

Report on an unannounced inspection of

HMP/YOI Swinfen Hall

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

23 June–3 July 2014

Glossary of terms

We try to make our reports as clear as possible, but if you find terms that you do not know, please see the glossary in our 'Guide for writing inspection reports' on our website at: <http://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/about-our-inspections/>

Crown copyright 2014

You may re-use this information (excluding logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, visit <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/> or email: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk

Where we have identified any third party copyright material you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at the address below or: hmiprisons.enquiries@hmiprisons.gsi.gov.uk

This publication is available for download at: <http://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/>

Printed and published by:
Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons
Victory House
6th floor
30–34 Kingsway
London
WC2B 6EX
England

Contents

Introduction	5
Fact page	7
About this inspection and report	9
Summary	11
Section 1. Safety	19
Section 2. Respect	31
Section 3. Purposeful activity	43
Section 4. Resettlement	51
Section 5. Summary of recommendations and housekeeping points	59
Section 6. Appendices	67
Appendix I: Inspection team	67
Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report	69
Appendix III: Prison population profile	83
Appendix IV: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews	85
Appendix V: Photographs	101

Introduction

HMP/YOI Swinfen Hall is a category C training prison near Lichfield holding just under 600 young adults serving between four years and life. Our last full inspection of the prison was in 2010 when we found outcomes to be reasonably good in all of our healthy prison tests, except for the provision of activity. The findings of this inspection were similar.

Relationships between staff and prisoners were the prison's main strength. Young men received good care and support on arrival and this continued throughout their time at Swinfen Hall. We saw many examples of good role modelling, staff challenging antisocial behaviour and genuine care, particularly in the segregation unit. This quality of relationships went some way towards mitigating other features of the prisons' provision that were weaker or required improvement.

The number of violent incidents was low, but in our survey prisoners had comparatively poor perceptions of their own safety, something we observed at our last inspection, and something the prison had still not looked into. The process to manage violence and bullying, which could have instilled greater confidence among prisoners, required improvement. A regime that integrated the sex offender population appeared to be well managed but monitoring was too limited.

There was a high number of incidents of self-harm, although a smaller number of prolific self-harmers accounted for a significant number of them. Tragically there had been a recent self-inflicted death and the prison was, at the time, awaiting the findings of an enquiry from the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman. Case management of those in crisis was mixed but prisoners at risk told us the quality of care they experienced was good. In our survey prisoners reported that it was easy to obtain illicit drugs, but other evidence suggested actual availability was more limited. Use of force was low for the type of prison and was used as a last resort. We were impressed that the prison managed a challenging young population without the need for special accommodation. Batons were hardly drawn or used.

Much of the accommodation continued to be sub-standard with nearly all cells on A, B and C wings needing repair to the windows and many containing damaged flooring. Repairs of some windows were taking place but much more needed to be done to ensure all young men were held in decent accommodation. The promotion of some aspects of equality and diversity, notably for gay and bisexual prisoners, was excellent, but provision as a whole was fragmented, leading to mixed outcomes for prisoners from some minority groups. The standard of care provided by nurses in health care was impressive.

The provision of purposeful activity had improved; the prison had a great range of work and vocational training and broadly sufficient places to meet the needs of the population. However, Swinfen Hall was still not succeeding in its central task as a training prison. In education not enough prisoners were achieving English and maths functional skills qualifications at levels one and two, despite these being the entry requirement for a prison job. Prison work for many was mundane and intermittent as workshops were too often closed due to staff shortages or insufficient work. The allocation of activity places required improvement, as did attendance and punctuality. As a consequence about a third of prisoners were locked in their cell during the working day, which was unacceptable for this type of prison and population. Library and PE facilities were satisfactory but like other aspects of the regime, both were underused.

Offender management was reasonably good and most prisoners knew their offender supervisor, but contact with prisoners was not always meaningful and was too often opportunistic and ad hoc. We were concerned about the limited nature of some risk management plans. Public protection arrangements were generally good, as was reintegration planning and provision across the resettlement pathways. The prison's application of what was, on paper, an interesting and innovative arrangement for pre-release planning was, however, inconsistent and disappointing.

Overall this is a satisfactory report. Swinfen Hall remains a generally safe and respectful prison where prisoners are prepared adequately for release. However, despite the addition of some more activity places, too many young men are locked up when they should be working or remain insufficiently active. This is a criticism we have raised before and for an establishment which styles itself as a training prison is a significant failing that undermines its other achievements.

Nick Hardwick
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

November 2014

Fact page

Task of the establishment

Young adult male long-term training and adult male category C prison.

Prison status

Public

Region

West Midlands

Number held

585

Certified normal accommodation

604, reduced to 544 for Crown Premises Inspection Group (CPIG) work.

Operational capacity

654, reduced to 594 for CPIG work (G wing closure)

Date of last full inspection

June 2010

Brief history

Swinfen Hall opened as a borstal in 1963 and, following a short period as a youth custody centre, in 1988-89 it became a long-term closed young offender institution. Two new wings were built in 1998, increasing the capacity to 320 places. The establishment has gone through a major expansion programme that has increased prisoner places from 320 to 654. It takes young men aged between 18 and 25 serving 3.5 years up to and including life.

Short description of residential units

<i>Wing</i>	<i>Number held</i>
A	64
B	60 – induction / first night
C	60
D	64
E	68
F	90
G	90 (currently closed due to CPIG work)
I	82
J	80
Care and separation unit (segregation)	17

Name of governor

Teresa Clarke

Escort contractor

GEOAmey

Health service provider

Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Partnership NHS Trust

Learning and skills providers

Milton Keynes College

Bournville College

South and City College Birmingham

Quality Transport Training

N-ergy

South Staffordshire Library

Shannon Trust Reading Plan

Independent Monitoring Board chair

Jane Calloway

About this inspection and report

A1 Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons is an independent, statutory organisation which reports on the treatment and conditions of those detained in prisons, young offender institutions, secure training centres, immigration detention facilities, police and court custody and military detention.

A2 All inspections carried out by HM Inspectorate of Prisons contribute to the UK's response to its international obligations under the Optional Protocol to the UN Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (OPCAT). OPCAT requires that all places of detention are visited regularly by independent bodies – known as the National Preventive Mechanism (NPM) – which monitor the treatment of and conditions for detainees. HM Inspectorate of Prisons is one of several bodies making up the NPM in the UK.

A3 All Inspectorate of Prisons reports carry a summary of the conditions and treatment of prisoners, based on the four tests of a healthy prison that were first introduced in this inspectorate's thematic review *Suicide is everyone's concern*, published in 1999. The tests are:

Safety	prisoners, particularly the most vulnerable, are held safely
Respect	prisoners are treated with respect for their human dignity
Purposeful activity	prisoners are able, and expected, to engage in activity that is likely to benefit them
Resettlement	prisoners are prepared for their release into the community and effectively helped to reduce the likelihood of reoffending.

A4 Under each test, we make an assessment of outcomes for prisoners and therefore of the establishment's overall performance against the test. There are four possible judgements: In some cases, this performance will be affected by matters outside the establishment's direct control, which need to be addressed by the National Offender Management Service.

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

- A5 Our assessments might result in one of the following:
- **recommendations:** will require significant change and/or new or redirected resources, so are not immediately achievable, and will be reviewed for implementation at future inspections
 - **housekeeping points:** achievable within a matter of days, or at most weeks, through the issue of instructions or changing routines
 - **examples of good practice:** impressive practice that not only meets or exceeds our expectations, but could be followed by other similar establishments to achieve positive outcomes for prisoners.
- A6 Five key sources of evidence are used by inspectors: observation; prisoner surveys; discussions with prisoners; discussions with staff and relevant third parties; and documentation. During inspections we use a mixed-method approach to data gathering and analysis, applying both qualitative and quantitative methodologies. Evidence from different sources is triangulated to strengthen the validity of our assessments.
- A7 Since April 2013, all our inspections have been unannounced, other than in exceptional circumstances. This replaces the previous system of announced and unannounced full main inspections with full or short follow-ups to review progress. All our inspections now follow up recommendations from the last full inspection, unless these have already been reviewed by a short follow-up inspection.

This report

- A8 This explanation of our approach is followed by a summary of our inspection findings against the four healthy prison tests. There then follow four sections each containing a detailed account of our findings against our *Expectations. Criteria for assessing the treatment of prisoners and conditions in prisons*. The reference numbers at the end of some recommendations indicate that they are repeated, and provide the paragraph location of the previous recommendation in the last report. Section 5 collates all recommendations, housekeeping points and examples of good practice arising from the inspection. Appendix II lists the recommendations from the previous inspection, and our assessment of whether they have been achieved.
- A9 Details of the inspection team and the prison population profile can be found in Appendices I and III respectively.
- A10 Findings from the survey of prisoners and a detailed description of the survey methodology can be found in Appendix IV of this report. Please note that we only refer to comparisons with other comparable establishments or previous inspections when these are statistically significant.¹

¹ The significance level is set at 0.05, which means that there is only a 5% chance that the difference in results is due to chance.

Summary

Safety

S1 *Reception, first night and induction arrangements were generally positive, and early days support for new arrivals provided effective care. Prisoner perceptions of safety remained poor but we found a fundamentally safe prison. The number of violent incidents was low but the analysis of violent incidents and bullying was inadequate, and arrangements to support victims required improvement. There had been one recent death in custody. Incidents of self-harm were high but support for prisoners in crisis was good. Security arrangements were mostly proportionate. Use of force was reasonably low but some aspects of governance were inadequate. The segregation unit was a reasonable environment with very good staff engagement, but the regime was still too limited. Substance misuse services were very good. **Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***

S2 *At the last inspection in 2010 we found that outcomes for prisoners in Swinfen Hall were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 33 recommendations in the area of safety. At this follow-up inspection we found that 17 of the recommendations had been achieved, six partially achieved, nine not achieved and one was no longer relevant.*

S3 The prison accepted convicted young adult and adult prisoners up to the age of 25 from all over the country and so some experienced long journeys to the establishment. Some escort vans were dirty and covered in graffiti, but relationships between escort staff and prisoners were professional. Prisoners and escort staff assured us that although some journeys were long, refreshments were available on vehicles.

S4 The care and support prisoners received on arrival was impressive and generally continued throughout their stay. This was the prison's key strength and mitigated some aspects that required improvement. The reception was a pleasant environment and staff demonstrated a caring approach to prisoners. First night arrangements were good: risk assessments were conducted well; access to showers and telephone calls was good; and handover arrangements to night staff and routine checks during the first night were appropriate. However, first night accommodation too often had graffiti and broken windows. The Swinfen Hall induction was comprehensive and involved multiagency partners, but we were not assured that all new arrivals received it.

S5 While the number of violent incidents was low, too many prisoners continued to feel unsafe, yet the prison had not investigated the reasons for these poor perceptions. Although incidents were low, many processes to manage and oversee violence and bullying required improvement. Strategic oversight of violence reduction was weak; the violence reduction meetings were poorly attended by senior staff and there was insufficient analysis of trends and causes of violence. The process for managing perpetrators was inflexible and weekly reviews did not always take place limiting opportunity for progression. There was no formal support for victims of bullying or violence, although we saw many examples of staff supporting prisoners. There was an integrated regime for the sex offender population, which appeared well managed, but the prison needed to do more to assure itself that the sex offender population were not more at risk than other prisoners.

S6 There was a high number of incidents of self-harm, which included several prolific self-harmers. There had also been a recent self-inflicted death, which was subject to a Prisons and Probation Ombudsman investigation. The establishment had considered early learning

opportunities. Care for prisoners in crisis was good and most at-risk prisoners on open assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management said they were well supported by staff. The weekly safer custody meeting was not attended by senior staff, and the quality assurance of self-harm and suicide procedures was weak. The quality of ACCT documents was mixed. Although care maps had improved since the last inspection, too many ACCTs showed poorly attended case reviews and insufficient observations that were not picked up by management checks. There were 19 Listeners (prisoners trained by the Samaritans to provide confidential emotional support to fellow prisoners) who were well supported by staff, and the prison had a good relationship with the Samaritans.

- S7 The prison had made links with local adult safeguarding boards, and support for identified individual prisoners at risk, because of disability or illness was better than we normally see. However, as there were no formal processes in place to identify at-risk prisoners we were not assured that all individuals at risk were being identified.
- S8 Some security arrangements, including strip-searching and the routine application of handcuffs to and from escort vehicles, were disproportionate, but the establishment reviewed and addressed these issues during the inspection. Good security intelligence was received, processed efficiently and used to inform properly focused, strategic security objectives. In our survey, more prisoners than the comparator said it was easy to get illicit drugs, although the availability of drugs was relatively low. The mandatory drug testing rate remained low but some testing arrangements required improvement.
- S9 Most warnings to prisoners under the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme were appropriate, and they had many opportunities to improve their behaviour before demotion to the basic level. Differentials between the levels were inadequate to encourage positive behaviour. The basic regime was too restrictive, applied for too long, and improvement targets and reviews were often perfunctory.
- S10 The number of adjudications was not excessive for the type of prison but there was no quality assurance and too many records showed insufficient enquiry before a finding of guilt. Use of force was reasonably low and records suggested that it was mostly applied as a last resort, with incidents usually de-escalated appropriately. However, we were concerned by the content of some planned intervention films we watched, and which we referred to the governor. It was impressive that the prison managed a complex population without the need for special accommodation and with very little use of batons.
- S11 Throughput of the CSU was low, and most segregated prisoners were reintegrated back to normal locations at Swinfen Hall. However, some remained for long periods. Engagement between unit staff and prisoners was very good, but the regime was poor and did not occupy prisoners constructively. Improvements were made during the inspection, including the routine issue of radios to residents and the installation of an exercise bike.
- S12 Clinical support for prisoners with substance misuse issues was very good, although the demand was low. Support for prisoners with both substance misuse and mental health needs was good. The new drug and alcohol recovery service provided a useful and improving range of support for prisoners with drug and alcohol problems.

Respect

S13 *The prison was clean but some of the accommodation was old and needed refurbishment. Too many cells had inadequate windows. Staff-prisoner engagement was very positive and many interactions demonstrated good care. Although most equality and diversity outcomes for prisoners were reasonable, support for minority groups was mixed. Faith provision was good, including support for prisoners observing Ramadan during the inspection. Health services were very good. Many prisoners were critical about the food but we found reasonable menus and good portions provided. The prison shop provided an adequate service. **Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test***

S14 *At the last inspection in 2010 we found that outcomes for prisoners in Swinfen Hall were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 64 recommendations in the area of respect.² At this follow-up inspection we found that 37 of the recommendations had been achieved, two had been partially achieved, 21 had not been achieved and four were no longer relevant.*

S15 Accommodation varied greatly, from sub-standard in the older part of the prison to brighter and mostly well maintained accommodation in the newer wings. Cells on the new accommodation were clean and well equipped, but those on the older wings were cramped, lacked chairs and many had windows and flooring in need of repair – the replacement of the windows needed immediate attention. Some cells designed for one were used to house two prisoners, and toilets in many of the shared cells were inadequately screened. Prisoners had adequate access to laundry facilities. Some exercise areas contained litter. Responses to applications were reasonable although some took too long.

S16 Staff-prisoner relationships were a real strength and we saw many examples of staff as good role models, challenging antisocial behaviour and showing genuine care. Staff demonstrated good knowledge of those in their care, and most prisoners said staff treated them with respect. Personal officer entries in prisoners' case histories were regular, constructive and generally sufficiently detailed. It was refreshing to find a staff group that took into account the maturity levels of individual prisoners in this age group.

S17 Work on equality and diversity was fragmented, with mixed support for prisoners from minority groups, and consultation arrangements for the different groups varied from excellent to non-existent. Equality of treatment monitoring data were generally within range, and in the one area where they were not this had been investigated and remedial action taken. Many prisoners said they had no confidence in the discrimination complaints process, and those we sampled had taken too long to complete, were inadequately investigated and quality assurance was ineffective.

S18 Muslim prisoners continued to hold less positive perceptions than non-Muslims about their treatment by staff, and the establishment had still to investigate this. Provision for most foreign national prisoners was adequate, but translation and interpretation services were underused. Support for prisoners with disabilities was reasonable. The support for gay and bisexual prisoners was excellent, with a well-attended monthly meeting and good links with external support agencies. Faith provision was good and the chaplaincy was integrated well into prison life. There were good arrangements for Muslim prisoners to manage Ramadan, which was being observed during our inspection.

² This included recommendations about the incentives and earned privileges scheme which, in our updated Expectations (Version 4, 2012), now appear under the healthy prison area of safety.

- S19 Most complaints we sampled answered the issue raised, were respectful and timely, although many could have been dealt with informally. Legal services provision was appropriate, and visiting arrangements for legal advisers had improved.
- S20 Prisoners were less satisfied with health care than when we last inspected but we found the health services to be impressive. Nurses knew their patients, and the range of clinics was appropriate to need. The health care complaints system was one of the best we have seen. The health centre was up to standards but the wing medical rooms did not comply with infection control standards. Despite prisoner perceptions, there was no one waiting for urgent dental treatment, and non-urgent waits were equivalent to those in the community. Prisoners with mental health needs had many opportunities to access emotional support and other therapies.
- S21 Although the food was unpopular with some prisoners, we found the quality and quantity were reasonable. Catering arrangements for Ramadan were good. Black and minority ethnic prisoners still had poorer perceptions about the range of items for sale in the prison shop, and it was inappropriate that prisoners had to pay an administrative fee on catalogue orders. Consultation arrangements on food and the shop were regular and responsive.

Purposeful activity

S22 *There were almost sufficient activity places but they were not used efficiently. We found too many prisoners locked up and time out of cell for many was inadequate. Poor attendance in education and workshops and poor punctuality at all activities was evident. The quality of education had improved and teaching was good and had outstanding features. Vocational provision was good Achievements were high for most qualifications, apart from mathematics and English at levels 1 and 2. Very few prisoners used the library. The PE facilities were underused. **Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.***

S23 *At the last inspection in 2010 we found that outcomes for prisoners in Swinfen Hall were poor against this healthy prison test. We made 26 recommendations in the area of purposeful activity. At this follow-up inspection we found that nine recommendations had been achieved, two partially achieved, 13 not achieved and two were no longer relevant.*

- S24 On average, 36% of prisoners were locked in their cell during our roll checks, which was too high and very disappointing for this type of prison. Time out of cell ranged from approximately 10 hours a day for a fully employed prisoner to less than two hours for the unemployed.
- S25 Senior managers had a clear sense of direction for the development of learning and skills and the need to occupy all prisoners meaningfully. There had been good recent developments to extend the range of vocational training and work. The prison was failing to manage low attendance and poor punctuality at the majority of education classes and industry workshops.
- S26 There were almost sufficient activity places for the current prison population, but they were not yet used efficiently. The variety and range of education and vocational courses were good, but prison work was generally mundane and low skilled. Work-related qualifications were achievable in most prison employment areas, but not in the main prison kitchen.
- S27 The teachers and trainers were good role models and managed prisoners' challenging and, sometimes, disruptive behaviour very well, which enabled prisoners to learn and meet their

targets. Teaching in education was mostly good, with some outstanding features. Vocational training was good and prisoners benefited from individual coaching that focused on improving their employability.

- S28 Not enough prisoners – only around 60% who took the courses – achieved English and mathematics qualifications at level 1, even though these were the entry requirements for a prison job. Likewise, level 2 qualifications in English, mathematics and information and communications technology (ICT) were achieved by only 54%, 68% and 58% respectively of those completing courses. Apart from this, achievement of accredited qualifications in most education and vocational training subjects was high. Prisoners developed impressive creative skills in an education workshop where they made high quality products for retail sale in the community.
- S29 The library had sufficient resources, but was underused and poorly promoted to prisoners. Prisoner membership had decreased since the previous inspection, and none of our previous library recommendations had been achieved. Library staff promoted literacy on family days and visits, including reading with prisoners and their families. The library ran Storybook Dads, enabling prisoners to record a story for their children, and 33 prisoners made recordings in 2013-14.
- S30 PE facilities were satisfactory and included a sports hall, cardiovascular equipment, weights room and an outside pitch, but they were poorly used, even though the number of allocated PE sessions had recently been reduced from four to two a week. The department did not monitor effectively prisoner attendance at the gym to assess its use by different prisoner groups. There were short vocational training courses at levels 2 and 3, which were highly successful.

Resettlement

S31 *The strategy for offender management, resettlement and public protection work was good. Sentence planning was generally good and most prisoners knew their offender supervisor. There was a backlog of OASys assessments, but their quality was variable. Some offender supervisor contact with prisoners was superficial and inconsistent. Public protection arrangements were good. Resettlement pathway provision was generally good, and accommodation support was impressive. **Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***

S32 *At the last inspection in 2010 we found that outcomes for prisoners in Swinfen Hall were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 33 recommendations in the area of resettlement. At this follow-up inspection we found that 17 of the recommendations had been achieved, six partially achieved, seven had not been achieved and three were no longer relevant.*

S33 The reducing reoffending, resettlement, offender management and public protection policies were comprehensive and covered all necessary aspects of work. The monthly reducing reoffending and quarterly resettlement pathways meetings were well attended by all necessary representatives. The use of offender supervisors in dual roles, also covering wing supervision, had presented some significant challenges, and affected the depth and frequency of offender supervisors' contact. While the prison's needs analysis was out of date, it did not have an adverse effect on outcomes for prisoners as the general range of provision was quite broad and as the specific data required to determine the provision needed to address offending behaviour was being used appropriately.

- S34 All prisoners were allocated an offender supervisor, and in our survey more prisoners than the comparator said that they knew who they were. The introduction of a sequencing meeting had been a positive initiative, and ensured that work with prisoners took place as required and on time.
- S35 There was a backlog of offender assessment system (OASys) assessments but this was not excessive. However, although most were timely, the quality was variable, as were the associated sentence plans. Prisoners in our survey were negative about their level of involvement in sentence planning. We were also concerned that some risk management plans were limited. The level of offender supervisor contact with prisoners too often lacked focus and was not always meaningful, and often took place ad hoc or while the offender supervisor was on wing duties. Despite this, the prisoners whose cases we reviewed in detail were knowledgeable about their sentence plans and targets, and were reasonably motivated. Quality assurance ensured the timely completion of reports, reviews and contact but did not monitor sufficiently the quality or focus of such work.
- S36 Public protection arrangements were generally good. Prisoners were screened appropriately and considered by the weekly safeguarding children committee, and the interdepartmental risk management team reviewed all multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) and high risk cases within the five months before their release. The system was efficient and ensured the prompt review and assessment of prisoners.
- S37 The prison sometimes held innovative tripartite pre-release meetings, involving the offender manager, offender supervisor and prisoner, to ensure all aspects of pre-release planning were in place. However, these meetings took place inconsistently, and we saw too many prisoners released without one. All prisoners had a preparation for release assessment by the resettlement team. These were completed consistently and included valuable information to inform the tripartite reviews.
- S38 Nacro staff saw all prisoners during their induction and then before their release to assess their accommodation and finance, benefit and debt needs. There were good arrangements to take immediate remedial action where necessary. Accommodation provision was well managed for prisoners before their release, and in the last eight years no prisoner had been released without an address, which was commendable. Finance, benefit and debt provision was appropriate for the population. Prisoners with debt problems were supported through access to Citizens Advice, and prisoners could open a bank account and take a money management course.
- S39 Information, advice and guidance for prisoners about education and careers were good and focused on individual needs to achieve resettlement goals.. The relevant pre-release programme was attended by over two-thirds of prisoners approaching release. They benefited from the input of other support agencies and advice on CV writing and job interviews.
- S40 There were effective systems for health care discharge planning, and pre-release planning and community liaison for prisoners with substance misuse issues were very good.
- S41 There was a good visitors' centre and support for families through HALOW (Help and Advice Line for Offenders' Wives, Partners and Families). Visits were reasonable, with a large and relaxed visits hall that had a staffed play area and a snack bar. There was other support and provision through regular family visits and the 'Being Dad' parenting course, run by the chaplaincy, but it was inappropriate that family visits were restricted to enhanced prisoners.
- S42 There was a range of programmes to address offending behaviour, with 192 programme places a year. Prisoners had good and timely access to programmes, managed in conjunction

with the fortnightly sequencing meeting. There was casework support for prisoners identified for the sex offender treatment programme, which was positive and linked well to the work of the OMU. Although there was some individual work with prisoners by the psychology department, one-to-one work through the OMU was limited.

Main concerns and recommendations

S43 Concern: The quality of the accommodation on A, B and C wings was substandard; cells were cramped, had no chairs, and many had flooring and windows that needed repair.

Recommendation: A, B and C wings should undergo a complete refurbishment to bring them up to modern standards. (Repeated main recommendation HP48)

S44 Concern: The prison had insufficient activity and was not making full use of its available activity places. Also, the prison often closed workshops or reduced prisoner attendance due to staff shortages or insufficient work.

Recommendation: The prison should provide sufficient and meaningful activity places and ensure they are used efficiently.

S45 Concern: Prisoner attendance at the majority of education classes and industry workshops was low, and their punctuality at activities was poor, but the prison was not effective enough in managing this or investigating any underlying causes and concerns.

Recommendation: The prison should ensure that prisoners arrive punctually at their allocated activities and, the reasons for prisoners' refusal to work and non-attendance should be checked to address any underlying causes and concerns.

S46 Concern: The proportion of prisoners achieving skills at level 1 English and mathematics were too low, even though these were the eligibility criteria for a prison job.

Recommendation: The prison should improve achievements at level 1 and 2 for English and mathematics and make alternative arrangements for prisoners whose abilities are too low to attend a combination of education and specific work activities.

Section 1. Safety

Courts, escorts and transfers

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners transferring to and from the prison are treated safely, decently and efficiently.

- I.1** *Some prisoners arriving at the prison experienced lengthy journeys in dirty, graffiti-covered vehicles. Relationships between escorting staff and prisoners were positive, and the routine handcuffing of prisoners on and off escort vehicles stopped during the inspection.*
- I.2** Swinfen Hall accepted convicted young adult and adult prisoners up to the age of 25 from all over the country. Many experienced lengthy journeys, sometimes in dirty, graffiti-covered vehicles, but relationships with escorting staff were good, toilets breaks were offered and refreshments were readily available.
- I.3** Although the reception was closed over lunchtime, as transfers in were planned this did not cause any major problem. Once vehicles arrived, prisoners were disembarked reasonably quickly into a secure area. We observed that all prisoners were handcuffed on and off the vehicles for the short distance to and from reception, without any individual risk assessment, which was disproportionate. The prison reviewed and stopped this practice during the inspection as a result of feedback from inspectors.

Early days in custody

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners are treated with respect and feel safe on their arrival into prison and for the first few days in custody. Prisoners' individual needs are identified and addressed, and they feel supported on their first night. During a prisoner's induction he/she is made aware of the prison routines, how to access available services and how to cope with imprisonment.

- I.4** *Reception was a generally positive experience for new arrivals and staff engaged with them in a caring and meaningful way. First night risk assessments were done well and properly focused. First night accommodation was sometimes poor but handover arrangements to night staff and support for new arrivals were good. The induction programme was appropriate but we were not assured that all prisoners completed all of it.*
- I.5** The prison received around 18 new prisoners a month. The large, clean and pleasant reception was not overly busy. In our survey, prisoners were more positive than the comparator about feeling treated well by reception staff, and this was confirmed by our observations.
- I.6** All prisoners were routinely strip-searched on arrival, but this practice was changed during the inspection as a result of our comments. Transfers in from other prisons were no longer strip-searched unless there was intelligence to justify this. Most prisoners spent less than two hours in reception. They were seen by health care staff, offered a free telephone call and

given a comprehensive, properly focused first night risk interview. We were told that an Insider/Listener (a prisoner trained by the Samaritans to provide confidential emotional support to fellow prisoners) worked in reception when new prisoners arrived, although he was not present during the inspection.

- 1.7** In our survey, prisoners were more negative than the comparator about feeling safe on their first night. All new arrivals were located on to B wing, which was a settled and calm unit that also housed other longer term prisoners. There were no dedicated first night cells. We were told that cells on the ground floor tended to be kept free for new arrivals. However, during the inspection new arrivals were located in cells on the first floor that had graffiti and missing window panes (see paragraph 2.3), although otherwise properly equipped. The new arrivals we spoke to were all locked up and said they had not spoken to any peer supporters on their first night. Handover arrangements to night staff about new arrivals were thorough. During our night visit we saw that staff were properly focused on new arrivals, and they told us they made enhanced checks on them throughout the first night.
- 1.8** In our survey, more respondents than the comparator said they had not received an induction, and some induction records and electronic case notes that we sampled were incomplete and did not assure us that everyone received all the required elements of the programme. As all new arrivals had already experienced prison life, the induction programme was abridged but appropriate. An officer gave a comprehensive presentation about life at Swinfen Hall, and a peer supporter saw prisoners within a day of their arrival. Various departments and agencies, including the chaplaincy, substance misuse provider, education, and gym staff, saw prisoners individually to assess their need. When prisoners were not engaged in induction they spent excessive amounts of time locked up before they were allocated to an activity.

Housekeeping points

- 1.9** All new arrivals should receive all elements of the induction programme, and this should be reflected in the induction records.
- 1.10** First night cells should be free from graffiti.

Bullying and violence reduction

Expected outcomes:

Everyone feels and is safe from bullying and victimisation (which includes verbal and racial abuse, theft, threats of violence and assault). Prisoners at risk/subject to victimisation are protected through active and fair systems known to staff, prisoners and visitors, and which inform all aspects of the regime.

- 1.11** *The number of violent incidents was low but prisoners felt less safe than at similar prisons and the prison had still not investigated the reasons for these perceptions which we had recommended during our last inspection (see paragraph 1.18). The management and oversight of violence and bullying reduction required improvement. The management of perpetrators was inflexible and there was no formal support for victims. The integration of sex offenders into the regime was well managed.*

- I.12** While the number of violent incidents had risen since the last inspection, it remained low for the type of prison. However, in our survey, prisoners continued to feel less safe than the comparator, and the prison had still not investigated the reasons for their poor perceptions which we had expressed concern about on our last inspection and had encouraged some enquiry as to why such perceptions existed. There was little consultation with prisoners about the levels and impact of bullying. There had been no recent safety survey, and prisoners did not attend the safer custody meeting.
- I.13** There was a bullying and violence reduction strategy and weekly violence reduction meetings, chaired by the safer custody manager. Strategic oversight of violence reduction was weak: meetings were not attended by senior staff and, while the minutes showed in-depth discussion about individual cases, there was insufficient analysis of trends and causes of violence.
- I.14** Violence, bullying and antisocial behaviour were reported through the incident reporting system to the safer custody team who investigated each incident. Perpetrators of violence and bullying were managed through a three stage system. Depending on the severity of incidents, interventions included informal monitoring, being placed on the basic regime or, for the most serious incidents, segregation. Violence reduction booklets, used for monitoring the behaviour of perpetrators, were generally incomplete, and the process for managing perpetrators was inflexible - prisoners were not set individual targets, weekly reviews did not always take place and, when they did, they never led to progression.
- I.15** The formal system for supporting victims had fallen out of use. Only two prisoners had been on support plans in the previous six months, although some prisoners were offered support from staff on the wing. We found several positive examples of wing staff and violence reduction officers using mediation in response to conflict.
- I.16** The prison also continued to apply temporary removal of some prisoners from off-wing activities. We found five prisoners who had been removed from off-wing activities for a variety of reasons, including prisoners at risk from other prisoners. While authorised by a governor grade, fortnightly reviews of these removals were too infrequent.
- I.17** The prison was managing a regime that integrated the sex offender population. This presented many challenges in ensuring they were not disproportionately affected by bullying and violence. Although it appeared to be managed well, the prison did not monitor outcomes for this group and had to do more to assure itself that sex offenders were not more at risk than other prisoners.

Recommendations

- I.18** **There should be further consultation with prisoners to explore the reasons for their poor perceptions of safety.** (Repeated recommendation 3.16)
- I.19** **The prison should introduce robust arrangements to support victims of bullying and violence.**
- I.20** **Prisoners monitored under the violence reduction policy should receive regular meaningful reviews.**
- I.21** **The prison should collect and monitor the information required to ensure sex offenders are not more at risk of bullying or violence than other prisoners.**

Housekeeping point

- I.22** Reviews of prisoners removed from off-wing activities should be more frequent.

Self-harm and suicide prevention

Expected outcomes:

The prison provides a safe and secure environment which reduces the risk of self-harm and suicide. Prisoners are identified at an early stage and given the necessary support. All staff are aware of and alert to vulnerability issues, are appropriately trained and have access to proper equipment and support.

I.23 *The incidence of self-harm was high, and there had been a recent self-inflicted death. Care for prisoners in crisis was good. The quality of case management was mixed, and quality assurance of self-harm and suicide prevention procedures was weak. Listeners were well supported by staff, and the prison had a good relationship with the Samaritans. The safer custody meeting was poorly attended.*

- I.24** There had been 250 incidents of self-harm in the previous six months, which was high, and the prison was managing several prolific self-harmers. Care for prisoners in crisis was good; prisoners on open assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management for prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm said they were well supported by staff. There had been a recent self-inflicted death, which was subject to a Prisons and Probation Ombudsman's investigation. The prison had considered learning opportunities identified by health care staff.
- I.25** Only 31.6% of staff had been trained in suicide prevention. The quality of the ACCT documents we saw was mixed. Care maps had improved since the last inspection and most were now comprehensive with suitable actions for the prisoner. Too many ACCT documents showed poorly attended case reviews and insufficient recording of observations and interactions by staff, these were not picked up in management checks. Post-closure reviews still required improvement; we found examples of reviews where the prisoner was not present. Quality assurance of self-harm and suicide prevention procedures was weak.
- I.26** It was positive that the use of CCTV to monitor prisoners on an ACCT document or constant watch had stopped since the last inspection, as support now focused on meaningful staff interaction with those in crisis.
- I.27** There were 19 Listeners who said that they were well supported by the safer custody manager and residential wing staff. The prison had a good relationship with the Samaritans, and direct line telephones to the Samaritans telephones were available on all wings.
- I.28** The weekly safer custody meeting considered individual cases in depth but was not attended by Listeners or senior staff.

Recommendations

- I.29** **The quality of assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) documents should be improved.**
- I.30** **All staff should be trained in suicide and self-harm prevention.**

Housekeeping point

- I.31** Senior staff should attend the safer custody meeting.

Safeguarding (protection of adults at risk)

Expected outcomes:

The prison promotes the welfare of prisoners, particularly adults at risk, and protects them from all kinds of harm and neglect.³

- I.32** *Some individual prisoners at risk received good support from a range of departments, although there was no formal process to identify such prisoners and protect them from harm.*

- I.33** Safeguarding policies and procedures were underdeveloped, but the prison's understanding of safeguarding and support for individuals at risk because of disability or illness was better than we usually see. We found examples of individual at-risk prisoners receiving good support from various departments, although there was no multiagency support or care planning and no formal process to identify and protect those at risk. The prison had made links with several local safeguarding adults boards and had sought advice for individual prisoners.

- I.34** The prison had drafted a safeguarding policy which was due to be implemented. It was comprehensive, identified a lead officer for safeguarding, and detailed procedures to identify at-risk prisoners as well as interventions.

Recommendation

- I.35** **The prison should implement a safeguarding policy and develop formal procedures that safeguard at-risk prisoners from harm.**

Security

Expected outcomes:

Security and good order are maintained through an attention to physical and procedural matters, including effective security intelligence as well as positive staff-prisoner relationships. Prisoners are safe from exposure to substance misuse while in prison.

- I.36** *Following changes to some practices during the inspection, security arrangements were now broadly proportionate. Good security information was received and used to set properly focused objectives that were monitored appropriately. Drug availability was low but some drug testing arrangements required improvement.*

³ We define an adult at risk as a vulnerable person aged 18 years or over, 'who is or may be in need of community care services by reason of mental or other disability, age or illness; and who is or may be unable to take care of him or herself, or unable to protect him or herself against significant harm or exploitation'. 'No secrets' definition (Department of Health 2000).

- I.37** During the inspection, and as a result of our feedback, the prison made changes to practices such as routine strip-searching and the application of handcuffs on and off escort vehicles for new arrivals. This had resulted in security arrangements that were now broadly proportionate and did not restrict prisoner access to the regime unnecessarily. Free flow to activities was well supervised and relaxed.
- I.38** A good level of security information, including 2,084 reports submitted between January and June 2014, were received and processed efficiently. The analysis of intelligence was good and used to set properly focused strategic objectives, which were monitored at the monthly security committee. Information was shared with other relevant departments across the prison.
- I.39** In our survey, more prisoners than the comparators said it was easy to get illicit drugs and that they had developed a problem with diverted medication in the prison. Prisoner reports, intelligence, finds and mandatory drug testing (MDT) results actually indicated quite limited illicit drug availability (cannabis was the main drug of choice, but prisoners and staff reported that some new psychoactive drugs, including 'Black Mamba' not yet detectable under the current testing arrangements were appearing). Prescribing of tradable medication was low. The prison had an effective drug supply reduction plan.
- I.40** The positive random MDT rate remained very low at 0.56% for the six months to May 2014 against the target of 3.5%, but testing was not spread evenly throughout the month. The positive suspicion MDT rate for the same period was too low at 12.88%, and too many tests were too late and outside the required timescale. Prisoners who provided positive MDTs were not consistently referred to the substance misuse service for support. The new MDT suite was clean, but staff used the same surface for paperwork and for urine samples, which was inappropriate.
- I.41** Closed visits were used sparingly and for appropriate reasons but were applied for a minimum of three months and often continued when there was no intelligence to support their use.

Recommendation

- I.42** **The mandatory drug testing programme should be adequately resourced to undertake the required level of testing throughout the month.**

Housekeeping points

- I.43** Prisoners who test positive in mandatory drug testing (MDT) should be consistently referred to the substance misuse service for support.
- I.44** Prisoners should only remain on closed visits when there is intelligence to support this.

Incentives and earned privileges⁴

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners understand the purpose of the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme and how to progress through it. The IEP scheme provides prisoners with incentives and rewards for effort and behaviour. The scheme is applied fairly, transparently and consistently.

- I.45** *Basic level reviews and targets were often brief and, opportunities for prisoners on the basic level to have contact with their families were restricted. Differentials between levels were inadequate to encourage positive behaviour. Maturity levels were taken into account before warnings were issued and prisoners had many opportunities to improve their behaviour. Prisoners did not always attend incentives review boards.*
- I.46** Around 36% of prisoners were on the enhanced level of the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme, 57% were on standard and 7% were on the basic level. The implementation of the revised national IEP policy in 2013 had narrowed differentials between the levels, and prisoners individually and in our structured groups said that the differentials were inadequate to encourage positive behaviour; we agreed. The prison had recognised this and was working on initiatives to improve the differentials.
- I.47** Most warnings to prisoners were for appropriate reasons, including many for refusing to attend education classes. Staff often took the prisoner's maturity level into account before deciding if a warning was appropriate, and prisoners were given many opportunities to improve their behaviour before demotion to basic (see paragraph 2.13). Some prisoners said they were not always told they had been given a warning or able to make representations before any subsequent incentives review board. We found no evidence that warnings were not issued but there was some to support the view that prisoners could not always attend the review board.
- I.48** Reviews of basic level prisoners were timely but brief. Even when a prisoner's behaviour had improved, it was usual for him to spend a minimum of 28 days on basic. Improvement targets were set but not adapted for the individual prisoner. The regime for prisoners on the basic level was too restrictive, and their access to family contact was inappropriately restricted to a twice weekly telephone call and three one-hour visits a month (see also paragraph 4.43).

Recommendations

- I.49** **The incentives and earned privileges scheme should be applied fairly, and improvement targets should be tailored for the individual prisoner.**
- I.50** **Prisoners on the basic level should have more opportunities to contact their families, basic level prisoners and those on closed visits should have the full visiting time, and family days should not be restricted to prisoners on the enhanced level.**

⁴ In the previous report, incentives and earned privileges were covered under the healthy prison area of respect. In our updated Expectations (Version 4, 2012) they now appear under the healthy prison area of safety.

Housekeeping point

- 1.51** Prisoners on the basic level should be able to make representations in person at review boards.

Discipline

Expected outcomes:

Disciplinary procedures are applied fairly and for good reason. Prisoners understand why they are being disciplined and can appeal against any sanctions imposed on them.

- 1.52** *Adjudications were only used when appropriate and the number was not excessive. There was however, no quality assurance and too many records showed insufficient investigation before a finding of guilt. Use of force was reasonably low and mostly as a last resort. Incidents were generally de-escalated well, but we were concerned by some planned interventions that were filmed. Throughput of the care and separation unit (CSU) was not excessive but we were not assured that all uses were warranted or for the shortest period. The environment in the CSU had improved but the regime was still inadequate, despite some minor improvements during the inspection. CSU staff engagement with segregated prisoners was impressive.*

Disciplinary procedures

- 1.53** The number of adjudications, 604 in the previous six months, was relatively low for the size and type of establishment. Charges were laid for good reasons. The records of hearings we sampled showed that prisoners were given sufficient time to prepare their case and could seek legal assistance, but there was no quality assurance and too many records indicated insufficient enquiry before a finding of guilt.
- 1.54** An adjudication standardisation meeting met quarterly but was not always well attended. It was informed by a comprehensive report, and we were assured from discussions with participants that relevant issues were discussed.

Recommendation

- 1.55** **The quality of adjudication records should be improved and adjudications should be subject to formal quality assurance.**

The use of force

- 1.56** Force had been used 81 times in the previous six months, which was reasonably low for the type of prison. Around 60% of cases involved the use of control and restraint techniques, but records suggested that force was generally used as a last resort and that incidents were de-escalated reasonably quickly. Use of handcuffs and relocation to the care and separation unit (CSU) were not routine following a use of force incident. The prison had recently introduced an informal weekly meeting to address missing or incomplete documentation, but this was yet to be effective as around two-thirds of the records we sampled were still incomplete.

- I.57** Planned interventions were infrequent but were not always filmed or reviewed. In the recordings we were able to watch, we were concerned that force seemed disproportionate and de-escalated poorly in two of the three cases; the associated documentation was also poor. We referred one incident to the governor.
- I.58** Special accommodation cells had been decommissioned after the last inspection and the prison managed well without them, which was commendable. It was also positive that batons were used infrequently and had not been drawn to date in 2014.
- I.59** There was a comprehensive database on the use of force, which was used to collate an informative report for the segregation monitoring meeting that was discussed and acted on.

Recommendation

- I.60 Governance of the use of force, particularly the completion of documentation and planned interventions, should be improved.**

Segregation

- I.61** Segregation had been used 145 times in the previous six months, was not excessive for the type of prison. However, the records and our conversations with staff did not assure us that all uses were warranted or for the shortest period. Very few prisoners sought refuge in the CSU for their own protection. The average length of stay was around 10 days but a significant minority remained segregated for much longer. Transfers out from the unit to other prisons were infrequent, and the majority of prisoners were reintegrated back to locations in Swinfen Hall.
- I.62** Efforts to maintain a reasonable environment in the CSU were evident and improvements had been made since the last inspection. Communal areas were clean and bright. Cells were clean and generally free from graffiti, but most cells lacked a chair and toilets were scaled, dirty and had no seats. The large exercise yard was bare.
- I.63** New arrivals on the unit were only strip-searched following a risk assessment, and protocols for unlocking individual prisoners were proportionate to their risk. In the previous six months, six prisoners on ACCTs had been segregated. We were assured that there were appropriate reasons to justify this, and that they had been authorised at a senior level.
- I.64** The regime was inadequate; segregated prisoners could only make telephone calls twice a week and had only 30 minutes exercise a day. Prisoners had access to a small stock of books but education staff did not visit the unit and there were insufficient opportunities for off-unit activities, apart from risk-assessed attendance at offending behaviour courses. Many prisoners complained of a lack of constructive activity to occupy them, although some minor improvements were made to the regime as a result of our observations and feedback. Only three of the 12 residents at the time of the inspection had a radio, although this was rectified during the inspection, and none were permitted to have a television in their cell, regardless of their IEP level or reason for their segregation. A supply of puzzles was available and some prisoners were offered these. An exercise bike was installed on the unit towards the end of the inspection.
- I.65** Multidisciplinary reviews of prisoners in the segregation unit were timely but authorising documentation was often completed poorly and many targets were brief. We saw one formal care/reintegration plan for a longer-term resident, which was very good, but otherwise reintegration planning was informal or non-existent. Prisoners were generally

complimentary about segregation unit staff and we observed some impressive and caring engagement by the staff with prisoners.

- I.66** The collation of data on segregation was generally good and used to inform the quarterly segregation monitoring meeting.

Recommendations

- I.67 Prisoners should only be segregated as a last resort, for good reason and for the shortest period.**

- I.68 The regime in the care and separation unit should be improved.**

Housekeeping point

- I.69** All cells in the care and separation unit should have a chair, and toilets should be cleaned and descaled.

Substance misuse

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners with drug and/or alcohol problems are identified at reception and receive effective treatment and support throughout their stay in custody.

- I.70** *Substance misuse services were good overall, although the drug strategy required review. Psychosocial support for prisoners with substance misuse problems was good and improving. Clinical support was very good, although demand was low.*

- I.71** Lifeline had provided the drug and alcohol recovery service (DARS) since October 2012. The team was supporting 158 prisoners at the time of the inspection. The service was well advertised and all new arrivals were offered the service during induction. Available support included individual sessions, a wide range of short groups and a 25-session prison recovery group. A new six-session alcohol treatment programme had recently been introduced and an alcohol and offending group was planned. Waiting lists for groups were short. Prisoners were positive about the service they received. Integration between DARS and other departments, including health care and offender management, was good.
- I.72** There was a good peer supporter programme with appropriate training and supervision, although it had been affected by long delays in security clearance for new applicants. An Alcoholics Anonymous group ran monthly. Voluntary compact based drug testing using mouth swabs was available to DARS clients. Regular service user feedback informed service development.
- I.73** Delphi medical – subcontracted by Lifeline to provide clinical services, had provided these services for prisoners with substance misuse problems since October 2012, but only eight prisoners had needed prescribing since April 2013, and none were receiving opiate substitution during the inspection. The records we examined and prisoners we spoke to indicated that prescribing was flexible, prisoners participated fully in regular reviews and overall support was good. The secondary mental health team provided dual diagnosis

support for prisoners with substance misuse and mental health problems. Waiting lists for smoking cessation treatment through primary health care were reasonable.

- I.74** There was poor attendance by other departments, including security, at the monthly drug strategy meetings, but this was being actively addressed. The substance misuse strategy and needs analysis were out of date, and there was no overarching action plan.

Recommendation

- I.75** **The substance misuse strategy should be updated annually and include a detailed action plan, with up-to-date performance measures informed by an annual needs analysis.**

Housekeeping point

- I.76** Security checks of prospective peer supporters should be completed promptly.

Section 2. Respect

Residential units

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners live in a safe, clean and decent environment within which they are encouraged to take personal responsibility for themselves and their possessions. Prisoners are aware of the rules and routines of the prison which encourage responsible behaviour.

- 2.1** *The standard of the accommodation varied greatly between the older and the newer wings. Cells in the new accommodation were clean and well equipped but in the older wings were cramped, lacked chairs, and many windows and flooring needed repair. Some cells designed for one held two prisoners, and toilets in many of the shared cells were inadequately screened. Some external exercise yards were littered. Responses to applications were reasonable although some took too long.*
- 2.2** The older units, A, B and C wings, had poor sightlines, which affected staff supervision. D, E, F, G, I and J wings were more modern, although G wing was closed during the inspection for Crown Premises Inspection Group fire safety work. I and J wings held enhanced prisoners, but due to a reduction in their number they both held standard and some basic prisoners. A, B and C wings held predominantly young adults, with B wing the induction wing. With the closure of G wing, some cells designed for one were used to hold two prisoners, and toilets in many of the shared cells were inadequately screened.
- 2.3** The quality of accommodation varied greatly. A, B and C wings were substandard; cells were cramped, did not contain chairs, and many had flooring and windows that needed immediate repair (see photos in Appendix V and main recommendation S43). The prison had a programme of window repairs, although there had been only one repair in 2014. Cells on the newer wings were clean and well equipped. The offensive display policy was well publicised and generally adhered to across all wings.
- 2.4** In our survey, fewer prisoners than the comparator (33% against 47%) said they had weekly access to cell cleaning materials, although we found that access was reasonable and cells and communal areas were kept clean. The exercise areas were generally well maintained, although those for A, B and C wings contained litter. Access to showers had improved since the last inspection and all prisoners were offered a shower daily. The showers on A, B and C wings were in reasonable condition and those on the newer wings were well maintained. Most prisoners could wear their own clothes and had adequate access to laundry facilities, as well as good access to their stored property.
- 2.5** Each wing had a reasonable supply of recreational equipment, although that on the newer wings was in better condition. Notice boards in association areas displayed a range of important information about prison services and routines.
- 2.6** Incoming and outgoing mail was dealt with promptly. Each wing had sufficient telephones and all had privacy hoods, although prisoners on the basic regime did not have daily access to telephones (see paragraph 1.48 and recommendation 1.49).
- 2.7** The application system worked adequately, and more prisoners than the comparator (84% against 75%) said it was easy to make an application. However, only 33% of prisoners, against the comparator of 50%, said they received a response within seven days.

Recommendations

- 2.8 Toilets in double cells should be adequately screened.**
- 2.9 All prisoners should have daily access to telephone calls.**
- 2.10 Prisoners should receive a prompt response to applications.**

Staff-prisoner relationships

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners are treated with respect by staff throughout the duration of their time in custody, and are encouraged to take responsibility for their own actions and decisions.

2.11 *Most prisoners said staff treated them with respect. The personal officer scheme was effective. Prisoner consultation arrangements were good.*

- 2.12** In our survey, 72% of respondents said that most staff treated them with respect, against the comparator of 66%, and 33%, against 22%, said staff had checked on them in the last week, although black and minority ethnic prisoners were less positive. We observed very good relationships with staff acting as positive role models. We saw staff engaging with prisoners during association, and most prisoners we spoke to said staff were respectful and helpful. Staff generally used prisoners' preferred names.
- 2.13** The personal officer scheme was working well. In our survey, more respondents than the comparator said they had a personal officer. Officer entries in prisoner case history notes were regular and demonstrated a good knowledge of prisoners in their care. In the cases we sampled, entries were balanced and much positive behaviour was acknowledged, as well as negative behaviour challenged. Staff took into account the maturity levels of young adults before issuing a warning about their behaviour under the IEP scheme (see paragraph 1.47), which we do not usually see. Quality assurance was effective.
- 2.14** There was no overarching prisoner consultative committee but prisoner wing representatives could meet at four clustered wing meetings. Each meeting had an agenda and generic issues raised were addressed at the senior management meeting. Minutes of the prisoner meetings showed that the arrangements were effective in achieving change.

Equality and diversity

Expected outcomes:

The prison demonstrates a clear and coordinated approach to eliminating discrimination, promoting equitable outcomes and fostering good relations, and ensures that no prisoner is unfairly disadvantaged. This is underpinned by effective processes to identify and resolve any inequality. The distinct needs of each protected characteristic⁵ are recognised and addressed: these include race equality, nationality, religion, disability (including mental, physical and learning disabilities and difficulties), gender, transgender issues, sexual orientation and age.

2.15 *The management of equality and diversity work was fragmented and inconsistent. Prisoners from minority groups were systematically identified, and consultation arrangements ranged from excellent to poor. The promotion and celebration of diversity was generally good. Race monitoring data were generally within range, but investigations into allegations of discrimination were poor. Muslim prisoners continued to hold less positive perceptions and the establishment had still not investigated the reasons why. Provision for foreign national prisoners was mixed, but better for disabled prisoners. Support for gay prisoners was excellent.*

Strategic management

- 2.16** The equality committee met bimonthly and was chaired by the governor, with good attendance from functional heads and peer representatives. The meeting covered all the protected characteristics, and the equality action plan was comprehensive. Arrangements to identify all new arrivals from minority groups, including the sharing of information between departments, were good.
- 2.17** Work on equality was fragmented and inconsistent leading to mixed outcomes for some minority groups. Support and consultation ranged from excellent for gay, bisexual and transgender prisoners and good arrangements for Gypsy, Romany and Travellers, to no consultation with black and minority ethnic, Muslim or foreign national prisoners or those with disabilities. A custodial manager oversaw equality work but had only eight hours a month designated to this. There was in addition, support from a disability liaison officer, residential officers and peer representatives. However, many of the designated peer representatives and officers had received no training and did not fully understand their role, and many prisoners said they were unsure of who to speak to about an equality issue.
- 2.18** The establishment had recently started to monitor the impact of its regime through the local monitoring data tool, which covered most of the protected characteristics, but it was too early to draw conclusions. Data from the systematic monitoring and analysis of race equality treatment (SMART) showed that black prisoners had been regularly over-represented in one key area (good order or discipline) in the previous 12 months, but this had been investigated and action taken.
- 2.19** Twenty-two discrimination incident report forms (DIRFs) had been submitted in the previous six months. In our structured groups, prisoners said they had no confidence in the DIRF process. We found that many were inadequately investigated, took too long to complete and quality assurance was ineffective.

⁵ The grounds upon which discrimination is unlawful (Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2010).

Recommendations

- 2.20** There should be regular consultation with prisoners from all minority groups, and issues raised should be pursued appropriately.
- 2.21** The prison should ensure that equality peer and staff representatives understand their role, and should promote this role throughout the establishment.
- 2.22** The quality of investigations into allegations of discrimination should be improved, and they should be completed on time.

Protected characteristics

- 2.23** Thirty-seven per cent of the population were from a black minority ethnic background and 15% were Muslim. In our survey, Muslim respondents were less positive than non-Muslim prisoners in responses about being victimised by staff. We found no evidence to support this view, but the same issues had been highlighted at our last inspection and the prison had still not investigated these perceptions. The consultation meeting for Gypsy, Romany and Traveller meetings was regularly attended by Traveller representatives from the community and an external agency that had received government funding to help prisoners from this group into employment or training on release.
- 2.24** There were 36 foreign national prisoners at the time of the inspection, including two detainees held beyond the end of their sentence. Although the detainees were held for only a short period before transfer out, they did not have the benefit of access to facilities available at an immigration removal centre, such as the internet, fax machines and a less restrictive regime. Home Office immigration staff attended the prison bimonthly. There was no independent immigration advice.
- 2.25** The prison had facilities to translate information into a range of foreign languages, and foreign national peer representatives had folders with relevant information for foreign national prisoners. However, these were underused, as was the professional interpreting service which had not been used in the previous 12 months. We were told of two Vietnamese prisoners who had struggled to communicate with staff and prisoners, and none of the support in place had been used. There was an over-reliance on other prisoners to interpret. The foreign national prisoners we spoke to said that, although they felt they were treated the same as British prisoners, they would have benefited from being able to communicate with each other and the prison.
- 2.26** There was good identification of new arrivals with disabilities, and the health care team shared information with the disability liaison officer. Prisoners with disabilities told us they were unsure what support was available for them or who the disability liaison officer was. However, it was clear from the number of personal emergency evacuation plans (PEEPs) open, staff awareness of them and the buddy scheme in place that prisoners requiring assistance had been given some support. Seven prisoners had reported hearing difficulties and in response some staff had been trained in sign language.
- 2.27** Support for gay, bisexual and transgender prisoners was excellent. In our survey, around 30 prisoners had declared themselves as gay or bisexual, and the prison had recorded a similar number, which was much higher than we normally see and a positive sign. Over 20 prisoners regularly attended a monthly meeting, 'Inside out', and a wide range of topics was discussed and valuable support offered. There were good links with external support agencies, including Staffordshire Buddies. Prisoners who attended the group said they felt well supported and that other prisons could learn from the support offered at Swinfen Hall.

Recommendations

- 2.28** The prison should explore the reasons why Muslim prisoners hold more negative perceptions than non-Muslims. (Repeated recommendation 4.40)
- 2.29** Immigration detainees should not be held in prison unless there are exceptional reasons to do so.
- 2.30** The prison should provide a coordinated approach to managing the needs of foreign national prisoners, including access to free independent immigration advice.

Good practice

- 2.31** *The prison offered excellent support, advice and guidance to gay, bisexual and transgender prisoners through the Inside out group.*

Faith and religious activity

Expected outcomes:

All prisoners are able to practise their religion fully and in safety. The chaplaincy plays a full part in prison life and contributes to prisoners' overall care, support and resettlement.

- 2.32** *Faith provision and facilities were very good. The chaplaincy was integrated well into the prison and provided valuable support. Ramadan was being observed during the inspection and arrangements were good.*

- 2.33** The chaplaincy saw new arrivals, who could apply to attend services at this initial meeting. The population was monitored monthly and provision had been adjusted to ensure Catholic prisoners had adequate faith provision. Worship facilities were good and the purpose-built mosque was excellent. Religious festivals were actively promoted and celebrated. Ramadan was being observed by Muslim prisoners during the inspection and arrangements were good. The Muslim chaplain visited the wings and kitchen regularly, and prisoner representatives had been appointed on each wing to liaise with him about Ramadan arrangements.
- 2.34** The chaplaincy was well integrated into prison life, visited each wing daily to speak to prisoners and attended ACCT reviews. The chaplaincy provided and facilitated a wide range of classes, groups and pastoral care. This included 'stepping stones', a group to assist prisoners who struggled to integrate to improve their social skills. Trained counselling provision was good.

Complaints

Expected outcomes:

Effective complaints procedures are in place for prisoners, which are easy to access, easy to use and provide timely responses. Prisoners feel safe from repercussions when using these procedures and are aware of an appeal procedure.

2.35 *Some prisoners perceived the complaints procedure to be unjust. Most responses to complaints were good.*

2.36 Prisoners in our structured groups told us that they had no faith in the complaints system. They said that staff sometimes destroyed complaints before they were logged by the complaints clerk, and that complaints about staff were not investigated. We found no evidence to substantiate these claims. However, the uniformed night orderly officer emptied the locked complaint boxes, which did not alleviate prisoners' concerns about the fairness of the procedure.

2.37 Complaint forms were readily accessible on wings, with notices, in a range of languages, explaining how to make a complaint. Information on how to contact the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman was prominently displayed. Most complaints were answered quickly. The standard of responses was generally good - most addressed the prisoner by his preferred name, demonstrated sufficient investigation of the issue and were answered at the appropriate level. However, many complaints could have been dealt with informally. Around half of all complaints in the previous six months had been upheld. A random 10% of responses were quality assured and this had led to some improvement. Senior managers analysed complaint trends at the monthly management meeting.

Housekeeping point

2.38 Complaints boxes should only be opened by staff responsible for processing complaints. (Recommendation 3.43 repeated as a housekeeping point)

Legal rights

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners are fully aware of, and understand their sentence or remand, both on arrival and release. Prisoners are supported by the prison staff to freely exercise their legal rights.

2.39 *Legal services provision was adequate, and prisoner access to their legal representative had improved.*

2.40 New arrivals were given information about legal services during induction. A trained legal services officer provided advice on applying to the Criminal Case Review Commission, accessing a legal adviser and assisted with complaints to the Legal Ombudsman. In our survey, 48% of respondents said it was easy to attend legal visits, against the 39% comparator. Access to a legal adviser in private had improved since our last inspection with the construction of four private rooms, which were well used.

Health services

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners are cared for by a health service that assesses and meets their health needs while in prison and which promotes continuity of health and social care on release. The standard of health service provided is equivalent to that which prisoners could expect to receive elsewhere in the community.

2.41 *The range of health services was appropriate. The health centre was equivalent to community standards but the medical rooms did not comply with requirements. The did-not-attend rate was too high for several clinics. The standard of care was impressive, and nurses knew their patients. Patients had a range of opportunities for emotional support and mental health services.*

Governance arrangements

- 2.42** NHS England commissioned the health services and Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Partnership NHS Trust provided the bulk of them. A comprehensive health needs assessment informed service provision, and the partnership board ensured the health action plan was being implemented; working relationships were described as very good.
- 2.43** Clinical governance was effective with detailed reporting arrangements and evidence of learning. There were few serious and untoward incidents – only 1.5 a month in 2013-14, mostly to do with medications.
- 2.44** There were sufficient health care staff with the right skills, including a nurse prescriber, to provide a comprehensive service. Services had been maintained despite temporary staff sickness. Some staff were not up to date with mandatory training but there was a plan to address this. The trust had a clear expectation that staff should receive clinical supervision but not all took advantage of this. Health staff were very professional, using appropriate language and good relationships with prisoners to deliver care. Nurses' knowledge of their patients was impressive. They knew their patients by sight and could recall them, even if they had not seen them for some time. There was clear leadership from the senior nurse manager.
- 2.45** The health care centre was equivalent to community primary care standards with commendable infection control compliance and patient environment action scores. The wing medical rooms did not comply with these standards, but were not used for treatments. Resuscitation kit was consistent throughout the prison, and strategically sited – although the automated external defibrillator (AED) for D and E wings was not in place. Equipment was regularly checked and maintained. We found that 83% of uniformed staff had been trained in the use of AEDs, which is the highest rate we have seen in any prison, although some had trained several years ago.
- 2.46** There was a commendable range of evidence-based practice guidance in the health centre and wing medical rooms. Treatment plans were evidence-based and there was an annual clinical audit of medical records. There were good policies and procedures for infection control and management of communicable diseases. A recent norovirus outbreak had been managed well with good joint working with prison staff. There was a relevant information sharing protocol.
- 2.47** Prisoners in our survey were less satisfied with the quality of health services than in 2010 (50% compared with 63%). There was a patient consultation forum every three months,

which prisoner health representatives attended. At the time of our visit the representatives were changing and we saw inconsistent health information posted on the wings as a result.

- 2.48** Prisoners knew how to comment or complain about their care and treatment. There had been about 4.5 complaints a month in 2013-4, a very low number, usually about medications. Responses were timely, focused and contained explanations and apologies. There was one compliment on file from the last year. The complaints system, through PALS (patient advice and liaison services), was the most independent we have seen. However, complaints forms and envelopes were not always available across the wings.
- 2.49** A new health promotion plan was due to be implemented. Health campaigning materials were not always available on the wings. A prison health day in early 2014 had been well received.

Housekeeping points

- 2.50** All clinical staff should receive clinical supervision.
- 2.51** The patient forum should meet more frequently, and there should be a check on the health care information available on the wings.
- 2.52** Health care complaints forms and envelopes should be consistently available on the wings.

Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.53** The reception health care room was well laid out. Interpreting services had been used on some occasions with non-English speaking new arrivals, and the reception screening tool was combined with the secondary assessment. We observed age-appropriate discussions by nurses in health care with new arrivals, including patient and clear explanation of consent for a prisoner who could not read or write. All new arrivals were offered chlamydia testing and other screening as clinically indicated. New arrivals were given written information about dental care but not about health services. There was also a lack of information on the wings; this had been prepared but not yet displayed.
- 2.54** There was an appropriate range of primary care services and clinics based on the needs assessment. The few patients with long-term conditions received efficient monitoring and treatment from the nurses and GP, and care plans were used appropriately.
- 2.55** Primary care staff offered services from 7.30am to 7.30pm with shorter hours at the weekend. GPs were available from the out-of-hours service – this was used about once a week and offered suturing and other minor interventions. There was an efficient and effective appointment system, and waiting times were short as health care had benefited from prison staffing changes that had improved patient flow. Despite concerted action, did-not-attend rates were too high. For example, in May 2014 that rate was 14% for the GP, 12% for the dentist, 38% for sexual health and 48% for screening. In our survey, black and minority ethnic and Muslim prisoners said they found it less easy to see a GP than white and non-Muslim prisoners, but we found no bias in the application system or waiting lists. Wing-based services were limited to medications and triage.
- 2.56** Prisoners had excellent access to relevant disease prevention programmes, such as testicular cancer, sexually transmitted diseases and mental health. There was appropriate emphasis on continuity of immunisation and vaccination cover, including tuberculosis, meningitis C and measles, mumps and rubella, as well as blood-borne virus protection and treatment, such as

hepatitis B and C. Barrier protection was available from the nurses on the wings and was used.

- 2.57** Prisoners had very good access to secondary health care with visiting clinicians for genitourinary medicine and hepatitis C. Fewer than two external escorts a month to hospital appointments had been lost in 2013-14 due to short notice security cancellations, which was very good.

Recommendations

- 2.58** **Written information on how prisoners can access health services should be available at their reception and on the wings.**
- 2.59** **The health care department should take sustained action to reduce did-not-attend rates.**

Pharmacy

- 2.60** Eighty-nine per cent of patients received their medication in possession; suitable risk assessments were carried out and available on the SystemOne clinical IT system. Prisoners were able to consult the pharmacist to discuss their medicines. While clinics were well attended, the health application form was not clear about how to access the pharmacist.
- 2.61** Although there were adequate medical rooms available, medicines were administered on the wings from medicine trolleys through locked gates. Medicine queues were inadequately supervised and we observed crowding at the gates that prevented confidentiality - two patients stood side by side as they received their controlled drugs with no officer nearby, which created the potential for diversion of the medications. Bullying was reported to be a problem by patients receiving nutritional supplements.
- 2.62** Prescribed medicines and over-the-counter medicines could not be given to prisoners when the health care department was closed, which sometimes necessitated a change of medication. Some simple remedies were available from the prison shop, but not analgesics.
- 2.63** Medicines were stored securely and in good order in clearly labelled cupboards, but we saw some loose packs of ibuprofen and paracetamol. There were good stock reconciliation procedures, but nursing staff did not always record stock taken from the emergency cupboard in health care. There was some excessive stock of supervised medicines in the A, B and C wing treatment room. There was no audit trail of who had accessed the controlled drugs cabinet. Date checking procedures were in place and fridge temperatures were monitored. There were no room temperature thermometers in any of the rooms used to store medicines even though they were sometimes hot. As a result, the emergency medicines stored in A, B and C wing treatment room had to be relocated, and other medicines stored there were given short expiry dates because of the temperature.
- 2.64** A well-attended medicines management committee met quarterly, discussed any concerns and monitored prescribing trends. There were appropriate and up-to-date protocols. We saw out-of-date pharmacy reference materials in several rooms.

Recommendations

- 2.65** Medicines should be administered from dedicated rooms, and from trolleys only by exception.
- 2.66** The queues for the collection and supervision of medicines should be adequately supervised to maintain patient confidentiality and reduce potential bullying.
- 2.67** There should be procedures to provide prescribed and over-the counter medicines when the health care department is closed.
- 2.68** The temperature in rooms where medicines are stored should not exceed 25°C.

Housekeeping points

- 2.69** The health care application form should include a clear option to request to see the pharmacist.
- 2.70** There should be a clear audit trail of who has accessed the controlled drugs cabinet.
- 2.71** Out-of-date pharmacy reference materials should be discarded.

Dentistry

- 2.72** The dentist and hygienist offered a full range of treatments, and access to the dentist was equivalent to that in the community. No prisoner was waiting for urgent treatment and 55 were on the list for non-urgent treatment, which started within three to six weeks and so not dissimilar to the community. However prisoners consistently criticised access to the dentist. Their perceptions were misinformed because, with the exception of one wing, noticeboards quoted 12 or 14 week waits to see the dentist.
- 2.73** The dental surgery was of a high standard. Decontamination practices were good, although the environment did not meet technical best practice standards. Required certifications were up to date.

Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.74** There was an open referral system to mental health services, and officers felt supported in caring for prisoners with mental health care needs. There was a complex mix of providers, involving three NHS Trusts and others, but multiagency working was effective. Staff were appropriately qualified and supervised. There was a rich mix of skills and therapeutic opportunities but there were insufficient mental health therapy rooms. The 'Schwartz round' offered staff education and peer support bimonthly for clinical issues and was well attended by health care staff, but less so by prison staff. This project, unique in the Prison Service, offered opportunities for staff to reflect on practice and identify learning points to inform safe practices in the care of patients.
- 2.75** Mental health primary care staff gave emotional support and care to patients with mental health problems. There were around 10 prisoners at a time in primary care support, receiving brief therapies. Staff required more time to prepare for one-to-one sessions and this was being considered.

- 2.76** The 'Inside Out' NHS Trust offered therapy to patients with post-traumatic stress disorder and other problems arising from abuse. Eighteen patients were in therapy and there was no limit on sessions, which enabled time for deep work. This service was excellent. The chaplaincy offered loss and bereavement counselling.
- 2.77** Patients with serious mental illnesses were treated by the in-reach team, which offered nursing, psychiatric, occupational therapy and social work inputs through individual and group therapies. The team received 21 referrals a month and 12 patients were being monitored under the care programme approach. Patients were given continuing support, including those determined not to accept medication. Only two patients in 2013-14 had required transfer to health services under the Mental Health Act; their transfers took longer than 14 days.
- 2.78** More than a third of custody staff, 34%, were trained in mental health awareness, which was a good level.

Recommendations

- 2.79** **There should be sufficient appropriate therapy space for patients with mental health problems.**
- 2.80** **Transfers of patients under the Mental Health Act should take place within the target transfer time.**

Good practice

- 2.81** *The Schwartz round offered health staff opportunities to reflect on practice and identify learning points to inform safe practices in the care of patients.*
- 2.82** *The Inside Out service offered timely and appropriate in-depth psychotherapies to patients with deep-rooted psychological traumas.*

Catering

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners are offered varied meals to meet their individual requirements and food is prepared and served according to religious, cultural and prevailing food safety and hygiene regulations.

- 2.83** *Catering arrangements were managed well. Although the meals were unpopular with some prisoners, they were of sufficient quality and quantity. There were responses to consultation about the food.*

- 2.84** A published pictorial menu cycle catered for different dietary needs and preferences, with at least one substantial hot meal every day. Each meal included four or five options as well as opportunities for fresh fruit and vegetables. Breakfast packs were issued the evening before they were to be eaten and many prisoners said they ate them then as they were hungry. Despite negative survey results, the meals we saw had adequate portions and were of a reasonable quality. Ramadan started during the inspection and arrangements for the appropriate provision were very good and appreciated by Muslim prisoners.

- 2.85** There were no facilities for communal dining. Serveries were generally clean but were not always managed properly; temperatures were not always taken, and servers were sometimes dressed incorrectly. The kitchen was generally clean and well equipped, with proper attention to arrangements for halal food. Prisoners who worked there could not achieve qualifications.
- 2.86** Prisoners were consulted about the food in a twice yearly survey and through the regular prisoner council meetings, and there was evidence that menus had changed as a result.

Recommendations

- 2.87** **Breakfast should be served on the day it is to be eaten.**
- 2.88** **Prisoners should be able to dine communally.**

Purchases

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners can purchase a suitable range of goods at reasonable prices to meet their diverse needs, and can do so safely.

2.89 *The shop list broadly met the needs of the population but black and minority ethnic prisoners remained negative. There were long delays for some new arrivals to receive their first order. Prisoners were charged an administration fee on catalogue orders.*

- 2.90** In our survey, black and minority ethnic prisoners remained more negative than white prisoners about the range of items on the prison shop list, but the prison had done nothing to understand or address these perceptions. However, we thought that the list offered a diverse range of products to meet the needs of the population. There was regular consultation about the shop list, with evidence of changes as a result.
- 2.91** New arrivals could wait up to 13 days for their first shop order, depending on the day of their arrival. However, they could buy smoker's and non-smoker's packs on arrival.
- 2.92** Prisoners could shop from a range of catalogues, but it was inappropriate that they were charged an administration fee for their orders.

Recommendations

- 2.93** **The prison should investigate and take action on the views of black and minority ethnic prisoners about the prison shop.** (Repeated recommendation 8.13)
- 2.94** **Prisoners should not be charged an administration fee for catalogue orders.**

Section 3. Purposeful activity

Time out of cell

Expected outcomes:

All prisoners are actively encouraged to engage in activities available during unlock and the prison offers a timetable of regular and varied activities.⁶

3.1 *Too many prisoners were locked in their cell. Some prisoners had restricted access to association, but access to exercise was good.*

3.2 The published core day showed time out of cell to be around 10 hours for a fully employed prisoner, but this figure fell to around eight hours on some days for prisoners on A, B or C wings, where association was on alternate evenings. An unemployed prisoner could expect less than two hours a day out of their cell, depending on their location. At roll checks during the morning and afternoon, we found an average of 36% of prisoners locked in their cells, which was too high for a training prison, especially one holding so many young adults.

3.3 In our survey, 55% of respondents said they could go on outside exercise three or more times a week, against the comparator of 42%, and 61%, against only 34%, said they could go on association five or more times a week. Each wing had its own yard with benches and the exercise period was popular with prisoners. Half of the population on A, B and C wings went on association on alternate days, which we were told was due to the design of the wings. Prisoners on these wings had no access to their cells during association periods and had to request to use the toilet then, which was unnecessary. Access to association on the other wings was good, and prisoners had good access to exercise everywhere. Association and exercise periods were rarely cancelled.

Recommendation

3.4 All prisoners should receive 10 hours a day out of their cell.

Housekeeping point

3.5 Prisoners on A, B and C wings should be able to use the toilet during association without having to ask staff.

⁶ Time out of cell, in addition to formal 'purposeful activity', includes any time prisoners are out of their cells to associate or use communal facilities to take showers or make telephone calls.

Learning and skills and work activities

Expected outcomes:

All prisoners can engage in activities that are purposeful, benefit them and increase their employability. Prisoners are encouraged and enabled to learn both during and after their sentence. The learning and skills and work provision is of a good standard and is effective in meeting the needs of all prisoners.

3.6 *The leadership and management of learning and skills and work required improvement. There were almost enough activity places for the population but not all the places were used. Prisoners' punctuality was often poor due to regime slippage, and there was low attendance at a few education classes and in many workshops. The management of the education and vocational provision was good. Teaching and learning in education and vocational sessions was good, with outstanding features. Achievement rates on most education and vocational courses were high, but for level 1 and 2 English and mathematics required improvement. Prisoners rarely visited the library.*

3.7 *Ofsted⁷ made the following assessments about the learning and skills and work provision:*

<i>Overall effectiveness of learning and skills and work:</i>	<i>required improvement</i>
<i>Achievements of prisoners engaged in learning and skills and work:</i>	<i>required improvement</i>
<i>Quality of learning and skills and work provision:</i>	<i>good</i>
<i>Leadership and management of learning and skills and work:</i>	<i>required improvement</i>

Management of learning and skills and work

3.8 The leadership and management of learning and skills and work required improvement. The learning and skills strategy provided a clear direction with a good focus on developing prisoners' functional and employability skills.

3.9 The learning, skills and work provision was complex and evolving, and managers did not receive sufficient information from all areas to inform decisions fully, or make enough use of data to evaluate different groups' participation in activities. In May 2014, the governor informed all staff about the need to improve prisoner attendance at activities, and this had started to improve in vocational training and a few education classes. However, attendance for key education subjects remained a concern, and insufficient work and staff shortages had affected the number of prisoners regularly attending workshops. Punctuality at activities was poor. Staff recorded prisoners' reasons for refusing to work, but did not investigate further to check for any underlying causes and concerns. Occasionally regime slippage impacted upon punctuality at work and education (see main recommendation S45).

3.10 The prison's 2013-14 self-assessment report did not include an evaluation of leadership and management or effectively evaluate all aspects of the learning and skills and work provision. The resulting action plan was detailed and useful, but did not include all relevant prison areas and partner organisations.

⁷ Ofsted is the Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills. It reports directly to the UK Parliament and is independent and impartial. It (inter alia) inspects and regulates services that provide education and skills for all ages, including those in custody. For information on Ofsted's inspection framework, please visit: <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk>.

- 3.11** The education and vocational training provided by Milton Keynes College (MKC) was good. The managers had been highly effective in improving the quality of teaching, learning and assessment since the contract started in August 2012. Their evaluation of the teaching observation outcomes had informed useful staff development and the sharing of good practice among teachers. MKC's 2012-13 self-assessment had led to many improvements.
- 3.12** MKC had offered prisoners a better choice of vocational and work-based training by subcontracting to Bournville College and Quality Transport Training (QTT). Its partnership with Barnardo's provided useful work for prisoners making high quality creative textiles for retail sale.
- 3.13** MKC had analysed prisoners' initial assessment results in June 2014 and identified the need for fewer English classes, as approximately half of new arrivals already had level 1 English awards; about a third had level 1 mathematics. Curriculum developments were due to be finalised following the outcome of a delayed training needs survey.
- 3.14** The prison had a well-established partnership with South and City College Birmingham, which provided a range of highly successful and popular construction courses. Some vocational qualifications had been replaced since the previous inspection. N-Ergy, an external training provider, had offered work-based qualifications in the prison industries since 2013. Waste management and horticulture qualifications had started in 2014, taught by prison staff.

Recommendations

- 3.15** **The prison and its learning and skill and work partners should share data and appropriate information to inform management decisions and plan for improvements.**
- 3.16** **The prison should secure more and regular contract work, and make better contingency plans to cover staff absence and keep prisoners in their allocated activities.**
- 3.17** **There should be an annual training needs analysis, and the prison should share the outcomes with its partners to inform curriculum development across all activities.**

Provision of activities

- 3.18** The prison had almost enough activity places for its current reduced number of prisoners, and unemployment was low. However, it did not make full use of the available activity places and too often closed contract workshops or had to reduce prisoner attendance due to staff shortages or insufficient work.
- 3.19** The variety and range of education and vocational training was good. The education department had places for around 100 prisoners at each session, slightly lower than at the last inspection. Prisoners were rarely allocated to more than 75% of these, and the reasons for this had not been sufficiently investigated (see main recommendation S44). Prisoners could attend education full or part time and study a variety of subjects. Around 24% of the population participated in education. Subjects included foundation level English and mathematics, functional skills at levels 1 and 2 in English, mathematics and information communication technology (ICT), and art, mentoring, creative textiles, and budgeting and money management.

- 3.20** MKC staff taught 10 prisoners on an industrial cleaning course, and managed the 12-place rail maintenance provision run by Bournville College and the small amount of warehouse and storage principles provision delivered by QTT. South and City College, Birmingham offered 54 places on a range of popular construction courses in bricklaying, painting and decorating, carpentry, fitted interiors, plumbing and tiling. The prison provided 10 places on a new horticulture programme that made good use of the prison grounds. Prisoners working in recycling could take waste management qualifications.
- 3.21** Wing domestic duties allocated to nearly 100 prisoners included cleaning communal areas and serving prisoners' food. There were a further 80 jobs around the prison as orderlies, trusted 'red band' roles, grounds maintenance, the clothing store, waste management and prison kitchens.
- 3.22** Contract work for around 100 prisoners in the workshops consisted of box assembly, card packing, electrical component packing, making Prison Service clothes, and cutting and binding carpet pieces. Prison work was mundane and low skilled, but prisoners could take work-based qualifications. N-Ergy also offered qualifications at levels 1 and 2 in customer service, team leading and performing manufacturing operations.
- 3.23** The pay policy was fair and linked to the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme.

Quality of provision

- 3.24** Teachers and trainers were good role models and managed prisoners' challenging and, sometimes, disruptive behaviour very well. Staff used distraction activities effectively to return prisoners to their planned tasks, and this enabled prisoners to learn and meet their targets.
- 3.25** Teaching in MKC's education sessions was good and had outstanding features. Teachers generally planned learning well and were effective in meeting individual prisoners' needs. They made good use of different learning strategies and resources to keep up prisoners' enthusiasm during long sessions. Learning resources included innovative hand-made materials, real objects, paper-based tasks and interactive projects. Teachers and prisoners used information learning technology (ILT) such as computers and interactive white boards well to develop new ideas and record key learning points. Classrooms were used effectively to promote the subjects taught, with wall displays providing useful subject-based information to maintain prisoner interest. These were significant improvements since the 2010 inspection.
- 3.26** Vocational training was good and prisoners benefited from individual coaching that focused on improving their employability. Trainers were generally highly experienced in their occupational areas and provided good industry-related advice to prisoners. Vocational training areas and contract workshops were clean, tidy, well equipped and well maintained.
- 3.27** Assessment was well planned and verification accorded with awarding body requirements. Teachers and trainers assessed prisoners' learning regularly and gave good verbal feedback on their work, but their written feedback varied in its quality and usefulness for prisoners in making improvements. Individual learning plans and learning journals contained some good reflective examples by staff and prisoners on learning and progress.
- 3.28** The work for around 300 prisoners was generally insufficiently challenging for too many prisoners, who became bored. The two workshops packing electrical components and card folding struggled to maintain sufficient work or a good workflow to reflect commercial pressures.

- 3.29** There was good additional learning support from MKC specialist staff for prisoners attending education, industrial cleaning and rail maintenance courses, but not for those in other activities. Teachers and trainers frequently used activities to develop prisoners' English and mathematics skills but did not always reflect these in their planning. Similarly, staff and prisoners often discussed equality and diversity topics, but did not always incorporate them into session planning.
- 3.30** Education and careers staff were enthusiastic and motivational in their presentations to new prisoners at induction. However, the omission of information about other providers' courses, prison employment and PE vocational courses meant prisoners did not have full details before their individual planning interviews with careers staff. The information given at induction on English and mathematics eligibility criteria for prison work contradicted some details on activity allocation lists. Prisoner allocation to activities had been improved by better sequencing to reflect their sentence plan and learning plan requirements and support their resettlement goals.

Recommendations

- 3.31** **Teachers' and trainers' written feedback on prisoners' assessed work and in their individual learning plans should be detailed enough for them to know what they did well and what they need to do to improve.**
- 3.32** **The prison should provide support for additional learning needs to all prisoners who require it.**
- 3.33** **The induction for new arrivals should cover all the education, training and work opportunities available to enable them to make informed choices at their advice and guidance interviews.**

Education and vocational achievements

- 3.34** Prisoners' achievements of accredited qualifications in vocational training, mentoring, creative crafts, ICT level 1, and entry level English and mathematics and the Stepping Stones basic English courses were high. Prisoners attending education and receiving additional learning support achieved overall at similar levels to those who did not.
- 3.35** The proportion of prisoners achieving functional skills at level 1 English and mathematics was too low at around 60%, especially as this was the eligibility criteria for a prison job (see main recommendation S46). Functional skills level 2 qualifications in English, mathematics and ICT were only achieved by 54%, 68% and 58% respectively of those completing courses.
- 3.36** Prisoners developed good construction craft skills. Prisoners made high quality products for retail sale nationally in the creative textiles workshop, where their skills development was impressive. In education classes, prisoners took pride in producing neat handwritten and computer graphics work.
- 3.37** The majority of prisoners made good progress in education and vocational training sessions, and teachers frequently confirmed their learning by reviewing prisoners' objectives for the session. Prisoners developed their self-confidence by achieving new knowledge and skills, and useful communication and social skills. Prisoners had respectful relationships with teachers and trainers in sessions. Education and vocational training areas were calm environments with a quiet purposeful atmosphere.

- 3.38** Punctuality at activities was often poor, mostly due to regime reasons, although some prisoners dawdled on their way and were not encouraged to move faster by patrol officers. This wasted learning and workshop production time, and did not help prisoners to develop good habits for sustainable employment on release (see main recommendation S45). Attendance at education classes had improved since May 2014 and was generally satisfactory, although very low at English and ICT level 1 as well as industrial cleaning theory sessions.

Library

- 3.39** Staffordshire County Council ran the prison library, which had two librarians and two orderlies and was open Tuesday to Friday daytime and on Saturday afternoon. Prisoners rarely visited the library and the planned allocation times frequently clashed with other activities. The percentage of the population registered as members of the library had fallen since the previous inspection. A mobile trolley service had been trialled unsuccessfully after the previous inspection. The library was not promoted well enough throughout the prison to encourage use of its facilities, and not all new arrivals attended the library induction.
- 3.40** There was insufficient monitoring of the use of the library by different groups of prisoners to plan improvements. A new computerised system was not yet producing library performance reports, and data on library stock and book loss were unavailable. The library had weak links with education and vocational training. Prisoners could not easily access reference legal texts and Prison Service Orders in the library.
- 3.41** Library staff promoted literacy at family days and visits well. Activities included making books and story bags for prisoners to use with their families and promote reading. The Storybook Dads scheme for prisoners to record stories for their children was promoted well to prisoners involved in family activities, and there had been 33 recordings in 2013-14. The Shannon Trust reading mentoring plan had 11 trained mentors.

Recommendations

- 3.42** **The library should improve access for prisoners by increasing opening hours and better promoting its services to prisoners.**
- 3.43** **Library staff should use data effectively to monitor stock and the use of the library by different groups of prisoners.**
- 3.44** **The library should establish links with all education and training areas to promote lifelong learning skills, such as prisoner research for future studies and job search.**

Physical education and healthy living

Expected outcomes:

All prisoners understand the importance of healthy living, and are encouraged and enabled to participate in physical education in safe and decent surroundings.

- 3.45** *Too few prisoners regularly attended PE, although they were all timetabled two sessions a week. The PE facilities were good and staff were well qualified and experienced. There were useful PE vocational courses.*

- 3.46** Physical education (PE) and healthy living provision was adequate, but we saw few prisoners using the facilities. Prisoner access to PE had been reduced recently from four to two timetabled sessions a week, but many sessions were underused. PE attendance records were not analysed to identify prisoners who regularly used the facilities.
- 3.47** Indoor facilities were very good and consisted of a compact sports hall with large cardiovascular and resistance weights areas. Outside facilities included a full-sized football pitch. The facilities were open early morning until late evening seven days a week. Local teams visited for occasional football matches.
- 3.48** Six well-qualified, experienced PE instructors provided a wide range of recreational PE courses. Prisoners had appropriate health assessments for physical exercise, and they could not use the facilities unless they completed the induction.
- 3.49** PE staff delivered vocational qualifications at levels 2 and 3, under subcontract to Bournville College. There had been no training needs analysis to inform the accredited courses offered. The level 2 gym instructors' course ran every six weeks throughout the year. Attendance on PE courses was good and success rates were high.
- 3.50** The PE staff had effective links with the health care and substance misuse teams. There were referrals for prisoners' rehabilitation and to improve their health and well-being, such as weight loss. Prisoners who used the gym, particularly the younger ones, developed a good understanding of the importance of a healthy diet and the benefits of exercise.
- 3.51** The main PE accommodation and equipment, including the showers, were well maintained. The exercise rooms on two wings had recently been removed from use for maintenance of equipment, which had reduced prisoners' ease of access to exercise on the wings.

Recommendation

- 3.52** **The prison should monitor the use of the PE facilities by different groups of prisoners and improve prisoner attendance.**

Housekeeping point

- 3.53** Exercise equipment on the wings should be checked for maintenance and use.

Section 4. Resettlement

Strategic management of resettlement

Expected outcomes:

Planning for a prisoner's release or transfer starts on their arrival at the prison.

Resettlement underpins the work of the whole prison, supported by strategic partnerships in the community and informed by assessment of prisoner risk and need.

Good planning ensures a seamless transition into the community.

4.1 *There were appropriate and comprehensive policies for offender management and resettlement, and well-attended reducing reoffending and resettlement pathways meetings. The prisons needs analysis was out of date but provision was sufficient for the population. The new dual role for offender supervisors had led to some difficulties and affected the provision.*

4.2 The prison had up-to-date policies on reducing reoffending, resettlement, offender management and public protection. Each was comprehensive, covered key issues and detailed the activity to be undertaken.

4.3 The strategy for all aspects of offender management and resettlement was supervised through monthly reducing reoffending and quarterly resettlement pathways meetings. Each was clearly constituted and had appropriate attendance, including representation from all the relevant prison departments.

4.4 The work was managed through two separate strands. All work on resettlement, including pathway and programme provision, was managed under the head of reducing reoffending, and all that on offender management, including public protection and work with indeterminate sentence prisoners, under the head of public protection. Both lead managers were on of the senior management team. The arrangement worked well with evidence of good links between the work of the various departments to ensure appropriate prisoner engagement.

4.5 In April 2014, the offender management unit (OMU) had reorganised to increase the number of officer offender supervisors to 16, each with the dual role of offender supervisor and wing supervisory officer. Although the time dedicated to offender management work was the same in principle, spread across more staff, it was causing some difficulties in practice. Fewer hours were often allocated to the OMU than were required, and shift patterns meant that offender supervisors could sometimes go for long periods without working in the department. Throughout the inspection, both staff and managers expressed frustration with this model, and prisoners in our groups and individually complained about the level of contact with offender supervisors. However, it was planned that the department would revert to dedicated staff in September 2014, with offender supervisors dropping the wing role, to maintain consistent and effective practice.

4.6 The last prisoner needs analysis had been in 2012 and was out of date, although we were told that it was being updated. Nevertheless, there was generally appropriate provision to meet prisoners' needs across the resettlement pathways. The high number of offending behaviour programme places was sufficient and based, appropriately, on data drawn from offender assessment system (OASys) information.

Recommendations

- 4.7** The prison should ensure that there are sufficient officer offender supervisors dedicated to offender management duties.
- 4.8** The prison should undertake a regular analysis of prisoner needs, and ensure that offender management and resettlement provision is sufficient to match what is required.

Offender management and planning

Expected outcomes:

All prisoners have a sentence plan based on an individual assessment of risk and need, which is regularly reviewed and implemented throughout and after their time in custody. Prisoners, together with all relevant staff, are involved in drawing up and reviewing plans.

4.9 *Offender supervisors saw most new arrivals promptly. While most had an up-to-date OASys, the quality of these and associated sentence plans was too variable. Contact between prisoners and offender supervisors was generally frequent but too often had little focus and was of limited benefit. Monitoring of offender supervisors' work did not focus sufficiently on the quality and effectiveness of their engagement with prisoners. Public protection arrangements were good. Work with indeterminate sentence prisoners was reasonable but some provision was only available for lifers.*

- 4.10** All prisoners were allocated an offender supervisor, with 62% assessed as high or very high risk of harm. In our survey, 89% of prisoners, against the 75% comparator, said they had an identified offender supervisor. More than the comparators also said they had an identified offender manager (community probation officer) and received telephone calls and visits from them.
- 4.11** Alongside the 16 officer offender supervisors, the OMU also had 2.5 whole-time-equivalent probation officers, who managed all prisoners on an indeterminate sentence for public protection, and a part-time probation officer and two officer offender supervisors who worked with lifers. The remaining 79% of the population were serving determinate sentences and were managed by officer offender supervisors.
- 4.12** During the inspection we were joined by colleagues from HM Inspectorate of Probation who undertook a detailed analysis of 12 cases (of which six were managed by community offender managers and six by prison offender supervisors). They reviewed a further nine cases of prisoners due to be released within the next fortnight, although in less detail.
- 4.13** An offender supervisor generally saw new arrivals within 10 days, following which their OASys and sentence plan would be reviewed, if they had one, or an assessment would begin if they did not. Although reviews were usually undertaken, sentence plans were sometimes not updated to reflect what was available at Swinfen Hall, and OASys assessments were not routinely reviewed and updated on arrival. There was a backlog of 88 OASys assessments and reviews, of which around 60% were the responsibility of the prison, but staff overtime was planned to rectify this. Since the last inspection, the prison had introduced a fortnightly sequencing meeting, which was a very positive initiative. This meeting included staff from education and training, substance misuse, the programmes team and OMU, and was designed to ensure that plans and identified work for prisoners took place without delay and with appropriate links to other departments. The model appeared to work well.

- 4.14** Engagement by community offender managers in sentence planning reviews was good overall, with many participating through telephone or video conferencing. Although most OASys assessments were completed on time, their quality of was variable, as were the associated sentence plans. In our survey, only 40% of respondents said that they had been involved in the development of their plans, against the 56% comparator. We were also concerned that five of the 12 cases we reviewed in detail either had no full risk of serious harm assessment or one that was inadequate, and there was no adequate risk management plan for the six cases managed by offender supervisors and two of those managed by offender managers.
- 4.15** The subsequent level and focus of contact beyond OASys and sentence planning was also variable, but insufficient overall. The prison's model was for all prisoners to have contact with their offender supervisor at least every three months, and in most circumstances this was the case. But our assessment suggested that this blanket approach was ineffective, as some prisoners required more and others less frequent engagement. In too many cases, primarily those managed by uniformed offender supervisors, contact was also unplanned and unfocused. There was little evidence that contact focused on developing motivation or challenging offending attitudes and thinking, and the records indicated that contact often took place opportunistically during prisoner movements or while offender supervisors were on their wing duties. Prisoners whose cases we reviewed and who we spoke to were negative about their level of contact, and said they were frustrated in obtaining responses to their applications to the OMU. More positively, they knew their offender supervisor and their sentence plan targets, and demonstrated motivation to progress.
- 4.16** Quality assurance to monitor the work of offender supervisors had been put in place since our last inspection. However, this focused almost entirely on the activity rather than the quality of the work. For example, in several cases OMU managers had checked prisoners' P-P-Nomis electronic case note files to see if contact had been made, rather than the nature of the contact or its effectiveness. While probation staff received some supervision from their line manager, there was no casework supervision for uniformed staff; this was of concern given the number of high and very high risk cases in the prison. There were also limited training and development opportunities for offender supervisors, especially officers, to develop skills that would help them engage effectively with prisoners in this role.
- 4.17** Given the population, relatively few prisoners qualified for home detention curfew release. In the previous six months, 27 prisoners had been considered but only four had been successful. Decisions to decline applications were appropriate and based on the prisoner's past behaviour.
- 4.18** Release on temporary licence (ROTL) had been developed since our last inspection, although the numbers remained low the level of scrutiny in respect of risk was appropriate. Four prisoners had been granted ROTL for 32 separate events in the previous six months, including placements at the National Arboretum and the development of a local community garden.
- 4.19** All prisoners had OMU contact logs that were only accessible by offender management staff. Recording of information was confused as some staff recorded information on P-Nomis and the contact log ,while others recorded on only one or the other.

Recommendations

- 4.20 Casework and professional supervision, personal development and training should be provided to all offender supervisors, whatever their professional background.**

- 4.21 The offender management unit should extend quality assurance to ensure that the quality and effectiveness of prisoner contact and engagement is effective and meaningful.**
- 4.22 The frequency of contact by offender supervisors with prisoners should be determined by prisoner need.**

Housekeeping point

- 4.23** The offender management unit should clarify its data recording and ensure that all staff adhere to it. Staff from other departments should also be able to access OMU information on prisoners and prisoner contact.

Public protection

- 4.24** Public protection arrangements were good. All multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPAs) cases (equating to 97% of the population), along with individuals identified as having a current or past sex offence, were screened and reviewed at the weekly safeguarding children committee meeting, which considered the levels of monitoring required, where necessary. All cases that required monitoring were reviewed regularly. At the time of the inspection, 182 were identified as a sex offender and 155 as a risk to children, and 37 prisoners had restrictions due to harassment.
- 4.25** The interdepartmental risk management team (IRMT) met monthly. While there was overlap with the safeguarding children meeting, both were attended appropriately from staff from key departments. At the time of the inspection, the prison held six prisoners identified as MAPPA level 3 (the highest risk level) and a further 52 at level 2 (requiring the active involvement of one or more agency). All MAPPA 3 cases were regularly reviewed by the IRMT, and all high risk cases and MAPPA 2s were reviewed five months before release. Offender supervisors were expected to contribute MAPPA reports to meetings considering cases they were responsible for, and those we saw were of a reasonable standard. Offender supervisors did not routinely attend IRMT meetings and only one had done so in the previous three months.

Recommendation

- 4.26 Where possible, offender supervisors should attend interdepartmental risk management team meetings reviewing prisoners for whom they are responsible.**

Categorisation

- 4.27** The prison held recategorisation boards when necessary and prisoners could attend and make representation. The assessment for consideration was led by offender supervisors, and offender managers were always consulted. In most cases, boards only took place when there was a reasonable chance of recategorisation and it was supported by the offender supervisor and offender manager. In the previous six months, 12 of the 16 prisoners reviewed were recategorised to category D.

Indeterminate sentence prisoners

- 4.28** The prison held 125 indeterminate sentence prisoners, including 79 sentenced for public protection (IPP) and 46 mandatory life cases. Work with indeterminate sentence prisoners was generally appropriate, and probation offender supervisors saw most IPPs more frequently than three-monthly minimum. There were no longer lifer liaison officers allocated to each wing, although the range of information and support from OMU staff was generally good. There were two lifer family days and two lifer forums a year. These were exclusively for mandatory lifers and IPPs were not included.

Recommendation

- 4.29** The prison should extend the lifer forums and family days to include all indeterminate sentence prisoners.

Reintegration planning

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners' resettlement needs are addressed prior to release. An effective multi-agency response is used to meet the specific needs of each individual prisoner in order to maximise the likelihood of successful reintegration into the community.

- 4.30** *Pre-release arrangements were generally good, but too many prisoners were not reviewed at three-way meetings. There was good support for housing needs and debt problems. Information, advice and guidance for prisoners were good, and the number entering education, training and employment on release exceeded national targets. Pre-release health care was efficient and support for substance misusers was appropriate. Family support was broadly reasonable but there were too many restrictions for some prisoners. There was a good range of offending behaviour programmes offering a high number of places.*

- 4.31** The prison released an average of between 18 and 20 prisoners a month. Since our last inspection, pre-release planning had been reorganised to include an innovative tripartite pre-release meetings that included the offender manager, offender supervisor and prisoner. It was supported by information from the resettlement team, including key points on the prisoner's accommodation and debt. Other departments were also encouraged to contribute and we saw information from personal officers and the substance misuse team.
- 4.32** The principle of these meetings was good - to review the prisoner's progress while in custody and ensure plans for his release were in place and understood. Where these meetings took place they were generally positive, although the level and quality of contributions varied. However, although the resettlement team prepared preparation for release assessments consistently, we saw too many cases where there had been no tripartite meeting before release.

Recommendation

- 4.33** All prisoners should have a tripartite pre-release meeting. These should be quality assured to ensure that the contributions from appropriate departments and the meeting itself are appropriately focused.

Accommodation

- 4.34** Nacro, the crime reduction charity, saw all new arrivals during their induction to assess their housing needs and review any outstanding debts. In our survey, fewer prisoners than the comparator said they had had housing problems when they arrived at the prison (8% against 17%). Where necessary and appropriate, work was undertaken to manage outstanding housing debts or court fines or to terminate tenancies. Referrals were also made to Citizens Advice for specialist debt advice and guidance.
- 4.35** Prisoners were seen again in the six months before their release to review housing needs. There was good liaison with community offender managers and offender supervisors to ensure appropriate accommodation was identified and in place before release.
- 4.36** Housing outcomes were good, and in the previous eight years no prisoner had been released without identified accommodation to go to. Where supported accommodation was organised, there were often post-release follow-up telephone calls to ensure the arrangements were appropriate. In the same eight-year period, only three prisoners had been recalled from supported housing that had been arranged.

Education, training and employment

- 4.37** The National Careers Service was provided by Coventry, Solihull and Warwickshire Partnership (CSWP) and the quality was good. Advisers presented the learning and skills and work induction with education staff, and had interviews with each prisoner about three times a year. Information, advice and guidance for prisoners was good and focused well on individual needs and using time in prison to prepare for release.
- 4.38** The support to help prisoners find education, training and employment on release was good. Prisoners had very useful individual interviews with CSWP advisers before release. Over two-thirds of prisoners approaching release attended a pre-release programme, which included advice on CVs and interviews. It was delivered by Pertemps People Development Group (PPDG) staff with visiting speakers from other support agencies, such as Citizens Advice, Jobcentre Plus and Nacro. The number of prisoners progressing to education, training and employment on release exceeded national targets, especially those going into employment, at 45% against 20%.

Health care

- 4.39** Pre-release health care was efficient. Prisoners were offered a health assessment, assistance to find a GP and take-home medication as required. There was an end-of-life and palliative care pathway, although it had not been used.

Drugs and alcohol

- 4.40** The drug and alcohol recovery service (DARS) started discharge planning generally six weeks before release. It gave harm reduction advice to all DARS clients and prisoners on the monthly resettlement pre-release course. Prescribing was continued on release or transfer where appropriate. Joint working with the offender management unit, probation and community teams was very good. DARS also offered support to families of service users.

Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.41** Support for finance, benefit and debt need was reasonably comprehensive and had improved since the last inspection. Prisoners could access advice and guidance from Citizens Advice, which attended the establishment once a week, and sometimes twice if necessary. In the previous six months, there had been 80 prisoner contacts for debt advice. Other provision included the opportunity for prisoners to open bank accounts with the Halifax before discharge or to have a savings account with a local credit union while still in custody. Prisoners could also now go on a money management course, and some basic guidance was included in the pre-release programme.

Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.42** Visits were available for prisoners on Tuesdays and Wednesdays as well as at weekends, which appeared appropriate for the population. The small visitors' centre outside the prison had been run by HALOW (Help and Advice Line for Offenders' Wives, Partners and Family; a West Midlands charity that ran several prison visitors' centres) since April 2014, and developments in the service were progressing well. Support for visitors was good and staff made a point of seeing new visitors whenever possible. A range of snacks was available and there was a small, but appropriate, play area.
- 4.43** The visits hall was pleasant and relaxed, with a small snack bar that sold a good range of food and a well-equipped play area staffed by volunteers at all sessions. Prisoners could still not go to the toilet during a visit. We were told that both closed visits and visits for prisoners on the basic level of the IEP scheme were limited to one hour, rather than the usual two hours. It was inappropriate to penalise families in this way, and restricting family contact was counterproductive, especially for men in this age group (see recommendation 1.49).
- 4.44** A range of further support included bimonthly two-hour family visits, soon to increase to monthly, along with two family days a year. However, these were also restricted to prisoners on the enhanced level of IEP. The prison was not aware of how many prisoners did not receive visits, and those who did not have visits were still not able to exchange visiting orders routinely for telephone credit.
- 4.45** A six-session 'Being Dad' parenting course, delivered over three weeks was run through the chaplaincy and, although not formally accredited, was oriented to the needs of prisoners at Swinfen Hall and could be specifically tailored to the participants. The Storybook Dads programme was available through the library (see paragraph 3.41).

Housekeeping points

- 4.46** There should be a clear policy for allowing prisoners to use the toilet during a visits session, which all visits managers should understand and adhere to. (Recommendation 9.95 repeated as a housekeeping point)
- 4.47** Prisoners should be able to exchange unused visiting orders for telephone credit. (Recommendation 9.96 repeated as a housekeeping point)

Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.48** The range of accredited offending behaviour programmes was appropriate for the population, and at 192 prisoner places a year was substantial. The prison ran the thinking

skills programme (TSP) Resolve (violence management course) and three of courses available under the sex offender treatment programme (SOTP). Programmes were well managed and waiting lists were not excessive. There were good links with the fortnightly sequencing meeting to ensure that prisoners went on to appropriate programmes in good time. In our survey, 30% of prisoners, against the comparator of 25%, said that it had been easy to access offending behaviour programmes at the prison.

- 4.49** All prisoners identified as a sex offender were allocated to one of the SOTP facilitators and the department operated a casework approach, in which prisoners were seen to support, encourage and motivate their participation in treatment. There were also good links to prisoners' offender supervisors. A similar approach had been extended to Resolve and TSP, although prisoner contact with facilitators was limited to when they were in the group.
- 4.50** The prison had been involved in the pilot of a new programme, 'Identity matters', oriented to offending in groups or gangs. Eight prisoners had completed the course and its future accreditation was anticipated. The psychology department also undertook some individual work, but it was rare for offender supervisors to carry out one-to-one offence-focused work.

Section 5. Summary of recommendations and housekeeping points

The following is a listing of repeated and new recommendations, housekeeping points and examples of good practice included in this report. The reference numbers at the end of each refer to the paragraph location in the main report, and in the previous report where recommendations have been repeated.

Main recommendations

To the governor

- 5.1 A, B and C wings should undergo a complete refurbishment to bring them up to modern standards. (S43, repeated main recommendation HP48)
- 5.2 The prison should provide sufficient and meaningful activity places and ensure they are used efficiently. (S44)
- 5.3 The prison should ensure that prisoners arrive punctually at their allocated activities and, the reasons for prisoners' refusal to work and non-attendance should be checked to address any underlying causes and concerns. (S45)
- 5.4 The prison should improve achievements at level 1 and 2 for English and mathematics and make alternative arrangements for prisoners whose abilities are too low to attend a combination of education and specific work activities. (S46)

Recommendation

To the Home Office

- 5.5 Immigration detainees should not be held in prison unless there are exceptional reasons to do so following risk assessment. (2.29)

Recommendations

To the governor

Bullying and violence reduction

- 5.6 There should be further consultation with prisoners to explore the reasons for their poor perceptions of safety. (1.18, repeated recommendation 3.16)
- 5.7 The prison should introduce robust arrangements to support victims of bullying and violence. (1.19)
- 5.8 Prisoners monitored under the violence reduction policy should receive regular meaningful reviews. (1.20)
- 5.9 The prison should collect and monitor the information required to ensure sex offenders are not more at risk of bullying or violence than other prisoners. (1.21)

Self-harm and suicide

- 5.10** The quality of assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) documents should be improved. (1.29)
- 5.11** All staff should be trained in suicide and self-harm prevention. (1.30)

Safeguarding

- 5.12** The prison should implement a safeguarding policy and develop formal procedures that safeguard at-risk prisoners from harm. (1.35)

Security

- 5.13** The mandatory drug testing programme should be adequately resourced to undertake the required level of testing throughout the month. (1.42)

Incentives and earned privileges

- 5.14** The incentives and earned privileges scheme should be applied fairly, and improvement targets should be tailored for the individual prisoner. (1.49)
- 5.15** Prisoners on the basic level should have more opportunities to contact their families, basic level prisoners and those on closed visits should have the full visiting time, and family days should not be restricted to prisoners on the enhanced level. (1.50)

Discipline

- 5.16** The quality of adjudication records should be improved and adjudications should be subject to formal quality assurance. (1.55)
- 5.17** Governance of the use of force, particularly the completion of documentation and planned interventions, should be improved. (1.60)
- 5.18** Prisoners should only be segregated as a last resort, for good reason and for the shortest period. (1.67)
- 5.19** The regime in the care and separation unit should be improved. (1.68)

Substance misuse

- 5.20** The substance misuse strategy should be updated annually and include a detailed action plan, with up-to-date performance measures informed by an annual needs analysis. (1.75)

Residential units

- 5.21** Toilets in double cells should be adequately screened. (2.8)
- 5.22** All prisoners should have daily access to telephone calls. (2.9)
- 5.23** Prisoners should receive a prompt response to applications. (2.10)

Equality and diversity

- 5.24** There should be regular consultation with prisoners from all minority groups, and issues raised should be pursued appropriately. (2.20)
- 5.25** The prison should ensure that equality peer and staff representatives understand their role, and should promote this role throughout the establishment. (2.21)
- 5.26** The quality of investigations into allegations of discrimination should be improved, and they should be completed on time. (2.22)
- 5.27** The prison should explore the reasons why Muslim prisoners hold more negative perceptions than non-Muslims. (2.28, repeated recommendation 4.40)
- 5.28** The prison should provide a coordinated approach to managing the needs of foreign national prisoners, including access to free independent immigration advice. (2.30)

Health services

- 5.29** Written information on how prisoners can access health services should be available at their reception and on the wings. (2.58)
- 5.30** The health care department should take sustained action to reduce did-not- attend rates. (2.59)
- 5.31** Medicines should be administered from dedicated rooms, and from trolleys only by exception. (2.65)
- 5.32** The queues for the collection and supervision of medicines should be adequately supervised to maintain patient confidentiality and reduce potential bullying. (2.66)
- 5.33** There should be procedures to provide prescribed and over-the counter medicines when the health care department is closed. (2.67)
- 5.34** The temperature in rooms where medicines are stored should not exceed 25°C. (2.68)
- 5.35** There should be sufficient appropriate therapy space for patients with mental health problems. (2.79)
- 5.36** Transfers of patients under the Mental Health Act should take place within the target transfer time. (2.80)

Catering

- 5.37** Breakfast should be served on the day it is to be eaten. (2.87)
- 5.38** Prisoners should be able to dine communally. (2.88)

Purchases

- 5.39** The prison should investigate and take action on the views of black and minority ethnic prisoners about the prison shop. (2.93, repeated recommendation 8.13)
- 5.40** Prisoners should not be charged an administration fee for catalogue orders. (2.94)

Time out of cell

- 5.41** All prisoners should receive 10 hours a day out of their cell. (3.4)

Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.42** The prison and its learning and skill and work partners should share data and appropriate information to inform management decisions and plan for improvements. (3.15)
- 5.43** The prison should secure more and regular contract work, and make better contingency plans to cover staff absence and keep prisoners in their allocated activities. (3.16)
- 5.44** There should be an annual training needs analysis, and the prison should share the outcomes with its partners to inform curriculum development across all activities. (3.17)
- 5.45** Teachers' and trainers' written feedback on prisoners' assessed work and in their individual learning plans should be detailed enough for them to know what they did well and what they need to do to improve. (3.31)
- 5.46** The prison should provide support for additional learning needs to all prisoners who require it. (3.32)
- 5.47** The induction for new arrivals should cover all the education, training and work opportunities available to enable them to make informed choices at their advice and guidance interviews. (3.33)
- 5.48** The library should improve access for prisoners by increasing opening hours and better promoting its services to prisoners. (3.42)
- 5.49** Library staff should use data effectively to monitor stock and the use of the library by different groups of prisoners. (3.43)
- 5.50** The library should establish links with all education and training areas to promote lifelong learning skills, such as prisoner research for future studies and job search. (3.44)

Physical education and healthy living

- 5.51** The prison should monitor the use of the PE facilities by different groups of prisoners and improve prisoner attendance. (3.52)

Strategic management of resettlement

- 5.52** The prison should ensure that there are sufficient officer offender supervisors dedicated to offender management duties. (4.7)
- 5.53** The prison should undertake a regular analysis of prisoner needs, and ensure that offender management and resettlement provision is sufficient to match what is required. (4.8)

Offender management and planning

- 5.54** Casework and professional supervision, personal development and training should be provided to all offender supervisors, whatever their professional background. (4.20)

- 5.55** The offender management unit should extend quality assurance to ensure that the quality and effectiveness of prisoner contact and engagement is effective and meaningful. (4.21)
- 5.56** The frequency of contact by offender supervisors with prisoners should be determined by prisoner need. (4.22)
- 5.57** Where possible, offender supervisors should attend interdepartmental risk management team meetings reviewing prisoners for whom they are responsible. (4.26)
- 5.58** The prison should extend the lifer forums and family days to include all indeterminate sentence prisoners. (4.29)

Reintegration planning

- 5.59** All prisoners should have a tripartite pre-release meeting. These should be quality assured to ensure that the contributions from appropriate departments and the meeting itself are appropriately focused. (4.33)

Housekeeping points

Early days in custody

- 5.60** All new arrivals should receive all elements of the induction programme, and this should be reflected in the induction records. (1.9)
- 5.61** First night cells should be free from graffiti. (1.10)

Bullying and violence reduction

- 5.62** Reviews of prisoners removed from off-wing activities should be more frequent. (1.22)

Self-harm and suicide

- 5.63** Senior staff should attend the safer custody meeting. (1.31)

Security

- 5.64** Prisoners who test positive in mandatory drug testing (MDT) should be consistently referred to the substance misuse service for support. (1.43)
- 5.65** Prisoners should only remain on closed visits when there is intelligence to support this. (1.44)

Incentives and earned privileges

- 5.66** Prisoners on the basic level should be able to make representations in person at review boards. (1.51)

Discipline

- 5.67** All cells in the care and separation unit should have a chair, and toilets should be cleaned and descaled. (1.69)

Substance misuse

- 5.68** Security checks of prospective peer supporters should be completed promptly. (1.76)

Complaints

- 5.69** Complaints boxes should only be opened by staff responsible for processing complaints. (2.38, recommendation 3.43 repeated as a housekeeping point)

Health services

- 5.70** All clinical staff should receive clinical supervision. (2.50)
- 5.71** The patient forum should meet more frequently, and there should be a check on the health care information available on the wings. (2.51)
- 5.72** Health care complaints forms and envelopes should be consistently available on the wings. (2.52)
- 5.73** The health care application form should include a clear option to request to see the pharmacist. (2.69)
- 5.74** There should be a clear audit trail of who has accessed the controlled drugs cabinet. (2.70)
- 5.75** Out-of-date pharmacy reference materials should be discarded. (2.71)

Time out of cell

- 5.76** Prisoners on A, B and C wings should be able to use the toilet during association without having to ask staff. (3.5)

Physical education and healthy living

- 5.77** Exercise equipment on the wings should be checked for maintenance and use. (3.53)

Offender management and planning

- 5.78** The offender management unit should clarify its data recording and ensure that all staff adhere to it. Staff from other departments should also be able to access OMU information on prisoners and prisoner contact. (4.23)

Reintegration planning

- 5.79** There should be a clear policy for allowing prisoners to use the toilet during a visits session, which all visits managers should understand and adhere to. (4.46, recommendation 9.95 repeated as a housekeeping point)

- 5.80** Prisoners should be able to exchange unused visiting orders for telephone credit. (4.47, recommendation 9.96 repeated as a housekeeping point)

Examples of good practice

- 5.81** The prison offered excellent support, advice and guidance to gay, bisexual and transgender prisoners through the Inside out group. (2.31)
- 5.82** The Schwartz round offered health staff opportunities to reflect on practice and identify learning points to inform safe practices in the care of patients. (2.81)
- 5.83** The Inside Out service offered timely and appropriate in-depth psychotherapies to patients with deep-rooted psychological traumas. (2.82)

Section 6. Appendices

Appendix I: Inspection team

Kieron Taylor	Team leader
Andy Lund	Inspector
Keith McInnis	Inspector
Angus Mulready-Jones	Inspector
Kellie Reeve	Inspector
Catherine Shaw	Head of research, development and thematic
Lucy Higgins	Researcher
Joe Simmonds	Researcher

Specialist inspectors

Majella Pearce	Substance misuse inspector
Paul Tarbuck	Health services inspector
Karena Reed	Care Quality Commission
Deborah Hylands	Pharmacist
Julia Horsman	Ofsted inspector
Gerard McGrath	Ofsted inspector
Paddy Doyle	Offender management inspector
Martyn Griffiths	Offender management inspector

Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report

The following is a summary of the main findings from the last report and a list of all the recommendations made, organised under the four tests of a healthy prison. The reference numbers at the end of each recommendation refer to the paragraph location in the previous report. If a recommendation has been repeated in the main report, its new paragraph number is also provided.

Safety

Prisoners, particularly the most vulnerable, are held safely.

At the last inspection, in 2010, procedures to manage early days in custody were adequate, although there needed to be improved and dedicated first night accommodation, and less lock up on the first night and during induction. Violence reduction arrangements were good but perceptions of safety were a concern for some prisoners. The number of violent incidents was low. Self-harm procedures were generally well managed but there was inappropriate continuous camera supervision of prisoners in crisis. The assimilation and use of security intelligence was good but many rules and procedures were petty or disproportionate. The environment and regime in the segregation unit were poor, although usage was low. Use of force was not excessive. The special cell was poor. There was very little use of drugs. Vulnerable prisoners were integrated and generally well supported and safe, but some protocols needed better safeguards. Outcomes for prisoners in Swinfen Hall were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendations

The prison should identify designated first night cells that are prepared for new occupants, and prisoners should not be routinely locked in cell for the first 24 hours after arrival. (HP47)

Not achieved

Recommendations

Planned transfers should be scheduled with a stopover if the travelling time is likely to be lengthy. (1.8)

Achieved

Reception should remain open during the lunch period when planned transfers and /or court returns are due. Escort vans should not be left waiting outside the prison and prisoners should be disembarked immediately. (1.9)

Not achieved

Prisoners should be given written information about the prison before a planned transfer in. (1.10)

Partially achieved

The prison should monitor and seek to improve prisoner perceptions of the reception process. (1.26)

Achieved

The reception Insider should always be available to assist new arrivals. (1.27)

Not achieved

The first night risk assessments should be meaningful and fully address the risk factors for new arrivals. (1.28)

Achieved

Prisoners should not spend prolonged periods in reception. (1.29)

Achieved

Prisoners should always be offered the opportunity to have a shower on their day of arrival. (1.30)

Achieved

Indeterminate-sentenced prisoners should not be located on the same wing as new arrivals. (1.31)

Not achieved

The induction programme should always start on the next working day after a prisoner has arrived, and prisoners on induction should spend less time locked in their cell. (1.32)

Partially achieved

There should be governance arrangements to ensure that the temporary removal from off-wing activities is managed correctly and does not include improper sanctions. (3.14)

Partially achieved

Criteria for the use of temporary removal from activities should be introduced. (3.15)

Achieved

There should be further consultation with prisoners to explore the reasons for their poor perceptions of safety. (3.16)

Not achieved (repeated recommendation 1.18)

The prison should work with new arrivals to alleviate their initial concerns and follow up their own findings regarding the rise in the number of ACCT documents. (3.26)

Achieved

The quality of care maps and post-closure reviews should be improved. (3.27)

Partially achieved

Up-to-date ACCT training records should be maintained. (3.28)

Not achieved

The constant supervision policy should be amended to ensure that prisoners at risk are managed without the use of intrusive methods. (3.29)

Achieved

Prisoners on normal ACCT procedures should not be located in a camera cell but should be managed through staff interaction. (3.30)

Achieved

Governance arrangements for the use of cell cameras should be improved. (3.31)

Achieved

Prisoners on the basic regime should be reviewed at least every week. (7.47)

Not achieved

The regime for prisoners should not be impeded by unnecessarily restrictive rules and security measures. (7.10)

Achieved

Rules and routines should be widely publicised on all wings and their application should be consistent. (7.11)

Achieved

Closed visits should be authorised only when there is a risk justified by security intelligence in addition to a drug dog indication. (9.90)

Achieved

There should be regular management checks of use of force documentation to ensure that it is completed correctly. (7.34)

Partially achieved

Special accommodation should only be used as a last resort and because of the most extreme circumstances. (7.35)

No longer relevant

The special cell in the segregation unit is unfit for purpose and its use should be discontinued. (7.36)

Achieved

Living conditions in the segregation unit should be improved, and graffiti should be removed from all areas. (7.37)

Achieved

All prisoners in the segregation unit should be able to have exercise, showers and access to a telephone every day, and the regime should be developed, including purposeful activity for longer stay prisoners. (7.38)

Not achieved

There should be reintegration and care planning for prisoners in the segregation unit. (7.39)

Not achieved

The remit of the counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare (CARAT) service should include work with prisoners who are primary alcohol users. (9.73)

Achieved

Joint work between counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare (CARAT) and health services should be formalised to improve care planning and coordination. (3.68)

Achieved

The mandatory drug testing (MDT) programme should be adequately resourced to undertake the required level of suspicion testing. (3.69)

Partially achieved

Respect

Prisoners are treated with respect for their human dignity.

At the last inspection, in 2010, the standard of accommodation varied depending on the age of the residential unit. Cleanliness was acceptable despite poor prisoner access to cleaning materials. Own clothes rules were confused. Overall, staff-prisoner relationships were satisfactory but could be more proactive. The personal officer scheme was, however, effective. The promotion of race equality was good, and work with foreign prisoners was developing. Other diversity stands were being addressed but also required more development. The catering and shop services were good and the prison had an impressive chaplaincy and health care centre. Outcomes for prisoners in Swinfen Hall were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendations

A, B and C wings should undergo a complete refurbishment to bring them up to modern standards. (HP48)

Not achieved (repeated recommendation S43)

Every strand of diversity should be covered by an up-to-date policy and related action plan. (HP49)

Achieved

Recommendations

Prisoners should be allowed unlimited stamps in possession. (2.14)

Achieved

Prisoners should not be charged to alter their PIN telephone account. (2.15)

Achieved

The own clothes policy should be revised so that it is easily understandable to staff and prisoners. (2.16)

Achieved

Cell cleaning time should be built into the regime and all prisoners should have weekly access to appropriate cell cleaning materials. (2.17)

Achieved

Prisoners should be allowed daily access to showers. (2.18)

Achieved

Managers should ensure prisoners receive a prompt response to submitted applications and the timeliness and quality of responses should be monitored formally. (3.42)

Partially achieved

The prison should develop a strategy that focuses on developing trust between staff and prisoners. (2.23)

Achieved

Staff should address prisoners by their preferred name or title. (2.24)

Achieved

Personal officers and/or back-up personal officers should make at least weekly case note entries on their prisoners. (2.29)

Achieved

Designated legal visits booths should be installed. (3.50)

Achieved

Prisoner monitoring should include all elements of diversity, including disability, age and religion. (4.9)

Achieved

There should be equality impact assessments for all areas of diversity. (4.10)

Achieved

The prison should ensure there are appropriate support mechanisms for prisoners from Gypsy, Romany or Traveller backgrounds. (4.11)

Achieved

The race equality action team (REAT) should analyse submitted racist incident report forms to identify and respond to any patterns or trends. (4.29)

Not achieved

The equalities manager should routinely analyse completed racist incident report form (RIRF) feedback forms, and the REAT should regularly discuss the information and, where necessary, act upon it. (4.30)

Not achieved

Reports of racist incidents should be fully investigated, including interviews with all those involved, and completed investigations should clearly evidence how conclusions were reached. (4.31)

Not achieved

There should be records of action taken in response to queries and concerns raised by the REAT chair when countersigning racist incident report forms. (4.32)

Not achieved

Investigations of complaints raised by staff defending themselves against an accusation of racism should explore the original reason for the accusation. (4.33)

Not achieved

There should be a programme to challenge racist and discriminatory prisoner behaviour. (4.34)

Not achieved

The equalities manager should ensure the appropriate and consistent use of formal measures, such as incentives and earned privileges reviews and adjudications, to challenge prisoners found to have engaged in racist behaviour. (4.35)

Achieved

There should be regular consultation with black and minority prisoners. (4.36)

Not achieved

The prison should explore the reasons why Muslim prisoners hold more negative perceptions than non-Muslims. (4.40)

Not achieved (repeated recommendation 2.28)

The foreign national policy should be informed by an annual needs assessment. (4.54)

Not achieved

All members of the foreign national team should receive specific training for the role. (4.55)

Not achieved

Initial interview forms should be completed for all prisoners identified as foreign nationals, and the completed forms should be shared with foreign national liaison officers and wing staff to ensure they are aware of prisoners' individual needs. (4.56)

Not achieved

The foreign national team should consult all foreign national prisoners to explore the reasons for poor attendance at monthly meetings and the negative findings in our survey. (4.57)

Not achieved

The foreign national coordinator should ensure all members of the foreign national committee regularly attend quarterly meetings, and that the membership includes prisoner representatives. (4.58)

No longer relevant

Action points from the quarterly foreign national committee should be shared with the REAT. (4.59)

No longer relevant

There should be appropriate priority and support to prisoner foreign national representatives, who should be promoted and readily identifiable to foreign national prisoners. (4.60)

Not achieved

The prison should work with the UK Border Agency to ensure that foreign national prisoners have regular access to UKBA representatives who are familiar with their individual cases and circumstances. (4.61)

Achieved

Foreign national prisoners should have access to accredited independent immigration advice. (4.62)

Not achieved

The prison should work with the UK Border Agency to ensure that decisions on whether to proceed to deportation or removal are made as early as possible in a prisoner's sentence, and at least six months before the earliest date of release. (4.63)

Partially achieved

Foreign national prisoners should not be charged a connection fee to make international calls, and the value of telephone card they receive should be based on their individual circumstances. (4.64)

No longer relevant

Prisoners should have access to accredited translation and interpreting services, particularly when there are issues of confidentiality. (4.65)

Not achieved

The REAT meeting should regularly review and update the disability action plan, and progress against identified action points should be clearly recorded. (4.75)

Achieved

The disability liaison officer should receive appropriate training. (4.76)

Achieved

There should be regular consultation with prisoners with disabilities to identify and respond to any areas of concern. (4.77)

Not achieved

A formal carer scheme should be introduced. (4.78)

Achieved

Support groups for transgender, gay and bisexual prisoners should be introduced. (4.81)

Achieved

Complaints boxes should only be opened by staff responsible for processing complaints. (3.43)

Not achieved (repeated as housekeeping point 2.38)

Prisoners should receive a response to their complaint within three days, or 10 days in exceptional circumstances. (3.44)

Achieved

The quality of complaint responses should be improved and formal quality assurances procedures should be introduced, with findings recorded and shared with managers. (3.45)

Achieved

Managers should monitor the reasons why complaints are withdrawn, and should ensure that all prisoners who wish to complain are able to do so. (3.46)

Achieved

The dental surgery should have dedicated resuscitation equipment. (5.11)

Achieved

There should be more administrative support, and nurses should not perform unnecessary administrative tasks. (5.28,)

Achieved

The responsibility for financing operational support grade staff support to health care should be reviewed. (5.29)

No longer relevant

Any non-attendance by the out of hours medical service should be reported to the health care manager and fully investigated. (5.30)

Achieved

There should be a dedicated health care prisoner forum so that prisoner representatives can speak directly to senior health care staff about general health care issues. (5.31)

Achieved

Prisoners should be able to access simple medication when the health care department is closed paragraph (5.54)

Not achieved

The appointment system should be revised to release nurses from non-clinical administrative duties. (5.42)

Achieved

There should be a documented nurse triage system. (5.43)

Achieved

There should be dedicated pharmacy-led clinics. (5.51)

Achieved

The pharmacist should date-check all medicines. (5.52)

Achieved

Medicine trolleys should be fixed to the wall. (5.53)

Achieved

Medicine administration records should always be completed and include whether prisoners have attended or not and if they have refused medication. Prisoners failing to comply with their medication should be routinely followed up. (5.55)

Achieved

Dental clinical records should be entered into the patient clinical record. (5.60)

Achieved

There should be dental triage to reduce waiting time for patients with problems. (5.61)

Achieved

There should be an additional hygienist session to increase clinic time and enhance oral health promotion. (5.62)

Achieved

The prison should provide regular mental health training for officers. (5.76)

Achieved

There should be more opportunities for prisoners to dine communally. (8.7)

Not achieved

The prison should investigate and take action on the views of black and minority ethnic prisoners about the prison shop. (8.13)

Not achieved (repeated recommendation 2.93)

Shop consultation meetings should be held routinely and at least quarterly. (8.14)

Achieved

Purposeful activity

Prisoners are able, and expected, to engage in activity that is likely to benefit them.

At the last inspection, in 2010, learning and skills overall lacked effectiveness. The provision of education needed to be better aligned with the identified needs of prisoners. Learning was too often uninspiring and allocation to learning inappropriately sequenced. Resources were limited and underutilised. Behaviour and engagement were inadequate. Vocational training was better with a breadth of provision and good standards. Activity sessions generally were too short and prisoners did not attend promptly. Library standards and access required improvement. The gym facility was excellent but underused. We found just under a third of prisoners locked in cell during the working part of the day and general access to time out of cell was poor. Outcomes for prisoners in Swinfen Hall were poor against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendations

Prisoners should have more time unlocked each day. (HP54)

Achieved

The quality of the Offender Learning and Skills Service (OLASS) provision should be improved to provide a better experience for prisoners, and the provider should ensure that the contracted hours are fulfilled and that there is sufficient staffing to prevent cancellation of classes. (HP50)

Achieved

The range of learning and skills provision should be broadened to meet prisoner need. (HP51)

Achieved

The core day should be revised to ensure longer activity sessions during the working day. (HP52)

Achieved

Allocation to activities should be improved to ensure that prisoners attend activities that are appropriate, sequenced correctly to respond to sentence planning requirements, and meet their educational and personal development needs. (HP53)

Partially achieved

Recommendations

An hour's outdoor exercise should be provided for all prisoners. (6.52)

Not achieved

There should be a period of general unlock in the morning before activity. (6.53)

Not achieved

All prisoners should receive evening association every day. (6.54)

Not achieved

Core day routines should be adhered to. (6.55)

Achieved

Prisoner movement to activity should start earlier and be concluded more quickly. (6.56)

Achieved

The quality of the education provision should be improved through better management of curriculum planning and implementation of quality improvement processes. (6.23)

Achieved

The collection and analysis of data should be improved to give accurate information on learner performance. (6.24)

Partially achieved

The prison should provide nationally recognised catering qualifications for prisoners working in the kitchens. (6.25)

Not achieved

The prison should further develop courses in reprographics, Prisons Information Communication Technology Academy (PICTA), CISCO (Computer Information System Company) and barbering to provide more activity opportunities. (6.26)

No longer relevant

The equipment and resources in the motor vehicle and car valeting workshops should be improved. (6.27)

No longer relevant

The range of personal and social development programmes should be extended. (6.28)

Not achieved

The quality of teaching and learning should be improved, including better use of information learning technology in classes. (6.29)

Achieved

There should be better setting and monitoring of learner targets to improve the management of learner progress. (6.30)

Achieved

Training and accredited qualifications should be provided for the library supervisors and assistants. (6.31)

Not achieved

The library accommodation should be extended to meet the needs of the population. (6.32)

Not achieved

Attendance at the library should be recorded and analysed by individuals to ensure equity of access. (6.33)

Not achieved

The library should develop links with education to support education courses. (6.34)

Not achieved

There should be a trolley book service for prisoners who cannot access the library. (6.35)

Not achieved

There should be promotional activities to encourage more prisoners to use the library. (6.36)

Not achieved

Records of PE attendance should be improved to monitor individual attendance and ensure fairer allocations from the wings. (6.44)

Not achieved

The use of the PE facilities should be increased to allow prisoners more access. (6.45)

Not achieved

Resettlement

Prisoners are prepared for their release back into the community and effectively helped to reduce the likelihood of reoffending.

At the last inspection, in 2010, there was a detailed reducing reoffending strategy, supported by a comprehensive needs analysis. All prisoners were appropriately assessed against resettlement pathways during induction; these linked well to the work of offender supervisors in the offender management unit. The core work of offender supervisors was generally good and coordinated well with community offender managers. Work on risk assessment and motivation required improvement. Public protection protocols were appropriate. There were good arrangements for sentence planning, resettlement boards and pre-release work. Pathway work was generally appropriate, particularly that on attitudes, thinking and behaviour. Outcomes for prisoners in Swinfen Hall were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

Recommendations

The quarterly resettlement committee meetings should be attended by all committee members or their representatives. (9.6)

Achieved

The monthly offender management and resettlement meetings should be attended by all members and representatives of each resettlement pathway, or their representatives. (9.7)

Achieved

All departments that engage with prisoners in offending behaviour work and sentence planning should use the Road to resettlement model to reinforce learning points. (9.28)

No longer relevant

The role of offender supervisor should be clarified, as should the level and frequency of contact with prisoners. (9.29)

Achieved

The offender management unit should be allocated the agreed staffing to meet its work objectives. (9.30)

Partially achieved

Category D prisons should offer more flexible acceptance criteria for indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP) prisoners to facilitate their effective progression through sentence. (9.34)

Achieved

There should be a quality assurance scheme to cover all aspects of offender management work as well as OASys (offender assessment system) assessments. (9.31)

Partially achieved

The psychology department should further develop work on offence paralleling, and offender supervisors should be included in assessments. (9.32)

Partially achieved

A range of work placements should be available through release on temporary licence (ROTL) to support resettlement. (9.33, see paragraph 9.19)

Partially achieved

All staff identified to work with indeterminate-sentenced prisoners should undertake managing indeterminate sentences and risk (MISAR) training. (9.35, see paragraph 9.25)

Not achieved

Young adult indeterminate-sentenced prisoners should not be accommodated on the first night centre. (9.36)

Not achieved

The role of wing indeterminate-sentenced prisoner liaison officers should be clearly defined, and they should have appropriate training. (9.37)

Not achieved

There should be forums for indeterminate-sentenced prisoners that focus specifically on their needs. (9.38)

Partially achieved

Consent should be sought from prisoners receiving support for debt management to share work with the offender management unit. (9.55)

Achieved

Citizens Advice staff should be asked to attend pre-release meetings and/or provide written information on the prisoner's debt and its likely consequence on release. (9.56)

Achieved

The prison should provide prisoners with a financial management programme. (9.57)

Achieved

Prisoners should be able to open bank accounts before release. (9.58)

Achieved

The visitors' centre should have refreshment and properly staffed play facilities. (9.88)

Achieved

Managers should continue to monitor visits admissions procedures to ensure that sessions always begin at the published time. (9.89)

Achieved

The furniture in the visits room should be replaced as a matter of urgency. (9.91)

Achieved

The range of refreshments sold in the visits room should be increased and include healthy options. (9.92)

Achieved

The play area should be staffed for all visits sessions. (9.93)

Achieved

Closed visits should last for the full duration of the visits session. (9.94)

Not achieved

There should be a clear policy for allowing prisoners to use the toilet during a visits session, which all visits managers should understand and adhere to. (9.95)

Not achieved (Repeated as housekeeping point 4.46)

Prisoners should be able to exchange unused visiting orders for telephone credit. (9.96)

Not achieved (Repeated as housekeeping point 4.47)

The prison should offer an accredited parenting and relationship course. (9.97)

Achieved

All prisoners should be able to participate in family visits, whatever their IEP status. (9.98)

Not achieved

The casework model of support for prisoners should be extended to all accredited programmes, link closely to the OMU, and clearly identify which department is responsible for what work. (9.106)

Achieved

Prisoners should only attend the employability course run by education towards the end of their sentence when they can gain most benefit from it. (9.52)

Achieved

The pilot programme to record and accredit prisoners' employability skills should be further developed to enable all prisoners to access it. (9.53)

Achieved

Links with employers should be extended to provide more employment opportunities for prisoners on release. (9.54)

Partially achieved

The establishment should reintroduce dedicated gym sessions for CARAT service clients and P-ASRO (prison addressing substance related offending) programme participants. (9.74)

No longer relevant

Compact-based drug testing facilities should be refurbished and extended to create an adequate testing and waiting environment. (9.75)

No longer relevant

Appendix III: Prison population profile

Please note: the following figures were supplied by the establishment and any errors are the establishment's own.

Population breakdown by:

Status	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Sentenced	259	301	96.2
Recall	8	14	3.8
Total	267	315	100.0

Sentence	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
12 months to less than 2 years	1	0	0.2
2 years to less than 4 years	32	14	17
4 years to less than 10 years	154	167	55.2
10 years and over (not life)	24	12	6.2
ISPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)	22	57	13.6
Life	34	12	21.5
Total	267	315	100.0

Age	Number of prisoners	%
Under 21 years: <i>minimum age=18</i>	267	45.9
21 years to 29 years	315	54.1
Total	582	100.0

Nationality	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
British	247	299	93.8
Foreign nationals	20	16	6.2
Total	267	315	100.0

Security category	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Category C		260	44.6
Category D		8	1.4
Other	267	47	54.0
Total	267	315	100.0

Ethnicity	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
White			
British	176	220	68.0
Irish	2	0	0.3
Gypsy/Irish Traveller	1	0	0.2
Other white	2	8	1.7
Mixed			
White and black Caribbean	16	10	4.5
White and black African	3	0	0.5
White and Asian	1	2	0.5
Other mixed	3	5	1.4
Asian or Asian British			
Indian	6	5	1.9
Pakistani	7	11	3.1
Bangladeshi	1	2	0.5
Chinese	2	0	0.3
Other Asian	3	6	1.5

Black or black British			
Caribbean	21	30	8.8
African	12	7	3.3
Other black	7	5	2.1
Other ethnic group	1	2	0.5
Not stated	3	2	0.9
Total	267	315	

Religion	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Church of England	29	34	10.8
Roman Catholic	46	53	17.0
Other Christian denominations	46	46	15.8
Muslim	41	50	15.6
Sikh	3	0	0.5
Buddhist	1	1	0.3
Jewish	1	0	0.2
Other	3	4	1.2
No religion	97	127	38.5
Total	267	315	

Other demographics	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Veteran (ex-armed services)	0	4	
Total	0	4	

Sentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18–20 yr olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	26	4.5	13	2.2
1 month to 3 months	68	11.7	20	3.4
3 months to six months	47	8.1	40	6.9
Six months to 1 year	56	9.6	83	14.3
1 year to 2 years	54	9.3	96	16.5
2 years to 4 years	16	2.7	41	7.0
4 years or more	0	0.0	22	3.8
Total	267	45.9	315	54.1

Sentenced prisoners only

	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Foreign nationals detained post sentence expiry	0	0	0.0
Public protection cases (this does not refer to public protection sentence categories but cases requiring monitoring/ restrictions).	247	276	89.9
Total	247	276	89.9

Main offence	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Violence against the person	83	63	
Sexual offences	74	88	
Burglary	19	34	
Robbery	55	55	
Theft and handling		5	
Drugs offences	9	27	
Other offences	27	48	
Total	267	320	

Appendix IV: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews

Prisoner survey methodology

A voluntary, confidential and anonymous survey of a representative proportion of the prisoner population was carried out for this inspection. The results of this survey formed part of the evidence base for the inspection.

Sampling

The prisoner survey was conducted on a representative sample of the prison population. Using a robust statistical formula provided by a government department statistician we calculated the sample size required to ensure that our survey findings reflected the experiences of the entire population of the establishment. Respondents were then randomly selected from a P-Nomis prisoner population printout using a stratified systematic sampling method. We also ensured that the proportion of black and minority ethnic prisoners in the sample reflected the proportion in the prison as a whole.

Distributing and collecting questionnaires

Every attempt was made to distribute the questionnaires to respondents individually. This gave researchers an opportunity to explain the purpose of the survey and to answer respondents' questions. We also stressed the voluntary nature of the survey and provided assurances about confidentiality and the independence of the Inspectorate. This information is also provided in writing on the front cover of the questionnaire.

Our questionnaire is available in a number of different languages and via a telephone translation service for respondents who do not read English. Respondents with literacy difficulties were offered the option of an interview.

Respondents were not asked to put their names on their questionnaire. In order to ensure confidentiality, respondents were asked to seal their completed questionnaire in the envelope provided and either hand it back to a member of the research team at a specified time or leave it in their room for collection.

Refusals were noted and no attempts were made to replace them.

Survey response

At the time of the survey on 23 June 2014, the young adult population at HMP/YOI Swinfen Hall was 582. Using the method described above, questionnaires were distributed to a sample of 194 young adults.

We received a total of 176 completed questionnaires, a response rate of 91%. This included four questionnaires completed via interview. Seven respondents refused to complete a questionnaire, eight questionnaires were not returned and three were returned blank.

Wing/Unit	Number of completed survey returns
A	21
B	15
C	18
D	21
E	23
F	25

I	26
J	25
Segregation unit	2

Presentation of survey results and analyses

Over the following pages we present the survey results for HMP/YOI Swinfen Hall.

First a full breakdown of responses is provided for each question. In this full breakdown all percentages, including those for filtered questions, refer to the full sample. Percentages have been rounded and therefore may not add up to 100%.

We also present a number of comparative analyses. In all the comparative analyses that follow, statistically significant differences are indicated by shading. Results that are significantly better are indicated by green shading, results that are significantly worse are indicated by blue shading. If the difference is not statistically significant there is no shading. Orange shading has been used to show a statistically significant difference in prisoners' background details.

Filtered questions are clearly indented and preceded by an explanation of how the filter has been applied. Percentages for filtered questions refer to the number of respondents filtered to that question. For all other questions, percentages refer to the entire sample. All missing responses have been excluded from analyses.

Percentages shown in the full breakdown may differ slightly from those shown in the comparative analyses. This is because the data have been weighted to enable valid statistical comparison between establishments.

The following comparative analyses are presented:

- The current survey responses from Swinfen Hall in 2014 compared with responses from young adults surveyed in all other young adult training prisons. This comparator is based on all responses from young adult surveys carried out in six other young adult training prisons since April 2009.
- The current survey responses from Swinfen Hall in 2014 compared with the responses of young adults surveyed at Swinfen Hall in 2010.
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between the responses of white young adults and those from a black and minority ethnic group.
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between the responses of Muslim and non-Muslim young adults.
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between the responses of young adults who consider themselves to have a disability and those who do not consider themselves to have a disability.
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between those who are aged 21 and under and those over 21.
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between wings A, B and C and wings D, E, F, I and J.

Survey summary

Section I: About you

Q1.2	How old are you?		
	<i>Under 21</i>		75 (43%)
	<i>21 - 29</i>		100 (57%)
	<i>30 - 39</i>		0 (0%)
	<i>40 - 49</i>		0 (0%)
	<i>50 - 59</i>		0 (0%)
	<i>60 - 69</i>		0 (0%)
	<i>70 and over</i>		0 (0%)
Q1.3	Are you sentenced?		
	<i>Yes</i>		166 (94%)
	<i>Yes - on recall</i>		10 (6%)
	<i>No - awaiting trial</i>		0 (0%)
	<i>No - awaiting sentence</i>		0 (0%)
	<i>No - awaiting deportation</i>		0 (0%)
Q1.4	How long is your sentence?		
	<i>Not sentenced</i>		0 (0%)
	<i>Less than 6 months</i>		2 (1%)
	<i>6 months to less than 1 year</i>		3 (2%)
	<i>1 year to less than 2 years</i>		5 (3%)
	<i>2 years to less than 4 years</i>		25 (14%)
	<i>4 years to less than 10 years</i>		93 (53%)
	<i>10 years or more</i>		8 (5%)
	<i>IPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)</i>		32 (18%)
	<i>Life</i>		7 (4%)
Q1.5	Are you a foreign national? (i.e. do not have UK citizenship.)		
	<i>Yes</i>		9 (5%)
	<i>No</i>		167 (95%)
Q1.6	Do you understand spoken English?		
	<i>Yes</i>		175 (99%)
	<i>No</i>		1 (1%)
Q1.7	Do you understand written English?		
	<i>Yes</i>		171 (97%)
	<i>No</i>		5 (3%)
Q1.8	What is your ethnic origin?		
	<i>White - British (English/ Welsh/ Scottish/ Northern Irish)</i>	107 (61%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - Chinese</i> 2 (1%)
	<i>White - Irish</i>	1 (1%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - other</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>White - other</i>	3 (2%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black Caribbean</i> 12 (7%)
	<i>Black or black British - Caribbean</i>	16 (9%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black African</i> 2 (1%)
	<i>Black or black British - African</i>	6 (3%)	<i>Mixed race - white and Asian</i> 4 (2%)
	<i>Black or black British - other</i>	1 (1%)	<i>Mixed race - other</i> 2 (1%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Indian</i>	1 (1%)	<i>Arab</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Pakistani</i>	8 (5%)	<i>Other ethnic group</i> 8 (5%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi</i>	2 (1%)	

Q1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?		
	Yes		12 (7%)
	No		161 (93%)
Q1.10	What is your religion?		
	None	65 (37%)	Hindu 1 (1%)
	Church of England	26 (15%)	Jewish 0 (0%)
	Catholic	33 (19%)	Muslim 26 (15%)
	Protestant	1 (1%)	Sikh 0 (0%)
	Other Christian denomination	9 (5%)	Other 11 (6%)
	Buddhist	2 (1%)	
Q1.11	How would you describe your sexual orientation?		
	Heterosexual/ Straight		167 (95%)
	Homosexual/Gay		3 (2%)
	Bisexual		5 (3%)
Q1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability? (i.e. do you need help with any long term physical, mental or learning needs.)		
	Yes		30 (17%)
	No		146 (83%)
Q1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?		
	Yes		5 (3%)
	No		169 (97%)
Q1.14	Is this your first time in prison?		
	Yes		93 (53%)
	No		82 (47%)
Q1.15	Do you have children under the age of 18?		
	Yes		49 (28%)
	No		127 (72%)

Section 2: Courts, transfers and escorts

Q2.1	On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?		
	Less than 2 hours		63 (36%)
	2 hours or longer		98 (56%)
	Don't remember		15 (9%)
Q2.2	On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?		
	My journey was less than two hours		63 (36%)
	Yes		66 (38%)
	No		39 (23%)
	Don't remember		5 (3%)
Q2.3	On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?		
	My journey was less than two hours		63 (36%)
	Yes		12 (7%)
	No		97 (55%)
	Don't remember		4 (2%)
Q2.4	On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?		
	Yes		72 (42%)
	No		84 (49%)
	Don't remember		17 (10%)

Q2.5	On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?	
	Yes	145 (83%)
	No	28 (16%)
	Don't remember	1 (1%)
Q2.6	On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?	
	Very well	30 (17%)
	Well	81 (46%)
	Neither	53 (30%)
	Badly	3 (2%)
	Very badly	7 (4%)
	Don't remember	1 (1%)
Q2.7	Before you arrived, were you given anything or told that you were coming here? (please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Yes, someone told me	103 (59%)
	Yes, I received written information	9 (5%)
	No, I was not told anything	63 (36%)
	Don't remember	2 (1%)
Q2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	
	Yes	154 (89%)
	No	19 (11%)
	Don't remember	1 (1%)

Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

Q3.1	How long were you in reception?			
	Less than 2 hours	90 (52%)		
	2 hours or longer	65 (38%)		
	Don't remember	18 (10%)		
Q3.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?			
	Yes	136 (79%)		
	No	28 (16%)		
	Don't remember	8 (5%)		
Q3.3	Overall, how were you treated in reception?			
	Very well	37 (21%)		
	Well	82 (47%)		
	Neither	30 (17%)		
	Badly	16 (9%)		
	Very badly	5 (3%)		
	Don't remember	3 (2%)		
Q3.4	Did you have any of the following problems when you first arrived here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)			
	Loss of property	33 (19%)	Physical health	12 (7%)
	Housing problems	14 (8%)	Mental health	23 (14%)
	Contacting employers	2 (1%)	Needing protection from other prisoners	13 (8%)
	Contacting family	34 (20%)	Getting phone numbers	21 (12%)
	Childcare	3 (2%)	Other	5 (3%)
	Money worries	24 (14%)	Did not have any problems	77 (45%)
	Feeling depressed or suicidal	23 (14%)		

Q3.5	Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems when you first arrived here?	
	Yes	30 (18%)
	No	62 (37%)
	Did not have any problems	77 (46%)
Q3.6	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Tobacco	145 (83%)
	A shower	65 (37%)
	A free telephone call	135 (78%)
	Something to eat	72 (41%)
	PIN phone credit	91 (52%)
	Toiletries/ basic items	72 (41%)
	Did not receive anything	8 (5%)
Q3.7	When you first arrived here, did you have access to the following people or services? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Chaplain	104 (61%)
	Someone from health services	123 (72%)
	A Listener/Samaritans	41 (24%)
	Prison shop/ canteen	55 (32%)
	Did not have access to any of these	22 (13%)
Q3.8	When you first arrived here, were you offered information on the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	What was going to happen to you	91 (54%)
	What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal	66 (40%)
	How to make routine requests (applications)	78 (47%)
	Your entitlement to visits	77 (46%)
	Health services	100 (60%)
	Chaplaincy	94 (56%)
	Not offered any information	37 (22%)
Q3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	
	Yes	123 (71%)
	No	41 (24%)
	Don't remember	9 (5%)
Q3.10	How soon after you arrived here did you go on an induction course?	
	Have not been on an induction course	32 (19%)
	Within the first week	81 (47%)
	More than a week	49 (28%)
	Don't remember	10 (6%)
Q3.11	Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	
	Have not been on an induction course	32 (19%)
	Yes	70 (41%)
	No	55 (32%)
	Don't remember	15 (9%)
Q3.12	How soon after you arrived here did you receive an education ('skills for life') assessment?	
	Did not receive an assessment	39 (23%)
	Within the first week	51 (30%)
	More than a week	54 (32%)
	Don't remember	27 (16%)

Section 4: Legal rights and respectful custody

Q4.1	How easy is it to.....						
		Very easy	Easy	Neither	Difficult	Very difficult	N/A
	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	18 (11%)	43 (25%)	31 (18%)	30 (18%)	28 (17%)	19 (11%)
	Attend legal visits?	29 (17%)	50 (30%)	29 (17%)	16 (10%)	12 (7%)	30 (18%)
	Get bail information?	11 (7%)	4 (2%)	29 (18%)	15 (9%)	18 (11%)	85 (52%)
Q4.2	Have staff here ever opened letters from your solicitor or your legal representative when you were not with them?						
	Not had any letters						33 (19%)
	Yes						78 (45%)
	No						61 (35%)
Q4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?						
	Yes						54 (31%)
	No						26 (15%)
	Don't know						92 (53%)
Q4.4	Please answer the following questions about the wing/unit you are currently living on:						
		Yes	No	Don't know			
	Do you normally have enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	89 (51%)	83 (48%)	1 (1%)			
	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	160 (92%)	13 (8%)	0 (0%)			
	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	121 (71%)	47 (27%)	3 (2%)			
	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	56 (33%)	111 (65%)	4 (2%)			
	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	69 (41%)	77 (46%)	22 (13%)			
	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	103 (60%)	68 (40%)	0 (0%)			
	If you need to, can you normally get your stored property?	67 (40%)	48 (29%)	53 (32%)			
Q4.5	What is the food like here?						
	Very good						2 (1%)
	Good						22 (13%)
	Neither						38 (22%)
	Bad						63 (36%)
	Very bad						48 (28%)
Q4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?						
	Have not bought anything yet/ don't know						1 (1%)
	Yes						84 (49%)
	No						88 (51%)
Q4.7	Can you speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?						
	Yes						62 (36%)
	No						37 (22%)
	Don't know						73 (42%)
Q4.8	Are your religious beliefs respected?						
	Yes						78 (46%)
	No						27 (16%)
	Don't know/ N/A						66 (39%)
Q4.9	Are you able to speak to a chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?						
	Yes						113 (65%)
	No						7 (4%)
	Don't know/ N/A						53 (31%)

Q4.10 How easy or difficult is it for you to attend religious services?

<i>I don't want to attend</i>	35 (21%)
<i>Very easy</i>	44 (26%)
<i>Easy</i>	34 (20%)
<i>Neither</i>	7 (4%)
<i>Difficult</i>	11 (7%)
<i>Very difficult</i>	9 (5%)
<i>Don't know</i>	29 (17%)

Section 5: Applications and complaints**Q5.1 Is it easy to make an application?**

<i>Yes</i>	145 (84%)
<i>No</i>	25 (15%)
<i>Don't know</i>	2 (1%)

Q5.2 Please answer the following questions about applications (If you have not made an application please tick the 'not made one' option).

	<i>Not made one</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>Are applications dealt with fairly?</i>	8 (5%)	90 (56%)	63 (39%)
<i>Are applications dealt with quickly (within seven days)?</i>	8 (5%)	51 (31%)	105 (64%)

Q5.3 Is it easy to make a complaint?

<i>Yes</i>	97 (57%)
<i>No</i>	35 (21%)
<i>Don't know</i>	37 (22%)

Q5.4 Please answer the following questions about complaints (If you have not made a complaint please tick the 'not made one' option).

	<i>Not made one</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>Are complaints dealt with fairly?</i>	55 (33%)	33 (20%)	78 (47%)
<i>Are complaints dealt with quickly (within seven days)?</i>	55 (33%)	36 (21%)	77 (46%)

Q5.5 Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?

<i>Yes</i>	45 (27%)
<i>No</i>	124 (73%)

Q5.6 How easy or difficult is it for you to see the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB)?

<i>Don't know who they are</i>	61 (36%)
<i>Very easy</i>	14 (8%)
<i>Easy</i>	22 (13%)
<i>Neither</i>	32 (19%)
<i>Difficult</i>	19 (11%)
<i>Very difficult</i>	21 (12%)

Section 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme**Q6.1 Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the incentive and earned privileges (IEP) scheme? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels.)**

<i>Don't know what the IEP scheme is</i>	4 (2%)
<i>Yes</i>	67 (39%)
<i>No</i>	89 (52%)
<i>Don't know</i>	12 (7%)

Q6.2 Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels.)

<i>Don't know what the IEP scheme is</i>	4 (2%)
--	--------

Yes	84 (49%)
No	78 (45%)
Don't know	6 (3%)

Q6.3 In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?

Yes	38 (22%)
No	134 (78%)

Q6.4 If you have spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit in the last six months, how were you treated by staff?

<i>I have not been to segregation in the last 6 months</i>	125 (74%)
Very well	7 (4%)
Well	10 (6%)
Neither	7 (4%)
Badly	11 (7%)
Very badly	9 (5%)

Section 7: Relationships with staff**Q7.1 Do most staff treat you with respect?**

Yes	123 (72%)
No	48 (28%)

Q7.2 Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?

Yes	123 (73%)
No	46 (27%)

Q7.3 Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?

Yes	57 (33%)
No	115 (67%)

Q7.4 How often do staff normally speak to you during association?

<i>Do not go on association</i>	8 (5%)
Never	33 (19%)
Rarely	47 (27%)
Some of the time	51 (30%)
Most of the time	19 (11%)
All of the time	13 (8%)

Q7.5 When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?

<i>I have not met him/her</i>	34 (20%)
<i>In the first week</i>	61 (36%)
<i>More than a week</i>	49 (29%)
<i>Don't remember</i>	27 (16%)

Q7.6 How helpful is your personal (named) officer?

<i>Do not have a personal officer/ I have not met him/ her</i>	34 (20%)
Very helpful	43 (25%)
Helpful	39 (23%)
Neither	21 (12%)
Not very helpful	14 (8%)
Not at all helpful	20 (12%)

Section 8: Safety

Q8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?		
	Yes		76 (44%)
	No		95 (56%)
Q8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?		
	Yes		34 (20%)
	No		138 (80%)
Q8.3	In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	Never felt unsafe	95 (58%)	At meal times
	Everywhere	17 (10%)	At health services
	Segregation unit	6 (4%)	Visits area
	Association areas	32 (19%)	In wing showers
	Reception area	6 (4%)	In gym showers
	At the gym	25 (15%)	In corridors/stairwells
	In an exercise yard	28 (17%)	On your landing/wing
	At work	24 (15%)	In your cell
	During movement	35 (21%)	At religious services
	At education	22 (13%)	
Q8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?		
	Yes		60 (35%)
	No		112 (65%)
Q8.5	If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)		36 (21%)
	Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)		38 (22%)
	Sexual abuse		6 (3%)
	Feeling threatened or intimidated		40 (23%)
	Having your canteen/property taken		29 (17%)
	Medication		5 (3%)
	Debt		21 (12%)
	Drugs		5 (3%)
	Your race or ethnic origin		13 (8%)
	Your religion/religious beliefs		10 (6%)
	Your nationality		9 (5%)
	You are from a different part of the country than others		15 (9%)
	You are from a traveller community		3 (2%)
	Your sexual orientation		6 (3%)
	Your age		2 (1%)
	You have a disability		9 (5%)
	You were new here		18 (10%)
	Your offence/ crime		29 (17%)
	Gang related issues		12 (7%)
Q8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?		
	Yes		63 (37%)
	No		108 (63%)
Q8.7	If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)		29 (17%)
	Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)		20 (12%)
	Sexual abuse		3 (2%)
	Feeling threatened or intimidated		30 (18%)
	Medication		6 (4%)

Debt	8 (5%)
Drugs	5 (3%)
Your race or ethnic origin	12 (7%)
Your religion/religious beliefs	10 (6%)
Your nationality	10 (6%)
You are from a different part of the country than others	15 (9%)
You are from a traveller community	4 (2%)
Your sexual orientation	5 (3%)
Your age	9 (5%)
You have a disability	8 (5%)
You were new here	15 (9%)
Your offence/ crime	14 (8%)
Gang related issues	4 (2%)

Q8.8 If you have been victimised by prisoners or staff, did you report it?

Not been victimised	82 (51%)
Yes	35 (22%)
No	44 (27%)

Section 9: Health services**Q9.1 How easy or difficult is it to see the following people?:**

	<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
The doctor	15 (9%)	21 (12%)	57 (33%)	18 (10%)	37 (22%)	24 (14%)
The nurse	15 (9%)	36 (21%)	59 (34%)	19 (11%)	23 (13%)	20 (12%)
The dentist	21 (12%)	5 (3%)	9 (5%)	10 (6%)	36 (21%)	91 (53%)

Q9.2 What do you think of the quality of the health service from the following people?:

	<i>Not been</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Bad</i>	<i>Very bad</i>
The doctor	22 (13%)	17 (10%)	70 (41%)	22 (13%)	21 (12%)	18 (11%)
The nurse	21 (12%)	31 (18%)	63 (37%)	29 (17%)	13 (8%)	13 (8%)
The dentist	50 (30%)	11 (7%)	33 (20%)	16 (9%)	22 (13%)	37 (22%)

Q9.3 What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?

Not been	9 (5%)
Very good	13 (8%)
Good	68 (40%)
Neither	33 (19%)
Bad	27 (16%)
Very bad	21 (12%)

Q9.4 Are you currently taking medication?

Yes	53 (31%)
No	119 (69%)

Q9.5 If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/ all of it in your own cell?

Not taking medication	119 (69%)
Yes, all my meds	37 (22%)
Yes, some of my meds	10 (6%)
No	6 (3%)

Q9.6 Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?

Yes	48 (28%)
No	121 (72%)

Q9.7 Are you being helped/ supported by anyone in this prison? (e.g. a psychologist, psychiatrist, nurse, mental health worker, counsellor or any other member of staff.)

Do not have any emotional or mental health problems	121 (74%)
---	-----------

Yes	17 (10%)
No	26 (16%)

Section 10: Drugs and alcohol

Q10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	
	Yes	51 (30%)
	No	120 (70%)
Q10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	
	Yes	34 (20%)
	No	137 (80%)
Q10.3	Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?	
	Very easy	21 (13%)
	Easy	25 (15%)
	Neither	15 (9%)
	Difficult	10 (6%)
	Very difficult	21 (13%)
	Don't know	74 (45%)
Q10.4	Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison?	
	Very easy	11 (7%)
	Easy	12 (7%)
	Neither	15 (9%)
	Difficult	12 (7%)
	Very difficult	33 (20%)
	Don't know	85 (51%)
Q10.5	Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?	
	Yes	11 (6%)
	No	159 (94%)
Q10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	
	Yes	15 (9%)
	No	155 (91%)
Q10.7	Have you received any support or help (for example substance misuse teams) for your drug problem, while in this prison?	
	<i>Did not / do not have a drug problem</i>	113 (68%)
	Yes	39 (23%)
	No	15 (9%)
Q10.8	Have you received any support or help (for example substance misuse teams) for your alcohol problem, while in this prison?	
	<i>Did not / do not have an alcohol problem</i>	137 (81%)
	Yes	24 (14%)
	No	9 (5%)
Q10.9	Was the support or help you received, while in this prison, helpful?	
	<i>Did not have a problem/ did not receive help</i>	122 (73%)
	Yes	35 (21%)
	No	9 (5%)

Section II: Activities

Q11.1	How easy or difficult is it to get into the following activities, in this prison?						
		<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
	Prison job	17 (10%)	17 (10%)	53 (32%)	22 (13%)	39 (23%)	20 (12%)
	Vocational or skills training	28 (17%)	19 (11%)	55 (33%)	28 (17%)	25 (15%)	12 (7%)
	Education (including basic skills)	20 (12%)	37 (22%)	68 (41%)	22 (13%)	12 (7%)	8 (5%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	44 (26%)	13 (8%)	38 (22%)	22 (13%)	23 (14%)	29 (17%)
Q11.2	Are you currently involved in the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)						
	<i>Not involved in any of these</i>						42 (25%)
	Prison job						82 (49%)
	Vocational or skills training						34 (20%)
	Education (including basic skills)						23 (14%)
	Offending behaviour programmes						20 (12%)
Q11.3	If you have been involved in any of the following, while in this prison, do you think they will help you on release?						
		<i>Not been involved</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>		
	Prison job	36 (23%)	54 (35%)	52 (34%)	13 (8%)		
	Vocational or skills training	36 (25%)	75 (51%)	24 (16%)	11 (8%)		
	Education (including basic skills)	23 (16%)	75 (52%)	37 (26%)	10 (7%)		
	Offending behaviour programmes	38 (27%)	63 (44%)	30 (21%)	12 (8%)		
Q11.4	How often do you usually go to the library?						
	<i>Don't want to go</i>						34 (20%)
	<i>Never</i>						43 (26%)
	<i>Less than once a week</i>						37 (22%)
	<i>About once a week</i>						47 (28%)
	<i>More than once a week</i>						7 (4%)
Q11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?						
	<i>Don't use it</i>						53 (32%)
	<i>Yes</i>						35 (21%)
	<i>No</i>						80 (48%)
Q11.6	How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?						
	<i>Don't want to go</i>						25 (15%)
	<i>0</i>						48 (29%)
	<i>1 to 2</i>						87 (52%)
	<i>3 to 5</i>						6 (4%)
	<i>More than 5</i>						2 (1%)
Q11.7	How many times do you usually go outside for exercise each week?						
	<i>Don't want to go</i>						28 (17%)
	<i>0</i>						18 (11%)
	<i>1 to 2</i>						31 (18%)
	<i>3 to 5</i>						24 (14%)
	<i>More than 5</i>						68 (40%)
Q11.8	How many times do you usually have association each week?						
	<i>Don't want to go</i>						6 (4%)
	<i>0</i>						8 (5%)
	<i>1 to 2</i>						14 (8%)
	<i>3 to 5</i>						38 (23%)
	<i>More than 5</i>						102 (61%)

Q11.9	How many hours do you usually spend out of your cell on a weekday? (Please include hours at education, at work etc)	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	46 (28%)
	<i>2 to less than 4 hours</i>	21 (13%)
	<i>4 to less than 6 hours</i>	25 (15%)
	<i>6 to less than 8 hours</i>	36 (22%)
	<i>8 to less than 10 hours</i>	19 (11%)
	<i>10 hours or more</i>	11 (7%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	8 (5%)

Section 12: Contact with family and friends

Q12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with your family/friends while in this prison?	
	<i>Yes</i>	59 (35%)
	<i>No</i>	109 (65%)
Q12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?	
	<i>Yes</i>	100 (58%)
	<i>No</i>	71 (42%)
Q12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	
	<i>Yes</i>	63 (38%)
	<i>No</i>	104 (62%)
Q12.4	How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	21 (13%)
	<i>Very easy</i>	17 (10%)
	<i>Easy</i>	28 (17%)
	<i>Neither</i>	16 (10%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	39 (23%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	45 (27%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	1 (1%)

Section 13: Preparation for release

Q13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Yes</i>	145 (87%)
	<i>No</i>	21 (13%)
Q13.2	What type of contact have you had with your offender manager since being in prison? (please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Not sentenced/ NA</i>	21 (13%)
	<i>No contact</i>	54 (32%)
	<i>Letter</i>	54 (32%)
	<i>Phone</i>	35 (21%)
	<i>Visit</i>	47 (28%)
Q13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	
	<i>Yes</i>	151 (89%)
	<i>No</i>	19 (11%)
Q13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Yes</i>	136 (81%)
	<i>No</i>	31 (19%)

Q13.5	How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?			
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>			31 (19%)
	<i>Very involved</i>			23 (14%)
	<i>Involved</i>			30 (18%)
	<i>Neither</i>			19 (12%)
	<i>Not very involved</i>			18 (11%)
	<i>Not at all involved</i>			43 (26%)
Q13.6	Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets? (please tick all that apply to you.)			
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>			31 (19%)
	<i>Nobody</i>			68 (43%)
	<i>Offender supervisor</i>			49 (31%)
	<i>Offender manager</i>			31 (19%)
	<i>Named/ personal officer</i>			14 (9%)
	<i>Staff from other departments</i>			21 (13%)
Q13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?			
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>			31 (19%)
	<i>Yes</i>			94 (57%)
	<i>No</i>			18 (11%)
	<i>Don't know</i>			23 (14%)
Q13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in another prison?			
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>			31 (19%)
	<i>Yes</i>			25 (15%)
	<i>No</i>			76 (46%)
	<i>Don't know</i>			34 (20%)
Q13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in the community?			
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>			31 (19%)
	<i>Yes</i>			30 (18%)
	<i>No</i>			55 (33%)
	<i>Don't know</i>			49 (30%)
Q13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?			
	<i>Yes</i>			9 (5%)
	<i>No</i>			52 (31%)
	<i>Don't know</i>			105 (63%)
Q13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?			
	<i>Yes</i>			23 (14%)
	<i>No</i>			136 (86%)
Q13.12	Do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you with the following on release: (please tick all that apply to you.)			
		<i>Do not need help</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
	Employment	36 (23%)	41 (26%)	81 (51%)
	Accommodation	41 (26%)	35 (22%)	83 (52%)
	Benefits	42 (27%)	29 (18%)	87 (55%)
	Finances	43 (27%)	25 (16%)	90 (57%)
	Education	40 (25%)	38 (24%)	82 (51%)
	Drugs and alcohol	50 (32%)	43 (27%)	64 (41%)

Q13.13 Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here, that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?

<i>Not sentenced</i>	0 (0%)
Yes	95 (58%)
No	69 (42%)

Appendix V: Photographs

B wing



B wing window



A wing window



F and G wings



Main comparator and comparator to last time



Prisoner survey responses HMYOI Swinfen Hall 2014

Prisoner survey responses (missing data have been excluded for each question). Please note: where there are apparently large differences, which are not indicated as statistically significant, this is likely to be due to chance.

Key to tables

		HMPYOI Swinfen Hall	Young adult trainer prisons comparator	HMPYOI Swinfen Hall 2014	HMPYOI Swinfen Hall 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		176	958	176	187
SECTION 1: General information					
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	43%	68%	43%	51%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.3	Are you on recall?	6%	7%	6%	3%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	3%	28%	3%	1%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	18%	3%	18%	36%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	5%	12%	5%	14%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%	100%	
1.7	Do you understand written English?	97%	98%	97%	
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	37%	44%	37%	35%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	7%	4%	7%	6%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	15%	23%	15%	17%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	5%	2%	5%	3%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	17%	11%	17%	9%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	3%	2%	3%	
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	53%	49%	53%	45%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	28%	25%	28%	19%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts					
On your most recent journey here:					
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	56%	49%	56%	43%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:					
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	60%	55%	60%	
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	11%	8%	11%	
2.4	Was the van clean?	42%	46%	42%	
2.5	Did you feel safe?	83%	80%	83%	
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	63%	61%	63%	66%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	59%	51%	59%	
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	5%	22%	5%	
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	89%	88%	89%	92%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Key to tables		HMPYOI Swinfen Hall	Young adult trainer prisons comparator	HMPYOI Swinfen Hall 2014	HMPYOI Swinfen Hall 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction					
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	52%	60%	52%	
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	79%	78%	79%	65%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	69%	58%	69%	58%
When you first arrived:					
3.4	Did you have any problems?	55%	63%	55%	61%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	19%	19%	19%	18%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	8%	17%	8%	11%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	1%	4%	1%	4%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	20%	25%	20%	21%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	2%	2%	2%	4%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	14%	17%	14%	22%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	14%	11%	14%	19%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	7%	5%	7%	
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	14%	9%	14%	
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	8%	10%	8%	10%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	12%	21%	12%	22%
For those with problems:					
3.5	Did you receive any help/ support from staff in dealing with these problems?	33%	29%	33%	
When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:					
3.6	Tobacco?	83%	86%	83%	92%
3.6	A shower?	37%	42%	37%	24%
3.6	A free telephone call?	78%	53%	78%	71%
3.6	Something to eat?	41%	63%	41%	66%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	52%	47%	52%	
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	41%	50%	41%	
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued					
When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:					
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	61%	60%	61%	
3.7	Someone from health services?	72%	66%	72%	
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	24%	27%	24%	
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	32%	17%	32%	13%
When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:					
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	54%	47%	54%	57%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	40%	45%	40%	53%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	47%	43%	47%	51%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	46%	45%	46%	59%
3.8	Health services?	60%	59%	60%	66%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	56%	55%	56%	63%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMPYOI Swinfen Hall	Young adult trainer prisons comparator	HMPYOI Swinfen Hall 2014	HMPYOI Swinfen Hall 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	71%	76%	71%	80%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	81%	91%	81%	92%
	For those who have been on an induction course:				
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	50%	52%	50%	69%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	77%	81%	77%	
SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody					
	In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:				
4.1	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	36%	36%	36%	44%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	48%	39%	48%	52%
4.1	Get bail information?	9%	15%	9%	14%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	45%	35%	45%	48%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	31%	32%	31%	
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:				
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	52%	55%	52%	52%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	93%	55%	93%	61%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	71%	62%	71%	78%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	33%	47%	33%	51%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	41%	38%	41%	45%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	60%	60%	60%	59%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	40%	28%	40%	50%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	14%	33%	14%	25%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	49%	46%	49%	45%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	36%	40%	36%	57%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	46%	53%	46%	52%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	65%	56%	65%	63%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	46%	56%	46%	
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints					
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	84%	75%	84%	
	For those who have made an application:				
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	59%	61%	59%	58%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	33%	50%	33%	42%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	57%	63%	57%	
	For those who have made a complaint:				
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	30%	31%	30%	34%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	32%	35%	32%	37%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	27%	23%	27%	
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	21%	28%	21%	28%
SECTION 6: Incentives and earned privileges scheme					
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	39%	44%	39%	54%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMPYOI Swinfen Hall	Young adult trainer prisons comparator	HMPYOI Swinfen Hall 2014	HMPYOI Swinfen Hall 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	49%	47%	49%	63%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	22%	16%	22%	11%
6.4	In the last six months, if you have spent a night in the segregation/ care and separation unit, were you treated very well/ well by staff?	39%	38%	39%	
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff					
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	72%	66%	72%	67%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	73%	69%	73%	76%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	33%	22%	33%	
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	19%	18%	19%	25%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	80%	69%	80%	96%
	For those with a personal officer:				
7.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	60%	56%	60%	60%
SECTION 8: Safety					
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	45%	37%	45%	36%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	20%	17%	20%	18%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	35%	22%	35%	28%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:				
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	21%	11%	21%	17%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	22%	9%	22%	13%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	4%	1%	4%	2%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	23%	17%	23%	
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	17%	6%	17%	9%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	3%	1%	3%	
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	12%	3%	12%	
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	3%	2%	3%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	8%	4%	8%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	6%	3%	6%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	5%	3%	5%	
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	9%	4%	9%	9%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	2%	1%	2%	
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	4%	1%	4%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	1%	1%	1%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	5%	2%	5%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	11%	7%	11%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	17%	4%	17%	11%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	7%	7%	7%	4%
SECTION 8: Safety continued					
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	37%	29%	37%	28%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMPYOI Swinfen Hall	Young adult trainer prisons comparator	HMPYOI Swinfen Hall 2014	HMPYOI Swinfen Hall 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
	Since you have been here, have staff:				
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	17%	12%	17%	16%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	12%	5%	12%	7%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	2%	1%	2%	2%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	18%	14%	18%	
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	4%	2%	4%	
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	5%	1%	5%	
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	3%	1%	3%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	7%	6%	7%	7%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	6%	4%	6%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	6%	2%	6%	
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	9%	3%	9%	7%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	2%	1%	2%	
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	3%	1%	3%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	5%	3%	5%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	5%	1%	5%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	9%	6%	9%	7%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	8%	4%	8%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	2%	4%	2%	4%
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:				
8.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	44%	31%	44%	45%
SECTION 9: Health services					
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	45%	45%	45%	54%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	55%	64%	55%	76%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	8%	19%	8%	19%
	For those who have been to the following services, do you think the quality of the health service from the following is good/very good:				
9.2	The doctor?	59%	60%	59%	60%
9.2	The nurse?	63%	65%	63%	72%
9.2	The dentist?	37%	45%	37%	55%
9.3	The overall quality of health services?	50%	55%	50%	63%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	31%	24%	31%	27%
	For those currently taking medication:				
9.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	89%	56%	89%	
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	28%	19%	28%	24%
	For those who have problems:				
9.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	39%	57%	39%	
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol					
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	30%	26%	30%	34%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMPYOI Swinfen Hall	Young adult trainer prisons comparator	HMPYOI Swinfen Hall 2014	HMPYOI Swinfen Hall 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	20%	19%	20%	33%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	28%	21%	28%	23%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	14%	11%	14%	
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	6%	5%	6%	4%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	9%	2%	9%	
	For those with drug or alcohol problems:				
10.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	72%	66%	72%	
10.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	73%	82%	73%	
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:				
10.9	Was the support helpful?	80%	82%	80%	87%
SECTION 11: Activities					
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:				
11.1	A prison job?	42%	25%	42%	
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	44%	36%	44%	
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	63%	54%	63%	
11.1	Offending behaviour programmes?	30%	25%	30%	
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:				
11.2	A prison job?	49%	35%	49%	47%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	20%	18%	20%	28%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	14%	39%	14%	45%
11.2	Offending behaviour programmes?	12%	10%	12%	19%
11.3	Have you had a job while in this prison?	77%	73%	77%	86%
	For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:				
11.3	Do you feel the job will help you on release?	45%	47%	45%	59%
11.3	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	75%	74%	75%	85%
	For those who have had vocational or skills training while in this prison:				
11.3	Do you feel the vocational or skills training will help you on release?	68%	57%	68%	85%
11.3	Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	84%	85%	84%	96%
	For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:				
11.3	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	61%	62%	61%	80%
11.3	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	73%	70%	73%	82%
	For those who have been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison:				
11.3	Do you feel the offending behaviour programme(s) will help you on release?	60%	49%	60%	75%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	32%	50%	32%	35%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	21%	40%	21%	
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	5%	16%	5%	17%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	55%	42%	55%	66%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	61%	34%	61%	54%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	7%	7%	7%	5%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMPYOI Swinton Hall	Young adult trainer prisons comparator	HMPYOI Swinton Hall 2014	HMPYOI Swinton Hall 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 12: Friends and family					
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	35%	37%	35%	50%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	59%	51%	59%	50%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	38%	42%	38%	26%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	27%	34%	27%	
SECTION 13: Preparation for release					
For those who are sentenced:					
13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	87%	79%	87%	
For those who are sentenced what type of contact have you had with your offender manager:					
13.2	No contact?	37%	41%	37%	
13.2	Contact by letter?	37%	25%	37%	
13.2	Contact by phone?	24%	16%	24%	
13.2	Contact by visit?	32%	34%	32%	
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	89%	75%	89%	
For those who are sentenced:					
13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	81%	63%	81%	89%
For those with a sentence plan:					
13.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	40%	56%	40%	58%
Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:					
13.6	Nobody?	53%	49%	53%	
13.6	Offender supervisor?	38%	36%	38%	
13.6	Offender manager?	24%	21%	24%	
13.6	Named/ personal officer?	11%	12%	11%	
13.6	Staff from other departments?	16%	16%	16%	
For those with a sentence plan:					
13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	70%	71%	70%	81%
13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	19%	22%	19%	
13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	22%	27%	22%	
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	6%	6%	6%	
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	14%	19%	14%	24%
For those that need help do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you on release with the following:					
13.12	Employment?	34%	44%	34%	
13.12	Accommodation?	30%	38%	30%	
13.12	Benefits?	25%	33%	25%	
13.12	Finances?	22%	26%	22%	
13.12	Education?	32%	41%	32%	
13.12	Drugs and alcohol?	40%	42%	40%	
For those who are sentenced:					
13.13	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here to make you less likely to offend in future?	58%	54%	58%	62%

Diversity analysis



Key question responses (ethnicity and religion) HMP Swinfen Hall 2014

Prisoner survey responses (missing data have been excluded for each question). Please note: where there are apparently large differences, which are not indicated as statistically significant, this is likely to be due to chance.

Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		64	111	26	148
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	9%	3%	20%	3%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%	100%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	97%	97%	97%	97%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)			88%	27%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	6%	7%	4%	8%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	37%	3%		
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	11%	21%	20%	17%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	5%	2%	4%	3%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	43%	59%	50%	54%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	58%	67%	58%	64%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	47%	67%	38%	63%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	78%	81%	92%	77%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	74%	67%	76%	67%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	61%	51%	63%	53%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	71%	74%	77%	71%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	76%	69%	65%	72%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	82%	82%	73%	84%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	39%	35%	35%	36%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	55%	50%	47%	52%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	95%	92%	88%	93%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	35%	45%	21%	45%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	15%	14%	8%	15%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	42%	53%	42%	50%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	32%	39%	35%	37%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	51%	43%	76%	41%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	73%	62%	81%	62%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	85%	85%	81%	85%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	65%	54%	72%	55%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	30%	44%	23%	42%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	48%	49%	38%	50%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	23%	21%	15%	23%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	67%	76%	64%	73%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	75%	72%	62%	75%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	10%	24%	4%	22%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	80%	81%	76%	81%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	28%	53%	42%	45%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	10%	25%	15%	21%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	16%	45%	20%	37%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	11%	30%	20%	24%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	8%	6%	12%	7%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	4%	7%	8%	5%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	4%	6%	12%	4%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	0%	8%	4%	5%
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	35%	38%	48%	35%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	13%	19%	36%	15%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	11%	4%	16%	5%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	5%	6%	16%	4%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	6%	5%	21%	4%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	2%	6%	8%	4%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	37%	50%	27%	49%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	48%	60%	42%	57%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	31%	31%	27%	32%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	13%	37%	21%	30%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	15%	34%	15%	30%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	49%	49%	38%	50%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	21%	20%	27%	19%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	6%	18%	12%	14%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	6%	15%	4%	13%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	38%	29%	28%	32%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	0%	7%	0%	6%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	65%	49%	54%	54%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	63%	60%	50%	62%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	9%	6%	4%	7%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	65%	54%	65%	57%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	37%	38%	42%	36%

Diversity analysis



Key question responses (disability and under 21) HMPYOI Swifen Hall

Prisoner survey responses (missing data have been excluded for each question). Please note: where there are apparently large differences, which are not indicated as statistically significant, this is likely to be due to chance.

Key to tables

		Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability	Prisoners under the age of 21	Prisoners aged 21 and over
Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better					
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse					
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details					
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference					
Number of completed questionnaires returned		30	146	75	100
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	7%	5%	8%	3%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%	99%	100%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	90%	99%	95%	99%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	23%	39%	35%	37%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	10%	6%	10%	5%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	17%	15%	16%	14%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?			23%	12%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	10%	2%	5%	1%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	57%	53%	64%	46%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	67%	63%	66%	62%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	67%	57%	57%	61%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	73%	80%	79%	80%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	63%	70%	62%	74%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	68%	52%	59%	51%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	72%	73%	67%	76%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	69%	72%	68%	74%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	79%	82%	82%	80%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	31%	37%	37%	36%

Key to tables

Diversity analysis

		Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability	Prisoners under the age of 21	Prisoners aged 21 and over
Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better					
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse					
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details					
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	43%	53%	50%	52%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	83%	95%	91%	94%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	37%	42%	45%	39%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	17%	13%	20%	9%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	40%	50%	53%	46%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	33%	37%	34%	38%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	42%	46%	49%	44%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	67%	65%	69%	62%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	73%	87%	84%	85%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	50%	59%	47%	65%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	23%	42%	32%	44%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	40%	51%	53%	46%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	23%	22%	26%	19%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	67%	73%	71%	73%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	76%	72%	66%	79%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	26%	17%	11%	25%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	77%	81%	74%	84%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	58%	42%	49%	41%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	27%	18%	29%	13%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	48%	32%	38%	33%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	38%	20%	20%	26%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	14%	6%	9%	6%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	18%	4%	9%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	24%	2%	7%	4%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	0%	2%	1%	1%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability	Prisoners under the age of 21	Prisoners aged 21 and over
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	21%	2%	5%	5%
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	47%	35%	42%	33%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	36%	14%	22%	15%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	10%	6%	5%	8%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	10%	5%	5%	6%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	13%	4%	8%	4%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	7%	5%	7%	4%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	17%	2%	5%	4%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	42%	46%	43%	48%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	55%	55%	51%	59%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	45%	28%	26%	34%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	48%	24%	40%	20%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	27%	28%	27%	28%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	58%	47%	40%	56%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	18%	21%	13%	26%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	14%	14%	21%	8%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	7%	13%	9%	15%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	32%	32%	27%	36%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	10%	4%	5%	4%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	31%	59%	51%	58%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	42%	65%	56%	66%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	3%	7%	1%	11%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	67%	57%	51%	64%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	48%	35%	35%	39%



Prisoner survey responses HMPYOI Swinfen Hall 2014 Wing Comparator

Prisoner survey responses (missing data have been excluded for each question) Please note: where there are apparently large differences, which are not indicated as statistically significant, this is likely to be due to chance.

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		A, B and C wings	D, E, F, I and J wings
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse			
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details			
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference			
Number of completed questionnaires returned		54	120
SECTION 1: General information			
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	53%	38%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%
1.3	Are you on recall?	10%	3%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	4%	3%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	25%	16%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	4%	6%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	98%	97%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	32%	39%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	6%	8%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	17%	14%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	4%	5%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	20%	15%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	0%	4%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	53%	54%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	30%	27%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts			
On your most recent journey here:			
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	70%	50%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	83%	83%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	60%	64%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	57%	60%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	83%	91%
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction			
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	53%	52%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	79%	79%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	68%	69%
When you first arrived:			
3.4	Did you have any problems?	58%	54%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	23%	18%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	10%	8%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	A, B and C wings	D, E, F, I and J wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	0%	2%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	21%	20%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	2%	2%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	13%	15%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	19%	11%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	10%	6%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	17%	12%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	13%	5%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	13%	12%
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:		
3.6	Tobacco?	87%	82%
3.6	A shower?	42%	35%
3.6	A free telephone call?	81%	76%
3.6	Something to eat?	47%	38%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	49%	53%
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	42%	40%
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued			
	When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:		
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	58%	62%
3.7	Someone from health services?	73%	72%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	23%	25%
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	27%	34%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:		
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	55%	54%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	45%	37%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	49%	46%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	53%	42%
3.8	Health services?	61%	59%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	57%	55%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	75%	69%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	83%	81%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	75%	79%
SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody			
	In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:		
4.1	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	35%	37%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	54%	44%
4.1	Get bail information?	6%	11%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	50%	43%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	29%	32%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	A, B and C wings	D, E, F, I and J wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	53%	51%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	87%	95%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	77%	69%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	13%	41%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	37%	43%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	51%	65%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	38%	41%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	21%	10%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	43%	50%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	40%	34%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	37%	50%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	64%	66%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	34%	52%
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints			
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	81%	86%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	58%	57%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	28%	26%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	17%	22%
SECTION 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme			
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	38%	40%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	53%	47%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	30%	18%
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff			
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	70%	73%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	67%	75%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	25%	36%
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	23%	17%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	75%	83%
SECTION 8: Safety			
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	48%	43%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	29%	15%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	41%	32%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:		
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	29%	17%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	31%	19%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	4%	3%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	A, B and C wings	D, E, F, I and J wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	31%	20%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	17%	17%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	4%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	15%	11%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	6%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	13%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	7%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	10%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	13%	7%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	2%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	6%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	6%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	13%	9%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	19%	16%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	10%	5%
SECTION 8: Safety continued			
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	34%	38%
	Since you have been here, have staff:		
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	17%	17%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	11%	12%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	2%	2%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	19%	17%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	2%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	2%	6%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	6%	8%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	6%	6%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	7%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	11%	8%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	4%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	4%	6%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	4%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	7%	9%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	7%	9%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	2%	3%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	A, B and C wings	D, E, F, I and J wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 9: Health services			
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	40%	47%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	42%	61%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	11%	7%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	32%	30%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	34%	26%
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol			
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	34%	28%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	21%	19%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	31%	26%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	19%	11%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	7%	6%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	17%	5%
SECTION 11: Activities			
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:		
11.1	A prison job?	39%	43%
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	33%	50%
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	47%	70%
11.1	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	32%	30%
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:		
11.2	A prison job?	38%	54%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	23%	19%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	13%	14%
11.2	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	15%	11%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	26%	35%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	13%	24%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	4%	5%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	43%	60%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	11%	84%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	0%	10%
SECTION 12: Friends and family			
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	32%	37%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	53%	60%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	40%	37%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	29%	27%
SECTION 13: Preparation for release			
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	88%	89%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	4%	6%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	12%	16%