



Debriefing paper by HM Inspectorate of Prisons

**Full inspection of:
Tinsley House IRC**

3-19 April 2018

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

Contents

Healthy establishment assessments

Note on methodology

1. Safety
2. Respect
3. Activities
4. Preparation for release and removal

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

Healthy establishment assessments

Outcomes for detainees are good against this healthy establishment test.
There is no evidence that outcomes for detainees are being adversely affected in any significant areas.

Outcomes for detainees are reasonably good against this healthy establishment test.
There is evidence of adverse outcomes for detainees in only a small number of areas. For the majority there are no significant concerns. Procedures to safeguard outcomes are in place.

Outcomes for detainees are not sufficiently good against this healthy establishment test.
There is evidence that outcomes for detainees are being adversely affected in many areas or particularly in those areas of greatest importance to the well-being of detainees.
Problems/concerns, if left unattended, are likely to become areas of serious concern.

Outcomes for detainees are poor against this healthy establishment test.
There is evidence that the outcomes for detainees are seriously affected by current practice.
There is a failure to ensure even adequate treatment of and/or conditions for detainees.
Immediate remedial action is required.

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

1. Safety

Summary

- Too many detainees continue to arrive overnight, some from nearby locations. Early days processes are not sufficiently thorough.
- The centre is a safe environment and there is very little violence.
- Self-harm is low and support is good.
- More work is needed to develop staff confidence about raising concerns.
- Security is generally well managed and effective, but some restrictions are disproportionate for this population, including reduced freedom of movement.
- There is little use of force or separation.
- Legal support from Bail for Immigration Detainees is valued and fewer detainees than we often see are held for long periods.
- Rule 35 reports are still not good enough or submitted when necessary. We are concerned about the number of cases where torture has been accepted but detention maintained.
- On-site immigration staff provide an improving service to detainees.

Outcomes for detainees against this healthy establishment test are reasonably good.

Arrival and early days in detention

- Too many detainees continue to arrive during the night (a third), often unnecessarily.
- The reception area is a clean and welcoming environment with reasonable facilities. Staff work hard to reassure detainees upon their arrival.
- Searching and detainee interviews are not conducted in private and reception screening processes are not robust enough to identify and respond to all risks and needs.
- For most detainees induction covers what they need to know about the centre and usually takes place within 24 hours of their arrival.

Safeguarding (protecting adults at risk)

- Most staff told us they would report safeguarding concerns but we have seen no examples of this being done so far. The reporting line involves a convoluted process and is potentially off-putting.
- However, a minority said they would not, as they were not confident confidentiality would be respected or did not have trust in managers. More information, reassurance and confidence building is still required.

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

- 28 adult detainees have been identified as being at risk, 13 level one and 15 level two.
- Custodial staff have little awareness of the adults at risk policy and the weekly safeguarding meeting is not working effectively: there is little discussion of individual cases and there is insufficient Home Office input.
- Rule 35 reports in our sample were vague and lacking in detail and did not address possible symptoms of PTSD. Detention was maintained in eight of the 10 cases we sampled despite evidence of torture being accepted.
- Despite 60 detainees being placed on an ACDT in the last six months, no Rule 35 reports have been submitted on suicidal ideation.

Self-harm and suicide prevention

- The number of self-harm incidents is low.
- In general, detainees in crisis receive good support from centre staff.
- The quality of ACDT case reviews is often very good. Observational entries in ACDT documents are meaningful but observations are not always at the required frequency. Some assessments and care maps lack detail.
- The new care suite is a very good resource.
- Food refusers are identified and are well cared for but clinical records do not provide sufficient assurance.

Personal safety

- The centre remains fundamentally safe; the atmosphere is calm and relaxed. The numbers of assaults are low, with nine in the last six months.
- In our detainee and staff interviews, we identified no evidence of abusive staff behaviour or an aggressive culture.
- However, 42% of detainees in our survey say they feel unsafe and more detainees than at other centres say they have felt threatened or intimidated by staff.
- This may be because of anxieties over immigration status and we have also heard many reports of detainees being threatened with transfer to Brook House. More work is needed to understand and address these perceptions.
- Over the last six months about 9% of detainees have been ex-prisoners, and about a quarter are currently ex-prisoners. There is no evidence that this has contributed to increased instability or violence in the centre.

Safeguarding children

- There are good links with West Sussex Safeguarding Children Board, whose meetings Tinsley House staff attend, and staff are trained in child protection issues.
- The number of age dispute cases has dropped sharply, with none since the re-opening in May 2017. There are reasonable contingency plans for anyone saying they are a child, with the option of short-term use of the new care suite.

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

Security and freedom of movement

- The strategic approach to security is reasonable with well attended monthly meetings covering a wide range of topics.
- Some procedures remain disproportionate to the risks presented by the population. These include routine room searching and the introduction of a restriction to movements at lunch and dinner time. Freedom of movement has reduced from 17 to 12 hours a day since the previous inspection.
- Intelligence is managed well and analysis and required actions are completed quickly.
- Handcuffing on escorts is not routine and the risk assessment process remains considered.
- There is little evidence of drug use within the centre and the drug supply reduction strategy is adequate.
- Corruption prevention processes are developing well and have led to tangible outcomes.

Use of force and single separation

- Force has been used 11 times in the last six months, less than at other centres.
- Paperwork justifying use of force is completed to a good standard.
- Video footage we viewed showed staff attempting to de-escalate and use the minimum amount of force when required to do so.
- Useful use of force scrutiny and committee meetings have taken place, but not consistently.
- The environment of the separation room is good and use of the observation room as an alternative is positive.
- There have been 12 uses of Rule 40 in the last six months, and paperwork provides appropriate reasons for separation.

Legal rights

- In our survey, only 23% of represented detainees had received a legal visit compared with 44% in other IRCs. The reasons for this are unclear and need to be explored as there are no waiting lists for legal visits or advice surgeries.
- Detainees have some good support from Bail for Immigration Detainees and welcome the regular surgeries.
- There is poor access to legal resources. Many legal texts books and country of origin reports are several years out of date and it is not possible to download documents from some legal advice websites.
- On average detainees are held for 45 days in total and 33 days at Tinsley House, less than in other IRCs. The longest detention has been for 10 months. In the last six months, 35% have been released directly from Tinsley House after detention.

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

- We have seen fewer examples of long delay in case progression than we often see. However, there are some very long delays in arranging escorted removals.
- Only 27% of detainees in our survey said it was easy to see immigration staff, and we are pleased to see that the team has just started weekly drop-in surgeries.
- The immigration team has been given additional resources to implement a new case working model in which detainees will have increased face-to-face contact with a named 'engagement officer'. Early signs are encouraging, although it is too soon to assess their impact.

DRAFT

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

2. Respect

Summary

- The living accommodation is clean and in good order, although it is more cramped, especially in light of more restricted movement.
- Staff-detainee relationships are good.
- Equalities and diversity work is under-developed.
- Faith provision is good.
- Complaints are usually managed effectively.
- The food is adequate but lacks cultural diversity.
- Healthcare provision is reasonable but more work is needed to improve communication with detainees and support for those with low level emotional needs is under-developed.

Outcomes for detainees against this healthy establishment test are reasonably good.

Staff-detainee relationships

- The quality of relationships between staff and detainees is generally good. In our survey, 78% of detainees said most staff were respectful. Interviewed detainees were positive about staff and mainly criticised attention to their needs by healthcare staff.
- A number of staff have told us that frequent and unpredictable redeployment is starting to affect their ability to form relationships with detainees in Tinsley, and this needs to be monitored.
- Staff do not always knock and wait before entering a detainee's room.
- Detainee consultation takes place monthly but is usually poorly attended and is not leading to consistent improvement.

Daily life

- The centre is clean and bright and outdoor areas are pleasant.
- Rooms have been refurbished and are in a good condition. However, detainees complain that their rooms are stuffy and they are unable to open their windows. Many mattresses are in poor condition.
- Access to showers and laundry facilities are good.
- Only 42% of detainees in our survey say it is quiet enough to sleep at night which is worse than at the comparator. Staff and detainees report this is due to more rooms accommodating up to six detainees at a time.
- Complaint forms and boxes are freely available throughout the centre and emptied daily.

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

- Complaints are usually polite and address the issue raised but some are not sufficiently timely.
- One PSU complaint about unprofessional staff behaviour was delayed for over a month before being sent to the HO for investigation.
- The quality of the food is adequate but the cultural diversity of the meals are limited.
- Religious and cultural awareness of food and storage is inadequate.
- There is insufficient access to the popular cultural kitchen.
- Access to the shop is good and there is a wide range of items available which are reasonably priced.

Equality and diversity

- The strategic management of equality and diversity is weak. There is a policy and action plan but not all protected characteristics of detainees are identified and monitoring is very rudimentary.
- There are no forums or groups taking place. Our group meetings during the inspection suggest there is a need for regular information and support groups, using interpreters where necessary.
- The equality representatives are unsure of their role and responsibilities.
- We have found no evidence of direct discrimination or tensions between different ethnic or nationality groups.
- Telephone interpretation is generally used well, but we have seen some exceptions.
- On our night visit, staff were vague about the location of PEEPs and could not identify the needs of the detainee on the supported living plan.
- Support for other detainees with protected needs is minimal.
- Faith provision is reasonably good and the chaplaincy team is visible and active. There is insufficient space for some groups to use the multi-faith room.

Healthcare

- Governance arrangements are sound and partnership working is good. A number of clinical vacancies are unfilled and a recruitment plan is in place to address future workforce demands.
- Some detainees feel that healthcare should be more responsive and communicate more effectively with detainees; but we found good access to services appropriate for the population and health complaints were dealt with objectively.
- Pharmacy and medicine management arrangements are effective and most detainees receive their medication in-possession which is positive.
- Mental health provision meets current acute demand, but more flexible 'drop-in' type arrangements that offer well-being support and counselling are needed to deliver more effective, responsive and culturally sensitive help for detainees.
- There is little demand from detainees needing support with illicit substance use. Access to psychosocial support is available and services are well promoted.

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

3. Activities

Summary

- There is a good range of activities and recreational facilities, but access is more limited than last time and staff vacancies have limited the availability of some activities.
- Fewer than half in our survey say they have enough to fill their time.
- Delivery of education is good.
- There is a reasonable number of paid roles but not all are filled.
- The library provides an accessible service but the range of books and other resources is very limited.
- Fitness provision is generally good.

Outcomes for detainees against this healthy establishment test are reasonably good.

Access to activities

- The centre offers a well-balanced mix of activities and facilities, which can effectively engage and interest detainees, especially those whose stay is fairly short.
- However, access to activities has reduced since the last inspection and only 45% of detainees in our survey say they can effectively fill their time. The promotion of activities is not good enough.
- Managers are usefully extending the range of activities. The take up of work has increased and activities are generally well-resourced, although the arrangements to cover staff absence and vacancies are not effective. At times this limits the quality and availability of education classes, and the quantity and safety of gym and sporting activity.

Education

- Skilfully taught, well-established programmes in ESOL and in arts and crafts remain the core of learning and skills provision. They cater effectively for detainees held for both short and longer periods.
- Expansion to provide a more extensive programme has begun but has not yet had any tangible impact.
- Arrangements to assure and improve the quality of learning and skills provision are limited. The centre does not have the specialist expertise and measures needed to evaluate its content and monitor its quality.

Paid work

- The centre provides a good range of paid work.
- Paid roles are not all being filled, although recruitment has improved.

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

- The Home Office restricts some detainees from working, which is inappropriate.

Library provision

- Access to the library is good. It provides detainees with a calm, and purposeful environment for internet research and quiet activities.
- The library has disposed of many old and damaged books and improved its display of the remainder, but book stock is very limited. Systems to manage borrowing, and to monitor and replenish stock are still not in place.

Fitness provision

- Access to fitness training and sporting activity, and the quality of facilities, are good. Fitness staff are enthusiastic, but only one is appropriately trained and there are not enough of them to supervise detainees properly.
- Too many detainees use gym equipment without completing a formal gym induction.

DRAFT

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

4. Preparation for release

Summary

- Welfare support is excellent.
- Visits provision is generally good and there is good support from the visiting group.
- Detainees have good access to phones but faxing can be difficult.
- Detainees can easily use the internet but not social media or Skype, and too many legitimate websites are blocked for prolonged periods.
- There is no systematic pre-discharge work.

Outcomes for detainees against this healthy establishment test are good.

Welfare

- The welfare service is very well used and an impressive level of support is given to detainees. We have seen determined and proactive work by welfare officers, including in some complex cases.
- Welfare officers are accredited by the OISC to provide Level 1 support, which enhances their ability to provide information and signposting of value to detainees.
- All detainees are seen promptly on arrival to assess their immediate needs, with a good focus on promoting family contact and legal support. They have reasonable access to the team thereafter.
- The team has good working relationships with other departments and plays a key role in ensuring the overall needs of detainees are met.

Visits

- The visits hall is bright with a play area for young children.
- Some restrictions are disproportionate, such as detainees being unable to sit next to their visitors and children being required to wear wristbands and lanyards.
- We are pleased to see that the centre has facilitated twice weekly visits from GDWG who provide good support.

Communications

- Detainees have reasonable access to email and internet. However, a number of websites and information are blocked, including legal and support websites. The process for unblocking legitimate sites is too long.
- Detainees still cannot use social networks or video calling which is an unnecessary restriction.

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

- Detainees can print, fax or photocopy, but the fax machines are unable to cope with demand.
- Detainees have good access to mobile phones.

Leaving the centre

- There is good support from the welfare team to help detainees resolve a range of issues before removal or release, but no systematic assessment of need prior to their departure. This would enhance the service.
- The practice of having reserve lists for some charter flights causes unnecessary distress and uncertainty.
- ‘No notice’ removals in Tinsley House are rare. However, detainees transferred to Brook House for removal for charter flights will not be given flight details prior to the day of their departure. Transfers receive as little as one hour’s notice.

DRAFT

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