



Research • Education • Information

A Measure of Success:

An analysis of the Prison Service's
performance against its Key Performance
Indicators 2003-2004

Enver Solomon

August 2004

CONTENTS

Introduction	2
How accurate are KPIs - a true measure of success?	4
Analysis of Prison Service performance against KPIs	7
Escapes	
Serious assaults	
Drug testing	
Purposeful activity	
Overcrowding	
Self-inflicted deaths/suicides	
Offending behaviour	
Staff sickness	
Race equality	
Education	
Resettlement	
Prisoner escorts	
The future and the need for different ways to measure success	20
Conclusion	23
References	24
Appendix A. Individual prisons performance	26

INTRODUCTION

1. The Prison Service is a major public sector organisation that for the past ten years has used Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) to measure its performance against objectives outlined in corporate and business plans and priorities set by the Prison Service Management Board. In 2003-2004 the Prison Service failed to meet 7 of its 18 KPIs. Although some prisons performed well, others failed to meet Prison Service targets by considerable margins (see Appendix A for details of how each prison performed on serious assaults, drug use, purposeful activity, self-inflicted deaths and overcrowding). This annual Prison Reform Trust report discusses whether the KPIs are a reliable indication of performance and reveals the best and worst prisons in England and Wales when assessed on these criteria. It also questions whether or not the Prison Service is making any real progress against its twin objectives outlined below.
2. It is important to note that the Prison Service is no longer responsible for the ten privately managed prisons in England Wales. These are now managed by the Office for Contracted Prisons which is directly accountable to the Chief Executive of the recently formed National Offender Management Service within the Home Office. This report does not include data on the performance of the privately managed prisons. The Prison Reform Trust (PRT) will be publishing a separate briefing paper later this year that assesses the performance of those establishments and examines the arguments for and against privatisation.
3. Last year the Prison Service for the first time began publishing league tables on a quarterly basis which rated each establishment's performance on a scale of one to four. The best performers were given a four rating and those rated as the worst performers were given a one rating. However, the league tables do not provide detailed information about the conditions in each prison or the Prison Service's overall performance. For example, Bullwood Hall which, as an exceptionally high performing jail, has a four rating was recently criticised by the Chief Inspector of Prisons, who concluded 'it needs accommodation that is decent and safe; it is simply unacceptable for women and girls, some of them pregnant, to be slopping out, in what is listed as one of the Prison Service's highest-performing prisons' (HM Chief Inspector of Prisons, 2004). The Prison Reform Trust has questioned the purpose of the league tables arguing that they are useful as an internal management tool but do not provide a clear picture of life in our jails.

Drawing on recently published Home Office data, this report is intended to fill the information gap and provide a detailed assessment of the situation in jails across the country . It will also raise questions about what information should be collected and how it should be presented.

4. The Prison Service is an agency within the Home Office, which from June this year is operating within the new National Offender Management Service (NOMS) framework. It works to further Home Office Aim 4, which seeks: 'To deliver effective custodial and community sentences to reduce re-offending and protect the public'. During 2003-2004, the Prison Service's net operating cost was £2.1 billion, around 16 per cent of the total spending on the courts and criminal justice system.

5. The Prison Service has twin objectives. These are:
- To protect the public by holding those committed by the courts in a safe, decent, and healthy environment;
 - To reduce crime by providing constructive regimes which address offending behaviour, improve educational and work skills and promote law-abiding behaviour in custody and after release.
6. The Prison Service has had to deal with a rapidly rising prison population putting it under great pressure. Ten years ago, in 1994, the average prison population was 48,621. By the beginning of 2004, there were 72,478 prisoners in England and Wales. This had increased to more than 75,000 by the end of 2003-2004 with the population reaching record highs during the year. On occasions there was little room left to house more prisoners with the 'headroom between the prison population and the maximum useable accommodation in the whole prison estate less than 200' (HM Prison Service, 2004).

HOW ACCURATE ARE KPIS - A TRUE MEASURE OF SUCCESS?

1. *The Prison Service's KPIS are set by the Home Office in consultation with the Director General of the Prison Service.* These are supplemented by Key Performance Targets, which are 'extended outcome measures requested internally as part of a new business planning process' (Home Office, 2000), not all of which apply to all prisons. There were 48 KPTs in 2003-2004, though on average only 40 of these will apply to each prison. There are also 61 Prison Service standards which lay down the policies and procedures to be followed throughout the Prison Service.
2. *There are difficulties in identifying the most appropriate KPIS for an organisation as complex as the Prison Service.* Firstly, there may not be agreement as to the most important goals. Secondly, there may be several possible ways of measuring performance against a particular goal. For example, the KPI on assaults is not the only way of measuring safety and order in prison. Other indications of safety include levels of bullying and minor disorder. Thirdly, even if there is agreement, the KPI target may be what is easily quantifiable rather than what matters. It is difficult finding the right balance between challenging targets and targets that are realistic and meaningful. Finally, measuring performance in a quantitative way does not necessarily give an indication of quality.
3. *It is possible that a prison could meet its KPIS and still not be treating prisoners humanely or constructively.* This is because KPIS do not measure the quality of prison conditions, standards of hygiene, healthcare, time out of cell or the way in which prisoners are treated by staff. The current set of KPIS would not pick up on the type of complaint made by the Chief Inspector of Prisons at Pentonville, one of the country's largest jails, who found that 'prisoners who were vulnerable or at risk were not properly identified' and that 'there was an inability to provide prisoners' basic requirements: adequate access to showers, clean clothes and telephones' (HM Chief Inspector of Prisons, 2003b). A recent Home Office study found that important aspects of prison quality can 'often be missed by performance and audit methods' (Liebling and Arnold, 2002).
4. *Positive achievements may be overlooked by KPIS.* As the Chief Inspector of Prisons reported after visiting Stafford Prison, '[vulnerable prisoners] were treated with humanity, care, sensitivity and fairness by a staff group which was outstanding in its down-to-earth grasp of managing troubled people. It was difficult to measure this quality of work in KPI outcomes but it deserved recognition' (HM Chief Inspector of Prisons, 2001a).
5. *There is an underlying assumption with KPIS that every prison needs to improve on the same targets at the same time and therefore the individual circumstances of a prison are overlooked.* This concern has been raised by the Prison Governor's Association. Its President, Mike Newell, has said that: 'whilst there is a Prison Service which is seen at the centre as homogenous, actually we have establishments ranging from high security prisons to open prisons and everything in between and a funding history which means that all those establishments started from different bases. In the Prison Service there is a general feeling that we do not target very well to the actual circumstances surrounding any particular prison' (Evidence to House of Commons Public Administration Committee, December 2002). KPIS do not take into account different populations and the fact that young offenders, for example, have a greater propensity to assault.
6. *KPIS can have a negative impact on staff morale.* In hierarchical organisations like the Prison Service rigid targets are imposed from the centre, without consultation, having a

potentially demoralising impact on the day to day work of prison officers. Staff can feel that priorities are being distorted and they are being pressed to meet unrealistic targets that can stifle innovation.

7. *KPI targets do not accurately reflect what services prisoners need.* They are not based on information gained from interviews with prisoners and therefore do not take account of their experiences in jail. This can result in prisoners being placed on programmes in order to get the numbers up to meet KPIs rather than as a result of a prisoner's actual needs. In her annual report the Chief Inspector of Prisons noted that in relation to resettlement there was 'an absence of secure funding, strategies and planning, based upon an analysis of prisoner needs' (HM Chief Inspector of Prisons, 2004a). These observations were supported in a National Audit Office review of prisoner programmes which found: 'At local level, prisons do not keep, in a standard format, information on the overall level of need amongst prisoners for individual programmes. The Prison Service, therefore, has no routine mechanism for forming an overall assessment of the range, nature and extent of prisoners' needs and any potential mismatch between need and provision' (National Audit Office, 2002).
8. *There is a difference between what prisoners and staff believe are important to the Prison Service's performance and the current range of KPIs.* A study by Alison Liebling of Cambridge University that was prompted by concerns that official measures of prison performance are inadequate, developed a set of measures based on interviews with prisoners and staff. They identified a range of important dimensions of prison life and quality that included, respect, humanity, relationships, trust, fairness, order, safety, well-being, personal development, family contact and the distribution of power (Liebling, 2004). Methods were then developed to assess a prison's performance against these dimensions. The current range of KPIs do not reflect all of these areas of prison life and overlook important issues such as family contact and well-being. However, the Prison Service has introduced a 'Measuring the Quality of Prison Life' survey as part of the prison audit process. The survey will be carried out every time a prison goes through the audit process.
9. *Martin Narey, the Chief Executive of NOMS, has defended the use of KPIs.* Speaking in 2001 when he was Director General of the Prison Service, shortly after the completion of a review into KPIs he said:

'I acknowledge that KPIs may not provide the full picture. But I will rest easy if all prisons are meeting them because they will necessarily be keeping prisoners securely, getting them off drugs and into voluntary testing wings, putting them through offending behaviour programmes, educating them and making them employable and underpinning the life of every prisoner with reasonable levels of purposeful activity. Show me a prison achieving all its KPIs and I will show you a prison which is also treating prisoners with dignity' (Speech to the Prison Governors Conference, February 2001).

In an attempt to make KPIs more reflective of the Prison Service's goals and objectives the range of KPIs has been modified on a number of occasions. The Prison Service believes they are now focused more accurately on outcomes (such as completing education programmes and getting jobs) that enable the Service to assess the impact it is having on reducing re-offending and improving resettlement opportunities. Targets have also been lowered when they have proved impossible to meet.

10. *The Prison Service itself has acknowledged that 'the arrangements for collecting and reporting data are deficient in many establishments'*. Prison Service standards audit reports have shown that regime monitoring returns are often incomplete, interruptions to purposeful activity are not deducted from regime monitoring returns, assaults figures have been inaccurately collected and data validation in prisons does not always detect and correct errors' (HM Prison Service, 2003a). The National Audit Office has reported that 'In public prisons the internal monitoring of data varied considerably as did the validity of the data. Some prisons carried out spot checks on data such as the amount of purposeful activity being recorded; others relied on the data being provided by wing staff and accepted that this may not always be reliable' (National Audit Office, 2003). There is also scope for massaging statistics. Alison Liebling has noted, 'establishments inevitably massage their statistics, for example, showing videos in workshop areas which might otherwise be closed and claiming these hours as 'work'' (Liebling, 2004). The Independent Monitoring Board at HMP The Mount recently reported that 'purposeful activity figures include time when workshops are closed or classes cancelled at short notice owing to staff shortages' (HMP The Mount IMB, 2004).

The Prison Service has been addressing the deficiencies in the collection of data by introducing new management information systems and 'improving guidance and training for practitioners and raising awareness about the importance of good quality data' (Public Accounts Committee, 2004).

ANALYSIS OF PRISON SERVICE PERFORMANCE AGAINST KPIs 2003-2004

Escapes

KPI: To ensure that no Category A prisoners escape

MET: No Category A escapes

KPI: To ensure that the rate of escapes from establishments and from escorts expressed as a percentage of the average prison population, is lower than 0.05 per cent

MET: The escape rate was 0.02 per cent

KPI: To ensure that the number of escapes from contracted out escorts is no more than one per 20,000 prisoners handled

MET: There was one escape for every 39,377 prisoners handled

1. Escapes are defined as where a prisoner is not recaptured within 15 minutes, or is recaptured earlier but not before committing a further offence. The KPI measurement does not include absconds, where a prisoner gains their liberty by an abuse of trust without having to overcome any physical security restraint and at a time when they were not in the presence of an officer specifically assigned to guard them.
2. All three KPIs relating to escapes were met for the fourth year running. There were no category A escapes in 2003-2004. The last Category A escape was in 1995. There were nine escapes from prisons and six escapes from Prison Service escorts, an escape rate of 0.02 per cent of the average prison population. Overall there were two fewer escapes than in the previous year. This was within the KPI target of 0.05 per cent and represents a dramatic improvement on ten years ago, when there were 232 escapes from prisons and escorts. The KPI target was also met for escapes from contracted out escorts. There was an escape for every 39,377 prisoners handled, significantly better than the KPI target of 1 per 20,000.
3. The Prison Service's record on escapes is very impressive, but it is important to note that if the KPI took account of absconds it would tell a different story. Around 4,500 prisoners - six per cent - are held in the open estate. In 2003 there were 1,244 absconds from open prisons, a significant increase on the previous year when there were 825 absconds (Hansard 15 March 2004, Column 145W). The Chief Inspector of Prisons has highlighted the challenges that open prisons are dealing with due to overcrowding, noting that 'population pressure has meant that open prisons are receiving prisoners who would not formerly have been sent to open conditions at that point in sentence' (HM Chief Inspector of Prisons, 2004a).

Serious assaults

KPI: To ensure that the number of serious assaults on prisoners, staff and others, expressed as a proportion of the average prison population, does not exceed the level recorded in 2002-2003.

NOT MET: The total rate of serious assaults was 1.54 per cent

1. This new target on assaults only measures serious assaults which result in a positive disciplinary adjudication whereas in previous years the KPI covered all assaults proven

at adjudication. There were 5,882 serious assaults recorded in 2003-2004, an assault rate of 1.54 per cent, above the target of 1.20 per cent.

- It is the seventh consecutive year that the KPI on assaults has not been met. The Prison Service believes that the high rate of serious assaults is partly due to more accurate data collection methods stating: 'cumulative numbers are still subject to improved recording and some of the increase is perceived rather than actual'. However, it also acknowledges that the record population over the past year is likely to be an important factor in the level of serious assaults:

'Population pressure has a significant impact on levels of distress and tension that can lead to violence' (HM Prison Service, 2004).

- The highest serious assault rates were at male young offender institutions (YOIs):

Average serious assault rate by type of prison during 2003-2004

	Per cent
Male open YOI	4.32
Male closed YOI	3.17
Female local	2.39
Male local	1.78
Male juvenile	1.17
Category C	1.14
Category B	1.07
Dispersal	0.98
Female closed	0.91
Semi-open	0.69
Male open	0.18
Female open	0.00

- The prison with the greatest proportion of assaults was Onley young offender institution near Rugby which had a serious assault rate of 8.79. This was followed by Northallerton, a young offender institution in Yorkshire, with 6.24 per cent, Brockhill, a women's prison in the Midlands with 6.17 per cent and Feltham, a young offender institution near London, with 5.96 per cent.
- There were eleven prisons which recorded no serious assaults. These were Askahm Grange, Bullwood Hall, Blantyre House, East Sutton Park, Ford, Hewell Grange, Kirklevington, Latchmere House, Morton Hall, Usk and Warren Hill.
- The differences between the prisons with the greatest proportion of serious assaults and those with the least serious assaults reflect the different challenges posed by different groups of prisoners. It is not surprising that the highest levels of assaults were in juvenile establishments or YOIs as the young prisoners in these jails tend to be more volatile and more vulnerable than other categories of prisoners. Conversely, open prisons house prisoners who have been assessed as being a low risk so it is to be expected that these would make up the majority of establishments which had no recorded serious assaults.
- Assaults on staff, prisoners and others are calculated as a proportion of the average prison population. The KPI includes serious assaults which are proven at an adjudication. Because it includes serious assaults on both prisoners and staff, it is

not possible to work out the likelihood of a prisoner being seriously assaulted. If a serious assault is not reported or does not lead to a prisoner being found guilty at a prison disciplinary hearing, then it does not show up in the KPI measure. The true extent of violence in prison is likely to be far greater than the level recorded by the KPI.

8. A victimisation study carried out in prisons in 1996 found that nearly a third of young offenders said they had been assaulted in the previous month, nearly half had been threatened with violence and one in ten had been robbed. The study also found that one in five adult male prisoners said they had been assaulted in the previous month and a quarter said they had been threatened with violence. Overall no more than ten per cent of those who had been victimised in any way said they had made a written report. This research suggests that certain types of victimisation are so frequent as to be routine and they are often not reported. (Edgar et al, 2003).

Drug testing

<p>KPI: To ensure that the average rate of positive random testing for drugs is lower than 10 per cent NOT MET: The rate of positive tests was 12.3 per cent</p>
--

1. The Prison Service measures the number of prisoners who give a mandatory drug test (MDT). MDT has been operating in all prisons since April 1996. Under the random element of the scheme, every prison must test a proportion (five or ten per cent) of their prison population for drugs every month. During 1996-1997, on average 24.4 per cent of those selected for random testing proved positive. This dropped to 20.8 per cent in 1997-1998, 19.3 per cent in 1998-1999, 14.4 per cent in 1999-2000, 12.4 per cent in 2000-2001 and 11.6 per cent in 2001-2002. After these five years of gradual reductions, it rose for the first time last year to 11.7 per cent.
2. In 2003-2004 the average rate of positive random drug tests increased for the second consecutive year to 12.3 per cent, returning to virtually the same level it was at three years ago. This was higher than the KPI target of 10 per cent. The Prison Service says that 'whilst disappointing, this reflects the increasingly difficult task of keeping drugs out of prison in the face of the high number of offenders entering prison with a serious drug problem (and the associated pressures to smuggle drugs) ...and pressures due to the increasing prison population - especially remand and short-term prisoners' (HM Prison Service 2004).
3. In his speech to the Prison Service annual conference this year, the Director-General, Phil Wheatley, highlighted drug use as a major area of concern:

'There are, however, significant operational challenges. These centre particularly around drug dealing in prisons which appears to be becoming much more organised and we will have to find ways of responding to this increased determination and sophistication on the part of drug dealers.'

A recent report by the Chief Inspector of Prisons found that in Wealstun prison in Yorkshire some dormitory doors had notices saying 'no salesmen' in order to discourage dealers (HM Chief Inspector of Prisons, 2004b).
4. The prison with the highest recorded drug use was Kirkham, an open prison in Lancashire, which had a positive MDT rate of 35 percent. This was followed by Leeds, a

local prison, with 30.5 per cent, Winchester with 28.5 per cent and Liverpool with 28.3 per cent and Risley in Cheshire with 26 per cent.

5. It should be noted that local prisons in urban areas would be expected to have higher rates of drug use because they take prisoners directly from the local courts and thus reflect the level of drug use in the local community. These prisons also experience a high turnover in their daily population. According to the Prison Service some are reporting that up to 80 per cent of new receptions are testing positive for opiates (Prison Reform Trust, 2004). Open prisons also face unique challenges in controlling the supply of drugs, particularly given the impact of overcrowding on that part of the prison estate. As the Chief Inspector of Prisons says: 'By definition, open prisons are poorly placed to control the supply of drugs to those still dependent on them; nor do they have the resources to offer treatment' (HM Chief Inspector of Prisons, 2004a).
6. Unlike last year there were no prisons which did not have any positive random drug tests. The prison with the least drug use was Whatton, a category C prison in Nottingham which focuses on the delivery of sex offender programmes, with 0.5 per cent. This was followed by Stoke Heath Young Offenders Institution in Shropshire and East Sutton Park, an open women's prison in Kent, both with 0.8 per cent and Morton Hall, an open women's prison in Lincoln with 1.5 per cent.
7. The Prison Service's KPI does not distinguish between drug types. It is impossible therefore to tell the nature or seriousness of drug use from the KPI. In the past Prison Service figures have revealed that nearly two-thirds of positive MDTs contained cannabis and nearly a third contained opiates. Many positive tests contain both cannabis and opiates. The Prison Service should consider introducing a new KPI which differentiates between Class A drug use and use of other illegal drugs, in order to reflect the fact that not all illegal drugs pose the same risk.
8. It is not clear that mandatory drug tests, in their present form, are producing an accurate picture of drug use within prisons. The former Chief Inspector of Prisons, Sir David Ramsbotham, recalls, 'One day I saw nine certificates on the wall of a prisoner's cell. "What are those for?" I asked. "Testing negative for drugs. They know I don't use, so they test me every month. I'll have ten if you come in two weeks' time.' He concludes:

'Mandatory testing initially sent a message around the prison system that drug testing was being taken seriously, but it is now largely discredited and certainly does not indicate the size of the problem.' (Ramsbotham, 2003)

A Home Office evaluation of drug testing in 1998 found that MDT failed to detect 35 per cent of prisoners who said they were using cannabis and 48 per cent of prisoners who said they were using opiates (Edgar and O'Donnell, 1998). A research study on the impact of MDT is being undertaken by the Office for National Statistics and the National Addiction Centre and is due to be published later this year.

Purposeful activity

KPI: To ensure that prisoners spend on average at least 24 hours per week engaged in purposeful activity
NOT MET: Average purposeful activity was 23.2 hours per week

1. Purposeful activity includes a wide range of activities including: education and training courses; employment; induction; resettlement and rehabilitation activities; sports and PE; religious activities and visits.
2. During 2003-2004 prisoners spent an average of 23.2 hours each week engaged in purposeful activity. This was lower than the KPI target, but an improvement on last year's outturn of 22.6 hours. The Prison Service has only met its purposeful activity KPI once in the last nine years.
3. Despite a substantive increase in programmed activities, the steep rise in the prison population has simply absorbed this additional provision. The Chief Executive of the National Offender Management Service, Martin Narey, told the Home Affairs Select Committee in May:

'I worked out last year the Prison Service produced an extra two and a half million activity hours for prisoners and it was absorbed entirely by the increase in the population of 2,000 people, so the average of 23.2 did not shift at all despite this huge expansion in work. If we got the population down and kept these work levels up we really would have the sort of regime for prisoners that you would want to see.'
4. Just 43 per cent of prisons met the Prison Service KPI target of providing prisoners with 24 hours or more purposeful activity a week. None of the 32 male local prisons and only one of the five female local prisons met the KPI. In contrast, all open prisons provided prisoners with in excess of 24 hours a week purposeful activity.
5. The majority of remand prisoners are held in local prisons and are therefore subject to the most impoverished regimes.
6. The most purposeful activity for the third consecutive year was at Latchmere House in Richmond, London, which provided 57.6 hours per prisoner each week. This was followed by Kirklevington Grange in Cleveland, with 51.7 hours, East Sutton Park women's prison in Kent with 46.3 hours, Thorn Cross YOI in Cheshire with 42.8 hours and Hewell Grange in Worcestershire with 42.1 hours.
7. The lowest amount of purposeful activity was provided at Brixton in London with just 10.4 hours per prisoner each week. This was followed by Pentonville, also in London with 14.1 hours, Belmarsh in London with 14.6, hours, High Down in Surrey with 15.2 hours and Woodhill in Milton Keynes with 15.4 hours.
8. The Prison Service has now decided to scrap the purposeful activity KPI. The Director General, Phil Wheatley said in his speech this year to the Service's annual conference that it is 'a target which was never properly resourced and was in danger of distracting us from our more important work in reducing re-offending, particularly delivering education and offending behaviour programmes.' But lack of resources is not a good reason to scrap this KPI. Prison Reform Trust believes the extent of purposeful activity, and its converse, long hours locked up, should be monitored rigorously.

Overcrowding

KPI: To ensure that the number of prisoners held two to a cell designed for one, expressed as a percentage of the average population, does not exceed 18 per cent

NOT MET: The average rate of 'doubling' was 21.7 per cent

1. For the purposes of its overcrowding KPI, the Prison Service defines overcrowding as the percentage of prisoners who are held two to a single cell. It does not include prisoners held three to a double cell or in overcrowded dormitories. It also does not measure those held in cells of less than minimum size. The Prison Service has recognised these shortcomings and has modified the KPI so that in future it will measure overcrowding in all forms of accommodation which will provide a more accurate measurement.
2. The Prison Service failed to meet its overcrowding KPI for the second consecutive year with the average rate of doubling up in single cells increasing by nearly one and a half per cent to 21.7 per cent. This means that an average of 16,500 prisoners was held two to a single cell. In addition, approximately fifteen hundred prisoners were held in other forms of overcrowded accommodation (Hansard 20 January 2004, Column 1226). The Chief Executive of the National Offender Management Service, Martin Narey, in a speech to the Prison Service conference last year said:

'The conditions in which prisoners have to live in overcrowded cells, cells in which they have to eat together and in which they have to defecate in front of one another are, we know, deeply inadequate.'

3. The most overcrowded prison was Preston with 91.4 per cent of the average population doubling up. This was followed by Shrewsbury with 89.3 per cent, Leicester with 87.7 per cent, Canterbury with 81.6 per cent and Cardiff with 79.4 per cent. These are all local prisons which experience the worst overcrowding because they serve local courts and hold a high proportion of people on remand, either pre-trial or awaiting sentence, as well as sentenced prisoners awaiting moves to other prisons. In her annual report the Chief Inspector of prisons, writing about what she has found during inspections of local prisons, said:

'It is clear that one of the consequences of overcrowding is that prisons struggle (and some fail) even to provide humane containment; ensuring positive activity for the majority of the population is largely beyond them'.
(HM Chief Inspector of Prisons, 2004a).

4. During the year the Prison Service announced that three female prisons would be re-rolled to male establishments due to the population pressures. The re-rolling of the Westhill women's section of Winchester prison has already been completed resulting in the uprooting of the first therapeutic community for women in Europe. It has been transferred to Send. Over the next twelve months Edmunds Hill will change function and women will be moved out of Durham prison.
5. Prison overcrowding continues to remain at high levels. At the end of June 83 of the 138 prisons in England and Wales were overcrowded. There also has been a significant increase in the level of movement of prisoners around the estate. Speaking to the Home Affairs Select Committee in May the Prisons Minister, Paul Goggins, said this was a major concern:

'I do not think it is necessarily the total numbers that is the real challenge, I think it is the amount of movement within the prison system that results from the very tight situation that we have at the moment. Last year there were some 100,000 transfers within the prison estate. It is that movement around that makes it difficult to work effectively on rehabilitation and resettlement. People are doing certain courses and then get moved to a different prison.'

6. Building new prisons has not been a solution to prison overcrowding. In the last 10 years, 12 new prisons have been opened. Of these, nine are already overcrowded.

Self-inflicted deaths/suicides

KPI: To ensure that the rate of self-inflicted deaths in 2003-2004 does not exceed 112.8 per 100,000 of the average prison population.
NOT MET: The rate was 135.9

1. In 2003-2004 there were 92 self-inflicted deaths (also known as suicides). Two of them were in the privately managed prison, Altcourse, near Liverpool. The ninety deaths in the public sector is the equivalent of an annual rate of 135.9 per 100,000 of the average prison population. This was an improvement on the previous year when there were a record 105 self-inflicted deaths, an annual rate of 146.9. However, since 2001-2002 when there were 75 self-inflicted deaths, there has been a significant increase.
2. The highest number of self-inflicted deaths was at Nottingham prison where five prisoners took their own lives. There were three prisons, Preston, Durham and Blakenhurst in Worcestershire, where in each prison four people committed suicide. Overall in 2003-2004 there were suicides in 50 of the 126 public sector prisons in England and Wales.
3. It is only the second year that the Prison Service has had a KPI for self-inflicted deaths. The target was originally set in 2000 and involved a 20 per cent reduction over three years. This has not been achieved but the Prison Service is confident that the underlying rate for the public sector over the last three years has stabilised at around 130 per 100,000. However, it accepts that the Service is facing a difficult challenge reducing the number of suicides due to the increase in prison numbers.

'Prison population rises have increased the throughput and movements of prisoners with an impact on their distress and vulnerability' (HM Prison Service, 2004).

4. The Prison Service has made significant improvements in its suicide prevention strategy. But the Director General Phil Wheatley recently told the All-Party Committee on Human Rights that progress has been slow:

'To some extent we are having to work very hard to stand still or get some slight reduction. The Safer Custody Programme is also targeting a number of establishments more specifically and substantial additional investment is going into improving the way we deal with prisoners in those prisons. The early indications are that that piloting is producing a reduction in the rate of suicide in those establishments with some very measurable improvements in the way in which staff in prisons are interacting, which we also think plays a part in reducing suicide.'

Offending behaviour

KPI: To ensure that at least 8,444 prisoners complete programmes accredited as being effective in reducing reoffending
MET: 9,169 offending behaviour programmes completed

KPI: To ensure that at least 1,168 prisoners complete the Sex Offender Treatment Programme
NOT MET: 1,046 Sex Offender Treatment Programmes completed

1. Increasing the provision of accredited offending behaviour programmes for prisoners has been one of the Prison Service's priorities. Accredited offending behaviour programmes are based on evidence-based practice and have been accredited as conforming to principles derived from what works in reducing re-offending. The two most widely available programmes are Enhanced Thinking Skills and Reasoning and Rehabilitation which are designed to develop thinking skills, social perspectives and moral reasoning.
2. In 2003-2004, there were 9,169 completions of offending behaviour programmes. This exceeded the KPI target of 8,444 and represents an increase of 25 per cent on the previous year. But the Prison Service failed to meet its target for the number of prisoners who complete Sex Offender Treatment Programmes (SOTP).
3. Not all prisons run accredited offending behaviour programmes. In 2003-2004, 100 public sector prisons (79 per cent) had prisoners who successfully completed accredited offending behaviour programmes. The prison with the most completions of offending behaviour programmes was Bullingdon in Oxford with 245, followed by Swaleside, in Kent, with 235, Wayland in Norfolk with 234, Risley in Cheshire with 211 and Whatton in Nottingham with 189. Whatton also had the highest number of SOTP completions, with 114 sex offenders undertaking the course.
4. Although the Prison Service met its overall target for completions of accredited offending behaviour programmes, this represented only a minority of prisoners. During 2003-2004 twelve per cent of the average daily prison population completed an accredited offending behaviour programme. Many prisoners with urgent needs are missing out. At Whitemoor high security prison the Chief Inspector of Prisons found that: 'There was a very limited range of offending behaviour work available. Consequently important offending behaviour needs were not being addressed for a very dangerous group of prisoners. The situation should be urgently reviewed' (HM Chief Inspector of Prisons, 2003a).
5. At present, offending behaviour programmes are not suitable for all prisoners. The National Audit Office has called on the Prison Service to 'ensure that programmes are appropriately targeted at all prisoner groups, including, for example, juvenile offenders (15 to 17 year olds), female prisoners and ethnic minorities' (National Audit Office, 2002). The Prison Service has been developing an Enhanced Thinking Skills programme for juvenile prisoners and an emotional management programme for women as well as offending behaviour programmes specifically for short-term prisoners.
6. There are question marks over the effectiveness of offending behaviour programmes. Two recent Home Office studies have found no difference between re-conviction rates for prisoners who had participated in the Enhanced Thinking Skills and Reasoning and

Rehabilitation programmes and for those who had not (Falshaw et al, 2003; Cann et al, 2003). The Prison Service acknowledges that these results are 'disappointing' and is 'taking forward a comprehensive programme of work to increase knowledge and understanding of what works with whom in order to optimise the impact of programmes' (HM Prison Service, 2004).

7. A clear indication of the Prison Service's unease about the effectiveness of these programmes is the fact that the KPI for 2004-2005 has been drastically cut back by a third. The target is for 5,490 programmes to be completed. This year the Service has decided to convert resources from 2,000 general offending behaviour programmes to drug treatment courses.
8. The Sex Offender Treatment Programme was completed by 1,046 prisoners in 2003-2004. This was a 20 per cent increase on the previous year and was just short of the Prison Service's target of 1,168. It is the sixth year running that the Prison Service has failed to meet its KPI target for treating sex offenders. In previous years the Prison Service has said that the failure to meet this KPI is due to a shortage of trained psychologists able to deliver this programme. The Prisons Minister, Paul Goggins, recently said that 'there is a larger than average number of deniers, people who deny their offence, amongst the sex offender prison population and therefore, engaging them with particular programmes can be quite a challenge' (evidence to the Home Affairs Select Committee, 25 May 2004).
9. The Sex Offender Treatment Programme was successfully completed by prisoners in 25 prisons (20 per cent). Over 4,000 sex offenders in prison did not undertake the Sex Offender Treatment Programme. Some prisons that hold sex offenders are not able to offer them any treatment. In her report on Dartmoor prison the Chief Inspector of Prisons noted: 'There was a critical shortfall in work with sex offenders and it was unacceptable that the prison should accommodate such a high number of sex offenders without proper provision being made available' (HM Chief Inspector of Prisons, 2003b). Lack of available programmes also has a negative effect on a prisoner's assessed suitability for parole.

Staff sickness

KPI: To ensure that the average rate of staff sickness does not exceed 13.5 working days per person
MET: The average rate of staff sickness was 13.3 days per person

1. The staff sickness KPI was met in 2003-2004, with an average rate of staff sickness of 13.3 days. It is the first time that this KPI has been met since it was introduced in 1999 and represents a ten per cent improvement on last year's performance when the average rate was 14.7 days.
2. Due to failing to meet the target year on year the KPI was revised upwards for 2003-2004 from nine days to 13.5 days per person. The target for the current financial year is 12.5 days, which is still higher than the average sickness level in other comparable public sector professions. The number of days lost per year due to sickness for police officers and probation officers is between 11 and 12. The target to reduce the average rate of sickness to nine days is now a long term goal for the Prison Service.

3. Sickness absence has been a serious problem across the prison estate. Between 1999 and 2003 the number of days lost per member of staff increased by 23 per cent (National Audit Office, 2004). The Chairman of the Prison Officers Association, Colin Moses, has said: 'This is due in the main to the stress of working in overcrowded conditions with little resolve from senior Prison Service staff and the Government to staff prisons to their correct level' (Prison Report, 2003). The Prison Service is now confident that both long-term and short-term sickness rates are falling but says medium term sickness remains a concern (HM Prison Service 2004).

Race equality

<p>KPI: To have at least 5.5 per cent minority ethnic staff MET: 5.5 per cent of staff were from minority ethnic groups</p>

1. The Prison Service met its race equality KPI, with 5.5 per cent of staff coming from minority ethnic groups. This was a marginal improvement on the previous year's figure of 5.1 per cent. Of those recruited to the Prison Service in 2003-2004, 7.6 per cent were from minority ethnic groups.
2. Two years ago the the Prison Service prohibited staff membership of racist groups and organisations such as the British National Party, National Front and Combat 18.
3. Despite the progress made in recruiting staff from minority ethnic groups and the fact that the Prison Service exceeded its KPI in 2002-2003, ethnic minorities are still under-represented within the Prison Service, particularly at senior levels within the organisation. There are currently no senior operational managers in charge of prisons (governing governors) and just three per cent of senior operational managers are from a minority ethnic group. Minority ethnic groups make up some seven per cent of the total working population in England and Wales. However, it is not until 2007 that the Prison Service aims to reach this figure.
4. Overall there are 18,000 prisoners from a minority ethnic group and there are now three prisons where minority ethnic prisoners are in the majority. But some prisons that have a significant number of minority ethnic prisoners, particularly in rural areas, have few minority ethnic staff.
5. The improvement in the proportion of staff from minority ethnic groups signifies how the Prison Service has prioritised race relations as a key issue. However, this has not necessarily led to improvements in race relations in many prisons. In her annual report the Chief Inspector of Prisons concluded: 'In practice, most prisons were unable to go beyond essentially reactive processes, to work actively to promote good race relations; and some lacked even the basic structures or understanding' (HM Chief Inspector of Prisons, 2004a).

Education

KPI: To achieve 7,174 awards at Basic Skills Entry Level

MET: Prisoners achieved 12,529 Entry Level awards

KPI: To achieve 13,660 awards at Basic Skills Level 1

MET: Prisoners achieved 17,864 Level 1 awards

KPI: To achieve 13,648 awards at Basic Skills Level 2

NOT MET: Prisoners achieved 13,338 Level 2 awards

KPI: To achieve 52,672 Key Work Skills awards

MET: Prisoners achieved 103,583 Key Work Skills awards

1. The Prison Service met its KPIs for basic skills entry level and level one in 2003-2004. This is a considerable achievement but it still falls short of the level of need. Half of all prisoners are at or below Basic Skills Level 1 (the level expected of an eleven year old child) in reading. And in some prisons as many as 70 per cent are at this level (Social Exclusion Unit, 2002). Therefore there are still thousands of prisoners who leave without any basic skills qualifications.
2. The standard that prisoners need to achieve for employability is Basic Skills Level 2. In 2003-2004 this target was not met with 13,338 awards achieved, just short of the target of 13,648. The number of prisoners reaching this level has fallen by nearly three thousand since it was introduced two years ago. At that time it was the only Basic Skills qualification available but the Prison Service quickly decided that a wider range of skills awards was needed to address the alarming deficit in basic skills qualifications amongst the prison population. It is understandable that the KPI for Basic Skills Level 2 has not been met as greater attention is paid to other levels. However, it means that less than half of those prisoners who need to reach the employability level in basic skills are achieving that qualification.
3. There is a real danger that education in prisons is becoming too narrowly focused on achieving the basic skills targets and not on the needs of individual prisoners. The Chief Inspector of Prisons reports that: 'Again and again in education inspections we point to the need to construct education and training plans around individual needs assessments. And the focus on education should not be at the expense of providing recreational and cultural opportunities, which may be the pivotal thing that a prisoner responds to' (HM Chief Inspector of Prisons, 2002). An inspection last year of the Verne, a training prison in Dorset which concentrates on education and training, found that education was 'very much focused on meeting key performance targets and not necessarily on meeting the needs of the population' (HM Chief Inspector of Prisons, 2003c).
4. In 2003-2004, prisoners achieved 103,583 key work skills qualifications. This was far in excess of the KPI target of just over 52,500. The target had not been informed by a credible baseline and so it is difficult to assess how good a performance this number of completions represents. Furthermore, these skills are not necessarily relevant to demand in the labour market. The Prison Service acknowledges that the appropriateness and usefulness of the work available in prisons does not match national skills shortages. The Prison Service's head of resettlement, Peter Wrench, recently told the Home Affairs Select Committee:

‘We want to see vocational training alongside the rest of education rather more than we have done in the past....vocational training will be incorporated [into education] in the same way it is in the community.’

5. On the basis of its performance against its KPIs the Prison Service’s record on education is impressive. Good progress has been made and the Service is proud of the fact that more than 15 per cent of adults in England and Wales who gained literacy and numeracy qualifications last year did so in prison. However, research by the Prison Reform Trust has found that from the prisoner’s perspective there remain considerable barriers to accessing education and training. Prisoners have to choose between education and the most basic needs such as phoning their families or taking exercise, and in one case even taking a shower. The study based on interviews with a range of prisoners found that their diverse educational and training needs were not being met. It concluded that ‘despite the highly appreciated efforts of some education staff there was a desultory second best feel to prisoners’ accounts of education’ (Prison Reform Trust, 2003).

Resettlement

KPI: To ensure that 29,044 sentenced prisoners have a job, education or training outcome within one month of release

MET: There were 32,592 education, training or employment outcomes

1. The resettlement KPI for 2003-2004 was that 29,044 sentenced prisoners should have a job or an education or training place arranged within one month of release. The outcome for the year was 32,592, above the target but slightly lower than last years education, training and employment outcomes which were just under 33,000. It is important to note that nearly a third of outcomes are prisoners who attended a Jobcentre ‘Freshstart’ interview with the intention of taking up an education, training or employment place. It is not known what actually happened to these prisoners. To address this the Prison Service has begun work to ‘improve the tracking of Freshstart outcomes’ (Home Office, 2004a).
2. There are question marks over the reliability of this KPI. The calculation that 32,592 prisoners gained an education, training or employment place in 2003-2004 is based on a survey of a representative sample of prisoners. These prisoners were interviewed within a month of release about their expectations concerning education, training or employment places. It is not known if they did, or did not, access the places that they said had been arranged or for how long. It would be more accurate to measure education, training or employment outcomes after release.
3. It is only the second year that the Prison Service has had a resettlement KPI and this reflects the greater priority given to this area of work, which is slowly improving. The KPI was also met last year. However, good resettlement programmes are still the exception rather than the rule and only a third of the 90,000 prisoners who are released each year enter employment or training. Home Office research has found that of those prisoners who have jobs, education or training arranged on release, only ten per cent made the arrangements through prison job clubs, prison pre-release programmes, prison education departments or a probation officer (Niven and Olagundaye, 2002). The Chief Inspector of Prisons has concluded that ‘resettlement in prisons can still best be described as patchy’ (HM Chief Inspector of Prisons, 2004a).

Prisoner escorts

KPI: To improve the proportion of prisoners escorted within the contracted area that arrives before the court sitting time.

MET: 82 per cent of prisoner escorts arrived on time against an overall target of 81 per cent.

1. This is a new KPI and reflects the government's drive to reduce delays in court proceedings and narrow what it calls the 'justice gap'. The KPI was only just met with 82 per cent of prisoner escorts arriving on time against an overall target of 81 per cent. This result is a weighted average of the total results from the eight contracted areas in England and Wales. In two areas the target was missed by one per cent.
2. The KPI on prisoner escorts is too narrowly defined and does not take into account prisoner welfare. Concerns have been raised to the Prison Reform Trust about the standard of care and decency provided by prisoner escorts. Pregnant women have been transported in unsuitable conditions and vulnerable women are often moved in the same escorts as men. An inspection of Onley Young Offenders Institution last year noted:

'It is deplorable to find, as we did, that some young people were not only reduced to urinating in the escort vehicle, but also had to clean it out on arrival.' (HM Chief Inspector of Prisons, 2003d)
3. The KPI should not simply fit in with the government's wider objectives for the criminal justice system but also attempt to measure the conditions for prisoners during escorts.

THE FUTURE AND THE NEED FOR DIFFERENT WAYS TO MEASURE SUCCESS

1. *Modified KPIs for 2004-2005.* From June this year the Prison Service began operating within the new National Offender Management Service. This has meant that its KPIs for the current financial year have been modified to make up a broader range of targets for what the Home Office now calls the 'correctional services' (Home Office, 2004). The modifications include a significant lowering in the target for completions of offending behaviour programmes and a widening of the overcrowding target to take account of overcrowding in all forms of accommodation. The Prison Service management board has raised concerns about the impact of wide-ranging structural change on the Service warning 'a dip in performance may well be an inevitable side-effect of major organisational change' (Prison Service News, May 2004).
2. *A new shadow KPI on accommodation outcomes.* This was introduced in April and includes a target for the number of prisoners who say they have an address to go to on leaving prison. However, this could be temporary accommodation on a friend's floor and is not necessarily long term stable housing. The KPI will be piloted and the Prison Service hopes to introduce it in 2005-2006. The long term aim is to modify it so that it measures stable accommodation outcomes. But the KPI should not only measure stable housing on release but also a month or two months after leaving prison. Research suggests that stable accommodation can make a difference of over 20 per cent in terms of a reduction in re-offending. Despite this, a third of prisoners lose their housing due to imprisonment (Home Office, 2004a).
3. *The Prison Service should not scrap the KPI on purposeful activity.* The KPI is a useful indicator of the level of constructive activity that prisoners are involved in. Removing the KPI could result in a narrowing of the Prison Service's priorities so that regime activities become less varied and opportunities, for example, to practice religious activities are not adequately resourced.
4. *The Prison Service should not have withdrawn its plans to introduce a KPI on mental health.* The Prison Service had committed itself to 'develop, test and implement a joint indicator with the Department of Health to reduce waiting times for mental health transfers and to implement the KPI from April 2002' (HM Prison Service, 2003b). In all, 72 per cent of male and 70 per cent of female sentenced prisoners suffer from two or more mental health disorders - 14 and 35 times the level in the general population (Singleton et al, 1998). But following the decision to transfer the funding responsibility for prison health to the Department of Health and Welsh Assembly from April 2003, the Prison Service decided it was no longer appropriate to introduce this new KPI. The transfer of prison healthcare to the Department of Health is an important development in order to achieve joined up government. This should have ensured that a KPI to reduce waiting times for mental health transfers was immediately developed.
5. *There should be a wider range of KPIs on substance misuse.* The prisons and probation inspectorates have recommended that: 'The Prison Service and the National Probation Directorate should, in collaboration with other organisations, develop a joint strategy for drug and alcohol misuse which includes...[the] development of a shared KPI identifying the number entering prison with a substance misuse problem, who leave prison drug and alcohol free and who remain so at the end of the licence period' (HM Inspectorate of Prisons/HM Inspectorate of Probation, 2001). The creation of the National Offender Management Service provides a good opportunity to develop a KPI as recommended by the inspectorates. Around two-thirds of prisoners used illegal

drugs in the year before imprisonment - at least double the general population aged between 16 and 29. Moreover, nearly two-thirds of sentenced male prisoners and two-fifths of sentenced female prisoners admitted to hazardous drinking (Singleton, 1998).

6. *The Prison Service should re-introduce a KPI for time out of cell with a separate element to measure time out of cell during the weekends.* A time out of cell KPI was scrapped in 1999, despite the fact that it had consistently not been met. Many prisoners are still locked up for most of the day. The prisons which provided prisoners with the least average daily hours out of their cell during weekdays in the financial year to the end of December 2003 were Brixton with 4.5 hours out of cell for prisoners, Holme House in Cleveland with 5.4 hours, followed by Hull with 5.6. (Hansard, 25 February 2004, Column 443 W). The average daily hours that prisoners spent out of their cells at the weekend was even lower. Information received from the Prison Reform Trust's advice and information service indicates that some prisoners are being locked in their cells for up to 23 hours, especially during the weekends. Introducing a KPI on time out of cell may help to provide a way of ensuring prisoners have less time locked up every day than at present.
7. *The Prison Service should introduce Key Performance Indicators that take account of the importance of family ties.* These would include closeness to home and facilities to arrange visits. A KPI on visiting entitlements was scrapped in 1997, this is despite the fact that research has found that 'the existence and maintenance of good family relationships helps to reduce re-offending, and the support of families and friends on release can help offenders successfully settle back into the community' (Home Office, 2004a). Each year approximately 150,000 children have a parent in prison. However, in 2003, 26,000 prisoners were held over 50 miles from their committal court town, 11,000 of whom were held over 100 miles away. On average prisoners were held 53 miles from home (Prison Reform Trust, 2004). The number of prison visits has fallen by a third in five years according to the latest available figures. This is despite a more than 20 per cent rise in the prison population (Loucks, 2002).
8. *The Prison Service should introduce a KPI that measures the success of individual prisons in reducing reoffending.* There is currently little data available on the performance of individual prisons in cutting reconviction rates. The National Audit Office has recommended that the Prison Service should: 'Develop management information systems that would enable an assessment to be made of.....the success of individual prisons in reducing re-offending' (National Audit Office, 2002). This would best be achieved by developing community prisons that have closer links to the local area. In the mean time to stand any chance of measuring the effectiveness of individual establishments against reconviction data, the Prison Service needs to reduce the large numbers of prisoners being moved around the estate due to population pressures.
9. *A KPI on sentence planning.* The creation of the National Offender Management Service is intended to result in the introduction of the concept and practice of 'end to end offender management' (Home Office, 2004b). Sentence planning for offenders whilst in custody will be a crucial part of this process. At present due to population pressures and staff shortages in many establishments prisoners do not have a proper sentence plan in place. The Prison Service should introduce a KPI on sentence planning to ensure that it is working effectively in all prisons.
10. *KPIs need to take account of the experience of prisoners.* The range of KPIs should draw on interviews with prisoners to establish their needs whilst in custody and to ensure that

the KPIs always remain relevant to a prisoner's daily experience. One prisoner wrote to the Prison Reform Trust last year explaining that he had spent five months sharing a cell in which there was 'insufficient space to move around, can't walk in a straight line from window to door. Insufficient ventilation for one, let alone two people. Windows do not open. Toilet not enclosed. Less than three foot from toilet when being used by other inmate'. The KPIs need to take account of this kind of experience. One option would be to make greater use of the 'Measuring the Quality of Prison Life' surveys that are part of the prison audit process and the research carried out by Alison Lieblich to inform the development of KPIs. Another possibility would be to modify the quality of life survey in order to conduct regular extensive surveys of prisoners' views as is done by the Scottish Prison Service each year. The Prison Service in England and Wales last conducted such a survey in 1991.

11. *There is scope for using KPIs in more flexible ways.* They can be used on a short term basis for a year or two to improve performance in one particular area and to enable the Prison Service to move in a different direction for a particular period of time. Under the current arrangements there is a risk that staff can view KPIs as part of a blame culture rather than as a valid tool for improving performance.

CONCLUSION

1. Over the past year the Prison Service has been under great pressure due to further increases in prison numbers. On occasions prisoners were being squeezed into every available space. Despite this, there have been some impressive achievements, notably in education and also the excellent record on security. However, overcrowding has had significant costs.
2. Staff have been overstretched and the level of regime that can be made available has not been adequate in many prisons resulting in low levels of purposeful activity. Too many prisoners have remained inactive, passively serving time. In these circumstances the causes of their offending are not addressed and they are highly likely to re-offend on release.
3. Overcrowding also increases tensions within establishments. Prisoners are more likely to feel distressed and aggrieved resulting in violent outbursts. It is not surprising therefore that the level of serious assaults remains high.
4. Pressures on staff and the frequent movement of prisoners make it much more difficult to identify, support and monitor vulnerable prisoners who are at increased risk of suicide. The Prison Service's Safer Custody Group has found that ten of the 20 prisons with the highest incidence of self-inflicted deaths are also in the top 20 for the turnover of population (Safer Custody News, August 2003).
5. The conditions in which prisoners are held inevitably deteriorate when so many people are crammed into what are often ageing Victorian jails that are not designed to hold large numbers. It is degrading for prisoners to have to share a cramped cell and defecate in front of one another. In some local prisons providing humane containment is now a struggle, with staff unable to get the majority of prisoners into constructive activities. Overcrowding also involves more prisoner movement and the need to hold prisoners further away from their home area, damaging family ties.
6. The Prison Service should not be expected to cope year after year with increasing numbers going into custody. Our jails are more unsafe, basic conditions are deteriorating, and with more drug users in jail, particularly remand and short term prisoners, drugs are more widely available. This demonstrates, more than ever before, the need to divert low risk, non-violent offenders away from custody into drug treatment, mental health provision and community penalties that make offenders pay back to communities rather than passively serving time in overcrowded jails.
7. Although KPIs can provide a useful indication of aspects of Prison Service performance, they should not be viewed in isolation. A number of KPIs, for example, on drugs, assaults, race and resettlement do not provide a clear picture of the situation in our jails and there is a danger that the KPI is distorting the reality of what is actually being achieved in these areas. Most importantly KPIs do not reflect whether or not the different needs of prisoners in different prisons are being met. The targets should be modified to take account of prisoners' concerns by incorporating results from the 'Measuring the Quality of Prison Life' surveys and carrying out regular Prison Service wide surveys. Ultimately, achieving KPIs should be viewed as a way of encouraging improved performance in prisons and not as firm evidence that prisoners are being treated humanely or constructively.

References

- Braggins J and Talbot J (2003) *Time to Learn: Prisoners' Views on Education*, London: Prison Reform Trust.
- Cann J, Falshaw L, Nugent F, Friendship C (2003) *Understanding What Works: accredited cognitive skills programmes for adult men and young offenders*, RDS Study 226, London: Home Office.
- Edgar K and O'Donnell I (1998) *Mandatory drug testing in prisons*, RDS Study 189, London: Home Office.
- Edgar K, O'Donnell I, Martin C (2003) *Prison Violence, The dynamic of conflict, fear and power*, Plymouth: Willan.
- Falshaw L, Friendship C, Travers R, Nugent F (2003) *Searching for 'What Works': an evaluation of cognitive skills programmes*, RDS Study 206, London: Home Office.
- HM Chief Inspector of Prisons (2001) *HM Prison Stafford, Report of a Full Announced Inspection, 16-20 July 2001*, London: Home Office.
- HM Chief Inspector of Prisons (2002) *Annual Report of the HM Chief Inspector of Prisons for England and Wales 2001-2002*, London: The Stationery Office.
- HM Chief Inspector of Prisons (2003) *HM Prison Pentonville, Unannounced follow-up Inspection*, London: Home Office.
- HM Chief Inspector of Prisons (2003a) *HM Prison Whitemoor, Unannounced follow-up Inspection, 15-17 July 2002*, Home Office: London.
- HM Chief Inspector of Prisons (2003b) *HM Prison Dartmoor, Announced Inspection*, London: Home Office.
- HM Chief Inspector of Prisons (2003c) *HM Prison The Verne, Announced Inspection 3-7 February 2003*, London: Home Office.
- HM Chief Inspector of Prisons (2003d) *HM YOI Onley, Announced Inspection, 27-31 January 2003*, London: Home Office.
- HM Chief Inspector of Prisons (2004) *HMP/YOI Bullwood Hall, Announced Inspection, 8-12 December 2003*, Home Office: London.
- HM Chief Inspector of Prisons (2004a) *Annual Report of the HM Chief Inspector of Prisons for England and Wales 2002-2003*, London: The Stationery Office.
- HM Chief Inspector of Prisons (2004b) *HMP Wealstun, Announced Inspection, 27-31 October 2003*, Home Office: London.
- HM Inspectorate of Prisons/HM Inspectorate of Probation (2001) *Through the Prison Gate, A Joint Thematic Review by HM Inspectorates of Prison and Probation*, London: Home Office.
- HM Prison Service (2004) *HM Prison Service Annual Report and Accounts April 2003 to March 2004*, London: The Stationery Office.
- HM Prison Service (2003) *Key Performance Indicators and Key Performance Targets, Collection and Distribution of Management Data, Prison Service Order 7100*, London: HM Prison Service.
- HM Prison Service (2003b) *Corporate Plan 2003-2004 to 2005-2006 and Business Plan 2003-2004*, London: HM Prison Service.
- Home Office (2004) *2004-2005 Targets for Offender Management*, London: Home Office.

- Home Office (2004a) *Reducing Re-offending National Action Plan*, London: Home Office.
- Home Office (2004b) *Reducing Crime - Changing Lives, The Government's plans for transforming the management of offenders*, London: Home Office.
- Home Office (2000) *Modernising the Management of the Prison Service, An Independent Report by the Targeted Performance Initiative Working Group Chaired by Lord Laming of Tewin*, London: Home Office.
- Liebling A and Arnold H (2002) *Measuring the quality of prison life, Home Office Research Findings 174*, London: Home Office.
- Liebling A (2004) *Prisons and Their Moral Performance: A study of Values, Quality and Prison Life*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Loucks N (2002), *Just Visiting? A Review of the Role of Prison Visitors' Centres*, London: Prison Reform Trust.
- National Audit Office (2002) *HM Prison Service, Reducing Prison Reoffending, Report by the Comptroller and Auditor General, HC548, Session 2001-2002*, London: National Audit Office.
- National Audit Office (2003), *The Operational Performance of PFI Prisons, Report by the Comptroller and Auditor General, HC 700, Session 2002-2003*, London: National Audit Office.
- National Audit Office (2004) *The Management of Sickness Absence in the Prison Service*, London: Stationery Office.
- Niven, S. and Olagundoye, J. (2002) *Jobs and Homes - a survey of prisoners nearing release, Home Office Research Findings 173*, London: Home Office.
- Prison Reform Trust (2004), *Prison Reform Trust Factfile, July 2004*, London: Prison Reform Trust.
- Prison Service News (May 2004) *PSMB responds to Carter report after staff consultations*, London: Prison Service.
- Public Accounts Committee (2004) *The Operational Performance of PFI Prisons*, online: <http://www.nao.org.uk/recommendation/report.asp?repld=426>
- Prison Report, Issue No 61, June 2003, *Managing to Work in Prisons*, London: Prison Reform Trust.
- Ramsbotham D (2003) *Prisongate*, London: Free Press.
- Singleton N et al. (1998) *Psychiatric Morbidity among prisoners in England and Wales*, London: Office for National Statistics.
- Singleton N. (1998) *Substance misuse among prisoners in England and Wales*, London: Office for National Statistics.
- Social Exclusion Unit (2002) *Reducing re-offending by ex-prisoners*, London: Social Exclusion Unit.
- The Mount IMB (2004) *HMP The Mount Independent Monitoring Board Annual Report 2003-2004*, HMP The Mount.

Appendix A

How public sector prisons in England and Wales performed against KPI targets for serious assaults, drug use, purposeful activity, overcrowding and number of self-inflicted deaths in each prison in 2003-2004.

	Serious assaults (rate on prisoners and staff)	Drug use (percentage of positive random mandatory drug tests)	Purposeful activity (average hours per prisoner each week)	Overcrowding (percentage of the prison population held two to a cell designed for one ¹)	Self-inflicted deaths in each prison
Prison Service KPI target	<i>1.20 per cent</i>	<i>10.0 per cent</i>	<i>24.0 hours</i>	<i>18.0 per cent</i>	
Prison Service average	<i>1.54 per cent</i>	<i>12.3 per cent</i>	<i>23.2 hours</i>	<i>21.7 per cent</i>	
Acklington	1.06%	16.0%	24.4	0.0%	1
Albany	0.59%	1.9%	22.2	0.0%	0
Ashwell	0.57%	16.6%	31.0	1.0%	0
Askham Grange	0.00%	3.1%	41.4	0.0%	0
Aylesbury	1.74%	4.8%	19.1	0.9%	1
Bedford	2.52%	16.4%	18.1	55.2%	1
Belmarsh	0.11%	14.1%	14.6	0.0%	3
Birmingham	0.35%	22.1%	18.8	41.5%	2
Blakenhurst	3.66%	18.7%	19.1	25.7%	4
Blantyre House	0.00%	2.0%	40.5	0.0%	0
Blundeston	2.41%	2.9%	21.9	8.3%	0
Brinsford	1.54%	10.9%	28.7	11.5%	0
Bristol	1.71%	14.5%	22.3	15.0%	1
Brixton	0.88%	12.0%	10.4	29.5%	2
Brockhill	6.17%	19.0%	18.1	0.0%	0
Buckley Hall	1.00%	5.3%	30.8	14.6%	0
Bullingdon	1.48%	14.3%	17.5	15.3%	0
Bullwood Hall	0.00%	3.3%	27.7	4.1%	0
Camp Hill	3.19%	9.1%	19.1	47.1%	1
Canterbury	1.01%	9.2%	21.9	81.6%	1
Cardiff	0.60%	25.3%	21.5	79.4%	0
Castington	1.83%	10.7%	22.9	0.0%	0
Channings Wood	0.94%	3.4%	28.6	6.0%	0
Chelmsford	1.92%	25.7%	15.8	45.3%	0
Coldingley	0.52%	16.6%	34.0	3.0%	0
Cookham Wood	0.75%	2.5%	22.6	47.1%	0
Dartmoor	0.33%	13.6%	23.3	8.4%	1
Deerbolt	3.13%	5.4%	20.5	0.0%	0

¹ Overcrowding is not dispersed evenly across the prison estate. It is particularly concentrated in local prisons, which are those that serve the courts in a specific area. Therefore these prisons will have a high rate of overcrowding whereas other prisons may not have any. This is reflected in zero targets for some prisons.

	Serious assaults (rate on prisoners and staff)	Drug use (percentage of positive random mandatory drug tests)	Purposeful activity (average hours per prisoner each week)	Overcrowding (percentage of the prison population held two to a cell designed for one²)	Self-inflicted deaths in each prison
Dorchester	2.13%	19.5%	17.6	76.2%	0
Downview	1.42%	11.5%	23.2	0.0%	1
Drake Hall	0.69%	3.1%	33.3	0.0%	0
Durham	1.41%	11.9%	18.0	50.7%	4
East Sutton Park	0.00%	0.8%	46.3	0.0%	0
Eastwood Park	1.42%	21.1%	17.9	15.7%	0
Edmunds Hill	0.42%	21.8%	21.0	0.0%	2
Elmley	1.23%	11.7%	20.6	24.5%	1
Erlestoke	1.22%	13.6%	25.5	3.9%	0
Everthorpe	0.45%	6.3%	28.1	13.7%	0
Exeter	0.57%	15.1%	22.5	41.5%	1
Featherstone	1.63%	4.7%	23.0	3.8%	0
Feltham	5.96%	8.4%	28.1	0.0%	0
Ford	0.00%	23.4%	37.6	0.0%	0
Foston Hall	1.36%	2.4%	24.5	0.0%	0
Frankland	0.31%	6.3%	22.2	0.0%	0
Full Sutton	1.16%	3.3%	19.0	0.0%	0
Garth	0.77%	6.9%	24.2	4.0%	0
Gartree	0.59%	4.2%	30.5	0.0%	0
Glen Parva	1.82%	8.5%	17.3	48.2%	0
Gloucester	1.00%	13.1%	20.2	55.4%	3
Grendon	0.19%	7.1%	32.5	0.0%	0
Guys Marsh	1.26%	19.9%	22.4	12.7%	0
Haverigg	2.35%	24.1%	29.9	1.9%	0
Hewell Grange	0.00%	21.8%	42.1	0.0%	0
High Down	1.09%	14.0%	15.2	0.0%	1
Highpoint	2.44%	20.2%	19.9	6.1%	0
Hindley	1.98%	14.1%	34.5	1.8%	0
Hollesley Bay	0.33%	16.2%	38.3	0.0%	0
Holloway	3.00%	19.1%	16.9	0.0%	0
Holme House	0.72%	14.3%	15.8	21.0%	1
Hull	2.05%	7.8%	15.8	42.9%	2
Huntercombe	1.56%	15.0%	30.1	0.0%	0
Kingston	0.62%	13.4%	25.1	0.0%	0
Kirkham	0.19%	35.0%	40.4	0.0%	0
Kirkclevington	0.00%	3.0%	51.7	0.0%	0
Lancaster	0.84%	4.5%	23.7	66.3%	0
Lancaster Farms	1.94%	6.2%	26.1	9.4%	1

² Overcrowding is not dispersed evenly across the prison estate. It is particularly concentrated in local prisons, which are those that serve the courts in a specific area. Therefore these prisons will have a high rate of overcrowding whereas other prisons may not have any. This is reflected in zero targets for some prisons.

	Serious assaults (rate on prisoners and staff)	Drug use (percentage of positive random mandatory drug tests)	Purposeful activity (average hours per prisoner each week)	Overcrowding (percentage of the prison population held two to a cell designed for one³)	Self-inflicted deaths in each prison
Latchmere House	0.00%	5.0%	57.6	0.0%	0
Leeds	1.44%	30.5%	18.1	75.1%	2
Leicester	2.63%	10.2%	23.1	87.7%	2
Lewes	5.22%	18.9%	21.0	28.9%	2
Leyhill	0.20%	20.3%	37.9	0.0%	0
Lincoln	2.60%	7.4%	19.3	67.8%	1
Lindholme	2.39%	12.4%	25.9	0.0%	0
Littlehey	1.05%	5.8%	20.2	10.4%	0
Liverpool	0.76%	28.3%	18.6	34.6%	3
Long Lartin	2.09%	6.4%	15.7	0.0%	1
Low Newton	3.19%	9.1%	24.6	28.7%	0
Maidstone	0.75%	9.1%	19.1	0.0%	0
Manchester	1.92%	18.5%	19.6	56.2%	2
Moorland	1.91%	5.3%	27.6	5.8%	0
Morton Hall	0.00%	1.5%	32.0	0.0%	0
Mount	0.79%	17.1%	20.4	13.5%	0
New Hall	1.39%	5.9%	23.5	12.5%	2
North Sea Camp	0.34%	25.8%	40.4	0.0%	0
Northallerton	6.24%	3.0%	22.2	68.2%	0
Norwich	2.36%	12.9%	17.9	48.5%	3
Nottingham	1.12%	16.0%	19.2	56.6%	5
Onley	8.79%	6.6%	28.1	0.0%	0
Parkhurst	3.65%	12.0%	20.3	7.6%	1
Pentonville	2.09%	14.4%	14.1	36.7%	0
Portland	2.46%	4.3%	20.9	0.0%	1
Preston	1.96%	17.8%	21.1	91.4%	4
Ranby	1.63%	12.8%	25.1	20.0%	1
Reading	1.15%	4.2%	18.3	67.7%	1
Risley	0.95%	26.0%	23.6	4.7%	0
Rochester	1.99%	9.3%	20.2	0.0%	0
Send	0.93%	4.9%	30.6	0.0%	0
Shepton Mallet	1.08%	2.7%	24.6	24.0%	1
Shrewsbury	2.66%	21.7%	19.5	89.3%	2
Stafford	1.57%	10.1%	24.1	67.9%	1
Standford Hill	0.23%	17.0%	38.1	0.0%	0
Stocken	1.46%	5.1%	26.0	4.2%	0
Stoke Heath	3.40%	0.8%	21.8	28.8%	0
Styal	1.18%	17.7%	21.0	7.0%	3

³ Overcrowding is not dispersed evenly across the prison estate. It is particularly concentrated in local prisons, which are those that serve the courts in a specific area. Therefore these prisons will have a high rate of overcrowding whereas other prisons may not have any. This is reflected in zero targets for some prisons.

	Serious assaults (rate on prisoners and staff)	Drug use (percentage of positive random mandatory drug tests)	Purposeful activity (average hours per prisoner each week)	Overcrowding (percentage of the prison population held two to a cell designed for one⁴)	Self-inflicted deaths in each prison
Sudbury	0.19%	14.2%	42.0	0.6%	0
Swaleside	1.04%	9.5%	27.2	3.2%	0
Swansea	1.45%	22.6%	21.1	71.6%	1
Swinfen Hall	3.52%	3.1%	28.7	0.0%	1
Thorn Cross	4.32%	18.6%	42.8	0.0%	0
Usk\Prescoed	0.00%	10.0%	36.0	50.4%	0
Verne	1.21%	8.0%	30.9	9.7%	1
Wakefield	0.36%	1.8%	16.0	0.0%	1
Wandsworth	0.62%	14.6%	16.8	58.9%	3
Warren Hill	0.00%	3.9%	26.2	0.0%	0
Wayland	1.00%	4.2%	24.8	11.9%	0
Wealstun	0.34%	16.3%	33.0	0.0%	0
Weare	1.33%	11.9%	18.6	0.0%	0
Wellingborough	1.16%	7.9%	22.6	0.6%	1
Werrington	2.45%	4.0%	27.3	0.0%	0
Wetherby	0.66%	2.6%	29.1	0.0%	0
Whatton	0.57%	0.5%	29.8	7.0%	0
Whitemoor	0.96%	4.1%	21.2	0.0%	0
Winchester	1.76%	28.5%	20.4	59.5%	3
Woodhill	3.37%	7.7%	15.4	29.5%	2
Wormwood Scrubs	2.55%	23.4%	18.4	10.2%	1
Wymott	0.24%	6.9%	30.9	4.0%	3

⁴ Overcrowding is not dispersed evenly across the prison estate. It is particularly concentrated in local prisons, which are those that serve the courts in a specific area. Therefore these prisons will have a high rate of overcrowding whereas other prisons may not have any. This is reflected in zero targets for some prisons.



Research • Education • Information

Prison Reform Trust,
15 Northburgh Street,
London EC1V 0JR

Registered Charity No: 1035525
Company Limited by Guarantee No. 2906362
Tel: 020 7251 5070
Fax: 020 7251 5076