints, as we have noted above. First, we asked how easy it was to make a healthcare complaint, and then, if respondents had complained, if the response had been satisfactory, and if not, why they felt that. Obviously, we could not ask questions of prisoners about their actual treatment, as that would be trespassing on patient confidentiality, but we hoped that the two questions we raised would give us an understanding of prisoners' perceptions of the wider healthcare provision.

Disappointingly, only 13% claimed to have had a satisfactory response to a healthcare complaint, and 87% had been dissatisfied. However, it was the free-form responses in explanation of their dissatisfaction which we believe should be considered by the prison and by the contractor as important comment on a key facet of prisoners' lives.

It is important to understand that the Board does not know the truth of the comments made, but we give a selection below (all comments have been provided to the healthcare contractor):

- 'I had to pull one of my teeth out as I have been in pain for two years'
- 'Asked for the head healthcare to respond; the deputy responded but only after four weeks'
- 'No prior notice of appointment given, not called up, and the length of time it takes to be seen – might as well self-medicate'
- 'They don't take responsibility, but blame me for their negligence'
- 'I know they are busy but I've been waiting for the dentist for six months'
- 'Not listened to/no reply/issue never resolved' (nine comments on variations of this complaint).

The important monitoring issue here, the Board believes, is that, in order to judge the accuracy of healthcare complaints, the Board needs access to the contractor's complaint system, or at least a statistical report showing issues, time to resolve, those escalated to level two, and so on, as with the prison's general complaints. We are aware that Care UK, the successor contractor to Virgin Health (now renamed as the Practice Plus Group), has now introduced its own complaints system. The Board has requested access to these reports but, so far, this has been refused, citing patient confidentiality and commercial sensitivity. The Board is unconvinced that such complaint statistics, which the Board presumes would be anonymised, would entail breaches of contractor financial or commercial information, but, even if they did, it would not take much effort to redact any sensitive elements. We were informed that there had been 102 complaints from September 2020 to February 2021 and that most of these related to refusal of medication requests and waiting times for dental appointments, subjects which, the Board believes, should be as open to independent scrutiny as any other prisoner treatment. The Board therefore believes that if healthcare contractors' contracts do not include such a requirement to allow Board inspection of the contractor's complaints process, excluding patient confidentiality issues, they should be revised to do so. Further, given the importance of monitoring healthcare delivery, the Board suggests that an additional, standard, waiver be included on the face of the standard IMB application form, confirming a prisoner's permission for the Board to see that prisoner's medical record, if the prisoner's Board application concerns dissatisfaction with healthcare treatment. The primary purpose of such reviews would not, of course, be to examine the appropriateness of medical treatment, but to enable claims of absence, or delay, of response, for example, to be independently verified.

## **6.2 Physical healthcare**

During the first lockdown, all screening of inward prisoner transfers stopped, but had recommenced by the end of May. There was a rise during lockdown in the number of prisoners under the influence of either drink or drugs, with 23 in one month not unusual. Healthcare nurses attend suspected cases under the local protocol, to determine whether urgent medical attention needs to be given.

The Covid-19 vaccination programme has reflected that in the community, according to age and vulnerability, but, as in the outside community, a number of eligible

prisoners have refused to be vaccinated, despite attempts to explain the potential seriousness of refusing vaccination and then being infected with Covid-19.

In one period, there were 300 positive cases of Covid-19 in the prisoner community. However, generally, the record has been lower in number and severity than anticipated, although, unfortunately, there has been one prisoner death from Covid-19. As previously described, we await the coroner's verdict on this.

As in the outside community, the provision of dental care has been severely disrupted by the pandemic and subsequent lockdowns. Face-to-face dental services were suspended at the beginning of the pandemic, but by May remote triaging was in place. Initially, however, there were delays in procuring the necessary personal protective equipment (PPE) for aerosol-generating procedures. Urgent dental consulting was then managed via remote triaging, using the 3A system (advice, analgesia and antibiotics) and then booked for urgent face-to-face treatment, if clinically determined.

### **6.3 Mental health**

At the start of the reporting year, the mental health team was seeing prisoners at their cell doors. The provision of the wellbeing service from the local council stopped after they withdrew their staff, with the result that the healthcare contractor's mental health team was picking up more low-level concerns. (see also section 6.7).

However, the mental health team has not, so far, seen an increase in formal diagnoses of depression, although there has been evidence of an increase in low mood, with commonly noted reasons stated as the lockdown regime and lack of purposeful activity. Similarly, the reason for many ACCTs being opened, the Board has been informed, is due to lockdown regime triggers, including the enforced isolation from others for extended periods. Unsurprisingly, therefore, there has been an increase in the workload of the mental health team, as they have continued to run their service with a patient-focused approach throughout. This has included referrals from reception staff for newly received prisoners, from wing staff after their observations, and self-referrals by prisoners through the digital application process. This has resulted in the hard-pressed staff having to maintain an increased caseload, attending more ACCT reviews and carrying out hospital gateway assessments. The team has also been assisting the primary healthcare team with mass Covid-19 testing, which started in January 2021, as well as medication administration and controlled drug checking. It is to the great credit of the team members that they have been able to deliver all this work while carrying one vacancy and with one nurse practitioner absent for an extended period on shielding leave.

### **6.4 Social care**

With regard to social care plans, at a recent sample point, Wayland held 143 prisoners who were aged over 50, 81 of whom had full agreed care plans in place. Following a review of procedures there is now more effective communication between the local authority over the provision of these plans.

### **6.5 Exercise, regime**

Time out of cell has been severely curtailed, with prisoners only having an hour a day for exercise in the fresh air and a further hour (sometimes reduced to half an hour because of staff shortages) for domestic activities (which includes cell cleaning, personal showering on those wings without in-cell showers, and use of the kiosk communication system for those prisoners whose laptop access has malfunctioned). The demand on showers in such a short time allowance during lockdown meant that regime changes enabling only one shower every other day, on a rota basis, were imposed. As we have reported in detail elsewhere, no purposeful activity has been taking place, except for wing cleaners, wing laundry workers, kitchen workers and those working in the DHL canteen-packing shop, supplying canteen orders for Wayland and the other Norfolk prisons. Gym access has been severely restricted, both because of the need for social distancing, and also because gym staff have been deployed elsewhere, due to a lack of general prison staff to cover exercise and other prisoner supervisory activities. There were occasions when some PE activity took place in the open air, but the Board believes that more could have been safely done along those lines, had staffing arrangements allowed.

## **6.6 Drug and alcohol rehabilitation**

Phoenix Futures has been on-site during the pandemic, although at times with fewer than the normal eight staff at work. They have managed to continue to see some of their clients on a one-to-one basis, with PPE and social distancing. New prisoners are given a self-assessment pack and, additionally, similar in-cell packs are also provided. The team has also given information on managing drug use and distraction strategies, using the prisoners' digital system.

Phoenix Futures staff have managed to continue some prisoner group work on occasions, although with smaller group numbers. The eight Phoenix Futures practitioners have personal caseloads of around 40 prisoners, with 50 on catch-up assessments. Support groups for a maximum of six prisoners in each group have been created and each wing also has a substance misuse liaison officer to alert Phoenix Futures of problematic cases. The contractor's communal group and interview space in at least one wing has recently been redecorated, to make it more therapeutic in use.

The Board appreciates the difficulties created for drug rehabilitation activities under Covid-19, welcomes the continuation of individual and group working, when possible, but is disappointed that innovative use of remote group contact was not vigorously pursued.

## **6.7 Soft skills**

The local council-provided wellbeing service withdrew its service at the beginning of the lockdown, in March 2020, but by September was back on-site, and has actually increased its team to six members, with three additional staff, comprising two counsellors and a clinical psychologist.

## **7 PROGRESSION AND RESETTLEMENT**

## 7.1 Education, library

### Education

At the start of the pandemic, it was reported to the Board that all contractor education and training staff had been instructed by their employer to leave the prison immediately. The precise instructions, and where they originated from, were, we were told at the time by the prison's management, a matter of dispute. However, what is not in dispute is that neither the Prison Service nor the contractor had any agreed strategy, policy or plan to respond to such a national, or perhaps even local, emergency of this nature. The lesson for the Prison Service, the Board believes, is that it cannot afford to be myopic in considering the horizon of future such challenges, and must plan for the maintenance of its core remits on a national basis, and the Board so recommends.

At the beginning of our reporting year, therefore, no education contact, other than in-cell packs, was taking place. In September 2020, it was recommended by the Ministry of Justice that any courses leading to formal qualifications should recommence. However, we have been informed that even this minor relaxation for formal qualification courses has proved difficult to implement with social distancing requirements. Further, we understand that, even if some courses could have been restarted with fewer attendees, the familiar problem of having insufficient staff to safely staff the education unit would have arisen. Therefore, there was no change.

Turning, however, to what was actually achieved by the education contractor in the seven months from September 2020 to March 2021, when at least a proportion of staff were in attendance and others working remotely, this was confined to learning disabilities screening and enrolment, and the remote provision of basic English and basic mathematics assessment and course work.

We have been provided with the following figures for such learning disability screenings, initial functional assessments, the delivery to the wings of functional English and mathematics assessments and courses, and their returns to the education unit. The total numbers are low because, as stated, no work was done for the first five months of the reporting year.

#### Learning disabilities (16 categories of assessment)

|                                     |     |                                     |     |
|-------------------------------------|-----|-------------------------------------|-----|
| Declared need at point of screening | 155 | Declared need at point of enrolment | 167 |
|-------------------------------------|-----|-------------------------------------|-----|

#### Initial assessments English

|        | English entry-level 1 | English entry-level 2 | English entry-level 3 | English level 1 | English level 2 | Grand total |
|--------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------|
| Totals | 10                    | 86                    | 12                    | 56              | 31              | 195         |

#### Initial assessments mathematics

|              | Mathematics entry-level 1 | Mathematics entry-level 2 | Mathematics entry-level 3 | Mathematics level 1 | Mathematics level 2 | Grand total |
|--------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------|
| <b>Total</b> | 4                         | 39                        | 63                        | 78                  | 9                   | 193         |

### Functional assessments and course packs under pandemic conditions

Following on from the initial assessments, the education contractor provided detailed diagnostic assessments and the course packs for those prisoners whose assessments indicated such a need. It is, however, unfortunate that, as was identified in the Board's previous annual report, the working, day-to-day collaboration between the education and operational teams in the prison does not seem to have been treated with sufficient priority. The Board believes that detailed communication between the education and operational teams should have received greater attention.

That this is crucial to a comprehensive educational delivery, the Board believes, is beyond question. It is surely the task of both teams to ensure that agreements and policies are in place – for example, to carry out the relatively simple task of issuing and collecting these functional assessment and their follow-on course packs. That this has not been pursued with as much vigour as would have been required, is seen in the facts that only half of the diagnostic packs, and less than half the course packs, were returned to the education team by the wing operational teams.

The details are in the table below.

| September 2020 - March 2021                                    | Diagnostic assessments sent | Course packs sent | Diagnostic assessments returned | Course packs returned |
|--|-----------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Functional skills qualification in English (entry-level 2)     | 1                           | 0                 | 1                               | 0                     |
| Functional skills qualification in English (entry-level 3)     | 10                          | 7                 | 7                               | 4                     |
| Functional skills qualification in English at level 1          | 13                          | 9                 | 9                               | 3                     |
| Functional skills qualification in English at level 2          | 11                          | 3                 | 1                               | 2                     |
| Functional skills qualification in mathematics (entry-level 3) | 7                           | 11                | 2                               | 4                     |
| Functional skills qualification in mathematics at level 1      | 13                          | 6                 | 8                               | 3                     |
| Functional skills qualification in mathematics at level 2      | 6                           | 3                 | 2                               | 3                     |
| <b>Total:</b>  | <b>61</b>                   | <b>39</b>         | <b>30</b>                       | <b>19</b>             |

The Board fully understands that, in a prison under pandemic restrictions, it is likely to be impossible to get 100% compliance in the management of such assessments

and instructional packs. What the Board finds difficulty with is the scale, and therefore the waste of resources implied, of the failure to return either diagnostic assessments or the subsequent course packs. It hopes that the Governor can remedy this situation and ensure that operational and educational teams are brought into harmony, and so recommends.

## **Library**

The library is staffed by librarians from the local authority, who have turned up for work during the pandemic, although the library has not been opened for prisoners to attend. The reason, the Board has been informed, is familiar; the lack of staff to supervise the education unit and to manage the movement of prisoners on and off the wing, as would be the case in normal regime times. Prisoners can, however, order books through the digital system, and these have been delivered to the wings by library staff. The number of loans has increased steadily through the lockdown, and in May 2021 1,102 loans were fulfilled. However, the lack of collaborative working, as we have noted above, has had a serious and detrimental effect on the library service, as a very large number of books have not been returned after issuance. To respond to this challenge, library staff have informed us that they are arranging for secure amnesty boxes to be made or purchased, where prisoners may leave overdue, or inappropriately obtained, books in their possession without penalty or question.

On a brighter note, we are pleased to record that library staff have also sought innovative ways of assisting prisoners cope with the frustrations of lockdown:

- A virtual reading group has been started by a library assistant, and although numbers have to be limited, this has proved popular.
- The Reading Ahead annual challenge (with prizes) has been placed on the prisoners' digital system and 53 prisoners have signed up for this. Six different books across different genres have been chosen by library staff; contact is kept with those who have signed up for the challenge, and staff monitor their progress and offer help via the digital system when needed. So far, 13 have returned their completed notebooks, which the Board understands is a higher percentage than in previous 'normal' years, and the project still has some time to run.
- In-cell activity packs have been created and distributed to those who ask for them via the digital system, in the same way as for library books.
- A jigsaw puzzle library has been created, and jigsaws loaned out to prisoners. The feedback is that this innovation is particularly welcomed.

The Board welcomes the innovative ways that the library team has found to continue a useful service throughout the pandemic restrictions. It is of note that we asked, in our recent survey, whether prisoners were satisfied with the library service during lockdown and after. To the credit of the work that the local authority library staff have done, the response was that the overwhelming majority, 70%, were satisfied.

## **7.2 Vocational training, work**

For the whole of this reporting year, the vast majority of prisoners have had no opportunities for vocational or other workshop training, or the possibility of employment habituation. For those on courses leading to qualifications, these were terminated, with no chance of the qualifications being completed before many prisoners on those courses were discharged. This is an indictment on many levels for those responsible for this important aspect of the prison's service delivery.

The Board accepts that national pandemic policies have severely restricted employment and other activity management, and that the situation has been made worse by the lack of staff availability. However, we fail to understand why there has not been a more innovative response by the education contractor, in collaboration with prison management, to work on different ways of delivering at least some training activities for at least a few prisoners. For example, the prison has a large, secure, open area given over to 'Streetworks' training (drainage, kerb and pavement laying, and so forth), for which the education contractor is responsible. This training course is ideally suited to social distancing and Covid-19-safe ways of working, even if the numbers might have had to be reduced from the normal 15. The Board cannot understand why innovative solutions to this and other challenges to the provision of work and training have not materialised, and trusts that policy decisions can be taken to plan for greater activity provision in future such emergencies, and so recommends to the Governor.

For the record, the only consistent work for prisoners has been the in-unit domestic activities of:

- general area cleaning
- servery duties
- laundry work.

Off-unit work has been limited to:

- work in the two kitchens
- the DHL canteen packaging workshop
- the waste management facility
- a small textile workshop making PPE items
- a small number of 'trustee' tasks, such as reception orderlies.

### **7.3 Offender management, progression**

In terms of what might normally be expected of offender management, the pandemic (with its restrictions, the effect on staffing numbers through Covid-19 measures and effects and the significant challenge of carrying out offender management remotely) has meant that there has been less opportunity for effective face-to-face offender management, aside from critical offender management interviews, for the whole of the reporting year. Parole reports have been maintained, however, although a number of prisoners have complained that they have not had enough opportunity to put their points across in the required paperwork.

With regard to sentence progression involving movement to a category D open prison towards the end of prisoners' sentences, this has also been affected in two ways. First, such moves have been frequently delayed beyond the expected point in

a prisoner's sentence when they might be expected to gain the maximum benefit from open conditions. Second, many prisoners have been disappointed in the virtual impossibility of relocation nearer to their homes on transfer, instead of which almost every such transfer has been directed by regional management to HMP Hollesley Bay in Suffolk. While such a move might be attractive to the more local prisoners, for many others it is even more remote for their families to visit than is Wayland itself.

There is also the fact that the effect of the pandemic has been to either limit extremely or stop sentence progression through interventions by psychological programmes, in the same way as with employment habituation and skills training needs. This has been the case even where the parole review requirements have included such programmes.

The recent Board survey included two questions about the effect of this challenge, but, because each prisoner's case is different, we limited the questions to asking for prisoners' personal views on the pandemic's effect on their life chances. The questions were:

- Do you think that the lack of education during lockdown will affect your life chances after release?
- Have you missed out on programmes or other activities required by your release plan or needed to make a good parole case?

The responses were almost evenly split; 54% answered 'Yes' to both questions, and 46% 'No'. However, the analysis of these responses is not as simple as saying 'only' half the respondents felt disadvantaged, as we do not know the detail of why those who answered 'No' did so. It might easily mean that a number of prisoners have a job and family, for example, to go back to, while the needs of the 'Yes' prisoners may be, and are likely to be, more complex. The high proportion of respondents who felt they will be worse off when they are released than they were before their sentence began should be worrying to the minister and the Prison Service. The Board believes that, even in the current pandemic, there should be a serious attempt to identify those with the highest need for release assistance and do what is possible to provide that assistance, and so recommends to the Prison Service.

### **The wider picture**

Looking more widely at the whole effect of the pandemic, however, it is the Board's view that the apparent lack of Prison Service interest in the unique effects of the pandemic on its core task, after security, of prisoner rehabilitation, is both a surprise and an indictment. What has been the case, for well over 12 months, and is likely to be so for many months more, is virtually a complete absence of many of those interventions which, for years, have been thought to be essential components in an effective rehabilitation programme. Although a few programmes for a few prisoners have been managed, most programmes, such as offending behaviour group-work, trained psychological therapies and social casework, literacy and numeracy improvement, skills training, employment habituation, and more have not been available, as we have noted.

The Board would have expected that the considerable policy thrust of these assumed essential factors in supporting prisoners' rehabilitation and avoidance of

reoffending after release might at least justify research into their actual effectiveness. This could be done by comparing pandemic with non-pandemic prisoner-experienced interventions and their subsequent criminal histories. If those histories are discovered to be significantly worse after a sentence without the interventions we have identified being experienced than for those who had benefited from such interventions, this would surely be a powerful argument for increased support for those interventions. We therefore draw this issue to the minister's attention, as required under our remit.

#### **7.4 Family contact**

As would be anticipated, social and family visits have been severely restricted this reporting year and there have been no Monday family and children's visits. In the short period that visits have been operating, they have been limited to 12 prisoners per session, about a quarter of what would normally be the case.

The Board had noted that the external visits reception entrance area was shabby and needed to be redecorated, but this had not been carried out. Eventually, a non-operational member of staff working in the building had redecorated the entrance area at her own expense and in her own time. The Board is surprised at the need for staff to carry out, voluntarily, necessary redecoration to a prison building. We understand that the redecoration had been properly requested through the GFSL maintenance system months before. However, as this member of staff obviously cared about the public face of the Prison Service towards its visitors, a job which should have been done by GFSL was carried out by her and her husband, in their own time and at their own expense. We therefore draw to the minister's attention the Board's concerns over the management of the prison's maintenance in this important, public-facing area.

Within the prison, the visits hall itself has been decorated by the two family development officers, whose appointment seems to be having a positive effect, while, under their tutelage, three prisoners have achieved category D status through their work in the Barista (the coffee shop). In terms of the maintenance of the public face of the Prison Service, however, a worrying aspect is that for 18 months there has been a leak in the roof in the visits hall, and water is being captured in two buckets. The structure in that area appears to have deteriorated and may present a potential danger to staff and visitors.

'Purple Visits', the visits held remotely by video link, have not had the take-up that was envisaged, perhaps because, as the Board has noted previously, some prisoners do not want the required family home details to be included. When in use, there are eight terminals, with four sessions in the mornings and one in the evenings, from Monday to Thursday. Each session lasts about 30 minutes.

#### **Survey responses**

To try to get prisoners' perspectives on visits under lockdown, in our recent survey we asked the question in the table below, about the opportunity of having Purple Visits. The answers surprised us, with the vast majority choosing 'Not much' as their response. The percentages are in the table below.

|   |          |       |            |           |
|---|----------|-------|------------|-----------|
| <i>'How helpful have Purple Visits been to compensate for lack of face-to-face visits?'</i> | Not much | A bit | Quite good | Very good |
|   | 67%      | 15%   | 7%         | 11%       |

Perhaps these results say something about the suspicions of prisoners that the sign-up requirements for their contacts would be used for more than Purple Visits purposes. However, we did not ask for more in-depth answers and it is therefore possible, although unlikely, that those who said 'Not much' were confined to those who had no actual experience of using the service. Nevertheless, if the cause of prisoners' disquiet was indeed the system operator's request for family details, perhaps this could have been avoided by a decision to use a commercially available system, like Zoom or Google, which might have had more buy-in from prisoners and their families than the bespoke system adopted. We appreciate that that might have been an additional challenge for the Service, but if the objective is to increase take-up of such visits, whether in a pandemic or not, it is surely incumbent upon the Prison Service to search for the most acceptable means available? The Board so recommends in the planning of future pandemic policies, or even as an acceptable alternative, or addition, to face-to-face social and family visits in normal times.

## 7.5 Resettlement planning

As with so much else in the prison's regime, resettlement provision has been badly affected by the pandemic, as most of the services have traditionally required face-to-face contact and this has frequently not been possible. The community rehabilitation company (CRC) has not been present in the prison for long periods and, when it returned, this comprised one new and inexperienced member of its staff for just two days per week. Added to the extended periods when prisoners have been confined to their cells for long periods of time during the year, other outside agencies have not been able to enter the prison. The announcement that the private sector responsibilities for the CRCs would cease and be taken back into public management might also have affected the effort made by those companies after that announcement, the Board suggests.

In detail, in the period that this report covers, the Norfolk and Suffolk CRC did not visit the prison, although its staff worked one day a week in the visitors centre outside the prison. It also sent out a questionnaire to the prisoners, to try to mitigate the effects of having no discharge boards. The lack of discharge boards, a fairly recent innovation, meant that no bank accounts and birth certificates were arranged for the prisoners, which would certainly have made life on release more difficult. In addition, therefore, for another year, the Board is appalled at the lack of effective care for prisoners who are about to be released. One prisoner to be released without secure accommodation would be an indictment; to have the proportion identified below, even if some of the 'not knows' had some sort of accommodation planned, is nothing short of shameful.

The Board urges the minister to charge the public sector successor to the CRCs with ensuring that, for all prisoners, there is effective planning for, and confirmed accommodation upon, their release.

As a typical example of the issue, we have taken the Norfolk and Suffolk CRC information for March 2021 which was provided to the Board.

### **Accommodation**

- 31 release plans completed. 44 prisoners discharged.
  - Released with accommodation 28 = 64%
    - Detailed accommodation on release:
      - two approved premises
      - 17 friends or family settled
      - nine transient or short-term accommodation
  - Released without accommodation 16 = 36%
    - Releases:
      - two rough sleeping
      - 14 not known.

### **Employment**

The figures on employment following release that we have received for the same released prisoners are:

- one full-time employment
- four unemployed, not on benefits
- 21 unemployed, on benefits = 47%
- 18 unknown = 40%.

Even if the 'unknowns' were all to be employed, a highly unlikely statistic, the 25 known to be unemployed still represent almost 60% of the total released. The real figure, of course, is much more likely to be nearer 80–90%.

These figures confirm, if that were at all necessary, that it is a very challenging experience for prisoners who are released from prison during a pandemic. The evidence, if evidence were needed, shows that if reoffending is to come down, ex-prisoners need stability once they leave prison. Which means that, in addition to accommodation, they need training and support for full-time employment, which we have called for throughout this report. In the present circumstances, this seems impossible to achieve.

### **THE WORK OF THE IMB**

In a normal world, the Board monitors the treatment of prisoners in Wayland in a number of ways through rota visits: when we respond to prisoner applications, visit prisoners on the wings, follow up their complaints with staff, observe staff meetings and prisoner forums, conduct surveys of prisoners on a variety of issues, and attend segregation reviews and adjudications.

However, as will be appreciated, this reporting year has been anything but a normal one. For some time, it was not possible to attend the prison, due to the pandemic, or know what was happening to prisoners and the prison in a direct way. Remote

meetings with senior staff were, however, managed and, after misunderstandings over how we could have access to the daily briefing and information publications had been overcome, and with the establishment of the national IMB 0800 freephone application call line, our ability to carry out our monitoring responsibilities improved considerably. We have raised issues with senior Prison Service managers, with success, as we have noted in this report, and by the end of the reporting year had re-established, with those Board members who felt able to do so, an effective working relationship with the prison and its community. As the pandemic is brought under further control, and as the country comes out of its necessary restrictions, we hope to return to the core of our work: the face-to-face personal engagement with prisoners as the normal way of monitoring the prison's work in its care for its prisoners.

In conclusion to this report, in an extraordinary year, the Board believes that readers might think a key monitoring concern, that the conditions under which prisoners have been held, could be thought by some to be tantamount to inhumane. That we do not make that judgement is due to the way that the Governor and staff have done what was in their power to do to mitigate the potential for the lockdown to be an inhumane experience. That effort would have been much easier if the increased staffing that we have consistently called for in this report had been available. We trust that the Prison Service will recognise the need, as we have done, for a fundamental staffing review in the coming year.

### Board statistics

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Recommended complement of Board members                      | 15  |
| Number of Board members at the start of the reporting period | 7   |
| Number of Board members at the end of the reporting period   | 9   |
| Total number of visits to the establishment                  | 203 |
| Total number of segregation reviews attended                 | 40  |

### Applications to the IMB

| Code | Subject   | Previous reporting year | Current reporting year |
|------|---|-------------------------|------------------------|
| A    | Accommodation, including laundry, clothing, ablutions                                       | 10                      | 9                      |
| B    | Discipline, including adjudications, IEP, sanctions   | 10                      | 18                     |
| C    | Equality  | 7                       | 12                     |
| D    | Purposeful activity, including education, work, training, library, regime, time out of cell | 11                      | 8                      |

|    |  |     |     |
|----|--|-----|-----|
| E1 | Letters, visits, telephones, public protection restrictions  | 23  | 14  |
| E2 | Finance, including pay, private monies, spends   | 14  | 6   |
| F  | Food and kitchens  | 5   | 13  |
| G  | Health, including physical, mental, social care  | 66  | 56  |
| H1 | Property within this establishment   | 35  | 18  |
| H2 | Property during transfer or in another establishment or location   | 50  | 50  |
| H3 | Canteen, facility list, catalogue(s)   | 15  | 4   |
| I  | Sentence management, including home detention curfew, release on temporary licence, parole, release dates, re-categorisation | 30  | 32  |
| J  | Staff/prisoner concerns, including bullying  | 25  | 28  |
| K  | Transfers  | 17  | 9   |
| L  | Miscellaneous, including complaints system   | 0   | 0   |
|    | Total number of applications   | 318 | 277 |



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>

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at [imb@justice.gov.uk](mailto:imb@justice.gov.uk).