



ANNEX B – EXTRACTS FROM INSPECTION REPORTS

1. The “*Report on an announced inspection of HMP Brixton 1- 10 December 2010*”,¹ contains the following conclusions:
 - i. At paragraph HP32, “*Prisoners complained that applications were not dealt with promptly. Complaints procedures were crudely managed and we were not assured that recording procedures were accurate. Some replies were limited and did not properly address the complaint.*”
 - ii. At paragraph 3.38, “*Only 48% of survey respondents ... felt applications were dealt with fairly. Prisoners continually told us that replies were perfunctory or did not respond to the request.*”
 - iii. At paragraph 3.39, “*As part of the inspection process, we submitted three complaint forms. We received no response. Upon further investigation, these had been shredded by the complaint clerk as they did not have a prison number on, although the form had a clear explanation of our approach. When questioned, the complaint clerk said that all forms without a number were not processed. This practice could affect not only prisoners unaware of how to complete the forms but prisoners in crisis who chose this channel to request help.*”
 - iv. At paragraph 3.41, “*In our survey, only 17% of respondents ... felt that complaints were dealt with fairly. Prisoners we spoke to had little confidence in the complaints system. Of the 1,131 complaints received in the previous six months, 70% had been rejected by the responding member of staff. Some replies we saw were curt and did not respond to the complaint. In one case, a vegan prisoner was told ‘you are a vegetarian’. It was rare for a complaint form to show that the prisoner had been spoken to about the issue. We found replies that left the issue unresolved with no follow-up action identified.*”
2. The “*Report on a full unannounced inspection of HMP Belmarsh, 6–15 April 2011*”² contains the following conclusions:

¹<http://www.justice.gov.uk/downloads/publications/inspectorate-reports/hmipris/prison-and-yoi-inspections/brixton/brixton-2010.pdf>

- i. At paragraph HP14: *"Prisoners expressed little confidence in applications and complaints procedures, with some justification."*
 - ii. At paragraph HP25, *"Prisoners reported negatively in our survey across most indicators relating to application and complaint procedures. Applications took a long time to be answered and we observed many left on the spur desks for all prisoners to see ... Many complaints were answered curtly and did not address the issues raised."*
 - iii. At paragraph 3.34, *"Prisoners had little confidence in the applications and complaints procedures. Applications took a long time to be answered and we were not assured about their level of confidentiality. Complaints were often responded to in a curt manner that did not always address the issues raised. The collection of forms by the night orderly officer was inappropriate."*
 - iv. At paragraph 3.36, *"There were no records of when applications were responded to. In our survey, 39% of respondents ... said that applications were not dealt with within seven days. Prisoners and house block staff expressed frustration at the time it took for a response to some applications."*
 - v. At paragraph 3.40, *"The prison had received approximately 1,000 complaints during the previous six months, which was broadly in line with previous years. Replies to many of the complaint forms we sampled were brief and perfunctory. We saw two complaints about specific officers that had been responded to by the officers named."*
3. The *"Report on an announced inspection of HMP Birmingham, 9–13 January 2012"*³ contains the following conclusions:
- i. At paragraph 2.27, of 155 discrimination incident report forms, *"in some cases insufficient action had been taken when the complaint had been upheld."*

²<http://www.justice.gov.uk/downloads/publications/inspectorate-reports/hmipris/prison-and-yoi-inspections/belmarsh/belmarsh-2011.pdf>

³<http://www.justice.gov.uk/downloads/publications/inspectorate-reports/hmipris/prison-and-yoi-inspections/birmingham/birmingham-2012.pdf>

- ii. At paragraph 2.58, *“Not all replies to complaints were thorough or answered the points raised.”*
 - iii. At paragraph 2.59, *“We saw some complaints about staff that had been poorly investigated and responded to. This did not give prisoners confidence that their legitimate complaints would be taken seriously.”*
4. In *“Report on an unannounced short follow- up inspection of HMYOI Ashfield, 11-13 October 2011”*,⁴ the Inspectorate concluded, at paragraph 2.34, that, *“In our focus groups, young people expressed little faith in the complaints system.”*
5. The *“Report on an unannounced full follow-up inspection of HMP Wandsworth, 28 February – 4 March 2011”*,⁵ contained the following conclusions:
- i. At p.5, *“Only 58% of prisoners ... said they had a member of staff in the prison they could turn to if they had a problem. We observed frequently indifferent and sometimes abusive staff interactions with prisoners. Prisoners struggled to get assistance with low level domestic issues or answers to simple queries. The formal application and complaints systems were overwhelmed and ineffective. Inspectors were inundated by prisoners asking for reasonable help with small things because the prison staff did not assist.”*
 - ii. At paragraph HP28, *“Prisoners expressed frustrations at, and little confidence in, application and complaint systems.”*
 - iii. At paragraph 3.35, *“Although there was a published policy and a series of instructions to staff about the management of prisoner applications, practice continued to vary across the residential units. On the whole, management of the system was inconsistent and its implementation across the prison was disorganised, with no way of checking the existence, nature or timeliness of responses.”*

⁴<http://www.justice.gov.uk/downloads/publications/inspectorate-reports/hmipris/prison-and-yoi-inspections/ashfield/ashfield-2011.pdf>

⁵<http://www.justice.gov.uk/downloads/publications/inspectorate-reports/hmipris/prison-and-yoi-inspections/wandsworth/wandsworth-2011.pdf>

- iv. At paragraph 3.38, *“Complaint forms were not readily available in languages other than English and there was no evidence that complaints were accepted in languages other than English.”*
6. In *“Report on an unannounced short follow- up inspection of HMP Altcourse, 15–17 October 2012”*,⁶ the Inspectorate voiced concern, at paragraph 2.60 that, *“Some wings, but not all, displayed information about how to make applications and complaints; no information was available in languages other than English.”*
7. In *“Report on an unannounced full follow-up inspection of HMP Wellingborough, 14–18 June 2010”*,⁷ the Inspector concluded, at paragraph 3.56: *“There was little information on any of the wings about the types and locations of application and complaint forms available. There was a notice explaining the role of the PPO on some wings but not on others. This notice was designed to be posted showing both sides, with the reverse side containing information in a range of languages, but only one side was in view, so prisoners who could not speak and/or read English could not access this information.”*
8. In *“Report on a full unannounced inspection of HMP Whitemoor, 11 – 21 January 2011”*,⁸ the Inspector voiced concern, at paragraph 3.23, that, *“... replies to complaints indicating a racist or bullying element often failed to address this issue.”*
9. In *“Report on an unannounced full follow-up inspection of HMP Wormwood Scrubs, 20 - 24 June 2011”*,⁹ the Inspector concluded:
- i. At paragraph 3.33, *“There was no written information about applications and complaints in the most commonly used languages”*.

⁶<http://www.justice.gov.uk/downloads/publications/inspectorate-reports/hmipris/prison-and-yoi-inspections/altcourse/altcourse-2012.pdf>

⁷http://www.justice.gov.uk/downloads/publications/inspectorate-reports/hmipris/prison-and-yoi-inspections/wellingborough/Wellingborough_2010_rps.pdf

⁸<http://www.justice.gov.uk/downloads/publications/inspectorate-reports/hmipris/prison-and-yoi-inspections/whitemoor/Whitemoor-2011.pdf>

⁹<http://www.justice.gov.uk/downloads/publications/inspectorate-reports/hmipris/prison-and-yoi-inspections/wormwood-scrubs/wormwood-scrubs-2011.pdf>

- ii. At paragraph 3.34, *“Not all the replies we looked at answered the issues raised. Most were polite and legible but few offered apologies when mistakes had been made.”*
- iii. At paragraph 3.87, *“... complaints were not monitored by subject area or where they originated to help identify trends over time, areas of concern and progress made in reducing the number of complaints.”*

10. In *“Report on an announced inspection of HMP Risley, 7 – 11 February 2011”*,¹⁰ the Inspector concluded, at paragraph 3.44, *“Replies to most complaints were polite and dealt with the issues raised but quality assurance procedures were weak. Complaints about staff were not always well handled.”*

11. In *“Report on an unannounced full follow-up inspection of HMP Pentonville, 24 February – 4 March 2011”*,¹¹ the Inspector concluded:

- i. At paragraph 3.35: *“The quality of responses varied significantly. While most were reasonably polite, relevant and prompt and some were very detailed, others were dismissive of the complaint or simply directed the prisoner to another department and quality assurance arrangements were not sufficiently robust.”*
- ii. At paragraph 3.39: *“Some individual members of staff produced consistently poor replies.”*
- iii. At paragraph 3.40, *“... only 31% of prisoners said complaints were dealt with promptly”.*

¹⁰<http://www.justice.gov.uk/downloads/publications/inspectorate-reports/hmipris/prison-and-yoi-inspections/risley/Risley-2011.pdf>

¹¹<http://www.justice.gov.uk/downloads/publications/inspectorate-reports/hmipris/prison-and-yoi-inspections/pentonville/pentonville-2011.pdf>