



Debriefing paper for the inspection of

HMP Wandsworth

by HM Inspectorate of Prisons

22nd April to 2nd May 2024

This paper represents the material presented at the full inspection debrief by HM Inspectorate of Prisons. The material and assessments are indicative only and may be changed at the discretion of the Chief Inspector after due reflection during the report production process or on the discovery of additional evidence. Inspected bodies will be offered the opportunity to correct factual inaccuracies as part of the publication process.

Contents

Healthy prison assessments.....	3
1. Leadership.....	4
2. Safety	6
3. Respect.....	10
4. Purposeful activity.....	14
5. Preparation for release	18

Healthy prison assessments

Outcomes for prisoners are good against this healthy prison test.

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

Outcomes for prisoners are reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

There is evidence of adverse outcomes for prisoners in only a small number of areas. For the majority there are no significant concerns. Procedures to safeguard outcomes are in place.

Outcomes for prisoners are not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.

There is evidence that outcomes for prisoners are being adversely affected in many areas or particularly in those areas of greatest importance to the well-being of prisoners. Problems/concerns, if left unattended, are likely to become areas of serious concern.

Outcomes for prisoners are poor against this healthy prison test.

There is evidence that the outcomes for prisoners are seriously affected by current practice. There is a failure to ensure even adequate treatment of and/or conditions for prisoners. Immediate remedial action is required.

1. Leadership

Our judgements about leadership take a narrative form and do not result in a score.

- The pace of change and improvement since the last inspection had been slow. A high-profile escape from the prison in September 2023 had understandably brought an intense level of scrutiny from ministers and HMPPS leaders. We were told that this had consumed most of the governor's time and focus and was the reason why progress had stalled in many key areas.
- Inexperience and inconsistency characterised much of the culture at Wandsworth. The vast range of issues that needed to improve spanned every healthy prison test, and most staff and prisoners lacked any optimism that change was possible. Inexperience across every grade of operational staff was crippling their ability to bring about much needed change. Most leaders were temporarily promoted, and new staff were learning from inexperienced frontline managers. The working culture was not supportive and there was little team ethos across functions which severely hindered progress.
- Relationships between staff and prisoners were distant and ineffective. Leaders had not set high standards of behaviour on residential units or provided any meaningful rewards to motivate prisoners to behave and engage; this led to a cycle of disruptive behaviour, violence, self-harm and drug misuse.
- Living conditions were poor. Although cleanliness had improved to a small extent and there were fewer vermin, the prison was still dirty and there was much to do to improve the living and working environment. The fabric of the buildings and facilities including showers and heating still needed significant investment to bring them up to a decent standard.
- There was no purposeful regime, and prisoners had no idea when or if they would be unlocked each day. Basic procedures to maintain order and control were not in place, staff could not account for their prisoners and life on residential units was chaotic and confusing for staff and prisoners alike.
- Despite a full complement of officers, over a third were not available to deploy to operational duties each day which led to curtailed regimes, cross-deployment and burnt-out staff. National leaders had commissioned a deep dive into the reasons for poor retention, which highlighted a lack of visible leadership and poor culture, which we also observed during the inspection. HMPPS had invested almost £900,000 in additional resources in safety and security, but this had so far had little impact on safety.
- Many well-meaning and hard-working leaders and partners persevered, trying to unpick and address the myriad of problems within their functions; their resilience was impressive, but they were often fighting against a tide of cross-cutting, intractable issues that needed wider comprehensive solutions.
- There were pockets of good work and some emerging plans that had the potential to have impact if HMPPS could create some stability in leadership roles. Local leaders had recently started an academy to develop front line

This paper represents the material presented at the full inspection debrief by HM Inspectorate of Prisons. The material and assessments are indicative only and may be changed at the discretion of the Chief Inspector after due reflection during the report production process or on the discovery of additional evidence. Inspected bodies will be offered the opportunity to correct factual inaccuracies as part of the publication process.

leaders and invested in additional new colleague mentors. Staff were not wilfully neglectful or unkind; they simply didn't understand their role or what good looks like; they lacked direction, training and consistent support from leaders at all levels; the net effect of this meant prisoners were neglected.

- Poor outcomes at Wandsworth stemmed from poor leadership at every level of the prison and from HMPPS and the Ministry of Justice leading to years of systemic and cultural failures that have been allowed to continue. While this remained the case, the risk of a further catastrophe, a self-inflicted death or escape from lawful custody, was ever present.

DRAFT

2. Safety

Outcomes for prisoners against this healthy prison test were poor.

Early days in custody

- Throughput at the prison was significant, for example the prison received on average 130 new prisoners a week. Reception processes were inefficient, and most prisoners spent around four or five hours, sometimes longer, before they could move to the induction unit (E wing).
- Prisoners only received one set of clothing, including underwear, to last them until the next clothing exchange day which in some cases could be a week later.
- In our survey only 23% said their cell was clean on the first night. Most first night cells were dirty, heavily graffitied and contained broken furniture.
- During the inspection, prisoners on E wing had gone without showers for five days because there was no hot water – leaders were not aware of this.
- Induction had been recently improved, and the video contained helpful information in an engaging format but had not been translated into languages that could be understood by over half the prisoners at Wandsworth who were foreign nationals.
- Prisoners waited for several weeks to have their PIN numbers added to the system which meant they could not keep in touch with their family and friends.

Promoting positive behavior

- A third of prisoners who responded to our survey said that they felt unsafe at the time of inspection. 69% said they had felt unsafe at some point. This was significantly worse than we find in similar prisons.
- Overall rates of violence including serious assaults had increased since the last inspection and were higher than most similar prisons. Recorded violence against staff, over the 12 months prior to the inspection, was the fourth highest of all adult male prisons. However, we acknowledged that overall rates of violence had reduced in the last 12 months.
- Leaders were sighted on these concerns and had identified the reduction of violence as a key priority. This included the introduction of a “Violence and Conflict Resolution Strategy” which showed promise.
- The response to violence included the use of CSIP (challenge support and intervention plans) but the process took too long and too many plans to address and change behaviour were limited in scope and lacked creativity. However, we saw some very good support from some individual custodial managers.
- There was no cohesive vision about how to motivate good behaviour. Leaders had not set and enforced high standards of behaviour and there were no meaningful rewards to motivate good behaviour. A lack of

purposeful activity, poor living conditions, and distant relationships with staff left prisoners demotivated and despondent.

- Local data evidenced that each month, around a quarter of disciplinary hearings were not proceeded with, including acts of serious violence, often due to delays in the process. This inevitably weakened the impact of adjudications as a deterrent to poor behaviour.

Segregation

- The communal areas on the unit were clean, but despite some refurbishment, many cells were in poor condition. The yards remained austere, bare and dirty.
- The regime was limited. Prisoners received just 30 minutes out of cell to exercise and use the phone, shower, and kiosk. During the inspection we identified some cases of staff restricting prisoners' access to the regime without appropriate authority, which was unacceptable.
- Except for some of the most complex cases, most prisoner stays in the segregation unit were short. Reintegration plans were communicated well to prisoners and in many cases supported a return to the main residential wings.

Use of force

- The use of force had increased since the last inspection and the rate was amongst the highest when compared to similar prisons.
- Relevant data was reviewed at the monthly use of force meeting. Non-compliance had been identified as the most frequent reason for staff to use force, but leaders had not analysed the data further to understand the reasons for non-compliance to inform actions to reduce it.
- There was a very small backlog of outstanding use of force paperwork, the quality of records we reviewed varied, some staff had recorded very little which did not provide an accurate reflection of their actions.
- Most incidents were captured on body-worn camera and most incidents we reviewed were managed well.
- Senior leaders reviewed high-level incidents including the use of batons and PAVA on a weekly basis, but their failure to review all incidents meant that some concerns about the use of force had not been identified and acted upon.

Security

- The findings from an independent investigation into a high-profile escape from Wandsworth in September 2023 were yet to be made public due to ongoing criminal proceedings.
- Scrutiny following the escape had led to over a hundred actions for the prison, but progress to address them had been very slow.
- Prior to the escape, security procedures had been neglected for a considerable time. For example, key elements of the prison local security

This paper represents the material presented at the full inspection debrief by HM Inspectorate of Prisons. The material and assessments are indicative only and may be changed at the discretion of the Chief Inspector after due reflection during the report production process or on the discovery of additional evidence. Inspected bodies will be offered the opportunity to correct factual inaccuracies as part of the publication process.

strategy (LSS) had not been fully reviewed for over 10 years and an action plan from a previous escape in 2019 had not been adequately implemented or reviewed.

- There were significant weaknesses in many aspects of procedural and dynamic security which impacted on outcomes for prisoners. This was reflected in a recent HMPPS security audit which was graded as unsatisfactory.
- Staff were inexperienced and lacked confidence in the application of basic tasks such as maintaining a running roll (headcount) of prisoners on their residential units. Leaders had not provided adequate training or oversight to rectify this.
- There had been five security managers in the 18 months before the inspection. Following the escape, senior leaders from the Long Term High Secure Estate (LTHSE) had provided support to the security team to develop strategies to improve procedures and build experience. However, these strategies were yet to be agreed and implemented by local senior leaders.
- There had been recent improvements to the management of security intelligence, but security objectives were not adequately communicated to staff.
- There was evidence of good partnership work with the police and community to address threats to security.
- In our survey over half (51%) of prisoners said it was easy to get illicit drugs.
- The prison's strategy to reduce the supply of and demand for drugs was failing.
- The supply of illicit items had been identified as the highest level of security risk (critical) by the prison. Despite this, leaders had suspended drug testing between August 2023 and January 2024. Inspectors found evidence of widespread drug misuse throughout the inspection.

Safeguarding

- There had been 10 self-inflicted deaths since the last inspection, seven of which had occurred in the last 12 months.
- An action plan to learn from the self-inflicted deaths was in place and had been reviewed, but not all actions were up to date.
- The rate of self-harm was high and was rising, although it was slightly lower than in comparable prisons.
- During the inspection we found many prisoners who were clearly in distress without an appropriate level of support.
- The monthly safety meeting reviewed appropriate data. The meeting was poorly attended by significant senior leaders despite safety being identified as a key priority. Therefore, there was an insufficient drive to implement the actions identified to improve safety and reduce self-harm.
- There were weaknesses in the ACCT (Assessment, Care in Custody and Teamwork) case management process. Reviews did not always identify appropriate risks and care maps were often blank or contained limited

information to help staff support prisoners. Reviews were sometimes missed or completed in wing offices which lacked privacy.

- In our survey, only 37% of those who had been supported using the ACCT process said they had felt cared for. Many prisoners we spoke to said ACCT reviews were perfunctory and rarely helped them to deal with their problems.
- Many prisoners being supported through ACCT process told us that a lack of contact with family was the key driver for their low mood. This was exacerbated by extensive waiting times for telephone PIN numbers and initial visiting orders.

DRAFT

3. Respect

Outcomes for prisoners against this healthy prison test were poor.

Staff-prisoner relationships

- In our survey only 41% of prisoners said that staff treated them with respect, significantly lower than in comparable prisons.
- We found staff and prisoner relationships to be distant and ineffective. While we saw some staff trying to engage positively with prisoners, many interactions were abrupt and there was little rapport evident. Prisoners frequently told us that they struggled to have their basic requests dealt with by staff.
- Poor time out of cell, staff absences and no key work reduced the opportunity to develop more meaningful relationships on wings.
- Whilst some staff tried to challenge low level bad behaviour, others ignored it, and officers were often left to manage some challenging situations without the support of effective and visible frontline leaders.
- The prison had a range of peer workers supporting different prison functions, but their supervision and impact was inconsistent. While some peer workers were active and well supported, other roles were not promoted or understood by staff which meant peer workers were not unlocked to perform their roles.

Daily life (living conditions)

- Overall living conditions were poor. Levels of overcrowding were high, with 80% of prisoners sharing cells designed for one.
- The prison was dirty. Many showers were in poor condition across the prison, and some should have been decommissioned. There were frequent issues with heating and hot water.
- Numerous cells had damaged furniture, flooring, windows or sinks. Many observation panels were blocked or smashed.
- Vermin remained a problem in the prison. Recent intensive work with an outside provider had seen some improvement, but prisoners told us that rodents were still seen frequently, and we found evidence of rat droppings across residential units.
- Cell bell response times were poor, with around 40% going unanswered for more than 5 minutes. Prisoners told us that they frequently waited for long periods for answers, and numerous cell bells could be seen active on wings. Cell bell response times were regularly monitored, but this had not led to improvements.
- The introduction of a decency lead and officer was a positive development which had helped to identify issues and log missing or damaged items. Senior managers also conducted regular cell checks. However, issues persisted because wing staff and managers did not ensure that standards were maintained every day.

This paper represents the material presented at the full inspection debrief by HM Inspectorate of Prisons. The material and assessments are indicative only and may be changed at the discretion of the Chief Inspector after due reflection during the report production process or on the discovery of additional evidence. Inspected bodies will be offered the opportunity to correct factual inaccuracies as part of the publication process.

Residential services (catering and shop)

- In our survey 24% of prisoners said that the food was very or quite good, against 38% in comparable prisons. Prisoners frequently told us that portions were too small, and it was our judgement that some lunch packs appeared meagre. The daily hot meal was more substantial and of better quality.
- Prisoners were not allowed to collect their own lunch meal which was disrespectful.
- Other than on the incentivised substance free living (ISFL) unit there were no toasters or microwaves to enable prisoners to prepare their own food. Almost all prisoners had to eat their meals in cramped cells next to their toilets.
- There was little prisoner consultation on food.
- The kitchen was now well ordered, but serveries on wings were not being supervised effectively. Basic food and hygiene practices were not enforced, and some hot plates were not working. While some serveries were reasonably clean, we found others that had rodent droppings.
- We had significant concerns about the management of the canteen service. Prisoners' orders were delivered weekly, but prisoners frequently reported missing items and then had to wait for weeks or months for refunds to be processed. Canteen issues were one of the most common sources of complaint over the past year and yet there was no data collection or monitoring around refunds for missing items.

Prisoner consultation, applications and redress

- Prisoner council meetings continued to take place monthly, and recordings of the meetings were broadcast on prison radio. Despite this, too few prisoners were aware of the consultation arrangements or of any changes that had taken place as a result.
- Prisoners were more negative about the applications system than in similar prisons and at the 2021 inspection. Monitoring data from the kiosks showed that most applications were responded to on time. However, it was clear that this did not reflect prisoners' experience as in many cases their issues had not been resolved.
- Prisoner complaints were poorly managed. Many responses were delayed, there was no quality assurance or monitoring of trends. The quality of investigation and responses was variable although most were at least adequate. Prisoners had little confidence in the system, although focussed effort had led to recent improvement to timeliness at the start of the process.
- There was good access to private legal visit facilities as well as a number of video conferencing suites. There was no longer a bail information officer to support the high number of remand prisoners.
- Prisoners also reported many cases of legal mail being opened and delays in receiving important time critical information from their legal representatives.

Fair treatment and inclusion

- Equalities work had not been sufficiently prioritised and support for prisoners with protected characteristics was underdeveloped. Forums to understand prisoners' experiences rarely took place, although more emphasis had been put on them recently it was too early to see the impact of this.
- Prisoner involvement in the monthly equalities meeting was positive but the meeting was not being used to drive improvement. Actions were not completed promptly; for example, actions to address the overuse of the basic incentives level with young, black and Muslim prisoners had not been carried out nearly a year after it was identified.
- Managers used data in some areas to identify disproportionate outcomes but did not then investigate this further.
- Around half the population were foreign nationals and services had not been designed with this in mind, for example ESOL provision in education was limited to 36 places. Interpretation and translated materials were not routinely used when they needed to be. Prisoners did not have the opportunity to meet the rest of their national group for mutual support; leaders had plans with PACT to address this.
- The recently introduced foreign nationals' strategy had a realistic action plan to address some of the identified shortcomings.
- The onsite immigration team was understaffed and could not offer wing surgeries.
- Identification of prisoners with disabilities was poor; leaders were aware of this and had started to address it. For those who had identified needs, provision included a small number of adapted cells, personal emergency evacuation plans, neurodivergent passports, support from equalities reps and, if required, social care support.
- DIRFs (Discrimination Incident Reporting Form) were subject to delay. Investigations evidenced involvement of the prisoner who raised the form, but some lacked sufficient enquiry.

Faith and religion

- The chaplaincy team was well integrated into prison life and provided valued support to prisoners.

Health, well-being and social care

- Overall, we found a stable, well-led healthcare team underpinned by good clinical governance who possessed a sound grasp of their service risks. However, consistent failures to enable provision due to prison staff absences resulted in important assessment and treatment interventions being curtailed. Clinic DNA (did not attend) rates were high at around 24%.
- Access for most clinical activity was reasonable, except for GP and optician clinics where prisoners experienced longer waits for routine appointments.
- Medicine administration was poorly supervised by officers and far too frequently patients missed critical treatments due to regime limitations.

This paper represents the material presented at the full inspection debrief by HM Inspectorate of Prisons. The material and assessments are indicative only and may be changed at the discretion of the Chief Inspector after due reflection during the report production process or on the discovery of additional evidence. Inspected bodies will be offered the opportunity to correct factual inaccuracies as part of the publication process.

- The physical environment of both inpatient facilities remained poor and still included accessible ligature points.
- Most prison staff were knowledgeable and supportive of patients' needs, with clinicians providing regular therapeutic activity, though this was subject to the same regime pressures faced elsewhere.
- Social care assessments took too long, and prisoners were not necessarily aware of how to access services. Some patients in receipt of a care package did not always receive personal care in line with their care plan but most support was fully appropriate.
- The dental service offered a full range of NHS treatment and waits for routine care were reasonable.
- Mental health services provided an appropriate range of therapeutic interventions. Significant numbers of prisoners required a Mental Health Act assessment and though there were delays in hospital transfers, the process was well managed, and risks escalated appropriately.
- Demand for clinical and psychosocial recovery services for prisoners with addictions was significant. Nevertheless, the support provided was generally good but accessing clients was a daily challenge with up to 30% not available for therapy due to the regime pressures.

4. Purposeful activity

Outcomes for prisoners against this healthy prison test were poor.

Time out of cell

- Time out of cell was poor.
- In our survey, 74% of prisoners told us that they spent less than 2 hours out of their cells on weekdays which was even worse than the poor 56% in comparable prisons. Only 51% of prisoners knew what the scheduled unlock and lock-up times were, and just 18% said that these times were normally kept to.
- We were unable to reach a reliable figure when conducting our routine roll checks during the inspection, although the evidence would suggest that around 80% of prisoners were locked up. Staff across most units were unable to confirm how many prisoners were on their wings, how many were locked up, working on the wing or off the wing in an activity or appointment. There was no reliable roll that could assure leaders that all prisoners were accounted for. Given the recent escape, it was unfathomable that leaders had not focussed their attention on this area until staff understood and were competent in managing this basic task.
- Slippages and curtailments in the daily routine were common due to delays in roll checks and staffing absences.
- At least two-thirds of prisoners were unemployed, and typically received less than two hours out of their cells each day. Full-time workers could be unlocked for 7.5 hours a day and part-time workers would typically receive around 4.5 hours per day unlocked provided they received their full regime.
- Inconsistencies in the daily regime frequently meant that prisoners received less than their scheduled two hours unlocked. Prisoners told us that they were often unable to shower, complete domestics or have association in the time available to them. Outside exercise was often cancelled.
- There were few recreational activities available on wings.

Library and PE

- The library was a large, well-ordered and welcoming space, but prisoners were rarely able to visit it.
- Available data indicated that footfall was low. In the last three months, just 10 out of 108 planned sessions had taken place due to a lack of staff to supervise prisoners.
- The library had a reasonable selection of English language books, but the provision of foreign language texts was too limited given the large population of foreign national prisoners.
- The prison had three gymnasiums and an astroturf pitch which had capacity for around 290 prisoners each day. Equipment was mostly in reasonable condition, though some showed signs of wear.

This paper represents the material presented at the full inspection debrief by HM Inspectorate of Prisons. The material and assessments are indicative only and may be changed at the discretion of the Chief Inspector after due reflection during the report production process or on the discovery of additional evidence. Inspected bodies will be offered the opportunity to correct factual inaccuracies as part of the publication process.

- The gym timetable restricted the majority of prisoners to a single session a week, even for prisoners on the enhanced level of the incentive scheme. Around 850 prisoners attended each week, although the most recent analysis we saw indicated that only 17% of prisoners were using the gym.
- A minority of prisoners could access additional sessions (including a remedial session and CrossFit sessions). There was an inconsistent range of sessions in the evenings and at weekends.
- The gym offered First Aid training and was due to commence accredited gym instructor courses.

Education, skills and work activity

- Prison leaders recognised that the education skills and work (ESW) provision was poor and were working hard to improve it. However, as most improvement actions were either very recent or yet to start, the impact of these actions so far was slight.
- Challenges for leaders included a very substantial lack of activity spaces compared to the total population and under-utilisation of the spaces that were available. Waiting lists were high. A very large proportion of prisoners were unemployed. Prisoners had very low awareness of, and consequently low participation in, ESW. Too many prisoners elected not to attend education induction sessions.
- Historically and currently, too few prisoners who were allocated to Education sessions attended them. Delays in moving men from the wings to activities meant that ESW sessions started late and learning time was much reduced. The curricula offered were not sufficiently ambitious or relevant for the majority of prisoners.
- There was far too little provision for foreign nationals with ESOL needs, who made up around half the total prison population, or for the small number of vulnerable prisoners. Wing staff were not all advocates for ESW, and too many were not encouraging prisoners into purposeful activity during the core day. The pay prisoners received for education sessions did not provide sufficient incentive for prisoners to sign up for academic courses.
- Leaders had firm plans to switch some of the provision in industries from full to part-time within a few weeks with a modest increase in activity places. The construction multi-skills course had closed and a small number of new courses were being introduced. The number of qualifications available in industries was about to rise with the imminent launch of a textiles course. More qualifications were planned, but they were not yet in place. Only a very small minority of prisoners were following Open University or distance learning courses.
- Leaders were focusing on engaging what they identified as priority groups for ESW engagement, but this strategy was at an early stage of implementation. Leaders recognised that the training needs analysis (TNA) produced in Autumn last year had rapidly become out of date and was of little value for future curriculum planning. A new TNA was being developed which was in its infancy.
- Leaders' most recent evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of the provision focused too much on aspirations. However, the many weaknesses reported were honestly and correctly identified, and far outweighed the

This paper represents the material presented at the full inspection debrief by HM Inspectorate of Prisons. The material and assessments are indicative only and may be changed at the discretion of the Chief Inspector after due reflection during the report production process or on the discovery of additional evidence. Inspected bodies will be offered the opportunity to correct factual inaccuracies as part of the publication process.

strengths. Leaders' quality improvement plans were being used as an effective agenda for change and improvement, but their content was not widely known by all managers.

- The prison's quality improvement group (QIG) met regularly but had had a low profile. The involvement of senior managers in, and a higher profile for, the QIG were planned but not yet in place.
- The reading strategy had not been implemented well enough. Reading was encouraged during the core working day and reading-related events were popular. However, the 19 trained Shannon Trust mentors based on the wings were not being unlocked at times best suited for learning sessions. Consequently, almost all of the 60 or so prisoners signed up to learn English had no or extremely few learning sessions with mentors. As a result, these men could not use on their own any service in the prison which involved reading or the use of English.
- Leaders had developed productive partnerships with external and specialist organisations such as Standout, Shannon Trust and Catch-22. They provided useful support services specific to prisoners' needs, not least foreign nationals. Far too many prisoners did not have timely or sufficient information, advice and guidance during their education induction to identify their starting points and support needs. Consequently, they did not have a personal learning plan. Prisoners needing support for SEND and additional support, once identified, received useful help to make progress in ESW activities.
- Leaders and managers arranged enrichment activities such as guest speakers, arts, yoga and chess sessions but too many men were not aware of them. Leaders did not ensure prisoners developed their understanding of the dangers and risks relating to radicalisation and extremism. Staff did not promote the benefits of healthy lifestyles consistently well. Prisoners' understanding of community values and how they applied to their own and others' lives was patchy.
- Leaders were changing the curricula to reflect the short time that most prisoners now spent at the prison by introducing shorter courses such as speaking and listening, reading and writing. Instructors in industries structured learning well to develop prisoners' technical skills, knowledge and understanding over time, alongside employability skills such as teamwork, following instructions and developing vocational skills. Consequently, prisoners could develop skills valued by industry.
- Managers in the education department accurately identified areas for improvement around teaching and had arranged relevant training. Instructors in industries were appropriately qualified and experienced for their roles, but few had teaching qualifications.
- In industries, prisoners behaved well, which promoted a calm and purposeful working and learning environment. They worked effectively with others. Most learners in industries enjoyed their learning. Prisoners in classrooms and workshops felt safe.
- A small staff team provided useful support for the small minority of prisoners close to release, for example to create CVs and disclosure statements. The team had developed some productive partnerships for referrals with a range of employers such as Price Waterhouse Cooper (PWC), Salvation Army and St Mungo's.

This paper represents the material presented at the full inspection debrief by HM Inspectorate of Prisons. The material and assessments are indicative only and may be changed at the discretion of the Chief Inspector after due reflection during the report production process or on the discovery of additional evidence. Inspected bodies will be offered the opportunity to correct factual inaccuracies as part of the publication process.

- Prisoners' achievements on education courses had mostly improved since the previous year and were high on many of them. Most prisoners on catering, dry lining, food safety, CSCS card, biohazard and Railtrack courses achieved the related qualifications.

DRAFT

5. Preparation for release

Outcomes for prisoners against this healthy prison test were not sufficiently good.

Children and families and contact with the outside world

- In-cell telephones and regular visiting sessions enabled prisoners to maintain good contact with their families. However, when prisoners first arrived in the prison, there were extensive delays in processes to approve phone numbers and visitors which delayed contact at a critical time.
- In our survey, only 15% of prisoners said their visits started or finished on time, and during our inspection we saw evidence to support this view.
- The walkway to the visits hall was filled with child-friendly murals which softened the environment, but the play area for younger children had been out of use for a lengthy period.
- The refreshments available to visitors were limited to cold drinks and unhealthy snacks.
- Prison Advice and Care Trust (PACT) provided a compassionate family service. This included good support and information for visitors, as well as aiding prisoners to re-establish contact with their children. To supplement this support, a solicitor held a monthly legal clinic free of charge to support prisoners' families.
- A good range of family days were held throughout the year with credible plans to provide events for prisoners who did not receive any visits.

Reducing reoffending

- The nature of the population at Wandsworth meant that staff were dealing with a significant turnover of prisoners and some complex cases.
- Leaders had conducted a needs analysis and devised a strategy to reduce reoffending. However, this did not seek to meet the needs of remanded or foreign national prisoners, both of whom formed the majority of prisoners at Wandsworth.
- The core function of assessing and planning for newly sentenced prisoners was achieved but there were often delays in the security categorisation process.
- Significant staffing shortages in the OMU had impacted on stability, and this was further compounded by changes in the management team.
- POM contact was dictated by key points in a prisoner's sentence such as parole hearings, OASys reviews or recategorisation. However, many of the prisoners we met could not name their POM and few described regular contact.
- Good effort was made to assess prisoners' level of risk and generate sentence plans. Backlogs for these were minimal. Of the twenty cases we examined in detail, most had an OASys assessment less than a year old. All but two had a sentence plan and these were generally accurate in terms of identifying the main targets within the plan.

This paper represents the material presented at the full inspection debrief by HM Inspectorate of Prisons. The material and assessments are indicative only and may be changed at the discretion of the Chief Inspector after due reflection during the report production process or on the discovery of additional evidence. Inspected bodies will be offered the opportunity to correct factual inaccuracies as part of the publication process.

- Progress against sentence plan targets was variable. Targets related to offending behaviour work were rarely achieved but those related to ESW; drug use; mental health and custodial behaviour were reasonably well achieved in most cases. We saw very few examples of POMs undertaking 1:1 work with prisoners.
- Key working was virtually non-existent and failed to support offender management.
- Most of the prisoners we spoke to were very negative about Wandsworth in terms of it offering a positive rehabilitative environment. In our survey, only 35% said their experience at Wandsworth made them less likely to reoffend in the future, a finding that was significantly worse than in similar prisons.

Public protection

- Public protection arrangements were weak. Only four prisoners had been identified as requiring phone and mail monitoring, and even this was not taking place consistently. On occasions where calls were monitored, intelligence obtained was not acted upon or shared with the relevant agencies.
- We were told that inter departmental risk management (IDRM) meetings were multi-disciplinary and held monthly, but there were no helpful records of such meetings, and it was hard to follow work done to prepare high risk prisoners for release. An action-tracker was completed but was not consistently followed up.
- MAPPA levels were generally confirmed prior to release, but the quality of written contributions for MAPPA meetings were inconsistent. POMs attended MAPPA meetings for the level 2 and 3 cases.

Interventions and support

- More than half the population were remanded to custody or unsentenced but there was no provision to support the needs of this group. A purposeful remand support team had been trialled for over a year, generating good outcomes, but this was disbanded in March 2024 due to a lack of funding.
- Despite some efforts to fill voids from the removal of this team, there remained significant gaps for the remand population, such as help with accommodation, finance, benefit and debt support.
- A small range of programmes were delivered to support the needs of the remainder of the population and the psychology team delivered some 1:1 work.

Returning to the community

- On average 260 prisoners were released from Wandsworth each month. A small pre-release team consisting of only two people managed this cohort with support from some external agencies such as NACRO Through the Gate justice services and St Mungos housing support.
- Only 11% of the prisoners leaving Wandsworth in the last 12 months were released into settled and sustainable accommodation.

- Very basic practical arrangements for the day of release were in place but prisoners were often delayed on the day of departure. Vulnerable prisoners were not always supported when leaving the prison to either reach their allocated accommodation or probation appointment.

DRAFT