

Report on an announced inspection of

HM Cayman Islands

Prison Service

22–27 July 2012

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

Crown copyright 2013

Printed and published by:
Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons
1st Floor, Ashley House
Monck Street
London SW1P 2BQ
England

Contents

	Introduction	5
	Fact page	7
	Healthy prison summary	9
1	Safety	21
<hr/>		
2	Respect	31
<hr/>		
3	Purposeful activity	47
<hr/>		
4	Resettlement	53
<hr/>		
5	Recommendations, housekeeping points and good practice	61
<hr/>		
	Appendices	
<hr/>		
	I Inspection team	68
	II Prison population profile	69
	III Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews	72
	IV Inspection photographs	101

Introduction

The Cayman Islands are a self-governing British Overseas Territory comprising three islands in the Caribbean. In January 2012, HM Inspectorate of Prisons received a formal letter from the Governor of the islands (who has responsibility for internal security including, ultimately, prisons) inviting an inspection of the Cayman Islands custodial facilities. There are two prisons located on Grand Cayman. HMP Northward is a male establishment holding about 200 men of varying age, status and category. HMP Fairbanks is a smaller facility, holding just four women at the time of our inspection.

In conducting our inspection, we used our usual inspection methodology and criteria but took a pragmatic approach to Expectations and took account of potential cultural and contextual differences between Cayman and the UK. We also compared services in the prisons with services in the Cayman community where relevant. Our findings at both prisons were disturbing. At Northward, some findings were shocking. Conditions were decrepit, meaningful accountability almost non-existent, and work to deliver decent standards and ensure people are prepared for a successful return to society severely lacking. Against almost all our tests of a healthy prison, both institutions were performing poorly.

Prisoners at Northward told us they did not feel safe, reporting high levels of victimisation by both staff and prisoners. Concepts such as individual risk management or strategies to confront antisocial behaviour hardly existed. The management of security intelligence was chaotic, and the evidence suggested illegal drug use was endemic. We had very serious concerns for the safety of a small number of children and young adults held at Northward. There were no systems to protect them from predatory behaviour, and it says much that those who seemed most concerned for their safety were other prisoners.

In our survey, many prisoners reported feeling depressed or suicidal when they arrived in custody, although recorded levels of self-harm seemed low. However, support for the well-being of those in crisis was crude and ineffective. Some were placed inappropriately in segregated conditions, and multidisciplinary or mental health interventions were hardly available.

The segregated conditions used to hold both the refractory and the vulnerable were disgraceful and unaccountable. Prisoners, some with mental health conditions, were held in squalid conditions, without any legitimate safeguards or authority.

At Fairbanks, the almost one-to-one nature of staff-prisoner numbers meant that women were treated much better and were safer, but we were not assured this would remain the case if there was a significant increase in numbers.

Both institutions were in poor physical condition and in dire need of significant investment. Cells in Northward were dark, stifling and intimidating. Prisoners lived in overcrowded cells on dirty overcrowded wings devoid of privacy. Conditions were shambolic with most accommodation barely fit for human habitation. Conditions at Fairbanks were marginally better but still very poor. Arguably the worst facility was the so-called 'high risk unit'. A small number of prisoners were locked up in appalling conditions for extended periods each day, and in some cases for many years. In our view, the facility had no legitimacy.

Staff-prisoner relationships were poor. Many staff were at best passive and at worst indifferent to the needs of prisoners. Relationships were better at Fairbanks, but barely half the prisoners at Northward felt treated with any respect. Of particular concern were the frustrations

individuals experienced with the arbitrary and unregulated exercise of staff discretion. Work to identify and promote the interests and well-being of minorities in such a diverse population was non-existent. Paradoxically, in our survey, it was the majority Caymanian population who felt disadvantaged across a number of important indicators.

In almost all respects the provision of health care was poor, falling well short of acceptable basic clinical standards or, to the best of our understanding, any broad equivalence with provision in the community.

We were pleased to see that prisoners experienced considerable time out of cell and in the open air, although there were some needless restrictions at Fairbanks. That aside, there was little for prisoners to do, with both institutions characterised by indolence and inactivity. There was no meaningful strategy to promote learning and skills, for example, in support of preparation for release.

The prisons similarly lacked a strategy to support resettlement. Work with partner agencies on the islands was uncoordinated and there was no assessment of need across the prison. The effective planning of sentences was optional, and few prisoners knew who to turn to for basic resettlement advice and support. Work with life sentence prisoners was very poor, and the failure to use temporary release to support resettlement and reintegration was a missed opportunity.

Any reader of this report should be troubled and concerned by what we found, particularly given that the prisons operated in the name of Her Majesty's Prison Service. Whatever one's view of the role of imprisonment in tackling crime and delinquency, most right-thinking people would expect prisons that operate in their name to hold prisoners safely and decently, and to ensure they leave as better people than when they came in. Northward and Fairbanks fall well short of this standard. The report's findings confirm my view that all custodial facilities need to be subject to regular independent inspection to ensure even the most basic human rights standards are upheld and meaningful accountability maintained. The absence of such arrangements in the Cayman Islands was a significant factor in the very poor conditions we found in this one-off inspection. We have offered a number of recommendations that we believe will assist the Cayman authorities to create improvement and reduce the risk of such failings from reoccurring in future.

Nick Hardwick
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

September 2012

Fact page

Task of the establishment

HMP Northward is a male establishment, holding remand and sentenced adult males and juveniles.
HMP Fairbanks is a female establishment, holding remand, and sentenced adult women and juveniles.
(See Appendix IV for photographs of the exterior of Fairbanks and Northward.)

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

Public

Region/Department

Cayman Islands

Number held

Northward: 205

Fairbanks: 4

Certified normal accommodation

Northward: 165

Fairbanks: 35

Operational capacity

N/A

Brief history

Her Majesty's Cayman Islands Prison Northward is a 31-year-old category C facility also holding category A and B 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

A wing holds mainly sentenced prisoners. It has a top roll of 39 prisoners in a mixture of single and double cells and a 12-bed dormitory. It houses the basic unit, which has 13 single cells.

B wing holds mainly sentenced prisoners. It has a top roll of 66 prisoners in mainly double cells.

D wing holds remand prisoners. It has a top roll of 38 prisoners in mainly double cells, and one dormitory that is used to hold four prisoners.

Eagle House holds a mix of adults, young adults and juveniles. It has a top roll of 40 prisoners in double and single cells.

E wing has two cells, with the capacity to hold four lower category long-term prisoners.

F wing is the enhanced unit, with 19 cells single cells.

The high-risk unit, located at the top of D wing, has a top roll of 14 prisoners in single cells.

The 'halfway house', located outside of the perimeter fence, is used to hold four category D life-sentenced prisoners.

Accommodation at Fairbanks consists of four dormitories, each capable of holding up to eight prisoners, and three single occupancy 'maximum security cells'.

Name of governor/director

Dwight Scott

Health service commissioner and providers

Commissioner: N/A

Provider: Cayman Health Service Authority

Learning and skills providers

N/A

Healthy prison summary

Introduction

HP1 Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons (HMIP) is an independent, statutory organisation which reports on the treatment and conditions of those detained in prisons, young offender institutions, immigration detention facilities and police custody. This work is normally undertaken in England and Wales, although from time to time, and by invitation, HMIP will inspect in other jurisdictions.

HP2 All inspections carried out by HM Inspectorate of Prisons 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.

HP3 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 criteria are:

Safety prisoners, particularly the most vulnerable, are held safely

Respect prisoners are treated with respect for their human dignity

Purposeful activity prisoners are able, and expected, to engage in activity that is likely to benefit them

Resettlement prisoners are prepared for their release into the community and effectively helped to reduce the likelihood of reoffending.

HP4 Under each test, we make an assessment of outcomes for prisoners and therefore of the establishment's overall performance against the test. In some cases, this performance will be affected by matters outside the establishment's direct control, which need to be addressed by the commissioning authorities.

- outcomes for prisoners are good against this healthy prison test.

There is no evidence that outcomes for prisoners are being adversely affected in any significant areas.

- outcomes for prisoners are reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

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 against this healthy prison

test.

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 against this healthy prison test.

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.

Safety

HP5 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. Male juvenile prisoners 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.

HP6 Transport provided by the prison was clean and there was the facility to transport juveniles and women separately. Ankle shackles were used unnecessarily to transfer some male prisoners to and from court.

HP7 The reception area at Northward was clean and processes were efficient but lacked any meaningful assessment of individual needs or risks around suicide and self-harm, disability or age. Reception and induction arrangements at Fairbanks were informal and individualised. Health care assessments did not take place at either prison until the day after arrival at the earliest, and their quality was poor. All newly arrived prisoners were offered free telephone calls and a shower, and were provided with adequate written information about the prison. New prisoners could not purchase goods from the shop immediately and no emergency packs of groceries or tobacco were provided to prevent prisoners from accruing debts.

HP8 Most new prisoners at Northward were located on D wing, and women at Fairbanks went into normal dormitory accommodation, but there were no consistent first night arrangements to offer additional support. Private interviews took place but there was no thorough cell sharing risk assessment to ensure that the prisoner was located safely.

HP9 Induction at Northward consisted of a talk given weekly to all new arrivals but was not always provided. At Fairbanks, induction consisted of advice from an assigned officer adviser.

HP10 Prisoners at Northward did not feel safe and reported high levels of victimisation, both by other prisoners and staff. Measures to address violence and bullying at both prisons were reactive and crude. There was no attempt to identify, analyse or

measure the extent of bullying or violence-related incidents in order to reduce violence and improve safety. The few women prisoners at Fairbanks said that they felt safe; however, there were few systems or structures that could provide any ongoing assurances or effective oversight if the number of women increased.

- HP11 In our survey,¹ approximately a third of men said that they had felt depressed or suicidal on arrival but screening of new receptions for risk of self-harm/suicide did not occur. The heightened vulnerability of some groups of prisoners had not been considered or effective support mechanisms implemented. However, levels of self-harm were low. Some prisoners at risk of suicide and self-harm were inappropriately located in appalling and segregated conditions in the basic unit.
- HP12 The physical structure and perimeter at both prisons were poor and not sufficiently secure. There was minimal security-related intelligence, which was mostly anecdotal and not adequately recorded or analysed to identify potential threats to the establishment or to identify any emerging issues.
- HP13 Dynamic security² was poor, with little positive interaction between staff and prisoners. There were high levels of illegal drugs at Northward. Many prisoners said that it was easy to get illegal drugs and alcohol into the prison and there were high numbers of drug finds. However, the prison took no action to prevent the ingress of drugs and undertook no targeted drug testing of prisoners suspected of being involved with drugs, with testing carried out almost entirely for parole or compliance reasons. There was minimal drug testing at Fairbanks and the positive rate was zero. The positive drug test rate at Northward was high, at around 28%, and exclusively for cannabis.
- HP14 The number of disciplinary adjudications held at Northward was low and there were no data available for Fairbanks. There was insufficient evidence of inquiry, wide disparities in punishments for similar offences and the quality of adjudication paperwork was generally poor. Prison staff were able to increase sentence length, which was unacceptable given the need to separate sentencing and custodial functions.

¹ **Inspection methodology:** There are five key sources of evidence for inspection: 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, applying both qualitative and quantitative methodologies. All findings and judgements are triangulated, which increases the validity of the data gathered. Survey results show the collective response (in percentages) from prisoners in the establishment being inspected compared with the collective response (in percentages) from respondents in all establishments of that type (the comparator figure). Where references to comparisons between these two sets of figures are made in the report, these relate to statistically significant differences only. Statistical significance is a way of estimating the likelihood that a difference between two samples indicates a real difference between the populations from which the samples are taken, rather than being due to chance. If a result is very unlikely to have arisen by chance, we say it is 'statistically significant'. 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. (Adapted from Towel et al (eds), *Dictionary of Forensic Psychology*.)

² Dynamic security is the active awareness by prison staff of prisoners' activities and behaviours that may contribute to or compromise safety and security. This 'soft' intelligence supports security systems in promoting and providing a secure environment.

- HP15 Force was used on prisoners without appropriate authority, recording or monitoring. Staff training in use of force had ceased and many staff were untrained or their qualifications had expired.
- HP16 The number of prisoners held on the basic unit and in the 'housing' unit (own protection) at Northward was high. Prisoners were segregated and held in basic cells without legitimate authority or senior management oversight. Prisoners could be, and were, held in segregation for long and indeterminate periods without review and without any plans to reintegrate them back into the general population. The environment was appalling. Cells were poorly equipped, dilapidated and had inadequate light and ventilation. Two of the occupied cells had no light fittings, leaving the prisoners in almost perpetual darkness. The prisoners held in them had no mattresses, bedding or changes of clothes. The regime was poor, with no access to telephones and daily access to only exercise and showers.
- HP17 High numbers of prisoners arrived at Northward with either drug or alcohol problems and our survey showed that a further 13% developed a problem while in prison. In spite of this, there was no provision for prisoners with drug or alcohol misuse issues to receive clinical treatment.
- HP18 Children and young adults shared accommodation with adult prisoners. The regime was not specific to the needs of juveniles and young adult prisoners. We found evidence of male juveniles put at risk of predatory sexual behaviour and recruitment into gangs.

Respect

- HP19 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.
- HP20 All wings at Northward were dark, decrepit, chaotic and dirty, with an oppressive and intimidating atmosphere and a strong smell of cannabis. Communal areas were grubby, bare and devoid of equipment. Cellular accommodation on A to E wings was cage-like and many prisoners used blankets and sheets as makeshift screens to provide some privacy. Most prisoners shared cells fit only for one. In-cell toilets were dirty and unscreened, and there was little natural light or ventilation.
- HP21 The dormitory accommodation at Fairbanks was clean but basic and bed spaces were unscreened and provided little privacy. Communal areas were run-down and dingy and the fabric and decorative state of the facility were poor. Access to toilets and showers was good at both prisons but they were dirty and in a very poor state of

repair. The lack of ventilation and air conditioning in both prisons made the prisoner accommodation unbearably hot. The contrast with the air conditioning available to staff was shocking.

- HP22 The high-risk unit (HRU) provided a highly controlled and restrictive environment. Allocation to the unit was not effectively justified and, once allocated, prisoners stayed there for many years without any effective monitoring, risk assessment, review or means of challenge. The environment on the unit was bleak and oppressive and there were no attempts to safeguard or support the physical and mental well-being of the prisoners held there. Prisoners were isolated, locked up in single cells for over 22 hours a day with only limited access to in-cell education and one hour of exercise, and most said that they had felt unsafe at some time.
- HP23 In our survey, only half of all prisoners at Northward said that staff treated them with respect. We saw occasional friendly engagement but too often staff appeared distant, disinterested and dismissive toward prisoners. There was little evidence of constructive challenge by staff toward prisoner inactivity or indolence. Prisoners felt they were treated unfairly and we observed inconsistent decision making and unregulated use of discretion.
- HP24 About two-thirds of prisoners told us that they had an assigned officer adviser but few found them helpful. Generally the information contained in wing records was sparse and superficial and did not evidence any meaningful engagement. At Fairbanks, with only four prisoners, relationships between staff and prisoners were more personal and in our survey all prisoners indicated that they felt respected by staff or able to turn to them if they needed help. This was confirmed by our observations, although relationships were passive and unchallenging. Entries in wing history sheets were more frequent than at Northward but lacked depth or assessment and mainly concerned the narrow reporting of occurrences.
- HP25 There was no formal approach to identifying and minimising discrimination or inequality. Caymanian prisoners, who were in the majority, reported far more negatively than other nationals around treatment by staff, victimisation by staff, access to activities and safety. There had been no consultation with them or action taken to explore their negative perceptions. There were no procedures for identifying those with a disability, even though 15% of men responding to our survey considered themselves as such. This group reported being victimised but there was no support available.
- HP26 Good ministerial and pastoral support, including bereavement and relationship counselling, were available. However, provision was almost exclusively Christian based and didn't provide for minority faiths. There were good links with faith communities.
- HP27 Complaint forms were freely available on residential units in both prisons. However, there were no confidential post boxes and complaints had to be handed to wing staff, which undermined prisoner confidence. Few complaints were made but quality and timeliness of responses were reasonable.
- HP28 There was no member of staff trained and assigned to provide legal support to prisoners and no up-to-date legal texts in the prison library. Legal visits were freely available in private during the week.

- HP29 There had been no assessment to determine the health needs or health services required by prisoners. The sole nurse was completely overwhelmed by his unacceptably high workload and he rarely left the clinic. Access to him was problematic. The clinic at Northward was shambolic and not fit for purpose. Fairbanks was better, but neither were secure or met infection control standards. Clinical records were poor and not contemporaneous. There were no systematic arrangements for following up those with chronic conditions. GP clinics were regularly cancelled but not rescheduled. There was no medicines management. Medicines were held in possession without a risk assessment and some were administered by wing officers. The dental room was reasonable and waiting lists were short. There was no primary mental health care provision and the consultant psychiatrist visited only monthly, to see a few patients, even though a quarter of prisoners in our survey reported having emotional and mental health problems. The consultant had never seen any of the accommodation and would have been unaware of the potential impact of such conditions on well-being. Psychiatric injections were commonly given under restraint and we were not assured of its legal justification.
- HP30 The quality, quantity and presentation of food at both Northward and Fairbanks were poor. Prisoners preparing food were untrained in basic food hygiene and we observed some dangerous food preparation procedures.

Purposeful activity

- HP31 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.
- HP32 Most prisoners at both Northward and Fairbanks were unlocked for 14 hours a day. Prisoners on most wings could access open spaces adjacent to their wings during the day, although prisoners told us that this was often restricted. An hour's exercise was offered to most each evening. Some of the exercise areas were little more than waste ground. The women at Fairbanks were limited to just one hour in the open air. We found three-quarters of the men and all of the women on wings during the day with nothing meaningful to do. Most spent their day either sleeping or hanging around smoking and chatting to other prisoners.
- HP33 The management of education, training and work was uncoordinated and lacked coherence. Lines of accountability and responsibility were unclear. There was no routine performance assessment to improve provision. There were insufficient activity places at Northward to meet prisoners' needs and even these were not fully utilised; Fairbanks had reasonable activity spaces but usage was poor. Attendance was voluntary and many did not attend, and failure to attend was not pursued rigorously.

- HP34 The range of work available in both prisons was mainly low level and menial. Work was often part time, leaving prisoners unoccupied for several hours during the day. Some work parties were cancelled at short notice if a member of staff was not available. No accredited vocational training was available. Skills and experience gained through work were not formally identified or recorded. Teachers provided effective individual support. Classrooms at Northward were generally bright, clean and well ventilated. They met basic requirements but lacked resources such as textbooks and creative displays. The classrooms at Fairbanks were small and lacked adequate ventilation. There were classes from time to time but women were generally unoccupied. Achievements for the small number of prisoners who took exams were variable.
- HP35 There was a pleasant, accessible library at Northward but few prisoners made regular use of it. The large stock of books had been donated and had not been selected to meet the needs of prisoners. The library facility at Fairbanks was poor.
- HP36 The gym at Northward was popular and reasonably well equipped, and access was equitable. The gym at Fairbanks was small, poorly lit and smelly. The large equipment was unsuitable for most females and was in a poor state of repair.

Resettlement

- HP37 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.
- HP38 Rehabilitation services were not informed by any analysis of prisoner need. There was no plan for the development and delivery of rehabilitation, and work between the prison and the Department of Children and Family Services and Department of Community Rehabilitation was disjointed. There was no unsupervised release on temporary licence for any prisoners beyond the vicinity of the prison.
- HP39 Involvement in sentence planning was voluntary and over a third of prisoners excluded themselves. The sentence assessment was of limited value and lacked focus on the likelihood of reoffending or risk of harm to others. The action plans we reviewed generally contained relevant objectives related to immediate needs but too many did not consider offending behaviour. Staff outside of sentence planning did not have access to the plan and formal information exchange between other departments and the case coordinator was weak. Contact between the case coordinator and the prisoner was undertaken in some cases but was not sufficiently meaningful or frequent.
- HP40 The executive release scheme assessment process was thorough but not always completed on time to enable release at the earliest eligibility date.

- HP41 There was no formal system for exchanging information and making plans to manage the risk of harm presented by prisoners. Parole processes were satisfactory, with a large proportion of applications being successful, but some reports were submitted late.
- HP42 The initial automatic categorisation of some prisoners to category A was unacceptable. Appropriate information was taken into account for recategorisation but reviews were not always undertaken on time. Prisoners were not routinely informed of the outcome and were frustrated by the lack of information.
- HP43 Insufficient work was being done to support prisoners serving life sentences.
- HP44 There was little provided to help prisoners resettle. The lack of housing for those released from prison was a serious barrier to effective rehabilitation but the absence of data collection made it impossible to evidence the number of prisoners requiring help. Prisoners could not access support in relation to financial management or debt issues before release.
- HP45 The only preparation for release which addressed employment on release was an ad hoc and infrequently run preparation for the job market programme at Northward.
- HP46 There was no ongoing health provision for prisoners being released, even for those with complex health issues.
- HP47 Narcotics Anonymous and Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) attended Northward twice a week, and AA attended Fairbanks monthly. The Cayman Against Substance Abuse (CASA) programme provided a useful educational course at Northward but links to the community were weak.
- HP48 Work with, and support for families and children were limited. Domestic visit sessions were too short, at 30 minutes, and some prisoners had to share this time between family members, which restricted contact time even further. The visits room at both prisons was poorly furnished and bleak.
- HP49 Work to address offending behaviour was not based on a comprehensive needs analysis. The Constructs course at Northward was relevant and well used, and additional courses delivered by probation staff extended the range of programmes. The sex offender treatment programme at Northward was not delivered often enough to meet need, resulting in some men being released without their offending being addressed. A useful and relevant programme was available for women.

Main concerns and recommendations

- HP50 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.

HP51 Concern: Prisoners at Northward did not feel safe. Nearly three-quarters said that they had felt unsafe at some time and almost half that they felt unsafe at the time of the survey. 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 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.

HP52 Concern: Illegal drug availability and use were rife in Northward. Nothing was done to prevent drugs coming into the prison, and there was no random drug testing or target testing of those suspected of being involved in drugs, and no clinical treatment available for drug users.

Recommendation: 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.

HP53 Concern: Prisoners on the basic unit or housed for their own protection on A wing at Northward, including those with serious mental health issues and at risk of suicide or self-harm, were segregated and held in wretched conditions, with minimal regime. The process to place prisoners on basic was unregulated, with no senior manager approval or oversight, and no comprehensive recording, monitoring or case management to plan for reintegration.

Recommendation: 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.

HP54 Concern: Accommodation wings and cells at Northward were barely fit for human habitation. Facilities were unbearably hot 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.

HP55 Concern: There was no transparency or consistency in the way that staff responded to prisoner need. The legitimacy of procedures and decisions was constantly

undermined by the unregulated and often illegitimate exercise of staff discretion. Staff often did not do what was required of them; prisoners had no effective means of redress and managers failed in their responsibility to supervise. The potential for the abuse of power was pervasive.

Recommendation: 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.

HP56 Concern: Prisoners on the high-risk unit (HRU) were subject to excessively controlled and restrictive conditions. Allocation to the unit lacked authority and effective approval, and prisoners remained on the unit for many years without any effective monitoring, assessment, review or means of challenge.

Recommendation: 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.

HP57 Concern: Male juveniles were accommodated in the same wings as adults. They were at serious risk of abuse, including sexual predation and gang recruitment. They had no access to activities or a regime suitable for their age.

Recommendation: Juveniles 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.

HP58 Concern: The health needs of prisoners at both Northward and Fairbanks were poorly served. The lack of a health needs assessment to determine need, coupled with a severe lack of health services staff, the absence of any governance, particularly in the area of medicines management, and inadequate mental health services resulted in a derisory service.

Recommendation: 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.

HP59 Concern: Most prisoners were unoccupied during the day. The education, training and work needs of prisoners had not been assessed and did not inform delivery.

There were insufficient work, training and education places, and even these were underused.

Recommendation: 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.

Section 1: Safety

Courts, escorts and transfers

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.1 Journeys to the prison were short and the transport used was basic but clean. Many prisoners' property did not arrive with them. Ankle shackles were used on some prisoners, which was disproportionate to the risk posed.
- 1.2 Journeys to and from the prison were short. Prison transport was used for those being taken to and from court, while police cars were used for new prisoners. The prison vehicles that we saw were clean and had bench seats with seat belts. There was a separate compartment to transport juveniles and women separately from adult males. Prisoners in our survey at Northward were negative about transport, with only 50% saying that they were treated well by escort staff and 42% that they felt safe during their journey. Women were more positive, with all telling us that they were treated well or very well and that they felt safe.
- 1.3 In the Northward survey, only 55% of prisoners, and two of the four women at Fairbanks told us that all their property arrived with them.
- 1.4 Owing to the absence of locked cells in the vans and the poor security at the court, most prisoners were handcuffed during the journey. In addition to this, category A and escape-risk male prisoners were required to wear shackles around their ankles which were chained to handcuffs, and we considered this to be excessive.

Recommendations

- 1.5 **Prisoners' property should be transported with them to prison.**
- 1.6 **Prisoners should not be shackled during escorts.**

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.

- 1.7 Both of the reception areas were clean and processes were efficient. The information arriving with prisoners was limited and reception assessments did not address aspects of vulnerability. The health care assessment was inadequate and did not take place on the day of arrival. Prisoners did not get immediate access to the prison shop and were not provided with interim

reception packs. There was no dedicated first night accommodation and the personal interview with new prisoners did not sufficiently address vulnerability or safety. Most male prisoners did not feel safe on their first night. There was a comprehensive induction presentation but it was not delivered immediately after arrival.

- 1.8 The reception area at Northward was clean and air conditioned. Prisoners were offered a shower before changing into prison clothing, and they could also get a shower on the wings. All arrivals, irrespective of risk, were subjected to a strip search. In our groups, prisoners told us that they had been required to squat, which was unacceptable as a routine process and without a supporting risk assessment. A prisoner orderly working in reception organised a full range of kit to give to new prisoners. At the time of the inspection there was a shortage of pillows. The orderly did not have a formal role in welcoming, advising or offering peer support to new prisoners.
- 1.9 At Fairbanks, the clean and tidy staff rest room was used as a reception area. It was used for searching prisoners, who then changed into prison clothing there. Women prisoners in our groups and in our survey said that they were searched respectfully and treated well in reception. Owing to the low number of receptions at Fairbanks, most reception processes were fairly informal and tailored to the individual needs of the prisoner, with staff conducting all elements of the process.
- 1.10 Newly arrived prisoners did not have early access to the prison shop and were not provided with reception packs of tobacco or other goods; this left some prisoners vulnerable to accruing debt.
- 1.11 Reception staff at Northward were professional and responsive to prisoners' requests, and processes were efficient, with prisoners being escorted to their accommodation directly after processing. New prisoners were given a comprehensive information leaflet about prison procedures and the complaints system. The leaflet was in English only and we did not see any check of their understanding of the information. We saw staff offering free telephone calls to newly arrived prisoners at Northward and were satisfied that this also took place at Fairbanks.
- 1.12 Information arriving with the prisoner was sparse, with no escort record, criminal record or court reports.
- 1.13 Assessments in reception were limited. Prisoners were asked if they had problems with other prisoners, to avoid putting them in situations of conflict, but there was no assessment of their mood, vulnerability to self-harm or the risk they might pose to other prisoners or staff. There was no assessment of special needs arising from age or disability.
- 1.14 There was no health care assessment in reception; this usually took place on the following day but we met some prisoners who had waited longer. Women prisoners were likely to have a long delay in receiving their health care assessment because the nurse visited Fairbanks only three days a week. This potentially left prisoners at risk, especially those who had addiction problems or required a regime of medication for chronic conditions. The quality of the assessment we observed was not adequate (see also section on delivery of care (physical health) and recommendation 2.78).
- 1.15 Most new prisoners at Northward went to D wing but this was not consistent because of a lack of spaces or potential conflict with other prisoners. At Fairbanks, women were assigned to one of the three dormitories.

- 1.16 In our survey at Northward, only 34% of prisoners said that they had felt safe on their first night but in Fairbanks all the women said that they had felt safe. On arrival on their wing, prisoners had a personal interview with a member of staff, who explained wing routines, but no thorough assessment to ensure that they were located safely in a shared cell.
- 1.17 An induction presentation was scheduled for new prisoners at Northward every Friday. It was comprehensive but did not take place when the sole officer responsible was absent. In our survey, only 62% said that they had undergone an induction course. At Fairbanks, the prisoner's assigned officer adviser provided induction information.

Recommendations

- 1.18 **Prisoners should not be strip searched or required to squat during searching in reception unless justified by a properly recorded individual risk assessment.**
- 1.19 **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.**
- 1.20 **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.**
- 1.21 **A clear set of first night procedures which addresses prisoners' feelings of safety should be developed and implemented.**
- 1.22 **The induction presentation should be provided consistently on the day after prisoners' arrival.**

Bullying and violence reduction

Expected outcomes:

Everyone feels 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.

- 1.23 Prisoners did not feel safe at Northward. 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.
- 1.24 Prisoners at Northward did not feel safe. In our survey, almost three-quarters of men said that they had felt unsafe at the prison at some time and nearly half said that they currently felt unsafe. The latter figure was much higher on A wing (68%). At the time of inspection, the women at Fairbanks said that they all felt safe.
- 1.25 Prisoners at Northward reported high levels of victimisation. Forty-one per cent of men reported being victimised by other prisoners – mainly due to nationality or because they were from different districts of the island. Most victimisation took the form of insulting remarks, threats or theft of belongings; 15% were physical assaults. No women reported victimisation from other prisoners. Almost two-thirds of men reported being victimised by staff – mainly due

to nationality or offence type. Most of this victimisation took the form of insulting remarks and threats, and 18% of men said that they had been physically assaulted by staff. There was a short anti-bullying statement on display at Northward, encouraging prisoners to report bullying, but prison managers made no attempt to identify, analyse or measure the extent of bullying or violence-related incidents in order to reduce violence and improve safety (see main recommendation HP51).

- 1.26 Incidents of violence and bullying activity were recorded in wing information books. There was evidence of some investigations into incidents of violence, which was supported by the examination of closed-circuit television footage, and some actions were taken against perpetrators. This usually consisted of a change of location and a disciplinary charge. However, we found examples where little or no action had been taken and noted cases where victims of violence had been moved to, or offered, the dreadful accommodation in segregated conditions on A wing for their own safety (see section on segregation/basic). There was evidence of prisoners having been threatened and assaulted (with visible injuries) by other prisoners but, other than treatment being administered, no further action had been taken to enquire into the circumstances of the incidents; entries in observation books frequently advised staff to merely 'monitor the situation'.
- 1.27 The prison did not have any form of strategy or policy to explain the different forms of victimisation or unacceptable behaviour, or the measures that were available to support victims and challenge perpetrators. There was no awareness of prisoners' perceptions of safety, and no attempt was made to consult them about these.

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.

- 1.28 Approximately a third of male prisoners said that they had felt depressed or suicidal on their arrival but screening for risk did not take place. Levels of self-harm were low but monitoring arrangements for those at risk were inadequate and ineffective. Some at-risk prisoners were inappropriately located in segregated conditions.
- 1.29 In our survey at Northward, 32% of men said that they had felt depressed or suicidal on arrival but there was no screening of new receptions for risk of self-harm/suicide. The absence of a self-harm/safer custody strategy meant that the heightened vulnerability of some groups of prisoners, such as adults with mental health issues, women, those on remand and those under 18, was not considered and there were no effective support mechanisms or care planning arrangements available.
- 1.30 We identified a small number of vulnerable prisoners who had been placed on a 15- or 30-minute 'watch' because they were either depressed or had threatened self-harm. However, the watch consisted of superficial and mainly observational entries recorded in a book, which was retained in the wing office. We noted in one wing observation book that a manager had asked other staff 'to be mindful' of a prisoner who had threatened to take his own life. Two days later this prisoner had been placed in appalling segregated conditions for assaulting a member of

staff and been placed on a watch. One particular prisoner, who had a history of self-harm, had also been located in segregation and been subject to a 15-minute watch for the previous 10 years without any review. In another example, a high-risk unit (HRU) prisoner who was already subject to a frequent watch for security reasons (this approach was applied to all prisoners in the HRU) had overdosed on sleeping tablets and been taken to an outside hospital. He had been returned after refusing treatment and relocated in the HRU with no additional safeguards in place.

- 1.31 Levels of self-harm were low but there was no evidence to suggest that incidents were monitored to improve practice.
- 1.32 There was some training for staff in suicide prevention, and in the year to date 11 staff had completed refresher training.

Recommendations

- 1.33 **New prisoners should be screened on arrival for the risk of self-harm or suicide.**
- 1.34 **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).**
- 1.35 **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.**

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.

- 1.36 Physical security at both sites was deficient. Security information handling systems were basic. There was inadequate focus on drug misuse at Northward and drug testing arrangements were poor. The limited staff-prisoner relationships resulted in little dynamic security.
- 1.37 Northward was surrounded by a single 5.2-metre security fence with a single point of access through a concrete-structured gate lodge. Parts of the gate lodge were out of bounds owing to the failing of the concrete and the supporting steel work. The poor physical condition of the cellular accommodation blocks (see section on residential units) compromised the security of the establishment and rendered them inadequate, especially for housing category A and B prisoners. Internal walls and fences were in a poor state of repair and there were many unprotected climb-points.
- 1.38 Fairbanks was surrounded by a 3-metre chain-link fence that was in a poor state of repair, with netting entangled throughout the old and decrepit barbed wire that had been erected at the top of the fence. This did not provide the prison with sufficient external security. The 'gate' was a tubular frame that slid across the main entrance and was not protected by barbed/razor wire. The main building was a concrete block construction resembling a warehouse. It was

partitioned off into caged dormitories by the use of chain-link fencing. There were also three 'maximum' cells (see section on segregation/basic), constructed of rigid wire mesh.

- 1.39 There was no security committee or any formal arrangement by which to pass on key information to other departments in the prison. Security intelligence systems were almost non-existent. Security information reports (SIRs) had been introduced but we were unable to find any completed forms relating to either site. There was a folder of 'incident reports' but there had been no analysis of these and any knowledge base was purely anecdotal. Effective staff-prisoner interactions were so limited at Northward that staff had little understanding of the prisoners in their charge, so the opportunity for effective dynamic security was minimal. The picture at Fairbanks was considerably better, although this was due to the almost one-to-one ratio of prisoners to staff, rather than any strategic consideration (see also section on staff-prisoner relationships).
- 1.40 A hand-written ledger was maintained of what were deemed to be significant issues, but the information it contained was not analysed to provide a picture of emerging issues or areas of concern to security, beyond the total number of searches and drug tests recorded each month.
- 1.41 Contact with the local police was minimal and was restricted to the disposal of illegal substances. There were high levels of illegal drugs at Northward, and the smell of cannabis pervaded throughout the establishment at all times of the day and night. In our survey, 45% of prisoners said that it was easy to get illegal drugs into the prison and there were high numbers of drug finds recorded in the ledger (a monthly average of 15 finds for the first six months of 2012), including the discovery of a pound and a half of cannabis in March 2012. In spite of this, the prison took no action to prevent the ingress of drugs; the small security team (two officers) were regularly redeployed to other duties and undertook no targeted drug testing of prisoners suspected of being involved with drugs. Thirty-eight per cent of prisoners at Northward said that it was easy to get alcohol into the prison but a review of the security ledger revealed only one instance of an alcohol find in 2012.
- 1.42 Mandatory drug testing facilities were poor and not sufficiently clinical, being carried out in the women's toilets at both sites. On-site urinalysis testing was carried out for cannabis and cocaine, although almost entirely for parole or compliance reasons. At Northward, a high positive testing rate of 28% in the year to date was recorded for cannabis, with no positives for cocaine. Testing equipment was inappropriately stored along with staff food items. At Fairbanks, there was minimal testing and no positive tests had resulted.
- 1.43 In spite of the high positive drug testing rate, the common knowledge of regular drug use and the anecdotal knowledge of high-profile prisoners within the drug culture, there was no prison-specific drug strategy or even a programme of target testing (see main recommendation HP52).

Recommendations

- 1.44 **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.**
- 1.45 **The security information report system should be re-launched and systems implemented to record, analyse and act on identified information.**

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

Incentives and earned privileges

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.

- 1.47 There was no incentives and earned privileges system.

- 1.48 There was no IEP system to encourage good behaviour or to manage poor behaviour. The terms 'enhanced, standard and basic' referred to accommodation facilities and related more to security category than to behaviour. We saw a draft IEP policy but an introduction date had yet to be identified.

- 1.49 The exception to this was a punitive measure referred to as 'basic' which was arbitrarily applied to prisoners by the duty manager (see section on segregation).

Recommendation

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

Disciplinary procedures

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.

- 1.51 Adjudication procedures were weak, the general quality of paperwork was poor and punishments were largely unregulated and harsh. Use of force procedures were poor and unmonitored, and staff training had ceased. Segregation arrangements were dreadful and lacked any effective governance.

- 1.52 The number of recorded adjudications at Northward was low, at an average of two per day; there were no data or adjudication records available for Fairbanks.

- 1.53 Hearings at Fairbanks took place in a small office, although we did not see any during the inspection. At Northward, they were undertaken either in the shift commander's office or in wing offices. The quality of paperwork was poor, with the majority not recording any enquiry into the incidents. Thirty-eight adjudications had been referred to the police for offences including assault, possession of unauthorised articles (drugs and mobile telephones), disobeying lawful orders, mutiny and fighting. The quality of these adjudication records was similarly poor, with only two being properly completed; the worst had no name, number, time or

date recorded. Few adjudications that had been referred to the police had been progressed and there was no evidence of any follow-up by the prison.

- 1.54 Although there was a published tariff, punishments varied greatly, depending on who was conducting them, and ranged from minor fines up to an increase in time in custody of up to 28 days. We considered it inappropriate that sentences could be increased by those outside the judiciary.
- 1.55 There was no standardisation process and, although the Director reviewed each 'completed' adjudication, the standard remained poor.

Recommendations

- 1.56 **The practice of prison staff increasing sentences should cease.**
- 1.57 **Adjudication procedures should be standardised and quality controlled.**

The use of force

- 1.58 The procedures and controls set out in Prison Service Order 1600 (use of force) previously adopted by the Cayman Islands Prison Service had lapsed; staff were largely untrained or qualifications had expired, use of force forms were not used and there was a general lack of monitoring or governance following any application of force.
- 1.59 The force used on prisoners ranged from the automatic handcuffing of prisoners on basic to the use of handcuffs and shackles in-cell in response to unruly and aggressive behaviour while locked up. We also found evidence of prisoners being restrained during forced administration of medicine.

Recommendation

- 1.60 **The procedures and regulations laid out in Prison Service Order 1600 should be reintroduced without delay.**

Segregation/Basic

- 1.61 The segregation unit was housed on A wing and comprised six high-control cells referred to as 'basic' and seven gated cells for prisoners held for their own protection, who were referred to as 'housed'. During the inspection, there were 11 prisoners held on the unit, which, in proportion to the prison's population, we considered to be high.
- 1.62 Prisoners on basic could expect to be located there for a period of usually not less than 28 days; this was often as the result of a 'shift commander' making a decision to place prisoners in the segregation/basic cells and, with the exception of the countersigning by a unit manager, there was little evidence of any legitimate authority to hold prisoners in these dreadful conditions (see main recommendation HP53). There was no regime activity for such prisoners, beyond a daily shower and an exercise period in an outside cage. Possessions were not allowed and cells were bare, dirty, graffiti ridden and austere, with almost no natural light. (See Appendix IV for photographs of a basic cell and exercise cage). Artificial light for two sets of three cells was controlled from the staff office, with no night light available for prisoner use.

Cells had a thick solid door, which, in addition to the lack of any effective ventilation, resulted in cells being stiflingly hot (see main recommendation HP54).

- 1.63 Two of the occupied cells had no light fittings, leaving the prisoners in almost perpetual darkness. The prisoners held in them had no mattresses, bedding or changes of clothes, and slept on plastic mattress covers. We were told on the first day of the inspection that the bedding had been sent to the laundry but this was not true and this position was not rectified, even though we commented on it on three occasions during the inspection.
- 1.64 Prisoners leaving the landing while on basic were handcuffed and were required to wear orange overalls. We observed one prisoner undergoing adjudication on the wing being subject to this treatment, even though there were five members of staff in the immediate area. The prisoner was quiet, subdued and clearly upset at his treatment. There was no risk assessment process to determine the need for any restraint and no record was made of the use of restraints (see section on use of force).
- 1.65 Daily recording of prisoners on basic was minimal, with comments such as 'well behaved' or 'lying on bed' being recorded. There was little or no management oversight of the unit and we observed unit managers attending the unit being told that all was well, recording this in the wing observation book and leaving without even going onto the basic spur.
- 1.66 There was no daily chaplaincy or health care oversight of prisoners on basic and we were told that any medical attention could only take place if the prisoner was taken to the health care unit as the nurse never attended any of the wings.
- 1.67 Other prisoners were held in these cells due to the need for higher levels of control. One prisoner with mental health problems had been located on the unit for over four years. These prisoners were allowed off the spur to associate with other A wing prisoners and to attend regime activities.
- 1.68 Prisoners who were 'housed' for their own protection were held in wire-fronted cells, which contained electric fans and afforded better conditions than those on basic. Their cells were lighter and usually unlocked for long periods of the day. Regime activities for them were minimal and usually consisted of sitting on the landing playing cards or dominoes.
- 1.69 There was no case management and, with no attempt at reintegration, it was possible for prisoners to spend their entire sentences on the wing.
- 1.70 Segregation at Fairbanks took the form of three cells, referred to as 'the Max' (see Appendix IV for photographs of 'the Max' cells). There were no prisoners located in the Max during the inspection and there were no records kept of its use. These cells were sparse, with no furniture other than a bed and a steel toilet. There was no written policy or procedures for their use and we were unable to establish the frequency or reasons for use of these cells (see also section on residential units).

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.

- 1.71 There was no immediate or ongoing clinical treatment for prisoners with substance misuse issues arriving at either Northward or Fairbanks.
- 1.72 In our survey, 24% of men had had a problem with drugs and 13% with alcohol on arrival at Northward, and a further 13% said that they had developed a problem with illegal drugs while at the establishment. In spite of these statistics, there was no provision for prisoners with drug or alcohol misuse issues to receive immediate, safe, effective and individualised clinical treatment.
- 1.73 Consultant psychiatrists estimated the percentage of patients on their community caseload with a dual diagnosis (mental health and substance misuse issues) to be approximately 50% but there were no similar estimates for the prison population.
- 1.74 There was an island-wide national anti-drug strategy (2009–2013), described as a ‘master plan’, which sought to prevent illicit drug use, effectively treat those with dependencies and combat the demand for, as well as the availability and distribution of, illicit drugs to and within all three Islands. However, it did not have specific targets and did not address the particular issues at either prison (see main recommendation HP52).

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 Prisoner accommodation at Northward was poor and some was appalling. The fabric of the buildings was dilapidated and the cage-like cells were dark, stifling and oppressive. Cleanliness was poor and prisoners had little privacy. Most accommodation was unfit for human habitation. The accommodation at Fairbanks was better but was also dingy, decrepit and oppressively hot.
- 2.2 Northwood comprised six accommodation wings of varying size and structure. With the exception of F wing, communal areas were dark, decrepit, dingy and chaotic. Association rooms were grubby, bare and lacking in recreational or other equipment. Prisoners told us that the units were infested with cockroaches and that the roofs leaked in poor weather. There was graffiti and dirt everywhere and it was difficult to see how much of the bare and crude concrete construction of these crumbling facilities could be improved.
- 2.3 Cellular accommodation on A to E wings was cage-like, and prisoners were often required to share cells fit only for one. Many prisoners used blankets and sheets as makeshift screens to provide some degree of privacy. Some had placed plastic sheeting on their ceilings to prevent the falling of rust particles from the structure and the ingress of water. The dormitory on A wing was overcrowded and dirty and was also full of makeshift blanket partitions. In-cell toilets were filthy and unscreened. Cell windows were layered with bars and screens and afforded little natural light. The wings were dark and intimidating. There was no air conditioning in either the communal areas or the cells. The heat and atmosphere were oppressive and particularly unacceptable given that the staff offices in the same buildings were air conditioned. Most prisoners had rickety and potentially dangerous fans in their cells. Living conditions on A and D wings and the high-risk unit (HRU) were particularly appalling (see main recommendation HP54). See Appendix IV for photographs of cells at Northward.
- 2.4 Prisoners throughout Northward obtained furniture where they could. Some had more than others but there was still insufficient and nearly all of it was decrepit. There were no lockable cabinets where prisoners could secure valuables or medication.
- 2.5 F wing was arguably the best accommodation and housed about 19 of the more trusted (category D) prisoners, mostly in single cells. The wing had the appearance of a large storage shed but was spacious and light and the prisoners had done their best to make their living conditions more tolerable, most managing to acquire some furniture and even some strips of carpet.
- 2.6 In our survey, 96% of prisoners said that they could shower daily, and access to showers and toilets across the prison was good. The fabric and cleanliness of showers and communal toilets were poor. Most prisoners we saw had adequate clothing, although some bedding we saw was in holes, torn and stained. Prisoners were issued with a prison kit on arrival and there

was a simple procedure for its exchange, although we met individuals who had waited several weeks for simple requests to be dealt with. Our survey suggested that nearly half of prisoners had difficulties in accessing clean bedding or clothing, although most prisoners we spoke to indicated that they were able to launder their possessions, with each wing allocated two laundry sessions per week. Only prisoners on F wing were able to wear their own clothes but they had to pay to have them laundered.

- 2.7 Northward prisoners were able to make applications or requests using a simple form that was available from wing staff. Applications were then recorded in a wing book. There was nothing recorded to confirm when and how applications were dealt with. In our survey, only a fifth of prisoners thought that it was easy to make an application and less than half thought that they were dealt with fairly; on B wing, only 6% of prisoners thought that it was easy to make an application/request.
- 2.8 There was reasonable access to telephones at Northward, with telephone points adjacent to most cells. Prisoners could purchase telephone PIN cards or have relatives hand or post them in. Free letters were available on each wing, although little mail was sent or received. All outgoing and incoming mail was censored which was excessive. There was no procedure to record letters of concern or to account for the interception of mail.
- 2.9 Fairbanks was a single structure comprising four dormitories (see Appendix IV) and a discrete segregated area referred to as 'the Max' (see paragraph 1.70). Each dormitory held about eight beds, although most of them were empty at the time of the inspection. The prison was reasonably clean, although bed spaces were unscreened and provided little privacy, it was run-down and dingy, and the fabric and decorative state were poor. Women had gathered together what furniture they could but it was old, worn and limited.
- 2.10 The central atrium to the building was a large wire cage and was referred to as the dayroom (see Appendix IV). It contained a few, limited facilities. The Max cells were not in use at the time of the inspection. Conditions in these cells were poor. The purpose of this facility was unclear, as it provided neither meaningful additional security nor effective segregation.
- 2.11 The accommodation at Fairbanks lacked air conditioning, so the atmosphere was stifling. Again, this was in stark contrast with the air conditioning operating in staff areas.
- 2.12 Access to the toilets and showers at Fairbanks was good but the fabric of these facilities was poor. An accessible laundry was provided and supplies of clothing, kit, cleaning and hygiene products were available. Women were not able to wear their own clothes, and the prison uniform looked as though it had been designed for men.
- 2.13 Procedures for accessing applications, telephones and mail were similar to those available to the male prisoners at Northward.

High-risk unit (HRU)

- 2.14 The HRU was a discrete 14-cell unit on the first floor of D wing (see Appendix IV). It housed prisoners remanded for, or convicted of, murder, all of whom were automatically assigned to category A and located in the HRU without an assessment or effective authorisation. Prisoners were not told why they had been allocated to the HRU but once there they stayed on the unit for many years without any monitoring, risk assessment, review or means of challenge. Two of the 11 residents had been there for seven years, and this was not unusual. The need for such restrictive measures was not evidenced or justified in either case (see main recommendation HP56).

- 2.15 The environment in the HRU was bleak, oppressive and excessively controlled, and the limited regime did little to safeguard or support the physical and mental well-being of prisoners held there. In our survey, 83% prisoners on the unit said that they had felt unsafe at some time. Prisoners were isolated, locked up in single cells for over 22 hours a day, most only coming out for one hour of exercise and two 20-minute periods for showering, cleaning, using the mini-gym or video games (see recommendation 3.6). These activities were mainly solitary, although some prisoners were unlocked in pairs if they were deemed compatible. A few prisoners had in-cell education and visits from the chaplaincy and a psychologist.
- 2.16 Because of their long periods locked up, prisoners on the HRU relied heavily on staff for assistance and support. However, in our survey only one prisoner on the unit said that it was easy to make an application. Less than half of them believed that staff treated them with respect and we observed remote staff–prisoner relationships. Prisoners had an allocated officer adviser, who wrote monthly behavioural reports. However, contact was minimal and there was little recording of any meaningful interaction, and 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

- 2.17 **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.**
- 2.18 **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.**
- 2.19 **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.**
- 2.20 **The Max cells at Fairbanks should not be used.**

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.

- 2.21 The quality of staff–prisoner relationships was poor. Many prisoners, in particular Caymanian prisoners, did not feel that they were treated respectfully or fairly and that staff applied rules inconsistently. The interpersonal skills of staff were poor. The assigned officer scheme had little impact or value.
- 2.22 In our Northward survey, only 53% of prisoners said that staff treated them with respect, and the same percentage said that there was a member of staff they could turn to if they had a problem. The responses to these survey questions were even more negative among

Caymanian prisoners (46% versus 78% of prisoners of other nationalities felt respected and 47% versus 78% had a member of staff they could turn to). Nearly two-thirds of prisoners said that they felt victimised by staff and, again, these findings were worse among Caymanian prisoners, who told us that they were treated unfairly by staff and that rules were inconsistently applied. We observed this on a number of occasions, particularly in regard to the lack of challenge made to the blatant smoking of cannabis in the prison (see main recommendation HP55).

- 2.23 Staff–prisoner relationships at Northward were passive. We saw occasional friendly engagement but generally we observed staff to be distant, disinterested and dismissive toward prisoners. A few staff expressed to us some disturbing attitudes about the treatment of prisoners and even argued against some basic initiatives attempted by the Director to mitigate the poor conditions in the prison. We saw little evidence of constructive challenge on the part of staff toward prisoners, with most seeming completely indifferent to prisoner inactivity or indolence.
- 2.24 About two-thirds of prisoners in our survey said that they had an assigned officer adviser and we saw lists of such allocations around the prison. Only a third said that the adviser was useful, and none of the prisoners we spoke to said that engagement with their assigned officer was meaningful, useful or had even taken place. Staff we spoke to seemed to know about the prisoners on their wing and wing history sheets were in use. Generally, the information contained in these records was sparse, superficial and pointless.
- 2.25 There was an assigned officer scheme at Fairbanks, although, with only four prisoners, relationships between staff and prisoners there were more personal and in our survey all of the women indicated that they felt respected by staff and able to turn to them if they needed help. This was confirmed by our observations, although relationships were passive and unchallenging. Entries in wing history sheets were more frequent than at Northwood but lacked depth or assessment and mainly concerned the narrow reporting of occurrences.

Recommendation

- 2.26 **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.**

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 characteristic³ 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.

³ The grounds upon which discrimination is unlawful (Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2010).

- 2.27 There was little awareness or perception among managers or staff of creating an environment which confronted discrimination, promoted equitable outcomes for prisoners and fostered good relationships. The different characteristics of the prison population had not been considered, so there were no systems to address their needs. Most Caymanian prisoners reported more negatively than other nationals about their treatment and other elements of prison life but there was no consultation with prisoners.

Strategic management

- 2.28 The prison did not demonstrate any formal approach to identifying and minimising discrimination or promoting equitable outcomes for prisoners. There were no systems to identify and distinguish the different forms of discrimination, including the unconscious and covert forms of discrimination detected in processes, attitudes and behaviour. As a result, there was no monitoring of the different characteristics of the population such as race, nationality, disability, age, gender or sexual orientation, in order to ensure fair treatment and access to services.

Recommendation

- 2.29 **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.**

Diversity strands

- 2.30 Just over three-quarters of the male population and all the women were Caymanian. In our survey and in our discussions with prisoners from this group, they reported far more negatively than other nationals around treatment by staff, victimisation by staff, access to activities and safety. There had been no consultation with them and no action had been taken to explore their negative perceptions.
- 2.31 There were no procedures for identifying older prisoners and those with disabilities, or their needs. There was no support available for them. Fifteen per cent of men considered themselves to have a disability and this group was much more negative across a range of indicators, including feeling safe and being victimised by staff and prisoners.
- 2.32 At the time of the inspection there were 48 male foreign national prisoners, 15 of whom were from outside of the Caribbean. Documentation indicated that they all spoke English. Support for foreign national prisoners was limited to visits by consular officials. Legislation meant that most foreign national prisoners serving a sentence of 12 months or more were deported and even those who held Caymanian passports could have their 'right to remain' revoked. Twenty-three prisoners had been deported from the prison in the previous 12 months. Most foreign national prisoners had family members on the island but they were not eligible for supervised home leave.
- 2.33 In our survey, 2% of male prisoners identified as being gay or bisexual but there was little awareness or material to support this group and we encountered homophobic attitudes among some staff and prisoners at Northward. However, examination of a random sample of prisoner complaints revealed a thorough investigation by managers into allegations of homophobic remarks made by a prisoner towards another. This had been dealt with and responded to appropriately.

Recommendations

- 2.34 **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 **The negative perceptions of Caymanian prisoners should be explored and acted on.**

Juveniles

- 2.36 A specialist wing for juveniles and young offenders was no longer available because of overcrowding. As a result, children and young offenders shared accommodation with adult prisoners. We found evidence of male juveniles put at risk of predatory sexual behaviour and recruitment into gangs. The regime was not specific to the needs of juveniles and young offenders and there was a lack of case conferencing or involvement of the Department of Children and Family Services. Wing files were uninformative and staff had not received any recent training in working with juveniles/young offenders or child protection.
- 2.37 C wing, also known as Eagle house, had previously held young offenders and juveniles, and before 2007 had had a good regime, delivered in a safe environment, including regular home visits, opening of bank accounts to prepare for release and individualised case conferencing with the Department of Children and Family Services. However, overcrowding had led to the ending of C wing as a specialised unit for juveniles and young offenders, and at the time of the inspection juveniles and young offenders were accommodated on this wing alongside adult prisoners. We evidenced juveniles and young adults put at risk of sexual predation and recruitment into gang crime. One adult prisoner on C wing had been convicted of sexual offences against children, and another was suspected of being involved in recruiting young people into gang crime on release. In addition, one of the juveniles had been placed in custody as he was in need of 'care and protection', and it was impossible to see how either of these could be guaranteed (see main recommendation HP57).
- 2.38 There was no policy or strategy for the management of juveniles and young offenders in prison. Their day-to-day activity was as limited as it was for other prisoners and they had no access to a regime suitable for their age. One of the juveniles we spoke to said that he spent his day 'sleeping and smoking ganja'.
- 2.39 Wing files contained no information, other than limited daily observations and some officer adviser updates. Formal involvement and case conferencing with the Children and Families Service was too limited. There had not been any training in working with juveniles and young offenders, including child protection, since 2004.

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.

- 2.40 There was no monitoring of religion and we had no assurance that faith provision catered for the needs of all the population. There were good links with faith communities on the island and a selection of services were provided daily but almost exclusively for Christian prisoners. Some groups of prisoners were denied access to services because of their location and new prisoners were not routinely seen or given information on chaplaincy services. Areas dedicated to worship at Northward were reasonably good. Faith-based classes were limited. Counselling services had recently been established.
- 2.41 Chaplaincy services were coordinated by a newly appointed, voluntary full-time chaplain. There were no other members of the chaplaincy team and the chaplain was not involved in other matters affecting the prison. Links with faith communities were good and a large number of visiting pastors provided a selection of mostly evening services at both prisons daily. Weekend services were also well catered for. However, services were largely Christian in nature.
- 2.42 Prisoners' religions were recorded on reception but the chaplain did not know the extent of different religious faiths in the prison or the number of prisoners involved, so we were not assured that all prisoners had their religious needs catered for or could access a chaplain of their faith regularly. Only half of all prisoners said that their religious beliefs were respected. The chaplain did not routinely see new prisoners as part of the induction process or individually.
- 2.43 Chaplaincy facilities at Northward were reasonably good, with a well-equipped and large air-conditioned chapel. Services at Fairbanks were conducted in a classroom and the chaplain visited one morning each week. Details of religious services were not published to prisoners, and Northward prisoners in the HRU or in segregation were denied access. We were told that all remand prisoners had to apply to attend services, with many of these requests being denied on security grounds. The chaplain did not routinely visit those held on the HRU or in segregation.
- 2.44 Faith-based classes were limited to Bible study twice a week by a visiting pastor at Northward. The chaplain was a trained counsellor and she had recently established a caseload of 10 prisoners who received counselling for significant events, including bereavement and relationship problems.

Recommendations

- 2.45 **The prison should monitor different religions in the prison to ensure that all faiths are catered for.**
- 2.46 **All prisoners should have access to corporate worship each week, including access to a chaplain of their faith.**
- 2.47 **When risk assessments indicate that a prisoner is unsuitable to attend corporate worship, alternative provision should be made.**

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.

- 2.48 There was a comprehensive complaints policy. Complaint forms were freely available on residential units but there were no posting boxes or systems to support confidentiality. The number of complaints made was low and prisoners had little confidence in the system. The responses to complaints which we examined were reasonable but some had not been finalised. There was no facility for complaint to an independent body.
- 2.49 In our survey, only 39% of prisoners at Northward said that it was easy to make a complaint but women at Fairbanks were more positive about the complaints procedure. Prisoners at Northward told us that they had no confidence in the fairness of the complaints system and feared reprisals from staff if they complained; this possibly accounted for the low level of complaints, with only 20 having been made in the six months before the inspection. Only one prisoner at Fairbanks reported having made a complaint.
- 2.50 There was a well-structured complaints system and prisoners were provided with written information about it on reception. If a prisoner was dissatisfied with a response, the complaint could be escalated to the Internal Complaints Committee, which comprised prison staff, and to the Director. On residential units at both Northward and Fairbanks we found racks stocked with complaint forms in communal areas, although prisoners had to request an envelope from staff for confidential complaints.
- 2.51 There was no assurance that complaints could be made confidentially. Completed complaint forms had to be submitted to the prisoner's officer adviser and a tear-off strip was returned to the prisoner. There were no posting boxes and there was no administrative complaints department, and most went directly to operational managers for a response.
- 2.52 Responses to complaints were reasonable and respectful. In the sample we examined, most prisoners had received a response within 24 hours. A complaint against a staff member had been taken seriously and upheld. However, we found some responses which indicated that an investigation into a complaint had been initiated or had been partially completed and there was no evidence that the prisoner had been informed of the final outcome.
- 2.53 Complaints about some matters could be made directly to the relevant ministry or portfolio without reference to the internal complaints procedure and, if still dissatisfied, a prisoner could refer a complaint to the Cayman Islands Complaints Commission.

Recommendation

- 2.54 **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.**

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.

- 2.55 There were no staff trained and assigned to provide legal advice, and legal information in the library was out of date. The handling of legally privileged mail was inconsistent. Legal visits were freely available.
- 2.56 There were no staff trained to provide legal advice or support to prisoners on either site and there was no prison-based bail information service for remanded prisoners who wished to pursue a bail application.
- 2.57 Legal information in the libraries on both sites was limited to donated textbooks and guides; much of it was out of date.
- 2.58 In our survey, 49% of prisoners at Northward said that legally privileged mail had been opened out of their presence. There was an instruction to staff, issued in 2007, that outlined the procedure for opening legal mail in the presence of the prisoner when there was a reasonable suspicion that it might contain contraband. We found that staff were not clear on these procedures and there was no record kept of mail opened for these reasons or in error.
- 2.59 Private interview facilities were not used at either site for legal visits, which took place in the visits rooms. In practice, the visits room was booked out by a single legal adviser, so confidentiality was acceptable.

Recommendations

- 2.60 **Legal support should be available for prisoners, and bail information for remand prisoners.**
- 2.61 **There should be up-to-date and reliable legal guidance available in the prison library.**
- 2.62 **Procedures for dealing with legally privileged mail should be followed and a record made when mail is opened.**

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.

- 2.63 There had been no health needs assessment to determine the services required to meet prisoners' health needs. Governance arrangements were lacking. The sole nurse, who served

both prisons, was overwhelmed by his unacceptably high workload, and prisoners' access to him was problematic. The clinic at Northward was shambolic and not fit for purpose. Fairbanks was better but neither were secure or met infection control standards. Those with chronic conditions were not followed up and GP clinics were regularly cancelled and not rescheduled. There was no medicines management. Medicines were held in possession without a risk assessment and some were administered by wing officers. The dental room was reasonable and waiting lists were short. There was no primary mental health care provision and the consultant psychiatrist visited only monthly, to see a few patients. Psychiatric injections were commonly given under restraint and we were not assured of the legality of this practice.

Governance arrangements

- 2.64 Since 2002, the Health Services Authority (HSA) had been responsible for the provision of health services to prisoners at both Northward and Fairbanks. There had been no health needs assessment to determine the services that were required, types of staff or how many were needed to meet the needs of the prison population; provision was based on custom and practice and was inadequate. There was no Service Level Agreement or memorandum of understanding for the service provided and secondary care had to be paid for by the Prison Service in addition to the costs paid for the primary care services. There were no regular meetings between the HSA and the Prison Service and no ratified policies specific to the health care of prisoners. There was no reporting of untoward incidents or near misses (see main recommendation HP58).
- 2.65 There was only one general and mental health-trained nurse, who provided services to prisoners at both Northward and Fairbanks. He worked from 8am until 4.30pm, from Monday to Friday, and was clearly overwhelmed by the volume of work; as a result, he rarely left his clinic at Northward, except to travel to Fairbanks or the hospital in George Town. In effect, he was the physical and mental health nurse, pharmacist, practice manager, administration clerk and porter. He had little support from senior managers in the HSA and no clinical supervision, although he was able to undertake some mandatory training days.
- 2.66 There was one policy that covered all aspects of prison health services; it was poorly written and it was not clear whether it had been ratified by all affected parties. It was not known to prison officers and it was not followed. There was no information-sharing policy and we found numerous examples of breaches of confidentiality, with prison officers being aware of the details of a prisoner's medical history and conditions.
- 2.67 Since 2005, the Cayman Islands Health Practice Commission (HPC) had been responsible for inspecting health service facilities in the Cayman Islands against national standards. There had been two inspections of facilities in the prisons; the most recent had taken place in June 2012. The HPC had passed both facilities, with some compliance actions and a certificate for a year.
- 2.68 We found the clinic at Northward to be cramped, shambolic and not fit for purpose. The layout of the room was poor. There was a 'working trolley' (see Appendix IV) that was untidy, and it was unclear what it was used for, and the tap was broken on the inadequate hand-wash sink. There were unlocked cupboards containing a range of items, including syringes, needles and intravenous fluids. The medicines cupboard was untidy and was unlocked when patients were in the room. The storage of clinical records was poor. The clinical room at Fairbanks was larger but in a similar state. In both rooms, infection control measures were inadequate, with both having dirty, unsterile cloth privacy screens. When we visited a community health clinic in order to compare the facilities that were available to prisoners with those available to the

general population, we found that the community clinic was clean, clinical, light and airy, with relevant health promotion materials available to patients and secure storage of medicines and clinical records.

- 2.69 There was a defibrillator in each prison clinical room, as well as oxygen and suction, all of which were checked weekly, but they were not in a 'grab bag' for easy transportation around the prison sites. The nurse told us that he would not go out to an incident; he expected the prisoner to be brought to the clinic. The resuscitation equipment was not readily available to prison staff, who were in any case untrained in its use.

Recommendation

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

Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.71 Most prisoners arrived in the late afternoon, by which time the nurse had often left Northward for the day, so it was rare for any prisoner at either establishment to be seen by the nurse on their day of arrival. In our survey, only 21% of men and two of the women said that they had had access to the nurse when they had first arrived at the establishment, and this was confirmed in our groups, where some men told us that they had not seen the nurse for several days after arrival. The reception screening was perfunctory. It included blood screening for HIV, but consent for this was only given verbally and was not documented. Health services did not provide hepatitis B vaccinations, although 'flu vaccinations were offered to those at risk.
- 2.72 Prisoners had to ask a prison officer if they wanted to see the nurse. In our survey, 44% of men said that it was easy or very easy to see him; however, prisoners in our groups told us that staff did not always tell the nurse and that he sometimes refused to see them. The nurse triaged patients and was able to administer a range of over-the-counter medications, such as simple linctus (which was given out in copious amounts) and throat lozenges. If needed, he could telephone a doctor for a prescription but it was not clear whether the prescription was ever signed to make it a legal document. The clinical assessments by the nurse that we saw were reasonable.
- 2.73 There were two GP clinics scheduled for Northward and one for Fairbanks each week. During the inspection, one clinic at Northward and the clinic at Fairbanks were cancelled and not rescheduled. We found evidence to suggest that this was a regular occurrence; prisoners in our groups confirmed that GP appointments were often cancelled and that the doctor often failed to arrive at all. No statistics were kept on the number of times that this occurred; under a third of men in our survey said that it was easy or very easy to see the doctor.
- 2.74 No lists were kept of prisoners with chronic or lifelong conditions such as diabetes or epilepsy. The nurse said that he knew who these prisoners were but there was no provision made if he was absent. We were not assured that prisoners with such conditions received regular review in line with evidence-based best practice.
- 2.75 Out of hours, prisoners were taken to the hospital in George Town if they required emergency care. The rudimentary statistics kept by the nurse did not record how many emergency attendances had occurred.

- 2.76 Clinical records were deficient. There was a paper record for each prisoner of the care they had received in the prison but it was not contemporaneous because any care provided by the hospital, including test results, was recorded onto the HSA's electronic clinical record system and not in the paper record. These records were stored in a wooden cupboard, which was locked when the nurse was absent, but the keys were easily obtainable. The nurse could access the electronic system to obtain test results but not for anything else. We were told that there were plans to extend the electronic system to the prisons, to allow the nurse to have full access and to provide a back-up system for record storage.
- 2.77 We spoke to some prisoners who had been to the hospital for outpatient appointments or inpatient stays. They had often been handcuffed and shackled for these appointments. The senior officer in charge of escorts made efforts to obtain information about the prisoner before the escort, so that he could make the necessary arrangements to have more staff available to escort a higher category prisoner if the nature of their condition precluded the use of handcuffs or shackles.

Recommendations

- 2.78 **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.**
- 2.79 **All prisoners should be offered hepatitis B vaccinations.**
- 2.80 **Applications to see health services staff should be confidential and not rely on the discretion of prison officers.**
- 2.81 **GP clinics should not be cancelled. If they are, they should be rescheduled within the week they were due to take place.**
- 2.82 **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.**
- 2.83 **There should be an electronic clinical record system installed for use by health services staff at both establishments.**

Pharmacy

- 2.84 Medicines management was appalling. At Northward, stock medicines were mostly kept in a metal filing cabinet, which was unlocked when prisoners were in the room. The drugs storage cupboard at Northward was untidy and overstocked. Emergency medicines were stored in a plastic box, in which we found some loose ampoules. The nurse was responsible for stock control. Relevant pharmacy reference materials were out of date; the HSA formulary was dated 2004, while the current edition had been published in 2007. The temperature of the drugs refrigerator was not checked to ensure that the medicines in it were stored correctly.
- 2.85 If a prisoner required a stock medicine, the nurse either dispensed it from stock or took the prescription to the pharmacy at the hospital. The medicine was then dispensed to the named patient, collected by the nurse and taken back to the prison; in most cases it was then given to the prisoner by an officer and the prisoner had to keep it in his or her possession. There was no risk assessment to assess whether the prisoners should have medicines in possession. However, some prisoners (those considered to have mental health issues who were held on

either A or D wing at Northward, and all the women at Fairbanks) had their medications held and administered by officers.

- 2.86 Bags of medicines were kept in poorly designed cupboards in the wing offices, and the cupboard on D wing was almost inaccessible (see Appendix IV). Officers were supposed to record each medication administration on a small 'medicine record card' and report to the nurse if a prisoner refused his medications; however, we found evidence to suggest, and prison officers told us, that this did not always happen.
- 2.87 The system at Fairbanks appeared more organised, although the nurse made no checks of the administration of medications. Officers also kept Panadol (a mild analgesic) and indigestion remedies on the wings and could administer them to prisoners on request, although this was not recorded. We spoke to the HSA's chief pharmacist, who told us of his concerns about medicines management and his desire to improve the situation.

Recommendations

- 2.88 **There should be a complete review of medicines management.**
- 2.89 **A pharmacist should have overall control of medications at both prisons.**
- 2.90 **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.**
- 2.91 **Prison officers should not routinely administer prescribed medications.**

Dentistry

- 2.92 The dental surgery was situated adjacent to the vehicle lock at Northward and was used by prisoners from both prisons. In spite of its location, it was reasonable. We were unable to speak to the dentist, who was on leave at the time of the inspection, and we were not given an opportunity to see the dental hygienist, who provided one session a week. In our surveys, less than a third of men and one woman said that it was easy or very easy to see the dentist. The waiting list to see the dentist was not long but it was unclear whether this was because officers did not pass prisoners' names to the dentist or because demand was low. He appeared to see seven or eight prisoners a week but the range of treatments offered was limited. There were no recall systems for those serving long sentences.

Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.93 There was minimal mental health care provision. There were no primary mental services, even though the nurse was qualified in mental health. A consultant psychiatrist visited the prison monthly; at the time of the inspection he had a caseload of 10 men and one woman. In our survey, a quarter of the men at Northward said that they had emotional well-being or mental health problems (this included 39% of those held on the HRU). During the inspection, the consultant saw seven men in 1.5 hours at Northward, including a new referral from the prison psychologist. The latter young man had expressed suicidal ideation and had been moved to 'basic' on A wing as a consequence. During the consultation he stated, *'I just want someone to talk to. Being on basic is making it worse – no fresh air, no light'* (see section on segregation/basic). Another prisoner, who had previously self-harmed and had been on basic

for several years in a cell with no light and nothing to do, spent less than three minutes with the consultant and appeared 'drugged'. The consultant told us that he had not seen any of the prison accommodation and would have been unaware of the potential impact of such conditions on well-being.

- 2.94 The Cayman Island Mental Health Law allowed for the prison to be used as a place of safety. No one was being held under the law at the time of the inspection but some prisoners were given psychiatric medication under force. The medication was sometimes prescribed without the psychiatrist seeing the patient. We questioned the legality of such practices and did not receive a satisfactory response.

Recommendations

- 2.95 **All health services staff providing mental health services should be aware of the living conditions of their patients.**
- 2.96 **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.**

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.

- 2.97 The quality, quantity and presentation of food at both Northward and Fairbanks were poor. Prisoners preparing food were untrained in basic food hygiene and we observed some dangerous food preparation procedures.
- 2.98 Prisoners were consistently negative about the quality and quantity of the food.
- 2.99 Meals were served too early, with lunch starting at around 11am and the evening meal at around 4pm. The food we tasted was bland, luke-warm and generally unappetising, with food portions being generally small.
- 2.100 The Northward prison kitchen (which provided meals for both sites) was in a poor state of repair, with many wall tiles either missing or broken. Equipment was in working order but old and there was no plan to refurbish or update the kitchen. At Fairbanks, there was a small well-equipped kitchen which was used to prepare breakfast. There was no supervision in the kitchen and food was prepared by any prisoner who had some cooking skills.
- 2.101 There was no opportunity to gain any qualifications and none of the prisoners working in food preparation at either site had been trained in even basic hygiene or food handling. We observed a frozen chicken being defrosted under running water in the Northward kitchen and prisoners we spoke to told us that this was commonplace.

- 2.102 Food was put into polystyrene cartons and taken to the wings on trolleys, to be issued to prisoners. This included meals for Fairbanks, even though the prison was at least 30 minutes away, resulting in all hot meals requiring reheating in microwaves before serving.

Recommendations

- 2.103 **The main prison kitchen should be refurbished.**
- 2.104 **Prisoners should be appropriately trained to work in food preparation.**

Purchases

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.105 The range of goods available for purchase was limited and there was no consultation with prisoners on what to offer for sale.
- 2.106 Prisoners could make purchases weekly from the prison shop. The range of goods available was limited mainly to snacks, soft drinks and tobacco. In our survey, only 31% of prisoners at Northward said that the shop sold a wide enough range of goods to meet their needs and this was also the view of prisoners in our groups. Women at Fairbanks were satisfied with the range of goods offered.
- 2.107 During visits, visitors could provide money to enable prisoners to make purchases from a similarly limited range of goods from the 'visits shop'.
- 2.108 Goods on the shop list were chosen by staff without consulting prisoners about what should be included.

Recommendation

- 2.109 **Prisoners should be regularly consulted over the range of goods available to purchase.**

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.⁴

- 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 were unacceptable.
- 3.2 Most prisoners at both Northwood and Fairbanks were unlocked at about 6.30am. They remained out of their cells or dormitories, with the exception of an hour to permit staff lunches, until about 9.30pm. However, prisoners in the high-risk unit (HRU) at Northward spent in excess of 22 hours a day confined to their cells. Prisoners on F wing had enhanced status and were never locked in 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, although prisoners told us that this was often restricted. An hour's exercise was offered to most prisoners on one of three exercise yards each evening. D wing had a bare concrete yard, while the C wing yard resembled waste ground. There were some facilities on the sports field. At Fairbanks, prisoners were limited to just one hour in the open air.
- 3.4 During our roll/activity checks, we found three-quarters of prisoners at Northward inactive on the wings, where most spent the day either sleeping or hanging around in groups chatting and smoking. The situation at Fairbanks was similar; with the exception of an occasional class, the women there had nothing to do. Both prisons were characterised by indolence and lack of purpose.

Recommendations

- 3.5 **Women at Fairbanks should be permitted more time in the open air.**
- 3.6 **The environment and facilities in all the exercise yards should be improved.**

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

⁴ 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.

sentence. The learning and skills and work provision is of a good standard and is effective in meeting the needs of all prisoners.

- 3.7 The planning and management of learning, skills and work activities were inadequate. Management information was not analysed and used to help to plan and improve provision. The number of activity places was insufficient to occupy prisoners fully and even those available were not fully utilised. There was no work-related accredited vocational training and attendance at education classes was low. Teachers provided good individual support for prisoners but classes were small and teachers lacked essential resources. Success rates in education varied too widely and were not consistently high. The library stock was old and not selected to meet the needs of prisoners.
- 3.8 Ofsted⁵ made the following assessments about the learning and skills and work provision:
- | | | |
|------|--|------------|
| 3.9 | Achievements of prisoners engaged in learning and skills and work: | inadequate |
| 3.10 | Quality of learning and skills and work provision: | inadequate |
| 3.11 | Leadership and management of learning and skills and work: | inadequate |

Management of learning and skills and work

- 3.12 The planning and management of learning, skills and work activities were inadequate. They were uncoordinated and lacked coherence. Lines of accountability and responsibility were unclear. There was no routine assessment of provision, performance or quality to evaluate the extent to which prisoners' needs were being met. Information about the achievement of qualifications and attendance in education classes was collected but data were not analysed or used to make judgements about quality or to plan provision. Daily lists of allocation to work were produced but these did not always provide an accurate picture of purposeful activity. No routine, formal observations of education and training were carried out to develop and improve provision or to share good practice. The prison had not produced a quality improvement plan for learning and skills and work activities. A recent external review of the service had been carried out and an action plan produced. Implementation was loosely planned for autumn 2012 but precise timelines were, as yet, unclear.
- 3.13 Attendance at learning and skills and work was voluntary and failure to attend was not usually pursued rigorously. Many prisoners chose not to enrol at education classes. Of those who did enrol, many did not attend regularly. Punctuality was sometimes poor and prisoners often left classes early to carry out a part-time work role.
- 3.14 Education staff were shared between Northward and Fairbanks, so all available capacity at both prisons was not fully used each day. When classes were held, the number of learners was frequently low, and well below maximum capacity (see main recommendation HP59).

⁵ 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>.

Provision of activities

- 3.15 There were insufficient activity places to meet prisoners' needs, and even these were not fully utilised. At Northward, there were around 45 places in education but no accredited work-related vocational training. Around 65 full-time-equivalent work places were available. Fifty-six prisoners were listed as unemployed but many more were unoccupied for most of the day (see main recommendation HP59).
- 3.16 At Fairbanks, there were approximately 10 education places available in the two classrooms but no accredited work-related vocational training. Classes were offered on only a maximum of five half-days each week and in reality only took place for one or two sessions, as places were often not taken up or classes were cancelled. The small amount of part-time work was not enough to occupy fully the four prisoners at Fairbanks at the time of the inspection. Three-quarters of prisoners at Northward and all those at Fairbanks observed during the day were inactive (see section on time out of cell).
- 3.17 A daily programme of mainly accredited classes was offered in the four classrooms at Northward. These included English and mathematics, basic literacy and numeracy, book keeping, information technology (IT) and art. Attendance was low, with classes typically attracting fewer than 20 prisoners each day. A similar, but much more reduced, programme was available in the two classrooms at Fairbanks. Neither prison offered any courses suitable for those with higher-level qualifications. A small number of prisoners followed correspondence courses at their own cost.
- 3.18 A workshop block had been constructed at Northward and individual workshops were in the process of being equipped for planned vocational training. However, staff had not yet been appointed and progress was slow.

Recommendation

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

Quality of provision

- 3.20 The four classrooms at Northward were generally bright, clean and well ventilated. They met basic requirements but lacked resources such as textbooks and creative displays to stimulate and promote learning. The two classrooms at Fairbanks were small and lacked adequate light and ventilation. There were not enough working computers to meet the needs of even the small population there at the time of the inspection, and the IT room was overcrowded with books and magazines piled high on desks. Satisfactorily equipped rooms were available at Fairbanks for sewing and for hairdressing and beauty. Prisoners were keen to use these facilities but they were rarely available to them because of the absence of suitably qualified and experienced staff, leaving prisoners generally unoccupied.
- 3.21 Teaching was adequate. Teachers provided good support to individual prisoners to help them to make progress but often, because of small class sizes, the range of teaching methods used was too limited to meet all needs. Prisoners who opted to attend education classes were given a basic initial assessment of their literacy and numeracy. There was no attempt to assess the needs and abilities of other prisoners. Standards of marking and assessment varied. Prisoners' progress was assessed mainly through practice examinations. In some subjects, work was

good and was constructively marked, while in others it was not marked regularly and some unacceptable work in exercise books had not been challenged or commented on.

- 3.22 The range of work available in both prisons was menial and low level. It included wing cleaning, kitchen work and the laundry. Skilled men were sometimes used to carry out maintenance work or construction around the prison but work parties were cancelled at short notice if a member of staff was not available. A labour board allocated prisoners to employment but the system was sometimes arbitrary and prisoners were often given work roles through word of mouth. Skills and experience gained through work were not formally identified or recorded. Work was often part-time, leaving prisoners unoccupied for several hours during the day.
- 3.23 The seven prisoners in the wood workshop worked purposefully and produced high-quality goods which were sold to the public. Health and safety standards in this workshop were poor. None of the prisoners used any protective equipment; machines were operated without guards and prisoners were inappropriately dressed.

Recommendations

- 3.24 **The lighting and ventilation in the classrooms at Fairbanks should be improved and broken computers replaced.**
- 3.25 **Essential teaching resources such as textbooks, displays and teaching materials should be provided at both prisons.**
- 3.26 **All work should be allocated through a labour board using clear job descriptions and an unambiguous and transparent application and allocation process.**
- 3.27 **Health and safety standards in the workshops should be adhered to, including the use of protective equipment, guards and safety clothing.**

Education and vocational achievements

- 3.28 Prisoners were prepared for a range of City and Guilds examinations, and for certification for the US General Education Diploma (GED) and the Caribbean Education Council. The latter had been introduced recently and no results were yet available. The prison did not have data on GED success rates. Success rates for the small number of prisoners who took City and Guilds examinations were variable, ranging from 50–100%. However, in the latter example, only three prisoners had followed the course and taken the examination. A few prisoners progressed from a basic to an intermediate level course but the curriculum was not well planned to ensure maximum progression. Skills and experience gained through work were not formally identified or recorded.

Recommendations

- 3.29 **Success rates should be analysed and improved to minimise the variability over time and between subjects.**
- 3.30 **Skills and experience gained through work should be identified, recorded and, where possible, accredited.**

Library

- 3.31 The library at Northward was open on weekday mornings and afternoons but not during the evenings or at weekends. It was centrally located in a fairly spacious, air-conditioned room and wing access to it was timetabled throughout the week. The large stock of books had been well organised by two prisoner orderlies, supported by a volunteer, but the entire stock had been donated and had not been selected to meet the needs and interests of prisoners. Many of the books were old, as were the few reference materials and magazines. There were no current legal reference materials and no easy readers, large-print or audio books, dictionaries or textbooks suitable to support education classes. Good records of loans and returns were kept but few prisoners made regular use of the library, other than to relax, cool down and chat. Typically, only around a dozen books were borrowed from the library each day. Some prisoners had free access to the library during opening hours, while those who needed to be escorted had access during timetabled wing periods. Prisoners told us that they could spend only a short time in the library, making it difficult to use the few reference materials. The noisy and overcrowded wing conditions made reading difficult outside of the library environment.
- 3.32 The small room set aside for the library at Fairbanks was untidy and disorganised. There were no suitable legal or other reference materials available and the range of donated books and magazines was old and not suitable for the prisoners. The library room was unlocked by officers on request.

Recommendations

- 3.33 **Access to the library at Northward should be improved, particularly during the evenings and at weekends and for those at work during the day.**
- 3.34 **The libraries should contain a stock of up-to-date and relevant fiction, non-fiction and reference material.**

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.

- 3.35 The gym at Northward was popular and well equipped. Access was equitable. Facilities for the women at Fairbanks were poor and there were no sessions supervised by a trained instructor.
- 3.36 The gym at Northward was spacious, air conditioned and well equipped with cardiovascular machines, free weights and a table tennis table. Most equipment was well maintained but some machines and the gym flooring were showing signs of wear. An officer who was also a trained instructor provided recreational programmes tailored to individual needs and abilities. Prisoners followed agreed and individualised exercise programmes. There was no accredited vocational training. A few prisoners played for the prison football team, which participated in an island league. The football pitch was uneven and poorly maintained.
- 3.37 Prisoners received a basic assessment and an induction to the gym, although information was not routinely passed on from the health care department to the PE officer. All had access to

the gym for at least one hour each day. The facility was popular with prisoners and access was equitable. The gym had a maximum capacity of around 22, which was enough to meet the needs of the prison population, and it was used regularly by a large number of prisoners.

- 3.38 There were no formal healthy living, smoking cessation or substance misuse programmes but the gym instructor promoted healthy living through advice and displays incorporated into the daily routine of the gym.
- 3.39 There was insufficient kit, particularly footwear, to ensure that all prisoners were appropriately dressed for physical activity. There were no adequate formal arrangements for routine staff cover for sickness or annual leave. The one officer was fully occupied with the gym on weekdays and there was no regular evening or weekend access.
- 3.40 There was no provision of supervised PE for prisoners at Fairbanks. The room set aside for exercise was small and poorly lit, with an unpleasant smell of mould. The large equipment which dominated the room was unsuitable for most females and was in a poor state of repair. There was little other equipment or displays to promote and encourage exercise. Although prisoners had free access to the room, which officers would unlock when required, they were not shown how to operate the equipment and were not supervised by a trained officer when using it.

Recommendation

- 3.41 **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.**

Section 4: Resettlement

Strategic management of resettlement

Expected outcomes:

Planning for a prisoner's release or transfer starts on their arrival to 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 There was little strategic management of rehabilitation, as provision was not informed by a comprehensive needs analysis and there was no strategy or action plan to direct work in either prison. Joint working between the criminal justice agencies was poor, as was access to rehabilitation services during custody. The lack of unescorted release on temporary licence further limited opportunities for prisoners to prepare for release.
- 4.2 There was little strategic management of rehabilitation. No comprehensive needs analysis had been undertaken to inform provision, in spite of the different types of prisoners held in both prisons – for example, different security categories, juveniles, women and those serving life sentences. The strategic commitment to rehabilitation, resources and provision had not been made explicit as there was no strategy or action plan. As a result, there was insufficient joint working between the core rehabilitation services (prison, community rehabilitation and the Department of Children and Family Services). The relationship between HMCI Prisons and the Department for Community Rehabilitation appeared tenuous, resulting in services being delivered in isolation and not fully informing the management of the prisoner's sentence. Joint working with the Department of Children and Families in the management of juveniles in prison had declined over recent years, resulting in a lack of case conferencing and planning. At the time of the inspection, there was no multidisciplinary meeting to share information, develop plans or hold people to account.
- 4.3 A limited number of community agencies provided services in the prison and there were large gaps in provision. Our survey results showed that almost half of the male prisoners arriving at Northward had problems with money and 17% had housing needs (see section on reintegration planning).
- 4.4 All activities, including work in the grounds outside of the perimeter fence, were escorted and there was no unescorted release on temporary licence (ROTL), limiting the opportunities for category D prisoners to prepare for release.

Recommendations

- 4.5 **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.**
- 4.6 **Partnership working with community agencies should be developed to ensure continuity of support during and post-custody.**

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

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 Involvement in sentence planning was voluntary and too many prisoners opted out, leaving them with no assessment of risk and need and no structured plan to manage their time in custody. Assessment of prisoners was partial and lacked attention to the likelihood of reoffending and risk of harm to others. Prisoners felt involved in setting the action plan but too many plans lacked a focus on their offending behaviour. The case coordinator role was promising but their contact with prisoners was limited and too often was superficial. There were no formal public protection arrangements, and failures in the categorisation processes meant that some prisoners were improperly restricted and left feeling confused. Parole processes were adequate but not always timely. Life-sentenced prisoners had no opportunity for parole and received little specific or meaningful resettlement support during their time in custody.
- 4.9 The importance of all prisoners having a plan to manage their time in custody and into release was not a core principle of rehabilitation. Involvement in sentence planning was voluntary and over a third of male prisoners excluded themselves. Wing staff asked the prisoner if they wanted to get involved; if they rejected the opportunity, nothing else was done to engage them.
- 4.10 The initial assessment was weak as it identified only the prisoner's view of their immediate needs. The introduction of a more comprehensive structured tool (Level of Service/Case Management Inventory; LSCMI) to assess the likelihood of reoffending and risk of harm to others had been unsuccessful and there was no specific structured assessment tool for juvenile prisoners.
- 4.11 The management of the prisoner during custody was disjointed and information exchange was poor. Probation officers did not become involved in the management of prisoners until an application for parole was made. There was no sharing of the pre-sentence report, previous convictions, victim statements or the LSCMI tool completed at the start of sentence with the prison case coordinators. Formal information exchange between other departments in the prison and the case coordinator was weak.
- 4.12 The sentence plan was prepared by a case coordinator and involved the prisoner. In our survey, 78% of the men and both of the women who had a plan said that they had been involved in its development. There was a lack of involvement of other staff in developing the plan and setting objectives. The plan was not made available to staff beyond the sentence planning unit.
- 4.13 The plans we reviewed included appropriate targets identified as immediate needs but failed to identify targets directly aimed at prisoners' offending behaviour. Few included offending behaviour programmes and none included victim awareness work. Plans were designed to cover only the current provision by the prison and not what was needed to reduce reoffending or risk of harm to others. The reviews we saw were too often incomplete and uninformative,

with a lack of new objectives set. Too many action plans were completed late; for example, in May 2012 only two out of four, and in June four out of seven plans had been completed on time.

- 4.14 Case coordinators' caseloads were manageable and there was some evidence of contact with the prisoner, but this was not always recorded monthly and case coordinators acknowledged that they found it difficult to maintain such regular contact. Contact was not always meaningful, lacking a focus on the sentence plan and offending behaviour. Cross-deployment to operational duties had resulted in the loss of case coordinator time. In spite of some recent awareness training sessions, the role of the case coordinators and sentence planning was not well understood by other staff in the prisons.
- 4.15 The executive release scheme provided the opportunity to release prisoners early with licence conditions, including the use of an electronic tag. The assessment process was thorough, with input from the case coordinator and the security department. However, not all assessments were completed ahead of the earliest release date and some prisoners were therefore released late. The number applying for the scheme, the timeliness of assessments and the number successful were not routinely monitored to identify improvements required.

Recommendations

- 4.16 **The initial assessment and sentence plan should be mandatory for convicted prisoners and include the likelihood of reoffending and risk of harm to others.**
- 4.17 **Sentence plans should be thoroughly reviewed at set intervals to ensure that progress is monitored, remedial action taken where necessary and new objectives set.**

Public protection

- 4.18 Inadequate attention was given to protecting the public, staff and other prisoners. There was no formal system for exchanging information or making plans to manage the risk of harm.
- 4.19 A system had recently been introduced whereby prisoners presenting a specific risk to female staff were identified on a board in the shift commander's office; however, little else was done to examine and manage these risks and we were not convinced that they had been made explicit to female staff.
- 4.20 We also found examples of unmanaged risk. In one example, a prisoner convicted of sexual abuse against a child was in regular contact with the victim's mother, without any assessment or management of the risks that this potentially presented. There was no mechanism for multi-agency exchange of information to explore the potential for further abuse or implement plans to minimise the risks.
- 4.21 Parole processes were well developed, with good links between the departments. Regular allocation meetings and information-sharing meetings were held to monitor the preparation of the dossier. Risk assessments were supported by the use of the LSCMI tool and the involvement of an allocated probation officer. Prisoners could attend a presentation held over two days to raise their awareness of the parole process and the requirements of supervision in the community. One review and seventeen parole applications had been received in the year to date. Seven of these had already been approved. The timeliness of parole dossiers was not monitored and we were told that it was not unusual for reports to be a week late.

Recommendation

- 4.22 **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.**

Categorisation

- 4.23 The categorisation assessment tool was adequate, including risks to the public following an escape, the means to escape, the motivation to escape and the potential for serious indiscipline within the prison. It also included individual needs and circumstances. However, the categorisation process was poorly implemented, with prisoners being left confused and uncertain, and not routinely informed of decisions.
- 4.24 Initial categorisation assessments were not completed as soon as possible after prisoners' arrival. Instead, prisoners were automatically allocated to category A or B, depending on their offence type, without an assessment of their risk of escape or potential for violent indiscipline in the prison.
- 4.25 Until recently, category A prisoners had not been routinely assessed, resulting in some of them waiting many years to be moved out of the high-risk unit. We did not see evidence of a specific category A assessment board, even though this was specified in the internal policy document.
- 4.26 We saw some examples of categorisation reviews being carried out but these were done on an ad hoc basis, generally instigated by the prisoner rather than adherence to the policy. Prisoners were not involved in the categorisation process.

Recommendation

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

Indeterminate sentence prisoners

- 4.28 Life-sentenced prisoners had no opportunity for parole and this was the main concern consistently expressed by these prisoners. It was hard to see how, without this opportunity, the prison could constructively occupy and support these prisoners throughout their sentence.
- 4.29 A 'halfway house', situated on the Northward site, on the outside of the perimeter fence, held four male life-sentenced prisoners. Other than the opportunity for self-catering and being unlocked, it did not provide any other incentive and as a result was underdeveloped in terms of its role in rehabilitation and resettlement.
- 4.30 Category D life-sentenced prisoners could only access work within the perimeters of the prison grounds, which was mundane and unchallenging, and they could not have any unescorted ROTL. We observed these prisoners having little to do to structure their day, with the exception of their working hours, and little to aim for.
- 4.31 Other life-sentenced prisoners at Northward experienced a regime identical to that of other prisoners. There was no specific provision for them, such as a forum for information sharing or more frequent or longer domestic visits, and no specific work aimed at their specific rehabilitation needs.

Recommendation

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

Reintegration planning

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners' resettlement needs are met 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.

4.33 Few reintegration plans were undertaken. Too many male prisoners said that they did not know whom to turn to for help and few felt prepared for release. Support with finding accommodation before release or addressing money and debt problems was lacking. Work to promote family ties was limited and visits provision, systems and facilities were inadequate. Offender behaviour programme provision had been increased but the type of programmes delivered was not based on a needs assessment and too few sex offender treatment programmes were delivered to meet demand, resulting in prisoners waiting too long or being released without accessing one.

- 4.34 Reintegration plans were scheduled to be completed two months before release but few actually took place. In our survey, 40% of the male prisoners said that no one was working with them to achieve their sentence plan targets. Too few male prisoners knew whom to turn to for help with specific resettlement problems. In our survey, only 23% of the male prisoners said that they had been helped to prepare for release. However, all three of the women interviewed said that they had been helped.
- 4.35 Overall, the results of our survey were disappointing, with only 54% of male prisoners and one of the two sentenced women saying that they were less likely to offend in the future.

Recommendation

- 4.36 **All sentenced prisoners should have a comprehensive reintegration plan.**

Accommodation

- 4.37 The lack of housing for those released from prison was a serious barrier to effective rehabilitation but a lack of data collection within the prison made it impossible to evidence the number of prisoners requiring help.
- 4.38 In our survey, only 13% of male prisoners who said that they needed help with accommodation knew whom to turn to. We spoke to a number of prisoners who said that they did not have accommodation to go to on release, and each of them described the difficulties this would cause them and their likelihood of reoffending as a result.

Education, training and employment

- 4.39 Some prisoners at Northward were offered a preparation for the job market programme, delivered at the prison by the National Workforce Development Agency. This course included interview skills and the preparation of individual work history summaries, and was designed to help prisoners find employment on release. The programme was usually offered to prisoners approximately six months before their likely release date. However, few courses were offered, and completion rates were often low. Two courses had been run in 2010, with only 15 prisoners completing it. Only one course had been run in 2011, with only six prisoners completing it, and one in 2012 to date, with only five completions. Prisoners did not all have equal access to the course, and the criteria for selection were unclear. There was no specific reintegration planning for further education or training. The course was not available to prisoners at Fairbanks.

Recommendation

- 4.40 **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.**

Health care

- 4.41 There was no provision for post-release health support, even for those with complex health issues.

Recommendation

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

Drugs and alcohol

- 4.43 Narcotics Anonymous and Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) attended Northward twice a week and AA also visited Fairbanks monthly, although we were unable to ascertain how many prisoners attended the sessions. In our survey, 24% and 32% of men said that they had received help with their drug and alcohol problems, respectively; of these, 43% said that the help had been useful.
- 4.44 The Cayman Against Substance Abuse (CASA) course was valued by prisoners; they told us that it was useful and had provided support in custody, but links to community services were weak. However, in our survey only 26% of men knew whom to ask for help with their drug and alcohol problems.

Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.45 Only 15% of men who said they had a problem with money or debts knew whom to turn to for help. There was no specific provision in either prison to help individuals to manage their debts

or improve budgeting skills. Prisoners were not able to open bank accounts to help them to save money in preparation for their release.

Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.46 In our survey, only a third of men said that they had been helped to maintain contact with family and friends but two of the three women who responded to this question said that they had been helped. There was no specific provision to promote contact with family, other than escorted home visits and domestic visits at the weekend.
- 4.47 Those whose family lived outside of the Cayman Islands found it particularly difficult to keep in contact with them as there was no formal arrangements for promoting this – for example, through additional telephone calls or letters.
- 4.48 No parenting skills courses were run. Some relationship counselling was provided but only to prisoners getting married.
- 4.49 Home leave was limited. Category D prisoners could access supervised home visits every three months but these had been reduced from eight hours to only four, which included travel time. Most category D prisoners we spoke to commented on the reduction in home leave time and the limitations of supervised visits.
- 4.50 Domestic visits were available only at weekends, and each prisoner was allowed only one 30-minute slot. Special permission could be given for further domestic visits during the week but we saw no evidence of this during the inspection. Visits could be accessed within a week of arrival at the prisons, provided that the prisoner had the names of visitors added to their approved list of names.
- 4.51 There was no booking system, and weekend visiting sessions at Northward could become busy, resulting in prisoners and visitors having to wait for space in the visits room. We saw evidence of visits being brought to an end after 30 minutes, even when there was adequate space in the visits room to allow it to continue. Women prisoners reported a little more flexibility in the application of this rule.
- 4.52 Only two adults and two children could visit a prisoner at any one time, even if there was room to facilitate more. We observed this rule not being applied consistently, with one male prisoner having three adults present, while another had to share his 30 minutes between three adults. We were told that one woman had to split her 30 minutes between her four children, and was only allowed to see her children in pairs for 15 minutes while the other pair waited outside the prison.
- 4.53 The visits room at both prisons was poorly furnished and bleak, particularly for children. No toys were provided and the mother and baby room at Fairbanks had been changed into a staff office.
- 4.54 The check-in building at Northward was based outside of the prison and its primary purpose was to screen property handed in for prisoners. However, it also provided a useful shelter for those waiting to start their visit. No such facility existed at Fairbanks, leaving visitors waiting in the car park.

Recommendations

- 4.55 **The duration of domestic visits and the number of visitors per session should be increased.**
- 4.56 **Visitors should be able to book visits, to avoid delays in entry or early termination of the session.**

Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.57 Only 35% of men said that it was easy to get onto an offending behaviour programme. However, three-quarters said that they had undertaken a programme at some point during their sentence. Two of the four women were undertaking a programme at the time of the inspection. Two-thirds of these men and both of the women said that completing such programmes would help them on release.
- 4.58 No needs analysis had been undertaken to inform the range of offending behaviour programmes. However, provision was relevant to the population. In recent months, probation staff had recommenced the delivery of more offending behaviour programmes, extending the range on offer. There was no schedule of programmes throughout the year to evidence how need would be met.
- 4.59 The Constructs programme delivered at Northward was relevant and well used. Since its introduction four years earlier, a total of 133 men had been offered a place, and in 2011 21 men had completed it.
- 4.60 Delivery of offending behaviour programmes to women prisoners was less well developed because of the low numbers. However, women prisoners had access to a 15-week programme called 'Making a Difference', which aimed to help women to set goals for the future and re-evaluate their options. Two women we spoke to who were doing this programme were positive about its content.
- 4.61 The sex offender treatment programme (SOTP) at Northward was not delivered often enough to meet need, resulting in some men being released without doing it. A further 12 men were waiting to be assessed for the programme but future provision was unlikely because of the loss of trained staff, and we were told that no SOTP was offered in the community.

Recommendation

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

Section 5: Recommendations, housekeeping points and good practice

The following is a listing of recommendations 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.

Main recommendations

To the director

- 5.1 The United Kingdom should extend OPCAT to the Cayman Islands. (HP50)
- 5.2 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)
- 5.3 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)
- 5.4 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)
- 5.5 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)
- 5.6 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)
- 5.7 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)

- 5.8 Juveniles 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)
- 5.9 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)
- 5.10 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)

Recommendation

To the health authority

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

Recommendations

To the director

Courts, escorts and transfers

- 5.12 Prisoners' property should be transported with them to prison. (1.5)
- 5.13 Prisoners should not be shackled during escorts. (1.6)

Early days in custody

- 5.14 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)
- 5.15 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)
- 5.16 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)
- 5.17 A clear set of first night procedures which addresses prisoners' feelings of safety should be developed and implemented. (1.21)
- 5.18 The induction presentation should be provided consistently on the day after prisoners' arrival. (1.22)

Self-harm and suicide prevention

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

- 5.20 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)
- 5.21 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)

Security

- 5.22 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)
- 5.23 The security information report system should be re-launched and systems implemented to record, analyse and act on identified information. (1.45)
- 5.24 Drug testing should take place in a suitably clinical environment and testing equipment should be stored appropriately. (1.46)

Incentives and earned privileges

- 5.25 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)

Disciplinary procedures

- 5.26 The practice of prison staff increasing sentences should cease. (1.56)
- 5.27 Adjudication procedures should be standardised and quality controlled. (1.57)

The use of force

- 5.28 The procedures and regulations laid out in Prison Service Order 1600 should be reintroduced without delay. (1.60)

Residential units

- 5.29 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)
- 5.30 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)
- 5.31 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)

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

Staff–prisoner relationships

- 5.33 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)

Equality and diversity

- 5.34 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)
- 5.35 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. (2.34)
- 5.36 The negative perceptions of Caymanian prisoners should be explored and acted on. (2.35)

Faith and religious activity

- 5.37 The prison should monitor different religions in the prison to ensure that all faiths are catered for. (2.45)
- 5.38 All prisoners should have access to corporate worship each week, including access to a chaplain of their faith. (2.46)
- 5.39 When risk assessments indicate that a prisoner is unsuitable to attend corporate worship, alternative provision should be made. (2.47)

Complaints

- 5.40 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)

Legal rights

- 5.41 Legal support should be available for prisoners, and bail information for remand prisoners. (2.60)
- 5.42 There should be up-to-date and reliable legal guidance available in the prison library. (2.61)
- 5.43 Procedures for dealing with legally privileged mail should be followed and a record made when mail is opened. (2.62)

Health services

- 5.44 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)

- 5.45 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)
- 5.46 All prisoners should be offered hepatitis B vaccinations. (2.79)
- 5.47 Applications to see health services staff should be confidential and not rely on the discretion of prison officers. (2.80)
- 5.48 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)
- 5.49 There should be an electronic clinical record system installed for use by health services staff at both establishments. (2.83)
- 5.50 There should be a complete review of medicines management. (2.88)
- 5.51 A pharmacist should have overall control of medications at both prisons. (2.89)
- 5.52 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)
- 5.53 Prison officers should not routinely administer prescribed medications. (2.91)
- 5.54 All health services staff providing mental health services should be aware of the living conditions of their patients. (2.95)
- 5.55 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)

Catering

- 5.56 The main prison kitchen should be refurbished. (2.103)
- 5.57 Prisoners should be appropriately trained to work in food preparation. (2.104)

Purchases

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

Time out of cell

- 5.59 Women at Fairbanks should be permitted more time in the open air. (3.5)
- 5.60 The environment and facilities in all the exercise yards should be improved. (3.6)

Learning and skills and work activities

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

- 5.62 The lighting and ventilation in the classrooms at Fairbanks should be improved and broken computers replaced. (3.24)
- 5.63 Essential teaching resources such as textbooks, displays and teaching materials should be provided at both prisons. (3.25)
- 5.64 All work should be allocated through a labour board using clear job descriptions and an unambiguous and transparent application and allocation process. (3.26)
- 5.65 Health and safety standards in the workshops should be adhered to, including the use of protective equipment, guards and safety clothing. (3.27)
- 5.66 Success rates should be analysed and improved to minimise the variability over time and between subjects. (3.29)
- 5.67 Skills and experience gained through work should be identified, recorded and, where possible, accredited. (3.30)
- 5.68 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)
- 5.69 The libraries should contain a stock of up-to-date and relevant fiction, non-fiction and reference material. (3.34)

Physical education and healthy living

- 5.70 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)

Strategic management of resettlement

- 5.71 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)
- 5.72 Partnership working with community agencies should be developed to ensure continuity of support during and post-custody. (4.6)
- 5.73 Unsupervised release on temporary licence should be available for category D prisoners and should be considered for category C prisoners. (4.7)

Offender management and planning

- 5.74 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)
- 5.75 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)
- 5.76 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)

- 5.77 A comprehensive categorisation assessment should be completed as soon as possible after a prisoner's arrival and reviewed at regular intervals. (4.27)
- 5.78 Life-sentenced prisoners should have access to meaningful and specific rehabilitation provision, including maintaining community ties and meaningful employment. (4.32)

Reintegration planning

- 5.79 All sentenced prisoners should have a comprehensive reintegration plan. (4.36)
- 5.80 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)
- 5.81 Prisoners' ongoing health needs should be assessed before release and referrals made to appropriate services. (4.42)
- 5.82 The duration of domestic visits and the number of visitors per session should be increased. (4.55)
- 5.83 Visitors should be able to book visits, to avoid delays in entry or early termination of the session. (4.56)
- 5.84 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)

Appendix I: Inspection team

Martin Lomas	Deputy Chief Inspector
Alison Perry	Team leader
Sandra Fieldhouse	Inspector
Michael Calvert	Inspector
Paul Rowlands	Inspector
Andrew Rooke	Inspector
Laura Nettleingham	Senior researcher
Rachel Murray	Researcher

Specialist inspectors

Elizabeth Tysoe	Health services inspector
Linda Truscott	Ofsted inspector

Appendix II: Prison population profile

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

Population breakdown by: ROLL- 201 (4 Prisoners under age 18)

Status	18-20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Sentenced	7	142	75.63
Recall		1	0.51
Convicted unsentenced			
Remand	8	39	23.86
Civil prisoners			
Detainees			
Total	15	182	100

Sentence	18-20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Unsentenced	8	39	23.86
Less than 6 months		2	1.02
6 months to less than 12 months	1	3	2.03
12 months to less than 2 years		15	7.61
2 years to less than 4 years	1	22	11.68
4 years to less than 10 years	3	47	25.38
10 years and over (not life)	1	36	18.78
ISPP			
Life	1	18	9.64
Total	15	182	100

Age	Number of prisoners	%
Please state minimum age : 15		
Under 21 years	19	9.45
21 years to 29 years	56	27.86
30 years to 39 years	60	29.85
40 years to 49 years	43	21.39
50 years to 59 years	20	9.95
60 years to 69 years	2	1
70 plus years	1	0.5
Please state maximum age: 70		
Total	201	100

Nationality	18-20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Caymanian	14	144	80.2
Foreign nationals	1	38	19.8
Total	15	182	100

Security category	18-20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Uncategorised unsentenced			
Uncategorised sentenced			
Category A	1	10	5.58
Category B	13	87	50.76
Category C	1	65	33.5
Category D		20	10.15

Other			
Total	15	182	99.99

Ethnicity	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
White			
British		1	0.51
Irish			
Other white		3	1.52
Mixed			
White and black Caribbean			
White and black African			
White and Asian			
Other mixed			
Asian or Asian British			
Indian		1	0.51
Pakistani			
Bangladeshi			
Other Asian			
Black or black British			
Caribbean	15	166	91.88
African			
Other black		11	5.58
Chinese or other ethnic group			
Chinese			
Arab			
Other ethnic group			
Not stated			
Total	15	182	100

Religion	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Baptist			
Church of England			
Roman Catholic			
Other Christian denominations	10	165	88.83
Muslim			
Sikh			
Hindu			
Buddhist			
Jewish		1	0.51
Other		4	2.03
No religion	5	12	8.63
Total	15	182	100

Other demographics	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Gypsy/Romany/Traveller	0	0	0
Total			

Other demographics	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Veteran (ex-armed services)		2	1.02
Total		2	1.02

Sentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18–20-year-olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month				
1 month to 3 months			1	0.67
3 months to 6 months			6	4.03
6 months to 1 year	1	0.67	3	2.01
1 year to 2 years	1	0.67	15	10.07
2 years to 4 years			22	14.79
4 years or more	5	3.36	95	63.76
Total	7	4.70	142	95.33

Unsentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18–20-year-olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	5	10.42	13	27.08
1 month to 3 months	3	6.25	13	27.08
3 months to 6 months	1	2.08	7	14.58
6 months to 1 year	1	2.08	5	10.43
1 year to 2 years				
2 years to 4 years				
4 years or more				
Total	10	20.83	38	79.17

Main offence	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Violence against the person	2	35	24.83
Sexual offences		13	8.72
Burglary	1	20	14.09
Robbery	4	1	3.36
Theft and handling		7	4.7
Fraud and forgery			
Drugs offences		34	22.82
Other offences		32	21.48
Civil offences			
Offence not recorded/holding warrant			
Total	7	142	100

Appendix III: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews

Prisoner survey methodology

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

Choosing the sample

At the time of the survey on 24–28 June 2012, the prisoner population at HMP Northward was 193 and at HMP Fairbanks was four. All individuals were offered a survey.

Selecting the sample

Completion of the questionnaire was voluntary. Refusals were noted and no attempts were made to replace them. At Northward, seven respondents refused to complete a questionnaire. At Fairbanks, no one refused to complete a questionnaire..

Interviews were carried out with any respondents with literacy difficulties. In total, three respondents at Northward were interviewed.

Methodology

Every attempt was made to distribute the questionnaires to each respondent on an individual basis. This gave researchers an opportunity to explain the independence of the Inspectorate and the purpose of the questionnaire, as well as to answer questions.

All completed questionnaires were confidential – only members of the Inspectorate saw them. In order to ensure confidentiality, respondents were asked to do one of the following:

- have their questionnaire ready to hand back to a member of the research team at a specified time;
- seal the questionnaire in the envelope provided and hand it to a member of staff, if they were agreeable; or
- seal the questionnaire in the envelope provided and leave it in their room for collection.

Respondents were not asked to put their names on their questionnaire.

Response rates

At Northward, 166 respondents completed and returned their questionnaires. This represented 86% of the prison population, meaning that the response rate was also 86%. In addition to the seven respondents who refused to complete a questionnaire, six questionnaires were not returned and 14 were returned blank.

At Fairbanks, all individuals completed and returned their questionnaire, meaning that 100% of the prisoner population was surveyed and the response rate was also 100%.

Comparisons

The following details the results from the survey. Data from each establishment were weighted, in order to mimic a consistent percentage sampled in the establishment.

Some questions have been filtered according to the response to a previous question. Filtered questions are clearly indented and preceded by an explanation as to which respondents are included in the filtered questions. Otherwise, percentages provided refer to the entire sample. All missing responses are excluded from the analysis.

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

For Northward, the following analyses have been conducted:

- A comparison within the 2012 survey between those who are Cayman nationals and those who are foreign nationals.
- A comparison within the 2012 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 best and worst wing comparison (excluding Echo wing and the Lifers House)

In all the above documents, statistical significance is used to indicate whether there is a real difference between the figures – that is, the difference is not due to chance alone. Results that are significantly better are indicated by green shading, results that are significantly worse are indicated by blue shading and where there is no significant difference, there is no shading. Orange shading has been used to show a significant difference in prisoners' background details.

It should be noted that, in order for statistical comparisons to be made between the most recent survey data and those of the previous survey, both sets of data have been coded in the same way. This may result in changes to percentages from previously published surveys. However, all percentages are true of the populations they were taken from, and the statistical significance is correct.

Summary

In addition, a summary of the survey results is attached. This shows a breakdown of responses for each question. Due to the small number of prisoners at HMP Fairbanks, only raw counts are provided. For Northward, percentages have been rounded and therefore may not add up to 100%.

No questions have been filtered within the summary, so all percentages refer to responses from the entire sample. The percentages to certain responses within the summary – for example, 'Not sentenced' options across questions – may differ slightly. This is due to different response rates across questions, meaning that the percentages have been calculated out of different totals (all missing data are excluded). The actual numbers will match up as the data are cleaned to be consistent.

Percentages shown in the summary may differ by 1% or 2 % from those shown in the comparison data, as the comparator data have been weighted for comparison purposes.

Summary of prisoner survey results – HMP Northward

Section 1: About you

Q1.2	How old are you?	
	<i>Under 21</i>	12 (7%)
	<i>21 - 29</i>	48 (29%)
	<i>30 - 39</i>	52 (32%)
	<i>40 - 49</i>	33 (20%)
	<i>50 - 59</i>	13 (8%)
	<i>60 - 69</i>	4 (2%)
	<i>70 and over</i>	1 (1%)
Q1.3	Are you sentenced?	
	<i>Yes</i>	127 (77%)
	<i>Yes - on recall</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>No - awaiting trial</i>	23 (14%)
	<i>No - awaiting sentence</i>	11 (7%)
	<i>No - awaiting deportation</i>	0 (0%)
Q1.4	How long is your sentence?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	34 (21%)
	<i>Less than 6 months</i>	4 (2%)
	<i>6 months to less than 1 year</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>1 year to less than 2 years</i>	10 (6%)
	<i>2 years to less than 4 years</i>	17 (10%)
	<i>4 years to less than 10 years</i>	40 (25%)
	<i>10 years or more</i>	33 (20%)
	<i>Courts Pleasure</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Life</i>	17 (10%)
Q1.5	Do you understand spoken English?	
	<i>Yes</i>	163 (100%)
	<i>No</i>	0 (0%)
Q1.6	Do you understand written English?	
	<i>Yes</i>	156 (98%)
	<i>No</i>	4 (3%)
Q1.7	Are you Caymanian?	
	<i>Yes</i>	128 (78%)
	<i>No</i>	36 (22%)
Q1.8	What region are you from?	
	<i>Africa</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>North America</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>Central America</i>	10 (6%)
	<i>South America</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Indian subcontinent (India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Sri-Lanka)</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>China</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Other Asia</i>	0 (0%)

Caribbean.....	136 (82%)
Europe.....	2 (1%)
Middle East.....	0 (0%)
Other.....	6 (4%)

Q1.9 What is your ethnic origin?

White.....	13 (8%)
Black.....	85 (54%)
Asian.....	3 (2%)
Mixed race.....	53 (34%)
Other ethnic group.....	2 (1%)

Q1.10 What is your religion?

None.....	28 (19%)	Hindu.....	0 (0%)
Church of England.....	15 (10%)	Jewish.....	0 (0%)
Catholic.....	8 (5%)	Muslim.....	0 (0%)
Protestant.....	5 (3%)	Sikh.....	0 (0%)
Other Christian denomination.....	61 (41%)	Other.....	32 (21%)
Buddhist.....	0 (0%)		

Q1.11 How would you describe your sexual orientation?

Heterosexual/straight.....	152 (98%)
Homosexual/gay.....	2 (1%)
Bisexual.....	1 (1%)

Q1.12 Do you consider yourself to have a disability (i.e. do you need help with any long term physical, mental or learning needs)?

Yes.....	23 (15%)
No.....	133 (85%)

Q1.13 Is this your first time in prison?

Yes.....	74 (45%)
No.....	89 (55%)

Section 2: Courts, transfers and escorts

Q2.1 On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?

Yes.....	79 (49%)
No.....	48 (30%)
Don't remember.....	33 (21%)

Q2.2 On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?

Yes.....	69 (42%)
No.....	84 (52%)
Don't remember.....	10 (6%)

Q2.3 On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?

Very well.....	23 (14%)
Well.....	58 (36%)
Neither.....	33 (20%)
Badly.....	21 (13%)
Very badly.....	13 (8%)
Don't remember.....	13 (8%)

Q2.4	Did you know where you were going when you left court?	
	Yes	139 (87%)
	No	19 (12%)
	Don't remember	1 (1%)

Q2.5	When you first arrived here did your personal belongings arrive at the same time as you?	
	Yes	88 (55%)
	No	60 (38%)
	Don't remember	12 (8%)

Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

Q3.1	How long were you in reception?	
	Less than 2 hours	80 (50%)
	2 hours or longer	53 (33%)
	Don't remember	28 (17%)

Q3.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	
	Yes	69 (43%)
	No	78 (48%)
	Don't remember	14 (9%)

Q3.3	Overall, how were you treated in reception?	
	Very well	14 (9%)
	Well	66 (42%)
	Neither	31 (20%)
	Badly	24 (15%)
	Very badly	9 (6%)
	Don't remember	14 (9%)

Q3.4	Did you have any of the following problems when you first arrived here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Loss of personal belongings	33 (21%)
	Housing problems	27 (17%)
	Contacting employers	17 (11%)
	Contacting family	52 (34%)
	Childcare	38 (25%)
	Money worries	67 (43%)
	Feeling depressed or suicidal	50 (32%)
	Physical health	29 (19%)
	Mental health	14 (9%)
	Needing protection from other prisoners	13 (8%)
	Getting phone numbers	31 (20%)
	Other	10 (6%)
	Did not have any problems	29 (19%)

Q3.5	Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems when you first arrived here?	
	Yes	26 (17%)
	No	97 (64%)
	Did not have any problems	29 (19%)

Q3.6	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	A shower	84 (52%)
	A free telephone call	56 (35%)
	Something to eat	92 (57%)
	A phone card	14 (9%)
	Toiletries/basic items	103 (64%)

Did not receive anything 28 (17%)

- Q3.7** When you first arrived here, did you have access to the following people or services? (Please tick all that apply to you.)
- Chaplain* 37 (24%)
 - Someone from health services* 31 (20%)
 - Social worker* 15 (10%)
 - Probation officer* 31 (20%)
 - Psychologist* 13 (9%)
 - Prison shop* 25 (16%)
 - Did not have access to any of these** 89 (59%)
- Q3.8** When you first arrived here, were you offered information on the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)
- What was going to happen to you* 41 (26%)
 - What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal* 24 (15%)
 - How to make routine requests (applications)* 45 (29%)
 - Your entitlement to visits* 68 (44%)
 - Health services* 33 (21%)
 - Chaplaincy/pastoral care/church services* 28 (18%)
 - Not offered any information** 67 (43%)
- Q3.9** Did you feel safe on your first night here?
- Yes* 55 (34%)
 - No* 98 (60%)
 - Don't remember* 11 (7%)
- Q3.10** How soon after you arrived here did you go on an induction/orientation course?
- Have not been on an induction/orientation course** 61 (37%)
 - Within the first week* 24 (15%)
 - More than a week* 40 (25%)
 - Don't remember* 38 (23%)
- Q3.11** Did the induction/orientation course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?
- Have not been on an induction/orientation course** 61 (39%)
 - Yes* 29 (19%)
 - No* 34 (22%)
 - Don't remember* 32 (21%)
- Q3.12** How soon after you arrived here did you receive an education ('skills for life') assessment?
- Did not receive an assessment** 53 (33%)
 - Within the first week* 14 (9%)
 - More than a week* 60 (37%)
 - Don't remember* 36 (22%)

Section 4: Legal rights and respectful custody

- Q4.1** How easy is it to:
- | | <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 (8%) | 29 (19%) | 14 (9%) | 50 (32%) | 41 (26%) | 9 (6%) |

Attend legal visits?	13 (9%)	46 (32%)	22 (15%)	25 (18%)	25 (18%)	11 (8%)
Get bail information?	7 (5%)	10 (7%)	9 (6%)	38 (27%)	43 (31%)	33 (24%)

- Q4.2 Have staff here ever opened letters from your lawyer or your legal representative when you were not with them?**
- Not had any letters* 50 (33%)
- Yes 75 (49%)
- No 27 (18%)
- Q4.3 Can you get legal books in the library?**
- Yes 89 (56%)
- No 32 (20%)
- Don't know 39 (24%)
- Q4.4 Please answer the following questions about the wing/unit you are currently living on:**
- | | Yes | No | Don't know |
|--|-----------|----------|------------|
| Do you normally have enough clean, suitable clothes for the week? | 86 (55%) | 68 (43%) | 3 (2%) |
| Are you normally able to have a shower every day? | 149 (96%) | 5 (3%) | 2 (1%) |
| Do you normally receive clean sheets every week? | 88 (57%) | 65 (42%) | 1 (1%) |
| Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week? | 101 (66%) | 48 (32%) | 3 (2%) |
| Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time? | 78 (50%) | 73 (47%) | 4 (3%) |
| If you need to can you normally get your personal belongings? | 53 (34%) | 89 (58%) | 12 (8%) |
- Q4.5 What is the food like here?**
- Very good 4 (3%)
- Good 11 (7%)
- Neither 35 (22%)
- Bad 45 (28%)
- Very bad 63 (40%)
- Q4.6 Does the shop sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?**
- Have not bought anything yet/don't know* 9 (6%)
- Yes 50 (31%)
- No 101 (63%)
- Q4.7 Are your religious beliefs respected?**
- Yes 79 (50%)
- No 43 (27%)
- Don't know/N/A 36 (23%)
- Q4.8 Are you able to speak to a Chaplain (pastor) of your faith in private if you want to?**
- Yes 57 (35%)
- No 68 (42%)
- Don't know/N/A 37 (23%)
- Q4.9 How easy or difficult is it for you to attend religious services?**
- I don't want to attend* 11 (7%)
- Very easy 44 (28%)
- Easy 43 (27%)
- Neither 12 (8%)
- Difficult 22 (14%)
- Very difficult 20 (13%)

Don't know 7 (4%)

Section 5: Applications and complaints

Q5.1	Is it easy to make an application (for work, move your category, etc)?			
	Yes	31	(19%)	
	No	109	(68%)	
	Don't know	20	(13%)	
Q5.2	Please answer the following questions about applications: (If you have not made an application please tick the 'not made one' option.)			
		Not made one	Yes	No
	Are <i>applications</i> dealt with fairly?	19 (12%)	62 (38%)	84 (51%)
	Are <i>applications</i> dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	19 (13%)	49 (33%)	80 (54%)
Q5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?			
	Yes	62	(39%)	
	No	80	(50%)	
	Don't know	19	(12%)	
Q5.4	Please answer the following questions about complaints: (If you have not made a complaint please tick the 'not made one' option.)			
		Not made one	Yes	No
	Are <i>complaints</i> dealt with fairly?	35 (23%)	20 (13%)	96 (64%)
	Are <i>complaints</i> dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	35 (24%)	17 (12%)	91 (64%)
Q5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?			
	Yes	66	(44%)	
	No	85	(56%)	
Q5.6	How easy or difficult is it for you to see the Prison Inspection Board (PIB)?			
	Don't know who they are	63	(40%)	
	Very easy	3	(2%)	
	Easy	9	(6%)	
	Neither	8	(5%)	
	Difficult	27	(17%)	
	Very difficult	49	(31%)	
Q5.7	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?			
	Yes	26	(17%)	
	No	128	(83%)	
Q5.8	If you have spent a night in basic unit in the last six months, how were you treated by staff?			
	I have not been to basic unit in the last 6 months	116	(75%)	
	Very well	0	(0%)	
	Well	5	(3%)	
	Neither	8	(5%)	
	Badly	10	(6%)	
	Very badly	16	(10%)	

Section 6: Relationships with staff

Q6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	
	Yes	80 (53%)
	No	72 (47%)
Q6.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	
	Yes	84 (53%)
	No	74 (47%)
Q6.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	
	Yes	39 (24%)
	No	121 (76%)
Q6.4	When did you first meet your officer advisor?	
	<i>I have not met him/her</i>	61 (38%)
	<i>In the first week</i>	17 (11%)
	<i>More than a week</i>	44 (28%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	38 (24%)
Q6.5	How helpful is your officer advisor?	
	<i>Do not have a officer advisor/I have not met him/her</i>	61 (39%)
	<i>Very helpful</i>	10 (6%)
	<i>Helpful</i>	22 (14%)
	<i>Neither</i>	16 (10%)
	<i>Not very helpful</i>	25 (16%)
	<i>Not at all helpful</i>	24 (15%)

Section 7: Safety

Q7.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	
	Yes	116 (72%)
	No	45 (28%)
Q7.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	
	Yes	75 (47%)
	No	83 (53%)
Q7.3	In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Never felt unsafe</i>	45 (31%)
	<i>Everywhere</i>	41 (28%)
	<i>Basic unit</i>	17 (12%)
	<i>TV room</i>	15 (10%)
	<i>Reception area</i>	8 (5%)
	<i>At the gym</i>	9 (6%)
	<i>In an exercise yard</i>	12 (8%)
	<i>At work</i>	11 (7%)
	<i>During movement</i>	22 (15%)
	<i>In the classrooms</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>At mealtimes</i>	15 (10%)
	<i>Nurses office</i>	11 (7%)
	<i>Visits area</i>	8 (5%)
	<i>In wing showers</i>	22 (15%)
	<i>In corridors/stairwells</i>	11 (7%)
	<i>On your wing</i>	31 (21%)
	<i>In your cell</i>	17 (12%)
	<i>At religious services</i>	4 (3%)
Q7.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	
	Yes	65 (41%)
	No	94 (59%)

Q7.5 If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i>	47 (30%)
<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	23 (15%)
<i>Sexual abuse</i>	3 (2%)
<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	39 (25%)
<i>Having your personal belongings taken</i>	37 (23%)
<i>Medication</i>	8 (5%)
<i>Debt</i>	11 (7%)
<i>Drugs</i>	14 (9%)
<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	9 (6%)
<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	2 (1%)
<i>Your nationality</i>	22 (14%)
<i>You are from a different part of the Island/district from others</i>	20 (13%)
<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	4 (3%)
<i>Your age</i>	8 (5%)
<i>You have a disability</i>	5 (3%)
<i>You were new here</i>	11 (7%)
<i>Your offence/crime</i>	15 (9%)
<i>Gang related issues</i>	12 (8%)

Q7.6 Have you been victimised by staff here?

Yes	93 (60%)
No.....	63 (40%)

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

<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i>	54 (35%)
<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	28 (18%)
<i>Sexual abuse</i>	2 (1%)
<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	46 (30%)
<i>Medication</i>	11 (7%)
<i>Debt</i>	3 (2%)
<i>Drugs</i>	9 (6%)
<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	14 (9%)
<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	8 (5%)
<i>Your nationality</i>	28 (18%)
<i>You are from a different part of the island/district from others</i>	11 (7%)
<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	2 (1%)
<i>Your age</i>	9 (6%)
<i>You have a disability</i>	8 (5%)
<i>You were new here</i>	11 (7%)
<i>Your offence/ crime</i>	21 (14%)
<i>Gang related issues</i>	11 (7%)

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

Not been victimised	49 (35%)
Yes.....	45 (32%)
No.....	48 (34%)

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		6 (4%)	15 (9%)	33 (21%)	24 (15%)	54 (34%)	27 (17%)
The nurse		4 (3%)	18 (12%)	50 (32%)	19 (12%)	51 (33%)	12 (8%)
The dentist		10 (6%)	15 (10%)	33 (21%)	24 (16%)	56 (36%)	16 (10%)
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		11 (7%)	17 (11%)	50 (33%)	23 (15%)	30 (20%)	19 (13%)
The nurse		10 (7%)	13 (8%)	38 (25%)	22 (14%)	41 (27%)	29 (19%)
The dentist		18 (12%)	10 (7%)	52 (35%)	23 (15%)	27 (18%)	19 (13%)
Q8.3	What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?						
		<i>Not been</i>					10 (6%)
		<i>Very good</i>					7 (4%)
		<i>Good</i>					38 (24%)
		<i>Neither</i>					27 (17%)
		<i>Bad</i>					39 (25%)
		<i>Very bad</i>					37 (23%)
Q8.4	Are you currently taking medication?						
		Yes					79 (50%)
		No					79 (50%)
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>					79 (50%)
		<i>Yes, all my meds</i>					42 (27%)
		<i>Yes, some of my meds</i>					30 (19%)
		<i>No</i>					7 (4%)
Q8.6	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?						
		Yes					38 (24%)
		No					120 (76%)
Q8.7	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)?						
		<i>Do not have any emotional or mental health problems</i>					120 (76%)
		Yes					14 (9%)
		No					23 (15%)

Section 9: Drugs and alcohol

Q9.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?		
		Yes	37 (23%)
		No	121 (77%)
Q9.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?		
		Yes	21 (13%)
		No	136 (87%)
Q9.3	Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?		
		<i>Very easy</i>	51 (33%)
		<i>Easy</i>	19 (12%)

<i>Neither</i>	17 (11%)
<i>Difficult</i>	19 (12%)
<i>Very difficult</i>	27 (17%)
<i>Don't know</i>	23 (15%)

Q9.4 Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison?

<i>Very easy</i>	36 (23%)
<i>Easy</i>	23 (15%)
<i>Neither</i>	19 (12%)
<i>Difficult</i>	18 (12%)
<i>Very difficult</i>	32 (21%)
<i>Don't know</i>	27 (17%)

Q9.5 Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?

<i>Yes</i>	20 (13%)
<i>No</i>	136 (87%)

Q9.6 Have you received any support or help (e.g. the Counselling Centre) for your drug problem while in this prison?

<i>Did not/do not have a drug problem</i>	112 (72%)
<i>Yes</i>	10 (6%)
<i>No</i>	34 (22%)

Q9.7 Have you received any support or help (e.g. the Counselling Centre) for your alcohol problem while in this prison?

<i>Did not/do not have an alcohol problem</i>	134 (86%)
<i>Yes</i>	7 (4%)
<i>No</i>	15 (10%)

Q9.8 Was the support or help you received while in this prison helpful?

<i>Did not have a problem/did not receive help</i>	129 (84%)
<i>Yes</i>	10 (7%)
<i>No</i>	14 (9%)

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%)	14 (9%)	32 (21%)	19 (13%)	48 (32%)	35 (23%)
Vocational or skills training	15 (10%)	7 (5%)	31 (21%)	17 (12%)	36 (24%)	41 (28%)
Education (including basic skills)	6 (4%)	13 (9%)	59 (41%)	17 (12%)	28 (19%)	22 (15%)
Offending behaviour programmes (e.g. Constructs, anger management courses etc)	19 (13%)	9 (6%)	41 (28%)	21 (14%)	32 (22%)	23 (16%)

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

<i>Not involved in any of these</i>	38 (25%)
Prison job.....	97 (65%)
Vocational or skills training.....	34 (23%)
Education (including basic skills).....	60 (40%)

Offending behaviour programmes (e.g. Constructs, Anger Management courses etc)	41 (27%)
--	----------

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>	Yes	No	<i>Don't know</i>
Prison job	21 (15%)	66 (47%)	35 (25%)	19 (13%)
Vocational or skills training	35 (29%)	52 (43%)	23 (19%)	10 (8%)
Education (including basic skills)	27 (21%)	70 (55%)	19 (15%)	11 (9%)
Offending behaviour programmes (e.g. Constructs, anger management courses etc)	32 (26%)	59 (49%)	18 (15%)	12 (10%)

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

<i>Don't know/never tried</i>	20 (13%)
Yes	87 (58%)
No	44 (29%)

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

<i>Don't use it</i>	33 (22%)
Yes	53 (35%)
No	66 (43%)

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

<i>Don't want to go</i>	38 (24%)
0	37 (24%)
1 to 2	41 (26%)
3 to 5	35 (22%)
More than 5	6 (4%)

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

<i>Don't want to go</i>	20 (13%)
0	23 (15%)
1 to 2	27 (18%)
3 to 5	25 (16%)
More than 5	58 (38%)

Q10.8 How many hours do you usually spend unlocked on a weekday? (Please include hours at education, at work etc.)

<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	19 (12%)
<i>2 to less than 4 hours</i>	3 (2%)
<i>4 to less than 6 hours</i>	9 (6%)
<i>6 to less than 8 hours</i>	13 (8%)
<i>8 to less than 10 hours</i>	16 (10%)
<i>10 hours or more</i>	76 (49%)
<i>Don't know</i>	19 (12%)

Section 11: Contact with family and friends

Q11.1 Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with your family/friends while in this prison?

Yes	51 (32%)
No	106 (68%)

Q11.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?	
	Yes	68 (44%)
	No	86 (56%)
Q11.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	
	Yes	61 (40%)
	No	92 (60%)
Q11.4	How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	16 (10%)
	Very easy	13 (8%)
	Easy	35 (23%)
	Neither	21 (14%)
	Difficult	30 (19%)
	Very difficult	37 (24%)
	Don't know	2 (1%)

Section 12: Preparation for release

Q12.1	Do you have a sentence plan?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	34 (22%)
	Yes	61 (39%)
	No	62 (39%)
Q12.2	How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced</i>	96 (62%)
	Very involved	23 (15%)
	Involved	23 (15%)
	Neither	3 (2%)
	Not very involved	7 (5%)
	Not at all involved	3 (2%)
Q12.3	Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced</i>	96 (62%)
	Nobody	23 (15%)
	Named probation officer	8 (5%)
	Social worker	1 (1%)
	Psychologist	2 (1%)
	Officer advisor	15 (10%)
	Staff from other departments	16 (10%)
Q12.4	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced</i>	96 (63%)
	Yes	28 (18%)
	No	19 (12%)
	Don't know	10 (7%)
Q12.5	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in the community?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced</i>	96 (63%)
	Yes	36 (24%)
	No	13 (8%)
	Don't know	8 (5%)

Q12.6 Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?
 Yes 34 (23%)
 No 113 (77%)

**Q12.7 Do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you with the following on release?
 (Please tick all that apply to you.)**

	<i>Do not need help</i>	Yes	No
Employment	18 (13%)	26 (19%)	92 (68%)
Accommodation	22 (17%)	14 (11%)	90 (71%)
Finances	17 (13%)	17 (13%)	98 (74%)
Education	20 (15%)	28 (21%)	86 (64%)
Drugs and alcohol	27 (21%)	27 (21%)	77 (59%)

Q12.8 Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here, that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?

Not sentenced 34 (23%)
 Yes 61 (41%)
 No 52 (35%)

Summary of prisoner survey results – HMP Fairbanks

Section 1: About you

Q1.2	How old are you?	
	<i>Under 21</i>	2
	<i>21 - 29</i>	1
	<i>30 - 39</i>	1
	<i>40 - 49</i>	0
	<i>50 - 59</i>	0
	<i>60 - 69</i>	0
	<i>70 and over</i>	0
Q1.3	Are you sentenced?	
	<i>Yes</i>	3
	<i>Yes - on recall</i>	0
	<i>No - awaiting trial</i>	1
	<i>No - awaiting sentence</i>	0
	<i>No - awaiting deportation</i>	0
Q1.4	How long is your sentence?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	1
	<i>Less than 6 months</i>	0
	<i>6 months to less than 1 year</i>	0
	<i>1 year to less than 2 years</i>	1
	<i>2 years to less than 4 years</i>	2
	<i>4 years to less than 10 years</i>	0
	<i>10 years or more</i>	0
	<i>Courts Pleasure</i>	0
	<i>Life</i>	0
Q1.5	Do you understand spoken English?	
	<i>Yes</i>	4
	<i>No</i>	0
Q1.6	Do you understand written English?	
	<i>Yes</i>	3
	<i>No</i>	0
Q1.7	Are you Caymanian?	
	<i>Yes</i>	4
	<i>No</i>	0
Q1.8	What region are you from?	
	<i>Africa</i>	0
	<i>North America</i>	0
	<i>Central America</i>	0
	<i>South America</i>	0
	<i>Indian subcontinent (India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Sri-Lanka)</i>	0
	<i>China</i>	0
	<i>Other Asia</i>	0

Caribbean.....	3
Europe.....	0
Middle East.....	0
Other.....	1

Q1.9 What is your ethnic origin?

White.....	0
Black.....	1
Asian.....	0
Mixed race.....	2
Other ethnic group.....	0

Q1.10 What is your religion?

None.....	0	Hindu.....	0
Church of England.....	1	Jewish.....	0
Catholic.....	0	Muslim.....	0
Protestant.....	0	Sikh.....	0
Other Christian denomination.....	2	Other.....	0
Buddhist.....	0		

Q1.11 How would you describe your sexual orientation?

Heterosexual/straight.....	3
Homosexual/gay.....	0
Bisexual.....	0

Q1.12 Do you consider yourself to have a disability (i.e. do you need help with any long term physical, mental or learning needs)?

Yes.....	0
No.....	3

Q1.13 Is this your first time in prison?

Yes.....	2
No.....	2

Section 2: Courts, transfers and escorts

Q2.1 On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?

Yes.....	4
No.....	0
Don't remember.....	0

Q2.2 On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?

Yes.....	4
No.....	0
Don't remember.....	0

Q2.3 On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?

Very well.....	2
Well.....	2
Neither.....	0
Badly.....	0
Very badly.....	0
Don't remember.....	0

Q2.4	Did you know where you were going when you left court?	
	Yes	4
	No	0
	Don't remember	0
Q2.5	When you first arrived here did your personal belongings arrive at the same time as you?	
	Yes	2
	No	2
	Don't remember	0

Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

Q3.1	How long were you in reception?	
	Less than 2 hours	2
	2 hours or longer	0
	Don't remember	1
Q3.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	
	Yes	3
	No	0
	Don't remember	0
Q3.3	Overall, how were you treated in reception?	
	Very well	0
	Well	3
	Neither	0
	Badly	0
	Very badly	0
	Don't remember	0
Q3.4	Did you have any of the following problems when you first arrived here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Loss of personal belongings	0
	Housing problems	0
	Contacting employers	0
	Contacting family	1
	Childcare	0
	Money worries	1
	Feeling depressed or suicidal	2
	Physical health	0
	Mental health	0
	Needing protection from other prisoners	0
	Getting phone numbers	0
	Other	0
	Did not have any problems	1
Q3.5	Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems when you first arrived here?	
	Yes	2
	No	0
	Did not have any problems	1
Q3.6	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	A shower	2
	A free telephone call	3
	Something to eat	2
	A phone card	0
	Toiletries/basic items	3
	Did not receive anything	0

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

Section 4: Legal rights and respectful custody

Q4.1	How easy is it to:						
		<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>	1	1	0	0	0	1
	<i>Attend legal visits?</i>	1	1	0	0	0	1

Get bail information? 0 1 1 0 0 0

Q4.2	Have staff here ever opened letters from your lawyer or your legal representative when you were not with them?			
	Not had any letters			0
	Yes			0
	No			2
Q4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?			
	Yes			1
	No			1
	Don't know			1
Q4.4	Please answer the following questions about the wing/unit you are currently living on:			
		Yes	No	Don't know
	<i>Do you normally have enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?</i>	3	0	0
	<i>Are you normally able to have a shower every day?</i>	3	0	0
	<i>Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?</i>	2	0	1
	<i>Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?</i>	2	0	1
	<i>Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?</i>	3	0	0
	<i>If you need to, can you normally get your personal belongings?</i>	3	0	0
Q4.5	What is the food like here?			
	Very good			0
	Good			2
	Neither			1
	Bad			0
	Very bad			0
Q4.6	Does the shop sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?			
	Have not bought anything yet/don't know			0
	Yes			3
	No			0
Q4.7	Are your religious beliefs respected?			
	Yes			4
	No			0
	Don't know/N/A			0
Q4.8	Are you able to speak to a Chaplain (pastor) of your faith in private if you want to?			
	Yes			3
	No			0
	Don't know/N/A			1
Q4.9	How easy or difficult is it for you to attend religious services?			
	I don't want to attend			0
	Very easy			2
	Easy			1
	Neither			0
	Difficult			0
	Very difficult			0
	Don't know			1

Section 5: Applications and complaints

Q5.1	Is it easy to make an application (for work, move your category, etc)?			
	Yes			3
	No			1
	Don't know			0
Q5.2	Please answer the following questions about applications: <i>(If you have not made an application please tick the 'not made one' option.)</i>			
		Not made one	Yes	No
	Are applications dealt with fairly?	1	3	0
	Are applications dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	1	3	0
Q5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?			
	Yes			1
	No			0
	Don't know			2
Q5.4	Please answer the following questions about complaints: <i>(If you have not made a complaint please tick the 'not made one' option.)</i>			
		Not made one	Yes	No
	Are complaints dealt with fairly?	2	1	0
	Are complaints dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	2	1	0
Q5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?			
	Yes			0
	No			2
Q5.6	How easy or difficult is it for you to see the Prison Inspection Board (PIB)?			
	Don't know who they are			3
	Very easy			0
	Easy			0
	Neither			0
	Difficult			0
	Very difficult			0
Q5.7	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?			
	Yes			0
	No			3
Q5.8	If you have spent a night in basic unit in the last six months, how were you treated by staff?			
	I have not been to basic unit in the last 6 months			3
	Very well			0
	Well			0
	Neither			0
	Badly			0
	Very badly			0

Section 6: Relationships with staff

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

Section 7: Safety

Q7.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	
	Yes	1
	No	3
Q7.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	
	Yes	0
	No	4
Q7.3	In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Never felt unsafe</i>	3
	<i>Everywhere</i>	0
	<i>Basic unit</i>	0
	<i>TV room</i>	0
	<i>Reception area</i>	0
	<i>At the gym</i>	0
	<i>In an exercise yard</i>	0
	<i>At work</i>	0
	<i>During movement</i>	0
	<i>In the classrooms</i>	0
	<i>At mealtimes</i>	0
	<i>Nurses office</i>	0
	<i>Visits area</i>	0
	<i>In wing showers</i>	0
	<i>In corridors/stairwells</i>	0
	<i>On your wing</i>	0
	<i>In your cell</i>	1
	<i>At religious services</i>	0
Q7.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	
	Yes	0
	No	3

Q7.5	If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i>	0
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	0
	<i>Sexual abuse</i>	0
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	0
	<i>Having your personal belongings taken</i>	0
	<i>Medication</i>	0
	<i>Debt</i>	0
	<i>Drugs</i>	0
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	0
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	0
	<i>Your nationality</i>	0
	<i>You are from a different part of the Island/district from others</i>	0
	<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	0
	<i>Your age</i>	0
	<i>You have a disability</i>	0
	<i>You were new here</i>	0
	<i>Your offence/crime</i>	0
	<i>Gang related issues</i>	0
Q7.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	
	Yes.....	2
	No.....	2
Q7.7	If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i>	1
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	0
	<i>Sexual abuse</i>	1
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	0
	<i>Medication</i>	0
	<i>Debt</i>	0
	<i>Drugs</i>	0
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	0
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	0
	<i>Your nationality</i>	0
	<i>You are from a different part of the Island/district from others</i>	0
	<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	0
	<i>Your age</i>	0
	<i>You have a disability</i>	0
	<i>You were new here</i>	0
	<i>Your offence/crime</i>	0
	<i>Gang related issues</i>	0
Q7.8	If you have been victimised by prisoners or staff did you report it?	
	Not been victimised	2
	Yes.....	0
	No.....	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	0	1	2	0	0	0
	The nurse	0	1	2	0	0	0
	The dentist	2	0	1	0	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	2	1	0	0	0
	The nurse	0	1	2	0	0	0
	The dentist	2	1	0	0	0	0
Q8.3	What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?						
	<i>Not been</i>						0
	<i>Very good</i>						1
	<i>Good</i>						2
	<i>Neither</i>						0
	<i>Bad</i>						0
	<i>Very bad</i>						0
Q8.4	Are you currently taking medication?						
	Yes						1
	No						2
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>						2
	<i>Yes, all my meds</i>						0
	<i>Yes, some of my meds</i>						0
	<i>No</i>						1
Q8.6	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?						
	Yes						0
	No						3
Q8.7	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)?						
	<i>Do not have any emotional or mental health problems</i>						3
	Yes						0
	No						0

Section 9: Drugs and alcohol

Q9.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	
	Yes	0
	No	4
Q9.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	
	Yes	1
	No	3
Q9.3	Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?	
	<i>Very easy</i>	1

Easy	0
Neither	0
Difficult	0
Very difficult	0
Don't know	3

Q9.4 Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison?

Very easy	1
Easy	0
Neither	0
Difficult	0
Very difficult	0
Don't know	3

Q9.5 Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?

Yes	0
No	4

Q9.6 Have you received any support or help (e.g. the Counselling Centre) for your drug problem while in this prison?

<i>Did not/do not have a drug problem</i>	4
Yes	0
No	0

Q9.7 Have you received any support or help (e.g. the Counselling Centre) for your alcohol problem while in this prison?

<i>Did not/do not have an alcohol problem</i>	3
Yes	1
No	0

Q9.8 Was the support or help you received while in this prison helpful?

<i>Did not have a problem/did not receive help</i>	3
Yes	1
No	0

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	0	3	0	0	0	0
Vocational or skills training	2	0	1	0	0	0
Education (including basic skills)	1	1	1	0	0	0
Offending behaviour programmes (e.g. Constructs, anger management courses etc)	1	2	0	0	0	0

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

<i>Not involved in any of these</i>	0
Prison job	3
Vocational or skills training	0
Education (including basic skills)	2
Offending behaviour programmes (e.g. Constructs, anger management courses etc) ...	2

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>	Yes	No	<i>Don't know</i>
	Prison job	0	2	0	1
	Vocational or skills training	0	0	0	0
	Education (including basic skills)	0	2	0	0
	Offending behaviour programmes (e.g. Constructs, anger management courses etc)	0	2	0	0
Q10.4	Is it easy to go to the library?				
	<i>Don't know/never tried</i>				0
	Yes				3
	No				0
Q10.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?				
	<i>Don't use it</i>				0
	Yes				1
	No				2
Q10.6	How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?				
	<i>Don't want to go</i>				1
	0				0
	1 to 2				0
	3 to 5				2
	More than 5				0
Q10.7	How many times do you usually go outside the wing for exercise each week?				
	<i>Don't want to go</i>				0
	0				0
	1 to 2				2
	3 to 5				0
	More than 5				1
Q10.8	How many hours do you usually spend unlocked on a weekday? (Please include hours at education, at work etc.)				
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i>				1
	<i>2 to less than 4 hours</i>				0
	<i>4 to less than 6 hours</i>				0
	<i>6 to less than 8 hours</i>				0
	<i>8 to less than 10 hours</i>				0
	<i>10 hours or more</i>				2
	<i>Don't know</i>				0

Section 11: Contact with family and friends

Q11.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with your family/friends while in this prison?				
	Yes				2
	No				1
Q11.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?				
	Yes				0
	No				3

Q11.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	
	Yes	0
	No	3
Q11.4	How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	1
	Very easy	1
	Easy	1
	Neither	0
	Difficult	0
	Very difficult	0
	Don't know	0

Section 12: Preparation for release

Q12.1	Do you have a sentence plan?	
	Not sentenced	1
	Yes	2
	No	0
Q12.2	How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?	
	Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced	1
	Very involved	1
	Involved	1
	Neither	0
	Not very involved	0
	Not at all involved	0
Q12.3	Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced	1
	Nobody	0
	Named probation officer	0
	Social worker	0
	Psychologist	0
	Officer advisor	1
	Staff from other departments	2
Q12.4	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	
	Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced	1
	Yes	2
	No	0
	Don't know	0
Q12.5	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in the community?	
	Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced	1
	Yes	2
	No	0
	Don't know	0
Q12.6	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?	
	Yes	3
	No	0

**Q12.7 Do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you with the following on release?
(Please tick all that apply to you.)**

	<i>Do not need help</i>	Yes	No
Employment	2	1	0
Accommodation	2	0	0
Finances	2	0	0
Education	2	1	0
Drugs and alcohol	2	1	0

Q12.8 Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here, that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?

<i>Not sentenced</i>	1
Yes	1
No	1

Main comparator and comparator to last time



Prisoner survey responses HMP Northward (male) 2012

	Prisoner survey responses (missing data have been excluded for each question).	HMP Northward (Grand Cayman)
Number of completed questionnaires returned		166
SECTION 1: General information		
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	7%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	80%
1.3	Are you recall?	2%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	5%
1.4	Are you here under courts pleasure?	2%
1.5	Do you understand spoken English?	100%
1.6	Do you understand written English?	97%
1.7	Are you Caymanian?	78%
1.8	Are you from a region outside of the Caribbean? (Including Africa, all Americas, Indian sub-continent, Asia, Europe or the Middle East)	17%
1.9	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white)	92%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	0%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	2%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	15%
1.13	Is this your first time in prison?	46%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts		
On your most recent journey here:		
2.1	Was the van clean?	50%
2.2	Did you feel safe?	42%
2.3	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	50%
2.4	Did you know where you were going when you left court?	88%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your personal belongings arrive at the same time as you?	55%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

	Prisoner survey responses (missing data have been excluded for each question).	HMP Northward (Grand Cayman)
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction		
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	50%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	43%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	51%
	When you first arrived:	
3.4	Did you have any problems?	81%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of personal belongings?	21%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	17%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	11%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	34%
3.4	Did you have any problems with child care?	24%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	43%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	32%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	19%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	9%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	8%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	20%
	For those with problems:	
3.5	Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems?	21%
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:	
3.6	A shower?	52%
3.6	A free telephone call?	35%
3.6	Something to eat?	57%
3.6	A phone card?	9%
3.6	Toiletries/basic items?	64%
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued		
	When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:	
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	24%
3.7	Someone from health services?	21%
3.7	A social worker?	10%
3.7	A probation officer?	21%
3.7	A psychologist?	9%
3.7	Prison shop?	17%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:	
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	27%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	16%
3.8	How to make routine requests (applications)?	29%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	44%
3.8	Health services?	21%
3.8	The chaplaincy/pastoral care?	18%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	34%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	62%
	For those who have been on an induction course:	
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	31%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

	Prisoner survey responses (missing data have been excluded for each question).	HMP Northward (Grand Cayman)
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	68%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

	Prisoner survey responses (missing data have been excluded for each question).	HMP Northward (Grand Cayman)
SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody		
	In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:	
4.1	Communicate with your lawyer or legal representative?	27%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	42%
4.1	Get bail information?	12%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your lawyer or legal representative when you were not with them?	49%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	56%
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:	
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	55%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	96%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	57%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	67%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	50%
4.4	Can you normally get your personal belongings?	34%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	9%
4.6	Does the shop sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	31%
4.7	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	50%
4.8	Are you able to speak to a Chaplain (pastor) of your faith in private if you want to?	35%
4.9	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	55%
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints		
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	19%
	For those who have made an application:	
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	43%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	38%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	39%
	For those who have made a complaint:	
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	17%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	16%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	44%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Prison Inspection Board (PIB)?	8%
5.7	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	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?	13%
SECTION 6: Relationships with staff		
6.1	Do most staff in this prison treat you with respect?	53%
6.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	53%
6.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	24%
6.4	Do you have an officer advisor?	62%
	For those with an officer advisor:	
6.5	Do you think your officer advisor is helpful/very helpful?	33%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

	Prisoner survey responses (missing data have been excluded for each question).	HMP Northward (Grand Cayman)
SECTION 7: Safety		
7.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	72%
7.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	48%
7.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	41%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:	
7.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	30%
7.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	15%
7.5	Sexually abused you?	2%
7.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	25%
7.5	Taken your personal belongings?	24%
7.5	Victimised you because of medication?	5%
7.5	Victimised you because of debt?	7%
7.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	9%
7.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	6%
7.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	1%
7.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	14%
7.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the island/district?	13%
7.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	3%
7.5	Victimised you because of your age?	5%
7.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	3%
7.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	7%
7.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	9%
7.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	8%
SECTION 8: Safety continued		
7.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	60%
	Since you have been here have staff:	
7.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	35%
7.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	18%
7.7	Sexually abused you?	1%
7.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	29%
7.7	Victimised you because of medication?	7%
7.7	Victimised you because of debt?	2%
7.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	6%
7.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	9%
7.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	5%
7.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	18%
7.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the island/district?	7%
7.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	1%
7.7	Victimised you because of your age?	6%
7.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	5%
7.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	7%
7.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	13%
7.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	7%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

	Prisoner survey responses (missing data have been excluded for each question).	HMP Northward (Grand Cayman)
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:	
7.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	48%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Prisoner survey responses (missing data have been excluded for each question).		HMP Northward (Grand Cayman)
SECTION 8: Health services		
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	30%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	44%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	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?	48%
8.2	The nurse?	36%
8.2	The dentist?	47%
8.3	The overall quality of health services?	30%
8.4	Are you currently taking medication?	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?	91%
8.6	Do you have any emotional well-being or mental health problems?	24%
	For those who have problems:	
8.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	37%
SECTION 9: Drugs and alcohol		
9.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	24%
9.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	13%
9.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	45%
9.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	38%
9.5	Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?	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?	24%
9.7	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	32%
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:	
9.8	Was the support helpful?	43%
SECTION 10: Activities		
	Is it very easy/easy to get into the following activities:	
10.1	A prison job?	30%
10.1	Vocational or skills training?	26%
10.1	Education (including basic skills)?	50%
10.1	Offending behaviour programmes?	35%
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:	
10.2	A prison job?	65%
10.2	Vocational or skills training?	22%
10.2	Education (including basic skills)?	40%
10.2	Offending behaviour programmes?	28%
10.3	Have you had a job while in this prison?	85%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Prisoner survey responses (missing data have been excluded for each question).		HMP Northward (Grand Cayman)
	For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:	
10.3	Do you feel the job will help you on release?	55%
10.3	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	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?	61%
10.3	Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	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?	70%
10.3	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	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?	66%
10.4	Is it easy to go to the library?	58%
10.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	35%
10.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	26%
10.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	54%
10.9	Do you spend ten or more hours unlocked on a weekday?	49%
SECTION 11: Friends and family		
11.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	32%
11.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	44%
11.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	40%
11.4	Is it easy/very easy for your friends and family to get here?	31%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

	Prisoner survey responses (missing data have been excluded for each question).	HMP Northward (Grand Cayman)
SECTION 12: Preparation for release		
	For those who are sentenced:	
12.1	Do you have a sentence plan?	50%
	For those with a sentence plan:	
12.2	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	78%
	Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:	
12.3	Nobody?	40%
12.3	Named probation officer?	13%
12.3	Social worker?	2%
12.3	Psychologist?	3%
12.3	Officer advisor?	25%
12.3	Staff from other departments?	28%
	For those with a sentence plan:	
12.4	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	49%
12.5	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	64%
12.6	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	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?	22%
12.7	Accommodation?	13%
12.7	Finances?	15%
12.7	Education?	24%
12.7	Drugs and alcohol?	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?	54%

Diversity Analysis



Key question responses (nationality & disability) HMP Northward (Grand Cayman) 2012

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

		Caymanian	All other nationalities	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	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				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		128	36	23	133
1.3	Are you sentenced?	78%	83%	70%	80%
1.5	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.6	Do you understand written English?	99%	95%	96%	98%
1.7	Are you Caymanian?			89%	76%
1.8	Are you from a region outside of the Caribbean? (Including Africa, all Americas, Indian sub-continent, Asia, Europe or the Middle East)	9%	49%	8%	20%
1.9	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white)	94%	85%	96%	91%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	17%	8%		
1.13	Is this your first time in prison?	32%	93%	27%	50%
2.3	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	46%	66%	52%	52%
2.4	Did you know where you were going when you left court?	91%	77%	91%	86%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	41%	49%	64%	41%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	46%	70%	63%	51%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	80%	85%	81%	81%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	17%	28%	33%	17%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	34%	34%	12%	39%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	62%	62%	50%	63%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your lawyer or legal representative?	27%	26%	24%	29%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Caymanian	All other nationalities	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	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 offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	50%	76%	54%	57%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	95%	100%	96%	96%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	6%	21%	13%	9%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	30%	39%	40%	31%
4.7	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	45%	66%	52%	52%
4.8	Are you able to speak to a chaplain (pastor) of your faith in private if you want to?	34%	43%	48%	34%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	18%	23%	23%	18%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	39%	40%	54%	36%
5.7	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	18%	9%	35%	12%
6.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	46%	78%	48%	55%
6.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	47%	78%	54%	54%
6.5	Do you have an officer advisor?	61%	63%	50%	65%
7.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	76%	56%	92%	68%
7.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	50%	33%	52%	45%
7.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	44%	31%	50%	37%
7.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	26%	18%	36%	21%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	5%	8%	4%	6%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	13%	18%	27%	12%
7.5	Have you been victimised because you were from a different part of the Island/District? (By prisoners)	15%	5%	32%	9%
7.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	4%	0%	19%	1%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Caymanian	All other nationalities	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	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				
7.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	64%	42%	76%	56%
7.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	35%	8%	58%	23%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	9%	8%	13%	9%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	18%	16%	24%	16%
7.7	Have you been victimised because you were from a different part of the Island District? (By staff)	9%	0%	13%	6%
7.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	6%	3%	33%	1%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	33%	21%	23%	32%
8.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	42%	54%	29%	48%
8.4	Are you currently taking medication?	49%	55%	73%	47%
8.6	Do you feel you have any emotional wellbeing/mental health issues?	26%	16%	54%	19%
9.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	43%	50%	38%	46%
9.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	35%	47%	29%	40%
10.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	59%	84%	48%	69%
10.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	19%	35%	20%	24%
10.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	34%	60%	29%	42%
10.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	26%	35%	24%	28%
10.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	54%	73%	52%	58%
10.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	25%	35%	19%	28%
10.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	48%	81%	58%	54%
10.8	Do you spend ten or more hours unlocked on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc.)	45%	62%	40%	51%
11.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	45%	38%	68%	40%
11.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	37%	47%	40%	40%
11.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	32%	35%	50%	29%



Prisoner survey responses HMP Northward (male) 2012

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

Percentages highlighted in green show the best score across wings		A wing	B wing	C wing (Eagle House)	D wing	F wing	HRU (High Risk Unit)	Overall (excl. E & House)
Percentages highlighted in blue show the worst score across wings								
Number of completed questionnaires returned		27	46	31	25	20	11	160
SECTION 1: General information								
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	0%	2%	22%	7%	0%	17%	7%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	81%	91%	75%	32%	100%	92%	78%
1.3	Are you recall?	3%	0%	3%	4%	0%	0%	2%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	7%	4%	9%	7%	0%	0%	5%
1.4	Are you here under courts pleasure?	3%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%
1.5	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.6	Do you understand written English?	97%	96%	97%	100%	100%	100%	98%
1.7	Are you Caymanian?	84%	89%	64%	82%	55%	83%	78%
1.8	Are you from a region outside of the Caribbean? (Including Africa, all Americas, Indian sub-continent, Asia, Europe or the Middle East)	10%	26%	20%	7%	13%	8%	16%
1.9	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white)	100%	88%	85%	88%	96%	100%	91%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	3%	2%	3%	0%	0%	0%	2%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	3%	12%	17%	24%	9%	39%	15%
1.13	Is this your first time in prison?	29%	28%	63%	37%	79%	39%	44%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts								
On your most recent journey here:								
2.1	Was the van clean?	33%	45%	61%	50%	65%	54%	50%
2.2	Did you feel safe?	26%	36%	54%	43%	57%	54%	43%
2.3	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	33%	39%	56%	62%	65%	83%	51%
2.4	Did you know where you were going when you left court?	90%	85%	91%	92%	86%	83%	88%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your personal belongings arrive at the same time as you?	70%	57%	56%	62%	14%	75%	55%
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction								
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	39%	55%	44%	56%	39%	75%	49%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	35%	37%	42%	54%	50%	54%	43%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	43%	42%	47%	56%	70%	62%	50%
When you first arrived:								
3.4	Did you have any problems?	90%	80%	77%	79%	87%	75%	82%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of personal belongings?	20%	31%	9%	7%	44%	17%	22%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	23%	16%	9%	25%	13%	25%	17%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	16%	7%	14%	7%	9%	8%	10%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	47%	26%	40%	21%	39%	17%	33%
3.4	Did you have any problems with child care?	27%	20%	23%	11%	50%	17%	24%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	39%	31%	50%	43%	65%	46%	44%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	23%	29%	43%	25%	44%	8%	31%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	23%	7%	20%	25%	21%	17%	18%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	7%	7%	14%	18%	4%	0%	9%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	16%	2%	9%	7%	9%	0%	8%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	10%	18%	17%	29%	35%	8%	20%

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

Percentages highlighted in green show the best score across wings		A wing	B wing	C wing (Eagle House)	D wing	F wing	HRU (High Risk Unit)	Overall (excl. E & House)
Percentages highlighted in blue show the worst score across wings								
When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:								
3.6	A shower?	53%	39%	53%	68%	55%	62%	52%
3.6	A free telephone call?	30%	31%	44%	46%	36%	0%	34%
3.6	Something to eat?	57%	49%	58%	57%	59%	62%	56%
3.6	A phone card?	10%	2%	19%	4%	9%	8%	8%
3.6	Toiletries/basic items?	80%	56%	53%	57%	68%	75%	62%
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued								
When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:								
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	35%	28%	15%	13%	44%	0%	24%
3.7	Someone from health services?	26%	20%	15%	29%	21%	17%	21%
3.7	A social worker?	19%	4%	6%	8%	21%	0%	9%
3.7	A probation officer?	30%	24%	18%	20%	26%	0%	22%
3.7	A psychologist?	19%	10%	3%	4%	13%	0%	9%
3.7	Prison shop?	22%	10%	18%	29%	13%	17%	17%
When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:								
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	26%	22%	41%	35%	21%	17%	27%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	22%	15%	23%	12%	13%	0%	16%
3.8	How to make routine requests (applications)?	26%	26%	29%	39%	26%	17%	28%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	48%	35%	45%	56%	57%	25%	44%
3.8	Health services?	12%	22%	19%	35%	30%	0%	21%
3.8	The chaplaincy/pastoral care?	19%	17%	23%	19%	26%	0%	18%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	27%	30%	36%	29%	44%	54%	34%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	61%	60%	71%	71%	65%	46%	64%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	77%	67%	75%	72%	79%	17%	69%
SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody								
In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:								
4.1	Communicate with your lawyer or legal representative?	24%	21%	20%	32%	39%	39%	27%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	33%	35%	26%	62%	57%	62%	42%
4.1	Get bail information?	9%	16%	7%	19%	11%	8%	12%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your lawyer or legal representative when you were not with them?	60%	48%	28%	48%	44%	92%	49%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	68%	53%	54%	55%	79%	25%	58%
For the wing/unit you are currently on:								
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	30%	40%	74%	37%	96%	75%	55%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	92%	96%	97%	93%	100%	100%	96%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	54%	54%	56%	37%	74%	83%	56%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	52%	65%	65%	44%	96%	83%	65%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	46%	43%	40%	46%	65%	83%	49%
4.4	Can you normally get your personal belongings?	27%	24%	40%	12%	65%	39%	33%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	7%	6%	17%	12%	4%	8%	9%
4.6	Does the shop sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	19%	32%	37%	21%	30%	62%	31%
4.7	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	52%	43%	43%	44%	91%	46%	51%
4.8	Are you able to speak to a chaplain (pastor) of your faith in private if you want to?	35%	28%	34%	35%	44%	42%	34%
4.9	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	66%	46%	57%	39%	100%	0%	54%

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

Percentages highlighted in green show the best score across wings		A wing	B wing	C wing (Eagle House)	D wing	F wing	HRU (High Risk Unit)	Overall (excl. E & House)
Percentages highlighted in blue show the worst score across wings								
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints								
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	17%	6%	26%	39%	21%	8%	18%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	41%	35%	29%	54%	36%	54%	39%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	50%	56%	32%	36%	26%	54%	44%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Prison Inspection Board (PIB)?	4%	4%	6%	10%	9%	9%	6%
5.7	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	22%	27%	10%	12%	0%	25%	17%
SECTION 6: Relationships with staff								
6.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	58%	37%	50%	64%	77%	46%	53%
6.2	Is there a member of staff in this prison that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	56%	45%	52%	57%	65%	50%	53%
6.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	21%	19%	27%	32%	26%	42%	25%
6.4	Do you have an officer advisor?	90%	55%	69%	66%	61%	25%	64%
SECTION 7: Safety								
7.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	79%	81%	59%	75%	50%	83%	72%
7.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	68%	50%	41%	48%	26%	58%	48%
7.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	39%	52%	24%	43%	39%	39%	40%
Since you have been here, have other prisoners:								
7.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	35%	42%	15%	21%	26%	39%	30%
7.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	12%	24%	3%	21%	9%	8%	15%
7.5	Sexually abused you?	4%	2%	0%	0%	4%	0%	2%
7.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	26%	26%	15%	32%	21%	25%	24%
7.5	Taken your personal belongings?	12%	32%	18%	32%	21%	17%	24%
7.5	Victimised you because of medication?	12%	6%	3%	4%	0%	0%	5%
7.5	Victimised you because of debt?	12%	11%	3%	4%	4%	0%	7%
7.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	8%	13%	6%	7%	4%	8%	9%
7.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	4%	9%	0%	0%	13%	0%	5%
7.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	19%	19%	0%	7%	13%	25%	13%
7.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the island/district?	8%	19%	0%	21%	4%	17%	12%
7.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	4%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%
7.5	Victimised you because of your age?	4%	6%	0%	4%	9%	0%	4%
7.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	4%	4%	0%	7%	0%	0%	3%
7.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	0%	6%	0%	4%	13%	17%	5%
7.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	4%	15%	0%	7%	4%	17%	8%
7.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	4%	15%	3%	4%	0%	17%	7%

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

Percentages highlighted in green show the best score across wings		A wing	B wing	C wing (Eagle House)	D wing	F wing	HRU (High Risk Unit)	Overall (excl. E & House)
Percentages highlighted in blue show the worst score across wings								
SECTION 8: Safety continued								
7.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	65%	72%	30%	54%	57%	83%	59%
	Since you have been here, have staff:							
7.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	30%	50%	18%	32%	26%	39%	34%
7.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	30%	22%	3%	19%	9%	8%	17%
7.7	Sexually abused you?	4%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
7.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	35%	40%	9%	27%	26%	25%	28%
7.7	Victimised you because of medication?	8%	13%	0%	4%	4%	0%	6%
7.7	Victimised you because of debt?	4%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%
7.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	8%	6%	6%	4%	0%	8%	5%
7.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	4%	19%	0%	4%	9%	0%	8%
7.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	13%	0%	4%	4%	0%	5%
7.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	26%	24%	6%	8%	9%	25%	17%
7.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the island/district?	0%	15%	0%	8%	0%	17%	7%
7.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	4%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
7.7	Victimised you because of your age?	8%	11%	0%	0%	9%	0%	6%
7.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	4%	4%	3%	12%	0%	0%	4%
7.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	12%	6%	0%	4%	4%	8%	5%
7.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	12%	15%	0%	19%	0%	39%	12%
7.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	8%	13%	0%	4%	0%	17%	7%
SECTION 8: Health services								
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	37%	33%	15%	31%	39%	17%	29%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	52%	47%	25%	46%	64%	17%	44%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	37%	31%	18%	29%	50%	17%	30%
8.4	Are you currently taking medication?	62%	57%	41%	43%	44%	54%	50%
8.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	26%	17%	38%	29%	9%	39%	25%
SECTION 9: Drugs and alcohol								
9.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	32%	23%	18%	29%	4%	46%	24%
9.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	35%	9%	3%	11%	9%	25%	13%
9.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	37%	33%	50%	43%	79%	9%	43%
9.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	29%	25%	53%	35%	65%	9%	37%
9.5	Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?	21%	16%	6%	22%	0%	8%	13%

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

Percentages highlighted in green show the best score across wings		A wing	B wing	C wing (Eagle House)	D wing	F wing	HRU (High Risk Unit)	Overall (excl. E & House)
Percentages highlighted in blue show the worst score across wings								
SECTION 10: Activities								
Is it very easy/easy to get into the following activities:								
10.1	A prison job?	27%	23%	56%	30%	35%	0%	31%
10.1	Vocational or skills training?	24%	14%	42%	36%	35%	8%	27%
10.1	Education (including basic skills)?	54%	42%	53%	50%	74%	8%	49%
10.1	Offending behaviour programmes?	40%	25%	31%	40%	65%	8%	35%
Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:								
10.2	A prison job?	52%	69%	74%	50%	96%	17%	64%
10.2	Vocational or skills training?	12%	20%	29%	13%	57%	0%	23%
10.2	Education (including basic skills)?	22%	31%	52%	39%	79%	17%	41%
10.2	Offending behaviour programmes?	26%	26%	23%	4%	74%	8%	27%
10.4	Is it easy to go to the library?	63%	50%	52%	44%	96%	39%	57%
10.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	32%	29%	33%	42%	57%	8%	34%
10.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	43%	15%	38%	26%	35%	0%	27%
10.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	68%	43%	65%	48%	64%	42%	55%
10.9	Do you spend ten or more hours unlocked on a weekday?	50%	45%	44%	48%	74%	8%	47%
SECTION 11: Friends and family								
11.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	25%	31%	27%	39%	30%	54%	32%
11.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	19%	56%	35%	63%	35%	62%	45%
11.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	35%	33%	59%	26%	26%	75%	39%
11.4	Is it easy/very easy for your friends and family to get here?	22%	31%	41%	22%	39%	9%	30%
12.6	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	25%	31%	16%	24%	32%	0%	24%