

Report on an unannounced inspection of

HMP/YOI Swinfen Hall

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

24 October–4 November 2016

This inspection was carried out with assistance from colleagues at the General Pharmaceutical Council and in partnership with the following bodies:



Crown copyright 2017

This publication (excluding logos) is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. To view this licence, visit nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3 or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

Where we have identified any third party copyright information 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	29
Section 3. Purposeful activity	41
Section 4. Resettlement	49
Section 5. Summary of recommendations and good practice	57
Section 6. Appendices	63
Appendix I: Inspection team	63
Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report	65
Appendix III: Photographs	71
Appendix IV: Prison population profile	73
Appendix V: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews	75

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.justiceinspectors.gov.uk/hmiprisons/about-our-inspections/>

Introduction

HMP/YOI Swinfen Hall near Lichfield is a young offender institution (YOI) and category C training prison for males aged 18–25 years. Over 90% of the 600 prisoners held there were serving sentences in excess of four years, with about 15% serving 10 years to life. We last inspected Swinfen Hall in late 2014 when we reported on generally satisfactory outcomes. This inspection, however, was a disappointment and reflected a significant deterioration in almost all aspects of the prison's delivery. It was a concern that too few of our previous recommendations had been addressed and assessments across three of our four healthy prison tests saw reduced scores.

Swinfen Hall was no longer safe enough. The prison's approach to safety was fragmented and lacked care. New prisoners were received without sufficient care or attention to the basics and it was not surprising that only 61% felt safe on their first night. Following a recent death in custody, an investigation into the circumstances identified weaknesses that had not been addressed to a standard that could provide assurance that lessons had been learned. Levels of self-harm had fallen but care for those in crisis was inconsistent. Levels of violence had risen and too many prisoners felt unsafe. Too many prisoners were also self-isolating as a response to their feelings of being unsafe. Use of force had risen markedly but accountability for its use was weak. Our main recommendations call for some effective joined-up working, based on a meaningful assessment of intelligence and evidence, leading to a measureable action plan to reduce violence and so address this fundamental safety concern.

A further main recommendation calls for clear improvement in basic standards in the accommodation provided. We describe in our report much of the accommodation in the prison, particularly on the older wings, as squalid. Cells were often dirty and poorly equipped and access to basic amenities was poor. Better standards on two of the newer wings, while welcome, did not mitigate these failings and underlined what could be achieved with better care and coordination of effort.

Staff-prisoner relationships were similarly not good enough. Too many staff lacked care, were permissive of poor behaviour and had low expectations of prisoners. The promotion of diversity was, however, improving and in general the provision of health care was reasonable.

Despite being a training prison, the quality of the regime and provision of work, learning and skills were poor. During the inspection we found 43% of prisoners locked in cell during the working day and our colleagues in Ofsted judged the overall effectiveness of learning, skills and work to be 'inadequate'. Provision was poorly managed, the pace of improvement was too slow and providers were not held to account. Activity spaces were not well used, training was variable and qualifications on offer were too basic. Work was mundane. Attendance and punctuality were not good enough and achievement rates, while beginning to improve, needed to be better. We address the fundamental weaknesses of the prison's regime and of the learning and skills offer in our main recommendations.

The prison was performing best in its attention to resettlement work. Support for care leavers was better than we often see, and in our survey prisoners fed back positively about their allocation to an offender supervisor and their sentence plan. Too many prisoners were without an up-to-date offender assessment system (OASys) assessment, but risk was being managed and public protection work remained good. The prison was not a designated resettlement prison, although good work was being done to support the typically 10 prisoners released each month. Work to support children and families was well developed and some impressive interventions to address offending behaviour were evident. The psychologically informed planned environment unit (PIPE) in particular was a good example of what could be achieved at Swinfen Hall.

A new governor arrived during the week of our inspection, presenting the opportunity to set a new direction for the prison. The need for strong leadership is clear if decline is to be arrested and a new vision for the prison is to be successful. Our main recommendations address fundamental issues across all four of our healthy prison tests. The prison needs to be safer. Basic standards need to improve and a coordinated and ambitious agenda for learning, work and rehabilitation needs to be prioritised at the heart of the prison's purpose, rather than at the periphery as it is now. The prison needs to rethink its approach and raise expectations amongst both staff and prisoners.

Peter Clarke CVO OBE QPM
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

January 2017

Fact page

Task of the establishment

Young offender institution and category C training prison for males aged 18–25 years.

Prison status

Public

Region

Midlands

Number held

599

Certified normal accommodation

604

Operational capacity

624

Date of last full inspection

23 June – 3 July 2014

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 since increased prisoner places to 624. It takes young men aged between 18 and 25 serving from 3.5 years up to and including life.

Short description of residential units

Prisoners are housed in nine wings:

A	-	64 places
B	-	60 places – induction /first night
C	-	60 places
D	-	68 places – ‘Enabling environment’
E	-	60 places – PIPE (psychologically informed planned environment)
F	-	90 places
G	-	90 places
I	-	62 places - enhanced
J	-	70 places

Name of governor

Ian West (from 24 October 2016)

Escort contractor

GEOAmey

Health service providers

Care UK Clinical Services

South Staffordshire and Shropshire NHS Foundation Trust

Learning and skills providers

Milton Keynes College

N-ergy

Independent Monitoring Board chair

Frances Ridge

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
 - **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.
- A8 All inspections of prisons are conducted jointly with Ofsted or Estyn (Wales), the Care Quality Commission, the General Pharmaceutical Council (GPhC) and HM Inspectorate of Probation. This joint work ensures expert knowledge is deployed in inspections and avoids multiple inspection visits.

This report

- A9 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.
- A10 Details of the inspection team and the prison population profile can be found in Appendices I and III respectively.
- A11 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 0.01, which means that there is only a 1% chance that the difference in results is due to chance.

Summary

Safety

- S1 *Prisoners arrived after long journeys and were located in poorly maintained first night cells. Induction was short and too many new arrivals had long periods locked up. Many prisoners did not feel safe on their first night, and the isolation experienced by some vulnerable prisoners went unnoticed. Almost a third of prisoners said they felt unsafe. Violence had increased, and work to identify bullying and violence was not successful in reducing the problem or supporting victims. Care and support for some prisoners in crisis was weak. The security team had identified appropriate threats but not enough was done to address them. The huge increase in the use of force was alarming and governance remained weak. The segregation unit was generally well managed, as was the adjudication process. Support for prisoners with a drug problem had deteriorated. **Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.***
- S2 *At the last inspection in June 2014 we found that outcomes for prisoners in Swinfen Hall were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 15 recommendations in the area of safety. At this follow-up inspection we found that three of the recommendations had been achieved, three had been partially achieved and nine had not been achieved.*
- S3 Many prisoners coming to the prison had long journeys on escort vehicles, often without a toilet break. Reception was spacious but not well maintained, and there was little information or peer support. All new arrivals were strip searched. While staff made an effort to locate new arrivals appropriately and give them support, too many vulnerable prisoners went unnoticed and spent long periods in isolation during their crucial early days. In our survey, only 61% of prisoners felt safe on their first night. New arrivals often faced aggressive behaviour, and some bullying, from other prisoners. First night cells were dirty and in a poor state of decoration, with very insanitary toilets and some graffiti. Prisoner Insiders gave a short but adequate talk to new arrivals, and almost all prisoners said that they had attended induction. However, the induction to activities only took place once a week and was sometimes cancelled, resulting in new arrivals spending a week or more without access to activities.
- S4 Levels of violence had risen, and in our survey, 30% of prisoners, against the comparator of 16%, said that they felt unsafe. There were systems and practices for identifying emerging issues about violence, and a range of data was discussed at regular meetings. Despite this, there was a fragmented approach to the reduction of violent incidents and addressing perceptions about safety. Perpetrators of violence were insufficiently challenged and support for victims was limited, resulting in too many on restricted regimes to maintain safety. Almost a third of the population were sex offenders who were located with mainstream prisoners; many were self-isolating to avoid victimisation.
- S5 A significant number of prisoners said they had felt depressed or suicidal. The number of self-harm incidents had fallen since the last inspection, but there had been one self-inflicted death; we were not assured that identified weaknesses in first night and early days procedures had been fully addressed. Care for prisoners in crisis on case management was mixed, and too many spent long periods locked in cells with little to do. Attendance at safer custody and multiagency safe health (MASH) meetings was patchy, particularly by residential staff. We were not assured that prisoners in crisis were always able to see a Listener (prisoners trained by the Samaritans to provide confidential emotional support to fellow prisoners).

- S6 Some elements of procedural security were disproportionate. The recent introduction of intelligence threat assessments had improved the identification of security objectives. However, there was a lack of coordinated approach between the security and safer custody departments to address some threats, and until recently there had been no drugs supply reduction action plan.
- S7 The incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme focused on punishment, with few incentives for good behaviour. Complicated systems to manage IEP and violence reduction delayed reviews for prisoners on the basic regime. The number of adjudications had risen by 83% since the previous inspection. The charges we reviewed were appropriate and managed well, hearings were carried out in an age-appropriate manner, and quality assurance was good.
- S8 Although in our survey fewer prisoners than the comparator said they had been restrained, use of force had increased by 45% since the last inspection. Batons had been drawn 49 times in the previous six months, which was concerning, and used 10 times, all in multiple fight situations. Governance of use of force had only recently begun to improve after a considerable period of weak oversight with little quality checking. Most cases recorded no evidence of debriefs to the prisoner or health care checks after use of force. Video recordings were available in only a few planned uses of force.
- S9 Segregation was not used excessively. Staff managed prisoners on the unit in a positive manner and there was little disruptive behaviour. Cellular confinement was used very sparingly, and men were rarely segregated for their own protection. There were management and care plans, with some evidence of good engagement by offender supervisors. However, segregated prisoners could not shower or telephone home every day.
- S10 A significant number of prisoners said they had developed a drug problem at Swinfen Hall. The amalgamation of substance misuse and mental health services had reduced staffing and lowered the quality of the provision. The substance misuse strategy had been reviewed, but attendance at meetings was poor and the prison was still unclear about service provision under the new model.

Respect

*S11 Most prisoners lived in impoverished conditions and had inadequate access to basic amenities. Prisoners on D and E wings experienced a much better quality of life than those on the run-down wings and felt respected by staff there, but staff-prisoner relationships had deteriorated in other residential areas. Work on equality and diversity was improving but there was little consultation with minority groups. The chaplaincy was well-integrated and respected and valued by prisoners. Prisoners lacked confidence in the complaints system. Health provision was reasonable, although regime issues affected the delivery of services. Most meal choices were adequate but prisoners had to eat them in dirty cells. **Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.***

S12 At the last inspection in June 2014 we found that outcomes for prisoners in Swinfen Hall were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 22 recommendations in the area of respect. At this follow-up inspection we found that five of the recommendations had been achieved, two had been partially achieved and 15 had not been achieved.

S13 Much of the accommodation was run down, and conditions on A, B and C wings were particularly squalid. Many cells were dirty, poorly equipped and contained graffiti, and many

had no glass in the windows, exposing prisoners to the elements. Toilets were also dirty. Some communal areas, exercise yards and laundries were also dirty and poorly equipped. Prisoner access to showers, telephone calls and stored property was inadequate. In stark contrast, standards were much higher on D and E wings, which were bright, clean and well ordered.

- S14 Staff-prisoner relationships had deteriorated since the previous inspection, although they varied across the prison and were much more positive on D and E wings than on other residential units. Too many staff had low expectations of the prisoners in their care, failed to enforce rules effectively, and had become far too accepting of the poor conditions in which prisoners lived. Consultation with prisoners also required improvement.
- S15 Some aspects of equality work, such as the investigation of discrimination complaints and data monitoring, had improved. Equality representatives were well supported and other work was developing but not yet embedded across the prison. As at our last inspection, support for gay, bisexual and transgender prisoners was very good but consultation with other groups was underdeveloped. Prisoners from a black and minority ethnic background and Muslim prisoners were more negative than white and non-Muslim prisoners in some key areas, and services for Gypsy, Traveller and Romany and foreign national prisoners were limited. Prisoners with disabilities were identified well, with some good individual support. However, in our survey they were more negative than prisoners without disabilities in many areas, including victimisation, and this needed exploring. The prison lacked focus on the needs of its young adult prisoners.
- S16 Although in our survey prisoners were negative about respect for their religious beliefs and the ability to attend services, this was not a reflection on the chaplaincy, which was respected and valued by prisoners. The team's work was very well integrated across the prison, and the areas for worship were attractive and peaceful.
- S17 In our survey, almost a third of prisoners said they had been prevented from making a complaint and we found that forms were not freely available. The responses to complaints that we sampled were generally prompt and polite, but some were too brief and a few were unhelpful. Quality assurance and feedback were underdeveloped.
- S18 Most areas of health provision were reasonable but staff vacancies had affected the delivery of services. Aspects of local governance required attention, including more detailed responses to health care complaints and more robust emergency equipment checks. Prisoner perceptions about health services were significantly worse than previously, although they had reasonable access to most services. Primary care services were appropriate and there were age-appropriate screening and vaccinations. The non-attendance rate for appointments was high, and the regime affected service delivery and wasted clinical time. Medicine management was adequate, although administering medication from a trolley was a risk. Some prisoners had delays in receiving their medication, resulting in gaps in treatment. Dental provision was good with reasonable waiting times for routine and urgent appointments. Primary mental health services were adequate but there were not enough interventions available. Secondary mental health care was good. The Care Quality Commission (CQC) found no breaches of the relevant regulations.
- S19 Although in our survey only 19% of respondents said the food was good, the meal choice was reasonable and of a decent quality. A lack of staff supervision on some serveries resulted in poor portion control, and there were no opportunities for communal dining. Consultation through a catering survey and a quarterly prison shop meeting was good.

Purposeful activity

S20 *The lack of time out of cell was unacceptable for a prison of this type, and affected many of the healthy prison tests. The leadership and management of purposeful activity were inadequate. There was insufficient work and education for all prisoners, and the limited spaces were not used effectively. The quality of teaching and learning at foundation level was good but needed to improve at the higher level. Prisoner attendance and punctuality were not sufficiently good. Achievement rates had been consistently high in vocational training but had declined in mathematics and English at the higher levels. Prisoners had insufficient access to the library and gym. **Outcomes for prisoners were poor against this healthy prison test.***

S21 *At the last inspection in June 2014 we found that outcomes for prisoners in Swinfen Hall were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test. We made 14 recommendations in the area of purposeful activity. At this follow-up inspection we found that two of the recommendations had been achieved, two had been partially achieved and 10 had not been achieved.*

S22 In our roll checks, an average of 43% of prisoners were locked in their cells during main work periods. Very few prisoners had daily association five times a week, and on half of days at least one wing lost its planned association. Activities had also been cancelled on more than three days a month, on average, for at least one wing. Apart from the enhanced wing, there were inadequate resources for activity during association.

S23 The effectiveness of the leadership and management of purposeful activity was inadequate. Confronted with a range of operational challenges, leaders and managers had mostly focused on managing the day-to-day running of activities rather than implementing an effective strategy for their development. Leaders and managers failed to hold learning and skills and work providers to account, demonstrating low aspirations for prisoner outcomes and the quality of provision. The prison's evaluation of the quality of purposeful activity was insufficiently critical and quality improvement planning lacked challenge. The pace of improvement had been remarkably slow since the last inspection. A significant number of our previous recommendations had not been addressed, and several further aspects of purposeful activity had now deteriorated. A culture of poor health and safety standards had developed in many activities, mirrored by the low expectations of the learning environment in some areas of work and vocational training.

S24 The prison did not use its already reduced number of activity spaces effectively. The prisoner pay policy meant that the large number of prisoners unemployed against their wish received very low pay. Vocational training was varied but the qualifications offered were too basic and not particularly valued by employers. Work was mundane and provided limited opportunity for skills development.

S25 In education, the quality of teaching, learning and assessment at foundation level was good, and learners received detailed feedback that helped them to improve, but teaching and learning at the higher level needed to be better. Tutors did not consistently reinforce good standards by correcting and guiding learners to improve. In vocational training, positive tutor feedback reinforced the skills developed and learners were clear about how they could improve their performance. Individual learning plans were not used effectively in all vocational training activities to ensure that learners made rapid progress.

S26 Attendance in learning and skills had not improved sufficiently since the last inspection. In all areas, punctuality was not sufficiently good, which affected the productivity of prisoners. Most prisoners attending education were developing self-confidence in communication skills, and their behaviour was mostly good. In the few cases where this was not the case, they

were challenged appropriately. Prisoners' development of English and mathematic skills required improvement. The standard of work was generally good in education. In commercial workshops, the use of personal protective equipment (PPE) was not routinely monitored or adhered to, limiting prisoners' understanding of health and safety at work.

- S27 Achievement rates in English and mathematics qualifications were very high at entry level but at the higher levels had further declined since the previous inspection, although there were indications of recent improvements. Achievement rates in vocational training had been consistently high. The prison had not analysed sufficiently the achievement rates by different groups of prisoners, in particular by age, to ensure that they all achieved as well as expected.
- S28 Prisoner access to the library remained a problem, despite changes to the provision, and only 22% had made visits in the previous six months. The library provided adequate stock and reading materials, and supported several reading initiatives.
- S29 There was good and well-maintained indoor gym equipment and a range of fitness activities, but most prisoners could only access the gym once a week. Links between the sports centre and health care staff were good.

Resettlement

S30 *There were some weaknesses in the strategic management of resettlement, and the prisoner needs assessment needed updating. Responses to our survey was positive in most areas of offender management. Offender supervisors had reasonable contact with prisoners on their caseload, despite regular redeployment. Too many prisoners arrived without an offender assessment system (OASys) assessment, and there were no resources dedicated to support the small number of prisoners released directly into the community. Public protection arrangements remained good. Resettlement pathways work was generally good. The programmes team worked hard to allocate prisoners to appropriate offender behaviour programmes, and helped them to prepare for release. **Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***

S31 *At the last inspection in 2014 we found that outcomes for prisoners in Swinfen Hall were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made eight recommendations in the area of resettlement. At this follow-up inspection we found that two of the recommendations had been achieved, two had been partially achieved and four had not been achieved.*

- S32 There were some weaknesses in the strategic management of resettlement. Key policies were out of date, as was the prisoner needs analysis on which the reducing reoffending action plan was based. The cross-deployment of prison officer offender supervisors to operational duties had a detrimental effect on important casework.
- S33 Identification of and support for prisoners who were care leavers was better than we usually find, and there were continued efforts to support those transferring into the prison from the secure children's estate.
- S34 In our survey, prisoners were positive about having an offender supervisor and an achievable sentence plan. All new arrivals were allocated an offender supervisor, and had a meaningful meeting soon after arriving and regular contact. Too many prisoners arrived without an OASys assessment and the prison was struggling to reduce the backlog. Assessment and management of risk was of a sufficient quality. Pre-release risk management plans were not completed for prisoners 'out of scope' for offender management, but they were covered by

- three-way meetings involving the offender supervisor, community offender management and the prisoner, at which licence conditions were established.
- S35 Public protection arrangements remained good. The handling of multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) was generally appropriate, but more was needed to confirm MAPPA risk management levels before release.
- S36 The recategorisation decisions we reviewed were appropriate but some prisoners had lengthy delays in transfer to category B prisons. The number of indeterminate sentence prisoners had halved since the previous inspection. Consultation with this group had recently been reintroduced, and an annual lifer family day was open to all indeterminate sentence prisoners.
- S37 The prison was not a designated resettlement prison and therefore was not resourced to provide adequate through-the-gate provision to the average of 10 prisoners released every month, although it worked hard to offset the impact of this shortfall. Prisoners approaching release were not always transferred to a resettlement prison and, as a result, not all received sufficient support from their local area in preparation for their release. Accommodation support was provided by offender supervisors, in partnership with PACT (Prison Advice and Care Trust), for prisoners likely to experience the greatest housing problems on release. The National Career Service delivered a good quality service, tailoring advice and guidance to meet individual need, and providing meaningful support for prisoners approaching their release dates.
- S38 Pre-release health planning for prisoners was timely and effective. Appropriate liaison with community mental health services ensured continuity of care. The substance misuse service had developed appropriate links with agencies in a wide catchment area to facilitate post-release support, and there was evidence of good pre-release preparation.
- S39 Children and families work was well developed; there was a full-time family engagement worker, a parenting course and the library supported Storybook Dads (enabling prisoners to record stories for their children). Facilities for visits were good, including a welcoming visitors' centre, and a large and relaxed visits hall that had a staffed play area and a snack bar. However, there were not enough visits slots to meet demand and visits regularly did not start on time.
- S40 There was a mostly appropriate range of offending behaviour programmes, and lack of OASys assessment did not always prevent prisoners from accessing interventions. The development of the PIPE (psychologically informed planned environment unit) was a positive initiative.

Main concerns and recommendations

S41 Concern: There was a fragmented approach to addressing safety across key functions, including safety, residential and security, and this did not fully address the reduction of violence and overall management of safety.

Recommendation: There should be sufficient interdepartmental working, supported by good intelligence and evidence on safety, to inform a relevant and measurable action plan to reduce violence.

S42 Concern: Many prisoners lived in extremely poor conditions, and some cells were not fit for use – many had no glass in the windows, exposing prisoners to the elements. Too many cells were dirty, had graffiti and were poorly furnished. Most prisoners spent too long in squalid conditions.

Recommendation: Conditions in the cells and residential areas should be improved and reach acceptable standards of cleanliness and living conditions. The communal areas and cells in A, B and C wings should be fully refurbished and maintained to a good standard. Cells across the prison should be adequately furnished, and toilets should be deep cleaned regularly.

S43 Concern: We found 43% of men locked in their cells during main work periods, and association only took place on alternate weekdays and was cancelled for one or more wings on half the days each month. Normal work had also been cancelled on more than three days a month, on average, for at least one wing. This unreasonable amount of lock-up had negative effects on the well-being of prisoners and their prospects to reduce reoffending.

Recommendation: All prisoners for whom there is no good reason to be confined to their cells should be unlocked for work and a period of domestic tasks and association on every working day.

S44 Concern: The quality and outcomes of learning and skills provision was insufficient, with a detrimental impact on outcomes for prisoners.

Recommendation: The prison's leaders and managers should assure the good quality of all learning and skills provision through evaluation that is sufficiently critical and leads to effective and sustained improvement.

S45 Concern: Swinfen Hall was not designated as a resettlement prison and so did not have the on-site resources to support the average of 10 prisoners released each month. Prisoners were not always transferred to appropriate resettlement prisons in line with the NOMS resettlement model, and we were not assured that prisoners approaching release received sufficient support from their local area as part of pre-release planning.

Recommendation: NOMS should ensure that its model for resettlement is applied consistently and that prisoners at Swinfen Hall can move to appropriate prisons in good time for their release. In exceptional cases where a transfer is not possible, resettlement services similar to those accessible at a resettlement prison should be available to prisoners at Swinfen Hall.

Section 1. Safety

Courts, escorts and transfers

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.1 The prison was a national resource for programme work and so drew prisoners from across the country, many of whom had long journeys to reach the prison. In our survey, almost two-thirds said that they had spent more than two hours in the van, which was more than the 56% in 2014. One new arrival we observed had had a journey of over three hours and had asked for a toilet stop that had not been made, which staff said was normal practice. Escort vans were reasonably clean and properly equipped.
- I.2 The reception was closed over lunchtime and some arriving prisoners had to wait in the van during this time, although there was liaison with the transport contractor to minimise this. Prisoners were no longer normally handcuffed to and from the van within the secure perimeter.

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.3 The reception was spacious but not tidy or well maintained, and the search area was dirty. Staff were efficient and reasonably courteous, but the first impression for new arrivals was not of a positive and purposeful institution. There was little information for new arrivals, and in our survey fewer prisoners than at the last inspection said they were given information on arrival. All were offered a telephone call in reception, but it did not provide food, or advice and support from an experienced prisoner. Although we observed most new arrivals being moved promptly to B wing (induction and first night unit), in our survey only 64% said they had been in reception for less than two hours. Arrivals were seen by a first night officer from B wing and by a nurse.
- I.4 All new arrivals were strip searched. We were told that this was due to the number of phones brought in, although there had been relatively few finds in reception. This measure was not proportionate to the risk. (See paragraph I.22 and recommendation I.39.)
- I.5 In our survey, only 61% of prisoners, against the comparator of 79%, said that they had felt safe on their first night. We observed loud and aggressive behaviour from some prisoners on the ground floor of B wing, which held several basic-level prisoners, including I1 who could not be moved anywhere else in the prison because of risk to themselves or others. Staff told us that some of these prisoners bullied new arrivals.
- I.6 First night officers worked hard to locate new arrivals appropriately and give them support. There was some good care, but this work was not overseen actively by managers and so could be inconsistent. Cells for new arrivals were in very poor condition, with insanitary toilets, some graffiti and generally poor state of decoration.

- I.7** Because of the combination of different groups of prisoners on B wing, too many vulnerable arrivals were not given appropriate support in their first days and were relatively isolated from other prisoners and purposeful activity. The first night and induction policy had not been reviewed for three years.
- I.8** Almost all prisoners had been on an induction course. This consisted of a brief interview with the first night officer and a short session with a prisoner peer supporter on the day of arrival. It was then followed up with an induction day for activities which was led by prison officers and specialist staff. However, because these sessions were only delivered weekly and were sometimes cancelled, some new arrivals had to wait for a week or more before they could take part in gym, work or education.

Recommendation

- I.9 All new arrivals should be given a cell in good condition and in an area away from potentially aggressive prisoners, and receive appropriate initial support, including prompt induction.**

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.

- I.10** There had been a gradual increase in all violent incidents since the previous inspection and the level of violence was now similar to comparable prisons. There had been 79 assaults on prisoners and 24 on staff, and 60 prisoner fights in the previous six months. In our survey, 30% of prisoners said that they currently felt unsafe, which was almost twice the comparator of 16%. The proportion of prisoners who said that they had been victimised by other prisoners had risen to 49% from 35% in 2014, and was much higher than the comparator of 24%.
- I.11** Violence reduction was discussed at the monthly safer custody meeting. A biweekly meeting focused on recent incidents, along with emerging issues, to examine individual prisoner concerns. Attendance at the meetings included security, residential staff and the chaplaincy. Discussion was usually limited to recent incidents and prisoners subject to anti-bullying measures, and lacked detailed analysis to identify underlying causes.
- I.12** Although there had been a prisoner survey about violence in 2015, responses were limited and there had been no further work on an action plan to reduce the high levels of violence.
- I.13** Security and residential staff were also focused on violence matters and held intelligence and knowledge on individual prisoners (see paragraph I.32). However, despite the joint attendance at key safer custody meetings, and the dissemination of intelligence after an incident, there was a fragmented approach to reducing violence and no establishment-wide strategy to improve safety (see main recommendation S41).
- I.14** Prisoners identified as perpetrators of violence were placed on a 'traffic light' scheme, ranging from regular observations, to a downgrade to basic level and then segregation. Other than this punitive approach, there was little to identify the reasons why such prisoners engaged in violence. Behavioural targets were perfunctory and mostly the same in

all cases. The targets were managed by the safer custody team but rarely communicated to the residential staff responsible for management of the prisoners. There were 63 prisoners on some form of monitoring for violence at the time of inspection, a number that was almost unmanageable. As a result, most spent lengthy periods locked up, and many told us that this did little to deter or improve their behaviour.

- I.15** The small team of safer custody officers were often redeployed and had insufficient time to oversee processes, offer guidance to residential staff or quality check all the documentation, which had a negative impact. We found 15 investigations into violent acts that had not been completed sufficiently, and that some prisoners subject to monitoring had not had regular reviews.
- I.16** There were 13 prisoners subject to regime restriction because they were a perpetrator or victim of violence at the time of inspection. Work to support victims was inadequate, and the establishment was unsighted on the number of prisoners who were self-isolating through fear of victimisation or physical assault.
- I.17** Prisoners convicted of a sexual offence accounted for 30% of the population. While they were integrated across the accommodation and were allocated to activity, there was no documented risk assessment for their individual needs or follow up to monitor outcomes. Many who we talked to claimed that they were fearful and self-isolating to some degree as a result.

Recommendations

- I.18** **The prison should investigate and take action to reduce levels of violence and improve safety. Arrangements to support victims and manage the perpetrators of violence should be more robust, with regular reviews and more effective target setting and intervention.**
- I.19** **A specific plan should be drawn up to reduce the threats to the sex offender population and address their poor perceptions of safety.**

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.20** The prison was managing a vulnerable group of prisoners; in our survey more prisoners than the comparator or at the previous inspection said they felt depressed or suicidal, and the number reporting emotional or mental health difficulties on arrival or currently had also risen since the previous inspection.
- I.21** There had been 198 incidents of self-harm in the previous six months, which was lower than the previous inspection and similar to comparable establishments. In the same period, 164 assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management documents for prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm had been opened, including 13 open at the time of the inspection. Care for prisoners in crisis was mixed; although some prisoners felt well supported by staff, many others were negative about their care. Our observations

confirmed that too many prisoners were locked in ill-equipped cells without occupation for too long (see main recommendation S43).

- I.22** Tragically, there had been one self-inflicted death since the previous inspection. A Prisons and Probation Ombudsman (PPO) investigation had been very critical of reception and first night procedures at Swinfen Hall. Although the prison had responded by implementing a checklist for reception staff and enhanced checks on all new arrivals, we found evidence that prisoners on open ACCTs had received poor care during their early days. This included being strip-searched, locked in squalid cells without basic items such as toothpaste, being moved off B wing before they had an induction, and waiting too long before allocation to activity (see paragraphs I.4 and I.8).
- I.23** As at the last inspection, most staff had not been trained in ACCT awareness. The ACCT documentation we saw required improvement; case management was inconsistent and although initial assessments were often good, the resulting actions were not recorded on care maps. Many recorded triggers that might generate self-harm that were too broad, and staff monitoring entries were not sufficiently frequent and did not demonstrate meaningful engagement with prisoners in crisis.
- I.24** There were strategic quarterly meetings and fortnightly multiagency safe health (MASH) meetings focused on individual care, but both forums were poorly attended.
- I.25** The constant watch cell on B wing was appropriate and had not been used since April 2015.
- I.26** In our survey, only 30% of respondents said they could see a Listener (prisoners trained by the Samaritans to provide confidential emotional support to fellow prisoners) at any time if they needed one. Although there were sufficient Listeners and a rota, prisoners and night staff told us that Listeners were not always unlocked at night. Samaritans telephones were available on all wings.

Recommendations

- I.27** **Care for prisoners in crisis should be improved, particularly during their early days, with greater attention to their interaction and the provision of activity.**
- I.28** **The quality of assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) documents should be improved.** (Repeated recommendation I.29).
- I.29** **All staff should be trained in suicide and self-harm prevention.** (Repeated recommendation I.30)

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.²

- I.30** Safeguarding policies and procedures had developed well since the previous inspection. There was now a policy that focused appropriately on internal prison processes for protecting vulnerable adults from harm. Prisoners at risk were identified at MASH meetings (see paragraph I.24) and there was evidence of action by the prison in response to concerns raised. The prison had made appropriate links with the local safeguarding adults board. However, inconsistent residential staff attendance at MASH meetings meant that at-risk prisoners might not be identified. In addition, support for victims of bullying and violence and prisoners self-isolating required improvement (see recommendations I.18 and I.27).

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.31** While overall security arrangements, such as prisoner movement to and from activities, were proportionate, some practices identified at the previous inspection had been reintroduced. For example, prisoners were routinely strip searched on reception and discharge without any risk assessment, including new arrivals, which was unnecessary and disproportionate. Some staff told us that this also happened when discharging prisoners.
- I.32** The security department was well resourced with a committed team of collators and analysts managing the flow of information. There had been 3,008 intelligence reports submitted in the previous six months, which was an increase of nearly a thousand since the same period at the previous inspection.
- I.33** For several months during 2016, analysis of intelligence had been relatively basic and failed to inform overall strategy. However, the introduction of a tactical intelligence report (TIR) was helping to develop a broader awareness of the prison's security risks and enabling identification of key threats.
- I.34** The security department was represented at key meetings and the TIR now provided a greater oversight of issues concerning the increase in violence. Nevertheless, the overall approach to reducing violence and addressing safety concerns remained fragmented, and there was no coordination with the safer custody team in using the TIR to inform a wider establishment violence reduction strategy (see paragraph I.13 and main recommendation S41).
- I.35** There were good relationships with external agencies, particularly the regional police intelligence unit and the NOMS West Midlands area search team. Security managers were

² 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).

sighted on the increasing supply of illicit items, and the external relationships supplemented the prison's procedural and physical security arrangements. Infrequent and low-level issues around extremism were well managed with good support from the Imam and external agencies if required.

- I.36** In our survey, 44% of prisoners thought it was easy to get illegal drugs, compared with 28% in 2014 and the comparator of 27%, and one in five said they had developed a drug problem while at the prison. The relatively low random mandatory drug testing (MDT) positive rate of 2.2% was higher than the previous inspection and did not reflect use of new psychoactive substances (NPS),³ for which testing had only started in September 2016. Suspicion drug testing had been inconsistent, and half of all requests for testing had not been met since April 2016.
- I.37** Intelligence reports and finds pointed to cannabis and NPS, such as 'spice' and 'mamba', as the main drugs used. While the prison was sighted on the scale of the problem and provided evidence of a decline in NPS use in the previous three months, there had been no detailed analysis until recently to inform a supply reduction action plan.
- I.38** The management of closed and banned visitors was appropriate and related only to incidents that took place on visits. At the time of inspection, two prisoners were subject to closed visits and five visitors were banned. Those subject to restrictions were given information to advise them of how they could be lifted.

Recommendations

- I.39 Prisoners should only be strip searched when deemed necessary, with authorisation clearly recorded against sound reasoning.**
- I.40 The prison should develop, implement and monitor a drug supply reduction action plan and ensure that there are effective measures to tackle drug availability.**

Incentives and earned privileges

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.41** In our survey, although 48% of white prisoners felt that they had been treated fairly under the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme, prisoners from black and minority ethnic backgrounds were more negative - just 32% felt they had been treated fairly. The prison's equality monitoring had shown that black and minority ethnic prisoners were out of range for the basic level but the equality team had not explored this (see paragraph 2.20).
- I.42** Almost a third of prisoners were on the enhanced level and 13% were on basic. Although some prisoners were on basic as a result of the IEP scheme, others had been put on this level through the anti-bullying process (see paragraph 1.14). This overlap caused some

³ New drugs that mimic the effects of illegal drugs such as cannabis, heroin or amphetamines and may have unpredictable and life-threatening effects.

confusion between residential staff managing the IEP scheme and violence reduction staff overseeing those on basic due to anti-bullying.

- I.43** Although the local policy was comprehensive, it focused predominantly on punishment with few incentives for good behaviour, especially for prisoners not located on I wing (the enhanced unit).
- I.44** Improvement targets for prisoners on basic were limited and the regime was particularly inadequate; access to showers and telephones could be limited to just two a week. Although some prisoners said that they were not always aware of when a basic review had taken place, we found evidence of documented reviews in both electronic and wing files.
- I.45** We found several cases of prisoners on basic as part of the anti-bullying process where reviews had not taken place within the specified timescales. In some cases, this added a significant time to the period spent on basic without appropriate review, which was not acceptable.

Recommendation

- I.46** **The incentives and earned privileges scheme should be applied consistently, with timely reviews and a clear focus on incentives for good behaviour through effective and consultative targets.**

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.

Disciplinary procedures

- I.47** The number of adjudications had risen by 83% since the previous inspection, to 1,105 in the previous six months. This overuse risked devaluing the impact of the disciplinary process. However, the processes were applied efficiently and fairly, and the hearings we observed were carried out properly but with a level of age-appropriate informality. The governor checked 10% of adjudication records, and very few were quashed, lapsed through time or failed on technicalities.

The use of force

- I.48** Although in our survey, fewer prisoners than the comparator said that force had been used on them in the previous six months, we found that force had been used 180 times in the last six months – an increase of 45% since the last inspection. Batons had been drawn 49 times in that period and used 10 times, always in the context of a fight involving more than two prisoners. Some officers, particularly those with less experience, were drawing batons to resolve incidents where there were insufficient staff to intervene; there was a risk that drawing the baton too often could reduce its effectiveness in protecting staff and de-escalating conflict. No batons had been drawn in the previous month.
- I.49** Governance of use of force had not improved and remained weak, although a proper system of scrutiny, analysis and learning of lessons had recently been started. The written

evidence of frontline staff, who wrote full and detailed accounts, showed that use of force was proportionate and reasonable, but almost no video recordings of planned interventions were available. In many cases, there were no recorded checks of use of force incidents or records by the orderly officer or a more senior person. There was evidence in only a very few cases that a health professional had examined the prisoner after use of force. Although an instruction had been issued that prisoners should be debriefed after force had been used on them, there was scarcely any evidence that this was done.

Recommendation

- I.50 All use of force, including the drawing of batons, should be subject to systematic scrutiny by managers to ensure safe and effective practice, and all planned interventions should be filmed.**

Segregation

- I.51** There were up to 10 prisoners in the care and separation unit (CSU) during the inspection. Segregation was not used excessively. Although during the inspection three prisoners had been held there for more than three months for legitimate reasons, the average stay was 12 days. All those in the unit during the inspection were segregated on the basis of risk. Cellular confinement was used sparingly, and men were not segregated for their own protection - those needing protection were generally located on the top landing of B wing. The CSU had held relatively few prisoners on ACCTs.
- I.52** Prisoners were not routinely strip searched on arrival at the CSU. Staff were calm, confident and positive in their interactions with prisoners, and there was little disruptive behaviour in the unit. Despite the findings of our survey, all those in the unit at the time of inspection said they were treated well and had a decent regime. The regime had improved a little, with library facilities and a weekly visit from PE staff, but the men did not have daily access to a shower or telephone, at least until the final day of the inspection. Prisoners on offending behaviour courses could continue them from the CSU, subject to risk assessment. Televisions were not available to anyone in the CSU. There were reintegration plans and care plans for any prisoner in the CSU for more than 28 days, and reviews were well attended.

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.53** The substance misuse strategy policy had been updated three months previously following a needs analysis, but since then a new model of delivering drug and alcohol services had been introduced, which the prison was still unclear about. Attendance at drug strategy meetings was poor.
- I.54** The South Staffordshire and Shropshire NHS Foundation Trust was the provider of integrated substance misuse and mental health services, and the teams were amalgamating. Under the new service model, the number of drug and alcohol recovery workers had been significantly reduced and the mental health team was not yet fully staffed, which affected outcomes for prisoners.

- I.55** Primary health care staff referred new arrivals who disclosed drug and/or alcohol problems during reception screening to the integrated team, but prisoners on induction were not given harm-reduction information on the use of NPS in prison. Drug and alcohol services were not well publicised enough, and some prisoners did not know how to access support, while others were reluctant.
- I.56** There were 138 prisoners actively engaging with the service, and we saw evidence of good quality one-to-one work based on detailed recovery plans. However, substance misuse awareness workshops only ran infrequently, there were no mutual aid groups, the peer mentor scheme was inactive and family engagement work had stopped.
- I.57** As part of the new service model an ‘emotional management’ course co-facilitated by recovery and mental health workers had just started, and care for prisoners with both substance misuse and mental health-related problems was well coordinated. Additional drug and alcohol recovery gym sessions were popular, and 65 prisoners had signed up to voluntary drug testing, which was undertaken by recovery workers.
- I.58** Care UK provided clinical substance misuse services, but demand was low and opiate substitute treatment had not been required in the past 18 months. Appropriate facilities, resources and expertise were available.

Recommendations

- I.59** **A multiagency substance misuse strategy committee should develop, implement and monitor the strategic approach to drugs and alcohol, and ensure effective joint working between departments and service providers.**
- I.60** **All prisoners should receive information during their induction about the dangers of substance misuse and the support available to them. Drug and alcohol recovery services should be well publicised and easily accessible.**
- I.61** **Prisoners should have access to an appropriate range of substance misuse interventions, including mutual aid and peer support, that meets their needs.**

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 Living conditions for most prisoners had deteriorated since the previous inspection. A, B and C wings were squalid; prisoners lived in cramped, dirty cells that were missing furniture and often contained graffiti and scaled toilets. A programme of window repairs reported at the 2014 inspection had only started during October 2016 for completion in March 2017. As a consequence, most of the 180 cells on these wings had windows without glass, leaving prisoners exposed to the elements (see photographs, Appendix V). While F, G, I and J wings were more modern with larger cells, they were also dirty, and cells lacked basic equipment, including tables and chairs – which was a particular problem as prisoners had to eat all meals in their cells (see paragraph 2.78). Many toilets were scaled and some were inadequately screened. In contrast to most of the prison, accommodation on D and E wings was bright clean and well ordered (see Appendix V). (See main recommendation S42.)
- 2.2 External areas and exercise yards were stark and contained litter. With the exception of D and E wings, communal areas were also dirty – even though more than 100 prisoners were employed as cleaners – and most association equipment was in a poor state of repair.
- 2.3 In our survey, only 27% of prisoners said they could have a daily shower, compared with 93% at the last inspection. While the showers were in a reasonable condition, the poor regime made a daily shower impossible for most prisoners, and many prisoners had to wait four days between showers (see also paragraph 3.2). There were shortages of prison clothing required for prisoners in work, which meant they wore dirty or ill-fitting clothing, and in addition wing laundry equipment needed repair. Only 28% of prisoners said they were able to get their stored property if needed, against 40% in 2014, and we found that they faced unreasonable delays in accessing their property.
- 2.4 In our survey, 46% of prisoners said they had problems accessing telephone calls, against the comparator of 30%. Again, while there were sufficient telephones, the regime prevented most prisoners from making a daily telephone call. Over half of prisoners (57%) also said they had problems receiving or sending mail. We found that incoming and outgoing mail was dealt with promptly, but there were some delays in delivering mail to prisoners.
- 2.5 In our survey, only 25% of respondents said that their cell call bell was normally answered within five minutes. Our observations confirmed delays of between 10 and 30 minutes in staff answering emergency cell bells.
- 2.6 Information on rules and routines displayed on notice boards was often out of date or incomplete. Prisoners were informed about basic rules on arrival, but staff did not consistently enforce some rules on smoking, standards of dress and inappropriate displays.
- 2.7 Prisoner perceptions about the application system had also deteriorated. Only half of prisoners thought their applications were dealt with fairly, against 59% in 2014. Only 28% said they were dealt with in seven days.

Recommendations

- 2.8 Prisoners should have daily access to telephones and showers.**
- 2.9 Toilets should be adequately screened.**
- 2.10 Staff should respond to emergency cell bells within five minutes.**

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** In our survey, fewer prisoners than at the previous inspection said that most staff treated them with respect. However, there were significant variations across Swinfen Hall. On D and E wings, where relationships were good, 82% of respondents said that most staff treated them with respect and 92% said there was a member of staff they could turn to if they had a problem, but the responses for all the other wings were 59% and 54% respectively.
- 2.12** It was clear to us that the poor regime, lack of access to basic amenities and long periods that prisoners spent in their cells created tensions and limited the opportunities for developing positive relationships with staff. We also found that too many staff had low expectations of their prisoners, and had accepted the poor living conditions across much of the prison.
- 2.13** The personal officer scheme functioned reasonably well. Officer entries in prisoner case history notes were frequent, but too often only focused on sanctions rather than promoting positive behaviour.
- 2.14** Monthly prisoner consultation meetings did not take place on some wings and there had not been a prison-wide meeting since June 2016. Minutes of meetings documented prisoner frustrations with the regime, broken equipment and lack of access to showers and telephones (see paragraphs 2.3 and 3.2).

Recommendations

- 2.15 The prison should develop a strategy to ensure good staff-prisoner relationships across the whole prison. Staff should consistently model good behaviour, have high expectations of prisoners and encourage them to contribute actively to the wider prison community.**
- 2.16 Formal consultation with prisoners should be regular and responsive on all wings.**

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 characteristic⁴ 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.

Strategic management

- 2.17** Some aspects of equality work were improving, but further work was needed to enhance outcomes for many prisoners. The overarching equality policy was out of date. The equality meeting covered a wide range of information but had insufficient attendance from functional heads. The equality action plan was comprehensive but the extent of management oversight or input into it outside the equality meeting was unclear. The equality meeting reviewed data on outcomes for different protected characteristics, and monitoring and oversight of this had improved since our last inspection. An equality newsletter was produced, and promotion of equality work and events was good.
- 2.18** Equality work was coordinated by a custodial manager who offered good support to individual prisoners. Each wing had equality representatives who were enthusiastic and well supported. They had a comprehensive job description and training, and were supported by wing equality officers. However, the work of these representatives and officers was not understood by all prisoners or well promoted across the prison. There were staff 'champions' for each protected characteristic, but this system was not embedded in all areas.
- 2.19** Discrimination incident reporting forms (DIRFs) were not available on all wings. Staff and prisoners lacked awareness of the process, few had confidence in the system, and staff did not use it to challenge discrimination. Prisoners often used the generic complaints system to raise discrimination concerns, which were usually picked up and treated as a DIRF. Investigation of discrimination incidents was good, and replies were prompt and polite. There was evidence of action being taken and staff being monitored when there were concerns. Quality assurance was appropriate, and reviewed by a governor. However, only 16 DIRFs had been submitted in the previous six months, which was lower than we usually see in similar prisons.

Protected characteristics

- 2.20** The number of black and minority ethnic prisoners had decreased since our last inspection, from 37% to just under 32%. In our survey, more black and minority ethnic than white prisoners said they felt safe, and they were less likely to report victimisation by other prisoners. However, they were more negative about their experiences of reception, the prison shop, incentives and earned privileges (IEP) and victimisation from staff. The prison had not explored the reasons for this difference in experience, and there was currently no consultation with this group. In our focus group with black and minority ethnic prisoners,

⁴ The grounds upon which discrimination is unlawful (Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2010).

they called for cultural awareness training for staff, more black and minority ethnic staff and food that better reflected their culture.

- 2.21** Support for Gypsy, Romany and Traveller prisoners had decreased since our last inspection. Although the chaplaincy still provided some support, this was only available to Catholics attending services. The Travellers we spoke to told us they needed more support with contacting their families. There was no meaningful consultation with this group.
- 2.22** Support for the 35 foreign national prisoners was limited and focused on the Home Office Immigration Enforcement surgery. They were offered no independent immigration advice, but offender management unit (OMU) staff had a list of local immigration solicitors. Few foreign nationals had taken up the free five-minute telephone call available for those not having visits. There was some translated information in reception and in the library, but we saw no evidence that the prison used professional interpreting services for significant meetings or conversations with prisoners. There was one detainee held beyond the end of his sentence during our inspection. No one had explained to him the difference in his rights as a detainee or the possible benefits of going to an immigration removal centre.
- 2.23** The number of Muslim prisoners had risen since our last inspection and was now 23% of the population. In our survey, Muslim prisoners were less favourable than non-Muslims about their experience of transfer to the prison, reception and contact with wing staff. There had been some consultation with these prisoners through the chaplaincy, but this was not ongoing.
- 2.24** Identification of new arrivals with disabilities was strong but it was not always clear if they were offered any additional support. Very few men had physical disabilities and wing staff were generally aware of their needs. While we saw two good personal emergency evacuation plans (PEEPs), others could not be located on the wings and it was unclear how they were held centrally, recorded and coordinated. Awareness of the needs of prisoners with hidden disabilities, such as learning and behavioural needs, was not consistent across all wing staff. Easy-read information was not readily available, and many information notices and posters were too complex.
- 2.25** As at our last inspection, there was good support for gay, bisexual and transgender prisoners. There was a regular Inside Out meeting and links with community organisations. The prison was developing a strategy for transgender prisoners and taking specialist advice on this. One prisoner exploring the possibility of gender reassignment was receiving good support from key staff.
- 2.26** Young prisoners (aged 18-21) were integrated with adult prisoners, with no difference in services. In our survey, young men under 21 found the IEP system fairer and were less likely to find it easy to make a complaint than prisoners over 21. More said they were taking medication and had access to illegal drugs. Younger men were overrepresented in adjudications and this was being monitored. The prison had given little consideration to the specific needs of the younger population, and there was a lack of focus on their developmental needs.

Recommendations

- 2.27** There should be meaningful consultation, leading to action plans, for all groups of prisoners with protected characteristics.
- 2.28** The prison should provide a coordinated approach to managing the needs of foreign national prisoners, including access to free independent immigration advice. (Repeated recommendation 2.30)

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.

- 2.29** In our survey, only 46% of prisoners, against the comparator of 55%, felt their religious beliefs were respected and 41%, against 52%, that it was easy to attend services. Although these perceptions could have been connected to the lack of time out of cell, the prison needed to explore the reasons behind them. It was notable that Muslim prisoners were more positive than non-Muslims - 61%, against 41%, felt their religious beliefs was respected and 72%, against 44%, said they could see a religious leader in private.
- 2.30** Despite these findings, the chaplaincy had a caring presence in the prison, and was respected and valued by prisoners. A chaplain saw all new arrivals individually, and pastoral support was good. The chaplains were well integrated into the prison, and regularly attended the segregation unit and assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management reviews of prisoners in crisis. They ran a Stepping Stones course for men who needed additional support, and were involved in all relevant functional meetings, as well as facilitating faith awareness training for officers.
- 2.31** All faiths were catered for, and the chaplaincy worked closely with the prison and kitchen staff to facilitate the celebration of festivals. Worship areas, including a chapel that could be partitioned and a well-attended mosque, were attractive and peaceful. The chaplaincy had its own confidential application system for prisoners. The team was well supported by volunteer chaplains and prison visitors, and one volunteer was supporting men to contact faith communities on release.

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.

- 2.32** In our survey, 31% of prisoners said they had been prevented from making a complaint. Complaint forms were not freely available; staff on I wing (enhanced) had put them in the staff office as they believed they would be damaged if left on the wing.
- 2.33** Although complaints were answered promptly, not all the responses we saw were helpful or thorough. There was not enough flexibility in accepting complaints that were not dated or completed fully, or were on the wrong form. Most complaints were about access to property or residential concerns. Although the senior management team discussed the

complaints, there was little evidence that this has led to changes in practice, and operational managers did not systematically check complaint responses for their functions. We saw evidence that complaints against staff were taken seriously. Quality assurance and feedback processes were improving, but underdeveloped.

Recommendation

- 2.34 Quality assurance of complaints should involve all relevant departments, and lead to improved responses and, where possible, changes in practice.**

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.

- 2.35** There was no legal officer or information about outside legal advice agencies. In our survey, only 24% of prisoners, against the comparator of 34%, said it was easy to communicate with their solicitor and only 36%, against 43%, that it was easy to get legal visits. Because of the time that prisoners spent in their cell, it was difficult for them to telephone lawyers during work hours. There were four confidential legal interview rooms, which was sufficient. Legal books were available in the library for reference only, and prisoners could not get photocopies of Prison Service instructions (PSIs) (see paragraph 3.36). Although there were PSIs in the library and on the 'virtual campus' computers (see paragraph 3.38), lack of time unlocked hindered access to them.

Recommendation

- 2.36 Information about legal rights and advice agencies should be freely available.**

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.

- 2.37** The inspection of health services was jointly undertaken by the Care Quality Commission (CQC)⁵ and HM Inspectorate of Prisons under a memorandum of understanding agreement between the agencies. The CQC found there were no breaches of the relevant regulations.

⁵ CQC is the independent regulator of health and adult social care in England. It monitors, inspects and regulates services to make sure they meet fundamental standards of quality and safety. For information on CQC's standards of care and the action it takes to improve services, please visit: <http://www.cqc.org.uk>.

Governance arrangements

- 2.38** Care UK Clinical Services Limited had been the main health provider since April 2016. Commissioners monitored the contract through monthly performance and quality data, and quarterly meetings with the provider. A monthly integrated quality assurance and improvement meeting was developing and well attended by prison and health staff.
- 2.39** Following the dissolution of the partnership board in February 2016, the local delivery board had not yet met, which had limited the strategic overview; a meeting was due to take place. A health needs assessment published in April 2015 informed service delivery. A new management team had started to implement change with clear direction and drive. Staff shortages had affected service delivery but this was mitigated by using regular bank staff and an ongoing recruitment campaign. We observed positive interactions with prisoners by health staff, who knew their patients well.
- 2.40** Professional development opportunities for health staff were good; although not all mandatory training had been completed, time was allocated for this. There was good managerial and clinical supervision in the mental health and substance misuse team. Too few primary care staff had received formal supervision, although there were plans to address this. Health staff had access to a wide range of policies, including safeguarding.
- 2.41** The electronic clinical incident system, Datix, was well used and incident data were analysed. However, we found some under-reporting of incidents involving new psychoactive substances (NPS), which would have contributed to lessons to be learned and service delivery.
- 2.42** The health care centre was well maintained, apart from several broken seats in the waiting area. Regular audits had identified that the sinks did not comply with the latest guidance on hygiene, and this needed to be addressed.
- 2.43** Staff had completed intermediate life support training. Emergency equipment, including oxygen and automated external defibrillators (AEDs), met Resuscitation Council's minimum recommendations for primary care. The seals on the emergency bags were difficult to break but this was rectified during the inspection. Monitoring needed to be more robust as we found a few items missing including a stethoscope and torch pens which had been signed for.
- 2.44** There were arrangements to ensure that first aid trained prison officers were on duty each shift. Approximately 23% of staff had received first aid training, with further sessions planned. An ambulance was called promptly in emergencies.
- 2.45** Health promotion was provided during consultations, and material was displayed in the health centre and on the wings. There was an annual health fair for prisoners and staff, which was positive.
- 2.46** Prisoner health care consultation was developing through patient surveys, a newly restarted health forum and prisoner health champions, which was positive. We observed well-organised care for a patient with potential tuberculosis, and effective liaison with Public Health England and the prison.
- 2.47** There had been 20 health care complaints between April and September 2016; the system was confidential. Concerns were resolved or progressed through to an interview between the complainant and the head of health care, which was positive. However, the written responses only stated that the interview had occurred without detailing how the complaint had been resolved. Health concern forms were not available on all wings.

- 2.48** There were arrangements with Staffordshire County Council for the provision of social care, although no prisoner had required a referral. There was access to mobility and health aids if needed.

Recommendation

- 2.49** Prisoners should receive prompt responses to health care complaints that adequately address and outline all the issues raised. Concern forms should be available on all units.

Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.50** In our survey, fewer prisoners than the comparator and at our last inspection (37% against 51% and 50%) said that the overall quality of health services was good. However, most prisoners we spoke to were positive about the care they received.
- 2.51** New arrivals were seen by a qualified nurse for a comprehensive health screening, and appropriate referrals were made. Telephone interpreting services were available if needed for non-English speakers. 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, and chlamydia screening was offered. Barrier protection was discussed and was available from nurses on the wings.
- 2.52** Primary care staff offered services from 7.30am to 7.30pm on weekdays with shorter hours at weekends. Weekday GP services were provided by regular doctors, waiting times for routine appointments were good at five days, and urgent 'on the day' GP appointments were facilitated. Out-of-hours provision was well organised with clear protocols.
- 2.53** The range of primary care services was reasonable with mostly acceptable waiting times. However, prisoners waited too long for immunisation and vaccinations, and smoking cessation. Long-term conditions were reasonably well managed, and nurse-led clinics were developing with care plans and assessment templates based on national clinical guidance. Telemedicine had recently been introduced and was starting to be used, which was positive.
- 2.54** The non-attendance rate for health appointments was too high, which wasted clinical time that could have been used to benefit prisoners. This was compounded by the prison regime, which sometimes failed to facilitate prisoners arriving for appointments, frequent inaccurate roll counts, and prisoners not unlocked or escorted to appointments. Prisoners did not always receive prior notification of health care appointments so could not plan their attendance around other activities.
- 2.55** Some external hospital visits had been rearranged for various reasons, including hospital cancellation, with appointments rescheduled. This was being monitored and was well managed.

Recommendation

- 2.56** The delivery board should take sustained action to reduce non-attendance rates for appointments and make good use of clinical time, and help reduce waiting times for some services.

Pharmacy

- 2.57** Eighty per cent of patients received their medicines in possession, which was based on suitable risk assessments that were recorded on the SystemOne clinical IT system. Records had recently been deleted in error after the introduction of a new version of the assessment, and nurses were reassessing patients. The new assessment was based on a scoring system, which was more objective and allowed for more suitable patients to have their medicines in possession. In one case we observed, a patient had been risk assessed for weekly in-possession medication, but the GP had cancelled the supervised prescription too soon leading to a gap in treatment, which was inappropriate, and we were told that this had happened on a few occasions.
- 2.58** Lloyds Pharmacy supplied medicines with appropriate patient information. A pharmacist visited monthly and held well-attended pharmacy-led clinics, and a dispensing assistant attended for two hours a week. A full-time pharmacy technician employed by Care UK could give prisoners advice about medicines, and referred to the pharmacist where necessary. A dedicated pharmacy application form allowed prisoners to order their medication, ask pharmacy-related questions and encouraged feedback, which was a positive initiative.
- 2.59** Medicines were administered on the wings twice a day from 8am and 4.30pm, so some recommended dosage intervals could not be adhered to. Although there were adequate medical rooms, medicines were often administered on the wings from medicine trolleys through locked gates, which was inappropriate and a potential security risk as they were sometimes left unattended. Medicine queues were inadequately supervised, which compromised confidentiality and created the potential for bullying and medicines diversion.
- 2.60** Staff could not give prisoners prescribed or over-the-counter medicines when the health care department was closed. Some simple remedies were available from the prison shop, but not painkillers. Prescribing of tradable medicines was low, with the exception of mirtazapine (a drug used to treat major depression), which was often initiated inappropriately by prison GPs without any specialist mental health input.
- 2.61** There were good stock reconciliation procedures. Management of controlled drugs was good, but an audit trail was needed to show who had accessed the controlled drugs cabinet. Monitoring of drug refrigerator temperatures was not always consistent, and it was unclear if out-of-range temperatures were managed appropriately.
- 2.62** Medicines management was discussed at monthly meetings attended by health care, pharmacy and prison staff; concerns were reviewed but there was no monitoring of prescribing trends.

Recommendations

- 2.63 Medicines should be administered from dedicated areas and from trolleys only by exception.** (Repeated recommendation 2.65)
- 2.64 All medication should be administered at an appropriate time for maximum therapeutic effect, with sufficient officer supervision and privacy to maintain patient safety and confidentiality and reduce the risk of bullying and diversion.**
- 2.65 There should be procedures to provide prescribed and over-the-counter medicines when the health care department is closed.** (Repeated recommendation 2.67)

- 2.66** There should be effective oversight of prescribing trends, and robust daily monitoring of drug refrigerators to ensure heat-sensitive items are stored within the correct temperature range.

Dentistry

- 2.67** Dental services were provided by Time for Teeth. A dentist provided two sessions a week and a dental therapist provided two sessions. Appointments were allocated based on clinical need. Waiting times for routine appointments were now between five and six weeks, which was reasonable although it had been longer. An emergency dental waiting list had recently been introduced but it was too soon to assess its effectiveness. The dental facility was excellent and decontamination complied with current regulation. Dental clinical governance, equipment maintenance and record keeping were appropriate. A full range of treatments was provided. Oral health promotion was provided during sessions.

Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.68** Mental health services were provided by South Staffordshire and Shropshire Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust. The mental health and substance misuse psychosocial teams had recently integrated and beginning to implement this new service model, although they were not yet fully staffed, which had affected the delivery of services.
- 2.69** The service was available from Monday to Friday, 8am to 5pm. The multidisciplinary team was developing a stepped care model and secondary care was good. The range of treatment for primary mental health was adequate but needed further development; there were firm plans to extend the range of treatment once all new staff had been cleared to work.
- 2.70** The team leader, psychosocial lead, occupational therapist and social worker covered three prisons including Swinfen Hall. A psychiatrist provided one session a week. A full-time senior mental health nurse and three recovery practitioners were based in the health care centre. The recovery practitioners had received additional mental health training. Communication with other departments in the prison was good. The occupational therapist had started a 'managing emotions' group, which was a positive initiative, and a further group was planned. A good counselling service provided by 'Inside Out', an independent counselling service, had been decommissioned in the new model, which would potentially leave a gap in provision. The chaplaincy provided bereavement counselling.
- 2.71** Approximately 20 referrals a month were received through an open referral system and prioritised daily, based on clinical need. There were 14 patients on the waiting list - the longest wait was four weeks and four days, although most were seen within two weeks. Urgent referrals were seen promptly, which was good. The team caseload was 62, including 23 patients with serious mental health needs who were managed effectively under the care programme approach (CPA). The recovery practitioners had received additional mental health training. All team members undertook initial assessments, which were discussed with the senior nurse or at the effective weekly multidisciplinary clinical team meeting, depending on complexity. This was also a forum for discussion of ongoing care and treatment.
- 2.72** Apart from officers on the specialist D and E wing units, no other custody staff had attended mental health awareness training since our last inspection, which reduced their ability to identify and effectively support prisoners with mental health needs.
- 2.73** One patient had been transferred to a secure mental health unit since February 2016. This had taken 16 weeks, which was too long and exceeded the transfer guideline of 14 days.

Recommendations

- 2.74** The integrated mental health service should have sufficient staffing to ensure a full range of support for prisoners with mild to moderate mental health problems.
- 2.75** All custody staff should have regular mental health awareness training to enable them to identify and support prisoners with mental health problems.
- 2.76** Transfers of patients under the Mental Health Act should take place within the current Department of Health transfer time guidelines.

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.

- 2.77** Although in our survey only 19% of prisoners said the food was good, the meals we saw and tasted were reasonable and the quality was decent. The menu had pictures to help with choice, and all cultural and religious diets, along with festivals, were catered for. Prisoners were consulted on the food through a quarterly survey, which was good. Although 49% of the population were under 21, the prison received only the lower adult prisoner rate for catering rather than the YOI rate (£2.02 rather than £2.62 per prisoner per day), which covers additional food and calcium products.
- 2.78** Beverage packs were readily available and biscuit packs were given out weekly, which the men preferred. As at our last inspection, breakfast packs were still issued the evening before. Kettles were not always available. As there were no self-cook facilities, prisoners used their kettles to heat solid food, which was not ideal. There were still no facilities for prisoners to dine out of cell, and their cells sometimes lacked tables and chairs (see paragraph 2.1).
- 2.79** Not all wing serveries were clean and not all servery workers wore the proper protective equipment. Some serveries were not supervised effectively, leading to poor portion control. Although fruit was available at mealtimes it was not always put out on the servery so went to waste.
- 2.80** Up to 24 prisoners could be employed in the kitchen but there were no training qualifications available, which was a missed opportunity (see also paragraph 3.15 and recommendation 3.18).

Recommendations

- 2.81** The allocated catering budget for split adult and young offender institution sites should be brought into line with designated YOIs.
- 2.82** Breakfast should be served on the day it is to be eaten. (Repeated recommendation 2.87)
- 2.83** Prisoners should have the opportunity to self-cook and dine out of their cell.

Purchases

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.84** In our survey, although 51% of white prisoners said that the prison shop met their needs, only 39% of black and minority ethnic prisoners agreed. However, consultation was good and the shop list was reviewed at a quarterly meeting with prisoner representatives.
- 2.85** New arrivals could not order within their first 24 hours and could wait up to 13 days for their first order, which was a potential risk for debt and bullying. We saw morning newspapers for prisoners that were still in wing offices after the evening lock up, which was unacceptable given the long hours that prisoners could be locked up for.
- 2.86** Although catalogue orders were processed reasonably quickly, ordering from paper catalogues meant items could be out of stock by the time the order was submitted and prisoners could not order alternatives until the next canteen day. Delivered items were kept in reception for too long and, as at our last inspection, there was still an inappropriate processing charge.

Recommendation

- 2.87** Newspapers and items ordered from catalogues should be delivered to prisoners promptly, and 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** Prisoners still could not access 10 hours a day out of cell on weekdays because association was regularly cancelled, and activity sessions were also cut. In our roll checks, an average of 43% of prisoners were locked in their cells during main work periods. In the previous three months, an average of 3.3 workdays a month had been cancelled for at least one wing.
- 3.2** In our survey, the proportion of prisoners who said they had association five times a week had dropped from 61% in 2014 to only 25%. The published regime only allocated association on most wings on alternate weekdays and even those sessions were regularly cancelled. Between January and October 2016, at least one wing had their association cancelled on an average of 15 days a month. The level of lock up was unreasonable, and affected prisoners' well-being and ability to address their offending behaviour. (See main recommendation S43.)
- 3.3** Exercise yards were mainly bare, and there was very little recreation equipment, apart from I wing (enhanced prisoners), which had snooker and pool tables.

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.

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

Overall effectiveness of learning and skills and work:	<i>Inadequate</i>
<i>Achievements of prisoners engaged in learning and skills and work:</i>	<i>Requires improvement</i>
<i>Quality of learning and skills and work provision, including the quality of teaching, training, learning and assessment:</i>	<i>Requires improvement</i>
<i>Personal development and behaviour:</i>	<i>Inadequate</i>
<i>Leadership and management of learning and skills and work:</i>	<i>Inadequate</i>

Management of learning and skills and work

- 3.5** The prison's management of purposeful activity was inadequate. In the context of regime restrictions, staff reductions and absences, and other operational challenges, leaders and managers had mostly focused on managing the day-to-day running of activities, and had neglected to implement an effective strategy for the development of activities.
- 3.6** The education and vocational training provision from Milton Keynes College required improvement. The college's managers had recently implemented a new delivery model to raise prisoner achievement of English and mathematics at the higher levels, and the teaching capability had been further developed, but it was too early to confirm sustained progress.
- 3.7** The prison's leaders and managers held frequent partnership review meetings but they failed to hold the learning and skills and work providers to account, indicating low aspirations for prisoner outcomes and the quality of provision.
- 3.8** The prison's leaders and managers did not use data sufficiently well to inform their decisions about developing and improving purposeful activity. For example, there was delayed, and ineffective, scrutiny of data on prisoner attendance at activities. The curriculum was also insufficiently informed by the prison's recent training needs analysis.
- 3.9** Managers had allowed a culture of poor health and safety standards to develop in many activity areas. This was further compounded by their low expectations of the learning environment in some areas of work and vocational training.

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>.

- 3.10** The prison's evaluation of the quality of purposeful activity was insufficiently critical, and quality improvement planning lacked challenge. As a consequence, the pace of progress towards improvement had been remarkably slow since the previous inspection. A significant number of our previous recommendations had not been addressed and remained unresolved, and several further aspects of purposeful activity had now deteriorated. (See main recommendation S44.)

Recommendations

- 3.11** **The prison should swiftly implement a comprehensive strategy for the rapid improvement and further development of the provision of purposeful activity. This should be informed by the thorough analysis of data, and designed to meet the needs of prisoners in a training prison.**
- 3.12** **The prison's leaders and managers should increase their focus on learners' outcomes and the quality of their learning experience, holding learning and skills and work partners to account for the delivery of excellent provision.**
- 3.13** **The prison should rapidly improve the standards of health and safety in learning and skills areas, and ensure that the learning environment mirrors industry and work standards.**

Provision of activities

- 3.14** The number of activity spaces had decreased since the previous inspection, and those available were poorly used, which had led to high levels of unemployment. Prisoners received a comprehensive induction to purposeful activity but this was not always timely. Pay was too low for prisoners who remained unemployed through no fault of their own for longer periods.
- 3.15** The college delivered all education and most vocational courses. Prisoners could pursue an appropriate range of English and mathematics qualifications, as well as art and courses in information and communications technology (ICT). Vocational training was varied but the qualifications offered were too basic and not particularly valued by employers. The prison did not use areas such as the kitchens to deliver catering qualifications. In 2015, a significant proportion of the vocational training was unavailable to prisoners for too long while the prison sourced funding for these areas. There were a small number of Railtrack courses through the year, and N-ergy delivered national vocational qualifications (NVQs) in customer service in some work areas.
- 3.16** Work for prisoners was repetitive and provided limited opportunity for skills development. Sessions were often cancelled due to the lack of contract work. The prison employed a disproportionate number of wing cleaners, who were mostly paid full time whatever the hours worked. Despite the large number of cleaners, the cleanliness in many wings was poor (see paragraph 2.2).
- 3.17** Staff in charge of prisoner allocation to activities did not always receive the appropriate information from other departments about sequencing and sentence planning to help them prioritise allocations.

Recommendations

- 3.18** Prison managers should ensure that all prisoners engaged in work activities have the opportunity to develop skills and acquire qualifications that will enhance their employability.
- 3.19** The prison should ensure that the qualifications offered to prisoners in vocational training are those valued and recognised by employers, and should manage work contracts to develop prisoners' skills in productivity and high quality work.
- 3.20** The allocation and use of learning and skills spaces should ensure that all prisoners participate in activities, at least part time.

Quality of provision

- 3.21** Teaching and learning at the higher level in education needed to improve, and was affected by the college's high staff turnover. Tutors did not always reinforce good standards of grammar and spelling by correcting and guiding learners to improve. The quality of teaching, learning and assessment at foundation level in education was good, and mentors and volunteers were used well to enhance prisoner learning.
- 3.22** The planning of learning in vocational training and work was not sufficiently effective to ensure that prisoners made rapid progress with their learning. Information obtained during the prisoners' initial assessment of English and mathematics was used effectively in education to plan for the learning and support of those with learning difficulties and disabilities. In vocational training and education, positive tutor feedback reinforced the skills developed, and prisoners were clear about how they could improve their performance. In forklift truck driving, tiling and plastering, good individual coaching helped learners consolidate their understanding and skills. English and mathematics skills had begun to be developed in a few vocational training workshops, and prisoners demonstrated the benefit of this approach for them.

Recommendations

- 3.23** The individual planning of learning in vocational training and work should be improved to ensure that all learners progress to their potential.
- 3.24** The development of English and mathematics skills by all learners should be further improved, and the teaching, learning and assessment they receive in all activities should be of a consistently high quality.

Personal development and behaviour

- 3.25** The quality of personal development and behaviour by prisoners was inadequate. Attendance had not improved sufficiently since the last inspection. Punctuality in all areas was not good enough, which failed to support prisoner development of essential employability skills and attitudes that was the key purpose of a training prison such as Swinfen Hall.
- 3.26** Learners' behaviour in education classes was mostly good, and in vocational training prisoners interacted well with staff and peers and were polite. In a few cases where

behaviour was inappropriate, there was sufficient staff challenge. There was graffiti in several work areas, demonstrating prisoners' limited understanding of acceptable behaviour at work.

- 3.27** The majority of learners attending education were developing self-confidence and communication skills, but some in the music and performance class did not develop their personal and employability skills sufficiently well.
- 3.28** The development of prisoners' English and mathematics skills across all activities required improvement, particularly in work areas. The development of skills in vocational training was good, and in this area tutors emphasised the importance of safe working practices. In contrast, the use of personal protective equipment (PPE) in the commercial workshops was not monitored or promoted well.

Recommendations

- 3.29 Attendance and punctuality at activities should be improved to a high level so that prisoners maximise their learning time.**
- 3.30 Managers should ensure that all prisoners improve and develop essential employability skills, such as a good level of English and mathematics and the attitudes and behaviour that will support them well on release, particularly in the work environment.**

Education and vocational achievements

- 3.31** Achievement rates in English and mathematics qualifications continued to be very high at entry level, but had declined at levels 1 and 2 since the previous inspection, and were particularly low in English. There were some indications of recent improved performance in these areas.
- 3.32** The rate of achievement of vocational qualifications had remained high since the previous inspection. The percentage of learners achieving their ICT qualifications had improved and was high for last year.
- 3.33** The college was planning to address the identified lower educational achievement by the younger prisoners. However, the prison's leaders and managers had not identified any differences in the performance of different groups of learners, including those on courses in English for speakers of other languages (ESOL).
- 3.34** The standard of work produced by prisoners in vocational training was good, and in areas such as tiling, plastering and general construction they exceeded the requirements set by the qualification. In education, the standards of current learners' work were generally good.

Recommendation

- 3.35 The prison should further and consistently improve prisoner achievement rates in English and mathematics at the higher levels, and ensure that different groups of learners experience good outcomes and fulfil their development potential.**

Library

- 3.36** The library was managed by Staffordshire County Council. It was a welcoming space offering appropriate stock to support readers of all levels and relevant reference manuals for vocational courses. Prisoners could access legal texts, including Prison Service Instructions, but they could not take them away or photocopy them (see paragraph 2.35).
- 3.37** The library remained underused by prisoners. Recent data indicated that only 22% of prisoners visited the library each month, which broadly matched the results of our survey, in which only 19% of prisoners, against the comparator of 38%, said they visited the library at least once a week. Timetable changes had not yet solved the access problems caused by operational issues, such as staff shortages. Managers did not analyse data sufficiently to understand use of the library by different groups of prisoners, such as younger prisoners or the unemployed.
- 3.38** Prisoners could undertake job searches through the library-based 'virtual campus', giving them internet access to community education, training and employment opportunities, and those enrolled on distance learning courses could use the library facilities one day a week. Library staff promoted reading initiatives, such as the 'Six-Book Challenge' and Storybook Dads (enabling prisoners to record a story for their children).

Recommendations

- 3.39** **The prison's managers should identify and implement sustainable solutions to the problems faced by prisoners in library access, particularly for visits made directly from the wings.**
- 3.40** **Data on library use by different groups of prisoners, including unemployed prisoners, should be regularly shared and analysed, and used to inform actions for improvement.**

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.

- 3.41** The indoor gym provided well-maintained exercise equipment and a range of fitness activities, such as cardiovascular, weights, circuit training sessions and team sports. Staff provided good advice and coaching to prisoners, which encouraged them to develop and appreciate healthy lifestyles.
- 3.42** Prisoners were introduced to fitness and healthy living through an appropriate induction programme, which gave detailed information on the facilities and activities that met their needs. However, prisoners had insufficient access to the gym. In our survey, the proportion of prisoners who went to the gym three or more times a week was distinctly lower than the comparator (5% against 19%), and none of the Muslim prisoners surveyed visited the gym regularly. Instructors collected data on prisoner attendance at the gym by ethnicity and by wing, but this was not yet analysed to inform decision-making and planning of prisoner access to the gym and PE activities.
- 3.43** Staff in the sports centre had good links with the health care department, and ensured that appropriate remedial activity was provided for prisoners who had received a medical

referral to PE. The gym instructors had also collaborated closely with health care staff in training prisoners on each wing to become 'health champions' to support prisoners with their health and fitness needs.

- 3.44** The limited data available indicated that prisoners taking fitness qualifications at the higher levels achieved well. Support in the development of English and mathematics skills in the gym had recently begun, but it was too early to judge its success.

Recommendation

- 3.45** **Managers should use the data on prisoner access to the gym to inform a strategy and development plan for the PE provision that maximises access and meets the needs of different groups of prisoners.**

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 The strategic management of resettlement needed more attention. Some key policies and the reducing reoffending action plan did not reflect the introduction of a new resettlement model across NOMS in 2015. The last prisoner needs analysis, which informed the reducing reoffending action plan, had been in 2014 and was due for review. The action plan was kept under review and there was evidence of some progress.
- 4.2 The strategy for offender management and resettlement was coordinated by the quarterly resettlement pathways leads meeting. This was not always attended by the areas of the prison that should have been represented, and there was insufficient discussion of some resettlement pathways.
- 4.3 Responsibility for work on offender management and reducing reoffending was split between the head of reducing reoffending, whose role incorporated pathway provision, and the head of offender management, who had responsibility for all other work including programme provision, public protection and work with indeterminate sentence prisoners. Both functional heads reported to the head of public protection, who coordinated the whole area.
- 4.4 The offender management unit (OMU) had 11 offender supervisors and six case administrators. Three of the offender supervisors were probation officers and the rest were prison officer offender supervisors, who were also used to cover staffing gaps on the residential units – in the previous three months, more than 50 hours of offender supervisor time a week had been lost in this way. More than two-thirds of the population, 69%, were assessed as high or very high risk of harm. Each offender supervisor took a share of these cases, as well as indeterminate sentence prisoners, and managed a caseload of 70 to 80 each.
- 4.5 The OMU's identification of and support for prisoners who had spent time in local authority care was developing well. Ten care leavers were taking part in piloting a course supported by the Care Leavers' Association covering their experience of the care system. Offender supervisors were also involved in helping the transition of 18 year olds who moved to the prison from the juvenile secure estate, including meeting them at their juvenile YOI before their transfer.

Recommendations

- 4.6 **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.** (Repeated recommendation 4.8)
- 4.7 **The prison should ensure that offender supervisors have sufficient time to manage their caseloads fully.**

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.

- 4.8** In our survey, more prisoners than the comparators said they had a named offender supervisor and also that they had an offender manager (a probation officer in the community), and of those who knew they had a sentence plan, 73%, against 60%, had targets they could achieve at Swinfen Hall.
- 4.9** New arrivals were allocated an offender supervisor, and in the sample of cases we reviewed, all had been seen promptly. Records showed that meetings covered meaningful discussions about prisoner needs and how these could be met at Swinfen Hall. During their induction, all prisoners were seen by substance misuse and health services, with appropriate follow-up work. The programmes team also reviewed new arrivals and referred them to a relevant programme.
- 4.10** Prisoners continued to arrive at the prison without a completed offender assessment system (OASys) assessment - over 80 were outstanding during the inspection. As at the previous inspection, in around 60% of cases, completion was Swinfen Hall's responsibility. The prison was struggling to reduce the backlog, which was not helped by the redeployment of offender supervisors (see paragraph 4.4), and it was not clear how individual cases were prioritised. There was no policy to escalate outstanding cases that were the responsibility of offender managers.
- 4.11** In the sample we reviewed, assessments were not always sufficiently analytical, which meant that some aspects of offending behaviour could be missed. Despite this, the assessments usually identified the broad areas that required intervention, and most sentence planning was good. There was little evidence of planned one-to-one work but prisoners were directed appropriately to the range of programmes available. Where an OASys assessment had not been completed, this did not necessarily delay a prisoner's progress at Swinfen Hall, but in 20% of our sample, prisoners were not engaged with any sentence plan because they were waiting for their OASys to be completed.
- 4.12** Management of risk was generally sufficient. The OMU was properly involved in decisions about visitors, monitoring of communications and recategorisation. Offender managers in the community were involved and engaged in risk management planning, and their plans showed evidence of liaison with the offender supervisor. All the 'in-scope' cases we reviewed (prisoners serving more than 12 months and considered to pose a high or very high risk of harm) who were approaching release had a sufficient risk management plan for their release. High risk cases were discussed at the interdepartmental risk management meeting (see paragraph 4.18). In the four out-of-scope cases due for release in the next three months, there was no risk management plan based on an up-to-date review of OASys, which was a weakness. However, risks in these cases were managed by the offender supervisor through three-way meetings with the offender manager and the prisoner before release to discuss how the risk the prisoner presented would be managed in the community.
- 4.13** Casework was subject to quality assurance. Offender supervisors were clear that this looked at the quality of the work rather than only checking that it had been completed. A senior probation officer provided regular supervision to the probation officer offender supervisors, but there was nothing similar for the prison officer offender supervisors.

Offender supervisors continued to maintain contact logs for each prisoner, and more use was now made of prisoners' electronic files to share information with other staff in the prison.

- 4.14** Few prisoners were eligible for home detention curfew (HDC) release. Seven had been considered in the previous six months and four had been successful. The decisions made were appropriate, and the four assessed as suitable were each released a few days after their eligibility date. The prison made no use of release on temporary licence.

Recommendations

- 4.15** **Staff should review risk assessments and plans for all out-of-scope prisoners three months before their release, and ensure they are discussed with offender managers before or at the three-way meeting.**
- 4.16** **Casework and professional supervision, personal development and training should be provided to all offender supervisors, whatever their professional background.** (Repeated recommendation 4.20)

Public protection

- 4.17** Arrangements to apply appropriate monitoring and restrictions on prisoners' contact with people in the community were organised well. A weekly safeguarding children's meeting reviewed all new arrivals and agreed any necessary restrictions and monitoring required. These were reviewed regularly and removed when no longer deemed necessary.
- 4.18** The interdepartmental risk management team met regularly and reviewed high risk and multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) 2 (high level) prisoners within six months of release, and for MAPPA 3 (highest level) prisoners regularly, but there was no provision to discuss other cases of concern. Attendance at meetings was generally appropriate, although there were not always contributions from some areas of the prison. Offender supervisors attended the meetings more often than at the previous inspection.
- 4.19** During the inspection, there were two MAPPA level 3 and 35 level 2 prisoners. MAPPA processes were generally appropriate and included good identification on arrival. Written assessments (known as MAPPA Fs) were prepared for community meetings at which MAPPA prisoners were discussed. While they contained the necessary information, they lacked analysis and were descriptive rather than assessing the prisoner's behaviour in relation to their future risk. Processes for confirming prisoners' MAPPA levels before their release did not include any escalation process if external agencies failed to pass on information to the OMU, and no oversight of this.

Recommendation

- 4.20** **Staff should be able to refer 'cases of concern' to the interdepartmental risk management team for discussion.**

Categorisation

- 4.21** Categorisation boards took place when needed. Offender supervisors initiated categorisation documentation and consulted with offender managers to get their views. Prisoners could attend their reviews and submit representations. In the sample of cases we reviewed, the decisions were appropriate and reviews were timely. The appeals process was managed appropriately. In the previous six months, 12 prisoners had been recategorised to category D and nine to B. Some of those recategorised to category B had to wait several months for transfer to a suitable prison.

Recommendation

- 4.22 Prisoners should be transferred to a prison appropriate to their security category promptly after recategorisation.**

Indeterminate sentence prisoners

- 4.23** Twenty-five prisoners were serving a mandatory life sentence and 29 an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP) – which was half the numbers at the previous inspection. Support for these prisoners had diminished, but a forum for those with a mandatory life sentence had recently been reintroduced and there were plans for a forum for IPP prisoners. A family day for IPP prisoners had been cancelled due to low numbers, and the prison was considering a combined day for 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.

- 4.24** Swinfen Hall was not designated as a resettlement prison but released around 10 prisoners a month. In our survey, fewer prisoners than the comparators knew who in the prison could help with resettlement pathways. The prison struggled to get some prisoners moved to a local resettlement prison to enable release work to be completed. In one case, the local resettlement prison was only willing to take the prisoner in the final week of his sentence, which gave no time for proper release planning. There was no on-site community rehabilitation company (CRC)⁸ provision at Swinfen Hall, and we were told that home area CRCs could be reluctant to get involved with prisoners completing their preparation for release at Swinfen Hall. (See main recommendation S45.)
- 4.25** Arrangements on the day of release were organised well, although it was inappropriate that prisoners were subject to a strip search before their departure (see recommendation 1.39). Prisoners using public transport were given a travel warrant and driven to the train station. Bags were available for prisoners' property and there was a stock of clean clothing (left by other prisoners) for anyone with nothing suitable to wear. Prisoners could also apply to have their stored clothing washed ready to wear on release.

⁸ Since May 2015 rehabilitation services, both in custody and after release, have been organised through CRCs which are responsible for work with medium- and low-risk offenders. The national probation service has maintained responsibility for high- and very high-risk offenders.

Accommodation

- 4.26** Most prisoners who were released went to approved premises, with input from the offender manager supervising them in the community. There was no specialist on-site service for prisoners who required assistance to find suitable accommodation, although they could be supported by offender supervisors, with input from a PACT (Prison Advice and Care Trust) worker for prisoners assessed as likely to experience the most problems on release. Offender supervisors described three recent cases where prisoners had to present themselves at a housing office on their day of release to gain accommodation rather than being given an address before their release.

Education, training and employment

- 4.27** The quality of the National Careers Service provided by Prospects was good. Prisoners received effective advice and guidance that enabled them to make informed choices about their employment and career options. Advisers used the information collected in skills action plans at induction to inform the allocation of prisoners to appropriate activity, but in a few cases this information lacked detail. Prisoners approaching their release date benefited from practical support with CV writing and interview techniques.

Recommendation

- 4.28** **Prisoners' skills action plans should be sufficiently specific to enable their allocation to the most appropriate activity.**

Health care

- 4.29** Health discharge arrangements were timely and effective. Health staff saw prisoners before their discharge and sent a summary of treatment to their GP. Prisoners on medication were given a week's supply to take with them. Information about dental services was provided. Sexual health was discussed and barrier protection provided. Patients with enduring mental health problems were managed effectively using the care programme approach, and there was good liaison with community mental health teams. No prisoner had required end-of-life or palliative care, but staff would deal with this on an individual basis if needed.

Drugs and alcohol

- 4.30** As a national resource, the prison served a large catchment area and recovery workers had appropriate links with community agencies to facilitate throughcare support. There was evidence of good quality pre-release planning and preparation, and prisoners were consistently provided with harm reduction and overdose prevention information before they left the prison.

Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.31** Work in this area was underdeveloped and most prisoners had no access to specialist advice or support. There had been no assessment of need in this area since 2014. Support to address prisoners' finance, benefit and debt needs was provided mainly through offender supervisors and was often limited to signposting. Prisoners could open a bank account while at the prison and attend a money management course. More specialist support for debt

management was available from a PACT worker, but only for the limited number of prisoners who were eligible as part of a programme co-funded by the European Social Fund.

Recommendation

- 4.32 The need for support with finance, benefit and debt should be assessed and addressed.**

Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.33** Support for prisoners to establish and maintain family ties was well developed. A full-time family engagement worker supported around 30 prisoners at a time. In addition, the chaplaincy ran two parenting courses a year and the library facilitated the Storybook Dads programme (see paragraph 3.38). There was also seven dads or family days a year (two- or four-hour visits between a father and his children or other family members that enabled prisoners to interact more naturally with their children and families), which was better than we usually see.
- 4.34** Despite this support, prisoners faced difficulties contacting their family by telephone or mail (see paragraph 2.4), and there were not enough visit sessions to meet demand, particularly at weekends, which made it difficult to book visits. The visits also regularly did not start on time, even though many visitors arrived early after long journeys. Prisoners and visitors were frustrated about these problems, although they said that staff treated families with respect, and our observations supported this.
- 4.35** Facilities for visits were good. HALOW (Help and Advice Line for Offenders' Wives, Partners and Family) ran a small but attractive visitors' centre that provided support for visitors, particularly those visiting for the first time. Visitors could buy refreshments and there was a well-maintained children's play area.
- 4.36** The visits hall was also pleasant and contained a snack bar and play area that were open for all sessions. Prisoners had to wear a coloured bib and a tag on their trainers, which was excessive given there was a biometric identification system. Closed visits were applied appropriately, but the closed visit booths were grubby and had graffiti.

Recommendation

- 4.37 Visits should start at the advertised time, and there should be sufficient visits slots to meet demand. Prisoners should not have to wear coloured bibs.**

Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.38** There was an appropriate range of offending behaviour programmes, and more than 150 prisoners a year could take part in them. The programmes included thinking skills (TSP), alcohol-related violence (ARV), Resolve (a violence management course), three sex offender treatment programme (SOTP) courses and the self-change programme (SCP), which addressed violence management for higher risk prisoners.
- 4.39** The prison gave priority to completion of offending behaviour programmes, and even when the rest of the prison was in lockdown due to staffing issues, programmes staff could unlock and escort participants to their course to maintain their progress.

- 4.40** New arrivals were assessed and allocated to the programme most suitable to address their identified risks and needs. Waiting lists were managed appropriately. Prisoners who declined to attend a programme they were assessed for were offered a place each time a new course started. Peer mentors helped ensure that prisoners had the information they needed about programmes and the benefits of attending. Interventions staff also undertook some one-to-one work with prisoners, including support after their programme had finished or preparation for sentence planning or parole review hearings.
- 4.41** Swinfen Hall offered a psychologically informed planned environment (PIPE) and an assessment and treatment service. The progression PIPE was on E wing and had opened in 2014 as part of the offender personality disorder pathway strategy. It offered progression opportunities for prisoners aged 18-25, with traits of emerging personality disorder, who had completed high intensity treatments and had no outstanding treatment needs.
- 4.42** Officers on this unit had received additional training to increase their psychological understanding, which enabled them to provide a supportive environment to those living on E wing. They delivered a range of groups, including socially creative activities and individual sessions, under the supervision of psychology staff. Approximately 38 prisoners were on the PIPE programme. Prisoners on the unit were positive about their experiences, and we observed mutually respectful interactions between prisoners and staff there. Prisoners were on the PIPE for a minimum of six months and up to two years, and there were clear selection and deselection criteria, although few had been de-selected. There were good links with PIPEs and therapeutic communities in other prisons.
- 4.43** Northamptonshire Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust provided the clinical staff to run the assessment and treatment unit on D wing. Thirty prisoners participated in a range of psychological therapies, including cognitive behavioural therapy and compassion-focused therapy, and were provided with a positive therapeutic environment.
- 4.44** Both the PIPE and D wing had submitted applications for the 'enabling environments award' - a standards-based quality improvement process run by the Royal College of Psychiatrists' centre for quality improvement - which was positive.

Section 5. Summary of recommendations and good practice

The following is a listing of repeated and new recommendations 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 recommendation

To NOMS

- 5.1** NOMS should ensure that its model for resettlement is applied consistently and that prisoners at Swinfen Hall can move to appropriate prisons in good time for their release. In exceptional cases where a transfer is not possible, resettlement services similar to those accessible at a resettlement prison should be available to prisoners at Swinfen Hall. (S45)

Main recommendations

To the governor

- 5.2** There should be sufficient interdepartmental working, supported by good intelligence and evidence on safety, to inform a relevant and measurable action plan to reduce violence. (S41)
- 5.3** Conditions in the cells and residential areas should be improved and reach acceptable standards of cleanliness and living conditions. The communal areas and cells in A, B and C wings should be fully refurbished and maintained to a good standard. Cells across the prison should be adequately furnished, and toilets should be deep cleaned regularly. (S42)
- 5.4** All prisoners for whom there is no good reason to be confined to their cells should be unlocked for work and a period of domestic tasks and association on every working day. (S43)
- 5.5** The prison's leaders and managers should assure the good quality of all learning and skills provision through evaluation that is sufficiently critical and leads to effective and sustained improvement. (S44)

Recommendations

To NOMS

- 5.6** The allocated catering budget for split adult and young offender institution sites should be brought into line with designated YOIs. (2.81)
- 5.7** Prisoners should be transferred to a prison appropriate to their security category promptly after recategorisation. (4.22)

Recommendations

To the governor

Early days in custody

- 5.8** All new arrivals should be given a cell in good condition and in an area away from potentially aggressive prisoners, and receive appropriate initial support, including prompt induction. (1.9)

Bullying and violence reduction

- 5.9** The prison should investigate and take action to reduce levels of violence and improve safety. Arrangements to support victims and manage the perpetrators of violence should be more robust, with regular reviews and more effective target setting and intervention. (1.18)
- 5.10** A specific plan should be drawn up to reduce the threats to the sex offender population and address their poor perceptions of safety. (1.19)

Self-harm and suicide

- 5.11** Care for prisoners in crisis should be improved, particularly during their early days, with greater attention to their interaction and the provision of activity. (1.27)
- 5.12** The quality of assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) documents should be improved. (1.28, repeated recommendation 1.29).
- 5.13** All staff should be trained in suicide and self-harm prevention. (1.29, repeated recommendation 1.30)

Security

- 5.14** Prisoners should only be strip searched when deemed necessary, with authorisation clearly recorded against sound reasoning. (1.39)
- 5.15** The prison should develop, implement and monitor a drug supply reduction action plan and ensure that there are effective measures to tackle drug availability. (1.40)

Incentives and earned privileges

- 5.16** The incentives and earned privileges scheme should be applied consistently, with timely reviews and a clear focus on incentives for good behaviour through effective and consultative targets. (1.46)

Discipline

- 5.17** All use of force, including the drawing of batons, should be subject to systematic scrutiny by managers to ensure safe and effective practice, and all planned interventions should be filmed. (1.50)

Substance misuse

- 5.18** A multiagency substance misuse strategy committee should develop, implement and monitor the strategic approach to drugs and alcohol, and ensure effective joint working between departments and service providers. (1.59)
- 5.19** All prisoners should receive information during their induction about the dangers of substance misuse and the support available to them. Drug and alcohol recovery services should be well publicised and easily accessible. (1.60)
- 5.20** Prisoners should have access to an appropriate range of substance misuse interventions, including mutual aid and peer support, that meets their needs. (1.61)

Residential units

- 5.21** Prisoners should have daily access to telephones and showers. (2.8)
- 5.22** Toilets should be adequately screened. (2.9)
- 5.23** Staff should respond to emergency cell bells within five minutes. (2.10)

Staff-prisoner relationships

- 5.24** The prison should develop a strategy to ensure good staff-prisoner relationships across the whole prison. Staff should consistently model good behaviour, have high expectations of prisoners and encourage them to contribute actively to the wider prison community. (2.15)
- 5.25** Formal consultation with prisoners should be regular and responsive on all wings. (2.16)

Equality and diversity

- 5.26** There should be meaningful consultation, leading to action plans, for all groups of prisoners with protected characteristics. (2.27)
- 5.27** The prison should provide a coordinated approach to managing the needs of foreign national prisoners, including access to free independent immigration advice. (2.28, repeated recommendation 2.30)

Complaints

- 5.28** Quality assurance of complaints should involve all relevant departments, and lead to improved responses and, where possible, changes in practice. (2.34)

Legal rights

- 5.29** Information about legal rights and advice agencies should be freely available. (2.36)

Health services

- 5.30** Prisoners should receive prompt responses to health care complaints that adequately address and outline all the issues raised. Concern forms should be available on all units. (2.49)

- 5.31** The delivery board should take sustained action to reduce non-attendance rates for appointments and make good use of clinical time, and help reduce waiting times for some services. (2.56)
- 5.32** Medicines should be administered from dedicated areas and from trolleys only by exception. (2.63, repeated recommendation 2.65)
- 5.33** All medication should be administered at an appropriate time for maximum therapeutic effect, with sufficient officer supervision and privacy to maintain patient safety and confidentiality and reduce the risk of bullying and diversion. (2.64)
- 5.34** There should be procedures to provide prescribed and over-the-counter medicines when the health care department is closed. (2.65, repeated recommendation 2.67)
- 5.35** There should be effective oversight of prescribing trends, and robust daily monitoring of drug refrigerators to ensure heat-sensitive items are stored within the correct temperature range. (2.66)
- 5.36** The integrated mental health service should have sufficient staffing to ensure a full range of support for prisoners with mild to moderate mental health problems. (2.74)
- 5.37** All custody staff should have regular mental health awareness training to enable them to identify and support prisoners with mental health problems. (2.75)
- 5.38** Transfers of patients under the Mental Health Act should take place within the current Department of Health transfer time guidelines. (2.76)

Catering

- 5.39** Breakfast should be served on the day it is to be eaten. (2.82, repeated recommendation 2.87)
- 5.40** Prisoners should have the opportunity to self-cook and dine out of their cell. (2.83)

Purchases

- 5.41** Newspapers and items ordered from catalogues should be delivered to prisoners promptly, and prisoners should not be charged an administration fee for catalogue orders. (2.87)

Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.42** The prison should swiftly implement a comprehensive strategy for the rapid improvement and further development of the provision of purposeful activity. This should be informed by the thorough analysis of data, and designed to meet the needs of prisoners in a training prison. (3.11)
- 5.43** The prison's leaders and managers should increase their focus on learners' outcomes and the quality of their learning experience, holding learning and skills and work partners to account for the delivery of excellent provision. (3.12)
- 5.44** The prison should rapidly improve the standards of health and safety in learning and skills areas, and ensure that the learning environment mirrors industry and work standards. (3.13)

- 5.45** Prison managers should ensure that all prisoners engaged in work activities have the opportunity to develop skills and acquire qualifications that will enhance their employability. (3.18)
- 5.46** The prison should ensure that the qualifications offered to prisoners in vocational training are those valued and recognised by employers, and should manage work contracts to develop prisoners' skills in productivity and high quality work. (3.19)
- 5.47** The allocation and use of learning and skills spaces should ensure that all prisoners participate in activities, at least part time. (3.20)
- 5.48** The individual planning of learning in vocational training and work should be improved to ensure that all learners progress to their potential. (3.23)
- 5.49** The development of English and mathematics skills by all learners should be further improved, and the teaching, learning and assessment they receive in all activities should be of a consistently high quality. (3.24)
- 5.50** Attendance and punctuality at activities should be improved to a high level so that prisoners maximise their learning time. (3.29)
- 5.51** Managers should ensure that all prisoners improve and develop essential employability skills, such as a good level of English and mathematics and the attitudes and behaviour that will support them well on release, particularly in the work environment. (3.30)
- 5.52** The prison should further and consistently improve prisoner achievement rates in English and mathematics at the higher levels, and ensure that different groups of learners experience good outcomes and fulfil their development potential. (3.35)
- 5.53** The prison's managers should identify and implement sustainable solutions to the problems faced by prisoners in library access, particularly for visits made directly from the wings. (3.39)
- 5.54** Data on library use by different groups of prisoners, including unemployed prisoners, should be regularly shared and analysed, and used to inform actions for improvement. (3.40)

Physical education and healthy living

- 5.55** Managers should use the data on prisoner access to the gym to inform a strategy and development plan for the PE provision that maximises access and meets the needs of different groups of prisoners. (3.45)

Strategic management of resettlement

- 5.56** 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. (4.6, repeated recommendation 4.8)
- 5.57** The prison should ensure that offender supervisors have sufficient time to manage their caseloads fully. (4.7)

Offender management and planning

- 5.58** Staff should review risk assessments and plans for all out-of-scope prisoners three months before their release, and ensure they are discussed with offender managers before or at the three-way meeting. (4.15)
- 5.59** Casework and professional supervision, personal development and training should be provided to all offender supervisors, whatever their professional background. (4.16, repeated recommendation 4.20)
- 5.60** Staff should be able to refer 'cases of concern' to the interdepartmental risk management team for discussion. (4.20)

Reintegration planning

- 5.61** Prisoners' skills action plans should be sufficiently specific to enable their allocation to the most appropriate activity. (4.28)
- 5.62** The need for support with finance, benefit and debt should be assessed and addressed. (4.32)
- 5.63** Visits should start at the advertised time, and there should be sufficient visits slots to meet demand. Prisoners should not have to wear coloured bibs. (4.37)

Section 6. Appendices

Appendix I: Inspection team

Martin Lomas	Deputy chief inspector
Deborah Butler	Team leader
Francesca Cooney	Inspector
Ian Dickens	Inspector
Angela Johnson	Inspector
Martin Kettle	Inspector
Angus Mulready-Jones	Inspector
Natalie-Anne Hall	Researcher
Helen Ranns	Researcher
Joe Simmonds	Researcher
Ellis Cowling	Researcher
Sigrid Engelen	Substance misuse inspector
Maureen Jamieson	Health services inspector
Helen Boniface	Pharmacist
Huw Jenkins	Care Quality Commission inspector
Maria Navarro	Ofsted inspector
Keith Hughes	Ofsted inspector
Sheena Maberly	Ofsted inspector
Iolo Madoc-Jones	Offender management inspector
Jayne Price	Observer

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 2014, 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.

Recommendations

There should be further consultation with prisoners to explore the reasons for their poor perceptions of safety. (1.18, repeated recommendation 3.16)

Not achieved

The prison should introduce robust arrangements to support victims of bullying and violence. (1.19)

Not achieved

Prisoners monitored under the violence reduction policy should receive regular meaningful reviews. (1.20)

Not achieved

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)

Not achieved

The quality of assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) documents should be improved. (1.29)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated 1.28)

All staff should be trained in suicide and self-harm prevention. (1.30)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated 1.29)

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

Achieved

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

Partially achieved

The incentives and earned privileges scheme should be applied fairly, and improvement targets should be tailored for the individual prisoner. (1.49)

Partially achieved

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)

Not achieved

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

Achieved

Governance of the use of force, particularly the completion of documentation and planned interventions, should be improved. (1.60)

Not achieved

Prisoners should only be segregated as a last resort, for good reason and for the shortest period. (1.67)

Achieved

The regime in the care and separation unit should be improved. (1.68)

Partially achieved

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)

Not achieved

Respect

Prisoners are treated with respect for their human dignity.

At the last inspection, in 2014, 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.

Main recommendation

A, B and C wings should undergo a complete refurbishment to bring them up to modern standards (S43, repeated main recommendation HP48)

Not achieved

Recommendations

Toilets in double cells should be adequately screened. (2.8)

Not achieved

All prisoners should have daily access to telephone calls. (2.9)

Not achieved

Prisoners should receive a prompt response to applications. (2.10)

Not achieved

There should be regular consultation with prisoners from all minority groups, and issues raised should be pursued appropriately. (2.20)

Partially achieved

The prison should ensure that equality peer and staff representatives understand their role, and should promote this role throughout the establishment. (2.21)

Achieved

The quality of investigations into allegations of discrimination should be improved, and they should be completed on time. (2.22)

Achieved

The prison should explore the reasons why Muslim prisoners hold more negative perceptions than non-Muslims. (2.28, repeated recommendation 4.40)

Partially achieved

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

Not achieved

The prison should provide a coordinated approach to managing the needs of foreign national prisoners, including access to free independent immigration advice. (2.30)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated 2.28)

Written information on how prisoners can access health services should be available at their reception and on the wings. (2.58)

Achieved

The health care department should take sustained action to reduce did-not- attend rates. (2.59)

Not achieved

Medicines should be administered from dedicated rooms, and from trolleys only by exception. (2.65)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated 2.63)

The queues for the collection and supervision of medicines should be adequately supervised to maintain patient confidentiality and reduce potential bullying. (2.66)

Not achieved

There should be procedures to provide prescribed and over-the counter medicines when the health care department is closed. (2.67)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated 2.65)

The temperature in rooms where medicines are stored should not exceed 25°C. (2.68)

Achieved

There should be sufficient appropriate therapy space for patients with mental health problems. (2.79)

Achieved

Transfers of patients under the Mental Health Act should take place within the target transfer time. (2.80)

Not achieved

Breakfast should be served on the day it is to be eaten. (2.87)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated 2.82)

Prisoners should be able to dine communally. (2.88)

Not achieved

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)

Not achieved

Prisoners should not be charged an administration fee for catalogue orders. (2.94)

Not achieved

Purposeful activity

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

At the last inspection, in 2014, 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.

Main recommendations

The prison should provide sufficient and meaningful activity places and ensure they are used efficiently. (S44)

Not achieved

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)

Not achieved

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)

Not achieved

Recommendations

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

Not achieved

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)

Not achieved

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)

Not achieved

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)

Not achieved

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)

Partially achieved

The prison should provide support for additional learning needs to all prisoners who require it. (3.32)

Partially achieved

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)

Achieved

The library should improve access for prisoners by increasing opening hours and better promoting its services to prisoners. (3.42)

Not achieved

Library staff should use data effectively to monitor stock and the use of the library by different groups of prisoners. (3.43)

Not achieved

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)

Achieved

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

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 2014, 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 offender assessment system (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.

Recommendations

The prison should ensure that there are sufficient officer offender supervisors dedicated to offender management duties. (4.7)

Not achieved

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)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated 4.6)

Casework and professional supervision, personal development and training should be provided to all offender supervisors, whatever their professional background. (4.21)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated 4.16)

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)

Partially achieved

The frequency of contact by offender supervisors with prisoners should be determined by prisoner need. (4.23)

Partially achieved

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

Achieved

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

Not achieved

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)

Achieved

Appendix III: Photographs

Window on C wing



Cardboard replacing glass panels on C wing



E wing



D wing



Appendix IV: 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	284	301	97.7
Recall	5	9	2.3
Total	289	310	100

Sentence	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
12 months to less than 2 years	2	0	0.3
2 years to less than 4 years	28	23	8.5
4 years to less than 10 years	209	246	76
10 years and over (not life)	26	12	6.3
ISPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)	2	22	4
Life	22	7	4.9
Total	289	310	100

Age	Number of prisoners	%
Under 21 years: <i>minimum age=18</i>	289	48.2
21 years to 29 years	310	51.8
Total	582	100

Nationality	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
British	271	293	94.2
Foreign nationals	18	17	5.9
Total	289	310	100

Security category	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Category B	0	6	1.0
Category C	1	280	46.9
Category D	0	4	0.7
Other	288	20	51.4
Total	289	310	100

Ethnicity	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
White			
British	183	207	65.1
Irish	3	1	0.7
Gypsy/Irish Traveller	1	4	0.8
Other white	6	6	2.0
Mixed			
White and black Caribbean	9	10	3.2
White and black African	3	1	0.7
White and Asian	2	1	0.5
Other mixed	3	3	1.0
Asian or Asian British			
Indian	5	7	2.0
Pakistani	17	14	5.2
Bangladeshi	2	4	1.0
Chinese	0	0	0
Other Asian	3	2	0.8
Black or black British			
Caribbean	19	21	6.7
African	19	18	6.2
Other black	10	8	3.0
Other ethnic group	4	3	1.2
Total	289	310	100

Religion	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Church of England	32	15	7.8
Roman Catholic	42	49	15.2
Other Christian denominations	45	47	15.4
Muslim	68	71	23.2
Sikh	0	1	0.2
Buddhist	1	1	0.3
Other	6	6	2.0
No religion	95	120	35.9
Total	289	310	100

Sentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18–20 yr olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	30	5.0	4	0.7
1 month to 3 months	38	6.3	35	5.8
3 months to six months	50	8.3	23	3.8
Six months to 1 year	74	12.4	93	15.5
1 year to 2 years	83	13.9	103	17.2
2 years to 4 years	14	2.3	43	7.2
4 years or more	0	0	9	1.5
Total	289	48.2	310	51.8

Appendix V: 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 establishment⁹. 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 24 October 2016 the young adult population at HMP/YOI Swinfen Hall was 599. Using the method described above, questionnaires were distributed to a sample of 199 young adults.

We received a total of 184 completed questionnaires, a response rate of 92%. This included one questionnaire completed via interview. Four respondents refused to complete a questionnaire and 11 questionnaires were not returned.

⁹ 95% confidence interval with a sampling error of 7%. The formula assumes a 75% response rate (65% in open establishments) and we routinely 'oversample' to ensure we achieve the minimum number of responses required.

Wing/unit	Number of completed survey returns
A	18
B	18
C	17
D	22
E	18
F	28
G	23
I	23
J	15
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 differences¹⁰ 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 HMP/YOI Swinfen Hall in 2016 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 three young adult training prisons since April 2014.
- The current survey responses from HMP/ Swinfen Hall in 2016 compared with the responses of young adults surveyed at HMP/YOI Swinfen Hall in 2014.
- A comparison within the 2016 survey between the responses of white young adults and those from a black and minority ethnic group.
- A comparison within the 2016 survey between the responses of Muslim young adults and non-Muslim young adults.
- A comparison within the 2016 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.

¹⁰ A statistically significant difference between the two samples is one that is unlikely to have arisen by chance alone, and can therefore be assumed to represent a real difference between the two populations. Our significance level is set at 0.01 which means that there is only a 1% likelihood that the difference is due to chance.

- A comparison within the 2016 survey between those who are aged 21 and under and those over 21.
- A comparison within the 2016 survey between the responses of prisoners on the older site (A, B and C wings) and the rest of the establishment.
- A comparison within the 2016 survey between the responses of prisoners on the D and E wings ('Enabling environment' and PIPE) and the rest of the establishment.

Survey summary

Section I: About you

Q1.2	How old are you?	
	<i>Under 21</i>	83 (45%)
	<i>21 - 29</i>	101 (55%)
	<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>	176 (96%)
	<i>Yes - on recall</i>	8 (4%)
	<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>	0 (0%)
	<i>6 months to less than 1 year</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>1 year to less than 2 years</i>	6 (3%)
	<i>2 years to less than 4 years</i>	30 (16%)
	<i>4 years to less than 10 years</i>	116 (64%)
	<i>10 years or more</i>	13 (7%)
	<i>IPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)</i>	10 (5%)
	<i>Life</i>	6 (3%)
Q1.5	Are you a foreign national (i.e. do not have UK citizenship)?	
	<i>Yes</i>	11 (6%)
	<i>No</i>	170 (94%)
Q1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	
	<i>Yes</i>	182 (99%)
	<i>No</i>	1 (1%)
Q1.7	Do you understand written English?	
	<i>Yes</i>	181 (99%)
	<i>No</i>	1 (1%)

Q1.8	What is your ethnic origin?		
	<i>White - British (English/ Welsh/ Scottish/ Northern Irish)</i>	114 (63%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - Chinese</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>White - Irish</i>	3 (2%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - other</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>White - other</i>	6 (3%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black Caribbean</i> 11 (6%)
	<i>Black or black British - Caribbean</i>	9 (5%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black African</i> 2 (1%)
	<i>Black or black British - African</i>	12 (7%)	<i>Mixed race - white and Asian</i> 3 (2%)
	<i>Black or black British - other</i>	2 (1%)	<i>Mixed race - other</i> 4 (2%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Indian</i>	2 (1%)	<i>Arab</i> 1 (1%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Pakistani</i>	8 (4%)	<i>Other ethnic group</i> 2 (1%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi</i>	3 (2%)	
Q1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?		
	<i>Yes</i>		8 (4%)
	<i>No</i>		171 (96%)
Q1.10	What is your religion?		
	<i>None</i>	63 (35%)	<i>Hindu</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>Church of England</i>	33 (18%)	<i>Jewish</i> 1 (1%)
	<i>Catholic</i>	23 (13%)	<i>Muslim</i> 42 (23%)
	<i>Protestant</i>	3 (2%)	<i>Sikh</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>Other Christian denomination</i>	7 (4%)	<i>Other</i> 8 (4%)
	<i>Buddhist</i>	1 (1%)	
Q1.11	How would you describe your sexual orientation?		
	<i>Heterosexual/ Straight</i>		168 (92%)
	<i>Homosexual/Gay</i>		5 (3%)
	<i>Bisexual</i>		9 (5%)
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)?		
	<i>Yes</i>		41 (22%)
	<i>No</i>		143 (78%)
Q1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?		
	<i>Yes</i>		3 (2%)
	<i>No</i>		179 (98%)
Q1.14	Is this your first time in prison?		
	<i>Yes</i>		115 (63%)
	<i>No</i>		67 (37%)
Q1.15	Do you have children under the age of 18?		
	<i>Yes</i>		49 (27%)
	<i>No</i>		135 (73%)

Section 2: Courts, transfers and escorts

Q2.1	On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	59 (32%)
	<i>2 hours or longer</i>	117 (64%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	8 (4%)

Q2.2	On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?	
	<i>My journey was less than two hours</i>	59 (32%)
	Yes	91 (49%)
	No	33 (18%)
	Don't remember	1 (1%)
Q2.3	On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?	
	<i>My journey was less than two hours</i>	59 (32%)
	Yes	16 (9%)
	No	100 (55%)
	Don't remember	8 (4%)
Q2.4	On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?	
	Yes	81 (45%)
	No	79 (43%)
	Don't remember	22 (12%)
Q2.5	On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?	
	Yes	144 (79%)
	No	34 (19%)
	Don't remember	4 (2%)
Q2.6	On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?	
	Very well	40 (22%)
	Well	73 (40%)
	Neither	51 (28%)
	Badly	6 (3%)
	Very badly	6 (3%)
	Don't remember	8 (4%)
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	91 (49%)
	Yes, I received written information	18 (10%)
	No, I was not told anything	72 (39%)
	Don't remember	5 (3%)
Q2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	
	Yes	156 (85%)
	No	25 (14%)
	Don't remember	3 (2%)

Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

Q3.1	How long were you in reception?	
	Less than 2 hours	117 (64%)
	2 hours or longer	50 (27%)
	Don't remember	16 (9%)
Q3.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	
	Yes	148 (83%)
	No	23 (13%)
	Don't remember	8 (4%)

Q3.3	Overall, how were you treated in reception?			
	Very well		32 (17%)	
	Well		88 (48%)	
	Neither		41 (22%)	
	Badly		13 (7%)	
	Very badly		5 (3%)	
	Don't remember		4 (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	32 (18%)	Physical health	9 (5%)
	Housing problems	7 (4%)	Mental health	41 (23%)
	Contacting employers	1 (1%)	Needing protection from other prisoners	24 (13%)
	Contacting family	29 (16%)	Getting phone numbers	19 (11%)
	Childcare	1 (1%)	Other	9 (5%)
	Money worries	16 (9%)	Did not have any problems	72 (40%)
	Feeling depressed or suicidal	35 (20%)		
Q3.5	Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems when you first arrived here?			
	Yes		26 (15%)	
	No		76 (44%)	
	Did not have any problems		72 (41%)	
Q3.6	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)			
	Tobacco		156 (86%)	
	A shower		64 (35%)	
	A free telephone call		146 (80%)	
	Something to eat		81 (45%)	
	PIN phone credit		93 (51%)	
	Toiletries/ basic items		83 (46%)	
	Did not receive anything		1 (1%)	
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		93 (51%)	
	Someone from health services		120 (66%)	
	A Listener/Samaritans		42 (23%)	
	Prison shop/ canteen		58 (32%)	
	Did not have access to any of these		33 (18%)	
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		83 (45%)	
	What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal		59 (32%)	
	How to make routine requests (applications)		71 (39%)	
	Your entitlement to visits		66 (36%)	
	Health services		75 (41%)	
	Chaplaincy		70 (38%)	
	Not offered any information		63 (34%)	

Q3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	
	Yes	110 (61%)
	No	60 (33%)
	Don't remember	10 (6%)
Q3.10	How soon after you arrived here did you go on an induction course?	
	Have not been on an induction course	12 (7%)
	Within the first week	62 (34%)
	More than a week	95 (52%)
	Don't remember	14 (8%)
Q3.11	Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	
	Have not been on an induction course	12 (7%)
	Yes	71 (40%)
	No	68 (38%)
	Don't remember	27 (15%)
Q3.12	How soon after you arrived here did you receive an education ('skills for life') assessment?	
	Did not receive an assessment	29 (16%)
	Within the first week	36 (20%)
	More than a week	87 (48%)
	Don't remember	30 (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?	12 (7%)	31 (17%)	29 (16%)	50 (28%)	41 (23%) 17 (9%)
	Attend legal visits?	14 (8%)	47 (27%)	39 (23%)	20 (12%)	21 (12%) 31 (18%)
	Get bail information?	2 (1%)	7 (4%)	31 (19%)	22 (13%)	23 (14%) 82 (49%)
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					43 (24%)
	Yes					79 (44%)
	No					59 (33%)
Q4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?					
	Yes					46 (26%)
	No					15 (8%)
	Don't know					117 (66%)
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?	90 (51%)	84 (47%)	3 (2%)		
	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	48 (27%)	129 (72%)	1 (1%)		
	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	113 (65%)	55 (32%)	6 (3%)		
	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	66 (38%)	107 (61%)	2 (1%)		
	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	45 (25%)	121 (68%)	12 (7%)		
	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	100 (57%)	71 (41%)	3 (2%)		
	If you need to, can you normally get your stored property?	50 (28%)	82 (47%)	44 (25%)		

Q4.5	What is the food like here?	
	<i>Very good</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Good</i>	34 (19%)
	<i>Neither</i>	37 (20%)
	<i>Bad</i>	57 (31%)
	<i>Very bad</i>	52 (29%)
Q4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	
	<i>Have not bought anything yet/ don't know</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Yes</i>	84 (47%)
	<i>No</i>	92 (51%)
Q4.7	Can you speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	
	<i>Yes</i>	55 (30%)
	<i>No</i>	61 (33%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	67 (37%)
Q4.8	Are your religious beliefs respected?	
	<i>Yes</i>	82 (46%)
	<i>No</i>	31 (17%)
	<i>Don't know/ N/A</i>	65 (37%)
Q4.9	Are you able to speak to a chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?	
	<i>Yes</i>	91 (50%)
	<i>No</i>	13 (7%)
	<i>Don't know/ N/A</i>	78 (43%)
Q4.10	How easy or difficult is it for you to attend religious services?	
	<i>I don't want to attend</i>	46 (25%)
	<i>Very easy</i>	30 (16%)
	<i>Easy</i>	44 (24%)
	<i>Neither</i>	11 (6%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	12 (7%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	8 (4%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	31 (17%)

Section 5: Applications and complaints

Q5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	
	<i>Yes</i>	141 (77%)
	<i>No</i>	35 (19%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	7 (4%)
Q5.2	Please answer the following questions about applications. (If you have not made an application please tick the 'not made one' option.)	
		Not made one Yes No
	Are applications dealt with fairly?	12 (7%) 82 (46%) 83 (47%)
	Are applications dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	12 (7%) 45 (26%) 118 (67%)
Q5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	
	<i>Yes</i>	88 (49%)
	<i>No</i>	57 (32%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	35 (19%)

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>
	Are complaints dealt with fairly?	61 (34%)	33 (18%)	88 (48%)
	Are complaints dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	61 (34%)	29 (16%)	87 (49%)
Q5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?			
	Yes			55 (31%)
	No			121 (69%)
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>			56 (31%)
	Very easy			6 (3%)
	Easy			16 (9%)
	Neither			34 (19%)
	Difficult			48 (27%)
	Very difficult			20 (11%)

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%)
	Yes		75 (42%)
	No		91 (51%)
	<i>Don't know</i>		9 (5%)
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		80 (44%)
	No		83 (46%)
	<i>Don't know</i>		13 (7%)
Q6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?		
	Yes		32 (18%)
	No		146 (82%)
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>		124 (70%)
	Very well		6 (3%)
	Well		6 (3%)
	Neither		10 (6%)
	Badly		9 (5%)
	Very badly		21 (12%)

Section 7: Relationships with staff

Q7.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	
	Yes	113 (64%)
	No	63 (36%)

Q7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	
	Yes	111 (63%)
	No	66 (37%)
Q7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	
	Yes	49 (27%)
	No	131 (73%)
Q7.4	How often do staff normally speak to you during association?	
	<i>Do not go on association</i>	18 (10%)
	<i>Never</i>	34 (19%)
	<i>Rarely</i>	46 (26%)
	<i>Some of the time</i>	44 (25%)
	<i>Most of the time</i>	26 (15%)
	<i>All of the time</i>	11 (6%)
Q7.5	When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?	
	<i>I have not met him/her</i>	38 (21%)
	<i>In the first week</i>	50 (28%)
	<i>More than a week</i>	57 (32%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	35 (19%)
Q7.6	How helpful is your personal (named) officer?	
	<i>Do not have a personal officer/ I have not met him/ her</i>	38 (21%)
	<i>Very helpful</i>	38 (21%)
	<i>Helpful</i>	37 (21%)
	<i>Neither</i>	19 (11%)
	<i>Not very helpful</i>	13 (7%)
	<i>Not at all helpful</i>	32 (18%)

Section 8: Safety

Q8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?			
	Yes	112 (62%)		
	No	69 (38%)		
Q8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?			
	Yes	51 (30%)		
	No	121 (70%)		
Q8.3	In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)			
	<i>Never felt unsafe</i>	69 (39%)	<i>At meal times</i>	25 (14%)
	<i>Everywhere</i>	35 (20%)	<i>At health services</i>	38 (21%)
	<i>Segregation unit</i>	15 (8%)	<i>Visits area</i>	27 (15%)
	<i>Association areas</i>	42 (24%)	<i>In wing showers</i>	40 (22%)
	<i>Reception area</i>	6 (3%)	<i>In gym showers</i>	23 (13%)
	<i>At the gym</i>	27 (15%)	<i>In corridors/stairwells</i>	30 (17%)
	<i>In an exercise yard</i>	47 (26%)	<i>On your landing/wing</i>	41 (23%)
	<i>At work</i>	28 (16%)	<i>In your cell</i>	18 (10%)
	<i>During movement</i>	65 (37%)	<i>At religious services</i>	16 (9%)
	<i>At education</i>	34 (19%)		

Q8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	
	Yes	88 (49%)
	No	91 (51%)
Q8.5	If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i>	49 (27%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	49 (27%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	61 (34%)
	<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i>	39 (22%)
	<i>Medication</i>	4 (2%)
	<i>Debt</i>	19 (11%)
	<i>Drugs</i>	10 (6%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	6 (3%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	13 (7%)
	<i>Your nationality</i>	6 (3%)
	<i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i>	18 (10%)
	<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	4 (2%)
	<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	10 (6%)
	<i>Your age</i>	4 (2%)
	<i>You have a disability</i>	10 (6%)
	<i>You were new here</i>	22 (12%)
	<i>Your offence/ crime</i>	38 (21%)
	<i>Gang related issues</i>	23 (13%)
Q8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	
	Yes	68 (38%)
	No	111 (62%)
Q8.7	If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i>	33 (18%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	10 (6%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	34 (19%)
	<i>Medication</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Debt</i>	4 (2%)
	<i>Drugs</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	10 (6%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	13 (7%)
	<i>Your nationality</i>	6 (3%)
	<i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i>	11 (6%)
	<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>Your age</i>	4 (2%)
	<i>You have a disability</i>	9 (5%)
	<i>You were new here</i>	10 (6%)
	<i>Your offence/ crime</i>	12 (7%)
	<i>Gang related issues</i>	3 (2%)
Q8.8	If you have been victimised by prisoners or staff, did you report it?	
	Not been victimised	59 (38%)
	Yes	38 (25%)
	No	57 (37%)

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	14 (8%)	8 (5%)	35 (20%)	37 (21%)	47 (27%)	34 (19%)
	The nurse	13 (8%)	25 (15%)	55 (32%)	28 (16%)	29 (17%)	21 (12%)
	The dentist	24 (14%)	3 (2%)	6 (3%)	15 (9%)	46 (27%)	79 (46%)
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	21 (12%)	16 (9%)	51 (29%)	32 (18%)	29 (17%)	25 (14%)
	The nurse	19 (11%)	34 (20%)	59 (34%)	26 (15%)	18 (10%)	18 (10%)
	The dentist	56 (32%)	10 (6%)	33 (19%)	24 (14%)	24 (14%)	27 (16%)
Q9.3	What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?						
	<i>Not been</i>						11 (6%)
	<i>Very good</i>						11 (6%)
	<i>Good</i>						49 (28%)
	<i>Neither</i>						46 (26%)
	<i>Bad</i>						31 (18%)
	<i>Very bad</i>						27 (15%)
Q9.4	Are you currently taking medication?						
	Yes						64 (36%)
	No						114 (64%)
Q9.5	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/ all of it in your own cell?						
	<i>Not taking medication</i>						114 (64%)
	<i>Yes, all my meds</i>						35 (20%)
	<i>Yes, some of my meds</i>						9 (5%)
	<i>No</i>						19 (11%)
Q9.6	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?						
	Yes						76 (43%)
	No						101 (57%)
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)?						
	<i>Do not have any emotional or mental health problems</i>						101 (57%)
	Yes						33 (19%)
	No						44 (25%)

Section 10: Drugs and alcohol

Q10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	
	Yes	49 (27%)
	No	130 (73%)
Q10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	
	Yes	25 (14%)
	No	153 (86%)

Q10.3	Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?	
	Very easy	63 (35%)
	Easy	15 (8%)
	Neither	13 (7%)
	Difficult	5 (3%)
	Very difficult	8 (4%)
	Don't know	74 (42%)
Q10.4	Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison?	
	Very easy	10 (6%)
	Easy	13 (7%)
	Neither	28 (16%)
	Difficult	16 (9%)
	Very difficult	20 (11%)
	Don't know	90 (51%)
Q10.5	Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?	
	Yes	37 (21%)
	No	141 (79%)
Q10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	
	Yes	11 (6%)
	No	164 (94%)
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>	110 (66%)
	Yes	37 (22%)
	No	20 (12%)
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>	153 (86%)
	Yes	15 (8%)
	No	10 (6%)
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>	126 (76%)
	Yes	26 (16%)
	No	14 (8%)

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	16 (9%)	14 (8%)	37 (21%)	33 (19%)	49 (28%)	25 (14%)
	Vocational or skills training	26 (15%)	8 (5%)	45 (26%)	31 (18%)	48 (28%)	13 (8%)
	Education (including basic skills)	16 (9%)	17 (10%)	62 (37%)	31 (18%)	29 (17%)	14 (8%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	26 (15%)	13 (8%)	32 (19%)	34 (20%)	45 (26%)	22 (13%)

Q11.2	Are you currently involved in the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)				
	<i>Not involved in any of these</i>				60 (35%)
	Prison job				76 (44%)
	Vocational or skills training				19 (11%)
	Education (including basic skills)				22 (13%)
	Offending behaviour programmes				23 (13%)
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	40 (26%)	55 (35%)	52 (33%)	9 (6%)
	Vocational or skills training	54 (36%)	53 (35%)	35 (23%)	8 (5%)
	Education (including basic skills)	39 (25%)	67 (43%)	45 (29%)	5 (3%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	52 (33%)	57 (36%)	41 (26%)	7 (4%)
Q11.4	How often do you usually go to the library?				
	<i>Don't want to go</i>				26 (15%)
	<i>Never</i>				64 (37%)
	<i>Less than once a week</i>				50 (29%)
	<i>About once a week</i>				29 (17%)
	<i>More than once a week</i>				4 (2%)
Q11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?				
	<i>Don't use it</i>				55 (32%)
	<i>Yes</i>				42 (24%)
	<i>No</i>				75 (44%)
Q11.6	How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?				
	<i>Don't want to go</i>				47 (27%)
	<i>0</i>				46 (26%)
	<i>1 to 2</i>				73 (42%)
	<i>3 to 5</i>				7 (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>				25 (14%)
	<i>0</i>				17 (10%)
	<i>1 to 2</i>				40 (23%)
	<i>3 to 5</i>				31 (18%)
	<i>More than 5</i>				63 (36%)
Q11.8	How many times do you usually have association each week?				
	<i>Don't want to go</i>				8 (5%)
	<i>0</i>				7 (4%)
	<i>1 to 2</i>				39 (23%)
	<i>3 to 5</i>				75 (44%)
	<i>More than 5</i>				42 (25%)

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>	67 (38%)
	<i>2 to less than 4 hours</i>	27 (15%)
	<i>4 to less than 6 hours</i>	23 (13%)
	<i>6 to less than 8 hours</i>	39 (22%)
	<i>8 to less than 10 hours</i>	9 (5%)
	<i>10 hours or more</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	7 (4%)

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?	
	Yes	55 (31%)
	No	123 (69%)
Q12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?	
	Yes	101 (57%)
	No	76 (43%)
Q12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	
	Yes	80 (45%)
	No	96 (55%)
Q12.4	How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	27 (15%)
	<i>Very easy</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>Easy</i>	29 (16%)
	<i>Neither</i>	10 (6%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	33 (19%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	69 (39%)
	<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%)
	Yes	151 (85%)
	No	26 (15%)
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>	26 (15%)
	<i>No contact</i>	52 (30%)
	<i>Letter</i>	41 (23%)
	<i>Phone</i>	43 (25%)
	<i>Visit</i>	45 (26%)
Q13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	
	Yes	149 (86%)
	No	24 (14%)

Q13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	0 (0%)
	Yes	137 (79%)
	No	36 (21%)
Q13.5	How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>	36 (21%)
	<i>Very involved</i>	27 (16%)
	<i>Involved</i>	32 (19%)
	<i>Neither</i>	25 (15%)
	<i>Not very involved</i>	24 (14%)
	<i>Not at all involved</i>	28 (16%)
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>	36 (21%)
	<i>Nobody</i>	52 (31%)
	<i>Offender supervisor</i>	59 (35%)
	<i>Offender manager</i>	43 (25%)
	<i>Named/ personal officer</i>	21 (12%)
	<i>Staff from other departments</i>	34 (20%)
Q13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>	36 (21%)
	Yes	100 (58%)
	No	19 (11%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	18 (10%)
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>	36 (21%)
	Yes	32 (18%)
	No	67 (39%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	39 (22%)
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>	36 (20%)
	Yes	36 (20%)
	No	53 (30%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	51 (29%)
Q13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	
	Yes	6 (3%)
	No	59 (33%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	112 (63%)
Q13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?	
	Yes	31 (18%)
	No	143 (82%)

**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	29 (17%)	30 (18%)	110 (65%)
Accommodation	31 (19%)	27 (17%)	105 (64%)
Benefits	35 (21%)	21 (13%)	110 (66%)
Finances	33 (20%)	21 (13%)	110 (67%)
Education	33 (20%)	37 (22%)	98 (58%)
Drugs and alcohol	46 (28%)	37 (22%)	82 (50%)

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%)
<i>Yes</i>	91 (53%)
<i>No</i>	82 (47%)

Main comparator and comparator to last time



Prisoner survey responses HMP & YOI Swinfen Hall 2016

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

		HMP & YOI Swinfen Hall 2016	Young adult training prisons comparator	HMP & YOI Swinfen Hall 2016	HMP & YOI Swinfen Hall 2014
	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		184	523	184	176
SECTION 1: General information					
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	45%	80%	45%	43%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	99%	100%	100%
1.3	Are you on recall?	4%	7%	4%	6%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	1%	12%	1%	3%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	6%	2%	6%	18%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	6%	13%	6%	5%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	100%	100%	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%	48%	32%	37%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	5%	4%	5%	7%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	23%	24%	23%	15%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	8%	1%	8%	5%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	22%	12%	22%	17%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	2%	1%	2%	3%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	63%	55%	63%	53%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	27%	20%	27%	28%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts					
On your most recent journey here:					
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	64%	55%	64%	56%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:					
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	73%	69%	73%	60%
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	13%	10%	13%	11%
2.4	Was the van clean?	45%	44%	45%	42%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	79%	78%	79%	83%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	61%	64%	61%	63%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	50%	56%	50%	59%
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	10%	12%	10%	5%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	85%	85%	85%	89%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP & YOI Swinfen Hall 2016	Young adult training prisons comparator	HMP & YOI Swinfen Hall 2016	HMP & YOI Swinfen Hall 2014
	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?	64%	75%	64%	52%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	83%	84%	83%	79%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	66%	70%	66%	69%
When you first arrived:					
3.4	Did you have any problems?	60%	53%	60%	55%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	18%	19%	18%	19%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	4%	9%	4%	8%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	1%	2%	1%	1%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	16%	18%	16%	20%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	1%	2%	1%	2%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	9%	12%	9%	14%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	20%	10%	20%	14%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	5%	4%	5%	7%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	23%	10%	23%	14%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	13%	7%	13%	8%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	11%	18%	11%	12%
For those with problems:					
3.5	Did you receive any help/ support from staff in dealing with these problems?	26%	33%	26%	33%
When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:					
3.6	Tobacco?	86%	80%	86%	83%
3.6	A shower?	35%	35%	35%	37%
3.6	A free telephone call?	80%	68%	80%	78%
3.6	Something to eat?	45%	54%	45%	41%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	51%	47%	51%	52%
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	46%	49%	46%	41%

Key to tables

Main comparator and comparator to last time

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP & YOJ Swinfen Hall 2016	Young adult training prisons comparator	HMP & YOJ Swinfen Hall 2016	HMP & YOJ Swinfen Hall 2014
	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 continued					
	When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:				
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	51%	66%	51%	61%
3.7	Someone from health services?	66%	64%	66%	72%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	23%	26%	23%	24%
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	32%	23%	32%	32%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:				
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	45%	44%	45%	54%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	32%	36%	32%	40%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	39%	35%	39%	47%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	36%	39%	36%	46%
3.8	Health services?	41%	51%	41%	60%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	38%	53%	38%	56%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	61%	79%	61%	71%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	94%	81%	94%	81%
	For those who have been on an induction course:				
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	43%	48%	43%	50%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	84%	79%	84%	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?	24%	34%	24%	36%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	36%	43%	36%	48%
4.1	Get bail information?	5%	16%	5%	9%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	44%	38%	44%	45%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	26%	29%	26%	31%
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:				
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	51%	51%	51%	52%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	27%	76%	27%	93%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	65%	67%	65%	71%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	38%	43%	38%	33%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	25%	36%	25%	41%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	58%	58%	58%	60%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	28%	26%	28%	40%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	19%	25%	19%	14%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	47%	38%	47%	49%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	30%	43%	30%	36%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs respected?	46%	55%	46%	46%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	50%	65%	50%	65%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	41%	52%	41%	46%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP & YOI Swinfen Hall 2016	Young adult training prisons comparator	HMP & YOI Swinfen Hall 2016	HMP & YOI Swinfen Hall 2014
	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 5: Applications and complaints					
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	77%	74%	77%	84%
	For those who have made an application:				
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	50%	56%	50%	59%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	28%	26%	28%	33%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	49%	50%	49%	57%
	For those who have made a complaint:				
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	27%	33%	27%	30%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	25%	29%	25%	32%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	31%	21%	31%	27%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	12%	25%	12%	21%
SECTION 6: Incentives and earned privileges scheme					
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	42%	40%	42%	39%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	45%	47%	45%	49%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	18%	25%	18%	22%
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?	23%	26%	23%	39%
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff					
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	64%	69%	64%	72%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	63%	66%	63%	73%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	27%	26%	27%	33%
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	21%	25%	21%	19%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	79%	64%	79%	80%
	For those with a personal officer:				
7.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	54%	49%	54%	60%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP & YOI Swinfen Hall 2016	Young adult training prisons comparator	HMP & YOI Swinfen Hall 2016	HMP & YOI Swinfen Hall 2014
	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 8: Safety					
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	62%	36%	62%	45%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	30%	16%	30%	20%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	49%	24%	49%	35%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:				
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	27%	13%	27%	21%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	27%	12%	27%	22%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	2%	1%	2%	4%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	34%	14%	34%	23%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	22%	6%	22%	17%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	2%	2%	2%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	11%	5%	11%	12%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	6%	4%	6%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	3%	4%	3%	8%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	7%	3%	7%	6%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	3%	3%	3%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	10%	6%	10%	9%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	2%	1%	2%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	6%	1%	6%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	2%	1%	2%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	6%	3%	6%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	12%	8%	12%	11%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	21%	5%	21%	17%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	13%	6%	13%	7%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP & YOI Swinfen Hall 2016	Young adult training prisons comparator	HMP & YOI Swinfen Hall 2016	HMP & YOI Swinfen Hall 2014
	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 8: Safety continued					
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	38%	29%	38%	37%
	Since you have been here, have staff:				
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	19%	14%	19%	17%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	6%	8%	6%	12%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	1%	2%	1%	2%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	19%	11%	19%	18%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	2%	1%	2%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	2%	2%	2%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	2%	1%	2%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	6%	6%	6%	7%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	7%	6%	7%	6%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	3%	4%	3%	6%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	6%	3%	6%	9%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	1%	0%	1%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	3%	1%	3%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	2%	2%	2%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	5%	2%	5%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	6%	6%	6%	9%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	6%	3%	7%	8%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	2%	3%	2%	2%
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:				
8.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	40%	31%	40%	44%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP & YOI Swinfen Hall 2016	Young adult training prisons comparator	HMP & YOI Swinfen Hall 2016	HMP & YOI Swinfen Hall 2014	
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?	25%	42%	25%	45%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	47%	59%	47%	55%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	5%	24%	5%	8%
	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?	44%	58%	44%	59%
9.2	The nurse?	60%	62%	60%	63%
9.2	The dentist?	37%	46%	37%	37%
9.3	The overall quality of health services?	37%	51%	37%	50%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	36%	20%	36%	31%
	For those currently taking medication:				
9.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	70%	59%	70%	89%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	43%	23%	43%	28%
	For those who have problems:				
9.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	43%	61%	43%	39%
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol					
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	27%	26%	27%	30%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	14%	15%	14%	20%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	44%	27%	44%	28%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	13%	9%	13%	14%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	21%	6%	21%	6%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	6%	2%	6%	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?	65%	65%	65%	72%
10.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	60%	66%	60%	73%
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:				
10.9	Was the support helpful?	65%	76%	65%	80%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP & YOI Swinfen Hall 2016	Young adult training prisons comparator	HMP & YOI Swinfen Hall 2016	HMP & YOI Swinfen Hall 2014
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 11: Activities				
Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:				
11.1 A prison job?	29%	24%	29%	42%
11.1 Vocational or skills training?	31%	31%	31%	44%
11.1 Education (including basic skills)?	47%	54%	47%	63%
11.1 Offending behaviour programmes?	26%	25%	26%	30%
Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:				
11.2 A prison job?	44%	39%	44%	49%
11.2 Vocational or skills training?	11%	11%	11%	20%
11.2 Education (including basic skills)?	13%	26%	13%	14%
11.2 Offending behaviour programmes?	14%	8%	14%	12%
11.3 Have you had a job while in this prison?	74%	70%	74%	77%
For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:				
11.3 Do you feel the job will help you on release?	47%	53%	47%	45%
11.3 Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	64%	63%	64%	75%
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?	55%	52%	55%	68%
11.3 Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	75%	78%	75%	84%
For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:				
11.3 Do you feel the education will help you on release?	57%	58%	57%	61%
11.3 Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	67%	61%	67%	73%
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?	54%	54%	54%	60%
11.4 Do you go to the library at least once a week?	19%	38%	19%	32%
11.5 Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	24%	46%	24%	21%
11.6 Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	5%	19%	5%	5%
11.7 Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	53%	61%	53%	55%
11.8 Do you go on association more than five times each week?	25%	62%	25%	61%
11.9 Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	2%	3%	2%	7%
SECTION 12: Friends and family				
12.1 Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	31%	34%	31%	35%
12.2 Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	57%	43%	57%	59%
12.3 Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	46%	30%	46%	38%
12.4 Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	20%	29%	20%	27%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP & YOI Swinfen Hall 2016	Young adult training prisons comparator	HMP & YOI Swinfen Hall 2016	HMP & YOI Swinfen Hall 2014
	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 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?	85%	80%	85%	87%
For those who are sentenced what type of contact have you had with your offender manager:					
13.2	No contact?	35%	43%	35%	37%
13.2	Contact by letter?	28%	22%	28%	37%
13.2	Contact by phone?	29%	13%	29%	24%
13.2	Contact by visit?	30%	35%	30%	32%
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	86%	73%	86%	89%
For those who are sentenced:					
13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	79%	55%	79%	81%
For those with a sentence plan:					
13.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	43%	54%	43%	40%
Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:					
13.6	Nobody?	39%	56%	39%	53%
13.6	Offender supervisor?	44%	29%	44%	38%
13.6	Offender manager?	32%	20%	32%	24%
13.6	Named/ personal officer?	16%	15%	16%	11%
13.6	Staff from other departments?	26%	14%	26%	16%
For those with a sentence plan:					
13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	73%	60%	73%	70%
13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	23%	24%	23%	19%
13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	26%	25%	26%	22%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	4%	6%	4%	6%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	18%	18%	18%	14%
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?	21%	40%	21%	34%
13.12	Accommodation?	21%	40%	21%	30%
13.12	Benefits?	16%	30%	16%	25%
13.12	Finances?	16%	21%	16%	22%
13.12	Education?	28%	39%	28%	32%
13.12	Drugs and alcohol?	31%	43%	31%	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?	53%	54%	53%	58%

Diversity analysis



Key question responses (ethnicity and religion) HMP & YOI Swinfen Hall 2016

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		59	123	42	139
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	14%	3%	10%	5%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%	100%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	99%	100%	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.)			85%	17%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	2%	5%	0%	5%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	61%	5%		
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	12%	27%	17%	25%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	0%	3%	0%	2%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	67%	61%	73%	61%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	54%	65%	50%	66%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	37%	55%	36%	53%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	75%	87%	68%	88%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	63%	67%	55%	70%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	58%	61%	56%	60%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	65%	68%	68%	65%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	68%	58%	68%	60%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	90%	95%	93%	94%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	15%	28%	19%	26%

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?	59%	47%	61%	48%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	19%	31%	12%	31%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	26%	25%	29%	25%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	19%	20%	17%	20%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	39%	51%	43%	48%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	22%	34%	17%	34%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	58%	41%	61%	41%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	59%	45%	72%	44%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	73%	80%	74%	78%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	44%	52%	44%	52%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	32%	48%	22%	48%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	38%	48%	37%	47%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	21%	17%	27%	15%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	60%	68%	60%	66%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	55%	67%	52%	66%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	16%	23%	12%	23%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	73%	82%	72%	81%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	45%	70%	47%	66%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	20%	35%	26%	31%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	25%	61%	19%	59%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	14%	44%	12%	42%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	5%	3%	2%	4%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	5%	8%	2%	9%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	4%	3%	2%	4%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	4%	7%	5%	6%

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				
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	40%	37%	41%	36%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	18%	20%	12%	21%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	14%	2%	10%	5%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	12%	5%	17%	5%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	5%	2%	5%	2%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	5%	5%	8%	5%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	19%	28%	17%	28%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	39%	51%	37%	50%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	26%	42%	31%	37%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	33%	48%	36%	45%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	29%	52%	36%	47%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	35%	49%	35%	47%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	19%	8%	18%	9%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	15%	12%	10%	14%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	4%	18%	5%	16%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	14%	22%	10%	22%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	4%	6%	0%	7%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	56%	52%	66%	49%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	14%	29%	12%	28%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	2%	2%	2%	2%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	59%	57%	66%	54%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	38%	49%	32%	50%

Diversity Analysis



Key question responses (disability and under 21) HMP & YOI Swinfen Hall 2016

Prisoner survey responses (missing data has 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		41	143		83	101
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%		100%	100%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	2%	7%		6%	6%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%		100%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	98%	100%		100%	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.)	18%	37%		30%	35%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	10%	3%		4%	5%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	17%	25%		24%	23%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?				22%	23%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	0%	2%		0%	3%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	54%	66%		72%	57%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	71%	59%		58%	64%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	44%	51%		49%	50%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	73%	86%		79%	86%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	68%	65%		63%	67%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	92%	51%		58%	61%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	75%	63%		62%	70%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	57%	62%		57%	64%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	95%	93%		94%	93%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	35%	21%		28%	21%

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				
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	42%	53%	44%	56%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	21%	29%	23%	31%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	18%	28%	28%	24%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	12%	21%	25%	15%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	52%	45%	49%	45%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	32%	29%	27%	33%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	61%	42%	46%	46%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	73%	44%	54%	46%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	73%	78%	76%	78%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	51%	48%	42%	55%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	35%	44%	33%	49%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	37%	47%	48%	42%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	25%	16%	21%	16%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	66%	64%	59%	69%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	78%	58%	61%	65%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	21%	21%	20%	22%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	88%	76%	82%	77%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	73%	59%	60%	64%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	58%	21%	29%	31%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	75%	42%	49%	49%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	58%	27%	33%	35%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	8%	2%	3%	4%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	22%	3%	8%	7%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	8%	2%	3%	4%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	8%	1%	3%	2%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	25%	0%	6%	5%

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				
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	52%	34%	34%	42%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	28%	17%	15%	22%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	10%	4%	4%	7%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	10%	6%	6%	8%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	8%	2%	4%	3%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	5%	2%	4%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	20%	1%	5%	5%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	41%	20%	21%	27%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	65%	42%	45%	48%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	58%	30%	27%	43%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	78%	33%	40%	45%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	63%	38%	33%	53%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	38%	46%	40%	49%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	8%	12%	6%	15%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	13%	13%	11%	14%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	11%	14%	9%	17%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	21%	19%	20%	18%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	5%	5%	4%	6%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	37%	58%	43%	62%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	22%	25%	24%	25%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	2%	2%	3%	1%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	67%	54%	56%	58%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	61%	41%	41%	50%



Prisoner survey responses HMP & YOI Swinfen Hall 2016

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, G, 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		53	129
SECTION 1: General information			
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	64%	37%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%
1.3	Are you on recall?	2%	6%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	0%	1%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	2%	7%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	8%	6%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	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.)	27%	34%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	4%	5%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	25%	22%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	2%	10%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	17%	25%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	0%	2%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	57%	66%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	27%	27%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts			
On your most recent journey here:			
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	61%	64%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	81%	79%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	55%	64%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	49%	50%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	78%	88%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	A, B and C wings	D, E, F, G, 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 3: Reception, first night and induction			
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	56%	68%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	75%	86%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	68%	66%
	When you first arrived:		
3.4	Did you have any problems?	65%	58%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	25%	15%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	6%	3%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	2%	0%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	25%	13%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	0%	1%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	14%	7%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	22%	19%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	4%	6%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	20%	25%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	16%	12%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	16%	9%
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:		
3.6	Tobacco?	91%	84%
3.6	A shower?	42%	33%
3.6	A free telephone call?	71%	85%
3.6	Something to eat?	44%	45%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	44%	53%
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	46%	45%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	A, B and C wings	D, E, F, G, 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 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?	53%	51%
3.7	Someone from health services?	72%	63%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	21%	24%
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	27%	35%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:		
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	45%	46%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	32%	33%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	36%	40%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	30%	39%
3.8	Health services?	40%	42%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	40%	38%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	56%	64%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	93%	94%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	77%	87%
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?	21%	25%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	36%	35%
4.1	Get bail information?	2%	7%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	39%	45%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	12%	32%
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	46%	53%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	8%	35%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	69%	64%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	47%	34%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	30%	23%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	43%	65%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	22%	32%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	22%	19%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	42%	49%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	19%	35%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	42%	48%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	36%	56%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	24%	47%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	A, B and C wings	D, E, F, G, 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 5: Applications and complaints			
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	73%	79%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	43%	52%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	40%	28%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	10%	13%
SECTION 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme			
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	25%	49%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	30%	51%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	34%	10%
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff			
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	51%	70%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	44%	70%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	18%	31%
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	14%	24%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	69%	84%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	A, B and C wings	D, E, F, G, 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 8: Safety			
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	73%	57%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	44%	24%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	56%	46%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:		
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	38%	24%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	32%	26%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	0%	2%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	36%	34%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	20%	23%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	4%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	12%	10%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	2%	7%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	2%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	2%	9%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	4%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	10%	10%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	8%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	2%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	6%	6%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	16%	11%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	20%	22%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	16%	11%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	A, B and C wings	D, E, F, G, 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 8: Safety continued			
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	46%	35%
	Since you have been here, have staff:		
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	18%	18%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	12%	2%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	2%	1%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	26%	16%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	4%	6%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	6%	8%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	6%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	10%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	2%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	2%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	4%	6%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	8%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	10%	6%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	2%
SECTION 9: Health services			
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	21%	27%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	37%	51%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	0%	7%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	35%	36%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	47%	42%
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol			
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	25%	29%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	16%	14%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	41%	45%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	18%	11%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	25%	19%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	12%	4%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	A, B and C wings	D, E, F, G, 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 11: Activities			
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:		
11.1	A prison job?	18%	35%
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	22%	36%
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	39%	51%
11.1	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	14%	32%
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:		
11.2	A prison job?	39%	48%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	6%	13%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	14%	13%
11.2	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	13%	14%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	14%	22%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	24%	25%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	0%	7%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	38%	60%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	2%	34%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	2%	2%
SECTION 12: Friends and family			
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	20%	36%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	67%	53%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	53%	43%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	16%	23%
SECTION 13: Preparation for release			
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	79%	88%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	6%	3%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	14%	20%



Prisoner survey responses HMP & YOI Swinfen Hall 2016

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	D and E wings	A, B, C, F, G, 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		40	142
SECTION 1: General information			
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	48%	44%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%
1.3	Are you on recall?	5%	4%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	0%	1%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	15%	3%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	8%	6%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	98%	100%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	98%	100%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	28%	33%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	11%	3%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	10%	27%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	21%	4%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	30%	21%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	0%	2%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	67%	62%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	25%	27%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts			
On your most recent journey here:			
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	68%	62%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	90%	76%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	82%	56%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	50%	49%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	90%	84%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	D and E wings	A, B, C, F, G, 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 3: Reception, first night and induction			
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	68%	63%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	90%	80%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	70%	65%
	When you first arrived:		
3.4	Did you have any problems?	58%	60%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	21%	17%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	2%	4%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	0%	1%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	8%	19%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	0%	1%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	11%	9%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	27%	18%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	8%	4%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	32%	21%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	19%	12%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	6%	12%
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:		
3.6	Tobacco?	87%	86%
3.6	A shower?	41%	34%
3.6	A free telephone call?	87%	79%
3.6	Something to eat?	47%	44%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	51%	50%
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	49%	45%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	D and E wings	A, B, C, F, G, 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 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?	55%	51%
3.7	Someone from health services?	63%	66%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	21%	24%
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?	57%	43%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	39%	31%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	47%	37%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	41%	35%
3.8	Health services?	49%	40%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	43%	37%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	64%	61%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	87%	95%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	87%	83%
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?	37%	21%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	56%	30%
4.1	Get bail information?	11%	4%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	39%	45%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	51%	19%
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	52%	50%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	63%	17%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	63%	66%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	30%	40%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	40%	21%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	57%	59%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	40%	26%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	28%	17%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	52%	45%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	57%	23%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	57%	43%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	67%	45%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	49%	38%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	D and E wings	A, B, C, F, G, 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 5: Applications and complaints			
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	80%	77%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	61%	46%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	31%	32%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	18%	11%
SECTION 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme			
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	52%	39%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	50%	44%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	8%	20%
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff			
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	82%	59%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	92%	54%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	49%	22%
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	41%	15%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	98%	74%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	D and E wings	A, B, C, F, G, 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 8: Safety			
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	60%	62%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	16%	34%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	55%	47%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:		
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	32%	26%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	32%	26%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	5%	1%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	37%	34%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	30%	20%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	2%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	12%	10%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	8%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	2%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	15%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	8%	11%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	2%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	15%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	2%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	8%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	8%	14%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	37%	17%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	10%	13%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	D and E wings	A, B, C, F, G, 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 8: Safety continued			
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	32%	39%
	Since you have been here, have staff:		
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	20%	18%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	2%	6%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	0%	2%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	15%	20%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	2%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	2%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	5%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	5%	8%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	5%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	5%	6%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	2%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	8%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	5%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	2%	7%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	8%	7%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	2%
SECTION 9: Health services			
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	37%	21%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	61%	43%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	16%	2%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	40%	35%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	48%	42%
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol			
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	40%	24%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	23%	12%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	48%	43%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	15%	13%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	22%	21%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	5%	7%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	D and E wings	A, B, C, F, G, 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 11: Activities			
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:		
11.1	A prison job?	48%	25%
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	49%	27%
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	62%	43%
11.1	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	43%	22%
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:		
11.2	A prison job?	58%	41%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	16%	10%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	8%	15%
11.2	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	27%	10%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	48%	11%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	39%	21%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	18%	2%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	61%	52%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	61%	14%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	0%	2%
SECTION 12: Friends and family			
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	55%	24%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	48%	59%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	26%	52%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	18%	22%
SECTION 13: Preparation for release			
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	95%	83%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	2%	4%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	30%	14%