



Ministry
of Justice

Annual Prison Performance Ratings Guide 2019/20

Ministry of Justice
Official Statistics Bulletin

30 July 2020

Contents

Introduction	3
Prison Performance Tool	3
Prison Scores	5
Moderation	6
Weights	7
Rules	7
First performance rating or change of function in year	8
Inclusion in the Prison Performance Tool	8
Prison Function	10
Comparator Groups	11
COVID-19	11
Worked Examples	12
Annex A – Performance Measure Information	17
Annex B – Performance Measure Rating Definitions	23
Annex C – Measure Weightings	28
Annex D – 2019/20 Prison Comparator Groups	30

Guide to Annual Prison Performance Ratings

Introduction

Her Majesty's Prison and Probation Service (HMPPS) is an executive agency of the Ministry of Justice (MoJ) with the goal of helping prison and probation services work together to manage offenders through their sentences. For 2019/20 HMPPS had responsibility for delivering prison performance using a suite of performance measures resulting in performance ratings for both public sector and privately managed prisons across England and Wales.

The Annual Prison Performance Ratings are derived from the Prison Performance Tool (PPT) which was introduced in April 2018. All prison performance ratings reflect performance between 1st April 2019 and 31st March 2020.

There is overlap between some information provided in the Annual Prison Performance Ratings and other MoJ publications:

- The Safety in Custody National Statistics published quarterly by MoJ. Previous and current publications can be found at www.gov.uk/government/collections/safety-in-custody-statistics.
- The HMPPS Annual Digest Official Statistics is published annually by MoJ. Previous and current publications can be found at <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/prison-and-probation-trusts-performance-statistics>.

Data presented in this report have been drawn from administrative IT systems. Although care is taken when processing and analysing the data, the level of detail collected is subject to the inaccuracies inherent in any large-scale recording system.

Further information regarding data quality of individual performance measures used to determine overall prison performance can be found in the accompanying supplementary tables to this guide.

Prison Performance Tool

The prison performance framework was revised for 2019/20 to replace the one used in 2018/19, to better ensure it meets Ministerial and Agency priorities. Accommodation on the first night following release, employment at six weeks following release and staff resignation rate were all added to the framework. Positive Random Mandatory drug testing was split into two measures, one excluding psychoactive substances and the other monitoring psychoactive substances only.

Prison level performance is monitored and measured using the Prison Performance Tool. The PPT uses a data-driven assessment of performance in each prison to derive overall prison performance ratings. As in previous years, data-driven ratings were ratified and subject to in depth scrutiny at the moderation process which took place in June 2020.

In the PPT, overall performance in each prison is rated on a 1 to 4 scale. The different ratings are 4: Performance is exceptional; 3: Performance is acceptable; 2: Performance is of concern and 1: Performance is of serious concern.

In 2019/20, the PPT used 33 performance measures including three sub measures, split into six domains which aim to reflect the HMPPS priorities:

- Safety;
- Security;
- Respect;
- Rehabilitation and Release Planning;
- Purposeful Activity;
- Organisational Effectiveness.

When the initial performance framework was devised for the PPT in 2018/19, work was undertaken jointly between MoJ and HMPPS to align the performance measures to an appropriate domain, and where appropriate linking to the expectations set by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons (HMIP). This process was repeated in 2019/20 when the new measures were introduced. The performance measures by domain are as follows:

PPT Domain	Performance Measure
Safety	Positive Random Mandatory drug testing (excluding new psychoactive substances)
	Positive Random Mandatory drug testing (new psychoactive substances only)
	Months drug testing levels not met (sub measure)
	Risk Management Audit
	Measuring the Quality of Prison Life - safety
	Prisoner on prisoner assaults incidents – rate per 1,000 prisoners
	Assaults on staff incidents – rate per 1,000 prisoners
	Control and Restraint training/Minimising and Managing Physical Restraint training**
	Tornado commitment
	Self-harm incidents – rate per 1,000 prisoners
	HM Inspectorate of Prisons – safety
Security	Number of escapes from prison or prisoner escort
	Absconds from open prison conditions – rate per 100,000 prisoner days
	Security Audit
Respect	Measuring the Quality of Prison Life – decency
	Audit of Living Conditions
	Measuring the Quality of Prison Life – BME simplified
	HM Inspectorate of Prisons – respect
Purposeful Activity	Hours worked by prisoners in industry
	HM Inspectorate of Prisons – purposeful activity
Rehabilitation and Release Planning	Accredited programme completions
	Accommodation on first night following release
	Employment at six weeks following release
	Release on Temporary Licence – % successful releases

PPT Domain	Performance Measure
	HM Inspectorate of Prisons – rehabilitation and release planning
Organisational Effectiveness	Incident Reporting System – data quality audit
	Incident Reporting System – assaults checks (sub measure)
	Incident Reporting System – self-harm checks (sub measure)
	Data Integrity (Governance & Operational Audit)
	Foreign National Offender referrals
	Prison operating within budget
	Staff sickness absence
	Staff resignation rate

* Male Young Offender Institution - Young People establishments undertake Minimising and Managing Physical Restraint training. All other prisons undertake Control and Restraint training.

Data is reported for each measure from 1 April 2019 to 31 March 2020 except for:

- Positive Random Mandatory drug testing (new psychoactive substances only) – due to concerns with data quality this measure only captures the period 1 December 2019 to 31 March 2020
- Accommodation on first night following release which measures data from 1 October 2019 to 31 March 2020
- Employment at six weeks following release which measures data from 1 October 2019 to 31 March 2020
- Measures impacted by COVID-19 as explained on page 11.

Descriptions of each performance measure along with the data source and target can be found in [Annex A](#). Information on rating definitions for each performance measure can be found in [Annex B](#).

Prison Scores

Overall prison performance ratings are derived from a data-driven score for each prison. Each measure in the performance framework carries a weighting, with the sum of all measure weights adding up to 100% for each prison. The weightings represent the importance of the performance measure for HMPPS. Measures are weighted differently for different prison functions, based on their relative importance. Not all performance measures in the framework apply to every prison as a result of varying prison functions.

Each applicable measure carries a rating for each prison; most are rated on a 1 to 4 scale, while some measures only allow ratings of 1 to 3 and others are binary. As such, the maximum possible score a prison can achieve on the PPT varies depending on which measures apply to the prison and the specific distribution of weights. To overcome this, the overall prison ratings are assigned using the score the prison achieved as a percentage of the maximum possible score achievable.

There are also differences in the way measure ratings are calculated. Some compare performance to target, some are set nationally to reflect consistent expectations across the estate, whereas others are specific to each prison considering a range of local factors. For

audit and HM Inspectorate of Prisons measures, the measure rating corresponds directly to the audit or inspection outcome.

The overall prison score is calculated by the sum of each individual measure weight multiplied by the individual measure rating.

The thresholds for the Annual Prison Performance Ratings 2019/20 are:

Rating	Percentage of max score
4: Performance is exceptional	Greater than or equal to 82%
3: Performance is acceptable	Less than 82% And Greater than or equal to 61%
2: Performance is of concern	Less than 61% And Greater than or equal to 51%
1: Performance is of serious concern	Less than 51%

Moderation

Prior to publication of Annual Prison Performance Ratings, an annual moderation process is undertaken by HMPPS. During this process performance data is scrutinised by key stakeholders in the prison performance process and considered alongside wider contextual evidence to make a final assessment for the year-end rating of each prison. This ensures the rating for each prison is fully reflective of performance.

In 2019/20, prisons could voluntarily enter the process, or were automatically referred if one or more of the following criteria was met:

- One or more escape from the prison or prisoner escort;
- Urgent Notification invoked; or
- First year a prison received a rating or where there was a major change within the year, e.g. change in function

A moderation panel discussed each proposal to agree a final rating. The panel consisted of representatives from across HMPPS and MoJ to ensure an independent approach was maintained.

Weights

Weights used in the PPT are separated into three overall distributions to reflect the main prison functions: male closed prisons; women's prisons; and male open prisons. The agreed weightings for each distribution can be seen in [Annex C](#).

Weight redistribution

Where a measure doesn't apply to a prison, the weighting for that measure is redistributed to all other measures across the PPT. This is done proportionately to ensure the weight distribution sums to 100% for all prisons.

Inspections, audits and surveys used in the PPT are not always carried out on annual basis, and as such these measures are age weighted on the assumption that the results become less relevant over time. The weightings for each of these measures reduce in weight over time as follows:

Age	Weighting reduces by:
Up to 1 year	0%
1 to 2 years	20%
2 to 3 years	40%
3 to 4 years	60%
Over 4 years	80%

In these cases, the weighting which no longer applies to the measure is proportionately redistributed across all other measures in the framework. As such, the measure which reduced in weight will regain some of this released weight.

Rules

A number of rules exist in the PPT for certain measures.

Drug testing levels

Prisons are required to undertake a minimum number of drug tests each month. Failure to do this affects the maximum achievable performance for the Positive Random Mandatory drug testing (excluding new psychoactive substances) and Positive Random Mandatory drug testing (new psychoactive substances only) performance measures.

If a prison misses the minimum number of mandatory tests in five or fewer months of the year, the maximum rating they can achieve for Positive Random Mandatory drug testing (excluding new psychoactive substances) and Positive Random Mandatory drug testing (new psychoactive substances only) is **3**.

If they miss the minimum number for six or more months, the rating for Positive Random Mandatory drug testing (excluding new psychoactive substances) and Positive Random Mandatory drug testing (new psychoactive substances only) will **reduce by 1 rating**.

Incident Reporting System – assaults checks

This is a subset of records reviewed as part of the Incident Reporting System Audit, looking specifically at assaults incidents. If a prison does not meet the target of 85% of assaults

incidents correctly recorded, the maximum rating they can achieve for both the prisoner on prison assaults rate and assaults on staff rate performance measure is a **2**.

Incident Reporting System – self-harm checks

This is a subset of records reviewed as part of the Incident Reporting System Audit, looking specifically at self-harm incidents. If a prison does not meet the target of 85% of self-harm incidents correctly recorded, the maximum rating they can achieve for the self-harm rate performance measure is a **2**.

Accommodation on first night following release and Employment at six weeks following release

The accommodation and employment outcomes are relevant to all offenders who are released from prison. Although the measures and targets are applied to all establishments, the measures take into account that some prisons only release small volumes of prisoners. Therefore, weighting is not applied for either the accommodation or employment measure for any prison with fewer than 30 releases in the performance year.

Not all releases are included in these measures. The rules for inclusion vary between accommodation on first night of release and employment at six weeks following release. If the accommodation measure contributes to the overall rating in a prison, this does not necessarily mean the employment measure also will and vice versa.

Release on Temporary Licence

Prisons that release fewer than 30 offenders on temporary licence in the performance year are exempt from this measure, with weighting redistributed across all other applicable measures.

Escapes from prison or prisoner escort

If a prison had an escape from prison or prisoner escort during 2019/20, they were automatically considered at the moderation process with a view for the overall performance rating to be reduced.

Urgent Notification

If a prison had an HM Inspectorate of Prisons inspection during 2019/20 and received an Urgent Notification as a result, the prison was automatically considered at the moderation process to further scrutinise their data-driven rating.

First performance rating or change of function in year

If a prison is included in the Prison Performance Tool for the first time, it was automatically considered at the moderation process to ensure the data-driven rating is reflective of performance over the whole performance year. If a prison was subject to a major change in-year, such as a change in primary function, it was also automatically considered at the moderation process.

Inclusion in the Prison Performance Tool

In 2019/20, 119 prisons were included in the PPT comprising of 95 male closed prisons, 12 male open prisons and 12 women's prisons. For a prison to be included in the PPT, they need to meet the following criteria:

- have received an HM Inspectorate of Prisons inspection;

- have received internal audits carried out by HMPPS Operational System & Assurance Group;
- have maintained consistent performance for six months;
- have stable Operational Capacity levels.

As a result, HMP The Verne were **not** included in the PPT in 2019/20 and do not feature in the Annual Prison Performance Ratings 2019/20.

HMP Berwyn is included in the Annual Prison Performance Ratings 2019/20 for the first time due to meeting the above criteria.

Prison Function

Prisons are classified by their predominant prison function. A number of prisons are multi-functional and hold a range of types of prisoner. In these cases, the predominant function has been reported in the Annual Prison Performance Ratings 2019/20.

Prison Function	Description
Male Dispersal	Hold male prisoners classified as category A; prisoners whose escape would be highly dangerous to the public or the police or the security of the state and for whom the aim must be to make escape impossible.
Male Category B	Hold male prisoners classified as category B; prisoners for whom the very highest conditions of security are not necessary but for whom escape must be made very difficult.
Male Category C	Hold male prisoners classified as category C; prisoners who cannot be trusted in open conditions but who do not have the will to make a determined escape attempt or the resources to do so.
Male Open	Accommodate male category D prisoners whose risk of absconding is considered to be low or who are of low risk to the public because of the way they have addressed their offending behaviour. Open prisons also house indeterminate and longer-sentenced prisoners who are coming towards the end of their sentence and who have gradually worked their way down the categories.
Male Local	Hold male prisoners. These serve the courts and receive remand and post-conviction prisoners, before their allocation to other establishments. They hold many short-term prisoners; remand prisoners; those waiting allocation to training prisons; and may hold a small number of immigration detainees. The short-term prisoners held in local prisons are those who are due for release in to the surrounding area and as such engage with resettlement providers in the last three months of their sentence.
Female Closed	Hold female prisoners for whom the very highest conditions of security are not necessary but who present too high a risk for open conditions or for whom open conditions are not appropriate.
Female Open	Similar to Male Open but holding female prisoners.
Female Local	Similar to Male Local but holding female prisoners.
Male Closed Young Offender Institution	Male closed establishment holding young men aged 18 to 21.
Male Young Offender Institution - Young People	Hold male young people aged 15 to 17.

Comparator Groups

The 2019/20 comparator groups of prisons can be found in [Annex D](#). A statistical methodology is used to calculate the comparator groups. A number of contextual variables are used to determine a statistical score for each prison. These include:

- Prison Type;
- Whether the prison holds young offenders;
- Prison Category;
- Gender of prisoners;
- Proportion of prisons who are sex offenders;
- Complexity of the prison to determine whether it is a standard site, complex or diverse and complex¹;
- Operational capacity;
- Average age of the prisoners;
- Churn of prisoners²;
- Building age;
- Proportion of different category prisoners;
- Proportion of prisoners who are foreign national offenders.

The variables are weighted with the most important (as set by HMPPS) contributing more to the statistically derived score. Prisons with the nearest scores are set as the comparators with each prison having a maximum of eight within their group. A maximum distance limit is set to ensure only statistically similar prisons are grouped together. This results in some smaller comparator groups, particularly for specialised prisons.

A comparator group is unique to the prison. If Prison A has Prison B and C in its comparator group, this does not necessarily mean Prison B would have Prison A and C in its group.

COVID-19

The following measures were impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic in March 2020 and data was excluded from the PPT.

- Random Mandatory Drug Testing Levels – March 2020 data excluded
- Control and Restraint Training and Minimising and Managing Physical Restraint Training – March 2020 data excluded
- Tornado commitment – March 2020 data excluded
- Hours worked in industry – March 2020 data excluded

¹ Prison complexity is a judgement based on prison population and churn rate, amount of staff, complexity of prisoner population and notoriety, location, site logistics, categorisation and risk, political scrutiny, media relations and management and financial commercial management.

² Churn of prisoners is the rate of new admissions or transfers in as a proportion of the prison population.

Worked Examples

Prison 1 is a male closed prison with all measures except absconds (not applicable to closed prisons). All audit and HMIP measures took place within the last year.

Performance Measure	Weighting	Rating	Measure score
Positive Random Mandatory drug testing (rMDT) (excluding new psychoactive substances)	2.5%	1	0.025
Positive rMDT (new psychoactive substances only)	2.5%	1	0.025
Months random testing level not met	0.0%	2	0
Risk Management Audit	5.0%	2	0.01
Measuring the Quality of Prison Life (MQPL) - safety	3.0%	2	0.06
Prisoner on prisoner assaults incidents – rate per 1,000 prisoners	4.0%	2	0.079
Assaults on staff incidents – rate per 1,000 prisoners	5.9%	2	0.119
Control and Restraint training	0.8%	2	0.02
Tornado commitment	0.8%	1	0.008
Self-harm incidents – rate per 1,000 prisoners	5.0%	1	0.05
HM Inspectorate of Prisons (HMIP) – Safety	6.1%	2	0.123
Number of escapes from prison	0.0%	3	0
Absconds from open prison conditions – rate per 100,000 prisoner days	N/A	N/A	N/A
Security Audit	9.9%	3	0.297
MQPL– decency	3.0%	3	0.089
Audit of Living Conditions	5.0%	3	0.149
MQPL – BME simplified	4.0%	3	0.119
HMIP– Respect	6.1%	3	0.184
Hours worked by prisoners in industry	1.6%	3	0.048
HMIP– Purposeful Activity	6.1%	1	0.061
Accredited programmes completions	3.3%	3	0.098
Accommodation on first night following release	0.8%	2	0.016
Employment at six weeks following release	0.8%	1	0.008
Release on Temporary Licence – successes	1.6%	3	0.048
HMIP– Rehabilitation and Release Planning	6.1%	2	0.122
Incident Reporting System – Data Quality Audit	5.0%	2	0.1
Incident Reporting System – assaults checks	0.0%	3	0
Incident Reporting System – self-harm checks	0.0%	3	0
Data Integrity (Governance & Operational Audit)	0.0%	3	0
Foreign National Offender Referrals	1.6%	2	0.032
Prison Operating within Budget	3.3%	3	0.098
Staff sickness absence	3.3%	2	0.065
Staff resignation rate	3.3%	3	0.098
Total:			2.23

The measure score is the measure weighting multiplied by the measure rating.

The overall score for the prison is the sum of each measure score. Prison 1 scored 2.23. The maximum score achievable is 3.85. This gives a percentage score of 57.9%, equivalent to an overall rating of 2

Prison percentage score: 57.9%

Overall prison rating: 2

Prison 2 is a women's prison. Some measures do not have data. All audits and HMIP measures took place within the last year.

Performance Measure	Weighting	Rating	Measure score	
Positive Random Mandatory drug testing (rMDT) (excluding new psychoactive substances)	2.7%	1	0.027	The measure score is the measure weighting multiplied by the measure rating.
Positive rMDT (new psychoactive substances only)	2.7%	1	0.027	
Months random testing level not met	0.0%	3	0	
Risk Management Audit	5.5%	3	0.165	
Measuring the Quality of Prison Life (MQPL) - safety	3.3%	1	0.033	Prison 2 does not have data for Audit of Living Conditions, Accredited Programme Completions or Foreign National Offender Referrals.
Prisoner on prisoner assaults incidents – rate per 1,000 prisoners	4.4%	3	0.132	
Assaults on staff incidents – rate per 1,000 prisoners	6.6%	2	0.132	
Control and Restraint training	0.9%	3	0.026	
Tornado commitment	0.9%	3	0.026	
Self-harm incidents – rate per 1,000 prisoners	5.5%	2	0.11	
HM Inspectorate of Prisons (HMIP) – Safety	6.8%	4	0.272	
Number of escapes from prison	0.0%	3	0	
Abconds from open prison conditions – rate per 100,000 prisoner days	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Security Audit	11%	1	0.11	
MQPL – decency	3.3%	2	0.066	The weight assigned to these measures is redistributed across all other measures with data.
Audit of Living Conditions	N/A	N/A	N/A	
MQPL – BME simplified	4.4%	3	0.132	The overall score for the prison is the sum of each measure score. Prison 2 scored 2.59. The maximum score achievable is 3.89. This gives a percentage score of 66.7%, equivalent to an overall rating of 3.
HMIP – Respect	6.8%	3	0.204	
Hours worked by prisoners in industry	1.8%	4	0.07	
HMIP – Purposeful Activity	6.8%	3	0.204	
Accredited programmes completions	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Accommodation on first night following release	0.9%	2	0.018	
Employment at six weeks following release	0.9%	1	0.009	
Release on Temporary Licence – successes	1.8%	3	0.053	
HMIP – Rehabilitation and Release Planning	6.8%	4	0.272	
Incident Reporting System – Data Quality Audit	5.5%	4	0.22	
Incident Reporting System – assaults checks	0.0%	3	0	Prison percentage score
Incident Reporting System – self-harm checks	0.0%	3	0	
Data Integrity (Governance & Operational Audit)	0.0%	3	0	
Foreign National Offender Referrals	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Prison Operating within Budget	3.6%	3	0.109	Overall prison rating
Staff sickness absence	3.6%	2	0.072	
Staff resignation rate	3.6%	3	0.109	
Total:			2.59	66.7%
				3

Prison 3 is a male open prison with all applicable measures. The HMIP inspection took place 2.5 years ago.

Performance Measure	Weighting	Rating	Measure score	The measure score is the measure weighting multiplied by the measure rating.
Positive Random Mandatory drug testing (rMDT) (excluding new psychoactive substances)	2.8%	1	0.028	
Positive rMDT (new psychoactive substances only)	2.8%	4	0.112	Prison 3 has all measures applicable to an open prison, except Foreign National Offender referrals.
Months random testing level not met	0.0%	3	0	
Risk Management Audit	4.5%	3	0.135	As the HMIP is 2.5 years old, the four HMIP measures have reduced in weighting by 40%.
Measuring the Quality of Prison Life (MQPL) - safety	3.2%	3	0.097	
Prisoner on prisoner assaults incidents – rate per 1,000 prisoners	3.6%	4	0.146	The freed weight is redistributed across all measures with data with the HMIP measures regaining some of this redistributed weight.
Assaults on staff incidents – rate per 1,000 prisoners	4.3%	2	0.086	
Control and Restraint training	1.9%	3	0.058	The overall score for the prison is the sum of each measure score. Prison 3 scored 3.17. The maximum score achievable is 3.82. This gives a percentage score of 83.0%, equivalent to an overall rating of 4.
Tornado commitment	0.0%	N/A	0	
Self-harm incidents – rate per 1,000 prisoners	3.9%	4	0.154	The overall score for the prison is the sum of each measure score. Prison 3 scored 3.17. The maximum score achievable is 3.82. This gives a percentage score of 83.0%, equivalent to an overall rating of 4.
HM Inspectorate of Prisons (HMIP) – Safety	4.4%	4	0.175	
Number of escapes from prison	N/A	N/A	N/A	The overall score for the prison is the sum of each measure score. Prison 3 scored 3.17. The maximum score achievable is 3.82. This gives a percentage score of 83.0%, equivalent to an overall rating of 4.
Absconds from open prison conditions – rate per 100,000 prisoner days	6.0%	4	0.24	
Security Audit	3.4%	4	0.137	The overall score for the prison is the sum of each measure score. Prison 3 scored 3.17. The maximum score achievable is 3.82. This gives a percentage score of 83.0%, equivalent to an overall rating of 4.
MQPL – decency	3.6%	3	0.109	
Audit of Living Conditions	7.3%	3	0.22	The overall score for the prison is the sum of each measure score. Prison 3 scored 3.17. The maximum score achievable is 3.82. This gives a percentage score of 83.0%, equivalent to an overall rating of 4.
MQPL – BME simplified	4.5%	2	0.09	
HMIP – Respect	4.4%	4	0.175	The overall score for the prison is the sum of each measure score. Prison 3 scored 3.17. The maximum score achievable is 3.82. This gives a percentage score of 83.0%, equivalent to an overall rating of 4.
Hours worked by prisoners in industry	1.9%	2	0.039	
HMIP – Purposeful Activity	5.0%	4	0.20	The overall score for the prison is the sum of each measure score. Prison 3 scored 3.17. The maximum score achievable is 3.82. This gives a percentage score of 83.0%, equivalent to an overall rating of 4.
Accredited programmes completions	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Accommodation on first night following release	1.1%	3	0.032	The overall score for the prison is the sum of each measure score. Prison 3 scored 3.17. The maximum score achievable is 3.82. This gives a percentage score of 83.0%, equivalent to an overall rating of 4.
Employment at six weeks following release	1.1%	2	0.021	
Release on Temporary Licence – successes	8.4%	3	0.251	The overall score for the prison is the sum of each measure score. Prison 3 scored 3.17. The maximum score achievable is 3.82. This gives a percentage score of 83.0%, equivalent to an overall rating of 4.
HMIP – Rehabilitation and Release Planning	5.0%	4	0.20	
Incident Reporting System – Data Quality Audit	5.6%	3	0.167	The overall score for the prison is the sum of each measure score. Prison 3 scored 3.17. The maximum score achievable is 3.82. This gives a percentage score of 83.0%, equivalent to an overall rating of 4.
Incident Reporting System – assaults checks	0.0%	3	0.00	
Incident Reporting System – self-harm checks	0.0%	3	0.00	The overall score for the prison is the sum of each measure score. Prison 3 scored 3.17. The maximum score achievable is 3.82. This gives a percentage score of 83.0%, equivalent to an overall rating of 4.
Data Integrity (Governance & Operational Audit)	0.0%	4	0.00	
Foreign National Offender Referrals	N/A	N/A	N/A	The overall score for the prison is the sum of each measure score. Prison 3 scored 3.17. The maximum score achievable is 3.82. This gives a percentage score of 83.0%, equivalent to an overall rating of 4.
Prison Operating within Budget	3.8%	3	0.113	
Staff sickness absence	3.8%	2	0.075	The overall score for the prison is the sum of each measure score. Prison 3 scored 3.17. The maximum score achievable is 3.82. This gives a percentage score of 83.0%, equivalent to an overall rating of 4.
Staff resignation rate	3.8%	3	0.113	
Total:			3.17	Prison percentage score
				83.0%
				Overall prison rating
				4

Prison 4 is a male closed prison. Some measures do not apply and the Security Audit was undertaken 1.5 years ago.

Performance Measure	Weighting	Rating	Measure score	
Positive Random Mandatory drug testing (rMDT) (excluding new psychoactive substances)	2.9%	2	0.058	The measure score is the measure weighting multiplied by the measure rating.
Positive rMDT (new psychoactive substances only)	2.9%	4	0.116	
Months random testing level not met	0.0%	3	0	
Risk Management Audit	5.8%	3	0.175	
Measuring the Quality of Prison Life (MQPL) - safety	3.5%	3	0.105	Due to the age of the Security Audit, the weighting for this will reduce by 20%. The weighting freed from this and the measures without data is proportionately redistributed across all measures with data. As such the Security Audit regains some of this redistributed weight.
Prisoner on prisoner assaults incidents – rate per 1,000 prisoners	4.7%	3	0.14	
Assaults on staff incidents – rate per 1,000 prisoners	7.0%	4	0.28	
Control and Restraint training	0.9%	3	0.028	
Tornado commitment	0.9%	3	0.028	
Self-harm incidents – rate per 1,000 prisoners	5.8%	2	0.116	
HM Inspectorate of Prisons (HMIP) – Safety	7.2%	4	0.29	
Number of escapes from prison	0.0%	3	0	
Abconds from open prison conditions – rate per 100,000 prisoner days	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Security Audit	9.3%	2	0.186	
MQPL – decency	3.5%	3	0.105	The overall score for the prison is the sum of each measure score. Prison 4 scored 3.08. The maximum score achievable is 3.90. This gives a percentage score of 79.0%, equivalent to an overall rating of 3.
Audit of Living Conditions	N/A	N/A	N/A	
MQPL – BME simplified	4.7%	3	0.14	
HMIP – Respect	7.2%	4	0.29	
Hours worked by prisoners in industry	1.9%	3	0.056	
HMIP – Purposeful Activity	7.2%	2	0.144	
Accredited programmes completions	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Accommodation on first night following release	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Employment at six weeks following release	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Release on Temporary Licence – successes	N/A	N/A	N/A	
HMIP – Rehabilitation and Release Planning	7.2%	4	0.29	Prison percentage score
Incident Reporting System – Data Quality Audit	5.8%	4	0.233	
Incident Reporting System – assaults checks	0.0%	3	0	
Incident Reporting System – self-harm checks	0.0%	3	0	
Data Integrity (Governance & Operational Audit)	0.0%	4	0	Overall prison rating
Foreign National Offender Referrals	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Prison Operating within Budget	3.8%	2	0.077	
Staff sickness absence	3.8%	3	0.115	
Staff resignation rate	3.8%	3	0.115	
Total:			3.08	79.0%
				3

Prison 5 is a women's prison which didn't meet target for IRS Assaults checks and IRS Self-Harm checks. It has data for all other measures and all audits and HMIPs are within the last year.

Performance Measure	Weighting	Rating	Measure score	The measure score is the measure weighting multiplied by the measure rating.
Positive Random Mandatory drug testing (rMDT) (excluding new psychoactive substances)	2.4%	1	0.024	
Positive rMDT (new psychoactive substances only)	2.4%	1	0.024	Prison 5 was rated 1 for the IRS Assaults check measure. The maximum rating achievable for Assaults on Staff and Prisoner on Prisoner Assaults was therefore a 2 regardless of performance compared to target.
Months random testing level not met	0.0%	3	0	
Risk Management Audit	4.9%	2	0.097	
Measuring the Quality of Prison Life (MQPL) - safety	2.9%	3	0.087	
Prisoner on prisoner assaults incidents – rate per 1,000 prisoners	3.9%	2	0.078	
Assaults on staff incidents – rate per 1,000 prisoners	5.8%	2	0.117	
Control and Restraint training	0.8%	3	0.023	
Tornado commitment	0.8%	3	0.023	
Self-harm incidents – rate per 1,000 prisoners	4.9%	1	0.049	
HM Inspectorate of Prisons (HMIP) – Safety	6.0%	3	0.18	
Number of escapes from prison	0.0%	3	0	Prison 5 was rated 1 for the IRS self-harm check measure. The maximum rating achievable Self-Harm Incidents was therefore a 2 regardless of performance compared to target.
Absconds from open prison conditions – rate per 100,000 prisoner days	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Security Audit	9.7%	3	0.291	
MQPL – decency	2.9%	3	0.087	
Audit of Living Conditions	5.3%	2	0.107	
MQPL – BME simplified	3.9%	3	0.117	
HMIP – Respect	6.0%	3	0.18	
Hours worked by prisoners in industry	1.6%	2	0.031	
HMIP – Purposeful Activity	6.0%	2	0.12	
Accredited programmes completions	4.7%	3	0.14	
Accommodation on first night following release	0.8%	2	0.016	The overall score for the prison is the sum of each measure score. Prison 5 scored 2.31. The maximum score achievable is 3.84. This gives a percentage score of 60.2%, equivalent to an overall rating of 2.
Employment at six weeks following release	0.8%	1	0.008	
Release on Temporary Licence – successes	1.6%	1	0.016	
HMIP – Rehabilitation and Release Planning	6.0%	3	0.18	
Incident Reporting System – Data Quality Audit	4.9%	1	0.05	
Incident Reporting System – assaults checks	0.0%	2	0	
Incident Reporting System – self-harm checks	0.0%	2	0	
Data Integrity (Governance & Operational Audit)	0.0%	3	0	
Foreign National Offender Referrals	1.6%	3	0.047	
Prison Operating within Budget	3.2%	3	0.096	
Staff sickness absence	3.2%	2	0.064	Prison percentage score
Staff resignation rate	3.2%	2	0.064	
Total:			2.31	Overall prison rating

Annex A – Performance Measure Information

PPT Domain	Performance Measure <i>Description in italics</i>	Data source	Target	Ratings available
Safety	Positive Random Mandatory drug testing (excluding new psychoactive substances) <i>The average rate of positive results from random mandatory drug testing excluding new psychoactive substances.</i> <i>Further information can be found in the HMPPS Annual Digest.</i>	Security Group MDT database	Locally set	1 to 4
	Positive Random Mandatory drug testing (new psychoactive substances only) <i>The average rate of positive results from random mandatory drug testing, new psychoactive substances only.</i> <i>Further information can be found in the HMPPS Annual Digest.</i>	Security Group MDT database	Locally set	1 to 4
	Months random drug testing levels not met <i>The number of months in the year where the prison did not undertake the required number of random drug tests.</i>	Security Group MDT database	N/A – measure affects rating for above measures	1 to 3
	Risk Management Audit <i>An announced audit to determine how effectively the prison is assessing and managing risks of violence and self-harm.</i>	Operational and System Assurance Group	Amber-green (rating of 3)	1 to 4
	Measuring the Quality of Prison Life – safety <i>A survey of prisoners' perceptions of safety in the prison.</i>	Operational and System Assurance Group	Rating of 3	1 to 4

PPT Domain	Performance Measure <i>Description in italics</i>	Data source	Target	Ratings available
	Prisoner on prisoner assaults incidents <i>Prisoner on prisoner assaults incidents reported as a rate per 1,000 prisoners. An assault is defined as unwanted physical contact between two or more individuals.</i> <i>Further information can be found in the Safety in Custody National Statistics.</i>	Prison NOMIS	Locally set	1 to 4
	Assaults on staff incidents <i>Assaults on staff reported as a rate per 1,000 prisoners. An assault is defined as unwanted physical contact between two or more individuals.</i> <i>Further information can be found in the Safety in Custody National Statistics.</i>	Prison NOMIS	Locally set	1 to 4
	Control and Restraint training <i>The percentage of operational staff who have attended 8 hours of initial or refresher training within the last 12 months.</i>	HMPPS Performance Hub	National: 80%	1 to 3
	Minimising and Managing Physical Restraint training (Male Young Offender Institution - Young People prisons only) <i>The percentage of eligible staff who have been trained in Minimising and Managing Physical Restraint techniques in the last six months.</i>	HMPPS Performance Hub	National: 80%	1 to 3
	Tornado commitment <i>The number of staff trained in advanced Control and Restraint techniques for Tornado purposes.</i>	HMPPS Performance Hub	Locally set	1 to 3
	Self-harm incidents <i>Self-harm incidents reported as a rate per 1,000 prisoners. Self-harm is defined as any act where a prisoner deliberately harms or injures themselves.</i> <i>Further information can be found in the Safety in Custody National Statistics.</i>	Prison NOMIS	Locally set	1 to 4

PPT Domain	Performance Measure <i>Description in italics</i>	Data source	Target	Ratings available
	HM Inspectorate of Prisons – Safety <i>Focusses on early days in custody, managing behaviour, security, safeguarding and leadership and management of safety.</i>	Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons	Reasonably good (rating of 3)	1 to 4
Security	Number of escapes from prison or prisoner escort <i>A prisoner escapes from a prison or prisoner escort if they unlawfully gain their liberty by breaching the secure perimeter of a closed prison, i.e. the outside wall or boundary of the prison.</i> <i>Further information can be found in the HMPPS Annual Digest.</i>	Prison NOMIS	N/A – managed through moderation	N/A
	Absconds from open prison conditions <i>Abscond incidents reported as a rate per 100,000 prisoner days. An abscond is an escape that does not involve overcoming a physical security. Only applies to open prisons.</i> <i>Further information can be found in the HMPPS Annual Digest.</i>	Prison NOMIS	Locally set	1 to 4
	Security Audit <i>To review levels of compliance within specific HM Prison Service Performance Standards.</i>	Operational and System Assurance Group	Moderate (rating of 3)	1 to 4
Respect	Measuring the Quality of Prison Life – decency <i>A survey of prisoners' perceptions of decency in the prison.</i>	Operational and System Assurance Group	Rating of 3	1 to 4
	Audit of Living Conditions <i>To help drive improvements in living conditions in prisons. Residential units, cells, communal areas including serveries, toilets and showers are observed.</i>	Operational and System Assurance Group	Moderate (rating of 3)	1 to 4

PPT Domain	Performance Measure <i>Description in italics</i>	Data source	Target	Ratings available
	Measuring the Quality of Prison Life – BME simplified <i>Whether any difference in survey results from white and BME prisoners is statistically significantly different (i.e. did not occur by chance).</i>	Operational and System Assurance Group	National: no statistically significant difference scores for White vs BME prisoners	2 to 3
	HM Inspectorate of Prisons – Respect <i>Focuses on staff-prisoner relationships, daily life, equality, diversity and faith, health, well-being and social care and leadership and management of respect.</i>	Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons	Reasonably good (rating of 3)	1 to 4
Purposeful Activity	Hours worked by prisoners in industry <i>Hours worked by prisoners in industry as a percentage of scheduled hours. Industries include woodwork, textiles and working in call centres.</i> <i>Further information can be found in the HMPPS Annual Digest publication.</i>	Prison NOMIS	National – 80%	1 to 4
	HM Inspectorate of Prisons – Purposeful Activity <i>Focusses on time out of cell, education, skills and work activities and leadership and management of purposeful activity.</i>	Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons	Reasonably good (rating of 3)	1 to 4
Rehabilitation and Release Planning	Accredited programmes completions <i>The number of completions of Offender Behaviour Programmes and Sex Offender Treatment Programmes.</i> <i>Further information can be found in the HMPPS Annual Digest.</i>	Prison NOMIS	Locally set	1 to 3
	Accommodation on first night following release <i>The number of releases with accommodation on the first night of release as a proportion of releases from a custodial sentence.</i>	National Delius and Prison NOMIS	Locally set	1 to 4

PPT Domain	Performance Measure <i>Description in italics</i>	Data source	Target	Ratings available
	Employment at six weeks following release <i>The number of releases in employment on the date six weeks after release date, as a proportion of releases from a custodial sentence.</i>	National Delius and Prison NOMIS	Locally set	1 to 4
	Release on Temporary Licence – successes <i>Percentage of prisoners who return from Release on Temporary Licence. Release on Temporary Licence allows eligible prisoners to be temporarily released for precisely defined activities that cannot be provided in prisons.</i>	Prison NOMIS	National: 95%	1 to 4
	HM Inspectorate of Prisons – Rehabilitation and Release Planning <i>Focusses on children and families and contact with the outside world, reducing risk, rehabilitation and progression, interventions, specialist units, release planning and leadership and management of rehabilitation and release planning.</i>	Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons	Reasonably good (rating of 3)	1 to 4
Organisational Effectiveness	Incident Reporting System – Data Quality Audit <i>Audit ensuring reportable incidents are recorded on the Incident Reporting System package of Prison-NOMIS.</i>	Operational and System Assurance Group	Moderate (rating of 3)	1 to 4
	Incident Reporting System – assaults checks <i>Percentage of assaults incidents checked in the Incident Reporting System Data Quality Audit recorded on Prison-NOMIS.</i>	Operational and System Assurance Group	National: 85%	2 to 3
	Incident Reporting System – self-harm checks <i>Percentage of self-harm incidents checked in the Incident Reporting System Data Quality Audit recorded on Prison-NOMIS.</i>	Operational and System Assurance Group	National: 85%	2 to 3
	Data Integrity (Governance & Operational Audit) <i>Review of financial and performance data processes.</i>	Government Internal Audit	Rating of 3	1 to 4

PPT Domain	Performance Measure <i>Description in italics</i>	Data source	Target	Ratings available
	Foreign National Offender Referrals <i>Percentage of referrals to the Home Office made within 10 days.</i> <i>Further information can be found in the HMPPS Annual Digest.</i>	Prison NOMIS	National: 90%	1 to 3
	Prison Operating within Budget <i>Expenditure as a proportion of the agreed annual budget.</i>	Single Operating Platform	Spend within annual budget	2 to 3
	Staff sickness absence <i>Average number of days lost to staff sickness per member of staff target.</i> <i>Further information can be found in the HMPPS Annual Digest.</i>	Single Operating Platform for public sector prisons, HMPPS Performance Hub for privately managed prisons.	National: 9 days per member of staff	1 to 4
	Staff resignation rate <i>Rate of Band 3 – 5 Prison Officer staff resignations per Public Sector Prison establishment.</i>	Single Operating Platform	Locally set	1 to 4

Annex B – Performance Measure Rating Definitions

PPT Domain	Performance Measure	Measure Rating			
		1	2	3	4
Safety	Positive Random Mandatory Drug Testing (excluding new psychoactive substances)	Greater than 125% of target	Greater than 100% and less than or equal to 125% of target	Less than the target and greater than 75% of target	Less than or equal to 75% of target
	Positive Random Mandatory Drug Testing (new psychoactive substances only)	Greater than 125% of target	Greater than 100% and less than or equal to 125% of target	Less than the target and greater than 75% of target	Less than or equal to 75% of target
	Months random drug testing levels not met	Missed required level for 6 or more months in 2018/19	Missed required level for 1 to 5 months in 2018/19	Met required level in all months	N/A
	Risk Management Audit	Audit rating of Red	Audit rating of Amber-Red	Audit rating of Amber-Green	Audit rating of Green
	Measuring the Quality of Prison Life - safety	Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
	Prisoner on prisoner assaults incidents – rate per 1,000 prisoners	Greater than 125% of target.	Greater than 100% and less than or equal to 125% of target.	Less than the target and greater than 75% of target.	Less than or equal to 75% of target.

PPT Domain	Performance Measure	Measure Rating			
		1	2	3	4
	Assaults on staff incidents – rate per 1,000 prisoners	Greater than 125% of target.	Greater than 100% and less than or equal to 125% of target.	Less than the target and greater than 75% of target.	Less than or equal to 75% of target.
	Control and Restraint training	Performance less than 76%	Performance between 76% and 79.9%	Performance greater or equal to 80%	N/A
	Minimising and Managing Physical Restraint training	Performance less than 76%	Performance between 76% and 79.9%	Performance greater or equal to 80%	N/A
	Tornado commitment	Less than 90% of target	Greater than or equal to 90% of target	Greater than or equal to target	N/A
	Self-harm incidents – rate per 1,000 prisoners	Greater than 125% of target	Greater than 100% and less than or equal to 125% of target	Less than the target and greater than 75% of target.	Less than or equal to 75% of target
	HM Inspectorate of Prisons – Safety	Outcomes for prisoners are poor	Outcomes for prisoners are not sufficiently good	Outcomes for prisoners are reasonably good	Outcomes for prisoners are good
Security	Number of escapes from prison	1 escape or more	N/A	No escapes	N/A

PPT Domain	Performance Measure	Measure Rating			
		1	2	3	4
	Absconds from open prison conditions – rate per 100,000 prisoner days	Less than 90% of target achieved	Missing target but 90% or more of target achieved	Target achieved	Target achieved and in the top 25% of prisons
	Security Audit	Audit rating of Unsatisfactory	Audit rating of Limited	Audit rating of Moderate	Audit rating of Substantial
Respect	Measuring the Quality of Prison Life – decency	Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
	Audit of Living Conditions	Audit rating of Unsatisfactory	Audit rating of Limited	Audit rating of Moderate	Audit rating of Substantial
	Measuring the Quality of Prison Life – BME simplified	N/A	Outcomes statistically significantly different	Outcomes not statistically significantly different	N/A
	HM Inspectorate of Prisons - Respect	Outcomes for prisoners are poor	Outcomes for prisoners are not sufficiently good	Outcomes for prisoners are reasonably good	Outcomes for prisoners are good
Purposeful Activity	Hours worked by prisoners in industry	Less than 65% of scheduled hours	65% to less than 80% of scheduled hours	80% to 100% of scheduled hours	Greater than 100% of scheduled hours
	HM Inspectorate of Prisons – Purposeful Activity	Outcomes for prisoners are poor	Outcomes for prisoners are not sufficiently good	Outcomes for prisoners are reasonably good	Outcomes for prisoners are good

PPT Domain	Performance Measure	Measure Rating			
		1	2	3	4
Rehabilitation and Release Planning	Accredited programmes completions	Less than 80% of target achieved	Missing target but 80% or greater of target achieved	Target achieved	N/A
	Accommodation on the first night following release	Less than or equal to 85% of target achieved	Missing target but greater than 85% of target achieved	Greater than or equal to target OR greater than or equal to 90% of performance	Greater than 115% of target and achieving greater than or equal to 75% of performance OR achieving greater than or equal to 95% of performance
	Employment at six weeks following release	Less than or equal to 70% of target achieved	Missing target but greater than 70% of target achieved	Greater than or equal to target achieved	Greater than 125% of target achieved
	Release on Temporary Licence – successes	Less than 95% of target	Missing target but greater than or equal to 95% of target	Greater than or equal to target	N/A
	HM Inspectorate of Prisons – Rehabilitation and Release Planning	Outcomes for prisoners are poor	Outcomes for prisoners are not sufficiently good	Outcomes for prisoners are reasonably good	Outcomes for prisoners are good

PPT Domain	Performance Measure	Measure Rating			
		1	2	3	4
Organisational Effectiveness	Incident Reporting System – Data Quality Audit	Audit rating of Unsatisfactory	Audit rating of Limited	Audit rating of Moderate	Audit rating of Substantial
	Incident Reporting System – assaults checks	N/A	Less than 85%	Greater than or equal to 85%	N/A
	Incident Reporting System – self-harm checks	N/A	Less than 85%	Greater than or equal to 85%	N/A
	Data Integrity (Governance & Operational Audit)	1	2	3	4
	Foreign National Offender Referrals	Less than 80%	80% to 89.9%	90% or more	N/A
	Prison Operating within Budget	N/A	Greater than 100% of budget spent	Less than or equal to 100% of budget spent	N/A
	Staff sickness absence	Greater than an average of 12 days per staff member	Greater than 9 days and less than or equal to 12 days	Less than or equal to 9 days	Less than or equal to 9 days and best performing 15% of prisons nationally
	Staff resignation rate	Greater than 125% of target	Greater than target but less than or equal to 125% of target	Less than or equal to target	N/A

Annex C – Measure Weightings

Performance Measure	Male Closed	Women's	Male Open
Positive Random Mandatory Drug Testing (excluding new psychoactive substances)	2.4%	2.4%	2.4%
Positive Random Mandatory Drug Testing (new psychoactive substances only)	2.4%	2.4%	2.4%
Months random drug testing levels not met	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Risk Management Audit	4.8%	4.7%	3.8%
Measuring the Quality of Prison Life - safety	2.9%	2.8%	2.7%
Prisoner on prisoner assaults incidents – rate per 1,000 prisoners	3.8%	3.8%	3.1%
Assaults on staff incidents – rate per 1,000 prisoners	5.8%	5.6%	3.6%
Control and Restraint training/ Minimising and Managing Physical Restraint training	0.8%	0.8%	1.6%
Tornado commitment	0.8%	0.8%	0.0%
Self-harm incidents – rate per 1,000 prisoners	4.8%	4.7%	3.2%
HM Inspectorate of Prisons – Safety	5.9%	5.8%	6.1%
Number of escapes from prison	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Absconds from open prison conditions – rate per 100,000 prisoner days	0.0%	0.0%	5.0%
Security Audit	9.6%	9.4%	3.6%
Measuring the Quality of Prison Life – decency	2.9%	2.8%	3.1%
Audit of Living Conditions	4.8%	5.2%	6.1%
Measuring the Quality of Prison Life – BME simplified	3.8%	3.8%	3.8%
HM Inspectorate of Prisons – Respect	5.9%	5.8%	6.1%
Hours worked by prisoners in industry	1.5%	1.5%	1.6%
HM Inspectorate of Prisons – Purposeful Activity	5.9%	5.8%	7.0%
Accredited programmes completions	3.2%	4.5%	0.0%
Accommodation on first night following release	0.8%	0.8%	0.9%
Employment at six weeks following release	0.8%	0.8%	0.9%
Release on Temporary Licence – successes	1.5%	1.5%	7.0%
HM Inspectorate of Prisons – Rehabilitation and Release Planning	5.9%	5.8%	7.0%
Incident Reporting System – Data Quality Audit	4.8%	4.7%	4.7%
Incident Reporting System – assaults checks	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Incident Reporting System – self-harm checks	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Data Integrity (Governance & Operational Audit)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Foreign National Offender Referrals	1.5%	1.5%	1.6%
Prison Operating within Budget	3.2%	3.1%	3.2%
Staff sickness absence	3.2%	3.1%	3.2%
Staff resignation rate	3.2%	3.1%	3.2%

The Male Closed weighting profile applies to Male Dispersal, Male Category B, Male Category C, Male Local, Male Closed Young Offender Institution, Male Young Offender Institution - Young People prisons.

The Women's weighting profile applies to Female Closed and Female Local prisons.

The Male Open weighting profile applies to Male Open and Female Open prisons.

Due to rounding, the individual measures in each distribution may not sum to exactly 100%.

Annex D – 2019/20 Prison Comparator Groups

Prison	Comparators							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Altcourse	Elmley	High Down	Bullington	Leeds	Thameside	Forest Bank	Preston	Durham
Ashfield	Verne	Stafford	Bure	Usk	Dartmoor	Whatton	Littlehey	Channings Wood
Askham Grange	East Sutton Park							
Aylesbury	Brinsford	Deerbolt	Feltham					
Bedford	Swansea	Winchester	Peterborough Male	Exeter	Leicester	Chelmsford	Bristol	Cardiff
Belmarsh	Woodhill	Manchester						
Berwyn	Humber	Ranby	Highpoint	Wayland	Wealstun	Stoke Heath	Stocken	Lindholme
Birmingham	Liverpool	Wormwood Scrubs	Pentonville	Hewell	Wandsworth	Lincoln	Preston	Lewes
Brinsford	Deerbolt	Feltham	Aylesbury					
Bristol	Norwich	Chelmsford	Lewes	Durham	Nottingham	Preston	Lincoln	Cardiff
Brixton	Northumberland	Holme House	Oakwood	Moorland	Lindholme	Stocken	Wayland	Wealstun
Bronzefield	New Hall	Styal	Eastwood Park	Peterborough Female	Foston Hall	Low Newton		
Buckley Hall	Featherstone	Lancaster Farms	Rochester	Coldingley	Onley	Guys Marsh	Haverigg	Huntercombe
Bullington	Leeds	Elmley	Altcourse	High Down	Thameside	Preston	Forest Bank	Lewes

Prison	Comparators							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Bure	Usk	Ashfield	Stafford	Verne	Dartmoor	Whatton	Littlehey	Channings Wood
Cardiff	Chelmsford	Nottingham	Durham	Bristol	Preston	Norwich	Lewes	Thameside
Channings Wood	Warren Hill	Maidstone	Huntercombe	Onley	Coldingley	Buckley Hall	Featherstone	Lancaster Farms
Chelmsford	Bristol	Nottingham	Norwich	Lewes	Durham	Cardiff	Preston	Lincoln
Coldingley	Buckley Hall	Featherstone	Lancaster Farms	Onley	Rochester	Guys Marsh	Haverigg	Huntercombe
Cookham Wood	Wetherby	Werrington						
Dartmoor	Channings Wood	Usk	Bure	Ashfield	Stafford	Verne	Warren Hill	Maidstone
Deerbolt	Brinsford	Feltham	Aylesbury					
Doncaster	Hull	Leeds	Bullington	Elmley	Altcourse	High Down	Thameside	Lincoln
Dovegate	Swaleside	Lowdham Grange	Gartree	Garth	Grendon	Isle of Wight		
Downview	Send	Drake Hall						
Drake Hall	Downview	Send						
Durham	Nottingham	Preston	Bristol	Norwich	Lewes	Chelmsford	Cardiff	Lincoln
East Sutton Park	Askham Grange							
Eastwood Park	Peterborough Female	Foston Hall	Low Newton	New Hall	Bronzefield	Styal		
Elmley	Altcourse	High Down	Bullington	Leeds	Thameside	Forest Bank	Preston	Durham

Prison	Comparators							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Erlestoke	Lindholme	Stocken	Wayland	Wealstun	Stoke Heath	Berwyn	Ranby	Humber
Exeter	Winchester	Leicester	Bedford	Swansea	Peterborough Male	Bristol	Norwich	Lewes
Featherstone	Buckley Hall	Lancaster Farms	Rochester	Coldingley	Onley	Guys Marsh	Haverigg	Huntercombe
Feltham – Young People	Cookham Wood	Werrington	Wetherby					
Feltham – Young Adults	Deerbolt	Brinsford	Aylesbury					
Ford	Kirkham	Hollesley Bay	Sudbury	Kirklevington Grange	Prescoed	Standford Hill	Hatfield	Spring Hill
Forest Bank	High Down	Thameside	Altcourse	Elmley	Bullington	Leeds	Nottingham	Durham
Foston Hall	Peterborough Female	Eastwood Park	Low Newton	New Hall	Bronzefield	Styal		
Frankland	Full Sutton	Long Lartin	Whitemoor	Wakefield				
Full Sutton	Frankland	Long Lartin	Whitemoor	Wakefield				
Garth	Grendon	Swaleside	Lowdham Grange	Gartree	Dovegate	Isle of Wight	Rye Hill	
Gartree	Lowdham Grange	Dovegate	Grendon	Garth	Swaleside			
Grendon	Garth	Swaleside	Gartree	Lowdham Grange	Dovegate	Rye Hill	Isle of Wight	
Guys Marsh	Haverigg	Featherstone	Lancaster Farms	Buckley Hall	Rochester	Coldingley	Onley	Huntercombe
Hatfield	Spring Hill	Standford Hill	Thorn Cross	Kirklevington Grange	Ford	Kirkham	Sudbury	Hollesley Bay
Haverigg	Guys Marsh	Lancaster Farms	Featherstone	Rochester	Buckley Hall	Coldingley	Onley	Huntercombe

Prison	Comparators							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Hewell	Wormwood Scrubs	Pentonville	Wandsworth	Liverpool	Birmingham	Thameside	High Down	Altcourse
High Down	Altcourse	Elmley	Bullington	Thameside	Leeds	Forest Bank	Durham	Nottingham
Highpoint	Ranby	Berwyn	Humber	Parc	Lindholme	Stocken	Wayland	Wealstun
Hindley	Isis	Portland	Swinfen Hall					
Hollesley Bay	Ford	Kirkham	Sudbury	Kirklevington Grange	Prescoed	Standford Hill	Hatfield	Spring Hill
Holme House	Parc	Oakwood	Ranby	Berwyn	Humber	Brixton	Northumberland	Highpoint
Hull	Doncaster	Leeds	Bullington	Elmley	Altcourse	High Down	Lincoln	Thameside
Humber	Berwyn	Ranby	Highpoint	Wealstun	Wayland	Stoke Heath	Stocken	Lindholme
Huntercombe	Maidstone	Onley	Coldingley	Warren Hill	Lancaster Farms	Rochester	Featherstone	Buckley Hall
Isis	Hindley	Portland	Swinfen Hall					
Isle of Wight	Rye Hill	Swaleside	Garth	Grendon	Dovegate			
Kirkham	Sudbury	Ford	Hollesley Bay	Kirklevington Grange	Prescoed	Standford Hill	Hatfield	Spring Hill
Kirklevington Grange	Hollesley Bay	Kirkham	Sudbury	Ford	Prescoed	Hatfield	Spring Hill	Standford Hill
Lancaster Farms	Rochester	Featherstone	Buckley Hall	Coldingley	Onley	Haverigg	Guys Marsh	Huntercombe
Leeds	Bullington	Elmley	Altcourse	High Down	Thameside	Preston	Lewes	Durham
Leicester	Exeter	Winchester	Bedford	Swansea	Peterborough Male	Norwich	Bristol	Lewes

Prison	Comparators							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Lewes	Norwich	Preston	Bristol	Lincoln	Durham	Chelmsford	Nottingham	Elmley
Leyhill	North Sea Camp	Prescoed	Ford	Hollesley Bay	Kirkham	Sudbury	Kirklevington Grange	Standford Hill
Lincoln	Lewes	Norwich	Preston	Bristol	Durham	Chelmsford	Nottingham	Leeds
Lindholme	Stocken	Wayland	Wealstun	Stoke Heath	Erlestoke	Berwyn	Ranby	Humber
Littlehey	Whatton	Wymott	Stafford	Bure	Ashfield	Verne	Moorland	Usk
Liverpool	Birmingham	Wormwood Scrubs	Pentonville	Hewell	Wandsworth	Norwich	Bristol	Lewes
Long Lartin	Whitemoor	Frankland	Full Sutton	Wakefield				
Low Newton	Foston Hall	Peterborough Female	Eastwood Park	New Hall	Bronze field	Styal		
Lowdham Grange	Gartree	Dovegate	Garth	Grandon	Swaleside			
Maidstone	Huntercombe	Warren Hill	Onley	Coldingley	Lancaster Farms	Featherstone	Rochester	Buckley Hall
Manchester	Belmarsh	Woodhill						
Moorland	Wymott	Northumberland	Brixton	Holme House	Oakwood	Parc	Ranby	Humber
Mount	Featherstone	Buckley Hall	Lancaster Farms	Rochester	Coldingley	Onley	Guys Marsh	Haverigg
New Hall	Bronze field	Styal	Eastwood Park	Peterborough Female	Foston Hall	Low Newton		
North Sea Camp	Leyhill	Prescoed	Ford	Hollesley Bay	Kirkham	Sudbury	Kirklevington Grange	Standford Hill
Northumberland	Oakwood	Parc	Moorland	Brixton	Holme House	Highpoint	Wymott	Ranby

Prison	Comparators							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Norwich	Lewes	Bristol	Preston	Durham	Lincoln	Chelmsford	Nottingham	Altcourse
Nottingham	Durham	Bristol	Chelmsford	Preston	Norwich	Cardiff	Lewes	High Down
Oakwood	Northumberland	Parc	Holme House	Highpoint	Brixton	Moorland	Ranby	Berwyn
Onley	Coldingley	Lancaster Farms	Featherstone	Rochester	Buckley Hall	Haverigg	Guys Marsh	Huntercombe
Parc	Oakwood	Holme House	Northumberland	Highpoint	Ranby	Berwyn	Humber	Brixton
Pentonville	Wormwood Scrubs	Hewell	Wandsworth	Liverpool	Birmingham	Thameside	High Down	Altcourse
Peterborough Female	Foston Hall	Eastwood Park	Low Newton	New Hall	Bronzefield	Styal		
Peterborough Male	Bedford	Swansea	Winchester	Exeter	Leicester	Cardiff	Nottingham	Chelmsford
Portland	Swinfen Hall	Hindley	Isis					
Prescoed	Kirklevington Grange	Hollesley Bay	Ford	Kirkham	Sudbury	Hatfield	Spring Hill	Standford Hill
Preston	Durham	Lewes	Norwich	Nottingham	Lincoln	Bristol	Chelmsford	Bullingdon
Ranby	Humber	Berwyn	Highpoint	Stoke Heath	Wealstun	Wayland	Stocken	Lindholme
Risley	Holme House	Parc	Oakwood	Ranby	Humber	Berwyn	Brixton	Northumberland
Rochester	Lancaster Farms	Featherstone	Buckley Hall	Coldingley	Onley	Haverigg	Guys Marsh	Huntercombe
Rye Hill	Isle of Wight	Garth	Grendon	Swaleside				
Send	Downview	Drake Hall						

Prison	Comparators							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Spring Hill	Hatfield	Standford Hill	Thorn Cross	Kirklevington Grange	Ford	Kirkham	Sudbury	Hollesley Bay
Stafford	Ashfield	Verne	Bure	Usk	Dartmoor	Whatton	Littlehey	Channings Wood
Standford Hill	Spring Hill	Hatfield	Thorn Cross	Ford	Hollesley Bay	Kirkham	Sudbury	Kirklevington Grange
Stocken	Wayland	Wealstun	Stoke Heath	Lindholme	Erlestoke	Berwyn	Ranby	Humber
Stoke Heath	Wealstun	Wayland	Stocken	Lindholme	Erlestoke	Humber	Ranby	Berwyn
Styal	Bronzefield	New Hall	Eastwood Park	Peterborough Female	Foston Hall	Low Newton		
Sudbury	Kirkham	Hollesley Bay	Ford	Kirklevington Grange	Prescoed	Standford Hill	Hatfield	Spring Hill
Swaleside	Dovegate	Garth	Grendon	Lowdham Grange	Gartree	Isle of Wight	Rye Hill	
Swansea	Bedford	Peterborough Male	Winchester	Exeter	Leicester	Cardiff	Chelmsford	Bristol
Swinfen Hall	Portland	Isis	Hindley					
Thameside	High Down	Altcourse	Elmley	Bullington	Forest Bank	Leeds	Nottingham	Chelmsford
Thorn Cross	Spring Hill	Hatfield	Standford Hill	Kirklevington Grange	Ford	Kirkham	Hollesley Bay	Sudbury
Usk	Bure	Ashfield	Stafford	Verne	Dartmoor	Whatton	Littlehey	Channings Wood
Wakefield	Full Sutton	Frankland	Long Lartin	Whitemoor				
Wandsworth	Pentonville	Wormwood Scrubs	Hewell	Liverpool	Forest Bank	Birmingham	Thameside	High Down
Warren Hill	Maidstone	Huntercombe	Guys Marsh	Haverigg	Onley	Coldingley	Buckley Hall	Featherstone

Prison	Comparators							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Wayland	Wealstun	Stoke Heath	Stocken	Lindholme	Erlestoke	Humber	Berwyn	Ranby
Wealstun	Wayland	Stoke Heath	Stocken	Lindholme	Erlestoke	Humber	Berwyn	Ranby
Werrington	Cookham Wood	Wetherby						
Wetherby	Cookham Wood	Werrington						
Whatton	Littlehey	Usk	Bure	Wymott	Stafford	Ashfield	Verne	Moorland
Whitemoor	Long Lartin	Frankland	Full Sutton	Wakefield				
Winchester	Exeter	Leicester	Bedford	Swansea	Peterborough Male	Bristol	Chelmsford	Norwich
Woodhill	Belmarsh	Manchester						
Wormwood Scrubs	Pentonville	Hewell	Wandsworth	Liverpool	Birmingham	Thameside	High Down	Altcourse
Wymott	Moorland	Northumberland	Brixton	Holme House	Oakwood	Parc	Littlehey	Whatton