

- HE.22 Detention duty advice surgeries were now more frequent. However, in our survey a third of respondents were without legal representation, and many of those who had lawyers reported a poor service. Detainees were unable to access some important legal websites and could not open many legitimate documents, which might have impeded their access to justice. Arrangements for legal visits were good.
- HE.23 The average length of detention was around three months, and there were several long-term detainees from countries to which removals were very difficult. Twenty-seven people had been held in the centre for over 10 months. Some monthly reviews were overdue, but records did not accurately show how many and for how long. Monthly reviews now contained a subheading recording progress since the last report, but were not always useful. Rule 35 letters (health care notifications, including allegations of torture) were more structured but did not provide UKBA with enough information or judgement. Replies were generally on time, and the contact management team diligently chased those that were not. Many replies were detailed but there was no evidence of rule 35 reports leading to release. Detainees reported difficulties in access to the on-site immigration team. Induction interviews were conducted adequately, using interpreters as necessary.

Respect

- HE.24 Residential units were clean but not appropriate for a detainee population. Staff-detainee relationships had improved – most staff managed detainees with greater confidence, and were better supported by managers. There was little evidence of discrimination, but not enough had been done to improve outcomes for detainees who spoke little English. Diversity work needed further development overall. The use of a punitive incentives scheme was inappropriate for a detainee population. The management of complaints was variable and trend analysis was weak. Faith provision remained generally good. There were many complaints about the food, but detainees were now more positive about the overall quality, and the cultural kitchen was a valued resource. Most detainees received a satisfactory health care service. Outcomes for detainees against this healthy establishment test were reasonably good.
- HE.25 Little had been done to differentiate the centre's environment from that of a prison. The residential units were visually harsh and noisy, and ventilation remained a considerable problem. Detainees' rooms were well equipped and spacious, but otherwise similar to prison cells, with poorly screened toilet areas – or no screens at all. With some minor exceptions, rooms, showers and communal areas were tidy and clean. However, the showers still lacked adequate privacy and many cells clearly needed repainting. The laundry was accessible, but about half the machines were designed for domestic use and broke down regularly.
- HE.26 We observed some positive and confident staff-detainee interactions, and most staff reported an improvement in management support and guidance. In our survey, three-quarters of respondents said that most staff treated them with respect, compared with only half at the previous inspection. There were no regular groups to help increase communication and support, and ensure that staff were abreast of detainee concerns. A new care officer scheme was not yet fully operational.

Section 6: Activities

Expected outcomes:

The centre encourages activities and provides facilities to preserve and promote the mental and physical well being of detainees.

Work and learning and skills

- 6.1 **The centre should offer structured training in using the internet and emailing to detainees unfamiliar with computers and ensure sufficient printing capacity to meet detainees' reasonable needs. (6.28)**

Partially achieved. Although there were plans to provide IT self-study software on two computers in an education classroom, there was no structured training for detainees in using the internet and emailing. The printer in one of the two internet suites provided sufficient capacity for detainees.

Further recommendation

- 6.2 The centre should offer structured training in using the internet and emailing to detainees unfamiliar with computers.

- 6.3 **The centre should reduce the length of time detainees are confined to their rooms each day, institute later lock up and increase the time detainees are allowed in communal areas. (6.29)**

Not achieved. There had been no reduction in the time detainees were confined to their rooms, which was around 11 hours a day – longer than at most other IRCs. Detainees continued to be unlocked for up to 13 hours a day, of which nine and three quarter hours were available to visit communal areas. The lock-up time each evening was still 9pm, which was earlier than in most other IRCs.

We repeat the recommendation.

- 6.4 **The centre should increase the volume of paid work available to detainees, accompanied by appropriate training for all work roles leading to internal or external accreditation. (6.30)**

Partially achieved. Paid work available had increased only slightly to about 60 places, catering for just over 15% of the detainee population, compared with 12.5% at the last inspection. Waiting lists were short, although some detainees had to wait more than a month to obtain work. All detainees were given basic instruction to enable them to carry out their work roles but not all received accredited training. Those working in the servery received internally certificated training and an assessment of competence. Detainees who worked in the kitchen followed an externally accredited food and hygiene training programme.

We repeat the recommendation.

- 6.5 **Detainees' cooperation or failure to cooperate with UKBA should not affect the process of allocating paid work roles. (6.31)**

Not achieved. Recruitment procedures continued to allow UKBA to veto individual