

Report on an unannounced inspection of

# **Juvenile unit at HMYOI Parc**

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

**28 April – 9 May 2014**

## **Glossary of terms**

We try to make our reports as clear as possible, but if you find terms that you do not know, please see the glossary in our 'Guide for writing inspection reports' on our website at: <http://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprison/about-our-inspections/>

Crown copyright 2014

You may re-use this information (excluding logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, visit <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/> or email: [psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk)

Where we have identified any third party copyright material you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at the address below or: [hmiprison.enquiries@hmiprison.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:hmiprison.enquiries@hmiprison.gsi.gov.uk)

This publication is available for download at: <http://www.justice.gov.uk/about/hmi-prison>

Printed and published by:  
Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons  
Victory House  
6th floor  
30–34 Kingsway  
London  
WC2B 6EX  
England

# Contents

Introduction	5
Fact page	7
About this inspection and report	9
Summary	11
Section 1. Safety	19
Section 2. Respect	31
Section 3. Purposeful activity	45
Section 4. Resettlement	51
Section 5. Recommendations and housekeeping points	59
Section 6. Appendices	63
Appendix I: Inspection team	63
Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report	65
Appendix III: Establishment population profile	69
Appendix IV: Summary of children and young people questionnaires and interviews	73



# Introduction

The juvenile unit at Parc is a small distinct and separate part of the much larger Parc prison near Bridgend in South Wales. With 64 places over two small wings, it holds boys under the age of 18, both remand and convicted, from a catchment area that has increased recently to include not only South Wales but also significant parts of south west England. We last inspected this facility in September 2012 when we reported generally very positive outcomes. At this inspection the unit was holding 50 young people. Again our overwhelming impression was that these young people were well cared for and that overall Parc was doing its best to ensure that they accessed good and useful services and continued to experience positive outcomes.

Parc is a safe institution. Young people indicated that they felt safe after their arrival and during their stay. Some young people experienced long waits at court and extended journeys, but procedures to receive them into the unit ensured effective assessment and useful induction. We found safeguarding and child protection arrangements to be robust, well integrated and efficient. There was a good understanding among staff of their responsibilities concerning child protection.

The unit itself was small and quite enclosed but this afforded the advantage of some close staff supervision and prompt support for those at risk of intimidation. Dynamic and procedural security was very good. Levels of violence, nearly all very minor, were similar to the previous inspection, despite the fact that the proportion of young people with more complex needs and therefore greater risks had increased. Behaviour management strategies based on an individual case work approach were in place and young people were very clear about the standards expected of them. Rules and routines were fair and proportionate, and there was good consultation about their application. In particular the unit ran a rewards and sanctions scheme, the legitimacy of which was evidenced by how well those on the lowest level of the scheme were engaged, the fairness of its application, and the fact that many young people thought it was motivational in helping them manage their behaviour.

Levels of self-harm were very low and structures to support those that might potentially be at risk were robust and well integrated. Use of force had reduced since we last inspected and it was clearly evident that it was only applied as a last resort. Supervision was thorough and arrangements accountable. The use of separation or segregation was commendably low but it was unfortunate that the discrete segregation unit was adjacent to an adult wing. There was some on-wing separation or loss of association, but again this still allowed for reasonable access to the regime and full access to activities. The evidence we found suggested hardly any use of drugs or illicit substances but with good support services for those who needed them. However, clinical services for newly arrived boys could be improved.

The unit was in a good state of repair and most cells were clean. However, some shared cells were cramped and toilet screening required improvement. Access to outside areas and general amenities, such as showers and telephones, was good. At the heart of the unit's success were the excellent relationships between staff and children. Poor behaviour was challenged in an atmosphere of mutual respect. There was good advocacy on behalf of young people and useful structures for meaningful consultation. Work to support equality was focused on the individual and in meeting their needs. Enquiries into the few complaints were thorough but there was a need for a more strategic approach that perhaps monitored data as it applied to minority groups more effectively. The chaplaincy had a very high profile in the unit and in addition to meeting the religious needs of young people supported the wider work of the unit well. Health services were similarly very good and appreciated by young people.

Young people had good access to time out of their cells and prompt access to a range of learning and skills activities. There was good initial assessment and some good planning of individual learning needs. Overall the standard of teaching was good; attendance at education was good and many boys achieved well. There was, however, not enough focus on the core skills of literacy and numeracy and insufficient support for those with additional learning needs.

Work to support the resettlement of young people was reasonably good. Initial assessment was prompt, including for those on remand. Training planning and remand management was child-focused and comprehensive with young people fully engaged and good involvement from specialist departments. Pre-release support was good, although less effective for those who lived further away, particularly in England. There had been an increased use of temporary release since we last inspected, although this could be expanded to better promote family relationships. Provision under the resettlement pathways, perhaps with the exception of quite limited support into education, training or employment, was ensuring useful and effective outcomes.

Parc is a good and accountable facility providing a safe and respectful environment where learning and resettlement support can be provided. The unit is well led and the attitude of staff is key to its success. Young people are not collectively seen as a problem or blamed, and the culture is not punitive. On the contrary, staff set clear boundaries and work legitimately with young people. Staff set a good example, advocate on their behalf and listen to their concerns. An added strength is the size of the unit which allows for really good supervision, and this brings confidence and security to staff and young people alike.

**Nick Hardwick**  
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

August 2014

# Fact page

## Task of the establishment

Category B training prison with operational capacity of 1,335 for offenders aged 18 plus. Juvenile unit with an operational capacity of 64 remand and convicted young people under the age of 18.

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

Private. G4S Central Government Services

## Region/Department

Wales and the south-west

## Number held

50 young people

## Certified normal accommodation

64

## Operational capacity

64

## Date of last full inspection

2 – 6 July 2012

## Brief history

The young person's unit at Parc opened in March 2002 as a 28-room facility for remand young people aged 15 to 18 years. In October 2004 the unit expanded to house 36 remand and sentenced young people. In February 2007 the John Charles unit expanded further to 64 remand and sentenced young people. The facility was for courts in south and mid Wales.

In March 2013 the court catchment area for the unit extended from Wales to the south-west of England to include North and South Somerset, Devon and Cornwall across to the Dorset border. In April 2014 the court catchment area increased further to include Bristol, Swindon and Wiltshire.

## Short description of residential units

The John Charles unit has two residential units, GI housing 36 young people and EI housing 28 young people.

## Director

Janet Wallsgrove

## Escort contractor

GEOAmey

## Health service commissioner and providers

G4S Integrated Services

## Learning and skills providers

G4S

## Independent Monitoring Board chair

Jean Davies





# About this inspection and report

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons is an independent, statutory organisation which reports on the treatment and conditions of those detained in prisons, young offender institutions, immigration detention facilities and police custody.

All inspections carried out by HM Inspectorate of Prisons contribute to the UK's response to its international obligations under the Optional Protocol to the UN Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (OPCAT). OPCAT requires that all places of detention are visited regularly by independent bodies – known as the National Preventive Mechanism (NPM) – which monitor the treatment of and conditions for detainees. HM Inspectorate of Prisons is one of several bodies making up the NPM in the UK.

All Inspectorate of Prisons reports include a summary of an establishment's performance against the model of a healthy prison. The four tests of a healthy prison are:

<b>Safety</b>	children and young people, particularly the most vulnerable, are held safely
<b>Respect</b>	children and young people are treated with respect for their human dignity
<b>Purposeful activity</b>	children and young people are able, and expected, to engage in activity that is likely to benefit them
<b>Resettlement</b>	children and young people are prepared for their release into the community and helped to reduce the likelihood of reoffending.

Under each test, we make an assessment of outcomes for children and young people and therefore of the establishment's overall performance against the test. In some cases, this performance will be affected by matters outside the establishment's direct control, which need to be addressed nationally.

- **outcomes for children and young people are good against this healthy prison test.**  
There is no evidence that outcomes for children and young people are being adversely affected in any significant areas.
- **outcomes for children and young people are reasonably good against this healthy prison test.**  
There is evidence of adverse outcomes for children and young people in only a small number of areas. For the majority, there are no significant concerns. Procedures to safeguard outcomes are in place.
- **outcomes for children and young people are not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.**  
There is evidence that outcomes for children and young people are being adversely affected in many areas or particularly in those areas of greatest importance to their well-being. Problems/concerns, if left unattended, are likely to become areas of serious concern.
- **outcomes for children and young people are poor against this healthy prison test.**  
There is evidence that the outcomes for children and young people are seriously affected by current practice. There is a failure to ensure even adequate treatment of and/or conditions for children and young people. Immediate remedial action is required.

Our assessments might result in one of the following:

- **recommendations:** will require significant change and/or new or redirected resources, so are not immediately achievable, and will be reviewed for implementation at future inspections
- **housekeeping points:** achievable within a matter of days, or at most weeks, through the issue of instructions or changing routines
- **examples of good practice:** impressive practice that not only meets or exceeds our expectations, but could be followed by other similar establishments to achieve positive outcomes for children and young people.

Five key sources of evidence are used by inspectors: observation; children and young people surveys; discussions with children and young people; discussions with staff and relevant third parties; and documentation. During inspections we use a mixed-method approach to data gathering and analysis, applying both qualitative and quantitative methodologies. Evidence from different sources is triangulated to strengthen the validity of our assessments.

Since April 2013, the majority of our inspections have been full follow-ups of previous inspections, with most unannounced. Previously, inspections were either full (a new inspection of the establishment), full follow-ups (a new inspection of the establishment with an assessment of whether recommendations at the previous inspection had been achieved and investigation of any areas of serious concern previously identified) or short follow-ups (where there were comparatively fewer concerns and establishments were assessed as making either sufficient or insufficient progress against the previous recommendations).

## This report

This explanation of our approach is followed by a summary of our inspection findings against the four healthy prison tests. There then follow four sections each containing a detailed account of our findings against our *Expectations. Criteria for assessing the treatment of children and young people and conditions in prisons*. The reference numbers at the end of some recommendations indicate that they are repeated, and provide the paragraph location of the previous recommendation in the last report. Section 5 collates all recommendations, housekeeping points and examples of good practice arising from the inspection. Appendix II lists the recommendations from the previous inspection, and our assessment of whether they have been achieved.

Details of the inspection team and the establishment population profile can be found in Appendices I and III respectively.

Findings from the survey of children and young people and a detailed description of the survey methodology can be found in Appendix IV of this report. Please note that we only refer to comparisons with other comparable establishments or previous inspections when these are statistically significant.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The significance level is set at 0.05, which means that there is only a 5% chance that the difference in results is due to chance.

# Summary

## Safety

- S1** *Children said they were treated well on escort to the prison and when they arrived. The reception and first night procedures were thorough and induction was well organised. The safeguarding and child protection arrangements remained effective. Self-harm was well managed. Use of force was proportionate and reducing. Levels of violence were not high and incidents resulting in serious injury were rare. Discipline procedures were administered fairly and the rewards and sanctions scheme was motivational. The young people's substance misuse service provided excellent support. Children generally reported feeling safe. **Outcomes for children and young people were good against this healthy prison test.***
- S2** *At the last inspection in July 2012, we found that outcomes for children and young people in Parc were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made eight recommendations about safety. At this follow-up inspection we found that five of the recommendations had been achieved, one had been partially achieved and two had not been achieved.*
- S3** In our survey, children were more likely than at similar establishments to say that escort staff had treated them well. Most children said that they had felt safe on the journey to Parc, although records showed that a quarter of the boys arriving at the prison had travelled in vans with adults. Now that children were being held further from home, the length of journeys to court, sometimes up to seven hours, were frequently identified as a problem.
- S4** Routine strip-searching on arrival and at other times was no longer carried out, which was commendable.
- S5** There were no undue delays in reception; first night arrangements were thorough and children said they felt safe during their early days in the establishment. All relevant background information was used to complete initial risk assessments and most were completed well. The induction programme was well structured and delivered by a skilled officer who adapted the material to suit each individual. The multidisciplinary exit board provided an effective check that each child had absorbed all the necessary information.
- S6** Child protection work continued to be dealt with effectively. The internal procedures were efficient, and there were good links with the local authority. Child protection referrals were subject to a comprehensive analysis.
- S7** Most safeguarding meetings were well attended, with multidisciplinary representation and input. The daily morning meeting was an effective way of sharing information on risks and needs and coordinating the support that staff provided to children.
- S8** Although the population mix was less straightforward and the number of boys with complex needs was greater than before, staff intervened early and incidents of violence were relatively low and roughly equivalent to the rate at the last inspection. None of the incidents had resulted in serious injuries. Mediation continued to be used following most incidents when boys gave their consent.
- S9** Arrangements to address bullying were sound and a new monitoring process was working well with continuous recording and regular case reviews.

- S10 The proportion of children saying that they had been victimised by others was in line with the comparator and with the previous inspection, but survey results showed that children at Parc had more confidence that staff would take seriously any report of victimisation.
- S11 The level of self-harm was not high: of 22 incidents in six months, 59% had involved punching or head butting a hard surface, and most of the others related to scratching of the arm.
- S12 An average of two ACCT forms (assessment, care in custody and teamwork case management of prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm) were opened a week. The quality of the ACCT documentation was generally very good, with a few lapses. The quality assurance procedure was thorough and the ACCT process was integrated with general care planning.
- S13 The rewards and sanctions scheme was well managed and applied fairly. There was reasonable differentiation between the levels and the regime for those on the lowest level continued to include a full activities programme and some association in the evening. Children understood how the scheme worked and survey results indicated they believed it made them change their behaviour.
- S14 Dynamic security was very good and procedural security was well managed and proportionate. Intelligence was used well and the security committee functioned effectively. On the whole, security measures did not interfere unnecessarily with children accessing a full regime.
- S15 Despite the volatile nature of the population, the number of adjudications was reasonable and had reduced since the last inspection. Records indicated that adjudications were conducted well and that punishments were fair and consistent. Data on disciplinary hearings were routinely collated and analysed by the safeguarding committee to identify patterns and trends. The minor report system was well embedded and was used appropriately to deal with less serious infringements of prison rules.
- S16 Mandatory drug testing rates, finds and children's responses to our survey indicated very little illicit drug use. Tobacco was more sought after than drugs but this was a low-level problem.
- S17 The use of force was not excessive and had reduced since the last inspection. Governance of the use of force through the safeguarding committee remained very good and written accounts from officers gave assurance that force was only used as a last resort. Almost three-quarters of incidents involving use of force did not involve use of locks and there was evidence that de-escalation techniques were the preferred response and used to good effect.
- S18 Use of the intensive support unit as a segregation unit for children was commendably low. The use of separation on the unit had also significantly reduced since the previous inspection. Boys on separation were reviewed every day and were given support to help them reintegrate. All separated children had access to a full activity regime, exercise and a daily shower.
- S19 The young people's substance misuse service provided comprehensive and proactive support to boys with substance misuse problems. Although the demand for clinical services was very low, the clinical support provided during detoxification was inadequate.

## Respect

**S20** Overall the living conditions were reasonable. Relationships between staff and children were a strength which had a positive impact across many areas. There was an individual approach to diversity but more needed to be done to identify potential concerns. Children benefited from an energetic and engaged chaplaincy. The complaints process was sound and children had suitable access to their solicitors. Health care continued to be good. The food provided was not popular but the meals we sampled were adequate. **Outcomes for children and young people were good against this healthy prison test.**

**S21** At the last inspection in July 2012, we found that outcomes for children and young people in Parc were good against this healthy prison test. We made 15 recommendations about respect.<sup>2</sup> At this follow-up inspection we found that seven of the recommendations had been achieved, five had been partially achieved, two had not been achieved and one was no longer relevant.

**S22** Residential areas were generally in a good state of repair, although cell ventilation and toilet screening remained inadequate. Most of the cells were of a reasonable standard but a few needed cleaning. All the shared cells were too cramped. Access to showers was good but the shower screens did not provide enough privacy.

**S23** Although we had not commented on it previously, we found the steel grid above the exercise yard on G wing to be oppressive and inappropriate in a children's unit.

**S24** We observed consistently respectful interactions between staff and children, and the use of first names was common. Inappropriate behaviour by children was challenged appropriately, and we observed some good pro-social modelling during the inspection.

**S25** In our survey, most boys said that their key worker tried to help them and that they saw them at least once a week. The standard of caseworkers' records varied and did not always reflect the quality of the work actually undertaken. We found examples of key workers advocating on behalf of their children, which was unusual.

**S26** Consultation arrangements were good, and there was evidence that some of the changes requested by children had been followed through.

**S27** The equality policy was comprehensive and specific to the young people's unit. The unit safeguarding committee was the forum for addressing diversity issues but substantive discussions about diversity did not often take place and equality reports were seldom available.

**S28** Some children told us that they perceived inequality in the treatment of Welsh and English boys, and between different religious faiths. We did not find evidence to support this. Monitoring of access to key areas of the regime and services needed to be introduced to address these negative perceptions.

**S29** Most discrimination incident report forms submitted related to use of inappropriate language. They were properly investigated and responded to.

<sup>2</sup> This included recommendations about the incentives and earned privileges scheme which, in our updated Expectations (Version 4, 2012), now appear under the healthy prison area of safety.

- S30 Children's needs were identified effectively and there was good information sharing on children with a disability and those who needed a supported living plan.
- S31 The chaplains had a high profile on the wings, which they visited each day, and they spoke to all the children present. Muslim children had good access to weekly discussion groups but Friday prayers were currently shared with adults which presented security problems. Plans to address this were well advanced.
- S32 In our survey, significantly more children than the comparator and the last inspection said it was easy to make a complaint. Complaints were dealt with in a timely manner, with appropriate and polite written responses and apologies where necessary.
- S33 Legal rights were explained to children during induction and they were helped by their caseworker to contact their legal representatives, social workers and youth offending team workers. They were also permitted free legal telephone calls. Bail applications were made within the appropriate timescales and there had been some positive outcomes.
- S34 Overall health services were good and boys were positive about the care they received. Although the need for direct nursing care was low, staff shortages made the high demand for nurse attendance at case reviews and meetings difficult to manage. Most health care services were now provided on the units and access for children was very good. However, the clinical rooms on the wings were not fit for purpose.
- S35 Support for boys with chronic diseases was very good. Dental services were very good and the quality of the pharmacy service was reasonable. The child and adolescent mental health service provided very good support to children with mental health problems, although local policies needed improvement. The lack of direct access to speech and language therapy was an omission.
- S36 Survey responses in relation to food were poor. The quality of food that we sampled was generally good, but evening meals were often delivered to the wings too early and left under lamps or in a heated trolley where they could deteriorate. Portion sizes were ample and little food was thrown away. We welcomed the fact that boys continued to have the opportunity to eat together.

## Purposeful activity

- S37** *All children were able to spend enough time out of their cell and adequate time outside for exercise. Better use needed to be made of the outside space. Estyn's overall judgement was that provision in learning and skills was good. The quality of teaching and learning was good, but about half the boys did not achieve well enough in core skills. Behaviour management was effective and boys felt safe in class. Children with additional learning needs did not receive enough support. There was a well stocked library, but access to it was too limited. The range of PE was narrow and access was variable. **Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***
- S38 *At the last inspection in July 2012, we found that outcomes for children and young people in Parc were good against this healthy prison test. We made five recommendations about purposeful activity. At this follow-up inspection we found that four of the recommendations had been achieved and one had been partially achieved.*

- S39 The amount of time all children spent out of their cells was very good and better than we usually find. The average was 10.5 hours on weekdays and nine hours at weekends. Children had enough time on outside exercise, but opportunities were missed to improve the quality of the experience.
- S40 There were good systems to collect and analyse data, and staff produced useful reports which helped to inform planning. A range of partnerships complemented the provision, enriched the curriculum and helped children to plan and prepare for employment. There were good systems to assess the quality of teaching and to support tutors who needed to improve.
- S41 Staff promoted equality and diversity well, and nearly all created an environment where boys were respectful and supportive to each other. Teachers liaised well with other prison and support staff to ensure that children received proper support. Boys felt safe in education and their behaviour was managed and monitored well.
- S42 Children had prompt access to a good range of activities which encouraged them to engage in education and training. In a few cases, achievements from low beginnings encouraged them to aim towards higher education as their next step.
- S43 Initial assessment was good and learning plans took effective account of boys' interests, skills and individual needs. There was not enough focus on the core skills of literacy, numeracy and ICT and about half the boys did not make enough progress in this area. Individual learning plans were not always integrated with other unit plans.
- S44 Children took pride in their work and achievements, which helped to improve their self-image.
- S45 Overall the standard of teaching was good and met the needs of most boys. Teachers did not always mark work or provide useful written feedback to a consistently high standard.
- S46 In a few classes boys had good opportunities to review their learning and reflect on the progress they had made. Attendance was good and children enjoyed their learning and attained a wide range of qualifications. The practical and written work was of a good standard. Children developed very good skills in cooking, music, and carpentry. Boys taking part in the Parc Academy sports programme achieved useful work-related qualifications which enhanced their employability.
- S47 There was not enough support for children with additional learning needs.
- S48 The library was well stocked and many boys made good use of their library time to browse and borrow. Most boys took care of the books they borrowed and book losses were low. Staff cover in the library was limited and library promotion activities, such as book clubs and reading development work, did not take place.
- S49 Children following the PE pathway and those on enhanced regimes had good access to the gym. Access for other groups was typically limited to two sessions a week. Staff ensured there was a reasonable balance between indoor and outdoor activity. However, the range of recreational activities was somewhat limited.
- S50 Not enough attention was paid to health promotion and to helping children improve their wellbeing. PE and health care staff did not liaise routinely to address and improve the health needs of children.

## Resettlement

- S51** *The management of resettlement had improved and was now well organised. The training and remand planning arrangements continued to be thorough and comprehensive. Children who were looked after were supported well by prison staff. Opportunities for release on temporary licence (ROTL) had increased, but not to maintain family relationships. Provision under the resettlement pathways was generally good but the education, training and employment input was weak and it was not always possible to obtain suitable accommodation for boys. The proportion of children who lived more than 50 miles away had increased significantly, which made the achievement of successful resettlement outcomes more difficult. The family support worker continued to provide good individual support to boys by maintaining contact with family and friends. **Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***
- S52** *At the last inspection in July 2012 we found that outcomes for children and young people in Parc were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made six recommendations about resettlement. At this follow-up inspection we found that one of the recommendations had been achieved, two had been partially achieved and three had not been achieved.*
- S53** A thorough needs analysis had been used to develop an up-to-date resettlement action plan. The quarterly resettlement forum provided a strategic focus for resettlement work, including the pathways, and was attended by a community representative. Regular meetings of this forum constituted an improvement since the previous inspection.
- S54** Risk and resettlement needs were quickly identified on arrival and there was an appropriate focus on preventing re-offending. Pre-release support for local boys was good. The broadening of the catchment area made it more difficult to sustain this further afield, although good efforts were being made to achieve this. Twenty per cent of boys lived over 100 miles away, and 22% lived 50 to 100 miles away.
- S55** Key workers continued to need more involvement with the resettlement process and with reinforcing learning from interventions on the wings.
- S56** The numbers of children receiving ROTL had increased since the previous inspection, but it was still not being used to promote family relationships.
- S57** Despite efforts by unit staff, community agencies did not provide the information needed to enable the tracking of children post release. The caseworkers demonstrated an awareness of children's rights and were tenacious in ensuring that children received their entitlements. There were good systems to identify children with looked-after status.
- S58** All children had training and remand management plans based on their identified needs. Training planning and remand management meetings were timely and those that we observed were well managed. The focus was on the child who was encouraged to contribute to the discussions and raise questions. The training planning documentation was good and gave a clear picture of engagement with the children.
- S59** Public protection cases were properly identified by caseworkers. The risk management committee met when required to discuss any boy identified to be a risk. Caseworkers attended first MAPPA reviews (multi-agency public protection arrangements) in the community for some boys, but not for those who lived a significant distance from the establishment.



- S60 Accommodation needs continued to be identified early and, if children were not returning home, sustained efforts were made to ensure that community agencies provided suitable accommodation. During the previous 12 months, no boy had been released without an address but boys were regularly not notified of their destination until two or three days before they were released. The quality of accommodation was sometimes inadequate.
- S61 Children had limited access to impartial advice, guidance and careers education, which affected progression planning in readiness for their release. Links with community support agencies helped a few boys to take up opportunities in education, training or employment.
- S62 All children were seen the week before release to address any outstanding health care issues and there was appropriate communication with GPs to ensure continuity of care. Discharge planning by the child and adolescent mental health service for boys with significant mental health problems was very good. Liaison between the young people's substance misuse service and community services was very good.
- S63 The Barclays Bank youth team visited the unit regularly to give effective advice on managing money. This was a useful addition to the routine advice and support given by caseworkers on bank accounts and money.
- S64 The visits room was bright, though rather bare and with rigid furniture. There was still little scope for visiting children to play. Family days remained restricted to boys on gold level of the incentives and earned privileges scheme and very few others. The family support worker quickly established and maintained good contact with families. This approach was fully integrated into the multidisciplinary care process.
- S65 A portfolio of seven age-appropriate offending behaviour courses, tailored for one-to-one delivery, was available and usually delivered individually. While there was no direct link to the recent needs analysis, there was informal evidence that the interventions were having a positive effect.



# Section 1. Safety

## Courts, escorts and transfers

### Expected outcomes:

**Children and young people transferring to and from the establishment are treated safely, decently and efficiently.**

**I.1** *Routine strip-searching on arrival had ceased. Children were reasonably well treated on journeys, but there were still long waits at court and they were frequently transported in vans with adult prisoners.*

**I.2** There was an average of four receptions a week. In our survey, 67% of children said that escort staff had treated them well against the comparator of 51%. Ninety per cent said that they had felt safe on the journey to Parc.

**I.3** Children were routinely received from courts further afield than at the previous inspection – throughout the south-west and as far east as Swindon – following the closure of HMYOI Ashfield. There were also a considerable number of transfers from other young offender institutions (YOIs), including the London area. The length of journeys to court was frequently mentioned as a problem at the safeguarding meeting, and children themselves confirmed this. In the previous six months, 69% of new arrivals had waited at court for two hours or more and 39% for three hours or more. Three had waited six hours and two for seven hours.

**I.4** In our survey, 41% of children said they had travelled with adults or female detainees, while the establishment put this at 25%, which was still too high. Screening in the vans provided a degree of separation.

**I.5** Routine strip-searching on arrival and departure had recently ceased, following a change to national instructions.

### Recommendations

**I.6** **Children should not spend lengthy periods waiting in court after their case has been completed, and NOMS should ensure that waits are kept to a minimum.**

**I.7** **Children should be transported separately from adult prisoners.** (repeated recommendation I.8)

## Early days in custody

### Expected outcomes:

**Children and young people are treated with respect and feel safe on their arrival into prison and for the first few days in custody. Children and young people's individual needs are identified and addressed, and they feel supported on their first night. During a young person's induction he/she is made aware of the establishment routines, how to access available services and how to cope with being in custody.**

- I.8** *Reception and first night procedures were generally sound, and children felt safe during their early days at Parc. The induction programme was thorough and well delivered.*
- I.9** Children did not spend long in reception and, in our survey, 92% said they had spent less than two hours in reception.
- I.10** First-night assessments were carried out perceptively and thoroughly. Children told us that they felt safe on the first night and subsequently. In our survey, only 31% said that they had been given telephone credit when they first arrived against the comparator of 61%. However, 45% said that they had been given information about feeling worried or upset against the comparator of 30% and 19% at the previous inspection.
- I.11** Risk assessment and management forms were generally completed thoroughly, and contained useful information, including comments on demeanour and evidence from records and self-disclosure. However, one form that we examined was inadequate, containing brief entries with no source of evidence or implications of specific risk. It included the entry: 'offence is robbery – no potential for harming others'.
- I.12** A five-day induction programme included information about Samaritans, Children's Commissioner Wales, Barnardo's, the NSPCC, Independent Monitoring Board and the counsellor. In our survey, 86% of those who had been on an induction course said that it had covered all that they needed to know. The officer who delivered most of the sessions was very experienced and adapted his material appropriately to the needs and situation of each child. Each induction programme ended with an exit board at which the multidisciplinary team checked that the young person understood the essential information about life on the unit and was coping sufficiently.
- I.13** The well-presented induction booklet had been updated in November 2013. It was only available in English and had not been translated into other languages on cost grounds.

### Recommendation

- I.14** **The induction booklet should be available in the main languages spoken by foreign national children.**

### Housekeeping point

- I.15** All children should be given telephone credit on arrival.

# Care and protection of children and young people

## Safeguarding

### Expected outcomes:

**The establishment promotes the welfare of children and young people, particularly those most at risk, and protects them from all kinds of harm and neglect.**

**I.16** *Governance and monitoring of safeguarding were robust, and almost all stakeholders were actively engaged. The daily routine reflected the operational requirements of safeguarding.*

**I.17** Key community partners such as Bridgend social services, Public Health Wales, Bridgend youth offending service and child and public protection team, and South Wales police attended safeguarding meetings. There was very good multidisciplinary attendance with the exception of the equality and diversity team, who had not attended or submitted a report in the previous 10 months.

**I.18** Each weekday morning a team representing all the professions and departments met to review and plan, giving special attention to children with more complex needs. This was a very effective forum for sharing information about risks and needs, and for agreeing coordinated safeguarding strategies for the day.

### Housekeeping point

**I.19** Issues of equality and diversity which relate to the safety of children should be identified and discussed at each safeguarding meeting.

## Child protection

### Expected outcomes:

**The establishment protects children and young people from maltreatment by adults or other children and young people.**

**I.20** *Child protection continued to be managed effectively. Internal procedures were efficient, there were good links with the local authority and a comprehensive analysis of child protection referrals had been carried out. Staff and children were aware of child protection procedures.*

**I.21** A comprehensive, up-to-date child protection policy had been approved by the local safeguarding children board (LSCB). It contained clear instructions on how staff should act and information on whom to inform when a referral needed to be made. It was evident from talking to staff that they were familiar with, and had a good understanding of, how to deal with child protection matters.

**I.22** All staff had received child protection training and had been issued with a guide on the whistle-blowing process.

- I.23** Staff had close links with the local authority and one of the managers was a member of the policy and training subgroups of the LSCB.
- I.24** All child protection referrals between May 2012 and August 2013 had been analysed. Seven referrals had been made, one of which concerned an allegation of staff assault and the remainder concerned use of force. All the referrals had been passed to external agencies, resulting in decisions of 'no further action'. CCTV footage was used extensively when investigating allegations and children were given the opportunity to view recordings. In two cases, internal investigations had been carried out: in one an officer had been required to undertake refresher training in safeguarding and in the other an observation panel had been replaced. During the three months before the inspection, one child protection referral had been made relating to use of force. All child protection logs had been signed off by the director.
- I.25** Family members and youth offending team workers were kept up to date during investigation of child protection referrals. The child was also kept informed of progress.
- I.26** A photographic display in the unit identified the child protection coordinator and explained safeguarding procedures. This information was also contained in the reception booklets. Children had access to free telephone lines to the Children's Commissioner for Wales and to Childline.

## Victims of bullying and intimidation

### Expected outcomes:

**Everyone feels safe from bullying and victimisation. Children and young people at risk/subject to victimisation are protected through active and fair systems known to staff, young people and visitors which inform all aspects of the regime.**

- I.27** *Close supervision by staff enabled them to identify promptly children at risk of intimidation by their peers, and to give appropriate support.*

- I.28** The new violence reduction strategy made adequate provision for the support of children at risk of victimisation. In our survey, 23% said that they had been victimised by other boys at Parc, while 48% said that staff would take it seriously if they told them that they had been victimised, against the comparator of 31% and 24% at the previous inspection. On the whole, the contained and well-supervised physical environment of the two units enabled staff to identify such behaviour early, and to prevent recurrence.

## Suicide and self-harm prevention

### Expected outcomes:

**The establishment provides a safe and secure environment which reduces the risk of self-harm and suicide. Children and young people are identified at an early stage and given the necessary support. All staff are aware of and alert to vulnerability issues, are appropriately trained and have access to proper equipment and support.**

**I.29** *The level and severity of self-harm were low. Monitoring and support systems were effective and integrated with the overall care of the children.*

**I.30** During the previous six months, 46 ACCTs had been opened (assessment, care in custody and teamwork case management for prisoners at risk of suicide and self-harm). They were no longer routinely opened for children who were in separation. They were opened occasionally for children showing signs of low mood rather than actual evidence of self-harm risk. There had been 22 incidents of self-harm in the previous six months: 59% involved punching or head-butting a hard surface and most of the others involved scratches to an arm.

**I.31** Some excellent entries in ACCT forms reflected perceptive, positive support by many officers, and there was a high frequency of entries in all cases. Quality assurance was generally effective: an operational manager checked all case reviews and the head of unit checked the completed documentation. However, some shortfalls in care or in the recording of care had not been picked up during this process. The ACCT procedure was integrated into the overall approach to individual care and support. Reviews were scheduled wherever possible when the case manager was on duty.

**I.32** Careful statistical analysis of self-harm incidents was reported each month to the safeguarding committee, and any patterns and underlying explanations were discussed and appropriate action taken.

### Housekeeping point

**I.33** Quality assurance of ACCT procedures should include all key elements identified in ACCT training and feedback should be given in each case to the relevant member of staff.

## Behaviour management

### Expected outcomes:

**Children and young people live in a safe, well-ordered and motivational environment where their good behaviour is promoted and rewarded. Unacceptable behaviour is dealt with in an objective, fair and consistent manner.**

**I.34** *The behaviour management strategy was comprehensive and linked to other relevant policies.*

- I.35** The organisational procedures for managing the behaviour of children had developed since the previous inspection and were very good. A case work approach to managing and changing poor behaviour through individual support plans had now become well established (see sections on separation and rewards and sanctions).
- I.36** Children understood the expected standard of behaviour, and local rules and routines were displayed throughout residential and communal areas. Rules and routines were proportionate and children were consulted about the fairness of the behaviour management procedures in group forums and one-to-one interviews.

## Rewards and sanctions

### Expected outcomes:

**Children and young people are motivated by an incentives scheme which rewards effort and good behaviour and applies sanctions appropriately for poor behaviour. The scheme is applied fairly, transparently and consistently, and is motivational.**

- I.37** *The rewards and sanctions scheme was well managed. There was a reasonable difference between the levels and the regime for children on the lowest level included a full activities programme. Children understood the scheme and in our survey indicated that it had made them change their behaviour.*

- I.38** The rewards and sanctions scheme was well embedded and staff and boys were familiar with how it worked. A discrete, age-appropriate policy had been published which described the management of the scheme, progression through the levels and the standards of expected behaviour. There were four incentive levels: bronze, silver, gold and platinum. At the time of the inspection, 52% of children were on platinum and gold levels, 40% on silver and 8% on bronze.
- I.39** It was clear that the scheme was being used strategically to support and encourage boys to behave well and to improve their behaviour. We saw evidence that it was an integral component of an overarching behaviour management strategy which was administered fairly and sensitively to meet the individual needs of children.
- I.40** There were reasonable differences between levels and a regime with full activities for children on bronze included association and access to telephones every evening.
- I.41** Individual behaviour improvement plans were raised for all boys on bronze to support and help them manage the issues that had caused their demotion. Key workers supported boys at all levels of the scheme and written records reflected appropriate challenge of poor behaviour and encouragement, praise and reward for good behaviour.
- I.42** Many children we spoke to said that progress through the levels gave them feelings of achievement. In our survey, 78% of respondents said they were treated fairly by the scheme and 70% said that it made them change their behaviour against respective comparators of 46% and 48%.



## Security and disciplinary procedures

### Expected outcomes:

**Security and good order are maintained through an attention to physical and procedural matters, including effective security intelligence as well as positive relationships between staff and children and young people. Disciplinary procedures are applied fairly and for good reason. Children and young people understand why they are being disciplined and can appeal against any sanctions imposed on them.**

- I.43** *Dynamic security was very good and procedural security was well managed and proportionate. Routine strip-searching was no longer carried out and security measures did not prevent children from accessing a full regime. Disciplinary procedures were fair and proportionate.*
- I.44** All the important elements of dynamic security were in place. Relationships between staff and children were excellent and the supervision of children while they were unlocked was very good (see section on relationships between staff and children). Staff and children were usually in close proximity to each other in the two small residential units which reduced opportunities for poor behaviour. Personal engagement between staff of all grades and children was particularly good and officers were familiar with children's personal circumstances, which supported dynamic security.
- I.45** Intelligence was well managed and security committee meetings were well attended. The standing agenda was appropriate and included a thorough analysis of security information reports (SIRs) received during the month. Security objectives were agreed and reviewed through consideration of intelligence.
- I.46** The security department received an average of 38 SIRs each month. These were processed and categorised on receipt by full-time security collators and analysts. Intelligence was effectively communicated to the safeguarding committee to enable them to make informed decisions. There were clear lines of communication between the security department and unit staff.
- I.47** Risk assessment and management systems were effective and included the use of information about the child's recent behaviour in custody.
- I.48** Some elements of procedural security had improved since the previous inspection. Routine strip-searching was no longer carried out. Strip-searches were rare and were always supported by intelligence, risk assessed and authorised by a senior manager. During the six months before the inspection, 15 strip-searches had been authorised.
- I.49** Mandatory drug testing rates, drug finds and children's responses in our survey and in our discussions indicated very little illicit drug use. There was evidence that tobacco was more sought after than drugs but this too was a low-level problem.
- I.50** During the six months before the inspection, there had been an average of 30 adjudications a month and 11 minor reports, a significant reduction since the previous inspection when we found 50 adjudications and 30 minor reports a month.
- I.51** Children were given written information about the procedure before adjudication and minor report and staff checked that they understood it. They were offered the help of an advocate for their adjudication but only two had used an advocate in the preceding six months. Following adjudication and a minor report, children met an operational manager who reviewed their punishment and agreed a behaviour management plan with them, which

included short-term targets to rescind part of their punishment (see section on separation and removal from normal location).

- I.52** The adjudication room on E wing was well decorated and comfortable. Records of hearings that we examined showed that they were conducted fairly and that punishment tariffs were used consistently and appropriately; we saw nothing to indicate that boys were not given the opportunity to put across their version of events.
- I.53** Monthly statistics on the number and nature of adjudications and minor reports were presented to the senior management team and the safeguarding committee. Results of proven offences were recorded, categorised and communicated to managers to identify and address trends. The head of young people reviewed most of the records each month.
- I.54** The minor report system was embedded and used appropriately to deal with less serious infringements of rules. Outcomes were monitored and records showed that proceedings were conducted fairly and punishment was appropriate and consistent.

## Bullying and violence reduction

### Expected outcomes:

**Active and fair systems to prevent and respond to bullying behaviour are known to staff, children and young people and visitors.**

- I.55** *The level of violence was similar to the previous inspection, although the number of children with complex needs had risen. A new approach to monitoring and supporting children identified as potential perpetrators was working effectively.*

- I.56** The number of violent incidents was similar to the previous inspection, although a greater proportion of children had complex needs and challenging behaviour. During the previous six months, 21 bullying incidents had been reported, 12 fights had been recorded, 18 assaults by one boy on another and 15 assaults on staff. Very few of these incidents had resulted in injury to a boy requiring treatment, and no grave injuries had been sustained.
- I.57** Violence reduction dossiers had been opened only three times in the previous six months. A new dossier had been introduced to parallel the ACCT document and this was working well. The dossiers included regular multidisciplinary case reviews, support plans and planned, continuous interaction and observations recorded by staff.

## The use of force

### Expected outcomes:

**Force is used only as a last resort and if applied is used legitimately and safely by trained staff. The use of force is minimised through preventive strategies and alternative approaches and this is monitored through robust governance arrangements.**

- I.58** *Use of force was not excessive and had reduced since the previous inspection. Governance through the safeguarding and security committees remained very good and written accounts by officers indicated that force was used as a last resort.*

- I.59** Incidents of the use of force were not excessive and had significantly reduced since the last inspection. During the six months before the inspection, there had been 67 incidents of use of force compared with 87 at the previous inspection. Nearly three-quarters of the 67 incidents had not involved the use of pain compliance locks; however the use of pain compliance with this age group is inappropriate.
- I.60** All but two incidents had been spontaneous. Violence remained the most common reason for force being used. Spontaneous and planned intervention was carried out particularly well and it was evident that staff focused on keeping children safe. Use of force documentation indicated that force was only justified when it was reasonable in the circumstances and proportionate. It was clear that de-escalation was the preferred response from officers when dealing with angry, aggressive children.
- I.61** Good monitoring arrangements were in place with excellent links to the security committee, the senior management and safeguarding teams. Information on the nature and location of the incident and the ethnicity and age of the child was collated and presented for analysis each month. Incidents were discussed at the monthly security committee and at safeguarding meetings. A senior manager, usually the head of young people, reviewed CCTV coverage of most spontaneous incidents. Children were debriefed immediately after the incident by an operational manager and a day later by a unit senior manager who had reviewed the documentation. Records of debriefs that we reviewed were very good, and it was clear that the child had been given the opportunity to reflect on the trigger for the incident and how a different outcome could have been achieved.

## Separation/removal from normal location

### Expected outcomes:

**Children and young people are only separated from their peers with the proper authorisation, safely, in line with their individual needs, for appropriate reasons and not as a punishment.**

**I.62** *The use of the intensive support unit as a segregation unit was commendably low. Unit separation had significantly reduced since the previous inspection. All children on separation had access to a full activity regime, exercise and a shower every day. Case reviews were conducted each day and records showed that progress in changing behaviour or circumstances was monitored and acted on. Individual care plans were raised, behaviour targets set and key workers supported children.*

- I.63** The most disruptive children continued to be segregated on the intensive support unit (ISU), a discrete unit in the main prison used to accommodate vulnerable adult prisoners. This was rarely used and boys were managed on E or G wing. During the six months before the inspection, the ISU had only been used twice for less than three hours in each case to calm two particularly disruptive children.
- I.64** The use of unit separation had significantly reduced since the last inspection. During the six months before the inspection, 131 children had been placed on single separation compared with 180 at the previous inspection. The average time on separation was about seven days.
- I.65** Most cases of on-unit separation derived from loss of association following adjudication or minor report. A few cases stemmed from antisocial or disruptive behaviour identified through violence reduction and anti-bullying protocols (see section on violence reduction).

- I.66** All children on separation had good access to a regime with full activities and exercise and a shower every day.
- I.67** Individual care plans were raised for all separated children. Entries demonstrated that progress in changing behaviour or circumstances was monitored and acted on. Key workers were familiar with the personal circumstances of children and supported them in improving their behaviour.

## Substance misuse

### Expected outcomes:

**Children and young people with drug and/or alcohol problems are identified at reception and receive effective treatment and support throughout their stay in custody.**

**I.68** *The demand for clinical services was very low, but clinical support during early days in custody for children who needed it was inadequate. The young people's substance misuse service (YSPMS) provided excellent psychosocial support to children with substance misuse issues.*

- I.69** Nurses screened boys for drug and alcohol during the first night procedure. Only two boys had required clinical services in the previous six months, one for opiate use and one for benzodiazepines. Both had been assessed promptly by a GP, but not all GPs had received specialist training. Neither young person had received daily clinical reviews during the first five days.
- I.70** There was a range of relevant clinical policies but they were not detailed enough and prescribing reduction regimes were too rigid. There were appropriate arrangements in place for 24-hour nursing care, but this was seldom required.
- I.71** A comprehensive, up-to-date drug strategy informed service delivery. The YPSMS workers attended the quarterly prison drug strategy meeting and children's services were always discussed.
- I.72** Young people had access to excellent psychosocial support. Two YPSMS workers provided an appropriate range of one-to-one and group support adapted to each child's needs. The workers assessed every child and offered continuing support to children who wanted to engage. Boys receiving detoxification or clinical prescribing were seen daily until stable and the YPSMS workers liaised with health care if required. Boys who did not want to engage were still seen regularly to offer education and support.
- I.73** The workers engaged effectively with other departments and youth offending teams and offered support to families. Record keeping and care planning were very good.
- I.74** The mandatory drug testing (MDT) random positive rate for the six months to April 2014 was 0%. Nine suspicion tests had been conducted in the same period with one positive each for cannabis and benzodiazepines. There was a dedicated team of testers and other security officers provided cover. There had been no slippage in the testing regime.
- I.75** Data on substance finds indicated that tobacco was the most sought after substance and children confirmed this in our discussions.

- I.76** The MDT suite was also used to test adult prisoners, although never at the same time. The suite was clean, tidy and appropriately equipped with a pull-down blind to cover the observation window into the testing area.

### **Recommendation**

- I.77** Children should receive clinical support services from appropriately trained staff guided by comprehensive policies which reflect best practice.



## Section 2. Respect

### Residential units

#### Expected outcomes:

**Children and young people live in a safe, clean and decent environment which is in a good state of repair and suitable for adolescents.**

- 2.1** *The units were generally in a good state of repair, although cell ventilation and toilet and shower screening were inadequate. The grid over the G wing exercise yard was inappropriate. Access to telephones, showers, applications and clothing was appropriate.*
- 2.2** Children were housed on two wings, E and G. G wing accommodated 36 children with 12 single and 12 double cells and E wing held 28 children in 16 single and six double cells. Three cells on E wing and two on G wing had CCTV for regular observation when needed.
- 2.3** Communal areas were light, clean and well maintained. Most cells were clean but a few needed deep cleaning and redecoration. Many sealed inner perspex cell windows had become opaque through deterioration and graffiti, and most provided poor ventilation. The outer sections of the windows opening on to the exercise yards on both wings were damaged and would not stay open. In many cells, litter and built-up grime was trapped between the window screens.
- 2.4** Shared cells were cramped. In-cell toilets were still not adequately screened and some toilet bowls were heavily stained. Cells now contained a chair but there was only space for one chair in shared cells. Children still did not have access to lockable cupboards.
- 2.5** In our survey, 69% of children said their cell call bell was responded to quickly against the comparator of 33%. We observed speedy and polite responses to several cell bell calls.
- 2.6** The size and design of the wings facilitated good sight lines, and supervision was enhanced by CCTV. Dining areas were in the centre of the wings. On G wing, the tables and seats were fixed, while on E wing chairs were removed after meals.
- 2.7** In our survey, 89% of children said they usually went outside every day against the comparator of 56%. The walls of the G wing exercise yard were decorated with murals and outside exercise equipment was provided for both wings. Although we had not commented on it previously, we found the steel grid above the exercise yard on G wing to be oppressive and inappropriate in a children's unit.
- 2.8** Each wing had two telephones but no information about free numbers or telephone monitoring was displayed in three of the four phone hoods. Children had good daily access to telephones but there was no opportunity to exchange unused visit entitlements for phone credit.
- 2.9** In our survey, 98% of children said they were able to shower daily against the comparator of 78%. The flooring and air vent grills in the showers had been replaced in both units since the previous inspection. The shower cubicles had a low wall at the front but this was not enough to maintain decency, especially on E wing with upper walkways opposite the showers.

- 2.10** Application forms were clearly displayed. Completed forms were handed to staff who logged their receipt and destination. In our survey, 90% of children against the comparator of 73% said it was easy to make an application.
- 2.11** Children could send two free letters each week. Incoming and outgoing mail was processed in a timely fashion.
- 2.12** Remand and sentenced children could wear their own clothes and had daily access to laundry facilities operated by wing cleaners. Prison-issue clothing was provided to children who needed it. New underwear and socks were also available. Bedding was exchanged weekly and laundered off wing.

## Recommendations

- 2.13** **Cells should have effective ventilation.** (repeated recommendation 2.16)
- 2.14** **The steel grid over the exercise yard on G wing should be removed.**
- 2.15** **Walls in front of showers should be sufficiently high to maintain decency.**
- 2.16** **Toilets should be fully screened.**
- 2.17** **Children should have access to a lockable cupboard.**

## Relationships between staff and children and young people

### Expected outcomes:

**Children and young people are treated with care and fairness by all staff, and are expected, encouraged and enabled to take responsibility for their own actions and decisions. Staff set clear and fair boundaries. Staff have high expectations of all children and young people and help them to achieve their potential.**

**2.18** *We observed consistently respectful relationships between staff and children. Poor behaviour was addressed appropriately and proportionately. Monthly forums enabled boys to raise concerns. The key worker scheme worked reasonably well and most boys spoke positively about their key worker.*

- 2.19** In our survey, two-thirds of children said staff treated them with respect. The same proportion said that a member of staff had checked on them personally in the last week to see how they were getting on, against the comparator of 38%. We observed mutually respectful relationships between children and staff and consistent use of first names for both. Photo boards on both units enabled children to identify staff and all staff wore name badges. Staff challenged poor behaviour appropriately, reflecting the different levels of maturity of the children.
- 2.20** Two monthly forums took place for children to attend: one to discuss a topic of the month and the other for children to choose topics for discussion through a suggestions box on their units. The children who attended changed from month to month to give as many as possible the opportunity to participate. Minutes of the meetings indicated that changes children had requested had taken place. Minutes were not displayed on unit notice boards.



- 2.21** All children had key workers and nearly three-quarters said that their key worker tried to help them. Key workers were allocated to boys rather than cells to provide continuity. Key workers made regular entries in wing files, some of which were purely observational. The quality of entries by key workers in other documentation was good and we saw evidence of key workers advocating on behalf of children, for example at rewards and sanctions reviews.

## Housekeeping point

- 2.22** Minutes of consultation meetings should be displayed on unit notice boards.

## Equality and diversity

### Expected outcomes:

**The establishment demonstrates a clear and coordinated approach to eliminating discrimination, promoting equitable outcomes and fostering good relations, and ensures that no child or young person is unfairly disadvantaged. This is underpinned by effective processes to identify and resolve any inequality. The diverse needs of each young person are recognised and addressed: these include, but are not restricted to, race equality, nationality, religion, disability (including mental, physical and learning disabilities and difficulties), gender, transgender issues and sexual orientation.**

- 2.23** *Equality work was organised well and focused on identifying and meeting the needs of individuals. Monitoring by protected characteristics was too limited and needed to be extended. Investigation of diversity incidents was thorough.*

## Strategic management

- 2.24** There was a clear management structure for equality work led by a unit manager and focused on meeting the needs of individual children. Policies and action planning were specific to children. The quality of impact assessments varied. The establishment community inclusion meeting monitored the timetable for completion of impact assessments.
- 2.25** Children community inclusion representatives reflected the diverse population and they received training for their role. They attended regular meetings with unit managers to discuss equality. The constant turnover of the population meant that new representatives were often appointed. Not all children we spoke to were aware of who their representatives were, despite their names being displayed around the wings.
- 2.26** The inclusion meeting was chaired by the director and attended by a manager from the children's unit. A report submitted to the meeting provided information on the ethnic composition of the unit and monitored the use of separation, use of force and strip-searching by ethnicity. There was no monitoring by other protected characteristics. During the inspection, some children said they thought there was different treatment of Welsh and English boys. We did not find evidence to support this, but the unit had no monitoring systems in place to address this with the children.
- 2.27** The unit safeguarding meeting was the main forum for the discussion of equality. Although minutes indicated that reports presented to the meeting covered equality, the community inclusion team was not represented at many meetings and no equality report was available for discussion, which was a weakness (see section on safeguarding).

- 2.28** Children were encouraged to participate in diversity events which were appropriately linked to education activities.
- 2.29** Eighteen discrimination incident report forms (DIRFs) had been submitted in the previous six months, most for use of inappropriate language in an ethnicity or nationality context. Investigations were carried out and appropriate action taken when discrimination was found to have taken place, including one-to-one interventions and mediation. DIRFs were quality assured by the director and a community agency checked a sample of completed DIRFs each quarter. Containers holding blank complaint forms for children to use did not include DIRFs.

## Recommendation

- 2.30** **Monitoring by protected characteristics should be put in place and equality reports should be regularly discussed at safeguarding meetings.**

## Housekeeping point

- 2.31** Blank DIRF forms should be available in the complaint boxes.

## Diverse needs

- 2.32** At the time of the inspection, there were 11 black or minority ethnic children (22%). In our survey, they reported less favourable treatment than white respondents in a few areas, including being treated with respect by staff and being victimised by staff. We did not see evidence of this and children did not raise it with us. There was no forum for black and minority ethnic children to meet as a group and to discuss their perceptions with staff. The unit was not aware of any Gypsy, Romany or Traveller children, although two children had identified themselves as such in our survey.
- 2.33** In our survey, Muslim and non-Muslim respondents reported similar treatment. One child wrote in his survey: *'Some staff are racist towards other religious prisoners'*, and in our focus groups there was discussion about one religious group being unlocked later than others for their group service and one group having more access to the main site chapel.
- 2.34** There was one foreign national child on the unit who said that he was happy with the support he had received. The unit generally accommodated few foreign nationals. A member of staff was responsible for foreign national children and they had access to the Home Office at regular surgeries held on the adult site. They could also seek independent legal advice. Appropriate use had been made of telephone and face-to-face interpreters when needed but there was no translated material about the unit. Foreign national children could have a free international monthly telephone call if they had not received any family visits. The names of Welsh language speakers among the staff were displayed on notice boards.
- 2.35** Identification of disability was good and the unit had identified more children with a disability than the eight who had declared it in our survey. Supported living plans identified the support that children needed and contained information on how disabilities might affect a child's behaviour. They were also used when children had an identified allergy. The plans were kept in children's files and staff were aware of which children had a supported living plan. There were no adapted facilities for children with physical disabilities.

- 2.36** At the time of the inspection, no children on the unit had identified themselves as gay, although they had previously. One-to-one support was available, and we were satisfied that the issue of staff not challenging homophobic comments identified at the previous inspection had been addressed. There was a policy for the management of transgender children. The unit had not so far held a transgender child.

## Housekeeping point

- 2.37** Forums for minority groups should be set up when numbers of children from a particular group make it viable to do so.

## Faith and religious activity

### Expected outcomes:

**All children and young people are able to practise their religion. The chaplaincy plays a full part in establishment life and contributes to young people's overall care, support and resettlement.**

- 2.38** *Children had good access to chaplains of different faiths. Muslim children attended Friday prayers with adult prisoners which presented a security problem. There were plans to address this. Chaplains had a high profile and were well integrated with other departments. They provided excellent pastoral care.*

- 2.39** The chaplaincy consisted of five Christian and two Muslim chaplains. Chaplains of other faiths were available when needed but there had been no requirement for them during the six months before the inspection.
- 2.40** Muslim children had good access to weekly discussion groups but they shared Friday prayers with adult prisoners which was presenting security problems. We were satisfied that the arrangement to share the facilities for worship was a reasonable short-term solution. Plans were advanced to enable children to worship on their own as soon as additional Muslim chaplains had been appointed.
- 2.41** Multi-denominational Christian worship and study groups were held weekly. Information on the unit described faith activities and encouraged children to request a visit from a chaplain of a particular faith.
- 2.42** The chaplaincy had a high profile in the unit and made a point of talking to all children each day. They played a central role in internal and external safeguarding meetings, ACCT (assessment, care in custody and teamwork case management documents) reviews and case conferences, exit boards and community inclusion meetings.
- 2.43** The chaplaincy provided excellent pastoral care and had achieved positive outcomes for children re-establishing contact with estranged family members. They also played a major role in facilitating and supporting boys moving to the main site when they reached 18 years of age.

## Complaints

### Expected outcomes:

**Effective complaints procedures are in place for children and young people, which are easy to access and use and provide timely responses. Children and young people are provided with the help they need to make a complaint. Children and young people feel safe from repercussions when using these procedures and are aware of an appeal procedure.**

**2.44** *Children in our survey said it was easy to make a complaint. Responses to complaints were timely and courteous. Appropriate governance and monitoring procedures were in place.*

- 2.45** In our survey, 82% of children said it was easy to make a complaint against the comparator of 54% and 51% at the previous inspection. Children were given information on how to make a complaint during induction and in the induction booklet. During the six months before the inspection, 21 complaints had been made. Children generally had very good relationships with staff which made it easy for them to discuss issues informally without recourse to a written complaint. Children also had the opportunity to attend community forum meetings with staff to discuss and resolve issues (see section on equality and diversity).
- 2.46** Complaint forms and confidential access envelopes were accessible on the two wings. Complaint boxes were emptied daily by the night duty orderly officer and checked by the complaints clerk. Safeguarding or child protection complaints were referred to the safeguarding manager. Replies were written by an operational manager or above. If the complaints clerk felt that the complaint should be resolved informally, it was referred back to unit staff to discuss with the child.
- 2.47** All complaints had been responded to within the prescribed timescale and responses were of good quality. The respondent addressed the child by his title and surname and, where necessary, apologies were made and a resolution offered with a time-scale for completion.
- 2.48** Four of the 21 complaints had been made against staff and had been dealt with by operational managers. One had been upheld. Two complaints had related to race, neither of which had been upheld. Children were aware of the appeals procedure and how to seek help from advocates. There had been no appeals against the decision in the complaints that we looked at.
- 2.49** A senior manager reviewed all complaints to check the quality and timeliness of responses. Analysis of complaints was undertaken but there were no emerging trends, given the small number of complaints submitted.

## Legal rights

### Expected outcomes:

**Children and young people are supported by the establishment staff to exercise their legal rights freely.**

**2.50** *Children were aware of their legal rights and had appropriate access to their legal advisers. There was a good service for boys on remand and legal assistance was given to those who made bail applications. The process for making early and late release decisions for children serving detention and training orders was well managed.*

**2.51** Children had their legal rights explained to them during induction. Caseworkers facilitated access to legal advisers via free telephone calls, and there were private facilities for legal visits. Appropriate adults were used when police interviews took place. The arrangements for early and late release for boys on a detention and training order were explained by caseworkers at the start of the sentence; boys whom we spoke to understood these.

**2.52** Boys on remand were well supported by a caseworker in applying for bail, and bail applications were considered as soon as possible. We were told that securing appropriate accommodation was often the most difficult aspect of making a bail application. One boy had made a successful bail application during the inspection via a video court link. Remand children had the same access to regime activities as sentenced children, and they had full remand management plans with regular reviews. Sentenced children were given the opportunity to appeal and boys who had been recalled to custody had access to suitable legal advice.

**2.53** The process for early release was organised well and children could appeal decisions. We saw evidence of caseworkers working assiduously to support two boys whose application for early release had not been sufficiently robust at a previous establishment. One was subsequently given early release on appeal. When necessary, caseworkers followed the procedure for recommending release on licence conditions for boys serving long sentences.

## Health services

### Expected outcomes:

**Children and young people are cared for by a health service that assesses and meets their health needs while in custody and which promotes continuity of health and social care on release. The standard of health service provided is equivalent to that which children and young people could expect to receive elsewhere in the community.**

**2.54** *Overall, health services were good and children were positive about the service. Nurses contributed to case reviews and meetings but struggled to do this with the available resources. The unit treatment rooms were poor. Dental services were very good. Pharmacy services were reasonable. Mental health support was generally very good, but speech and language therapy was not available.*

## Governance arrangements

- 2.55** The Youth Justice Board (YJB) commissioned G4S Integrated Services to provide health services. Clinical governance arrangements were good. Well attended, regular governance meetings informed the partnership board. Working relationships between the provider and the local health board were excellent. The health needs assessment was out of date and the YJB had commissioned a new health needs assessment to inform service development. There was no health service user forum.
- 2.56** There were registered nurses at Parc at all times. A senior nurse and a small core team with a balanced skill mix provided most of the nursing services to the young persons' unit between 7.30am and 4pm Monday to Friday. Nurses from the wider team attended the unit at other times as needed.
- 2.57** The unit nurse attended a wide range of key multidisciplinary meetings each day, including the morning meeting, exit boards and case management meetings. This ensured effective communication. However, there were not enough resources for the multidisciplinary work and clinical activity which meant that some meetings were missed and service development was restricted.
- 2.58** Nursing staff used the comprehensive range of electronic policies, including infection control, consent and information sharing. Access to staff training and supervision was good.
- 2.59** Most services were provided from clinical rooms on the wings, but both rooms needed refurbishment and neither met infection control requirements. The door on the E Wing treatment room had not been modified for use as an office and could not be opened from the inside, which presented an unacceptable safety risk. All consultations were held in private.
- 2.60** All nursing staff were trained in life support and had good access to appropriate emergency equipment. All discipline staff were first aid trained.
- 2.61** Health staff were clearly identifiable and we observed very good interactions with the boys. All new arrivals received a health services leaflet, but it was not suitable for children with reading difficulties.
- 2.62** Children could complain about the health service through the general complaints procedure, which did not provide enough confidentiality. The response to the one complaint received in the previous six months was appropriate.
- 2.63** There was a strong whole prison approach to health promotion and there were good health promotion displays throughout the unit. Boys could not smoke and, although nicotine replacement therapy was available, there were often delays because it had to be prescribed by a GP. There was good access to age-appropriate immunisations, vaccinations and screening for blood-borne viruses. The condom policy did not reflect children's needs and some staff were unclear about the correct procedures.

## Recommendations

- 2.64** **All clinical areas should be safe and fully compliant with infection control guidelines.**
- 2.65** **Condoms should be available and the supporting policy should specifically consider the needs of children.**

## Housekeeping points

- 2.66** Regular consultation with children should inform service delivery.
- 2.67** The health service information leaflet should be appropriate for the population and specific to the unit.
- 2.68** Children should be able to complain about health services through a confidential system accessible only to health staff.

## Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.69** Most children we spoke to were positive about health services and in our survey 80% reported that the overall quality of health services was good against the comparator of 53% and 50% at the previous inspection.
- 2.70** Nurses saw all new arrivals promptly for an initial assessment, although a discipline officer was usually present, which was inappropriate. If a child identified a significant health problem, a supported living plan was opened and passed to officers, which remained good practice. Effective liaison with community services ensured continuity of care. All new arrivals were routinely seen by the GP in the next clinic. Routine dentist and optician check-ups were promoted. Separate secondary mental health and physical health screens were completed at a later date, although these were often delayed.
- 2.71** Nurses were very visible and easily approached on the wings. Children either asked the nurse for services or submitted applications. Waiting times for services were good, except for the dentist (see paragraph 2.86).
- 2.72** Nurses with specialist training provided regular clinics for lifelong conditions. Emergency GP appointments were available daily and there was good out-of-hours GP provision. The SystmOne electronic clinical records that we sampled were good, but some GPs did not check the clinical record consistently as part of the consultation, which had led to poor outcomes for one boy.
- 2.73** Two cells in an annexe off an adult prisoner wing were used for boys who needed 24-hour nursing care. These were seldom used and robust procedures ensured the boys' wellbeing within a mixed environment.
- 2.74** Access to hospital appointments was good but demand was low.

## Housekeeping point

- 2.75** GPs should consistently check the SystmOne clinical record during consultations.

## Pharmacy

- 2.76** Focus Healthcare Ltd provided pharmacy services from a dedicated room in the health unit. Medication was supplied promptly, but written information was not consistently included. Boys could request a pharmacist appointment, but services such as medicine use reviews were not routinely offered.

- 2.77** Medicines management and clinical governance procedures were good. The full range of required policies and procedures were in place and had been read and signed by staff. Current reference sources were available, although we found an out-of-date reference book in one treatment room. The level of prescribing was low and suitable for the population. There was appropriate access to medication out of hours.
- 2.78** Risk assessments were completed on SystmOne for medicines supplied in possession and lockable boxes were supplied for storage as needed. Most medicines were supervised. Most medicines were supplied in blister packs for supervised administration up to four times a day on the unit. Boys came into the treatment room for medication while an officer waited outside the room, but there was not enough privacy as other boys crowded around the door. Controlled drugs were administered in the main health care unit, where boys were kept separate from adults.
- 2.79** A good range of appropriate patient group directions<sup>3</sup> (PGDs) was in place. PGDs supplied were recorded on SystmOne but not on the boy's prescription chart and were not audited.
- 2.80** The well attended medicines management committee met quarterly. The agenda was appropriate but did not include discussion of relevant aggregated prescribing data. There were no regular prescribing audits.

## Recommendation

- 2.81** **Children should have regular access to pharmacy clinics, including medicine use reviews.**

## Housekeeping points

- 2.82** Patient leaflets should always be given with medication.
- 2.83** Medication should be administered privately and safely.
- 2.84** The supply and stock of PGD medication should be regularly audited.
- 2.85** The medicines management committee should receive relevant aggregated prescribing data and regular pharmacy audits.

## Dentistry

- 2.86** The contractors 'Time for Teeth' provided six dentist sessions a week. All new arrivals were encouraged to have a dental check up and there were usually short waits for treatment. Boys were usually prioritised for the dentist and were seen quickly, but at the time of the inspection some boys had waited up to eight weeks to be seen, which was too long. This was resolved by the health care manager during the inspection. There were appropriate arrangements for emergency treatment. A good range of local protocols and NHS-equivalent dental treatment were available. The dental consultation that we observed was excellent.

---

<sup>3</sup> Enable the supply and administration of prescription-only medicine by persons other than a doctor or pharmacist, usually a nurse



- 2.87** There was very good oral health promotion. Appropriate entries were made in clinical records. The dental surgery met best practice standards. All dental equipment was appropriately maintained and dental waste was disposed of professionally.

### **Delivery of care (mental health)**

- 2.88** There were effective working relationships between prison and mental health staff. Discipline staff had good access to mental health awareness training.
- 2.89** Screening for mental health and learning disabilities occurred at reception and during induction. Boys could self refer for support or be referred by any staff member. Wing-based mental health and learning disability nurses supported children with mild mental health needs. Bereavement counselling was provided by the chaplaincy and generic counselling by case workers. The range of age-appropriate self-help and guided-help materials was good.
- 2.90** The forensic adolescent consultation and treatment service (FACTS) had provided mental health services for boys with complex mental health needs since January 2014. At the time of the inspection, the team supported 12 boys. A further two boys who had been released had continuing community support.
- 2.91** A senior mental health nurse practitioner based in the community provided weekly sessions and made good records on SystmOne at the time, however liaison work completed between sessions was recorded in paper records held in the community meaning SystmOne records were incomplete. A psychiatrist attended as required. Weekly psychiatrist and psychologist input was planned, but there was no speech and language therapy. FACTS provided very good responsive support and boys who were referred were seen within seven days. Liaison with community services was very good, but there were no agreed mental health policies to ensure consistency.
- 2.92** Since January 2014, one boy had been transferred quickly to a community mental health facility.

### **Recommendations**

- 2.93** **Children should have timely access to speech and language therapy as clinically indicated.**
- 2.94** **Local policies for the provision of mental health services should be agreed.**
- 2.95** **All notes and correspondence relating to a boy's care should be included on SystmOne.**

## Catering

### Expected outcomes:

**Children and young people are offered varied meals to meet their individual requirements and food is prepared and served according to religious, cultural and prevailing food safety and hygiene regulations.**

**2.96** *Many children were not happy with the quality of the food, although the food that we sampled was generally good. Evening meals were often delivered to the wings too early. Portion sizes were ample. Boys continued to have the opportunity to eat together.*

**2.97** The menu was based on a four-week cycle, providing daily choices of five lunch and five evening meals to meet religious and nutritional diets. Each meal included a good selection of fruit and vegetables.

**2.98** Some children we spoke to complained about the catering, and in our survey only 16% described the food as good.

**2.99** Most meals were provided by external suppliers and reheated in the kitchen outside the prison gate. The kitchen was well managed and clean, with appropriate measures in place to keep halal and kosher items separate. Prepared meals were taken by van in hot trolleys to the children's unit. The quality of food that we sampled was generally good. Evening meals were often delivered to the wings too early and left under lamps or in a heated trolley where temperature and appearance could deteriorate. Portion sizes were ample and little food was thrown away.

**2.100** Staff on each wing kept a catering log, recording daily fridge and food temperatures on arrival at the wing and before serving. These logs also showed that management checks had taken place.

**2.101** Food comments books had been introduced since the last inspection: most comments were negative, with many complaints about the temperature of the food. Catering staff attended children's forum meetings.

**2.102** Boys receiving medication to treat attention deficit hyperactivity disorder and those with identified nutritional deficiencies received a sandwich pack with fruit and a biscuit each evening to eat when locked up.

**2.103** Boys continued to have the opportunity to eat together on the wings.

### Housekeeping point

**2.104** Food should be served at the correct temperature.

## Purchases

### Expected outcomes:

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

**2.105** *All children received an induction pack of canteen items. Canteen lists were well advertised on the wings, although they also contained items for adult prisoners only. Catalogue orders no longer had a 50p administration charge.*

**2.106** The shop was managed in house by G4S and weekly purchases were delivered in clear sealed bags. In our survey, just over half the boys said that the shop sold a wide enough range of products.

**2.107** Emergency canteen items could be ordered on arrival, and all children received a free, well-stocked induction pack which gave them time to earn money for their first order the following week.

**2.108** The canteen list was well advertised on the wings, although children told us they were frustrated at having to use canteen sheets listing items like tobacco which only adult prisoners could order.

**2.109** Boys were able to order newspapers and magazines and could shop from several catalogues. The catalogue administration charge of 50p previously levied had been removed.

A large, empty rectangular box with a light gray border, intended for a purposeful activity. The box occupies the majority of the page area below the header and above the footer.

## Section 3. Purposeful activity

### Time out of cell

#### Expected outcomes:

**Children and young people spend most of their time out of their cell, engaged in activities such as education, leisure and cultural pursuits, seven days a week.<sup>4</sup>**

**3.1** *All children were given enough time unlocked. However, access to outdoor areas was somewhat limited.*

**3.2** The time that children could spend out of their cells was very good: the average was about 10.5 hours on weekdays and nine hours at weekends. This ranged from nearly 11 hours for boys on the higher levels of the reward and sanctions scheme to about nine for the few boys on the lowest level. The small number of boys placed on separation on the unit had full access to an activities regime and spent about seven hours out of their cells (see section on separation).

**3.3** Periods of exercise and association were never cancelled and there was little or no slippage in the regime due to late unlocking. During four separate roll checks, we found nobody locked in their cells in the morning or the afternoon during the core day.

**3.4** Although children had exercise periods every day, access to outside areas was generally restricted to small exercise yards which were stark and cramped. Use of the wider prison grounds was not permitted.

### Recommendation

**3.5 Children should have better access to outdoor facilities.**

<sup>4</sup> Time out of cell, in addition to formal 'purposeful activity', includes any time children and young people are out of their cells to associate or use communal facilities to take showers or make telephone calls.

## Education, learning and skills

Inspection of the provision of education and educational standards, as well as vocational training in YOIs for young people, is undertaken by Estyn<sup>5</sup>, working under the general direction of HM Inspectorate of Prisons. For information on how Estyn inspects education and training see the Estyn inspection guidance.

### Expected outcomes:

**All children and young people engage well in education, learning and skills that enable them to gain confidence and experience success. Expectations of children and young people are high. Children and young people are encouraged and enabled to make progress in their learning and their personal and social development to increase their employability and help them to be successful learners on their return to the wider community. Education, learning and skills are of high quality, provide sufficient challenge to children and young people and enable them to gain meaningful qualifications.**

- 3.6** *The strategic management of education, learning and skills was good. The prison worked well with a range of partners to enhance the curriculum. Children had prompt access to a good range of activities which encouraged them to engage in education and training. The focus on the core skills of literacy, numeracy and ICT was not strong enough. Children attended regularly, enjoyed their learning and attained a wide range of qualifications. Overall, the standard of teaching was good. There was not enough learning support for boys with additional learning needs. Many boys made good use of the library; however, staff cover was limited.*
- 3.7** *Estyn made the following assessments about the learning and skills and work provision:*
- |  |             |
|--|-------------|
| <i>Overall effectiveness of learning and skills and work:</i>  | <i>Good</i> |
| <i>Outcomes for children engaged in learning and skills and work activities:</i>   | <i>Good</i> |
| <i>Quality of learning and skills and work activities, including the quality of teaching, training, learning and assessment:</i> | <i>Good</i> |
| <i>Effectiveness of leadership and management of learning and skills and work activities:</i>                                    | <i>Good</i> |

## Management of education and learning and skills

- 3.8** The senior management team provided good leadership in developing and maintaining education provision for children.
- 3.9** There were good systems for collecting and analysing data on learners' progress and achievement. Staff produced useful data evaluating learners' performance, which were used to inform planning. Arrangements for the assessment of the quality of teaching and for supporting tutors who needed to improve were good. There was good shared communication of learners' needs, and effective daily staff meetings ensured that all staff were aware of children's progress and developing needs.

<sup>5</sup> Estyn is the office of Her Majesty's Inspectorate for Education and Training in Wales. Estyn is independent of, but funded by, the National Assembly for Wales. The purpose of Estyn is to inspect quality and standards in education and training in Wales.

- 3.10** There was a wide range of partnerships with organisations such as Barclays Bank, Homeward Bound and Cynon Valley Crime Prevention, which complemented provision, enriched the curriculum and helped learners to improve their preparation for employment and career planning.
- 3.11** The unit's annual self-assessment report was broadly consistent with inspectors' judgements and evaluated the main strengths and areas for improvement in the education provision. The priorities for development were appropriately derived from the self-assessment report and progress was monitored regularly.
- 3.12** Staff promoted equality and diversity well, and nearly all created an environment where learners were respectful and supportive to each other. Learners felt safe in education and their behaviour was monitored and managed well.
- 3.13** Staff liaised well with other prison and support staff, such as youth offending team workers and social workers. This helped boys to get the support they needed. However, recent changes in the population and in careers service provision had eroded children's access to careers guidance and support.

## Recommendation

- 3.14 All children should receive good access to impartial careers guidance and support.**

## Provision of activities

- 3.15** Induction procedures were effective and children were aware of the education and vocational opportunities available. Initial assessment of children's basic skills was effective and informed their individual learning plans. Most staff used these well to adapt their teaching to meet individual needs. Staff liaised well with previous institutions and services with which boys had been involved and used a broad range of information to assess their needs accurately.
- 3.16** Learners had prompt access to a good range of activities which encouraged them to engage in education. Progression was good and boys had many opportunities to take qualifications, including in a few cases GCSEs. For a few boys, achievements from low beginnings encouraged them to aim towards higher education as their next step. Boys took part in citizenship classes which improved their understanding of equality and diversity and of sustainable development. They had good opportunities to take part in subjects and projects which encouraged them to express themselves through language, music or art. Many participated in projects that helped them to budget.
- 3.17** Provision for the core skills of literacy, numeracy and ICT did not have a strong enough focus across all areas of the curriculum.
- 3.18** Many learners improved their awareness of the culture of Wales. However, opportunities for Welsh speakers to engage with tutors through the medium of Welsh were limited.
- 3.19** Most children behaved well in class. Attendance was good, they arrived punctually and took pride in their work and achievements. In carpentry, for example, high quality items of furniture were produced. This experience helped to improve their self-image.

- 3.20** Nearly all staff monitored and managed boys' behaviour well. However, in a very few cases, use of abusive language was not addressed effectively.

## Quality of provision

- 3.21** In most sessions that we observed, teaching was good and met the needs of most boys. Teachers used a good variety of teaching methods. They explained things clearly and in practical sessions made good use of demonstrations to help develop learners' skills. There was good use of questioning to check that boys had understood the task. Many teachers used praise well to increase boys' sense of achievement. However, in a few sessions, the pace of teaching was too fast and teachers did not manage poor behaviour well enough.
- 3.22** The quality of individual learning plans varied and they were not always coordinated well enough with other unit plans. In the best plans, children's progress against their targets was reviewed regularly at useful meetings with their teachers. In a few classes, children had good opportunities to review their learning and reflect on their progress.
- 3.23** Overall, resources for education were of good quality and enabled nearly all children to acquire up-to-date skills. The education unit was bright and decorated with many examples of children's creative art work. However, in music, the ICT equipment was not of a high enough standard to meet the demands of the course and this impeded learners' progress.
- 3.24** Many teachers gave good verbal feedback. Teachers did not always mark work or provide useful written feedback to a consistently high standard. Written feedback was often generic and did not explain what boys needed to do to improve. Teachers did not give enough attention to marking errors in grammar and spelling.
- 3.25** Teachers paid good attention to the views of learners through regular surveys. A few boys received training to help them represent their classes on the Student Council.
- 3.26** There were good systems for collecting information from teachers and providing useful reports to training planning meetings.

## Education and vocational achievements

- 3.27** Most boys enjoyed their learning, participated well and made good progress. They attained a range of qualifications at entry level and level 1 in subjects such as art, citizenship and carpentry. A few boys attained qualifications at a higher level, for example a level 3 qualification in sports psychology. Boys taking part in the Parc Academy sports programme attained useful work-related qualifications which enhanced their employability. During 2012 to 2013 about half the children did not attain well enough in the core skills of literacy, numeracy and ICT.
- 3.28** Children produced practical and written work of a good standard. They produced pieces of extended writing, paid good attention to punctuation and developed their handwriting skills. In decorative tiling courses, they reviewed their own learning and identified how they could improve their work.
- 3.29** In cookery, music, and carpentry boys developed very good skills. In cookery, for example, they enjoyed working in a professional kitchen and a few boys expressed an interest in catering careers. Boys developed their social and personal skills in many sessions. They arrived on time and engaged quickly. In citizenship classes they developed a good understanding of global warming in lively discussion groups.



- 3.30** Almost half the children had been assessed as having additional learning needs, although the number of learning support assistants had been reduced to one member of staff. This was not enough to ensure that all children received appropriate support and that their progress was not impeded.
- 3.31** More able boys followed distance learning courses at higher levels. Teacher support for this was too limited and systems to monitor progress were underdeveloped.

## Recommendations

- 3.32 The curriculum for the core skills of literacy, numeracy and ICT should be strengthened and attainment rates improved to a good level.**
- 3.33 All children with additional learning needs should receive appropriate support.**

## Library

- 3.34** Children had access to the library twice a week. Many boys made good use of this opportunity to read for pleasure or to support their education programmes. There was an efficient request service for books from the library in the adult prison, although books requested from outside the prison often took too long to arrive. There was a good range of fiction and non-fiction titles including biographies, history, art and poetry. There was a good stock of easy readers. Audio books and graphic novels were also available as were books in other languages for the few boys whose first language was not English. There was a good selection of books in the Welsh language.
- 3.35** Most children took good care of the books they borrowed and book losses were low. The library had good arrangements for collecting requests for the prison radio station. This encouraged boys to visit the library and develop a good relationship with the librarian.
- 3.36** The library did not have any computers and opportunities for library visitors to develop their on-line research skills were very limited.
- 3.37** At the time of the inspection, the library did not have the full complement of staff. As a result of this, opening times were limited and library promotion and development work had been greatly reduced.

## Recommendation

- 3.38 More time should be allocated to a professional librarian to develop library services.**

## Physical education and healthy living

### Expected outcomes:

**All children and young people understand the importance of healthy living, and are encouraged and enabled to participate in and enjoy physical education in safety, regardless of their ability. The programme of activities is inclusive and well planned. It is varied and includes indoor and outdoor activities.**

**3.39** *Children received appropriate induction to PE and there were good checks to ensure that all children were fit to use the gym equipment and knew how to do so safely.*

**3.40** Children following the PE pathway and those on enhanced regimes had good access to the gym. Access for other groups was satisfactory. There were adequate facilities for PE and staff ensured a reasonable balance between indoor and outdoor activity. However, most recreational activity was restricted to football and weightlifting.

**3.41** There were enough well-qualified PE staff who attended useful additional training such as steroid awareness and an expedition leaders' course.

**3.42** Shower facilities were good and safe and boys could shower in privacy.

**3.43** Attention to health promotion and to helping children improve their wellbeing was only satisfactory. Children did not have individual PE plans and staff did not liaise routinely with health care staff to address and improve the health needs of children.

**3.44** Boys taking part in the Parc Academy sports programme attained many useful qualifications, but in other areas of PE provision, opportunities to develop sports theory knowledge or develop and practise skills were limited.

### Recommendation

**3.45 Opportunities for children to develop sports theory knowledge and skills training in PE should be improved.**

## Section 4. Resettlement

### Pre-release and resettlement

#### Expected outcomes:

**Planning for a child or young person's release or transfer starts on their arrival at the establishment. Resettlement underpins the work of the whole establishment, supported by strategic partnerships in the community and informed by assessment of young people's risk and need. Ongoing planning ensures a seamless transition into the community.**

- 4.1 *The strategic management of resettlement had improved, although the task had become more complex as boys originated from a wider geographic spread than previously. There was more use of release on temporary licence, but this was still not used to maintain family relationships. Despite efforts by unit staff, resettlement outcomes were still not being monitored effectively.*
- 4.2 The resettlement strategy was comprehensive and was reviewed regularly, most recently in December 2013. Implementation of the strategy was overseen by the resettlement committee which met quarterly. There was appropriate attendance from key areas of the unit and a resettlement broker from South Wales had started to attend meetings. A thorough resettlement needs analysis had been completed in late 2013 which was used to inform an action plan. Progress was monitored by the resettlement committee.
- 4.3 The unit court catchment area had been extended twice in the previous 14 months. The unit routinely accommodated children from Devon and Cornwall and had recently become the designated location for children from Bristol, Wiltshire and Swindon. Caseworkers and other resettlement staff had to establish working relationships with a wide range of youth offending services, local authorities and resettlement services. We were told of reluctance by some community services to visit boys at the unit because of the lengthy and costly journeys involved. English boys could not use some services funded by the Welsh Assembly.
- 4.4 Core resettlement work was carried out by a group of caseworkers who provided boys with good support. They had caseloads of about 10 each. Remand boys were managed by a seconded youth offending team (YOT) officer, and other boys were shared among the caseworkers. Risk and resettlement needs were identified quickly after arrival and there was emphasis on preventing reoffending. Caseworkers chaired training planning meetings. It was evident that they had a strong focus on children's rights and sometimes advocated on behalf of the children.
- 4.5 At the time of the previous inspection, there had not been any use of release on temporary licence (ROTL). This had improved, although there was scope for further improvement. Three boys had received ROTL in the previous six months for placements in the community. There was no use of ROTL to support family ties. We were satisfied that boys were being considered for ROTL and that efforts were being made to enhance the range of opportunities available to boys who were suitable.
- 4.6 The unit had continued to try to monitor resettlement outcomes for children released from Parc, but the return of information from regional youth offending services was poor. This was being addressed through the resettlement consortium but in the meantime the unit was not able to monitor resettlement outcomes effectively.

## Recommendations

- 4.7 All children should have access to the same level of resettlement support from their home area.**
- 4.8 The unit should work with their regional resettlement consortia, youth offending services and the Youth Justice Board to ensure that information on resettlement outcomes is collected after children leave the unit. (repeated recommendation 4.7)**

## Training planning and remand management

### Expected outcomes:

**All children and young people have a training or remand management plan which is based on an individual assessment of risk and need. Relevant staff work collaboratively with children and young people and their parents or carers in drawing up and reviewing their plans. The plans are reviewed regularly and implemented throughout and after young people's time in custody to ensure a smooth transition to the community.**

**4.9** *Planning was well organised and efficient and each child had an individualised plan. A seconded social worker ensured that looked-after children were identified and their needs met. Public protection arrangements remained sound and appropriate preparations were made for children transferring to the adult estate.*

- 4.10** All children were allocated a caseworker who contacted them quickly. Initial training and remand management plans were put in place within the appropriate timescale and children were encouraged to participate in the process. Initial liaison with the boy's community youth offending worker was good and families were contacted when possible. In some cases families and YOTs contacted caseworkers before the boy arrived.
- 4.11** The training and remand management plans that we looked at focused on the individual needs of the child and had clear targets which were discussed with the child at the meetings that we observed. One boy told us he thought there was too much focus on behaviour targets and not enough on post-release issues. The plans that we looked at had appropriately balanced targets.
- 4.12** Remand children continued to receive an excellent service. They met their caseworker soon after arrival who helped them to make a bail application. They had remand plans which were regularly reviewed and benefited from the same services as sentenced children (see section on legal rights).
- 4.13** Training planning and remand management meetings continued to be well organised and timely. Attendance at the meetings was good by internal departments other than key workers, and by many external youth offending services. The planning meetings that we attended were managed well. Boys were encouraged to contribute and their progress and achievements were acknowledged. Resettlement was discussed and children were given the opportunity to raise any concerns.
- 4.14** There were good transition arrangements for boys who transferred to the adult site at the age of 18. Two boys we spoke to who were approaching their 18<sup>th</sup> birthdays were happy with the arrangements for their move and felt prepared for it. More boys were transferring to the main site than previously. The unit social worker was not able to continue to support looked-after children when they moved to the adult site as care leavers. There was effective

sharing of information between relevant departments. Boys serving detention and training orders were able to stay in the young people's unit when they reached the age of 18 unless they were assessed as a risk to other children.

- 4.15** The number of boys with sexually related offences was very low. There were no on-site interventions to address their offending behaviour, but one-to-one work could be commissioned from a specialist external provider.
- 4.16** The unit managed a few boys serving long determinate sentences. Their caseworkers were clear about the procedures to be followed, including the preparation of reports to assess their suitability for early release on home detention curfew.

## Public protection

- 4.17** Children who were assessed as a risk to the public were identified by caseworkers soon after their arrival. Oversight of public protection cases by the unit senior managers remained adequate. An interdepartmental risk management team meeting was convened when required. Caseworkers attended MAPPA (multi-agency public protection arrangements) refresher training and were clear about the procedures to reduce the risk to the public. All relevant information was shared at the daily morning briefings.
- 4.18** The recent resettlement needs analysis showed that over a 10-month period 23 boys (18%) had been MAPPA level 1 and two (1%) had been MAPPA level 2. Caseworkers completed MAPPA reports on boys being released and attended initial community MAPPA reviews when possible. This happened more often for Welsh boys than for those who lived further away.
- 4.19** Appropriate consideration was given to the need for restrictions on the contact that some boys had with people outside the establishment. When deemed necessary, restrictions were imposed on mail, telephone contact and visits. Few boys fell into this category and any who did had their cases reviewed as circumstances changed.

## Looked-after children

- 4.20** Since the previous inspection, a unit social worker had been appointed to ensure that looked-after children received appropriate support from their local authority. New arrivals known to local authorities were identified and discussed at the next daily briefing. The social worker contacted home local authorities quickly, and in some cases had to persuade the local authority of the responsibilities they had to the child, escalating the case when support was not forthcoming. The levels of support that boys received was variable. Obtaining suitable accommodation for some looked-after children in good time for their release was a problem. In two out of five recent cases addresses had been provided just days before the child's release.
- 4.21** Unit staff tried to arrange training planning and looked-after children reviews on the same day, but this was not always possible. Social workers were not always able to attend training and remand management meetings. Looked after children reviews were taking place but the local authorities responsible for their care were not arranging for statutory medical reviews to take place.

## Recommendation

- 4.22 All children with looked-after status should receive the same minimum levels of support from their local authority.**

## Reintegration planning

### Expected outcomes:

**Children and young people's resettlement needs are addressed prior to release.**

**An effective multi-agency response is used to meet the specific needs of each individual young person in order to maximise the likelihood of successful reintegration into the community.**

- 4.23** *Caseworkers continued to provide the main source of support for children before their release. Provision under the resettlement pathways was generally good but education, training and employment was weak and it was not always possible to obtain suitable accommodation for boys before their release. The proportion of children who lived more than 50 miles away had increased significantly. The family support worker continued to provide good individual support and maintained contact with family and friends. Children had access to relevant one-to-one programmes and there were plans to evaluate these.*

- 4.24** In our survey, 58% of children said they had had a say in what would happen to them when they were released and 65% that their case worker had helped them prepare for release against respective comparators of 38% and 45%.
- 4.25** Practical arrangements for preparing boys for release remained sound. They were issued with travel bags and staff ensured that they did not return home unaccompanied.
- 4.26** A representative from the unit attended all first reviews in the local community and submitted a written report if boys lived further away.

## Accommodation

- 4.27** Most children returned to live with their family on release and we were told that in the previous 12 months no child had been released without an address. However, boys had regularly not been notified of where they were going until two or three days beforehand. The quality of the accommodation was sometimes inadequate, when children were placed in bed and breakfast or hostel accommodation.
- 4.28** Accommodation needs continued to be identified early by caseworkers. If problems or uncertainty about the provision were identified, contact was made with the community YOT worker and sustained efforts were made by unit staff to try to ensure that suitable accommodation was available before release.
- 4.29** Following discussions with the Youth Justice Board earlier in the year, an agreement had been reached for unit staff to escalate cases to Youth Justice Board Wales, if they thought the accommodation was inadequate or information was not forthcoming quickly enough. It was too early to determine the effectiveness of this practice.

## Education, training and employment

- 4.30** Many boys did not know how to seek careers advice or the range of opportunities available to them on release. Voluntary sector providers helped to support the improvement of children's career planning. However, the statutory service provided by Careers Wales had been reduced and children had significantly less access to a qualified careers adviser. Boys from England did not have satisfactory support from the National Careers Service.
- 4.31** A few boys gained work experience on the unit and a few had recently used ROTL to undertake work experience placements with a local voluntary organisation. Many other boys did not acquire work experience.
- 4.32** Support from YOTs in some parts of England was poor and they did not visit boys for whom they were responsible.

## Health care

- 4.33** All children were seen the week before release to address outstanding health care issues. Wing nurses attended discharge boards and there was good communication with GPs to ensure continuity of care. Children on medication were given three to five days' supply on release but appointments for them to continue medication in the community were not made.
- 4.34** The forensic adolescent consultation and treatment service started discharge planning early to ensure that services were in place.

## Housekeeping point

- 4.35** A community GP appointment should be booked before release for boys on medication to ensure continuity of treatment.

## Drugs and alcohol

- 4.36** Young people's substance misuse service workers delivered a harm reduction session with every boy before release. There was excellent liaison with community services and the workers had attended community appointments with some boys to support the transition to community services.

## Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.37** The casework team continued to give practical support and information on finance. Courses delivered by the education department included money management. A regular programme of visits by the local Barclays Bank youth team had started and they had given a significant number of boys specific advice on their financial circumstances.

## Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.38** At the time of the inspection, 20% of boys were over 100 miles away from home, and 22% were between 50 to 100 miles away. The distance made it difficult for many families to visit.

- 4.39** Boys spoke positively about the conditions and atmosphere in visits. Staff were welcoming and the visits room was bright, although it was bare with rigid, fixed furniture and very limited facilities for younger children. There was a drinks and snacks vending machine and a hot drinks machine in the room, and hot drinks and hot food were available in the tea bar in the main visits hall. The free bus continued to serve all the visits sessions. Visits continued to be held each weekday and in four one-hour blocks on Saturday and Sunday. A very low screen was fixed to the visiting table if risk had been identified: only four boys had been subject to this in the previous six months.
- 4.40** The family support worker often arranged double weekend visits when families had a long way to travel or a specific need, for example double visits on Saturday and Sunday had been arranged for a London mother who had stayed with a local family.
- 4.41** All visitors were still required to have ID with them every time they visited, even though their photograph was on the system for repeat visits. This was unnecessary for a small unit.
- 4.42** Quarterly family days continued to be organised but they were restricted to children on the platinum and gold levels of the rewards and sanctions scheme and a very few who had been nominated for achievements in education. Attendance at the most recent family day had been low because there were few boys on the gold level.
- 4.43** The family support worker sent a pack to all families which contained a well-presented booklet and other information. She contacted each family within a working day of the boy's arrival and knew the families of many local children. Families were invited to all training planning meetings. Release on temporary licence was not being used for family contact.

## Recommendations

- 4.44 Distance from home should be a key factor in planning the custody of children.**
- 4.45 The visits area should be made comfortable and welcoming, particularly for children.**
- 4.46 Visitors should not be turned away if they do not have identification on every visit.** (repeated recommendation 4.50)
- 4.47 Family days should be open to all children.** (repeated recommendation 4.48)
- 4.48 ROTL should be used to help maintain family relationships.** (repeated recommendation 4.49)

## Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.49** A number of interventions were available to boys, including self esteem, problem solving, anger management and conflict resolution. These were used flexibly and there was informal evidence that they had been effective in supporting personal change. The tutors, who were prison custody officers, adapted the programmes for those identified as bullies or as victims of bullying. They were not specifically trained or professionally supervised in intervention work; some work was planned in partnership with Cardiff University to evaluate the impact of these interventions. The tutors attended initial detention and training order meetings and other individual case management meetings to pick up referrals and to report back on boys' progress.



- 4.50** The interventions tutors did one-to-one work with some separated boys and adapted their material for boys with reading and writing difficulties.

### **Recommendation**

- 4.51** A framework of training, independent evaluation and feedback should be put in place for interventions work, while preserving the existing child-focused approach.



## Section 5. Recommendations and housekeeping points

The following is a listing of recommendations, housekeeping points and examples of good practice included in this report. The reference numbers at the end of each refer to the paragraph location in the main report.

### Recommendations

#### To the Youth Justice Board

##### Pre-release and resettlement

- 5.1** All children should have access to the same level of resettlement support from their home area. (4.7)

##### Training planning and remand management

- 5.2** All children with looked-after status should receive the same minimum levels of support from their local authority. (4.22)

### Recommendations

#### To the Youth Justice Board and the director

##### Education, learning and skills

- 5.3** All children should receive good access to impartial careers guidance and support. (3.14)

##### Pre-release and resettlement

- 5.4** The unit should work with their regional resettlement consortia, youth offending services and the Youth Justice Board to ensure that information on resettlement outcomes is collected after children leave the unit. (4.8)

### Recommendation

#### To NOMS

##### Reintegration planning

- 5.5** Distance from home should be a key factor in planning the custody of children. (4.44)

### Recommendation

#### To the escort contractor and NOMS

##### Courts, escorts and transfers

- 5.6** Children should not spend lengthy periods waiting in court after their case has been completed, and NOMS should ensure that waits are kept to a minimum. (1.6)

## Recommendation

To the escort contractor

### Courts, escorts and transfers

- 5.7** Children should be transported separately from adult prisoners. (1.7)

## Recommendations

To the director

### Early days in custody

- 5.8** The induction booklet should be available in the main languages spoken by foreign national children. (1.14)

### Substance misuse

- 5.9** Children should receive clinical support services from appropriately trained staff guided by comprehensive policies which reflect best practice. (1.77)

### Residential units

- 5.10** Cells should have effective ventilation. (2.13)
- 5.11** The steel grid over the exercise yard on G wing should be removed. (2.14)
- 5.12** Walls in front of showers should be sufficiently high to maintain decency. (2.15)
- 5.13** Toilets should be fully screened. (2.16)
- 5.14** Children should have access to a lockable cupboard. (2.17)

### Equality and diversity

- 5.15** Monitoring by protected characteristics should be put in place and equality reports should be regularly discussed at safeguarding meetings. (2.30)

### Health services

- 5.16** All clinical areas should be safe and fully compliant with infection control guidelines. (2.64)
- 5.17** Condoms should be available and the supporting policy should specifically consider the needs of children. (2.65)
- 5.18** Children should have regular access to pharmacy clinics, including medicine use reviews. (2.81)
- 5.19** Children should have timely access to speech and language therapy as clinically indicated. (2.93)
- 5.20** Local policies for the provision of mental health services should be agreed. (2.94)

- 5.21** All notes and correspondence related to a boy's care should be included on SystmOne. (2.95)

#### Time out of cell

- 5.22** Children should have better access to outdoor facilities. (3.5)

#### Education, learning and skills

- 5.23** The curriculum for the core skills of literacy, numeracy and ICT should be strengthened and attainment rates improved to a good level. (3.32)
- 5.24** All children with additional learning needs should receive appropriate support. (3.33)
- 5.25** More time should be allocated to a professional librarian to develop library services. (3.38)

#### Physical education and healthy living

- 5.26** Opportunities for children to develop sports theory knowledge and skills training in PE should be improved. (3.45)

#### Reintegration planning

- 5.27** The visits area should be made comfortable and welcoming, particularly for children. (4.45)
- 5.28** Visitors should not be turned away if they do not have identification on every visit. (4.46)
- 5.29** Family days should be open to all children. (4.47)
- 5.30** ROTL should be used to help maintain family relationships. (4.48)
- 5.31** A framework of training, independent evaluation and feedback should be put in place for interventions work, while preserving the existing child-focused approach. (4.51)

## Housekeeping points

#### Early days in custody

- 5.32** All children should be given telephone credit on arrival. (1.15)

#### Care and protection of children and young people

- 5.33** Issues of equality and diversity which relate to the safety of children should be identified and discussed at each safeguarding meeting. (1.19)
- 5.34** Quality assurance of ACCT procedures should include all key elements identified in ACCT training and feedback should be given in each case to the relevant member of staff. (1.33)

#### Relationships between staff and children and young people

- 5.35** Minutes of consultation meetings should be displayed on unit notice boards. (2.22)

### Equality and diversity

- 5.36** Blank DIRF forms should be available in the complaint boxes. (2.31)
- 5.37** Forums for minority groups should be set up when numbers of children from a particular group make it viable to do so. (2.37)

### Health services

- 5.38** Regular consultation with children should inform service delivery. (2.66)
- 5.39** The health service information leaflet should be appropriate for the population and specific to the unit. (2.67)
- 5.40** Children should be able to complain about health services through a confidential system accessible only to health staff. (2.68)
- 5.41** GPs should consistently check the SystmOne clinical record during consultations. (2.75)
- 5.42** Patient leaflets should always be given with medication. (2.82)
- 5.43** Medication should be administered privately and safely. (2.83)
- 5.44** The supply and stock of PGD medication should be regularly audited. (2.84)
- 5.45** The medicines management committee should receive relevant aggregated prescribing data and regular pharmacy audits. (2.85)

### Catering

- 5.46** Food should be served at the correct temperature. (2.104)

### Reintegration planning

- 5.47** A community GP appointment should be booked before release for boys on medication to ensure continuity of treatment. (4.35)

## Section 6. Appendices

### Appendix I: Inspection team

Martin Lomas  
 Ian MacFadyen  
 Angela Johnson  
 Martin Kettle  
 Gordon Riach  
 Paul Roberts  
 Louise Finer  
 Sam Booth  
 Rachel Prime

Deputy chief inspector  
 Team leader  
 Inspector  
 Inspector  
 Inspector  
 Inspector  
 Policy officer  
 Senior research officer  
 Research officer

#### **Specialist inspectors**

Majella Pearce  
 Helen Boniface  
 Rachael Bubalo  
 Alun Connick

Health services inspector  
 Pharmacist  
 Estyn inspector  
 Estyn inspector

Sally Ireland

Observer (Office of the Children's Commissioner)





## Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report

The following is a summary of the main findings from the last report and a list of all the recommendations made, organised under the four tests of a healthy prison. The reference numbers at the end of each recommendation refer to the paragraph location in the previous report. If a recommendation has been repeated in the main report, its new paragraph number is provided here.

### Safety

**Children and young people, particularly the most vulnerable, are held safely.**

*At the last inspection in 2012, we found that children were looked after well on admission. Early days procedures were thorough and young people found the induction process helpful. The reintroduction of routine strip-searching was a retrograde step. Safeguarding arrangements were efficient and child protection procedures were extremely well organised. Vulnerable children were well cared for and staff took incidents of bullying seriously and dealt with them efficiently. The use of separation was high but this usually took place in the children and young people's unit and relatively few children were held in the intensive support unit in the main part of the prison. Fights occurred regularly but children told us they felt safe and the unit remained a reasonably safe place. Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.*

#### Main recommendation

Strip-searching of young people in custody should only be carried out after a properly conducted risk assessment has indicated this is necessary. (HP75)

**Achieved**

#### Recommendations

Young people should not spend lengthy periods waiting in court after their case has been completed, and this should be monitored by the prison. (I.7)

**Partially achieved**

Young people should be transported separately from adult prisoners. (I.8)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, I.7)

All aspects of the initial induction assessments should be completed properly and in private and they should accurately identify and record personal characteristics and vulnerabilities available in the ASSET document. (I.18)

**Achieved**

The care planning arrangements should be streamlined in order to avoid confusion and duplication. Plans should be integrated and of a consistently good quality. (I.31)

**Achieved**

The allocated case manager should be present at all ACCT reviews. (I.56)

**Achieved**

Young people placed in the intensive support unit should only be placed on an ACCT document where there are identified risks of suicide or self-harm. (1.57)

**Achieved**

Only staff from the young people's unit should be used for planned use of force. (1.81)

**Not achieved**

## Respect

**Children and young people are treated with respect for their human dignity.**

*At the last inspection in 2012 we found that staff and children interacted extremely well and treated each other with respect. The living conditions were reasonable. Boys enjoyed eating together but did not like the food. There were various constructive avenues open to young people who had complaints and they were well supported in pursuing their legal rights. Children's religious needs were well catered for and progress was beginning to be made in developing work on diversity. The standard of health care had improved but there were still gaps in specialist provision. Outcomes for children and young people were good against this healthy prison test.*

### Recommendations

Cells should have effective ventilation. (2.16)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.13)

Cells should be equipped with chairs, toilets should be fully screened, and young people should have access to a lockable cupboard. (2.17)

**Partially achieved**

Showers should always be of a serviceable standard. (2.18)

**Partially achieved**

Work being carried out to address discrimination should be sustained and additional effort made to promote positive images of minority groups. (2.39)

**Partially achieved**

There should be a separate focus in the monthly prison report on equality and diversity issues for young people. (2.44)

**Achieved**

More young people should be invited to the equality forum, particularly representatives from the range of minority groups on the unit. (2.45)

**Achieved**

The pharmacist and pharmacy technicians should be supported to develop pharmacy services such as pharmacy-led clinics and medicines use reviews. (2.83)

**Partially achieved**

Lockable boxes should be provided in shared cells for storage of in-possession medicines. (2.84)

**Achieved**

Fixtures in the dental suite decontamination room should be infection control compliant. (2.89)

**Achieved**

Young people should have access to clinical psychology and speech and language therapy as clinically indicated. (2.94)

**Not achieved**

Menus should be designed in consultation with a dietician/nutritionist. (2.104)

**Achieved**

Catering equipment on units should match the facilities on the adult wings. (2.105)

**No longer relevant**

Food should be served at the correct temperature, and temperatures should be recorded at the point of service and effectively monitored by managers. (2.106)

**Partially achieved**

Young people arriving without private money should be offered an advance of up to one week's pay to use for purchases, with repayment staged over a period of time. (2.114)

**Achieved**

Young people should not be charged an administration fee for catalogue orders. (2.115)

**Achieved**

## Purposeful activity

**Children and young people are able, and expected, to engage in activity that is likely to benefit them.**

*At the last inspection in 2012 we found that most boys received ample time out of their cells, but they often became bored. Their educational needs were assessed thoroughly and classroom work was well planned. Attendance and attainment in class were good and the standard of teaching was high. There were still problems with boys arriving at class on time. Lessons were too long, but teachers organised breaks to mitigate this. Some children had the chance to participate in simulated work experience, the library was now better resourced and children received sufficient access to PE. Outcomes for children and young people were good against this healthy prison test.*

## Recommendations

Young people should be given the opportunity to participate in activities which allow them to make constructive use of their leisure time. (3.8)

**Achieved**

All lessons should be sufficiently challenging to engage and motivate young people. (3.23)

**Partially achieved**

Young people should arrive on time for all lessons. (3.29)

**Achieved**

The duration of classroom sessions should be designed to suit the learning needs of young people. (3.30)

**Achieved**

Young people should have more opportunity for work experience including, where appropriate, the use of release on temporary licence. (3.36)

**Partially achieved**

## Resettlement

**Children and young people are effectively helped to prepare for their release back into the community and to reduce the likelihood of reoffending.**

*At the last inspection in 2012, we found that the resettlement committee had not been convened for some time and as a result there was an absence of strategic management in this area. Internal planning arrangements remained efficient: children felt involved and received support from caseworkers. There was no release on temporary licence (ROTL) and some boys faced serious difficulty in obtaining decent accommodation on release. Public protection arrangements were sound and the needs of looked-after children were recognised. Children were given adequate support in relation to finance. All children were interviewed prior to discharge to make sure anyone with health, drug or alcohol problems continued to receive the help they needed. A range of life skills and offending behaviour programmes had recently been introduced which were designed to meet the needs of boys on the unit. Staff helped boys to maintain contact with their families and visiting arrangements were supportive. Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.*

### Main recommendation

All eligible young people should be given opportunities for release on temporary licence. (HP76)

**Partially achieved**

### Recommendations

The resettlement committee should be reinstated with more involvement from external organisations. The committee should oversee the implementation of the resettlement strategy and action plans. (4.6)

**Achieved**

The establishment should work with their regional resettlement consortium, youth offending services and the Youth Justice Board to ensure that information on resettlement outcomes is collected after young people leave the unit. (4.7)

**Partially achieved** (Recommendation repeated, 4.8)

Family days should be open to all young people. (4.48)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 4.47)

ROTL should be used to help maintain family relationships. (4.49)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 4.48)

Visitors should not be turned away if they do not have identification on every visit. (4.50)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 4.46)

## Appendix III: Establishment population profile

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

### Population breakdown by:

Status	Number of young people	%
Sentenced	41	82
Recall	1	2
Convicted unsentenced	2	4
Remand	6	12
Detainees		0
<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100</b>

Age	Number of young people	%
15 years	3	6
16 years	9	18
17 years	34	68
18 years	4	8
<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100</b>

Nationality	Number of young people	%
British	49	98
Foreign nationals	1	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100</b>

Ethnicity	Number of young people	%
White		
British	36	72
Irish		
Gypsy/Irish Traveller		
Other white	2	4
Mixed		
White and black Caribbean	1	2
White and black African		
White and Asian		
Other mixed		
Asian or Asian British		
Indian		
Pakistani	3	6
Bangladeshi		
Chinese		
Other Asian		
Black or black British		
Caribbean	4	8
African	1	2
Other black	2	4
Other ethnic group		
Arab		
Other ethnic group		
Not stated	1	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100</b>

Religion	Number of young people	%
Baptist		
Church of England	2	4
Roman Catholic	5	10
Other Christian denominations	10	20
Muslim	6	12
Sikh		
Hindu		
Buddhist		
Jewish		
Other		
No religion	27	54
<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100</b>

Other demographics	Number of young people	%
Gypsy/Romany/Traveller		
<b>Total</b>		

**Sentenced only – length of stay by age**

Length of stay	<1 mth	1–3 mths	3–6 mths	6–12 mths	1–2 yrs	2 yrs +	4 yrs +	Total
<b>Age</b>								
15 years		2	1					3
16 years	3	2	3	1				9
17 years	6	12	2	5	1			26
18 years	3	1						4
<b>Total</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>			<b>42</b>

**Unsented only – length of stay by age**

Length of stay	<1 mth	1–3 mths	3–6 mths	6–12 mths	1–2 yrs	2 yrs+	4 yrs +	Total
<b>Age</b>								
15 years								
16 years								
17 years	2	4	2					8
18 years								
<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>					<b>8</b>

Main offence	Number of young people	%
Violence against the person	10	20
Sexual offences	1	2
Burglary	11	22
Robbery	16	32
Theft and handling	2	4
Fraud and forgery		
Drugs offences	5	10
Other offences	5	10
Offence not recorded / holding warrant		
<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100</b>

**Number of DTOs by age and full sentence length, including the time in the community**

Sentence	4 mths	6 mths	8 mths	10 mths	12 mths	18 mths	24 mths	Recall	Total
Age									
15 years	1				2				3
16 years	3	1			1	1		1	7
17 years		1	4		9		3	1	18
18 years			2			1	1		4
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>		<b>12</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>32</b>

**Number of Section 91s, (determinate sentences only) by age and length of sentence**

Sentence	Under 2 yrs	2–3 yrs	3–4 yrs	4–5 yrs	5 yrs +	Recall	Total
Age							
15 years							
16 years			1		1		2
17 years		5	2	1			8
18 years							
<b>Total</b>		<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>		<b>10</b>

**Number of extended sentences under Section 228 (extended sentence for public protection) by age and full sentence length, including the time in the community**

Sentence	Under 2 yrs	2–3 yrs	3–4 yrs	4–5 yrs	5 yrs +	Recall	Total
Age							
15 years							
16 years							
17 years					1		1
18 years							
<b>Total</b>					<b>1</b>		<b>1</b>

**Number of indeterminate sentences under Section 226 (detention for public protection) by age and length of tariff**

Sentence	Under 2 yrs	2–5 yrs	5 - 10 yrs	10 – 15 yrs	15 – 20 yrs	Recall	Total
Age							
15 years							
16 years							
17 years							
18 years							
<b>Total</b>							

**Number of mandatory life sentences under Section 90 by age and length of tariff**

Sentence	Under 2 yrs	2–5 yrs	5 - 10 yrs	10 – 15 yrs	15 – 20 yrs	20yrs +	Total
Age							
15 years							
16 years							
17 years							
18 years							
<b>Total</b>							





## Appendix IV: Summary of children and young people questionnaires and interviews

### Children and young people survey methodology

A voluntary, confidential and anonymous survey of the population of young people (15–18 years) was carried out by HM Inspectorate of Prisons.

### Sampling

Questionnaires were offered to all young people.

### Distributing and collecting questionnaires

Every attempt was made to distribute the questionnaires to respondents individually. This gave researchers an opportunity to explain the purpose of the survey and to answer respondents' questions. We also stressed the voluntary nature of the survey and provided assurances about confidentiality and the independence of the Inspectorate. This information is also provided in writing on the front cover of the questionnaire.

Interviews were offered to any young person who could not read or write in English, or who had literacy difficulties.

Respondents were not asked to put their names on their questionnaire, although their responses could be identified back to them in line with child protection requirements. In order to ensure confidentiality, respondents were asked to seal their completed questionnaire in the envelope provided and either hand it back to a member of the research team at a specified time or leave it in their room for collection.

Refusals were noted and no attempts were made to replace them.

### Survey response

At the time of the survey on 28 April 2014 the young person population at HMP & YOI Parc was 49. Questionnaires were distributed to all 49 young people.

We received a total of 45 completed questionnaires, a response rate of 92%. This included one questionnaire completed via interview. Two respondents refused to complete a questionnaire and two questionnaires were not returned.

Wing/Unit	Number of completed survey returns
E	21
G	24

## Presentation of survey results and analyses

Over the following pages we present the survey results for HMP & YOI Parc.

First a full breakdown of responses is provided for each question. In this full breakdown all percentages, including those for filtered questions, refer to the full sample. Percentages have been rounded and therefore may not add up to 100%.

We also present a number of comparative analyses. In all the comparative analyses that follow, statistically significant<sup>6</sup> differences are indicated by shading. Results that are significantly better are indicated by green shading, results that are significantly worse are indicated by blue shading. If the difference is not statistically significant there is no shading. Orange shading has been used to show a statistically significant difference in young people's background details.

Filtered questions are clearly indented and preceded by an explanation of how the filter has been applied. Percentages for filtered questions refer to the number of respondents filtered to that question. For all other questions, percentages refer to the entire sample. All missing responses have been excluded from analyses.

Percentages shown in the full breakdown may differ slightly from those shown in the comparative analyses. This is because the data have been weighted to enable valid statistical comparison between establishments.

The following comparative analyses are presented:

- The current survey responses from HMP & YOI Parc in 2014 compared with responses from young people surveyed in all other young offender institutions. This comparator is based on all responses from young people surveys carried out in seven YOIs since April 2013.
- The current survey responses from HMP & YOI Parc in 2014 compared with the responses of young people surveyed at HMP & YOI Parc in 2013.
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between the responses of white young people and those from a black and minority ethnic group.
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between the responses of Muslim young people and non-Muslim young people.
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between the responses of young people who had been in local authority care and those who had not.

---

<sup>6</sup> A statistically significant difference between the two samples is one that is unlikely to have arisen by chance alone, and can therefore be assumed to represent a real difference between the two populations. Our significance level is set at 0.05 which means that there is only a 5% likelihood that the difference is due to chance.

## Survey summary

### SECTION I: ABOUT YOU

<b>Q1</b>	<b>How old are you?</b>	
	15 .....	4 (9%)
	16 .....	6 (14%)
	17 .....	30 (68%)
	18 .....	4 (9%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Are you a British citizen?</b>	
	Yes .....	40 (93%)
	No .....	3 (7%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>Do you understand spoken English?</b>	
	Yes .....	44 (100%)
	No .....	0 (0%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Do you understand written English?</b>	
	Yes .....	43 (98%)
	No .....	1 (2%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>What is your ethnic origin?</b>	
	White - British .....	31 (70%)
	White - Irish .....	1 (2%)
	White - Other .....	0 (0%)
	Black or Black British - Caribbean .....	5 (11%)
	Black or Black British - African .....	0 (0%)
	Black or Black British - Other .....	0 (0%)
	Asian or Asian British - Indian .....	0 (0%)
	Asian or Asian British - Pakistani .....	2 (5%)
	Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi .....	0 (0%)
	Asian or Asian British - Chinese .....	0 (0%)
	Asian or Asian British - Other .....	0 (0%)
	Mixed race - White and Black Caribbean .....	1 (2%)
	Mixed race - White and Black African .....	1 (2%)
	Mixed race - White and Asian .....	1 (2%)
	Mixed race - Other .....	0 (0%)
	Arab .....	1 (2%)
	Other ethnic group .....	1 (2%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>What is your religion?</b>	
	None .....	17 (40%)
	Church of England .....	5 (12%)
	Catholic .....	8 (19%)
	Protestant .....	0 (0%)
	Other Christian denomination .....	2 (5%)
	Buddhist .....	0 (0%)
	Hindu .....	0 (0%)
	Jewish .....	0 (0%)
	Muslim .....	11 (26%)
	Sikh .....	0 (0%)

<b>Q7</b>	<b>Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?</b>	
	Yes .....	2 (4%)
	No.....	42 (93%)
	Don't know .....	1 (2%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>Do you have any children?</b>	
	Yes .....	7 (16%)
	No.....	38 (84%)
<b>Q9</b>	<b>Do you consider yourself to have a disability? (i.e. do you need help with any long-term physical, mental or learning needs.)</b>	
	Yes .....	8 (18%)
	No.....	36 (82%)
<b>Q10</b>	<b>Have you ever been in local authority care?</b>	
	Yes .....	18 (41%)
	No.....	26 (59%)

## SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Are you sentenced?</b>	
	Yes .....	38 (84%)
	No - unsentenced/on remand .....	7 (16%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>How long is your sentence (the full DTO sentence)?</b>	
	Not sentenced .....	7 (16%)
	Less than 6 months .....	8 (18%)
	6 to 12 months.....	14 (32%)
	More than 12 months, up to 2 years.....	5 (11%)
	More than 2 years.....	10 (23%)
	Indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP).....	0 (0%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>How long have you been in this establishment?</b>	
	Less than 1 month.....	7 (16%)
	1 to 6 months .....	29 (64%)
	More than 6 months, but less than 12 months.....	5 (11%)
	12 months to 2 years.....	3 (7%)
	More than 2 years.....	1 (2%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?</b>	
	Yes .....	21 (47%)
	No.....	24 (53%)

## SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS

<b>Q1</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?</b>	
	Yes .....	40 (89%)
	No.....	2 (4%)
	Don't remember .....	3 (7%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, were there any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females travelling with you?</b>	
	Yes .....	18 (40%)
	No.....	21 (47%)
	Don't remember .....	6 (13%)

<b>Q3</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?</b>	
	Less than 2 hours .....	25 (56%)
	2 to 4 hours.....	16 (36%)
	More than 4 hours .....	3 (7%)
	Don't remember .....	1 (2%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?</b>	
	My journey was less than 2 hours .....	25 (56%)
	Yes .....	2 (4%)
	No.....	18 (40%)
	Don't remember .....	0 (0%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?</b>	
	My journey was less than 2 hours .....	25 (56%)
	Yes .....	10 (22%)
	No.....	9 (20%)
	Don't remember .....	1 (2%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, how did you feel you were treated by the escort staff?</b>	
	Very well.....	9 (20%)
	Well.....	21 (47%)
	Neither .....	10 (22%)
	Badly.....	2 (4%)
	Very badly .....	1 (2%)
	Don't remember .....	2 (4%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>Before you arrived here, did you receive any information to help you prepare for coming here?</b>	
	Yes - and it was helpful.....	11 (24%)
	Yes - but it was not helpful.....	4 (9%)
	No - I received no information .....	25 (56%)
	Don't remember .....	5 (11%)

#### SECTION 4: FIRST DAYS

<b>Q1</b>	<b>How long were you in reception?</b>	
	Less than 2 hours .....	41 (91%)
	2 hours or longer .....	3 (7%)
	Don't remember .....	1 (2%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?</b>	
	Yes .....	37 (84%)
	No.....	3 (7%)
	Don't remember/Not applicable .....	4 (9%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>How well did you feel you were treated in reception?</b>	
	Very well.....	10 (22%)
	Well.....	25 (56%)
	Neither .....	7 (16%)
	Badly.....	0 (0%)
	Very badly .....	2 (4%)
	Don't remember .....	1 (2%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>When you first arrived here, did staff ask if you needed help or support with any of the following things? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	Not being able to smoke .....	28 (65%)
	Money worries.....	7 (16%)

Loss of property .....	6 (14%)	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to .....	17 (40%)
Feeling scared.....	13 (30%)	Health problems .....	17 (40%)
Gang problems.....	11 (26%)	Getting phone numbers .....	19 (44%)
Contacting family .....	24 (56%)	Staff did not ask me about any of these	5 (12%)

**Q5 When you first arrived here, did you have any of the following problems? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**

Not being able to smoke .....	21 (51%)	Money worries.....	7 (17%)
Loss of property .....	3 (7%)	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to .....	4 (10%)
Feeling scared.....	5 (12%)	Health problems .....	3 (7%)
Gang problems.....	4 (10%)	Getting phone numbers .....	6 (15%)
Contacting family .....	10 (24%)	I did not have any problems.....	10 (24%)

**Q6 When you first arrived here, were you given any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**

Toiletries/basic items .....	30 (67%)
The opportunity to have a shower .....	28 (62%)
Something to eat.....	34 (76%)
A free phone call to friends/family.....	33 (73%)
PIN phone credit.....	14 (31%)
Information about feeling worried/upset.....	20 (44%)
Don't remember .....	1 (2%)
I was not given any of these .....	3 (7%)

**Q7 Within your first 24 hours here, did you have access to the following people or services? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**

Chaplain.....	24 (55%)
Peer mentor.....	3 (7%)
Childline/Samaritans.....	9 (20%)
The prison shop/canteen.....	3 (7%)
Don't remember .....	9 (20%)
I did not have access to any of these .....	9 (20%)

**Q8 Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?**

Yes .....	31 (69%)
No.....	11 (24%)
Don't remember .....	3 (7%)

**Q9 Did you feel safe on your first night here?**

Yes .....	40 (89%)
No.....	3 (7%)
Don't remember .....	2 (4%)

**Q10 Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the establishment?**

I have not been on an induction course .....	0 (0%)
Yes .....	39 (87%)
No.....	4 (9%)
Don't remember .....	2 (4%)

## SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT

**Q1 Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?**

Yes .....	44 (98%)
No .....	1 (2%)
Don't know .....	0 (0%)

<b>Q2</b>	<b>Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?</b>	
	Yes .....	31 (69%)
	No.....	12 (27%)
	Don't know .....	2 (4%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>What is the food like here?</b>	
	Very good.....	0 (0%)
	Good.....	7 (16%)
	Neither .....	19 (42%)
	Bad .....	9 (20%)
	Very bad.....	10 (22%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?</b>	
	I have not bought anything yet/Don't know.....	0 (0%)
	Yes .....	24 (53%)
	No.....	21 (47%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>How easy is it for you to attend religious services?</b>	
	I don't want to attend religious services .....	10 (22%)
	Very easy.....	9 (20%)
	Easy .....	10 (22%)
	Neither .....	4 (9%)
	Difficult.....	3 (7%)
	Very difficult.....	3 (7%)
	Don't know .....	6 (13%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>Are you religious beliefs respected?</b>	
	Yes .....	23 (51%)
	No.....	10 (22%)
	Don't know/Not applicable.....	12 (27%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>Can you speak to a Chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?</b>	
	Yes .....	33 (73%)
	No.....	5 (11%)
	Don't know/Not applicable.....	7 (16%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>Can you speak to a peer mentor when you need to?</b>	
	Yes .....	17 (38%)
	No.....	11 (24%)
	Don't know .....	17 (38%)
<b>Q9</b>	<b>Can you speak to a member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board) when you need to?</b>	
	Yes .....	11 (24%)
	No .....	9 (20%)
	Don't know .....	25 (56%)
<b>Q10</b>	<b>Can you speak to an advocate (an outside person to help you) when you need to?</b>	
	Yes .....	30 (67%)
	No.....	2 (4%)
	Don't know .....	13 (29%)

## SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Do most staff treat you with respect?</b>	
	Yes .....	30 (67%)
	No.....	15 (33%)

<b>Q2</b>	<b>If you had a problem, who would you turn to? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	No-one .....	11 (26%)
	Personal officer .....	15 (35%)
	Wing Officer .....	12 (28%)
	Teacher/education staff .....	4 (9%)
	Gym staff .....	4 (9%)
	Chaplain .....	9 (21%)
	Independent Monitoring Board (IMB) ..	1 (2%)
	YOT worker .....	13 (30%)
	Social worker .....	6 (14%)
	Health services staff .....	2 (5%)
	Peer mentor .....	1 (2%)
	Another young person here .....	8 (19%)
	Case worker .....	20 (47%)
	Advocate .....	2 (5%)
	Family/friends .....	21 (49%)
	Childline/Samaritans .....	1 (2%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?</b>	
	Yes .....	28 (64%)
	No .....	16 (36%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?</b>	
	I still have not met him/her .....	4 (9%)
	In your first week .....	25 (57%)
	After your first week .....	12 (27%)
	Don't remember .....	3 (7%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>How often do you see your personal (named) officer?</b>	
	I still have not met him/her .....	4 (10%)
	At least once a week .....	29 (71%)
	Less than once a week .....	8 (20%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>Do you feel your personal (named) officer tries to help you?</b>	
	I still have not met him/her .....	4 (9%)
	Yes .....	29 (67%)
	No .....	10 (23%)

## SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Is it easy to make an application?</b>	
	Yes .....	40 (89%)
	No .....	2 (4%)
	Don't know .....	3 (7%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Are applications sorted out fairly?</b>	
	I have not made an application .....	17 (38%)
	Yes .....	20 (44%)
	No .....	8 (18%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>Are applications sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?</b>	
	I have not made an application .....	17 (40%)
	Yes .....	17 (40%)
	No .....	9 (21%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Is it easy to make a complaint?</b>	
	Yes .....	37 (82%)
	No .....	2 (4%)
	Don't know .....	6 (13%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>Are complaints sorted out fairly?</b>	
	I have not made a complaint .....	26 (59%)
	Yes .....	6 (14%)
	No .....	12 (27%)



<b>Q6</b>	<b>Are complaints sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?</b>	
	<i>I have not made a complaint</i> .....	26 (59%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	7 (16%)
	<i>No</i> .....	11 (25%)

<b>Q7</b>	<b>Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	2 (5%)
	<i>No</i> .....	22 (56%)
	<i>Never needed to make a complaint</i> .....	15 (38%)

## SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE

<b>Q1</b>	<b>What level of the rewards and sanctions scheme are you on?</b>	
	<i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Enhanced (top)</i> .....	26 (58%)
	<i>Standard (middle)</i> .....	12 (27%)
	<i>Basic (bottom)</i> .....	6 (13%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	1 (2%)

<b>Q2</b>	<b>Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the rewards and sanctions scheme?</b>	
	<i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	32 (78%)
	<i>No</i> .....	8 (20%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	1 (2%)

<b>Q3</b>	<b>Do the different levels of the rewards and sanctions scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?</b>	
	<i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	29 (69%)
	<i>No</i> .....	11 (26%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	2 (5%)

<b>Q4</b>	<b>Have you had a minor report since you have been here?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	16 (36%)
	<i>No</i> .....	26 (58%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	3 (7%)

<b>Q5</b>	<b>If you have had a minor report, was the process explained clearly to you?</b>	
	<i>I have not had a minor report</i> .....	29 (67%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	11 (26%)
	<i>No</i> .....	3 (7%)

<b>Q6</b>	<b>Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	22 (49%)
	<i>No</i> .....	22 (49%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	1 (2%)

<b>Q7</b>	<b>If you have had an adjudication ('nicking'), was the process explained clearly to you?</b>	
	<i>I have not had an adjudication</i> .....	23 (51%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	19 (42%)
	<i>No</i> .....	3 (7%)

<b>Q8</b>	<b>Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	13 (29%)
	<i>No</i> .....	29 (64%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	3 (7%)

<b>Q9</b>	<b>If you have spent a night in the care and separation unit (CSU), how were you treated by staff?</b>	
	<i>I have not been to the care and separation unit .....</i>	33 (75%)
	<i>Very well.....</i>	3 (7%)
	<i>Well.....</i>	3 (7%)
	<i>Neither.....</i>	2 (5%)
	<i>Badly.....</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Very badly.....</i>	3 (7%)

## SECTION 9: SAFETY

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Have you ever felt unsafe here?</b>	
	Yes .....	8 (19%)
	No.....	35 (81%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Do you feel unsafe now?</b>	
	Yes .....	2 (5%)
	No.....	41 (95%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Never felt unsafe .....</i>	35 (85%)
	<i>Everywhere .....</i>	2 (5%)
	<i>Care and separation unit.....</i>	1 (2%)
	<i>Association areas .....</i>	2 (5%)
	<i>Reception area.....</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>At the gym.....</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>In an exercise yard .....</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>At work.....</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>At education .....</i>	1 (2%)
	<i>At religious services.....</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>At meal times.....</i>	2 (5%)
	<i>At healthcare .....</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Visits area .....</i>	1 (2%)
	<i>In wing showers.....</i>	1 (2%)
	<i>In gym showers .....</i>	2 (5%)
	<i>In corridors/stairwells.....</i>	1 (2%)
	<i>On your landing/wing .....</i>	1 (2%)
	<i>During movement.....</i>	1 (2%)
	<i>In your cell.....</i>	0 (0%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Have you ever been victimised by another young person/group of young people here? (e.g. insulted or assaulted you)</b>	
	Yes .....	10 (23%)
	No.....	33 (77%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you, your family or friends).....</i>	5 (12%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted) .....</i>	2 (5%)
	<i>Sexual abuse .....</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated.....</i>	4 (9%)
	<i>Having your canteen/property taken.....</i>	1 (2%)
	<i>Medication.....</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Debt .....</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Drugs.....</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin.....</i>	2 (5%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs .....</i>	1 (2%)
	<i>Your nationality.....</i>	1 (2%)

You are from a different part of the country to others .....	2 (5%)
You are from a Traveller community.....	0 (0%)
Your sexuality .....	0 (0%)
Your age.....	0 (0%)
You having a disability .....	1 (2%)
You were new here.....	2 (5%)
Your offence/crime.....	1 (2%)
Gang related issues.....	1 (2%)

<b>Q7</b>	<b>Have you ever been victimised by staff here? (e.g. insulted or assaulted you)</b>	
	Yes .....	8 (19%)
	No.....	34 (81%)

<b>Q8</b>	<b>If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	Insulting remarks (about you, your family or friends) .....	2 (5%)
	Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted) .....	1 (2%)
	Sexual abuse .....	0 (0%)
	Feeling threatened or intimidated .....	0 (0%)
	Having your canteen/property taken.....	0 (0%)
	Medication.....	0 (0%)
	Debt .....	0 (0%)
	Drugs.....	1 (2%)
	Your race or ethnic origin.....	2 (5%)
	Your religion/religious beliefs .....	0 (0%)
	Your nationality .....	3 (7%)
	You are from a different part of the country to others .....	3 (7%)
	You are from a Traveller community.....	0 (0%)
	Your sexuality .....	0 (0%)
	Your age.....	0 (0%)
	You having a disability .....	0 (0%)
	You were new here.....	1 (2%)
	Your offence/crime.....	0 (0%)
	Gang related issues.....	0 (0%)
	Because you made a complaint .....	0 (0%)

<b>Q10</b>	<b>If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?</b>	
	Yes .....	15 (38%)
	No.....	19 (49%)
	Don't know .....	5 (13%)

<b>Q11</b>	<b>Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?</b>	
	Yes .....	20 (48%)
	No.....	16 (38%)
	Don't know .....	6 (14%)

<b>Q12</b>	<b>Is shouting through the windows a problem here?</b>	
	Yes .....	13 (33%)
	No.....	24 (60%)
	Don't know .....	3 (8%)

## SECTION 10: HEALTH SERVICES

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Is it easy to see the following people if you need to?</b>			
		Yes	No	Don't know
	The doctor .....	25 (60%)	15 (36%)	2 (5%)
	The nurse .....	34 (81%)	7 (17%)	1 (2%)
	The dentist .....	17 (40%)	22 (52%)	3 (7%)

<b>Q2</b>	<b>What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?</b>	
	<i>I have not been .....</i>	2 (5%)
	<i>Very good.....</i>	10 (24%)
	<i>Good.....</i>	22 (52%)
	<i>Neither .....</i>	4 (10%)
	<i>Bad .....</i>	2 (5%)
	<i>Very bad.....</i>	2 (5%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/all of it in your room?</b>	
	<i>I am not taking any medication .....</i>	20 (50%)
	<i>Yes, all of my meds.....</i>	2 (5%)
	<i>Yes, some of my meds .....</i>	1 (3%)
	<i>No.....</i>	17 (43%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?</b>	
	<i>Yes .....</i>	5 (12%)
	<i>No.....</i>	37 (88%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>Are you being helped by anyone here with your emotional or mental health problems? (e.g. a psychologist, doctor, counsellor, personal officer or another member of staff.)</b>	
	<i>I do not have any emotional or mental health problems .....</i>	37 (88%)
	<i>Yes .....</i>	5 (12%)
	<i>No.....</i>	0 (0%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>Did you have problems with alcohol when you first arrived here?</b>	
	<i>Yes .....</i>	2 (5%)
	<i>No.....</i>	39 (95%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>Have you received any help with alcohol problems here?</b>	
	<i>Yes .....</i>	2 (5%)
	<i>No.....</i>	39 (95%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>Did you have problems with drugs when you first arrived here?</b>	
	<i>Yes .....</i>	20 (48%)
	<i>No.....</i>	22 (52%)
<b>Q9</b>	<b>Do you have problems with drugs now?</b>	
	<i>Yes .....</i>	2 (5%)
	<i>No.....</i>	39 (95%)
<b>Q10</b>	<b>Have you received any help with drugs problems here?</b>	
	<i>Yes .....</i>	10 (24%)
	<i>No.....</i>	31 (76%)
<b>Q11</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it to get illegal drugs here?</b>	
	<i>Very easy.....</i>	3 (8%)
	<i>Easy .....</i>	3 (8%)
	<i>Neither .....</i>	4 (10%)
	<i>Difficult.....</i>	3 (8%)
	<i>Very difficult.....</i>	5 (13%)
	<i>Don't know .....</i>	21 (54%)

## SECTION II: ACTIVITIES

<b>Q1</b>	<b>How old were you when you were last at school?</b>	
	<i>14 or under .....</i>	16 (40%)
	<i>15 or over.....</i>	24 (60%)

<b>Q2</b>	<b>Have you ever been excluded from school?</b>				
	Yes .....	38	(93%)		
	No.....	2	(5%)		
	Not applicable.....	1	(2%)		
<b>Q3</b>	<b>Did you ever skip school before you came into custody?</b>				
	Yes .....	36	(86%)		
	No.....	4	(10%)		
	Not applicable.....	2	(5%)		
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Do you CURRENTLY take part in any of the following activities? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>				
	Education .....	34	(81%)		
	A job in this establishment.....	4	(10%)		
	Vocational or skills training .....	9	(21%)		
	Offending behaviour programmes .....	11	(26%)		
	I am not currently involved in any of these.....	3	(7%)		
<b>Q5</b>	<b>If you have been involved in any of the following activities here, do you think they will help you when you leave prison?</b>				
		<i>Not been involved</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
	Education .....	1 (2%)	28 (68%)	8 (20%)	4 (10%)
	A job in this establishment .....	6 (21%)	9 (31%)	7 (24%)	7 (24%)
	Vocational or skills training .....	5 (16%)	17 (53%)	6 (19%)	4 (13%)
	Offending behaviour programmes .....	5 (17%)	16 (53%)	6 (20%)	3 (10%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>Do you usually have association every day?</b>				
	Yes .....	35	(83%)		
	No.....	7	(17%)		
<b>Q7</b>	<b>Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?</b>				
	Don't want to go.....	2	(5%)		
	Yes .....	37	(88%)		
	No.....	3	(7%)		
<b>Q8</b>	<b>How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?</b>				
	Don't want to go.....	0	(0%)		
	None.....	0	(0%)		
	One to two times .....	11	(26%)		
	Three to five times.....	18	(43%)		
	More than five times .....	13	(31%)		

## SECTION 12: FAMILY AND FRIENDS

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Are you able to use the telephone every day, if you want to?</b>				
	Yes .....	38	(90%)		
	No.....	3	(7%)		
	Don't know .....	1	(2%)		
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?</b>				
	Yes .....	14	(34%)		
	No.....	27	(66%)		
	Don't know .....	0	(0%)		
<b>Q3</b>	<b>How many visits do you usually have each week, from family or friends?</b>				
	I don't get visits .....	8	(19%)		
	Less than one a week.....	10	(24%)		

About one a week.....	9 (21%)
More than one a week.....	13 (31%)
Don't know .....	2 (5%)

**Q4 How easy is it for your family and friends to visit you here?**

I don't get visits .....	8 (19%)
Very easy.....	9 (21%)
Easy .....	11 (26%)
Neither .....	4 (10%)
Difficult.....	8 (19%)
Very difficult.....	2 (5%)
Don't know .....	0 (0%)

**Q5 Do your visits usually start on time?**

I don't get visits .....	8 (20%)
Yes .....	21 (51%)
No.....	11 (27%)
Don't know .....	1 (2%)

**SECTION 13: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE****Q1 Do you think you will have a problem with any of the following things, when you are released? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**

Finding accommodation .....	11 (28%)
Getting into school or college.....	9 (23%)
Getting a job.....	19 (48%)
Money/finances .....	14 (35%)
Claiming benefits.....	6 (15%)
Continuing health services.....	3 (8%)
Opening a bank account.....	7 (18%)
Avoiding bad relationships .....	7 (18%)
I won't have any problems.....	14 (35%)

**Q2 Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan? (i.e. a plan that is discussed in your DTO/planning meetings, which sets out your targets.)**

Yes .....	24 (59%)
No.....	6 (15%)
Don't know .....	11 (27%)

**Q3 Were you involved in the development of your plan?**

I don't have a plan/don't know if I have a plan .....	17 (44%)
Yes .....	17 (44%)
No.....	5 (13%)

**Q4 Do you understand the targets that have been set in your plan?**

I don't have a plan/don't know if I have a plan .....	17 (41%)
Yes .....	22 (54%)
No.....	2 (5%)

**Q5 Do you have a caseworker here?**

Yes .....	39 (91%)
No.....	3 (7%)
Don't know .....	1 (2%)

**Q6 Has your caseworker helped to prepare you for release?**

I don't have a caseworker.....	4 (10%)
Yes .....	24 (59%)

	No.....	9 (22%)
	Don't know .....	4 (10%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>Has your social worker been to visit you since you have been here?</b>	
	<i>I don't have a social worker.....</i>	13 (31%)
	Yes .....	19 (45%)
	No.....	10 (24%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?</b>	
	Yes .....	24 (59%)
	No.....	12 (29%)
	Don't know .....	5 (12%)
<b>Q9</b>	<b>Do you know who to contact for help with any of the following problems, before your release? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Finding accommodation .....</i>	11 (32%)
	<i>Getting into school or college.....</i>	8 (24%)
	<i>Getting a job.....</i>	16 (47%)
	<i>Help with money/finances .....</i>	6 (18%)
	<i>Help with claiming benefits .....</i>	5 (15%)
	<i>Continuing health services .....</i>	4 (12%)
	<i>Opening a bank account.....</i>	4 (12%)
	<i>Avoiding bad relationships .....</i>	5 (15%)
	<i>I don't know who to contact.....</i>	14 (41%)
<b>Q10</b>	<b>What is most likely to stop you offending in the future? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Not sentenced .....</i>	7 (16%)
	<i>Nothing, it is up to me .....</i>	12 (28%)
	<i>Making new friends outside.....</i>	8 (19%)
	<i>Going back to live with my family .....</i>	9 (21%)
	<i>Getting a place of my own.....</i>	9 (21%)
	<i>Getting a job.....</i>	23 (53%)
	<i>Having a partner (girlfriend or boyfriend).....</i>	18 (42%)
	<i>Staying off alcohol/drugs .....</i>	16 (37%)
	<i>Having a mentor (someone you can ask for advice).....</i>	3 (7%)
	<i>Having a YOT worker or social worker that I get on with .....</i>	6 (14%)
	<i>Having children .....</i>	15 (35%)
	<i>Having something to do that isn't crime .....</i>	17 (40%)
	<i>This sentence .....</i>	12 (28%)
	<i>Getting into school/college .....</i>	11 (26%)
	<i>Talking about my offending behaviour with staff.....</i>	1 (2%)
	<i>Anything else .....</i>	1 (2%)
<b>Q11</b>	<b>Do you want to stop offending?</b>	
	<i>Not sentenced .....</i>	7 (16%)
	Yes .....	31 (72%)
	No.....	3 (7%)
	Don't know .....	2 (5%)
<b>Q12</b>	<b>Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here, that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?</b>	
	<i>Not sentenced .....</i>	7 (16%)
	Yes .....	17 (40%)
	No.....	19 (44%)

# Comparison with young people's comparator and previous survey results.



## Survey responses from children and young people: HMP & YOI Parc 2014

**Survey responses** (missing data have been excluded for each question). Please note: where there are apparently large differences, which are not indicated as statistically significant, this is likely to be due to chance. NB: This document shows a comparison between the responses from all young people surveyed in this establishment with all young people surveyed for the comparator.

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP & YOI Parc 2014	Young people's comparator	HMP & YOI Parc 2014	HMP & YOI Parc 2012
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		45	685	45	38
<b>SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU</b>					
1.1	Are you 18 years of age?	8%	12%	8%	2%
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	6%	4%	6%	6%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%	100%	98%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	98%	98%	98%	98%
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other category.	27%	43%	27%	24%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	26%	23%	26%	15%
1.7	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	4%	6%	4%	2%
1.8	Do you have any children?	16%	11%	16%	8%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	19%	19%	19%	14%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	42%	33%	42%	38%
<b>SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE</b>					
2.1	Are you sentenced?	84%	78%	84%	86%
2.2	Is your sentence 12 months or less?	50%	37%	50%	44%
2.3	Have you been in this establishment for one month or less?	16%	17%	16%	24%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	47%	53%	47%	71%
<b>SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS</b>					
On your most recent journey here:					
3.1	Did you feel safe?	90%	81%	90%	90%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	41%	38%	41%	52%
3.3	Did you spend more than 4 hours in the van?	6%	7%	6%	2%
For those who spent 2 or more hours in the escort van:					
3.4	Were you offered a toilet break if you needed it?	9%	15%	9%	0%
3.5	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	50%	36%	50%	20%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	67%	51%	67%	50%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	25%	15%	25%	24%



## Comparison with young people's comparator and previous survey results.

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP & YOJ Parc 2014	Young people's comparator	HMP & YOJ Parc 2014	HMP & YOJ Parc 2012
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		45	685	45	38
<b>SECTION 4: YOUR FIRST FEW DAYS HERE</b>					
4.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	92%	82%	92%	59%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	83%	78%	83%	86%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	78%	64%	78%	57%
When you first arrived, did staff ask if you needed help or support with any of the following:					
4.4a	Not being able to smoke?	66%	49%	66%	54%
4.4b	Loss of property?	15%	19%	15%	18%
4.4c	Feeling scared?	30%	25%	30%	16%
4.4d	Gang problems?	26%	48%	26%	18%
4.4e	Contacting family?	55%	52%	55%	59%
4.4f	Money worries?	17%	17%	17%	18%
4.4g	Feeling worried/upset/needling someone to talk to?	40%	30%	40%	33%
4.4h	Health problems?	40%	54%	40%	54%
4.4i	Getting phone numbers?	45%	38%	45%	43%
4.5	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	76%	74%	76%	84%
When you first arrived, did you have problems with any of the following:					
4.5a	Not being able to smoke?	51%	46%	51%	59%
4.5b	Loss of property?	7%	11%	7%	18%
4.5c	Feeling scared?	11%	10%	11%	7%
4.5d	Gang problems?	9%	16%	9%	7%
4.5e	Contacting family?	24%	28%	24%	24%
4.5f	Money worries?	18%	15%	18%	16%
4.5g	Feeling worried/upset/needling someone to talk to?	9%	11%	9%	2%
4.5h	Health problems?	7%	12%	7%	9%
4.5i	Getting phone numbers?	16%	28%	16%	24%
When you first arrived, were you given any of the following:					
4.6a	Toiletries/basic items?	67%	79%	67%	85%
4.6b	The opportunity to have a shower?	62%	48%	62%	62%
4.6c	Something to eat?	76%	84%	76%	77%
4.6d	A free phone call to friends/family?	74%	80%	74%	89%
4.6e	PIN phone credit?	31%	61%	31%	47%
4.6f	Information about feeling worried/upset?	45%	30%	45%	33%
Within your first 24 hours, did you have access to the following people or services:					

## Comparison with young people's comparator and previous survey results.

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP & YOI Parc 2014	Young people's comparator	HMP & YOI Parc 2014	HMP & YOI Parc 2012
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>45</b>	<b>685</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>4.7a</b>	A chaplain?	54%	44%	54%	77%
<b>4.7b</b>	A peer mentor?	6%	13%	6%	9%
<b>4.7c</b>	Childline/Samaritans	21%	17%	21%	28%
<b>4.7d</b>	The prison shop/canteen?	6%	11%	6%	11%
<b>4.8</b>	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	69%	67%	69%	86%
<b>4.9</b>	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	90%	77%	90%	86%
<b>4.10</b>	For those who have been on an induction course: did it cover everything you needed to know about the establishment	86%	60%	86%	77%
<b>SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT</b>					
<b>5.1</b>	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	98%	78%	98%	100%
<b>5.2</b>	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	69%	33%	69%	65%
<b>5.3</b>	Do you find the food here good/very good?	16%	15%	16%	6%
<b>5.4</b>	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	53%	50%	53%	62%
<b>5.5</b>	Is it easy/very easy for you to attend religious services?	43%	56%	43%	65%
<b>5.6</b>	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	51%	59%	51%	
Can you speak to:					
<b>5.7</b>	A chaplain of your faith in private?	74%	68%	74%	82%
<b>5.8</b>	A peer mentor?	38%	33%	38%	43%
<b>5.9</b>	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	25%	21%	25%	17%
<b>5.10</b>	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	67%	45%	67%	49%
<b>SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF</b>					
<b>6.1</b>	Do most staff treat you with respect?	67%	68%	67%	72%
<b>6.2</b>	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	26%	21%	26%	16%
<b>6.3</b>	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	65%	38%	65%	59%
For those who have met their personal officer:					
<b>6.4</b>	Did you meet your personal (named) officer within the first week?	63%	40%	63%	53%
<b>6.5</b>	Do you see your personal (named) officer at least once a week?	78%	56%	78%	75%
<b>6.6</b>	Do you feel your personal (named) officer tries to help you?	74%	69%	74%	82%
<b>SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS</b>					
<b>7.1</b>	Is it easy to make an application?	90%	73%	90%	86%
For those who have made an application:					
<b>7.2</b>	Do you feel applications are sorted out fairly?	71%	67%	71%	69%
<b>7.3</b>	Do you feel applications are sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	66%	53%	66%	72%
<b>7.4</b>	Is it easy to make a complaint?	82%	54%	82%	69%
For those who have made a complaint:					

## Comparison with young people's comparator and previous survey results.

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP & YOI Parc 2014	Young people's comparator	HMP & YOI Parc 2014	HMP & YOI Parc 2012
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		45	685	45	38
7.5	Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	35%	37%	35%	18%
7.6	Do you feel complaints are sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	40%	35%	40%	19%
7.7	Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint?	5%	9%	5%	11%
<b>SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE</b>					
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	57%	26%	57%	43%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	78%	46%	78%	57%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	70%	48%	70%	69%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	35%	52%	35%	51%
For those who have had a minor report:					
8.5	Was the process explained clearly to you?	80%	79%	80%	72%
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	49%	63%	49%	61%
For those who have had an adjudication ('nicking'):					
8.7	Was the process explained clearly to you?	88%	85%	88%	85%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (Cand R) since you have been here?	29%	39%	29%	23%
8.9	For those who had spent a night in the care and separation unit: did the staff treat you well/very well?	58%	39%	58%	100%
<b>SECTION 9: SAFETY</b>					
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	19%	30%	19%	18%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	4%	10%	4%	6%
9.4	Have you ever been victimised by other young people here?	23%	22%	23%	16%
Since you have been here, have other young people:					
9.5a	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	11%	11%	11%	0%
9.5b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	4%	8%	4%	14%
9.5c	Sexually abused you?	0%	1%	0%	0%
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	9%	8%	9%	2%
9.5e	Taken your canteen/property?	2%	3%	2%	2%
9.5f	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	0%	0%	0%
9.5g	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	1%	0%	0%
9.5h	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	1%	0%	0%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	4%	1%	4%	0%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	2%	1%	2%	0%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	2%	2%	2%	0%
9.5l	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	4%	2%	4%	0%

## Comparison with young people's comparator and previous survey results.

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP & YOI Parc 2014	Young people's comparator	HMP & YOI Parc 2014	HMP & YOI Parc 2012
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		45	685	45	38
9.5m	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%	0%	0%	0%
9.5n	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	1%	0%	0%
9.5o	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	1%	0%	0%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	2%	1%	2%	0%
9.5q	Victimised you because you were new here?	4%	6%	4%	0%
9.5r	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	2%	3%	2%	0%
9.5s	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	2%	5%	2%	0%
9.7	Have you ever been victimised by a member of staff here?	20%	25%	20%	31%
Since you have been here, have staff:					
9.8a	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	4%	14%	4%	17%
9.8b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	2%	5%	2%	6%
9.8c	Sexually abused you?	0%	0%	0%	0%
9.8d	Threatened or intimidated you?	0%	4%	0%	11%
9.8e	Taken your canteen/property?	0%	3%	0%	8%
9.8f	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	1%	0%	0%
9.8g	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	0%	0%	0%
9.8h	Victimised you because of drugs?	2%	1%	2%	0%
9.8i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	4%	4%	4%	0%
9.8j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	2%	0%	0%
9.8k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	7%	2%	7%	0%
9.8k	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	7%	2%	7%	2%
9.8m	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%	1%	0%	0%
9.8n	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	0%	0%	0%
9.8o	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	1%	0%	0%
9.8p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	1%	0%	0%
9.8q	Victimised you because you were new here?	2%	2%	2%	0%
9.8r	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	0%	2%	0%	8%
9.8s	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	1%	0%	0%
9.8t	Victimised you because you made a complaint?	0%	5%	0%	11%
9.10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	38%	27%	38%	50%
9.11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	48%	31%	48%	43%
9.12	Is shouting through the windows a problem here?	33%	33%	33%	49%

## Comparison with young people's comparator and previous survey results.

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP & YOI Parc 2014	Young people's comparator	HMP & YOI Parc 2014	HMP & YOI Parc 2012
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		45	685	45	38
<b>SECTION 10: HEALTH SERVICES</b>					
10.1a	Is it easy for you to see the doctor?	59%	59%	59%	63%
10.1b	Is it easy for you to see the nurse?	80%	70%	80%	84%
10.1c	Is it easy for you to see the dentist?	41%	38%	41%	46%
10.2	For those who have been to health services: Do you think the overall quality is good/very good?	80%	53%	80%	47%
10.3	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/all of it in your cell?	14%	53%	14%	13%
10.4	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?	11%	23%	11%	9%
10.5	If you have emotional or mental health problems, are you being helped by anyone here?	100%	68%	100%	75%
10.6	Did you have any problems with alcohol when you first arrived?	4%	8%	4%	11%
10.7	Have you received any help with any alcohol problems here?	4%	4%	4%	9%
10.8	Did you have any problems with drugs when you first arrived?	48%	35%	48%	44%
10.9	Do you have a problem with drugs now?	4%	8%	4%	7%
10.10	Have you received any help with any drug problems here?	24%	21%	24%	33%
10.11	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs here?	16%	15%	16%	23%
<b>SECTION 11: ACTIVITIES</b>					
11.1	Were you 14 or younger when you were last at school?	40%	37%	40%	36%
11.2	Have you ever been excluded from school?	93%	87%	93%	89%
11.3	Did you ever skip school before you came into custody?	85%	74%	85%	83%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:					
11.4a	Education?	80%	74%	80%	89%
11.4b	A job in this establishment?	9%	31%	9%	0%
11.4c	Vocational or skills training?	22%	14%	22%	17%
11.4d	Offending behaviour programmes?	26%	20%	26%	25%
11.4e	Nothing	7%	15%	7%	6%
For those who have taken part in the following activities while in this establishment, do you think that they will help you when you leave prison:					
11.5a	Education?	71%	65%	71%	79%
11.5b	A job in this establishment?	40%	54%	40%	71%
11.5c	Vocational or skills training?	63%	51%	63%	76%
11.5d	Offending behaviour programmes?	63%	51%	63%	72%
11.6	Do you usually have association every day?	83%	72%	83%	94%
11.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	89%	56%	89%	94%
11.8	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	30%	12%	30%	2%
<b>SECTION 12: KEEPING IN TOUCH WITH FAMILY AND FRIENDS</b>					
12.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	91%	81%	91%	98%

## Comparison with young people's comparator and previous survey results.

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP & YOI Parc 2014	Young people's comparator	HMP & YOI Parc 2014	HMP & YOI Parc 2012
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		45	685	45	38
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	34%	40%	34%	23%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	52%	39%	52%	65%
12.4	Is it easy/very easy for your family and friends to visit you here?	48%	36%	48%	47%
12.5	Do your visits start on time?	51%	41%	51%	75%
<b>SECTION 13: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE</b>					
Do you think you will have a problem with the following, when you are released:					
13.1a	Finding accommodation?	27%	25%	27%	11%
13.1b	Getting into school or college?	23%	30%	23%	17%
13.1c	Getting a job?	48%	53%	48%	61%
13.1d	Money/finances?	35%	37%	35%	26%
13.1e	Claiming benefits?	16%	20%	16%	15%
13.1f	Continuing health services?	7%	7%	7%	0%
13.1g	Opening a bank account?	18%	14%	18%	9%
13.1h	Avoiding bad relationships?	18%	16%	18%	9%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	58%	50%	58%	64%
For those with a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan:					
13.3	Were you involved in the development of your plan?	79%	83%	79%	100%
13.4	Do you understand the targets set in your plan?	92%	93%	92%	100%
13.5	Do you have a caseworker here?	92%	82%	92%	82%
13.6	Has your caseworker helped to prepare you for release?	65%	45%	65%	89%
For those with a social worker:					
13.7	Has your social worker been to visit you since you have been here?	66%	67%	66%	65%
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	58%	38%	58%	56%
Do you know who to contact for help with the following problems?					
13.9a	Finding accommodation	32%	27%	32%	39%
13.9b	Getting into school or college	24%	28%	24%	42%
13.9c	Getting a job	46%	32%	46%	49%
13.9d	Help with money/finances	18%	22%	18%	37%
13.9e	Help with claiming benefits	14%	17%	14%	27%
13.9f	Continuing health services	11%	14%	11%	22%
13.9g	Opening a bank account	11%	17%	11%	37%
13.9h	Avoiding bad relationships	14%	15%	14%	27%
For those who were sentenced:					
13.11	Do you want to stop offending?	87%	90%	87%	87%
13.12	Have you done anything or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future	48%	47%	48%	54%

## Diversity analysis



### Key question responses (ethnicity/religion) HMP & YOI Parc 2014

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

#### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	<b>Black and minority ethnic young people</b>	<b>White young people</b>	<b>Muslim young people</b>	<b>Non-Muslim young people</b>
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>12</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>1.2</b>	Are you a foreign national?	8%	6%	0%	9%
<b>1.3</b>	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	100%	100%	100%
<b>1.4</b>	Do you understand written English?	100%	97%	100%	97%
<b>1.5</b>	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)			50%	23%
<b>1.6</b>	Are you Muslim?	39%	16%		
<b>1.5</b>	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	15%	0%	8%	3%
<b>1.9</b>	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	8%	24%	8%	21%
<b>1.10</b>	Have you ever been in local authority care?	42%	40%	42%	38%
<b>2.1</b>	Are you sentenced?	69%	91%	75%	89%
<b>2.4</b>	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	39%	50%	33%	50%
<b>3.2</b>	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	31%	40%	58%	37%
<b>3.6</b>	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	62%	69%	75%	66%
<b>3.7</b>	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare coming here?	15%	29%	17%	23%
<b>4.2</b>	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	83%	85%	92%	79%
<b>4.3</b>	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	69%	80%	75%	77%
<b>4.8</b>	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	62%	71%	75%	66%
<b>4.9</b>	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	77%	94%	83%	91%
<b>5.1</b>	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	92%	100%	100%	97%
<b>5.2</b>	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	50%	77%	42%	77%
<b>5.3</b>	Do you find the food here good/very good?	0%	23%	0%	23%
<b>5.4</b>	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	15%	66%	42%	57%
<b>5.6</b>	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	50%	50%	83%	40%

## Diversity analysis

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic young people	White young people	Muslim young people	Non-Muslim young people
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>12</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>32</b>
Can you speak to:					
5.7	A chaplain of your faith in private?	69%	74%	75%	74%
5.8	A peer mentor?	15%	43%	25%	40%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	15%	26%	33%	23%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	69%	66%	83%	63%
6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	31%	80%	42%	74%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	31%	24%	33%	24%
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	92%	89%	100%	85%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	92%	77%	92%	80%
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	39%	63%	58%	60%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	70%	85%	82%	78%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	56%	71%	75%	69%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	39%	31%	33%	37%
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	62%	43%	67%	43%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	39%	23%	25%	29%
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	31%	9%	27%	15%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	8%	3%	9%	3%
9.4	Have you been victimised by other young people here?	23%	21%	27%	23%
Since you have been here, have other young people:					
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	8%	9%	9%	9%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	15%	0%	9%	3%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	8%	0%	9%	0%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	8%	0%	9%	0%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	3%	0%	3%



## Diversity analysis

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic young people	White young people	Muslim young people	Non-Muslim young people
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>12</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>9.7</b>	Have you been victimised by staff here?	50%	7%	9%	24%
Since you have been here, have staff:					
<b>9.8d</b>	Threatened or intimidated you?	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>9.8i</b>	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	15%	0%	0%	16%
<b>9.8j</b>	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>9.8k</b>	Victimised you because of your nationality?	8%	7%	0%	9%
<b>9.8p</b>	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>9.10</b>	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	33%	41%	30%	38%
<b>9.11</b>	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	31%	55%	27%	52%
<b>10.1a</b>	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the doctor?	23%	72%	50%	62%
<b>10.1b</b>	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the nurse?	69%	87%	91%	77%
<b>10.4</b>	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	15%	10%	0%	15%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:					
<b>11.4a</b>	Education?	77%	84%	82%	79%
<b>11.4b</b>	A job in this establishment?	15%	7%	0%	12%
<b>11.4c</b>	Vocational or skills training?	15%	25%	9%	27%
<b>11.4d</b>	Offending behaviour programmes?	8%	34%	27%	24%
<b>11.4e</b>	Nothing?	15%	3%	18%	3%
<b>11.6</b>	Do you usually have association every day?	69%	90%	91%	79%
<b>11.7</b>	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	85%	90%	91%	88%
<b>11.8</b>	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	8%	38%	18%	35%
<b>12.1</b>	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	85%	97%	91%	91%
<b>12.2</b>	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	58%	25%	36%	33%
<b>12.3</b>	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	39%	55%	50%	53%
<b>13.2</b>	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	33%	69%	73%	58%
<b>13.8</b>	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	73%	53%	70%	56%



Diversity analysis  
**Key question responses (local authority care analysis)**  
**HMP & YOI Parc 2014**

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

**Key to tables**

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Young people who have been in local authority care	Young people who have not been in local authority care
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>18</b>	<b>26</b>
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	5%	8%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	100%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	95%	100%
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	26%	25%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	28%	25%
1.5	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	5%	4%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	11%	24%
2.1	Are you sentenced?	90%	86%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	26%	57%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	45%	39%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	65%	66%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	21%	24%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	89%	82%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	65%	86%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	60%	76%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	90%	89%
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	95%	100%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	60%	72%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	5%	24%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	40%	66%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	50%	54%
Can you speak to:			

## Diversity analysis

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Young people who have been in local authority care	Young people who have not been in local authority care
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
5.7	A chaplain of your faith in private?	74%	76%
5.8	A peer mentor?	35%	43%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	21%	28%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	74%	61%
6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	50%	82%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	24%	28%
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	90%	89%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	79%	86%
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	50%	61%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	61%	89%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	60%	74%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	35%	39%
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	60%	43%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	26%	31%
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	6%	24%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	6%	4%
9.4	Have you been victimised by other young people here?	18%	28%
Since you have been here, have other young people:			
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	0%	14%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	7%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	4%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	4%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	4%
9.7	Have you been victimised by staff here?	25%	11%
Since you have been here, have staff:			

## Diversity analysis

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Young people who have been in local authority care	Young people who have not been in local authority care
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
9.8d	Threatened or intimidated you?	0%	0%
9.8i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	13%	0%
9.8j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	0%
9.8k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	7%
9.8p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	0%
9.10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	24%	50%
9.11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	29%	59%
10.1a	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the doctor?	39%	75%
10.1b	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the nurse?	61%	96%
10.4	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	18%	7%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:			
11.4a	Education?	82%	85%
11.4b	A job in this establishment?	0%	11%
11.4c	Vocational or skills training?	18%	25%
11.4d	Offending behaviour programmes?	39%	19%
11.4e	Nothing?	6%	7%
11.6	Do you usually have association every day?	71%	93%
11.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	82%	96%
11.8	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	24%	37%
12.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	88%	96%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	44%	29%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	24%	68%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	50%	63%
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	61%	54%