

## Prison Service Performance Rating System

### Quarter 2 - 2006/07

All prisons are rated on a 1 to 4 performance scale. Level 4 is awarded to excellent establishments that are delivering exceptionally high performance. Level 1 indicates a poor performer. The Director of Operations makes the assessment for public prisons, in consultation with Prison Service Directors and Area Managers. Helen Edwards, as Commissioner for Correctional Services has responsibility for the performance of contracted sector establishments and she makes an assessment of contracted establishments on the same basis. The ratings are reviewed quarterly.

The performance rating of each public prison will be used in part to inform which of the three strands of the Benchmarking improvement programme that prison will follow. All public sector prisons will be benchmarked over the next seven years.

The rating is a professional judgement based upon:

- Cost performance and output data from the Weighted Scorecard, showing performance against key performance targets;
- Compliance with Prison Service Standards;
- Findings from external inspections by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons and Independent Monitoring Boards; and,
- The views of Prison Service Area Managers and the Prison Service Management Board, allowing for assessment of more subjective factors such as decency and the prison's commitment to delivering change.

<u>Performance Level</u>	<u>Criteria</u>
4	Exceptionally high performing, consistently meeting or exceeding targets, no significant operating problems, achieving significantly more than similar establishments with similar resources
3	Meeting the majority of targets, experiencing no significant problems in doing so, delivering a reasonable and decent regime
2	Basically stable, secure and providing a limited but decent regime; experiencing significant problems in meeting targets and / or experiencing major operational problems
1	Failing to provide secure, ordered, or decent regimes and / or has significant shortfalls against the majority of key targets.

Where an establishment has a low rating based on poor performance on a range of performance factors, this does not necessarily mean that a prison is unsafe, does not deliver some very good services or that the staff are not working hard in often difficult circumstances. It does mean that performance must be improved in a number of key areas.

## Prison Service Performance Rating System

<b>Alphabetical List of Prison Establishments</b> <b>Quarter 2 - 2006/07</b>		
Establishment	Rating	Trend
Acklington	2	↓
Albany	3	↔
Altcourse (CP) <small>HIGH PERFORMING prison</small>	4	↔
Ashfield (CP)	3	↔
Ashwell	3	↔
Askham Grange	4	↔
Aylesbury	3	↔
Bedford <small>HIGH PERFORMING prison</small>	4	↔
Belmarsh	3	↔
Birmingham	3	↔
Blakenhurst	4	↔
Blantyre House	4	↔
Blundeston	3	↔
Brinsford	3	↔
Bristol	2	↔
Brixton	3	↔
Brockhill	2	↔
Bronzefield (CP)	3	↔
Buckley Hall	2	↔
Bullington	3	↔
Bullwood Hall	2	↓
Camp Hill	3	↔
Canterbury	3	↔
Cardiff	4	↔
Castington	4	↔
Channings Wood	3	↔
Chelmsford	3	↔
Coldingley	2	↓
Cookham Wood	3	↔
Dartmoor	3	↔
Deerbolt	3	↔
Doncaster (CP)	3	↔

<b>Alphabetical List of Prison Establishments</b> Quarter 2 - 2006/07		
Establishment	Rating	Trend
Dorchester	3	↔
Dovegate (CP)	2	↔
Dover	3	↔
Downview	4	↑
Drake Hall	3	↔
Durham	3	↑
East Sutton Park	3	↔
Eastwood Park	3	↔
Edmunds Hill	3	↔
Elmley	3	↔
Erlestoke	3	↔
Everthorpe	4	↑
Exeter	3	↔
Featherstone	3	↔
Feltham	3	↔
Ford	3	↔
Forest Bank (CP)	3	↔
Foston Hall	3	↔
Frankland	4	↔
Full Sutton	4	↔
Garth	3	↔
Gartree	3	↔
Glen Parva	3	↔
Gloucester	3	↔
Grendon / Spring Hill	4	↔
Guys Marsh	3	↔
Haslar	3	↔
Haverigg	2	↔
Hewell Grange	3	↔
High Down	3	↑
Highpoint	3	↔
Hindley	2	↔
Hollesley Bay	3	↔
Holloway	4	↑
Holme House	3	↔
Hull	3	↔

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Alphabetical List of Prison Establishments</b> Quarter 2 - 2006/07</p>		
Establishment	Rating	Trend
Huntercombe	3	↔
Kingston	4	↔
Kirkham	3	↔
Kirklevington	4	↔
Lancaster	4	↔
Lancaster Farms	3	↓
Latchmere House	3	↔
Leeds	3	↔
Leicester	3	↔
Lewes	3	↔
Leyhill	3	↔
Lincoln	3	↔
Lindholme	3	↔
Littlehey	3	↔
Liverpool	3	↔
Long Lartin	3	↔
Low Newton	4	↔
Lowdham Grange (CP)	3	↔
Maidstone	3	↔
Manchester	4	↔
Moorland	4	↔
Morton Hall	4	↑
New Hall	3	↔
North Sea Camp	2	↔
Northallerton	3	↔
Norwich	2	↔
Nottingham	3	↔
Onley	3	↔
Parc (CP)	3	↔
Parkhurst	3	↔
Pentonville	2	↔
Peterborough (CP)	2	↔
Portland	3	↔
Preston	3	↔
Ranby	3	↓
Reading	3	↔

<b>Alphabetical List of Prison Establishments</b> Quarter 2 - 2006/07		
Establishment	Rating	Trend
Risley	3	↔
Rochester	3	↔
Rye Hill (CP)	2	↔
Send	4	↔
Shepton Mallet	3	↔
Shrewsbury	3	↔
Stafford	3	↔
Standford Hill	3	↔
Stocken	2	↔
Stoke Heath	3	↔
Styal	3	↑
Sudbury <small>HIGH PERFORMING prison</small>	4	↔
Swaleside	3	↔
Swansea	3	↔
Swinfen Hall	4	↔
The Mount	3	↔
The Verne	3	↔
Thorn Cross	3	↔
Usk/ Prescoed <small>HIGH PERFORMING prison</small>	4	↔
Wakefield	2	↔
Wandsworth	2	↔
Warren Hill	3	↔
Wayland <small>HIGH PERFORMING prison</small>	4	↔
Wealstun	3	↔
Wellingborough	3	↔
Werrington	3	↔
Wetherby	4	↔
Whatton	3	↓
Whitemoor	4	↔
Winchester	3	↔
Wolds (CP)	3	↔
Woodhill	2	↔
Wormwood Scrubs	3	↓
Wymott	3	↔

## Prison Service Performance Rating System

### Alphabetical List of Prison Establishments Quarter 2 - 2006/07

<b>Level</b>	<b>Public Sector</b>	<b>Contracted Sector</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>4</b>	26 (20%)	1 (9%)	27 (19%)
<b>3</b>	86 (68%)	7 (64%)	93 (69%)
<b>2</b>	15 (12%)	3 (27%)	18 (12%)
<b>1</b>	0	0	0
<b><u>Total</u></b>	<b><u>127</u></b>	<b><u>11</u></b>	<b><u>138</u></b>