



HM Prison &
Probation Service



The Perceived Impact of the Enabling Environments Programme within Her Majesty's Prison and Probation Service Settings A Qualitative Evaluation

Final Report

Published September 2019

Authored by Dr Maria Kordowicz on behalf of the Royal College of Psychiatrists and
Her Majesty's Prison and Probation Service.

Executive Summary

This report presents evaluation findings of the perceived impact of the Royal College of Psychiatrists (RCPsych) Enabling Environments Programme (EE) within a range of Her Majesty's Prison and Probation Service (HMPPS) settings. The reported evaluation work was undertaken in the period of June 2017 to March 2018. It is concluded that EE is perceived by staff, service users and other stakeholders to have a positive and broad-ranging impact within HMPPS organisations, creating settings where person-centred values lie at the core of rehabilitation.

The findings stemming from analysis are presented as a set of overarching themes capturing EE's impact namely:

- Explicit vs. Implicit Change
- Change and the Role of Values
- Building a Culture of Trust
- Wider Policy Context.

Two further themes pertaining to understandings of how to evaluate EE and resourcing are also presented:

- Evaluating EE – Process vs. Impact
- Resourcing Considerations.

These themes are discussed in the context of the literature. Implications for operational delivery are put forward. The report findings present a strong case for settings' engagement with EE, as well as for on-going funding for the programme and its rollout.

About the Author

Dr Maria Kordowicz

BSc(Hons) MSc MRes PhD ProfCertHSCMgt MBPsS PPABP MIHM FCMI CPsychol

Dr Kordowicz is a Chartered Psychologist and organisational scholar, delivering service evaluations on behalf of consultancy clients and formerly as part of her academic role as Quality Improvement Research Fellow at the School of Population Health and Environmental Sciences, King's College London. Presently, Dr Kordowicz is Senior Lecturer in Business Psychology at Lincoln International Business School, University of Lincoln.

Contact email: MKordowicz@lincoln.ac.uk



Welcome sign at one of the participating sites, taken with permission.

Contents

1.0	Background	5
2.0	Rapid Literature Review	10
3.0	Evaluation Aim & Research Questions	13
4.0	Methods	14
4.1	Approach	14
4.2	Participants & Process	16
5.0	Results	20
5.1	Theme 1: EE Impact – Explicit vs. Implicit Change	21
5.2	Theme 2: EE Impact – Change and the Role of Values	24
5.3	Theme 3: EE Impact – Building a Culture of Trust	26
5.4	Theme 4: EE Impact – Wider Policy Context	28
5.5	Theme 5: Evaluating EE – Process vs. Impact	31
5.6	Theme 6: Resourcing Considerations	32
6.0	Discussion	35
6.1	Study Limitations and Further Evaluation Research	39
7.0	Implications for Practice	41
8.0	Conclusions	42
9.0	Appendix 1: Interview Schedule – Staff	43
10.0	Appendix 2: Interview Schedule – Residents	44
11.0	Appendix 3: Interview Schedule – RCPsych & Other Stakeholders	45

1.0 Background

The qualitative evaluation was commissioned by the Royal College of Psychiatrists (RCPsych) into the perceived impact of their Enabling Environments (EE) Award within Her Majesty's Prison and Probation Service (HMPPS) settings.

The EE Award is obtained by settings meeting ten core value-driven standards set out by the RCPsych College Centre for Quality Improvement (CCQI). EE can be viewed as a mark of quality given in recognition to its members who create and promote a positive social environment. EEs are defined as places where good relationships are upheld and facilitate well-being for all participants, staff and service users alike, and where new ways of relating can be learned through mutual respect and recognition, nurturing a sense of belonging¹.

Members of EE undergo a quality improvement process over one to three years in order to achieve and maintain the EE Award. The membership process includes collating the EE Portfolio, along with completed staff and service user questionnaires and an Award assessment visit. Members are supported through the process by their nominated RCPsych Enabling Environment Lead (EEL). Members may not achieve the Award at first attempt, in which case they receive a developmental report identifying areas for improvement. To maintain the Award, members undergo an interim revalidation assessment to make sure that high quality relationships are being sustained.

Whilst the Award is designed to be applicable to a range of settings in a variety of sectors, this evaluation is concerned with the impact of EE on its HMPPS member organisations and the staff and service users within them. These membership organisations consist of public or private sector prisons, approved premises managed

¹ National Offender Management Service & Department of Health (2012) *A Guide to Psychologically Informed Planned Environments*. London: National Offender Management Service & Department of Health.

by either the National Probation Service or by independent providers, and community rehabilitation provision.

Furthermore, EE is embedded into the HMPPS & NHS Offender Personality Disorder (OPD) Pathway (formerly the National Offender Management Service – NOMS & NHS OPD Pathway) as part of the OPD-funded National Enabling Environments in Prison and Probation (NEEPP) project². At the centre of the OPD programme is a desire to deliver psychologically-informed services for a challenging offender population, who are likely to have a diagnosis of personality disorder and to pose a high risk to the community³. All treatment and residential services which form part of this pathway are expected to achieve the EE award. EE is seen as influencing the wellbeing of both service users and staff and was defined by the OPD pathway as a ‘quality improvement mechanism to support services to increase the use of therapeutic principles to create positive living and working environments’².

It is of interest to this evaluation to explore the extent to which EE can contribute to building social environments which support safe and beneficial interactions in what are complex settings. The cost of the OPD programme pathway amounts to £64 million per annum and the importance of evaluating its effectiveness on reducing reoffending rates and improving the wellbeing of its users was recognised by the OPD pathway², along with whether any resulting benefits have justified the cost to the tax payer. At the time of writing (March 2018), the OPD Programme Board had approved a third and final phase of the NEEPP project. Thus, highlighting the role EE can play in facilitating positive change within OPD settings and the mechanisms by which any change occurs is of particular interest to a perceived impact study. Further, there is a plan for NEEPP to move from a centrally-funded project to a sustainable, peer-led

² The programme covers England and health and housing in Wales.

³ National Offender Management Service & NHS England (2015). *The Offender Personality Disorder Pathway Strategy*. London: National Offender Management Service & NHS England.

‘business as usual’ embedded model. This evaluation hopes to highlight any relevant learning pertaining to EE sustainability within prison and probation.

Another policy development which contributes to the backdrop to this evaluation is the Psychologically Informed Planned Environments (PIPEs) model. PIPEs are a key part of the government’s OPD strategy, whereby selected services, either within prison or probation settings, are supported to become PIPEs⁴. This is achieved through creating contained environments where staff receive ongoing training to develop an increased psychological awareness of the impact of their work and gain a recognition of the importance and quality of relationships and interactions in helping the setting become enabling. Further, specific OPD treatment services also are required to operate in a psychologically informed framework.

Indeed, PIPEs and OPD treatment services are required to work toward an EE award. Whilst this is encouraging and a reflection of a clear recognition of the potential benefits of EE, and more broadly EE as a philosophy underpinning psychotherapeutic work with offenders, the PIPE and OPD treatment strategies may to some extent be confounding within an EE impact study, whereby it may be difficult to isolate direction correlations between EE and variables denoting change. Therefore, through a qualitative approach, this evaluation unpicks the features and dynamics which lie behind the facilitation of a setting becoming enabling.

On the other hand, it has been noted that whilst initially EE was designed as a mark of recognition for environments that were already enabling, contrastingly EE has attracted member settings which use the award to facilitate in a process towards becoming enabling. This is especially useful to a qualitative study which seeks to retrospectively and longitudinally capture any change resulting from the EE Award journey of its members. It is also worth noting that as EE is embedded within the OPD

⁴ National Offender Management Service (2013). *Enabling Features of Psychologically Informed Planned Environments*. London: National Offender Management Service.

Pathway, this evaluation will explore whether members consider EE as something that is imposed upon them at the start of the process, how such perceptions of EE evolve, and whether they influence the level of engagement with and success of EE within those settings. Indeed, the evaluation will also explore what EE success itself means for those settings.

Evaluations of impact are important due to capturing the changes (both intended and unintended) which are attributable to a specific defined intervention. Thus, an impact evaluation is concerned with whether changes would have taken place had EE not been implemented and therefore the difference that EE has made to its member settings. Moreover, the aim of a complete impact study is not only to isolate and measure change on selected variables resulting from an intervention, in this case EE, but also to understand the underlying qualitative processes driving the change. Change processes in organisations have been widely studied and are typically concerned with stakeholder perceptions, management and leadership, all of which influence the impact of an intervention, along with the broader macro-environment. Naturally, the overarching aim of an impact evaluation is to increase the effectiveness of public spending and promote evidence-based service improvement.

The evaluation will be carried out within a policy and service landscape in flux, with the criminal justice sector undergoing unprecedented reforms, with all but high-risk service contracts being put out to competitive tender. As a result, it is anticipated that settings are undergoing a period of uncertainty with likely resulting staff dissatisfaction and low levels of retention, as is often the case during disruptive waves of public sector reforms⁵. It would be of interest to the evaluation to explore how, if at all, EE helps organisations and their staff manage this process of transition and change, or whether broader system changes act as a barrier to EE's impact.

⁵ Fernandez, S. & Rainey, H.G.. (2006). Managing successful organizational change in the public sector. *Theory to Practice*, 66(2): 168-176.

Against this uncertain backdrop, it is especially salient to gauge the effectiveness of interventions which may have the potential to drive quality improvement and organisational well-being, such as EE. Furthermore, it is relevant to unpick the dynamics underpinning positive change in the face of challenging and multi-layered reforms. No doubt such an endeavour requires the utilisation of research methodology which can suitably get ‘under the skin’ of such complex cultural change processes.

Through the study of the public sector, it has been argued that achieving complex organisational change may require whole system transformation⁶. Crucially, Greenhalgh and others⁷ argue that ‘the question of whether an implementation has been successful or not is socially negotiated’, emphasizing that complex sustainable system changes are a process of social change and that ‘the effectiveness of these systems is sensitive to an array of barriers and facilitators: leadership, changing environments, details of implementation, organizational history, and much more’. Thus, this evaluation aims to remain sensitive to the multi-faceted socially-negotiated nature and the potential breadth of the impact of EE on its members.

In sum, this evaluation sets out to capture the organisational impact of EE amongst its HMPPS members and to identify the dynamic social processes driving any resulting organisational change. This impact evaluation will be carried out with the overarching aim of producing a robust evidence-base which can be used to inform decisions regarding continued funding for the EE programme as part of the OPD pathway, or HMPPS/NHS more widely.

⁶ White, L. (2000). Changing the ‘whole system’ in the public sector. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 13(2): 162-177.

⁷ Greenhalgh, T., Humphrey, C., Hughes, J., Macfarlane, F., Butler, & Pawson R. (2009). How do you modernize a health service? A realist evaluation of whole-scale transformation in London. *The Milbank Quarterly*, 87(2): 391–416.

2.0 Rapid Literature Review

A rapid literature review⁸ has been undertaken to set the academic context to the EE programme. This was primarily carried out using the search terms ‘enabling environments’, ‘prisons’, ‘probation’ and ‘criminal justice’, alongside scoping literature which looks at the impact of values and relational working in the criminal justice setting.

The concept of an enabling environment is presented in the literature as a means of helping to embed values related to the practice of therapeutic communities and psychologically-informed service delivery. Selected papers call for services universally to espouse core values and a level of psychological awareness and indicate that EE is the vehicle required for embedding such an organisational culture.^{9 10} EE is conceived as an approach and methodology which facilitates a sense of societal connectedness and has the potential of reducing social exclusion⁸. In addition, EE provides the toolkit necessary to embed values underpinning psycho-social approaches to client wellbeing into real service change. Thus, it is argued that EE needs to be a key social policy priority in order to promote social inclusion. No doubt, this is of particular salience to the criminal justice sector, whereby those leaving prison and probation are at higher risk of experiencing social inequity and exclusion.¹¹ However, the introduction of EE into HMPPS is a relatively new development and there is a paucity of published

⁸ Khangura, S., Konnyu, K., Cushman, R., Grimshaw, J. & Moher, D. (2012). Evidence summaries: the evolution of a rapid review approach. *Syst Rev*, 1 pp.10. doi:10.1186/2046-4053-1-10.

⁹ Haigh, R., Tom Harrison, T., Johnson, R., Paget, S., & Williams, S. (2012). Psychologically informed environments and the Enabling Environments initiative. *Housing, Care and Support*, 15(1), pp.34-42. <https://doi.org/10.1108/14608791211238412>.

¹⁰ Johnson, R. & Haigh, R. (2011). Social psychiatry and social policy for the 21st century: new concepts for new needs - the Enabling Environments initiative. *Mental Health and Social Inclusion*, 15(1), pp.17-23. <https://doi.org/10.5042/mhsi.2011.0054>.

literature exploring the effects of EE within HMPPS settings, and this evaluation aims to address this gap.

Further to this, through its value-driven standards, EE aims to promote and entrench improved human relationships both within the staff and service recipient groups, and between them, within the service setting. There is a wealth of literature supporting the nurturing of relationships organisationally for improved morale and performance¹², not least in prison settings.^{13 14} However, it has been highlighted that some of the features associated with a more ‘traditional’ prison culture, namely a sense of boundaries and vigilance, may contribute to a sense of fairness and safety, whilst on the other hand, staff who are too trusting of and yielding towards prisoners could inadvertently lead to negative prisoner outcomes¹⁵. Nonetheless, leadership, structure and safety lie at the heart of the EE framework, and are three of the standards that member organisations work towards.

Indeed, the review of papers reveals an established body of literature supporting the numerous facets of EE standards and philosophy within criminal justice and beyond, offering rich potential theoretical frameworks to later contextualise and conceptualise evaluation findings. The broad evidence-base ranges from enabling organisational and psychological features improving staff satisfaction¹⁶ and in turn better patient

¹² Baumeister, R. & Leary, M. (1995). The need to belong: desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117(3), pp. 497-529.

¹³ Crewe, B. (2011). Soft power in prison: implications for staff–prisoner relationships, liberty and legitimacy. *European Journal of Criminology*, 8(6): pp. 455 – 468.

¹⁴ Liebling, A. and Crewe, B. (2014). ‘Staff-prisoner relationships, moral performance, and privatisation’, in Durnescu, I. and McNeill, F. *Understanding Penal Practice*. New York: Routledge, pp. 153-166.

¹⁵ Crewe, B., Liebling, A. & Hulley, S. (2011). Staff culture, use of authority and prisoner quality of life in public and private sector prisons. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 44(1): 94-115.

¹⁶ Laschinger, H.K. & Leiter M.P. (2006). The impact of nursing work environments on patient safety outcomes: the mediating role of burnout/engagement. *Journal of Nursing Administration*, 5: 259-267.

outcomes¹⁷, to reducing staff sickness absence⁵, increasing engagement and improving productivity¹⁸. Further, literature pertaining to social climate within forensic psychiatry and prison settings, and beyond, is likely to be of relevance to this evaluation, which tends to focus around the measurement of a supportive social climate¹⁹ and the impact of a sense of community on rehabilitation²⁰. At the core of several studies, lies the notion of trust within staff/prisoner relationships, which EE aims to foster through its value based relational standards, and how its decline impacts negatively on prisoner rehabilitation.^{21 22 23} Thus, the literature themes closely translate to the ten EE standards, which are: belonging, boundaries, communication, development, involvement, safety, structure, empowerment, leadership and openness.

However, the direct impact of the EE programme and award on its members has not been systematically evaluated to date and this gap in knowledge is the overarching rationale for carrying out this evaluation. Based on the reviewed body of literature supporting the philosophy of an environment being enabling and the positive difference this can make to its users and staff, one can make several assumptions around the outputs and outcomes that EE is likely to have an impact on, including resident experience, staff satisfaction and organisational wellbeing. Further

¹⁷ West, M. & Dawson, J. (2012). *Employee Engagement and NHS Performance*. London: The King's Fund.

¹⁸ Rondeau, K. & Wagar, T. (2012). Employee high-involvement work practices and voluntary turnover: does human capital accumulation or an employee empowerment culture mediate the process? Examining the evidence in Canadian healthcare organisations. Paper presented at the *European Conference on Intellectual Capital*.

¹⁹ Schalast, N., Redies, M., Collins, M., Stacey, J. and Howells, K. (2008), EssenCES, a short questionnaire for assessing the social climate of forensic psychiatric wards. *Criminal Behav. Ment. Health*, 18: 49–58. doi:10.1002/cbm.67.

²⁰ Townley, G. & Kloos, B. (2011). *Community Ment Health J*, 47: 436. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10597-010-9338-9>.

²¹ Crewe, B., Liebling, A. and Hulley, S. (2015), Staff-Prisoner Relationships, Staff Professionalism, and the Use of Authority in Public- and Private-Sector Prisons. *Law Soc Inq*, 40: 309–344. doi:10.1111/lsi.

²² Hulley, S., Liebling, A. and Crewe, B. (2012) Respect in prisons: Prisoners' experiences of respect in public and private sector prisons. *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 12: 3-23.

²³ Liebling, A., Crewe, B. and Hulley, S. (2011). Values and practices in public and private sector prisons: A summary of key findings from an evaluation. *Prison Service Journal*, 196, 55-58.

considerations informed by the literature concern the relationship fostering role of EE and its resulting impact on a sense of safety and providing a boundaried structure for improved service user outcomes.

3.0 Evaluation Aim & Research Questions

The aim of the project is to carry out a qualitative evaluation of the perceived impact of EE on its HMPPS member organisations.

The overarching research question is:

- What perceived and observed impact has EE had on its HMPPS member settings?

The secondary research questions are as follows:

- Has EE made a difference to its HMPPS members and, if so, how?
- What has EE enabled, if anything, that could not be achieved before?

It is expected that in answering the above, the evaluation will shed light on the following:

- What are the barriers to and facilitators of HMPPS settings becoming enabling environments?
- What are the barriers to and facilitators of HMPPS settings attaining the EE Award?

4.0 Methods

4.1 Approach

This is a qualitative perceived impact service evaluation, which draws on the theoretical principles of realist evaluation.

Realist evaluation is an approach increasingly utilised to evaluate whole systems change and one that is primarily concerned with exploring the ‘complex and dynamic interaction among context, mechanism, and outcome’⁹ The approach uses multiple data sources and methods in a pragmatic and reflexive manner to build a picture of an organisational setting. In the same way as Greenhalgh and others⁹ – proponents of realist evaluation – advise, the context-mechanism-outcome relationship will be explored using the guiding question ‘what in terms of EE works, for whom, under what circumstances?’ Of key advantage to this study is that realist evaluation can draw pertinent lessons about how particular preconditions make particular outcomes more likely. Mechanisms attempt to explain what it is about EE that creates an outcome in a set context. The context is that of the member setting, and the outcome is what is produced for the staff, service users, the organisation and the macro-environment.

In their book “Realistic Evaluation”, Pawson and Tilley²⁴ argue that ‘experimentalists have pursued too single-mindedly questions of whether a programme works at the expense of knowing why it works’. They suggest a broader methodological approach that aims to explain why a programme works, for whom and under what circumstances. It is a formative evaluation approach, developing and testing theories in an iterative fashion with stakeholders rather than a summative approach where judgements are made at the conclusion of the programme. Thus, stakeholder feedback

²⁴ Pawson, R. & Tilley, N. (1997). *Realistic Evaluation*. London: Sage.

from the interim report will be utilised as a form of member checking to improve the accuracy of the findings.

A formative approach is preferred by NHS England, joint funder of the OPD Pathway (to the value of £54 million²⁵), for its potential to support effective implementation²⁵. At the core of realist evaluation is the overarching goal to effectively utilise knowledge gained through evaluation. EE stakeholders play a critical role in the change process of their organisations both directly in their day-to-day work and through the utilisation of knowledge created. Further, information and themes from observation and interviews will be explored with key stakeholders as part of member checking, and it is expected that they will be able to integrate new understandings within their practice.

It should be noted that realist evaluation is a complex endeavour. For instance, it has previously been used to evaluate NHS reorganisation in London where identifying mechanisms of change and drawing conclusions about causality were difficult⁹. Greenhalgh and others caution against assuming that change in complex contexts is simple or straightforward and, importantly, urge that the success of interpretive methods like realist evaluation is not measured against positivist criteria based on separation of evaluators from the case study. Realist evaluation means engaging with the ‘messy reality of the “case”’ and ‘accompanying practitioners closely on their unfolding journey’⁹. This notion clearly supports the importance of carrying out a qualitative evaluation, reflective of the social realities of key stakeholders. The realist evaluation of EE’s impact incorporates a range of qualitative ethnographically-informed techniques, including interviews with stakeholders, observation, analysis of documentary evidence and interpretation of organisational behaviours. The use of

²⁵ NHS England, (2016). *Evaluation Strategy for New Care Model Vanguards*. London: NHS England.

these varied data sources adds robustness to the evaluation through the triangulation that it provides.

No doubt, research in the current, complex and rapidly moving criminal justice policy landscape needs to be flexible and responsive to change. In addition, the formative nature of the research and particularly the realist approach will ensure that the investigator will work prospectively with recruited EE members. However, this will not be merely a reporting function or a quality improvement tool but will ensure considered feedback based on the literature and the analysis of data and will remain independent of the management of the EE programme and HMPPS if it is to have credibility.

4.2 Participants & Process

This study presents the views of key stakeholders, namely staff and service users of participating HMPPS settings, RCPsych EE team members, commissioners and external consultants to EE, gathered through 44 semi-structured interviews (11 of those with service users), along with some brief observation of the settings' environments.

In addition, several RCPsych Team meetings were observed as part of this study, and fieldnotes taken. Further, the 'Our Story' self-reported narratives taken from anonymised EE reports from seven sites which were awarded for the second time, were synthesised as a capture of change over time.

Presently, NEEPP has over 100 members. There are three part-time EELs, directly contracted by the RCPsych EE Programme, responsible for supporting EE members in Wales, South, Central, South East and South West England; Midlands and the North; and Women's Services. Whilst generalisability is not the aim of interpretive qualitative research, transferability of findings can be facilitated through the inclusion of settings representative of EE HMPPS members. Furthermore, the work and

approach of the RCPsych EE team itself has been studied for the purpose the evaluation. As well as for use as primary data and for 'triangulation' with site data, RCPsych team interviews were conducted for the purpose of scoping, piloting and development of the interview guides (see Appendices 1-3 pgs. 44-45).

The following four sites were recruited to participate in the study, and leads at the sites gave consent to their organisation being named:

- HMP Swaleside
- HMP Peterborough
- AP Camden
- AP Elizabeth Fry.

The chosen sites represent the following member setting types:

- New joiners, including those which have joined but demonstrated differing levels of engagement with the EE process
- Members with the EE Award
- Members who have not been successful in attaining the EE Award
- Prisons (Male and Female) and Approved Premises (Male and Female)
- Non-PIPE and non-treatment settings to reduce 'confounding' factors.

Amongst the staff participants, staff from eight further member sites (5 prisons and 2 approved premises) were interviewed by telephone.

The evaluation work respected and upheld confidentiality in relation to those interviewed and the information they provided, with consent sought from participating site leads for access and from individual participants prior to data collection. The study has been registered with and approved by the National Research Committee (Reference 2017-250).

Telephone interview participants were recruited as an opportunity sample through RCPsych EE team contacts. Selection bias in terms of participants from member settings was minimised by sending a group recruitment email, though the participants who responded are self-selected, and this may affect the transferability of findings. Participants within sites were approached either by email in advance or on the day of the visit, with the researcher clearly stating that participation in the study was voluntary. The interviews were conducted during the site visits.

Each participant was provided with written information about the study and their consent was sought for participation prior to data collection, after they were assured that their contributions would be anonymised and non-attributable. Participants were informed that they are able to withdraw their data from their study at any time by contacting the lead researcher. Where interviews were recorded using an encrypted Dictaphone, they were transcribed verbatim, omitting any identifying data. Records for the study have been kept in accordance with research ethics guidance and the Data Protection Act 1998²⁶.

The following research work provided the data sources for this study, the qualitative analysis of which will be presented in the next chapter of the report:

²⁶ Please note that the study was carried out prior to the introduction of the General Data Protection Regulations coming into force 25.05.2018.

Table 1: Research data sources

Sites visited	3 (1 Prison, 2 APs – 5 sets of fieldnotes) ²⁷
Number of total visits for all sites	7
Staff Interviews	22
Resident Interviews	11
EEL Interviews	3
RCPsych Team Interviews	3
Other stakeholders (e.g. assessors, commissioners, external consultants)	5
Documents synthesised	14
Meetings observed	9

²⁷ Please note that only interviews, rather than observational visits, were held at HMP Swaleside due to lack of staff availability.

5.0 Results

The results are presented as six themes, resulting from an iterative thematic analysis of the data, utilising the Fereday and Muir-Cochrane²⁸ six phase analytic framework, eliciting the salient features, successes and complexities surrounding the perceived impact of EE on its members. The first four themes comprise of findings which directly relate to the perceived impact of EE on service delivery and member/service user experience; the last two to considerations around the evaluation itself and resourcing.

These themes have been refined and have evolved throughout the course of the evaluation, based on iterative feedback from the participants through member checking and until a data saturation point had been reached, where no new findings emerged from the participant pool. Parallel overarching themes emerged across all participant groups, thus presenting the responses of prison versus probation participants, or those of other key stakeholders in isolation would have been limiting, and rather views are grouped within the overall themes. The quotes are labelled as follows, so as to identify the type of participant:

- Staff – prison and approved premises staff, predominantly officers and support workers. Psychologists and managers were also interviewed.
- Residents – residents of prisons and approved premises.
- RCPsych – Used to denote the responses of the RCPsych Team and EELs – these have been grouped together due to the small sample to prevent identification.
- Other stakeholders – commissioners, external consultants and EE assessors.

²⁸ Fereday, J. & Muir-Cochrane, E. (2006). Demonstrating rigor using thematic analysis: a hybrid approach of inductive and deductive coding and theme development. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 5(1): 1-10.

5.1 Theme 1: EE Impact - Explicit vs. Implicit Change

Participants highlighted several explicit areas of organisational performance and service delivery which had improved because of EE, such as greater staff and service user engagement and an improved physical environment:

“It has made us think about staff more, not just the service. We provided staff with access to resources – office space, Dictaphones, meetings and support, supervision for officer staff which is new to them, three reflective practice meetings” (Staff Pp. 2)

“We have seen a lot change as a result of the process. EE has given us an insight into how we can work better and be more inclusive to everyone. So, for instance, we now have a display and achievement board, explaining people’s work, being more inclusive.” (Staff Pp. 3)

Attempts at improving the comfort and aesthetics of the physical space of the settings was observed during the course of the study:

“The bedrooms have whiteboards for family photos (I am told that this is the result of EE)

There is a ‘thank you’ board and box for residents and staff

There are enabling inspirational quotes on canvas displayed on the walls.”

(Fieldnote 3)

It was felt that EE brought with it a wide range of opportunities for improving organisational wellbeing and, due to the time taken to undergo the EE process, gave leaders and teams the space to reflect on the importance of relationships and the role they play in fulfilling working lives, reducing staff sickness absence, driving

rehabilitation and reducing the number of incidents. EE also appeared to drive a sense of relational safety and security:

“Some staff struggled due to culture and high security – some staff hadn’t experienced anything like that before.” (RCPsych Pp. 1)

“We had low staff sickness levels anyway, but there is a greater sense of job satisfaction and confidence – both amongst residents and staff, and greater levels of trust, and we now work double hard to build their confidence that they will be treated respectfully.” (Staff Pp. 8)

“EE has helped with reducing incidents definitely. It is a safety thing. There was one resident who was awful when they came on, but they have definitely calmed down. They feel safer in the peace of our wing compared to the other (non-EE) wings” (Staff Pp. 18)

“People do feel safe here. EE is a way of working that we believe in anyway as a way of reducing incidents. The ideals are good. And if you work within these structures you will work in a happier environment.” (Staff Pp. 42)

Both PIPE and non-PIPE settings echoed this theme.

Further, the programme was seen as providing services with an opportunity to evidence and be rewarded for their good practice:

“the good services were good anyway and EE has just enforced that” (Staff Pp. 11)

However, two AP staff members interviewed did not see that EE had made a difference at all, because they felt as though they were already an enabling environment and that EE was an unnecessary tick-box exercise:

“It took up time and there was little point to it. We know that we do our best here for the men and we didn’t need to be told this.” (Staff Pp. 6)

“And there was a feeling they were paying lip service to it to gather documents, but we were doing it already and finding the time and effort to gather the evidence.” (Staff Pp. 37)

On the other hand, staff reflected on how EE provided them with a toolkit which legitimised the more person-centred approaches they wanted to take with the residents, but may have been prevented from doing so due to the pre-existing culture within their setting:

“Doing EE genuinely made a massive difference to my life. In a prison environment where it’s us and them merging that line where we are all looking after each other, made my life so much easier. I am the kind of person who likes to make connections with the residents, I feel it benefits their progress, but that can be looked down upon by the others. Having EE, and having management support it, gave me that extra confidence or protection if you like to be able to work in that way.” (Staff Pp. 19).

Overwhelmingly, participants underlined the unprecedented improvement in the quality of relationships, within the staff team and between staff and service users. Participants also conveyed the role EE played in improved morale in the service setting. Overall, it was felt that change relating to relationships and morale was harder to evidence, and yet was a phenomenon that was implicitly felt and collectively experienced, leading to a much-improved working and service environment.

The following are not an exhaustive list of interview excerpts evidencing these qualitative ‘soft’ changes that settings had experienced because of EE:

“Prisoners behave differently as a result they are more able to resolve to their issues in a polite and understanding way more and to talk about their problems.

These get resolved more easily and staff are more open. This is harder to measure, but I believe we have had fewer incidents.” (Staff Pp. 3)

“EE is a fantastic concept, it gets the staff and prisoners working together totally with the same aims and objectives – prisoners think it’s a nice environment to live in.” (RCPsych Pp. 1)

“The staff are really lovely, and it’s been nice sitting down together writing the testimonies for the EE folder. We all got together round the kitchen table, it made me feel like others were interested in me and what I had to say, we all shared stories, I kind of felt like I belonged.” (Resident Pp. 24)

“(EE) really helps with staff prisoner relationships. Gives a joint focus around the 10 standards. Joint training could not have gone any better.” (RCPsych Pp.1)

“User Voice have come in to speak to the prisoners. Men have said that they have more of a voice and are able to express themselves. Time, group programmes, structure to the day and they value what they are doing. Staff training and expertise of staff – better able to de-escalate than react. There is an understanding that all behaviour has meaning rather than reacting to the behaviour, which has helped our men to feel understood.” (Staff Pp. 7)

5.2 Theme 2: EE Impact – Change and the Role of Values

The values underpinning the EE standards were perceived by the participants to be accessible due to their universality across a range of settings. It was felt that they provide a core framework for the rehabilitation of service users because of their applicability within and beyond criminal justice. The values were seen to be based upon compassion and common sense:

“EE helps prisoners in their progress beyond prison. Gives them certain standards to aspire to. Never had anyone say anything negative about the standards.” (RCPsych Pp. 1)

Further, the EE process was seen as a key mode of challenging the traditional criminal justice ‘command and control’ culture, to establish a new more person-centred paradigm of working with service recipients and in terms of institutional culture, new processes and relational security:

“the tick box nature of the prison service is infantilising (...) there is almost this impotence which allows the environment to be controlled, and one might argue that it has to be like that within a secure environment. (...) what I do find that in the environments where they have adopted it, there has been a real sense of joy (...) a new commitment and motivation (...) the values have an effect on lives in a positive way” (RCPsych Pp. 9)

“Because EE has created bit more of a relaxed environment the residents can speak to each other more because they know it’s a safe environment to speak to others. It helps them go through their experiences with like-minded people and people who are genuinely there for them. This is where EE has made a difference. You see so many people go in and out for the same things and five minutes could have done so much more to help them change. All they need is a bit of support, hope and trust between the staff and residents to make them feel safe.” (Staff Pp. 19)

“EE has made definitely made a difference – it helps us to work with individuals and overcome a sense of ‘one size fits all’. So, for example we withdrew the warning system, which was punitive and tended to escalate situations and stress everyone out and also increased our rate of recalls, which was actually unfair. Instead, we opened up dialogue and involved residents in the decision-

making and now we resolve things less formally and positively, without confrontation or fear of aggression. I think not only our staff, but also the residents feel safer here as a result.” (Staff Pp. 16)

However, it was felt that at times of serious incidents within the prison settings, the ‘command and control’ culture would have a resurgence and here the values of EE have a role as a long-term strategy for debrief and relational support at times of organisational crisis:

“Having the space to stop and think will pay dividends vs. responding and thinking later, but prisons do not think in this way as you still have to keep the prison” (Staff Pp. 4)

The appraisal of ‘Our Story’ reports does not evidence a change over time in terms of values, rather identifies the importance of them to the settings at the point of joining EE and how their EE journey helped to solidify their identities as a staff and service user community:

“creating social relationships with a staff ‘team’ rather than an individual, with importance placed upon the value of being part of a community.” (Story Report EE067)

5.3 Theme 3: EE Impact – Building a Culture of Trust

There was a strong sense of EE helping to foster a culture of trust within the settings. This was achieved through the time taken to nurture relationships amongst and between staff and residents as a result of taking part in the programme. Trust was mentioned by numerous participants in PIPE and non-PIPE settings alike, either directly or indirectly, as underpinning better organisational culture, wellbeing and resident outcomes:

“I can always approach the staff, we get old residents coming to visit too and it feel like a family, like a community, this isn’t something that I was used to, but seeing the signs up I think this EE thing is probably related to that, because there are all these quotes up on the walls to get us to get on with one another.”
(Resident Pp. 27)

“The staff are very good here, ‘cause this is the vulnerable wing, so we get extra things to help us all get on, like those board games and we do crafts and things. The staff speak to us more, ask how we’re feeling, make us feel more like a person you know? I’m much happier here.” (Resident Pp. 23)

“The ‘thank you’ box is lovely ‘cause we can tell the staff we appreciate what they do for us and we believe that they will keep fighting our corner.” (Resident Pp. 28)

Furthermore, a sense of trust created in part by undergoing the EE process was seen as contributing to a reduction in incidents and an increased sense of safety amongst the staff and residents:

“There are less incidents here than elsewhere as the staff are really approachable. Respect is an earned thing and it’s about building mutual respect. Like for instance when the staff understood that I need light duties due to my injury.” (Resident Pp. 26)

“You get some bad ones, but generally we know the screws are here just to do their jobs and if we get treated with respect, we all get on, things are quiet, that’s how I like them you know? You feel safer too because you know the screws are not out to get you.” (Resident Pp. 29)

“Here things don’t go ‘tits up’ as much, because if we see someone bringing in Spice²⁹ we tell the staff and we know it’ll get dealt with because they trust us and we trust them, like I’ll pat your back you pat mine sort of thing. We get listened to and taken seriously” (Resident Pp. 26)

“The (residents) will always tell me about drugs as they hate them on them. You still have the professionalism from our end and you haven’t broken that boundary but you’re more a friend. That way you get rid of cliques and we are all there as one. The (residents) have a sense of agency about their living environment. EE has really empowered the residents, because we all trust each other day to day, because at the end of the day we want to make things better and safer for one another.” (Staff Pp. 18)

5.4 Theme 4: EE Impact - Wider Policy Context

Overwhelmingly, the staff and stakeholder participants conceptualised EE as a springboard to wider policy initiatives such as PIPEs and developing a rehabilitative culture, offering the necessary value-based infrastructure and team and service user engagement for their implementation. Participants were also able to disentangle EE from other programmes such as PIPEs and the OPD treatment services, which is perhaps counter to what the policy review within this report suggested, as these initiatives are interlinked operationally and in terms of their theoretical underpinnings. This was demonstrated by discussing EE as a free-standing independent programme. It was felt that EE itself created a greater openness and willingness to embrace change organisationally, and created stronger, more cohesive teams within settings in order to drive change:

²⁹ A synthetic cannabinoid.

“you will have a much stronger team of people and will be able to achieve more. EE standards underpin a wealth of government policy and provide a good grounding for their introduction” (Staff Pp. 12)

“you have more committed staff to change and if you are trying to create a rehabilitative culture you have to create a possibility and you have to instil hope” (Other Stakeholders Pp. 9)

However, there was a sense that EE being part of a top down mandate, ran somewhat counter to the values of an enabling environment:

“There is a confused top down policy agenda. Feels frustrating. The EE themes which go through the award are common sense and how we would want to run the award, the ethos and principles make sense. What is at odds is being told – what will happen if we don’t get the award, further up the food chain, so those principles don’t apply.” (Staff Pp. 6)

Further, there was a general sense of dissatisfaction and malaise beyond the scope of this study with system-wide issues in prison and probation voiced almost unanimously by the study’s participants. It appears that the values of EE could play a key role in creating enabling policies more broadly, for instance in terms of workforce development and staff growth:

“Prisons are a festering source of criminality (...) without education for the staff it’s never going to change. You have men and women who should be stacking shelves in Sainsbury’s, but they are custodians of men, but cannot help as they are uneducated and under trained. But the authorities don’t care. It’s a big job, but not an impossible one with the right sort of motivation. The change has to come from policy makers and staff, you have a package coming in in terms of prisoners to change, the staff should encourage not enforce the change. The standard of staffing presently is that they accept whoever they’ve got, but why

shouldn't they when they themselves are contented with who they are."
(Resident Pp. 44)

"There is a massive difference way in the way we work with the residents versus how the civil service works with us." (Staff Pp. 37)

And funding for social care provision:

*"The trouble is there is no housing, not for someone like me, if you're lucky you get given some sh**** little dive and all you want to do is get into trouble again just so you can go back so you are away from all the noise and drugs and trouble makers back to somewhere where at least you can sleep in peace."* (Resident Pp. 38)

"Due to universal credit we are seeing (the residents) being turned down for benefits, so we are also doing more support for people to get jobs. It's hard you know, it's a new system we are all trying to get our head around. It's all well and good talking about being more enabling, but we are up against a bigger system which causes us lots of problems in helping (the residents) get better and actually lead normal lives." (Staff Pp. 32)

EE was seen as having the scope to cut across health and social care settings encountered throughout the criminal justice journey and beyond:

"It'd be great if once the guys leave here they could go to another setting that was enabling or even had the award. This way the values of respect and how one creates better relationships could carry on and it'd be something that they already know, which would reduce their anxieties and maybe even keep them from reoffending you never know." (Staff Pp. 40)

5.5 Theme 5: Evaluating EE – Process vs. Impact

Staff and stakeholder participants conveyed the complexity of disentangling the EE process from its impact and vice versa, and overall felt that it was short-sighted to do so. Given participant testimonies regarding the implicit ‘soft’ change their organisations underwent as a result of EE, this is perhaps unsurprising. Undergoing the process of the EE journey was considered to be the core catalyst for change within the service setting. The receipt of the award itself was not felt to be as important as the experience of embedding the principles of EE within the organisation, which was perceived as more difficult to evaluate:

“Extremely rich and valuable and worthwhile process, the process itself is the impact, not the award, but then I suppose that is harder to measure” (Staff Pp. 7)

Indeed, the capture of the impact of EE overall was deemed to be complex and at times problematic:

“It’s nebulous what seems to happen, fundamentally it’s about making relationships rather than procedures a priority – relationships without the process could have been ignored or done in a mechanical way. EE is something that’s found between people rather than defined. It’s about the way people see and experience each other.” (Staff Pp. 5)

“EE is all about coming round to nebulous values. The more senior people are more likely they are to understand. Middle ranking commissioners, managers often don’t get it. Does not have ‘the right sort of data behind it’ they will say, though clearly this misses the point.” (Other Stakeholder Pp. 5)

It was also felt that EE itself risks falling victim to data capture centrism through its assessment mechanisms:

“evidence is contrived, and is there a better way of assessing – more weight on observations rather than documents? We need to be having an ongoing dialogue of process vs outcome. The membership process can feel very administrative.”
(Staff Pp. 6)

Interestingly, the demands placed on the impact evaluation itself have centred around considerations of process versus impact with mixed messages received by the evaluator from the RCPsych EE team, HMPPS commissioners and the National Research Committee as to what the focus of the evaluation should be, often oscillating between the two constructs. It is likely that this itself is a reflection of the staff and stakeholder participants’ perceived limitations of separating the EE process from its impact.

Nonetheless, participants conveyed the importance of programme evaluation, one that looks beyond measurable data, in order to build an evidence-base for on-going funding:

“It’s so important to evaluate what you are doing (...) an EE impact is best captured beyond metrics (...) otherwise we are looking at the side-effects and not the real impact (...) and when you are putting a lot of money into something you need to know that it is working well and meaningfully say whether it is an effective programme” (Staff Pp.10)

5.6 Theme 6: Resourcing Considerations

Several participants voiced their frustrations at the additional human resource required to undertake the EE process, often citing the administrative demands of the portfolio production as especially challenging and time-consuming. In addition, the time and creativity required to operationalise the EE values within the service setting were perceived by some participants to be a notable challenge of the EE journey. Further, it was conveyed by the participants that PIPE or treatment settings were

better prepared to achieve the EE award due to the additional financial resource available to them:

“If there was a different way of evidencing our work it would be better, the portfolio takes us away from service delivery and we do not have the resource of say a PIPE setting.” (Staff Pp. 2)

The organisational frustrations related to EE were mainly linked to high staff turnover levels, which in turn affected the sustainability of the newly established EE culture and it was felt that adequate resourcing would likely overcome this:

“We have had enormous issues with staff turnover. We began with great enthusiasm and a team selected on suitability for the service. Culture carriers moved on to other settings as part of promotion and due to staffing issues more broadly we couldn’t be as selective with new staff coming in.” (Staff Pp. 7)

“Staff are keen on EE, but we do not have available resources. We have had a lot of staff changes so there is a lack of continuity. So, for instance, staff have been sent on RCPsych training, but they often move on. Also, we rarely have time as a staff group to reflect and it is difficult to get staff to attend at committee meetings due to short-staffing and rota issues.” (Staff Pp. 4)

Further, participants from service settings explained that the support of the Royal College EELs had been an invaluable resource in supporting their EE journey. It was felt that their input as a party external to HMPPS struck the crucial balance between guidance and encouraging autonomy to gain confidence in implementing the EE values:

“We had regular visits from EELs where they did a mock assessment and reviewed the portfolio and delivered training, this was really helpful in making us understand the essence of EE.” (Staff Pp. 2)

Though several staff participants from member setting reflected in retrospect that the EE process was necessarily lengthy and requiring of effort:

“We took a month break to reflect, as we all felt deflated initially at how long everything had taken us, I mean worked hard for over a year only not to get the award. But then started to look at the areas and criticism, positive and negative, take it board and take it as an opportunity to create change and also to see that that time was really needed to help us make the changes that we had already put into place. I guess changing a culture of a place does take time.” (Staff Pp. 39)

6.0 Discussion

The discussion links the results of this qualitative EE impact study to the academic and policy literature. The findings strongly imply that the perceived impact of EE requires time to embed and is wide-ranging; from improved relationships between staff and service users and better ways of working, to EE acting as a springboard for wider policy initiatives within prison and probation settings. Further, the strengths and limitations of the study are presented, and suggestions for future research made.

The findings clearly echo the academic body of literature reviewed within the report. There is an overwhelming sense of support for environments which are enabling for recovery, rehabilitation and improved staff morale. In terms of explicit versus implicit change, typically explicit behaviour is deemed to be more directly modifiable³⁰, whereas implicit change is harder to achieve, takes time and is more difficult to measure.

Therefore, the chosen research methodology of qualitative enquiry, mirrors the thoughts of participants about the difficulty of evidencing impact which is more felt than observed through metrics alone. The qualitative methodology utilised within this study highlights the essential relationship between process and impact, and the difficulty of extricating one from the other.

Indeed, the felt sense of better personal and group conditions being achieved through the creation of an environment which is enabling has been widely studied in the context of organisational well-being more broadly³¹. It is perhaps reassuring that these findings closely match pre-existing discourses and the very beliefs upon which EE itself is based. Furthermore, it is likely that EE enables implicit and tacit organisational

³⁰ James L. Fosshage Ph.D. (2008) The explicit and implicit domains in psychoanalytic change, *psychoanalytic inquiry*, 25:4, 516-539, DOI: 10.2513/s07351690pi2504_7.

³¹ Mitleton-Kelly, E. (2003). *Complex Systems and Evolutionary Perspectives on Organisations*. Oxford: Pergamon.

processes, such as ‘softer’ facets of human relationships and new informal group norms, which help its values embed within member settings. This is an important point in driving expectations of the type of impact EE is likely to achieve, as well as tools which lend themselves to capturing that impact.

It appears that trust is a key facet of the improved relationships enabled by EE within member settings. This is line with several studies, which promote the value of trust as a key foundation to staff/prisoner relationships, and good outcomes in terms of prisoner rehabilitation.^{32 33 34} The trust facilitated by EE was discussed by the study’s participants in the context of fostering relational security, which recognises the central role positive staff/service user relationships play in reducing risk and upholding safety³⁵. In addition, findings pertaining to the perceived advantages of the space for reflection offered by EE, mirror literature supporting the role of time for reflective practice as crucial to risk reduction and relational safety³⁶.

Whilst comprising some quantitative elements, for instance staffing ratios, contact time etc., relational security is difficult to measure through quantitative tools alone³⁷, as rather it predominantly concerns a sense of understanding and intuitiveness about one’s environment and again trust between service users and professionals. It is a concept and tool promoted in service guidance, as an effective and cost-effective risk

³² Crewe, B., Liebling, A. and Hulley, S. (2015), Staff-prisoner relationships, staff professionalism, and the Use of authority in public- and private-sector prisons. *Law Soc Inq*, 40: 309–344. doi:10.1111/lsi.

³³ Hulley, S., Liebling, A. and Crewe, B. (2012) Respect in prisons: Prisoners' experiences of respect in public and private sector prisons. *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 12: 3-23.

³⁴ Liebling, A., Crewe, B. and Hulley, S. (2011). Values and practices in public and private sector prisons: A summary of key findings from an evaluation. *Prison Service Journal*, 196, 55-58.

³⁵ Tighe, J. & Gisli H. Gudjonsson, G. H. (2012). *See, Think, Act* Scale: preliminary development and validation of a measure of relational security in medium- and low-secure units. *The Journal of Forensic Psychiatry & Psychology*, 23:2, 184-199.

³⁶ Deacon, J. (2010). Testing boundaries: the social context of physical and relational containment in a maximum secure psychiatric hospital. *Journal of Social Work Practice*, 18(1): 81-91.

³⁷ Chester, V., Alexander, R. T., & Morgan, W. (2017). Measuring relational security in forensic mental health services. *BJ Psych Bulletin*, 41(6), 358–363. <http://doi.org/10.1192/pb.bp.116.055509>.

reduction practice^{38 39} and an alternative to traditional top down ‘command and control’ security enforcement within medium secure and secure settings. The results of this study strongly suggest that EE can be viewed as an enabling mechanism for driving relational security.

The ten EE standards (belonging, boundaries, communication, development, involvement, safety, structure, empowerment, leadership and openness) are perceived to be ‘common sense’ by this study’s participants; they help to create a trust infrastructure and challenge the traditional ‘command and control’ criminal justice culture. Instead, EE fosters a recognition of potential for change and human growth through collaborative and respectful interaction. This creates a sense of hope for service users, a concept which has been recognised as playing a key part in helping prisoners gain a sense of meaning from their imprisonment. Moreover, these findings imply that EE can play a central role as a mechanism for change in helping to drive forward one of the central priorities of HMPPS – prisoner rehabilitation⁴⁰.

Interestingly, the staff reports, and those of wider stakeholders, echoed those of the residents. Staff too felt that EE offered them the toolkit to legitimise new, more person-centred approaches to their work with residents, and helped to drive up staff morale, against a backdrop of funding cuts and policy-change. Again, this is of ‘bottom-up’ relevance, during a time when the importance of appraising the role and efficacy of services is central to policy-making, along with sustaining staff engagement during a period of austerity cuts and unprecedented upheaval.⁴¹

³⁸ Department of Health (2010). *See, Think Act: Your Guide to Relational Security*. London: Department of Health.

³⁹ Department of Health (2015) (2nd ed.). *See, Think, Act: Your Guide to Relational Security*. London: Department of Health.

⁴⁰ <https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/her-majestys-prison-and-probation-service/about>. Accessed 01.03.2018.

⁴¹ Liebling, A., Arnold, A. & Straub, C. (2011). *Report: Exploration of Staff-Prisoner Relationships at HMP Whitemoor: Twelve Years On*. Cambridge: Cambridge Institute of Criminology.

Unsurprisingly, there is a wealth of literature highlighting the importance of staff wellbeing within prisons and secure settings^{42 43} and its effects on improving the lives of service users⁴⁴, and decreasing financial costs in relation to staff sickness and burnout⁴⁵. Further, staff highlighted the need for on-going resource to help embed EE principles and how funding for additional staff time would offer the space to create more enabling, reflective environments. This is no doubt of interest to commissioning intentions concerning support around ensuring that NEEPP embeds into everyday practice and leaves behind an enduring legacy.

Furthermore, the findings of this study strongly point to the salient role values play in driving EE's impact, along with cultural change within HMPPS settings. Values and 'moral vision' have been previously recognised as underpinning professional styles amongst prison staff and subsequent influence on regimes and leadership within them⁴⁶. The value-based framework of EE held high acceptability for the participants of the study, who felt that they were 'human', compassionate and person-centred, driving tangible desirable change amongst staff and prisoners, and it is recommended that these values continue to be emphasised through change initiatives at all layers of prison and probation organisations.

Finally, the findings of the study could lend themselves to informing policy logic modelling within HMPPS. Logic models are typically used to understand complex

⁴² Wright, K. & Saylor, W. (1991). Male and female employees' perceptions of prison work: is there a difference? *Justice Quarterly*, 8(4): 505-524.

⁴³ Bennett, B., Crewe, B. & Wahidin, A. (2012) (eds.). *Understanding Prison Staff*. Oxford: Routledge.

⁴⁴ Helliwell, J. (2011). Institutions as enablers of wellbeing. The Singapore prison case study. *International Journal of Wellbeing*, 1(2): 255-265.

⁴⁵ Stewart, W. & Terry, L. (2014). Reducing burnout in nurses and care workers in secure settings. *Nursing Standard*, 28(34): 37-45.

⁴⁶ Liebling, A., Crewe, B. and Hulley, S. (2011). Values and practices in public and private sector prisons: A summary of key findings from an evaluation. *Prison Service Journal*, 196, 55-58.

interventions within health and social care policy making⁴⁷. This study has captured several processes perceived to underpin service change as a result of EE's impact, which hold transferability to policy-making considerations and logic modelling beyond EE, for instance recognising the centrality of values in fostering healthy prison and AP organisations for staff and service users alike.

6.1 Study Limitations and Further Evaluation Research

By utilising qualitative methodology, the study allowed for unprecedented access into EE member settings, to help get 'under the skin' of their day to day realities and conceptualisations of the impact of EE amongst their staff and residents. Semi-structured interviews with a wide range of stakeholders produced rich data, the analysis of which helped to facilitate new understandings of the beliefs and feelings stakeholders hold about EE.

However, the evaluation itself was time limited to offer value for money, and it could be argued that a more in depth ethnographic approach would have allowed for greater triangulation of data sources and researcher immersion with the data. For instance, exploring research questions more directly comparing EEs impact in PIPE and non-PIPE settings would help to shed light on whether the impact of EE is enabled by PIPEs and vice versa. However, within this study there were no overarching thematic differences in how the impact of EE was conceptualised by PIPE and non-PIPE participants, suggesting that EE has an impact as an independent programme and in settings which do not obtain extra resourcing to become 'psychologically informed'.

There was a sense from some AP participants that they were already an enabling environment, and that going through the EE process was somewhat tokenistic as a

⁴⁷ Anderson, L., Petticrew, M. et al. (2011). Using logic models to capture complexity in systematic reviews. *Research Synthesis Methods*, 2(1): 33-42.

result. These differences between AP and prison settings and the processes underpinning how they engage with the EE process would be of interest to explore in a further study. In addition, a longer-term ethnographic study could track members at different time points within the EE journey - the findings of which could potentially contribute to a theory of organisational change and the development of toolkits to support each stage of change.

Further impact evaluation work could be broadened to include longitudinal quantitative data, using metrics which EE appears to influence, such as incidents, staff sickness absence, recalls and the like, to enhance the qualitative findings and allow for statistical generalisability of results across HMPPS settings. However, performance on such metrics is multi-factorial, and as such, there will be a difficulty in arguing direct causality between EE and performance change. Again, we can identify the strength of the qualitative method here, which has shed light on the processes underpinning organisational improvement perceived to be the result of EE. As the funding for EE by the OPD pathway is time bound, it would be of interest to study how the perceived impact of EE is affected by changes in funding structures and modes of programme delivery.

7.0 Implications for Practice

The evaluation has produced several summary learning points and clear implications for practice, which stem directly from the data and convey the overarching views of the study's participants:

- Qualitative methodology is the appropriate approach for evaluating the 'softer' implicit impact of EE, which lies beyond metrics
- EE is overwhelmingly viewed as a positive experience, driving constructive change over time (sometimes over several years), along with staff, service user, and organisational well-being
- EE offers a toolkit for legitimising the importance of nurturing relationships within HMPPS settings, which are viewed as a key enabler to a sense of safety and improved resident outcomes
- The role of the EELs is perceived as invaluable to help achieve award success, and continued funding for the posts should be considered to sustain engagement with the initiative
- Settings may require greater support with resourcing in order to engage fully with the process (non-PIPE/treatment settings in particular)
- EE should be viewed by policy-makers as offering a springboard for the implementation of change initiatives
- As the impact and influence of the EE Programme continue to grow, a NEEPP business case around sustainability, likely through peer-review, and national rollout would be timely.

8.0 Conclusions

To summarise by addressing the overarching research question – *what perceived and observed impact has EE had on its HMPPS member settings?* – findings point to EE being perceived as having a range of both instinctive and tangible positive effects within HMPPS settings, with participants highlighting the organisational barriers and facilitators throughout their EE ‘journeys’. Thus, it would be short-sighted to attempt to capture EE’s ‘impact’ through metrics alone, and this evaluation has been pivotal in capturing the qualitative facets of EE’s influence within HMPPS settings.

According to the evaluation participants, EE makes a difference to its members through a process of embedding relational working and person-centred ‘common sense’ values. EE helps to foster trust between staff and residents and within staff and resident groups. The focus on nurturing relationships which EE provides member settings with is seen to play a key role in improving organisational well-being and the service user experience. Better relationships resulting from EE are an enabler of a sense of safety within member settings. Crucially, EE gives staff and residents the tools needed to challenge traditional authoritarian culture, shifting the focus to creating more compassionate prison and probation settings, ones where values lie at the core of rehabilitation. EE drives its members to achieve improved staff and service recipient morale and openness, and thus holds the potential to act as a springboard for the implementation of wider change policy within Her Majesty’s prison and probation settings.

9.0 Appendix 1: Interview Guide - Staff

Can you tell me about your service's story of the EE process?

- *What worked well? What didn't?*
- *What do you think of EE?*
- *What were/are your organisation's views of EE?*

What impact did receiving the EE award/the EE process thus far have on your organisation?

- *Teams*
- *Individuals*
 - *Consider levels of seniority throughout the organisational system.*
- *Service recipients.*

Has the award made a difference and, if so, how?

- *Can you give some specific examples of where EE has had an impact on your service?*
- *What differences have you felt/observed?*
- *What had EE 'enabled', if anything, that could not be achieved before?*
- *If EE hasn't made a difference, why do you think this is?*

Had you not known about/participated in EE, would your service be a different service to the one it is today?

What are your reflections on maintaining the award?

10.0 Appendix 2: Interview Guide – Residents

Have you heard of Enabling Environments (EE)?

What are your thoughts about EE?

- *What do you think of EE?*
- *What worked well? What didn't?*

What impact did receiving the EE award/the EE process thus far have on your setting?

- *The feel of the environment*
- *Other residents*
- *Staff.*

Has the award made a difference and, if so, how?

- *Can you give some specific examples of where EE has had an impact on your service?*
- *What differences have you felt/observed?*
- *What had EE 'enabled', if anything, that could not be achieved before?*
- *If EE hasn't made a difference, why do you think this is?*

Had you not known about/participated in EE, would your service be a different service to the one it is today?

11.0 Appendix 3: Interview Guide – RCPsych & Other Stakeholders

Tell me about your role in EE

What do you think about EE?

Does EE make a difference within HMPPS settings, and how?

How does EE affect staff/residents/the environment, if at all?

Can EE be improved and if so, how?

PUBLICATIONS: COPYRIGHT AND PERMISSIONS

All content published by the Royal College of Psychiatrists is protected by copyright.

Please see <https://www.rcpsych.ac.uk/about-us/contact-us/permissions> for more information.