

Report on an unannounced inspection of

HMYOI Werrington

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

12 – 23 October 2015

This inspection was carried out in partnership with the following bodies:



Crown copyright 2016

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

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: hmiprisons.enquiries@hmiprisons.gsi.gov.uk

This publication is available for download at: <http://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/about-our-inspections/>

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	13
Section 1. Safety	21
Section 2. Respect	35
Section 3. Purposeful activity	47
Section 4. Resettlement	55
Section 5. Recommendations and housekeeping points	63
Section 6. Appendices	69
Appendix I: Inspection team	69
Appendix II: Photograph	71
Appendix III: Progress on recommendations from the last report	73
Appendix IV: Establishment population profile	79
Appendix V: Summary of children and young people questionnaires and interviews	83

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/hmiprisons/about-our-inspections/>

Introduction

HMYOI Werrington can hold up to 142 boys between the ages of 15 and 18 but, as at the last inspection, the population averages just over 100. This inspection took place at a challenging time for Werrington as it was in the early stages of implementing the extended education day for young people and was doing so with a largely new staff and management group. The juvenile estate has contracted and Werrington, like other similar establishments, has been left holding some boys who are very difficult to manage, but with the problem of limited options regarding accommodation. These factors had clearly led to a concerning deterioration in safety, and the perception of safety, at the establishment. In contrast, we found that the establishment had done well to maintain positive findings in the areas of respect, purposeful activity and resettlement.

An impressive reception area and a caring approach to the delivery of first night procedures created a positive early experience for most boys. However, some inappropriate allocations to the induction unit created confusion about its role and contributed to some negative perceptions of safety. High levels of violence and significant evidence of bullying explained why one in four boys reported feeling unsafe at the time of our inspection and half said that they had been victimised by other young people. There were some good formal structures to support the most vulnerable but incidences of self-harm and the numbers subject to assessment, care in custody and teamwork (case management for prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm) procedures were still too high. The establishment needed to do more to analyse and understand the high levels of violence and the reasons why too many boys were isolating themselves to stay safe.

The management of poor behaviour was a significant weakness at the establishment. We witnessed low-level anti-social behaviour that went completely unchallenged by staff and there was a clear over-reliance on the use of the formal adjudication process to manage non-compliance rather than improving and making better use of incentives. The irony of this was that we found over 100 remanded adjudications, many of which would never be heard, so there would be no consequence for those who were poorly behaved. There were many boys who told us that the only way to receive staff attention and help was to behave badly. To support this belief, we found that the few incentives to behave really well were regularly withdrawn to accommodate the poorly behaved and the vulnerable. Boys on the enhanced level of the incentives scheme frequently lost their extra association time to facilitate the chaotic management of mealtimes for prisoners on the basic level and those who had to be separated. Furthermore, it seemed perverse that the location for boys on the enhanced level had the worst exercise yard and no access to the youth club.

Efforts to improve living accommodation meant that this was now reasonable for most. With the exception of C wing, exercise yards were better equipped and boys could enjoy more time in the open air. Access to clean clothing had improved and complaints were well managed. However, there was still work to be done; some areas remained grubby and there were restrictions to daily showers and phone calls for some boys. Relationships with specialist staff such as youth workers, teachers and offender supervisors were strong, and health care provision was very good. It was evident that 60% of the operational staff were in their probation period and some of them were struggling to juggle the various tasks pertaining to their new role. Some residential officers appeared to be unsure how to deal with poor behaviour and would have benefitted from more concerted mentoring and coaching from peers and managers.

That said, the senior management team themselves were newly formed and were beginning to find their feet. They were clearly committed and enthusiastic but issues to be addressed remained. For example, once again we found equality and diversity to be weak as it was not being driven from the top. Considering that 50% of the population was from a Muslim and/or black and minority ethnic background, little had been done to consult with this group or understand why they held such negative perceptions, as borne out in our survey. Consultation in general was ineffective; boys didn't

have a legitimate voice in areas that were important to them and peer support and active citizenship was underdeveloped.

The senior team had, however, worked effectively with the education provider to introduce the extended education day. This new timetable had increased the time out of cell for most boys and, although there was still regime slippage, it was better than we see at other similar establishments.

Leadership and management of learning and skills and work were good and levels of achievement were high. We commend Werrington for its energetic and proactive response to the raised expectation to provide each boy with 30 hours of education. However, more needed to be done for the 25% of boys who were not on a learning pathway and, as a result, could spend as little as four hours out of their cell each day.

Resettlement work at Werrington continued to be one of its strengths. The introduction of a duty caseworker and transition liaison officers were positive steps. The information gained in the important follow up after release was being used to inform the provision of resettlement services. We continued to be concerned about accommodation outcomes for some boys on release but the establishment was working with partners in the community to tackle this critical problem. Visits and work with the families of offenders demonstrated care and a real understanding of the anxieties faced by loved ones when young people are imprisoned.

While we were greatly concerned about the deficiencies in the management of safety at Werrington, we found managers and staff to be receptive to our findings and were confident that they would make concerted efforts to make the establishment safer. Their success in maintaining positive outcomes in our other tests of a healthy prison, despite some significant challenges, was commendable.

Martin Lomas
HM Deputy Chief Inspector of Prisons

December 2015

Fact page

Task of the establishment

Werrington is a centre for sentenced and remanded boys aged between 15 and 18.

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

Public

Region/Department

Young people's estate

Number held

110

Certified normal accommodation

142

Operational capacity

142

Date of last full inspection

September 2014

Brief history

The establishment opened in 1895 as an industrial school and was subsequently purchased by the Prison Commissioners in 1955. Two years later it opened as a senior detention centre. Following the implementation of the Criminal Justice Act 1982 it converted to a youth custody centre in 1985 and in 1988 became a dedicated juvenile centre (15-18 year olds) with secure accommodation for those serving a Detention and Training Order. Young people serving extended sentences under Section 91 of the Criminal Justice Act and remanded young people are also held at Werrington.

Short description of residential units

Doulton Unit (A and B Wings): main accommodation unit

Denby Unit (C Wing): the first night/induction and enhanced unit

Care and support unit: eight cells

Name of governor/director

Peter Gormley

Escort contractor

GeoAmey

Health service commissioner and providers

Commissioner: NHS England.

Providers: Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Partnership Trust

South Staffordshire and Shropshire NHS Foundation Trust

Learning and skills providers

NOVUS Foundations for change

Independent Monitoring Board chair

Pamela Pritchard

About this inspection and report

A1 Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons is an independent, statutory organisation which reports on the treatment and conditions of those detained in prisons, young offender institutions, immigration detention facilities and police custody.

A2 All inspections carried out by HM Inspectorate of Prisons contribute to the UK's response to its international obligations under the Optional Protocol to the UN Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (OPCAT). OPCAT requires that all places of detention are visited regularly by independent bodies – known as the National Preventive Mechanism (NPM) – which monitor the treatment of and conditions for detainees. HM Inspectorate of Prisons is one of several bodies making up the NPM in the UK.

A3 All Inspectorate of Prisons reports include a summary of an establishment's performance against the model of a healthy prison. The four tests of a healthy prison are:

Safety children and young people, particularly the most vulnerable, are held safely

Respect children and young people are treated with respect for their human dignity

Purposeful activity children and young people are able, and expected, to engage in activity that is likely to benefit them

Resettlement children and young people are prepared for their release into the community and helped to reduce the likelihood of reoffending.

A4 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.

- A5 Our assessments might result in one of the following:
- **recommendations:** will require significant change and/or new or redirected resources, so are not immediately achievable, and will be reviewed for implementation at future inspections
 - **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.
- A6 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.
- A7 Since April 2013, all our inspections have been unannounced, other than in exceptional circumstances. This replaces the previous system of announced and unannounced full main inspections with full or short follow-ups to review progress. All our inspections now follow up recommendations from the last full inspection.
- A8 All inspections of prisons are conducted jointly with Ofsted or Estyn (Wales), the Care Quality Commission, the General Pharmaceutical Council (GPhC) and HM Inspectorate of Probation. This joint work ensures expert knowledge is deployed in inspections and avoids multiple inspection visits.

This report

- A9 This explanation of our approach is followed by a summary of our inspection findings against the four healthy prison tests. There then follow four sections each containing a detailed account of our findings against our *Expectations. Criteria for assessing the treatment of 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.
- A10 Details of the inspection team and the establishment population profile can be found in Appendices I and III respectively.
- A11 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.¹

¹ 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 *After long journeys for some boys, reception and first night procedures were good. Safeguarding procedures were well developed. The level of self-harm was high and, although not always reflected in the documentation, care was generally good. Levels of violence were high and one in four boys felt unsafe at the time of our inspection. More needed to be done to manage bullying behaviour, support the significant number of isolated boys, and make the prison safer. The incentives and earned privileges scheme was not used effectively to promote good behaviour and there was an over-reliance on the adjudication process. Levels of use of force remained high but force was applied appropriately. Too many boys, some of whom were subject to ACCT² procedures, spent long periods in segregation. Psychosocial services for boys with substance misuse issues were good. **Outcomes for children and young people were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.***

S2 *At the last inspection in September 2014, we found that outcomes for children and young people in Werrington were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 14 recommendations about safety. At this follow-up inspection we found that four of the recommendations had been achieved, one had been partially achieved and nine had not been achieved.*

S3 Some boys experienced long delays in court, were transferred in a van with adults and arrived late at the prison. However, the reception environment continued to be one of the best we have seen, with welcoming staff who provided appropriate care for boys on their arrival.

S4 First night procedures were carried out thoroughly and safely and cells on the induction unit had been well prepared for new arrivals. The unit was also used to accommodate some difficult to manage boys which potentially compromised safety and perceptions of safety. Induction was personalised but fragmented. Not every boy received all elements of the programme and some were locked up for long periods between modules.

S5 Safeguarding procedures were well developed and links with the local authority safeguarding children board were strong. The bullying report plans and multi-agency safety and health meetings enabled the management of difficult and vulnerable boys and some good support was offered to those most at risk of self-harm.

S6 Child protection procedures continued to work well, with allegations of mistreatment swiftly referred to the local authority designated officer and appropriately investigated.

S7 The number of self-harm incidents and ACCT documents was higher than in similar prisons. Most boys on open ACCTs received appropriate support, but the quality of some ACCT documents did not reflect this.

² Assessment, care in custody and teamwork case management of prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm.

- S8 The establishment was dealing with significant violence and bullying but we were not confident that appropriate analysis and action were taking place to make the establishment safer. In our survey, a quarter of boys reported that they felt unsafe and nearly half reported being victimised by other boys, predominantly through insulting remarks about family and friends or canteen.
- S9 Recorded levels of violence were higher than in similar prisons and had increased since our last inspection. Over 40% of assaults on boys involved multiple assailants. Measures were in place to keep boys in conflict apart and some victims of bullying received good care. However, the management of perpetrators was inadequate in some cases. Bullying related information reports had more than doubled since our last inspection and not enough attention was paid to those who voluntarily isolated themselves on wings.
- S10 There were too few incentives to promote good behaviour. Low-level antisocial behaviour went unchallenged and there was an over-reliance on adjudications to address the problem. Some boys told us that behaving badly was the only way to get attention and be listened to. One in five boys was on the basic regime, some for significant periods, and the use of short-term incentives for this group was underdeveloped.
- S11 Security procedures remained proportionate and the security team had good links with other departments. The security team managed a high number of information reports efficiently but actions were not tracked. The number of adjudications was exceptionally high, nearly doubling since the previous inspection. At the time of the inspection, over 100 of these were remanded and unlikely to be heard.
- S12 Levels of use of force remained high but most incidents we reviewed showed that force was applied appropriately in response to fights and assaults. Pain-inducing techniques continued to be used, which was inappropriate. The introduction of managing and minimising physical restraint (MMPR) had led to improvements in recording and governance.
- S13 The number of boys segregated had reduced since the previous inspection and was similar to other establishments. The regime was limited and it was inappropriate that boys were denied access to showers, exercise and telephone calls in response to poor behaviour. Relationships between staff and boys in the segregation unit were positive. Reviews were well attended and appropriately focused on reintegration. Too many boys had been segregated while subject to an open ACCT.
- S14 In our survey, 30% of boys told us it was easy to get illegal drugs but we were unable to find evidence of this and the mandatory drug testing positive rate was below target. There were no boys in clinical treatment but psychosocial services were well developed and all boys were offered access to the service.

Respect

S15 *Living accommodation had improved and was reasonable. Most outdoor exercise yards had improved and were well equipped. Some boys did not have a daily shower or telephone call. Relationships between staff and boys were generally good. Consultation was limited, and despite substantial numbers of boys with protected characteristics, equality and diversity remained inadequate. Management of complaints was good and health care provision was very good. Supervision at meal service was poor but the quality of food was reasonable. **Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***

S16 *At the last inspection in September 2014, we found that outcomes for children and young people in Werrington were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 17 recommendations about respect.³ At this follow-up inspection we found that seven of the recommendations had been achieved, four had been partially achieved and six had not been achieved.*

- S17** Efforts had been made to brighten boys' living accommodation and most individual cells were reasonably clean. Some communal areas were grubby. Access to clean clothing had improved. The application of individual regime restrictions meant that some boys did not get a daily shower or telephone call. Boys on the enhanced wing had reduced facilities and no access to the youth club. Outdoor exercise yards had improved apart from on C wing and time in the open air had increased. Applications could be submitted daily but logs did not record when responses were received.
- S18** For the most part the establishment felt relaxed and we observed some good individual interactions. Boys were particularly positive about staff in specialist areas such as education, health care, youth work and offender management. In contrast, we also observed some inappropriate and unacceptable shouting and swearing by a few staff and bad behaviour by boys who were not challenged. The personal officer scheme was not working and some boys did not feel they were listened to, which led to frustration. The limited consultation was mostly ineffective.
- S19** The strategic management of diversity was inadequate. Numbers of discrimination incident report forms were much higher than at other young offender institutions (YOIs) and investigations and interventions were inconsistent. Out-of-range monitoring data were not analysed sufficiently. Consultation with minority groups had ceased and there were no longer any diversity peer supporters. In our survey, boys from a black or minority ethnic background, who made up half the population, and Muslim boys were less positive than their counterparts across a number of indicators. Provision for Travellers, foreign national boys and boys with disabilities was adequate.
- S20** Faith provision was good and the chaplaincy was integrated into most aspects of prison life.
- S21** Responses to complaints were timely and polite and often delivered in person, which was good. Complaint forms were freely available and analysis of trends and patterns was good. Arrangements to support boys with their legal rights were organised appropriately.
- S22** Health services were very good. Access to nurses and doctors was excellent but access to some specialist clinics was inadequate, leading to long waits.
- S23** There was no clear audit trail of the outcome of complaints made by boys about health care and responses were not age appropriate. Medicines management was good as was access to dental provision.
- S24** Mental health services met the need and we welcomed the further development of child and adolescent mental health services. There were some delays in transfer to NHS mental health units and lack of access to beds in YOI in-patient units which left boys with potential undiagnosed mental disorders to be managed in segregation. This was unacceptable.
- S25** The new standardised menu had been implemented and initial responses from boys were positive. The serving of meals was chaotic and affected the evening regime. Supervision of

³ 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.

serveries was poor, leading to bullying and poor hygiene practices. Boys were provided with pin credit and groceries on arrival and could place an interim order for both during their first week.

Purposeful activity

S26 *Time out of cell was better than we normally see for most boys but there were still too many boys locked up for long periods. Leadership and management of learning and skills were good and there was effective partnership working between the establishment and the provider. There was a good range of education and training opportunities but English and mathematics were not well integrated. There was not enough outreach work for boys who were not attending full-time activities. The quality of learning, teaching and assessment was good and levels of achievement in qualifications were high overall. Library and PE provision were good but attendance was restricted for boys not attending education or training. **Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***

S27 *At the last inspection in September 2014, we found that outcomes for children and young people in Werrington were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made nine recommendations about purposeful activity. At this follow-up inspection we found that four of the recommendations had been achieved, one had been partially achieved and four had not been achieved.*

S28 The new core day had increased the time out of cell for most boys. Most boys could have more than eight hours out of cell each day which was better than at other YOIs. However, slippage in the regime still reduced time out of cell at times. About a quarter of boys were not on a learning pathway and spent as little as four hours out of cell.

S29 Partnerships across the prison were good. The prison and Novus worked closely and productively to develop education and skills. Their response to the raised expectation for boys to follow programmes of 30 hours a week (known as pathways) was carefully planned and largely effective. Measures to build capacity and sustain improvement in teaching, learning and assessment were effective. Standards remained good and class cancellations for staffing reasons were very rare. The focus on inclusion was strong and there was a good strategy to meet the needs of the high number of boys with special educational needs. Self-assessment of education and skills gave a thorough and evaluative view of Novus provision, but was inadequate for the library and PE.

S30 The 30 hour pathways provision was planned well to meet boys' needs from entry to level 2. This was supplemented by outreach provision for boys not ready for full participation in education and skills, although there was not enough to meet needs. English and mathematics were not consistently well integrated into other vocational and subject areas or work experience. Allocation to activities was effective, drawing on good multidisciplinary working by staff who knew the boys well. Work experience pathways for a few boys developed useful practical skills, but the programme was not yet complete.

S31 Much teaching and learning was good. Boys received coaching and individual help in education and training workshops and most learners made good progress. There was some good management of challenging behaviour, enabling boys to participate productively in learning. The quality of written feedback did not always provide enough guidance on what boys needed to do to improve.

S32 The level of respect between education and skills staff and boys was mainly good. Boys in most vocational and creative areas were proud of their work and what they had achieved.

Classes led by youth workers raised boys' awareness of personal, social and ethical issues. Attendance was sometimes interrupted because boys were removed for poor behaviour.

- S33 Levels of achievement in qualifications were high overall. Standards of work in vocational training and creative arts were high. Learners progressed well within and between levels.
- S34 The library provided a good stock of suitable books. Access was good for boys following the 30-hour pathways but was more restricted for others as too many Saturday sessions were cancelled.
- S35 Access to PE was good for boys attending education and training but more limited for other boys. Resources were good and links with health care were effective.

Resettlement

S36 *Strategic oversight of resettlement was good and there were well developed partnerships with key stakeholders. Boys were seen by a duty caseworker the day after arrival and were allocated a dedicated caseworker quickly. All boys had a training or remand plan but residential staff needed more involvement in its delivery. Public protection arrangements were generally good but not enough was done in preparation for release. Reintegration planning was mostly good. However, accommodation was not always identified in good time before release and, although offending behaviour work was improving, there were still gaps in provision. The children and families pathway was particularly well developed. **Outcomes for children and young people were good against this healthy prison test.***

S37 *At the last inspection in September 2014, we found that outcomes for children and young people in Werrington were good against this healthy prison test. We made seven recommendations about resettlement. At this follow-up inspection we found that one of the recommendations had been achieved, three had been partially achieved and three had not been achieved.*

- S38 The reducing reoffending policy was informed by a comprehensive needs analysis and strategic oversight was good. The casework team maintained effective links with key stakeholders. We welcomed the introduction of transition liaison officers as part of the support for boys moving to an adult prison after their eighteenth birthday. Follow up post release was better than we usually see and the annual analysis of the related data was used to inform provision.
- S39 All boys were seen by a duty caseworker the day after their arrival and allocation to a dedicated caseworker was prompt. Boys had training and remand management plans based on need but, although they were given a copy of their targets, only a third of the boys in our survey thought they had a plan. Residential staff were not adequately involved in helping boys achieve sentence or remand planning review targets. However, reviews were good and boys were fully involved in the process.
- S40 Public protection cases were properly identified, and the risk management committee met regularly. We were not confident that all boys who should be subject to MAPPAs (multi-agency public protection arrangements) had a confirmed MAPPAs level at the point of release. Werrington was not resourced to meet the needs of the small number of boys serving indeterminate or long-term sentences. Systems to identify boys with looked-after status and the support available to them were good.
- S41 Reintegration planning was good and pathways were discussed at all reviews.

- S42 Practical arrangements for the day of release were well organised and most boys were met at the gate to be taken to their accommodation. Release on temporary licence was used appropriately and boys could gain early release.
- S43 Accommodation for some boys was identified too close to their release date and data showed that 19% of boys were no longer in their accommodation three months after release, which was too many.
- S44 Some financial management work was available from Kinetic Youth Service (an external youth work organisation providing a range of support to boys at Werrington) and the independent living skills programme, but boys were not able to open bank accounts. The needs analysis identified a need for work to address gambling.
- S45 Education, training and employment information, advice and guidance were good. There were good links between prison caseworkers and internal and community support agencies. The range of pre-release support was good but the virtual campus⁴ was not used to help job search.
- S46 Arrangements to ensure continuity of mental and physical health care and drug support on transfer or release were appropriate.
- S47 The children and families pathway was well developed with access to the building bridges course, which was designed to build relationships between boys and their families where a need had been identified. There was also a family support worker and monthly family days. The families of new arrivals could have an induction visit to meet a number of agencies who explained the support they would give to the boy, which was an excellent initiative. Visitors were positive about the visits experience and facilities were adequate.
- S48 One-to-one offending behaviour work was delivered by specialist youth services and a range of accredited programmes were to be delivered imminently by the newly appointed team of psychologists. Restorative justice work, including conferences and the Sycamore tree course, was good. There were no interventions for boys whose offence included sexually harmful behaviour.

Main concerns and recommendations

- S49 **Concern:** There was a lack of consistency in behaviour management. The rewards and sanctions scheme did not work well and there was no incentive to behave. Boys who achieved enhanced status saw few benefits in their daily regime and activities. Low-level antisocial behaviour was not challenged and often led to curtailment of the regime for all boys.

Recommendation: The establishment should review the behaviour management policy and its application to ensure that low-level poor behaviour is consistently challenged and good behaviour is rewarded appropriately.

- S50 **Concern:** There was too little opportunity for boys to be heard through meaningful consultation or one-to-one interaction with staff. The youth council was being re-formed and in the interim there was little evidence of concerns raised by boys being followed up. There was no consultation for boys with protected characteristics. Meetings at which discussions took place about support for and management of vulnerable or challenging boys

⁴ Internet access for prisoners to community education, training and employment opportunities.

did not include the boys. The personal officer scheme was not working and boys told us, and we observed, that they sometimes behaved badly to be noticed and get things done.

Recommendation: Boys should collectively and individually have a voice in areas of interest to them and areas of importance to the establishment, particularly safety, bullying and violence, and diversity.

S51 **Concern:** Over half the population were from a black or minority ethnic background and a third were Muslim. Despite this diverse population, there had been only two diversity and equality meetings in 2015 and discussion about each protected characteristic at the meeting was limited. Inequality in outcomes revealed by equality monitoring data was not always identified and addressed. The equality officer had frequently been deployed to other duties. Some actions in the equality action plan were out of date.

Recommendation: The equality agenda should be given a high priority throughout the establishment and should be sufficiently resourced to improve outcomes for boys with a protected characteristic. Inequality identified through monitoring data should be investigated and addressed.

S52 **Concern:** There was no nationally agreed transfer pathway for boys who required inpatient facilities. We were made aware of an example in which a disturbed and potentially unwell boy was left in the care and separation unit after transfer to an inpatient facility at another establishment was refused on the grounds that the boy was not within the receiving establishment's catchment area. This was unacceptable.

Recommendation: There should be a national transfer pathway for boys who need admission to an establishment with inpatient facilities.

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.

1.1 *Some boys experienced long journeys and late arrivals were not uncommon. Video link was still not in use. Escort vehicles were in good condition.*

1.2 Too many boys continued to experience lengthy delays in court after their case had been dealt with. In our survey, only 75% of boys said they felt safe on their journey to the prison compared to 89% at the previous inspection. With the contraction of the youth estate, some boys now travelled long distances in vans, often with adults, and arrived late in the evening. Some boys continued to arrive without full or up-to-date documentation but enhanced checks were in place until documentation arrived. The on-site video link facility was still not in operation.

1.3 The condition of escort vehicles was checked on arrival at the prison and any issues were referred to the escort contractor. Escort vehicles that we looked at were generally clean and well equipped. Boys were not handcuffed while getting on and off vehicles at the establishment.

Recommendations

1.4 **The escort contract should be reviewed to ensure that children arrive at the establishment in good time to be assessed and settled on their first night.**

1.5 **The establishment should make use of the on-site video link facilities.** (Repeated recommendation 1.4)

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.

1.6 *The environment in reception was excellent. New arrivals continued to have a positive experience. First night accommodation was good but we were concerned about the mix of boys on the unit. Not all boys received a full induction.*

- I.7** The environment in the purpose-built reception building was one of the best we have seen. The establishment had carried out a review of early days procedures and further improvements were planned, including painting the holding rooms in brighter colours. Reception was clean, well maintained and created a welcoming atmosphere for children on arrival. In our survey, most boys said they were treated well in reception compared to similar prisons (86% v 67%) and we observed staff demonstrating care for new arrivals, putting them at ease. There was no routine strip-searching.
- I.8** All first night procedures were carried out in reception. Regardless of their arrival time, all boys had a health care screening and a full risk assessment before moving to the first night unit. Risk assessment management documents were thorough, although some still did not include actions to address risk and those that did were often too generic. Boys responded positively in our survey on access to a shower and toiletry pack and we found access to be good.
- I.9** New arrivals were escorted to the first night unit past the main accommodation where shouting and intimidating language were frequently directed at new arrivals and not always challenged by staff. The first night unit was in good condition and cells were well prepared for new arrivals. The co-location of new boys and those on the enhanced level of the rewards and sanctions scheme continued and was a positive feature. However, we were concerned by the presence of some boys who were more difficult to manage who could not be located on the main accommodation. This potentially compromised safety and perceptions of safety. Enhanced checks were in place for all new arrivals on the first night.
- I.10** Induction began the day after arrival, was scheduled for five days and was mostly delivered individually. Boys we spoke to, and only 38% of boys in our survey, said that induction covered everything they needed to know. Staff and boys told us that modules were not always completed and there was no tracking system to verify this. Boys spent long periods locked up between modules.

Recommendations

- I.11** **Where concerns are identified in the risk assessment management documentation, relevant action points should be allocated to a member of staff and followed up.** (Repeated recommendation I.12)
- I.12** **The first night unit should not be used to hold boys who are difficult to manage.**
- I.13** **All boys should receive a full induction.**

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.14** *Safeguarding procedures were well developed and there were good links with the local authority. Appropriate community agencies were well integrated into the prison. Good support was offered to boys who were at most risk of self-harm.*
- I.15** Safeguarding structures remained well developed with a comprehensive safeguarding strategy linked to relevant associated policies. There were strong links with the local safeguarding children board (LSCB) and local authorities in general.
- I.16** Quarterly safeguarding committee meetings took place with appropriate designated membership, including the local authority. These meetings were chaired by the head of safeguarding and focused appropriately on the strategic management of safeguarding. The local monthly safeguarding meetings, which were not always chaired by an appropriate manager, had a more operational focus. The head of safeguarding also attended a quarterly meeting with the LSCB to discuss child protection referrals and other safeguarding matters.
- I.17** Attendance at meetings was generally good and the agenda focused appropriately on the analysis of data on issues such as the use of force, adjudications, complaints, child protection referrals and incidents of self-harm. However, there was not enough focus on antisocial behaviour, particularly bullying and victims of bullying.
- I.18** Weekly multi-agency safety and health meetings focused on the most vulnerable boys and we saw evidence of good support offered to boys at most risk of self-harm. Weekly bullying reduction plan meetings were less comprehensive and there was little discussion on measuring the scale of bullying at Werrington. Residential staff were not sufficiently involved in safeguarding matters for individual boys.
- I.19** There were clear protocols if a member of staff received information that a child was at risk while in custody and these were monitored at the monthly local safeguarding meetings. There were few opportunities for boys to discuss perceptions of safety and how they could be improved.

Recommendations

- I.20** **More focus should be given to the analysis of bullying statistics so that the scale of bullying can be measured and appropriate action taken to protect victims and manage perpetrators appropriately.**
- I.21** **Safeguarding should be embedded in the work of residential officers.** (Repeated recommendation I.21)

Child protection

Expected outcomes:

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

I.22 *Child protection procedures continued to work well. Allegations of mistreatment were swiftly referred and appropriately investigated.*

I.23 The child protection process remained clear. A high number of new staff were working at all levels in the establishment and many had not received child protection training. Despite this, all those we spoke to knew how to raise child protection concerns and were confident about doing so.

I.24 During the previous six months, the establishment had contacted the local authority on 13 occasions for advice on child protection matters. Most of these enquiries related to incidents of restraint and were referred to the local authority by one of two local authority social workers based at Werrington. The establishment had an open working relationship with Staffordshire Safeguarding Children Board and the local authority designated officer, and well maintained chronologies demonstrated timely investigations in all cases. Where appropriate, the police were involved in investigations from an early stage. Despite a proactive approach by the establishment, there were some delays in Crown Prosecution Service decisions to prosecute. At the time of the inspection, this had delayed the conclusion of two referrals.

Recommendation

I.25 All staff should undertake child protection training.

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.26 *The establishment was dealing with significant violence and bullying and we were not confident that appropriate analysis and actions took place to make the establishment safer. A quarter of boys in our survey said that they felt unsafe now. We found cases of bullying that had not been investigated. Not enough attention was paid to boys who voluntarily isolated themselves on wings.*

I.27 Systems for identifying bullying and its victims were inadequate and we were unable to determine the number of bullying incidents or the number of victims from the information collated by the establishment.

I.28 A quarter of boys said in our survey that they felt unsafe at the time of our inspection and 56% reported feeling unsafe at some time against the comparator of 40%.

- I.29** Formal information-sharing arrangements among departments, through the dedicated safeguarding team and the security department, were well developed but some reported incidents of bullying had not been investigated.
- I.30** The supervision of boys when they were unlocked was good and CCTV coverage of many areas provided further support. Staff reported bullying incidents to the security department through information reports. However, staff and boys told us that some minor incidents were dealt with informally through mediation between the parties involved and these may not have been reported to security for intelligence building. Staff were not formally trained in the use of mediation.
- I.31** Opportunities for bullying were evident and, in our survey, 46% of respondents said that they had been victimised by other boys against the comparator of 32%. In many cases, this related to insulting remarks about family and friends or about canteen.
- I.32** Formal support was reasonable for victims of bullying on residential units and most were discussed at the weekly multi-agency safety and health meetings. We were concerned about at least a quarter of boys who self isolated in their cells with little investigation into their circumstances or how to help them. They had no access to a structured regime if they chose not to attend work or education activities or to collect their meals and some came out of their cells for as little as four hours a day.

Recommendation

- I.33** **All boys who self isolate should be given the opportunity to discuss their circumstances with someone they trust and to access a full regime safely.**

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.34** *The number of self-harm incidents and ACCT⁵ documents had increased since our last inspection. Most boys on open ACCTs received appropriate support but some ACCT documents did not reflect this.*

- I.35** Suicide and self-harm were discussed in detail at the monthly local safeguarding meetings. The collection and analysis of information was very good. A wide range of information was used to identify trends and patterns of behaviour but little action was identified to address some of the issues highlighted by the analysis.
- I.36** There had been 62 incidents of self-harm during the previous six months, which was slightly higher than at the previous inspection and higher than at similar establishments. These incidents involved 43 boys with a small number of boys accounting for several incidents each.

⁵ Assessment, care in custody and teamwork case management for prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm.

Incidents of self-harm were minor apart from one where a boy had swallowed a battery and spent two weeks in hospital.

- I.37** During the previous six months, 104 ACCT documents had been opened and four were open at the time of the inspection. The quality of ACCTs that we examined was reasonable but daily entries by staff often lacked detail and few conversations with boys were recorded. However, the residential staff we spoke to clearly knew and cared about the personal circumstances of individual boys. Case reviews were carried out in a timely fashion and were attended by appropriate staff, including nominated caseworkers. Some care maps lacked detail and actions were not time bound in many cases. We found little evidence of regular management checks on the quality of ACCT documents, although the suicide prevention officer carried out audit checks and identified a few quality issues. It was a local requirement for boys subject to ACCT procedures to be referred to the weekly multi-agency safety and health meeting where additional support was identified and offered. We found three cases where this had not happened. Boys were not involved in these discussions, but they were informed of the outcome of the meeting.
- I.38** We also found two examples of boys on ACCTs who had been locked up for too long with nothing to do. This was remedied during the inspection.

Recommendations

- I.39** **The quality of ACCT documentation should be consistent and regular management checks should be carried out.**
- I.40** **Care maps should be detailed with time-bound actions.**

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.41** *We found high levels of bullying and violence at Werrington. While there was an appropriate strategy to manage this, in practice there were too few incentives to promote good behaviour. Low-level disruption went unchallenged and there was a continued over-reliance on formal measures, mainly adjudications, to address poor behaviour.*

- I.42** We found significant levels of poor behaviour and violence in all areas of the establishment (see sections on victims of bullying and intimidation and education, learning and skills). Individually, in groups and in our survey boys reported high levels of victimisation and violence and said that some boys were charging others 'rent' for occupying cells. The behaviour management strategy was appropriate and well communicated to boys on arrival but in practice we found several aspects of its implementation that required significant improvement.
- I.43** Low-level poor behaviour, including shouting intimidating remarks through windows, refusing to return to cells during domestic periods or association, and swearing at other boys or staff was not addressed consistently in residential units, education or activity. This low-level disruption was allowed to escalate before it was challenged. Controls on the volume of

canteen items were not being enforced on residential units despite prominent displays of excessive canteen in some cells and significant evidence of 'rent' being charged by some boys (see photo in Appendix II).

- I.44** Staff relied too heavily on the adjudication system which struggled to hear the very high number of charges that were being laid (see paragraphs I.57 and I.58).

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.45** *There were too few incentives for boys who behaved well and some benefits of the enhanced regime were regularly curtailed due to slippage in the regime. More than a fifth of boys were on the basic regime, which was high. Many boys had been on basic for significant periods and the use of short-term incentives for this group was underdeveloped.*

- I.46** The incentives scheme operated on a system of merits and demerits; boys who received more merits than demerits could apply to move up the levels and those who received demerits were automatically reviewed and downgraded. Boys who transferred in on the enhanced level could retain that status. Boys downgraded to basic were reviewed weekly. Reviews were still not multidisciplinary and did not always take account of the boy's circumstances and targets. Boys told us they did not always know when they received a demerit and that merits for good behaviour were harder to achieve. Most entries in electronic case notes continued to focus on poor behaviour.
- I.47** In our survey, only 48% of boys said that the incentives and earned privileges scheme encouraged them to change their behaviour. We found that, while the scheme offered some differentiation between levels, there were too few incentives for boys on the enhanced regime. They could apply to live on the enhanced unit and most boys we spoke to appreciated the calmer environment this offered. However, boys on this unit could not use the youth club, had a bare exercise yard and did not have the same variety of association equipment as those on main location. One of the main benefits of the enhanced regime was 45 minutes' extra association every weekday but in practice regime slippage meant that boys on enhanced received the same association as those on standard regime.
- I.48** At the time of the inspection, 21% of boys were on the basic regime, which was high. The basic regime was not too punitive and boys could attend activity, dine communally and access association at the weekend. Many boys had been on basic for significant periods and the use of short-term incentives for this group was underdeveloped.

Recommendation

- I.49** **Short-term incentive plans should be implemented for boys who spend longer than two weeks on the basic regime.**

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.50** *The security team managed a very high number of information reports efficiently but actions that had been carried out were not tracked. Security procedures remained proportionate and the security team had good links with other departments. The number of adjudications was exceptionally high and over 100 adjudications were remanded and unlikely to be heard.*
- I.51** Physical and procedural security remained proportionate to the risks posed and the establishment did not restrict unnecessarily access to education, work, communal dining or association.
- I.52** The number of information reports received by the security department had doubled since the previous inspection to over 600 a month during the previous six months. These reports continued to concern bullying, inappropriate behaviour, violence and threats. The high volume of information was analysed swiftly and actions allocated to relevant departments. There was no evidence of actions being delayed, but the security team did not routinely check or record when actions had been carried out.
- I.53** The security committee met monthly and was well attended. The meeting appropriately focused on bullying, violence and reducing the supply of tobacco in the establishment. However, the wider staff group were not using the information from the meeting to reduce violence and bullying. The security department continued to have good links with the safeguarding team and the local police.
- I.54** All searches remained intelligence led. Strip-searches were rarely carried out and there had been none under restraint during the previous six months. All such searches were appropriately authorised by a governor. Closed visits were used appropriately and regular reviews ensured that boys did not stay on closed visits for unnecessarily long periods.
- I.55** Twenty-seven boys were managed through a 'keep apart' list. Despite this, managers focused on maximising activity and time out of cell, which was commendable.
- I.56** There was little evidence of drug or alcohol in the establishment but, in our survey, 30% of boys said it was easy to get illegal drugs against the comparator of 17%. There had been two positive drug tests in the past 12 months and the establishment was achieving its mandatory drug testing target of 2.5%. Intelligence-led searching and suspicion-led drug testing took place promptly. Security finds were mainly tobacco. Supply reduction was well integrated into the overall drug strategy and there was good information sharing between departments.
- I.57** In the previous inspection report, we commented on the high number of adjudications and the plans managers had to reduce over-reliance on the adjudication system. Despite this, the number of adjudications had increased dramatically to 1,464 during the previous six months compared to 863 in the same period in 2014. This was more than double the level at other YOIs. In our survey, 81% of boys against the comparator of 63% said they had had an adjudication, including nearly all boys from a black or minority ethnic or Muslim background (see paragraph 2.24).

- I.58** Adjudicators regularly had to remand charges when they ran out of time. We found over 100 adjudications had been remanded and we could not be confident that all of these would be heard.
- I.59** The main charges continued to relate to bullying and violence and the more serious charges were referred to the independent adjudicator who visited monthly. We came across some more minor charges that could have been dealt with under the IEP or minor report system.
- I.60** Use of the minor report system, a process similar to adjudications but for less serious matters, had also increased. There had been 220 minor reports in the previous six months, compared to 128 at the time of the previous inspection. These were heard by custodial managers and punishments reflected the agreed tariff.
- I.61** The adjudications room remained appropriate and documentation showed that boys were given the opportunity to describe their account of what had happened. Hearings were appropriately adjourned if a boy needed to seek advice after the hearing had started. Adjudicators adhered to a published tariff which listed the punishments and took account of mitigating circumstances. Removal from unit was not used as a punishment.
- I.62** Monitoring of trends in adjudications and minor reports required improvement and adjudication review meetings no longer took place.

Recommendation

- I.63** **Adjudicators should attend regular meetings to monitor the application of the adjudication and minor report systems.**

Housekeeping point

- I.64** The security team should track all actions to ensure they take place in a timely fashion.

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.65** *The number of violent incidents had increased significantly since the last inspection and was high. Although few were serious, over 40% involved multiple assailants. The severity and number of attacks on staff had increased. The management of perpetrators of bullying and violence was inadequate in some cases.*

- I.66** The number of fights and assaults on staff and other boys in the previous six months had increased significantly since our last inspection and were higher than in similar establishments. There had been 74 assaults on boys, of which over 40% involved multiple assailants, and 84 fights. Injuries were generally minor, although there had been a few more serious injuries. There had been 35 assaults on staff, and the level of violence and seriousness of injuries to staff had increased. We were made aware of brave efforts by prison officers to protect boys who were being attacked, resulting in injuries to themselves.

- I.67** During the previous six months, 494 information reports relating to bullying had been received, more than double the number at our last inspection. Although some of these related to the same incident, only 47 boys were subsequently subject to formal monitoring. We could not determine the actual number of bullying incidents as this information was not collected.
- I.68** Perpetrators of violence were managed through the adjudications process or referral to the police. Perpetrators of bullying were managed through bullying report plans (BRPs) which were discussed at weekly BRP meetings, although boys were not present for these discussions.
- I.69** The BRPs we looked at were poorly documented and not always signed by the boy involved and we found some requiring daily behavioural reports which had not been completed. Some BRPs had been closed too quickly because these reports had not been done and others had been closed despite evidence of continued bullying reported in the boy's review. Few boys were set targets to help them improve their behaviour and there were no formal programmes or interventions to deal with perpetrators of bullying or violence.
- I.70** A common form of bullying, across the custodial estate, is forcing boys to hand over their canteen, which is the term given to goods they have bought from the prison shop. Some boys at Werrington were in possession of excessive amounts of canteen items. One case that we checked involved a boy who had created a display of a significant number of shower products in his cell (see photograph in Appendix II). His canteen records showed that he had not ordered the items from the prison shop, yet this had not been challenged 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.71 *Levels of use of force remained high but had not increased since the previous inspection. Most incidents that we reviewed showed that force was applied appropriately in response to fights and assaults. Pain-inducing techniques continued to be used, which was inappropriate. The introduction of managing and minimising physical restraint (MMPR) had led to improvements in recording and governance. An MMPR coordinator or social worker carried out a debrief with the boy after every incident.*

- I.72** The establishment had implemented a new system of restraint, minimising and managing physical restraint (MMPR) in May 2015. Key differences to the previous system included increased emphasis on de-escalation, changes to restraint techniques and improved oversight. There had been 294 incidents of use of force during the previous six months, a similar level to that before the previous inspection. Most of these were spontaneous incidents, initiated in response to fights and assaults, and around half of all use of force incidents involved higher level techniques being used.
- I.73** Oversight of use of force was reasonably good; MMPR coordinators worked well to ensure staff involved in incidents submitted use of force reports promptly. All incidents where force had been used were reviewed by an MMPR coordinator and those involving pain-inflicting techniques, passive non-compliance and full relocations were reviewed by a senior manager at the weekly use of force meeting. Good practice and learning points were fed back to staff

involved. A quarterly meeting considered a comprehensive report monitoring trends and patterns and the MMPR national team carried out their own quarterly reviews of practice. However, despite the availability of a camera, only a minority of the 24 planned use of force incidents were recorded.

- I.74** CCTV footage was available for most incidents, although the lack of audio and coverage in cells, where many incidents took place, limited its value. The sample of footage and documentation that we reviewed showed that force was generally initiated appropriately in response to assaults and altercations between boys. There was evidence of appropriate de-escalation and most boys were taken back to their own cells after an incident. We also saw evidence of staff acting appropriately in response to serious injury and warning signs (when a child is injured or shows signs of injury) by adjusting holds and referring these cases to the national team for investigation. However, it was concerning that the use of pain-inflicting techniques had increased from one during the six months before the previous inspection to 10 in the same period before this inspection.
- I.75** Health care staff attended every incident and carried out an assessment on each boy after the incident. There was no system for implementing restraint handling plans for boys with specific health conditions or disabilities which could be exacerbated by certain MMPR holds. We were not confident that potential concerns would be systematically identified and a plan implemented.
- I.76** MMPR coordinators carried out a post-incident debrief with boys and if any concerns or allegations were made a social worker interviewed the boy and made appropriate referrals to the local authority (see paragraph I.24).
- I.77** Boys who experienced multiple restraints in a short period of time were appropriately referred to the multi-agency safety and health meeting (MASH) which discussed their care.

Recommendations

- I.78** **Pain-inducing techniques should not be used on boys.**
- I.79** **All incidents involving use of force should be recorded, including audio.**
- I.80** **There should be restraint handling plans in place for all boys with a medical condition that may be adversely affected by restraint. All staff should be aware of their contents and use the information during incidents.**

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.81** *The number of boys segregated had fallen slightly since the previous inspection. The care and separation unit was reasonably clean but the regime was limited which was a particular concern for the increasing number of boys who spent long periods in the unit. Relationships between staff and boys were positive. Too many boys had been segregated while on an open ACCT. The recording and oversight of boys separated for short periods on normal location required improvement.*

- I.82** During the previous six months, 125 boys had spent time in the care and separation unit (CSU) which was fewer than at the previous inspection. However, the proportion of boys staying longer than 10 days had increased and we were particularly concerned about the increasing number of boys who were segregated for excessive periods: one boy had spent 89 days in the CSU.
- I.83** Cells, communal areas and the communal shower were clean and there was little graffiti. None of the cells contained plug sockets, limiting the activities available to boys. Most boys did not have a radio in their cell.
- I.84** Seven boys were resident in the CSU during the inspection, including a boy who had been segregated for two months. Most of these boys felt under threat on normal location and were refusing to reintegrate on the main wings. Boys we spoke to were positive about staff on the unit but frustrated by a limited regime which required improvement. Boys could have half an hour of exercise, a shower and a telephone call each day. Education outreach visited the unit daily but because of the high occupancy levels boys received as little as half an hour education every other day. We were particularly concerned about the impact on boys' development of prolonged periods with no activity and limited time in the open air.
- I.85** The regime was applied consistently but boys who behaved poorly were denied access to basic items, including showers, telephone calls and exercise, which was inappropriate.
- I.86** A dedicated staff team worked on the CSU but staff shortages required other staff to work regularly on the unit. As at the previous inspection, not all staff who worked in the CSU had undertaken mental health training.
- I.87** Twenty-three boys had been segregated while on an open ACCT document during the previous six months. No enhanced review was carried out and we were not confident that this was always in response to exceptional circumstances.
- I.88** Segregation was properly authorised and reviewed weekly. Reviews were well attended and appropriately focused on reintegration, although some boys we spoke to were unaware of their targets. An increasing number of boys feared for their safety and resisted reintegration. The design of the main residential units left managers with few options for this group.
- I.89** Since the previous inspection, a system had been introduced for recording instances of boys being separated (locked in their cells) for up to 14 hours on normal location. This was usually implemented immediately after an assault or other dispute. In many cases, separation was appropriately used and authorised. However, it was only recorded on weekdays when a boy missed education, training or work as a result and therefore no records were made at weekends.

Recommendations

- I.90** **The regime in the care and separation unit should be improved to include an hour in the open air and daily access to education for all boys.**
- I.91** **All segregation unit staff should receive mental health training.** (Repeated recommendation I.88)
- I.92** **Boys on an open ACCT should only be segregated in exceptional circumstances which are well documented.**

- I.93 All instances of boys being separated for short periods on normal location should be recorded.**

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.94 *Substance misuse services were impressive and focused on recovery, with demonstrable partnership working and effective clinical and psychosocial services. The health regulator required no improvements on this occasion.*

- I.95** The 2015 establishment drug strategy and drug strategy action plan were supported by an informative drug and alcohol needs analysis. An effective multi-agency drug strategy committee met every two months to monitor and develop drug and alcohol services.
- I.96** The young people's drug and alcohol support service (YPDASS) provided by the Lifeline Project offered a good range of age-appropriate support to boys. The service correctly focused on harm reduction and preparation of boys for release to a lifestyle free of substance misuse.
- I.97** All new arrivals were assessed on their first day (except for weekends) using an adapted version of the comprehensive health assessment tool. All boys were encouraged to engage with the service, and those who declined support were actively followed up. The service provided clinical and psychosocial support, but at the time of the inspection no boys were receiving clinical support.
- I.98** Psychosocial interventions included one-to-one casework and group work sessions for boys on induction in conjunction with PE staff. Group topics included alcohol and cannabis awareness and harm reduction. There were plans to develop group work on a range of substance misuse-related issues, which was encouraging.
- I.99** Boys we spoke to were aware of the range of interventions available. They usually met a named substance misuse worker at least once a month. We saw evidence of good quality one-to-one support by the team and boys we spoke to were positive about their contact with the team.

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** *Efforts had been made to brighten living accommodation and most cells were reasonably clean. Some communal areas were grubby. The application of individual regime restrictions meant that some boys did not get a daily shower or telephone call. Cell call bells were not always responded to quickly. Boys on the enhanced wing had reduced association facilities. Outdoor exercise yards had improved apart from C wing. Clothing and bedding exchange was adequate. Applications could be submitted daily but logs did not record when responses were received.*
- 2.2** Living accommodation had been decorated since our last inspection and was much brighter. Most cells were reasonable with very little graffiti and boys were readily able to get cleaning materials. The offensive displays policy was applied consistently.
- 2.3** There were three wings across two units. Most cells were for single occupancy and the number of double cells had reduced. There were now only 13 double cells across the units and many of these were occupied by only one boy. Double cells remained popular and sharing was only permitted after a thorough risk assessment, which was reasonable.
- 2.4** Communal areas on all three units were grubby and stairwells were particularly dirty. Shower rooms were reasonably clean and private but the unsafe practice of locking boys in the showers together continued. Telephones had privacy hoods and additional phones had been installed on exercise yards. Many boys were subject to restrictions to their regimes following disciplinary procedures and the time taken to administer this prevented some boys from having access to a shower and a telephone call every day.
- 2.5** Up-to-date notices were displayed on all units and some walls were decorated with inspirational quotes chosen by the boys. Association equipment was in reasonably good condition and the youth club provided a welcome area for the boys on the enhanced regime on A and B wings. Enhanced boys on C wing, the induction and enhanced unit, had poorer association facilities and no access to the youth club. Exercise yards had improved, apart from on C wing, and time in the open air had increased under the new core day.
- 2.6** All cells were fitted with cell call bells but we observed that they were still not always answered quickly by officers. A print out showed that some boys waited up to 20 minutes for their bells to be answered, which was too long. The system was checked regularly by managers but this had not improved response times.
- 2.7** The provision of clean prison clothing was adequate and had improved since the last inspection. Boys could exchange clothes each day and bedding and towels were changed weekly. A laundry facility opened on B wing during the inspection and laundries were to be installed on the other wings.
- 2.8** Arrangements for sending and receiving mail remained good. Boys could send two free letters a week, and no restrictions were applied to the amount of mail they could receive.

- 2.9** Management of the applications system was poor and logs did not record when responses were received. In our survey, only 52% of boys said that it was easy to make an application and only 47% said that applications were dealt with fairly against respective comparators of 64% and 63%.

Recommendations

- 2.10** **Cells designed for one should not accommodate two people.** (Repeated recommendation 2.10)
- 2.11** **Children should not be locked together in showers.** (Repeated recommendation 2.11)
- 2.12** **Cell call bells should be answered promptly.** (Repeated recommendation 2.13)

Housekeeping point

- 2.13** The application system should record when responses are received.

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.

2.14 *We observed some good individual interactions by staff with boys. We also heard some staff shouting and swearing at boys and not challenging poor behaviour, which was concerning. Electronic case notes rarely contained personal officer entries. Consultation with boys was ineffective and there was a lack of opportunity for boys to have their say. This resulted in frustration and poor behaviour.*

- 2.15** In our survey, two-thirds of boys said that most staff treated them with respect. We observed some good interactions between staff and boys, particularly staff from education and other partnership agencies. Poor behaviour and swearing by some boys went unchallenged and we observed some negative role modelling from a few staff who were also shouting and, on occasion, swearing at boys to get them to respond to requests.
- 2.16** The personal officer scheme did not work effectively. Entries by personal officers in boys' records were sparse and showed little engagement by staff in sentence planning. Consultation with boys was ineffective. The youth council was only slowly being reintroduced and there was no follow up of issues raised by boys at weekly forums. There was a lack of opportunity for boys to express their views and many boys told us they felt frustrated and behaved poorly to get things done. Our observations confirmed this.

Recommendations

- 2.17** **Each boy should have a designated officer on their residential unit who is their central point of contact and support and takes responsibility for their day-to-day**

care and wellbeing through frequent contact and by attending relevant meetings relating to their care. (Repeated recommendation 2.18)

- 2.18 Staff relationships with boys should be properly supervised to ensure that staff interact in a respectful way and that poor behaviour by boys is challenged.**

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.

- 2.19** *The strategic management of equality was weak. Out-of-range monitoring data were not adequately investigated and enquiries into incidents of discrimination were inconsistent. There was no consultation with boys from a protected characteristic group. Black and minority ethnic and Muslim boys held more negative perceptions than white boys. Provision for foreign national boys and boys with disabilities was adequate.*

Strategic management

- 2.20** The strategic management of equality was inadequate and was not central to the work of the establishment. Only two diversity and equality action team (DEAT) meetings had been held so far in 2015 and the most recent had been poorly attended. Senior managers were designated as protected characteristic leads but this was superficial and there was little discussion at DEAT meetings about some minority groups. Equality data were out of range in some areas, including use of force with black and minority ethnic boys, and the establishment had not done enough to understand or address this. The equality officer had been redeployed to other duties for nearly half their time and a long period of absence had not been covered by other staff. The equality action plan was not up to date.
- 2.21** During the previous six months, 81 discrimination incident report forms (DIRFs) had been submitted, much higher than similar establishments. Most continued to be related to race. Investigations into complaints and the resulting recommendations were inconsistent, particularly complaints about the use of racist language. Quality assurance by protected characteristic leads was ineffective and there was no external quality assurance.
- 2.22** There was no consultation with boys from protected characteristic groups and there were no longer any diversity peer supporters. The establishment was working towards accreditation in investors in diversity. The action plan drawn up by the awarding body had identified a need for greater consultation with boys about diversity issues. Celebrations of diversity were good and had included a visit from the Anne Frank exhibition. Diversity displays were promoted by the education department. Links to community organisations, including the hate crime network, were developing.

Recommendation

- 2.23 The quality of investigations into discrimination incident reports should be improved and should include effective quality assurance.**

Diverse needs

- 2.24** Half the population were from a black or minority ethnic background and about a third were recorded by the prison as Muslim. In our survey and structured groups, both Muslim boys and those from a black and minority ethnic background responded more negatively than their counterparts about their experiences across a range of indicators. Out of range equalities data and the inconsistent investigation of DIRFs related to the use of racist language demonstrated that the establishment had not done enough to understand and address differences in the treatment of these boys.
- 2.25** Only two boys had identified themselves to the prison as Gypsy, Romany or Traveller and yet eight had identified themselves in our survey and we met four during the inspection. A weekly Travellers group was held in the chaplaincy and boys we spoke to said that their needs were being met.
- 2.26** Ten boys were identified as foreign nationals. Home office immigration held quarterly surgeries and provided updates to boys' caseworkers but relevant information was not passed to the equality officer for action. Limited information was displayed in other languages but records showed that telephone interpretation was used when required. English for speakers of other languages was available through the education department.
- 2.27** Forty boys had identified themselves or had been identified by the prison as having learning difficulties. Special educational needs support was very good and information was shared with relevant departments. No boys with a physical disability had been identified, although we met a boy who needed crutches to move around. A personal emergency evacuation plan was in place, although it was perfunctory and some staff were not aware of its existence.
- 2.28** No gay or bisexual boys had identified themselves at the time of the inspection. The prison had links with a support network in Stoke. There were displays of positive imagery about gay people around the establishment.

Recommendation

- 2.29 There should be consultations with black and minority ethnic and Muslim boys to understand their negative perceptions and address any concerns raised.**

Housekeeping points

- 2.30** Boys with a protected characteristic should be identified on arrival.
- 2.31** Personal emergency evacuation plans should be meaningful and all staff should be aware of boys with a plan in place.

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.

2.32 *Faith services were good and the chaplaincy was well integrated into the life of the establishment.*

2.33 The Muslim chaplain was full time and other members of the team were employed on a part-time or sessional basis. The chaplaincy was visible around the establishment and a member of the team met new arrivals on their first day in custody. They attended a wide range of meetings and were often present at assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) and good order or discipline reviews.

2.34 Boys did not have to apply to attend corporate worship and attendance was good. Shared facilities were large enough to hold the different religious services. A range of classes and courses were delivered, including the 'managing my emotions' course, and a community organisation called Reflex delivered some mentoring and through-the-gate work. The chaplaincy had delivered faith awareness sessions to staff and boys and a wide range of religious festivals were celebrated.

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.

2.35 *Complaint forms were freely available. Responses to complaints were focused and timely and were explained to boys, which was good practice.*

2.36 In our survey, only 39% of boys said it was easy to make a complaint against the comparator of 51%. Complaint forms and locked complaints boxes were available on all wings. Between April and September 2015, 230 complaints had been submitted which was higher than similar prisons.

2.37 Responses to complaints that we sampled were polite, timely and focused. Quality assurance by the safeguarding team and a social worker was effective. We found many examples of the response being explained to the boy in person by the originator, which was good practice. An advocate from Barnardo's continued to help boys who required assistance in making a complaint. The analysis of trends and patterns in complaints was good.

Good practice

2.38 *Respondents to complaints met boys to explain the response and discuss any outstanding issues.*

Legal rights

Expected outcomes:

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

2.39 *Arrangements to check boys were aware of and able to exercise their legal rights were organised well.*

2.40 There was a clear legal services policy which described how boys could access information and support to exercise their legal rights.

2.41 Induction staff used a '24-hour legal questionnaire' to check and record information about the newly arrived boys. This included whether they were convicted, their intentions regarding an appeal against their sentence or conviction, and whether they needed help with finding legal support or contacting a legal representative.

2.42 Caseworkers followed up actions identified in the questionnaire. Bail applications were facilitated by the boy's community youth offending team and bail was discussed at remand planning meetings. Caseworkers checked that boys knew about the key dates in their sentence, and licence conditions for boys approaching release were discussed and explained at training planning meetings. Caseworkers also facilitated contact with legal advisers. Legal visits took place four afternoons a week in the main visits room. This could compromise confidentiality if the visits session was busy, although four small private booths were available for professional visitors who required them.

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.

2.43 *Health services were very good. The comprehensive health assessment tool (CHAT) had now bedded in and was used effectively. Access to adolescent-specific training had improved. Dental and pharmacy services were good, though waiting times for some specialist clinics were too long. Mental health services met the need and had attracted new investment.*

2.44 *The inspection of health services was jointly undertaken by the Care Quality Commission (CQC)⁶ and HM Inspectorate of Prisons under a memorandum of understanding agreement between the agencies. The CQC found there were no breaches of the relevant regulations.*

⁶ CQC is the independent regulator of health and adult social care in England. It monitors, inspects and regulates services to make sure they meet fundamental standards of quality and safety. For information on CQC's standards of care and the action it takes to improve services, please visit: <http://www.cqc.org.uk>.

Governance arrangements

- 2.45** NHS England commissioned Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Partnership Trust (SSOTP) to provide primary care services. South Staffordshire and Shropshire NHS Foundation Trust provided child and adolescent mental health services (CAMHS). An informative health needs assessment had been completed in 2015, and the contract for health care was out to tender. Partnership working and relationships between the providers, commissioners and the establishment were very good.
- 2.46** A senior nurse manager provided effective clinical leadership. The nursing team had a good and developing skill mix with 24-hour nursing cover. The tendering process had affected recruitment to some posts, although the service was stable. GPs from a local practice delivered five clinics a week. All staff were in date with mandatory training and adolescent-specific training had been sourced and arranged. All staff received clinical supervision in line with the SSOTP policy.
- 2.47** Governance arrangements were generally good. During the six months to September 2015, 57 serious incidents had been reported to the Trust and two complaints had been made to PALS (patient advice and liaison service) in the last year. Letters responding to complaints under the PALS system were not age appropriate and did not advise the recipient what to do if he was unhappy with the answer. In addition, there was no feedback on trends on which to base service improvements.
- 2.48** Boys we spoke to said the quality of health services was good. There was a service user forum (although meetings had been infrequent and minutes were sparse) and an ongoing patient satisfaction survey. However, no data was collected from these to analyse trends and inform service development.
- 2.49** Health services were delivered from the health department and three dispensing rooms based on wings. All areas complied with infection control standards and provided an excellent environment. Plans were in hand to develop the health centre to include CAMHS therapy. Nursing staff had good access to regularly checked emergency equipment. Fifty-seven custody staff had been trained in first aid or in using automated defibrillators, which was an improvement, but some had not received an update in three years.
- 2.50** Health staff were easily identifiable and we observed excellent interactions with boys. All new arrivals received age-appropriate information on health services. Use of electronic clinical records (SystemOne) and care planning were good. SSOTP policies and procedures were available to staff.
- 2.51** Boys had good access to nicotine replacement therapy, barrier protection, screening services and age-appropriate immunisation and vaccination clinics. SSOTP was now meeting its target for hepatitis B vaccination. There was a whole-prison approach to health promotion with relevant displays and literature across the establishment. A wellbeing day in the summer had been well received. The CQC found there were no breaches of the relevant regulations.

Recommendation

- 2.52 Responses to complaints should be written in an age-appropriate manner and should explain what to do if dissatisfied; data on trends in complaints should be made available to the health service manager.**

Housekeeping point

- 2.53** Health care should engage the service users in meaningful discussions to inform service improvement and use the data to analyse trends.

Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.54** An average of six new receptions a week were seen by nurses for a private initial assessment, and appropriate referrals were made. The reception health room was very good. Effective liaison with community services ensured continuity of care. All boys received further assessments of their physical and mental health including neuro-disability using the CHAT, which was now fully established and used well.
- 2.55** There was an appropriate range of primary care services. Nurses were very visible on the wings and knew their patients; we observed boys having quick access to nurses and a doctor was available the following day. Standardised triage guidance on minor injuries was available to nurses in each wing dispensing room, which was commendable.
- 2.56** The average waiting time for the genitourinary and optometry clinics was eight weeks, although some boys waited up to 14 weeks which was too long. The did-not-attend rates for the dentist (15% in September) and optician (18% average since April) were too high.
- 2.57** Access to external hospital appointments was well managed and usually efficient, although on two occasions in the last six months escorts had been delayed because there were no escort staff. These incidents had been appropriately reported to the Trust.

Recommendations

- 2.58** **Boys should have timely access to specialist clinics with low waiting times and few missed appointments.**
- 2.59** **The partnership board should receive data on did-not-attend rates, delayed attendance at appointments and cancelled external escorts to inform and manage improvements.**

Pharmacy

- 2.60** The supply, storage, management and administration of medicines were very good. There were overarching Trust policies and regular staff were familiar with local working practices and risk management procedures. Direct access to a pharmacist was advertised well but was not used. Prescribing levels were low and appropriate to the population. We observed safe medicines administration.
- 2.61** The in-possession policy allowed some boys to take appropriate responsibility for their medication following a risk assessment. Risk assessments were undertaken at each repeat prescription.

- 2.62** Nurses could administer an appropriate range of medicines without access to a doctor under an over-the-counter medicines policy and patient group directions⁷, which ensured timely treatment.
- 2.63** Regular medicines and therapeutics committee meetings had been established with good attendance.

Good practice

- 2.64** *In-possession medication risk assessments were completed each time medicines were re-prescribed. This was the best way to ensure the continuing safety of boys with drugs in possession.*

Dentistry

- 2.65** SSOTP delivered dental clinics three days a month and there was access to local community provision for urgent emergency treatment. All boys were offered a dental check up and the average wait for routine appointments was three weeks six days. At times of increased demand, additional clinics were arranged. Boys we spoke to were positive about access to the dental service and the treatment they received.
- 2.66** The dental surgery was spacious, met infection control standards and was suitably equipped, with a separate decontamination room. All dental equipment was appropriately maintained and arrangements for the disposal of dental waste were in place.
- 2.67** We did not meet any dental staff from SSOTP but had full access to the surgery and a range of documents which confirmed that the service was suitably maintained to ensure the delivery of safe and appropriate treatment.

Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.68** Working relationships between prison and mental health staff were effective in supporting boys with complex needs. Some staff in the segregation unit told us they had not received mental health awareness training but most other discipline staff had, although several years ago in many cases. Regular training sessions had recently been established with the involvement of CAMHS.
- 2.69** Mental health needs were identified during reception screening through CHAT and an open referral system. Boys with complex presentations or indicators of early onset disease were referred to CAMHS. Boys could also self-refer to CAMHS, which was excellent practice.
- 2.70** SSOTP provided primary mental health care services, although no boys were receiving care at the time of the inspection, and the chaplaincy provided emotional support. CAMHS offered psychological therapies and regular psychiatric clinics with an average caseload of 20 to 25 boys. Staff were frustrated that appointments often started late and regime and escort problems resulted in frequent non-attendance. Money had been secured to recruit a speech and language therapist and other CAMHS professionals. Some posts were being covered with long-term temporary agency staff until the outcome of contract tendering was known. This was not ideal.

⁷ Authorise appropriate health care professionals to supply and administer prescription-only medicine.

- 2.71** Three boys had been transferred to residential NHS mental health services in the previous 12 months. Staff told us that it had been a challenge to transfer boys in need of 24-hour health care to establishments with inpatient facilities because they were told that the boy was not within the receiving prison's catchment area. As a consequence, one such disturbed and unwell boy had to remain in segregation, which was unacceptable. Werrington had tried to address this problem directly with the establishment concerned, but that establishment's view was that it was not a national resource. The young people's estate has contracted significantly and is managed as one directorate within the National Offender Management Service, yet establishments locally did not fully understand their role within it.

Housekeeping point

- 2.72** Recruitment to the vacant CAMHS team posts should be completed as soon as possible.

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.

- 2.73** *The new standardised menu had received a positive response. The serving of meals was chaotic which affected the evening regime badly. Supervision of the serveries was poor: not enough attention was paid to hygiene and there was bullying in the queue.*

- 2.74** The kitchen was clean and well maintained. There were good food storage facilities, with separate areas for halal products. Trolleys were cleaned by kitchen staff.
- 2.75** Serveries on residential units were clean and boys had the opportunity to eat their meals together out of their cells.
- 2.76** The new standardised menu for children had been implemented in September 2015 and the initial response from boys had been positive. Lunch and dinner were selected from a four-week rolling menu with a reasonable variety of healthy options. Menu options included vegetables, and fruit was available. In our survey, 21% of respondents said that the food was good or very good, which was better than in comparator prisons and than at our last inspection.
- 2.77** Lunch was served between 12.15 and 12.45pm to boys' cells. Dinner should have been served between 5.45 and 6.15pm but the evening meal time was chaotic. We saw staff spending much time persuading boys, mostly by shouting at them, to return to their cells at the end of the domestic period so that the evening meal could be served. Serving of the meal eventually started after 6pm. A considerable number of boys chose to eat in their cells each day or were required to as a disciplinary punishment and staff spent an inordinate amount of time serving meals to these boys in their cells. The serving of meals at doors was inappropriate and in these circumstances did not help to address the reasons why boys would not come out of their cells to collect their meals. Boys who chose to dine in association were eventually unlocked close to 6.30pm for their meals.

- 2.78** The supervision of serveries was poor which led to poor hygiene practices and bullying. Not all boys were appropriately dressed to serve food and the correct utensils were not used. We observed one boy being bullied in the queue with no staff present to challenge it. The perpetrator was eventually spoken to but the victim was ignored.
- 2.79** Breakfast packs were issued in the morning. Portions at lunch and the teatime meal were adequate for boys and an evening snack was provided.
- 2.80** Consultation arrangements were reasonable. There were food comments books on each wing and boys were surveyed twice a year. The catering manager attended consultation meetings and dealt well with individual complaints by visiting boys to discuss the matters they had raised.

Recommendations

- 2.81** **Staff should investigate why so many boys will not collect their meals from the servery. All boys should be encouraged to collect their meals and staff should ensure they can do so safely.**
- 2.82** **All meals should be served at the advertised times.**
- 2.83** **The serving of food should be adequately supervised to ensure that appropriate hygiene requirements are met.**

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.

2.84 *Boys were provided with groceries and pin credit for the telephones on arrival and could place an interim order for both during the first week. Consultation with boys about canteen was adequate.*

- 2.85** All new arrivals were given a pack of grocery items in reception, including snacks and squash, and £2 pin credit. The cost of these was repaid at 50 pence a week. Boys could place an interim shop order during their first week and while on induction could request additional pin phone credit. This was an improvement since our last inspection. Boys submitted their canteen orders on Thursday and goods were delivered to the prison nine days later and issued within 24 hours of arrival. This created delays for some new arrivals.
- 2.86** In our survey, 61% of boys said the canteen sold a wide enough variety of products, compared to 46% at our last inspection. There was some consultation about purchases at the weekly forums and the youth council and this needed further development (see paragraph 2.16). Boys were able to order from catalogues and could buy approved newspapers and magazines.

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.⁸

3.1 *Most boys could have more than eight hours out of cell each weekday. While this did not meet our expectations, it was higher than at other young offender institutions. About a quarter of boys who did not attend education spent as little as four hours out of cell.*

3.2 The establishment had recently implemented the national core day which had increased time out of cell for most boys. Werrington had recorded an average of 8.4 hours out of cell during the week and 6.5 hours at the weekend, but this did not account for regular slippage in the regime which reduced these figures. We estimated that most boys received about eight hours out of cell during the week but about a quarter of boys who did not attend activities had as little as four hours on any one day. This did not meet our expectations but was better than at comparable establishments.

3.3 We found that 28% of boys continued to be locked up during core activity time. There were good reasons in all cases, but the number of boys requiring education outreach put pressure on this service (see paragraph 3.16).

3.4 In our survey, the number of boys who said they spent an hour exercising outside every day had increased to 58% from 27% at the previous inspection. In contrast, fewer than half the boys said they had association every day. In some cases this was appropriate when boys were on the basic regime or had received loss of association as a punishment, but staff shortages resulted in the regular cancellation of association on A and B wings.

Recommendation

3.5 Boys should have access to 10 hours out of cell each day.

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 the Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted⁹) working under the general direction of HM Inspectorate of Prisons. For information on how Ofsted inspects education and training see the Ofsted framework and handbook for inspection.

⁸ 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.

⁹ Ofsted is the Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills. It reports directly to the UK Parliament and is independent and impartial. It (inter alia) inspects and regulates services that provide education and skills for all ages, including those in custody. For information on Ofsted's inspection framework, please visit: <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk>.

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 *Leadership and management of learning and skills and work were good. Effective partnership working had resulted in a broad, well-balanced curriculum which catered well for most boys. Outreach provision in the residential units was good, but not always sufficient. Teaching and learning were good and support for additional learning needs was very effective. Boys developed good personal skills and their behaviour in class was mainly good. The achievement of qualifications was high and boys made good progress. The library stock met boys' needs well but access was restricted for those not attending classes.*

3.7 *Ofsted made the following assessments about the learning and skills and work provision:*

Overall effectiveness of learning and skills and work: *Good*

Outcomes for children and young people engaged in learning and skills and work activities: *Good*

Quality of learning and skills and work activities, including the quality of teaching, training, learning and assessment: *Good*

Personal development and behaviour: *Good*

Effectiveness of leadership and management of learning and skills and work activities: *Good*

Management of education and learning and skills

3.8 Partnerships across the prison were strong and effective. The prison and the education provider Novus (part of The Manchester College) worked closely and very productively to develop education and skills. Their response to the recently raised expectation for boys to follow programmes extending to 30 hours a week had been very carefully planned. It effectively provided a broad, well-balanced curriculum which included significant contributions from across the establishment. Youth work carried out by Kinetic was integrated well with the programmes. Coordination with the library and the PE department was effective. The education and vocational training provided by Novus was good.

3.9 Staff numbers had been increased to support the recent curriculum changes. The development of staff and management of their performance had helped to maintain good standards of teaching and learning during a period of expansion since the previous inspection. As a result of good staffing levels and careful deployment, class cancellations were very rare.

3.10 The focus on inclusion across the prison was very effective. A very good strategy catered well for the high numbers of boys with special educational needs (SEN). Dedicated engagement and resettlement staff made good and timely use of links with schools that boys had attended previously and with caseworkers at the prison, ensuring their needs were

established early in their custody. A weekly register of boys with SEN made staff across the prison aware of the needs of individuals and strategies to support and manage them. The promotion of equality and diversity was effective across the provision.

- 3.11** The impact of interruptions to boys' learning caused by scheduled appointments and lapses in behaviour was effectively minimised. Appointments, such as social visits, were carefully planned in line with external requirements and restricted to specific times. Well-established measures enabled boys to reflect on and improve their behaviour successfully so they could return to classes.
- 3.12** Self-assessment of education and skills gave a thorough, evaluative and largely accurate view of the Novus provision and included the views of boys and staff. Plans to improve the provision were appropriate. However, aspects of self-assessment reporting were still at an early stage and did not yet include all other areas of activity across the establishment.

Recommendation

- 3.13 Self-assessment should provide a comprehensive evaluation of all aspects of education and skills.**

Provision of activities

- 3.14** Provision was planned well to attract and engage boys and meet their broad educational needs. A good range of carefully structured educational, pre-vocational and work experience programmes known as pathways were available spanning entry level 1 to level 2.
- 3.15** All pathways included a common core of mathematics and English, together with regular PE and sessions to develop boys' personal and work skills. There were enough places to meet the needs of all boys and offer them a choice.
- 3.16** Outreach work in the residential units provided a very effective short-term alternative for boys unable to participate fully in education and skills. However, it was not always possible to meet demand in full.
- 3.17** Multidisciplinary teams from across the prison worked very effectively to allocate boys to education and skills. Staff knew the boys well and used their knowledge to make appropriate decisions. Reviews of each boy receiving outreach were regular and thorough and ensured that boys joined or returned to pathway provision in a timely manner. When boys needed to change course, interventions were swift, with a strong focus on their safety and the safety of others.
- 3.18** Work experience pathways acted as a useful stepping stone for small numbers of boys to join education or vocational training. However, arrangements to accredit the skills they acquired and to provide core subjects were not yet complete.
- 3.19** The volume of stand-alone English and mathematics classes had substantially increased since the last inspection and suitable places were available for most boys. Short units with qualifications were offered for boys whose period at the establishment was brief. However, the development of boys' English and mathematics in vocational areas and other subjects was not good enough.

Recommendations

- 3.20** The work experience pathway should include core subjects and provide accreditation for the skills that boys develop.
- 3.21** The use of mathematics and English in subject and vocational training should be developed more strongly to increase boys' ability to apply these skills.

Quality of provision

- 3.22** Teaching, learning and assessment were good. In education classes, teachers devised imaginative activities which engaged and motivated boys and enabled them to make good progress. They were involved productively in practical tasks, such as measuring objects to provide data for calculations in mathematics classes, or recording their own rap songs as part of music production. On occasions when boys struggled, teachers gave them individual help which enabled them to progress well.
- 3.23** Training and coaching in vocational workshops were good. Teaching was particularly impressive in barista training. Highly skilled, enthusiastic trainers challenged and stretched boys very effectively. They took on management roles and led teams to devise business plans for extending the scope of the training café. Boys relished this opportunity and recognised how it would improve their job prospects.
- 3.24** Additional support for boys was very good. Teachers and learning support practitioners (LSPs) made good use of comprehensive information on the specific education needs of the boys in their classes. Guidance from the SEN manager on how best to help boys in the classroom and vocational settings was very effective. LSPs' support for individuals and groups was good, particularly in entry level classes. Staff used the SEN register very effectively to monitor boys' progress throughout their sentence.
- 3.25** Outreach support was good. LSPs worked well with boys who were not engaged in formal education and training pathways. Each boy had a detailed reintegration plan which mapped his progress in joining formal education and training sessions. Teaching to improve their English and mathematics was well planned and imaginatively structured. It provided boys with stimulating ways to improve their skills.
- 3.26** The management of boys' behaviour was often good. Teachers and LSPs had a good understanding of the complex and sometimes challenging behaviours this group of boys displayed and were skilled at identifying when boys started to become distracted. They employed a good range of effective strategies to minimise potential disruptions to learning and ensure that boys remained engaged. This included sensitive use of a dedicated reflection room where boys spent short periods working individually with an LSP until they were calm enough to return to the classroom. Regular discussion sessions with youth workers helped boys to focus constructively on their behaviour.
- 3.27** Teachers, trainers and LSPs provided clear verbal feedback to boys on the quality of their work during learning sessions to motivate and encourage them. They used records of individual learning to measure achievement during these sessions. However, their marking of written work did not always indicate clearly enough what improvement was needed. Errors in spelling, grammar and punctuation too often went uncorrected.

Recommendation

- 3.28** Education managers and staff should ensure that they give boys sufficiently detailed and accurate feedback so that they know what they need to do to improve their written work.

Personal development and behaviour

- 3.29** Boys showed good levels of respect towards teaching and training staff and to each other. In most sessions they were confident in their approach to learning and often keen to help less able learners. In some vocational areas, a small minority of learners acted effectively as informal mentors, teaching skills such as bricklaying.
- 3.30** Boys were proud of their work and achievements, particularly in vocational and creative areas. Some had achieved relevant additional qualifications which enhanced their potential for employment on release. Those following work experience pathways developed useful work skills and disciplines. On creative arts programmes learners had entered for and won prestigious national awards.
- 3.31** In sessions led by youth workers, boys articulated a mature awareness of personal, social and ethical issues in areas that were relevant to themselves and their lives. For example, members of faith groups acquired insight into potential differences between their personal choices and religious teachings on sexual behaviour.
- 3.32** The information, advice and guidance which boys received was effective. It enabled them over time to make well-informed choices about their next steps in learning or work.
- 3.33** Attendance at learning sessions was sometimes interrupted when boys left for scheduled appointments, or were removed for poor behaviour. Behaviour in a small minority of learning sessions was not good enough. Punctuality was adequate.

Recommendation

- 3.34** Strategies for improvement should be implemented in the few classes and subjects where behaviour is not good.

Education and vocational achievements

- 3.35** The achievement of qualifications was good and had remained at a high level since the previous inspection. The proportion of boys who gained vocational and personal development qualifications was consistently high.
- 3.36** Levels of achievement in progression awards in English and mathematics were high overall. Achievement rates in functional skills English qualifications at level 1 were very high, but low for the small number of boys who took English and mathematics at level 2.
- 3.37** Standards of work in vocational and creative areas were high, and standards across the provision were good overall. Boys made good progress from their starting points within and between levels. There were no significant variations in achievement between different groups of boys.

Library

- 3.38** The library was provided by Staffordshire County Council and run by an experienced library supervisor and her colleague. It offered a welcoming, well-lit environment with comfortable seating and adequate study space.
- 3.39** A good range of up-to-date adult and teenage fiction was chosen well to attract boys' interest. An extensive collection of 'easy readers' and graphic novels catered well for those who struggled with reading. An appropriate collection of books in foreign languages was regularly reviewed to match potential demand. A few daily newspapers and periodicals were on display.
- 3.40** In consultation with teachers, the library stocked books that allowed boys to extend their knowledge further in areas they were studying. It had increased GCSE mathematics texts since the previous inspection, and added new titles to support study for GCSE examinations. Two computers ran a good range of games and applications of general interest such as driving test theory practice. Initiatives such as the Six Book Challenge and a reading group encouraged more boys to read.
- 3.41** Most boys had good access to the library through scheduled weekly visits which formed part of their learning pathways. For the minority who did not follow these programmes, access was restricted because their scheduled Saturday morning visits were too often cancelled.

Recommendation

- 3.42** **Access to the library should not be curtailed by cancellation of Saturday sessions.**

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.

- 3.43** *Physical education facilities and resources remained good, but the outdoor area was still not used enough. Access to PE was good for boys attending pathways but less so for boys who did not attend pathways or were less confident about using the gym facilities. There were effective links with health care.*

- 3.44** The PE facilities and resources were good. They included a large sports hall used for activities such as football and a well-equipped weight training room. It was disappointing that use of an outdoor football pitch was restricted because of poor drainage. Six qualified instructors provided boys with good instruction and support. The high priority they gave to health and fitness included a number of wellbeing days to promote healthy living. They also ensured that boys had restricted access to and used free weights appropriately.
- 3.45** An accredited course in sports science was popular and successful. Short accredited sports awards and fitness programmes had recently been introduced which some boys had already completed.

- 3.46** Participation in North Staffordshire football leagues allowed boys to engage effectively in competitive sport and develop useful personal skills.
- 3.47** Boys following pathways had good access to PE facilities. A high proportion used the gym regularly and participated in a wide range of activities. However, those not attending pathways received only one to two hours' PE a week. This included the small number of boys who were less confident about using the gym, and used the facilities at different times to other users.
- 3.48** Induction to the facilities was comprehensive. Links with health care staff were effective. PE staff gave boys suitable advice and support following referrals to the gym to improve their fitness and health. Staff promoted healthy living appropriately. Plans to offer Duke of Edinburgh awards were well advanced.

Recommendations

- 3.49** The drainage in the outdoor field should be rectified to ensure that full use is made of the facilities.
- 3.50** All boys should have access to a minimum of three hours of PE each week.

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** *Strategic oversight of reducing reoffending work was good and informed by a recent needs analysis. Casework support was an integral part of the reducing reoffending policy and was organised well. Tracking of outcomes for released boys was still in place and providing useful data, but more interrogation of the data was needed. Early release and release on temporary licence were being used appropriately.*
- 4.2** Resettlement work continued to be organised well. The reducing reoffending policy was informed by an up-to-date needs analysis which included boys' views. Casework and transitions were an integral part of the policy. An action plan had been developed from the findings of the needs analysis and progress was monitored at the quarterly reducing reoffending meeting. Attendance at the meeting was generally good and each pathway had an allocated lead and minutes indicated that work took place between meetings.
- 4.3** It was impressive that the establishment followed up boys three months after release and compiled an annual analysis of the results to help shape the provision of services and to use in discussions with community partners. More detailed analysis was needed to identify any links between, for example, a lack of sustainable accommodation or employment and a return to custody. Useful links with community stakeholders such as the East Midlands resettlement consortium were in place. The consortium had recently appointed a youth worker to act as a resettlement mentor for boys at Werrington, which was a promising initiative.
- 4.4** Caseworkers had the main responsibility for identifying risk and resettlement needs and maintaining a focus on preventing reoffending. The casework team consisted of uniformed and non-uniformed staff, each with a manageable caseload of remanded and sentenced boys. Cases were usually allocated according to workload, although there was scope for caseworkers to specialise, for example one was responsible for Welsh boys.
- 4.5** In our survey, 93% of boys said they had a caseworker. A duty caseworker scheme had been introduced since the previous inspection which ensured that a caseworker met new arrivals and visited residential areas each day. Boys were allocated to a permanent caseworker soon after their arrival. Caseworkers were a main point of contact with families and developed good working relationships with community youth offending teams (YOTs) and internal staff including social workers, education, advocates and health care.
- 4.6** Early release arrangements were used appropriately for boys serving a detention and training order (DTO) and 31 boys had achieved early release over the previous six months. Obtaining suitable accommodation could be a problem (see paragraph 4.30). Boys serving a DTO were told about late release provisions during their initial review, but in practice late release was not being used.

- 4.7** Appropriate use was being made of release on temporary licence (ROTL) for work experience, community reparation, college interviews and to visit release accommodation. Twenty-three boys had accounted for 228 ROTL episodes in the previous six months. Boys were told about ROTL at their first review meeting and processes to determine suitability for ROTL had been improved so that decisions were made in time for their eligibility date. Boards to determine suitability for ROTL included representatives from community partners and boys attended the board for interview. The use of ROTL and early release helped to underline the positive behaviour valued at Werrington.

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.

- 4.8** *Planning reviews were timely and well run but too few staff other than caseworkers attended the reviews and reinforcement of work towards boys' targets between reviews needed strengthening. Public protection arrangements were organised well and support for boys with looked-after status was good. Werrington was now holding boys with indeterminate sentences, and the services and support for these boys needed development.*

- 4.9** Training planning and remand management meetings were timely, with good attendance by community YOTs. Many parents attended these meetings. Attendance by other departments was rare and caseworkers were dependent on information provided by other departments or from electronic case notes. In the reviews that we observed, caseworkers gave balanced feedback, highlighting positives as well as areas that had not gone well. Pathways were discussed during the reviews and boys were encouraged to share their views and raise issues. Caseworkers attended some, but not all, initial post-release reviews in the community.
- 4.10** Caseworkers took the lead in managing boys' training or remand management plans. Despite being given a copy of the targets in their plan, only a third of boys in our survey knew they had a plan. Of those, 77% said they understood their targets and 64% said they were involved in the development of their plan against respective comparators of 94% and 87%. Appropriate efforts had been made to improve the quality of targets in remand and sentence plans and many were now couched in terms of 'my target is to...' and 'to achieve this I will ...'. Some appeared very hard for boys to achieve, for example 'my target is to adjust my lifestyle'. Plans still did not name staff members responsible for helping boys to meet targets, but referred to a department in the establishment.
- 4.11** Fewer boys than at the previous inspection said their caseworker had helped to prepare them for release (33% v 49%), and some boys told us they were not able to see their caseworkers as often as they would like. There was no expectation that caseworkers would have one-to-one meetings with boys between reviews, and for a sentenced boy this could mean a three-month gap unless he asked to see his caseworker. Residential staff were not involved in remand and sentence planning reviews and it was difficult to see how the need to work towards targets was being regularly reinforced, and how boys were encouraged and supported to achieve them.

- 4.12** Transition arrangements for boys preparing to move to the young adult estate after their 18th birthday continued to develop well. Moving from a secure training centre to a young offender institution had also been identified as a difficult transition needing support and again the establishment was tackling this issue well. Transition liaison officers had been introduced in June 2015, with each caseworker linked to another secure establishment to build relationships and develop knowledge about the establishment. Transitions were discussed in review meetings, and staff explained the differences boys would find at a young adult prison.

Recommendations

- 4.13** **Caseworkers should undertake planned formal casework meetings with boys outside of reviews.** (Repeated recommendation 4.23)
- 4.14** **Training planning and remand management meetings should include staff who regularly work with boys so that all relevant activity is captured in their remand or training plans and there is consistent reinforcement to help boys achieve their targets. The sharing of targets with relevant staff who do not attend meetings should be improved.**

Housekeeping point

- 4.15** Members of staff responsible for helping boys to achieve their targets should be named in their management plans.

Good practice

- 4.16** *The introduction of transition liaison officers to help improve information and support available to boys moving to and from Werrington was a promising initiative.*

Public protection

- 4.17** Initial public protection procedures were managed well. All new arrivals were screened using available information and community YOTs were contacted to confirm details of MAPPAs (multi-agency public protection arrangements) levels, restraining or harassment orders and whether they posed a risk to children. An electronic database was maintained which was available to all staff. When it was deemed necessary, restrictions were placed on mail, telephone contact and visits. These restrictions were kept under review by the monthly risk management team meeting and removed as boys' circumstances changed and the level of risk was deemed to have reduced sufficiently. Caseworkers explained monitoring restrictions to boys.
- 4.18** MAPPAs arrangements were generally effective, but the establishment was not routinely asking community YOTs for confirmation of MAPPAs management levels before release and we were not confident that all boys who required one had a confirmed MAPPAs level before release. The establishment remedied this process during the inspection. Those who were known to be MAPPAs 2 or 3 were monitored at the monthly risk management team meeting which was reasonably well attended, although minutes showed one meeting with only three attendees. The establishment was rarely represented at external MAPPAs meetings, but appropriate reports were provided.

Recommendation

- 4.19** The management level in **MAPPA** cases should be confirmed six months before the boy's release date, or at the earliest possible date for those serving shorter sentences.

Indeterminate sentence young people

- 4.20** At the previous inspection, there were no boys serving indeterminate sentences. At this inspection there were three, and other boys on remand who were potentially facing an indeterminate sentence. There was enough expertise in the casework team to ensure that indeterminate sentence processes were completed properly. Boys with indeterminate sentences had the same regular review and planning meetings as other boys.
- 4.21** There was no long-term unit at Werrington. The establishment was not set up to support these boys with long-term education programmes and interventions or to help them engage with the implications of their sentence and how they would be managed in the criminal justice system.

Recommendation

- 4.22** Work should be developed to ensure that boys with, or facing, indeterminate sentences have the services and support they need.

Looked-after children

- 4.23** Arrangements to identify boys who were looked after, or had previously been looked after, were good. Two seconded social workers identified and met boys with looked-after status soon after their arrival. They contacted local authority children's services to let them know a child they had responsibility for had been received and to remind them of their obligations to that child. The on-site social workers received good support from their own local authority in escalating cases where the responsible local authority was not proactive in arranging review meetings and supporting looked-after boys.
- 4.24** In our survey, 38% of boys said that they had been in local authority care. During the inspection, 57 boys (53%) had been identified as looked-after children, 27 of them remanded. They included boys subject to full care orders or care leavers, and boys who had been 'accommodated' by their local authority. Several boys continued to fall into more than one category. Looked-after review meetings were taking place, and one meeting that we observed included appropriate discussion of health needs and available financial support as well as plans for the boy's progress. Not all local authorities provided financial support for boys in their care and this was challenged by establishment social workers at review meetings. They requested £10 a week for each boy and were successful in most cases.
- 4.25** A review of boys' medical needs by responsible local authorities varied. Some were happy for the assessment to be carried out by the establishment health care team, and others preferred to commission their own review. Both could be facilitated by the establishment social workers.

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.

4.26 *Reintegration planning was organised well. Provision across the pathways was generally well developed, although obtaining suitable accommodation in good time for release remained problematic, and the lack of interventions for boys with sexually harmful behaviour needed to be remedied.*

4.27 Release plans were discussed during training planning meetings which gave boys the opportunity to ask questions about their release conditions. The conditions were discussed again with the boy on the day of release. The establishment tried to ensure that all boys being released were picked up by a responsible person at the gate but in a few cases this did not happen.

4.28 Practical arrangements for the day of release were reasonably efficient, although one release that we saw was delayed because the boy had to wait to see the nurse. Once the boy had left, a reception officer phoned the boy's YOT to explain why he was unlikely to arrive at their office at the appointed time. Boys were given holdalls for their belongings and clothes if they did not have anything suitable of their own to wear. Boys could have their stored clothing washed ready for release.

Accommodation

4.29 In our survey, only 20% of boys said they knew who to contact for help with finding accommodation. In practice, community YOTs or the responsible local authority took the lead in identifying suitable accommodation. Boys were released with an address, and most went back to their families. Others went to supported or independent living and a few went to a hostel, bed and breakfast, a foster placement or local authority care.

4.30 Records showed that accommodation was discussed from initial remand or training planning meetings and subsequent meetings. Staff continued to pursue community partners rigorously for accommodation but, as at similar establishments, it was often difficult to get an address until close to the release date. This could be a particular problem for boys with looked-after status and we were told of a case where a boy and his YOT worker had to wait at Werrington until after lunch on the day of his release for his local authority to provide an address. The establishment's social workers and independent advocates from Barnardo's provided good support to escalate the needs of boys without suitable accommodation.

4.31 Boys released during 2014 were followed up by the establishment and 81% were in their release accommodation three months later. More use needed to be made of these data to identify why accommodation was not sustainable and to inform future provision.

Recommendation

4.32 All boys should be provided with a suitable address in good time for their release.

Education, training and employment

- 4.33** The quality of the careers advice and guidance provided by Novus was good. Its engagement and resettlement team worked effectively with boys throughout their sentence. Boys were interviewed when they arrived at the establishment and their needs clearly identified. Action plans drawn up at these interviews were used well to allocate boys to education and skills.
- 4.34** The Novus team worked productively with internal and community partners. They frequently reviewed boys' progress towards targets in their action plans and kept caseworkers informed. Information on boys' achievements and progress was transferred efficiently between Werrington and other establishments.
- 4.35** The structures and processes for ROTL had improved and good contacts had been made with national employers and training providers. This had led to good support for boys to take up training on release.
- 4.36** The range of vocation related programmes to provide boys with employability skills had improved. A good range of pre-release programmes included writing a CV and preparing for job interviews. The virtual campus¹⁰ was not available for boys to use when searching for jobs.

Recommendation

- 4.37** **The establishment should ensure that all boys are able to use the virtual campus to research employment opportunities.**

Health care

- 4.38** Boys were seen a day or two before release or transfer to identify any outstanding health needs and offer health promotion advice. They were helped to register with a GP if required and discharge letters were routinely sent to the boy's GP with details of current medication and immunisation history. The local YOT nurse occasionally attended to ensure effective through-the-gate care, which was commendable. Links with community services were good. The child and adolescent mental health service arranged appropriate community follow up for boys with mental health issues.

Drugs and alcohol

- 4.39** The young people's drug and alcohol support service team had an impressive array of joint working protocols with other agencies and departments which aimed to reduce reoffending, vulnerability and risk of harm following release.
- 4.40** The care and transition pathway facilitated successful community reintegration of boys following their release. The team had good links with community YOTs and other community services. Release plans were in place and boys were given a copy of their care plan and their multi-agency resettlement plan before their release, along with harm reduction information. The team worked with families towards successful outcomes for boys returning to their community, which was commendable.

¹⁰ Internet access for prisoners to community education, training and employment opportunities.

Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.41** Provision for finance, benefit and debt needed further development. In our survey, only a quarter of boys knew who to go to for advice about money and finances. Financial awareness was covered during an independent living skills course offered by the education provider. Kinetic Youth Service offered a money management tool kit, but there was no opportunity for boys to open a bank account.
- 4.42** Boys told us that gambling and the debt that could be accrued were prevalent. The reducing reoffending needs analysis had identified gambling as an area that required attention and this had been included in the associated action plan. These actions needed to be implemented swiftly to educate boys about the risks of gambling and provide support to those who were involved.

Recommendations

- 4.43** **Boys should be able to open a bank account while at Werrington.**
- 4.44** **Work to address gambling should be developed.**

Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.45** Despite the absence of Story Book Dads¹¹ and a parenting course, the children and families pathway was good. The building bridges course to improve relationships between boys and their families was run by PACT (Prison Advice and Care Trust). Monthly family days were open to boys on the standard and enhanced levels of the rewards and sanctions scheme. A family support worker from PACT continued to work with troubled families from the local area. The recently implemented induction visit was an excellent initiative. The families of new arrivals were offered the opportunity to meet a range of departments (including the interventions team and caseworkers) who would work with the boy at Werrington and they were then given a tour of the establishment. The mother of one boy told us that it had put her mind at ease about the care her son was receiving and that it had improved contact and broken down barriers with the establishment. Contact with parents and carers by caseworkers was good.
- 4.46** A review of visits provision had been undertaken in response to visitor feedback and some improvements had been made, particularly to the small visitors' centre which had been painted, new seating installed and was now a more welcoming environment. Social visits took place on six afternoons a week in the small but adequate visits hall. In our survey, 46% of boys said they could have one or more visits from family each week against the comparator of 31%. Visitors were positive about the visits experience and said there were no delays in booking a visit, entering the prison or in visits sessions starting promptly. However, some said it was difficult to park at the prison as the visitors' car park was often full and we found this to be the case.

Recommendation

- 4.47** **Story Book Dads and a parenting course should be reinstated.**

¹¹ Project for prisoners to record stories for their children.

Good practice

- 4.48** *Induction visits were arranged for families of new arrivals to meet a range of departments who would work with the boy and to be given a tour of the establishment.*

Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.49** A range of non-accredited interventions including victim awareness and emotional control had been delivered in the previous 12 months. These had ceased with the imminent introduction of a range of interventions accredited for use across the young people's estate, including 'starving the anger gremlin' and motivational one-to-one work. Community YOTs continued to provide work on prevention strategies. There were no interventions for boys to address sexually harmful behaviour, despite there being a number of boys who may have benefitted from this. Restorative justice was delivered through the Sycamore tree course and restorative justice conferences were facilitated by community agencies. Barnardo's continued to provide advice and support to boys.

Recommendation

- 4.50** **There should be interventions in place to help boys to address sexually harmful behaviour.**

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.

Main recommendation To the Youth Justice Board and NOMS

- 5.1** There should be a national transfer pathway for boys who need admission to an establishment with inpatient facilities. (S52)

Main recommendations To the governor

- 5.2** The establishment should review the behaviour management policy and its application to ensure that low-level poor behaviour is consistently challenged and good behaviour is rewarded appropriately. (S49)
- 5.3** Boys should collectively and individually have a voice in areas of interest to them and areas of importance to the establishment, particularly safety, bullying and violence, and diversity. (S50)
- 5.4** The equality agenda should be given a high priority throughout the establishment and should be sufficiently resourced to improve outcomes for boys with a protected characteristic. Inequality identified through monitoring data should be investigated and addressed. (S51)

Recommendation To NOMS

- 5.5** The escort contract should be reviewed to ensure that children arrive at the establishment in good time to be assessed and settled on their first night. (1.4)

Recommendations To the governor

Courts, escort and transfers

- 5.6** The establishment should make use of the on-site video link facilities. (1.5)

Early days in custody

- 5.7** Where concerns are identified in the risk assessment management documentation, relevant action points should be allocated to a member of staff and followed up. (1.11)
- 5.8** The first night unit should not be used to hold boys who are difficult to manage. (1.12)
- 5.9** All boys should receive a full induction. (1.13)

Care and protection of children and young people

- 5.10** More focus should be given to the analysis of bullying statistics so that the scale of bullying can be measured and appropriate action taken to protect victims and manage perpetrators appropriately. (1.20)
- 5.11** Safeguarding should be embedded in the work of residential officers. (1.21)
- 5.12** All staff should undertake child protection training. (1.25)
- 5.13** All boys who self isolate should be given the opportunity to discuss their circumstances with someone they trust and to access a full regime safely. (1.33)
- 5.14** The quality of ACCT documentation should be consistent and regular management checks should be carried out. (1.39)
- 5.15** Care maps should be detailed with time-bound actions. (1.40)

Behaviour management

- 5.16** Short-term incentive plans should be implemented for boys who spend longer than two weeks on the basic regime. (1.49)
- 5.17** Adjudicators should attend regular meetings to monitor the application of the adjudication and minor report systems. (1.63)
- 5.18** Pain-inducing techniques should not be used on boys. (1.78)
- 5.19** All incidents involving use of force should be recorded, including audio. (1.79)
- 5.20** There should be restraint handling plans in place for all boys with a medical condition that may be adversely affected by restraint. All staff should be aware of their contents and use the information during incidents. (1.80)
- 5.21** The regime in the care and separation unit should be improved to include an hour in the open air and daily access to education for all boys. (1.90)
- 5.22** All segregation unit staff should receive mental health training. (1.91)
- 5.23** Boys on an open ACCT should only be segregated in exceptional circumstances which are well documented. (1.92)
- 5.24** All instances of boys being separated for short periods on normal location should be recorded. (1.93)

Residential units

- 5.25** Cells designed for one should not accommodate two people. (2.10)
- 5.26** Children should not be locked together in showers. (2.11)
- 5.27** Cell call bells should be answered promptly. (2.12)

Relationships between staff and children and young people

- 5.28** Each boy should have a designated officer on their residential unit who is their central point of contact and support and takes responsibility for their day-to-day care and wellbeing through frequent contact and by attending relevant meetings relating to their care. (2.17)
- 5.29** Staff relationships with boys should be properly supervised to ensure that staff interact in a respectful way and that poor behaviour by boys is challenged. (2.18)

Equality and diversity

- 5.30** The quality of investigations into discrimination incident reports should be improved and should include effective quality assurance. (2.23)
- 5.31** There should be consultations with black and minority ethnic and Muslim boys to understand their negative perceptions and address any concerns raised. (2.29)

Health services

- 5.32** Responses to complaints should be written in an age-appropriate manner and should explain what to do if dissatisfied; data on trends in complaints should be made available to the health service manager. (2.52)
- 5.33** Boys should have timely access to specialist clinics with low waiting times and few missed appointments. (2.58)
- 5.34** The partnership board should receive data on did-not-attend rates, delayed attendance at appointments and cancelled external escorts to inform and manage improvements. (2.59)

Catering

- 5.35** Staff should investigate why so many boys will not collect their meals from the servery. All boys should be encouraged to collect their meals and staff should ensure they can do so safely. (2.81)
- 5.36** All meals should be served at the advertised times. (2.82)
- 5.37** The serving of food should be adequately supervised to ensure that appropriate hygiene requirements are met. (2.83)

Time out of cell

- 5.38** Boys should have access to 10 hours out of cell each day. (3.5)

Education, learning and skills

- 5.39** Self-assessment should provide a comprehensive evaluation of all aspects of education and skills. (3.13)
- 5.40** The work experience pathway should include core subjects and provide accreditation for the skills that boys develop. (3.20)

- 5.41** The use of mathematics and English in subject and vocational training should be developed more strongly to increase boys' ability to apply these skills. (3.21)
- 5.42** Education managers and staff should ensure that they give boys sufficiently detailed and accurate feedback so that they know what they need to do to improve their written work. (3.28)
- 5.43** Strategies for improvement should be implemented in the few classes and subjects where behaviour is not good. (3.34)
- 5.44** Access to the library should not be curtailed by cancellation of Saturday sessions. (3.42)

Physical education and healthy living

- 5.45** The drainage in the outdoor field should be rectified to ensure that full use is made of the facilities. (3.49)
- 5.46** All boys should have access to a minimum of three hours of PE each week. (3.50)

Training planning and remand management

- 5.47** Caseworkers should undertake planned formal casework meetings with boys outside of reviews. (4.13)
- 5.48** Training planning and remand management meetings should include staff who regularly work with boys so that all relevant activity is captured in their remand or training plans and there is consistent reinforcement to help boys achieve their targets. The sharing of targets with relevant staff who do not attend meetings should be improved. (4.14)
- 5.49** The management level in MAPPA cases should be confirmed six months before the boy's release date, or at the earliest possible date for those serving shorter sentences. (4.19)
- 5.50** Work should be developed to ensure that boys with, or facing, indeterminate sentences have the services and support they need. (4.22)

Reintegration planning

- 5.51** All boys should be provided with a suitable address in good time for their release. (4.32)
- 5.52** The establishment should ensure that all boys are able to use the virtual campus to research employment opportunities. (4.37)
- 5.53** Boys should be able to open a bank account while at Werrington. (4.43)
- 5.54** Work to address gambling should be developed. (4.44)
- 5.55** Story Book Dads and a parenting course should be reinstated. (4.47)
- 5.56** There should be interventions in place to help boys to address sexually harmful behaviour. (4.50)

Housekeeping points

Behaviour management

5.57 The security team should track all actions to ensure they take place in a timely fashion. (1.64)

Residential units

5.58 The application system should record when responses are received. (2.13)

Equality and diversity

5.59 Boys with a protected characteristic should be identified on arrival. (2.30)

5.60 Personal emergency evacuation plans should be meaningful and all staff should be aware of boys with a plan in place. (2.31)

Health services

5.61 Health care should engage the service users in meaningful discussions to inform service improvement and use the data to analyse trends. (2.53)

5.62 Recruitment to the vacant CAMHS team posts should be completed as soon as possible. (2.72)

Training planning and remand management

5.63 Members of staff responsible for helping boys to achieve their targets should be named in their management plans. (4.15)

Examples of good practice

5.64 Respondents to complaints met boys to explain the response and discuss any outstanding issues. (2.38)

5.65 In-possession medication risk assessments were completed each time medicines were re-prescribed. This was the best way to ensure the continuing safety of boys with drugs in possession. (2.64)

5.66 The introduction of transition liaison officers to help improve information and support available to boys moving to and from Werrington was a promising initiative. (4.16)

5.67 Induction visits were arranged for families of new arrivals to meet a range of departments who would work with the boy and to be given a tour of the establishment. (4.48)

Section 6. Appendices

Appendix I: Inspection team

Deborah Butler	Team leader
Alison Perry	Team leader/critical friend
Karen Dillon	Inspector
Angela Johnson	Inspector
Andy Lund	Inspector
Angus Mulready-Jones	Inspector
Tim McSweeney	Researcher
Joe Simmonds	Researcher
Heidi Webb	Researcher
Paul Tarbuck	Health services inspector
Kathleen Byrne	Care Quality Commission inspector
Alistair Pearson	Ofsted inspector
Bob Cowdrey	Ofsted inspector

Appendix II: Photograph

Display of excessive canteen in a cell.



Appendix III: Progress on recommendations from the last report

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

Safety

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

At the last inspection in 2014, boys were treated well during their early days at the establishment. Significant improvements had been made to the first night accommodation. Safeguarding and child protection arrangements worked well and vulnerable children were identified and adequately cared for. The number of fights and assaults remained high and a large proportion of boys reported feeling unsafe. Despite this, the number of serious injuries sustained was small. The level of self-harm incidents had reduced. Use of force and separation were used proportionately. The rewards and sanctions scheme was not used effectively and there was a heavy reliance on formal disciplinary procedures. Support for boys with substance misuse problems was comprehensive and of a good standard. Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendation

Boys should have a regular opportunity to discuss with staff they trust their perceptions of safety and how they think safety could be improved. (S62)

Not achieved

Recommendations

The establishment should make use of the on-site video link facilities. (1.4)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 1.5)

Vans should be clean and properly equipped. (1.5)

Partially achieved

All relevant information about a boy should be available to the establishment before, or at the point of, his arrival. (1.6)

Not achieved

Where concerns are identified in the risk assessment management documentation, relevant action points should be developed, allocated to a member of staff and followed up. (1.12)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 1.11)

Safeguarding should be embedded in the work of residential officers. (1.21)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 1.21)

The quality of ACCT documentation should be consistently good. (1.37)

Not achieved

While boys are subject to ACCT procedures, they should have a consistent personal officer or caseworker working alongside them. These key figures should help boys prepare for ACCT reviews and should form an integral part of the care plan. (1.38)

Achieved

All rewards and sanctions scheme reviews should be fully documented and should take account of all the boy's circumstances. Clear individual targets should be set to help boys improve their behaviour. (1.47)

Not achieved

Staff from all departments should attend the security committee meeting to enable the development of appropriate strategic objectives. (1.59)

Achieved

Closed visits should only be used following illicit behaviour related to visits.(1.60)

Achieved

Pain infliction should not be applied to boys. (1.79)

Not achieved

All segregation unit staff should receive mental health training. (1.88)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 1.92)

The establishment should ensure that substance-related intelligence is acted on promptly. (1.96)

Achieved

Respect

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

At the last inspection in 2014, living conditions had improved and cells were now in reasonable condition. Relationships between staff and boys were consistently good, although the personal officer scheme was not operating well. Boys' spiritual needs were well catered for but work on diversity was weak and a more strategic approach and better consultation were required. The complaints system worked efficiently and young people received the support they required in relation to legal rights. Health care services were good. The food was unpopular with the boys but we found it to be adequate. Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendation

The review of equality work should be sufficiently resourced to achieve improved outcomes for children. Support groups should be established for boys who belong to minority groups. (S63)

Not achieved

Recommendations

Cells designed for one should not accommodate two people. (2.10)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 2.10)

Children should not be locked together in showers. (2.11)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 2.11)

Wings and exercise yards should be decorated and equipped to reflect the needs of the population.

(2.12)

Achieved

Cell call bells should be answered promptly. (2.13)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 2.12)

Each boy should have a designated officer on their residential unit who is their central point of contact and support and takes responsibility for their day-to-day care and wellbeing through frequent contact and by attending relevant meetings relating to their care. (2.18)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 2.17)

Specific child-focused skills and knowledge training, including mental health, should be available to nursing staff. (2.59)

Partially achieved

All prison staff should have up-to-date basic life support skills, including use of automated defibrillators. (2.60)

Partially achieved

All health staff should receive regular documented clinical supervision. (2.61)

Achieved

An appropriate range of establishment specific policies and procedures should be ratified by a well attended medicines and therapeutics committee which meets regularly. (2.70)

Achieved

Mental health awareness training, including learning disability, for prison staff should be prioritised to ensure they can support and manage children effectively. (2.77)

Partially achieved

Boys should have access to speech and language therapy on site. (2.78)

Partially achieved

There should be a national transfer pathway for boys who need admission to a prison establishment with inpatient facilities. (2.79)

Not achieved

Boys should not be denied the opportunity to eat together as a sanction. (2.86)

Achieved

All boys employed in the preparation and service of food should be appropriately qualified to do so. (2.87)

Achieved

Goods ordered from the canteen list should be delivered when they arrive. (2.92)

Achieved

There should be interim arrangements for boys arriving later in the week to purchase some goods. (2.93)

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 2014, young people received a similar amount of time unlocked as at the previous inspection, and this still fell short of our expectations. Time in the fresh air had increased but was still poor. Classes were no longer cancelled and punctuality was good. The quality of teaching was significantly better and the level of achievement had increased dramatically and was now very high. The range of classroom and vocational provision was now wider. Access to both the library and the gym were good. Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

Recommendations

All boys should receive 10 hours out of cell each day. (3.6)

Not achieved

Boys should have at least one hour outside each day. (3.7)

Achieved

The procedure for observing lessons should be improved further so that observers record and make use of all the available evidence when assessing teachers' performance and the quality of learning.

(3.13)

Achieved

More and better use should be made of learning technology in sessions to engage learners more fully.

(3.24)

Partially achieved

The virtual campus should be used to enhance job search opportunities for boys. (3.25)

Not achieved

The use of mathematics and English in vocational training should be promoted more strongly. (3.26)

Not achieved

The number and range of books for GCSE studies should be increased. (3.32)

Achieved

The outdoor field should be used more effectively to promote the health and fitness of boys. (3.39)

Not achieved

The showering facilities in the gym should be adequate for the population. (3.40)

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 2014, the resettlement committee operated effectively and the planning arrangements for all children continued to function efficiently. The resettlement policy required some improvements. Release on temporary licence was promoted well. Work relating to public protection and looked-after children remained good. Obtaining suitable accommodation on release was difficult but we found clear evidence of prison staff adopting an assertive approach in pursuing this. Provision under the other resettlement pathways was good, particularly work carried out by the family engagement coordinator. The follow-up work on boys' progress post release was very promising. Outcomes for children and young people were good against this healthy prison test.

Recommendations

The reducing reoffending policy should describe how the establishment should meet the identified needs of specific groups of boys. (4.10)

Partially achieved

Targets in training/remand plans should be based on identified need and should describe what they aim to achieve. (4.21)

Partially achieved

Caseworkers should attend all post-release reviews in the community. (4.22)

Partially achieved

Caseworkers should undertake planned formal casework meetings with boys outside of reviews. (4.23)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 4.14)

Information obtained from the analysis of accommodation provision and re-offending rates should be used to improve service provision. (4.42)

Not achieved

Conditions in the visitors' centre should be improved so that it provides a welcoming environment. (4.58)

Achieved

A visitors' support group should be set up. (4.59)

Not achieved

Appendix IV: 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	77	71
Recall	6	6
Convicted unsentenced	0	
Remand	25	25
Detainees	0	
Total	108	100

Age	Number of young people	%
15 years	5	5
16 years	31	29
17 years	61	56
18 years	11	10
Total	108	100

Nationality	Number of young people	%
British	98	90
Foreign nationals	10	10
Total	108	100

Ethnicity	Number of young people	%
White		
British	49	45
Irish		
Gypsy/Irish Traveller	2	1.5
Other white	3	3
Mixed		
White and black Caribbean	11	10
White and black African		
White and Asian		
Other mixed	1	1
Asian or Asian British		
Indian	3	3
Pakistani	11	10
Bangladeshi	1	1
Chinese		
Other Asian	3	3
Black or black British		
Caribbean	12	11
African	4	4
Other black	5	4.5
Other ethnic group		
Arab		

Other ethnic group	3	3
Not stated		
Total	108	100

Religion	Number of young people	%
Baptist		
Church of England	5	5
Roman Catholic	9	8
Other Christian denominations	20	19
Muslim	35	32
Sikh		
Hindu		
Buddhist		
Jewish		
Other	4	4
No religion	35	32
Total	108	100

Other demographics	Number of young people	%
Gypsy/Romany/Traveller	2	1.8
Total	2	1.8

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
Age								
15 years	1	1	1					3
16 years	6	5	7	5	1			24
17 years	9	13	11	13				46
18 years		3	5	2				10
Total	16	22	24	20	1			83

Unsentenced 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
Age								
15 years	1	1						2
16 years	2	2	3					7
17 years	4	4	5	1				14
18 years	1	1						2
Total	8	8	8	1				25

Main offence	Number of young people	%
Violence against the person	30	28
Sexual offences	11	10
Burglary	15	14
Robbery	24	22
Theft and handling	3	3
Fraud and forgery		
Drugs offences	9	8
Other offences	16	15
Offence not recorded / holding warrant		
Total	108	100

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	2	2	1	2	12
17 years	2	4	1	1	4	8	6	4	30
18 years			1		5	1	1		8
Total	5	4	3	3	13	11	8	6	53

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		3	1		5	1	10
17 years	1	4	6		3		14
18 years			1				1
Total	1	7	8		8	1	25

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					2		2
18 years							
Total					2		2

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

Sentence	Under 2 yrs	2–3 yrs	3–4 yrs	4–5 yrs	5 yrs +	Recall	Total
Age							
15 years							
16 years							
17 years							
18 years							
Total							0

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	20 yrs +	Total
Age							
15 years							
16 years			1		1		2
17 years							
18 years					1		1
Total			1		2		3

Appendix V: Summary of children and young people questionnaires and interviews

Children and young people survey methodology

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 12 October 2015 the young person population at HMYOI Werrington was 108. Questionnaires were distributed to all 107 young people.¹²

We received a total of 79 completed questionnaires, a response rate of 74%. This included two questionnaires completed via interview. 25 questionnaires were not returned and three were returned blank.

Wing/unit	Number of completed survey returns
A	27
B	29
C	18
Care and separation unit	5

¹² A survey was not distributed to one young person who was at court on the day of the survey.

Presentation of survey results and analyses

Over the following pages we present the survey results for HMYOI Werrington.

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 significant¹³ 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 current survey responses from HMYOI Werrington in 2015 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 five YOIs since April 2014.
- The current survey responses from HMYOI Werrington in 2015 compared with the responses of young people surveyed at HMYOI Werrington in 2014.
- A comparison within the 2015 survey between the responses of white young people and those from a black and minority ethnic group.
- A comparison within the 2015 survey between the responses of Muslim young people and non-Muslim young people.
- A comparison within the 2015 survey between the responses of young people who consider themselves to have a disability and those who do not consider themselves to have a disability.
- A comparison within the 2015 survey between responses of young people who have been in local authority care and those who have not been in local authority care.

¹³ 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

Q1	How old are you?	
	15	1 (1%)
	16	21 (27%)
	17	47 (59%)
	18	10 (13%)
Q2	Are you a British citizen?	
	Yes	75 (97%)
	No	2 (3%)
Q3	Do you understand spoken English?	
	Yes	76 (100%)
	No	0 (0%)
Q4	Do you understand written English?	
	Yes	77 (100%)
	No	0 (0%)
Q5	What is your ethnic origin?	
	White - British	38 (48%)
	White - Irish	2 (3%)
	White - Other	1 (1%)
	Black or Black British - Caribbean	11 (14%)
	Black or Black British - African	3 (4%)
	Black or Black British - Other	0 (0%)
	Asian or Asian British - Indian	0 (0%)
	Asian or Asian British - Pakistani	12 (15%)
	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	7 (9%)
	Mixed race - White and Black African	2 (3%)
	Mixed race - White and Asian	1 (1%)
	Mixed race - Other	0 (0%)
	Arab	0 (0%)
Q6	What is your religion?	
	None	23 (30%)
	Church of England	16 (21%)
	Catholic	11 (14%)
	Protestant	0 (0%)
	Other Christian denomination	2 (3%)
	Buddhist	0 (0%)
	Hindu	0 (0%)
	Jewish	0 (0%)
	Muslim	25 (32%)
	Sikh	0 (0%)

Q7	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	
	Yes	7 (9%)
	No.....	65 (88%)
	Don't know	2 (3%)
Q8	Do you have any children?	
	Yes	10 (13%)
	No.....	68 (87%)
Q9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability (i.e. do you need help with any long-term physical, mental or learning needs)?	
	Yes.....	16 (21%)
	No.....	60 (79%)
Q10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	
	Yes	30 (38%)
	No.....	48 (62%)

SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE

Q1	Are you sentenced?	
	Yes	60 (79%)
	No - unsentenced/on remand	16 (21%)
Q2	How long is your sentence (the full DTO sentence)?	
	Not sentenced	16 (21%)
	Less than 6 months.....	12 (16%)
	6 to 12 months.....	14 (19%)
	More than 12 months, up to 2 years.....	15 (20%)
	More than 2 years.....	16 (21%)
	Indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP).....	2 (3%)
Q3	How long have you been in this establishment?	
	Less than 1 month.....	16 (20%)
	1 to 6 months	40 (51%)
	More than 6 months, but less than 12 months.....	19 (24%)
	12 months to 2 years.....	3 (4%)
	More than 2 years.....	1 (1%)
Q4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	
	Yes	44 (57%)
	No.....	33 (43%)

SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS

Q1	On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?	
	Yes	58 (74%)
	No.....	10 (13%)
	Don't remember	10 (13%)
Q2	On your most recent journey here, were there any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females travelling with you?	
	Yes	22 (29%)
	No.....	47 (61%)
	Don't remember	8 (10%)

Q3	On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	45 (58%)
	<i>2 to 4 hours</i>	23 (30%)
	<i>More than 4 hours</i>	5 (6%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	4 (5%)
Q4	On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?	
	<i>My journey was less than 2 hours</i>	45 (58%)
	<i>Yes</i>	3 (4%)
	<i>No</i>	27 (35%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	3 (4%)
Q5	On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?	
	<i>My journey was less than 2 hours</i>	45 (58%)
	<i>Yes</i>	14 (18%)
	<i>No</i>	17 (22%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	1 (1%)
Q6	On your most recent journey here, how did you feel you were treated by the escort staff?	
	<i>Very well</i>	11 (14%)
	<i>Well</i>	32 (42%)
	<i>Neither</i>	18 (23%)
	<i>Badly</i>	6 (8%)
	<i>Very badly</i>	6 (8%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	4 (5%)
Q7	Before you arrived here, did you receive any information to help you prepare for coming here?	
	<i>Yes - and it was helpful</i>	8 (11%)
	<i>Yes - but it was not helpful</i>	8 (11%)
	<i>No - I received no information</i>	51 (68%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	8 (11%)

SECTION 4: FIRST DAYS

Q1	How long were you in reception?	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	56 (73%)
	<i>2 hours or longer</i>	15 (19%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	6 (8%)
Q2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	
	<i>Yes</i>	64 (85%)
	<i>No</i>	4 (5%)
	<i>Don't remember/Not applicable</i>	7 (9%)
Q3	How well did you feel you were treated in reception?	
	<i>Very well</i>	27 (35%)
	<i>Well</i>	39 (51%)
	<i>Neither</i>	6 (8%)
	<i>Badly</i>	3 (4%)
	<i>Very badly</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	1 (1%)

- Q4 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.)**
- | | | | |
|-------------------------------|----------|---|----------|
| Not being able to smoke | 30 (41%) | Money worries..... | 12 (16%) |
| Loss of property | 12 (16%) | Feeling worried/upset/need someone to talk to | 23 (31%) |
| Feeling scared..... | 23 (31%) | Health problems | 39 (53%) |
| Gang problems..... | 31 (42%) | Getting phone numbers | 24 (32%) |
| Contacting family | 34 (46%) | Staff did not ask me about any of these | 15 (20%) |
- 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 | 29 (43%) | Money worries..... | 8 (12%) |
| Loss of property | 5 (7%) | Feeling worried/upset/need someone to talk to | 13 (19%) |
| Feeling scared..... | 14 (21%) | Health problems | 9 (13%) |
| Gang problems..... | 16 (24%) | Getting phone numbers | 17 (25%) |
| Contacting family | 22 (32%) | I did not have any problems..... | 15 (22%) |
- Q6 When you first arrived here, were you given any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**
- | | |
|--|----------|
| Toiletries/basic items | 66 (87%) |
| The opportunity to have a shower | 57 (75%) |
| Something to eat..... | 62 (82%) |
| A free phone call to friends/family..... | 53 (70%) |
| PIN phone credit..... | 42 (55%) |
| Information about feeling worried/upset..... | 26 (34%) |
| Don't remember | 3 (4%) |
| I was not given any of these | 3 (4%) |
- 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..... | 26 (35%) |
| Peer mentor..... | 8 (11%) |
| Childline/Samaritans..... | 11 (15%) |
| The prison shop/canteen..... | 7 (9%) |
| Don't remember | 18 (24%) |
| I did not have access to any of these | 30 (40%) |
- Q8 Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?**
- | | |
|----------------------|----------|
| Yes | 62 (81%) |
| No..... | 12 (16%) |
| Don't remember | 3 (4%) |
- Q9 Did you feel safe on your first night here?**
- | | |
|----------------------|----------|
| Yes | 58 (76%) |
| No..... | 14 (18%) |
| Don't remember | 4 (5%) |
- Q10 Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the establishment?**
- | | |
|--|----------|
| I have not been on an induction course | 7 (9%) |
| Yes | 26 (35%) |
| No..... | 29 (39%) |
| Don't remember | 13 (17%) |

SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT

Q1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	
	Yes	54 (68%)
	No	24 (30%)
	Don't know	1 (1%)
Q2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	
	Yes	17 (22%)
	No.....	55 (71%)
	Don't know	5 (6%)
Q3	What is the food like here?	
	Very good.....	0 (0%)
	Good.....	16 (21%)
	Neither	28 (36%)
	Bad	20 (26%)
	Very bad.....	13 (17%)
Q4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	
	<i>I have not bought anything yet/Don't know</i>	3 (4%)
	Yes	47 (61%)
	No.....	27 (35%)
Q5	How easy is it for you to attend religious services?	
	<i>I don't want to attend religious services</i>	9 (11%)
	Very easy.....	21 (27%)
	Easy.....	21 (27%)
	Neither	9 (11%)
	Difficult.....	6 (8%)
	Very difficult.....	3 (4%)
	Don't know	10 (13%)
Q6	Are you religious beliefs respected?	
	Yes	45 (58%)
	No.....	14 (18%)
	Don't know/Not applicable.....	19 (24%)
Q7	Can you speak to a Chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?	
	Yes.....	49 (62%)
	No.....	4 (5%)
	Don't know/Not applicable.....	26 (33%)
Q8	Can you speak to a peer mentor when you need to?	
	Yes	25 (32%)
	No.....	20 (25%)
	Don't know	34 (43%)
Q9	Can you speak to a member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board) when you need to?	
	Yes	22 (28%)
	No	20 (25%)
	Don't know	37 (47%)

Q10	Can you speak to an advocate (an outside person to help you) when you need to?	
	Yes	30 (38%)
	No.....	14 (18%)
	Don't know	34 (44%)

SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF

Q1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	
	Yes	48 (67%)
	No.....	24 (33%)

Q2	If you had a problem, who would you turn to? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	No-one	16 (22%)
	Personal officer	20 (27%)
	Wing Officer	17 (23%)
	Teacher/education staff	9 (12%)
	Gym staff	3 (4%)
	Chaplain.....	9 (12%)
	Independent Monitoring Board (IMB)	2 (3%)
	YOT worker	16 (22%)
	Social worker.....	19 (26%)
	Health services staff.....	2 (3%)
	Peer mentor.....	2 (3%)
	Another young person here	10 (14%)
	Case worker	24 (33%)
	Advocate	5 (7%)
	Family/friends	39 (53%)
	Childline/Samaritans.....	6 (8%)

Q3	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	
	Yes	30 (41%)
	No.....	44 (59%)

Q4	When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?	
	I still have not met him/her	18 (25%)
	In your first week	12 (16%)
	After your first week	28 (38%)
	Don't remember	15 (21%)

Q5	How often do you see your personal (named) officer?	
	I still have not met him/her	18 (26%)
	At least once a week	31 (44%)
	Less than once a week.....	21 (30%)

Q6	Do you feel your personal (named) officer tries to help you?	
	I still have not met him/her	18 (25%)
	Yes	39 (53%)
	No.....	16 (22%)

SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS

Q1	Is it easy to make an application?	
	Yes	38 (51%)
	No.....	17 (23%)
	Don't know	19 (26%)

Q2	Are applications sorted out fairly?	
	I have not made an application	20 (28%)
	Yes	24 (33%)
	No.....	28 (39%)

Q3	Are applications sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	
	<i>I have not made an application</i>	20 (27%)
	Yes	16 (22%)
	No.....	38 (51%)
Q4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	
	Yes	29 (39%)
	No.....	14 (19%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	31 (42%)
Q5	Are complaints sorted out fairly?	
	<i>I have not made a complaint</i>	31 (42%)
	Yes	16 (22%)
	No.....	27 (36%)
Q6	Are complaints sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	
	<i>I have not made a complaint</i>	31 (42%)
	Yes	11 (15%)
	No.....	32 (43%)
Q7	Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint?	
	Yes	16 (22%)
	No.....	38 (51%)
	<i>Never needed to make a complaint</i>	20 (27%)

SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE

Q1	What level of the rewards and sanctions scheme are you on?	
	<i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i>	3 (4%)
	<i>Enhanced (top)</i>	17 (23%)
	<i>Standard (middle)</i>	38 (52%)
	<i>Basic (bottom)</i>	13 (18%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	2 (3%)
Q2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the rewards and sanctions scheme?	
	<i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i>	3 (4%)
	Yes	29 (41%)
	No.....	28 (39%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	11 (15%)
Q3	Do the different levels of the rewards and sanctions scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	
	<i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i>	3 (4%)
	Yes	34 (48%)
	No.....	28 (39%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	6 (8%)
Q4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	
	Yes	40 (53%)
	No.....	27 (36%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	8 (11%)
Q5	If you have had a minor report, was the process explained clearly to you?	
	<i>I have not had a minor report</i>	35 (47%)
	Yes	29 (39%)
	No.....	11 (15%)

Q6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	
	Yes	59 (81%)
	No.....	12 (16%)
	Don't know	2 (3%)
Q7	If you have had an adjudication ('nicking'), was the process explained clearly to you?	
	<i>I have not had an adjudication</i>	14 (19%)
	Yes	42 (58%)
	No.....	17 (23%)
Q8	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	
	Yes	36 (49%)
	No.....	36 (49%)
	Don't know	2 (3%)
Q9	If you have spent a night in the care and separation unit (CSU), how were you treated by staff?	
	<i>I have not been to the care and separation unit</i>	47 (64%)
	Very well.....	4 (5%)
	Well.....	6 (8%)
	Neither	6 (8%)
	Badly.....	6 (8%)
	Very badly	4 (5%)

SECTION 9: SAFETY

Q1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	
	Yes	41 (56%)
	No.....	32 (44%)
Q2	Do you feel unsafe now?	
	Yes	18 (25%)
	No.....	55 (75%)
Q3	In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Never felt unsafe	32 (47%)
	Everywhere	9 (13%)
	Care and separation unit	1 (1%)
	Association areas	16 (24%)
	Reception area	1 (1%)
	At the gym	11 (16%)
	In an exercise yard	17 (25%)
	At work.....	5 (7%)
	At education	14 (21%)
	At religious services.....	7 (10%)
	At meal times	14 (21%)
	At healthcare	1 (1%)
	Visits area	9 (13%)
	In wing showers.....	8 (12%)
	In gym showers	7 (10%)
	In corridors/stairwells.....	8 (12%)
	On your landing/wing	17 (25%)
	During movement	19 (28%)
	In your cell	3 (4%)

Q4	Have you ever been victimised by another young person/group of young people here (e.g. insulted or assaulted you)?	
	Yes	33 (46%)
	No.....	39 (54%)
Q5	If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you, your family or friends)</i>	22 (31%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	13 (18%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	18 (25%)
	<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i>	12 (17%)
	<i>Medication</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Debt</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Drugs</i>	2 (3%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	4 (6%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	4 (6%)
	<i>Your nationality</i>	3 (4%)
	<i>You are from a different part of the country to others</i>	4 (6%)
	<i>You are from a Traveller community</i>	4 (6%)
	<i>Your sexuality</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your age</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>You having a disability</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>You were new here</i>	14 (19%)
	<i>Your offence/crime</i>	3 (4%)
	<i>Gang related issues</i>	9 (13%)
Q7	Have you ever been victimised by staff here (e.g. insulted or assaulted you)?	
	Yes	24 (34%)
	No.....	47 (66%)
Q8	If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you, your family or friends)</i>	11 (15%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	9 (13%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	4 (6%)
	<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Medication</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Debt</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Drugs</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	4 (6%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	3 (4%)
	<i>Your nationality</i>	2 (3%)
	<i>You are from a different part of the country to others</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>You are from a Traveller community</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your sexuality</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your age</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>You having a disability</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>You were new here</i>	2 (3%)
	<i>Your offence/crime</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Gang related issues</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Because you made a complaint</i>	2 (3%)
Q10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	
	Yes	33 (48%)
	No.....	30 (43%)
	Don't know	6 (9%)

Q11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?		
	Yes	20 (27%)	
	No.....	35 (48%)	
	Don't know	18 (25%)	

Q12	Is shouting through the windows a problem here?		
	Yes	44 (59%)	
	No.....	23 (31%)	
	Don't know	7 (9%)	

SECTION 10: HEALTH SERVICES

Q1	Is it easy to see the following people if you need to?			
		Yes	No	Don't know
	The doctor	34 (46%)	28 (38%)	12 (16%)
	The nurse	46 (65%)	18 (25%)	7 (10%)
	The dentist	14 (20%)	43 (61%)	14 (20%)

Q2	What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?		
	<i>I have not been</i>		5 (7%)
	<i>Very good</i>		13 (18%)
	<i>Good</i>		25 (35%)
	<i>Neither</i>		17 (24%)
	<i>Bad</i>		7 (10%)
	<i>Very bad</i>		5 (7%)

Q3	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/all of it in your room?		
	<i>I am not taking any medication</i>		50 (68%)
	<i>Yes, all of my meds</i>		4 (5%)
	<i>Yes, some of my meds</i>		8 (11%)
	<i>No</i>		11 (15%)

Q4	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?		
	Yes		17 (24%)
	No.....		55 (76%)

Q5	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)?		
	<i>I do not have any emotional or mental health problems</i>		55 (79%)
	Yes		7 (10%)
	No.....		8 (11%)

Q6	Did you have problems with alcohol when you first arrived here?		
	Yes		4 (6%)
	No.....		67 (94%)

Q7	Have you received any help with alcohol problems here?		
	Yes		3 (4%)
	No.....		69 (96%)

Q8	Did you have problems with drugs when you first arrived here?		
	Yes		21 (29%)
	No.....		51 (71%)

Q9	Do you have problems with drugs now?		
	Yes		2 (3%)
	No.....		70 (97%)

Q10	Have you received any help with drugs problems here?	
	Yes	16 (23%)
	No.....	55 (77%)
Q11	How easy or difficult is it to get illegal drugs here?	
	Very easy.....	13 (18%)
	Easy	8 (11%)
	Neither	6 (8%)
	Difficult.....	4 (6%)
	Very difficult.....	9 (13%)
	Don't know	31 (44%)

SECTION II: ACTIVITIES

Q1	How old were you when you were last at school?				
	14 or under	20 (27%)			
	15 or over.....	53 (73%)			
Q2	Have you ever been excluded from school?				
	Yes	65 (90%)			
	No.....	6 (8%)			
	Not applicable.....	1 (1%)			
Q3	Did you ever skip school before you came into custody?				
	Yes	49 (67%)			
	No.....	19 (26%)			
	Not applicable.....	5 (7%)			
Q4	Do you CURRENTLY take part in any of the following activities? (Please tick all that apply to you.)				
	Education	55 (73%)			
	A job in this establishment.....	17 (23%)			
	Vocational or skills training	10 (13%)			
	Offending behaviour programmes	15 (20%)			
	I am not currently involved in any of these.....	5 (7%)			
Q5	If you have been involved in any of the following activities here, do you think they will help you when you leave prison?				
		Not been involved	Yes	No	Don't know
	Education	5 (7%)	46 (64%)	14 (19%)	7 (10%)
	A job in this establishment	11 (19%)	19 (33%)	22 (39%)	5 (9%)
	Vocational or skills training	9 (16%)	25 (45%)	15 (27%)	6 (11%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	10 (19%)	23 (43%)	18 (33%)	3 (6%)
Q6	Do you usually have association every day?				
	Yes	33 (46%)			
	No.....	38 (54%)			
Q7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?				
	Don't want to go.....	9 (13%)			
	Yes	40 (58%)			
	No.....	20 (29%)			

Q8	How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?	
	<i>Don't want to go</i>	7 (10%)
	<i>None</i>	16 (22%)
	<i>One to two times</i>	36 (50%)
	<i>Three to five times</i>	9 (13%)
	<i>More than five times</i>	4 (6%)

SECTION 12: FAMILY AND FRIENDS

Q1	Are you able to use the telephone every day, if you want to?	
	<i>Yes</i>	49 (65%)
	<i>No</i>	24 (32%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	2 (3%)

Q2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?	
	<i>Yes</i>	36 (49%)
	<i>No</i>	35 (48%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	2 (3%)

Q3	How many visits do you usually have each week, from family or friends?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	19 (25%)
	<i>Less than one a week</i>	14 (19%)
	<i>About one a week</i>	31 (41%)
	<i>More than one a week</i>	3 (4%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	8 (11%)

Q4	How easy is it for your family and friends to visit you here?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	19 (26%)
	<i>Very easy</i>	5 (7%)
	<i>Easy</i>	19 (26%)
	<i>Neither</i>	7 (9%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	14 (19%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	6 (8%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	4 (5%)

Q5	Do your visits usually start on time?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	19 (26%)
	<i>Yes</i>	27 (37%)
	<i>No</i>	20 (27%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	7 (10%)

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.)	
	<i>Finding accommodation</i>	16 (23%)
	<i>Getting into school or college</i>	20 (28%)
	<i>Getting a job</i>	41 (58%)
	<i>Money/finances</i>	24 (34%)
	<i>Claiming benefits</i>	10 (14%)
	<i>Continuing health services</i>	5 (7%)
	<i>Opening a bank account</i>	12 (17%)
	<i>Avoiding bad relationships</i>	11 (15%)
	<i>I won't have any problems</i>	22 (31%)

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	27 (38%)
	No.....	20 (28%)
	Don't know	24 (34%)
Q3	Were you involved in the development of your plan?	
	<i>I don't have a plan/don't know if I have a plan</i>	44 (65%)
	Yes	15 (22%)
	No.....	9 (13%)
Q4	Do you understand the targets that have been set in your plan?	
	<i>I don't have a plan/don't know if I have a plan</i>	44 (63%)
	Yes	20 (29%)
	No.....	6 (9%)
Q5	Do you have a caseworker here?	
	Yes	68 (93%)
	No.....	0 (0%)
	Don't know	5 (7%)
Q6	Has your caseworker helped to prepare you for release?	
	<i>I don't have a caseworker</i>	5 (7%)
	Yes	22 (31%)
	No.....	37 (51%)
	Don't know	8 (11%)
Q7	Has your social worker been to visit you since you have been here?	
	<i>I don't have a social worker</i>	23 (32%)
	Yes	36 (51%)
	No.....	12 (17%)
Q8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	
	Yes	24 (33%)
	No.....	38 (53%)
	Don't know	10 (14%)
Q9	Do you know who to contact for help with any of the following problems, before your release? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Finding accommodation</i>	13 (19%)
	<i>Getting into school or college</i>	19 (28%)
	<i>Getting a job</i>	20 (30%)
	<i>Help with money/finances</i>	17 (25%)
	<i>Help with claiming benefits</i>	10 (15%)
	<i>Continuing health services</i>	10 (15%)
	<i>Opening a bank account</i>	15 (22%)
	<i>Avoiding bad relationships</i>	10 (15%)
	<i>I don't know who to contact</i>	35 (52%)

Q10 What is most likely to stop you offending in the future? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

<i>Not sentenced</i>	16 (22%)	<i>Having a mentor (someone you can ask for advice)</i>	7 (9%)
<i>Nothing, it is up to me</i>	19 (26%)	<i>Having a YOT worker or social worker that I get on with</i>	15 (20%)
<i>Making new friends outside</i>	12 (16%)	<i>Having children</i>	7 (9%)
<i>Going back to live with my family</i>	13 (18%)	<i>Having something to do that isn't crime</i>	17 (23%)
<i>Getting a place of my own</i>	15 (20%)	<i>This sentence</i>	15 (20%)
<i>Getting a job</i>	35 (47%)	<i>Getting into school/college</i>	14 (19%)
<i>Having a partner (girlfriend or boyfriend)</i>	16 (22%)	<i>Talking about my offending behaviour with staff</i>	5 (7%)
<i>Staying off alcohol/drugs</i>	16 (22%)	<i>Anything else</i>	3 (4%)

Q11 Do you want to stop offending?

<i>Not sentenced</i>	16 (22%)
<i>Yes</i>	51 (71%)
<i>No</i>	2 (3%)
<i>Don't know</i>	3 (4%)

Q12 Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here, that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?

<i>Not sentenced</i>	16 (23%)
<i>Yes</i>	31 (45%)
<i>No</i>	22 (32%)

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



Survey responses from children and young people: HMYOI Werrington 2015

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

		HMYOI Werrington 2015	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Werrington 2015	HMYOI Werrington 2014
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		79	523	79	97
SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU					
1.1	Are you 18 years of age?	13%	11%	13%	14%
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	3%	6%	3%	7%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%	100%	98%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	100%	98%	100%	97%
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other category.)	48%	45%	48%	40%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	32%	22%	32%	21%
1.7	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	10%	8%	10%	9%
1.8	Do you have any children?	13%	11%	13%	7%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	21%	20%	21%	12%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	38%	40%	38%	36%
SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE					
2.1	Are you sentenced?	79%	77%	79%	81%
2.2	Is your sentence 12 months or less?	35%	33%	35%	36%
2.3	Have you been in this establishment for one month or less?	20%	17%	20%	19%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	57%	56%	57%	61%
SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS					
On your most recent journey here:					
3.1	Did you feel safe?	75%	80%	75%	89%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	29%	35%	29%	31%
3.3	Did you spend more than 4 hours in the van?	7%	7%	7%	4%
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%	9%	9%	15%
3.5	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	43%	39%	43%	62%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	56%	55%	56%	47%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	11%	17%	11%	16%

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

Key to tables

		HMYOI Werrington 2015	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Werrington 2015	HMYOI Werrington 2014
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		79	523	79	97
SECTION 4: YOUR FIRST FEW DAYS HERE					
4.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	73%	82%	73%	70%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	85%	83%	85%	81%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	86%	67%	86%	82%
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?	41%	50%	41%	46%
4.4b	Loss of property?	16%	18%	16%	16%
4.4c	Feeling scared?	31%	26%	31%	23%
4.4d	Gang problems?	42%	44%	42%	37%
4.4e	Contacting family?	46%	55%	46%	58%
4.4f	Money worries?	16%	16%	16%	19%
4.4g	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	31%	35%	31%	27%
4.4h	Health problems?	53%	54%	53%	47%
4.4i	Getting phone numbers?	32%	42%	32%	45%
4.5	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	78%	78%	78%	63%
When you first arrived, did you have problems with any of the following:					
4.5a	Not being able to smoke?	43%	48%	43%	41%
4.5b	Loss of property?	8%	12%	8%	8%
4.5c	Feeling scared?	20%	12%	20%	6%
4.5d	Gang problems?	24%	18%	24%	10%
4.5e	Contacting family?	32%	32%	32%	27%
4.5f	Money worries?	12%	18%	12%	8%
4.5g	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	19%	13%	19%	13%
4.5h	Health problems?	13%	15%	13%	9%
4.5i	Getting phone numbers?	25%	32%	25%	25%
When you first arrived, were you given any of the following:					
4.6a	Toiletries/basic items?	87%	74%	87%	88%
4.6b	The opportunity to have a shower?	75%	47%	75%	65%
4.6c	Something to eat?	82%	82%	82%	86%
4.6d	A free phone call to friends/family?	70%	77%	70%	87%
4.6e	PIN phone credit?	55%	56%	55%	62%
4.6f	Information about feeling worried/upset?	34%	30%	34%	36%

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMYOI Werrington 2015	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Werrington 2015	HMYOI Werrington 2014
	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		79	523	79	97
Within your first 24 hours, did you have access to the following people or services:					
4.7a	A chaplain?	35%	44%	35%	37%
4.7b	A peer mentor?	11%	8%	11%	12%
4.7c	Childline/Samaritans	15%	16%	15%	12%
4.7d	The prison shop/canteen?	10%	10%	10%	11%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	80%	65%	80%	83%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	76%	76%	76%	82%
4.10	For those who have been on an induction course: did it cover everything you needed to know about the establishment	38%	58%	38%	59%
SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT					
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	69%	92%	69%	74%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	22%	32%	22%	32%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	21%	17%	21%	12%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	61%	52%	61%	46%
5.5	Is it easy/very easy for you to attend religious services?	53%	51%	53%	65%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	58%	60%	58%	60%
Can you speak to:					
5.7	A chaplain of your faith in private?	62%	64%	62%	70%
5.8	A peer mentor?	32%	30%	32%	30%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	28%	18%	28%	19%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	38%	44%	38%	40%
SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF					
6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	67%	68%	67%	69%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	22%	25%	22%	34%
6.3	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	41%	34%	41%	29%
For those who have met their personal officer:					
6.4	Did you meet your personal (named) officer within the first week?	21%	39%	21%	31%
6.5	Do you see your personal (named) officer at least once a week?	59%	46%	59%	42%
6.6	Do you feel your personal (named) officer tries to help you?	71%	64%	71%	56%
SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS					
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	52%	64%	52%	72%
For those who have made an application:					
7.2	Do you feel applications are sorted out fairly?	47%	63%	47%	65%
7.3	Do you feel applications are sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	30%	37%	30%	47%

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMYOI Werrington 2015	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Werrington 2015	HMYOI Werrington 2014
	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		79	523	79	97
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	39%	51%	39%	61%
For those who have made a complaint:					
7.5	Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	37%	38%	37%	29%
7.6	Do you feel complaints are sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	25%	31%	25%	35%
7.7	Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint?	22%	9%	22%	11%
SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE					
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	23%	25%	23%	21%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	41%	47%	41%	42%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	48%	43%	48%	54%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	53%	46%	53%	49%
For those who have had a minor report:					
8.5	Was the process explained clearly to you?	73%	73%	73%	78%
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	81%	63%	81%	76%
For those who have had an adjudication ('nicking'):					
8.7	Was the process explained clearly to you?	72%	86%	72%	89%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (Cand R) since you have been here?	49%	41%	49%	35%
8.9	For those who had spent a night in the care and separation unit: did the staff treat you well/very well?	39%	43%	39%	42%
SECTION 9: SAFETY					
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	56%	40%	56%	43%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	25%	16%	25%	21%
9.4	Have you ever been victimised by other young people here?	46%	32%	46%	31%
Since you have been here, have other young people:					
9.5a	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	30%	17%	30%	13%
9.5b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	18%	13%	18%	14%
9.5c	Sexually abused you?	0%	1%	0%	1%
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	25%	12%	25%	13%
9.5e	Taken your canteen/property?	16%	3%	16%	6%
9.5f	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	2%	0%	1%
9.5g	Victimised you because of debt?	1%	1%	1%	2%
9.5h	Victimised you because of drugs?	3%	1%	3%	0%

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMYOI Werrington 2015	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Werrington 2015	HMYOI Werrington 2014
	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		79	523	79	97
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	5%	4%	5%	2%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	5%	3%	5%	2%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	4%	3%	4%	3%
9.5l	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	5%	4%	5%	2%
9.5m	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	5%	1%	5%	2%
9.5n	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	1%	0%	0%
9.5o	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	1%	0%	1%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	1%	2%	1%	1%
9.5q	Victimised you because you were new here?	19%	7%	19%	8%
9.5r	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	4%	5%	4%	1%
9.5s	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	12%	8%	12%	6%
9.7	Have you ever been victimised by a member of staff here?	34%	25%	34%	30%
Since you have been here, have staff:					
9.8a	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	16%	13%	16%	12%
9.8b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	12%	7%	12%	4%
9.8c	Sexually abused you?	0%	1%	0%	1%
9.8d	Threatened or intimidated you?	5%	5%	5%	7%
9.8e	Taken your canteen/property?	1%	4%	1%	1%
9.8f	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	1%	0%	0%
9.8g	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	1%	0%	0%
9.8h	Victimised you because of drugs?	1%	1%	1%	0%
9.8i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	5%	3%	5%	3%
9.8j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	4%	1%	4%	3%
9.8k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	3%	3%	3%	2%
9.8k	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	0%	3%	0%	0%
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%	1%
9.8o	Victimised you because of your age?	1%	1%	1%	1%
9.8p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	1%	0%	0%
9.8q	Victimised you because you were new here?	3%	3%	3%	2%
9.8r	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	0%	2%	0%	0%

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

Key to tables

		HMYOI Werrington 2015	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Werrington 2015	HMYOI Werrington 2014
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		79	523	79	97
9.8s	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	1%	1%	1%	0%
9.8t	Victimised you because you made a complaint?	3%	3%	3%	6%
9.10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	48%	26%	48%	29%
9.11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	27%	31%	27%	27%
9.12	Is shouting through the windows a problem here?	59%	39%	59%	44%
SECTION 10: HEALTH SERVICES					
10.1a	Is it easy for you to see the doctor?	46%	49%	46%	58%
10.1b	Is it easy for you to see the nurse?	65%	63%	65%	78%
10.1c	Is it easy for you to see the dentist?	20%	28%	20%	38%
10.2	For those who have been to health services: Do you think the overall quality is good/very good?	57%	51%	57%	64%
10.3	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/all of it in your cell?	52%	51%	52%	68%
10.4	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?	24%	25%	24%	18%
10.5	If you have emotional or mental health problems, are you being helped by anyone here?	48%	63%	48%	63%
10.6	Did you have any problems with alcohol when you first arrived?	5%	7%	5%	4%
10.7	Have you received any help with any alcohol problems here?	4%	4%	4%	7%
10.8	Did you have any problems with drugs when you first arrived?	29%	36%	29%	37%
10.9	Do you have a problem with drugs now?	3%	6%	3%	8%
10.10	Have you received any help with any drug problems here?	23%	20%	23%	34%
10.11	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs here?	30%	17%	30%	23%
SECTION 11: ACTIVITIES					
11.1	Were you 14 or younger when you were last at school?	27%	41%	27%	48%
11.2	Have you ever been excluded from school?	90%	88%	90%	77%
11.3	Did you ever skip school before you came into custody?	67%	75%	67%	70%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:					
11.4a	Education?	74%	73%	74%	80%
11.4b	A job in this establishment?	23%	27%	23%	32%
11.4c	Vocational or skills training?	14%	12%	14%	12%
11.4d	Offending behaviour programmes?	20%	13%	20%	26%
11.4e	Nothing	7%	19%	7%	14%

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

Key to tables

		HMYOI Werrington 2015	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Werrington 2015	HMYOI Werrington 2014
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		79	523	79	97
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?	69%	61%	69%	71%
11.5b	A job in this establishment?	41%	40%	41%	52%
11.5c	Vocational or skills training?	54%	43%	54%	50%
11.5d	Offending behaviour programmes?	53%	41%	53%	50%
11.6	Do you usually have association every day?	46%	63%	46%	34%
11.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	58%	67%	58%	27%
11.8	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	5%	9%	5%	4%
SECTION 12: KEEPING IN TOUCH WITH FAMILY AND FRIENDS					
12.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	65%	82%	65%	65%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	49%	48%	49%	35%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	46%	31%	46%	45%
12.4	Is it easy/very easy for your family and friends to visit you here?	32%	32%	32%	36%
12.5	Do your visits start on time?	37%	33%	37%	38%
SECTION 13: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE					
Do you think you will have a problem with the following, when you are released:					
13.1a	Finding accommodation?	23%	26%	23%	21%
13.1b	Getting into school or college?	28%	30%	28%	27%
13.1c	Getting a job?	58%	49%	58%	57%
13.1d	Money/finances?	34%	35%	34%	31%
13.1e	Claiming benefits?	14%	14%	14%	16%
13.1f	Continuing health services?	7%	9%	7%	7%
13.1g	Opening a bank account?	17%	17%	17%	19%
13.1h	Avoiding bad relationships?	16%	17%	16%	15%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	38%	45%	38%	44%
For those with a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan:					
13.3	Were you involved in the development of your plan?	64%	87%	64%	83%
13.4	Do you understand the targets set in your plan?	77%	94%	77%	97%
13.5	Do you have a caseworker here?	93%	88%	93%	92%
13.6	Has your caseworker helped to prepare you for release?	33%	41%	33%	49%
For those with a social worker:					
13.7	Has your social worker been to visit you since you have been here?	75%	75%	75%	65%
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	33%	43%	33%	42%

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMYOI Werrington 2015	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Werrington 2015	HMYOI Werrington 2014
	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		79	523	79	97
Do you know who to contact for help with the following problems?					
13.9a	Finding accommodation	20%	28%	20%	19%
13.9b	Getting into school or college	28%	29%	28%	21%
13.9c	Getting a job	30%	32%	30%	24%
13.9d	Help with money/finances	25%	23%	25%	17%
13.9e	Help with claiming benefits	15%	17%	15%	16%
13.9f	Continuing health services	15%	15%	15%	11%
13.9g	Opening a bank account	23%	18%	23%	14%
13.9h	Avoiding bad relationships	15%	15%	15%	14%
For those who were sentenced:					
13.11	Do you want to stop offending?	91%	90%	91%	91%
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	58%	52%	58%	54%

Diversity analysis



Key question responses (ethnicity and religion) HMYOI Werrington 2015

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	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		Black and minority ethnic young people	White young people	Muslim young people	Non-Muslim young people
Number of completed questionnaires returned							38	41	25	52
1.2	Are you a foreign national?						6%	0%	3%	1%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?						100%	100%	100%	100%
1.4	Do you understand written English?						100%	100%	100%	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.)								97%	25%
1.6	Are you Muslim?						65%	2%		
1.5	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?						2%	15%	3%	12%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?						14%	27%	16%	23%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?						35%	41%	44%	35%
2.1	Are you sentenced?						92%	67%	97%	70%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?						57%	58%	47%	64%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?						22%	35%	21%	31%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?						57%	55%	46%	59%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?						8%	13%	9%	12%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?						84%	87%	84%	88%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?						80%	91%	76%	93%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?						81%	79%	79%	80%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?						79%	73%	85%	72%
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?						65%	71%	56%	75%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?						15%	28%	21%	24%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?						20%	21%	24%	19%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?						61%	61%	52%	63%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?						60%	55%	68%	53%
Can you speak to:										
5.7	A chaplain of your faith in private?						64%	61%	65%	59%
5.8	A peer mentor?						35%	29%	32%	29%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?						29%	27%	35%	25%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?						31%	46%	35%	41%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic young people	White young people	Muslim young people	Non-Muslim young people
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		38	41	25	52
6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	50%	80%	38%	78%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	18%	26%	17%	22%
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	54%	49%	53%	50%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	39%	40%	39%	39%
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	11%	35%	10%	31%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	31%	50%	26%	48%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	44%	53%	47%	49%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	61%	46%	66%	46%
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	92%	71%	97%	73%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	58%	40%	56%	45%
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	53%	59%	52%	60%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	23%	27%	32%	22%
9.4	Have you been victimised by other young people here?	38%	54%	40%	50%
Since you have been here, have other young people:					
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	17%	32%	23%	27%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	10%	0%	8%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	2%	8%	3%	6%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	2%	6%	3%	5%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	2%	0%	2%
9.7	Have you been victimised by staff here?	53%	16%	57%	23%
Since you have been here, have staff:					
9.8d	Threatened or intimidated you?	6%	6%	10%	5%
9.8i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	11%	0%	18%	0%
9.8j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	9%	0%	14%	0%
9.8k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	2%	2%	4%	2%
9.8p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	0%	0%	0%
9.10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	40%	55%	41%	53%
9.11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	11%	41%	4%	36%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic young people	White young people	Muslim young people	Non-Muslim young people
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		38	41	25	52
10.1a	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the doctor?	40%	51%	40%	50%
10.1b	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the nurse?	68%	63%	62%	67%
10.4	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	15%	31%	17%	27%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:					
11.4a	Education?	78%	70%	74%	72%
11.4b	A job in this establishment?	20%	26%	9%	30%
11.4c	Vocational or skills training?	8%	19%	9%	16%
11.4d	Offending behaviour programmes?	14%	26%	13%	24%
11.4e	Nothing?	8%	6%	13%	4%
11.6	Do you usually have association every day?	52%	42%	44%	50%
11.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	46%	69%	48%	65%
11.8	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	2%	8%	3%	6%
12.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	64%	67%	61%	70%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	47%	51%	52%	50%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	55%	36%	66%	38%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	26%	49%	39%	37%
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	26%	40%	27%	38%



Key question responses (disability analysis) HMYOI Werrington 2015

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	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		16	60
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	0%	4%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	100%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	100%	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.)	32%	51%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	24%	34%
1.5	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	5%	10%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	55%	33%
2.1	Are you sentenced?	75%	82%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	60%	56%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	32%	28%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	50%	55%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	14%	10%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	75%	90%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	86%	88%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	76%	81%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	64%	80%
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	50%	73%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	5%	28%
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?	55%	60%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	36%	61%
Can you speak to:			
5.7	A chaplain of your faith in private?	32%	72%
5.8	A peer mentor?	18%	35%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	18%	32%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	32%	42%

Diversity analysis - disability

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	55%	69%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	20%	23%
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	50%	53%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	18%	45%
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	0%	31%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	32%	45%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	24%	56%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	46%	55%
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	68%	84%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	50%	47%
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	64%	54%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	33%	21%
9.4	Have you been victimised by other young people here?	48%	45%
Since you have been here, have other young people:			
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	25%	24%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	7%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	5%	5%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	5%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	1%
9.7	Have you been victimised by staff here?	40%	32%
Since you have been here, have staff:			
9.8d	Threatened or intimidated you?	5%	6%
9.8i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	14%	4%
9.8j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	5%	4%
9.8k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	5%	1%
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?	60%	44%
9.11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	14%	31%

Diversity analysis - disability

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
10.1a	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the doctor?	36%	49%
10.1b	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the nurse?	64%	66%
10.4	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	46%	17%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:			
11.4a	Education?	76%	73%
11.4b	A job in this establishment?	14%	27%
11.4c	Vocational or skills training?	24%	10%
11.4d	Offending behaviour programmes?	32%	16%
11.4e	Nothing?	14%	5%
11.6	Do you usually have association every day?	58%	45%
11.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	63%	57%
11.8	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	0%	7%
12.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	50%	71%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	64%	46%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	32%	48%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	40%	40%
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	40%	33%

Diversity analysis



Key question responses (local authority care analysis) HMYOI Werrington 2015

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		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		30	48
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	0%	5%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	100%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	100%	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.)	44%	50%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	38%	29%
1.5	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	3%	13%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	31%	15%
2.1	Are you sentenced?	83%	77%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	31%	75%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	24%	33%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	61%	52%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	3%	16%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	90%	84%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	88%	87%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	81%	81%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	76%	76%
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	61%	73%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	12%	29%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	12%	25%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	61%	60%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	55%	59%
Can you speak to:			
5.7	A chaplain of your faith in private?	61%	62%
5.8	A peer mentor?	29%	32%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	34%	25%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	44%	36%

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		
6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	53%	76%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	29%	18%
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	53%	53%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	40%	40%
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	19%	26%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	36%	45%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	32%	60%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	55%	52%
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	81%	80%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	46%	48%
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	61%	55%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	27%	24%
9.4	Have you been victimised by other young people here?	41%	50%
Since you have been here, have other young people:			
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	22%	27%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	3%	7%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	8%	5%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	3%	5%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	3%	0%
9.7	Have you been victimised by staff here?	41%	28%
Since you have been here, have staff:			
9.8d	Threatened or intimidated you?	11%	2%
9.8i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	8%	5%
9.8j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	11%	0%
9.8k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	3%	2%
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?	39%	55%
9.11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	26%	30%

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		
10.1a	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the doctor?	58%	40%
10.1b	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the nurse?	62%	64%
10.4	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	26%	24%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:			
11.4a	Education?	68%	76%
11.4b	A job in this establishment?	8%	33%
11.4c	Vocational or skills training?	26%	6%
11.4d	Offending behaviour programmes?	32%	13%
11.4e	Nothing?	8%	6%
11.6	Do you usually have association every day?	40%	52%
11.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	47%	64%
11.8	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	8%	5%
12.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	54%	75%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	51%	48%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	32%	54%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	41%	37%
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	30%	37%