

Report on announced inspections of

# **HMP Fairbanks and HMP Northward**

**(Cayman Islands)**

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

**8–15 January 2015**

## **Glossary of terms**

We try to make our reports as clear as possible, but if you find terms that you do not know, please see the glossary in our 'Guide for writing inspection reports' on our website at: <http://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/about-our-inspections/>

Crown copyright 2015

You may re-use this information (excluding logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, visit <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/> or email: [psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk)

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

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at the address below or: [hmiprisons.enquiries@hmiprisons.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:hmiprisons.enquiries@hmiprisons.gsi.gov.uk)

This publication is available for download at: <http://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons>

Printed and published by:  
Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons  
Victory House  
6th floor  
30–34 Kingsway  
London  
WC2B 6EX  
England

# Contents

Introduction	5
Fact page	7
About this inspection and report	9
Summary	11
Section 1. Safety	21
Section 2. Respect	31
Section 3. Purposeful activity	47
Section 4. Resettlement	55
Section 5. Summary of recommendations and housekeeping points	63
Section 6. Appendices	71
Appendix I: Inspection team	71
Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report	73
Appendix III: Prison population profile	83
Appendix IV: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews	87
Appendix V: Inspection photographs	117



# Introduction

The Cayman Islands are a self governing British Overseas Territory comprising a number of Islands in the Caribbean. In May 2014, HM Inspectorate of Prisons received its second invitation from the Governor of the Islands (who has responsibility for internal security, including prisons) to inspect custodial facilities on Cayman. We first inspected Cayman in 2012. This second inspection took place in early 2015. We visited two prisons on Grand Cayman: HMP Northward, a male establishment holding about 200 prisoners of varying status, age and category; and HMP Fairbanks, a facility for women which held 14 prisoners during this inspection.

Building on the experience we gained in 2012 we again used our full methodology, but adopted an approach that was sensitive to local culture and the contextual differences that distinguish Cayman from our jurisdiction in the UK. Our intent was to carry out a rigorous and open examination of the treatment and conditions experienced by prisoners; to follow up our inspection undertaken three years ago; and to provide what assistance we could in aiding Island authorities in their own work to improve custodial standards.

When we reported in 2012 we were highly critical as the treatment and conditions experienced by prisoners were very poor. In many respects they still were, but improvement was evident. The prisons now had a new Director who had made a significant difference. There was more accountability and the lethargy and indifference we observed last time was being challenged through new procedures and more energetic leadership.

Both prisons were safer in our judgement, although many prisoners, both men and women, reported in our survey that they had felt unsafe while in custody and had experienced victimisation from both staff and other prisoners. Arrangements for the reception of prisoners at Northward had improved and levels of recorded violence were not high, although policies to confront potential violence were not yet well embedded. Levels of self-harm were similar and thankfully low, but the introduction of a case management approach to supporting those at risk or in crisis was still a welcome improvement.

The security of the perimeter at Northward had been enhanced but the lack of a secure perimeter at Fairbanks was denying women adequate access to the prison's grounds. The availability of illegal drugs, particularly marijuana, in Northward remained high. The supervision of segregation also remained problematic. Prisoners could be segregated without legitimate authority, effective accountability or proper supervision, and the conditions in the segregation facility were completely unacceptable. The unregulated and arbitrary application of punishments and authority generally remained a risk and was something we observed. The supervision of segregation in Fairbanks was similarly inadequate.

Perhaps our most important criticism concerns the very poor condition of both prisons. Fairbanks resembles a storage facility and was an oppressive environment that provided no stimulation for those held there. Much of Northward was decrepit and squalid. The one exception was the refurbishment of the young persons unit at Northward, but both prisons still needed new investment and refurbishment. The kitchen at Northward was in an appalling state and should be replaced immediately.

Prisoners retained very mixed views about the staff. We found the prisons to be generally relaxed but prisoner frustration at what they saw as staff inaction, indifference and unaccountability were clearly evident. New consultation arrangements, particularly at Northward were an improvement, but again frustration for want of progress followed meetings. Women at Fairbanks all felt respected by the staff.

Arrangements to promote equality were very crude if they existed at all, although there was more attention to the safety of young people in Northward. Joint working with Children and Family Services in the community to promote their well-being was poor. Access to chaplaincy support had improved, as had the complaints system available to prisoners. Perhaps the most visible improvement was in the provision of health services. There was much still to do, not least the refurbishment of the very poor health facility at Northward, but provision was now achieving a broad equivalence with community services. The improvement was also clear evidence of what could be achieved when more effective joint working with community services was achieved.

Prisoners continued to experience good levels of unlock from their cells, but too few engaged in meaningful or purposeful activity that might better equip them for resettlement. There was broadly sufficient work and education to employ everybody but prisoners often chose not to attend. Sessions were often cancelled and quality was poor. Despite poor literacy and numeracy skills among many, these deficits were not being addressed, few qualifications were gained and too little was done to support employability. Resettlement services were similarly poor. Links to the Department for Community Rehabilitation and Children and Family Services were at best tenuous and prisoner sentence planning had effectively ceased. Prisoners felt unsupported and uncertain about their future and work to ensure effective risk management and consequent public protection was limited. However, release on temporary licence was being used more proactively to support work and family ties.

The independent inspection of places of custody – institutions that are normally hidden from public view – is about transparency and good governance. It allows communities to be better informed about what are important public services. The Cayman authorities have demonstrated confidence and courage in engaging in this process. Northward and Fairbanks were still not good prisons. There was much to do to make them better. The prisons need urgent investment, improved joint working with other public services and strong support for the Director. That said improvement was evident and the prisons were more hopeful places. This in part illustrated the benefits of inspection, although the distance still to be travelled reinforced our view, first expressed in 2012, that custodial facilities need to be subject to regular, independent preventive monitoring in order to ensure that human rights are upheld and that meaningful accountability is maintained. We have formulated a number of recommendations that we hope will further encourage this progress.

**Nick Hardwick**  
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

June 2015

# Fact page

**Task of the establishment**

HMP Northward is a male establishment, holding remand and sentenced adult males and young prisoners aged from 14 years (known locally as juveniles).

HMP Fairbanks is a female establishment, holding remand and sentenced adult women, and young prisoners.

**Prison status (public or private, with name of contractor if private)**

Public

**Region/Department**

Cayman Islands, Caribbean (British Overseas Territories)

**Number held**

Northward: 189;

Fairbanks: 16

**Certified normal accommodation**

Northward: 131;

Fairbanks: 39

**Operational capacity**

Northward: 209;

Fairbanks: 75

**Date of last full inspection**

July 2012

**Brief history**

Her Majesty's Cayman Islands Prison Northward is a 31-year-old category C facility also holding category A, B and D prisoners. The facility first opened in 1981 but suffered a riot in 1999, when A wing, B wing, Eagle House (which held female prisoners) and some ancillary buildings were set on fire. These buildings were mainly repaired and bought back into use.

HM Prison Fairbanks, formerly an immigration centre, came into existence as a female establishment as a direct consequence of the riots.

**Short description of residential units**

HMP Northward has seven residential units in total. These consist of a high-risk unit, a remand unit, an enhanced unit, a segregation unit, a young prisoner wing, and two general category B and C wings. Additionally, there is a small bungalow, where up to four long-term category D prisoners are housed external to the prison.

HMP Fairbanks has four dormitories and three single cells.

**Name of Director**

Neil Lavis

**Escort contractor**

Not applicable; escorts conducted internally

**Health services**

Commissioner: Ministry of Home Affairs

Provider: Health Services Authority (HAS)

**Learning and skills providers**

Not applicable

**Prison Inspection Board chair**

Arek Joseph



# About this inspection and report

A1 Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons is an independent, statutory organisation which reports on the treatment and conditions of those detained in prisons, young offender institutions, secure training centres, immigration detention facilities, police and court custody and military detention. This work is normally undertaken in England and Wales, although from time to time work is undertaken in other jurisdictions by invitation. This inspection was undertaken following a formal invitation from the Governor of the Cayman Islands and under the auspices of the Ministry of Home Affairs.

A2 All inspections carried out by HM Inspectorate of Prisons normally contribute to the UK's response to its international obligations under the Optional Protocol to the UN Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (OPCAT). OPCAT requires that all places of detention are visited regularly by independent bodies – known as the National Preventive Mechanism (NPM) – which monitor the treatment of and conditions for detainees. HM Inspectorate of Prisons is one of several bodies making up the NPM in the UK. The Cayman Islands are not however, party to OPCAT.

A3 All Inspectorate of Prisons reports carry a summary of the conditions and treatment of prisoners, based on the four tests of a healthy prison that were first introduced in this inspectorate's thematic review *Suicide is everyone's concern*, published in 1999. The tests are:

<b>Safety</b>	prisoners, particularly the most vulnerable, are held safely
<b>Respect</b>	prisoners are treated with respect for their human dignity
<b>Purposeful activity</b>	prisoners are able, and expected, to engage in activity that is likely to benefit them
<b>Resettlement</b>	prisoners are prepared for their release into the community and effectively helped to reduce the likelihood of reoffending.

A4 Under each test, we make an assessment of outcomes for prisoners and therefore of the establishment's overall performance against the test. There are four possible judgements: In some cases, this performance will be affected by matters outside the establishment's direct control, which need to be addressed by the National Offender Management Service.

- **outcomes for prisoners are good.**  
There is no evidence that outcomes for prisoners are being adversely affected in any significant areas.
- **outcomes for prisoners are reasonably good.**  
There is evidence of adverse outcomes for prisoners in only a small number of areas. For the majority, there are no significant concerns. Procedures to safeguard outcomes are in place.
- **outcomes for prisoners are not sufficiently good.**  
There is evidence that outcomes for prisoners are being adversely affected in many areas or particularly in those areas of greatest importance to the well-being of prisoners. Problems/concerns, if left unattended, are likely to become areas of serious concern.

- **outcomes for prisoners are poor.**  
There is evidence that the outcomes for prisoners are seriously affected by current practice. There is a failure to ensure even adequate treatment of and/or conditions for prisoners. Immediate remedial action is required.
- A5 Our assessments might result in one of the following:
- **recommendations:** will require significant change and/or new or redirected resources, so are not immediately achievable, and will be reviewed for implementation at future inspections
  - **housekeeping points:** achievable within a matter of days, or at most weeks, through the issue of instructions or changing routines
  - **examples of good practice:** impressive practice that not only meets or exceeds our expectations, but could be followed by other similar establishments to achieve positive outcomes for prisoners.
- A6 Five key sources of evidence are used by inspectors: observation; prisoner surveys; discussions with prisoners; discussions with staff and relevant third parties; and documentation. During inspections we use a mixed-method approach to data gathering and analysis, applying both qualitative and quantitative methodologies. Evidence from different sources is triangulated to strengthen the validity of our assessments. The methodology has been applied in full to Cayman, although some account has been taken for specific or cultural differences as appropriate.
- A7 Since April 2013, all our inspections have been unannounced, other than in exceptional circumstances or as is the case with this inspection where logistical or practical considerations make an unannounced approach impossible.
- A8 This explanation of our approach is followed by a summary of our inspection findings against the four healthy prison tests. There then follow four sections each containing a detailed account of our findings against our *Expectations. Criteria for assessing the treatment of prisoners and conditions in prisons*. The reference numbers at the end of some recommendations indicate that they are repeated, and provide the paragraph location of the previous recommendation in the last report. Section 5 collates all recommendations, housekeeping points and examples of good practice arising from the inspection. Appendix II lists the recommendations from the previous inspection, and our assessment of whether they have been achieved.
- A9 Details of the inspection team and the prison population profile can be found in Appendices I and III respectively.
- A10 Findings from the survey of prisoners and a detailed description of the survey methodology can be found in Appendix IV of this report. Please note that we only refer to comparisons with other comparable establishments or previous inspections when these are statistically significant.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The significance level is set at 0.05, which means that there is only a 5% chance that the difference in results is due to chance.

# Summary

## Safety

- S1** *Reception and induction processes were generally sound. Overall levels of violence and self-harm were not high, although prisoners reported high levels of victimisation and many said that they did not feel safe. Casework with prisoners at risk of self-harm had been introduced recently. Physical security at Northward had improved but Fairbanks remained largely deficient. The management of security information had also improved but lacked sufficient rigour fully to address threats to the prisons. Illegal drugs were easily available but drug testing arrangements were inadequate. Segregation processes were inadequate and the accommodation remained appalling. **Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test at both Northward and Fairbanks.***
- S2** *At the last inspection in 2012 we found that outcomes for prisoners at Northward were poor and at Fairbanks were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test. We made 21 recommendations in the area of safety. At this follow-up inspection we found that five of the recommendations had been achieved, seven had been partially achieved and nine had not been achieved.*
- S3** Prisoners were transported to and from the prisons in suitably equipped vehicles, with appropriate separation of men and women, and adults and young people.
- S4** Reception processes at Northward were well managed and we saw staff treating new arrivals in a professional but friendly manner. Arrangements for informing newly arrived prisoners at Northward about processes in the prison were delivered effectively through an interview with the induction orderly, written information and a weekly induction presentation. There were similar arrangements at Fairbanks. There was no health assessment as part of reception processes and new arrivals were not seen by the nurse until the day after arrival. This had the potential to miss health risks which could have had consequences on the first night. At both prisons, a basic safety and self-harm check was undertaken during reception.
- S5** We did not find evidence of high levels of violence but prisoners still reported feeling unsafe, with almost two-thirds of men and half of the women in our survey saying that they had felt unsafe at the prisons at some time. Men and women alike reported high levels of victimisation from staff and prisoners.
- S6** There was a comprehensive and clear safer custody policy but much of it had not been implemented. A safer custody group had been identified but there was no process to monitor and analyse violent incidents and identify appropriate action, and no structured system to manage bullies or support victims. There was no consultation with prisoners to identify, understand and meet their safety concerns.
- S7** Levels of self-harm were low. Casework with prisoners at risk of suicide and self-harm had been introduced recently, based on assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management system used in the UK. This was an important step forward. Assessments of risk and need were reasonable, but not sufficiently detailed in some cases, and care planning was inadequate, although interaction with prisoners being monitored was good.

- S8 There had been some improvements in security arrangements. The prison perimeter at Northward had been reinforced and provided a better barrier to escape but at Fairbanks was inadequate. The security intelligence reporting process had been reintroduced but there was a low level of engagement across the prisons and little meaningful analysis of intelligence received. The well-attended security meetings lacked appropriate focus on risks to the prisons.
- S9 Survey results and drug finds indicated high levels of drug availability (mainly marijuana). The selection of prisoners for drug testing was not subject to a random process and too little testing was undertaken. The overall positive drug testing rate at Northward was too high. There was no published drug and alcohol strategy to address some of the issues of concern.
- S10 There were few disciplinary adjudications. Some adjudication records showed insufficient enquiry, and management oversight was not sufficiently robust. We witnessed an unregulated, arbitrary punishment issued on the young persons unit to an inmate located in a lockdown cell without authority.
- S11 The level of use of force was low but we were not assured that all uses were recorded; when it was recorded, the documentation was often incomplete. We were concerned by the use of leg shackles, which was unnecessary and excessive.
- S12 Prisoners at Northward could be held in the segregation unit (known locally as 'basic') without legitimate authority or senior management oversight. Recording of segregation use was inadequate. Prisoners were held in segregated conditions for long and indeterminate periods without review and there was no effective reintegration process. The environment was unacceptable; cells were in a poor state of repair, some being dirty and graffiti strewn, with almost no natural light and leaking toilets, and not all cells had running water. Governance of the three segregation cells at Fairbanks was similarly inadequate. The cells there, although austere, were in a reasonable condition.
- S13 Clinical treatment for substance misuse was available on a symptomatic basis, but rarely needed or used. Psychosocial interventions were in a state of transition, with a reduction in one-to-one support due to staff vacancies. Both group and peer support were available.

## Respect

- S14** *The environment was very poor, with improvements confined to the refurbishment of a young persons facility in Northward. Both prisons needed replacement or refurbishment. Management oversight of the high-risk unit was better but conditions and treatment were oppressive. There was some evidence of improved staff-prisoner relationships but prisoners at both prisons reported the arbitrary and unregulated exercise of authority. Work to promote equality and diversity was very limited. Faith provision was much improved and the chaplaincy was active. Arrangements to deal with prisoner complaints were also improved. With the exception of mental health, health provision for both men and women had improved and mostly ensured a reasonable level of basic care. The prison kitchen required immediate replacement. **Outcomes for prisoners were poor at Northward and not sufficiently good at Fairbanks against this healthy prison test.***

*S15 At the last inspection in 2012 we found that outcomes for prisoners at Northward were poor and at Fairbanks not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test. We made 36 recommendations in the area of respect.<sup>2</sup> At this follow-up inspection we found that 13 of the recommendations had been achieved, 11 had been partially achieved, 11 had not been achieved and one was no longer relevant.*

- S16 Improvement to the environment at both prisons was limited to the refurbishment of the new young persons unit at Northward. The other wings at Northward were rundown and decrepit; most cells were dark and cage-like, and communal areas grubby, bare and devoid of equipment. A wing was particularly squalid. Prisoners lacked any privacy. Prisoners were able to shower daily. Some additional fans had been introduced to the wings but the high temperatures and general lack of ventilation were an ongoing cause for prisoner complaint.
- S17 Accommodation at Fairbanks resembled a large storage facility. The dormitory accommodation was sparse but clean and relatively spacious, although the women were afforded little privacy. The main communal space, called the dayroom, was a large wire cage, although contained some soft furnishings. Women had good access to toilets, showers and a laundry.
- S18 There were sufficient telephones for prisoners across both sites, and access had improved.
- S19 The application system had improved, particularly at Northward, where prisoners had greater confidence in the system and most issues were dealt with.
- S20 The high-risk unit at Northward provided a highly controlled and restrictive environment. Its purpose was unclear. Prisoners who presented an escape risk or were convicted of serious offences which attracted category A status were allocated to the unit automatically. However, it was sometimes used inappropriately, and without proper authority, as an alternative segregation unit for some prisoners segregated for good order and discipline. The processes for monitoring and assessing prisoners on the unit had improved and prisoners were subject to a high-quality multidisciplinary assessment and review, although the reviews were too infrequent and unpredictable. The environment on the unit was bleak and oppressive, and some prisoners were subject to additional extreme restrictions on their movement, such as the application of shackles and handcuffs, without proper reason or authority. The regime on the unit had not improved and was over-restrictive, with prisoners locked up in single cells for up to 22 hours a day.
- S21 At Northward, our survey results in relation to staff–prisoner relationships were inconsistent across the wings but positive overall, although over half of prisoners felt victimised by staff. We saw staff engaging with prisoners and most prisoners seemed to be at ease in their company. However, prisoners repeatedly expressed their frustration at what they saw as the indifference and inaction of staff in meeting their needs, as well as the unaccountable exercise of authority. The quality of staff entries in wing files varied but was much improved. Nearly all the women at Fairbanks felt respected but also reported relatively high levels of victimisation.
- S22 The relatively new Northward prisoner consultation committee showed a highly developed level of engagement from prisoners but they were frustrated about a lack of progress on issues raised. The Fairbanks council was less well developed.

<sup>2</sup> This included recommendations about the incentives and earned privileges scheme which, in our updated Expectations (Version 4, 2012), now appear under the healthy prison area of safety.

- S23 There was no formal equality policy. There were no arrangements to consult with or provide support to minority groups and there was no systematic monitoring of the fairness of treatment of such groups across the prisons. There were no adaptations for people with mobility difficulties, nor provision for any form of disability, including learning difficulties, even though 17% of respondents to our survey identified themselves as having a disability. In our survey, they reported higher levels of victimisation, by staff and prisoners alike, than their able-bodied counterparts.
- S24 There was no record of any prisoners having disclosed as lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender (LGBT) but prisoners were not at any stage asked about their sexual orientation. Over 20% of the population were foreign nationals. Interpreting provision was adequate.
- S25 The safety of young people at Northward had improved with the opening of a dedicated unit, which provided a more pleasant and suitable living environment. The decision to keep young people apart from adults at all times was not based on a risk assessment and limited their opportunity to take part in the main regime and activities, as well as potentially leading to increased isolation. Links with the Children and Family Services in the community were very poor, leaving young people unsure about their plan and progression opportunities.
- S26 Our survey showed better access to a chaplain, and to worship, than at the time of the previous inspection. The chaplain was actively engaged with many aspects of prison life, provided counselling in liaison with mental health staff and fostered support in the community for those released from prison. There was a wide variety of corporate Christian worship but it was relatively rare for faiths other than Christianity to be represented, and there was insufficient provision for them.
- S27 A new complaints system had been introduced and was working well, and prisoners were generally more positive about the arrangements. Basic facts about complaints were reported monthly to the senior management team, and some analysis was undertaken. The timeliness of responses was monitored and late replies chased.
- S28 Most women and more men than at the time of the previous inspection said that access to the nurse and the overall quality of health services had improved. The location of the health centre at Northward was temporary and the whole environment required refurbishment to meet primary care and infection control standards. Arrangements for prisoners with long-term conditions had improved. Information sharing with the local hospital using the clinical information system represented good practice, but there was no agreement to share information with prison substance misuse services. Most prisoners held their medicines in-possession but we saw no documented in-possession risk assessments. Although prison officers had been trained to administer not-in-possession medications, their competence had not been assessed and they were not suitably supervised. Access to dental services was excellent and the quality of care was good.
- S29 Health services at Fairbanks had improved and there was a systematic and female-focused approach.
- S30 Mental health care was available but relatively unsophisticated. The involuntary treatment of persons with mental health disorders was occurring under a new mental health law but the practice had not been subject to assurance by the Mental Health Commission.
- S31 In our survey, more Northward prisoners than at the time of the previous inspection said that the food provided was good or very good. In our Fairbanks group, female prisoners complained of the poor quality of the food they received from Northward. Provision of preferential diets was rudimentary and informal.

- S32 The kitchen environment and standards of cleanliness were extremely poor. A large amount of kitchen equipment was broken and out of action. The kitchen required complete and immediate refurbishment.
- S33 Access to the prison shop was good but products were limited mainly to snacks and confectionery. Prisoners could no longer purchase tobacco, although, paradoxically, cigarettes could be handed in by relatives. This was inequitable and could potentially lead to debt and bullying problems.

## Purposeful activity

- S34** *The amount of time unlocked was very good, but most prisoners were inactive and not doing anything purposeful. The management of learning and skills and work was inadequate. There were enough activity places to engage all prisoners but many sessions were cancelled or prisoners failed to attend. A suitable range of education, vocational training and work was offered but much of the work was of poor quality. At neither prison were accredited vocational and educational qualifications available. Library services were poor. Recreational PE provision was reasonably good. **Outcomes for prisoners at both Northward and Fairbanks were poor against this healthy prison test.***
- S35 *At the last inspection in 2012 we found that outcomes for prisoners at both prisons were poor against this healthy prison test. We made 13 recommendations in the area of purposeful activity. At this follow-up inspection we found that two of the recommendations had been achieved, three had been partially achieved and eight had not been achieved.*

- S36 The amount of time unlocked at both prisons was very good, at over 14 hours a day for the majority of prisoners, but we found most prisoners on the wings during the day with nothing meaningful to do. At Northward, prisoners on most wings could access open spaces adjacent to their wings freely during the day. The women at Fairbanks were limited to just one hour in the open air. Less than 40% of men and no women were engaged in purposeful activity during our spot checks.
- S37 The learning and skills and work provision was suitably based on meeting both national skills shortages and identified prisoner needs, particularly the low standards of literacy and numeracy. The operational management of learning, skills and work was inadequate, with poorly defined responsibilities and accountabilities. Effective quality assurance and improvement arrangements were not established. The number of purposeful activity places (work, education and vocational training) had increased substantially and there was enough to occupy both prison populations, but many sessions were cancelled and attendance was poor. Allocation to activities had recently improved and was fair and equitable, but places were underused.
- S38 The quality of learning and skills and work was inadequate. A large proportion of the Northward prisoners had poor literacy and numeracy skills that were not being addressed. In the small number of education sessions we observed, the quality of individual coaching was adequate. However, session planning did not ensure that specific needs identified by initial assessment were met. Most work places did not develop an adequate range and standard of employability skills to support successful resettlement. There was no process to recognise and record skills developed at work to improve future employability. Learning resources at Northward had improved, as had the lighting and ventilation in the Fairbanks classrooms, with computers now operational.

- S39 Neither prison provided accredited vocational or educational qualifications. Only three learners had achieved qualifications in the previous 12 months. Behaviour during the sessions we observed was generally satisfactory.
- S40 In our survey, few prisoners said that they could access the library easily. At both prisons, the extensive library stock was not based on prisoners' needs, and there were insufficient resources to support education and vocational training. There were well developed plans to introduce Toe by Toe (a mentoring scheme to help prisoners learn to read).
- S41 The Northward gym was managed effectively. Participation rates had improved and prisoners had reasonable access to recreational PE. At Fairbanks, the gym had been improved but little was done to encourage its use. Across both prisons, links with the health care department were underdeveloped and the promotion of wider healthy living and lifestyles was weak.

## Resettlement

**S42** *The strategic management of resettlement had improved but there was no analysis of the needs of the population to inform provision. Prisoners' needs were not assessed on arrival, and sentence planning and case management had effectively ceased. Release on temporary licence, parole and the executive release schemes were managed appropriately and categorisation had improved but multi-agency public protection work was limited. Too few prisoners were prepared for release. There was inadequate help with housing, debt and employment. Visits arrangements had not improved but family days and parenting programmes were positive additions. The lack of offending behaviour programmes was a significant gap. **Outcomes for prisoners at both Northward and Fairbanks were poor against this healthy prison test.***

**S43** *At the last inspection in 2012 we found that outcomes for prisoners at both prisons were poor against this healthy prison test. We made 14 recommendations in the area of resettlement. At this follow-up inspection we found that three of the recommendations had been achieved, three had been partially achieved and eight had not been achieved.*

- S44 At both prisons, there was no comprehensive needs analysis and the range of resettlement provision was limited. Strategic oversight had improved but there was still no formal committee to monitor and review progress against the newly developed action plan. Links with the Department for Community Rehabilitation and the Children and Families Services were tenuous, and information exchange was poor, which significantly limited risk assessment work and decision making. The provision of unsupervised release on temporary licence (ROTL) for work and family ties had developed well.
- S45 The prisoner case management function had effectively ceased. There was no current risk and needs assessment tool, prisoners' needs were not assessed on arrival, and formal sentence and reintegration planning had ended. Prisoners we spoke to felt unsupported and uncertain about their future. The timeliness of the executive release scheme, which enabled prisoners to be released at their earliest eligibility date, had improved.
- S46 There was a lack of attention given to identifying risk of harm and protecting victims throughout the sentence, although there was some multi-agency working in preparation for ROTL and parole. Sound ROTL processes had been introduced but decision making was hindered, particularly for the more serious offenders, by the lack of a formal risk and needs assessment.



- S47 More robust categorisation processes had been introduced. Initial allocation was now undertaken and reviews were up to date and defensible.
- S48 The regime, support and progression opportunities for life-sentenced prisoners were limited, although a lifer liaison officer had recently been appointed. The Conditional Release Act (yet to be enacted) was due to introduce the opportunity for parole for life-sentenced prisoners and three prisoners had been released in the previous year at the Island Governor's discretion.
- S49 Formal reintegration planning had ended, other than for those applying for parole. In our survey, too few prisoners felt prepared for release and most prisoners did not know who to go to for resettlement help.
- S50 Many prisoners had housing problems on arrival but few knew who to turn to in the prison for help. Advice and support were not available before release and the number of prisoners released homeless was not monitored.
- S51 An employability skills course at Northward was offered but attendance was not compulsory and only six prisoners had completed it in 2014. ROTL for work experience had been introduced and the development of links with employers was welcome.
- S52 Prisoners with ongoing medical and/or substance misuse needs were referred to appropriate services in the community before release.
- S53 No help was provided in either prison with finance and debt problems, despite evidence of significant problems among prisoners. Effort had been made to open bank accounts before release but this was proving very difficult.
- S54 In our survey, most female prisoners said that they felt supported in maintaining contact with family and friends but male prisoners were less positive. Other than some improvements to the layout of the visit rooms at each prison, arrangements for visits remained restrictive. However, some wider improvements had been made, parenting programmes had been delivered to a small number of men and women, and family fun days had been developed.
- S55 The offending-related needs of the population were not assessed, so it was difficult to identify which offending behaviour programmes were required. Resources dedicated to programme delivery had reduced, and at the time of the inspection there were no offending behaviour courses available, other than three drug programmes.

## Main concerns and recommendations

- S56 Concern: The findings in this report raise some significant human rights concerns. The Optional Protocol for the Convention Against Torture (OPCAT) does not apply in the Cayman Islands, which means that areas of detention on the islands are not subject to regular independent monitoring.

**Recommendation: The United Kingdom should extend OPCAT to the Cayman Islands.** (Repeated recommendation HP50)

- S57 Concern: Prisoners did not feel safe. Nearly two-thirds of men and half of the women said that they had felt unsafe at some time. They reported high levels of victimisation from other prisoners and staff. No attempt was made to identify, analyse or measure the levels of violence or extent of victimisation and bullying in order to reduce levels of violence and improve safety.

**Recommendation: The prison should fully implement a violence reduction strategy. Incidents of violence, bullying and intimidatory behaviour should be recorded, collated and analysed to identify trends and hot spots. Action should be taken to reduce violence and bullying. Victims should be supported and perpetrators monitored and challenged. Prisoners should be regularly consulted on their perceptions of safety and managers should actively promote a climate and culture in which violence and victimisation are not tolerated.** (Repeated recommendation HP51)

- S58 Concern: Prisoners on the segregation (basic) unit on A wing at Northward were segregated and held in wretched conditions, with minimal regime. The process to place prisoners in segregation was unregulated, with no senior manager approval or oversight, and no comprehensive recording, monitoring or case management to plan for reintegration.

**Recommendation: The current use of segregation (basic) should be replaced by a regulated, risk-assessed and controlled system of segregation. Cells should be suitably equipped and access to a suitable regime provided. Prisoners should be individually case managed and, where possible, plans made and implemented for reintegration into the main population.** (Repeated recommendation HP53)

- S59 Concern: The kitchen and health care facilities were not fit for purpose. Wings and cells at Northward were barely fit for human habitation. Facilities were poorly ventilated and often filthy, dark and oppressive. There was no privacy and most cells were overcrowded. The general fabric of the environment was very poor, with water ingress and vermin infestation. Facilities at Fairbanks were only marginally better.

**Recommendation: Many of the current facilities at both Northward and Fairbanks should be demolished and the rest should undergo complete renovation. New prisoner accommodation should be developed that provides safe and secure accommodation commensurate with internationally accepted minimum standards.** (Repeated recommendation HP54)

- S60 Concern: There was no transparency or consistency in the way that staff responded to prisoner need or behaviour. The legitimacy of procedures and decisions was constantly undermined by the unregulated and often illegitimate exercise of staff discretion, and managers failed in their responsibility to supervise.

**Recommendation: The prison should develop clear, transparent operating procedures concerning daily routines and arrangements directly relevant to the daily lives of prisoners. Meaningful management checks should be introduced to ensure that, on a daily basis, all members of staff, at all levels, are accountable for their actions and deliver their remit consistently and fairly.** (Repeated recommendation HP55)

- S61 Concern: There were sufficient work, training and education places. However, too many prisoners chose not to attend activity sessions or the sessions were cancelled owing to staff shortages, and most prisoners were unoccupied during the day.

**Recommendation: The number of cancelled activities should be reduced and prisoners should be required to attend.**

S62 Concern: The prisoner case management function had effectively ceased since the previous inspection. Prisoners did not have their needs assessed on arrival and did not receive a sentence plan to address their offending behaviour.

**Recommendation: All prisoners should have their needs assessed on arrival and have a sentence plan to address these needs and their offending behaviour.**

S63 Concern: Very little was done to help prisoners prepare for release and, despite evident need, they were not assisted with debt issues or with finding accommodation or employment on release.

**Recommendation: Prisoners should be helped to prepare for release and reduce their likelihood of reoffending. In particular, a reintegration plan including help with debts and finding accommodation and employment should be provided.**



# Section 1. Safety

## Courts, escorts and transfers

### Expected outcomes:

**Prisoners transferring to and from the prison are treated safely, decently and efficiently.**

- I.1** *Journeys to the prisons were short and the vans used were clean and well appointed, but property could not be transported with prisoners. The use of shackles was unnecessary. A good video-link service had been introduced.*
- I.2** Journeys to the prisons were short. The transport vans used (by both police and the prison) were clean, with air conditioning and separate compartments for men and women, and adults and young people. They had comfortable bench seats and seat belts.
- I.3** Space for property in vans was limited and large numbers of men and women in our survey said that their property had not arrived with them.
- I.4** As a result of poor security at the court, prisoners were restrained during transport to the prisons; however, leg shackles were used for male prisoners, which was disproportionate and unnecessary.
- I.5** A video-link court had been introduced and was well used, avoiding unnecessary journeys to court.

### Recommendations

- I.6** **Prisoners' property should be transported with them to prison.** (Repeated recommendation I.5)
- I.7** **Prisoners should not be shackled.** (Repeated recommendation I.6)

## Early days in custody

### Expected outcomes:

**Prisoners are treated with respect and feel safe on their arrival into prison and for the first few days in custody. Prisoners' individual needs are identified and addressed, and they feel supported on their first night. During a prisoner's induction he/she is made aware of the prison routines, how to access available services and how to cope with imprisonment.**

- I.8** *Reception processes at both prisons were good and had been improved by a new checklist which included safety considerations, but there was no health care assessment on the day of arrival. Prisoner orderlies had been appointed at both sites and provided a valuable service to new arrivals. Insufficient information arrived with prisoners and too little was passed on to residential wings. There were no enhanced first night arrangements for new prisoners and a full range of toiletries and bedding was not always provided.*
- I.9** Around six new prisoners were received into Northward each week. The reception area was clean, air conditioned and well run. Staff were professional, efficient and friendly. Prisoners were offered a shower before changing into prison clothing and their own clothing was washed. Sentenced prisoners were provided with a free telephone card but remand prisoners had to buy one or had a free telephone call in reception.
- I.10** A reception pack of snacks and a drink had been introduced at both prisons but this was insufficient to last until prisoners could buy goods from the prison shop. Although we saw prisoners being provided with a full set of kit at both prisons, including bedding and toiletries, at Northward we were told that they were not reliably available; we met prisoners who had not been given pillows or shower gel on their first night. No attention was paid to preparing accommodation for new arrivals.
- I.11** The information we saw arriving with prisoners was limited, although we were told by the police that a risk assessment completed on those held in police custody should have been sent to the prison. Some prisoners' criminal record and victim statements were emailed to the prison but usually not until the day after their arrival. This made it difficult for staff fully to assess the risks and vulnerabilities of new prisoners (see also section on offender management and public protection)
- I.12** A revised, basic reception checklist, which included questions about feelings of safety and self-harm, had been introduced at both prisons and was completed with the reception officer in privacy. However, we found that this assessment was not included in the wing file at Northward, so the information was not shared with residential staff.
- I.13** There was no health assessment on the day of arrival for men or women, which meant that immediate risks, such as withdrawal from alcohol, might not have been identified, putting such prisoners at risk on the first night. Most prisoners were seen by health services staff on the following day.
- I.14** Reception procedures at Fairbanks were undertaken in the staff rest room, where the women were searched and changed into prison clothing. In our survey, they reported positively about their treatment in reception. They also received free telephone calls and a telephone card, if sentenced.

- I.15** At both prisons, procedures had been introduced to support new prisoners. Prisoner orderlies welcomed new arrivals, provided them with written information, which they explained verbally, and accompanied them to their accommodation. At Northward, the orderly was available on the wing where many new prisoners were located, so he was available to answer any queries; at Fairbanks, this individual was easily available during the day.
- I.16** At Northward, a check was undertaken of any conflicts with prisoners currently held, so that new arrivals could be located safely. In our survey, only 44% of men said that they had felt safe on their first night, which was similar to the proportion at the time of the previous inspection. There were no specified first night procedures at either prison to provide enhanced checks of new prisoners. In our survey, five of the 14 women questioned said that they had not felt safe on their first night at Fairbanks.
- I.17** At Northward, there was a weekly induction presentation, covering much of the information provided on arrival. On the day after arrival, prisoners at both sites were seen by the chaplain, and by the nurse for a health care assessment.

## Recommendations

- I.18** **Newly arrived prisoners should be able to purchase shop goods immediately or be provided with an interim pack sufficient to cover the period until they can buy goods.** (Repeated recommendation I.19)
- I.19** **Access to all previous offending information, victim impact statements and safety and risk information held by the police and courts should be improved to support good risk assessment work by prison staff. All such information should be in wing and case management files and accessible to staff.**
- I.20** **An assessment of all new prisoners should be undertaken on the day of arrival to identify immediate health needs.**
- I.21** **A clear set of first night procedures which addresses prisoners' feelings of safety should be developed and implemented.** (Repeated recommendation I.21)

## Bullying and violence reduction

### Expected outcomes:

**Everyone feels and is safe from bullying and victimisation (which includes verbal and racial abuse, theft, threats of violence and assault). Prisoners at risk/subject to victimisation are protected through active and fair systems known to staff, prisoners and visitors, and which inform all aspects of the regime.**

- I.22** *Levels of recorded violence were low. Prisoners at both prisons reported negatively about safety and victimisation by prisoners and staff. There was a comprehensive and clear safer custody policy but the violence reduction procedures had not been fully implemented. Incidents of violence were not systematically recorded and analysed. There were no procedures to manage bullies or support victims.*

- I.23** In our survey at Northward, almost two-thirds of prisoners said that they had felt unsafe at some time at the prison and over a third that they currently felt unsafe, both figures being similar to those at the time of the previous inspection (see main recommendation S57). The prison reported low levels of violence, with just 16 incidents in the previous six months.
- I.24** At Fairbanks, of the 14 women being held, seven said they had felt unsafe at some time at the prison and three that they currently felt unsafe (see main recommendation S57). Women prisoners in our group were also negative about levels of victimisation.
- I.25** Almost half of male prisoners reported victimisation by other prisoners, mostly in the form of insulting remarks or threats, and more than half said that they had been victimised by staff (see section on staff–prisoner relationships); both figures were similar to those at the time of the previous inspection (see main recommendation S57).
- I.26** A good safer custody policy, covering violence reduction and suicide and self-harm prevention, had been published. The plans for violence reduction had yet to be implemented and, although a safer custody staff group had been appointed, there was no systematic gathering of information about incidents to facilitate an analysis of violence to inform measures to address bullying, intimidation and assaults, or support victims. Violence in the prison was poorly understood and there was no framework for obtaining the prisoners’ perspective about their experience and to meet their concerns (see main recommendation S57). Training in anti-bullying had been delivered to only 16 officers in 2014.
- I.27** Incidents of violence and bullying were recorded in wing information books but responses were limited. There were several examples of mediation between prisoners in conflict but there was little investigation into the causes of violent incidents (see main recommendation S57). When conflict or bullying had occurred, there had been notes to staff to monitor the situation but no ongoing record to indicate if prisoners continued to be violent or victimised, or processes to manage bullies and protect victims. Violent prisoners could be moved to the austere segregation cells, and some prisoners at risk of victimisation were located in segregation on A wing, with little attention paid to planning for their safe reintegration into the prison.

## Self-harm and suicide prevention

### Expected outcomes:

**The prison provides a safe and secure environment which reduces the risk of self-harm and suicide. Prisoners are identified at an early stage and given the necessary support. All staff are aware of and alert to vulnerability issues, are appropriately trained and have access to proper equipment and support.**

**I.28** *The number of incidents of self-harm was low at both prisons. The safer custody policy provided good guidance for staff and a promising start had been made to the use of the case management support system based on assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) procedures.*

**I.29** The comprehensive safer custody policy (see section on bullying and violence reduction) provided guidance for staff on self-harm prevention. Measures to identify those at risk of self-harm on arrival had been implemented but many other aspects had yet to be applied. In our survey, around 30% of men reported feeling depressed or suicidal on arrival, which was similar to the percentage at the time of the previous inspection; nearly half (5/14) of the women we surveyed reported such feelings.



- I.30** Neither prison had experienced any self-inflicted deaths in custody and there had been no incidents of self-harm in the previous six months at either prison. However, the prisons held prisoners with self-harm histories, including attempts to commit suicide. A process for case managing prisoners at risk of self-harm, based on assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management procedures used in the UK, had been introduced shortly before the inspection and two men and a woman were being managed under the system. This process had got off to a reasonable start, although we identified some areas for development. There was clearly an awareness of risk factors, as the woman was subject to case management because of the circumstances of her offending rather than an overt expression of distress from her. Assessments of risk and need were reasonable but not sufficiently detailed in some cases, and care planning was inadequate. ACCT reviews were overdue in some cases. Engagement with prisoners being managed under these procedures was mostly good and well recorded, with examples of good interaction on most days.
- I.31** Training in ACCT procedures had started during 2014, and at the time of the inspection 59 staff (out of a total of 90) had been trained.

## Recommendation

- I.32** **The implementation of the case management of prisoners at risk of self-harm should be reviewed, further to improve care of those at risk.**

## Security

### Expected outcomes:

**Security and good order are maintained through an attention to physical and procedural matters, including effective security intelligence as well as positive staff-prisoner relationships. Prisoners are safe from exposure to substance misuse while in prison.**

- I.33** *Physical security had improved at Northward. Security systems had improved but still lacked sufficient rigour. A limited number of drug tests were carried out. Drug use was high.*

- I.34** The perimeter fence at Northward had been reinforced, improving security arrangements. However, physical security at Fairbanks remained inadequate, which meant that female prisoners were given only limited access to the fresh air.
- I.35** The fabric of some of the units was poor (see section on residential units) and not sufficiently robust to house category B prisoners. Staff conducted daily checks of the accommodation; those that we observed were conducted thoroughly.
- I.36** The security intelligence report (SIR) process had been re-launched but there was a low level of engagement across the prisons, with as few as 20 reports received each month. These were logged in a hand-written book, with little analysis or monitoring to identify emerging or repeat issues. There appeared to be little understanding of the role of SIRs in the collation of data; for example, in one set of security meeting minutes it had been reported that no significant SIRs had been received in the previous month, despite the discovery of 12 pounds of 'Ganja' (marijuana).

- I.37** The monthly security meeting was well attended. However, there was little discussion about SIRs and any subsequent actions identified; although the high and regular instances of contraband finds (usually marijuana and mobile telephones) were discussed there, little direct action was taken to address these issues and no monthly security objectives were set.
- I.38** The high level of finds (at Northward) and also the results of our survey indicated a high availability of drugs and other contraband, including in sensitive areas such as the high-risk unit (HRU), where a number of mobile telephones had recently been discovered.
- I.39** In our Northward survey, 35% of respondents said that it was easy to get drugs at the prison, which was similar to the figure at the time of the previous inspection. There was no 'random' mandatory drug testing programme to measure drug use and provide a deterrent. There had been insufficient drug testing; in 2014 there had been only 30 tests at Northward and six at Fairbanks, most of which had been risk assessment tests before release on temporary licence (ROTL), recategorisation or parole applications. The level of suspicion testing was also inadequate, with only seven tests in 2014 at Northward and none at Fairbanks, and little or no coordination with any security intelligence. The overall positive drug testing rate at Northward was 26.8% for cannabis and, occasionally, cocaine; this was similar to the figure in 2012, and was unacceptably high. Drug supply reduction arrangements were rudimentary and haphazard, with no published strategy and little evidence of directed actions to reduce the supply into the prisons.
- I.40** Drug testing facilities at Northward and Fairbanks were unacceptable, with staff toilets being used as the test facilities. There was no dedicated space for the storage of testing equipment.

## Recommendations

- I.41** The external perimeter fencing of at Fairbanks should be brought up to category C standard.
- I.42** The use of security intelligence reports should be promoted, and detailed monitoring of data received should be undertaken to identify risks to the establishments.
- I.43** The publication and application of a drug and alcohol supply reduction policy should be expedited.
- I.44** A system of regular mandatory random drug testing should be initiated to measure drug misuse and to provide a robust deterrent.
- I.45** Drug testing should take place in a suitably clinical environment and testing equipment should be stored appropriately. (Repeated recommendation I.46)

## Incentives and earned privileges<sup>3</sup>

### Expected outcomes:

**Prisoners understand the purpose of the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme and how to progress through it. The IEP scheme provides prisoners with incentives and rewards for effort and behaviour. The scheme is applied fairly, transparently and consistently.**

**I.46** *There was no incentive and earned privileges scheme at either prison.*

**I.47** Due to the wide range of new initiatives that the Director was implementing at the prisons, the introduction of an incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme had been put on hold. Minor infractions often resulted in adjudications (see section on discipline).

### Recommendation

**I.48** **A behavioural management system to encourage and reward and good behaviour should be introduced as soon as is practicable.**

## Discipline

### Expected outcomes:

**Disciplinary procedures are applied fairly and for good reason. Prisoners understand why they are being disciplined and can appeal against any sanctions imposed on them.**

**I.49** *There were few adjudications. Management oversight was limited and additional days were inappropriately awarded by prison staff. Use of force procedures had improved and staff training had restarted. Segregation arrangements were extremely poor and lacked any effective governance.*

### Disciplinary procedures

**I.50** There were few adjudications, with an average of about 10 a week at Northward and less than two a month at Fairbanks. Hearings were held on an ad hoc basis and were conducted by custodial managers. The adjudications we observed were relaxed and conducted appropriately but some of the records we saw displayed little evidence of enquiry beyond the 'guilty' or 'not guilty' plea and we were not assured that quality assurance processes were effective. There was no standardisation process in place to ensure the equivalence of punishments, and prison staff continued to award additional days to sentences. The lack of an IEP scheme resulted in some minor infringements being dealt with as adjudications; this disproportionately affected the prisoner's ability to apply for ROTL or for a place on F wing.

<sup>3</sup> In the previous report, incentives and earned privileges were covered under the healthy prison area of respect. In our updated Expectations (Version 4, 2012) they now appear under the healthy prison area of safety.

- I.51** Prisoners complained about arbitrary decisions and unregulated punishments. We observed an unregulated, arbitrary punishment issued on the young persons unit to a young person who was located in a lockdown cell with loss of association for not making his bed; this had not been authorised and there were no recorded reasons for it (see main recommendation S60).

## Recommendations

- I.52** **Adjudication procedures should be standardised and quality controlled.** (Repeated recommendation I.57)
- I.53** **The practice of prison staff increasing sentences should cease.** (Repeated recommendation I.56)

## The use of force

- I.54** There were few recorded uses of force at either prison, with five at Northward and none at Fairbanks in the previous year. However, we were not satisfied that all uses of force were recorded. When force had been recorded, the full documentation was often missing (the prison was unable to provide use of force forms for three of the five incidents) and, despite some managerial oversight, we were not satisfied with the quality of dossiers or that they demonstrated sufficient accountability.
- I.55** Leg shackles were used unnecessarily and we saw evidence of handcuffs and leg shackles being used in response to unruly and aggressive behaviour while prisoners were locked in their cells and without their use being properly authorised (see also sections on courts, escorts and transfers and the HRU).

## Recommendations

- I.56** **All use of force should be fully recorded.**
- I.57** **Handcuffs should only be used to restrain prisoners in-cell in the most extreme of circumstances, following appropriate managerial approval.**

## Segregation

- I.58** At Northward, the segregation unit was housed on A wing and comprised six high-control cells (referred to variously as 'segregation', 'basic' or the 'care and separation unit') and seven cage-fronted cells for prisoners held for their own protection, who were referred to as 'housed'. The wing diary showed that the high-control cells had been used almost constantly before the inspection but none were in use during it. The process to place prisoners in segregation was unregulated, with no senior manager approval or oversight, and no comprehensive recording or monitoring of their stay (see main recommendation S58).
- I.59** Wing record books showed that the length of time that prisoners spent in segregation had reduced to between seven and 14 days, depending on their behaviour. Additionally, prisoners pending adjudication were often held there for up to 72 hours. A new set of segregation approval and monitoring procedures had been drafted but had yet to be implemented. The reported regime for those held under these conditions was minimal, with prisoners locked up for around 23 hours a day and little movement off the unit.

- I.60** The living conditions in segregation were wretched. Some minor decorative work had been carried out since the previous inspection and all cells now had lighting, although this was controlled remotely from the wing office. The cells had little natural light and no night light. All but two of the cells were filthy and graffiti strewn, only two had running water and toilets were completely unscreened. Although these cells remained empty for the duration of the inspection, the opportunity was not taken to clean, repair and equip any of the cells (see main recommendation S58).
- I.61** There was little recorded evidence of routine attendance of senior managers, chaplains or health services staff on the unit. However, we were satisfied that the nurse would attend the unit if required.
- I.62** Prisoners who were 'housed' (most for their own protection) were held in wire-fronted cells, which contained electric fans and afforded better conditions than the high-control cells, although some remained dire, with prisoners living in squalid conditions with no electric light, leaking toilets and extremely poor mattresses (see Appendix V for photographs of a housed cell and housed cell mattress). However, these cells had more natural daylight and were usually unlocked for long periods of the day. Housed prisoners had limited access to some regime activities, but for most this usually consisted of sitting on the landing playing cards or dominoes, or watching the communal television on the landing (see main recommendation S58).
- I.63** There was no case management for any of the prisoners on the segregation unit and, with no attempt at reintegration, it was possible for prisoners to spend years on the unit. Managers were adamant that there were management and reintegration plans but after some intensive discussion we were satisfied that, although they had been drafted, they were yet to be introduced (see main recommendation S58).
- I.64** Segregation at Fairbanks took the form of three cells, referred to as 'maximum', 'high-support cells' or (as listed in the wing office) 'segregation'. There were two prisoners located there during the inspection – one a category A remand prisoner held for her own protection as well as her security category, and one who wanted some time out from the dormitories (see section on residential units). There was no written policy and no procedures for their use and we were unable to establish the frequency or reasons for use of these cells. The cells were maintained and equipped to a reasonable standard but were austere compared with the rest of the accommodation (see main recommendation S58).

## Substance misuse

### Expected outcomes:

**Prisoners with drug and/or alcohol problems are identified at reception and receive effective treatment and support throughout their stay in custody.**

**I.65** *Clinical treatment for substance misuse was available on a symptomatic basis and psychosocial interventions were available to those with substance misuse needs.*

**I.66** Clinical treatment for substance misuse was available on a symptomatic basis but the need for and use of this treatment was rare. More prisoners were entering Northward with alcohol problems compared with 2012 (23% versus 13%). Alcohol detoxification and symptomatic relief were used as clinically indicated.

- I.67** More prisoners than in 2012 (44% versus 24%) had received support for drug misuse. In October 2014, about 25% of clients (46) were on the caseload of the psychosocial interventions teams, mostly with cocaine- and alcohol-related needs. The team was in a state of transition, with a reduction in one-to-one support available to prisoners because of staff vacancies; these vacancies had been advertised. Compact-based drug testing was available but used infrequently; there was a plan to increase its use.
- I.68** The National Drug Council offered therapeutic groups. Alcoholics Anonymous and Narcotics Anonymous ran group and peer support groups.

## Section 2. Respect

### Residential units

#### Expected outcomes:

**Prisoners live in a safe, clean and decent environment within which they are encouraged to take personal responsibility for themselves and their possessions. Prisoners are aware of the rules and routines of the prison which encourage responsible behaviour.**

**2.1** *At Northward, most of the accommodation was in an appalling state and hardly fit for habitation, although there had been some refurbishment of a small facility for young people. Accommodation at Fairbanks was better but was rundown and claustrophobic. Access to basic amenities and facilities at both prisons was mixed, although the applications system had improved.*

- 2.2** Northward's six accommodation blocks were dark, decrepit and dingy, with leaking roofs, a cockroach infestation, graffiti and dirty cells. Cells on all the wings except F wing were cage-like, and prisoners used makeshift screens of bed sheets or bin liners to provide basic levels of privacy. Many cells were overcrowded, toilets were unscreened and filthy, and cell furniture was both limited and in a poor state of repair. Communal areas were grubby, bare and devoid of equipment (see main recommendation S59).
- 2.3** Multiple layers of bars at the windows of cells meant that natural light was severely restricted and ventilation poor. Some additional fans had been introduced to the wings but the high temperatures and general lack of ventilation were an ongoing cause for prisoner complaint and an issue raised repeatedly at the prisoner council. In our survey, only a fifth of prisoners thought that the ventilation was good, dropping to as low as 7% and 6% on A and B wings, respectively.
- 2.4** The worst conditions were on A and B wings, and the dormitory on A wing was overcrowded. We agreed with the Prisons Inspection Board that the accommodation on B wing should be replaced immediately. The accommodation on F wing, which held up to 19 of the prison's more trusted prisoners, was crude but the facility was open and spacious, and prisoners were able to make use of a recreational area and a rundown but functional self-catering kitchen. The prison's Director had engaged consultants about the refurbishments and replacement of the prison (see main recommendation S59)
- 2.5** The only acceptable accommodation at Northward was a part of C wing, where a number of cells had been renovated to hold a small number of young people. The cells were lighter and cleaner than elsewhere, and adjacent facilities such as showers and classrooms had also been improved. Importantly, some air conditioning had been installed in the recreation rooms and classrooms.
- 2.6** In our survey, nearly all prisoners indicated that they were able to shower daily, although most shower facilities were in a poor state of repair. Just under two-thirds of prisoners reported good access to clean sheets each week, although slightly fewer said that they had good access to clean and suitable clothes. However, findings varied greatly between the wings. A simple laundry system was in operation and prisoners at Northward could get their clothes laundered twice a week. Those on F wing could wear their own (handed in) clothes and had access to an additional laundry based on the wing, although they were charged for using it. Prison kit, issued in reception, could be exchanged via a simple application.

However, we spoke to many prisoners who lacked basic kit items or indicated that they had difficulties in acquiring or replacing kit.

- 2.7** Applications (by the use of a simple form) were recorded in a wing book. In our survey, responses in relation to the ease of use of the application system and the timeliness of responses had improved at Northward but were mixed at Fairbanks, and most issues were dealt with.
- 2.8** Access to telephones at Northward had improved and was reasonable, with sufficient to meet the needs of the population. Prisoners could purchase telephone PIN cards or have relatives hand them in. Free letters were available on each wing, although little mail was sent or received. Procedures to account for mail, including arrangements to account for the interception of confidential legal correspondence, were informal and unaccountable, and therefore provided no assurances.
- 2.9** Fairbanks remained little changed from the time of the previous inspection, with the building rundown and resembling a large storage facility. Each of the prison's four dormitories held about eight beds and was reasonably clean and spacious, although sparsely furnished, and bed spaces were unscreened and provided little privacy (see main recommendation S59). There were also three cells used for women who were to be segregated (see section on segregation). The main communal space, called the dayroom, which had been improved with the addition of some tables and comfortable chairs, was central to the prison and was essentially a wire cage. There was no air conditioning and poor natural light, which contributed to a claustrophobic, oppressive and austere feel to the prison. There was little to stimulate or motivate the women held there (see main recommendation S59).
- 2.10** Access to the toilets and showers at Fairbanks was good. An accessible laundry was provided and supplies of clothing, kit, and cleaning and hygiene products were available. Procedures for accessing applications, telephones and mail were similar to those available to the male prisoners at Northward.

## Recommendations

- 2.11 All prisoners should have sufficient furniture, of a satisfactory standard, in their cells. The amount of furniture to which an individual is entitled should be specified and staff should check routinely to ensure that the prisoner has it.** (Repeated recommendation 2.17)
- 2.12 Prisoners at both prisons should be able to access replacement kit and bedding when they need it and reasonable requests should be addressed immediately. The amount of kit to which an individual is entitled should be specified and staff should be proactive in ensuring that the entitlement is met.** (Repeated recommendation 2.18)

## Housekeeping points

- 2.13** Prisoners should not have to pay to have their clothes laundered.
- 2.14** Mail should only be censored if an individual risk assessment indicates that it is necessary. Procedures and systems should be introduced that properly account and ensure appropriate authority for the interception of mail.



## High-risk unit (HRU)

- 2.15** The HRU was a discrete 14-cell unit on the first floor of D wing, providing a highly controlled and restrictive environment. Its purpose was unclear. Prisoners who presented an escape risk or were convicted of serious offences which attracted category A status were allocated to the unit automatically. However, we found it being used inappropriately as an alternative segregation unit for some prisoners segregated for good order and discipline. We were not assured that location in the HRU was necessary or justified in such cases and there was insufficient management oversight of these decisions.
- 2.16** Prisoners were told why they had been allocated to the HRU and (with the exception of those on good order and discipline) were subject to a high-quality multidisciplinary risk assessment and review, although the reviews were infrequent and unpredictable. We were satisfied that location in the HRU was appropriate (again, with the exception of those there for good order and discipline). One of the nine residents on the unit during the inspection had been there for seven years, primarily because he refused to be located within the main population. However, in general, the length of time that prisoners spent in the HRU had reduced considerably. Plans to reintegrate prisoners into the main population were crude and informal, and mainly consisted of a move to the lower level of D wing.
- 2.17** The environment in the HRU was stifling and excessively controlled. Prisoners were isolated and locked up in single cells for over 22 hours a day, most only coming out for one hour of exercise and two short periods for showering and cleaning. Some prisoners were permitted to use the video games room, or have time unlocked in the corridor or to visit the main library. Most of these activities were solitary, although some prisoners were unlocked in pairs if they were deemed compatible. Visits from the chaplaincy, psychologist and a counsellor went some way to addressing the mental well-being of residents.
- 2.18** Within this heavily controlled environment, additional and ad hoc extreme restrictions were sometimes placed on prisoners' movements. In response to their poor behaviour (for example, abusive language or throwing food), decisions were made to handcuff them within the unit, and handcuff and shackle them during exercise and other internal movements. These measures were extreme, unnecessary and not appropriately authorised (see main recommendation S60 and recommendation I.57).
- 2.19** Because of their long periods locked up on this unit, prisoners had limited contact with staff. The recording of interactions had improved and evidenced some engagement but it was difficult to see how officers could assess prisoners for their suitability for progression off the unit when they were locked up for most of the day.

## Recommendations

- 2.20** Prisoners should not be housed in the high-risk unit (HRU) for punishment or good order.
- 2.21** Prisoners on the HRU should be individually case managed and, where possible, plans made and implemented for reintegration back into the main population.
- 2.22** A full regime should be provided on the HRU, including education, training and association.

## Staff-prisoner relationships

### Expected outcomes:

**Prisoners are treated with respect by staff throughout the duration of their time in custody, and are encouraged to take responsibility for their own actions and decisions.**

**2.23** *More prisoners at Northward than at the time of the previous inspection indicated that there was a staff member they could turn to if they needed help but confidence in the competence and helpfulness of staff remained limited. Most women prisoners felt respected but reported levels of victimisation by staff at both prisons were high. The officer adviser scheme had improved and structures to aid more effective consultation had been introduced.*

**2.24** At Northward, our survey results in relation to staff–prisoner relationships were inconsistent across the wings but positive overall. Around two-thirds said that staff treated them respectfully, and nearly three-quarters, better than at the time of the previous inspection, that there was a member of staff they could turn to for help. However, too many (over half) reported victimisation by staff. We saw staff engaging with prisoners, and most prisoners seemed at ease in their company. However, prisoners constantly expressed their frustration and anger at what they saw as the inaction and indifference of staff in meeting their needs, and some unaccountable exercise of authority (see main recommendation S60). However, they could point to and name a small minority of staff that they respected and in whom they had confidence.

**2.25** Nearly all the women at Fairbanks felt respected and knew someone they could turn to if they needed help. However, again, nearly half of them felt victimised by staff.

**2.26** The officer adviser scheme (whereby prisoners had a named officer they could turn to for support and assistance) had been re-launched, with a new and thorough policy document, and staff were formally trained in its use. Two-thirds of Northward prisoners were aware of their adviser and just under half thought that they were useful, which were similar to the proportions at Fairbanks. The quality of staff comments in wing files varied but was much improved, and nearly every file we scrutinised had some entries, including both positive and negative comments, with some being particularly good.

**2.27** Northward had recently introduced a prisoner consultation committee. Its members were elected and took their role seriously. Minutes and correspondence submitted by the committee suggested a highly developed level of engagement that included the submission of strategy papers, informed and thoughtful commentaries on issues affecting the prison, and the submission of correspondence to officials in government. However, the committee expressed frustration at their inability to make progress on issues raised. A committee had been set up at Fairbanks but it was less sophisticated and the minutes just recorded lists of domestic issues to be fixed, although this was useful (see main recommendation S60).

## Equality and diversity

### Expected outcomes:

The prison demonstrates a clear and coordinated approach to eliminating discrimination, promoting equitable outcomes and fostering good relations, and ensures that no prisoner is unfairly disadvantaged. This is underpinned by effective processes to identify and resolve any inequality. The distinct needs of each protected characteristic<sup>4</sup> are recognised and addressed: these include race equality, nationality, religion, disability (including mental, physical and learning disabilities and difficulties), gender, transgender issues, sexual orientation and age.

**2.28** *There was no formal equality policy or structured monitoring. Caymanian prisoners' perceptions of their treatment were no longer more negative than those of other prisoners. There was no provision for those with disabilities, including mobility issues or learning difficulties. Interpretation for those who did not speak English was limited to local resources.*

### Strategic management

**2.29** There was no formal policy on equality issues, although there was a target date to agree one as part of a systematic programme. A senior manager had responsibility for equality issues, reporting directly to the Director; no specific equality issues had been raised at senior management meetings. There were no arrangements to consult with or provide support to minority groups and there was no systematic monitoring of the relative treatment and experience of different groups across the prisons.

### Recommendation

**2.30** **The prisons should implement an equality and diversity policy which outlines how the needs of all groups in the prison will be recognised and addressed.**  
(Repeated recommendation 2.29)

### Protected characteristics

**2.31** Most prisoners had been born in Cayman but few of the staff had been (28% were Caymanian but most of these were citizens by naturalisation). Managers understood the complex dynamics which arose from this and other factors in a relatively small island community. Whereas, at the previous inspection, Caymanians had reported far more negatively than those of other nationalities on a range of treatment issues, in our current survey there were almost no differences in their responses.

**2.32** No clear patterns of perceived discrimination were revealed by our survey. There were no adaptations for people with mobility difficulties, nor provision for any form of disability, including learning difficulties, even though 17% of respondents to our survey identified themselves as having a disability. In our survey, they reported higher levels of victimisation, by staff and prisoners alike, than their able-bodied counterparts. Older prisoners did not feel themselves to be disadvantaged.

<sup>4</sup> The grounds upon which discrimination is unlawful (Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2010).

- 2.33** In the previous 18 months, no complaints had been received relating directly to equality issues. There was no record of any prisoners having disclosed as lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender (LGBT), but prisoners were not at any stage asked about their sexual orientation. Several staff believed that it would be difficult for a prisoner to disclose an LGBT identity.
- 2.34** There were 37 foreign nationals at the time of the inspection, representing 20% of the population; half of these were Jamaican. A list of staff able to speak languages other than English was maintained. If a staff member was not able to interpret for a prisoner, managers had access to professional interpreters retained by the immigration service, and this resource had been used for a Mandarin-speaking prisoner. To date, these arrangements had been adequate, although no telephone interpreting service was available for languages for which no face-to-face interpreter could be sourced.

## Recommendation

- 2.35** **There should be effective and regular monitoring of the distinct characteristics of prisoners such as race, nationality, disability, age, gender or sexual orientation, in order to ensure fair treatment and access to services.** (Repeated recommendation 2.34)

## Young prisoners

**2.36** *Young males were located on a dedicated wing which provided better conditions than the main wings and kept them safer. The decision to isolate young people from adults was not based on a risk assessment and limited their opportunity to take part in the main regime and activities. Links with the Department of Children and Families were poor and did not provide adequate safeguarding of the needs of young people.*

- 2.37** At Northward, our previous concerns about the co-location of young people with convicted sex offenders and other adult males who could pose a risk had been addressed by the establishment of a dedicated wing for young people at the far end of C wing. The unit had been decorated and furnished, and provided a pleasant, safe and suitable living environment. It could accommodate six young people, and five were located there at the time of the inspection, all of whom were 17 years of age. Fairbanks did not have the space to provide a dedicated unit but young people were located in a separate dormitory at night. There were no young people in Fairbanks during the inspection.
- 2.38** The regime for young people at Northward was still in an early stage of development and remained limited at the time of the inspection, with some activities being cancelled. The regime and range of activities for young females were no different to those given to the adults.
- 2.39** The decision to have completely separate regime activities for young people at both Northward and Fairbanks was not based on a comprehensive risk assessment and limited their opportunity to take part in the main regime and activities, as well as potentially leading to increased isolation. We spoke to all five of the young people at Northward and they were bored with the limited regime; they complained about their limited access to sports and to religious services at the same time as adults. Staff told us that young people held in Fairbanks over Christmas had been kept completely separate to the adults, to the point that they had celebrated Christmas separately.

- 2.40** Links with the Children and Family Services were very poor. No case conferences had been held in recent months, leaving young people unsure about their plan and progression opportunities during custody and on release. One young person told us that he had not seen his social worker in 14 months.

## Recommendations

- 2.41** **Young people should be able to access the adult regime based on an individualised risk assessment.**
- 2.42** **Links with the Children and Families Services should be improved and formal case conferencing for young people should be undertaken at regular intervals in order to safeguard their needs.**

## Faith and religious activity

### Expected outcomes:

**All prisoners are able to practise their religion fully and in safety. The chaplaincy plays a full part in prison life and contributes to prisoners' overall care, support and resettlement.**

**2.43** *The chaplaincy service had improved markedly. All prisoners saw the chaplain on arrival, and corporate worship was available to all prisoners, subject to risk assessment, and well publicised. The chaplaincy was involved in many aspects of prisoner care, including counselling and post-release support. Provision for faiths other than Christianity was inadequate.*

- 2.44** There was an excellent chapel at the centre of the Northward site, and at Fairbanks religious services were conducted in the small visits room. Our survey showed much better access to a chaplain, and to worship, than at the time of the previous inspection. The chaplain was full-time, and visited both prisons every week. A wide variety of corporate Christian worship and study was offered at both sites, subject to risk assessment, and was well publicised, and many local churches sent volunteers into the prisons to support a range of activities.
- 2.45** All new arrivals were seen by the chaplain and their religious affiliation ascertained. A new and comprehensive policy had been published. Weekly service schedules were posted in each residential area. Corporate worship had recently begun to be offered to prisoners in the HRU.
- 2.46** It was relatively rare for faiths other than Christianity to be represented among the prisoner population, and there was no provision of religious artefacts such as a prayer mat or Qur'an in the case of a Muslim prisoner being held; prayer facilities had been improvised for one such prisoner who had been held in the prison for a single night. We were told that faith-based diets such as kosher or halal were not catered for (see also section on catering).
- 2.47** The chaplain was well integrated into the management of the establishment, attending senior management meetings and categorisation boards. She carried out formal counselling, in liaison with the mental health and substance misuse counsellor. Through partner agencies on the island, she fostered contact and support for those who had been released.

## Recommendation

- 2.48** The prison should ensure that relevant provision is available for the requirements of the main world faiths.

## Complaints

### Expected outcomes:

**Effective complaints procedures are in place for prisoners, which are easy to access, easy to use and provide timely responses. Prisoners feel safe from repercussions when using these procedures and are aware of an appeal procedure.**

- 2.49** *A new system for complaints had recently been introduced. It worked well and prisoners found it easy to use. There was still some room for improvement in tracking and discussion of issues raised by complaints, and in checking the quality of responses.*

- 2.50** In our Northward survey, more people than at the time of the previous inspection said that it was easy to make a complaint (55% versus 39%). A new system had been working well for three months. Complaint forms were freely available at Northward, but at Fairbanks were available only on request to staff because forms had been spoiled by a prisoner. At both prisons, lockable boxes on all wings were emptied daily by a member of the administrative staff. Any complaints to the Prison Inspection Board or higher bodies were forwarded through the general complaints process.

- 2.51** A monthly report on complaints was submitted to the senior management team, noting any patterns in the location and topic of complaint. There was no evidence of discussion of the content of complaints. Relevant data were collated for analysis and tracking over time, although this was at an early stage. The timeliness of responses was monitored and late replies chased, and informal quality checks were carried out. Neither the Director nor Deputy Directors routinely checked the quality of responses.

## Recommendation

- 2.52** The prison should analyse complaints data and quality control responses.

## Legal rights

### Expected outcomes:

**Prisoners are fully aware of, and understand their sentence or remand, both on arrival and release. Prisoners are supported by the prison staff to freely exercise their legal rights.**

- 2.53** *Access to a lawyer had improved, but to current legal information had not. Legally privileged mail was handled appropriately.*

- 2.54** Legal visits were facilitated appropriately. Most prisoners had a lawyer, and legal advisers could visit on any weekday. More people than at the time of the previous inspection said that it was easy to communicate with a legal representative.
- 2.55** No staff had received training to advise prisoners on legal issues such as bail and appeals. Bail application forms were available, and were signposted on induction. A solicitor attended for two hours each week to provide free legal advice at both prisons.
- 2.56** The handling of legally privileged mail had improved. There were no current legal reference books in the library at either site.

## Recommendation

- 2.57** **There should be up-to-date and reliable legal guidance available in the prison libraries.** (Repeated recommendation 2.61)

## Health services

### Expected outcomes:

**Prisoners are cared for by a health service that assesses and meets their health needs while in prison and which promotes continuity of health and social care on release. The standard of health service provided is equivalent to that which prisoners could expect to receive elsewhere in the community.**

- 2.58** *Prisoners were generally satisfied with the quality of health services provided. There had been improvements in contracting, staffing, clinical governance and the care of long-term conditions. Fairbanks had a model service. Clinical records were accessible by both prison and George Town Hospital clinicians. There remained problems with medicines administration. Access to dental treatment was excellent. Mental health care was available but was relatively unsophisticated.*

## Governance arrangements

- 2.59** The Ministry of Home Affairs had a service level agreement with the Health Services Authority (HSA) to provide health services to the prisons. Working relationships between the Director and the HSA were very good. There had been a limited health conditions assessment in 2013 and a full exercise had started.
- 2.60** There was a system for escalating untoward incidents or near misses, although none had occurred in the previous year.
- 2.61** There was no prisoner health forum at either prison, although health care issues could be raised at the prison consultative council. In our Northward survey, more prisoners than at the time of the previous inspection said that the overall quality of health services was good or very good (42% versus 30%), and 85% of the women at Fairbanks expressed satisfaction with health services. There had been only two health care-related complaints in 2014. These were managed using the general prison complaints system, which did not preserve medical confidentiality as non-HSA staff were involved.

- 2.62** At Northward, a registered nurse provided primary care services. At Fairbanks, a female registered nurse provided regular clinics. There was good support and regular supervision from HSA managers. Both nurses felt well supported and had access to HSA training events. There was ad hoc clinical supervision, but no formal system.
- 2.63** A suite of clinical policies and procedures was being developed. We saw the first tranche of the policies, which were specific to the prisons; they included policies on infection control and the management of communicable diseases. There was no protocol to share information with the prison substance misuse services, which meant that the same information was collected and held in two separate places. This had the potential to lead to duplicated or discordant tracking of treatment, particularly for prisoners with both mental health and substance misuse problems. Information sharing on a case-by-case basis was appropriate.
- 2.64** Clinical records were kept on Cerner (an electronic clinical information system), which was accessible from other HSA services, including George Town Hospital. On an ad hoc basis, clinical audit of patient records were undertaken, providing a good form of oversight.
- 2.65** The clinical care environment at Northward was poor. The health centre and dental suite (see section on dentistry) were in temporary accommodation, and had been so since a major incident many years earlier, and were not designed for purpose. While staff made best use of the facilities, the health centre did not meet modern standards for primary care design and infection control. For example, in the treatment area the walls were textured and impossible to decontaminate; the floor edging was not sealed and many of the chairs were non-wipeable (see main recommendation S59).
- 2.66** The health care room at Fairbanks was adequate for purpose but had no natural light.
- 2.67** There was oxygen, suction and an automated external defibrillator (AED) in each prison health facility. The AED chest pads were out of date at both prisons; they were replaced immediately when we pointed this out. The equipment was not in 'grab bags', which would enable easy transportation around the prisons. Thirty-nine (27%) prison staff had been trained in first aid and cardiopulmonary resuscitation. While the AEDs were available to prison staff, they had to retrieve keys in order to enter the health rooms and access this equipment, which would lose valuable time in an emergency.
- 2.68** There was gender-appropriate health promotion in each prison health facility, but no overarching approach to well-being, and the importance of exercise and a good diet was not imparted consistently to prisoners.

## Recommendations

- 2.69** **The health care complaints system should preserve medical confidentiality.**
- 2.70** **There should be an information-sharing protocol with the prison substance misuse services.**

## Housekeeping points

- 2.71** The Health Services Authority (HSA) should survey prisoners to identify areas for service improvement.
- 2.72** Health care should be a standing agenda item at the prisoners' consultative council.



- 2.73** The prison and HSA should relocate automated external defibrillators, to optimise accessibility.
- 2.74** There should be a prison-wide health and well-being strategy to promote a healthy lifestyle.

### Good practice

- 2.75** *Clinical records were accessible by both prison and George Town Hospital clinicians.*

### Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.76** Most new prisoners were not seen by health services staff on the day of arrival. The HSA had introduced a standard to ensure that all new prisoners were screened within 24 hours. Recruitment was under way to employ a second nurse at Northward, to be available on the evening of arrival and reduce the response time further. A comprehensive health screen had been introduced and all new prisoners were offered a vaccination against hepatitis B.
- 2.77** At both prisons, prisoners usually accessed health care via wing officers. The process involved them giving an explanation as to why an appointment was necessary and potentially divulging confidential medical information. At Northward, considerably more prisoners than at the time of the previous inspection said that it was easy or very easy to see the nurse (64% versus 44%) and at Fairbanks most women said that access was easy.
- 2.78** Primary care services were good. There were regular GP clinics and live registers of prisoners with long-term conditions at both prisons, which was an improvement on the situation at the time of the previous inspection. Care planning and ongoing care were appropriate. Young people had access to age-related immunisations, such as meningitis C, following clinical assessment. Out of hours, prisoners had access to emergency care at the George Town Hospital, and secondary care appointments outside the prisons were rarely cancelled for security reasons.
- 2.79** Health care provision at Fairbanks was led by a female nurse and visiting female GP, which provided a suitable female-focused approach. A model service was provided to the women, with a systematic approach to gender-specific health promotion on a one-to-one basis. Health screening for cervical cancer and other issues, and antenatal, postnatal and baby care were available.

### Recommendation

- 2.80** **Applications to see health services staff should be confidential and not rely on the discretion of prison officers.** (Repeated recommendation 2.80)

### Pharmacy

- 2.81** Medicines management had generally improved following a review which had resulted in a new policy and changes to practice. However, a pharmacist did not regularly visit the prisons, give advice to prisoners, review medicines use or supervise those responsible for the storage and administration of medicines.

- 2.82** Nurses ordered medicines to be delivered to the prison from the HSA hospital pharmacy; medicines could be acquired on the same day if necessary. Medicines were in date and stored in a tidy fashion within locked cabinets at both prisons. Although rarely used, there were no dedicated cabinets for the storage of controlled drugs.
- 2.83** Repeat medicines were supplied in containers labelled for individual patients. New medicines were prescribed by the nurses, or doctors. We could not identify any triage algorithms or patient group directions to underpin the nurses' prescribing. Nurses used stock to supply new medicines and placed them in labelled containers. Although 92% of prisoners in our survey said that they held their medicines in-possession, we saw no documented risk assessments to underpin the practice.
- 2.84** At Northward, wing storage facilities for medicines were of variable quality and accessibility. Forty-five (33%) prison officers had been trained by an HSA pharmacist to administer medicines. They recorded the medicines that they administered or reasons for non-administration, although we saw some gaps on the charts. The officers' medicines administration training did not include an assessment of competence and they were not supervised by the pharmacist, which introduced unnecessary risks for the prisoners and staff concerned.
- 2.85** Although levels of prescribing were known to pharmacists, there was no medicines and therapeutics committee to take a multidisciplinary view of prescribing practices and trends, or to approve pharmacy policy and practice. Clinical staff had access to online pharmacy information via Cerner, although printed reference materials at both prisons were out of date.

## Recommendations

- 2.86** **A pharmacist should have overall control of medicines at both prisons.** (Repeated recommendation 2.89)
- 2.87** **Controlled drugs should be stored within a locked cabinet separate to general stock.**
- 2.88** **Prisoners should be risk-assessed before receiving medicines in-possession.**
- 2.89** **The pharmacist offering training in medicines administration to non-clinicians should assure him- or herself of that person's competency before authorising practice.**

## Housekeeping points

- 2.90** Nurses' prescribing practices should be guided by triage algorithms and/or patient group directions.
- 2.91** There should be a medicines and therapeutics committee for the prisons.

## Dentistry

- 2.92** Access to dental services was excellent, with no waiting list for treatment. A good and full range of treatments was available to patients via the services of a dentist and hygienist.
- 2.93** Prisoners from both prisons used the temporary dental suite, housed in a room entered directly from the vehicle lock in the Northward gatehouse. This meant that any passing person could open the door while treatment was under way, compromising privacy. Noise from the vehicle lock was intrusive. There was a good range but limited stock of dental pieces.
- 2.94** The fixtures and fittings of the dental suite required refurbishment, although the dental chair was acceptable and well maintained. The X-ray machine was only partially installed, and had been so for over two years. The dentist remarked that patients had to be taken out of the prison to get X-rays, which was unsatisfactory as it increased the time between assessment and the start of treatment. The toilet attached to the dental suite was heavily stained and was a contamination risk. There was no emergency equipment sited in the dental surgery.
- 2.95** Decontamination facilities were not separate from the treatment area and therefore did not meet best practice standards.

## Recommendation

- 2.96** **The dental surgery should be co-located with the health centre, where emergency equipment can be shared, and there should be a separate decontamination area.**

## Housekeeping point

- 2.97** Until relocated, the dental fixtures, fittings and equipment should be upgraded and the installation of the X-ray equipment should be completed without delay.

## Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.98** Mental health care was available but relatively unsophisticated. In our survey, 25% of the men at Northward and eight (over 50%) of the women at Fairbanks said that they had emotional/mental health problems. Since the previous inspection, 26 (18%) prison officers had been trained in mental health awareness. Anecdotally, they believed there to be over a dozen male prisoners with behavioural challenges associated with mental health problems at any one time.
- 2.99** In our survey, 50% of male prisoners and six (under 50%) female prisoners with mental health problems said that they were being supported.
- 2.100** Counselling was available via the chaplaincy. Primary care nurses and GPs offered support but this was limited because of time constraints, and there were no primary mental health services.

- 2.101** Several prisoners were in treatment for psychotic illnesses. There was a visiting psychiatrist but a mental health nurse in-reach worker had left and had not been replaced. The substance misuse counsellor offered support to clients with dual diagnosis issues (the co-existence of mental health and substance misuse problems). There were no defined pathways for individual or group therapies using evidence-based practices, such as cognitive behavioural therapy.
- 2.102** At the time of the inspection, one prisoner at Northward was being treated under an Assisted Outpatient Treatment Order (Mental Health Law, 2013, Section 12(1)). This provided for treatment to be given without consent if necessary. Some staff questioned the legality of this practice in prisons. The Mental Health Commission had not yet monitored the use of Section 12(1) at Northward. Some staff members remarked that the HSA psychiatric unit would be a preferable alternative mental health treatment venue to enforced treatment in the prison, but there were no secure facilities there.

## Recommendations

- 2.103** **The health conditions assessment should take into account the perceptions of prison staff and directly address the level of mental health problems, in addition to psychiatric morbidity, in the prisons' populations.**
- 2.104** **The Director should invite the Mental Health Commission to review involuntary treatment under the Mental Health Law within the prisons.**

## Housekeeping point

- 2.105** All contact prison staff should be trained to identify when a referral to medical services of a prisoner suspected of having mental health problems is required.

## Catering

### Expected outcomes:

**Prisoners are offered varied meals to meet their individual requirements and food is prepared and served according to religious, cultural and prevailing food safety and hygiene regulations.**

**2.106** *The condition and cleanliness of the kitchen at Northward were disgraceful and required immediate improvement. Few prisoners thought that the food provided was good, and meals were served too early. There was no consultation about the quality of the food and arrangements to cater for special diets were too informal. Food was needlessly transported to Fairbanks, when women could easily have prepared their own meals.*

- 2.107** The kitchen at Northward was in a terrible condition. Standards of cleanliness were very poor, tiles were cracked, there was standing dirty water in holes in the floor and a large amount of kitchen equipment, ranging from cold storage facilities to ovens, were broken and out of action. The Director was actively seeking the means by which the kitchen could be replaced (see main recommendation S59).

- 2.108** None of the 11 prisoners working in the kitchen could gain qualifications, and none of the current cohort of workers was trained in basic food hygiene; not surprisingly, the food hygiene practice we observed was poor (see Appendix V for photograph of defrosting chickens).
- 2.109** In our survey, 18% of Northward prisoners said the food provided was good or very good, which was better than at the time of the previous inspection (9%). There was no consultation about the quality of the food, and arrangements to cater for special diets and religious diets were too informal.
- 2.110** Mealtimes were too early, particularly lunch, which was served at 11.30am. Evening meals were served at 4.30pm.
- 2.111** Food was plated in the kitchen and served in plastic cartons. A selection of meals were sent to the wings and taken on a first-come, first-served basis. Prisoners repeatedly told us that they skipped meals because what was on offer was unacceptable to them.
- 2.112** Prisoners on F wing had their own kitchen and were able to self-cater; this was appreciated by those who used it. Food could be handed in by relatives.
- 2.113** The kitchen at Fairbanks was a good facility and women were able to prepare breakfasts and meals, albeit only at weekends. All other meals were prepared at Northward and transported the considerable distance in ordinary vans, to be microwaved on arrival. In our Fairbanks group, female prisoners complained of the poor quality of the food they received from Northward.

## Recommendations

- 2.114** **Prisoners should be appropriately trained to work in food preparation.** (Repeated recommendation 2.104)
- 2.115** **The lunchtime and evening meals should not be served before noon and 5pm, respectively.**
- 2.116** **Cultural, health and religious needs should be taken into consideration when providing meals to prisoners.**
- 2.117** **Food for those at Fairbanks should be transported in hygienic refrigerated vehicles or be freshly prepared on site.**

## Purchases

### Expected outcomes:

**Prisoners can purchase a suitable range of goods at reasonable prices to meet their diverse needs, and can do so safely.**

- 2.118** *The prison shop sold a limited range of goods. There was some consultation with prisoners but too few thought that the shop fully met their needs. Arrangements for prisoners to access tobacco were inequitable.*

- 2.119** Prisoners could access the prison shop weekly. Products were limited mainly to snacks and confectionery. There had been some limited consultation but in our survey only 30% of prisoners at Northward and 36% at Fairbanks thought that the range of goods sold met their needs.
- 2.120** Many products could be handed in by families for both men and women, and special purchases could be made by application. Prisoners were paid up to \$21 a week, dependent on their job. The unemployed received \$6 a week. All were required to save at least \$3 a week. The savings accrued could be used for larger purchases.
- 2.121** Prisoners could no longer purchase tobacco, although, paradoxically, five packs of cigarettes per week could be handed in by relatives. Such an approach took no account of those who had no external or family support; this was inequitable and could potentially lead to debt and bullying problems.

### **Recommendation**

- 2.122 The consequences of not selling tobacco in the shop should be explored and action taken in response to the findings.**

## Section 3. Purposeful activity

### Time out of cell

#### Expected outcomes:

**All prisoners are actively encouraged to engage in activities available during unlock and the prison offers a timetable of regular and varied activities.<sup>5</sup>**

**3.1** *Prisoners spent long periods unlocked and out of their cells, and those at Northward had reasonable access to the open air. However, arrangements at Fairfield were needlessly restrictive. Most prisoners had nothing meaningful to do. Time unlocked arrangements for prisoners in the high-risk unit at Northward and 'maximum' at Fairbanks were unacceptable.*

**3.2** Most prisoners at both Northward and Fairbanks were unlocked at about 6.30am. They remained out of their cells or dormitories, with the exception of an hour at lunchtime, until about 9.15pm. However, prisoners in the high-risk unit (HRU) at Northward and women in 'maximum' at Fairbanks spent in excess of 22 hours a day confined to their cells. Prisoners on F wing had enhanced status and were never locked in their cell, although their movement was restricted after 9.30pm.

**3.3** Prisoners on most wings at Northward could access open spaces adjacent to their wings during the day. At Fairbanks, prisoners had a pleasant outdoor area but access was limited to just one hour each day.

**3.4** During our roll/activity checks, we found around 60% prisoners at Northward inactive on the wings. This was far too many, although less than the 75% we found at the time of the previous inspection. Most of these prisoners spent the day either sleeping or hanging around in groups chatting and smoking. The situation at Fairbanks was worse; we saw no women doing anything purposeful during our roll/activity checks and the women told us that, with the exception of an occasional optional class, they had nothing to do.

### Recommendation

**3.5** **Women at Fairbanks should be permitted more time in the open air.** (Repeated recommendation 3.5)

<sup>5</sup> Time out of cell, in addition to formal 'purposeful activity', includes any time prisoners are out of their cells to associate or use communal facilities to take showers or make telephone calls.

## Learning and skills and work activities

### Expected outcomes:

**All prisoners can engage in activities that are purposeful, benefit them and increase their employability. Prisoners are encouraged and enabled to learn both during and after their sentence. The learning and skills and work provision is of a good standard and is effective in meeting the needs of all prisoners.**

**3.6** *The management of learning and skills and work was inadequate. There were enough activity places to engage all prisoners but many sessions were cancelled or prisoners failed to attend. A suitable range of education, vocational training and work was offered but much of the work was of poor quality. There were no accredited vocational and educational qualifications available at either prison. Library services were poor.*

**3.7** *Ofsted<sup>6</sup> made the following assessments about the learning and skills and work provision:*

<i>Overall effectiveness of learning and skills and work:</i>	<i>Inadequate</i>
<i>Achievements of prisoners engaged in learning and skills and work:</i>	<i>Inadequate</i>
<i>Quality of learning and skills and work provision:</i>	<i>Inadequate</i>
<i>Leadership and management of learning and skills and work:</i>	<i>Inadequate</i>

### Management of learning and skills and work

**3.8** The prison had planned for the learning and skills and work provision to address national skills shortages as well as identified needs within the prison population, particularly the large number of prisoners with low standards of literacy and numeracy; however, this was not being addressed sufficiently. The building of teaching capacity within education and vocational provision through staff participation in relevant development opportunities had been given appropriate priority.

**3.9** The management of learning, skills and work remained inadequate, with poorly defined responsibility and accountability for the delivery of the function's roles. Effective quality assurance and improvement arrangements had not been established to help to assess and drive up standards. Appropriate arrangements to satisfy awarding body internal verification requirements for vocational training were undeveloped. Numerical data were not routinely collected and evaluated against challenging targets. There was no overarching self-assessment process and the few existing informal processes were ineffective. The prison had yet to implement appropriate development plans designed to deliver consistently high outcomes for all prisoners. In addition, it was not addressing the high rate of session non-attendance, poor punctuality, and excessive session cancellation with sufficient rigour (see main recommendation S61).

<sup>6</sup> Ofsted is the Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills. It reports directly to the UK Parliament and is independent and impartial. It (inter alia) inspects and regulates services that provide education and skills for all ages, including those in custody. For information on Ofsted's inspection framework, please visit: <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk>.



## Recommendations

- 3.10** **Effective operational management of learning, skills and work should be implemented and supported by rigorous quality assurance, improvement and self-assessment arrangements.**
- 3.11** **Collection and analysis of numerical data should be used in conjunction with challenging targets to inform performance management.**

## Provision of activities

- 3.12** Applications for and allocation to activities had recently improved and were fair and equitable. The process included appropriate reference to the assessment of prisoners' literacy and numeracy skills levels undertaken by the education unit. However, detailed targets to support resettlement, such as those found in sentence plans, were not routinely available. Activity and job descriptions had yet to be written. The prison had reviewed pay for activity attendance but rates for education were lower than for most other activities.
- 3.13** A suitable range of learning and skills activity and work was available at both prisons. The number of purposeful activity places (work, education and vocational training) at Northward had increased considerably and there were enough to occupy all the prison population. However most places were not fully utilised and many classes were cancelled and/or prisoners chose not to attend, leaving most prisoners on the wings and unoccupied for much, if not all, of the day.
- 3.14** Sixty full-time-equivalent education places were offered at Northward and approximately 10 at Fairbanks, although uptake at both prisons was low. At Northward, education courses comprised English and mathematics, information and communication technology (ICT) programmes and an employability skills course. A non-accredited art course was also available. No distance learning courses were available. A part-time programme of study for the five young people at Northward had started very recently and it was too early to judge its effectiveness. Neither prison offered study for higher education. Tutors, external volunteers or supervised prisoners taught education courses.
- 3.15** Northward provided nine full-time-equivalent vocational training places in woodworking. Other workshops offering training in car mechanics, plumbing, and refrigeration and air-conditioning had been established but were not operational.
- 3.16** There were 124 full-time-equivalent work places at Northward; the range was adequate and included roles in building repair and maintenance, waste disposal, kitchens, livestock husbandry, gardens and laundry. The wide range of orderly duties included work in the library, reception, gym, prison shop and chapel, as well as cleaning. Work was available on a full- or part-time basis. At the time of the inspection, three prisoners were being released on temporary licence. In addition, groups of prisoners had participated in community-based projects, including painting the local fire station and removing beach storm debris.
- 3.17** At Fairbanks, six learners participated in a range of education programmes similar to those found at Northward, with the vocational training on offer comprising sewing, and hairdressing and beauty therapy courses. Orderly activities included work in the kitchen, laundry, gardens and as cleaners.

## Recommendations

- 3.18** The prison should allocate prisoners to activities according to their identified need, using job descriptions, and ensure that all prisoners participate in purposeful activity that fully occupies them.
- 3.19** The Northward vocational training workshops should be brought into full operation.

## Quality of provision

- 3.20** In the small number of taught sessions we observed, the quality of individual coaching was adequate overall. In the better sessions, tutors enhanced learning through the use of well-planned and challenging activities that promoted learners' progress. However, session planning did not routinely include the use of initial assessment results, gained during induction, to ensure that specific needs were met through differentiated learning activities. The planning of individual learning and the use of challenging targets to review and improve learners' performance were weak. A large proportion of the Northward prison population had low levels of English and mathematic skills that were not being addressed. Neither prison provided outreach support to develop these skills in non-classroom settings.
- 3.21** Tracking of learners' progress was not consistently effective. They did not receive specialist support while undertaking learning and skills sessions, and there were no arrangements for formal diagnostic assessments. Small group sizes limited the range of teaching strategies to engage and motivate learners.
- 3.22** The Northward classrooms were well maintained and provided a conducive learning environment. The ICT classroom had good subject identity through the use of stimulating displays, although this was less effective in other Northward and Fairbanks classrooms. Since the previous inspection, the prison had provided adequate resources to support learning; however, the Northward whiteboards were in need of refurbishment. The prison had rectified the lighting and ventilation issues we had previously found in the Fairbanks classrooms and repaired the computers. The women could access satisfactorily equipped and furnished sewing, and hairdressing and beauty therapy rooms. However, at both prisons, staffing shortages resulted in excessive session cancellation (see main recommendation S61).

## Recommendations

- 3.23** The English and mathematics skills development needs of prisoners should be addressed and outreach support provided in non-classroom settings at both prisons.
- 3.24** The prison should provide learners with specialist support while undertaking learning and skills sessions, and diagnostic assessments to meet needs.

## Housekeeping point

- 3.25** Essential teaching resources such as textbooks, displays and teaching materials should be provided at both prisons.

## Education and vocational achievements

- 3.26** Neither prison provided accredited vocational or educational qualifications. The three learners who had sat (and paid for) externally accredited courses in the previous year had passed. The relatively small number of learners who attended education courses improved their social and personal skills adequately. Within ICT sessions at Northward, learners made appropriate progress and enjoyed their studies. Learners in art classes were beginning to demonstrate an effective understanding of painting techniques.
- 3.27** A large proportion of prisoners at work did not develop an adequate range and standard of employability skills to support successful resettlement. Their performance was usually well below that needed to sustain employment on release, with weak or no improvement evident. Few managed their time well or worked diligently to achieve deadlines and high standards of completed work. The prison did not have a process to recognise and record the skills developed during work, as part of a strategy to improve future employability. They did not always gain an adequate appreciation of the importance of healthy and safe work practices through the use of appropriate personal protective equipment.
- 3.28** Learners' behaviour during education and workshop sessions was generally satisfactory but a positive attitude to learning was not always developed. In the taught classes we observed, learners and tutors treated each other with appropriate mutual respect.

## Recommendations

- 3.29** **Appropriate accredited education and accredited work-related vocational training, which reflects realistic employment prospects on the islands, should be available to prisoners.** (Repeated recommendation 3.19)
- 3.30** **The prison should ensure that all prisoners engage in high-quality work that develops a sound work ethic and that skills and experience gained through work should be identified, recorded and, where possible, accredited.**
- 3.31** **Health and safety standards in the workshops should be adhered to, including the use of protective equipment, guards and safety clothing.** (Repeated recommendation 3.27)

## Library

- 3.32** The Northward library was of an adequate size, air conditioned and clean. It was managed by an officer librarian, supported by one orderly. It opened on weekday mornings and afternoons but not during the evenings or weekends, and unplanned closures and restrictions limited prisoners' access. In our survey, at both prisons, fewer prisoners than at the time of the previous inspection said that it was easy to get to the library. Typically, only 18 prisoners per week visited the Northward library.
- 3.33** At both prisons, the range and variety of donated fiction and non-fiction resources were not based on a recent survey of the populations' needs, and the stock was in need of review. There were no CDs, easy readers, graphic novels or large-print books, and current newspapers and magazines were not routinely available. Prisoners had access to Prison Service Instructions but not up-to-date legal texts (see recommendation 2.57) or an inter-library loan service. There were insufficient learning resources and reference materials to support education and vocational training. At Northward, a minority of accommodation

wings had a small selection of books, which were refreshed periodically. The young persons wing housed a small but age-appropriate library stock.

- 3.34** Since December 2014, 22 men had recorded stories for their children on CDs. In addition, the librarian supported a learner to improve his literacy; two women were similarly supported at Fairbanks. However, the prison did not effectively use the library to raise literacy levels. Plans to introduce Toe by Toe (a mentoring scheme to help prisoners learn to read) were well developed.

## Recommendations

- 3.35** **Access to the library at Northward should be improved, particularly during the evenings and at weekends and for those at work during the day.** (Repeated recommendation 3.33)
- 3.36** **The reasons why prisoners do not use the libraries should be identified and strategies implemented to improve access and raise participation.**
- 3.37** **The libraries should contain a stock of up-to-date and relevant fiction, non-fiction and reference material.** (Repeated recommendation 3.34)

## Physical education and healthy living

### Expected outcomes:

**All prisoners understand the importance of healthy living, and are encouraged and enabled to participate in physical education in safe and decent surroundings.**

**3.38** *PE provision overall was reasonably good. The Northward gym was managed effectively and offered reasonable access to recreational PE. Most equipment and facilities were adequate, although showed signs of wear. An outdoor football pitch and basketball court were available. The Fairbanks gym had improved and offered free weights and running machines, although the latter were in need of repair and maintenance. Participation rates had improved at Northward and were satisfactory. Few women regularly used the facilities at Fairbanks. At both prisons, prisoners' received an appropriate induction to the gym. Links with the health care department were underdeveloped and there was insufficient promotion of healthy lifestyles at both prisons. There was insufficient focus on developing a positive body image at Fairbanks. The quantity of vocational training offered was low and the range too narrow.*

- 3.39** A suitably qualified, full-time PE officer managed the Northward gym effectively, supported by one orderly. The air-conditioned gym housed cardiovascular machines and free weights equipment and could accommodate 22 prisoners per session. Most of the equipment was maintained adequately, although the gym floor and some machines were heavily used and required refurbishment. Prisoners could use an outdoor football pitch and basketball court.
- 3.40** Northward prisoners had reasonable access to recreational PE, with all adult and young people timetabled to visit the gym at least twice a week. Our survey indicated that overall participation rates had improved considerably since the previous inspection and were satisfactory. Weekend and evening gym sessions were not offered. Prisoners received sufficient kit, including footwear, to allow for participation in gym activities. Adequate shower and changing facilities were available.

- 3.41** The quantity of vocational training offered was low and the range too narrow; it was limited to the personal trainer award, with only two learners on the programme at Northward. Uptake had been historically very low, and robust data on success rates were not available.
- 3.42** At both prisons, prisoners received an adequate fitness assessment and induction before using the gym. Links with the health care department at both prisons were underdeveloped. Sessions were not offered for specific groups, such as the over-50s and those with a physical disability. However, the prison held well-attended physiotherapy sessions in a room attached to the gym. Promotion of healthy living lifestyles was weak at both prisons, and staff at Fairbanks did not act to endorse helpful individual views of body image.
- 3.43** The small but adequate PE room at Fairbanks had been decorated since the previous inspection. A range of free weights and cardiovascular machines were available, although the latter were in need of repair and maintenance. An outdoor area provided a hard surface for netball and five-a-side football but was largely unused, other than for one hour's formal exercise each day. Supervised PE sessions were not offered routinely but volunteer teachers provided weekly yoga sessions, although few women took up these opportunities.

## Recommendations

- 3.44 A larger quantity and variety of courses supporting employment in the fitness industry should be offered at both prisons.**
- 3.45 Links between the PE and health care departments should be improved, healthy lifestyles should be promoted effectively at both prisons and the concept of a positive body image should be promoted at Fairbanks.**
- 3.46 At Northward, sessions should be offered for specific groups with identified needs.**



# Section 4. Resettlement

## Strategic management of resettlement

### Expected outcomes:

**Planning for a prisoner's release or transfer starts on their arrival at the prison.**

**Resettlement underpins the work of the whole prison, supported by strategic partnerships in the community and informed by assessment of prisoner risk and need.**

**Good planning ensures a seamless transition into the community.**

**4.1** *Strategic oversight had improved but was hindered by the lack of a needs analysis, strategy or committee. Joint working with other statutory agencies remained very limited, relationships were tenuous and there was not enough access to resettlement help for prisoners. However, release on temporary licence was developing well.*

**4.2** The strategic oversight of rehabilitation and resettlement at both prisons had improved with the appointment of a senior manager, who oversaw a small team of workers. However, strategic management was hindered by the lack of a needs analysis of the complex population, no formal strategy, and no committee to hold people to account and monitor progress against the recently developed action plan. The planned introduction of a structured risk and needs assessment tool was a promising step forward which would provide the ability to analyse risks, although the start date for this was unclear.

**4.3** Prisoners at both prisons had little access to rehabilitation and resettlement services, and few joint working agreements had been established, despite evidence of significant needs at both Northward and Fairbanks (see section on reintegration planning and main recommendation S63).

**4.4** Links with the Department for Community Rehabilitation and the Children and Families Services were tenuous and there was little joint working, which impeded information exchange, risk assessment work and decision making. For example, pre-sentence information was not routinely shared with the prison and the Children and Families Services had stopped attending case conferences on the young people in their care who were held in custody.

**4.5** Good progress had been made in introducing unsupervised release on temporary licence (ROTL) but numbers assessed as suitable were still very small. ROTL was available to men and women for special purposes, work, family ties and engagement with community services.

## Recommendations

**4.6** **A comprehensive needs analysis should inform a strategy specific to rehabilitation and re-entry into the community, and a committee should be established to provide oversight of progress made.**

**4.7** **Partnership working with community agencies should be developed to ensure continuity of support during and post-custody. (Repeated recommendation 4.6)**

## Offender management and planning

### Expected outcomes:

**All prisoners have a sentence plan based on an individual assessment of risk and need, which is regularly reviewed and implemented throughout and after their time in custody. Prisoners, together with all relevant staff, are involved in drawing up and reviewing plans.**

**4.8** *The case management function had ceased. Prisoners' risks and needs were not assessed and most prisoners did not know who to turn to for help with resettlement issues. Many would be released without doing any offending behaviour work. The executive release scheme and the parole process were managed appropriately and timeliness had improved. Public protection work was underdeveloped and information exchange was limited, which impacted on the quality of risk assessments. Initial categorisation and review processes were much improved. The regime for life-sentenced prisoners was too limited but the soon-to-be introduced opportunity for parole was a huge step forward.*

**4.9** The prisoner case management function had effectively ceased since the previous inspection; the three case managers no longer held caseloads and there was no expectation for them to see prisoners during their sentence, except for preparing parole or ROTL reports.

**4.10** Prisoners' needs were no longer assessed on arrival, and sentence and reintegration planning had ended (see main recommendation S63). There was no current risk and needs assessment tool, although plans to introduce one were advanced. This would provide a screening tool, a core assessment tool alongside specialist tools (for example, for young people and domestic violence offenders), and a tool assessing readiness for release, all of which would be useful to prison staff for decision making. It would give case managers the ability to assess, plan and manage cases, although it was difficult to see how only three case managers would be able to manage the full population of sentenced prisoners.

**4.11** At the time of the inspection, there was no psychologist in post to support risk assessment and provide intervention, although recruitment was well under way.

**4.12** Prison staff did not currently have routine access to pre-sentence information, previous convictions or victim impact statements (see section on courts escorts and transfers) but work was under way to rectify this.

**4.13** Prisoners who were not applying for parole or ROTL were left to their own devices in terms of planning their sentence and preparing for release, and those we spoke to felt unsupported and uncertain about their future. They had no one to turn to for help and many of them struggled to access any services. Many would be released without undertaking any offending behaviour work to reduce their likelihood of reconviction and risk of harm to others (see main recommendation S63).

**4.14** The executive release scheme enabled suitable prisoners at both prisons to be released at their earliest eligibility date, which for some was three months early. The scheme was well used and about 15 prisoners had been released early in 2014. Applications were dealt with appropriately and all relevant departments were asked to contribute to the assessment. The Director had the final approval, and the timeliness of those recently granted had improved.



## Recommendation

- 4.15 Prisoners' risks and needs should be assessed using a structured and validated assessment tool, and the frequency and type of contact with them should be based on that assessment.**

## Public protection

- 4.16** Public protection concerns were not assessed on arrival and restrictions on contacting victims or potential victims were not identified. Little attention was given to multi-agency public protection work during the sentence or before release, except for those released on ROTL or applying for parole. Even in these cases, the assessment by the prison was hindered owing to the lack of pre-sentence and previous conviction information, victim impact statements and information about licence conditions, although progress had been made on gaining access to these (see section on courts, escorts and transfers and recommendation 1.19).
- 4.17** Sound ROTL processes had been implemented, and records of attendance at the ROTL boards showed evidence of some multi-agency public protection work. However, decision making was hindered, particularly for the more serious offenders, by the lack of a structured risk and needs assessment (see section on offender management and planning).
- 4.18** Parole report preparation was good at both prisons, with effective links between prison departments and the other criminal justice agencies. The timeliness of report writing had improved. In the previous 10 months, 25 out of 40 eligible prisoners had applied for parole and 21 of these reports had been completed at the time of the inspection.

## Recommendation

- 4.19 Multi-agency processes for assessing and managing prisoners' risk of harm to others should be developed in order to protect the public, staff and other prisoners.** (Repeated recommendation 4.22)

## Categorisation

- 4.20** Prison Service Instructions covering categorisation had been introduced a year earlier and the robust processes were working well. At the time of the inspection, 18 category A, 103 category B, 50 category C and 23 category D prisoners were being held at the two prisons.
- 4.21** For men and women alike, initial allocation to category A, B, C or D within one month of sentencing had been introduced and used a clear algorithm to determine the most appropriate security category.
- 4.22** At both prisons, reviews of categorisation were scheduled clearly and were up to date. The reviews we looked at contained adequate detail, were defensible and were approved by the Director without delay. Attendance at the review board was good but the prisoner was not asked to contribute in writing to support their recategorisation. In recent weeks, the manager in charge of categorisation had started telling prisoners about the outcome in person, which was a positive step in helping them to have a better understanding of the process. Prisoners could appeal against the recategorisation decision through the complaints system.

## Recommendation

### **4.23 Prisoners should be able make a written contribution to support their recategorisation review.**

## Indeterminate sentence prisoners

- 4.24** At the time of the inspection, there were no life-sentenced prisoners at Fairbanks and 18 at Northward. Many of them were held in the high-risk unit (HRU; see section on residential units), with six being located on A, D and F wings. Those on F wing had a more positive regime and environment, but for the others the regime, support and available progression opportunities were limited, and for many the regime was identical to that of other prisoners. A lifer liaison officer had recently been appointed and the first support forum had been held. However, none of the life-sentenced prisoners had an allocated case manager and those we spoke to were frustrated at the lack of support provided. There were no offending behaviour programmes for them and no specific support was given to remand prisoners potentially facing a life sentence. The category A life-sentenced prisoners we spoke to said that they had little opportunity to take part in the main regime, such as going to the chapel or the library, owing to a lack of staff to escort them. They said that they spent most of their days sleeping and hanging around the wing.
- 4.25** The Conditional Release Act (yet to be enacted) was due to provide a set minimum tariff for life-sentenced prisoners and introduce the opportunity for parole. Three prisoners had been released in the previous year at the Island Governor's discretion, which was a positive step forward. Some other life-sentenced prisoners still did not have a set tariff, which left them uncertain about their future. The hostel (bungalow) outside Northward held two life-sentenced prisoners at the time of the inspection, with one of them going out on ROTL to work, which was a significant improvement since the previous inspection. Fairbanks did not provide anything similar for women, and their opportunity for progression remained poor.

## Recommendation

- 4.26 Life-sentenced prisoners should have access to a more constructive regime specific to their needs and have more progression and rehabilitation opportunities.**

## Reintegration planning

### Expected outcomes:

**Prisoners' resettlement needs are addressed prior to release. An effective multi-agency response is used to meet the specific needs of each individual prisoner in order to maximise the likelihood of successful reintegration into the community.**

**4.27** *Reintegration planning had ended and few prisoners felt prepared for release. Housing advice and support were available only on release, and the numbers released without suitable accommodation were not monitored. The National Workforce Development Agency provided a useful pre-release course but attendance was voluntary and too many left prison without sufficient preparation for work or training. There was limited access to community support for those with drug and alcohol dependencies. Health referrals were made before release, and palliative care arrangements were adequate. Help with money worries was not available. Some improvement had been made to the children and families pathway but not to visits arrangements. Provision of offending behaviour work had deteriorated significantly and there had been no needs analysis.*

**4.28** Reintegration planning at both prisons had ended, other than for those applying for parole. Little resettlement help was available and most prisoners did not know who to go to for resettlement help. In our survey, only 29% of men and 36% of women said that they had been helped to prepare for release (see main recommendation S63).

### Accommodation

**4.29** Many prisoners had housing problems on arrival but in our survey only 7% of men and 8% of women who needed help with housing said that they knew who to turn to.

**4.30** Advice and support were not available before release, and the number of prisoners released without suitable accommodation was not monitored. We spoke to several prisoners who said that the lack of suitable housing would be a significant barrier to their successful resettlement (see main recommendation S63).

### Education, training and employment

**4.31** An employability skills course was offered at both prisons, in conjunction with the National Workforce Development Agency (NWDA), and focused on developing the skills required to secure education, training and/or employment on release. The NWDA career one-to-one service was used at Northward to assess prisoners' aptitude for vocational training and clarify wider career aspirations. They could attend the course from three months to three years before leaving the prison. However, attendance was not compulsory and prisoners often left without receiving adequate pre-release preparation (see main recommendation S63). In 2014, three courses had been run, with only six prisoners completing them. ROTL for work experience had been introduced at Northward (see section on indeterminate sentence prisoners) and the development of links with employers was welcome. Provision for women under this pathway was non-existent.

## Recommendation

- 4.32** The prison should ensure that all prisoners attend an employability skills course that effectively prepares them for employment, education and/or training on release.

## Health care

- 4.33** Patients at both prisons were referred to appropriate medical services in community before release, and those requiring medications were given them to take home. Those requiring palliative care were referred to the hospital.

## Drugs and alcohol

- 4.34** The psychosocial team and peer support group workers assisted men and women with ongoing drug and alcohol needs to access support in the community, although we were told that community options were limited.

## Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.35** There were high levels of money and debt problems among prisoners. In our survey, a third of male prisoners said that they had had financial problems at the start of their time in prison but only 8% of those who needed help said that they knew who to turn to. The situation for female prisoners was similar, with only 8% of those needing help with money problems knowing who to turn to. No help was provided in either prison for these problems (see main recommendation S63).
- 4.36** Effort had been made to enable prisoners to open bank accounts before release but this was proving very difficult, and only one had been opened in the previous year.

## Recommendation

- 4.37** Prisoners should be able to open bank accounts before release.

## Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.38** In our survey, most female prisoners said that they felt supported in maintaining contact with family and friends but male prisoners were less positive. There had been some improvements in provision. Parenting programmes, run by the Family Resource Centre, had been delivered to a small number of men and women. Three family fun days had been delivered at Northward in the previous year but only one at Fairbanks. However, those run for men were only open to those on F wing as they were delivered outside of the prison. Special-purpose visits were available at both prisons, and prisoners could apply for one when circumstances warranted it – for example, for contact with new babies or an escorted home visit to an elderly relative.
- 4.39** Other than some improvements to the layout of the visits room at each prison, arrangements remained restrictive. There was no booking system and social visits were only available at the weekend. Each session lasted only 30 minutes, even when the visits room was not busy, which was an unnecessary restriction. We were assured that when several

children from the same family visited at the same time, they would not have to split the 30-minute time slot between them, unlike at the time of the previous inspection. Visitors said that they experienced delays in getting into the visits hall.

## Recommendations

**4.40 Visitors should be able to book visits, to avoid delays in entry or early termination of the session.** (Repeated recommendation 4.56)

**4.41 The duration of domestic visits should be increased.**

## Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

**4.42** The prisons were unsighted on the main priorities for the type and number of offending behaviour programmes needed at both prisons, as a needs analysis had not been undertaken. A ‘wish list’ of programmes to be bought in had been developed but this was far too ambitious and not based on any evidence of need.

**4.43** Resources dedicated to programme delivery had reduced considerably. At the time of the inspection, there were no offending behaviour courses available at either prison, other than three drug programmes. The Department of Community Rehabilitation had stopped delivering its anger management programme to men and did not have a firm plan to restart this in the near future. The women’s programme in place at the time of the previous inspection had ended. The sex offender treatment programme (SOTP) for men had also ended but staff were due to be trained in this in the near future. We were not assured that implementation of the SOTP had been thought through well enough, as little was known about the sex offender population, including the number eligible and their suitability. There was no general offending behaviour programme and no victim awareness work. As a result, many prisoners would leave custody without their offending behaviour being addressed.

## Recommendation

**4.44 A comprehensive needs analysis should be completed to evidence the type and amount of offending behaviour work needed for male and female prisoners.**

## Additional resettlement services

**4.45** Women held at Fairbanks were asked about their experiences of sexual abuse or prostitution on arrival. Those who wanted help could access emotional and practical support from the Crisis Centre (a community based organisation which provided support for women who had experienced abuse); staff from the Crisis Centre attended the prison when requested. Domestic violence and sexual abuse awareness sessions were also provided at Fairbanks, to help to support women and children at risk of abuse.



## Section 5. Summary of recommendations and housekeeping points

The following is a listing of repeated and new recommendations, housekeeping points and examples of good practice included in this report. The reference numbers at the end of each refer to the paragraph location in the main report, and in the previous report where recommendations have been repeated.

### Main recommendations

#### To the Ministry of Home Affairs

- 5.1 The United Kingdom should extend OPCAT to the Cayman Islands. (S56, repeated recommendation HP50)
- 5.2 Many of the current facilities at both Northward and Fairbanks should be demolished and the rest should undergo complete renovation. New prisoner accommodation should be developed that provides safe and secure accommodation commensurate with internationally accepted minimum standards. (S59, repeated recommendation HP54)

### Main recommendations

#### To the Director

- 5.3 The prison should fully implement a violence reduction strategy. Incidents of violence, bullying and intimidatory behaviour should be recorded, collated and analysed to identify trends and hot spots. Action should be taken to reduce violence and bullying. Victims should be supported and perpetrators monitored and challenged. Prisoners should be regularly consulted on their perceptions of safety and managers should actively promote a climate and culture in which violence and victimisation are not tolerated. (S57, repeated recommendation HP51)
- 5.4 The current use of segregation (basic) should be replaced by a regulated, risk-assessed and controlled system of segregation. Cells should be suitably equipped and access to a suitable regime provided. Prisoners should be individually case managed and, where possible, plans made and implemented for reintegration into the main population. (S58, repeated recommendation HP53)
- 5.5 The prison should develop clear, transparent operating procedures concerning daily routines and arrangements directly relevant to the daily lives of prisoners. Meaningful management checks should be introduced to ensure that, on a daily basis, all members of staff, at all levels, are accountable for their actions and deliver their remit consistently and fairly. (S60, repeated recommendation HP55)
- 5.6 The number of cancelled activities should be reduced and prisoners should be required to attend. (S61)
- 5.7 All prisoners should have their needs assessed on arrival and have a sentence plan to address these needs and their offending behaviour. (S62)
- 5.8 Prisoners should be helped to prepare for release and reduce their likelihood of reoffending. In particular, a reintegration plan including help with debts and finding accommodation and employment should be provided. (S63)

## Recommendations

To the Director

### Courts, escort and transfers

- 5.9** Prisoners' property should be transported with them to prison. (1.6, repeated recommendation 1.5)
- 5.10** Prisoners should not be shackled. (1.7, repeated recommendation 1.6)

### Early days in custody

- 5.11** Newly arrived prisoners should be able to purchase shop goods immediately or be provided with an interim pack sufficient to cover the period until they can buy goods. (1.18, repeated recommendation 1.19)
- 5.12** Access to all previous offending information, victim impact statements and safety and risk information held by the police and courts should be improved to support good risk assessment work by prison staff. All such information should be in wing and case management files and accessible to staff. (1.19)
- 5.13** An assessment of all new prisoners should be undertaken on the day of arrival to identify immediate health needs. (1.20)
- 5.14** A clear set of first night procedures which addresses prisoners' feelings of safety should be developed and implemented. (1.21, repeated recommendation 1.21)

### Self-harm and suicide

- 5.15** The implementation of the case management of prisoners at risk of self-harm should be reviewed, further to improve care of those at risk. (1.32)

### Security

- 5.16** The external perimeter fencing of at Fairbanks should be brought up to category C standard. (1.41)
- 5.17** The use of security intelligence reports should be promoted, and detailed monitoring of data received should be undertaken to identify risks to the establishments. (1.42)
- 5.18** The publication and application of a drug and alcohol supply reduction policy should be expedited. (1.43)
- 5.19** A system of regular mandatory random drug testing should be initiated to measure drug misuse and to provide a robust deterrent. (1.44)
- 5.20** Drug testing should take place in a suitably clinical environment and testing equipment should be stored appropriately. (1.45, repeated recommendation 1.46)

### Incentives and earned privileges

- 5.21** A behavioural management system to encourage and reward and good behaviour should be introduced as soon as is practicable. (1.48)



## Discipline

- 5.22** Adjudication procedures should be standardised and quality controlled. (1.52, repeated recommendation 1.57)
- 5.23** The practice of prison staff increasing sentences should cease. (1.53, repeated recommendation 1.56)
- 5.24** All use of force should be fully recorded. (1.56)
- 5.25** Handcuffs should only be used to restrain prisoners in-cell in the most extreme of circumstances, following appropriate managerial approval. (1.57)

## Residential units

- 5.26** All prisoners should have sufficient furniture, of a satisfactory standard, in their cells. The amount of furniture to which an individual is entitled to should be specified and staff should check routinely to ensure that the prisoner has it. (2.11, repeated recommendation 2.17)
- 5.27** Prisoners at both prisons should be able to access replacement kit and bedding when they need it and reasonable requests should be addressed immediately. The amount of kit to which an individual is entitled should be specified and staff should be proactive in ensuring that the entitlement is met. (2.12, repeated recommendation 2.18)
- 5.28** Prisoners should not be housed in the high-risk unit (HRU) for punishment or good order. (2.20)
- 5.29** Prisoners on the HRU should be individually case managed and, where possible, plans made and implemented for reintegration back into the main population. (2.21)
- 5.30** A full regime should be provided on the HRU, including education, training and association. (2.22)

## Equality and diversity

- 5.31** The prisons should implement an equality and diversity policy which outlines how the needs of all groups in the prison will be recognised and addressed. (2.30, repeated recommendation 2.29)
- 5.32** There should be effective and regular monitoring of the distinct characteristics of prisoners such as race, nationality, disability, age, gender or sexual orientation, in order to ensure fair treatment and access to services. (2.35, repeated recommendation 2.34)
- 5.33** Young people should be able to access the adult regime based on an individualised risk assessment. (2.41)
- 5.34** Links with the Children and Families Services should be improved and formal case conferencing for young people should be undertaken at regular intervals in order to safeguard their needs. (2.42)

## Faith and religious activity

- 5.35** The prison should ensure that relevant provision is available for the requirements of the main world faiths. (2.48)

## Complaints

**5.36** The prison should analyse complaints data and quality control responses. (2.52)

## Legal rights

**5.37** There should be up-to-date and reliable legal guidance available in the prison libraries. (2.57, repeated recommendation 2.61)

## Health services

**5.38** The health care complaints system should preserve medical confidentiality. (2.69)

**5.39** There should be an information-sharing protocol with the prison substance misuse services. (2.70)

**5.40** Applications to see health services staff should be confidential and not rely on the discretion of prison officers. (2.80, repeated recommendation 2.80)

**5.41** A pharmacist should have overall control of medicines at both prisons. (2.86, repeated recommendation 2.89)

**5.42** Controlled drugs should be stored within a locked cabinet separate to general stock. (2.87)

**5.43** Prisoners should be risk-assessed before receiving medicines in-possession. (2.88)

**5.44** The pharmacist offering training in medicines administration to non-clinicians should assure him- or herself of that person's competency before authorising practice. (2.89)

**5.45** The dental surgery should be co-located with the health centre, where emergency equipment can be shared, and there should be a separate decontamination area. (2.96)

**5.46** The health conditions assessment should take into account the perceptions of prison staff and directly address the level of mental health problems, in addition to psychiatric morbidity, in the prisons' populations. (2.103)

**5.47** The Director should invite the Mental Health Commission to review involuntary treatment under the Mental Health Law within the prisons. (2.104)

## Catering

**5.48** Prisoners should be appropriately trained to work in food preparation. (2.114, repeated recommendation 2.104)

**5.49** The lunchtime and evening meals should not be served before noon and 5pm, respectively. (2.115)

**5.50** Cultural, health and religious needs should be taken into consideration when providing meals to prisoners. (2.116)

**5.51** Food for those at Fairbanks should be transported in hygienic refrigerated vehicles or be freshly prepared on site. (2.117)

## Purchases

- 5.52** The consequences of not selling tobacco in the shop should be explored and action taken in response to the findings. (2.122)

## Time out of cell

- 5.53** Women at Fairbanks should be permitted more time in the open air. (3.5, repeated recommendation 3.5)

## Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.54** Effective operational management of learning, skills and work should be implemented and supported by rigorous quality assurance, improvement and self-assessment arrangements. (3.10)
- 5.55** Collection and analysis of numerical data should be used in conjunction with challenging targets to inform performance management. (3.11)
- 5.56** The prison should allocate prisoners to activities according to their identified need, using job descriptions, and ensure that all prisoners participate in purposeful activity that fully occupies them. (3.18)
- 5.57** The Northward vocational training workshops should be brought into full operation. (3.19)
- 5.58** The English and mathematics skills development needs of prisoners should be addressed and outreach support provided in non-classroom settings at both prisons. (3.23)
- 5.59** The prison should provide learners with specialist support while undertaking learning and skills sessions, and diagnostic assessments to meet needs. (3.24)
- 5.60** Appropriate accredited education and accredited work-related vocational training, which reflects realistic employment prospects on the islands, should be available to prisoners. (3.29, repeated recommendation 3.19)
- 5.61** The prison should ensure that all prisoners engage in high-quality work that develops a sound work ethic and that skills and experience gained through work should be identified, recorded and, where possible, accredited. (3.30, repeated recommendation 3.30)
- 5.62** Health and safety standards in the workshops should be adhered to, including the use of protective equipment, guards and safety clothing. (3.31, repeated recommendation 3.27)
- 5.63** Access to the library at Northward should be improved, particularly during the evenings and at weekends and for those at work during the day. (3.35, repeated recommendation 3.33)
- 5.64** The reasons why prisoners do not use the libraries should be identified and strategies implemented to improve access and raise participation. (3.36)
- 5.65** The libraries should contain a stock of up-to-date and relevant fiction, non-fiction and reference material. (3.37, repeated recommendation 3.34)

### Physical education and healthy living

- 5.66** A larger quantity and variety of courses supporting employment in the fitness industry should be offered at both prisons. (3.44)
- 5.67** Links between the PE and health care departments should be improved, healthy lifestyles should be promoted effectively at both prisons and the concept of a positive body image should be promoted at Fairbanks. (3.45)
- 5.68** At Northward, sessions should be offered for specific groups with identified needs. (3.46)

### Strategic management of resettlement

- 5.69** A comprehensive needs analysis should inform a strategy specific to rehabilitation and re-entry into the community, and a committee should be established to provide oversight of progress made. (4.6)
- 5.70** Partnership working with community agencies should be developed to ensure continuity of support during and post-custody. (4.7, repeated recommendation 4.6)

### Offender management and planning

- 5.71** Prisoners' risks and needs should be assessed using a structured and validated assessment tool, and the frequency and type of contact with them should be based on that assessment. (4.15)
- 5.72** Multi-agency processes for assessing and managing prisoners' risk of harm to others should be developed in order to protect the public, staff and other prisoners. (4.19, repeated recommendation 4.22)
- 5.73** Prisoners should be able make a written contribution to support their recategorisation review. (4.23)
- 5.74** Life-sentenced prisoners should have access to a more constructive regime specific to their needs and have more progression and rehabilitation opportunities. (4.26)

### Reintegration planning

- 5.75** The prison should ensure that all prisoners attend an employability skills course that effectively prepares them for employment, education and/or training on release. (4.32)
- 5.76** Prisoners should be able to open bank accounts before release. (4.37)
- 5.77** Visitors should be able to book visits, to avoid delays in entry or early termination of the session. (4.40, repeated recommendation 4.56)
- 5.78** The duration of domestic visits should be increased. (4.41)
- 5.79** A comprehensive needs analysis should be completed to evidence the type and amount of offending behaviour work needed for male and female prisoners. (4.44)

## Housekeeping points

### Residential units

- 5.80** Prisoners should not have to pay to have their clothes laundered. (2.13)
- 5.81** Mail should only be censored if an individual risk assessment indicates that it is necessary. Procedures and systems should be introduced that properly account and ensure appropriate authority for the interception of mail. (2.14)

### Health services

- 5.82** The Health Services Authority (HSA) should survey prisoners to identify areas for service improvement. (2.71)
- 5.83** Health care should be a standing agenda item at the prisoners' consultative council. (2.72)
- 5.84** The prison and HSA should consider the location of automated external defibrillators, to optimise accessibility. (2.73)
- 5.85** There should be a prison-wide health and well-being strategy to promote a healthy lifestyle. (2.74)
- 5.86** Nurses' prescribing practices should be guided by triage algorithms and/or patient group directions. (2.90)
- 5.87** There should be a medicines and therapeutics committee for the prisons. (2.91)
- 5.88** Until relocated, the dental fixtures, fittings and equipment should be upgraded and the installation of the X-ray equipment should be completed without delay. (2.97)
- 5.89** All contact prison staff should be trained to identify when a referral to medical services of a prisoner suspected of having mental health problems is required. (2.105)

### Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.90** Essential teaching resources such as textbooks, displays and teaching materials should be provided at both prisons. (3.25)

## Examples of good practice

### Health services

- 5.91** Clinical records were accessible by both prison and George Town Hospital clinicians. (2.75)



# Section 6. Appendices

## Appendix I: Inspection team

Martin Lomas	Deputy Chief Inspector/Inspector
Alison Perry	Team leader prison inspection/Inspector
Sandra Fieldhouse	Inspector
Martin Kettle	Team leader police and courts inspections/Inspector
Andrew Rooke	Inspector
Paul Rowlands	Inspector
Rachel Murray	Researcher
Alissa Redmond	Researcher
Catherine Shaw	Researcher

### **Specialist inspectors**

Paul Tarbuck	Drugs inspector and health services inspector
Nigel Bragg	Ofsted inspector





## Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report

The following is a summary of the main findings from the last report and a list of all the recommendations made, organised under the four tests of a healthy prison. The reference numbers at the end of each recommendation refer to the paragraph location in the previous report. If a recommendation has been repeated in the main report, its new paragraph number is also provided.

### Safety

#### **Prisoners, particularly the most vulnerable, are held safely.**

*At the last inspection, in 2012, Northward was not a safe prison but the situation at Fairbanks was better. Reception processes at both prisons were satisfactory but meaningful assessment and risk management were not addressed. Prisoners at Northward did not feel safe and many felt victimised both by staff and other prisoners. Prisoners at Fairbanks felt safe. Measures to address violence and bullying at both prisons were reactive and crude. Support for the vulnerable or those at risk of self-harm was inadequate. Young males were at serious risk of harm. Security arrangements were poor. Illegal drug use was endemic at Northward. The segregation of prisoners in basic cells lacked any legitimate authority and their treatment was appalling. Outcomes for prisoners at Northward were poor and not sufficiently good at Fairbanks against this healthy prison test.*

#### **Main recommendations**

The United Kingdom should extend OPCAT to the Cayman Islands. (HP50)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, S56)

The prison should develop a violence reduction strategy. Incidents of violence, bullying and intimidatory behaviour should be recorded, collated and analysed to identify trends and hot spots. Action should be taken to reduce violence and bullying. Victims should be supported and perpetrators monitored and challenged. Prisoners should be regularly consulted on their perceptions of safety and managers should actively promote a climate and culture in which violence and victimisation are not tolerated. (HP51)

**Partially achieved** (recommendation repeated, S57)

A comprehensive, prison-specific drug strategy should be developed and implemented. This should include the use of intelligence to identify areas of concern, measures to reduce supply, robust drug testing arrangements and the provision of clinical treatment for prisoners with drug misuse issues. (HP52)

**Partially achieved**

The use of basic and 'housing' for own protection should cease immediately and be replaced by a regulated, risk-assessed and controlled system of segregation in suitably equipped cellular accommodation with access to a suitable regime. Prisoners should be individually case managed and, where possible, plans made and implemented for reintegration into the main population. (HP53)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, S58)

#### **Recommendations**

Prisoners' property should be transported with them to prison. (I.5)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, I.6)

Prisoners should not be shackled during escorts. (1.6)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 1.7)

Prisoners should not be strip searched or required to squat during searching in reception unless justified by a properly recorded individual risk assessment. (1.18)

**Partially achieved**

Newly arrived prisoners should be able to purchase shop goods immediately or be provided with an interim pack sufficient to cover the period until they can buy goods. (1.19)

**Partially achieved** (recommendation repeated, 1.18)

The reception assessment, including health care, should address a prisoner's vulnerability and the risk they present to staff and other prisoners. This should inform their location and the support they receive. (1.20)

**Partially achieved**

A clear set of first night procedures which addresses prisoners' feelings of safety should be developed and implemented. (1.21)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 1.21)

The induction presentation should be provided consistently on the day after prisoners' arrival. (1.22)

**Achieved**

New prisoners should be screened on arrival for the risk of self-harm or suicide. (1.33)

**Achieved**

The prison should develop a safer custody strategy which recognises the risks posed by specific groups of prisoners and identifies the procedures that are in place to help reduce risk (for example, activity, counselling, family contact). (1.34)

**Achieved**

Detailed care and support plans should be used for prisoners at risk. These should identify individual needs and evidence good-quality interactions and engagement with prisoners. (1.35)

**Achieved**

The external perimeter, fencing and cellular accommodation of both Northward and Fairbanks should be brought up to category C standard and more secure inner compounds introduced to hold higher risk prisoners. (1.44)

**Partially achieved**

The security information report system should be re-launched and systems implemented to record, analyse and act on identified information. (1.45)

**Partially achieved**

Drug testing should take place in a suitably clinical environment and testing equipment should be stored appropriately. (1.46)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 1.45)

The planned introduction of an incentives and earned privileges system should be expedited, to encourage positive behaviour and to underpin the disciplinary procedure. (1.50)

**Not achieved**

The practice of prison staff increasing sentences should cease. (1.56)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 1.53)

Adjudication procedures should be standardised and quality controlled. (I.57)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, I.52)

The procedures and regulations laid out in Prison Service Order 1600 should be reintroduced without delay. (I.60)

**Achieved**

## Respect

**Prisoners are treated with respect for their human dignity.**

*At the last inspection, in 2012, living conditions for prisoners at Northward were unremittingly poor, with most cells barely fit for human habitation. Accommodation at Fairbanks was marginally better but grim. Staff–prisoner relationships at Northward were distant and many prisoners perceived staff as disrespectful. Relationships at Fairbanks were good. Many prisoners questioned the transparency and fairness of their treatment and care. We questioned the legitimacy of the high-risk unit regime, aspects of which were shocking. There was little awareness of the diversity of the population and their different needs. The perceptions of Caymanian prisoners were more negative than those of prisoners of other nationalities. Complaints were reasonably well managed and there was good support for the Christian faith. The food was poor and health provision, including mental health, very poor. Outcomes for prisoners were poor at both Northward and Fairbanks against this healthy prison test.*

### Main recommendations

Many of the current facilities at both Northward and Fairbanks should be demolished and the rest should undergo complete renovation. New prisoner accommodation should be developed that provides safe and secure accommodation commensurate with internationally accepted minimum standards. (HP54)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, S59)

The prison should develop clear, transparent operating procedures concerning daily routines and arrangements directly relevant to the daily lives of prisoners. Training should be introduced to support staff in the delivery of their responsibilities. Particular attention should be paid to the role and responsibilities of managers at all levels. Meaningful management checks should be introduced to ensure that, on a daily basis, all members of staff, at all levels, are accountable for their actions and deliver their remit consistently and fairly. (HP55)

**Partially achieved** (recommendation repeated, S60)

Prisoners on the HRU should be subject to an initial full risk assessment to determine whether they need such a controlled and restrictive environment. They should be given reasons for their allocation, and be subject to regular multidisciplinary reviews and assessments regarding the necessity of their continuing stay. Plans should be made for their reintegration into the main population. A full regime should be provided on the unit, including education, training and association. (HP56)

**Partially achieved**

Young people should be protected from abuse and bullying, and as a minimum should not be accommodated on the same wing as adult prisoners. Activities should be specific to their needs and include education and a focus on rehabilitation. (HP57)

**Partially achieved**

There should be a formal arrangement with the Health Services Authority (HSA) to ensure that prisoners receive health services that are equivalent to those provided in the HSA community clinics. There should be an annual needs assessment. There should be enough nurses, doctors and administration staff, with the right skills, to ensure that prisoners' physical and mental health needs can be assessed and treated as appropriate, in a timely manner. The premises should be clean and tidy, meet infection control standards and have the right equipment in them. (HP58)

**Partially achieved**

### **Recommendations**

All prisoners should have sufficient furniture, of a satisfactory standard, in their cells. The amount of furniture to which an individual is entitled to should be specified and staff should check routinely to ensure that the prisoner has it. (2.17)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.11)

Prisoners at both prisons should be able to access replacement kit and bedding when they need it and reasonable requests should be addressed immediately. The amount of kit to which an individual is entitled should be specified and staff should be proactive in ensuring that the entitlement is met. (2.18)

**Partially achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.12)

Mail should only be censored if an individual risk assessment indicates that it is necessary. Procedures and systems should be introduced that properly account and ensure proper authority for the interception of mail. (2.19)

**Not achieved**

The Max cells at Fairbanks should not be used. (2.20)

**Not achieved**

The assigned officer scheme should be further developed to improve support for prisoners and should be supplemented by effective and regular case recording in wing files. (2.26)

**Achieved**

The prison should implement an equality and diversity policy which outlines how the needs of all groups in the prison will be recognised and addressed. (2.29)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.30)

There should be effective and regular monitoring of the distinct characteristics of prisoners such as race, nationality, disability, age, gender or sexual orientation, in order to ensure fair treatment and access to services. (2.34)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.35)

The negative perceptions of Caymanian prisoners should be explored and acted on. (2.35)

**Achieved**

The prison should monitor different religions in the prison to ensure that all faiths are catered for. (2.45)

**Partially achieved**

All prisoners should have access to corporate worship each week, including access to a chaplain of their faith. (2.46)

**Achieved**

When risk assessments indicate that a prisoner is unsuitable to attend corporate worship, alternative provision should be made. (2.47)

**Achieved**

Measures to improve prisoner confidence in the complaints system should be introduced, including sealed posting boxes for submission of complaints, access to envelopes for confidential complaints and non-operational administration of the complaints system. (2.54)

**Achieved**

Legal support should be available for prisoners, and bail information for remand prisoners. (2.60)

**Partially achieved**

There should be up-to-date and reliable legal guidance available in the prison library. (2.61)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.57)

Procedures for dealing with legally privileged mail should be followed and a record made when mail is opened. (2.62)

**Achieved**

Health policies, including an information-sharing policy, should be relevant to the prison environment and used to ensure that practices meet acceptable standards. (2.70)

**Partially achieved**

The health reception screen should be completed on the day of arrival. It should include assessment of both a prisoner's physical and mental health. (2.78)

**Partially achieved**

All prisoners should be offered hepatitis B vaccinations. (2.79)

**Achieved**

Applications to see health services staff should be confidential and not rely on the discretion of prison officers. (2.80)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.80)

GP clinics should not be cancelled. If they are, they should be rescheduled within the week they were due to take place. (2.81)

**Achieved**

Up-to-date lists of all patients with lifelong conditions should be kept; such patients should receive care and reviews in line with evidence-based best practice. (2.82)

**Achieved**

There should be an electronic clinical record system installed for use by health services staff at both establishments. (2.83)

**Achieved**

There should be a complete review of medicines management. (2.88)

**Achieved**

A pharmacist should have overall control of medications at both prisons. (2.89)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.86)

Health services staff should be responsible and accountable for the administration of all medications and should use a documented risk assessment to determine the suitability of both patient and medication for in-possession medications. (2.90)

**Not achieved**

Prison officers should not routinely administer prescribed medications. (2.91)

**No longer relevant**

All health services staff providing mental health services should be aware of the living conditions of their patients. (2.95)

**Achieved**

The Prison Service and Health Services Authority should urgently satisfy themselves of the legality of the current practice of administering medications under force to some prisoners. (2.96)

**Partially achieved**

The main prison kitchen should be refurbished. (2.103)

**Not achieved**

Prisoners should be appropriately trained to work in food preparation. (2.104)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.114)

Prisoners should be regularly consulted over the range of goods available to purchase. (2.109)

**Achieved**

## Purposeful activity

**Prisoners are able, and expected, to engage in activity that is likely to benefit them.**

*At the last inspection, in 2012, most prisoners were unlocked from their cells for most of the day. Most had access to outside areas, although arrangements for the women at Fairbanks were needlessly restrictive. There were insufficient activity places for the population and even these were not fully utilised. Three-quarters of the prisoners at Northward and all the women at Fairbanks had nothing meaningful to do. The provision of education and work lacked coordination or coherence. Teachers did their best to provide good individual support for the few students who attended class. Much work was menial. The libraries were poorly stocked and little used. Prisoners appreciated a well-organised recreational gym at Northward but facilities at Fairbanks had taken no account of the needs of the women. Outcomes for prisoner at both Northward and Fairbanks were poor against this healthy prison test.*

### Main recommendations

The number, range and duration of meaningful activity places in education, training and work should be increased, based on a comprehensive needs assessment. Prisoners should be allocated to activity according to their needs and should be required to attend. (HP59)

**Partially achieved**

### Recommendations

Women at Fairbanks should be permitted more time in the open air. (3.5)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 3.5)

The environment and facilities in all the exercise yards should be improved. (3.6)

**Not achieved**

Accredited work-related vocational training, which reflects realistic employment prospects on the islands, should be available to prisoners. (3.19)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 3.29)

The lighting and ventilation in the classrooms at Fairbanks should be improved and broken computers replaced. (3.24)

**Achieved**

Essential teaching resources such as textbooks, displays and teaching materials should be provided at both prisons. (3.25)

**Partially achieved**

All work should be allocated through a labour board using clear job descriptions and an unambiguous and transparent application and allocation process. (3.26)

**Partially achieved**

Health and safety standards in the workshops should be adhered to, including the use of protective equipment, guards and safety clothing. (3.27)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 3.31)

Success rates should be analysed and improved to minimise the variability over time and between subjects. (3.29)

**Not achieved**

Skills and experience gained through work should be identified, recorded and, where possible, accredited. (3.30)

**Not achieved**

Access to the library at Northward should be improved, particularly during the evenings and at weekends and for those at work during the day. (3.33)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 3.35)

The libraries should contain a stock of up-to-date and relevant fiction, non-fiction and reference material. (3.34)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 3.37)

A suitable indoor area should be provided for physical activity for prisoners at Fairbanks. It should be appropriately resourced and equipped for female prisoners. Women should receive an induction to the gym and the opportunity for supervision by a trained instructor. (3.41)

**Achieved**

## Resettlement

### **Prisoners are prepared for their release back into the community and effectively helped to reduce the likelihood of reoffending.**

*At the last inspection, in 2012, the prisons lacked a strategic approach to the provision of rehabilitation services. Coordination and joint working with other relevant Island agencies and services was lacking. There was no meaningful assessment of prisoner need as the basis for determining provision. Prisoners were able to, and did, opt out of sentence planning, and the planning of prisoners' sentences was only partial. There were no formal public protection arrangements, and failures in categorisation processes meant that prisoners were improperly restricted. There was little resettlement support and prisoners did not know whom to turn to for help when preparing for release. There was no use of unsupervised temporary release to aid reintegration. Outcomes for prisoners at both Northward and Fairbanks were poor against this healthy prison test.*

### **Recommendations**

A strategy and action plan setting out the commitment to rehabilitation should be developed. This should be based on a comprehensive and regularly updated analysis of the resettlement needs of the population. (4.5)

#### **Partially achieved**

Partnership working with community agencies should be developed to ensure continuity of support during and post-custody. (4.6)

#### **Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 4.7)

Unsupervised release on temporary licence should be available for category D prisoners and should be considered for category C prisoners. (4.7)

#### **Achieved**

The initial assessment and sentence plan should be mandatory for convicted prisoners and include the likelihood of reoffending and risk of harm to others. (4.16)

#### **Not achieved**

Sentence plans should be thoroughly reviewed at set intervals to ensure that progress is monitored, remedial action taken where necessary and new objectives set. (4.17)

#### **Not achieved**

Multi-agency processes for assessing and managing prisoners' risk of harm to others should be developed in order to protect the public, staff and other prisoners. (4.22)

#### **Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 4.19)

A comprehensive categorisation assessment should be completed as soon as possible after a prisoner's arrival and reviewed at regular intervals. (4.27)

#### **Achieved**

Life-sentenced prisoners should have access to meaningful and specific rehabilitation provision, including maintaining community ties and meaningful employment. (4.32)

#### **Partially achieved**

All sentenced prisoners should have a comprehensive reintegration plan. (4.36)

#### **Not achieved**



Regular resettlement courses should be offered to all prisoners who are nearing release at both prisons. Criteria for selection should be clear and fair and courses should prepare prisoners for further education and training, as well as employment, on release. (4.40)

**Not achieved**

Prisoners' ongoing health needs should be assessed before release and referrals made to appropriate services. (4.42)

**Achieved**

The duration of domestic visits and the number of visitors per session should be increased. (4.55)

**Not achieved**

Visitors should be able to book visits, to avoid delays in entry or early termination of the session. (4.56)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 4.40)

Sex offender treatment programme provision should meet need, to avoid men waiting too long to join the programme or being released without completing it. (4.62)

**Not achieved**



## Appendix III: Prison population profile

Please note: the following figures were supplied by the establishment and any errors are the establishment's own.

Status	17–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Sentenced	5	127	46.43
Recall	-	1	10.50
Convicted unsentenced	-	3	22.48
Remand	3	50	20.59
Civil prisoners	-	-	
Detainees	-	-	
<b>Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>100</b>

Sentence	17–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Unsentenced	3	53	29.63
Less than six months	-	4	2.12
six months to less than 12 months	-	2	1.06
12 months to less than 2 years	2	6	4.23
2 years to less than 4 years	3	24	14.29
4 years to less than 10 years	-	45	23.81
10 years and over (not life)	-	30	15.87
ISPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)	-	-	0.00
Life	-	17	8.99
<b>Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>100</b>

Age	Number of prisoners	%
Please state minimum age here:	<b>17</b>	
Under 21 years	8	6.7
21 years to 29 years	58	29.9
30 years to 39 years	69	35.6
40 years to 49 years	34	17.5
50 years to 59 years	16	8.25
60 years to 69 years	03	1.55
70 plus years	01	0.5
Please state maximum age here:	<b>73</b>	
<b>Total</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Nationality	17–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Caymanian	8	145	80.95
Foreign nationals	-	36	19.05
<b>Total</b>		<b>37</b>	<b>100</b>

Security category	17–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Uncategorised unsentenced	5	48	28.04
Uncategorised sentenced			0.00
Category A		15	7.94
Category B		52	27.51
Category C	3	43	24.34
Category D		23	12.17
Other			
<b>Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>100</b>

<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>17–20-year-olds</b>	<b>21 and over</b>	<b>%</b>
White	-	2	1.06
British	-	1	0.53
Irish			
Gypsy/Irish Traveller			
Other white			
Mixed			
White and black Caribbean			
White and black African			
White and Asian			
Other mixed (ROMANIANS)		4	2.12
Asian or Asian British			
Indian			
Pakistani			
Bangladeshi			
Chinese			
Other Asian		1	0.53
Black or black British			
Caribbean	8	165	91.53
African			
Other black			
Other ethnic group (HISPANICS)		8	4.12
Arab			
Other ethnic group			
Not stated			
<b>Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>100</b>

**Sentenced prisoners only 132**

<b>Length of stay</b>	<b>17–20-year-olds</b>		<b>21 and over</b>	
	<b>Number</b>		<b>Number</b>	<b>%</b>
Less than 1 month	1		14	11.36
1 month to 3 months			21	15.91
3 months to six months			32	25.76
six months to 1 year	2		25	18.94
1 year to 2 years	2		33	26.52
2 years to 4 years			2	1.52
4 years or more				
<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>		<b>127</b>	<b>69.84</b>

**Sentenced prisoners only**

	<b>17–20-year-olds</b>	<b>21 and over</b>	<b>%</b>
Foreign nationals detained post sentence expiry	0	0	0
Public protection cases (this does not refer to public protection sentence categories but cases requiring monitoring/restrictions).	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

**Unsentenced prisoners only**

<b>Length of stay</b>	<b>17–20-year-olds</b>		<b>21 and over</b>	
	<b>Number</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>%</b>
Less than 1 month	1		23	12.70
1 month to 3 months	2		14	8.99
3 months to six months			10	5.29
six months to 1 year			5	2.65
1 year to 2 years			1	0.53
2 years to 4 years				
4 years or more				
<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>		<b>53</b>	<b>30.16</b>

<b>Main offence</b>	<b>17–20-year-olds</b>	<b>21 and over</b>	<b>%</b>
Violence against the person	2	43	23.3
Sexual offences		14	7.2
Burglary	3	28	14.4
Robbery		29	14.9
Theft and handling		11	5.7
Fraud and forgery		03	1.5
Drugs offences	1	25	12.9
Other offences	1	29	14.9
Civil offences			
Offence not recorded /holding warrant			
<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>182</b>	<b>94.8</b>



## Appendix IV: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews

### Prisoner survey methodology

A voluntary, confidential and anonymous survey of the prisoner population was carried out for this inspection. The results of this survey formed part of the evidence base for the inspection.

### Sampling

Questionnaires were offered to all prisoners.

### Distributing and collecting questionnaires

Every attempt was made to distribute the questionnaires to respondents individually. This gave researchers an opportunity to explain the purpose of the survey and to answer respondents' questions. We also stressed the voluntary nature of the survey and provided assurances about confidentiality and the independence of the Inspectorate. This information is also provided in writing on the front cover of the questionnaire.

Our questionnaire is available in a number of different languages and via a telephone translation service for respondents who do not read English. Respondents with literacy difficulties were offered the option of an interview.

Respondents were not asked to put their names on their questionnaire. In order to ensure confidentiality, respondents were asked to seal their completed questionnaire in the envelope provided and either hand it back to a member of the research team at a specified time or leave it in their room for collection.

Refusals were noted and no attempts were made to replace them.

### Survey response

At the time of the survey on 8 December 2014, the prisoner population at HMP Northward was 167. Using the method described above, questionnaires were distributed to all prisoners.

We received a total of 139 completed questionnaires at HMP Northward, a response rate of 83%. This included one questionnaire completed via interview. Seven respondents refused to complete a questionnaire, seven questionnaires were not returned and 14 were returned blank.

Wing/Unit	Number of completed survey returns
A	10
Basic	4
B	32
C	25
D	27
E	3
F	29
High-risk unit (HRU)	7
House	2

At HMP Fairbanks, the prisoner population at the time of the survey was 15; questionnaires were offered to all prisoners. We received a total of 14 completed questionnaires, a response rate of 93%. This included one questionnaire completed via interview. One prisoner refused to complete a questionnaire.

### **Presentation of survey results and analyses**

Over the following pages we present the survey results for HMP Northward and HMP Fairbanks.

First, a full breakdown of responses is provided for each question. In this full breakdown all percentages, including those for filtered questions, refer to the full sample. Percentages have been rounded and therefore may not add up to 100%.

We also present a number of comparative analyses. In all the comparative analyses that follow, statistically significant<sup>7</sup> differences are indicated by shading. Results that are significantly better are indicated by green shading, results that are significantly worse are indicated by blue shading. If the difference is not statistically significant there is no shading. Orange shading has been used to show a statistically significant difference in prisoners' background details.

Filtered questions are clearly indented and preceded by an explanation of how the filter has been applied. Percentages for filtered questions refer to the number of respondents filtered to that question. For all other questions, percentages refer to the entire sample. All missing responses have been excluded from analyses.

Percentages shown in the full breakdown may differ slightly from those shown in the comparative analyses. This is because the data has been weighted to enable valid statistical comparison between establishments.

Due to the small sample size at HMP Fairbanks, no additional analyses were conducted.

For HMP Northward, the following comparative analyses are presented:

- The current survey responses from HMP Northward in 2014 compared with the responses of prisoners surveyed at HMP Northward in 2012.
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between those who are Cayman nationals and those who are Jamaican nationals.
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between the responses of prisoners who consider themselves to have a disability and those who do not consider themselves to have a disability.
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between those who are aged 50 and over and those under 50.
- A best and worst wing comparison (excluding E wing, the HRU and the lifers house).

---

<sup>7</sup> A statistically significant difference between the two samples is one that is unlikely to have arisen by chance alone, and can therefore be assumed to represent a real difference between the two populations. Our significance level is set at 0.05 which means that there is only a 5% likelihood that the difference is due to chance.



## Survey summary – HMP Northward

### Section I: About You

<b>QI.1</b>	<b>What wing are you currently living on?</b> See section on shortened methodology	
<b>QI.2</b>	<b>How old are you?</b>	
	<i>Under 21</i>	8 (6%)
	<i>21 - 29</i>	42 (30%)
	<i>30 - 39</i>	47 (34%)
	<i>40 - 49</i>	25 (18%)
	<i>50 - 59</i>	11 (8%)
	<i>60 - 69</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>70 and over</i>	1 (1%)
<b>QI.3</b>	<b>Are you sentenced?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i>	104 (75%)
	<i>Yes - on recall</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>No - awaiting trial</i>	13 (9%)
	<i>No - awaiting sentence</i>	18 (13%)
	<i>No - awaiting deportation</i>	2 (1%)
<b>QI.4</b>	<b>How long is your sentence?</b>	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	33 (24%)
	<i>Less than 6 months</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>6 months to less than 1 year</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>1 year to less than 2 years</i>	9 (7%)
	<i>2 years to less than 4 years</i>	21 (15%)
	<i>4 years to less than 10 years</i>	34 (25%)
	<i>10 years or more</i>	20 (15%)
	<i>Court's pleasure</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Life</i>	14 (10%)
<b>QI.5</b>	<b>Do you understand spoken English?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i>	138 (99%)
	<i>No</i>	1 (1%)
<b>QI.6</b>	<b>Do you understand written English?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i>	135 (98%)
	<i>No</i>	3 (2%)

<b>Q1.7</b>	<b>What region are you from?</b>			
	Cayman			107 (80%)
	Jamaica			16 (12%)
	Other Caribbean			1 (1%)
	Africa			0 (0%)
	North America			1 (1%)
	Central America			3 (2%)
	South America			1 (1%)
	Indian subcontinent (India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Sri-Lanka)			0 (0%)
	China			0 (0%)
	Other Asia			2 (1%)
	Europe			2 (1%)
	Middle East			0 (0%)
	Other			1 (1%)
<b>Q1.8</b>	<b>What is your ethnic origin?</b>			
	White			12 (9%)
	Black			64 (47%)
	Asian			2 (1%)
	Mixed race			54 (40%)
	Other ethnic group			3 (2%)
<b>Q1.9</b>	<b>What is your religion?</b>			
	None	32 (25%)	Hindu	0 (0%)
	Church of England	12 (9%)	Jewish	2 (2%)
	Catholic	5 (4%)	Muslim	1 (1%)
	Protestant	2 (2%)	Sikh	0 (0%)
	Other Christian denomination	65 (50%)	Other	9 (7%)
	Buddhist	2 (2%)		
<b>Q1.10</b>	<b>How would you describe your sexual orientation?</b>			
	Heterosexual/ Straight			132 (99%)
	Homosexual/Gay			1 (1%)
	Bisexual			1 (1%)
<b>Q1.11</b>	<b>Do you consider yourself to have a disability? (i.e. do you need help with any long term physical, mental or learning needs).</b>			
	Yes			23 (17%)
	No			112 (83%)
<b>Q1.12</b>	<b>Is this your first time in prison?</b>			
	Yes			51 (37%)
	No			87 (63%)

## Section 2: Courts, transfers and escorts

<b>Q2.1</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?</b>		
	Yes		70 (53%)
	No		43 (32%)
	Don't remember		20 (15%)
<b>Q2.2</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?</b>		
	Yes		61 (46%)
	No		65 (49%)
	Don't remember		6 (5%)

<b>Q2.3</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?</b>	
	Very well	14 (10%)
	Well	54 (40%)
	Neither	17 (13%)
	Badly	26 (19%)
	Very badly	15 (11%)
	Don't remember	10 (7%)

<b>Q2.4</b>	<b>When you first arrived here did your personal belongings arrive at the same time as you?</b>	
	Yes	76 (55%)
	No	45 (33%)
	Don't remember	16 (12%)

### Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

<b>Q3.1</b>	<b>How long were you in reception?</b>	
	Less than 2 hours	74 (54%)
	2 hours or longer	32 (24%)
	Don't remember	30 (22%)

<b>Q3.2</b>	<b>When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?</b>	
	Yes	70 (51%)
	No	48 (35%)
	Don't remember	19 (14%)

<b>Q3.3</b>	<b>Overall, how were you treated in reception?</b>	
	Very well	14 (11%)
	Well	59 (44%)
	Neither	22 (17%)
	Badly	18 (14%)
	Very badly	8 (6%)
	Don't remember	12 (9%)

<b>Q3.4</b>	<b>Did you have any of the following problems when you first arrived here? (Please tick all that applies to you.)</b>			
	Loss of personal belongings	32 (24%)	Physical health	26 (19%)
	Housing problems	19 (14%)	Mental health	16 (12%)
	Contacting employers	15 (11%)	Needing protection from other prisoners	18 (13%)
	Contacting family	47 (35%)	Getting phone numbers	30 (22%)
	Childcare	20 (15%)	Other	5 (4%)
	Money worries	46 (34%)	Did not have any problems	26 (19%)
	Feeling depressed or suicidal	36 (27%)		

<b>Q3.5</b>	<b>Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems when you first arrived here?</b>	
	Yes	31 (24%)
	No	74 (56%)
	Did not have any problems	26 (20%)

<b>Q3.6</b>	<b>When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following? (Please tick all that applies to you.)</b>	
	<i>A shower</i>	80 (60%)
	<i>A free telephone call</i>	55 (41%)
	<i>Something to eat</i>	88 (66%)
	<i>A phone card</i>	11 (8%)
	<i>Toiletries/ basic items</i>	92 (69%)
	<i>Did not receive anything</i>	11 (8%)
<b>Q3.7</b>	<b>When you first arrived here, did you have access to the following people or services? (Please tick all that applies to you.)</b>	
	<i>Chaplain</i>	62 (47%)
	<i>Someone from health services</i>	31 (24%)
	<i>Social worker</i>	9 (7%)
	<i>Probation officer</i>	16 (12%)
	<i>Psychologist</i>	14 (11%)
	<i>Prison shop</i>	17 (13%)
	<i>Did not have access to any of these</i>	54 (41%)
<b>Q3.8</b>	<b>When you first arrived here, were you offered information on the following? (Please tick all that applies to you.)</b>	
	<i>What was going to happen to you</i>	32 (24%)
	<i>What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal</i>	12 (9%)
	<i>How to make routine requests (applications)</i>	39 (30%)
	<i>Your entitlement to visits</i>	53 (40%)
	<i>Health services</i>	28 (21%)
	<i>Chaplaincy/ pastoral care/ church services</i>	43 (33%)
	<i>Not offered any information</i>	50 (38%)
<b>Q3.9</b>	<b>Did you feel safe on your first night here?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i>	59 (44%)
	<i>No</i>	59 (44%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	16 (12%)
<b>Q3.10</b>	<b>How soon after you arrived here did you go on an induction/ orientation course?</b>	
	<i>Have not been on an induction/ orientation course</i>	48 (37%)
	<i>Within the first week</i>	13 (10%)
	<i>More than a week</i>	26 (20%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	43 (33%)
<b>Q3.11</b>	<b>Did the induction/orientation course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?</b>	
	<i>Have not been on an induction/ orientation course</i>	48 (37%)
	<i>Yes</i>	21 (16%)
	<i>No</i>	33 (26%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	27 (21%)
<b>Q3.12</b>	<b>How soon after you arrived here did you receive an education ('skills for life') assessment?</b>	
	<i>Did not receive an assessment</i>	64 (47%)
	<i>Within the first week</i>	7 (5%)
	<i>More than a week</i>	42 (31%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	23 (17%)

### Section 4: Legal rights and respectful custody

<b>Q4.1</b>	<b>How easy is it to...</b>	<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>	<i>N/A</i>
	<i>Communicate with your lawyer or legal representative?</i>	13 (10%)	39 (29%)	17 (13%)	39 (29%)	24 (18%)	3 (2%)
	<i>Attend legal visits?</i>	11 (10%)	43 (37%)	13 (11%)	19 (17%)	21 (18%)	8 (7%)
	<i>Get bail information?</i>	2 (2%)	14 (13%)	18 (17%)	21 (20%)	29 (27%)	23 (21%)
<b>Q4.2</b>	<b>Have staff here ever opened letters from your lawyer or your legal representative when you were not with them?</b>						
	<i>Not had any letters</i>						43 (33%)
	<i>Yes</i>						51 (39%)
	<i>No</i>						36 (28%)
<b>Q4.3</b>	<b>Can you get legal books in the library?</b>						
	<i>Yes</i>						79 (60%)
	<i>No</i>						22 (17%)
	<i>Don't know</i>						31 (23%)
<b>Q4.4</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions about the wing/ unit you are currently living on:</b>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>			
	<i>Do you normally have enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?</i>	78 (57%)	58 (42%)	1 (1%)			
	<i>Are you normally able to have a shower every day?</i>	130 (96%)	6 (4%)	0(0%)			
	<i>Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?</i>	83(63%)	47 (36%)	1 (1%)			
	<i>Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?</i>	104 (77%)	29 (21%)	2 (1%)			
	<i>Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?</i>	82 (62%)	49(37%)	1 (1%)			
	<i>If you need to, can you normally get your personal belongings?</i>	63 (48%)	56 (43%)	11(8%)			
<b>Q4.5</b>	<b>How would you rate the condition of your cell?</b>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Bad</i>			
	<i>Cleanliness</i>	71 (55%)	20 (15%)	39 (30%)			
	<i>Ventilation/air quality</i>	23 (19%)	17 (14%)	80 (67%)			
	<i>Temperature</i>	27 (22%)	17 (14%)	78 (64%)			
	<i>Lighting</i>	75 (63%)	9 (8%)	35 (29%)			
<b>Q4.6</b>	<b>What is the food like here?</b>						
	<i>Very good</i>						6 (4%)
	<i>Good</i>						18 (13%)
	<i>Neither</i>						30 (22%)
	<i>Bad</i>						32 (24%)
	<i>Very bad</i>						49 (36%)
<b>Q4.7</b>	<b>Does the shop sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?</b>						
	<i>Have not bought anything yet/ don't know</i>						10 (7%)
	<i>Yes</i>						41 (30%)
	<i>No</i>						84 (62%)
<b>Q4.8</b>	<b>Are your religious beliefs respected?</b>						
	<i>Yes</i>						74 (56%)
	<i>No</i>						31 (23%)
	<i>Don't know/ N/A</i>						27 (20%)

<b>Q4.9</b>	<b>Are you able to speak to a Chaplain (pastor) of your faith in private if you want to?</b>	
	Yes	107 (77%)
	No	20 (14%)
	Don't know/ N/A	12 (9%)
<b>Q4.10</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it for you to attend religious services?</b>	
	<i>I don't want to attend</i>	15 (11%)
	Very easy	51 (37%)
	Easy	42 (30%)
	Neither	4 (3%)
	Difficult	5 (4%)
	Very difficult	14 (10%)
	Don't know	8 (6%)

### Section 5: Applications and complaints

<b>Q5.1</b>	<b>Is it easy to make an application (for work, move your category, etc)?</b>	
	Yes	57 (41%)
	No	70 (51%)
	Don't know	11 (8%)
<b>Q5.2</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions about applications (If you have not made an application please tick the 'not made one' option).</b>	
		Not made one      Yes      No
	Are applications dealt with fairly?	9 (7%)      59 (46%)      61 (47%)
	Are applications dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	9 (8%)      58 (48%)      53 (44%)
<b>Q5.3</b>	<b>Is it easy to make a complaint?</b>	
	Yes	74 (55%)
	No	46 (34%)
	Don't know	14 (10%)
<b>Q5.4</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions about complaints (If you have not made a complaint please tick the 'not made one' option).</b>	
		Not made one      Yes      No
	Are complaints dealt with fairly?	42 (34%)      23 (18%)      60 (48%)
	Are complaints dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	42 (36%)      19 (16%)      55 (47%)
<b>Q5.5</b>	<b>Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?</b>	
	Yes	48 (39%)
	No	75 (61%)
<b>Q5.6</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it for you to see the Prison Inspection Board (PIB)?</b>	
	<i>Don't know who they are</i>	55 (42%)
	Very easy	3 (2%)
	Easy	8 (6%)
	Neither	12 (9%)
	Difficult	27 (20%)
	Very difficult	27 (20%)
<b>Q5.7</b>	<b>In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&amp;R)?</b>	
	Yes	15 (11%)
	No	119 (89%)

<b>Q5.8</b>	<b>If you have spent a night in basic unit in the last six months, how were you treated by staff?</b>	
	<i>I have not been to basic unit in the last 6 months</i>	101 (75%)
	<i>Very well</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>Well</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>Neither</i>	7 (5%)
	<i>Badly</i>	5 (4%)
	<i>Very badly</i>	13 (10%)

### Section 6: Relationships with staff

<b>Q6.1</b>	<b>Do most staff treat you with respect?</b>	
	Yes	85 (63%)
	No	51 (38%)
<b>Q6.2</b>	<b>Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?</b>	
	Yes	94 (71%)
	No	38 (29%)
<b>Q6.3</b>	<b>Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?</b>	
	Yes	44 (33%)
	No	88 (67%)
<b>Q6.4</b>	<b>When did you first meet your officer advisor?</b>	
	<i>I have not met him/her</i>	44 (33%)
	<i>In the first week</i>	17 (13%)
	<i>More than a week</i>	34 (26%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	38 (29%)
<b>Q6.5</b>	<b>How helpful is your officer advisor?</b>	
	<i>Do not have a officer advisor/ I have not met him/ her</i>	44 (33%)
	<i>Very helpful</i>	18 (14%)
	<i>Helpful</i>	23 (17%)
	<i>Neither</i>	8 (6%)
	<i>Not very helpful</i>	19 (14%)
	<i>Not at all helpful</i>	21 (16%)

### Section 7: Safety

<b>Q7.1</b>	<b>Have you ever felt unsafe here?</b>	
	Yes	87 (64%)
	No	48 (36%)
<b>Q7.2</b>	<b>Do you feel unsafe now?</b>	
	Yes	49 (37%)
	No	85 (63%)

<b>Q7.3</b>	<b>In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that applies to you.)</b>		
	Never felt unsafe	48 (40%)	In the classrooms
	Everywhere	34 (28%)	At meal times
	Basic unit	14 (12%)	Nurses office
	TV room	8 (7%)	Visits area
	Reception area	8 (7%)	In wing showers
	At the gym	12 (10%)	In corridors/stairwells
	In an exercise yard	21 (18%)	On your wing
	At work	11 (9%)	In your cell
	During movement	19 (16%)	At religious services
			11 (9%)
			9 (8%)
			11 (9%)
			9 (8%)
			21 (18%)
			11 (9%)
			23 (19%)
			12 (10%)
			7 (6%)
<b>Q7.4</b>	<b>Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?</b>		
	Yes		64 (48%)
	No		70 (52%)
<b>Q7.5</b>	<b>If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that applies to you.)</b>		
	Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)		44 (33%)
	Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)		25 (19%)
	Sexual abuse		3 (2%)
	Feeling threatened or intimidated		35 (26%)
	Having your personal belongings taken		23 (17%)
	Medication		6 (4%)
	Debt		7 (5%)
	Drugs		10 (7%)
	Your race or ethnic origin		9 (7%)
	Your religion/religious beliefs		6 (4%)
	Your nationality		17 (13%)
	You are from a different part of the Island/ District than others		9 (7%)
	Your sexual orientation		2 (1%)
	Your age		8 (6%)
	You have a disability		4 (3%)
	You were new here		17 (13%)
	Your offence/ crime		18 (13%)
	Gang related issues		10 (7%)
<b>Q7.6</b>	<b>Have you been victimised by staff here?</b>		
	Yes		69 (52%)
	No		63 (48%)



<b>Q7.7</b>	<b>If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that applies to you.)</b>	
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i>	40 (30%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	24 (18%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	33 (25%)
	<i>Medication</i>	11 (8%)
	<i>Debt</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>Drugs</i>	9 (7%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	6 (5%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	5 (4%)
	<i>Your nationality</i>	21 (16%)
	<i>You are from a different part of the Island/ District than others</i>	6 (5%)
	<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Your age</i>	8 (6%)
	<i>You have a disability</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>You were new here</i>	14 (11%)
	<i>Your offence/ crime</i>	28 (21%)
	<i>Gang related issues</i>	8 (6%)

<b>Q7.8</b>	<b>If you have been victimised by prisoners or staff, did you report it?</b>	
	<i>Not been victimised</i>	48 (41%)
	<i>Yes</i>	37 (32%)
	<i>No</i>	31 (27%)

### Section 8: Health services

<b>Q8.1</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it to see the following people?</b>						
		<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
	The doctor	7 (5%)	10 (8%)	37 (28%)	18 (14%)	46 (35%)	14 (11%)
	The nurse	1 (1%)	18 (14%)	63 (50%)	12 (10%)	23 (18%)	9 (7%)
	The dentist	11 (9%)	9 (7%)	39 (32%)	18 (15%)	34 (28%)	11 (9%)

<b>Q8.2</b>	<b>What do you think of the quality of the health service from the following people?</b>						
		<i>Not been</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Bad</i>	<i>Very bad</i>
	The doctor	9 (7%)	13 (10%)	40 (31%)	23 (18%)	23 (18%)	19 (15%)
	The nurse	2 (2%)	11 (9%)	40 (32%)	17 (14%)	34 (27%)	20 (16%)
	The dentist	19 (16%)	10 (8%)	33 (28%)	22 (18%)	16 (13%)	20 (17%)

<b>Q8.3</b>	<b>What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?</b>	
	<i>Not been</i>	2 (2%)
	<i>Very good</i>	9 (7%)
	<i>Good</i>	44 (34%)
	<i>Neither</i>	22 (17%)
	<i>Bad</i>	24 (19%)
	<i>Very bad</i>	27 (21%)

<b>Q8.4</b>	<b>Are you currently taking medication?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i>	41 (31%)
	<i>No</i>	92 (69%)

<b>Q8.5</b>	<b>If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/ all of it in your own cell?</b>	
	<i>Not taking medication</i>	92 (68%)
	<i>Yes, all my meds</i>	29 (21%)
	<i>Yes, some of my meds</i>	11 (8%)
	<i>No</i>	3 (2%)

<b>Q8.6</b>	<b>Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?</b>	
	Yes	33 (25%)
	No	98 (75%)
<b>Q8.7</b>	<b>Are you being helped/ supported by anyone in this prison? (e.g. a psychologist, psychiatrist, nurse, mental health worker, counsellor or any other member of staff).</b>	
	<i>Do not have any emotional or mental health problems</i>	98 (77%)
	Yes	15 (12%)
	No	15 (12%)

### Section 9: Drugs and alcohol

<b>Q9.1</b>	<b>Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?</b>	
	Yes	43 (32%)
	No	91 (68%)
<b>Q9.2</b>	<b>Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?</b>	
	Yes	29 (22%)
	No	100 (78%)
<b>Q9.3</b>	<b>Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?</b>	
	Very easy	34 (26%)
	Easy	12 (9%)
	Neither	7 (5%)
	Difficult	14 (11%)
	Very difficult	22 (17%)
	Don't know	41 (32%)
<b>Q9.4</b>	<b>Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison?</b>	
	Very easy	20 (15%)
	Easy	17 (13%)
	Neither	10 (8%)
	Difficult	14 (11%)
	Very difficult	27 (21%)
	Don't know	42 (32%)
<b>Q9.5</b>	<b>Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?</b>	
	Yes	15 (11%)
	No	116 (89%)
<b>Q9.6</b>	<b>Have you received any support or help (for example the Counselling Centre) for your drug problem, while in this prison?</b>	
	<i>Did not / do not have a drug problem</i>	84 (65%)
	Yes	20 (16%)
	No	25 (19%)
<b>Q9.7</b>	<b>Have you received any support or help (for example the Counselling Centre) for your alcohol problem, whilst in this prison?</b>	
	<i>Did not / do not have an alcohol problem</i>	100 (79%)
	Yes	10 (8%)
	No	17 (13%)
<b>Q9.8</b>	<b>Was the support or help you received, whilst in this prison, helpful?</b>	
	<i>Did not have a problem/ did not receive help</i>	103 (83%)
	Yes	12 (10%)
	No	9 (7%)

## Section 10: Activities

**Q10.1 How easy or difficult is it to get into the following activities, in this prison?**

	<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very Easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
Prison job	4(3%)	15(12%)	34(27%)	7(6%)	41(33%)	25 (20%)
Vocational or skills training	6 (5%)	7 (6%)	23(19%)	14(12%)	34(28%)	36 (30%)
Education (including basic skills)	5 (4%)	9(8%)	46(39%)	13(11%)	17(14%)	29 (24%)
Offending behaviour programmes (e.g. Constructs, Anger Management courses etc)	13 (11%)	8(7%)	28(24%)	18(15%)	26(22%)	26 (22%)

**Q10.2 Are you currently involved in the following? (Please tick all that applies to you.)**

<i>Not involved in any of these</i>	26 (20%)
Prison job	87 (67%)
Vocational or skills training	28 (22%)
Education (including basic skills)	44 (34%)
Offending behaviour programmes (e.g. Constructs, Anger Management courses, etc.)	27 (21%)

**Q10.3 If you have been involved in any of the following, while in this prison, do you think they will help you on release?**

	<i>Not been involved</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
Prison job	10 (8%)	62 (52%)	32 (27%)	15 (13%)
Vocational or skills training	18 (19%)	42 (45%)	23 (24%)	11 (12%)
Education (including basic skills)	15 (16%)	51 (55%)	20 (22%)	7 (8%)
Offending behaviour programmes (e.g. Constructs, Anger Management courses, etc.)	19 (21%)	36 (40%)	23 (25%)	13 (14%)

**Q10.4 Is it easy to go to the library?**

<i>Don't know/ never tried</i>	26 (20%)
Yes	40 (30%)
No	66 (50%)

**Q10.5 Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?**

<i>Don't use it</i>	37 (29%)
Yes	47 (36%)
No	45 (35%)

**Q10.6 How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?**

<i>Don't want to go</i>	27 (21%)
0	24 (19%)
1 to 2	24 (19%)
3 to 5	50 (39%)
More than 5	4 (3%)

**Q10.7 How many times do you usually go outside the wing for exercise each week?**

<i>Don't want to go</i>	14 (11%)
0	30 (23%)
1 to 2	20 (15%)
3 to 5	34 (26%)
More than 5	33 (25%)

<b>Q10.8</b>	<b>How many hours do you usually spend unlocked on a weekday? (Please include hours at education, at work etc)</b>	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	13 (10%)
	<i>2 to less than 4 hours</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>4 to less than 6 hours</i>	8 (6%)
	<i>6 to less than 8 hours</i>	10 (8%)
	<i>8 to less than 10 hours</i>	11 (9%)
	<i>10 hours or more</i>	68 (53%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	15 (12%)

### Section 11: Contact with family and friends

<b>Q11.1</b>	<b>Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with your family/friends while in this prison?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i>	51 (39%)
	<i>No</i>	79 (61%)
<b>Q11.2</b>	<b>Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i>	40 (34%)
	<i>No</i>	78 (66%)
<b>Q11.3</b>	<b>Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i>	35 (27%)
	<i>No</i>	94 (73%)
<b>Q11.4</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?</b>	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	14 (10%)
	<i>Very easy</i>	13 (10%)
	<i>Easy</i>	39 (29%)
	<i>Neither</i>	12 (9%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	29 (22%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	23 (17%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	4 (3%)

### Section 12: Preparation for release

<b>Q12.1</b>	<b>Do you have a sentence plan?</b>	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	33 (25%)
	<i>Yes</i>	41 (31%)
	<i>No</i>	58 (44%)
<b>Q12.2</b>	<b>How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?</b>	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>	91 (71%)
	<i>Very involved</i>	21 (16%)
	<i>Involved</i>	11 (9%)
	<i>Neither</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>Not very involved</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Not at all involved</i>	2 (2%)

<b>Q12.3</b>	<b>Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets? (please tick all that applies to you.)</b>			
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>			91 (71%)
	<i>Nobody</i>			15 (12%)
	<i>Named probation officer</i>			7 (5%)
	<i>Social worker</i>			1 (1%)
	<i>Psychologist</i>			7 (5%)
	<i>Officer advisor</i>			7 (5%)
	<i>Staff from other departments</i>			13 (10%)
<b>Q12.4</b>	<b>Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?</b>			
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>			91 (69%)
	<i>Yes</i>			21 (16%)
	<i>No</i>			9 (7%)
	<i>Don't know</i>			10 (8%)
<b>Q12.5</b>	<b>Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in the community?</b>			
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>			91 (67%)
	<i>Yes</i>			28 (21%)
	<i>No</i>			7 (5%)
	<i>Don't know</i>			9 (7%)
<b>Q12.6</b>	<b>Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?</b>			
	<i>Yes</i>			36 (29%)
	<i>No</i>			90 (71%)
<b>Q12.7</b>	<b>Do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you with the following on release? (please tick all that applies to you.)</b>			
		<i>Do not need help</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
	Employment	19 (16%)	18 (15%)	81 (69%)
	Accommodation	20 (19%)	6 (6%)	77 (75%)
	Finances	17 (16%)	7 (7%)	81 (77%)
	Education	18 (16%)	23 (21%)	69 (63%)
	Drugs and alcohol	26 (25%)	15 (14%)	65 (61%)
<b>Q12.8</b>	<b>Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here, that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?</b>			
	<i>Not sentenced</i>			33 (25%)
	<i>Yes</i>			63 (48%)
	<i>No</i>			34 (26%)



## Survey summary – HMP Fairbanks

### Section I: About You

<b>Q1.1</b>	<b>What wing are you currently living on?</b> See section on shortened methodology	
<b>Q1.2</b>	<b>How old are you?</b>	
	<i>Under 21</i>	2 (14%)
	<i>21 - 29</i>	5 (36%)
	<i>30 - 39</i>	5 (36%)
	<i>40 - 49</i>	2 (14%)
	<i>50 - 59</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>60 - 69</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>70 and over</i>	0 (0%)
<b>Q1.3</b>	<b>Are you sentenced?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i>	10 (77%)
	<i>Yes - on recall</i>	1 (8%)
	<i>No - awaiting trial</i>	1 (8%)
	<i>No - awaiting sentence</i>	1 (8%)
	<i>No - awaiting deportation</i>	0 (0%)
<b>Q1.4</b>	<b>How long is your sentence?</b>	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	2 (17%)
	<i>Less than 6 months</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>6 months to less than 1 year</i>	1 (8%)
	<i>1 year to less than 2 years</i>	2 (17%)
	<i>2 years to less than 4 years</i>	2 (17%)
	<i>4 years to less than 10 years</i>	4 (33%)
	<i>10 years or more</i>	1 (8%)
	<i>Court's pleasure</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Life</i>	0 (0%)
<b>Q1.5</b>	<b>Do you understand spoken English?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i>	14 (100%)
	<i>No</i>	0 (0%)
<b>Q1.6</b>	<b>Do you understand written English?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i>	14 (100%)
	<i>No</i>	0 (0%)

<b>Q1.7</b>	<b>What region are you from?</b>			
	Cayman		9 (69%)	
	Jamaica		0 (0%)	
	Other Caribbean		0 (0%)	
	Africa		0 (0%)	
	North America		0 (0%)	
	Central America		2 (15%)	
	South America		2 (15%)	
	Indian subcontinent (India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Sri-Lanka)		0 (0%)	
	China		0 (0%)	
	Other Asia		0 (0%)	
	Europe		0 (0%)	
	Middle East		0 (0%)	
	Other		0 (0%)	
<b>Q1.8</b>	<b>What is your ethnic origin?</b>			
	White		1 (8%)	
	Black		7 (54%)	
	Asian		0 (0%)	
	Mixed race		4 (31%)	
	Other ethnic group		1 (8%)	
<b>Q1.9</b>	<b>What is your religion?</b>			
	None	4 (29%)	Hindu	0 (0%)
	Church of England	0 (0%)	Jewish	0 (0%)
	Catholic	0 (0%)	Muslim	0 (0%)
	Protestant	0 (0%)	Sikh	0 (0%)
	Other Christian denomination	8 (57%)	Other	2 (14%)
	Buddhist	0 (0%)		
<b>Q1.10</b>	<b>How would you describe your sexual orientation?</b>			
	<i>Heterosexual/ Straight</i>		14 (100%)	
	<i>Homosexual/Gay</i>		0 (0%)	
	<i>Bisexual</i>		0 (0%)	
<b>Q1.11</b>	<b>Do you consider yourself to have a disability? (i.e. do you need help with any long term physical, mental or learning needs.)</b>			
	Yes		2 (14%)	
	No		12 (86%)	
<b>Q1.12</b>	<b>Is this your first time in prison?</b>			
	Yes		8 (57%)	
	No		6 (43%)	

## Section 2: Courts, transfers and escorts

<b>Q2.1</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?</b>	
	Yes	9 (64%)
	No	1 (7%)
	Don't remember	4 (29%)
<b>Q2.2</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?</b>	
	Yes	9 (64%)
	No	5 (36%)
	Don't remember	0 (0%)



<b>Q2.3</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?</b>	
	Very well	5 (36%)
	Well	8 (57%)
	Neither	1 (7%)
	Badly	0 (0%)
	Very badly	0 (0%)
	Don't remember	0 (0%)

<b>Q2.4</b>	<b>When you first arrived here did your personal belongings arrive at the same time as you?</b>	
	Yes	9 (64%)
	No	5 (36%)
	Don't remember	0 (0%)

### Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

<b>Q3.1</b>	<b>How long were you in reception?</b>	
	Less than 2 hours	9 (64%)
	2 hours or longer	2 (14%)
	Don't remember	3 (21%)

<b>Q3.2</b>	<b>When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?</b>	
	Yes	10 (71%)
	No	2 (14%)
	Don't remember	2 (14%)

<b>Q3.3</b>	<b>Overall, how were you treated in reception?</b>	
	Very well	5 (36%)
	Well	8 (57%)
	Neither	1 (7%)
	Badly	0 (0%)
	Very badly	0 (0%)
	Don't remember	0 (0%)

<b>Q3.4</b>	<b>Did you have any of the following problems when you first arrived here? (Please tick all that applies to you.)</b>			
	Loss of personal belongings	0 (0%)	Physical health	1 (7%)
	Housing problems	1 (7%)	Mental health	2 (14%)
	Contacting employers	0 (0%)	Needing protection from other prisoners	1 (7%)
	Contacting family	2 (14%)	Getting phone numbers	1 (7%)
	Childcare	2 (14%)	Other	0 (0%)
	Money worries	2 (14%)	Did not have any problems	5 (36%)
	Feeling depressed or suicidal	5 (36%)		

<b>Q3.5</b>	<b>Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems when you first arrived here?</b>	
	Yes	7 (54%)
	No	1 (8%)
	Did not have any problems	5 (38%)

<b>Q3.6</b>	<b>When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following? (Please tick all that applies to you.)</b>	
	<i>A shower</i>	10 (71%)
	<i>A free telephone call</i>	10 (71%)
	<i>Something to eat</i>	10 (71%)
	<i>A phone card</i>	2 (14%)
	<i>Toiletries/ basic items</i>	11 (79%)
	<i>Did not receive anything</i>	1 (7%)
<b>Q3.7</b>	<b>When you first arrived here, did you have access to the following people or services? (Please tick all that applies to you.)</b>	
	<i>Chaplain</i>	5 (36%)
	<i>Someone from health services</i>	8 (57%)
	<i>Social worker</i>	3 (21%)
	<i>Probation officer</i>	3 (21%)
	<i>Psychologist</i>	3 (21%)
	<i>Prison shop</i>	3 (21%)
	<i>Did not have access to any of these</i>	5 (36%)
<b>Q3.8</b>	<b>When you first arrived here, were you offered information on the following? (Please tick all that applies to you.)</b>	
	<i>What was going to happen to you</i>	4 (29%)
	<i>What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal</i>	3 (21%)
	<i>How to make routine requests (applications)</i>	6 (43%)
	<i>Your entitlement to visits</i>	10 (71%)
	<i>Health services</i>	7 (50%)
	<i>Chaplaincy/ pastoral care/ church services</i>	7 (50%)
	<i>Not offered any information</i>	2 (14%)
<b>Q3.9</b>	<b>Did you feel safe on your first night here?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i>	9 (64%)
	<i>No</i>	5 (36%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	0 (0%)
<b>Q3.10</b>	<b>How soon after you arrived here did you go on an induction/ orientation course?</b>	
	<i>Have not been on an induction/ orientation course</i>	7 (50%)
	<i>Within the first week</i>	3 (21%)
	<i>More than a week</i>	1 (7%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	3 (21%)
<b>Q3.11</b>	<b>Did the induction/orientation course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?</b>	
	<i>Have not been on an induction/ orientation course</i>	7 (50%)
	<i>Yes</i>	2 (14%)
	<i>No</i>	2 (14%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	3 (21%)
<b>Q3.12</b>	<b>How soon after you arrived here did you receive an education ('skills for life') assessment?</b>	
	<i>Did not receive an assessment</i>	4 (29%)
	<i>Within the first week</i>	1 (7%)
	<i>More than a week</i>	7 (50%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	2 (14%)

## Section 4: Legal rights and respectful custody

<b>Q4.1</b>	<b>How easy is it to...</b>					
		Very easy	Easy	Neither	Difficult	Very difficult N/A
	Communicate with your lawyer or legal representative?	5 (38%)	3 (23%)	2 (15%)	0 (0%)	2 (15%) 1 (8%)
	Attend legal visits?	3 (23%)	3 (23%)	4 (31%)	1 (8%)	0 (0%) 2 (15%)
	Get bail information?	2 (15%)	2 (15%)	2 (15%)	3 (23%)	1 (8%) 3 (23%)
<b>Q4.2</b>	<b>Have staff here ever opened letters from your lawyer or your legal representative when you were not with them?</b>					
	Not had any letters					9 (69%)
	Yes					1 (8%)
	No					3 (23%)
<b>Q4.3</b>	<b>Can you get legal books in the library?</b>					
	Yes					7 (50%)
	No					1 (7%)
	Don't know					6 (43%)
<b>Q4.4</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions about the wing/ unit you are currently living on:</b>					
		Yes	No	Don't know		
	Do you normally have enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	12 (86%)	2 (14%)	0 (0%)		
	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	13 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)		
	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	9 (64%)	4 (29%)	1 (7%)		
	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	12 (86%)	2 (14%)	0 (0%)		
	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	10 (77%)	3 (23%)	0 (0%)		
	If you need to, can you normally get your personal belongings?	14 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)		
<b>Q4.5</b>	<b>How would you rate the condition of your cell?</b>					
		Good	Neither	Bad		
	Cleanliness	8 (62%)	2 (15%)	3 (23%)		
	Ventilation/air quality	8 (57%)	1 (7%)	5 (36%)		
	Temperature	7 (54%)	3 (23%)	3 (23%)		
	Lighting	11 (85%)	1 (8%)	1 (8%)		
<b>Q4.6</b>	<b>What is the food like here?</b>					
	Very good					1 (7%)
	Good					3 (21%)
	Neither					2 (14%)
	Bad					3 (21%)
	Very bad					5 (36%)
<b>Q4.7</b>	<b>Does the shop sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?</b>					
	Have not bought anything yet/ don't know					1 (7%)
	Yes					5 (36%)
	No					8 (57%)
<b>Q4.8</b>	<b>Are your religious beliefs respected?</b>					
	Yes					12 (86%)
	No					0 (0%)
	Don't know/ N/A					2 (14%)

<b>Q4.9</b>	<b>Are you able to speak to a Chaplain (pastor) of your faith in private if you want to?</b>	
	Yes	11 (79%)
	No	2 (14%)
	Don't know/ N/A	1 (7%)
<b>Q4.10</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it for you to attend religious services?</b>	
	<i>I don't want to attend</i>	2 (14%)
	Very easy	11 (79%)
	Easy	1 (7%)
	Neither	0 (0%)
	Difficult	0 (0%)
	Very difficult	0 (0%)
	Don't know	0 (0%)

### Section 5: Applications and complaints

<b>Q5.1</b>	<b>Is it easy to make an application (for work, move your category, etc)?</b>	
	Yes	4 (29%)
	No	4 (29%)
	Don't know	6 (43%)
<b>Q5.2</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions about applications (If you have not made an application please tick the 'not made one' option).</b>	
		Not made one    Yes    No
	Are applications dealt with fairly?	5 (36%)    5 (36%)    4 (29%)
	Are applications dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	5 (36%)    5 (36%)    4 (29%)
<b>Q5.3</b>	<b>Is it easy to make a complaint?</b>	
	Yes	8 (57%)
	No	3 (21%)
	Don't know	3 (21%)
<b>Q5.4</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions about complaints (If you have not made a complaint please tick the 'not made one' option).</b>	
		Not made one    Yes    No
	Are complaints dealt with fairly?	9 (64%)    2 (14%)    3 (21%)
	Are complaints dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	9 (69%)    2 (15%)    2 (15%)
<b>Q5.5</b>	<b>Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?</b>	
	Yes	2 (15%)
	No	11 (85%)
<b>Q5.6</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it for you to see the Prison Inspection Board (PIB)?</b>	
	<i>Don't know who they are</i>	5 (36%)
	Very easy	2 (14%)
	Easy	0 (0%)
	Neither	4 (29%)
	Difficult	3 (21%)
	Very difficult	0 (0%)
<b>Q5.7</b>	<b>In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&amp;R)?</b>	
	Yes	0 (0%)
	No	14 (100%)

<b>Q5.8</b>	<b>If you have spent a night in basic unit in the last six months, how were you treated by staff?</b>	
	<i>I have not been to basic unit in the last 6 months</i>	11 (79%)
	<i>Very well</i>	1 (7%)
	<i>Well</i>	2 (14%)
	<i>Neither</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Badly</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Very badly</i>	0 (0%)

### Section 6: Relationships with staff

<b>Q6.1</b>	<b>Do most staff treat you with respect?</b>	
	Yes	12 (86%)
	No	2 (14%)
<b>Q6.2</b>	<b>Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?</b>	
	Yes	14 (100%)
	No	0 (0%)
<b>Q6.3</b>	<b>Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?</b>	
	Yes	9 (64%)
	No	5 (36%)
<b>Q6.4</b>	<b>When did you first meet your officer advisor?</b>	
	<i>I have not met him/her</i>	2 (14%)
	<i>In the first week</i>	6 (43%)
	<i>More than a week</i>	5 (36%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	1 (7%)
<b>Q6.5</b>	<b>How helpful is your officer advisor?</b>	
	<i>Do not have a officer advisor/ I have not met him/ her</i>	2 (14%)
	<i>Very helpful</i>	5 (36%)
	<i>Helpful</i>	3 (21%)
	<i>Neither</i>	2 (14%)
	<i>Not very helpful</i>	1 (7%)
	<i>Not at all helpful</i>	1 (7%)

### Section 7: Safety

<b>Q7.1</b>	<b>Have you ever felt unsafe here?</b>	
	Yes	7 (50%)
	No	7 (50%)
<b>Q7.2</b>	<b>Do you feel unsafe now?</b>	
	Yes	3 (21%)
	No	11 (79%)

<b>Q7.3</b>	<b>In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that applies to you.)</b>		
	Never felt unsafe	7 (54%)	In the classrooms
	Everywhere	1 (8%)	At meal times
	Basic unit	1 (8%)	Nurses office
	TV room	1 (8%)	Visits area
	Reception area	0 (0%)	In wing showers
	At the gym	0 (0%)	In corridors/stairwells
	In an exercise yard	0 (0%)	On your wing
	At work	1 (8%)	In your cell
	During movement	2 (15%)	At religious services
			0 (0%)
			2 (15%)
			0 (0%)
			0 (0%)
			0 (0%)
			1 (8%)
			0 (0%)
<b>Q7.4</b>	<b>Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?</b>		
	Yes		6 (43%)
	No		8 (57%)
<b>Q7.5</b>	<b>If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that applies to you.)</b>		
	Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)		6 (43%)
	Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)		1 (7%)
	Sexual abuse		0 (0%)
	Feeling threatened or intimidated		4 (29%)
	Having your personal belongings taken		1 (7%)
	Medication		0 (0%)
	Debt		0 (0%)
	Drugs		1 (7%)
	Your race or ethnic origin		0 (0%)
	Your religion/religious beliefs		0 (0%)
	Your nationality		3 (21%)
	You are from a different part of the Island/ District than others		2 (14%)
	Your sexual orientation		0 (0%)
	Your age		2 (14%)
	You have a disability		0 (0%)
	You were new here		2 (14%)
	Your offence/ crime		4 (29%)
	Gang related issues		0 (0%)
<b>Q7.6</b>	<b>Have you been victimised by staff here?</b>		
	Yes		6 (43%)
	No		8 (57%)

**Q7.7 If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that applies to you.)**

<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i>	4 (29%)
<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Sexual abuse</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Medication</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Debt</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Drugs</i>	1 (7%)
<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Your nationality</i>	2 (14%)
<i>You are from a different part of the Island/ District than others</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Your age</i>	0 (0%)
<i>You have a disability</i>	0 (0%)
<i>You were new here</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Your offence/ crime</i>	4 (29%)
<i>Gang related issues</i>	0 (0%)

**Q7.8 If you have been victimised by prisoners or staff, did you report it?**

<i>Not been victimised</i>	5 (38%)
<i>Yes</i>	8 (62%)
<i>No</i>	0 (0%)

### Section 8: Health services

**Q8.1 How easy or difficult is it to see the following people?**

	<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
The doctor	2 (14%)	5 (36%)	5 (36%)	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	0 (0%)
The nurse	2 (14%)	7 (50%)	4 (29%)	1 (7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
The dentist	3 (21%)	2 (14%)	7 (50%)	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	0 (0%)

**Q8.2 What do you think of the quality of the health service from the following people?**

	<i>Not been</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Bad</i>	<i>Very bad</i>
The doctor	0 (0%)	3 (21%)	8 (57%)	2 (14%)	1 (7%)	0 (0%)
The nurse	1 (7%)	4 (29%)	7 (50%)	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	0 (0%)
The dentist	5 (36%)	2 (14%)	4 (29%)	1 (7%)	2 (14%)	0 (0%)

**Q8.3 What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?**

<i>Not been</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Very good</i>	3 (23%)
<i>Good</i>	8 (62%)
<i>Neither</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Bad</i>	2 (15%)
<i>Very bad</i>	0 (0%)

**Q8.4 Are you currently taking medication?**

<i>Yes</i>	9 (64%)
<i>No</i>	5 (36%)

**Q8.5 If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/ all of it in your own cell?**

<i>Not taking medication</i>	5 (36%)
<i>Yes, all my meds</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Yes, some of my meds</i>	3 (21%)
<i>No</i>	6 (43%)

<b>Q8.6</b>	<b>Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?</b>	
	Yes	8 (57%)
	No	6 (43%)
<b>Q8.7</b>	<b>Are you being helped/ supported by anyone in this prison? (e.g. a psychologist, psychiatrist, nurse, mental health worker, counsellor or any other member of staff)</b>	
	<i>Do not have any emotional or mental health problems</i>	6 (43%)
	Yes	6 (43%)
	No	2 (14%)

### Section 9: Drugs and alcohol

<b>Q9.1</b>	<b>Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?</b>	
	Yes	4 (29%)
	No	10 (71%)
<b>Q9.2</b>	<b>Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?</b>	
	Yes	3 (21%)
	No	11 (79%)
<b>Q9.3</b>	<b>Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?</b>	
	Very easy	0 (0%)
	Easy	0 (0%)
	Neither	2 (14%)
	Difficult	1 (7%)
	Very difficult	3 (21%)
	Don't know	8 (57%)
<b>Q9.4</b>	<b>Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison?</b>	
	Very easy	0 (0%)
	Easy	1 (7%)
	Neither	2 (14%)
	Difficult	0 (0%)
	Very difficult	3 (21%)
	Don't know	8 (57%)
<b>Q9.5</b>	<b>Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?</b>	
	Yes	0 (0%)
	No	14 (100%)
<b>Q9.6</b>	<b>Have you received any support or help (for example the Counselling Centre) for your drug problem, while in this prison?</b>	
	<i>Did not / do not have a drug problem</i>	10 (77%)
	Yes	1 (8%)
	No	2 (15%)
<b>Q9.7</b>	<b>Have you received any support or help (for example the Counselling Centre) for your alcohol problem, whilst in this prison?</b>	
	<i>Did not / do not have an alcohol problem</i>	11 (79%)
	Yes	1 (7%)
	No	2 (14%)
<b>Q9.8</b>	<b>Was the support or help you received, whilst in this prison, helpful?</b>	
	<i>Did not have a problem/ did not receive help</i>	12 (92%)
	Yes	1 (8%)
	No	0 (0%)



## Section 10: Activities

<b>Q10.1</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it to get into the following activities, in this prison?</b>						
		<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very Easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
	Prison job	2 (14%)	5 (36%)	5(36%)	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	0 (0%)
	Vocational or skills training	3 (21%)	4 (29%)	4 29%)	0 (0%)	2 (14%)	1 (7%)
	Education (including basic skills)	3 (21%)	4 (29%)	3(21%)	0 (0%)	4 (29%)	0 (0%)
	Offending behaviour programmes (e.g. Constructs, Anger Management courses etc)	6 (43%)	4 (29%)	1 (7%)	2(14%)	1 (7%)	0 (0%)
<b>Q10.2</b>	<b>Are you currently involved in the following? (Please tick all that applies to you.)</b>						
	<i>Not involved in any of these</i>						3 (21%)
	Prison job						10 (71%)
	Vocational or skills training						6 (43%)
	Education (including basic skills)						9 (64%)
	Offending behaviour programmes (e.g. Constructs, Anger Management courses, etc.)						3 (21%)
<b>Q10.3</b>	<b>If you have been involved in any of the following, while in this prison, do you think they will help you on release?</b>						
		<i>Not been involved</i>	<i>Yes</i>		<i>No</i>		<i>Don't know</i>
	Prison job	3 (23%)	5 (38%)		3 (23%)		2 (15%)
	Vocational or skills training	4 (33%)	5 (42%)		2 (17%)		1 (8%)
	Education (including basic skills)	4 (31%)	7 (54%)		1 (8%)		1 (8%)
	Offending behaviour programmes (e.g. Constructs, Anger Management courses etc)	6 (60%)	4 (40%)		0 (0%)		0 (0%)
<b>Q10.4</b>	<b>Is it easy to go to the library?</b>						
	<i>Don't know/ never tried</i>						3 (21%)
	Yes						5 (36%)
	No						6 (43%)
<b>Q10.5</b>	<b>Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?</b>						
	<i>Don't use it</i>						2 (15%)
	Yes						6 (46%)
	No						5 (38%)
<b>Q10.6</b>	<b>How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?</b>						
	<i>Don't want to go</i>						2 (14%)
	0						5 (36%)
	1 to 2						7 (50%)
	3 to 5						0 (0%)
	More than 5						0 (0%)
<b>Q10.7</b>	<b>How many times do you usually go outside the wing for exercise each week?</b>						
	<i>Don't want to go</i>						4 (29%)
	0						0 (0%)
	1 to 2						6 (43%)
	3 to 5						1 (7%)
	More than 5						3 (21%)

<b>Q10.8</b>	<b>How many hours do you usually spend unlocked on a weekday? (Please include hours at education, at work etc)</b>	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	2 (14%)
	<i>2 to less than 4 hours</i>	1 (7%)
	<i>4 to less than 6 hours</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>6 to less than 8 hours</i>	2 (14%)
	<i>8 to less than 10 hours</i>	1 (7%)
	<i>10 hours or more</i>	8 (57%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	0 (0%)

### Section 11: Contact with family and friends

<b>Q11.1</b>	<b>Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with your family/friends while in this prison?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i>	9 (64%)
	<i>No</i>	5 (36%)
<b>Q11.2</b>	<b>Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i>	3 (21%)
	<i>No</i>	11 (79%)
<b>Q11.3</b>	<b>Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i>	5 (36%)
	<i>No</i>	9 (64%)
<b>Q11.4</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?</b>	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	2 (14%)
	<i>Very easy</i>	5 (36%)
	<i>Easy</i>	4 (29%)
	<i>Neither</i>	1 (7%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	2 (14%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	0 (0%)

### Section 12: Preparation for release

<b>Q12.1</b>	<b>Do you have a sentence plan?</b>	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	2 (15%)
	<i>Yes</i>	6 (46%)
	<i>No</i>	5 (38%)
<b>Q12.2</b>	<b>How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?</b>	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>	7 (54%)
	<i>Very involved</i>	4 (31%)
	<i>Involved</i>	2 (15%)
	<i>Neither</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Not very involved</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Not at all involved</i>	0 (0%)

<b>Q12.3</b>	<b>Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets? (please tick all that applies to you.)</b>			
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>			7 (54%)
	<i>Nobody</i>			0 (0%)
	<i>Named probation officer</i>			1 (8%)
	<i>Social worker</i>			1 (8%)
	<i>Psychologist</i>			3 (23%)
	<i>Officer advisor</i>			2 (15%)
	<i>Staff from other departments</i>			2 (15%)
<b>Q12.4</b>	<b>Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?</b>			
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>			7 (58%)
	<i>Yes</i>			3 (25%)
	<i>No</i>			0 (0%)
	<i>Don't know</i>			2 (17%)
<b>Q12.5</b>	<b>Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in the community?</b>			
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>			7 (54%)
	<i>Yes</i>			4 (31%)
	<i>No</i>			1 (8%)
	<i>Don't know</i>			1 (8%)
<b>Q12.6</b>	<b>Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?</b>			
	<i>Yes</i>			5 (36%)
	<i>No</i>			9 (64%)
<b>Q12.7</b>	<b>Do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you with the following on release? (please tick all that applies to you.)</b>			
		<i>Do not need help</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
	Employment	2 (14%)	4 (29%)	8 (57%)
	Accommodation	3 (23%)	1 (8%)	9 (69%)
	Finances	4 (33%)	1 (8%)	7 (58%)
	Education	3 (25%)	4 (33%)	5 (42%)
	Drugs and alcohol	6 (46%)	2 (15%)	5 (38%)
<b>Q12.8</b>	<b>Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here, that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?</b>			
	<i>Not sentenced</i>			2 (14%)
	<i>Yes</i>			6 (43%)
	<i>No</i>			6 (43%)



## Appendix V: Inspection photographs

A 'housed' cell



A mattress in a housed cell



### The kitchen at Northward



Comparator to last time



Prisoner survey responses HMP Northward (male) 2014

Prisoner survey responses (missing data have been excluded for each question). Please note: where there are apparently large differences, which are not indicated as statistically significant, this is likely to be due to chance.

Key to tables

		HMP Northward (Grand Cayman) 2014	HMP Northward (Grand Cayman) 2012
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>139</b>	<b>166</b>
<b>SECTION 1: General information</b>			
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	6%	7%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	76%	80%
1.3	Are you recall?	1%	2%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	4%	5%
1.4	Are you here under courts pleasure?	1%	2%
1.5	Do you understand spoken English?	99%	100%
1.6	Do you understand written English?	98%	97%
1.8	Are you Caymanian?	80%	
1.8	Are you from elsewhere in the Caribbean?	13%	
1.8	Are you from a region outside of the Caribbean? (Including Africa, all Americas, Indian sub-continent, Asia, Europe or the Middle East)	8%	
1.9	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white)	91%	92%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	1%	0%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	1%	2%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	17%	15%
1.13	Is this your first time in prison?	37%	46%
<b>SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts</b>			
On your most recent journey here:			
2.1	Was the van clean?	53%	50%
2.2	Did you feel safe?	46%	42%
2.3	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	50%	50%
2.4	When you first arrived here did your personal belongings arrive at the same time as you?	56%	55%
<b>SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction</b>			
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	55%	50%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	51%	43%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	55%	51%
When you first arrived:			
3.4	Did you have any problems?	81%	81%

## Comparator to last time

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Northward (Grand Cayman) 2014	HMP Northward (Grand Cayman) 2012
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of personal belongings?	24%	21%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	14%	17%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	11%	11%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	35%	34%
3.4	Did you have any problems with childcare?	15%	24%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	34%	43%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	27%	32%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	19%	19%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	12%	9%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	14%	8%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	22%	20%
	For those with problems:		
3.5	Did you receive any help/ support from staff in dealing with these problems?	29%	21%
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:		
3.6	A shower?	60%	52%
3.6	A free telephone call?	41%	35%
3.6	Something to eat?	66%	57%
3.6	A phone card?	8%	9%
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	69%	64%
<b>SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued</b>			
	When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:		
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	47%	24%
3.7	Someone from health services?	24%	21%
3.7	A social worker?	7%	10%
3.7	A Probation officer?	12%	21%
3.7	A Psychologist?	11%	9%
3.7	Prison shop?	13%	17%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:		
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	24%	27%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	9%	16%
3.8	How to make routine requests (applications)?	30%	29%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	41%	44%
3.8	Health services?	22%	21%
3.8	The chaplaincy/ pastoral care?	33%	18%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	44%	34%



## Comparator to last time

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Northward (Grand Cayman) 2014	HMP Northward (Grand Cayman) 2012
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	63%	62%
	For those who have been on an induction course:		
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	26%	31%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	53%	68%
<b>SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody</b>			
	In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:		
4.1	Communicate with your lawyer or legal representative?	38%	27%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	47%	42%
4.1	Get bail information?	15%	12%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your lawyer or legal representative when you were not with them?	39%	49%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	60%	56%
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	57%	55%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	96%	96%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	63%	57%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	77%	67%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	62%	50%
4.4	Can you normally get your personal belongings?	49%	34%
	Is the condition of your cell good in regards to the following areas:		
4.5	Cleanliness?	55%	
4.5	Ventilation/air quality?	19%	
4.5	Temperature?	22%	
4.5	Lighting?	63%	
4.6	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	18%	9%
4.7	Does the shop sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	30%	31%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	56%	50%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a Chaplain (pastor) of your faith in private if you want to?	77%	35%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	67%	55%
<b>SECTION 5: Applications and complaints</b>			
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	41%	19%
	For those who have made an application:		
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	49%	43%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	52%	38%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	55%	39%
	For those who have made a complaint:		
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	28%	17%

## Comparator to last time

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Northward (Grand Cayman) 2014	HMP Northward (Grand Cayman) 2012
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	26%	16%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	39%	44%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Prison Inspection Board (PIB)?	8%	8%
5.7	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	11%	17%
5.8	In the last six months, if you have spent a night in the segregation/ care and separation unit, were you treated very well/ well by staff?	25%	13%
<b>SECTION 6: Relationships with staff</b>			
6.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	63%	53%
6.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	71%	53%
6.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	33%	24%
6.4	Do you have an officer advisor?	67%	62%
	For those with an officer advisor:		
6.5	Do you think your officer advisor is helpful/very helpful?	46%	33%
<b>SECTION 7: Safety</b>			
7.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	64%	72%
7.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	37%	48%
7.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	48%	41%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:		
7.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	33%	30%
7.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	19%	15%
7.5	Sexually abused you?	3%	2%
7.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	26%	25%
7.5	Taken your personal belongings?	17%	24%
7.5	Victimised you because of medication?	4%	5%
7.5	Victimised you because of debt?	5%	7%
7.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	8%	9%
7.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	7%	6%
7.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	4%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	13%	14%
7.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the Island/ District?	7%	13%
7.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	1%	3%
7.5	Victimised you because of your age?	6%	5%
7.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	3%	3%
7.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	13%	7%
7.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	14%	9%

## Comparator to last time

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Northward (Grand Cayman) 2014	HMP Northward (Grand Cayman) 2012	
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse			
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details			
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference			
7.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	8%	8%
<b>SECTION 8: Safety continued</b>			
7.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	52%	60%
	Since you have been here, have staff:		
7.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	30%	35%
7.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	18%	18%
7.7	Sexually abused you?	3%	1%
7.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	25%	29%
7.7	Victimised you because of medication?	8%	7%
7.7	Victimised you because of debt?	3%	2%
7.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	7%	6%
7.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	4%	9%
7.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	4%	5%
7.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	16%	18%
7.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the Island/ District?	4%	7%
7.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	3%	1%
7.7	Victimised you because of your age?	6%	6%
7.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	3%	5%
7.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	11%	7%
7.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	21%	13%
7.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	6%	7%
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:		
7.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	54%	48%
<b>SECTION 8: Health services</b>			
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	35%	30%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	64%	44%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	40%	31%
	For those who have been to the following services, do you think the quality of the health service from the following is good/very good:		
8.2	The doctor?	45%	48%
8.2	The nurse?	42%	36%
8.2	The dentist?	43%	47%
8.3	The overall quality of health services?	42%	30%
8.4	Are you currently taking medication?	31%	50%
	For those currently taking medication:		
8.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	92%	91%

## Comparator to last time

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Northward (Grand Cayman) 2014	HMP Northward (Grand Cayman) 2012
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
8.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	25%	24%
	For those who have problems:		
8.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	50%	37%
<b>SECTION 9: Drugs and alcohol</b>			
9.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	32%	24%
9.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	23%	13%
9.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	35%	45%
9.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	28%	38%
9.5	Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?	12%	13%
	For those with drug or alcohol problems:		
9.6	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	44%	24%
9.7	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	38%	32%
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:		
9.8	Was the support helpful?	56%	43%
<b>SECTION 10: Activities</b>			
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:		
10.1	A prison job?	39%	30%
10.1	Vocational or skills training?	25%	26%
10.1	Education (including basic skills)?	46%	50%
10.1	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	30%	35%
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:		
10.2	A prison job?	68%	65%
10.2	Vocational or skills training?	22%	22%
10.2	Education (including basic skills)?	34%	40%
10.2	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	21%	28%
10.3	Have you had a job while in this prison?	92%	85%
	For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:		
10.3	Do you feel the job will help you on release?	57%	55%
10.3	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	81%	71%
	For those who have had vocational or skills training while in this prison:		
10.3	Do you feel the vocational or skills training will help you on release?	55%	61%
10.3	Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	84%	79%
	For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:		
10.3	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	66%	70%
10.3	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	79%	74%
	For those who have been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison:		
10.3	Do you feel the offending behaviour programme(s) will help you on release?	50%	66%

## Comparator to last time

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Northward (Grand Cayman) 2014	HMP Northward (Grand Cayman) 2012
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
10.4	Is it easy to go to the library?	30%	58%
10.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	36%	35%
10.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	42%	26%
10.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	51%	54%
10.9	Do you spend ten or more hours unlocked on a weekday?	53%	49%
<b>SECTION 11: Friends and family</b>			
11.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	39%	32%
11.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	34%	44%
11.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	27%	40%
11.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	39%	31%
<b>SECTION 12: Preparation for release</b>			
For those who are sentenced:			
12.1	Do you have a sentence plan?	41%	50%
For those with a sentence plan:			
12.2	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	84%	78%
Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:			
12.3	Nobody?	41%	40%
12.3	Named probation officer?	18%	13%
12.3	Social worker?	2%	2%
12.3	Psychologist?	18%	3%
12.3	Officer advisor?	18%	25%
12.3	Staff from other departments?	36%	28%
For those with a sentence plan:			
12.4	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	52%	49%
12.5	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	64%	64%
12.6	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	29%	23%
For those that need help do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you on release with the following:			
12.7	Employment?	19%	22%
12.7	Accommodation?	7%	13%
12.7	Finances?	8%	15%
12.7	Education?	25%	24%
12.7	Drugs and alcohol?	19%	26%
For those who are sentenced:			
12.8	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here to make you less likely to offend in future?	65%	54%



## Prisoner survey responses (wing breakdown) HMP Northward 2014

Prisoner survey responses (missing data have been excluded for each question).

		A wing/basic unit	B	C (Eagle House)	D	F	Overall (excl. E wing, HRU & House)
	Percentages highlighted in green show the best score across wings						
	Percentages highlighted in blue show the worst score across wings						
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>14</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>127</b>
<b>SECTION 1: General information</b>							
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	0%	3%	7%	3%	0%	3%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	77%	90%	77%	38%	97%	77%
1.3	Are you recall?	0%	5%	0%	0%	0%	1%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	0%	3%	7%	3%	0%	3%
1.4	Are you here under courts pleasure?	0%	0%	3%	0%	0%	1%
1.5	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	100%	97%	100%	100%	99%
1.6	Do you understand written English?	100%	100%	93%	100%	97%	98%
1.8	Are you Caymanian?	77%	97%	67%	84%	65%	78%
1.8	Are you from elsewhere in the Caribbean?	24%	0%	23%	13%	15%	14%
1.8	Are you from a region outside of the Caribbean? (Including Africa, all Americas, Indian sub-continent, Asia, Europe or the Middle East)	0%	3%	7%	3%	21%	8%
1.9	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white)	100%	90%	87%	97%	85%	91%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	0%	0%	7%	0%	0%	1%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	13%	16%	24%	19%	15%	18%
1.13	Is this your first time in prison?	35%	19%	40%	25%	66%	37%
<b>SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts</b>							
On your most recent journey here:							
2.1	Was the van clean?	57%	34%	40%	59%	84%	54%
2.2	Did you feel safe?	25%	33%	47%	63%	63%	48%
2.3	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	41%	38%	43%	59%	68%	51%
2.4	When you first arrived here did your personal belongings arrive at the same time as you?	50%	61%	47%	78%	41%	56%
<b>SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction</b>							
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	35%	51%	57%	61%	54%	53%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	35%	31%	60%	67%	66%	53%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	59%	29%	63%	65%	59%	54%
When you first arrived:							
3.4	Did you have any problems?	88%	77%	87%	65%	85%	79%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of personal belongings?	29%	14%	23%	23%	21%	21%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	29%	17%	13%	13%	6%	14%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	0%	14%	13%	16%	6%	11%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	50%	29%	47%	39%	18%	34%
3.4	Did you have any problems with childcare?	13%	11%	0%	16%	21%	12%

Prisoner survey responses (missing data have been excluded for each question).

Percentages highlighted in green show the best score across wings		A wing/basic unit	B	C (Eagle House)	D	E	Overall (excl. E wing, HRU & House)
Percentages highlighted in blue show the worst score across wings							
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	50%	29%	20%	45%	32%	34%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	35%	31%	27%	31%	15%	27%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	50%	17%	17%	13%	15%	19%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	24%	11%	13%	13%	6%	12%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	13%	11%	17%	3%	18%	12%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	29%	14%	23%	31%	18%	22%
When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:							
3.6	A shower?	41%	46%	74%	94%	41%	60%
3.6	A free telephone call?	35%	41%	39%	67%	20%	41%
3.6	Something to eat?	65%	54%	64%	88%	59%	66%
3.6	A phone card?	0%	6%	21%	6%	3%	8%
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	88%	49%	61%	85%	71%	69%
<b>SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued</b>							
When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:							
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	50%	47%	59%	55%	41%	50%
3.7	Someone from health services?	35%	15%	38%	26%	19%	25%
3.7	A social worker?	6%	6%	17%	0%	3%	6%
3.7	A Probation officer?	13%	18%	14%	7%	12%	13%
3.7	A Psychologist?	13%	6%	24%	3%	6%	10%
3.7	Prison shop?	6%	18%	24%	7%	12%	14%
When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:							
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	7%	28%	17%	41%	20%	24%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	0%	11%	14%	24%	0%	10%
3.8	How to make routine requests (applications)?	25%	31%	21%	55%	20%	30%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	38%	36%	35%	50%	37%	39%
3.8	Health services?	7%	19%	29%	38%	14%	22%
3.8	The chaplaincy/ pastoral care?	31%	28%	38%	45%	31%	35%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	41%	42%	35%	58%	53%	46%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	73%	72%	60%	61%	63%	65%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	41%	68%	43%	45%	66%	55%
<b>SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody</b>							
In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:							
4.1	Communicate with your lawyer or legal representative?	41%	32%	40%	45%	38%	39%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	15%	33%	52%	64%	53%	47%
4.1	Get bail information?	0%	20%	21%	26%	4%	16%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your lawyer or legal representative when you were not with them?	63%	54%	33%	33%	33%	42%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	50%	62%	73%	55%	52%	59%

Prisoner survey responses (missing data have been excluded for each question).

	A wing/basic unit	B	C (Eagle House)	D	F	Overall (excl. E wing, HRU & House)
Percentages highlighted in green show the best score across wings						
Percentages highlighted in blue show the worst score across wings						
For the wing/unit you are currently on:						
4.4 Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	35%	41%	43%	70%	85%	57%
4.4 Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	94%	84%	100%	100%	100%	95%
4.4 Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	69%	50%	71%	77%	60%	64%
4.4 Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	75%	70%	71%	85%	88%	78%
4.4 Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	41%	56%	41%	74%	85%	62%
4.4 Can you normally get your personal belongings?	38%	41%	35%	55%	75%	50%
Would you rate the condition of your cell, as 'good' for:						
4.5 Cleanliness?	57%	34%	40%	59%	84%	54%
4.5 Ventilation/air quality?	7%	6%	21%	19%	36%	19%
4.5 Temperature?	13%	12%	35%	21%	30%	23%
4.5 Lighting?	57%	49%	52%	75%	84%	63%
4.5 Is the food in this prison good/very good?	24%	10%	35%	16%	15%	19%
4.6 Does the shop sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	24%	19%	53%	16%	29%	28%
4.7 Are your religious beliefs are respected?	50%	49%	67%	43%	75%	57%
4.8 Are you able to speak to a Chaplain (pastor) of your faith in private if you want to?	77%	79%	80%	67%	89%	78%
4.9 Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	65%	66%	80%	59%	80%	70%
<b>SECTION 5: Applications and complaints</b>						
5.1 Is it easy to make an application?	59%	21%	53%	41%	53%	43%
5.3 Is it easy to make a complaint?	24%	47%	57%	63%	77%	57%
5.5 Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	47%	45%	38%	36%	27%	38%
5.6 Is it easy/very easy to see the Prison Inspection Board (PIB)?	0%	3%	13%	4%	22%	9%
5.7 In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	13%	10%	20%	14%	3%	12%
<b>SECTION 6: Relationships with staff</b>						
6.1 Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	59%	54%	55%	65%	83%	64%
6.2 Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	59%	50%	76%	83%	88%	72%
6.3 Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	35%	19%	24%	37%	49%	32%
6.4 Do you have an officer advisor?	71%	68%	52%	62%	83%	68%
<b>SECTION 7: Safety</b>						
7.1 Have you ever felt unsafe here?	71%	70%	71%	63%	41%	62%
7.2 Do you feel unsafe now?	35%	49%	21%	47%	14%	33%
7.4 Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	59%	46%	62%	45%	34%	48%
Since you have been here, have other prisoners:						
7.5 Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	41%	30%	35%	38%	29%	33%
7.5 Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	35%	16%	17%	17%	17%	19%
7.5 Sexually abused you?	0%	3%	7%	0%	0%	2%



Prisoner survey responses (missing data have been excluded for each question).

		A wing/basic unit	B	C (Eagle House)	D	F	Overall (excl. E wing, HRU & House)
	Percentages highlighted in green show the best score across wings						
	Percentages highlighted in blue show the worst score across wings						
7.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	35%	19%	35%	21%	20%	25%
7.5	Taken your personal belongings?	41%	5%	35%	14%	11%	18%
7.5	Victimised you because of medication?	6%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%
7.5	Victimised you because of debt?	13%	3%	7%	3%	0%	4%
7.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	6%	3%	14%	7%	6%	7%
7.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	24%	0%	14%	3%	6%	8%
7.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	29%	0%	3%	3%	0%	5%
7.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	29%	0%	24%	14%	14%	14%
7.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the Island/ District?	13%	14%	0%	3%	6%	7%
7.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	0%	7%	0%	0%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	5%	3%	14%	6%	6%
7.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	3%	7%	3%	0%	3%
7.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	35%	0%	24%	7%	6%	12%
7.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	24%	5%	17%	17%	11%	14%
7.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	6%	16%	3%	7%	0%	7%
<b>SECTION 8: Safety continued</b>							
7.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	71%	42%	43%	55%	42%	48%
	Since you have been here, have staff:						
7.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	71%	16%	26%	35%	24%	30%
7.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	24%	19%	14%	24%	6%	17%
7.7	Sexually abused you?	6%	3%	7%	0%	0%	3%
7.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	35%	14%	26%	21%	21%	22%
7.7	Victimised you because of medication?	13%	11%	7%	3%	0%	6%
7.7	Victimised you because of debt?	6%	5%	4%	0%	0%	3%
7.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	11%	7%	3%	0%	5%
7.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	6%	5%	14%	0%	0%	5%
7.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	13%	5%	4%	0%	0%	4%
7.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	29%	11%	30%	17%	12%	18%
7.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the Island/ District?	0%	11%	4%	3%	3%	5%
7.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	3%	7%	0%	0%	2%
7.7	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	3%	4%	14%	6%	6%
7.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	5%	7%	0%	0%	3%
7.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	24%	5%	14%	14%	12%	12%
7.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	29%	14%	18%	35%	18%	21%
7.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	11%	4%	7%	3%	6%

Prisoner survey responses (missing data have been excluded for each question).

Percentages highlighted in green show the best score across wings		A wing/basic unit	B	C (Eagle House)	D	F	Overall (excl. E wing, HRU & House)
Percentages highlighted in blue show the worst score across wings							
<b>SECTION 8: Health services</b>							
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	13%	26%	45%	33%	56%	37%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	59%	46%	57%	82%	94%	68%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	35%	32%	37%	43%	57%	41%
8.4	Are you currently taking medication?	59%	11%	38%	26%	46%	33%
8.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	13%	28%	35%	36%	6%	24%
<b>SECTION 9: Drugs and alcohol</b>							
9.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	41%	38%	38%	45%	14%	34%
9.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	33%	29%	26%	29%	14%	25%
9.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	31%	17%	45%	21%	59%	35%
9.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	25%	19%	35%	14%	51%	30%
9.5	Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?	13%	22%	17%	3%	3%	12%
<b>SECTION 10: Activities</b>							
Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:							
10.1	A prison job?	29%	17%	50%	24%	81%	41%
10.1	Vocational or skills training?	29%	13%	39%	18%	38%	27%
10.1	Education (including basic skills)?	50%	17%	57%	41%	81%	49%
10.1	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	35%	17%	36%	27%	49%	33%
Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:							
10.2	A prison job?	77%	86%	64%	45%	81%	71%
10.2	Vocational or skills training?	29%	33%	4%	17%	25%	22%
10.2	Education (including basic skills)?	41%	22%	30%	24%	59%	35%
10.2	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	24%	17%	7%	17%	41%	21%
10.4	Is it easy to go to the library?	35%	31%	24%	14%	47%	30%
10.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	47%	19%	48%	26%	47%	36%
10.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	31%	61%	36%	50%	32%	44%
10.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	71%	49%	57%	38%	56%	52%
10.9	Do you spend ten or more hours unlocked on a weekday?	50%	50%	59%	48%	77%	58%
<b>SECTION 11: Friends and family</b>							
11.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	35%	38%	35%	52%	44%	41%
11.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	53%	39%	46%	27%	13%	34%
11.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	41%	26%	41%	30%	3%	27%
11.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	13%	38%	38%	29%	66%	40%
12.6	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	35%	21%	7%	18%	59%	29%

## Diversity Analysis



### Key Question Responses (nationality) HMP Northward (Grand Cayman) 2014

**Prisoner Survey Responses** (Missing data has been excluded for each question) Please note:  
Where there are apparently large differences, which are not indicated as statistically significant, this is likely to be due to chance.

#### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Caymanian nationals	Jamaican nationals
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>107</b>	<b>16</b>
1.3	Are you sentenced?	75%	68%
1.5	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	100%
1.6	Do you understand written English?	99%	100%
1.9	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white)	92%	100%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	16%	28%
1.13	Is this your first time in prison?	27%	90%
2.3	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	44%	89%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	48%	50%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	52%	68%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	80%	95%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from healthcare when you first arrived here?	21%	61%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	40%	39%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	65%	56%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your lawyer or legal representative?	38%	37%
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	52%	74%

## Diversity Analysis

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Caymanian nationals	Jamaican nationals
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	94%	100%
4.6	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	16%	20%
4.7	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	30%	42%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	53%	68%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a Chaplain (pastor) of your faith in private if you want to?	75%	90%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	37%	58%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	57%	58%
5.7	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	14%	6%
6.1	Do <b>most</b> staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	57%	78%
6.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	71%	89%
6.5	Do you have an officer advisor?	69%	72%
7.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	72%	56%
7.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	42%	29%
7.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	50%	67%
7.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	28%	33%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	3%	33%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	7%	44%
7.5	Have you been victimised because you were from a different part of the Island/ District? (By prisoners)	9%	0%
7.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	4%	0%
7.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	59%	44%

## Key to tables

## Diversity Analysis

		Caymanian nationals	Jamaican nationals
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
7.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	29%	22%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	6%	0%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	14%	33%
7.7	Have you been victimised because you were from a different part of the Island/ District? (By staff)	6%	0%
7.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	4%	0%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	33%	50%
8.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	62%	72%
8.4	Are you currently taking medication?	30%	33%
8.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	26%	33%
9.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	34%	44%
9.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	29%	28%
10.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	66%	67%
10.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	24%	22%
10.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	30%	56%
10.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	21%	28%
10.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	26%	56%
10.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	41%	39%
10.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	46%	72%
10.8	Do you spend ten or more hours unlocked on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	50%	61%
11.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	38%	25%
11.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	32%	6%
11.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	36%	61%

## Diversity Analysis



### Key Question Responses (disability, age over 50) HMP Northward (Grand Cayman) 2014

**Prisoner Survey Responses** (Missing data has been excluded for each question) Please note: Where there are apparently large differences, which are not indicated as statistically significant, this is likely to be due to chance.

#### Key to tables

		Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability	Prisoners aged over 50	Prisoners aged under 50
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>23</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>122</b>
1.3	Are you sentenced?	79%	76%	80%	75%
1.5	Do you understand spoken English?	96%	100%	100%	99%
1.6	Do you understand written English?	96%	99%	95%	99%
1.8	Are you Caymanian?	74%	82%	74%	81%
1.8	Are you from elsewhere in the Caribbean?	18%	11%	11%	12%
1.8	Are you from a region outside of the Caribbean? (Including Africa, all Americas, Indian sub-continent, Asia, Europe or the Middle East)	7%	8%	11%	7%
1.9	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white)	96%	90%	72%	93%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?			24%	17%
1.13	Is this your first time in prison?	43%	37%	50%	36%
2.3	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	43%	50%	90%	45%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	52%	50%	90%	46%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	39%	58%	78%	52%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	96%	78%	89%	80%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from healthcare when you first arrived here?	21%	23%	56%	20%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	27%	47%	50%	43%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	62%	63%	53%	65%

## Key to tables

## Diversity Analysis

		Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability	Prisoners aged over 50	Prisoners aged under 50
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your lawyer or legal representative?	39%	37%	72%	34%
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	48%	58%	80%	54%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	92%	96%	95%	96%
4.6	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	21%	18%	22%	18%
4.7	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	36%	29%	61%	26%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	50%	56%	78%	53%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a Chaplain (pastor) of your faith in private if you want to?	64%	79%	68%	78%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	30%	43%	74%	37%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	48%	57%	71%	53%
5.7	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	30%	8%	6%	12%
6.1	Do <b>most</b> staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	59%	62%	80%	59%
6.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	68%	72%	95%	68%
6.5	Do you have an officer advisor?	73%	65%	77%	65%
7.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	77%	63%	61%	66%
7.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	41%	36%	6%	41%
7.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	59%	47%	33%	49%
7.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	37%	25%	22%	27%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	8%	6%	11%	6%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	31%	9%	11%	13%
7.5	Have you been victimised because you were from a different part of the Island/ District? (By prisoners)	4%	8%	6%	7%
7.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	15%	1%	0%	4%
7.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	77%	49%	44%	53%

## Key to tables

## Diversity Analysis

		Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability	Prisoners aged over 50	Prisoners aged under 50
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
7.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	31%	24%	28%	25%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	8%	4%	0%	5%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	50%	9%	28%	14%
7.7	Have you been victimised because you were from a different part of the Island/ District? (By staff)	4%	5%	6%	4%
7.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	15%	1%	0%	4%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	46%	31%	63%	32%
8.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	52%	65%	78%	62%
8.4	Are you currently taking medication?	41%	29%	72%	26%
8.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	37%	23%	11%	27%
9.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	23%	38%	59%	32%
9.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	19%	31%	31%	29%
10.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	62%	69%	65%	68%
10.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	28%	21%	24%	22%
10.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	28%	36%	13%	37%
10.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	20%	21%	13%	22%
10.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	23%	32%	33%	30%
10.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	39%	43%	6%	47%
10.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	50%	50%	65%	50%
10.8	Do you spend ten or more hours unlocked on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	58%	53%	65%	52%
11.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	44%	33%	29%	35%
11.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	27%	28%	6%	30%
11.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	41%	38%	65%	36%