

Report on an unannounced inspection of

HMP Swansea

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

7, 8, 14–17 August 2017

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



Arolygiaeth Ei Mawrhydi dros Addysg a Hyfforddiant yng Nghymru
Her Majesty's Inspectorate for Education and Training in Wales

Crown copyright 2018

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.justiceinspectors.gov.uk/hmiprisons/>

Printed and published by:
Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons
Clive House
5th floor
70 Petty France
London
SW1H 9EX
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 | 47 |
| Section 5. Summary of recommendations and good practice | 55 |
| Section 6. Appendices | 61 |
| Appendix I: Inspection team | 61 |
| Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report | 63 |
| Appendix III: Prison population profile | 71 |
| Appendix IV: 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 Swansea is a local category B prison. It is a fairly typical Victorian establishment in an inner-city location and on a fairly compact site. It was overcrowded and at the time of this inspection was holding 458 men in accommodation that was certified, in normal circumstances, to hold 268. It was last inspected in October 2014, and at that time we concluded that ‘Swansea has many positive features but there are obvious areas for improvement... Many of our positive judgements were only marginally so, and the prison needs to be energised, rejuvenated and refocused on delivering better outcomes.’ This latest inspection is a very disappointing one. Standards had slipped in three of the four healthy prison tests by which we judge the treatment and conditions of prisoners. It is clear that the complacency we warned about after the last inspection had been allowed to take hold.

For instance, there had been four self-inflicted deaths in the period before the 2014 inspection. The Prisons and Probation Ombudsman (PPO) had made a number of recommendations as a result of those deaths. On this occasion we found that since that inspection there had been four more such deaths, but significant and highly relevant PPO recommendations had not been implemented. This was inexcusable, particularly in view of the fact that in the previous six months there had been 134 incidents of self-harm – three times the rate that was recorded at the last inspection. Basic procedures designed to improve safety in our prisons, such as assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) documentation, were poor. In the context of the high levels of self-harm, suicide and prisoners presenting with mental health problems, this was inexplicable. Much more needed to be done to analyse and understand what sat behind the suicides and self-harm in the prison.

As with so many prisons, the ready availability of illicit drugs was having a significant impact. Forty per cent of the prisoners we surveyed told us that it was easy or very easy to get hold of drugs. Seventeen per cent said they had acquired a drug habit while being held in the jail, against a figure of 11% seen in similar jails elsewhere. These figures were borne out by mandatory drug testing which, when combined with the figures for those testing positive for synthetic cannabinoids, showed that very nearly a quarter of prisoners were using illicit drugs. The drug strategy was neither comprehensive nor adequately implemented. In a three month period prior to the inspection, more than 200 intelligence-led drug searches had been requested, but less than half had been carried out.

In terms of living conditions for prisoners in HMP Swansea, far too little attention was being paid to ensuring that prisoners could obtain the very basics for everyday living, such as clothing and bedding. This report details the many areas that need to be improved, including access to telephone calls, monitoring the response to applications and answering cell call bells promptly.

The area of inspection which we term ‘purposeful activity’ was particularly disappointing, having fallen to the lowest possible assessment of ‘poor’. I would invite the reader to look at this section of the report in detail in order to understand how we and our colleagues from Estyn came to that judgement. Suffice to say that for a prison of this type to have a regime where half the prisoners are locked up during the working day, with unemployed prisoners locked up for around 22 hours each day, was unacceptable. There were not enough activity places available, nor was there sufficient effort being put into encouraging or ensuring that prisoners attended. A clear failure of leadership was that on one wing staff were unwilling to facilitate access to the library for prisoners, yet managers had not successfully addressed this.

An issue that needs further analysis to understand whether or not it is impinging on the successful resettlement of prisoners on release from HMP Swansea is that of the Welsh Assembly’s policy of not giving priority on housing lists to prisoners on release. This means that half of the prisoners being released from Swansea are not being sent to what is termed ‘sustainable accommodation’. It is beyond the scope of this inspection to ascertain the possible impact of this on the resettlement plans of prisoners and their success or otherwise in following a number of resettlement pathways. If we had been in a position to identify clear negative impacts of this policy, it is most likely that our

judgement would have been that outcomes for prisoners in the area of resettlement had also sunk to 'poor', the lowest possible.

The response to the 2014 inspection of HMP Swansea was inadequate. At the last inspection we made five main recommendations and 58 other recommendations. On this occasion we found that none of the main recommendations had been achieved, and a mere eight of the remaining 58 had been fully achieved. 36 recommendations had not been achieved at all.

The current governor had a number of coherent plans for improvement and had made some progress. He was enthusiastic about the future and he has the opportunity to move the prison forward and to once again make it a decent, safe and productive establishment. However, in order to do so he will need the active support of his leadership team and staff at all levels within the prison and in Her Majesty's Prison and Probation Service (HMPPS). Grudging acceptance of change or passive resistance will not suffice.

Peter Clarke CVO OBE QPM
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

October 2017

Fact page

Task of the establishment

Local male category B

Prison status (public or private, with name of contractor if private)

Public

Region/Department

Wales

Number held

458

Certified normal accommodation

268

Operational capacity

503

Date of last full inspection

October 2014

Brief history

Situated about half a mile from the city centre, on the coastal road. Building started in 1845 and was completed in 1861. It functioned as a prison for both male and female prisoners until 1922 when females were transferred to Cardiff Prison. Swansea has since operated as a local prison, holding prisoners up to and including category B. In the early 1980s, Swansea started the Samaritan-trained prisoner Listener scheme that has now developed into a nationwide provision. An intensive prisoner support unit has been established to help prisoners with coping strategies. Delivery supports a range of interventions tailored to individuals who are 'poor copers', persistent self-harmers or have mental health issues.

Short description of residential units

| | | |
|----------------------------|---|--|
| A wing holds 185 prisoners | - | General population, remand and convicted |
| B wing holds 51 prisoners | - | First night/induction |
| C wing holds 40 prisoners | - | Full-time workers, drug-free/enhanced |
| D wing holds 116 prisoners | - | General population, remand and convicted |
| E wing | - | Care and separation unit |
| F wing holds 59 prisoners | - | General population, remand and convicted |
| G wing holds 52 | - | Resettlement, predominantly men in their last three months of sentence |

Name of governor

Graham Barrett

Escort contractor

GeoAmey

Health service provider

Abertawe Bro Morgannwg University Health Board

Learning and skills providers

Her Majesty's Prison and Probation Service (HMPPS)

Independent Monitoring Board chair

Paul Baker

Community rehabilitation company (CRC)

Wales CRC

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 Her Majesty's Prison and Probation Service (HMPPS).

- **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 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 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 *Initial risk assessment arrangements and early days support were weak. Most prisoners felt safe but violence reduction measures were underdeveloped. The number of self-harm incidents was high and significant recommendations from the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman (PPO) on deaths in custody had not been met. Security arrangements were reasonable and useful but limited work had been done to tackle drug supply. The use of segregation was low and adjudications were handled appropriately. Use of force was proportionate and quality assurance was developing. The high demand for substance use interventions was not adequately met. **Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.***

S2 *At the last inspection in 2014, we found that outcomes for prisoners in Swansea were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 17 recommendations in the area of safety. At this follow-up inspection we found that two of the recommendations had been achieved, three had been partially achieved and 12 had not been achieved.*

S3 Prisoners were reasonably positive about their experience of being escorted to Swansea. Information-sharing between escort and reception staff was good. Reception staff were friendly and welcoming. However, initial safety assessments in reception were neither private nor sufficiently detailed. Not all prisoners subsequently received on to the first night unit were interviewed to identify vulnerability. The first night centre was crowded and noisy, and did not provide an appropriate environment for new arrivals. There were no Listeners² or Insiders³ in reception, but good work was done by peer supporters on the first night unit to inform and support newly arrived prisoners. Enhanced first night checks were also undertaken. Shortage of spaces meant that new receptions were often located in other parts of the prison. The induction and reception board was often poorly attended and the useful introduction to the custody induction programme was not being delivered.

S4 In our survey, prisoners responded more positively on safety and victimisation than at other local prisons. The number of recorded assaults was similar to other prisons but higher than at our last inspection. Most incidents were low level. Not all violence, antisocial behaviour and self-harm was recorded and investigations lacked rigour. Management of perpetrators of antisocial behaviour was inadequate and there was little evidence to suggest that victims were supported.

S5 In our survey, a third of prisoners said they were depressed or suicidal on arrival, higher than other prisons (27%) and the last inspection (20%). There had been 134 incidents of self-harm in the previous six months, three times the recorded rate at the last inspection. There was not enough analysis of data to help understand this. There had been four self-inflicted deaths since the previous inspection, all within a week of arrival. This replicated findings at our previous inspection of Swansea. Despite this, significant PPO recommendations relating to ACCTs⁴ and early days procedures had not been met. Prisoners on ACCTs were positive about the support they received from staff, but the quality of ACCT documentation was poor. There was no safeguarding policy and many staff were unaware of safeguarding requirements.

² Prisoners trained by the Samaritans to provide confidential emotional support to fellow prisoners.

³ Prisoners who introduce new arrivals to prison life.

⁴ Assessment, care in custody and teamwork case management of prisoners at risk of suicide and self-harm.

- S6 Security priorities were appropriately aligned to threats of violence and drug concerns. There was a reasonable flow of intelligence and it was analysed efficiently. However, not all incidents were reported and subsequent action was not always taken promptly. Under half the target searches over the previous four months and only 44% of suspicion tests over the previous six months had taken place. When action was taken, finds and positive rates were good.
- S7 Some positive action had been taken to reduce drug supply, such as positioning staff outside the wall during movements. However, the supply reduction strategy was not integrated into an effective whole prison drug strategy. Mandatory drug testing positive levels were high and drug testing arrangements were inadequate.
- S8 Levels of segregation had reduced and were comparatively low, although a large proportion of prisoners were held pending adjudication. There was a limited regime for segregated prisoners, but lengths of stay were short. Adjudications were dealt with promptly, but they were not quality assured.
- S9 Recorded use of force had increased substantially and was higher than the comparator. Records indicated that force was used proportionately and there was evidence of de-escalation. However, not all use of force was recorded and quality assurance processes had only recently started. Analysis of data was underdeveloped for use of force, segregation and adjudications.
- S10 The incentives and earned privileges scheme had little obvious impact on encouraging positive behaviour. Some staff were applying arbitrary restrictions to basic level prisoners that were not reflected in the policy. The quality of paperwork was poor and there was no evidence of quality assurance.
- S11 In our survey, far fewer prisoners with drug and alcohol problems than at comparator prisons said they had received help. A new area strategy was being developed, but in the meantime the overall strategic approach to substance misuse was weak. There was no local drug and alcohol strategy and there had only been two strategy meetings in the first seven months of 2017. All newly arrived prisoners received prompt psychosocial substance misuse assessments and harm reduction advice. However, the range of interventions was inadequate. Clinical treatment for newly arrived prisoners withdrawing from opiates remained inadequate and contributed to a high demand for illicit drugs. Clinical monitoring in early days was poor.

Respect

- S12** *Communal areas were reasonably clean but the prison was very crowded and a number of cells were in poor condition. Too many prisoners were not receiving basic necessities such as clean clothes, sheets and access to telephone calls. Staff-prisoner relationships were generally good but sometimes passive. The management of equality and diversity was weak but improving. Faith provision was good. Complaints were usually managed appropriately. Health services did not adequately meet the need. A good amount of hot food was provided, but meal times were too early. **Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.***
- S13 *At the last inspection in 2014, we found that outcomes for prisoners in Swansea were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test. We made 20 recommendations in the area of respect. At this follow-up inspection we found that five of the recommendations had been achieved, three had been partially achieved and 12 had not been achieved.*

- S14 The prison was overcrowded with most cells accommodating more prisoners than they were designed for. Communal landings on most wings were reasonably clean but some areas were old and worn. Many cells were in reasonable condition but others were dirty and poorly ventilated, with not enough furniture and poorly screened toilets. Prisoners were unable to access enough clean prison clothing and bedding, and arrangements for them to wash their own clothes were inadequate. This was a serious problem and concerted action was required to resolve it. Prisoners had considerable difficulty in accessing telephones. Cell bells were left unanswered for unacceptable periods.
- S15 Most prisoners reported good relationships with staff. Many officers engaged positively with prisoners and had an appropriate interest in their welfare. However, a number seemed complacent and unwilling to challenge prisoners to improve their behaviour or encourage them to progress.
- S16 The strategic management of equality and diversity was weak, but had been improving following the recent appointment of a new lead officer. Identification of prisoners' protected characteristics was good but there was very little targeted provision for them. The comprehensive equality policy was underpinned by a good action plan but monitoring data were not scrutinised rigorously enough to identify and address discrimination. Black and minority ethnic prisoners responded more negatively than white prisoners across a wide range of questions in our survey; we found disparities in the monitoring data that we examined which supported some of these negative perceptions. Investigations into discrimination incidents were very poor. The equality prisoner representatives were enthusiastic but their role was not promoted well. They encouraged prisoners to declare their protected characteristics to the equality officer and advised prisoners how to report discrimination. Not all relevant staff were aware of prisoners who needed help in the event of an emergency.
- S17 The chaplaincy delivered services for almost all religions and vacancies were being filled. Induction interviews with the chaplaincy were prompt and very good. The chaplaincy facilitated the Sycamore Tree programme and links with community groups were reasonably good.
- S18 The quality of replies to complaints was reasonably good, but some were superficial and did not demonstrate adequate investigation. Many complaints concerned minor issues that could have been dealt with quickly by wing staff. Quality assurance was reasonably good but analysis of data to identify trends and patterns was weak.
- S19 The library stocked a reasonable range of text books on prison and criminal law. The legal visits booths did not provide complete privacy for consultations. The bail accommodation support service was adequate.
- S20 Health services were delivered by competent practitioners and health outcomes for patients were largely met. However, services were stretched and provision was too reactive. Prisoners were less positive in our survey about the overall quality of health care than at the last inspection. Dentist and optician waiting times were very long and some prisoners with acute dental needs were not being treated quickly enough. Many clinical governance processes, including audit, supervision, patient engagement and health promotion, remained underdeveloped. Pharmacy and medicines management services were adequate. In our survey, 62% of prisoners reported mental health or wellbeing problems. While some elements of the mental health provision were good, including access to counselling, overall provision was inadequate for the high level of need. There was not enough understanding or mitigation of the impact of entering a smoke-free environment. There was no psychosocial support for prisoners withdrawing from nicotine and the approach to nicotine replacement therapy did not meet the needs of the population.

- S21 In our survey, only 22% of prisoners said that the food was good or very good. Portion sizes were large but the food was of inconsistent quality. The availability of a cooked breakfast on weekdays was positive. Meals were served far too early at 11am and 4.15pm. Canteen and catalogue arrangements were reasonably good and prisoners could order a wide range of products.

Purposeful activity

S22 *Time out of cell was too limited. The strategic management of activities was weak. There was not enough activity for the population. Achievements for those who attended were good. Teaching and learning were adequate but attendance was poor. The library was well managed but one wing had virtually no access to it, which was unacceptable. PE provision met the needs of most prisoners. **Outcomes for prisoners were poor against this healthy prison test.***

S23 *At the last inspection in 2014, we found that outcomes for prisoners in Swansea were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test. We made 11 recommendations in the area of purposeful activity. At this follow-up inspection we found that one of the recommendations had been achieved, three had been partially achieved and seven had not been achieved.*

S24 Employed prisoners had about seven hours a day out of their cell, which was low. This reduced to about two hours for unemployed prisoners. Our roll checks showed that half the prisoners were locked up during the working day. Access to exercise was reasonable but too short at half an hour a day. On weekdays, prisoners had short periods to complete domestic tasks but very little opportunity for association and no access to association equipment.

S25 Strategic planning had not supported the development of learning and skills provision effectively. There were too few staff to resource learning and skills activities fully. Poor communication between learning and skills and wing staff had had an adverse impact on attendance at activities. The range of work was inadequate and there were not enough opportunities for prisoners to improve their employment skills. There was no clear strategy for ensuring that prisoners in work developed their literacy or numeracy.

S26 There were good partnerships with other organisations which offered opportunities to extend provision and support for prisoners. Data collection and reporting had improved, but areas for improvement had not been routinely acted on. A comprehensive self-assessment report was evaluative and identified areas for improvement. However, progress towards the objectives in the quality development plan was slow.

S27 There were not enough activity places to occupy prisoners purposefully during the core day. Many activities were purposeful and provided work-related skills, but these skills were not linked to the needs of local employers. Attendance at activity sessions was poor: about half the prisoners did not attend regularly and they were not given enough encouragement to do so.

S28 Learning and skills staff had positive, respectful relationships with prisoners. Initial literacy, numeracy and wellbeing assessments were not used well enough by tutors to inform planning and meet the learning needs of prisoners. The quality of teaching was not good enough. Prisoners' learning plans were too generic and did not set clear individual targets. Most classrooms and workshops were of good quality, with good access to learning equipment and modern technology. Prisoners' individual learning needs were not identified clearly enough based on assessment of their skills.

- S29 Nearly all prisoners who completed a course achieved a certificate or recognised unit qualification. Prisoners who attended learning, skills and work sessions regularly developed a range of work-related skills. There were limited opportunities for prisoners to develop essential skills in other areas of the education and skills provision.
- S30 The library contained a good range of books and resources which met the needs of prisoners well. Library attendance was good for most. However, prisoners on one wing had almost no library access as a result of staff practices, which was unacceptable. Prisoners who attended the library spoke highly of the support they received from library staff and the impact that reading had on their wellbeing.
- S31 Many prisoners were enthusiastic about the PE provision. They followed exercise routines independently and with minimal supervision. Access to the gym was reasonably good. A number of prisoners spoke of how the prison supported them to improve their health and wellbeing.

Resettlement

S32 *The strategic oversight of resettlement work was weak and a whole prison approach to resettlement was lacking. Offender management was poor. There was reasonable community rehabilitation company (CRC) provision but too many men were released without sustainable accommodation. Public protection work was sound. Home detention curfew processes were efficient. Support for indeterminate sentence prisoners was limited. Work to support family ties was good. Visits arrangements were appropriate but the environment was run down. **Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.***

S33 *At the last inspection in 2014, we found that outcomes for prisoners in Swansea were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 10 recommendations in the area of resettlement. At this follow-up inspection we found that nine of the recommendations had not been achieved and one was no longer relevant.*

- S34 The strategic management of resettlement work was weak. Strategy meetings were sporadic and unfocused, and action planning was poor. Residential staff had limited understanding of the prison's resettlement function. The reducing reoffending strategy was rudimentary and not based on a needs analysis. Some significant need was not met, for example for the high proportion of men with domestic violence issues. About two-thirds of men were not allocated an offender supervisor, most of them on remand or serving shorter sentences. There was some reasonable pathway support for these prisoners, but this was potentially undermined by the high percentage released without sustainable accommodation. Some good initiatives were planned and, though in its early stages, recent work to develop G wing as a resettlement unit was positive.
- S35 Prison offender supervisors had little contact with prisoners and outcomes were poor. Their work was hampered by lack of staff, training, supervision and support.
- S36 Good probation offender supervisor work was undermined in some cases by weak OASys (offender assessment systems). Public protection arrangements were well managed in nearly all the cases that we saw. Cases were discussed thoroughly at the monthly interdepartmental risk management team meetings but the completion of actions was not always documented. Support for indeterminate sentenced men was limited and not all were transferred promptly to a more suitable prison. Home detention curfew applications were managed reasonably well and, where appropriate, men were released on their eligibility date.

- S37 Assessments and planning by CRC staff were timely and appropriate. There was poor communication about the outcome of referrals that they had made and the effectiveness of their work was therefore not clear. There was reasonable access to a group of well-trained and valued CRC peer supporters.
- S38 It was concerning that nearly half the men leaving Swansea did not have sustainable accommodation. This was due in large part to the Welsh Assembly's removal of prisoners from the category of priority housing need. Support for finance, benefit and debt needs was reasonable, but the prison had only recently arranged for men to be able to open bank accounts before release.
- S39 Prisoners had appropriate access to independent careers advice. Links with local colleges and training providers were underdeveloped and few prisoners entered work, training or education on release. Prisoners' awareness of progression opportunities was limited. Links between education and skills and CRCs were underdeveloped which had led to repetition of courses.
- S40 The primary care team supported prisoners effectively before discharge. The mental health team linked appropriately with community mental health teams to support discharge planning, including for men with severe and enduring mental health needs. Release planning for prisoners with substance use needs, including harm reduction, was very good.
- S41 PACT (Prison Advice and Care Trust) provided very good support to help men rebuild and maintain relationships with their families, including baby and toddler groups. Family days were regular and well attended, and Story Book Dads⁵ was well used. There were enough visits sessions each week but it was difficult for visitors to get through on the telephone booking line. Visitors said that visits staff were respectful. Visits started on time, but the visits environment lacked natural light and felt run-down and unwelcoming.
- S42 There were no accredited programmes and some offending behaviour need was unmet. Sycamore Tree (a victim awareness course based on principles of restorative justice) reached a reasonable number of men. The new Tools for Change programme was a welcome development.

Main concerns and recommendations

- S43 **Concern:** In our survey, a third of prisoners said they felt depressed or suicidal or had mental health problems on arrival. There had been four self-inflicted deaths since the previous inspection, all within a few days of arrival. However, reception risk assessments were not sufficiently rigorous and first night procedures were inconsistent. Subsequent ACCT processes were poor and too many Prisons and Probation Ombudsman recommendations following deaths in custody had not been implemented.

Recommendation: All newly arrived prisoners should have a private interview to help identify vulnerability and risk, followed by systematic support during their early days in the prison. There should be rigorous support for prisoners identified as being at risk of self-harm and Prisons and Probation Ombudsman recommendations should be implemented in full.

⁵ Project for prisoners to record stories for their children.

S44 **Concern:** Provision of prison clothing and bedding was unacceptably poor. Prisoners were unable to get enough decent and clean clothes during the week and the prison was unable to supply even the most basic items.

Recommendation: Prisoners should be provided with sufficient and good quality clothing, bedding and towels each week. (Repeated recommendation 2.7)

S45 **Concern:** Time out of cell had deteriorated and our roll checks showed that half the prisoners were locked up during the working day. The limited number and range of activities did not support prisoners to develop skills required in the local labour market. Attendance at activity sessions was poor.

Recommendation: Managers should ensure that prisoners are unlocked and engaged in constructive activity during the working day, and that poor attendance is addressed consistently. The number, range and quality of education, training and work places should be sufficient to give sentenced prisoners realistic opportunities to improve their employment prospects.

S46 **Concern:** The lack of strategic direction and focus for resettlement and offender management affected provision for prisoners, particularly those serving shorter sentences or on remand. There was no up-to-date needs analysis. Prison officer offender supervisors were often redirected elsewhere in the prison and had little regular contact with prisoners. Pathway support and offender supervisors' work with prisoners was potentially undermined by the high percentage of men released without sustainable accommodation. This problem was due in large part to the Welsh Assembly's removal of prisoners from the category of priority housing need.

Recommendation: An up-to-date reducing reoffending strategy and action plan should reflect the offending behaviour and resettlement needs of all prisoners, including those on short sentences and remand. Local and national managers should ensure that there are enough offender management unit staff to support prisoners through sentence. The strategic approach should ensure that action is taken to reduce substantially the high number of men released without sustainable accommodation, including support from the Ministry of Justice to address the underlying causes of the problem.

Section 1. Safety

Courts, escorts and transfers

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.1 Most prisoners lived nearby and records showed that journey times were usually less than two hours. We observed escort staff who were polite and respectful and those we spoke to were focused on the wellbeing of prisoners. Vans that we inspected were reasonably clean and free of graffiti. Escort staff shared information about prisoners verbally with prison officers in reception, and written escort records were up to date and informative. In our survey, 78% of prisoners said they felt safe during their journey and 71% that they were treated well by escort staff.
- I.2 Prisoners were not handcuffed between the vans and reception, which was proportionate to the risk.

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 Reception was busy, and in the previous six months there had been an average of nearly 200 new arrivals a month. The reception area was reasonably clean but entry points, such as the stairs leading to reception, were dirty. The two holding rooms were small and cramped but prisoners were processed quickly and spent less than two hours in the holding rooms.
- I.4 We observed friendly interaction between reception staff and prisoners, and in our survey 78% of prisoners against the comparator of 61% said they were treated well in reception. Prisoners were asked if they understood what had happened to them before they were transferred to the prison and if they had any immediate needs. We observed searching procedures carried out sensitively by two officers in private, but all prisoners were strip-searched regardless of individual risk, including those on transfer from other prisons.
- I.5 In our survey, 43% of prisoners, more than the comparator (30%) and the last inspection (26%), said they had mental health problems on arrival. About a third of prisoners also said they felt depressed or suicidal when they arrived. There had been four self-inflicted deaths since the previous inspection, all within a few days of arrival (see paragraph I.18). Despite this, the risk assessment of new arrivals was weak and had not significantly improved since the last inspection (see main recommendation S43).
- I.6 Although cell-sharing risk assessments were completed, initial safety assessments were not sufficiently detailed nor were they conducted in private. We saw examples in prisoner records of incomplete initial safety assessment forms (see main recommendation S43).

Neither Listeners⁶ nor Insiders (trained prisoner peer supporters) worked in reception to support new prisoners.

- I.7** Most new arrivals went to the first night unit on B wing, but many were located on other wings because the first night centre was not large enough. Some prisoners slept on camp beds placed in the larger cells on G wing. We were told by staff and managers that this was fairly typical.
- I.8** The first night centre on B wing was clean but crowded. Insider peer supporters saw new arrivals and gave them useful information about prison life. However, prisoners were seen on busy, noisy landings and information was given too quickly for them to assimilate it.
- I.9** All prisoners received routine enhanced checks by staff during their first night, but handovers between reception and first night staff were not always adequate, and too many new arrivals were not interviewed before they were locked in their cells. In our survey, 73% of prisoners said they felt safe on their first night compared with 87% at the previous inspection.
- I.10** Formal induction arrangements were weak and the published induction programme was not being delivered at the time of the inspection. All prisoners had secondary health reviews the day after they arrived and saw the chaplain and substance misuse workers.

Recommendations

- I.11 All new prisoners should be located in a supportive and calm environment, where they can assimilate information and receive help to settle into the prison.**
- I.12 All prisoners should receive a full induction programme that meets their needs.**

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.13** In our survey, prisoners responded more positively than the comparator to questions about feeling safe and victimisation by other prisoners. Black and minority ethnic and foreign national prisoners responded more negatively than white and British prisoners to a range of questions.
- I.14** Violence had increased since our last inspection. There had been 33 fights in the previous six months, more than at other prisons. The number of recorded assaults was similar to other prisons: there had been 54 assaults in the previous six months, 22 against staff, and five were classed as serious. Of the 32 assaults against prisoners, one was classed as serious.
- I.15** Systems for identifying violence and antisocial behaviour were weak. Not all violent incidents or subsequent use of force had been recorded (see paragraph I.47). Incidents were only investigated if they had been reported on the incident reporting system or in a security intelligence report. We found a number of entries in wing observation books concerning

⁶ Prisoners trained by the Samaritans to provide confidential emotional support to fellow prisoners.

prisoners who had disclosed being bullied, which had not been investigated. Completed investigations lacked detail and analysis. Support for victims was inadequate. The prison had introduced an anti-bullying strategy the week before our inspection. We found examples of it being applied without proper consideration of the individual circumstances and vulnerability of prisoners.

- I.16** Data on violence collected by the safer custody team were monitored and analysed at the monthly violence reduction meeting, but this was limited in scope. A detailed survey had been carried out by a forensic psychologist but useful recommendations had not been acted on.

Recommendation

- I.17 All incidents of violence, bullying and use of force should be recorded and thoroughly investigated, with appropriate action taken. Victims should be supported.**

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.18** There had been four self-inflicted deaths since our last inspection, all of which occurred within the first seven days of arrival at Swansea. At our last inspection in 2014, there had also been four self-inflicted deaths; all of those men had similarly taken their own lives during their early days at Swansea. Subsequent recommendations by the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman had not been fully addressed or monitored (see main recommendation S43 and paragraph I.5).
- I.19** In our survey, 33% of prisoners told us that they had problems with feeling depressed or suicidal when they arrived against the comparator of 27% and 20% at the previous inspection. The number of self-harm incidents was three times higher than at the previous inspection and higher than comparable prisons. During the previous six months, 134 acts of self-harm had been carried out by 74 prisoners.
- I.20** During the previous six months, 235 ACCTs⁷ had been opened. We spoke to a number of prisoners on ACCTs, most of whom were positive about the support they had received. However, ACCT documents did not indicate consistent and well planned care and the overall quality was poor. Many staff entries were perfunctory and predictable. Risk assessment was weak, and some care maps did not reflect needs and were not updated regularly. There was no continuity of case managers. There were no management checks of ACCT documents (see main recommendation S43).
- I.21** The monthly safer custody meeting did not cover all areas of concern and analysis of incidents was inadequate. Action points, such as quality assurance of ACCT documents, remained unresolved and rolled over from one month to the next.

⁷ Assessment, care in custody and teamwork case management of prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm.

- I.22** Thirteen prisoners at risk of suicide had been located in the constant observation cell on C wing in the previous six months. The cell was unwelcoming, dirty and unfurnished.
- I.23** In our survey, 54% of prisoners said that they could speak to a Listener at any time against 68% at the previous inspection. Listeners were enthusiastic and committed but told us that they felt underused and undervalued. Their concerns were reflected in safer custody meeting minutes but had not been addressed.

Recommendations

- I.24** **The strategy to prevent self-harm should be based on analysis of information about the nature of incidents, patterns and trends. It should be rigorously overseen by the safer custody meeting.**
- I.25** **Constant watch cells should provide a clean and decent environment for prisoners in crisis.**
- I.26** **The safer custody meeting should establish why so many prisoners do not feel they can speak to a Listener when they need to, and investigate concerns reported by the Listeners.**

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.⁸

- I.27** Since the last inspection, some contact had been made with the local safeguarding adults board. There remained no overarching safeguarding policy for the whole prison and no safeguarding meetings. During the previous six months, no safeguarding referrals had been made and staff were unaware of safeguarding referral procedures.

Recommendation

- I.28** **A safeguarding policy should be developed and implemented. All staff should be trained in safeguarding procedures and be aware of their responsibilities under the Social Services and Wellbeing (Wales) Act 2014.**

⁸ 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).

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.29** There was a clear strategic approach to security management. An overarching threat assessment was in place and there was a focus on the primary objectives of reducing violence and the availability of unauthorised items in the establishment. Attendance at the monthly security meetings varied. Governance had improved, but some incidents had not been reported locally or through the incident reporting system, which was concerning.
- I.30** The inner city location of Swansea continued to present a heightened risk of items such as drugs and mobile phones being thrown over the perimeter wall. Some useful initiatives had been introduced to try to minimise this risk, including positioning staff outside the perimeter wall during peak movement times, proportionate additions to physical security and positive working arrangements with the local police and community. The additional security measures did not unduly restrict prisoners' access to the regime.
- I.31** During the previous six months, 1,152 intelligence reports had been submitted to the security department, more than at our previous inspection but still comparatively low. The security department collated and analysed data effectively, but intelligence was not always acted on promptly. Between March and June 2017, 226 intelligence-led searches had been requested, of which fewer than half had been carried out. This undermined attempts to reduce the number of unauthorised articles in the establishment.
- I.32** The drug supply reduction policy included useful initiatives, but was not part of an effective whole prison drug strategy (see paragraph I.60). The availability of drugs remained of significant concern and, in our survey, 17% of prisoners said they had developed a drug problem while at the establishment against the comparator of 11%.
- I.33** The random mandatory drug testing (MDT) positive rate for January to June 2017 was 20%, against a local target of 10%. Buprenorphine was the drug most frequently detected. With the inclusion of synthetic cannabinoids, the percentage of prisoners testing positive increased to 24%.
- I.34** Suspicion drug testing was not adequately resourced, which limited the impact of the supply reduction action plan. During the six months to June 2017, the security department had requested 99 tests, only 44 of which had been conducted, with 26 positive results. Positive MDT results did not consistently result in adjudications, or adjudications were dismissed, because MDT staff were redeployed and were unable to complete the required paperwork within permitted timescales. Referrals to the substance misuse team following positive results or proven adjudications had lapsed. The MDT suite required refurbishment.
- I.35** Some security arrangements remained disproportionate, including unnecessary levels of routine strip-searching. One prisoner was on closed visits at the time of our inspection. Thirteen prisoners had been on closed visits in the previous six months, not always for reasons related to visits. Prisoners on closed visits remained on them for a minimum of three months, which was excessive.

Recommendations

- I.36** The prison should have an integrated approach to reducing the demand and supply of drugs in the establishment. Supply reduction measures should include an adequately resourced mandatory drug testing programme that ensures the required level of target testing and completion of all requested suspicion tests and target searches.
- I.37** Security measures should be proportionate. Strip-searching should only be conducted when the decision is supported by intelligence. Closed visits should be for visits-related activity, with restrictions lifted during monthly reviews if they are no longer supported by intelligence.

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.38** At the time of the inspection, 18% of prisoners were on the enhanced level of the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme, 4% were on basic and the remainder were on standard or entry level. We were satisfied that new prisoners moved from entry to standard level promptly.
- I.39** The IEP scheme was not being used effectively to encourage good behaviour or manage poor behaviour. There were no individual behaviour improvement plans and insufficient differentials between the levels. The regime for men on basic level was applied inconsistently and was dependent on individual staff rather than a clear policy. There were no quality assurance processes in place.

Recommendation

- I.40** The incentives and earned privileges scheme should provide incentives for good behaviour and include individual and meaningful targets. Those on the basic level should be managed consistently.

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.41** There had been 1,194 adjudications during the previous six months compared with the low number of 390 at the previous inspection. Many adjudication charges related to antisocial behaviour and unauthorised items which reflected the challenges faced by the establishment.

- I.42** The records of adjudications that we examined showed that prisoners were given enough time to prepare cases and could seek legal assistance. However, some records indicated inadequate investigation before a finding of guilt.
- I.43** There was an increasing number of referrals to the independent adjudicator. These were for appropriate reasons and measures were in place to ensure they were dealt with promptly. Despite the increase in adjudications, staff had retained an effective grasp of the process. At the time of the inspection, there were only 14 adjourned adjudications.
- I.44** Adjudication standardisation issues were discussed at segregation monitoring meetings (see paragraph I.56). We looked at the minutes of two meetings which indicated that analysis of data and ensuing discussions were inadequate. There was no evidence of any quality assurance of adjudication procedures.

Recommendations

- I.45** **Data on adjudications should be routinely analysed to identify emerging patterns Trends should be investigated and appropriate action taken to address concerns.**
- I.46** **An adjudication quality assurance procedure should be introduced.**

The use of force

- I.47** Records indicated that force had been used on 111 occasions in the previous six months, a significant increase since the previous inspection and more than at comparator prisons. Focus on incident reporting had improved, but some use of force remained unrecorded (see recommendation I.15).
- I.48** Batons had not been drawn in the previous six months. Special accommodation had been used twice in that period and we were satisfied that it had been appropriate to do so.
- I.49** Most of the use of force documentation that we reviewed was complete, but some reports lacked detail and handwritten reports were difficult to read. Planned interventions were recorded but not routinely downloaded and not therefore available for examination.
- I.50** Governance of use of force had been very poor, but had recently improved. Use of force incidents were now reviewed at a weekly meeting, which was a positive initiative. However, the analysis did not cover all relevant factors; for example, while we were told that high numbers of prisoners from tornado moves affected the amount of force used, there was no monitoring of the impact of such prisoners on the figures. It was too early to determine its effectiveness, but at least two investigations on the use of force had been commissioned following the reviews.
- I.51** Limited analysis of data was undertaken during segregation monitoring meetings (see paragraph I.44).

Recommendation

- I.52** **Analysis of use of force data should cover all relevant factors in order to monitor trends and be able to proactively respond to emerging threats.**

Segregation

- I.53** The small segregation unit was adjacent to C wing. It had been used on 90 occasions during the previous six months, similar to the last inspection. Most periods in segregation were relatively short. Cells were of a reasonable standard, although some had graffiti and soiled toilets.
- I.54** The daily regime in segregation comprised access to showers, exercise and telephones with no opportunity for activities off the wing. Most prisoners spent nearly all day locked in their cells with little to do. It was unclear how many prisoners were strip-searched on arrival at the unit as staff followed different procedures. There was no oversight of this.
- I.55** Few prisoners were located in segregation on Rule 45 own protection, but records indicated that those who were experienced a regime similar to prisoners held on punishment. This was inappropriate. There was no individual care planning or reintegration work for the few prisoners who remained on the unit for a significant period.
- I.56** Too many prisoners were unnecessarily located on the unit while awaiting adjudication. We examined the minutes of two segregation monitoring and review group meetings. The agenda was not focused appropriately and not all stakeholders attended.

Recommendations

- I.57 Individual care plans should be in place for all segregated prisoners with a clear focus on identified risks and successful reintegration planning.**
- I.58 Prisoners should not routinely be held in the segregation unit before their adjudications.**
- I.59 Segregation monitoring meetings should be held regularly, with consistent core attendance and analysis of data.**

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.60** The strategic approach to substance misuse was weak. There was no local substance misuse strategy and there had only been two strategy meetings in 2017. The newly appointed head of reducing reoffending was addressing this and a regional drug strategy was to be adapted for local use.
- I.61** In our survey, 53% of prisoners said they had problems with drugs and 32% problems with alcohol on arrival, against respective comparators of 34% and 21%. The percentage who responded that they had received help with their drug or alcohol problem was low, particularly for alcohol where 31% said they had received support against the comparator of 53% and 62% at the previous inspection.
- I.62** Dyfodol delivered psychosocial support. The five workers were skilled, sought out their clients on wings and were effectively supported by a regional service manager. Partnership working with health care and the wider prison was good. Overall psychosocial support for

many prisoners was inadequate because of low Dyfodol staffing levels exacerbated by prison regime restrictions.

- I.63** Dyfodol saw all new arrivals promptly to assess support needs and provide individual harm reduction advice. Prisoners with low-level needs were signposted to services and those with medium to high needs were allocated a case worker. The team supported about 200 prisoners. The team used OASys (offender assessment system), P-NOMIS (Prison Service electronic records) and PalBase⁹, which informed effective risk management and release planning. There were no group interventions or peer support. There was no drug recovery wing and capacity for effective individual work was limited. Drop-in sessions were offered weekly on A and G wings. Alcoholics Anonymous groups had ceased because there were no prison staff to facilitate the group, but they were restarting in September 2017. Dyfodol was starting workshops on G wing on new psychoactive substances¹⁰ and harm reduction.
- I.64** The primary health care team delivered clinical substance misuse services. Prisoners requiring prescribing for alcohol or drug problems were identified promptly and received initial prescribing from a nurse using agreed protocols. Prescribing was reviewed by a doctor the following day. Prisoners with opiate addiction who arrived on a confirmed community prescription could remain on it. However, those who were not prescribed only received symptomatic prescribing, which created significant distress and drove the demand for illicit drug use.
- I.65** Nurses checked on newly arrived prisoners three times a night for the first three nights, but daytime monitoring was inadequate. The primary medication for opiate withdrawals (Lofexidine) required regular blood pressure and pulse monitoring which did not occur. Comprehensive checks on withdrawals were not carried out regularly to inform treatment.
- I.66** At the time of the inspection, 58 prisoners were on opiate substitution treatment. Forty-six were maintained on community prescriptions but they did not receive regular prescribing reviews. Eighteen prisoners were withdrawing from opiates using symptomatic prescribing and Lofexidine only. During the previous six months, 240 prisoners had completed alcohol detoxification prescribing.
- I.67** The level of specialist clinical support had reduced from two nurses to one who delivered three clinics a week, focusing on release planning. Treatment plans were discussed at a weekly meeting attended by the clinical nurse lead, Dyfodol and community partners. Sentenced prisoners with six to twelve weeks to serve could start opiate substitution before release, but those who were not eligible for prescribing left the prison with much reduced tolerance to opiates and increased vulnerability to overdose.
- I.68** Methadone and buprenorphine were administered at I Iam. Nurses did not routinely check photographic ID, which had contributed to a recent case of a prisoner given medication intended for somebody else.

⁹ Electronic case management system for Wales community substance misuse services.

¹⁰ Drugs that are developed or chosen to mimic the effects of illegal drugs such as cannabis, heroin or amphetamines and may have unpredictable and life-threatening effects.

Recommendations

- I.69 All prisoners with substance misuse issues should have prompt and sustained access to a comprehensive range of psychosocial support which meets their identified needs.**

- I.70 All prisoners withdrawing from drugs and alcohol should receive comprehensive monitoring and prescribing according to the Drug Misuse and Dependence UK Guidelines on Clinical Management 2017. Prisoners continuing opiate substitution from the community should receive regular prescribing reviews.**

Section 2. Respect

Residential units

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.1 The Victorian residential wings A, B, C and E, were worn and gloomy. D and F wings were relatively new buildings of modern design with wider galleried landings and good levels of natural light. G wing was a recent building used as a resettlement unit for up to 49 prisoners.
- 2.2 The prison was overcrowded and most cells accommodated more prisoners than they were designed for. Most cells held two prisoners, and a few double cells accommodated three. There were a few single cells. While many cells were in reasonable condition, some were dirty and inadequately furnished or had graffiti. Most were poorly ventilated. Prisoners usually had to eat their meals next to their toilets, which did not always have seats or lids. Prisoners were not allowed kettles in their cells except on G wing.
- 2.3 Conditions on G wing were better. Cells were larger and most areas were clean and well maintained. Prisoners were able to eat meals out of their cells and there were wing laundry facilities.
- 2.4 Communal landings on most wings were reasonably clean. Many showers had recently been refurbished and were clean and in working order. Most prisoners could have a shower every day. Association equipment was in poor condition and some notices on the walls were out of date.
- 2.5 Prisoners could wear their own clothes but they did not have adequate facilities to wash them except on G wing. There was a small prison laundry at the end of A wing, but access was poor and machines were broken. Prisoners complained that items of clothing often went missing.
- 2.6 Provision of clean prison clothing and bedding was unacceptably poor. Prisoners were unable to get enough decent and clean clothing and there were not enough of even the most basic items such as socks, boxer shorts, sheets and towels. This was clearly causing tension among prisoners (see main recommendation S44). There were enough telephones, but limited access to telephones at times when their families or friends were available (see paragraph 4.42).
- 2.7 Records indicated that cell call bells were usually answered fairly quickly, but we saw many examples of bells not being answered within five minutes. In our survey, only 26% of prisoners said that their cell bells were answered quickly against 47% at the previous inspection.
- 2.8 In our survey, fewer prisoners than at the previous inspection said that applications were dealt with quickly. There was no reliable way of checking the timeliness of responses or whether applications had been addressed.

Recommendations

- 2.9** Cells should not accommodate more prisoners than they are designed for.
- 2.10** The cleanliness and condition of cells and communal areas on all wings should be of a good standard.
- 2.11** Prisoners should be able to make a telephone call every day.
- 2.12** Cell bells should be answered promptly.
- 2.13** The applications system should be monitored to ensure that responses are timely and focused.

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.

- 2.14** We observed respectful relationships between staff and prisoners and, in our survey, 78% of prisoners against the comparator of 71% said that most staff treated them with respect. Many officers engaged positively with prisoners and showed an appropriate interest in their welfare and an awareness of their needs. A range of consultations were carried out with prisoners.
- 2.15** Most responses by staff to demanding behaviour were not over-reactive or heavy handed and we saw occasions when residential officers dealt with difficult situations in a calm and mature way. However, we also saw officers who appeared complacent and unable or unwilling to support prisoners to engage with the regime. On occasion, poor behaviour went unchallenged and some prisoners refused to attend work or education without sanction. In our survey, only 18% of respondents said that they had a personal officer.

Recommendation

- 2.16** Staff should exercise consistent care and management of prisoners. They should challenge inappropriate conduct and encourage prisoners to engage with the regime.

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 characteristic¹¹ 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** The strategic management of equality and diversity work was weak but improving after a period of inaction. An officer had been appointed shortly before our inspection to work exclusively on equality. The identification of prisoners' protected characteristics was good. The equality officer saw most new prisoners shortly after arrival and gathered data on their protected characteristics.
- 2.18** The equality policy was up to date, covered all relevant protected characteristics and was underpinned by a good action plan. Equality meetings had restarted and were held every two months, but attendance varied. Equality monitoring data were not scrutinised well enough at the meetings to identify and address areas of possible discrimination. The data were only produced quarterly which prevented the equality team from reacting quickly to emerging patterns of discrimination. Important areas were not monitored, for example the use of force and segregation and the basic level of the incentives and earned privileges scheme.
- 2.19** Nine prisoners acted as equality representatives. They promoted equality work, helped prisoners to report discrimination and encouraged them to disclose protected characteristics to the equality officer. Equality representatives met the equality officer regularly. They were positive about their role and the support they received from the equality team, although not all prisoners knew who their equality representatives were.
- 2.20** Twenty-three discrimination incidents had been reported in the last six months, nearly all concerning race. Complaints involving an allegation of discrimination were not investigated under the discrimination incident reporting system. Discrimination incident report forms (DIRFs) were freely available on wings. Investigations into discrimination incidents were very poor. Many were perfunctory and minimised poor staff behaviour and it was not clear if all witnesses were interviewed.
- 2.21** One prisoner had claimed that he was racially abused and assaulted by a member of staff, yet the assault was not investigated. In another case, an officer had allegedly used a racist term when addressing a prisoner, but the matter was not fully investigated. Most investigations were not signed or dated and in only one case was the outcome recorded. Despite these omissions, a manager had confirmed that all the investigations were satisfactory. There was no external scrutiny of investigations.
- 2.22** Consultation with minority groups was poor. Other than with older prisoners, there were no forums to identify and address potential areas of discrimination. There was little provision for minority groups and no targeted support from community groups.

¹¹ The grounds upon which discrimination is unlawful (Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2010).

Recommendations

- 2.23** The national equality monitoring tool should be revised so that the data are no more than one month old. Disparities should be considered by the equality team, thoroughly investigated and addressed.
- 2.24** All incidents of alleged discrimination should be thoroughly investigated. Quality assurance should be effective and include external scrutiny. Standard complaints that allege discrimination should be investigated as DIRFs.

Protected characteristics

- 2.25** Thirteen per cent of the population were from a black and minority ethnic background. They responded more negatively than white prisoners in our survey across many areas, including feelings of safety, access to religious leaders, respect from staff and victimisation by staff and prisoners. The equality monitoring tool showed that black prisoners were more likely than white prisoners to have an adjudication charge proved. Little had been done to address such findings (see recommendation 2.23).
- 2.26** There was an under-recording of Gypsy and Traveller prisoners. In our survey, 2% of prisoners said that they were a Gypsy or Traveller. This equated to about nine prisoners, while the prison had only recorded one. We witnessed staff using dismissive and stereotypical language when talking about Gypsy and Traveller prisoners. One Traveller acted as an equality representative.
- 2.27** Twenty-seven foreign national prisoners were held at the start of our inspection, about 6% of the population. In our survey, foreign national prisoners responded less favourably than British prisoners across a range of questions, including victimisation by other prisoners and by staff. Foreign nationals who did not receive visits could apply for a free five-minute telephone call to their country of origin once a month. A Home Office immigration enforcement officer attended the prison once a week. On the first day of our inspection, two immigration detainees were held. One had been held for more than seven months. Some foreign nationals were only informed that they would be detained under immigration powers the day before their custodial sentence ended. Telephone interpreting was not always used when appropriate. We found five basic custody screening assessments which had not been completed because the prisoner did not speak English or Welsh.
- 2.28** The prison had identified 178 prisoners with a disability, similar to the proportion in our survey. Prisoners with disabilities responded more negatively across a range of questions, including feeling unsafe and access to work. Monitoring data also showed that prisoners with disabilities were less favourably treated and were more likely to have an adjudication charge brought against them and to be found guilty than prisoners with no disability. Similarly, more disabled prisoners submitted complaints. At the time of the inspection, two prisoners required assistance in the event of an emergency but not all wing staff were aware of them. Few adaptations had been made and the prison was not suitable for wheelchair users, although none was held at the time of the inspection. Care planning was not used to support prisoners with disabilities.
- 2.29** Two transgender prisoners had been held earlier in 2017. Documentation showed that good efforts had been made to meet their needs but some staff used masculine pronouns when referring to them.
- 2.30** In our survey, one prisoner said he was gay or bisexual. There were 40 young adults. There was no targeted provision or strategy to identify and address the needs of these groups.

2.31 Twenty-one prisoners over the age of 50 were held, and the oldest was 68. The gym ran some dedicated sessions for over-50s. A forum had recently been held for over 60s and those who attended were complimentary about their treatment by staff. Many older prisoners continued to work and we did not find any locked in their cells during the core day.

Recommendation

2.32 The distinct needs of prisoners with protected characteristics should be identified and systematically addressed.

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.

2.33 Records showed that 54% of prisoners had no religion, 35% were Christian and 6% Muslim. The chaplaincy provided services for almost all major religions. Vacancies for Buddhist and Pagan chaplains were being filled. In our survey, of those prisoners who answered questions on religion and chaplaincy (excluding the large proportion who said that the questions were 'not applicable' or 'do not know'), about 69% said that their religious beliefs were respected and 78% said that it was easy to speak to a chaplain in private if they wanted to.

2.34 The chaplaincy facilitated the six-week Sycamore Tree programme (a victim awareness course based on the principles of restorative justice) four times a year. Twenty men could attend each programme. Links with community groups were reasonably good and included the Prison Fellowship, Christianity Explored and the local mosque. At the time of our inspection there was one official prison visitor. On Sundays Christian prisoners had to choose between attending the gym or Christian services.

2.35 A member of the chaplaincy met all prisoners the day after arrival to tell them about chaplaincy services and offer practical support. The chaplaincy was not represented on the senior management team but attended safer custody, resettlement and equality meetings. A member of the chaplaincy was trained to assess prisoners in crisis but the team did not attend many ACCT¹² case reviews.

¹² Assessment, care in custody and teamwork case management of prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm.

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.

- 2.36** The quality of replies to complaints was generally good, but a significant number were superficial and did not demonstrate sufficient investigation. Some replies promised a full investigation of a complaint which was not followed through. A few were dismissive. Many prisoners told us that they had little confidence in the complaints system and, in our survey, only a third of respondents said that it operated fairly.
- 2.37** Many complaints concerned low-level issues that should have been dealt with through the applications system. There were many complaints from prisoners who were angry and frustrated that they could not get simple matters dealt with (see section on residential units).
- 2.38** A lack of analysis of complaints hindered the identification of trends and patterns, but there was evidence that quality assurance was helping to raise the standard of replies.

Recommendation

- 2.39** **Complaints processes should be implemented consistently and managers should ensure that prisoners receive polite and focused responses.**

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.

- 2.40** The library stocked a reasonable range of resources on prison and criminal law (see paragraph 3.32). Legal visits took place every weekday morning. The legal visits booths did not afford privacy for consultations, and prisoners could overhear consultation in other booths.
- 2.41** In the last six months, 46 prisoners had been bailed. The bail accommodation support service was adequate.

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.

Governance arrangements

- 2.42** Abertawe Bro Morgannwg University Health Board delivered all health services. A recent health needs analysis was shaping service development. A partnership board met regularly and provided strategic direction. Governance processes remained undeveloped. There were no routine clinical audits or formal prisoner consultations to drive service improvement, although learning from incidents, including deaths in custody, informed some developments.
- 2.43** The team benefited from good clinical leadership, but the health care lead was routinely engaged in front-line duties. There were chronic nursing and medical vacancies and the primary care team concentrated on core services in a reactive manner. Recruitment had recently taken place for key nursing posts.
- 2.44** Training was appropriate and professional development opportunities were available through an effective appraisal system. Clinical supervision was not routinely accessible, which was a significant shortfall given the pressures on staff. Policies included communicable disease management. Appropriate information-sharing protocols were in place.
- 2.45** The main health department was clean and provided a satisfactory clinical environment, but lack of space limited the number of clinics. The waiting room was small but prisoners only spent short periods there. The clinical rooms on the centre and D wing were dirty and required refurbishment.
- 2.46** Prison staff knew how to seek support for medical crises, but there was no systematic recording of medical emergencies and records that we examined indicated that ambulances were not always summoned promptly. There was 24-hour nurse presence. There was resuscitation equipment, including automated external defibrillators, in the two main wing areas, but none in the health care centre which could have created delays in delivering support. The equipment was checked regularly, but there was no standardised list and we found some out-of-date and inappropriate kit.
- 2.47** There was no written information about health care or advice about how to complain. Health complaints went through the prison system, which was not sufficiently confidential. Themes were identified but no learning or actions arose from them. Responses were timely and courteous, but few adequately addressed the issues raised and prisoners were not routinely advised how to escalate complaints to the health board.
- 2.48** A regular health promotion group included community involvement, but there were no systematic health promotion activities linked to national campaigns. Screening services for older adults, such as bowel screening, were not available, although the numbers affected were low. Visiting specialists provided prompt access to sexual health services and treatment for blood-borne viruses. Access to immunisations was good.
- 2.49** The prison had been smoke free since March 2016 and was managing a number of risks including prisoners using wires to ignite contraband and smoking nicotine patches. The introduction of vaping devices had been positive but not all new arrivals had access to them.

The range of nicotine replacement options was too limited and there was no psychosocial support to help newly arrived prisoners to adjust to a smoke-free environment. A regional approach to the issue was being developed.

Recommendations

- 2.50** Formal clinical governance arrangements should be established to ensure consistent delivery of appropriate standards related to health promotion, audit, infection prevention, complaints management, prisoner engagement and clinical supervision.
- 2.51** Responses to medical emergencies should be routinely recorded and monitored to ensure that expected standards are reached. Resuscitation equipment should be available in the health care department and all equipment should be routinely checked against standardised lists.
- 2.52** Prisoners should be able to complain about health services through a confidential, well advertised system and responses should address all issues raised.
- 2.53** Prisoners should have easy access to relevant health promotion interventions, including smoke-free support and all relevant community screening programmes.

Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.54** Men arriving at the prison received an initial reception screening followed by a comprehensive secondary health assessment within 24 hours. GPs reviewed notes to ensure prescribed medicines were maintained and saw prisoners if indicated. Patient group directions¹³ were in place to support men requiring detoxification support and there was appropriate access to a telephone interpreting service. A nurse was on site at all times and medical advice was available out of hours.
- 2.55** In our survey, only 15% of prisoners said it was easy to see the GP and 36% said the quality of health services was good against 33% and 49% respectively at our last inspection. The application process was straightforward and access to most clinics was good, but waiting times for the optician remained excessive. Patients were triaged within 48 hours by a nurse and could see a doctor within a week for most routine applications. Slots were embargoed for urgent care. All men were given an 8.30am appointment and told to wait on wings until collected, but we saw medical clinics which started late morning or afternoon. This caused frustration for prisoners.
- 2.56** Patients with long-term conditions were identified and flagged for medical review, but there were no regular clinics. Monitoring of health needs and promotion of wellbeing were weak. This was acknowledged by the service and there were plans for in-house physiotherapy sessions, multi-agency pain management approaches and use of social prescribing.
- 2.57** We observed care being delivered by competent practitioners. Access to secondary care, including external hospital appointments, was proportionate, but not formally monitored. Clinical records varied in quality.

¹³ Patient group directions authorise appropriate health care professionals to supply and administer prescription-only medicine.

Recommendation

- 2.58** **Waiting time for the optician should be reduced to ensure prisoners receive timely care.** (Repeated recommendation 2.58)

Pharmacy

- 2.59** The pharmacy team included a full-time pharmacist, a technician and a part-time pharmacy assistant post which was vacant. Medicines were promptly supplied and just over a third of patients received medicines in possession. In-cell secure storage was limited and we were told officers conducted periodic cell checks. In-possession risk assessments were carried out and we saw evidence that these were reviewed. There were no pharmacy-led clinics. The pharmacy team found it difficult to provide services other than dispensing because of their limited capacity and additional tasks, including administrative activities. The pharmacist also operated as an independent prescriber. We observed the pharmacist generating a prescription for a prisoner being discharged because the doctor was not familiar with the process.
- 2.60** Prescribing and administration were completed electronically using an appropriate prescribing formulary. Administration of medicines usually occurred three times a day. There was little administration of medicines at night because of the prison regime and night sedation was routinely administered at 5pm. Nurses did not ask for identity cards before supplying medication and photographic identification was not always available on SystemOne (electronic case notes). Most medicine queues were well supervised by officers, but patient confidentiality was not provided during administration.
- 2.61** Most medicines that were not in possession were supplied as stock rather than named-patient medicines. Medicines management procedures were reasonably good, but drug refrigerator temperatures were not consistently recorded and some expired test strips for monitoring Warfarin (medication used to thin blood) were found on D wing. Insulin pens in wing drug trolleys did not indicate the date they had been removed from the fridge. Controlled drug management was generally good but requisitions for controlled drugs were not signed by the doctor.
- 2.62** Up-to-date protocols and procedures were in place. Arrangements for prisoners to receive simple analgesia and other medicines without seeing a doctor were good. The pharmacy was notified and a record made on SystemOne when prisoners purchased paracetamol from the canteen. A medicines management committee met quarterly to ratify policies and review medicines incidents, but did not analyse prescribing data.

Recommendations

- 2.63** **The capacity of the pharmacy team should be reviewed so that the team can deliver medicines use review clinics and other services to improve prisoner care and outcomes.**
- 2.64** **Facilities should be provided to allow in-possession medicines to be stored securely.**
- 2.65** **All medicines rounds should be adequately managed and supervised to ensure that patients are identified correctly, patient confidentiality is protected and medicines administered at therapeutic times.**

Good practice

- 2.66** *The pharmacy is notified when prisoners buy paracetamol from the canteen and records are made on SystmOne.*

Dentistry

- 2.67** In the absence of a formal contract, East Side dental services delivered a weekly drop-in service of up to 16 appointments, which were allocated by the primary health care team and booked only two weeks in advance. Prioritisation of care was not effective and access to routine care was inadequate. It was especially concerning that men in acute pain and distress were not being seen promptly or assisted appropriately. The dental suite was clean and fit for purpose, but recent problems with dental equipment had further extended waiting times. Records and individual dental impressions were not kept securely, and there was no immediate access to resuscitation equipment. Governance arrangements were vague. Ad hoc processes were in place and accountability for the environment, waste disposal, equipment testing and maintenance needed urgent clarification.

Recommendation

- 2.68** **The service contract for dentistry should be agreed and tendered for as soon as possible to ensure that prisoners have timely access to dental health services which are appropriately governed. In particular, men in acute pain and distress should be treated as a matter of priority.**

Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.69** In our survey, 62% of prisoners said they had emotional wellbeing or mental health problems against the comparator of 46% and 41% at the previous inspection. Only 36% said they were being helped. Joint working between the prison and mental health staff was very good. Many prison officers were newly trained and had recently completed mental health awareness training. The secondary mental health team was planning refresher training for all staff.
- 2.70** Mental health provision did not meet the high level of need, although the care that was provided was good. Prisoners with identified mental health needs were referred to the primary mental health clinic (Lighthouse), which ran five times a week. Referrals were accepted from staff and prisoners, but most originated from the health reception screen. Waiting times for routine referrals were too long at about four weeks, but men with urgent needs were seen promptly. Due to primary care staffing shortages, the team primarily focused on assessment, signposting and crisis management and were unable to offer ongoing interventions or attend all ACCT reviews. There was prompt access to a psychiatrist. A nurse delivered cognitive behavioural therapy to a few patients, but there were no group therapies. A full-time prison counsellor provided up to six sessions for sentenced prisoners with more than six months to serve, which was a valued service.
- 2.71** The small secondary mental health team covered two prisons. Managers spoke of high levels of staff burnout because of the team's limited resources. At the time of the inspection, they were supporting 20 patients with severe and enduring mental illness. New referrals were seen promptly and patients were reviewed regularly, but there was no access to psychological therapies or advocacy services. There were no agreed services for patients with learning disabilities or older patients. There were no formal meetings between primary and secondary mental health services, although informal communication remained good.

- 2.72** One patient had been transferred to mental health facilities in 2017, which had taken four weeks.

Recommendation

- 2.73** **All patients with mental health conditions should have timely access to a range of interventions which meet their identified needs.**

Social care

- 2.74** A memorandum of understanding was in place between the prison and the City and Council of Swansea and staff awareness training had been delivered. A local implementation group had recently been constituted to enhance operational input and support for staff and further multi-agency training was planned. The local authority lead attended the strategic partnership board.
- 2.75** Social care needs were identified during the reception health screen and referrals could be made by all staff or by prisoner self-referral. Eighteen referrals had been raised in the last 12 months and five had received a timely assessment. No prisoners were in receipt of a social care package at the time of the inspection. The health care manager and local authority lead were satisfied that there was no unmet need.
- 2.76** Access to mobility aids and specialist medical equipment was appropriate.

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** In our survey, only 22% of prisoners said that the food was good or very good. The food we tasted varied but too much lacked taste and variety. Portion sizes were large. Prisoners were given a cooked breakfast on weekdays, which was appreciated. Meals were served far too early, with lunch at 11am and the evening meal at 4.15pm. Serveries, kitchens and trolleys were reasonably clean. The menu was on a four-week cycle. Men on special diets were catered for.
- 2.78** Twenty-two men could work in the kitchen but there were three vacancies at the time of the inspection. They could not achieve catering qualifications other than a basic food hygiene certificate. Catering was a standing agenda item at wing representative consultation meetings, but only two catering surveys had been completed since our last inspection.

Recommendation

- 2.79** **Lunch should not be served before midday and the late meal should be in the evening.**

Purchases

Expected outcomes:

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

2.80 Prisoners could buy goods from the wide-ranging canteen list once a week. In our survey, 67% of prisoners said the canteen sold a wide enough range of goods to meet their needs against the comparator of 47%. Delivery arrangements were reasonably good. Prisoners could order goods from a range of catalogues. The processing of these orders was sometimes slow and the prison levied a 50p handling fee on every order.

Recommendation

2.81 Prisoners should not be charged an administration fee for catalogue orders.
(Repeated recommendation 2.89)

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.¹⁴

- 3.1** A part-time regime was in operation and prisoners worked or attended education in the morning or afternoon. Domestic time was provided on the wing for the other half day, but this was limited. Prisoners who were in full-time employment or education could expect to be out of their cells for about seven hours a day. Prisoners on basic level of the incentives and earned privileges scheme only received about two hours a day out of cell if they were unemployed. We were told that C and G were working wings and prisoners located there were fully occupied. However, our roll checks revealed that 52% of prisoners on average were locked up during the working day, far more than at our last inspection (see main recommendation S45).
- 3.2** Poor access to basic amenities and long periods locked up led to tension among prisoners (see paragraph 2.6). Exercise in the open air was limited to 30 minutes each day. Prisoners had some time for domestic tasks each day but very little opportunity for association and no access to association equipment. Association effectively took place only at weekends.

Recommendation

- 3.3 Prisoners should have a regime that includes daily association and at least one hour in the open air.**

¹⁴ 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 Estyn¹⁵ made the following assessments about the learning and skills and work provision:

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| Overall effectiveness of learning and skills and work: | <i>Unsatisfactory</i> |
| <i>Achievements of prisoners engaged in learning and skills and work:</i> | <i>Adequate</i> |
| <i>Quality of learning and skills and work provision:</i> | <i>Unsatisfactory</i> |
| <i>Leadership and management of learning and skills and work:</i> | <i>Adequate</i> |

Management of learning and skills and work

- 3.5** Strategic planning had not contributed effectively to the development of learning and skills provision and its potential to reduce reoffending behaviour. The very recent appointment of a head of reducing offending had improved the priority given to learning and skills and the development of plans to ensure that provision met prisoners' needs.
- 3.6** The collection and reporting of data had improved and reports had been produced on learner attendance and performance. However, where areas for improvement were highlighted in the data, the senior management team had not followed these through effectively. There were advanced plans to update the management information system in September 2017, to enhance the management of prisoners' performance in education.
- 3.7** The staff resource for learning and skills activities was unsatisfactory and limited the range of provision. Staff absence was not covered effectively, which impeded prisoners' progress in their learning.
- 3.8** The introduction of a regional head of learning and skills for Wales had improved support for the prison's head of learning and skills. Prisons in the region were able to share good practice, which had helped learning and skills staff to develop new courses and strengthen their management information system. The regional manager liaised regularly with senior managers at Swansea.
- 3.9** Useful partnerships were emerging with community organisations to extend provision and support for prisoners. For example, Shannon Trust¹⁶ volunteers supported prisoners to develop reading skills. The prison had secured an agreement with Gower College Swansea to establish a facility to improve learners' access to a broader range of progression opportunities, including apprenticeship training.

¹⁵ Estyn is the office of Her Majesty's Inspectorate for Education and Training in Wales. It is independent of, but funded by, the National Assembly for Wales. The purpose of Estyn is to inspect quality and standards in education and training in Wales.

¹⁶ Provides peer-mentored reading plan resources and training to prisons.

- 3.10** The head of learning and skills had produced a comprehensive and evaluative self-assessment report which identified appropriate areas for improvement and informed the production of a relevant quality development plan. However, progress with many objectives in the plan was too slow.
- 3.11** Many of the recommendations of the previous inspection had not yet been addressed.

Recommendations

- 3.12** **The role of the learning and skills provision in reducing offending should be central to the prison's strategic vision.**
- 3.13** **Managers should ensure that swift progress is made in achieving the objectives in the prison's quality development plan. Data should be used effectively to inform improvements in curriculum planning, quality and performance.**

Provision of activities

- 3.14** There were not enough activity places to occupy all prisoners purposefully during the day. At the time of the inspection, 163 full-time activity placements were available, 86 part-time morning education places and 88 part-time afternoon education places (see main recommendation S45).
- 3.15** There were 456 prisoners, with about 106 unemployed or refusing activities. The prison had recently introduced a regime that offered only part-time access to many opportunities which further restricted many prisoners' access to and progress in education or work. There was not enough flexibility for prisoners to combine education and work options.
- 3.16** Arrangements to promote good attendance and challenge non-attendance were not effective enough. Many prisoners had been allocated to activities that did not meet their interests or learning needs. Not all wing staff worked co-operatively enough with learning and skills staff to ensure that all prisoners benefited from education or work activities. Prisoners' attendance and engagement was adversely affected and on one day almost half the learners failed to attend sessions (see main recommendation S45). Those who did attend arrived on time and engaged quickly in their learning.
- 3.17** The curriculum was too narrow and many activities did not reflect the needs of the local labour market well enough (see main recommendation S45). Too many prisoners waited too long to complete the second part of the assessment. Until they did so, access to education, work and the gym was restricted and too many prisoners spent time in their cells unoccupied. Once they had completed the assessment, most prisoners were placed in work or education promptly.
- 3.18** Many activities provided appropriate opportunities for prisoners to develop a range of personal and generic work-related skills such as working independently, managing stressful situations and communicating with others. This helped prisoners to build their confidence and self-esteem and prepared them for paid employment or training.

Quality of provision

- 3.19** The quality of teaching was adequate. Most teachers set clear objectives for sessions and feedback was often used sensitively and constructively. Many teachers used well-produced worksheets, but they were not always appropriate for all learners. A few teachers did not plan lessons well enough to reflect the range of abilities. Teachers did not challenge more able learners enough in a few sessions. Some classes were focused too much on the teacher and learners were not motivated to participate fully. Relationships in classrooms and workshops were generally respectful and positive. Most classrooms were of a good standard with a range of learning resources.
- 3.20** Most prisoners had individual learning plans but the targets were generic rather than focusing on what individuals needed to do to improve. Although a programme of peer observation for teachers was in place, teachers' skills and learning needs were not adequately assessed and managers were therefore unable to plan appropriate development and support.
- 3.21** Most employment workshops gave prisoners a realistic experience of an industrial setting. Many prisoners had production targets which supervisors expected them to meet. They received appropriate training and were supported well to develop practical skills and to work in teams. In one laundry workshop the fabric of the building was not good enough.

Recommendations

- 3.22** **Managers should ensure that teachers' learning needs are appropriately assessed and that they have opportunities to improve their skills.**
- 3.23** **Teachers should deliver well-planned sessions that meet prisoners' individual learning needs.**

Education and vocational achievements

- 3.24** In 2016 to 2017, the overall success rate for all courses was good at 80% which was 10% higher than the Her Majesty's Prison and Probation Service (HMPPS) Wales targets. The success rate on vocational courses was 91% and on non-vocational courses 79%. The success rate in essential skills courses was 76% and in employability it was 87%. The learning and skills department had met or exceeded nearly all its key performance indicators over the year. Nearly all learners who completed a course achieved an entry certificate or unit credit award.
- 3.25** The unit-based design of qualifications and certificates was appropriate for the transient population. However, opportunities were too limited for prisoners to progress from entry level qualifications, particularly in literacy, numeracy and work-related industries. There were not enough opportunities for prisoners with existing qualifications or expertise to progress.
- 3.26** In a few areas, valuable opportunities to achieve accreditation were missed. Many prisoners were not prepared well enough for the next steps in their education, work or training pathways. A very few prisoners were working diligently towards achieving higher level qualifications such as NVQs and Open University qualifications. The quality of written work that they produced was very high.
- 3.27** The initial assessment procedures ensured that all tutors had enough basic information about prisoners' literacy and numeracy levels. However, prisoners' progress in achieving their goals was not monitored well enough across the learning and skills provision.

- 3.28** Peer mentors performed a valuable role in supporting and motivating prisoners to learn. They encouraged prisoners to attend and engage in a range of activities such as art, food hygiene and the gym. Reading mentors from the Shannon Trust provided highly beneficial support for prisoners who wanted to improve their reading skills during the evening and weekends. Prisoners who made use of this support improved their self-esteem and confidence and their attendance and engagement in activities.
- 3.29** Learning and skills courses provided suitable opportunities for prisoners to improve their employability, for example writing a CV and preparing for interview. A few workshop activities, including recycling and the laundry, provided prisoners with useful transferable skills.

Recommendation

- 3.30 Prisoners should be able to undertake a wide range of accredited learning and have opportunities to progress to higher levels.**

Library

- 3.31** The library was well run by two part-time librarians supported effectively by two full-time orderlies. It was situated in a central location in the education block and provided a calm and welcoming environment. Independent study areas in the library were helpful for the few prisoners completing distance learning courses.
- 3.32** The library contained a good range of books and resources, including fiction and non-fiction books, material for prisoners learning to read and books in other languages. The library stocked a reasonable range of text books on prison and criminal law but none on immigration law. There was a broad range of Welsh-medium books and books on Welsh history and culture.
- 3.33** Very effective systems ensured that prisoners could borrow books from community libraries quickly. Prison librarians visited the workshops and wings each Friday for prisoners to order books of interest to them.
- 3.34** Prisoners on most wings could access the library to a reasonable extent. However, virtually no prisoners on one wing had visited the library in the past year because staff on that wing were unwilling to support library access. This was known to managers and it was unacceptable that it had not been addressed. Prisoners who attended the library regularly valued the support they received from library staff and the positive impact that reading had on their wellbeing.

Recommendation

- 3.35 Managers should ensure that all prisoners have regular access to the library.**

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.

- 3.36** Many prisoners spoke confidently about the benefits of regular physical exercise and maintaining a healthy lifestyle. They showed a good understanding of the importance of a healthy diet and explained clearly the impact of regular exercise on losing weight and on maintaining good mental health. Many prisoners understood the benefits of stopping smoking and had done so successfully since arriving at the prison (but see paragraph 2.49).
- 3.37** Prisoners who took part in physical activity usually did so enthusiastically and many told us that PE had reduced the stress and anxiety of being in prison. They followed exercise routines independently and with minimal supervision. They supported and motivated each other well during sessions and there were many opportunities for purposeful social interaction.
- 3.38** Nearly all prisoners had access to PE at least twice a week and just under one-third of prisoners used the facilities regularly. The range of provision had improved since the last inspection. Facilities included weight-training and cardiovascular activity, indoor and outdoor courts and a teaching room. Activities to meet individual needs had improved, and included fitness programmes for prisoners with mental health conditions. PE staff worked effectively with health care staff to provide remedial programmes for prisoners who were disabled or overweight.
- 3.39** PE and fitness staff had appropriate qualifications and expertise. They gave prisoners an effective induction into PE and fitness facilities, which included a useful introduction to gym equipment, safe lifting, the prevention of common injuries and basic first aid. There were appropriate procedures to identify prisoners' health and medical needs before they undertook PE activities.
- 3.40** PE staff had introduced a worthwhile course on health and nutrition and delivered instruction on manual handling for prisoners working in the prison workshops. A few prisoners acquired useful qualifications in first aid each year. However, overall, opportunities for prisoners to accredit their learning in PE or develop their essential skills through PE activity remained limited (see recommendation 3.30).

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 Insufficient attention had been paid to the strategic resettlement challenges facing the prison and action planning was poor. Management of resettlement was inconsistent. There had been only three resettlement meetings in the previous eight months. Meetings concentrated on operational problems and little progress was made in resolving them. Some significant offending behaviour needs were not met (see paragraph 4.46). The rudimentary reducing reoffending strategy was not based on a needs analysis (see main recommendation S46).
- 4.2 Prisoners on remand and those serving shorter sentences – about two-thirds of the population – were not allocated an offender supervisor. There was little provision for them beyond resettlement pathway work. Some reasonable pathway support was undermined by the high percentage of men released without sustainable accommodation. No analysis had been undertaken to understand how this might affect their rehabilitation.
- 4.3 The prison recognised the weaknesses in its strategic management of resettlement work and some good initiatives were planned. Although in its early stages, work to develop G Wing as a resettlement unit was positive. The development of the resettlement unit also helped to resolve other issues, for example the movement of prisoners to resettlement activities.
- 4.4 Frequent redeployment of offender supervisors was compromising communication between departments (see paragraph 4.12). St Giles Trust staff (who represented the Wales community rehabilitation company, Working Links) told us that staff in other departments often failed to tell them the outcome of referrals. Some resettlement plans that we looked at confirmed this.
- 4.5 Few residential staff had an understanding of offender management. The offender management unit had a low profile in the prison. Links with community organisations were underdeveloped and there was little through-the-gate support for prisoners.

Recommendations

- 4.6 **Staff in all departments, including residential staff and St Giles Trust staff, should work together effectively to ensure the rehabilitation and resettlement needs of prisoners are met. In particular, agencies should always report to St Giles Trust on the outcome of referrals to ensure effective ongoing resettlement planning.**
- 4.7 **Contacts should be developed with community organisations which can contribute to resettlement work.**

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** All new prisoners were assessed for their resettlement needs on arrival. Resettlement plans were put in place promptly by St Giles Trust staff. Although most plans that we looked at addressed identified need, monitoring of progress against plans was inadequate. This was a particular problem for the majority of prisoners who did not have an offender supervisor.
- 4.9** Only about a third of prisoners were allocated an offender supervisor, those sentenced to 12 months or more and young adults. A prisoner was only allocated an offender supervisor when his OASys (offender assessment system) had been completed. At the time of the inspection, there was a backlog of 29 OASys, which records showed was a typical number. There were long delays in completion of OASys and prisoners could wait some months before they were allocated an offender supervisor. In our survey, only 18% of sentenced prisoners said they had a named offender supervisor compared with 32% in similar prisons.
- 4.10** Sixty-five prisoners were assessed as high or very high risk of harm and were the responsibility of community offender managers. Work with higher risk prisoners was undertaken by three probation offender supervisors and was adequately resourced. There were not enough staff to carry out offender management work with the 69 lower risk prisoners managed by prison offender supervisors. Three offender supervisors were allocated to this role, but routine redeployment meant that usually only one was available (see main recommendation S46).
- 4.11** Prison offender supervisors told us they did not have enough time to contact prisoners in their caseload regularly. They described their work as reactive, carrying out essential tasks or responding to prisoner applications. In our survey, only 16% of sentenced prisoners said their offender supervisor was helping them achieve their sentence plan targets against the comparator of 33%. In some cases, contact was non-existent. Significant needs were not addressed and actions were long delayed. Risk assessment and sentence planning were inadequate in some cases in our sample.
- 4.12** We saw good work by probation staff in our casework sample, but it was inconsistent. They maintained reasonable levels of contact with prisoners but, in some cases, poor initial assessment and planning left subsequent contact unfocused. Not all cases in our sample were well assessed by offender managers in the community and they did not always communicate well with probation offender supervisors. There remained no consistent process for resolving such problems. There was evidence in a number of cases of good work with families by PACT (Prison Advice and Care Trust).
- 4.13** There was no senior probation officer and inadequate supervision of probation staff. Quality assurance checks on the work of probation staff were carried out by a manager who was not well qualified to conduct them. Prison offender supervisors did not receive enough training and were not supervised. Quality assurance of their work was poor.
- 4.14** In the previous six months, 174 prisoners had been considered for home detention curfew (HDC) with 90 released, generally on their eligibility date. A new system had recently been introduced for prisoners to attend and make representations to an HDC board, which was a positive development. We were told there had been a significant improvement in the timeliness of reports from community offender supervisors and that it was now rare for such

reports to be late. There was no system to track the timeliness of various stages in the process. However, individual records that we checked showed that work was timely and decisions appropriate.

- 4.15** Prisoners were not considered for release on temporary licence (ROTL), although there were plans to develop this later in 2017.

Recommendation

- 4.16** **Offender supervisors should be appropriately trained and supervised. There should be effective quality assurance of their work.**

Public protection

- 4.17** Thorough screening was carried out for public protection concerns on new arrivals, including domestic violence. Prisoners who needed monitoring or other supervision were identified. Appropriate measures were put in place quickly, and prisoners not subject to offender management were managed through a weekly interdepartmental risk management meeting (IRMT).
- 4.18** The cases of prisoners of greatest concern were reviewed at a separate monthly strategic IRMT meeting. Cases were considered thoroughly at these meetings. Each case was given an action plan, but actions were not routinely followed up to check they had been completed. In our casework sample, one prisoner was only referred to the IRMT shortly before his release and too late to ensure effective management of his risk.
- 4.19** The prison sought to confirm MAPPA (multi-agency public protection arrangements) risk levels in good time. However, as we find elsewhere, community offender managers often did not respond promptly. MAPPA F reports that we reviewed were adequate.

Recommendation

- 4.20** **Cases should be referred promptly to the interdepartmental risk management team and action plans should be monitored to ensure that all actions are completed.**

Categorisation

- 4.21** Categorisation and re-categorisation processes were well managed and timely. Re-categorisation boards had recently been introduced and prisoners were now more engaged in the assessment process.
- 4.22** Prisoners assessed to remain in their existing category were given appropriate advice on how to progress. There were few opportunities for prisoners to address their offending behaviour at Swansea. Most prisoners transferred to HMP Parc to access programmes and complete such work. Transfers were generally prompt.

Indeterminate sentence prisoners

- 4.23** The prison held six indeterminate sentence prisoners. They were all allocated an offender supervisor on arrival. There were no forums for men in this group and there was little in the way of programmes to support their progression. We saw an example of good proactive work with an indeterminate prisoner in our case work sample. In another case that we looked at, despite the prison's best efforts, it had taken too long to transfer the prisoner to a suitable prison to undertake offending behaviour work.

Recommendation

- 4.24** **There should be appropriate support for indeterminate sentence prisoners. Those who need to attend an offending behaviour programme which is not available at Swansea should be transferred to an appropriate prison promptly.**

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.

- 4.25** The Wales Community Rehabilitation Company was represented in the prison by St Giles Trust. Prisoners received initial basic custody screening to meet immediate practical needs and a resettlement plan from St Giles Trust. The Trust was not contracted to follow up resettlement plans until the review 12 weeks before release. Initial resettlement plans for prisoners transferred to Swansea were not always reviewed which could mean that needs were not identified until the pre-release review.
- 4.26** Assessments and planning by St Giles Trust staff were timely and appropriate. However, communication by other prison departments about the outcome of referrals from the Trust was poor and the effectiveness of this work was not clear (see recommendation 4.6). The prison had recently started to hold release boards for prisoners two weeks before their release, which was a positive development.
- 4.27** Prisoners had reasonable access to a group of valued peer advisers. Peer advisers worked effectively to support prisoners towards resettlement, especially in signposting to housing and other services. The advisers were given structured training towards NVQ level 3, and the level of training and supervision of their work was good.

Accommodation

- 4.28** St Giles Trust workers undertook an appropriate range of accommodation support, including maintaining or surrendering tenancies and securing accommodation on release where possible.
- 4.29** Nevertheless, the percentage of men leaving Swansea with no sustainable accommodation had increased significantly since the last inspection to a high 49% and was unacceptable. This increase in large part reflected the Welsh Assembly's removal of prisoners from the category of priority housing need.

- 4.30** No analysis had been undertaken to understand the needs of men released without sustainable accommodation and how this might affect their rehabilitation. Some pathway support and offender supervisor work to manage and reduce risk on release were potentially undermined by the high percentage of men released with no sustainable accommodation (see main recommendation S46).

Education, training and employment

- 4.31** Prisoners participated in resettlement activities during the 12 weeks before release but there was insufficient focus on securing education and training placements. Prisoners had appropriate access to independent careers advice from a Careers Wales careers adviser. However, prisoners had limited awareness of progression opportunities available after release.
- 4.32** Links with local colleges and training providers were underdeveloped. No prisoners had benefited from release on temporary licence to attend work experience or interviews. Only very few prisoners had secured education, training and employment placements on release in the last six months (see main recommendation S46). Links between education and skills and St Giles Trust were underdeveloped and there were examples of repetition of courses (see paragraph 4.37).
- 4.33** The resettlement team was supported well by a small team of peer mentors. Together they delivered a range of helpful programmes to prepare prisoners for release. Peer mentors worked alongside prisoners to develop resettlement plans and review progress about 12 weeks before release. They also signposted prisoners to useful community agencies and services to support their resettlement plans.
- 4.34** The learning and skills and resettlement teams had not worked closely enough since the previous inspection to ensure that support programmes were well coordinated and offered sufficient progression for prisoners. Links with community education, training and employment providers such as local colleges and training providers were still at a very early stage of development. The prison did not routinely evaluate its work in securing appropriate education, employment or training placements for prisoners before release.

Health care

- 4.35** Support was given to prisoners before release to register or reinstate contact with community health services. Patients were seen to discuss health needs and issued with a supply of take-home medication if required. Discharge planning for patients with mental ill health was effective, including timely liaison with community services.

Drugs and alcohol

- 4.36** Release planning was effective, including liaison with community services, offender management unit and the community rehabilitation company. Naloxone (an opiate reversal agent) and training to use it were offered in individual harm reduction sessions for all prisoners working with the substance misuse team a few days before release.

Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.37** Swansea Citizens' Advice no longer attended the prison to help prisoners in debt. St Giles Trust caseworkers provided a basic debt advice service and signposted prisoners for appropriate assistance. The education department ran a range of money management and debt courses, although there was some duplication with a course run by St Giles Trust (see paragraph 4.32).
- 4.38** Jobcentre Plus staff were available for benefits advice and support and to link prisoners with potential employers. The prison had recently arranged for prisoners to be able to open a bank account and 22 had been opened since April 2017.

Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.39** PACT (Prison Advice and Care Trust) delivered very good support to help men rebuild and maintain relationships with their families. PACT employed two full-time family engagement workers. Baby and toddler groups ran on alternate weeks, where fathers could play and bond with their new-born children or toddlers. PACT facilitated Story Book Dads¹⁷ and had helped prisoners to record 35 stories so far in 2017. Four family days had been held in school holidays since January 2017, involving 152 families and 304 children. Any prisoner could apply to attend, regardless of status on the incentives and earned privileges scheme. The family days were supported by Swansea Council's play team.
- 4.40** The two family engagement workers also had a caseload of about 45 prisoners whom they worked with to enhance family relationships. The team also facilitated last contact visits between prisoners and children being taken into care and ran the Time to Connect parenting course. A social worker from the local council had worked with PACT on a four-week placement earlier in 2017.
- 4.41** There were enough visits sessions each week to meet prisoner demand. Visitors found it difficult to get through on the telephone booking line. Visitors who arrived early could wait in a small Portakabin outside the prison run by the charity Family and Friends of Prisoners (FFOPs). A FFOPs worker helped visitors with the assisted prison visits scheme and signposted visitors to other support organisations. On entering the prison, visitors were taken to the visitors' centre, which had an unwelcoming entrance but was reasonably well equipped. Visitors said that visits staff were respectful.
- 4.42** Visits started on time. The visits hall was shabby and unwelcoming. It lacked natural light and carpets were worn. The closed visits booths remained in the visits hall in sight of visitors, which was incongruous. Prisoners sat on movable chairs but had to wear bibs. They had no access to toilet facilities. Access to telephones on the wings was poor. In our survey, 53% of prisoners said they had problems getting access to telephones against the comparator of 36% and 42% at the previous inspection (see recommendation 2.11 and paragraph 3.2).

Recommendation

- 4.43** **The visits area should be refurbished to provide a welcoming environment and the closed visits booths should be relocated out of sight of the main visits area.**

¹⁷ Project for prisoners to record stories for their children.

Good practice

- 4.44** *The baby and toddler groups run by the Prison Advice and Care Trust helped men to maintain and develop relationships with their children.*

Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.45** Prisoners serving sentences of 12 months or more were likely to move to a training prison where they could complete courses. Very little work on changing attitudes and addressing offending behaviour was available for prisoners serving sentences of less than 12 months (see main recommendation S46).
- 4.46** There were no accredited programmes and there was some unmet offending behaviour need. There were no programmes, for example, for the many men who had problems with domestic violence. A victim awareness course (Sycamore Tree) was accessible to a reasonable number of men. A 'Tools for Change' programme had recently been introduced which was designed to help men with anger and stress management problems. This was a welcome development. Some men had benefited from excellent one-to-one professional counselling.

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 recommendations

To the governor

- 5.1 All newly arrived prisoners should have a private interview to help identify vulnerability and risk, followed by systematic support during their early days in the prison. There should be rigorous support for prisoners identified as being at risk of self-harm and Prisons and Probation Ombudsman recommendations should be implemented in full. (S43)
- 5.2 Prisoners should be provided with sufficient and good quality clothing, bedding and towels each week. (S44, repeated recommendation 2.7)
- 5.3 Managers should ensure that prisoners are unlocked and engaged in constructive activity during the working day, and that poor attendance is addressed consistently. The number, range and quality of education, training and work places should be sufficient to give sentenced prisoners realistic opportunities to improve their employment prospects. (S45)

Main recommendation

To the Ministry of Justice,
HMPPS and the governor

- 5.4 An up-to-date reducing reoffending strategy and action plan should reflect the offending behaviour and resettlement needs of all prisoners, including those on short sentences and remand. Local and national managers should ensure that there are enough offender management unit staff to support prisoners through sentence. The strategic approach should ensure that action is taken to reduce substantially the high number of men released without sustainable accommodation, including support from the Ministry of Justice to address the underlying causes of the problem. (S46)

Recommendation

To HMPPS and the governor

- 5.5 The national equality monitoring tool should be revised so that the data are no more than one month old. Disparities should be considered by the equality team, thoroughly investigated and addressed. (2.23)

Recommendations

To the governor

Early days in custody

- 5.6** All new prisoners should be located in a supportive and calm environment, where they can assimilate information and receive help to settle into the prison. (1.11)
- 5.7** All prisoners should receive a full induction programme that meets their needs. (1.12)

Bullying and violence reduction

- 5.8** All incidents of violence, bullying and use of force should be recorded and thoroughly investigated, with appropriate action taken. Victims should be supported. (1.17)

Self-harm and suicide

- 5.9** The strategy to prevent self-harm should be based on analysis of information about the nature of incidents, patterns and trends. It should be rigorously overseen by the safer custody meeting. (1.24)
- 5.10** Constant watch cells should provide a clean and decent environment for prisoners in crisis. (1.25)
- 5.11** The safer custody meeting should establish why so many prisoners do not feel they can speak to a Listener when they need to, and investigate concerns reported by the Listeners. (1.26)

Safeguarding

- 5.12** A safeguarding policy should be developed and implemented. All staff should be trained in safeguarding procedures and be aware of their responsibilities under the Social Services and Wellbeing (Wales) Act 2014. (1.28)

Security

- 5.13** The prison should have an integrated approach to reducing the demand and supply of drugs in the establishment. Supply reduction measures should include an adequately resourced mandatory drug testing programme that ensures the required level of target testing and completion of all requested suspicion tests and target searches. (1.36)
- 5.14** Security measures should be proportionate. Strip-searching should only be conducted when the decision is supported by intelligence. Closed visits should be for visits-related activity, with restrictions lifted during monthly reviews if they are no longer supported by intelligence. (1.37)

Incentives and earned privileges

- 5.15** The incentives and earned privileges scheme should provide incentives for good behaviour and include individual and meaningful targets. Those on the basic level should be managed consistently. (1.40)

Discipline

- 5.16** Data on adjudications should be routinely analysed to identify emerging patterns Trends should be investigated and appropriate action taken to address concerns. (1.45)
- 5.17** An adjudication quality assurance procedure should be introduced. (1.46)
- 5.18** Analysis of use of force data should cover all relevant factors in order to monitor trends and be able to proactively respond to emerging threats. (1.52)
- 5.19** Individual care plans should be in place for all segregated prisoners with a clear focus on identified risks and successful reintegration planning. (1.57)
- 5.20** Prisoners should not routinely be held in the segregation unit before their adjudications. (1.58)
- 5.21** Segregation monitoring meetings should be held regularly, with consistent core attendance and analysis of data. (1.59)

Substance misuse

- 5.22** All prisoners with substance misuse issues should have prompt and sustained access to a comprehensive range of psychosocial support which meets their identified needs. (1.69)
- 5.23** All prisoners withdrawing from drugs and alcohol should receive comprehensive monitoring and prescribing according to the Drug Misuse and Dependence UK Guidelines on Clinical Management 2017. Prisoners continuing opiate substitution from the community should receive regular prescribing reviews. (1.70)

Residential units

- 5.24** Cells should not accommodate more prisoners than they are designed for. (2.9)
- 5.25** The cleanliness and condition of cells and communal areas on all wings should be of a good standard. (2.10)
- 5.26** Prisoners should be able to make a telephone call every day. (2.11)
- 5.27** Cell bells should be answered promptly. (2.12)
- 5.28** The applications system should be monitored to ensure that responses are timely and focused. (2.13)

Staff-prisoner relationships

- 5.29** Staff should exercise consistent care and management of prisoners. They should challenge inappropriate conduct and encourage prisoners to engage with the regime. (2.16)

Equality and diversity

- 5.30** All incidents of alleged discrimination should be thoroughly investigated. Quality assurance should be effective and include external scrutiny. Standard complaints that allege discrimination should be investigated as DIRFs. (2.24)

- 5.31** The distinct needs of prisoners with protected characteristics should be identified and systematically addressed. (2.32)

Complaints

- 5.32** Complaints processes should be implemented consistently and managers should ensure that prisoners receive polite and focused responses. (2.39)

Health services

- 5.33** Formal clinical governance arrangements should be established to ensure consistent delivery of appropriate standards related to health promotion, audit, infection prevention, complaints management, prisoner engagement and clinical supervision. (2.50)
- 5.34** Responses to medical emergencies should be routinely recorded and monitored to ensure that expected standards are reached. Resuscitation equipment should be available in the health care department and all equipment should be routinely checked against standardised lists. (2.51)
- 5.35** Prisoners should be able to complain about health services through a confidential, well advertised system and responses should address all issues raised. (2.52)
- 5.36** Prisoners should have easy access to relevant health promotion interventions, including smoke-free support and all relevant community screening programmes. (2.53)
- 5.37** Waiting time for the optician should be reduced to ensure prisoners receive timely care. (2.58, Repeated recommendation 2.58)
- 5.38** The capacity of the pharmacy team should be reviewed so that the team can deliver medicines use review clinics and other services to improve prisoner care and outcomes. (2.63)
- 5.39** Facilities should be provided to allow in-possession medicines to be stored securely. (2.64)
- 5.40** All medicines rounds should be adequately managed and supervised to ensure that patients are identified correctly, patient confidentiality is protected and medicines administered at therapeutic times. (2.65)
- 5.41** The service contract for dentistry should be agreed and tendered for as soon as possible to ensure that prisoners have timely access to dental health services which are appropriately governed. In particular, men in acute pain and distress should be treated as a matter of priority. (2.68)
- 5.42** All patients with mental health conditions should have timely access to a range of interventions which meet their identified needs. (2.73)

Catering

- 5.43** Lunch should not be served before midday and the late meal should be in the evening. (2.79)

Purchases

- 5.44** Prisoners should not be charged an administration fee for catalogue orders. (2.81, repeated recommendation 2.89)

Time out of cell

- 5.45** Prisoners should have a regime that includes daily association and at least one hour in the open air. (3.3)

Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.46** The role of the learning and skills provision in reducing offending should be central to the prison's strategic vision. (3.12)
- 5.47** Managers should ensure that swift progress is made in achieving the objectives in the prison's quality development plan. Data should be used effectively to inform improvements in curriculum planning, quality and performance. (3.13)
- 5.48** Managers should ensure that teachers' learning needs are appropriately assessed and that they have opportunities to improve their skills. (3.22)
- 5.49** Teachers should deliver well-planned sessions that meet prisoners' individual learning needs. (3.23)
- 5.50** Prisoners should be able to undertake a wide range of accredited learning and have opportunities to progress to higher levels. (3.30)
- 5.51** Managers should ensure that all prisoners have regular access to the library. (3.35)

Strategic management of resettlement

- 5.52** Staff in all departments, including residential staff and St Giles Trust staff, should work together effectively to ensure the rehabilitation and resettlement needs of prisoners are met. In particular, agencies should always report to St Giles Trust on the outcome of referrals to ensure effective ongoing resettlement planning. (4.6)
- 5.53** Contacts should be developed with community organisations which can contribute to resettlement work. (4.7)

Offender management and planning

- 5.54** Offender supervisors should be appropriately trained and supervised. There should be effective quality assurance of their work. (4.16)
- 5.55** Cases should be referred promptly to the interdepartmental risk management team and action plans should be monitored to ensure that all actions are completed. (4.20)
- 5.56** There should be appropriate support for indeterminate sentence prisoners. Those who need to attend an offending behaviour programme which is not available at Swansea should be transferred to an appropriate prison promptly. (4.24)

Reintegration planning

- 5.57** The visits area should be refurbished to provide a welcoming environment and the closed visits booths should be relocated out of sight of the main visits area. (4.43)

Examples of good practice

Health services

- 5.58** The pharmacy is notified when prisoners buy paracetamol from the canteen and records are made on SystemOne. (2.66)

Reintegration planning

- 5.59** The baby and toddler groups run by the Prison Advice and Care Trust helped men to maintain and develop relationships with their children. (4.44)

Section 6. Appendices

Appendix I: Inspection team

| | |
|---------------------|-------------------------------|
| Peter Clarke | Chief inspector |
| Hindpal Singh Bhui | Team leader |
| Kam Sarai | Inspector |
| Tamara Pattinson | Inspector |
| Colin Carroll | Inspector |
| Deri Hughes-Roberts | Inspector |
| Gordon Riach | Inspector |
| Sigrid Engelen | Inspector |
| Steve Eley | Health services inspector |
| Majella Pearce | Substance misuse inspector |
| Lisa Bresner | Healthcare Inspectorate Wales |
| Helen Boniface | Pharmacy inspector |
| Paddy Doyle | Probation inspector |
| Alun Connick | Estyn inspector |
| Richard Tither | Estyn inspector |
| Margaret Davies | Estyn inspector |
| Patricia Taflan | Researcher |
| Laura Green | Researcher |
| Natalie-Anne Hall | Researcher |
| Emma Seymour | Researcher |

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 our last inspection in 2014, prisoners responded very positively on many indicators of safety. The reception environment was reasonable and relationships with staff were good, although risk assessments were not always completed in private. Induction arrangements were weak. Levels of violence were low and prisoners consistently indicated that they felt safe, but bullying was under-reported and support for victims was insufficient. Although the incidence of self-harm was low, the prison had not been sufficiently sighted on the pattern of self-inflicted deaths and recent serious incidents. The quality of case management documentation for at-risk prisoners was poor. Security arrangements were not always proportionate. The prison was tackling a significant drug problem. Adjudications and the use of force were low but some quality assurance was ineffective. The use of special accommodation was high and not always warranted. The segregation unit was a poor environment with a limited regime. Support for drug and alcohol misusers was broadly appropriate but diminished by the lack of psychosocial support. **Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***

Main recommendation

The prison should thoroughly investigate all serious incidents of self-harm, and act on learning points and recommendations. It should implement learning points from recommendations in Prisons and Probation Ombudsman death in custody reports, and review them regularly. (S38)

Not achieved

Recommendations

Prisoners should receive all elements of the induction programme, and their understanding of each element should be checked. (1.12)

Not achieved

The prison should take a coherent approach to managing violence and bullying, including meaningful analysis of data and a comprehensive action plan to ensure the safety of prisoners is maintained. (1.19)

Not achieved

Allegations of bullying should be recorded as such, thoroughly investigated and action taken where required. (1.20)

Not achieved

The quality of assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management documents and support for those in crisis should be improved. (1.27)

Not achieved

Prisoners on ACCT or who are actively self-harming should only be located in special accommodation as a last resort and when there are exceptional circumstances. (1.28)

Achieved

The governor should initiate contact with the local safeguarding adults board to develop local safeguarding processes. (1.33)

Partially achieved

Strip-searching, handcuffing and closed visits should only be applied when there is appropriate intelligence to support their use. (1.39)

Not achieved

The quality of adjudication records and quality assurance should be improved to ensure consistency and fairness. (1.48)

Partially achieved

The use of unofficial punishments should stop. (1.49)

Achieved

There should be improvements in the governance of the use of force, particularly the completion of documentation, planned interventions and use of special accommodation. (1.52)

Not achieved

Prisoners should only be segregated when there are justified reasons to warrant it. (1.58)

Not achieved

The segregation regime should be applied consistently among prisoners and the environment should be improved to ensure appropriate facilities. (1.59)

Partially achieved

The counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare (CARAT) team should be resourced to provide additional psychosocial interventions for prisoners on clinical treatment. (1.71)

Not achieved

CARAT and clinical substance misuse services should further integrate and undertake joint care plans and reviews. (1.72)

Not achieved

Groupwork programmes and fellowship meetings should be reintroduced on general locations and the drug recovery wing without delay. (1.73)

Not achieved

All new arrivals testing positive for opiates should receive clinical stabilisation in line with the specific guidance (Clinical Management of Drug Dependence in the Adult Prison Setting 2006, p14) from their first night to reduce the risk of self-harm, suicide and overdose, and to give clinicians time to discuss future treatment options. (1.74)

Not achieved

Respect

Prisoners are treated with respect for their human dignity.

*At our last inspection in 2014, the standard of residential units varied. Most cells were poor; they were cramped and needed refurbishment. Not all prisoners could have a daily shower, and kit change was sometimes inadequate. Staff-prisoner relations were good. Faith provision was generally good but work to support minority groups was poor. The number of complaints was low but quality assurance was ineffective. Health care provision was good overall, with good pharmacy and mental health support. Prisoners were reasonably positive about the food and prison shop. **Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.***

Main recommendations

Cells should not hold more prisoners than they are designed for, and the standard of cells should be improved. (S39)

Not achieved

The needs of prisoners with protected characteristics should be promptly identified and met through individual assessment, regular direct consultation with minority groups, effective care planning and monitoring. (S40)

Not achieved

Recommendations

Prisoners should be provided with sufficient and good quality clothing, bedding and towels each week. (2.7)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, S44)

Personal officers should introduce themselves to prisoners, make regular and comprehensive records of contacts with their prisoners, and support them to achieve their sentence plan targets. (2.13)

Not achieved

Discrimination incident report forms (DIRFs) should be freely available and all incidents of alleged discrimination should be thoroughly investigated. Quality assurance should be effective and include external scrutiny. Standard complaints that allege discrimination should be investigated as DIRFs. (2.19)

Partially achieved

The prison should explore and address the reasons for the negative perceptions of prisoners with disabilities. (2.25)

Not achieved

All responses to complaints should be legible and fully address the issues raised. (2.32) **Partially achieved**

Prisoners should have routine access to bail information, Community Legal Advice and independent immigration advice. (2.36)

Not achieved

Formal governance arrangements should reflect common NHS systems and standards and include (but not be limited to) reporting and learning from incidents, complaints, safeguarding concerns, policy formulation and review, and infection control audits. (2.47)

Not achieved

The prison should ensure that staff responsible for the assessment of prisoner vulnerability have received appropriate child protection training. (2.48)

Achieved

There should be a daily review of diagnostic results to ensure information is picked up and dealt with efficiently. (2.49)

Achieved

Waiting time for the optician should be reduced to ensure prisoners receive timely care. (2.58)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 2.58)

The timing of evening medicine administration should be appropriate for the prescription, such as night sedation and recommended dose intervals. (2.67)

Not achieved

Simple pain relief should be available on the prison shop list and in possession. (2.68)

Achieved

Initial dental appointments should reflect waiting times in the community. (2.73)

Not achieved

The dental suite should meet national infection control standards, including clear separation between clean and dirty areas. (2.74)

Achieved

The weekly mental health multidisciplinary meeting should be reinstated. (2.79)

Not achieved

Breakfast should be served on the day it is to be eaten. (2.85)

Partially achieved

The management of serveries should be improved. (2.86)

Achieved

Prisoners should not be charged an administration fee for catalogue orders. (2.89)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 2.81)

Purposeful activity

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

*At our last inspection in 2014, time out of cell was better than we often see for the type of prison, but activity for prisoners was limited. Data on learning and skills and work were not used sufficiently well, and progress against the quality improvement plan was too slow. The range of work was insufficient. Individual assessments and work plans for learners were not comprehensive or used effectively. Teaching was only adequate overall. Prisoners' opportunities to develop employability skills were limited. Although achievement targets were met, too many qualifications were low level. Punctuality at work and education was poor. The library was a positive environment, but access was limited. Access to PE was generally good but the range of activities was narrow. **Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.***

Main recommendation

The number and quality of education, training and work places should be increased and fully used so that all sentenced prisoners are purposefully occupied in activity that will improve their employment prospects. (S41)

Not achieved

Recommendations

All prisoners should have the opportunity to access daily association, including showers and telephone calls. (3.4)

Not achieved

The prison should further improve its collection and analysis of learning and skills data to inform strategic planning. (3.16)

Partially achieved

All the actions in the learning and skills quality development plan should be completed. (3.17)

Not achieved

There should be more opportunities for prisoners to follow accredited essential and other workplace skills across the prison. (3.23)

Not achieved

All new arrivals should have an education assessment on induction and the results should inform the planning of teaching, learning and support. (3.28)

Partially achieved

The quality of teaching and assessment should be improved so that all lessons are of a good or better standard. (3.29)

Not achieved

Progression rates for all prisoners should be improved. (3.35)

Not achieved

Staffing in the library should be improved to ensure reasonable access for all prisoners. (3.40)

Achieved

The range of physical activities should be improved to meet the needs of all prisoners. (3.45)

Partially achieved

There should be more opportunities for prisoners to accredit their learning in PE and develop their essential skills. (3.46)

Not achieved

Resettlement

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

*At our last inspection in 2014, there was no clear strategic direction for resettlement work, compounded by a lack of strategic meetings in the previous six months. Not all prisoners had their needs assessed initially, especially those serving short sentences. The quality of assessments and sentence plans were too variable, and quality assurance and casework supervision was limited. Contact between prisoners and offender supervisors was not focused enough. Although risk management planning was weak overall, public protection arrangements were good. All prisoners received a pre-release assessment and most resettlement pathway work was appropriate. Relatively few prisoners were released without accommodation, and the children's and families pathway provision was particularly good. The prison exceeded its target for prisoners going into education, training and employment, but preparation for release needed developing. Opportunities for offending behaviour work were limited. **Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***

Main recommendation

The reducing reoffending strategy and action plan should be updated to reflect the offending behaviour and resettlement needs of all prisoners held at Swansea, including those on short sentences and remand. Prisoner outcomes should be monitored to ensure that need is met. (S42)

Not achieved

Recommendations

Prisoners should be transferred quickly to an appropriate prison to enable them to progress. (4.22)

Not achieved

The prison's resettlement policy team should introduce an effective strategy for the transition of Swansea to a resettlement prison. (4.4)

No longer relevant

All new arrivals should be appropriately assessed for their initial resettlement and offending behaviour needs. (4.13)

Not achieved

All case managers should have the appropriate knowledge and skills to assess and manage prisoner risk of harm confidently. (4.14)

Not achieved

Joint working and communication between the offender management unit and offender managers in the community should be improved. (4.15)

Not achieved

Offender supervisors should receive regular casework supervision and appropriate training to ensure high quality outcomes for prisoners in all aspects of offender management and resettlement. Quality assurance should be introduced to support quality improvement. (4.16)

Not achieved

There should be a formal process to ensure the appropriate escalation of concern when there are delays in prisoner assessments by offender managers, including OASys and home detention curfew reports. (4.17)

Not achieved

The closed visits booths should be relocated out of sight of the main visits area. (4.40)

Not achieved

The prison should identify the offending behaviour needs of prisoners during initial sentence planning, and arrange to meet those needs without delay. (4.44)

Not achieved

Appendix III: Prison population profile

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

Population breakdown by:

| Status | 18–20 yr olds | 21 and over | % |
|-----------------------|---------------|-------------|------|
| Sentenced | 20 | 257 | 60.5 |
| Recall | 3 | 31 | 7.4 |
| Convicted unsentenced | 5 | 34 | 8.5 |
| Remand | 11 | 84 | 20.7 |
| Civil prisoners | 1 | 2 | |
| Detainees | | | |
| Total | 40 | 408 | |

| Sentence | 18–20 yr olds | 21 and over | % |
|---|---------------|-------------|------------|
| Unsentenced | 18 | 125 | 31.4 |
| Less than six months | 10 | 93 | 22.5 |
| six months to less than 12 months | 3 | 50 | 11.6 |
| 12 months to less than 2 years | 2 | 52 | 11.8 |
| 2 years to less than 4 years | 6 | 57 | |
| 4 years to less than 10 years | 1 | 24 | 5.5 |
| 10 years and over (not life) | 0 | 6 | 1.3 |
| ISPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection) | 0 | 6 | 1.3 |
| Life | 0 | 5 | 2.0 |
| Total | 40 | 418 | 100 |

| Age | Number of prisoners | % |
|--------------------------------|---------------------|------------|
| Please state minimum age here: | 18 | |
| Under 21 years | 40 | 8.7 |
| 21 years to 29 years | 141 | 30.8 |
| 30 years to 39 years | 167 | 36.5 |
| 40 years to 49 years | 89 | 19.4 |
| 50 years to 59 years | 16 | 3.5 |
| 60 years to 69 years | 5 | 1.1 |
| 70 plus years | | |
| Please state maximum age here: | 68 | |
| Total | 458 | 100 |

| Nationality | 18–20 yr olds | 21 and over | % |
|-------------------|---------------|-------------|------|
| British | 37 | 391 | 93.4 |
| Foreign nationals | 2 | 25 | 5.9 |
| Total | 39 | 416 | |

| Security category | 18–20 yr olds | 21 and over | % |
|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|----------|
| Uncategorised unsentenced | 18 | 124 | 31 |
| Uncategorised sentenced | | | |
| Category A | | | |
| Category B | | 9 | 2.0 |
| Category C | 2 | 242 | 53.3 |
| Category D | | 11 | 2.4 |
| Other | | | |
| Total | 20 | 386 | |

| Ethnicity | 18–20 yr olds | 21 and over | % |
|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|------------|
| White | | | |
| British | 29 | 362 | 85.4 |
| Irish | 1 | 1 | 0.4 |
| Gypsy/Irish Traveller | | 1 | 0.2 |
| Other white | | 8 | 1.7 |
| Mixed | | | |
| White and black Caribbean | 1 | 4 | 1.1 |
| White and black African | 0 | 1 | 0.2 |
| White and Asian | | | |
| Other mixed | | 6 | 1.3 |
| Asian or Asian British | | | |
| Indian | 1 | 4 | 1.1 |
| Pakistani | | 2 | 0.4 |
| Bangladeshi | 1 | 1 | 0.4 |
| Chinese | | 1 | 0.2 |
| Other Asian | 2 | 2 | 0.9 |
| Black or black British | | | |
| Caribbean | 1 | 4 | 1.1 |
| African | | 7 | 1.5 |
| Other black | 2 | 3 | 1.1 |
| Other ethnic group | | | |
| Arab | | 3 | 0.7 |
| Other ethnic group | 1 | 7 | 1.7 |
| Not stated | 1 | 1 | 0.4 |
| Total | 40 | 418 | 100 |

| Religion | 18–20 yr olds | 21 and over | % |
|-------------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|
| Baptist | | 1 | 0.2 |
| Church of England | 1 | 18 | 4.1 |
| Roman Catholic | 2 | 63 | 14.2 |
| Other Christian denominations | 3 | 73 | 16.6 |
| Muslim | 5 | 24 | 6.3 |
| Sikh | | 3 | 0.7 |
| Hindu | | | |
| Buddhist | 1 | 4 | 1.1 |
| Jewish | | | |
| Other | 1 | 6 | 1.5 |
| No religion | 25 | 222 | |
| Total | 38 | 414 | 98.7 |

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

Sentenced prisoners only

| Length of stay | 18–20 yr olds | | 21 and over | |
|------------------------|---------------|------------|-------------|-------------|
| | Number | % | Number | % |
| Less than 1 month | 8 | 1.7 | 96 | 21 |
| 1 month to 3 months | 10 | 2.2 | 128 | 27.9 |
| 3 months to six months | 3 | 0.7 | 36 | 7.9 |
| six months to 1 year | 1 | 0.2 | 22 | 4.8 |
| 1 year to 2 years | 0 | 0 | 9 | 2.0 |
| 2 years to 4 years | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.2 |
| 4 years or more | | | | |
| Total | 22 | 4.8 | 292 | 63.8 |

Sentenced prisoners only

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

Unsentenced prisoners only

| Length of stay | 18–20 yr olds | | 21 and over | |
|------------------------|---------------|------------|-------------|-------------|
| | Number | % | Number | % |
| Less than 1 month | 8 | 5.6 | 53 | 36.8 |
| 1 month to 3 months | 9 | 6.3 | 51 | 35.4 |
| 3 months to six months | 1 | 0.7 | 19 | 13.2 |
| six months to 1 year | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2.1 |
| 1 year to 2 years | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 years to 4 years | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 years or more | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 18 | 3.9 | 126 | 27.5 |

| Main offence | 18–20 yr olds | 21 and over | % |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|----------|
| Violence against the person | | | |
| Sexual offences | | | |
| Burglary | | | |
| Robbery | | | |
| Theft and handling | | | |
| Fraud and forgery | | | |
| Drugs offences | | | |
| Other offences | | | |
| Civil offences | | | |
| Offence not recorded /holding warrant | | | |
| Total | | | |

Appendix IV: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews

Prisoner survey methodology

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

Sampling

The prisoner survey was conducted on a representative sample of the prison population. Using a robust statistical formula provided by a government department statistician we calculated the sample size required to ensure that our survey findings reflected the experiences of the entire population of the establishment¹⁸. 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 7 August 2017 the prisoner population at HMP Swansea was 471. Using the method described above, questionnaires were distributed to a sample of 188 prisoners.

We received a total of 164 completed questionnaires, a response rate of 87%. This included two questionnaires completed via interview. Eight respondents refused to complete a questionnaire and 16 questionnaires were not returned.

¹⁸ 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 | 58 |
| B | 18 |
| C | 11 |
| D | 41 |
| F | 19 |
| G | 16 |
| Segregation unit (E) | 1 |

Presentation of survey results and analyses

Over the following pages we present the survey results for HMP Swansea.

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 differences¹⁹ 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 Swansea in 2017 compared with responses from prisoners surveyed in all other local prisons. This comparator is based on all responses from prisoner surveys carried out in 33 local prisons since April 2014.
- The current survey responses from HMP Swansea in 2017 compared with the responses of prisoners surveyed at HMP Swansea in 2014.
- A comparison within the 2017 survey between the responses of white prisoners and those from a black and minority ethnic group.
- A comparison within the 2017 survey between those who are British and those who are foreign nationals.
- A comparison within the 2017 survey between the responses of prisoners who consider themselves to have a disability and those who do not consider themselves to have a disability.
- A comparison within the 2017 survey between responses of prisoners who are unsentenced and those who are sentenced.

¹⁹ 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.

Survey summary

Section I: About You

| | | |
|-------------|--|-----------|
| Q1.1 | What wing or houseblock are you currently living on? See survey methodology. | |
| Q1.2 | How old are you? | |
| | Under 21 | 16 (10%) |
| | 21 - 29..... | 44 (27%) |
| | 30 - 39..... | 62 (38%) |
| | 40 - 49..... | 34 (21%) |
| | 50 - 59..... | 5 (3%) |
| | 60 - 69..... | 1 (1%) |
| | 70 and over | 0 (0%) |
| Q1.3 | Are you sentenced? | |
| | Yes | 98 (60%) |
| | Yes - on recall..... | 13 (8%) |
| | No - awaiting trial..... | 37 (23%) |
| | No - awaiting sentence | 15 (9%) |
| | No - awaiting deportation..... | 0 (0%) |
| Q1.4 | How long is your sentence? | |
| | Not sentenced..... | 52 (33%) |
| | Less than 6 months..... | 39 (25%) |
| | 6 months to less than 1 year | 19 (12%) |
| | 1 year to less than 2 years | 14 (9%) |
| | 2 years to less than 4 years | 18 (11%) |
| | 4 years to less than 10 years..... | 9 (6%) |
| | 10 years or more..... | 2 (1%) |
| | IPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection) | 4 (3%) |
| | Life..... | 1 (1%) |
| Q1.5 | Are you a foreign national (i.e. do not have UK citizenship)? | |
| | Yes | 17 (10%) |
| | No..... | 146 (90%) |
| Q1.6 | Do you understand spoken English? | |
| | Yes..... | 160 (99%) |
| | No..... | 2 (1%) |
| Q1.7 | Do you understand written English? | |
| | Yes | 159 (98%) |
| | No..... | 3 (2%) |

| | | | |
|--------------|--|-----------|---|
| Q1.8 | What is your ethnic origin? | | |
| | White - British (English/ Welsh/ Scottish/ Northern Irish)..... | 132 (83%) | Asian or Asian British - Chinese 1 (1%) |
| | White - Irish | 2 (1%) | Asian or Asian British - other..... 0 (0%) |
| | White - other..... | 9 (6%) | Mixed race - white and black Caribbean. 3 (2%) |
| | Black or black British - Caribbean..... | 3 (2%) | Mixed race - white and black African 1 (1%) |
| | Black or black British - African | 6 (4%) | Mixed race - white and Asian |
| | Black or black British - other | 0 (0%) | Mixed race - other..... 0 (0%) |
| | Asian or Asian British - Indian | 0 (0%) | Arab..... 0 (0%) |
| | Asian or Asian British - Pakistani..... | 0 (0%) | Other ethnic group |
| | Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi..... | 2 (1%) | 1 (1%) |
| Q1.9 | Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller? | | |
| | Yes | | 3 (2%) |
| | No..... | | 153 (98%) |
| Q1.10 | What is your religion? | | |
| | None..... | 83 (52%) | Hindu |
| | Church of England | 27 (17%) | Jewish |
| | Catholic | 24 (15%) | Muslim |
| | Protestant..... | 2 (1%) | Sikh..... |
| | Other Christian denomination | 11 (7%) | Other |
| | Buddhist..... | 1 (1%) | 4 (2%) |
| Q1.11 | How would you describe your sexual orientation? | | |
| | Heterosexual/ Straight | | 158 (99%) |
| | Homosexual/Gay..... | | 0 (0%) |
| | Bisexual..... | | 1 (1%) |
| Q1.12 | Do you consider yourself to have a disability (i.e do you need help with any long term physical, mental or learning needs)? | | |
| | Yes | | 62 (38%) |
| | No..... | | 100 (62%) |
| Q1.13 | Are you a veteran (ex- armed services)? | | |
| | Yes | | 9 (6%) |
| | No..... | | 152 (94%) |
| Q1.14 | Is this your first time in prison? | | |
| | Yes | | 46 (28%) |
| | No..... | | 116 (72%) |
| Q1.15 | Do you have children under the age of 18? | | |
| | Yes | | 88 (54%) |
| | No..... | | 75 (46%) |

Section 2: Courts, transfers and escorts

| | | | |
|-------------|---|--|-----------|
| Q2.1 | On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van? | | |
| | Less than 2 hours | | 107 (66%) |
| | 2 hours or longer | | 47 (29%) |
| | Don't remember | | 9 (6%) |

| | | |
|-------------|--|-----------|
| 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> | 107 (66%) |
| | Yes | 19 (12%) |
| | No..... | 29 (18%) |
| | <i>Don't remember</i> | 7 (4%) |
| Q2.3 | On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break? | |
| | <i>My journey was less than two hours</i> | 107 (66%) |
| | Yes | 2 (1%) |
| | No..... | 51 (31%) |
| | <i>Don't remember</i> | 3 (2%) |
| Q2.4 | On your most recent journey here, was the van clean? | |
| | Yes | 96 (59%) |
| | No..... | 56 (34%) |
| | <i>Don't remember</i> | 11 (7%) |
| Q2.5 | On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe? | |
| | Yes | 126 (78%) |
| | No..... | 29 (18%) |
| | <i>Don't remember</i> | 6 (4%) |
| Q2.6 | On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff? | |
| | <i>Very well</i> | 58 (36%) |
| | <i>Well</i> | 56 (35%) |
| | <i>Neither</i> | 29 (18%) |
| | <i>Badly</i> | 7 (4%) |
| | <i>Very badly</i> | 7 (4%) |
| | <i>Don't remember</i> | 4 (2%) |
| Q2.7 | Before you arrived, were you given anything or told that you were coming here? (Please tick all that apply to you.) | |
| | <i>Yes, someone told me</i> | 119 (73%) |
| | <i>Yes, I received written information</i> | 2 (1%) |
| | <i>No, I was not told anything</i> | 36 (22%) |
| | <i>Don't remember</i> | 7 (4%) |
| Q2.8 | When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you? | |
| | Yes | 132 (81%) |
| | No..... | 23 (14%) |
| | <i>Don't remember</i> | 7 (4%) |

Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

| | | |
|-------------|--|-----------|
| Q3.1 | How long were you in reception? | |
| | <i>Less than 2 hours</i> | 104 (63%) |
| | <i>2 hours or longer</i> | 48 (29%) |
| | <i>Don't remember</i> | 12 (7%) |
| Q3.2 | When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way? | |
| | Yes | 137 (84%) |
| | No | 20 (12%) |
| | <i>Don't remember</i> | 6 (4%) |

| | | |
|-------------|---|-----------|
| Q3.3 | Overall, how were you treated in reception? | |
| | Very well..... | 61 (37%) |
| | Well..... | 67 (41%) |
| | Neither..... | 19 (12%) |
| | Badly..... | 10 (6%) |
| | Very badly..... | 4 (2%) |
| | Don't remember..... | 3 (2%) |
| Q3.4 | Did you have any of the following problems when you first arrived here? (Please tick all that apply to you.) | |
| | Loss of property..... | 26 (16%) |
| | Housing problems..... | 39 (24%) |
| | Contacting employers..... | 11 (7%) |
| | Contacting family..... | 72 (45%) |
| | Childcare..... | 3 (2%) |
| | Money worries..... | 44 (28%) |
| | Feeling depressed or suicidal..... | 52 (33%) |
| | Physical health..... | 30 (19%) |
| | Mental health..... | 69 (43%) |
| | Needing protection from other prisoners..... | 9 (6%) |
| | Getting phone numbers..... | 62 (39%) |
| | Other..... | 7 (4%) |
| | Did not have any problems..... | 30 (19%) |
| Q3.5 | Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems when you first arrived here? | |
| | Yes..... | 46 (29%) |
| | No..... | 82 (52%) |
| | Did not have any problems..... | 30 (19%) |
| Q3.6 | When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.) | |
| | Tobacco..... | 2 (1%) |
| | A shower..... | 29 (18%) |
| | A free telephone call..... | 37 (23%) |
| | Something to eat..... | 104 (65%) |
| | PIN phone credit..... | 80 (50%) |
| | Toiletries/ basic items..... | 80 (50%) |
| | Did not receive anything..... | 27 (17%) |
| 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..... | 52 (32%) |
| | Someone from health services..... | 96 (60%) |
| | A Listener/Samaritans..... | 59 (37%) |
| | Prison shop/ canteen..... | 29 (18%) |
| | Did not have access to any of these..... | 36 (22%) |
| 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..... | 56 (36%) |
| | What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal..... | 67 (43%) |
| | How to make routine requests (applications)..... | 49 (32%) |
| | Your entitlement to visits..... | 43 (28%) |
| | Health services..... | 63 (41%) |
| | Chaplaincy..... | 51 (33%) |
| | Not offered any information..... | 50 (32%) |
| Q3.9 | Did you feel safe on your first night here? | |
| | Yes..... | 118 (73%) |
| | No..... | 36 (22%) |
| | Don't remember..... | 7 (4%) |

| | | |
|--------------|---|----------|
| Q3.10 | How soon after you arrived here did you go on an induction course? | |
| | <i>Have not been on an induction course</i> | 40 (25%) |
| | <i>Within the first week</i> | 59 (37%) |
| | <i>More than a week</i> | 50 (31%) |
| | <i>Don't remember</i> | 12 (7%) |
| Q3.11 | Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison? | |
| | <i>Have not been on an induction course</i> | 40 (26%) |
| | <i>Yes</i> | 48 (31%) |
| | <i>No</i> | 57 (37%) |
| | <i>Don't remember</i> | 11 (7%) |
| Q3.12 | How soon after you arrived here did you receive an education ('skills for life') assessment? | |
| | <i>Did not receive an assessment</i> | 28 (18%) |
| | <i>Within the first week</i> | 39 (25%) |
| | <i>More than a week</i> | 82 (52%) |
| | <i>Don't remember</i> | 8 (5%) |

Section 4: Legal rights and respectful custody

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------|--|------------------|-------------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------------|------------|
| Q4.1 | How easy is it to..... | | | | | | |
| | | <i>Very easy</i> | <i>Easy</i> | <i>Neither</i> | <i>Difficult</i> | <i>Very difficult</i> | <i>N/A</i> |
| | <i>Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?</i> | 13 (8%) | 32 (20%) | 19 (12%) | 35 (22%) | 29 (18%) | 30 (19%) |
| | <i>Attend legal visits?</i> | 18 (12%) | 42 (28%) | 19 (13%) | 18 (12%) | 19 (13%) | 33 (22%) |
| | <i>Get bail information?</i> | 5 (3%) | 17 (12%) | 16 (11%) | 30 (21%) | 29 (20%) | 49 (34%) |
| Q4.2 | Have staff here ever opened letters from your solicitor or your legal representative when you were not with them? | | | | | | |
| | <i>Not had any letters</i> | | | | | | 32 (20%) |
| | <i>Yes</i> | | | | | | 71 (45%) |
| | <i>No</i> | | | | | | 55 (35%) |
| Q4.3 | Can you get legal books in the library? | | | | | | |
| | <i>Yes</i> | | | | | | 58 (37%) |
| | <i>No</i> | | | | | | 30 (19%) |
| | <i>Don't know</i> | | | | | | 70 (44%) |
| Q4.4 | Please answer the following questions about the wing/unit you are currently living on: | | | | | | |
| | | <i>Yes</i> | <i>No</i> | <i>Don't know</i> | | | |
| | <i>Do you normally have enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?</i> | 52 (33%) | 106 (67%) | 1 (1%) | | | |
| | <i>Are you normally able to have a shower every day?</i> | 103 (65%) | 53 (34%) | 2 (1%) | | | |
| | <i>Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?</i> | 102 (65%) | 51 (32%) | 4 (3%) | | | |
| | <i>Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?</i> | 75 (47%) | 77 (49%) | 6 (4%) | | | |
| | <i>Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?</i> | 42 (26%) | 106 (66%) | 12 (8%) | | | |
| | <i>Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?</i> | 80 (52%) | 74 (48%) | 1 (1%) | | | |
| | <i>If you need to, can you normally get your stored property?</i> | 23 (15%) | 86 (55%) | 46 (30%) | | | |

| | | |
|--------------|---|-----------|
| Q4.5 | What is the food like here? | |
| | Very good..... | 7 (4%) |
| | Good..... | 28 (17%) |
| | Neither..... | 49 (30%) |
| | Bad..... | 39 (24%) |
| | Very bad..... | 38 (24%) |
| Q4.6 | Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs? | |
| | Have not bought anything yet/ don't know..... | 17 (11%) |
| | Yes..... | 106 (67%) |
| | No..... | 36 (23%) |
| Q4.7 | Can you speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to? | |
| | Yes..... | 87 (54%) |
| | No..... | 26 (16%) |
| | Don't know..... | 48 (30%) |
| Q4.8 | Are your religious beliefs respected? | |
| | Yes..... | 55 (35%) |
| | No..... | 25 (16%) |
| | Don't know/ N/A..... | 78 (49%) |
| Q4.9 | Are you able to speak to a Chaplain of your faith in private if you want to? | |
| | Yes..... | 68 (42%) |
| | No..... | 19 (12%) |
| | Don't know/ N/A..... | 74 (46%) |
| Q4.10 | How easy or difficult is it for you to attend religious services? | |
| | I don't want to attend..... | 38 (24%) |
| | Very easy..... | 36 (23%) |
| | Easy..... | 27 (17%) |
| | Neither..... | 11 (7%) |
| | Difficult..... | 10 (6%) |
| | Very difficult..... | 5 (3%) |
| | Don't know..... | 33 (21%) |

Section 5: Applications and complaints

| | | | | |
|-------------|---|-----------------|----------|----------|
| Q5.1 | Is it easy to make an application? | | | |
| | Yes..... | 107 (67%) | | |
| | No..... | 42 (26%) | | |
| | Don't know..... | 11 (7%) | | |
| 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 | | |
| | Are applications dealt with fairly? | 22 (14%) | 68 (44%) | 64 (42%) |
| | Are applications dealt with quickly (within seven days)? | 22 (15%) | 46 (32%) | 76 (53%) |
| Q5.3 | Is it easy to make a complaint? | | | |
| | Yes..... | 71 (45%) | | |
| | No..... | 34 (22%) | | |
| | Don't know..... | 52 (33%) | | |

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

| | Not made one | Yes | No |
|--|-----------------|----------|----------|
| Are complaints dealt with fairly? | 86 (55%) | 23 (15%) | 48 (31%) |
| Are complaints dealt with quickly (within seven days)? | 86 (57%) | 15 (10%) | 50 (33%) |

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

| | |
|-----------|-----------|
| Yes | 32 (21%) |
| No..... | 117 (79%) |

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

| | |
|------------------------------|----------|
| Don't know who they are..... | 71 (46%) |
| Very easy..... | 10 (7%) |
| Easy..... | 15 (10%) |
| Neither..... | 24 (16%) |
| Difficult..... | 16 (10%) |
| Very difficult..... | 17 (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.)**

| | |
|--|----------|
| Don't know what the IEP scheme is..... | 34 (22%) |
| Yes | 59 (39%) |
| No | 34 (22%) |
| Don't know | 26 (17%) |

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

| | |
|--|----------|
| Don't know what the IEP scheme is..... | 34 (22%) |
| Yes | 52 (34%) |
| No..... | 52 (34%) |
| Don't know | 15 (10%) |

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

| | |
|-----------|-----------|
| Yes | 16 (10%) |
| No..... | 140 (90%) |

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 have not been to segregation in the last 6 months | 122 (79%) |
| Very well..... | 3 (2%) |
| Well..... | 4 (3%) |
| Neither..... | 9 (6%) |
| Badly..... | 8 (5%) |
| Very badly | 9 (6%) |

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

| | |
|-----------|-----------|
| Yes | 123 (78%) |
| No..... | 34 (22%) |

| | | |
|-------------|--|-----------|
| Q7.2 | Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem? | |
| | Yes | 121 (79%) |
| | No..... | 33 (21%) |
| Q7.3 | Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on? | |
| | Yes | 44 (28%) |
| | No..... | 115 (72%) |
| Q7.4 | How often do staff normally speak to you during association? | |
| | <i>Do not go on association</i> | 8 (5%) |
| | <i>Never</i> | 41 (26%) |
| | <i>Rarely</i> | 36 (23%) |
| | <i>Some of the time</i> | 35 (22%) |
| | <i>Most of the time</i> | 26 (17%) |
| | <i>All of the time</i> | 10 (6%) |
| Q7.5 | When did you first meet your personal (named) officer? | |
| | <i>I have not met him/her</i> | 130 (82%) |
| | <i>In the first week</i> | 13 (8%) |
| | <i>More than a week</i> | 6 (4%) |
| | <i>Don't remember</i> | 10 (6%) |
| Q7.6 | How helpful is your personal (named) officer? | |
| | <i>Do not have a personal officer/ I have not met him/ her</i> | 130 (83%) |
| | <i>Very helpful</i> | 13 (8%) |
| | <i>Helpful</i> | 6 (4%) |
| | <i>Neither</i> | 5 (3%) |
| | <i>Not very helpful</i> | 1 (1%) |
| | <i>Not at all helpful</i> | 1 (1%) |

Section 8: Safety

| | | | | |
|-------------|--|-----------|--------------------------------------|---------|
| Q8.1 | Have you ever felt unsafe here? | | | |
| | Yes | 61 (38%) | | |
| | No..... | 99 (62%) | | |
| Q8.2 | Do you feel unsafe now? | | | |
| | Yes | 25 (16%) | | |
| | No..... | 132 (84%) | | |
| Q8.3 | In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.) | | | |
| | <i>Never felt unsafe</i> | 99 (64%) | <i>At meal times</i> | 10 (6%) |
| | <i>Everywhere</i> | 26 (17%) | <i>At health services</i> | 5 (3%) |
| | <i>Segregation unit</i> | 6 (4%) | <i>Visits area</i> | 9 (6%) |
| | <i>Association areas</i> | 14 (9%) | <i>In wing showers</i> | 14 (9%) |
| | <i>Reception area</i> | 4 (3%) | <i>In gym showers</i> | 6 (4%) |
| | <i>At the gym</i> | 4 (3%) | <i>In corridors/stairwells</i> | 11 (7%) |
| | <i>In an exercise yard</i> | 16 (10%) | <i>On your landing/wing</i> | 11 (7%) |
| | <i>At work</i> | 7 (5%) | <i>In your cell</i> | 13 (8%) |
| | <i>During movement</i> | 14 (9%) | <i>At religious services</i> | 2 (1%) |
| | <i>At education</i> | 6 (4%) | | |

| | | |
|-------------|--|-----------|
| Q8.4 | Have you been victimised by other prisoners here? | |
| | Yes | 34 (22%) |
| | No..... | 124 (78%) |
| 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> | 20 (13%) |
| | <i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i> | 12 (8%) |
| | <i>Sexual abuse</i> | 2 (1%) |
| | <i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i> | 20 (13%) |
| | <i>Having your canteen/property taken</i> | 11 (7%) |
| | <i>Medication</i> | 11 (7%) |
| | <i>Debt</i> | 8 (5%) |
| | <i>Drugs</i> | 11 (7%) |
| | <i>Your race or ethnic origin</i> | 8 (5%) |
| | <i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i> | 8 (5%) |
| | <i>Your nationality</i> | 5 (3%) |
| | <i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i> | 8 (5%) |
| | <i>You are from a traveller community</i> | 1 (1%) |
| | <i>Your sexual orientation</i> | 1 (1%) |
| | <i>Your age</i> | 4 (3%) |
| | <i>You have a disability</i> | 8 (5%) |
| | <i>You were new here</i> | 13 (8%) |
| | <i>Your offence/ crime</i> | 6 (4%) |
| | <i>Gang related issues</i> | 8 (5%) |
| Q8.6 | Have you been victimised by staff here? | |
| | Yes | 36 (23%) |
| | No..... | 119 (77%) |
| 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> | 15 (10%) |
| | <i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i> | 5 (3%) |
| | <i>Sexual abuse</i> | 1 (1%) |
| | <i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i> | 20 (13%) |
| | <i>Medication</i> | 6 (4%) |
| | <i>Debt</i> | 1 (1%) |
| | <i>Drugs</i> | 6 (4%) |
| | <i>Your race or ethnic origin</i> | 7 (5%) |
| | <i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i> | 4 (3%) |
| | <i>Your nationality</i> | 3 (2%) |
| | <i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i> | 5 (3%) |
| | <i>You are from a traveller community</i> | 0 (0%) |
| | <i>Your sexual orientation</i> | 0 (0%) |
| | <i>Your age</i> | 5 (3%) |
| | <i>You have a disability</i> | 5 (3%) |
| | <i>You were new here</i> | 7 (5%) |
| | <i>Your offence/ crime</i> | 7 (5%) |
| | <i>Gang related issues</i> | 2 (1%) |
| Q8.8 | If you have been victimised by prisoners or staff, did you report it? | |
| | <i>Not been victimised</i> | 104 (71%) |
| | <i>Yes</i> | 13 (9%) |
| | <i>No</i> | 29 (20%) |

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 | 23 (15%) | 11 (7%) | 12 (8%) | 16 (11%) | 43 (28%) | 47 (31%) |
| | The nurse | 16 (11%) | 26 (17%) | 51 (34%) | 13 (9%) | 24 (16%) | 19 (13%) |
| | The dentist | 33 (22%) | 4 (3%) | 4 (3%) | 6 (4%) | 32 (22%) | 69 (47%) |
| 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 | 41 (27%) | 14 (9%) | 30 (19%) | 22 (14%) | 23 (15%) | 24 (16%) |
| | The nurse | 22 (15%) | 34 (23%) | 45 (30%) | 20 (13%) | 18 (12%) | 11 (7%) |
| | The dentist | 67 (47%) | 8 (6%) | 12 (8%) | 14 (10%) | 14 (10%) | 29 (20%) |
| Q9.3 | What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here? | | | | | | |
| | <i>Not been</i> | | | | | | 13 (9%) |
| | <i>Very good</i> | | | | | | 18 (12%) |
| | <i>Good</i> | | | | | | 31 (21%) |
| | <i>Neither</i> | | | | | | 34 (23%) |
| | <i>Bad</i> | | | | | | 27 (18%) |
| | <i>Very bad</i> | | | | | | 27 (18%) |
| Q9.4 | Are you currently taking medication? | | | | | | |
| | Yes | | | | | | 100 (65%) |
| | No..... | | | | | | 53 (35%) |
| 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> | | | | | | 53 (34%) |
| | <i>Yes, all my meds</i> | | | | | | 29 (19%) |
| | <i>Yes, some of my meds</i> | | | | | | 26 (17%) |
| | <i>No</i> | | | | | | 47 (30%) |
| Q9.6 | Do you have any emotional or mental health problems? | | | | | | |
| | Yes | | | | | | 94 (62%) |
| | No..... | | | | | | 58 (38%) |
| 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> | | | | | | 58 (38%) |
| | Yes | | | | | | 34 (22%) |
| | No..... | | | | | | 60 (39%) |

Section 10: Drugs and alcohol

| | | |
|--------------|--|-----------|
| Q10.1 | Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison? | |
| | Yes | 83 (53%) |
| | No..... | 73 (47%) |
| Q10.2 | Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison? | |
| | Yes | 49 (31%) |
| | No..... | 107 (69%) |

| | | |
|--------------|--|-----------|
| Q10.3 | Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison? | |
| | Very easy..... | 39 (25%) |
| | Easy..... | 23 (15%) |
| | Neither..... | 17 (11%) |
| | Difficult..... | 10 (6%) |
| | Very difficult..... | 9 (6%) |
| | Don't know..... | 58 (37%) |
| Q10.4 | Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison? | |
| | Very easy..... | 12 (8%) |
| | Easy..... | 21 (14%) |
| | Neither..... | 12 (8%) |
| | Difficult..... | 6 (4%) |
| | Very difficult..... | 24 (15%) |
| | Don't know..... | 80 (52%) |
| Q10.5 | Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison? | |
| | Yes..... | 26 (17%) |
| | No..... | 127 (83%) |
| Q10.6 | Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison? | |
| | Yes..... | 23 (15%) |
| | No..... | 131 (85%) |
| Q10.7 | Have you received any support or help (for example substance misuse teams) for your drug problem, while in this prison? | |
| | Did not / do not have a drug problem..... | 59 (41%) |
| | Yes..... | 35 (24%) |
| | No..... | 51 (35%) |
| Q10.8 | Have you received any support or help (for example substance misuse teams) for your alcohol problem, whilst in this prison? | |
| | Did not / do not have an alcohol problem..... | 107 (69%) |
| | Yes..... | 15 (10%) |
| | No..... | 33 (21%) |
| Q10.9 | Was the support or help you received, whilst in this prison, helpful? | |
| | Did not have a problem/ did not receive help..... | 107 (71%) |
| | Yes..... | 30 (20%) |
| | No..... | 13 (9%) |

Section 11: 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 | 20 (13%) | 16 (11%) | 40 (27%) | 22 (15%) | 33 (22%) | 18 (12%) |
| | Vocational or skills training | 34 (24%) | 15 (11%) | 31 (22%) | 21 (15%) | 25 (18%) | 13 (9%) |
| | Education (including basic skills) | 26 (18%) | 24 (17%) | 45 (32%) | 19 (13%) | 17 (12%) | 10 (7%) |
| | Offending behaviour programmes | 51 (36%) | 8 (6%) | 10 (7%) | 27 (19%) | 22 (15%) | 24 (17%) |

| | | | | | |
|--------------|---|--------------------------|------------|-----------|-------------------|
| Q11.2 | Are you currently involved in the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.) | | | | |
| | <i>Not involved in any of these</i> | | | | 47 (33%) |
| | Prison job | | | | 69 (48%) |
| | Vocational or skills training..... | | | | 7 (5%) |
| | Education (including basic skills)..... | | | | 31 (22%) |
| | Offending behaviour programmes | | | | 11 (8%) |
| 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 | 46 (33%) | 31 (22%) | 47 (34%) | 15 (11%) |
| | Vocational or skills training | 56 (48%) | 19 (16%) | 27 (23%) | 15 (13%) |
| | Education (including basic skills) | 48 (38%) | 39 (31%) | 25 (20%) | 14 (11%) |
| | Offending behaviour programmes | 66 (55%) | 20 (17%) | 24 (20%) | 11 (9%) |
| Q11.4 | How often do you usually go to the library? | | | | |
| | <i>Don't want to go</i> | | | | 32 (21%) |
| | <i>Never</i> | | | | 68 (44%) |
| | <i>Less than once a week</i> | | | | 35 (23%) |
| | <i>About once a week</i> | | | | 12 (8%) |
| | <i>More than once a week</i> | | | | 6 (4%) |
| Q11.5 | Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs? | | | | |
| | <i>Don't use it</i> | | | | 70 (47%) |
| | <i>Yes</i> | | | | 54 (36%) |
| | <i>No</i> | | | | 26 (17%) |
| Q11.6 | How many times do you usually go to the gym each week? | | | | |
| | <i>Don't want to go</i> | | | | 38 (25%) |
| | <i>0</i> | | | | 33 (22%) |
| | <i>1 to 2</i> | | | | 35 (23%) |
| | <i>3 to 5</i> | | | | 43 (28%) |
| | <i>More than 5</i> | | | | 3 (2%) |
| Q11.7 | How many times do you usually go outside for exercise each week? | | | | |
| | <i>Don't want to go</i> | | | | 11 (7%) |
| | <i>0</i> | | | | 10 (6%) |
| | <i>1 to 2</i> | | | | 39 (25%) |
| | <i>3 to 5</i> | | | | 64 (41%) |
| | <i>More than 5</i> | | | | 31 (20%) |
| Q11.8 | How many times do you usually have association each week? | | | | |
| | <i>Don't want to go</i> | | | | 7 (5%) |
| | <i>0</i> | | | | 12 (8%) |
| | <i>1 to 2</i> | | | | 65 (42%) |
| | <i>3 to 5</i> | | | | 34 (22%) |
| | <i>More than 5</i> | | | | 37 (24%) |

| | | |
|--------------|---|----------|
| 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> | 64 (41%) |
| | <i>2 to less than 4 hours</i> | 24 (15%) |
| | <i>4 to less than 6 hours</i> | 18 (12%) |
| | <i>6 to less than 8 hours</i> | 19 (12%) |
| | <i>8 to less than 10 hours</i> | 12 (8%) |
| | <i>10 hours or more</i> | 9 (6%) |
| | <i>Don't know</i> | 9 (6%) |

Section 12: Contact with family and friends

| | | |
|--------------|---|----------|
| Q12.1 | Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with your family/friends while in this prison? | |
| | <i>Yes</i> | 56 (37%) |
| | <i>No</i> | 95 (63%) |
| Q12.2 | Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)? | |
| | <i>Yes</i> | 58 (38%) |
| | <i>No</i> | 94 (62%) |
| Q12.3 | Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones? | |
| | <i>Yes</i> | 81 (53%) |
| | <i>No</i> | 72 (47%) |
| Q12.4 | How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here? | |
| | <i>I don't get visits</i> | 27 (18%) |
| | <i>Very easy</i> | 16 (10%) |
| | <i>Easy</i> | 30 (20%) |
| | <i>Neither</i> | 17 (11%) |
| | <i>Difficult</i> | 28 (18%) |
| | <i>Very difficult</i> | 32 (21%) |
| | <i>Don't know</i> | 3 (2%) |

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> | 52 (34%) |
| | <i>Yes</i> | 67 (44%) |
| | <i>No</i> | 33 (22%) |
| 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> | 85 (56%) |
| | <i>No contact</i> | 32 (21%) |
| | <i>Letter</i> | 19 (12%) |
| | <i>Phone</i> | 8 (5%) |
| | <i>Visit</i> | 17 (11%) |
| Q13.3 | Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison? | |
| | <i>Yes</i> | 26 (18%) |
| | <i>No</i> | 121 (82%) |

| | | |
|---------------|--|-----------|
| Q13.4 | Do you have a sentence plan? | |
| | <i>Not sentenced</i> | 52 (34%) |
| | <i>Yes</i> | 23 (15%) |
| | <i>No</i> | 79 (51%) |
| Q13.5 | How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan? | |
| | <i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i> | 131 (86%) |
| | <i>Very involved</i> | 5 (3%) |
| | <i>Involved</i> | 6 (4%) |
| | <i>Neither</i> | 5 (3%) |
| | <i>Not very involved</i> | 2 (1%) |
| | <i>Not at all involved</i> | 4 (3%) |
| 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> | 131 (87%) |
| | <i>Nobody</i> | 8 (5%) |
| | <i>Offender supervisor</i> | 3 (2%) |
| | <i>Offender manager</i> | 7 (5%) |
| | <i>Named/ personal officer</i> | 2 (1%) |
| | <i>Staff from other departments</i> | 8 (5%) |
| Q13.7 | Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison? | |
| | <i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i> | 131 (85%) |
| | <i>Yes</i> | 11 (7%) |
| | <i>No</i> | 5 (3%) |
| | <i>Don't know</i> | 7 (5%) |
| 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> | 131 (84%) |
| | <i>Yes</i> | 5 (3%) |
| | <i>No</i> | 10 (6%) |
| | <i>Don't know</i> | 10 (6%) |
| 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> | 131 (86%) |
| | <i>Yes</i> | 7 (5%) |
| | <i>No</i> | 5 (3%) |
| | <i>Don't know</i> | 10 (7%) |
| Q13.10 | Do you have a needs based custody plan? | |
| | <i>Yes</i> | 13 (9%) |
| | <i>No</i> | 65 (45%) |
| | <i>Don't know</i> | 67 (46%) |
| Q13.11 | Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release? | |
| | <i>Yes</i> | 19 (13%) |
| | <i>No</i> | 125 (87%) |

**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 | 39 (28%) | 29 (21%) | 71 (51%) |
| Accommodation | 35 (25%) | 37 (27%) | 67 (48%) |
| Benefits | 33 (24%) | 36 (26%) | 68 (50%) |
| Finances | 31 (23%) | 30 (23%) | 72 (54%) |
| Education | 34 (26%) | 29 (22%) | 67 (52%) |
| Drugs and alcohol | 33 (24%) | 47 (34%) | 57 (42%) |

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> | 52 (35%) |
| <i>Yes</i> | 37 (25%) |
| <i>No</i> | 58 (39%) |

Main comparator and comparator to last time



Prisoner survey responses HMP Swansea 2017

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 Swansea 2017 | Local prisons comparator | HMP Swansea 2017 | HMP Swansea 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 | | 164 | 6,070 | 164 | 174 |
| SECTION 1: General information | | | | | |
| 1.2 | Are you under 21 years of age? | 10% | 6% | 10% | 5% |
| 1.3 | Are you sentenced? | 68% | 70% | 68% | 71% |
| 1.3 | Are you on recall? | 8% | 10% | 8% | 11% |
| 1.4 | Is your sentence less than 12 months? | 37% | 20% | 37% | 26% |
| 1.4 | Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)? | 2% | 3% | 2% | 1% |
| 1.5 | Are you a foreign national? | 11% | 13% | 11% | 2% |
| 1.6 | Do you understand spoken English? | 99% | 98% | 99% | 100% |
| 1.7 | Do you understand written English? | 98% | 96% | 98% | 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.) | 11% | 25% | 11% | 8% |
| 1.9 | Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller? | 2% | 5% | 2% | 3% |
| 1.1 | Are you Muslim? | 5% | 13% | 5% | 5% |
| 1.11 | Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual? | 1% | 3% | 1% | 2% |
| 1.12 | Do you consider yourself to have a disability? | 38% | 29% | 38% | 27% |
| 1.13 | Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)? | 6% | 6% | 6% | 6% |
| 1.14 | Is this your first time in prison? | 28% | 34% | 28% | 21% |
| 1.15 | Do you have any children under the age of 18? | 54% | 52% | 54% | 57% |
| SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts | | | | | |
| On your most recent journey here: | | | | | |
| 2.1 | Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van? | 29% | 24% | 29% | 20% |
| For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van: | | | | | |
| 2.2 | Were you offered anything to eat or drink? | 35% | 42% | 35% | 23% |
| 2.3 | Were you offered a toilet break? | 4% | 8% | 4% | 9% |
| 2.4 | Was the van clean? | 59% | 56% | 59% | 54% |
| 2.5 | Did you feel safe? | 78% | 73% | 78% | 83% |
| 2.6 | Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff? | 71% | 67% | 71% | 72% |
| 2.7 | Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here? | 73% | 63% | 73% | 74% |
| 2.7 | Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here? | 1% | 3% | 1% | 2% |
| 2.8 | When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you? | 82% | 78% | 82% | 85% |

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

| | | HMP Swansea 2017 | Local prisons comparator | HMP Swansea 2017 | HMP Swansea 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? | 63% | 39% | 63% | 70% |
| 3.2 | When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way? | 84% | 76% | 84% | 86% |
| 3.3 | Were you treated well/very well in reception? | 78% | 61% | 78% | 77% |
| | When you first arrived: | | | | |
| 3.4 | Did you have any problems? | 81% | 79% | 81% | 68% |
| 3.4 | Did you have any problems with loss of property? | 16% | 17% | 16% | 8% |
| 3.4 | Did you have any housing problems? | 24% | 23% | 24% | 27% |
| 3.4 | Did you have any problems contacting employers? | 7% | 5% | 7% | 5% |
| 3.4 | Did you have any problems contacting family? | 45% | 36% | 45% | 23% |
| 3.4 | Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after? | 2% | 3% | 2% | 5% |
| 3.4 | Did you have any money worries? | 28% | 24% | 28% | 25% |
| 3.4 | Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal? | 33% | 27% | 33% | 20% |
| 3.4 | Did you have any physical health problems? | 19% | 19% | 19% | 18% |
| 3.4 | Did you have any mental health problems? | 43% | 30% | 43% | 26% |
| 3.4 | Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners? | 6% | 10% | 6% | 5% |
| 3.4 | Did you have problems accessing phone numbers? | 39% | 33% | 39% | 24% |
| | For those with problems: | | | | |
| 3.5 | Did you receive any help/ support from staff in dealing with these problems? | 36% | 31% | 36% | 49% |
| | When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following: | | | | |
| 3.6 | Tobacco? | 1% | 75% | 1% | 93% |
| 3.6 | A shower? | 18% | 30% | 18% | 37% |
| 3.6 | A free telephone call? | 23% | 53% | 23% | 50% |
| 3.6 | Something to eat? | 65% | 71% | 65% | 74% |
| 3.6 | PIN phone credit? | 50% | 49% | 50% | 74% |
| 3.6 | Toiletries/ basic items? | 50% | 58% | 50% | 74% |

Key to tables

Main comparator and comparator to last time

| | | HMP Swansea 2017 | Local prisons comparator | HMP Swansea 2017 | HMP Swansea 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 continued | | | | | |
| | When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people: | | | | |
| 3.7 | The chaplain or a religious leader? | 32% | 45% | 32% | 57% |
| 3.7 | Someone from health services? | 60% | 65% | 60% | 73% |
| 3.7 | A Listener/Samaritans? | 37% | 30% | 37% | 51% |
| 3.7 | Prison shop/ canteen? | 18% | 22% | 18% | 21% |
| | When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following: | | | | |
| 3.8 | What was going to happen to you? | 36% | 40% | 36% | 59% |
| 3.8 | Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal? | 43% | 35% | 43% | 57% |
| 3.8 | How to make routine requests? | 32% | 33% | 32% | 56% |
| 3.8 | Your entitlement to visits? | 28% | 32% | 28% | 46% |
| 3.8 | Health services? | 41% | 43% | 41% | 54% |
| 3.8 | The chaplaincy? | 33% | 39% | 33% | 55% |
| 3.9 | Did you feel safe on your first night here? | 73% | 66% | 73% | 87% |
| 3.10 | Have you been on an induction course? | 75% | 75% | 75% | 72% |
| | For those who have been on an induction course: | | | | |
| 3.11 | Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison? | 41% | 49% | 41% | 54% |
| 3.12 | Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment? | 82% | 75% | 82% | 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? | 29% | 34% | 29% | 46% |
| 4.1 | Attend legal visits? | 40% | 48% | 40% | 61% |
| 4.1 | Get bail information? | 15% | 15% | 15% | 28% |
| 4.2 | Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them? | 45% | 41% | 45% | 56% |
| 4.3 | Can you get legal books in the library? | 37% | 34% | 37% | 41% |
| | For the wing/unit you are currently on: | | | | |
| 4.4 | Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week? | 33% | 48% | 33% | 36% |
| 4.4 | Are you normally able to have a shower every day? | 65% | 73% | 65% | 48% |
| 4.4 | Do you normally receive clean sheets every week? | 65% | 61% | 65% | 87% |
| 4.4 | Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week? | 48% | 48% | 48% | 62% |
| 4.4 | Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes? | 26% | 21% | 26% | 47% |
| 4.4 | Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time? | 52% | 54% | 52% | 63% |
| 4.4 | Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to? | 15% | 18% | 15% | 26% |
| 4.5 | Is the food in this prison good/very good? | 22% | 22% | 22% | 19% |
| 4.6 | Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs? | 67% | 47% | 67% | 59% |
| 4.7 | Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to? | 54% | 52% | 54% | 68% |
| 4.8 | Are your religious beliefs respected? | 35% | 48% | 35% | 46% |
| 4.9 | Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to? | 42% | 49% | 42% | 58% |
| 4.10 | Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services? | 39% | 44% | 39% | 53% |

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

| | | | | |
|--|------------------|--------------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better | HMP Swansea 2017 | Local prisons comparator | HMP Swansea 2017 | HMP Swansea 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 5: Applications and complaints | | | | |
| 5.1 Is it easy to make an application? | 67% | 71% | 67% | 76% |
| For those who have made an application: | | | | |
| 5.2 Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly? | 52% | 45% | 52% | 58% |
| 5.2 Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)? | 38% | 30% | 38% | 49% |
| 5.3 Is it easy to make a complaint? | 45% | 47% | 45% | 52% |
| For those who have made a complaint: | | | | |
| 5.4 Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly? | 32% | 25% | 32% | 31% |
| 5.4 Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)? | 23% | 20% | 23% | 33% |
| 5.5 Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to? | 22% | 22% | 22% | 19% |
| 5.6 Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board? | 16% | 17% | 16% | 23% |
| SECTION 6: Incentives and earned privileges scheme | | | | |
| 6.1 Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme? | 39% | 39% | 39% | 57% |
| 6.2 Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour? | 34% | 38% | 34% | 48% |
| 6.3 In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)? | 10% | 12% | 10% | 7% |
| 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? | 21% | 32% | 21% | 60% |
| SECTION 7: Relationships with staff | | | | |
| 7.1 Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect? | 78% | 71% | 78% | 74% |
| 7.2 Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem? | 79% | 67% | 79% | 77% |
| 7.3 Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on? | 28% | 27% | 28% | 35% |
| 7.4 Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association? | 23% | 17% | 23% | 16% |
| 7.5 Do you have a personal officer? | 18% | 31% | 18% | 36% |
| For those with a personal officer: | | | | |
| 7.6 Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful? | 73% | 64% | 73% | 61% |

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

| | | HMP Swansea 2017 | Local prisons comparator | HMP Swansea 2017 | HMP Swansea 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? | 38% | 53% | 38% | 28% |
| 8.2 | Do you feel unsafe now? | 16% | 25% | 16% | 12% |
| 8.4 | Have you been victimised by other prisoners here? | 22% | 33% | 22% | 19% |
| Since you have been here, have other prisoners: | | | | | |
| 8.5 | Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends? | 13% | 14% | 13% | 6% |
| 8.5 | Hit, kicked or assaulted you? | 8% | 11% | 8% | 4% |
| 8.5 | Sexually abused you? | 1% | 2% | 1% | 2% |
| 8.5 | Threatened or intimidated you? | 13% | 19% | 13% | 11% |
| 8.5 | Taken your canteen/property? | 7% | 9% | 7% | 5% |
| 8.5 | Victimised you because of medication? | 7% | 6% | 7% | 6% |
| 8.5 | Victimised you because of debt? | 5% | 5% | 5% | 4% |
| 8.5 | Victimised you because of drugs? | 7% | 5% | 7% | 7% |
| 8.5 | Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin? | 5% | 5% | 5% | 2% |
| 8.5 | Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs? | 5% | 4% | 5% | 2% |
| 8.5 | Victimised you because of your nationality? | 3% | 4% | 3% | 3% |
| 8.5 | Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country? | 5% | 4% | 5% | 2% |
| 8.5 | Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community? | 1% | 2% | 1% | 1% |
| 8.5 | Victimised you because of your sexual orientation? | 1% | 2% | 1% | 1% |
| 8.5 | Victimised you because of your age? | 2% | 3% | 2% | 1% |
| 8.5 | Victimised you because you have a disability? | 5% | 5% | 5% | 2% |
| 8.5 | Victimised you because you were new here? | 8% | 7% | 8% | 4% |
| 8.5 | Victimised you because of your offence/crime? | 4% | 7% | 4% | 2% |
| 8.5 | Victimised you because of gang related issues? | 5% | 6% | 5% | 1% |

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

| | | HMP Swansea 2017 | Local prisons comparator | HMP Swansea 2017 | HMP Swansea 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? | 23% | 33% | 23% | 24% |
| | Since you have been here, have staff: | | | | |
| 8.7 | Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends? | 10% | 13% | 10% | 4% |
| 8.7 | Hit, kicked or assaulted you? | 3% | 7% | 3% | 3% |
| 8.7 | Sexually abused you? | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| 8.7 | Threatened or intimidated you? | 13% | 14% | 13% | 7% |
| 8.7 | Victimised you because of medication? | 4% | 7% | 4% | 6% |
| 8.7 | Victimised you because of debt? | 1% | 2% | 1% | 3% |
| 8.7 | Victimised you because of drugs? | 4% | 3% | 4% | 8% |
| 8.7 | Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin? | 5% | 5% | 5% | 3% |
| 8.7 | Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs? | 3% | 4% | 3% | 3% |
| 8.7 | Victimised you because of your nationality? | 2% | 4% | 2% | 3% |
| 8.7 | Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country? | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% |
| 8.7 | Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community? | 0% | 1% | 0% | 2% |
| 8.7 | Victimised you because of your sexual orientation? | 0% | 1% | 0% | 3% |
| 8.7 | Victimised you because of your age? | 3% | 2% | 3% | 1% |
| 8.7 | Victimised you because you have a disability? | 3% | 4% | 3% | 3% |
| 8.7 | Victimised you because you were new here? | 5% | 6% | 5% | 4% |
| 8.7 | Victimised you because of your offence/crime? | 5% | 5% | 5% | 3% |
| 8.7 | Victimised you because of gang related issues? | 1% | 3% | 1% | 1% |
| | For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners: | | | | |
| 8.8 | Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced? | 31% | 34% | 31% | 23% |

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

| | | HMP Swansea 2017 | Local prisons comparator | HMP Swansea 2017 | HMP Swansea 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 9: Health services | | | | | |
| 9.1 | Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor? | 15% | 19% | 15% | 33% |
| 9.1 | Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse? | 52% | 39% | 52% | 65% |
| 9.1 | Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist? | 5% | 9% | 5% | 13% |
| | 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? | 39% | 39% | 39% | 46% |
| 9.2 | The nurse? | 62% | 48% | 62% | 63% |
| 9.2 | The dentist? | 26% | 30% | 26% | 40% |
| 9.3 | The overall quality of health services? | 36% | 33% | 36% | 49% |
| 9.4 | Are you currently taking medication? | 65% | 54% | 65% | 62% |
| | For those currently taking medication: | | | | |
| 9.5 | Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell? | 54% | 56% | 54% | 72% |
| 9.6 | Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems? | 62% | 46% | 62% | 41% |
| | For those who have problems: | | | | |
| 9.7 | Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison? | 36% | 40% | 36% | 49% |
| SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol | | | | | |
| 10.1 | Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison? | 53% | 34% | 53% | 51% |
| 10.2 | Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison? | 32% | 21% | 32% | 39% |
| 10.3 | Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison? | 40% | 43% | 40% | 44% |
| 10.4 | Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison? | 21% | 21% | 21% | 17% |
| 10.5 | Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison? | 17% | 11% | 17% | 18% |
| 10.6 | Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison? | 15% | 9% | 15% | 17% |
| | For those with drug or alcohol problems: | | | | |
| 10.7 | Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison? | 41% | 57% | 41% | 46% |
| 10.8 | Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison? | 31% | 53% | 31% | 62% |
| | For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem: | | | | |
| 10.9 | Was the support helpful? | 70% | 72% | 70% | 76% |

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

| | | HMP Swansea 2017 | Local prisons comparator | HMP Swansea 2017 | HMP Swansea 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 11: Activities | | | | | |
| Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities: | | | | | |
| 11.1 | A prison job? | 38% | 33% | 38% | 52% |
| 11.1 | Vocational or skills training? | 33% | 30% | 33% | 45% |
| 11.1 | Education (including basic skills)? | 49% | 45% | 49% | 54% |
| 11.1 | Offending behaviour programmes? | 13% | 18% | 13% | 22% |
| Are you currently involved in any of the following activities: | | | | | |
| 11.2 | A prison job? | 48% | 47% | 48% | 58% |
| 11.2 | Vocational or skills training? | 5% | 8% | 5% | 7% |
| 11.2 | Education (including basic skills)? | 22% | 23% | 22% | 20% |
| 11.2 | Offending behaviour programmes? | 8% | 7% | 8% | 6% |
| 11.3 | Have you had a job while in this prison? | 67% | 71% | 67% | 79% |
| For those who have had a prison job while in this prison: | | | | | |
| 11.3 | Do you feel the job will help you on release? | 33% | 39% | 33% | 40% |
| 11.3 | Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison? | 52% | 56% | 52% | 64% |
| 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? | 31% | 41% | 31% | 34% |
| 11.3 | Have you been involved in education while in this prison? | 62% | 67% | 62% | 73% |
| For those who have been involved in education while in this prison: | | | | | |
| 11.3 | Do you feel the education will help you on release? | 50% | 48% | 50% | 41% |
| 11.3 | Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison? | 46% | 55% | 46% | 60% |
| 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? | 36% | 39% | 36% | 37% |
| 11.4 | Do you go to the library at least once a week? | 12% | 28% | 12% | 18% |
| 11.5 | Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs? | 36% | 32% | 36% | 35% |
| 11.6 | Do you go to the gym three or more times a week? | 30% | 24% | 30% | 38% |
| 11.7 | Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week? | 61% | 39% | 61% | 73% |
| 11.8 | Do you go on association more than five times each week? | 24% | 42% | 24% | 23% |
| 11.9 | Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? | 6% | 9% | 6% | 6% |
| SECTION 12: Friends and family | | | | | |
| 12.1 | Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison? | 37% | 31% | 37% | 38% |
| 12.2 | Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail? | 38% | 48% | 38% | 39% |
| 12.3 | Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones? | 53% | 36% | 53% | 42% |
| 12.4 | Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here? | 30% | 34% | 30% | 52% |

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

| | | HMP Swansea 2017 | Local prisons comparator | HMP Swansea 2017 | HMP Swansea 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? | 67% | 62% | 67% | 54% |
| For those who are sentenced what type of contact have you had with your offender manager: | | | | | |
| 13.2 | No contact? | 47% | 44% | 47% | 42% |
| 13.2 | Contact by letter? | 28% | 26% | 28% | 31% |
| 13.2 | Contact by phone? | 12% | 14% | 12% | 9% |
| 13.2 | Contact by visit? | 25% | 33% | 25% | 38% |
| 13.3 | Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison? | 18% | 32% | 18% | 26% |
| For those who are sentenced: | | | | | |
| 13.4 | Do you have a sentence plan? | 23% | 32% | 23% | 31% |
| For those with a sentence plan: | | | | | |
| 13.5 | Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan? | 50% | 54% | 50% | 79% |
| Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets: | | | | | |
| 13.6 | Nobody? | 40% | 49% | 40% | 46% |
| 13.6 | Offender supervisor? | 16% | 33% | 16% | 38% |
| 13.6 | Offender manager? | 35% | 24% | 35% | 18% |
| 13.6 | Named/ personal officer? | 10% | 10% | 10% | 6% |
| 13.6 | Staff from other departments? | 40% | 17% | 40% | 16% |
| For those with a sentence plan: | | | | | |
| 13.7 | Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison? | 49% | 50% | 49% | 66% |
| 13.8 | Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison? | 20% | 28% | 20% | 15% |
| 13.9 | Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community? | 32% | 33% | 32% | 38% |
| 13.10 | Do you have a needs based custody plan? | 9% | 7% | 9% | 7% |
| 13.11 | Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release? | 13% | 11% | 13% | 16% |
| 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? | 29% | 26% | 29% | 29% |
| 13.12 | Accommodation? | 36% | 32% | 36% | 45% |
| 13.12 | Benefits? | 35% | 34% | 35% | 48% |
| 13.12 | Finances? | 29% | 21% | 29% | 27% |
| 13.12 | Education? | 30% | 27% | 30% | 30% |
| 13.12 | Drugs and alcohol? | 45% | 40% | 45% | 51% |
| 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? | 39% | 44% | 39% | 35% |

Diversity analysis



Key question responses (ethnicity and foreign national) HMP Swansea 2017

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 | | Foreign national prisoners | | British 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 | | 17 | 143 | 17 | 146 | | | | |
| 1.3 | Are you sentenced? | 59% | 70% | 53% | 70% | | | | |
| 1.5 | Are you a foreign national? | 29% | 8% | | | | | | |
| 1.6 | Do you understand spoken English? | 87% | 100% | 88% | 100% | | | | |
| 1.7 | Do you understand written English? | 88% | 99% | 88% | 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.) | | | 30% | 8% | | | | |
| 1.9 | Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller? | 8% | 2% | 14% | 1% | | | | |
| 1.1 | Are you Muslim? | 41% | 1% | 13% | 4% | | | | |
| 1.12 | Do you consider yourself to have a disability? | 7% | 41% | 41% | 38% | | | | |
| 1.13 | Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)? | 0% | 6% | 6% | 6% | | | | |
| 1.14 | Is this your first time in prison? | 53% | 25% | 41% | 27% | | | | |
| 2.6 | Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff? | 47% | 75% | 44% | 74% | | | | |
| 2.7 | Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here? | 41% | 78% | 47% | 77% | | | | |
| 3.2 | When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way? | 71% | 86% | 59% | 87% | | | | |
| 3.3 | Were you treated well/very well in reception? | 53% | 81% | 65% | 80% | | | | |
| 3.4 | Did you have any problems when you first arrived? | 88% | 81% | 88% | 80% | | | | |
| 3.7 | Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here? | 63% | 59% | 37% | 63% | | | | |
| 3.9 | Did you feel safe on your first night here? | 50% | 77% | 63% | 75% | | | | |
| 3.10 | Have you been on an induction course? | 74% | 75% | 63% | 76% | | | | |
| 4.1 | Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative? | 6% | 31% | 33% | 28% | | | | |

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

| | Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better | Black and minority ethnic prisoners | White prisoners | Foreign national prisoners | British 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? | 23% | 34% | 50% | 31% |
| 4.4 | Are you normally able to have a shower every day? | 47% | 67% | 57% | 67% |
| 4.4 | Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes? | 6% | 29% | 30% | 26% |
| 4.5 | Is the food in this prison good/very good? | 6% | 24% | 24% | 22% |
| 4.6 | Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs? | 59% | 67% | 44% | 69% |
| 4.7 | Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to? | 6% | 60% | 47% | 55% |
| 4.8 | Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected? | 29% | 36% | 26% | 36% |
| 4.9 | Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to? | 12% | 47% | 23% | 45% |
| 5.1 | Is it easy to make an application? | 47% | 70% | 65% | 68% |
| 5.3 | Is it easy to make a complaint? | 35% | 47% | 57% | 44% |
| 6.1 | Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme? | 12% | 42% | 35% | 39% |
| 6.2 | Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour? | 6% | 38% | 41% | 33% |
| 6.3 | In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)? | 18% | 10% | 12% | 10% |
| 7.1 | Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect? | 44% | 82% | 71% | 80% |
| 7.2 | Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison? | 57% | 81% | 73% | 80% |
| 7.3 | Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time) | 13% | 24% | 23% | 23% |
| 7.4 | Do you have a personal officer? | 0% | 21% | 18% | 19% |
| 8.1 | Have you ever felt unsafe here? | 65% | 35% | 47% | 37% |
| 8.2 | Do you feel unsafe now? | 24% | 15% | 13% | 16% |
| 8.3 | Have you been victimised by other prisoners? | 47% | 18% | 50% | 18% |
| 8.5 | Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here? | 12% | 13% | 24% | 11% |
| 8.5 | Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners) | 35% | 1% | 30% | 2% |
| 8.5 | Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners) | 23% | 2% | 30% | 2% |
| 8.5 | Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners) | 18% | 1% | 24% | 1% |
| 8.5 | Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners) | 6% | 4% | 13% | 4% |

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

| | Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better | Black and minority ethnic prisoners | White prisoners | Foreign national prisoners | British 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? | 50% | 20% | 40% | 21% |
| 8.7 | Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here? | 13% | 13% | 21% | 12% |
| 8.7 | Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff) | 37% | 0% | 21% | 3% |
| 8.7 | Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff) | 13% | 1% | 21% | 1% |
| 8.7 | Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff) | 7% | 1% | 21% | 0% |
| 8.7 | Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff) | 7% | 2% | 14% | 2% |
| 9.1 | Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor? | 0% | 17% | 16% | 15% |
| 9.1 | Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse? | 61% | 50% | 50% | 52% |
| 9.4 | Are you currently taking medication? | 44% | 67% | 67% | 65% |
| 9.6 | Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues? | 40% | 64% | 74% | 61% |
| 10.3 | Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison? | 30% | 41% | 26% | 41% |
| 11.2 | Are you currently working in the prison? | 50% | 47% | 41% | 48% |
| 11.2 | Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training? | 0% | 6% | 0% | 5% |
| 11.2 | Are you currently in education (including basic skills)? | 20% | 22% | 9% | 23% |
| 11.2 | Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme? | 0% | 9% | 9% | 8% |
| 11.4 | Do you go to the library at least once a week? | 24% | 10% | 8% | 12% |
| 11.6 | Do you go to the gym three or more times a week? | 37% | 29% | 28% | 31% |
| 11.7 | Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week? | 70% | 60% | 61% | 62% |
| 11.8 | On average, do you go on association more than five times each week? | 14% | 24% | 22% | 24% |
| 11.9 | Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc) | 0% | 7% | 0% | 7% |
| 12.2 | Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail? | 73% | 34% | 50% | 37% |
| 12.3 | Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones? | 85% | 50% | 65% | 52% |

Diversity Analysis



Key question responses (disability) HMP Swansea 2017

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

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better | Consider themselves to have a disability | Do not consider themselves to have a disability |
| | 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 | | 62 | 100 |
| 1.3 | Are you sentenced? | 69% | 68% |
| 1.5 | Are you a foreign national? | 11% | 10% |
| 1.6 | Do you understand spoken English? | 100% | 98% |
| 1.7 | Do you understand written English? | 98% | 98% |
| 1.8 | Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.) | 2% | 15% |
| 1.9 | Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller? | 4% | 1% |
| 1.1 | Are you Muslim? | 0% | 7% |
| 1.12 | Do you consider yourself to have a disability? | | |
| 1.13 | Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)? | 5% | 6% |
| 1.14 | Is this your first time in prison? | 24% | 30% |
| 2.6 | Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff? | 66% | 74% |
| 2.7 | Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here? | 65% | 78% |
| 3.2 | When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way? | 81% | 87% |
| 3.3 | Were you treated well/very well in reception? | 81% | 76% |
| 3.4 | Did you have any problems when you first arrived? | 95% | 73% |
| 3.7 | Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here? | 63% | 57% |
| 3.9 | Did you feel safe on your first night here? | 69% | 75% |
| 3.10 | Have you been on an induction course? | 74% | 75% |
| 4.1 | Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative? | 29% | 28% |

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 |
| | 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? | 22% | 39% |
| 4.4 | Are you normally able to have a shower every day? | 58% | 69% |
| 4.4 | Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes? | 27% | 26% |
| 4.5 | Is the food in this prison good/very good? | 14% | 27% |
| 4.6 | Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs? | 66% | 67% |
| 4.7 | Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to? | 54% | 55% |
| 4.8 | Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected? | 31% | 36% |
| 4.9 | Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to? | 42% | 42% |
| 5.1 | Is it easy to make an application? | 66% | 68% |
| 5.3 | Is it easy to make a complaint? | 46% | 46% |
| 6.1 | Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme? | 40% | 38% |
| 6.2 | Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour? | 28% | 37% |
| 6.3 | In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)? | 12% | 8% |
| 7.1 | Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect? | 83% | 75% |
| 7.2 | Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison? | 76% | 80% |
| 7.3 | Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time) | 15% | 28% |
| 7.4 | Do you have a personal officer? | 12% | 23% |
| 8.1 | Have you ever felt unsafe here? | 50% | 31% |
| 8.2 | Do you feel unsafe now? | 19% | 14% |
| 8.3 | Have you been victimised by other prisoners? | 26% | 20% |
| 8.5 | Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here? | 17% | 10% |
| 8.5 | Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners) | 4% | 6% |
| 8.5 | Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners) | 7% | 4% |
| 8.5 | Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners) | 2% | 4% |
| 8.5 | Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners) | 5% | 1% |
| 8.5 | Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners) | 14% | 0% |

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 |
| | 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? | 21% | 24% |
| 8.7 | Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here? | 16% | 12% |
| 8.7 | Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff) | 4% | 5% |
| 8.7 | Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff) | 6% | 1% |
| 8.7 | Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff) | 2% | 2% |
| 8.7 | Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff) | 7% | 1% |
| 8.7 | Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff) | 9% | 0% |
| 9.1 | Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor? | 11% | 18% |
| 9.1 | Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse? | 50% | 52% |
| 9.4 | Are you currently taking medication? | 93% | 48% |
| 9.6 | Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues? | 93% | 44% |
| 10.3 | Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison? | 56% | 31% |
| 11.2 | Are you currently working in the prison? | 34% | 55% |
| 11.2 | Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training? | 2% | 6% |
| 11.2 | Are you currently in education (including basic skills)? | 18% | 22% |
| 11.2 | Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme? | 6% | 9% |
| 11.4 | Do you go to the library at least once a week? | 7% | 12% |
| 11.6 | Do you go to the gym three or more times a week? | 20% | 37% |
| 11.7 | Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week? | 53% | 66% |
| 11.8 | On average, do you go on association more than five times each week? | 20% | 26% |
| 11.9 | Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc) | 0% | 9% |
| 12.2 | Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail? | 38% | 39% |
| 12.3 | Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones? | 59% | 51% |



Prisoner survey responses HMP Swansea 2017 (Unsentenced comparator)

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

Key to tables

| Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better | Unsentenced prisoners | Sentenced 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 | | |
| Number of completed questionnaires returned | 52 | 111 |
| SECTION 1: General information | | |
| 1.2 Are you under 21 years of age? | 12% | 9% |
| 1.3 Are you on recall? | 0% | 12% |
| 1.5 Are you a foreign national? | 15% | 8% |
| 1.6 Do you understand spoken English? | 98% | 99% |
| 1.7 Do you understand written English? | 96% | 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.) | 14% | 9% |
| 1.9 Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller? | 2% | 2% |
| 1.1 Are you Muslim? | 6% | 5% |
| 1.11 Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual? | 0% | 1% |
| 1.12 Do you consider yourself to have a disability? | 37% | 39% |
| 1.13 Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)? | 8% | 4% |
| 1.14 Is this your first time in prison? | 32% | 27% |
| 1.15 Do you have any children under the age of 18? | 53% | 54% |
| SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts | | |
| On your most recent journey here: | | |
| 2.1 Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van? | 49% | 19% |
| 2.5 Did you feel safe? | 76% | 80% |
| 2.6 Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff? | 68% | 73% |
| 2.7 Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here? | 65% | 77% |
| 2.8 When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you? | 75% | 85% |

Key to tables

| | | | |
|--|--|--------------------------------|------------|
| Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better | Unsentenced prisoners | Sentenced 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 | | | |
| SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction | | | |
| 3.1 | Were you in reception for less than 2 hours? | 69% | 60% |
| 3.2 | When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way? | 85% | 84% |
| 3.3 | Were you treated well/very well in reception? | 77% | 78% |
| | When you first arrived: | | |
| 3.4 | Did you have any problems? | 85% | 80% |
| 3.4 | Did you have any problems with loss of property? | 13% | 18% |
| 3.4 | Did you have any housing problems? | 25% | 24% |
| 3.4 | Did you have any problems contacting employers? | 7% | 6% |
| 3.4 | Did you have any problems contacting family? | 58% | 39% |
| 3.4 | Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after? | 2% | 2% |
| 3.4 | Did you have any money worries? | 37% | 23% |
| 3.4 | Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal? | 33% | 32% |
| 3.4 | Did you have any physical health problems? | 21% | 18% |
| 3.4 | Did you have any mental health problems? | 46% | 42% |
| 3.4 | Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners? | 11% | 3% |
| 3.4 | Did you have problems accessing phone numbers? | 52% | 33% |
| | When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following: | | |
| 3.6 | Tobacco? | 2% | 1% |
| 3.6 | A shower? | 16% | 19% |
| 3.6 | A free telephone call? | 25% | 22% |
| 3.6 | Something to eat? | 67% | 64% |
| 3.6 | PIN phone credit? | 49% | 51% |
| 3.6 | Toiletries/ basic items? | 49% | 51% |

Key to tables

| | | | |
|--|---|-----------------------|---------------------|
| | Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better | Unsentenced prisoners | Sentenced 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 | | |
| 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? | 21% | 38% |
| 3.7 | Someone from health services? | 60% | 60% |
| 3.7 | A Listener/Samaritans? | 33% | 38% |
| 3.7 | Prison shop/ canteen? | 11% | 21% |
| When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following: | | | |
| 3.8 | What was going to happen to you? | 34% | 38% |
| 3.8 | Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal? | 40% | 45% |
| 3.8 | How to make routine requests? | 26% | 35% |
| 3.8 | Your entitlement to visits? | 20% | 32% |
| 3.8 | Health services? | 32% | 45% |
| 3.8 | The chaplaincy? | 22% | 39% |
| 3.9 | Did you feel safe on your first night here? | 75% | 74% |
| 3.10 | Have you been on an induction course? | 73% | 76% |
| 3.12 | Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment? | 77% | 84% |
| 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? | 26% | 29% |
| 4.1 | Attend legal visits? | 44% | 38% |
| 4.1 | Get bail information? | 8% | 19% |
| 4.2 | Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them? | 56% | 39% |
| 4.3 | Can you get legal books in the library? | 36% | 37% |
| For the wing/unit you are currently on: | | | |
| 4.4 | Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week? | 24% | 37% |
| 4.4 | Are you normally able to have a shower every day? | 59% | 68% |
| 4.4 | Do you normally receive clean sheets every week? | 57% | 69% |
| 4.4 | Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week? | 35% | 54% |
| 4.4 | Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes? | 22% | 28% |
| 4.4 | Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time? | 40% | 58% |
| 4.4 | Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to? | 8% | 18% |
| 4.5 | Is the food in this prison good/very good? | 22% | 22% |
| 4.6 | Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs? | 56% | 71% |
| 4.7 | Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to? | 49% | 56% |
| 4.8 | Are your religious beliefs are respected? | 41% | 32% |
| 4.9 | Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to? | 37% | 45% |
| 4.10 | Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services? | 34% | 42% |

Key to tables

| | | | |
|--|--|-----------------------|---------------------|
| | Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better | Unsentenced prisoners | Sentenced 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 | | |
| SECTION 5: Applications and complaints | | | |
| 5.1 | Is it easy to make an application? | 57% | 72% |
| 5.3 | Is it easy to make a complaint? | 36% | 50% |
| 5.5 | Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to? | 31% | 16% |
| 5.6 | Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board? | 12% | 19% |
| SECTION 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme | | | |
| 6.1 | Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme? | 27% | 44% |
| 6.2 | Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour? | 32% | 34% |
| 6.3 | In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)? | 10% | 11% |
| SECTION 7: Relationships with staff | | | |
| 7.1 | Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect? | 74% | 81% |
| 7.2 | Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem? | 76% | 81% |
| 7.3 | Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on? | 27% | 28% |
| 7.4 | Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association? | 16% | 26% |
| 7.5 | Do you have a personal officer? | 16% | 20% |

Key to tables

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| | Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better | Unsentenced prisoners | Sentenced 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 | | |
| SECTION 8: Safety | | | |
| 8.1 | Have you ever felt unsafe here? | 41% | 36% |
| 8.2 | Do you feel unsafe now? | 25% | 11% |
| 8.4 | Have you been victimised by other prisoners here? | 26% | 18% |
| | Since you have been here, have other prisoners: | | |
| 8.5 | Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends? | 14% | 12% |
| 8.5 | Hit, kicked or assaulted you? | 8% | 7% |
| 8.5 | Sexually abused you? | 2% | 1% |
| 8.5 | Threatened or intimidated you? | 14% | 11% |
| 8.5 | Taken your canteen/property? | 12% | 5% |
| 8.5 | Victimised you because of medication? | 10% | 6% |
| 8.5 | Victimised you because of debt? | 6% | 5% |
| 8.5 | Victimised you because of drugs? | 8% | 7% |
| 8.5 | Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin? | 10% | 3% |
| 8.5 | Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs? | 12% | 2% |
| 8.5 | Victimised you because of your nationality? | 8% | 1% |
| 8.5 | Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country? | 10% | 3% |
| 8.5 | Victimised you because you are from a traveller community? | 2% | 0% |
| 8.5 | Victimised you because of your sexual orientation? | 2% | 0% |
| 8.5 | Victimised you because of your age? | 6% | 1% |
| 8.5 | Victimised you because you have a disability? | 6% | 5% |
| 8.5 | Victimised you because you were new here? | 10% | 7% |
| 8.5 | Victimised you because of your offence/crime? | 8% | 2% |
| 8.5 | Victimised you because of gang related issues? | 4% | 6% |

Key to tables

| | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------|
| | Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better | Unsentenced prisoners | Sentenced 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 | | |
| SECTION 8: Safety continued | | | |
| 8.6 | Have you been victimised by staff here? | 29% | 20% |
| | Since you have been here, have staff: | | |
| 8.7 | Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends? | 12% | 8% |
| 8.7 | Hit, kicked or assaulted you? | 4% | 3% |
| 8.7 | Sexually abused you? | 0% | 1% |
| 8.7 | Threatened or intimidated you? | 15% | 11% |
| 8.7 | Victimised you because of medication? | 10% | 1% |
| 8.7 | Victimised you because of debt? | 2% | 0% |
| 8.7 | Victimised you because of drugs? | 8% | 2% |
| 8.7 | Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin? | 7% | 4% |
| 8.7 | Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs? | 7% | 1% |
| 8.7 | Victimised you because of your nationality? | 4% | 1% |
| 8.7 | Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country? | 8% | 1% |
| 8.7 | Victimised you because you are from a traveller community? | 0% | 0% |
| 8.7 | Victimised you because of your sexual orientation? | 0% | 0% |
| 8.7 | Victimised you because of your age? | 4% | 3% |
| 8.7 | Victimised you because you have a disability? | 4% | 3% |
| 8.7 | Victimised you because you were new here? | 7% | 4% |
| 8.7 | Victimised you because of your offence/crime? | 4% | 5% |
| 8.7 | Victimised you because of gang related issues? | 2% | 1% |
| SECTION 9: Health services | | | |
| 9.1 | Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor? | 7% | 19% |
| 9.1 | Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse? | 54% | 51% |
| 9.1 | Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist? | 2% | 7% |
| 9.4 | Are you currently taking medication? | 72% | 62% |
| 9.6 | Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems? | 65% | 61% |
| SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol | | | |
| 10.1 | Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison? | 67% | 48% |
| 10.2 | Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison? | 36% | 30% |
| 10.3 | Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison? | 42% | 38% |
| 10.4 | Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison? | 25% | 19% |
| 10.5 | Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison? | 19% | 16% |
| 10.6 | Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison? | 19% | 13% |

Key to tables

| | | |
|--|-----------------------|---------------------|
| Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better | Unsentenced prisoners | Sentenced 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 | | |
| SECTION 11: Activities | | |
| Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities: | | |
| 11.1 A prison job? | 24% | 44% |
| 11.1 Vocational or skills training? | 23% | 38% |
| 11.1 Education (including basic skills)? | 45% | 50% |
| 11.1 Offending Behaviour Programmes? | 8% | 15% |
| Are you currently involved in any of the following activities: | | |
| 11.2 A prison job? | 40% | 51% |
| 11.2 Vocational or skills training? | 2% | 6% |
| 11.2 Education (including basic skills)? | 26% | 20% |
| 11.2 Offending Behaviour Programmes? | 7% | 8% |
| 11.4 Do you go to the library at least once a week? | 17% | 10% |
| 11.5 Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs? | 37% | 35% |
| 11.6 Do you go to the gym three or more times a week? | 26% | 32% |
| 11.7 Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week? | 64% | 61% |
| 11.8 Do you go on association more than five times each week? | 23% | 25% |
| 11.9 Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? | 4% | 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? | 44% | 34% |
| 12.2 Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail? | 41% | 37% |
| 12.3 Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones? | 50% | 54% |
| 12.4 Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here? | 30% | 31% |
| SECTION 13: Preparation for release | | |
| 13.3 Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison? | 0% | 26% |
| 13.10 Do you have a needs based custody plan? | 5% | 11% |
| 13.11 Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release? | 5% | 18% |