

Report on an unannounced inspection of

**HMYOI Wetherby and
Keppel**

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

13–24 March 2017

This inspection was carried out with assistance from colleagues at the General Pharmaceutical Council and in partnership with the following bodies:



Crown copyright 2017

This publication (excluding logos) is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. To view this licence, visit nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3 or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, 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/>

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. Summary of recommendations and good practice	63
Section 6. Appendices	69
Appendix I: Inspection team	69
Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report	71
Appendix III: Care Quality Commission Requirement Notice	79
Appendix IV: Establishment population profile	81
Appendix V: Summary of children and young people questionnaires and interviews	85

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 Wetherby is a young offender institution which at the time of this inspection was holding 260 boys aged 15 to 18. Of these, approximately 40 boys were held on the Keppel unit, a specialist facility within the wider prison designed to manage some of the most challenging and vulnerable young people currently held anywhere in a custodial setting. As Keppel is a self-contained facility, we have assessed it separately against our healthy prison tests. As with all custodial facilities for young people, the risks and accountabilities prevalent require that we inspect these institutions on an annual basis.

When we inspected last year, we made clear that there remained much to commend at Wetherby but also identified some significant recent deterioration in outcomes. Failings in safety and a failure to deliver an acceptable and predictable daily routine, leading in turn to unacceptable shortcomings in the provision of activities, work and education, were clear themes in our report. We were reassured to find that the situation a year later appeared to be more stable. A new governor had recently been appointed and he, in our view, was a steadying influence.

It was particularly pleasing to see that a sense of purpose and confidence had been restored to Keppel. Good leadership on the unit was helping staff and boys alike, and overall the unit was showing clear evidence of improvement. The wider prison was still not safe enough and reported levels of violence were high, with increasing violence against staff evident. There were signs of improvement in behaviour management strategies, with more effort to incentivise boys, but the approach to violence reduction in general was still not adequate. Features of the problem were a general lack of confidence and an aversion to managing risk. Many approaches to, for example, security or the use of segregation lacked proportionality and were needlessly restrictive. On a more positive note, the number of boys exhibiting self-harming behaviours had reduced since the last inspection.

Keppel, being a more modern facility, provided a better environment than the rest of the institution, but that in itself was no excuse for the dirtiness and graffiti we observed in the main units. Our survey provided reassurance that most boys felt respected by staff and we saw some good interactions, especially on Keppel. There remained, however, a minority of staff who retained low expectations of what could be achieved with boys, and who failed to challenge constructively anti-social behaviour they observed. Such attitudes held the institution back and needed to be confronted. Work to promote equality was weak, although health care was better despite the impact of staff shortages.

The provision of activities and learning had improved, but from a low base. The establishment was still operating a restricted daily routine and time out of cell was insufficient. During the working day we found nearly half of boys locked in cell, although the situation was much better on Keppel. The quality of education was improving, but it was still not given sufficient priority and too much was cancelled owing to staff shortages. Sufficient activity places were provided for all, but outcomes were undermined by poor attendance, poor punctuality and cancellations. It was a compelling observation that once in class most boys demonstrated good behaviour and, in the main, seemed to be acquiring useful interpersonal skills.

A strength of the institution was its work to resettle boys at the end of their sentences. There was a good understanding of need and community partnerships were improving, as was the use of release on temporary licence (ROTL) to support resettlement work. Training management plans, however, remained too variable and not all boys were engaged in the process, which represented a missed opportunity to focus effectively on reducing future risk of offending.

Overall we were more optimistic about Wetherby following this inspection than we were after last year's. Stability was more evident and staff seemed to be recovering their confidence. The governor had a good understanding of the challenges he faced and was beginning the process of improvement.

Our report highlights a number of priorities, including work to tackle bullying, the promotion of equality and ensuring boys spend their time out of cell in constructive activity, which we hope will assist.

Peter Clarke CVO OBE QPM
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

June 2017

Fact page

Task of the establishment

To hold in custody boys between the ages of 15 and 18 years committed by the courts

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

Public

Region/Department

Young people's estate

Number held

260

Certified normal accommodation

336 (including 48 on Keppel unit)

Operational capacity

336 (including 48 on Keppel unit)

Date of last full inspection

March 2016

Brief history

A former naval base, Wetherby became a borstal in 1958, and has since changed its role from an open youth custody centre to a closed youth custody centre and is now a dedicated centre for males under 18.

Short description of residential units

Anson – segregation unit

Benbow – long-term determinate and life-sentenced young people

Frobisher – first night facility and standard accommodation

Collingwood – standard accommodation

Drake – standard accommodation

Exmouth – standard accommodation

Keppel – specialist complex issues unit

Name of governor

Andrew Dickinson

Escort contractor

GeoAmey

Health service commissioner and providers

Commissioner: NHS England

Lead provider: Leeds Community Health Care NHS Trust

Subcontractors

GP services: Crossley Street Medical Practice, Wetherby

Mental health care: South West Yorkshire NHS Foundation Trust

Learning and skills providers

Novus (The Manchester College)

Independent Monitoring Board chair

Catherine Porter

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
- **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 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 IV respectively.

A11 Findings from the survey of children and young people and a detailed description of the survey methodology can be found in Appendix V 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 0.01, which means that there is only a 1% chance that the difference in results is due to chance.

Summary

Safety

S1 *Many boys arrived too late from court to benefit from a safe introduction to the establishment. There was a shortage of important basic items and boys spent too long locked in sparse cells on Wetherby's induction unit. Too many boys did not feel safe and some safeguarding practices increased risk. Levels of self-harm and the number of boys on ACCTs² had reduced. Procedures to reduce violence and bullying still had inherent weaknesses. There were early signs of improvement in behaviour management, particularly on Keppel. Too many security measures were disproportionate, frustrating legitimate attempts to help boys. Management of adjudications had improved, but we remained concerned about some governance arrangements for the use of force. There was not enough management oversight of the segregation unit which we found to be risk averse. Proportionately fewer boys from Keppel were subject to the use of force and segregation. **Outcomes for children and young people at Wetherby were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test. Outcomes for children and young people at Keppel were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***

S2 *At the last inspection in 2016, we found that outcomes for children and young people at Wetherby were not sufficiently good and outcomes for children and young people at Keppel were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 26 recommendations about safety. At this follow-up inspection we found that eight of the recommendations had been achieved, three had been partially achieved and 15 had not been achieved.*

S3 Late arrival continued to present a significant risk to vulnerable boys and compromised the support needed on the first night in custody. The reception area was bright and spacious, and staff were welcoming. Holding rooms were clean but they were stark and uninspiring. The first night unit on the main site continued to accommodate boys reintegrated from the segregation unit and boys who were having difficulties on other units. Cells were sparse and there was a lack of basic items for new prisoners, including essential clothing. The introduction of peer support on the induction wing was positive but it was underdeveloped and lacked oversight. The induction programme delivered on the main site was brief and boys spent too long locked in their cells before being allocated to education. Separate induction programmes were delivered on Benbow (unit for long-term determinate and life-sentenced young people) and Keppel (specialist complex issues unit) and were responsive to the individual needs of these boys.

S4 In our survey, 18% of boys at Wetherby and 29% on Keppel did not feel safe at the time of the inspection. Weekly, monthly and quarterly meetings provided a potentially sound structure to safeguard boys but we had significant concerns about practice in a number of areas. Identification and support for victims of violence and bullying was inadequate. Governance of use of force required improvement and body-worn cameras were not always used appropriately. The management of child protection required improvement with significant delays in investigations and poor recording. In most child protection logs we reviewed there was no evidence of action taken to prevent further harm.

S5 Incidents of self-harm and the number of boys subject to ACCT monitoring had reduced since the last inspection. Boys at risk of self-harm were identified quickly and provided with

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

- suitable support and monitoring. Assessments were thorough and the boy's views were well recorded. However, some care plans and reviews lacked appropriate detail and guidance.
- S6 There was some confusion about the figures used by the establishment to calculate levels of violence but, based on reported data, this remained high. Levels of violence against staff had increased since the last inspection and an action plan had been produced to try to reduce incidents of violence towards staff. There was no similar action plan to reduce levels of violence against boys, although there were pockets of constructive work in this area and levels had reduced. The PACT (positive attitudes created together) system³ did not address bullying behaviour effectively.
- S7 There had been some improvements to behaviour management since the previous inspection and the rewards and sanctions scheme now offered more incentives. However, the regime for boys on the red level was poor and many remained on this lowest level for excessive periods with little productive work to change their behaviour. Too many boys were prevented from going to education or important appointments as a result of poor behaviour. More encouragingly, the use of adjudications had reduced significantly and charges laid were appropriate and for the more serious allegations.
- S8 There was a risk-averse approach to managing security across the site and we found numerous examples of unnecessarily restrictive measures which created a barrier to important work with boys. Although drug supply reduction and violence had been identified as security priorities, there was no integrated strategic approach to managing these issues.
- S9 The use of force was at a similar level to the previous inspection and the cases we reviewed indicated that its use was generally proportionate. Governance had improved from a low base but oversight was undermined by the frequent redeployment of MMPR (minimising and managing physical restraint) coordinators. We were also made aware of a very concerning incident of alleged abuse during use of force that was subject to police investigation. In too many incidents, body-worn video cameras were not switched on, which was unacceptable.
- S10 The use of segregation had reduced and lengths of stay were now relatively short. It was encouraging that few boys from Keppel had been segregated. However, a risk-averse and controlling approach to managing the unit frustrated attempts to support and develop some boys with complex needs. Some segregation procedures were disproportionate and the regime was limited. Accommodation was dirty and there was much offensive graffiti.
- S11 The establishment was not alert to positive trends in mandatory drug testing, and supply and demand reduction were not integrated. The team from Lifeline provided good one-to-one substance misuse support but group work was limited at the time of the inspection because of staff shortages.

³ PACT (positive attitudes created together) is a system to identify, assess and reduce bullying. Stage one intended to identify the perpetrator of bullying, and gave them two weeks to change their behaviour before more formal action was taken, including loss of privileges. Stage two was implemented if stage one did not reduce bullying. This provided a formal action plan, which was intended to penalise bullying behaviour and be reviewed frequently. Boys could be on this stage for up to four weeks.

Respect

S12 *Keppel unit was cleaner and better equipped than the main site where too many areas were dirty and there was a shortage of important basic items. Access to telephones and showers was more restricted on the main site. Relationships between staff and boys were generally good but were hindered by some negative influences. There were significant weaknesses in equality work. The chaplaincy was a real strength. The application system was not monitored effectively. Management of complaints was starting to improve. Health services were generally good but affected by staff shortfalls. Boys were negative about the food but there were some opportunities to eat communally. **Outcomes for children and young people at Wetherby were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test. Outcomes for children and young people at Keppel were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***

S13 *At the last inspection in 2016, we found that outcomes for children and young people in Wetherby and Keppel were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 30 recommendations about respect.⁴ At this follow-up inspection we found that five of the recommendations had been achieved, one had been partially achieved and 24 had not been achieved.*

S14 Accommodation and communal areas were better equipped and cleaner on Keppel than on the main site where graffiti remained a problem. With the exception of F wing, too many areas were dirty. Toilets in a number of cells across the main site remained unscreened, many cells did not have curtains, and there was a lack of important basic items such as kettles, cutlery and clothing. The restricted core day affected access to showers and telephone calls. Cell call bells were not always answered promptly and there was no monitoring of applications.

S15 In our survey, 83% of boys said that staff treated them with respect and only 7% said they would have nobody to turn to if they had a problem. We observed some positive interactions between staff and boys, particularly on Keppel. Relationships between specialist staff and boys were good. However, we also found examples of staff continuing to have low expectations of boys and not challenging low-level poor behaviour, and others who accepted poor conditions for the boys in their care. Despite many enthusiastic and approachable staff, the development of positive relationships was hindered by restricted regimes and a core of negative staff. Consultation with boys required improvement.

S16 Oversight of equality work was weak and provision had been undermined by regular re-deployment. Until recently there had been little consultation with boys and there was no investigation of adverse monitoring data. Governance of discrimination incident report forms was poor, as was the identification in residential areas of boys with disabilities. Good support had been provided to gay, bisexual and transgender boys on Keppel and the appointment of an equality coordinator was a positive initiative.

S17 The chaplaincy was well led and efficient and provided a good range of services and classes for the main faith groups. They provided strong support for boys in crisis and facilitated good through-the-gate mentoring work.

S18 There had been some improvement to the complaints procedure in recent months and most responses were polite, fair and focused. However, too many responses were late and

⁴ This included recommendations about the incentives and earned privileges scheme which, in our updated Expectations (Version 3, 2012), now appear under the healthy prison area of safety.

some complaints had never been responded to. Good support was provided to boys with legal problems but facilities for legal visits remained poor.

- S19 There was a range of appropriate and timely health services, except for dentistry where appointments took too long. Workforce vacancies were affecting the wider contribution to the prison regime, but overall outcomes for boys were being met. The health care environment was reasonable but the waiting area was bleak and there were no toilet facilities. The beds in health care were rarely used and most rooms were extremely poor. They were generally used for reasons not related to health care, which was inappropriate. Mental health services met most needs, but more could be done to meet the significant need on the Keppel unit.
- S20 The boys' perception of food was poor. With the exception of breakfast, portion sizes were adequate but some of the food we sampled was bland. There were some opportunities to eat communally. The purchasing system was well organised but the problem of canteen theft was not managed effectively.

Purposeful activity

S21 *Too many boys were locked up during the core day at Wetherby, although there had been significant improvements in this area on the Keppel unit. Education was still not given enough priority. Sufficient activities were provided to occupy every boy but attendance and punctuality were not managed effectively and not enough effort was made to get boys back to education following a behavioural incident. The quality of teaching was generally good and most boys behaved well in class. Achievement rates when boys attended classes were good. Access to the library was limited for boys on Wetherby. Boys had no opportunities to gain meaningful PE qualifications. **Outcomes for children and young people at Wetherby and Keppel were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.***

S22 *At the last inspection in 2016, we found that outcomes for children and young people in Wetherby and Keppel were poor against this healthy prison test. We made 12 recommendations about purposeful activity. At this follow-up inspection we found that five of the recommendations had been achieved, one had been partially achieved and six had not been achieved.*

- S23 The establishment was operating a restricted core day and even that was not always delivered as published. Time out of cell was insufficient, especially for boys on the red regime who were sometimes only unlocked for a telephone call, shower and a brief period of exercise. Our roll checks found 48% of boys locked up during the core day at Wetherby. Keppel had improved significantly since the last inspection with less than 10% locked up during the core day.
- S24 Good management action had been taken to improve the quality of the education provision. The self-assessment process was evaluative, generally accurate and led to effective quality improvement actions. However, prison staff shortages resulted in cancellations to boys' education and training entitlement, and for one session a week boys had to choose between staying on the wing to shower and make telephone calls or go to education. Not enough priority was given to encourage boys to attend mandatory education or to the punctual arrival and departure of those who did attend. Suspension of boys from education for incidents occurring on wings was affecting their education and progress adversely.

- S25 Sufficient activities were provided to meet the needs of the population and the allocation of boys to activities was effective. The provision of outreach education on wings required improvement.
- S26 Taught sessions were generally well planned and reflected individual needs. Teachers used questioning techniques well to check and reinforce understanding and good use was made of learning support practitioners to work with boys who needed additional help to achieve. Observations of teaching and learning were providing good quality checks resulting in improvements to teaching. English and mathematics skills were appropriately developed across the provision. Target setting was generally effective but not all tutors set challenging personal development targets.
- S27 Most boys displayed good behaviour on courses, acquired good communication skills and developed an empathy and mutual respect for others. However, too many classes were poorly attended and punctuality to and from sessions was poor. Inappropriate language and behaviour was not always challenged properly or targets set to improve behaviour.
- S28 Achievement rates for boys who attended education were high on most courses.
- S29 The small but welcoming library facility provided a good range of stock. Boys on Keppel had good access to the library but access was limited for those not attending education in the building where the library was situated. The library in the segregation unit was inadequate.
- S30 The provision of recreational PE was well planned to meet the needs of all boys. There were no opportunities to gain meaningful PE qualifications.

Resettlement

S31 *The strategic management of resettlement was informed by an up-to-date needs analysis. Community partnerships were improving and there was more use of release on temporary licence (ROTL). Management of the training plan process was generally good but the quality of casework remained too variable and only half the boys knew that they had a training plan. Public protection work was good but management of MAPPA (multi-agency public protection arrangements) needed further improvement. Looked-after children were supported well and there was dedicated case management of boys serving long sentences. Reintegration planning was sound and most of the pathway work was well managed. Intervention to help boys with sexually harmful behaviours was good. **Outcomes for children and young people at Wetherby and Keppel were reasonably good against this healthy prison test***

S32 *At the last inspection in 2016, we found that outcomes for children and young people in Wetherby and Keppel were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 12 recommendations about resettlement. At this follow-up inspection we found that three of the recommendations had been achieved, two had been partially achieved and seven had not been achieved.*

S33 The strategic management of resettlement continued to cover key issues of case management and reintegration planning and was informed by an up-to-date needs analysis. There were well developed links with community partners and work had recently started to monitor resettlement outcomes after release. There was good use of ROTL to help boys progress.

- S34 Remand and training planning meetings were timely but rarely involved residential staff. Only half the boys knew they had a training or remand management plan and the quality of plans was variable with some generic targets. Good work was being done to improve the quality of casework and the use of sequencing meetings aided the coordination of services to meet boys' needs.
- S35 The interdepartmental risk management board maintained regular oversight of boys subject to mail and telephone monitoring, but attendance at the meeting was inconsistent. Work to strengthen internal MAPPA arrangements was in its infancy.
- S36 Boys with indeterminate sentences were managed by a discrete team of caseworkers. The long-term unit 'Benbow' served little purpose other than to keep long termers together. Transition arrangements were timely for boys moving to the adult estate.
- S37 All boys were seen soon after arrival by a social worker when looked-after boys were identified and appropriately supported.
- S38 Reintegration planning was good, although boys on Keppel could not access the resettlement course offered by the education provider. The establishment continued to provide appropriate practical help for release, including ensuring that boys were met at the gate on their last day. The In2Out mentoring scheme continued to provide good through-the-gate support.
- S39 No boys had been released without an address, although in too many cases addresses were not confirmed until very close to release, affecting resettlement planning. St Giles Trust and Job Centre Plus provided assistance with finance, benefit and debt and some boys could now open bank accounts in preparation for release. The increased use of ROTL was leading to more positive education, training and employment outcomes and there was good use of the virtual campus⁵ for resettlement courses.
- S40 The primary health care team provided effective support for boys before release, providing information about registering with a GP and issuing a supply of medication, or prescription if required. The mental health team linked with community networks to support boys with ongoing needs.
- S41 The number of boys who said that they had weekly visits from family or friends remained low (29% on Keppel and 32% at Wetherby). However, the use of Family Talk trained therapists and social workers to improve family contact remained good practice. Family days were used as a platform to celebrate achievements.
- S42 All boys were assessed to identify appropriate offending behaviour interventions. A good range of accredited programmes was available, including a specialist service for boys with sexually harmful behaviours. In addition, over 50 boys were benefiting from one-to-one work with forensic psychologists.

⁵ Internet access for prisoners to community education, training and employment opportunities.

Main concerns and recommendations

S43 **Concern:** The regime in the segregation unit was limited and boys had little opportunity to demonstrate any improvement in behaviour. The risk-averse culture on the unit created a barrier to constructive engagement with boys and potentially hindered their development.

Recommendation: Governance of the segregation unit should be improved to ensure that the relevant policies and procedures are proportionate and constructive.

S44 **Concern:** Oversight of the use of force lacked sufficient focus; MMPR coordinators continued to be redeployed, body-worn cameras remained underused and issues identified at the weekly scrutiny panel were not addressed adequately.

Recommendation: MMPR coordinators should not be redeployed to other duties. Body-worn cameras should be turned on and all incidents of use of force should be recorded. Written reports and recordings should be reviewed promptly and action taken to address any concerns raised. Oversight and quality assurance should be at a senior level.

S45 **Concern:** Despite widespread bullying and intimidation, the prison had only recorded nine cases of bullying in the previous six months. There was no systematic support for boys who were the victims of bullying.

Recommendation: Incidents of bullying and intimidation should be tracked and monitored effectively to reduce them. Victims of bullying should be properly supported.

S46 **Concern:** Oversight of equality work remained weak. There was poor identification of boys in protected groups, little consultation, no effective governance of many reports of discrimination and no investigation of adverse equality monitoring data.

Recommendation: There should be effective oversight of equality work to ensure boys in protected groups are systematically identified. Equalities monitoring data and regular consultation should be used to identify and address concerns.

S47 **Concern:** The core day was not designed to meet the needs of boys and there had been several additional restrictions leading up to the inspection, with extended periods when boys were locked up. Time out of cell was not consistent between wings, and staff and boys told us that it was unpredictable from day to day.

Recommendation: Boys on the standard regime level should be out of their cells for 10 hours each day, in accordance with a core day timetable driven by their needs. (Repeated main recommendation S53)

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 Although more than three-quarters of boys said that they felt safe during escort, a third of boys on the Wetherby site and half on the Keppel unit said they had travelled with adult prisoners, which was inappropriate.
- 1.2 During the previous six months, more than a third of boys had arrived after 7pm, the latest at 11.35pm. Most boys whose cases had been completed during the morning or early afternoon waited in court holding cells for long periods before being escorted to the prison. For many, their journeys to the establishment were made longer because the adult prisoners they travelled with were dropped off at their prisons first.
- 1.3 More use had been made of the video link since the previous inspection and about a third of court appearances were heard in this way.

Recommendation

- 1.4 **On completion of their court appearance, boys should be transferred to limit the time spent in court cells and should be prioritised for drop off at the receiving prison.**

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.

- 1.5 Reception staff were welcoming and boys were offered a hot meal and drink. The reception area was clean, bright and spacious. Holding rooms were stark with only a television to keep boys occupied. There was no peer support in reception.
- 1.6 Boys were asked for personal details at an open counter which was within earshot of other boys and visitors passing through. The risk assessment and management documentation was completed in a suitably private interview room. Boys who were to be located in Benbow (unit for long-term determinate and life sentenced young people) or Keppel were interviewed in private on the units. Interviews were thorough and staff made appropriate use of the information.
- 1.7 New arrivals for the Wetherby site went to Frobisher, the first night and induction unit, where they remained for about two weeks. Some cells were dirty and contained graffiti, and lacked basic equipment such as kettles (see paragraphs 2.1-2.2). All boys were given a

'passport' booklet that accompanied them during the induction process, which contained information relevant to induction. New arrivals were checked by staff every hour during their first 24 hours in custody.

- I.8 The first night unit continued to accommodate boys who were reintegrating from the segregation unit or were having difficulties on other units. Peer support had started on the induction unit during the week of the inspection but it was underdeveloped and lacked oversight by staff.
- I.9 Induction started on the day after arrival. The programme did not reflect the published timetable. Boys spent some of the morning after arrival in health care completing the second part of the health screen before induction started in the afternoon. An officer delivered a power point presentation which did little to inspire boys to aim high while in custody and contained out-of-date information. However, boys were given ample opportunity to ask questions during the session. Similar first night and induction procedures were used on Benbow and Keppel units which were responsive to the individual needs of these boys.
- I.10 Boys on the Frobisher induction unit spent too long locked in their cells waiting for risk assessments to be completed. They were only unlocked for short induction meetings with staff or for short periods of exercise and association. The labour allocation board only took place once a week and it could take two weeks for many boys to be allocated a place in education. On Keppel unit, boys had more time out of their cell.

Recommendations

- I.11 **The environment in reception should be improved and more information should be available to boys. All new arrivals should be given the opportunity to speak to a peer mentor.**
- I.12 **Boys should be interviewed in private in reception.**
- I.13 **All cells should be adequately equipped for boys on their first night in custody.**
- I.14 **The first night centre should not be used to accommodate boys reintegrating from the segregation unit and others who are disruptive. (Repeated recommendation I.13)**
- I.15 **The induction package should be up to date and should provide boys with accurate information on what they can expect during the early days.**
- I.16 **All boys on the first night unit should have a regime which keeps them occupied. They should not be locked in cells during the working day and delays to risk assessment procedures should be reduced.**

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.17** The quarterly and monthly strategic meetings, combined with weekly operational meetings, remained a potentially useful structure for sharing information and safeguarding boys.
- I.18** However, the weekly meetings were still not attended consistently and it was not clear how actions were disseminated to the wider staff group on the main site or whether actions had been completed. This was mitigated on Keppel unit by the daily briefings which gave all staff access to appropriate information, such as details of new admissions, behaviour management plans or changes relating to boys on an ACCT⁶.
- I.19** The attendance at the strategic meetings was reasonable, discussions were meaningful and some positive actions had been carried out.
- I.20** In our survey, 18% of boys at Wetherby and 29% of boys at Keppel said that they felt unsafe at the time of the inspection. We had significant concerns about safeguarding practice in a number of areas that may have contributed to these negative perceptions. Procedures for identifying victims of violence and bullying were inadequate as was the formal support offered (see paragraph 1.68). There was inadequate oversight of the segregation unit see paragraph 1.84). We also found shortcomings in the complaints system and governance of the use of force (see paragraphs 2.54 and 1.73).
- I.21** Despite some improvements in our survey regarding boys' perceptions of staff, 24% of boys at Wetherby and 7% at Keppel said they would have nobody to turn to if they had a problem. Thirty-nine per cent of black and minority ethnic boys at Wetherby said that this was an issue and we were not confident that the equality structures were robust enough to investigate and address this (see paragraph 2.33). Fewer than a quarter of boys at Wetherby said they would feel able to report victimisation to staff or believed that staff would take reports of victimisation seriously. In contrast, about half the boys on Keppel responded positively to these questions.

Recommendation

- I.22 Staff from all relevant areas should attend the weekly safeguarding meetings.**
(Repeated recommendation 1.21)

⁶ Assessment, care in custody and teamwork case management of prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm.

Child protection

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.23 Child protection arrangements had deteriorated since the previous inspection at Wetherby and Keppel.
- I.24 There remained an appropriate child protection policy which provided a formal basis for interaction between the establishment and the local authority. The local authority provided a significant social work resource at Wetherby and working relationships between the partners remained positive. The safeguarding manager continued to attend a specialist sub-group of the local safeguarding children board, which dealt with juvenile justice matters.
- I.25 There had been 40 referrals to the local authority designated officer (LADO) during the previous six months, including 14 for the Keppel unit. Numbers had reduced since the previous inspection. A new triage system had been implemented on the advice of the LADO to ensure that the LADO only received relevant referrals.
- I.26 These structures were undermined by poor record keeping, delays in investigations and staff redeployment. The child protection files that we saw were poor: there were no completed chronologies, advice from the LADO had not been recorded and it was not clear what action had been taken to prevent further harm during an investigation. Investigations into allegations also took far too long. Some boys who had made allegations more than a month before the inspection had not yet been interviewed by the child protection coordinator. This stemmed from regular staff redeployment and the fact that the child protection coordinator was not always able to see boys at her first attempt, particularly when they were located in the segregation unit.
- I.27 The route for referrals was unclear in cases where there was an immediate risk of harm to boys or harm had occurred. The LADO was notified but referrals were not always passed immediately to the local authority child protection team if the LADO was not on duty.
- I.28 Managers were unable to track delays in investigations because the child protection log was incomplete. So far in 2017, the safeguarding team had triaged 44 allegations, but the log only recorded eight interviews with boys and only six outcomes.
- I.29 Most allegations continued to relate to the use of force by staff which, in the most serious cases, had led to police investigations. The inconsistent use of body-worn video cameras by staff from all areas frustrated investigations into maltreatment (see paragraph I.76).
- I.30 The practice of strip-searching boys under restraint continued.

Recommendations

- I.31 **Child protection arrangements should be robust. Investigations should be prompt and underpinned by clear procedures, agreed with external safeguarding partners and reinforced by appropriate escalation procedures.**
- I.32 **Children should never be strip-searched under restraint.**

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.33** The full scope and range of bullying had been underestimated by prison managers. Systems intended to identify and support the victims of bullying and intimidation had not been used systematically and had not reduced the impact of bullying effectively.
- I.34** In our survey, 32% of boys at Wetherby and 38% on Keppel said that they had been victimised by other boys. A number of boys told us about having to give up their canteen to other boys, known as paying rent or taxing. The prison had recorded nine cases of bullying in the past six months, by opening 'positive attitudes created together' (PACT)⁷ documents (see paragraph I.44). We found many more examples of bullying in case notes and observation books and in discussion with staff and boys.
- I.35** There was no recorded support planning or evaluation of actions taken for boys who were the victims of bullying. As a result, the prison was unable to identify the full extent of bullying.
- I.36** Some boys told us that they would not report bullying as nothing would happen. In one case that we tracked, a boy who had reported being bullied did not know what support he had been given. When we checked his PACT document, it was blank.
- I.37** On the Keppel unit, staff quickly identified bullying and took steps to keep victims safe. This individual approach was aided by detailed handovers and consistent management of bullying.

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.38** The levels of self-harm had reduced at Wetherby and Keppel since the last inspection, although some boys continued to display serious and consistent self-harming behaviour. Staff were vigilant and quickly opened ACCT documents to support boys. They understood the impact of long sentences on emotional wellbeing and were aware of boys who might be vulnerable because of the nature of their offence. Careful consideration was given to ongoing support for boys, including referrals to mental health workers and family contact.
- I.39** Staff on the Keppel unit ensured that the two boys on constant watch could access a range of activities. Staff had good relationships with these boys, enabling them to monitor and adapt to changing moods. As there was no care suite, constant watch cells were fitted with

⁷ PACT (positive attitudes created together) is a system to identify, assess and reduce bullying. Stage one intended to identify the perpetrator of bullying, and gave them two weeks to change their behaviour before more formal action was taken, including loss of privileges. Stage two was implemented if stage one did not reduce bullying. This provided a formal action plan, which was intended to penalise bullying behaviour and be reviewed frequently. Boys could be on this stage for up to four weeks.

photochromatic doors, but these doors were locked open and boys were observed through gates.

- I.40 The quality of ACCT documents varied, but most outlined the concerns and actions to be taken. Post-closure reviews identified the need for continuing support. Staff handovers included information about boys on ACCTs.
- I.41 There was insufficient refresher training for staff dealing with some very serious incidents of self-harm.

Recommendation

- I.42 **Suicide and self-harm refresher training should be available to all staff.**

Behaviour management

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.43 The behaviour management strategy described the different methods of managing boys' behaviour, but these were still not coordinated which undermined the promotion of positive behaviour. Some boys were subject to several plans, each with targets, and it was unclear which took priority.
- I.44 PACT (positive attitudes created together) procedures continued to be used: PACT 1 consisted of ways of monitoring poor behaviour and PACT 2 provided interventions when the behaviour deteriorated. The underlying principles were sound, but better management was needed to prevent boys drifting for weeks on a PACT 2 with no improvement in behaviour due to a lack of reviews. The regime for boys on PACT 2 was poor, particularly if they were also suspended from education (see paragraph 1.34).
- I.45 The management of the most challenging boys was not coordinated. For example, management plans were put in place for boys who had not responded to PACT 2 which offered boys the opportunity to earn incentives for shorter periods of good behaviour. However, we came across boys on management plans who were subject to a loss of incentives following adjudications which rendered the plans ineffective.
- I.46 Behaviour management had been enhanced by the introduction of the merit scheme. Boys earned merits for good behaviour which they could exchange for confectionery in weekly tuck shops on the wings. The scheme was not yet fully embedded and merits were rarely awarded outside education. Records showed significant periods when tuck shops were not stocked (see paragraph 3.11).
- I.47 A conflict resolution team had been introduced to mediate between boys in conflict. This was a positive initiative but it was too early to assess its effectiveness.
- I.48 The situation was better on the Keppel unit where the PACT measures were underpinned by stronger relationships between staff and boys.

Recommendations

- I.49 Behaviour management should be coordinated more effectively. Staff and boys should understand how interventions are linked and which take priority.**
- I.50 Merits should be awarded by staff from all areas and tuck shops should be regularly stocked.**

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.51** The rewards and sanctions policy was under review at the time of the inspection and the existing policy did not reflect recent improvements.
- I.52** The scheme operated on three levels: gold, silver and red. Incentives had been added to the scheme, including a small refrigerator and a soft pillow for those on gold level. At the time of the inspection, 28% of boys were on gold and 20% on red level. Boys remained on red level for at least 28 days, although many boys stayed on this level for much longer. After 28 days, they should have received weekly reviews before moving on to a management plan. This was too long an interval without an individual support plan to address continuing poor behaviour. In many cases even weekly reviews were not adhered to.
- I.53** The regime for boys on red was austere, particularly for those suspended from education or on loss of privileges following an adjudication.

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.54** Procedural security across the site had become risk averse. Measures had been introduced in some areas which prevented key work strands from being achieved. Some measures were disproportionate and disrespectful; for example, all boys had been issued with non-standard flimsy plastic cutlery which broke easily, supposedly to prevent weapons from being made.
- I.55** Decisions were too often made without the knowledge of the security department: for example, officers in the segregation unit were frequently making decisions to restrict access to the unit, and to individual prisoners, with no record of appropriate risk assessment or authority at a senior level (see paragraph I.84). Similarly, there was ad hoc removal of boys from activities without approval at an appropriate level. There were no clear protocols to govern how such decisions should be made to ensure that they were fair and did not have a negative impact on the individuals concerned.

- I.56** During the previous six months, there had been 3,902 intelligence reports, slightly more than at the previous inspection. Most intelligence logs were now processed promptly, although about 130 actions remained outstanding.
- I.57** A monthly security committee was chaired by either the deputy governor or head of security. During the previous six months, some crucial areas such as safeguarding and substance misuse had not always been represented. The committee ratified the security objectives for the following month based on analysis of the intelligence. The objectives were broadly aligned with the risks faced by Wetherby, but the management of key issues was not sufficiently focused. For example, 42% of intelligence reports concerned incidents of violence, but there was no coordinated strategy or action plan to reduce the level of violence among boys at Wetherby.
- I.58** Records of searches were poor and there was no coordinated log to monitor the number of boys subject to strip-search or the number of cell searches conducted. We found evidence of a boy in the segregation unit who had been strip-searched under restraint but there was no search record. This was unacceptable. The search records for January and part of February 2017 could not be located. We found a few records with no managerial approval for the search. Most records did not explain in enough detail why the search was required.
- I.59** Positive trends in mandatory drug testing (MDT) were not being addressed and there was no supply reduction action plan. During the previous six months, nine boys had tested positive under random and suspicion MDT, mainly for cannabis. Drug finds confirmed that cannabis was the main substance of use followed by synthetic cannabinoids (NPS⁸). In our survey, 32% of boys at Wetherby said it was easy to get illegal drugs against the comparator of 17%.
- I.60** Supply reduction and substance misuse support services were not integrated. Boys testing positive under MDT were not referred to the Lifeline team and drug strategy meetings attended by all relevant departments had only resumed in February 2017.
- I.61** During the previous six months, there had been 656 adjudications which was less than half the number at the previous inspection. The charges that we reviewed confirmed that adjudications were used to address the more serious behaviour.
- I.62** Most adjudications were conducted on the residential units in a relaxed atmosphere. Documentation was issued the day before the hearing. The Barnardo's advocacy service was available to all boys on request. Boys who had been subject to adjudication said that they were made fully aware of the procedures and our observations reflected this. In our survey, 87% of boys said the process had been clearly explained to them compared with 69% at the previous inspection. Despite these findings, a number of records that we examined did not demonstrate adequate enquiry before a finding of guilt.
- I.63** When adjudications were proven, awards reflected the local tariff guide and mitigation. Removal from unit was not applied as a punishment at Wetherby or Keppel. More serious charges were referred to the police or independent adjudicator and the tracking of outstanding charges was now more effective. At the time of the inspection, 47 charges were with the police and none was outstanding with the independent adjudicator. This represented a marked improvement since the previous inspection.
- I.64** A quality check of adjudications was carried out each month by the deputy governor and they were discussed at a quarterly standardisation meeting. Managers who had conducted adjudications did not always attend the meetings, but attendance by advocates was good.

⁸ Drugs that are developed or chosen to mimic the effects of illegal drugs such as cannabis, heroin or amphetamines and may have unpredictable and life threatening effects.

Data and trends were not analysed well enough at the meetings to inform decision making. For example, the HMPPS equality monitoring tool had identified a number of out-of-range areas for black and minority ethnic boys, but this had not been discussed at the standardisation meeting (see paragraph 2.33). Actions that had been identified had often not been completed by the time of the next meeting.

Recommendations

- 1.65 All strip-searching should be properly authorised, logged and monitored by the safeguarding children strategy committee.** (Repeated recommendation 1.66)
- 1.66 The standardisation meeting for disciplinary procedures should include thorough analysis of data and trends to address any identified concerns, with particular focus on equality strands.**

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.

- 1.67** Despite a reduction since the previous inspection, violence between boys remained high, including serious violence. Assaults on staff had remained at the same level. Violence was monitored effectively at the monthly safeguarding meetings and a detailed analysis of patterns of violence was provided for each wing or unit. A boy who demonstrated repeated violence was placed on PACT level 1, which included a warning that his behaviour needed to improve. Some boys went on to PACT 2, which was not being used consistently (see paragraph 1.44). One boy had been on PACT 2 for 70 days with no improvement in his behaviour.
- 1.68** A range of measures to reduce violence had been introduced and a conflict resolution team had recently been formed. The analysis of violence was being used effectively, but some data on violence provided to inspectors were inaccurate.
- 1.69** A violence reduction action plan had been produced relating to assaults on staff, but there was no similar plan for violence between boys.
- 1.70** A number of boys told us that theft of their canteen was a common form of bullying and some staff confirmed this. The extent of this problem was not monitored and there was little advice or support for boys when it occurred (see paragraph 2.115).

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.

- 1.71** Levels of force across Wetherby and Keppel remained similar to the previous inspection with 423 incidents of force recorded, 78 of which were for boys on Keppel. Minimising and managing physical restraint (MMPR) holds had been applied in nearly half these incidents. Many incidents involving use of force were spontaneous in response to fights or assaults. About 10% of the incidents required planned intervention.

- I.72** Pain-inducing techniques had been used on 22 occasions. When incidents led to boys being strip-searched, record keeping was poor and the number of times force had been used was not known.
- I.73** Governance of use of force had improved in a number of areas but some significant gaps remained. More than three-quarters of staff were now trained in the use of MMRP and the number of use of force reports awaiting completion had reduced considerably to about 40 at the time of the inspection.
- I.74** Use of force was reviewed by a weekly scrutiny panel chaired by the head of safeguarding. Minutes did not always reflect attendance which was usually limited to an MMRP coordinator and a social work team representative. Other areas such as residential units were not represented. The panel reviewed incidents involving deployment of MMRP. Records indicated concerns that had been identified but there was not enough evidence to demonstrate actions that had been taken. There was further discussion at the monthly safeguarding meeting at which a range of data were presented, including trends and hotspots. There was again no evidence of actions taken as a result of this information. The restraint minimisation strategy had been produced five years previously and did not reflect the current risks faced at Wetherby.
- I.75** There had been a longstanding vacancy among MMRP coordinators who were frequently redeployed to other areas. This meant that coordinators were unable to scrutinise incidents of force in the immediate aftermath or analyse data consistently. Records indicated that 65 hours had been lost through redeployment between January and March 2017. This number did not always reflect ad hoc redeployment.
- I.76** A high number of body-worn video cameras were available for staff to use, but there was inadequate coverage in too many incidents. In a number of incidents that we reviewed, staff were wearing cameras but had either failed to use them or footage had not been downloaded. The camera used for hand-held video recording had not been working for about two months and coordinators had to rely on fixed CCTV. This was often inadequate for scrutinising use of force incidents appropriately and more up-to-date technology should have been used (see paragraph I.29).
- I.77** Incidents that we reviewed demonstrated appropriate use of techniques, although in some cases many staff had responded and then remained at the scene. This appeared disproportionate and sometimes hampered immediate de-escalation. Post-incident debriefs were conducted and there was now a health care presence at planned incidents. During the inspection we were made aware of a concerning incident that was now subject to investigation.

Recommendation

- I.78** **Use of force data should identify hotspots and analyse trends to identify and record actions to reduce the number of incidents across the site.**

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.79** The use of segregation had reduced at Wetherby and Keppel. 71 boys had been segregated during the previous six months. Average stays were relatively short and most were less than a week. A few boys had been segregated for longer periods and at the time of the inspection one boy had been segregated for 120 days before he was relocated.
- I.80** The segregation unit remained on Anson which had a large spacious association area, a number of group/interview rooms and a large servery area. However, most boys were not given access to the association area and equipment because of the numerous restrictions that were in place. The areas where boys spent most of their time, mainly their cells, were dirty and contained graffiti which had been there for some time.
- I.81** The daily regime was limited to a shower, telephone call and exercise. The yards remained caged with no facilities to occupy boys. Outreach education was available to boys on the unit, although at the time of this inspection only two of the six boys segregated were under tuition. Library provision was inadequate and in-cell activity remained poor. Boys were not allowed to collect their own meals from the servery and food was delivered to cell doors.
- I.82** While we recognised the challenges presented in managing some of the more violent boys in the system, the default position for all boys in the segregation unit was one of control and restriction. We were not assured that the risk management plans in place were sufficiently individualised or used to review risk to enable some boys to engage in a more fulfilling regime while segregated. We saw a number of cases where this risk-averse approach was disproportionate and it was difficult for boys to progress and demonstrate improvements in behaviour.
- I.83** All boys were subject to an unlock protocol which required a minimum of two staff in standard uniform and up to four staff in full personal protective equipment (PPE). At the time of our inspection, one boy was only unlocked when there were four staff dressed in full personal protective clothing. This had been the case for some time with little evidence of constructive work to address his heightened risk. This approach was extremely resource intensive and affected the regime for other boys. Risk management plans were not clear as to how and why unlock levels had been agreed or how they could be reduced.
- I.84** Access to the unit by non-unit staff was controlled by the segregation staff. All visitors, including managers, were instructed to phone ahead or knock and wait before entering. We were told this was to protect staff from a boy who was being closely guarded by four officers in full PPE. We were also told by a number of staff and service providers who needed to see segregated boys that they sometimes felt unnecessarily obstructed by the staff on the unit.
- I.85** This excessively restricted approach to managing the unit hampered the delivery of interventions designed to improve behaviour and outcomes for boys. We were particularly concerned to see education and health care interventions being carried out through a fence on the cage-like exercise yard.
- I.86** Segregation monitoring meetings were in place, chaired by a functional manager. A quarterly report was produced which was designed to analyse trends across a range of data, such as length of stay and the segregation of prisoners with protected characteristics. However, the report lacked sufficient information to plan for a reduction in the use of segregation or

improve the regime for those located there. Parts of the report were simply repeated each quarter.

- I.87** The introduction of a small psychology team to the unit was a welcome initiative. They had conducted a needs analysis of the unit in July 2016 which made constructive recommendations to provide support for both boys and staff. It was disappointing that there had been little progress in implementing the recommendations and this was a missed opportunity to create a more positive culture on the unit.
- I.88** Segregation reviews took place regularly and records that we examined indicated that attendance had improved. Boys received a written copy of the targets but most were generic and did not address the behaviour that had led to segregation. In some cases we observed boys who were willing to progress back to normal location but remained on good order because little had been done to set meaningful targets, test behaviour or reassess risk.
- I.89** An integration risk management plan was drawn up for boys returning to normal location. This document was used to inform residential staff about previous history and the proposed daily management of the individual. We observed some positive work by a residential custodial manager who oversaw the successful reintegration of a boy with challenging behaviour back to normal location. We were also told about advanced plans to use existing accommodation to support boys during their early reintegration, which would be a positive move forward.

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.90** Designated drug strategy meetings had been suspended until February 2017, but the need for improved integration among departments had been recognised and a multi-agency committee was now timetabled to meet every two months. A substance misuse policy and action plan had been drawn up and a needs assessment was to be completed shortly.
- I.91** In our survey, 38% of boys said they had a drug problem on arrival against the comparator of 28%. Lifeline delivered the young people's drug and alcohol support service (YPDASS) and saw boys within five days of arrival, but usually sooner. The team used the CHAT (comprehensive health assessment tool) and the initial assessment included harm reduction advice and information.
- I.92** General drug and alcohol awareness was provided by the education department as part of personal development training. The YPDASS focused on boys requiring targeted or specialist interventions. At the time of the inspection, 114 boys (43% of the population) were engaging with the team, 92 at Wetherby and 22 on the Keppel unit.
- I.93** There was evidence of detailed care plans, good quality one-to-one work and effective information sharing with case workers and health services. Care was coordinated during joint sequencing planning meetings. Due to staff shortages, group work was limited at the time of the inspection and the YPDASS had not developed family or peer support services.
- I.94** Boys on Keppel received more intensive input to support their complex needs but the unit no longer benefited from designated YPDASS workers.

- I.95** Clinical substance misuse services were provided by the Leeds Community Healthcare NHS Trust. Appropriate arrangements were in place to manage boys safely during detoxification, but the need for these services was very low. Only one boy had required opiate substitute treatment in the previous 12 months. Two senior nurses and a GP had specialised in substance misuse treatment and there was good joint working with the YPDASS and the CAMHS (child and adolescent mental health service) to coordinate the care of boys with complex needs.

Recommendation

- I.96** The YPDASS should further develop services based on the needs of the population, taking account of the particularly complex needs of boys on the Keppel unit.

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 Graffiti remained a problem across the site. Standards of cleanliness varied in cells, showers and communal areas. Most areas were clean but we saw overflowing bins, grubby stairwells and dirty serveries. On Benbow unit, boys serving the longest sentences remained in the smallest cells. The accommodation on the restricted status spur was particularly poor. We found material on the walls of cells across the site which contravened the offensive display policy. Keppel unit provided a better standard of accommodation than the main site.
- 2.2 Cells were single occupancy and adequately maintained, but toilets were very dirty. Toilets did not have lids or seats and were still not screened adequately. Staff and boys told us that there remained a problem with the supply of basic items such as kettles, curtains, and cutlery, and not all boys had these. Only boys on the highest level of the rewards scheme had lockable cabinets.
- 2.3 In our survey, only 61% of boys on the Wetherby site said they could shower every day compared with 89% at the last inspection and the comparator of 76%. Showers were in individual cubicles in communal areas on the Wetherby site and in cells on Keppel. The condition of showers across the Wetherby site varied and on Benbow they were poor with mouldy, damp and smelly cubicles.
- 2.4 Only 11% of boys on the Wetherby site said their cell call bells were answered within five minutes. When we tested the bells, response times were poor, which was concerning. Cell call bell response times were still not centrally monitored by managers on either site.
- 2.5 In our survey, only 54% of boys on the Wetherby site said they could use the telephone every day against 81% at the last inspection. We saw an example of staff not managing use of the phones appropriately to give fair access to all boys on the unit. There was better access to telephones on Keppel with 92% of boys in our survey saying that they could use the phone every day.
- 2.6 Exercise yards on the Wetherby site were stark with only a few metal benches. There was broken equipment and litter on the Benbow exercise yard. The outdoor area around Keppel unit was better.
- 2.7 Only boys on the highest level of the privileges scheme could wear their own clothes on the units. However, many boys chose not to as it was limited to clothes which resembled prison clothing, such as grey or white tracksuit bottoms. Boys on the Wetherby site did not have enough prison clothing. We saw boys sitting in wet clothes after being in the rain because they did not have a coat or other clothes to change into, which was unacceptable. Staff on the Wetherby site said that they had difficulty finding enough clothes, although this was not highlighted as a problem on the Keppel unit.
- 2.8 There was no tracking or monitoring of applications across the site. However, in our survey more boys than the comparator felt that applications were sorted out fairly and quickly.

Recommendations

- 2.9 All graffiti should be removed promptly.** (Repeated recommendation 2.9)
- 2.10 Accommodation for boys on the restricted status spur should be deep cleaned and improved and the showers on Benbow unit should be deep cleaned to remove mould and damp.**
- 2.11 Toilets should be adequately screened, with seats and lids.** (Repeated recommendation 2.10)
- 2.12 All boys should be able to shower and make a telephone call daily.**
- 2.13 Regular monitoring of cell call bell response times should be undertaken to ensure they are answered promptly.** (Repeated recommendation 2.11)
- 2.14 Exercise yards should be improved and recreational activities should be available for boys to participate in.**
- 2.15 Boys should be able to wear their own clothes.**
- 2.16 There should be enough clothing for boys to have a change of clothes when necessary. Appropriate outdoor clothes should be provided.**
- 2.17 Applications should be tracked and responses monitored.**

Relationships between staff and children and young people

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.18** In our survey, boys on the Wetherby site said that 74% of staff treated them with respect against the comparator of 62% and 58% at the previous inspection. On Keppel unit 83% said that staff treated them with respect.
- 2.19** We observed positive interactions between staff and boys, particularly on Keppel. Case notes contained evidence of meaningful interactions and positive comments about boys' behaviour, including their achievements. However, we observed some staff who continued to have low expectations of boys. They did not address poor behaviour, such as swearing, or encourage more appropriate behaviour. Although we found generally poor living conditions across the site, some staff we spoke to thought this was either acceptable or inevitable and so were unlikely to try to improve conditions for boys.
- 2.20** We observed an overbearing focus on risk rather than the needs of boys. We saw staff restricting access to the regime for minor infringements, which was inappropriate. This often affected boys for long periods and prevented the development of positive relationships.
- 2.21** Consultation with boys on the Wetherby site had developed since the previous inspection, although the youth council had not met since November 2016. Monthly consultations took place on the Keppel site.

Recommendations

- 2.22** All staff should engage positively with boys and have higher expectations of them. Managers should identify and challenge any poor staff attitudes.
- 2.23** Managers should support the development of positive relationships by ensuring that the management of poor behaviour is consistent and proportionate.
- 2.24** Consultation meetings should be held regularly.

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.

Strategic management

- 2.25** Equality work had been undermined by regular redeployment of equality staff. Oversight of equality work was weak. The recent appointment of an equality coordinator was a positive initiative, but it was too early to assess the effectiveness.
- 2.26** The equality policy did not reflect current practice. Equality action group meetings took place infrequently, action planning was poor and key weaknesses had not been addressed quickly enough.
- 2.27** The prison had used its own threshold for the investigation of adverse data from the equality monitoring tool, which was less rigorous than that set by HMPPS. Significantly adverse data on the treatment of black and minority ethnic boys had not been investigated. There was no separate monitoring of outcomes for the Keppel unit.
- 2.28** There were no prisoner equality representatives and there had been little consultation with boys in protected groups. A new consultation programme had been started shortly before the inspection. We attended a forum with Muslim boys which was well run and appropriately focused on equality issues.
- 2.29** During the previous six months, 21 discrimination incident report forms (DIRFs) had been submitted, six from the Keppel unit. A few DIRFs were dealt with appropriately by the equality team but in most cases reports of discrimination were considered outside the DIRF process, which was incorrect. There was no effective governance of these cases, which were dealt with by residential staff. The majority involved racial abuse and it was unclear to the equality team or the complainant whether the complaint had been investigated.
- 2.30** The education department delivered a good programme of themed diversity work, although with little involvement from community groups.

Recommendation

2.31 There should be effective oversight of equality work. Strategy and action planning should be informed by effective analysis of monitoring data, identification of boys in protected groups, a programme of regular consultation with boys and robust investigation of discrimination incident report forms.

Diverse needs

- 2.32** Thirty per cent of boys across the site were from a black and minority ethnic background, but only 2% of boys in the Keppel unit. The Youth Justice Board had not investigated this discrepancy in a timely manner.
- 2.33** The responses to our survey of black and minority ethnic boys on the main site were similar to those of white boys in most respects. However, they reported a significantly worse experience of victimisation by other boys and by staff. There had been little consultation with this group and the prison was ill equipped to understand these findings. Adverse monitoring data for black and minority ethnic boys had not been investigated. This was compounded by poor oversight of the DIRF process and a lack of clarity on whether racist abuse was being managed effectively.
- 2.34** In our survey of the main site, 7% of boys said they were from a Gypsy/Roma/Traveller background, suggesting a population of about 15. The prison only had records of two. There had been little provision for this group, but discussions had been held recently with the two boys and actions agreed to develop this area of work.
- 2.35** Fourteen per cent of boys across the site were Muslim. The responses to our survey of Muslim boys on the main site were similar to other boys with the exception again of questions on victimisation by other boys and staff. There had been no consultations with this group about their perceptions, although one took place during the inspection. Data from the equality monitoring tool indicated no discrimination of Muslim boys across the areas measured.
- 2.36** Our survey suggested that overall about 65 boys had a disability. In our survey, 40% of boys with a disability said they felt unsafe currently and 68% said they had emotional or mental health problems compared with 14% and 18% of other boys respectively.
- 2.37** Records of disability on the prison case management system were very poor. In 71% of cases, there was no record of whether a boy had a disability. The equality monitoring tool could not provide any data on the treatment of this group.
- 2.38** There had been no consultation with boys with disabilities to investigate their perceptions of their safety and the prison did not collate data on whether the victims of assault had a disability.
- 2.39** Health and education staff did not systematically share with residential staff information on less obvious disabilities, such as attention deficit hyperactivity disorder or autism. Residential staff had little awareness of many such boys. There were no wing plans to help staff to understand behaviour which might be associated with a disability and to ensure that needs were met.
- 2.40** There were 15 foreign national boys at the time of the inspection. Practical support was provided by the casework team who were fully aware of trafficking issues. Awareness of such issues among wing staff was poor.

- 2.41** The Home Office held ad hoc surgeries in Wetherby, but there was no access to independent legal representation. Staff were not sufficiently alert to the need for boys to receive prompt advice, for example concerning their immigration status. One boy with a particularly complex immigration case was not sure if his family had instructed a solicitor to help him.
- 2.42** In our survey, 99% of boys said that they understood spoken English. Facilities for telephone interpreting were available, but we were concerned that telephone interpretation had not been used for safety assessments of one boy who had arrived shortly before the inspection.
- 2.43** No boys had disclosed they were gay on the main site and there were no external support groups. However, two boys on the Keppel unit were gay and a support group had recently met. Records indicated that these boys were subject to homophobic abuse. Good support was available for boys who said they wished to transition.

Recommendations

- 2.44 Information on boys with a disability should be shared with unit staff and, where necessary, unit care plans should be produced to help staff meet the needs of this group.**
- 2.45 Staff should use an accredited interpretation service whenever there are issues of accuracy or confidentiality.**

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.

- 2.46** The chaplaincy was well led and efficient and delivered a range of services and classes for the main faith groups. The team consisted of a managing chaplain who was well supported by sessional and part-time staff.
- 2.47** Staff and boys spoke positively about the chaplaincy. In our survey, 67% on both the main site and Keppel said they felt able to speak to a chaplain of their faith in private. Only 48% of boys on the main site said they had access to a chaplain in their first 24 hours, but chaplaincy records indicated that all new boys were seen promptly.
- 2.48** The team was visible and supported boys throughout the establishment. There was strong support for boys in crisis and the segregation unit was visited each day. The team had made 667 visits to boys on an ACCT⁹ in the previous six months and had attended 259 ACCT reviews. There was evidence of good support for boys experiencing family problems and bereavement.
- 2.49** The chaplaincy facilitated a very good range of faith programmes, including the Time out for Dads course and Challenge Plus, a programme to develop confidence, team working and social skills for boys in the Keppel unit. The impressive In2Out mentoring scheme continued to support boys from both sites before and after their release (see paragraph 4.24).

⁹ Assessment, care in custody and teamwork case management of prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm.

- 2.50** The multi-faith centre had appropriate facilities, including a small group room with comfortable seats. Facilities for ablutions were shabby and in need of decoration.

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.

- 2.51** There had been 272 complaints during the previous six months, similar to the last inspection.
- 2.52** Only 28% of boys on the main site said that complaints were sorted out fairly and 18% that they were dealt with quickly. Concerns about the fairness and promptness of the process were reflected in our interviews with boys.
- 2.53** Although there had been some improvement in recent months, many responses to complaints were late and some had never been replied to. Barnardo's provided useful support to boys who wished to complain, a number of whom had little confidence in the process.
- 2.54** Many complaints concerned low-level issues which could have been resolved informally. Most responses that we looked at were polite, fair and focused, although some were not clear enough. We were particularly concerned about a complaint from a boy who had waited 45 minutes for staff to answer his cell bell and was in some distress. He was advised that staff would have responded more quickly if his behaviour had been better.
- 2.55** A basic analysis of complaints by location and type was presented to the safeguarding meeting. There was some evidence that trends were identified and acted on. The head of safeguarding reviewed a 10% sample of complaints each month, although this had not yet been undertaken for complaints in January 2017.
- 2.56** There was no effective consultation on the complaints process.

Recommendation

- 2.57** **The complaints procedure should be based on prompt decisions with effective consultation and quality assurance so that boys have confidence in the system.**

Legal rights

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.58** Good support was provided to boys on legal matters. Caseworkers met boys soon after arrival to explain their legal position and give them an informative booklet about their sentence. Remanded boys were referred to youth offending teams to help with bail applications. Caseworkers and Barnardo's advocates helped boys with other legal matters

such as appeals and contact with appropriate legal representatives. Only a third of boys in our survey said they could speak to an advocate if they wanted to.

- 2.59** Provision for legal visits was poor. Solicitors could use rooms for closed visits, but they were few in number and too small and could not be booked in advance. Most visits took place in the visits hall which was not a confidential setting.

Recommendation

- 2.60** **Appropriate facilities should be provided for legal visits to be conducted in confidence.**

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.

- 2.61** The inspection of health services was jointly undertaken by the Care Quality Commission (CQC)¹⁰ and HM Inspectorate of Prisons under a memorandum of understanding agreement between the agencies. A number of areas have been identified that require improvement with subsequent notices issued by the CQC which are detailed in Appendix III of this report.

Governance arrangements

- 2.62** Leeds Community Health Care NHS Trust was the lead provider of health services, with South West Yorkshire NHS Foundation Trust delivering subcontracted generic mental health services and forensic child and adolescent services (CAMHS). The Crossley Street Medical Practice provided GP services. There had been no recent health needs assessment of the population, but regular thorough analysis of the data from individual comprehensive health assessment tool (CHAT) assessments was used to inform plans.
- 2.63** Reporting of serious and untoward incidents was effective. The arrangements were well understood by staff and we saw clear evidence of learning. Local health partners met regularly to facilitate collaborative working. There was an operational prison health board but we observed some tensions within the regime in facilitating health care and security concerns had caused restrictions to be placed on access to health care.
- 2.64** There were no health representatives and no discrete patient forum, although the views of boys were sought in generic forums and a recent survey had elicited useful feedback about health services.
- 2.65** There was good leadership of clinical staff and an appropriate skill mix, but there were a number of workforce vacancies. A plan to deal with shortfalls and enhance recruitment was having positive results and, although staff were stretched, patient demand was being met

¹⁰ 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>.

overall. Induction, training and supervision were good, and staff told us that they had access to opportunities for professional development.

- 2.66** Care plans were based on evidence and records were subject to audit. Staff understood the importance of medical confidentiality and arrangements for appropriate information sharing were in place.
- 2.67** Treatment rooms in the health care department were fit for purpose. Infection prevention standards were largely met, although a recent audit had identified areas requiring action. These were being addressed. The upgrading of wing facilities had started to address most areas of concern.
- 2.68** Recent records indicated that emergency services did not often need to be called. The internal response to medical crises was good. Clinical staff were appropriately trained and emergency resuscitation equipment was appropriate and regularly checked. All wings had automated external defibrillators, but too few prison staff had basic life support skills.
- 2.69** Safeguarding arrangements in health care were good and we saw examples of appropriate responses to support boys potentially at risk. Good health information was provided for boys during induction, but there was limited written information on the wings.
- 2.70** Boys used the prison complaints procedure to raise concerns about health care, which lacked confidentiality. Many issues were dealt with appropriately face to face and few formal written complaints were recorded. There was no evidence of learning from complaints and boys did not know how to escalate matters which were not resolved to their satisfaction.
- 2.71** The approach to disease prevention was good. A dedicated health care support worker offered advice and health promotion information, including access to barrier protection and nicotine patches. However, there was no overarching strategic plan targeting the needs of boys. Age-appropriate screening was carried out and there was a good range of immunisation and vaccination programmes.
- 2.72** The CQC issued requirement to improve notices following the inspection (see Appendix III).

Recommendations

- 2.73** **Boys' access to health care appointments should not be compromised because of the prison regime.**
- 2.74** **All custody staff should receive regular basic life support training as part of their mandatory training programme.**
- 2.75** **Boys should be able to complain about health services through a well-publicised, confidential system which explains how to escalate their complaint if they are not satisfied with the response.**

Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.76** Boys received a health screening on arrival using the CHAT assessment tool. They had a comprehensive health induction and were seen routinely by a GP within 24 hours.
- 2.77** The application system was straightforward and ensured prompt access to appropriate services. GP provision was good with six sessions each week. This facilitated prompt access

to urgent medical support and boys were seen within two to three days for routine medical appointments.

- 2.78** Leeds Community Health Care NHS Trust facilitated a variety of appropriate primary care services including physiotherapy, optician and a range of nurse-led consultations. There were short waiting times for all clinics. Support for long-term conditions was good and appropriate care plans were in place. Non-attendance at many clinics was a concern. There was limited monitoring of this and the service only partially understood why it was happening. The main waiting room in the health care department was run down and shabby with very limited health information available. There were no dedicated patient toilet facilities in the building, which was unacceptable.
- 2.79** Only a few boys needed planned external health appointments, but too many were cancelled through operational demands. A protocol had been introduced to mitigate this which had effected some improvement, but more needed to be done.
- 2.80** Health care staff attended the segregation unit regularly, but access to boys was restricted and rarely confidential with the risk of poor disclosure of health concerns. We were advised that a member of the health care team always attended planned physical interventions. However, it was clear during the inspection that they were not always told of such events, placing boys at increased risk. All nursing staff had been trained in the prevention and management of aggression.
- 2.81** The four beds in the health care department were still occasionally used to accommodate boys who were vulnerable or unable to cope in the main prison. We deemed only one room to be adequate and there were no separate shower facilities. It was not possible to operate a constructive regime in this area which was very disruptive to the running of clinical services. Three boys had used these beds recently, which we judged to be inappropriate.

Recommendations

- 2.82 All do-not-attends should be followed up to identify why boys are missing appointments.**
- 2.83 The main waiting room in the health care department should be refurbished and there should be a dedicated toilet facility for boys.**
- 2.84 Boys should have access to planned external health appointments.**
- 2.85 Nurses should be called to and routinely attend any use of force/restraint.**
(Repeated recommendation 2.78)
- 2.86 The inpatient facility should be closed.**

Pharmacy

- 2.87** Individually labelled medicines were dispensed by Lloyd's Pharmacy and prescribing followed the agreed formulary. Stock medications were appropriate and checked regularly. The movement and storage of medicines were secure. The pharmacy worked closely with prescribers and checked medication reviews each day to ensure prompt re-ordering of treatments. There was an appropriate range of standard operating policies and patient group

directions¹¹. A dedicated pharmacy team consisted of a clinical pharmacist and three technicians, which met patient need appropriately.

- 2.88** Medicines were administered by a nurse or pharmacy technician four times a day at 7.45am, 11.30am, 4.15pm and 8pm. Administration times varied which could affect therapeutic efficiency, but overall risks were appropriately managed. Medicines were issued from treatment rooms on the wings. Officers supervised medication queues well and boys had a degree of confidentiality at the hatch.
- 2.89** Few boys received in-possession medication, which reflected the risk to boys. None had medication in possession on the Keppel unit, which was appropriate. Medicine rounds could take up to 40 minutes. We observed delays in starting administration which potentially placed pressure on health professionals to accelerate procedures which could increase the risk of error. Controlled drugs were administered by a single health care practitioner following a risk assessment which we judged to be a proportionate approach.
- 2.90** A range of over-the-counter medicines were available and the regular GP presence on site, with other prescribers, meant that boys had timely access to appropriate treatment. Governance and oversight of medicine management were reasonable.

Dentistry

- 2.91** Dentistry was provided by the community dental team at two clinic sessions per week. Boys with oral pain or infection were appropriately prioritised for consultation, but the waiting time for initial routine dental appointments was about 10 weeks. Individual oral health education was provided by the dentist and dental nurse during consultations.
- 2.92** The dental suite was clean, with equipment appropriately maintained. Instruments were cleaned and sterilised at an external facility. There was a thorough procedure for keeping sharp instruments safely stored, transported and monitored. The dental team recorded appropriate information on SystemOne (electronic case notes) for access by all clinical staff.

Recommendation

- 2.93** **There should be timely access to routine dental assessment and treatment.**

Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.94** The CAMHS and Focus Forensic Service were delivered by the South West Yorkshire Partnership NHS Foundation Trust. There were 139 boys on the caseload, of whom 32 were residents of Keppel unit. A multidisciplinary team included a learning disability specialist and speech and language therapists. There were a few practitioner vacancies in the team.
- 2.95** All boys were assessed using CHAT to identify mental health needs and neuro-disability. Boys on the caseload were allocated a care navigator and a care plan was drawn up. Boys could be referred by any staff member at Wetherby, or could self-refer.
- 2.96** Most interventions were delivered individually, although the occupational therapist ran a number of therapeutic group sessions. Boys with serious and enduring mental health problems were appropriately reviewed by psychiatrists. They had more than doubled in

¹¹ Authorise appropriate health care professionals to supply and administer prescription-only medicine.

number since the previous inspection. In our survey, 58% of boys on Keppel said they had mental health problems against the comparator of 25%.

- 2.97** Boys did not attend 18% of planned mental health appointments, including many with the psychiatrist. This was occasionally because officer escorts were not available.
- 2.98** Most boys on Keppel were on the caseload. They received a reasonable level of individual support but there was no dedicated CAMHS provision and prison staff did not receive enough training or supervision given the large number of boys with complex needs.
- 2.99** Work with boys presenting with harmful sexual behaviour was more embedded than at the previous inspection, with individual treatment programmes for 31 boys (including 17 on Keppel). Services addressed sexual offending and inappropriate sexual behaviour while in custody.
- 2.100** During the previous year, there had been six direct transfers to hospitals under the Mental Health Act. Most had taken less than two weeks to complete, but one had taken six months because finding secure hospital accommodation once boys reached the age of 17 was difficult.
- 2.101** CAMHS delivered mental health awareness training during staff induction and offered training on attachment theory to a few staff. Personal officers were invited to attend case formulation meetings.

Recommendations

- 2.102 All do-not-attends for mental health appointments should be followed up to identify why boys are not attending appointments and prioritise important clinical sessions.**
- 2.103 Keppel staff should have access to dedicated training, supervision and day-to-day support from the mental health team to improve the care for the large number of boys with particularly complex needs.**
- 2.104 All prison staff should receive regular mental health awareness training.** (Repeated recommendation 2.117)

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.

- 2.105** In our survey, only 14% of boys said the food was good. Meal times were orderly and well managed, and boys were able to eat their main meal together. Meals that we observed took place in a calm and respectful atmosphere. On Keppel, staff ate with the boys which provided an opportunity to develop relationships and a sense of normality.
- 2.106** Breakfast packs and sandwich lunches were still eaten in cells.
- 2.107** Menus were rotated every four weeks and boys were consulted twice a year about the menus. Boys we spoke to complained that they did not have enough food and were often

hungry. The meals were of an adequate size, but, apart from buying items from the shop, there were very few opportunities to supplement the diet.

2.108 Religious and dietary needs were catered for.

2.109 Boys were not able to work in the kitchen to gain qualifications. No further consideration had been given to managing any risks.

2.110 The kitchen and serveries were clean and well maintained.

Recommendations

2.111 **Boys should be able to eat in association for all meals.** (Repeated recommendation 2.124)

2.112 **Boys from across the establishment should have the opportunity to work in the kitchen to gain qualifications in catering.** (Repeated recommendation 2.126)

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.

2.113 Purchases could be made weekly from a selection of age-appropriate items.

2.114 Systems in place ensured that boys could access goods quickly after arrival. The ordering of limited items from a catalogue was effectively administered.

2.115 A number of boys and staff told us that some boys were bullied into giving their canteen to others, in the form of 'rent' or 'tax'. This was not monitored effectively nor were boys supported when this happened. We spoke to one boy who told us that he had not bullied boys in other prisons, but he 'taxed' boys at Wetherby. He said he had to do this or his canteen would be taken.

2.116 Some boys had more items in their cells than they were permitted under the privileges scheme. There was no system to identify if these items had been bought legitimately.

Recommendation

2.117 **Procedures should be implemented to ensure that boys are not bullied into giving away their canteen.**

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.¹²

- 3.1** An interim regime had been introduced a month before the inspection to try to provide a more consistent, transparent approach to time unlocked, which was still affected by a shortage of staff. This was not implemented consistently and the regime remained restrictive. Boys could access a maximum of 10.75 hours out of cell but in practice it was much less. Boys who were on the basic regime could be limited to time out of cell for just a telephone call, shower and 30 minutes' exercise each day.
- 3.2** The published regime indicated that each unit would remain locked up one evening a week (Monday to Thursday). If boys did not attend the gym, they remained in their cell for at least two evenings a week. On units where association would be curtailed, boys could choose to take association during the day or attend education. This was not appropriate.
- 3.3** During our roll checks at peak education periods, we found a concerning 48% of boys locked up at Wetherby, nearly twice the percentage at the previous inspection. We identified a number of cases of spontaneous removal of boys from activities without adequate managerial oversight or governance. We found 10% of boys in their cells on Keppel, which was a significant improvement since the previous inspection.
- 3.4** In our survey, 48% of boys at Wetherby said that they had association every day compared with 77% of boys on Keppel and 64% at the previous inspection. Seventy-one per cent of boys at Wetherby said they accessed exercise daily compared to 54% at our previous inspection. However, exercise was usually restricted to no more than 30 minutes in exercise yards that remained stark.

Recommendations

- 3.5** **The core day should be revised to meet the needs of the young population at Wetherby and Keppel.** (Repeated recommendation 3.4)
- 3.6** **Boys should be given the opportunity to spend at least one hour in the open air every day.** (Repeated recommendation 3.5)

¹² Time out of cell, in addition to formal 'purposeful activity', includes any time children and young people are out of their cells to associate or use communal facilities to take showers or make telephone calls.

Education, learning and skills

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.

3.7 Ofsted¹³ made the following assessments about the learning and skills and work provision:

Overall effectiveness of learning and skills and work: Requires improvement

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: Requires improvement

Management of education and learning and skills

3.8 Since the last inspection, education managers had established a suitable full-time curriculum of education and training activities and had significantly improved the collection, analysis and use of data. Regular management meetings used data well to accurately monitor participation and the impact of the provision on boys. For example, data had shown that boys actively participating in education and training were significantly less likely to return to prison.

3.9 The self-assessment process was evaluative and generally accurate and led to effective quality improvement action plans. The quality improvement group (QIG) met monthly to review the progress of improvement action plans and to monitor performance against expectations. QIG meetings were well attended by all education managers and other partners involved in quality improvement such as the Independent Monitoring Board and HMPPS managers.

3.10 Equality and diversity were promoted well in the education and training areas through posters and the use of positive role images. Opportunities to contextualise relevant equality and diversity topics into education and training sessions were well planned and discussions were well managed. British values were promoted well through discussions in lessons and information displayed in the classrooms.

¹³ 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 Children's Services and Skills (Ofsted) working under the general direction of HM Inspectorate of Prisons. 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>.

- 3.11** Incentives were used well in education and training to reward good behaviour using a system of merits that could be exchanged for treats from 'merits shops' set up to support the scheme. The focus was on encouraging good behaviour rather than punishing poor behaviour. Boys valued the merits, but prison officers very rarely used them to encourage good behaviour on the wings (see paragraph 1.46).
- 3.12** Boys were required to undertake 27 hours of education and three hours of PE a week and the appropriate provision was available for all boys to participate in. A well-balanced curriculum was provided by Novus using learning pathways from which boys could select. However, too many boys did not attend their allotted education and training activities. Prison staff shortages had resulted in the cancellation of education classes for Wetherby boys. An alternative regime had been implemented to free up officers and allow education buildings to stay open. This involved young people/residential wings choosing between education or wing association for one session three times a month. Many boys did not complete their required weekly education hours and this remained an unsatisfactory arrangement.
- 3.13** Not enough priority was given to encouraging Wetherby boys to attend their allocated education or training activity and to the punctual arrival and departure of boys who did attend. Too many boys refused to go to education each day. Wing officers used available sanctions and merits inconsistently to discourage poor behaviour or encourage good behaviour. Arrivals to education each day were often late because of regime requirements and boys were often collected from courses too early. This affected the time spent in lessons and the progress that they made. Boys located on the Keppel unit attended their allocated activities more consistently and there were fewer cancellations, refusals or suspensions.
- 3.14** Boys were regularly suspended from education and training sessions for incidents that occurred on the residential wings. Education and prison staff met weekly to reassess boys who had been suspended, although it was often some weeks before they were allowed to return to their courses because of concerns about conflict and bullying. This affected their education programmes adversely and led to slow progress for some.

Provision of activities

- 3.15** Sufficient suitable places were available to allow all boys to engage in purposeful activities. The allocation to activities was effective and all boys were placed on suitable programmes. However, too many boys at Wetherby did not attend their allocated courses. Outreach provision was available on residential units for boys not attending classroom sessions. This was used to promote education and training to boys on restricted regimes because of safety concerns, behaviour issues or their refusal to attend education classes. However, a significant number of boys did not attend education and training, and not all were able to receive outreach support.
- 3.16** Induction arrangements were suitable and provided boys with appropriate information about the available provision. Boys received an assessment of their English, mathematics and ICT skills to inform the level of course they would be allocated to.
- 3.17** The range of education courses was adequate to meet the needs of most boys. Boys could attend courses from entry level to level 2 in English, mathematics, information technology, art and design and musical performance.
- 3.18** A suitable range of vocational training courses were available in cycle maintenance, multi-skills, industrial cleaning, horticulture and carpentry. The brickwork practical workshop was closed at the time of our inspection and was expected to re-open in the next few weeks.

- 3.19** Work opportunities were available in wing cleaning and serving food on the residential units. Good employment skills were developed in horticulture, the staff café, industrial cleaning and on Army cadet courses.

Recommendation

- 3.20** **Prison and education managers should ensure that boys of compulsory school age punctually attend a range of appropriate education and training. Regime constraints should not result in interrupted learning.**

Quality of provision

- 3.21** Teaching, coaching and learning provided by Novus (The Manchester College) were good. Teachers planned sessions well and made appropriate use of information on boys' needs to plan the delivery of individual learning. Teachers effectively managed the work of learning support practitioners (LSPs) who knew the boys well and used this knowledge to support and accelerate their achievements.
- 3.22** Teachers ensured that boys could make productive links between taught theory and its application to practical tasks. For example, boys in a bicycle maintenance workshop used their newly acquired knowledge of how gears work to set appropriate chain tensions. Teachers made good reference to how specific skills and knowledge could broaden the range of employment opportunities for boys on release. Most teachers made good use of questioning techniques to check and reinforce boys' understanding.
- 3.23** The large majority of teachers managed group activities effectively to promote learning. However, in a few cases they allowed individual boys to dominate discussions which limited the progress of others. Not all teachers exploited the potential of information and learning technology to enhance learning.
- 3.24** Assessment of boys' work was thorough and supported further achievement. In most vocational areas, boys were encouraged to identify opportunities to demonstrate their competence. Target setting was usually effective. However, not all teachers routinely set challenging personal development targets to promote change in behaviour.
- 3.25** Tracking of boys' progress in achieving their qualifications was effective. Boys had an appropriate or better understanding of the stage they were at in their programme. Teachers routinely marked boys' written work and included helpful feedback to help them progress.
- 3.26** Teachers enhanced boys' appreciation of equality and diversity through appropriate reference in course topics. For example, boys in a catering class were able to describe the differing dietary requirements of the main religions. In most classes, teachers used effective strategies to develop boys' English and mathematics skills. This helped boys to move to other education and training options and improve their employability skills.
- 3.27** Teachers enhanced boys' understanding of safe working practices and the use of personal protective equipment. For example, in bricklaying, boys at an early stage in their course had a good appreciation of the safe handling of hazardous substances such as lime. However, in some vocational areas boys did not routinely have access to their own safety boots or appropriate skin protection from oils and grease.
- 3.28** Most education and training took place in accommodation of a good standard which was well resourced. However, the arrangements for the commissioned outreach provision on the

wings required improvement. Qualified teachers did not deliver the outreach sessions and appropriate teaching resources were not available. Boys receiving outreach support did not cover all aspects of the core curriculum and they only attended for about half the hours undertaken by other boys.

Recommendations

- 3.29 The quality of all taught sessions should be of a consistently high standard.**
- 3.30 Teachers should routinely set challenging personal development targets to promote change in boys' behaviour.**
- 3.31 All boys should have access to appropriate personal protective footwear and hand or skin protection where necessary.**
- 3.32 Arrangements for the delivery of commissioned outreach provision should meet boys' needs.**

Personal development and behaviour

- 3.33** Boys developed collaborative working skills while participating in class activities. In the best cases tutors ensured that boys used effective self-critical analysis and evaluation to improve their work. For example, in a music technology class one boy supported another to produce and improve a range of sound effects. Class tasks often enhanced boys' communication skills and empathy with others very effectively. In drama, exercises enhanced boys' confidence to express themselves to a group and accept suggestions for improvement from each other.
- 3.34** Boys participated in a good range of enrichment activities which supported their personal and social skills. For example, boys made Christmas cards which they sold and donated the proceeds to charity.
- 3.35** Boys' behaviour in sessions was usually good. They exhibited an awareness of the importance of showing mutual respect to each other and staff. Teachers were generally adept at mediation to help boys reflect on and adjust inappropriate behaviour. Teachers made effective use of 'cool down' periods to allow boys to adopt more appropriate behaviour. However, suitable 'cool down' areas were not routinely available outside classrooms. In a few cases, teachers failed to address low-level misbehaviour quickly and effectively. Teachers did not consistently challenge boys' use of inappropriate language.

Recommendation

- 3.36 The prison should provide appropriate 'cool down' areas for boys away from the classroom.**

Education and vocational achievements

- 3.37** Achievement rates on most courses were high. However, the rates for functional skills English at level 2 and those for boys with Irish heritage required improvement. Most boys made the expected or better progress from their starting points. In a few cases, more able boys did not make expected progress because classroom tasks did not challenge them enough. Progress in completing Barista training was impeded as the coffee machine was not working.
- 3.38** Practical skill development relevant to employment was particularly good for boys who worked in realistic work conditions in the prison. For example, boys on the horticulture course used strimmers and lawnmowers proficiently to maintain the estate grounds. Boys working in the staff mess used their catering and customer care skills to deliver a good standard of service. They competently used industry relevant terminology and procedures to complete tasks. In vocational areas, boys quickly acquired skills to use tools safely and efficiently. For example, boys on the Army cadet programme competently erected and dismantled a field radio aerial.
- 3.39** The standard of boys' completed work was appropriate or better. The quality of completed work in art was often of a high standard.

Recommendations

- 3.40** Teachers should ensure that more able boys are suitably challenged to succeed to their full potential.
- 3.41** The prison should improve the achievement rates for functional skills English at level 2 and for boys with an Irish heritage.
- 3.42** Managers should ensure that maintenance and repair of the Barista coffee-making machine is carried out so that relevant training can resume.

Library

- 3.43** Novus provided the well-maintained library which was staffed by learning support practitioners. Boys from the Keppel unit had good access to the library. However, access for other boys was limited unless they were attending classes in the same building as the library. Attendance rates were sometimes reduced because of session cancellations.
- 3.44** The library contained a wide range of easy reads, reference texts, graphic novels, fiction and non-fiction books. A good variety of newspapers and magazines were available. Relevant books were provided to support boys undertaking education and training. Boys could use audio books only in the library. The stock of foreign language books was small but adequate. More resources were needed to support careers education. Inter-library loans were not routinely used. Three computers offered access to a restricted but relevant range of resources, including driving test theory. Boys could use the virtual campus¹⁴ on two of the computers to support their studies. All boys received an appropriate induction before using the library.

¹⁴ Internet access for prisoners to community education, training and employment opportunities.

- 3.45** Since the previous inspection, good progress had been made in collecting data on library use. The impact of data evaluation to drive improvement had yet to be fully realised. The use of activities to promote literacy across the prison, including the introduction of Storybook Dads¹⁵, was at an early stage.

Recommendations

- 3.46** The prison should ensure that all boys have adequate access to the full range of library resources.
- 3.47** Comprehensive resources should be provided to support boys' careers education.
- 3.48** The range of prison-wide activities to promote literacy should be enhanced.

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.

- 3.49** A good range of recreational PE activities were provided in a large multi-purpose sports hall and a fitness room with an appropriate range of weights and cardiovascular equipment. An all-weather outdoor football pitch was well used. PE staff used a large room next to the gym, previously used as a classroom, as an exercise room for boys from the Keppel unit to have recreational PE. The room contained suitable cardiovascular and weights equipment.
- 3.50** Seven qualified PE officers delivered well planned recreational PE to meet the needs of all boys attending the gym. A further two PE officers had been identified to start after completing their qualifications. Attendance at the gym was good and sessions were rarely cancelled. Healthy living was promoted well on the wings and in communal areas. There were good links with health care staff and boys with specific health needs were referred for suitably tailored fitness programmes.
- 3.51** Bottled drinking water was provided for boys while the feasibility of installing a drinking fountain was being explored.
- 3.52** Feedback from a recent survey of boys' views on the PE provision had been effectively used to improve the type of activities available at weekends.
- 3.53** PE facilities were generally clean and well maintained. However, the showers did not provide suitable modesty screening for boys and there were excessive damp problems in the shower room as a result of the poor ventilation.
- 3.54** There were no opportunities for boys to gain meaningful qualifications and no opportunities to play against visiting teams.

¹⁵ Project for prisoners to record stories for their children.

Recommendations

- 3.55** The ventilation in the shower room of the sports hall should be improved to control temperature and humidity. (Repeated recommendation 3.55)
- 3.56** There should be access to nationally recognised vocational PE related qualifications.
- 3.57** The prison should provide opportunities for boys to play against visiting teams.

Section 4. Resettlement

Pre-release and resettlement

Expected outcomes:

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

- 4.1 The reducing reoffending strategy was reviewed and updated annually and was informed by an up-to-date needs analysis. The strategy covered resettlement pathways and case management work and the reducing reoffending action plan was based on areas for development identified in the strategy. The reducing reoffending and case management functions worked collaboratively and a quarterly reducing reoffending strategy group provided oversight of resettlement work. The meetings were appropriately attended by departments across the establishment.
- 4.2 Work had recently started to follow up boys after their release. This built on the good relationships the establishment had with youth offending teams (YOTs) and resettlement consortia. For example, there was a YOT link worker on site for boys from South and West Yorkshire. The initiative afforded a promising opportunity to assess the effectiveness of work undertaken with boys while they were at Wetherby.
- 4.3 Links with other reducing reoffending and casework teams across the HMPPS young people's estate had been strengthened by regular meetings of functional heads. These had the potential to inform practice across the estate.
- 4.4 The casework team at Wetherby remained well organised and had retained its focus despite four changes of manager since the previous inspection. The 17 caseworkers were split into four hubs, two for the main units and one each dedicated to the Keppel and Benbow units. Each hub had a seconded social worker which facilitated integrated working. The five operational (supervising officer) caseworkers were sometimes cross deployed to generic duties and had slightly reduced caseloads as a result. We were told that more effort was now made to redeploy only when boys could not be removed from education for review meetings or other interventions.
- 4.5 Release on temporary licence (ROTL) continued to be used well. All boys were able to apply when they reached their eligibility date and careful consideration was given to determining suitability. Work was in progress to increase the range of opportunities available. During the previous six months, 14 boys had been released on licence from Keppel and 35 from the main site. In total, boys had benefited from ROTL 423 times over the six months. ROTL had principally been used for supervised community work or specific job experience but also for pre-release visits to college or accommodation and to support family ties.
- 4.6 Early release and home detention curfew (HDC) arrangements were managed appropriately. During the previous six months, 185 boys had been released, 27 of whom had achieved early release and one had been given HDC. Most boys who achieved early release came from Wetherby main site. The late release provisions of the detention and training order (DTO) sentence had been used once to add to the custodial element of a boy's sentence to reflect his poor behaviour while in custody.

- 4.7** At the time of the inspection, 82 boys were serving sentences of over two years and seven were serving indeterminate sentences. Many of these boys were located on Benbow or Keppel units (see paragraph 4.19). Procedures to support boys moving to the adult estate were appropriate. Eighty-nine boys had moved to adult prisons in the previous 12 months. Planning started in good time and reflected the boy's needs, for example offending behaviour work, education and training and maintenance of family ties. Links had been established with prisons which most often took boys from Wetherby. Whenever possible, telephone conferencing or videolink enabled a boy to raise questions with his new offender supervisor before transfer, complementing pre-transition planning between the caseworker and the receiving prison.

Recommendation

- 4.8** **Appropriate data should be systematically collected to determine the resettlement and re-offending outcomes for boys who leave Wetherby and the Keppel unit.** (Repeated recommendation 4.8)

Training planning and remand management

Expected outcomes:

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

- 4.9** Remand and training plans continued to be managed well and review meetings were timely. Meetings were organised and chaired by caseworkers who were knowledgeable about the boys they were responsible for. Attendance by Wetherby staff varied and residential staff were rarely represented. Written contributions were not always submitted by those who did not attend, leaving the meeting to rely on entries in the electronic case notes.
- 4.10** Training or remand plans were in place for all the cases we reviewed but some targets remained too generic. Regular multidisciplinary sequencing meetings took a more structured approach to how boys accessed the support and interventions needed to address their offending behaviour and identified risk factors. Records of these discussions indicated that the link to sentence planning had been made.
- 4.11** In our survey at Wetherby main site and Keppel unit, only 45% of boys said they had a training, sentence or remand plan. On the main site this was a significant reduction from 58% at the previous inspection. The reasons for this were not clear, although some boys were subject to a number of different plans, frequently relating to their behaviour. It was not clear how these plans were coordinated to ensure a consistent approach to the boy's support and management.
- 4.12** Social workers undertook monthly feedback sessions with boys to build a picture of the establishment from their perspectives. Some boys said they would like more contact with their caseworkers. Electronic case notes indicated that levels of contact varied but there was generally evidence of regular contact and informative entries benefited other staff. Caseworkers on Benbow and Keppel units had more frequent, recorded care plan meetings with boys. Originally intended to be multidisciplinary, they were more often bilateral meetings between a boy and his caseworker.

- 4.13** Managers were aware of areas needing improvement and a clear action plan was in place. A procedures manual had been drafted and training was being sourced from the local authority. Standards of work for the casework function had been developed. Plans for the senior social worker to provide supervision for caseworkers had progressed more slowly than anticipated and take up had been limited. The head of casework and casework manager were shortly to attend training to provide regular supervision.

Recommendation

- 4.14** **Staff from all relevant departments should be represented at training planning or remand management reviews or submit a detailed report if they cannot attend.** (Repeated recommendation 4.14)

Public protection

- 4.15** The interdepartmental risk management board (IDRM) met monthly to review boys who had been identified on reception as a potential risk to children or were subject to harassment or restraining orders. Decisions about subsequent monitoring or restrictions on contact were made and reviewed regularly. Attendance at the meeting varied. The police liaison officer had attended one of the last four meetings and either the head of security or operations attended. Attendance by caseworkers was generally good but other departments working with boys were not represented. This was a missed opportunity to review thoroughly the risks they posed. The IDRM did not review boys approaching release who were subject to multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) to ensure that necessary arrangements were in place.
- 4.16** Work to strengthen MAPPA procedures was at an early stage and was being well supported by the YOT worker based at Wetherby. At the time of the inspection, the establishment did not know how many MAPPA boys were held. Wetherby had been taking a reactive approach to MAPPA, providing MAPPA F reports when requested but doing little to identify boys convicted of a MAPPA offence during their initial screening. New procedures included screening all new arrivals and a database of all boys for whom MAPPA needed to be in place. This enabled caseworkers to ask community YOTs for confirmed MAPPA levels in good time for release. The establishment was now taking a more proactive approach and was initiating discussions of proposed MAPPA levels and attending MAPPA meetings in the community.

Recommendations

- 4.17** **Attendance at the monthly interdepartmental risk management board meeting should include representatives from all key departments.** (Repeated recommendation 4.20)
- 4.18** **A robust and consistent management plan should be in place for all boys subject to MAPPA. Caseworkers should work closely with YOTs to ensure that cases are identified and boys subject to MAPPA level two or three should be monitored at the monthly IDRM meeting.** (Repeated recommendation 4.21)

Indeterminate sentence young people

- 4.19** At the time of the inspection, seven boys were serving indeterminate sentences. They were accommodated on Benbow unit which was a national resource for boys serving long sentences. A dedicated team of caseworkers worked with these boys, seeing them regularly between sentence planning reviews. Transition work to prepare for a move to the adult estate started in good time. The casework team had appropriate expertise to manage sentences properly and worked closely with the psychology team to inform sentence management and planning for transition to the adult estate. One of the interventions offered, to address use of aggression, was only available to boys serving indeterminate or long sentences but there were no other specific programmes for these boys.

Looked-after children

- 4.20** At the time of the inspection, 28 boys had been subject to full care orders before arriving at Wetherby, 34 had been voluntarily accommodated by their local authority and 49 were looked after by virtue of their remand status. Together these made up about 44% of the population. All new arrivals were seen by one of the team of five social workers seconded to Wetherby. Their looked-after status was determined and risk and vulnerability identified and shared with others involved in their care. Prompt contact was made with local authorities to remind them of their continuing responsibility for the boy while he was in custody. The level of support provided by local authorities remained variable and there was still a lack of consistency in providing pocket money.
- 4.21** Records indicated that timely statutory reviews for looked-after children were taking place.
- 4.22** In our survey, boys at Wetherby main site with looked-after status said they had more emotional or mental health problems than other boys (41% v 20%) and that they had been threatened or intimidated by other boys more than their peers (21% v 6%). The introduction of a support group for boys in care had been delayed but was due to start shortly with support from the Care Leavers' Association.

Reintegration planning

Expected outcomes:

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

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

- 4.23** Appropriate practical support was in place to prepare for release, including ensuring that boys had suitable clothes to wear. Caseworkers advocated for all boys to be met on release and taken home by a responsible adult. If this did not happen, boys were taken by staff to the appropriate public transport.
- 4.24** The impressive In2Out mentoring scheme continued to support boys from both sites before and after release. Over the previous 12 months, 76 boys had been supported in the community and 250 in the past three years. The service was promoted well and boys who needed help were matched with a mentor before release. Where possible, mentors attended the pre-release training planning meeting to coordinate work with other agencies. Boys continued to receive help from their mentor for up to a year after they were released.

Accommodation

4.25 On both sites about a quarter of boys in our survey thought they would have a problem finding accommodation when they were released. The training planning process included discussion about accommodation and started early in the boy's time at Wetherby or Keppel unit. No boys had been released without an address, but finding suitable accommodation remained a concern for some boys, who were often looked-after children. Caseworkers and social workers advocated on behalf of boys and additional support was provided by Barnardo's advocates and the In2Out mentors. There was evidence of robust challenge when accommodation deemed unsuitable was suggested, for example a hostel. Boys had been helped to acquire legal support to challenge their local authority for appropriate accommodation. In some cases, accommodation was only identified close to the date of release which hampered release planning in other crucial resettlement areas, for example securing appropriate education, training or work placements. It also had a potentially negative impact on the mental and emotional wellbeing of the boys concerned.

Recommendation

4.26 All boys leaving custody should be provided with appropriate accommodation in good time for their release.

Education, training and employment

4.27 The quality of information, advice and guidance provided by Novus teaching and support staff was good. The engagement and resettlement team provided good advice about future career planning and further education opportunities. They created individual action plans based on previously acquired education and skills and agreed suitable courses to expand and enhance existing interests and career opportunities. Since the last inspection, a comprehensive booklet had been produced to give boys information about all the education, vocational training and work opportunities available.

4.28 All boys were offered a place on the resettlement course two weeks before release. The course focused on producing an up-to-date CV, completing application forms, interview techniques and other job search skills. If boys completed all elements of the resettlement course, they received a nationally recognised qualification in career planning and making applications.

4.29 The virtual campus¹⁶ was being used very well to create CVs, develop job search skills and complete job applications before release.

Health care

4.30 The primary care team supported boys effectively before discharge, providing information about registering with a GP and issuing a supply of medication or prescription if required.

4.31 The mental health team linked with community networks to support boys with ongoing needs. Before release or transfer to the adult estate, preparatory work was coordinated by one of the Focus psychologists through joint sessions with the boy's CAMHS (child and adolescent mental health services) team care navigator.

¹⁶ Internet access for prisoners to community education, training and employment opportunities.

Drugs and alcohol

- 4.32** The YPDASS linked well with case workers and attended or contributed to DTO meetings. The team facilitated a pre-release group with the education department and all boys were given harm reduction advice and information before leaving the establishment. Case files demonstrated detailed release plans and referrals to young people's community drug and alcohol services. A module called 'next steps' was used to prepare boys transferring to the adult estate.

Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.33** Money management was incorporated into a number of courses in education. Wetherby main site boys attended a two-week pre-release course with more focused input. The St Giles Trust (a charity supporting ex-offenders) took sessions on every day living costs, budgeting and managing food costs, planning for rent and other bills and how benefits work. Boys from Keppel unit did not have the same access to this course.
- 4.34** Caseworkers and social workers continued to provide individual guidance on financial matters and arranged appointments with a visiting worker from Job Centre Plus for boys who needed more detailed benefits advice or to arrange appointments with their local job centre in preparation for release. Wetherby had worked hard to enable boys to open a bank account and now had an arrangement with a bank for 18 year olds to open an account. Eighteen boys had done so since the facility became available in November 2016.

Recommendation

- 4.35 All boys should have access to comprehensive advice and guidance on finance, benefit and debt irrespective of their location within the establishment.**

Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.36** The number of boys at Wetherby and Keppel who received weekly visits from families or friends remained low (32% and 29% respectively). In our survey, only 54% of boys said they could access the telephone each day against the comparator of 75% and 81% at the previous inspection.
- 4.37** Casework staff remained primarily responsible for helping boys to build family ties and were the first to update families following any significant events. The Family Talk initiative continued to promote family therapy and remained good practice. The initiative was overseen by an enthusiastic senior psychologist, who had received additional training as an accredited family therapist. Caseworkers identified boys with specific needs relevant to Family Talk and boys could also self-refer. During the previous six months, 12 families had been involved in work with the therapist.
- 4.38** The chaplaincy continued to run the 'time out for dads course', although this had only been delivered once since the previous inspection because of external funding issues.
- 4.39** Events were held regularly to celebrate successful outcomes for boys in a range of interventions, including offending behaviour programmes, the army cadet programme and educational awards. Families were invited to the events and staff who had worked with the boys provided information and answered questions. We saw a number of examples of confidence building and self belief in boys and the days were a positive experience.

- 4.40** Domestic visits were still limited to weekends and Wednesday evenings. The visitors' centre remained sparse with little information for families. A generic parent and external partners book could be sent to families but there were no copies for families to take away. The visits hall remained clean and comfortable although no hot food was provided. Refreshments from the snack bar were only available at weekend visits. Visitors were processed promptly and the visit session that we observed was relaxed. Senior managers held regular consultations with visitors and an action plan was in place to improve the visitors' centre and facilities for children.

Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.41** Wetherby offered a good range of interventions accredited by HMPPS for use in the young people's estate. These included JETS (juvenile enhanced thinking skills) which 29 boys had completed in the previous year and six were undertaking at the time of the inspection. TEAM (emotion awareness and management) had been completed by 49 boys, another five had completed A – Z (motivation to engage) on a one-to-one basis and seven had completed STAG (anger management) one to one. Five boys had completed Life Minus Violence – Enhanced (LMV-E) which was available to boys serving longer sentences and took nine months to complete. Another LMV-E course was in progress with six participants. The first JETS course for boys on Keppel unit had started shortly before the inspection. Members of the interventions team were preparing for the introduction of ART (aggression replacement therapy) which would be delivered twice in 2017/18. Wetherby was also part of the pilot for Timewise, which addressed institutional violence.
- 4.42** All boys had their intervention needs screened by their caseworker within six weeks of their arrival and this was used by the interventions and psychology teams to determine the most appropriate interventions. One-to-one work was offered to boys who were not suitable for group interventions. One-to-one work addressed both offending behaviour and behaviour while in custody and could include criminogenic need, gang and identity work, peer pressure or exploring and changing attitudes underpinning offending. At the time of the inspection, the forensic psychology team were working one to one with 51 boys. Family Talk (see paragraph 4.37) continued to be available to boys who needed to rebuild relationships with their families.
- 4.43** Work with boys who had been convicted of a sexual offence was delivered by Focus as part of the CAMHS service commissioned by NHS England. The team of five clinicians had a caseload of 31 boys, more than half based on the Keppel unit. They were aware of another five boys on remand who would be referred to them if convicted. The one-to-one work was tailored to meet individual need. There was evidence of clinicians attending sentence planning meetings for boys they were working with and the wider CAMHS team was represented at sequencing meetings, although not at reducing reoffending strategy meetings where they could have made a valuable contribution. Prison managers continued to express reservations about the integration of the work into the reducing reoffending and risk reduction agenda at Wetherby. This needed to be resolved with local managers of the service.

Section 5. Summary of recommendations and good practice

The following is a listing of recommendations 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 recommendations

To the governor

- 5.1 Governance of the segregation unit should be improved to ensure that the relevant policies and procedures are proportionate and constructive. (S43)
- 5.2 MMPR coordinators should not be redeployed to other duties. Body-worn cameras should be turned on and all incidents of use of force should be recorded. Written reports and recordings should be reviewed promptly and action taken to address any concerns raised. Oversight and quality assurance should be at a senior level. (S44)
- 5.3 Incidents of bullying and intimidation should be tracked and monitored effectively to reduce them. Victims of bullying should be properly supported. (S45)
- 5.4 There should be effective oversight of equality work to ensure boys in protected groups are systematically identified. Equalities monitoring data and regular consultation should be used to identify and address concerns. (S46)
- 5.5 Boys on the standard regime level should be out of their cells for 10 hours each day, in accordance with a core day timetable driven by their needs. (S47)

Recommendation

To the Ministry of Justice

- 5.6 All boys leaving custody should be provided with appropriate accommodation in good time for their release. (4.26)

Recommendation

To the escort contractor

- 5.7 On completion of their court appearance, boys should be transferred to limit the time spent in court cells and should be prioritised for drop off at the receiving prison. (1.4)

Recommendations

To the governor

Early days in custody

- 5.8 The environment in reception should be improved and more information should be available to boys. All new arrivals should be given the opportunity to speak to a peer mentor. (1.11)
- 5.9 Boys should be interviewed in private in reception. (1.12)
- 5.10 All cells should be adequately equipped for boys on their first night in custody. (1.13)

- 5.11** The first night centre should not be used to accommodate boys reintegrating from the segregation unit and others who are disruptive. (1.14, repeated recommendation 1.13)
- 5.12** The induction package should be up to date and should provide boys with accurate information on what they can expect during the early days. (1.15)
- 5.13** All boys on the first night unit should have a regime which keeps them occupied. They should not be locked in cells during the working day and delays to risk assessment procedures should be reduced. (1.16)

Care and protection of children and young people

- 5.14** Staff from all relevant areas should attend the weekly safeguarding meetings. (1.22, repeated recommendation 1.21)
- 5.15** Child protection arrangements should be robust. Investigations should be prompt and underpinned by clear procedures, agreed with external safeguarding partners and reinforced by appropriate escalation procedures. (1.31)
- 5.16** Children should never be strip-searched under restraint. (1.32)

Suicide and self-harm prevention

- 5.17** Suicide and self-harm refresher training should be available to all staff. (1.42)

Behaviour management

- 5.18** Behaviour management should be coordinated more effectively. Staff and boys should understand how interventions are linked and which take priority. (1.49)
- 5.19** Merits should be awarded by staff from all areas and tuck shops should be regularly stocked. (1.50)

Security and disciplinary procedures

- 5.20** All strip-searching should be properly authorised, logged and monitored by the safeguarding children strategy committee. (1.65, repeated recommendation 1.66)
- 5.21** The standardisation meeting for disciplinary procedures should include thorough analysis of data and trends to address any identified concerns, with particular focus on equality strands. (1.66)

The use of force

- 5.22** Use of force data should identify hotspots and analyse trends to identify and record actions to reduce the number of incidents across the site. (1.78)

Substance misuse

- 5.23** The YPDASS should further develop services based on the needs of the population, taking account of the particularly complex needs of boys on the Keppel unit. (1.96)

Residential units

- 5.24** All graffiti should be removed promptly. (2.9, repeated recommendation 2.9)
- 5.25** Accommodation for boys on the restricted status spur should be deep cleaned and improved and the showers on Benbow unit should be deep cleaned to remove mould and damp. (2.10)
- 5.26** Toilets should be adequately screened, with seats and lids. (2.11, repeated recommendation 2.10)
- 5.27** All boys should be able to shower and make a telephone call daily. (2.12)
- 5.28** Regular monitoring of cell call bell response times should be undertaken to ensure they are answered promptly. (2.13, repeated recommendation 2.11)
- 5.29** Exercise yards should be improved and recreational activities should be available for boys to participate in. (2.14)
- 5.30** Boys should be able to wear their own clothes. (2.15)
- 5.31** There should be enough clothing for boys to have a change of clothes when necessary. Appropriate outdoor clothes should be provided. (2.16)
- 5.32** Applications should be tracked and responses monitored. (2.17)

Relationships between staff and children and younger people

- 5.33** All staff should engage positively with boys and have higher expectations of them. Managers should identify and challenge any poor staff attitudes. (2.22)
- 5.34** Managers should support the development of positive relationships by ensuring that the management of poor behaviour is consistent and proportionate. (2.23)
- 5.35** Consultation meetings should be held regularly. (2.24)

Equality and diversity

- 5.36** There should be effective oversight of equality work. Strategy and action planning should be informed by effective analysis of monitoring data, identification of boys in protected groups, a programme of regular consultation with boys and robust investigation of discrimination incident report forms. (2.31)
- 5.37** Information on boys with a disability should be shared with unit staff and, where necessary, unit care plans should be produced to help staff meet the needs of this group. (2.44)
- 5.38** Staff should use an accredited interpretation service whenever there are issues of accuracy or confidentiality. (2.45)

Complaints

- 5.39** The complaints procedure should be based on prompt decisions with effective consultation and quality assurance so that boys have confidence in the system. (2.57)

Legal rights

- 5.40** Appropriate facilities should be provided for legal visits to be conducted in confidence. (2.60)

Health services

- 5.41** Boys' access to health care appointments should not be compromised because of the prison regime. (2.73)
- 5.42** All custody staff should receive regular basic life support training as part of their mandatory training programme. (2.74)
- 5.43** Boys should be able to complain about health services through a well-publicised, confidential system which explains how to escalate their complaint if they are not satisfied with the response. (2.75)
- 5.44** All do-not-attends should be followed up to identify why boys are missing appointments. (2.82)
- 5.45** The main waiting room in the health care department should be refurbished and there should be a dedicated toilet facility for boys. (2.83)
- 5.46** Boys should have access to planned external health appointments. (2.84)
- 5.47** Nurses should be called to and routinely attend any use of force/restraint. (2.85, repeated recommendation 2.78)
- 5.48** The inpatient facility should be closed. (2.86)
- 5.49** There should be timely access to routine dental assessment and treatment. (2.93)
- 5.50** All do-not-attends for mental health appointments should be followed up to identify why boys are not attending appointments and prioritise important clinical sessions. (2.102)
- 5.51** Keppel staff should have access to dedicated training, supervision and day-to-day support from the mental health team to improve the care for the large number of boys with particularly complex needs. (2.103)
- 5.52** All prison staff should receive regular mental health awareness training. (2.104, repeated recommendation 2.117)

Catering

- 5.53** Boys should be able to eat in association for all meals. (2.111, repeated recommendation 2.124)
- 5.54** Boys from across the establishment should have the opportunity to work in the kitchen to gain qualifications in catering. (2.112, repeated recommendation 2.126)

Purchases

- 5.55** Procedures should be implemented to ensure that boys are not bullied into giving away their canteen. (2.117)

Time out of cell

- 5.56** The core day should be revised to meet the needs of the young population at Wetherby and Keppel. (3.5, repeated recommendation 3.4)
- 5.57** Boys should be given the opportunity to spend at least one hour in the open air every day. (3.6, repeated recommendation 3.5)

Education, learning and skills

- 5.58** Prison and education managers should ensure that boys of compulsory school age punctually attend a range of appropriate education and training. Regime constraints should not result in interrupted learning. (3.20)
- 5.59** The quality of all taught sessions should be of a consistently high standard. (3.29)
- 5.60** Teachers should routinely set challenging personal development targets to promote change in boys' behaviour. (3.30)
- 5.61** All boys should have access to appropriate personal protective footwear and hand or skin protection where necessary. (3.31)
- 5.62** Arrangements for the delivery of commissioned outreach provision should meet boys' needs. (3.32)
- 5.63** The prison should provide appropriate 'cool down' areas for boys away from the classroom. (3.36)
- 5.64** Teachers should ensure that more able boys are suitably challenged to succeed to their full potential. (3.40)
- 5.65** The prison should improve the achievement rates for functional skills English at level 2 and for boys with an Irish heritage. (3.41)
- 5.66** Managers should ensure that maintenance and repair of the Barista coffee-making machine is carried out so that relevant training can resume. (3.42)
- 5.67** The prison should ensure that all boys have adequate access to the full range of library resources. (3.46)
- 5.68** Comprehensive resources should be provided to support boys' careers education. (3.47)
- 5.69** The range of prison-wide activities to promote literacy should be enhanced. (3.48)

Physical education and healthy living

- 5.70** The ventilation in the shower room of the sports hall should be improved to control temperature and humidity. (3.55, repeated recommendation 3.55)
- 5.71** There should be access to nationally recognised vocational PE related qualifications. (3.56)
- 5.72** The prison should provide opportunities for boys to play against visiting teams. (3.57)

Pre-release and resettlement

- 5.73** Appropriate data should be systematically collected to determine the resettlement and re-offending outcomes for boys who leave Wetherby and the Keppel unit. (4.8, repeated recommendation 4.8)

Training planning and remand management

- 5.74** Staff from all relevant departments should be represented at training planning or remand management reviews or submit a detailed report if they cannot attend. (4.14, repeated recommendation 4.14)
- 5.75** Attendance at the monthly interdepartmental risk management board meeting should include representatives from all key departments. (4.17, repeated recommendation 4.20)
- 5.76** A robust and consistent management plan should be in place for all boys subject to MAPPA. Caseworkers should work closely with YOTs to ensure that cases are identified and boys subject to MAPPA level two or three should be monitored at the monthly IDRMR meeting. (4.18, repeated recommendation 4.21)

Reintegration planning

- 5.77** All boys should have access to comprehensive advice and guidance on finance, benefit and debt irrespective of their location within the establishment. (4.35)

Section 6. Appendices

Appendix I: Inspection team

Martin Lomas	Deputy chief inspector
Deborah Butler	Team leader
Ian Dickens	Inspector
Deri Hughes-Roberts	Inspector
Angela Johnson	Inspector
Yvonne McGuckian	Inspector
Angus Mulready-Jones	Inspector
Tamara Pattinson	Inspector
Ellis Cowling	Researcher
Emma Seymour	Researcher
Helen Ranns	Researcher
Laura Green	Researcher
Catherine Shaw	Researcher
Sigrid Engelen	Substance misuse inspector
Stephen Eley	Health services inspector
Catriona Reeves	Care Quality Commission inspector
John Grimmer	Ofsted inspector
Nigel Bragg	Ofsted inspector

Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report

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

Safety

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

At the last inspection in 2016, some boys arrived unacceptably late at Wetherby. Reception staff were welcoming. Safeguarding and child protection arrangements were sound. Support for boys on ACCTs was particularly good on Keppel unit, although the quality of documentation varied across the site. Levels of violence were high, particularly at Wetherby, and there was a predominantly punitive approach to addressing this which was not wholly effective. The volume of unprocessed intelligence reports and written off adjudications meant that some bad behaviour was not addressed. The use of mediation had been effective. Too many boys were on very restricted regimes, and not all boys who isolated themselves had been identified and supported. Governance of the use of force was weak. The segregation environment had improved but the regime remained poor. There had been significant improvements in the management of substance misuse. Outcomes for children and young people at Wetherby were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test. Outcomes for children and young people at Keppel unit were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendation

MMPR coordinators should not be redeployed to other duties and all staff should be properly trained. All incidents where force is used should be recorded, including by audio and body-worn cameras. Staff should complete accurate and detailed use of force reports within 24 hours of an incident, which should describe all holds applied, including use of pain. MMPR coordinators should review reports and recordings and address any concerns with the staff involved. All incidents should be reviewed by a senior manager within seven days.

Not achieved

Recommendations

Procedures should be expedited to limit the time boys spend in court cells and ensure a timely arrival at the prison. Boys should not travel with adult

Not achieved

The reception area should be cleaned regularly and maintenance issues resolved. (1.12)

Achieved

The first night centre should not be used to accommodate boys reintegrating from the segregation unit and others who are disruptive. (1.13)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 1.14)

All new arrivals should be given the opportunity to speak to a peer mentor before they are locked up for the night. (I.14)

Not achieved

First night risk management plans should be relevant to the boy's needs and identified risks, and managers should monitor quality through robust quality assurance. (I.15)

Partially achieved

All new arrivals should receive a good quality induction to the prison. (I.16)

Partially achieved

Staff from all relevant areas should attend the weekly safeguarding meetings. (I.21)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, I.22)

More emphasis should be placed at strategic safeguarding meetings on analysing patterns and trends and taking appropriate action to address issues that arise. (I.22)

Achieved

Children should never be strip-searched under restraint. (I.28)

Not achieved

There should be clear and accountable systems of support and monitoring for boys who have been victims of bullying or who withdraw themselves to a significant extent from shared activities. (I.32)

Not achieved

The gated cells should be replaced by care suites suitable for vulnerable boys, and those under continuous supervision should have their own clothes and possessions with them unless a mental health assessment indicates otherwise. (I.38)

Not achieved

Structured refresher training in supporting boys at risk of self-harm should be delivered regularly to all operational staff. (I.39)

Not achieved

Components of the behaviour management strategy should be strengthened and they should complement each other. (I.49)

Not achieved

More emphasis should be placed on promoting positive behaviour, including more use of mediation and multidisciplinary work and wider involvement of family members. (I.50)

Partially achieved

Boys should be consulted about the content and application of the rewards and sanctions scheme. The findings should be used to make the scheme more effective and motivational. (I.54)

Achieved

All intelligence reports should be processed swiftly and actions should be tracked by the security team. (I.65)

Achieved

All strip-searching should be properly authorised, logged and monitored by the safeguarding children strategy committee. (I.66)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, I.65)

The mandatory drug testing suite should be cleaned regularly to ensure it is a suitable, safe testing environment. (1.67)

Achieved

Adjudications should only be used to deal with more serious breaches of rules and all adjudications should be heard. (1.68)

Achieved

Collective punishments, including regime shutdowns, should not be used. (1.69)

Achieved

Behaviour management approaches should give priority to describing, modelling, encouraging and reinforcing constructive behaviour. (1.74)

Not achieved

Data on violence and bullying should be used to identify trends and to inform specific actions and strategic priorities. (1.75)

Achieved

All boys held in the segregation unit should have access to education, an hour of exercise in the open air, and be able to make a telephone call every day. (1.89)

Not achieved

Oversight of the segregation unit should be improved. (1.90)

Not achieved

Children on an open ACCT document should only be segregated in well documented exceptional circumstances. (1.91)

Not achieved

Respect

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

At the last inspection in 2016, most communal areas and cells were clean and well maintained but some areas were untidy and dirty. Graffiti was widespread. Keppel still provided a better living environment. Our survey and some interviews indicated a decline in the quality of relationships between staff and boys on the main site. Boys spoke of good relationships with some staff and we observed many positive and supportive interactions. However, we were concerned about low expectations of boys by some staff. Consultation was adequate but the use of peer mentors was underdeveloped. Equality and diversity work was not given priority. Faith provision was very good. Health services were also good. Outcomes for children and young people at Wetherby and Keppel unit were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

Recommendations

All graffiti should be removed promptly. (2.9)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 2.9)

Toilets should be adequately screened, with seats and lids. (2.10)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 2.11)

Regular monitoring of cell call bell response times should be undertaken to ensure they are answered promptly. (2.11)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 2.13)

Boys on remand should be able to wear their own clothes. (2.12)

Not achieved

The poor perceptions of boys about treatment by staff should be investigated and addressed. (2.19)

Not achieved

Personal officers should introduce themselves to boys as soon as possible after arrival, and undertake and record regular and meaningful welfare checks. (2.20)

Not achieved

The equality policy should be updated. (2.28)

Not achieved

There should be effective monitoring across both sites of outcomes for boys from all protected characteristics groups and action taken to rectify identified disadvantage. (2.29)

Not achieved

Consultation and peer support groups should be held for all boys with protected characteristics. (2.41)

Not achieved

The poor perceptions of safety by boys who consider themselves to have a disability should be addressed. (2.42)

Not achieved

The reasons for the underrepresentation on the unit of boys from minority ethnic and Muslim backgrounds should be investigated. (2.43)

Not achieved

Foreign national boys under threat of deportation should have access to specialist legal advice. (2.44)

Not achieved

The reasons why some boys have no confidence in the integrity of the complaints system should be investigated and appropriate action taken. (2.55)

Not achieved

Professional visitors should be able to book a private interview room in advance. (2.59)

Not achieved

All areas for the treatment of patients should be cleaned and should meet national infection control standards. (2.77)

Partially achieved

Nurses should be called to and routinely attend any use of force/restraint. (2.78)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 2.85)

All health care staff should have personal protection/breakaway training to support them and increase their confidence. (2.79)

Achieved

All prison staff should be trained in basic resuscitation skills, including use of the automated defibrillator. (2.80)

Not achieved

The prison regime should not compromise boys' access to health care appointments and appropriate measures should be taken to improve the effective use of clinics. (2.89)

Not achieved

The inpatient facility should be closed and robust arrangements made to ensure that boys with acute health needs are transferred to hospital or managed in the prison with support from health services. (2.90)

Not achieved

A pharmacist led team, including cover for absence, should ensure robust medicines governance. Pharmacy led clinics, clinical audits and medication reviews should be conducted regularly. (2.102)

Achieved

Two staff should be present during the administration of a controlled drug in line with the standard operating procedure and best practice. (2.103)

Not achieved

There should be a robust system for ensuring that boys receive prescribed medicines when attending court. (2.104)

Achieved

All prison staff should receive regular mental health awareness training. (2.117)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 2.104)

The transfer of patients to hospital under the Mental Health Act should take place within agreed Department of Health timescales. (2.118)

Not achieved

Boys should be able to dine in association for all meals. (2.124)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 2.111)

The fabric and painting programme for the catering department should be improved to prevent potential hygiene hazards. (2.125)

Achieved

Boys from across the establishment should have the opportunity to work in the kitchen to gain qualifications in catering. (2.126)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 2.112)

Regular consultation with boys should take place to ensure that the range of goods on the canteen list meets the diverse needs of the population. (2.101)

Not achieved

Boys should be able to order items from catalogues. (2.102)

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 2016, the core day did not meet the needs of the population and too many boys were locked up for long periods. The leadership and management of learning and skills were inadequate and education was not sufficiently prioritised. The quality of education provision was good. Outcomes were excellent for the minority of boys who were able to complete their learning. Progress was limited for many because lessons were cancelled. Personal development and behaviour in classes were good. Gym facilities were appropriate but there were gaps in attendance and no access to qualifications. Library facilities were good but access was limited for boys who did not attend education. Outcomes for children and young people at Wetherby and Keppel unit were poor against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendations

Boys on the standard regime level should be out of their cells for 10 hours each day, in accordance with a core day timetable driven by their needs. (S53)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, S47)

Education managers should provide a full-time curriculum of education and training activities that meet the needs of children. Prison and education managers should ensure that boys of compulsory school age attend a range of appropriate education and training. Regime constraints should not result in interrupted learning.

Partially achieved

Recommendations

The core day should be revised to meet the needs of the young population at Wetherby and Keppel. (3.4)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 3.5)

Boys should be given the opportunity to spend at least one hour in the open air every day. (3.5)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 3.6)

Managers should improve their collection, analysis and use of data to monitor more accurately participation in and the impact of the provision. (3.14)

Achieved

The support provided to boys on all courses should be improved so that they make good progress from their starting points and achieve their planned qualifications. (3.29)

Achieved

The quality of outreach provision should be further improved by ensuring that all planned interventions are delivered in appropriate surroundings. (3.30)

Not achieved

The analysis of data should be improved so that use of the library and associated services can be monitored. (3.45)

Achieved

The range of activities which promote literacy should be enhanced, including the introduction of Storybook Dads. (3.46)

Not achieved

All boys should have free access to drinking water while exercising. (3.53)

Achieved

Regime constraints should not result in cancelled sessions. (3.54)

Achieved

The ventilation in the shower room of the sports hall should be improved to control temperature and humidity. (3.55)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 3.55)

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 2016, the resettlement strategy was comprehensive. There were significant shortfalls in the quality of training plans and casework needed further development. The introduction of formal supervision by a senior social worker was excellent and demonstrated a commitment to improve. The level of engagement and focus of work were generally higher on Keppel unit but the weekly sequencing meetings on the main site were more focused and increased the confidence of caseworkers. Public protection arrangements were sound but MAPPA (multi-agency public protection arrangements) needed improvement. The high number of looked-after children were supported well. Reintegration planning was good and work in most pathways was adequate. The absence of a coordinated approach to working with boys with sexual offences was concerning. Outcomes for children and young people at Wetherby and Keppel unit were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

Recommendations

Appropriate data should be systematically collected to determine the resettlement and re-offending outcomes for boys who leave Wetherby and the Keppel unit. (4.8)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 4.8)

Staff from all relevant departments should be represented at training planning or remand management reviews or submit a detailed report if they cannot attend. (4.14)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 4.14)

Training and remand planning targets should be individual and focused on addressing identified risks of reoffending and harm. (4.15)

Partially achieved

Attendance at the monthly interdepartmental risk management board meeting should include representatives from all key departments. (4.20)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 4.17)

A robust and consistent management plan should be in place for all boys subject to MAPPA.

Caseworkers should work closely with YOTs to ensure that cases are identified and boys subject to MAPPA level two or three should be monitored at the monthly IRMB meeting. (4.21)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 4.18)

Boys identified as at risk of serious harm should be prioritised for engagement and appropriate interventions. (4.22)

Achieved

Boys should be given written and electronic information on education and training opportunities at Wetherby. (4.38)

Achieved

Use of the virtual campus should be enhanced to create CVs and develop job search skills. (4.39)

Achieved

All boys should receive comprehensive advice and guidance on finance, benefit and debt. (4.47)

Not achieved

Technology should be used to support family relationships. (4.51)

Not achieved

Visitors should be able to buy hot food and the facilities for children visiting should be improved. (4.52)

Not achieved

Robust arrangements should be put in place to ensure that all boys convicted of a sexual offence are assessed and that work to reduce the risk they present is carried out efficiently. (4.61)

Partially achieved

Appendix III: Care Quality Commission Requirement Notice



Requirement Notices

Provider: Leeds Community Healthcare NHS Trust

Location: HMYOI Wetherby

Location ID: RY6X5

Regulated activities: Treatment of disease, disorder, or injury, Diagnostic and screening procedures.

Action we have told the provider to take

The table below shows the regulations that were not being met. The provider must send CQC a report that says what action it is going to take to meet these regulations.

Regulation 16: Receiving and acting on complaints

Regulation 16 HSCA (RA) Regulations 2014 Receiving and acting on complaints.

How the regulation was not being met:

We found that the provider did not operate an effective and accessible system for identifying, receiving, recording, handling and responding to complaints. Complaints specific to healthcare were received through the main prison complaints system. This meant that patient details and the reason for their complaint were not kept private and confidential. The process was little used by patients making healthcare complaints, with only one having been received through this system in recent months.

Staff told us that most complaints were received verbally, and were dealt with by team members. We saw information displayed in healthcare advising patients to speak to a member of staff if they had a concern or complaint. However, these verbal complaints were not logged in order to identify and address trends or themes.

We therefore found that the complaints system was not effective in ensuring that complainants received appropriate responses, or that proportionate action was taken in response to complaints.

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	212	82
Recall	2	1
Convicted unsentenced		
Remand	46	17
Detainees		
Total	260	100

Age	Number of young people	%
15 years	12	5
16 years	64	25
17 years	147	56
18 years	37	14
Total	260	100

Nationality	Number of young people	%
British	244	94
Foreign nationals	16	6
Total	260	100

Ethnicity	Number of young people	%
White		
British	170	65
Irish	1	0.4
Gypsy/Irish Traveller	2	0.8
Other white	8	3
Mixed		
White and black Caribbean	20	8
White and black African	3	1.2
White and Asian	4	1.6
Other mixed	4	1.6
Asian or Asian British		
Indian	1	8
Pakistani	14	1.2
Bangladeshi	4	1.6
Chinese	0	0
Other Asian	3	1.2
Black or black British		
Caribbean	11	4
African	7	3
Other black	6	2.4
Other ethnic group		
Arab		
Other ethnic group	2	0.8
Not stated		
Total	260	100

Religion	Number of young people	%
Baptist		
Church of England	11	4
Roman Catholic	31	12
Other Christian denominations	41	16
Muslim	35	14
Sikh		
Hindu		
Buddhist		
Jewish		
Other	6	2
No religion	136	52
Total	260	260

Other demographics	Number of young people	%
Gypsy/Romany/Traveller	2	0.8
Total	2	0.8

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	5	4					10
16 years	10	20	7	12	3			52
17 years	11	32	25	28	16	5		117
18 years		7	7	11	10			35
Total	22	64	43	51	29	5		214

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	1	7	2	2				12
17 years	13	10	5	2				30
18 years	1		1					2
Total								46

Main offence	Number of young people	%
Violence against the person	73	28
Sexual offences	37	14
Burglary	24	9.5
Robbery	60	23
Theft and handling	11	4.5
Fraud and forgery		
Drugs offences	10	4
Other offences	45	17
Offence not recorded / holding warrant		
Total	260	100

Number of DTO's 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			2	1	2	2			7
16 years	2	3	5		9	4	2	3	28
17 years	8	8	8	6	21	11	4	1	67
18 years	2	1	1		10	5	2		21
Total	12	12	16	7	42	22	8	4	123

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				1			1
16 years		1	5	5	3		14
17 years		4	6	17	12	1	40
18 years		2	5	4	1	1	13
Total		7	16	27	16	2	68

Extended determinate sentences under Section 226B (detention for public protection) by age and length of tariff

Sentence	Under 2 yrs	2–5 yrs	5–10 yrs	10–15 yrs	15–20 yrs	Recall	Total
Age							
15 years							
16 years			3	3			6
17 years		1	6	3			10
18 years							
Total		1	9	6			16

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				1	1		2
16 years				2			2
17 years			1	1			2
18 years				1			1
Total			1	5	1		7

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

Children and young people survey methodology Wetherby

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

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 13 March 2017, the young person population at HMYOI Wetherby was 216. Questionnaires were offered to 212 young people¹⁷.

We received a total of 188 completed questionnaires, a response rate of 89%. This included one questionnaire completed via interview. Thirteen respondents refused to complete a questionnaire and eleven questionnaires were not returned.

Wing/unit	Number of completed survey returns
B	32
C	41
D	36
E	38
F	36
Segregation unit	5

¹⁷ Surveys were not distributed to four young people who were 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 Wetherby.

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 significant¹⁸ 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 peoples' background details.

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

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

The following comparative analyses are presented:

- The current survey responses from HMYOI Wetherby in 2017 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 YOI's since April 2016.
- The current survey responses from HMYOI Wetherby in 2017 compared with the responses of young people surveyed at HMYOI Wetherby in 2016.
- A comparison within the 2017 survey between the responses of white young people and those from a black and minority ethnic group.
- A comparison within the 2017 survey between the responses of Muslim young people and non-Muslim young people.
- A comparison within the 2017 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 2017 survey between the responses of young people who have been in local authority care and those who have not been in local authority care.
- A comparison within the 2017 survey between the responses of young people on B wing and the responses of young people on C, D, E and F wings.

Children and young people survey methodology Keppel

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

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

¹⁸ 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. In order to appropriately adjust p-values in light of multiple testing, $p < 0.01$ was considered statistically significant for all comparisons undertaken. This means there is only a 1% likelihood that the difference is due to chance.

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 13 March 2017, the young person population at the Keppel unit was 42. Questionnaires were offered to all 42 young people.

We received a total of 37 completed questionnaires, a response rate of 88%. Two respondents refused to complete a questionnaire and three questionnaires were not returned.

Presentation of survey results and analyses

Over the following pages we present the survey results for the Keppel unit.

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 significant¹⁹ differences are indicated by shading. Results that are significantly better are indicated by green shading, results that are significantly worse are indicated by blue shading. If the difference is not statistically significant there is no shading. Orange shading has been used to show a statistically significant difference in young people's background details.

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

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

The following comparative analyses are presented:

- The current survey responses from the Keppel unit 2017 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 2016.
- The current survey responses from the Keppel unit in 2017 compared with the responses of young people surveyed at the Keppel unit in 2016.

¹⁹ 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. In order to appropriately adjust p-values in light of multiple testing, $p < 0.01$ was considered statistically significant for all comparisons undertaken. This means there is only a 1% likelihood that the difference is due to chance.

- A comparison within the 2017 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 2017 survey between the responses of young people who have been in local authority care and those who have not been in local authority care

Survey summary Wetherby

SECTION I: ABOUT YOU

Q1	How old are you?	
	15	13 (7%)
	16	41 (22%)
	17	107 (57%)
	18	26 (14%)
Q2	Are you a British citizen?	
	Yes	170 (93%)
	No	13 (7%)
Q3	Do you understand spoken English?	
	Yes	180 (98%)
	No	3 (2%)
Q4	Do you understand written English?	
	Yes	180 (99%)
	No	2 (1%)
Q5	What is your ethnic origin?	
	White - British	106 (57%)
	White - Irish	5 (3%)
	White - Other	6 (3%)
	Black or Black British - Caribbean	11 (6%)
	Black or Black British - African	5 (3%)
	Black or Black British - Other	3 (2%)
	Asian or Asian British - Indian	2 (1%)
	Asian or Asian British - Pakistani	14 (8%)
	Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi	4 (2%)
	Asian or Asian British - Chinese	1 (1%)
	Asian or Asian British - Other	1 (1%)
	Mixed race - White and Black Caribbean	15 (8%)
	Mixed race - White and Black African	3 (2%)
	Mixed race - White and Asian	1 (1%)
	Mixed race - Other	5 (3%)
	Arab	1 (1%)
	Other ethnic group	2 (1%)
Q6	What is your religion?	
	None	73 (40%)
	Church of England	33 (18%)
	Catholic	29 (16%)
	Protestant	2 (1%)
	Other Christian denomination	13 (7%)
	Buddhist	2 (1%)
	Hindu	0 (0%)
	Jewish	0 (0%)
	Muslim	30 (16%)
	Sikh	1 (1%)

Q7	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	
	Yes	12 (7%)
	No.....	162 (89%)
	Don't know	8 (4%)
Q8	Do you have any children?	
	Yes	23 (13%)
	No.....	158 (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	33 (18%)
	No.....	151 (82%)
Q10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	
	Yes	73 (40%)
	No.....	110 (60%)

SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE

Q1	Are you sentenced?	
	Yes	154 (82%)
	No - unsentenced/on remand	34 (18%)
Q2	How long is your sentence (the full DTO sentence)?	
	Not sentenced.....	34 (18%)
	Less than 6 months.....	18 (10%)
	6 to 12 months.....	30 (16%)
	More than 12 months, up to 2 years.....	38 (21%)
	More than 2 years.....	57 (31%)
	Indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP).....	8 (4%)
Q3	How long have you been in this establishment?	
	Less than 1 month.....	24 (13%)
	1 to 6 months.....	73 (40%)
	More than 6 months, but less than 12 months.....	45 (25%)
	12 months to 2 years.....	30 (17%)
	More than 2 years.....	9 (5%)
Q4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	
	Yes	104 (56%)
	No.....	81 (44%)

SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS

Q1	On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?	
	Yes	154 (83%)
	No.....	16 (9%)
	Don't remember.....	16 (9%)
Q2	On your most recent journey here, were there any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females travelling with you?	
	Yes	59 (32%)
	No.....	100 (54%)
	Don't remember	26 (14%)

Q3	On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	81 (44%)
	<i>2 to 4 hours</i>	82 (44%)
	<i>More than 4 hours</i>	13 (7%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	9 (5%)
Q4	On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?	
	<i>My journey was less than 2 hours</i>	81 (44%)
	<i>Yes</i>	14 (8%)
	<i>No</i>	80 (43%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	10 (5%)
Q5	On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?	
	<i>My journey was less than 2 hours</i>	81 (45%)
	<i>Yes</i>	49 (27%)
	<i>No</i>	51 (28%)
	<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>	35 (19%)
	<i>Well</i>	70 (38%)
	<i>Neither</i>	49 (27%)
	<i>Badly</i>	14 (8%)
	<i>Very badly</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	15 (8%)
Q7	Before you arrived here, did you receive any information to help you prepare for coming here?	
	<i>Yes - and it was helpful</i>	22 (12%)
	<i>Yes - but it was not helpful</i>	36 (20%)
	<i>No - I received no information</i>	99 (54%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	26 (14%)

SECTION 4: FIRST DAYS

Q1	How long were you in reception?	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	147 (79%)
	<i>2 hours or longer</i>	22 (12%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	17 (9%)
Q2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	
	<i>Yes</i>	156 (84%)
	<i>No</i>	16 (9%)
	<i>Don't remember/Not applicable</i>	13 (7%)
Q3	How well did you feel you were treated in reception?	
	<i>Very well</i>	41 (22%)
	<i>Well</i>	90 (48%)
	<i>Neither</i>	39 (21%)
	<i>Badly</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>Very badly</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	8 (4%)

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	116 (68%)
	Loss of property	40 (23%)
	Feeling scared.....	52 (30%)
	Gang problems.....	63 (37%)
	Contacting family	94 (55%)
	Money worries	39 (23%)
	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to.....	60 (35%)
	Health problems.....	99 (58%)
	Getting phone numbers.....	77 (45%)
	Staff did not ask me about any of these	18 (11%)
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	87 (51%)
	Loss of property	13 (8%)
	Feeling scared.....	24 (14%)
	Gang problems.....	19 (11%)
	Contacting family	53 (31%)
	Money worries	27 (16%)
	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to.....	28 (16%)
	Health problems.....	28 (16%)
	Getting phone numbers.....	58 (34%)
	I did not have any problems	36 (21%)
Q6	When you first arrived here, were you given any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Toiletries/basic items	156 (87%)
	The opportunity to have a shower	38 (21%)
	Something to eat.....	147 (82%)
	A free phone call to friends/family.....	146 (81%)
	PIN phone credit.....	106 (59%)
	Information about feeling worried/upset.....	57 (32%)
	Don't remember	5 (3%)
	I was not given any of these	3 (2%)
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.....	84 (47%)
	Peer mentor.....	20 (11%)
	Childline/Samaritans.....	28 (16%)
	The prison shop/canteen.....	23 (13%)
	Don't remember	31 (18%)
	I did not have access to any of these	57 (32%)
Q8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	
	Yes	140 (77%)
	No.....	26 (14%)
	Don't remember	17 (9%)
Q9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	
	Yes	135 (74%)
	No.....	29 (16%)
	Don't remember.....	18 (10%)
Q10	Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the establishment?	
	I have not been on an induction course	36 (20%)
	Yes	69 (38%)
	No.....	40 (22%)
	Don't remember.....	37 (20%)

SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT

Q1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	
	Yes	112 (62%)
	No	68 (37%)
	Don't know	2 (1%)
Q2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	
	Yes	21 (11%)
	No.....	156 (85%)
	Don't know	6 (3%)
Q3	What is the food like here?	
	Very good.....	0 (0%)
	Good.....	26 (14%)
	Neither	69 (38%)
	Bad	50 (28%)
	Very bad.....	36 (20%)
Q4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	
	I have not bought anything yet/Don't know	8 (4%)
	Yes	93 (52%)
	No.....	79 (44%)
Q5	How easy is it for you to attend religious services?	
	I don't want to attend religious services	26 (14%)
	Very easy.....	38 (21%)
	Easy	58 (32%)
	Neither	18 (10%)
	Difficult.....	13 (7%)
	Very difficult.....	7 (4%)
	Don't know	21 (12%)
Q6	Are your religious beliefs respected?	
	Yes	88 (49%)
	No.....	25 (14%)
	Don't know/Not applicable.....	68 (38%)
Q7	Can you speak to a Chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?	
	Yes	120 (67%)
	No.....	7 (4%)
	Don't know/Not applicable	53 (29%)
Q8	Can you speak to a peer mentor when you need to?	
	Yes	45 (25%)
	No.....	30 (17%)
	Don't know	106 (59%)
Q9	Can you speak to a member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board) when you need to?	
	Yes	26 (14%)
	No	29 (16%)
	Don't know	126 (70%)

Q10	Can you speak to an advocate (an outside person to help you) when you need to?	
	Yes	62 (34%)
	No.....	32 (18%)
	Don't know	88 (48%)

SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF

Q1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	
	Yes	129 (74%)
	No.....	46 (26%)

Q2	If you had a problem, who would you turn to? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	No-one	42 (24%)
	Personal officer	39 (22%)
	Wing Officer.....	42 (24%)
	Teacher/education staff	10 (6%)
	Gym staff	4 (2%)
	Chaplain.....	33 (19%)
	Independent Monitoring Board (IMB).....	8 (5%)
	YOT worker	44 (25%)
	Social worker	20 (11%)
	Health services staff.....	6 (3%)
	Peer mentor	3 (2%)
	Another young person here.....	34 (19%)
	Case worker.....	54 (31%)
	Advocate.....	7 (4%)
	Family/friends.....	98 (55%)
	Childline/Samaritans	3 (2%)

Q3	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	
	Yes	61 (34%)
	No.....	120 (66%)

Q4	When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?	
	I still have not met him/her	45 (26%)
	In your first week	40 (23%)
	After your first week.....	44 (25%)
	Don't remember	47 (27%)

Q5	How often do you see your personal (named) officer?	
	I still have not met him/her	45 (27%)
	At least once a week	61 (36%)
	Less than once a week.....	63 (37%)

Q6	Do you feel your personal (named) officer tries to help you?	
	I still have not met him/her.....	45 (26%)
	Yes	85 (49%)
	No.....	43 (25%)

SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS

Q1	Is it easy to make an application?	
	Yes	127 (71%)
	No.....	19 (11%)
	Don't know	34 (19%)

Q2	Are applications sorted out fairly?	
	I have not made an application	34 (22%)
	Yes	78 (50%)
	No.....	44 (28%)

Q3	Are applications sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	
	<i>I have not made an application</i>	34 (22%)
	Yes	58 (37%)
	No.....	64 (41%)
Q4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	
	Yes	91 (51%)
	No.....	28 (16%)
	Don't know	60 (34%)
Q5	Are complaints sorted out fairly?	
	<i>I have not made a complaint</i>	62 (42%)
	Yes	24 (16%)
	No.....	62 (42%)
Q6	Are complaints sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	
	<i>I have not made a complaint</i>	62 (42%)
	Yes	15 (10%)
	No.....	69 (47%)
Q7	Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint?	
	Yes	19 (11%)
	No.....	97 (55%)
	Never needed to make a complaint.....	59 (34%)

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>	9 (5%)
	<i>Enhanced (top)</i>	56 (31%)
	<i>Standard (middle)</i>	75 (41%)
	<i>Basic (bottom)</i>	40 (22%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	2 (1%)
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>	9 (5%)
	Yes	76 (44%)
	No.....	68 (39%)
	Don't know	21 (12%)
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>	9 (5%)
	Yes	79 (45%)
	No.....	68 (38%)
	Don't know	21 (12%)
Q4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	
	Yes	96 (53%)
	No.....	65 (36%)
	Don't know	21 (12%)
Q5	If you have had a minor report, was the process explained clearly to you?	
	<i>I have not had a minor report</i>	86 (48%)
	Yes	54 (30%)
	No.....	38 (21%)

Q6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	
	Yes	106 (59%)
	No.....	63 (35%)
	Don't know	11 (6%)
Q7	If you have had an adjudication ('nicking'), was the process explained clearly to you?	
	<i>I have not had an adjudication</i>	74 (41%)
	Yes	91 (51%)
	No.....	14 (8%)
Q8	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	
	Yes	73 (41%)
	No.....	97 (54%)
	Don't know	9 (5%)
Q9	If you have spent a night in the segregation unit (CSU), how were you treated by staff?	
	<i>I have not been to the segregation unit</i>	133 (74%)
	Very well.....	14 (8%)
	Well.....	11 (6%)
	Neither	10 (6%)
	Badly.....	6 (3%)
	Very badly.....	6 (3%)

SECTION 9: SAFETY

Q1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	
	Yes	69 (39%)
	No.....	110 (61%)
Q2	Do you feel unsafe now?	
	Yes	32 (18%)
	No.....	147 (82%)
Q3	In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Never felt unsafe	110 (65%)
	Everywhere	18 (11%)
	Segregation unit	3 (2%)
	Association areas	21 (13%)
	Reception area	7 (4%)
	At the gym	21 (13%)
	In an exercise yard	22 (13%)
	At work.....	7 (4%)
	At education	28 (17%)
	At religious services.....	8 (5%)
	At meal times	17 (10%)
	At healthcare	8 (5%)
	Visits area	15 (9%)
	In wing showers.....	3 (2%)
	In gym showers	16 (10%)
	In corridors/stairwells.....	17 (10%)
	On your landing/wing	20 (12%)
	During movement.....	27 (16%)
	In your cell	13 (8%)

Q4	Have you ever been victimised by another young person/group of young people here (e.g. insulted or assaulted you)?	
	Yes	56 (32%)
	No.....	121 (68%)
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>	39 (22%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	18 (10%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	22 (12%)
	<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i>	14 (8%)
	<i>Medication</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Debt</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>Drugs</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	10 (6%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	8 (5%)
	<i>Your nationality</i>	4 (2%)
	<i>You are from a different part of the country to others</i>	6 (3%)
	<i>You are from a Traveller community</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>Your sexuality</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Your age</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>You having a disability</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>You were new here</i>	18 (10%)
	<i>Your offence/crime</i>	6 (3%)
	<i>Gang related issues</i>	12 (7%)
Q7	Have you ever been victimised by staff here (e.g. insulted or assaulted you)?	
	Yes	55 (31%)
	No.....	122 (69%)
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>	29 (16%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	15 (8%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	12 (7%)
	<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>Medication</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Debt</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>Drugs</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	8 (5%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>Your nationality</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>You are from a different part of the country to others</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>You are from a Traveller community</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Your sexuality</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your age</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>You having a disability</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>You were new here</i>	4 (2%)
	<i>Your offence/crime</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Gang related issues</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Because you made a complaint</i>	9 (5%)
Q10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	
	Yes	35 (21%)
	No.....	104 (62%)
	Don't know	29 (17%)

Q11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?		
	Yes	41 (24%)	
	No.....	70 (40%)	
	Don't know	62 (36%)	

Q12	Is shouting through the windows a problem here?		
	Yes	85 (49%)	
	No.....	71 (41%)	
	Don't know.....	18 (10%)	

SECTION 10: HEALTH SERVICES

Q1	Is it easy to see the following people if you need to?			
		Yes	No	Don't know
	The doctor	102 (58%)	44 (25%)	30 (17%)
	The nurse	126 (72%)	23 (13%)	27 (15%)
	The dentist	53 (30%)	85 (49%)	36 (21%)

Q2	What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?		
	<i>I have not been</i>		16 (9%)
	<i>Very good</i>		11 (6%)
	<i>Good</i>		67 (38%)
	<i>Neither</i>		49 (28%)
	<i>Bad</i>		21 (12%)
	<i>Very bad</i>		13 (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>		87 (49%)
	<i>Yes, all of my meds</i>		12 (7%)
	<i>Yes, some of my meds</i>		29 (16%)
	<i>No</i>		48 (27%)

Q4	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?		
	Yes		49 (28%)
	No.....		127 (72%)

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>		127 (73%)
	Yes		26 (15%)
	No.....		21 (12%)

Q6	Did you have problems with alcohol when you first arrived here?		
	Yes		13 (7%)
	No.....		166 (93%)

Q7	Have you received any help with alcohol problems here?		
	Yes		7 (4%)
	No.....		172 (96%)

Q8	Did you have problems with drugs when you first arrived here?		
	Yes		68 (38%)
	No.....		110 (62%)

Q9	Do you have problems with drugs now?		
	Yes		16 (9%)
	No.....		159 (91%)

Q10	Have you received any help with drugs problems here?	
	Yes	42 (24%)
	No.....	134 (76%)
Q11	How easy or difficult is it to get illegal drugs here?	
	Very easy.....	35 (21%)
	Easy	19 (11%)
	Neither	11 (7%)
	Difficult.....	7 (4%)
	Very difficult.....	19 (11%)
	Don't know	77 (46%)

SECTION 11: ACTIVITIES

Q1	How old were you when you were last at school?				
	14 or under	75 (43%)			
	15 or over.....	98 (57%)			
Q2	Have you ever been excluded from school?				
	Yes	167 (93%)			
	No.....	9 (5%)			
	Not applicable.....	3 (2%)			
Q3	Did you ever skip school before you came into custody?				
	Yes	137 (77%)			
	No.....	35 (20%)			
	Not applicable.....	6 (3%)			
Q4	Do you CURRENTLY take part in any of the following activities? (Please tick all that apply to you.)				
	Education	129 (74%)			
	A job in this establishment.....	22 (13%)			
	Vocational or skills training	11 (6%)			
	Offending behaviour programmes	47 (27%)			
	I am not currently involved in any of these.....	35 (20%)			
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	14 (8%)	94 (57%)	41 (25%)	16 (10%)
	A job in this establishment	39 (33%)	33 (28%)	28 (24%)	19 (16%)
	Vocational or skills training	43 (37%)	31 (27%)	22 (19%)	20 (17%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	30 (24%)	52 (41%)	23 (18%)	22 (17%)
Q6	Do you usually have association every day?				
	Yes	84 (48%)			
	No.....	91 (52%)			
Q7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?				
	Don't want to go.....	25 (14%)			
	Yes	124 (71%)			
	No.....	25 (14%)			

Q8	How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?	
	<i>Don't want to go</i>	12 (7%)
	<i>None</i>	23 (13%)
	<i>One to two times</i>	89 (51%)
	<i>Three to five times</i>	47 (27%)
	<i>More than five times</i>	2 (1%)

SECTION 12: FAMILY AND FRIENDS

Q1	Are you able to use the telephone every day, if you want to?	
	<i>Yes</i>	96 (54%)
	<i>No</i>	77 (43%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	6 (3%)

Q2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?	
	<i>Yes</i>	84 (47%)
	<i>No</i>	77 (44%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	16 (9%)

Q3	How many visits do you usually have each week, from family or friends?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	40 (22%)
	<i>Less than one a week</i>	53 (30%)
	<i>About one a week</i>	52 (29%)
	<i>More than one a week</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	28 (16%)

Q4	How easy is it for your family and friends to visit you here?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	40 (23%)
	<i>Very easy</i>	13 (7%)
	<i>Easy</i>	37 (21%)
	<i>Neither</i>	26 (15%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	35 (20%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	21 (12%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	5 (3%)

Q5	Do your visits usually start on time?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	40 (23%)
	<i>Yes</i>	81 (46%)
	<i>No</i>	35 (20%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	19 (11%)

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>	38 (22%)
	<i>Getting into school or college</i>	42 (25%)
	<i>Getting a job</i>	73 (43%)
	<i>Money/finances</i>	57 (34%)
	<i>Claiming benefits</i>	31 (18%)
	<i>Continuing health services</i>	12 (7%)
	<i>Opening a bank account</i>	20 (12%)
	<i>Avoiding bad relationships</i>	28 (17%)
	<i>I won't have any problems</i>	72 (43%)

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	78 (45%)
	No.....	40 (23%)
	Don't know	57 (33%)
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>	97 (58%)
	Yes	59 (35%)
	No.....	12 (7%)
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>	97 (57%)
	Yes	65 (38%)
	No.....	7 (4%)
Q5	Do you have a caseworker here?	
	Yes	172 (98%)
	No.....	1 (1%)
	Don't know	3 (2%)
Q6	Has your caseworker helped to prepare you for release?	
	<i>I don't have a caseworker</i>	4 (2%)
	Yes	80 (47%)
	No.....	55 (33%)
	Don't know	30 (18%)
Q7	Has your social worker been to visit you since you have been here?	
	<i>I don't have a social worker</i>	60 (34%)
	Yes	82 (47%)
	No.....	32 (18%)
Q8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	
	Yes	69 (39%)
	No.....	75 (43%)
	Don't know	32 (18%)
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>	48 (31%)
	<i>Getting into school or college</i>	39 (25%)
	<i>Getting a job</i>	52 (34%)
	<i>Help with money/finances</i>	39 (25%)
	<i>Help with claiming benefits</i>	37 (24%)
	<i>Continuing health services</i>	34 (22%)
	<i>Opening a bank account</i>	41 (27%)
	<i>Avoiding bad relationships</i>	32 (21%)
	<i>I don't know who to contact</i>	83 (54%)

Q10	What is most likely to stop you offending in the future? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	34 (20%) <i>Having a mentor (someone you can ask for advice)</i> 12 (7%)
	<i>Nothing, it is up to me</i>	33 (20%) <i>Having a YOT worker or social worker that I get on with</i> 33 (20%)
	<i>Making new friends outside</i>	34 (20%) <i>Having children</i> 24 (14%)
	<i>Going back to live with my family</i>	39 (23%) <i>Having something to do that isn't crime</i> 55 (33%)
	<i>Getting a place of my own</i>	43 (26%) <i>This sentence</i> 50 (30%)
	<i>Getting a job</i>	76 (45%) <i>Getting into school/college</i> 34 (20%)
	<i>Having a partner (girlfriend or boyfriend)</i>	59 (35%) <i>Talking about my offending behaviour with staff</i> 4 (2%)
	<i>Staying off alcohol/drugs</i>	40 (24%) <i>Anything else</i> 5 (3%)
Q11	Do you want to stop offending?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	34 (20%)
	<i>Yes</i>	126 (73%)
	<i>No</i>	4 (2%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	8 (5%)
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>	34 (20%)
	<i>Yes</i>	64 (37%)
	<i>No</i>	73 (43%)

Survey summary Keppel

SECTION I: ABOUT YOU

Q1	How old are you?	
	15	1 (3%)
	16	12 (32%)
	17	18 (49%)
	18	6 (16%)
Q2	Are you a British citizen?	
	Yes	35 (95%)
	No	2 (5%)
Q3	Do you understand spoken English?	
	Yes	36 (100%)
	No	0 (0%)
Q4	Do you understand written English?	
	Yes	37 (100%)
	No	0 (0%)
Q5	What is your ethnic origin?	
	White - British	30 (81%)
	White - Irish	1 (3%)
	White - Other	1 (3%)
	Black or Black British - Caribbean	0 (0%)
	Black or Black British - African	0 (0%)
	Black or Black British - Other	0 (0%)
	Asian or Asian British - Indian	1 (3%)
	Asian or Asian British - Pakistani	1 (3%)
	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	3 (8%)
	Mixed race - White and Black African	0 (0%)
	Mixed race - White and Asian	0 (0%)
	Mixed race - Other	0 (0%)
	Arab	0 (0%)
	Other ethnic group	0 (0%)

Q6	What is your religion?	
	None.....	17 (47%)
	Church of England.....	8 (22%)
	Catholic.....	8 (22%)
	Protestant.....	0 (0%)
	Other Christian denomination.....	2 (6%)
	Buddhist.....	0 (0%)
	Hindu.....	0 (0%)
	Jewish.....	0 (0%)
	Muslim.....	1 (3%)
	Sikh.....	0 (0%)
Q7	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	
	Yes.....	2 (6%)
	No.....	31 (86%)
	Don't know.....	3 (8%)
Q8	Do you have any children?	
	Yes.....	6 (17%)
	No.....	30 (83%)
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.....	22 (59%)
	No.....	15 (41%)
Q10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	
	Yes.....	19 (53%)
	No.....	17 (47%)

SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE

Q1	Are you sentenced?	
	Yes.....	30 (81%)
	No - unsentenced/on remand.....	7 (19%)
Q2	How long is your sentence (the full DTO sentence)?	
	Not sentenced.....	7 (19%)
	Less than 6 months.....	5 (14%)
	6 to 12 months.....	6 (16%)
	More than 12 months, up to 2 years.....	8 (22%)
	More than 2 years.....	11 (30%)
	Indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP).....	0 (0%)
Q3	How long have you been in this establishment?	
	Less than 1 month.....	6 (16%)
	1 to 6 months.....	19 (51%)
	More than 6 months, but less than 12 months.....	6 (16%)
	12 months to 2 years.....	5 (14%)
	More than 2 years.....	1 (3%)
Q4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	
	Yes.....	21 (58%)
	No.....	15 (42%)

SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS

Q1	On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?	
	Yes	28 (76%)
	No.....	6 (16%)
	Don't remember	3 (8%)
Q2	On your most recent journey here, were there any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females travelling with you?	
	Yes	19 (51%)
	No.....	10 (27%)
	Don't remember	8 (22%)
Q3	On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?	
	Less than 2 hours	8 (22%)
	2 to 4 hours.....	21 (58%)
	More than 4 hours	6 (17%)
	Don't remember	1 (3%)
Q4	On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?	
	My journey was less than 2 hours	8 (22%)
	Yes	9 (25%)
	No.....	18 (50%)
	Don't remember	1 (3%)
Q5	On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?	
	My journey was less than 2 hours	8 (22%)
	Yes	20 (54%)
	No.....	9 (24%)
	Don't remember	0 (0%)
Q6	On your most recent journey here, how did you feel you were treated by the escort staff?	
	Very well.....	12 (32%)
	Well.....	11 (30%)
	Neither	6 (16%)
	Badly.....	4 (11%)
	Very badly	1 (3%)
	Don't remember	3 (8%)
Q7	Before you arrived here, did you receive any information to help you prepare for coming here?	
	Yes - and it was helpful.....	9 (24%)
	Yes - but it was not helpful.....	4 (11%)
	No - I received no information	15 (41%)
	Don't remember	9 (24%)

SECTION 4: FIRST DAYS

Q1	How long were you in reception?	
	Less than 2 hours	26 (70%)
	2 hours or longer	6 (16%)
	Don't remember	5 (14%)
Q2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	
	Yes	31 (84%)
	No.....	2 (5%)
	Don't remember/Not applicable	4 (11%)

Q3	How well did you feel you were treated in reception?		
	Very well.....	10 (27%)	
	Well.....	14 (38%)	
	Neither.....	7 (19%)	
	Badly.....	3 (8%)	
	Very badly.....	0 (0%)	
	Don't remember.....	3 (8%)	
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.....	15 (41%)	Money worries..... 9 (24%)
	Loss of property.....	6 (16%)	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to..... 18 (49%)
	Feeling scared.....	14 (38%)	Health problems..... 17 (46%)
	Gang problems.....	10 (27%)	Getting phone numbers..... 18 (49%)
	Contacting family.....	22 (59%)	Staff did not ask me about any of these 3 (8%)
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.....	17 (49%)	Money worries..... 5 (14%)
	Loss of property.....	1 (3%)	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to..... 15 (43%)
	Feeling scared.....	13 (37%)	Health problems..... 8 (23%)
	Gang problems.....	5 (14%)	Getting phone numbers..... 13 (37%)
	Contacting family.....	12 (34%)	I did not have any problems..... 6 (17%)
Q6	When you first arrived here, were you given any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	Toiletries/basic items.....	30 (83%)	
	The opportunity to have a shower.....	21 (58%)	
	Something to eat.....	29 (81%)	
	A free phone call to friends/family.....	29 (81%)	
	PIN phone credit.....	22 (61%)	
	Information about feeling worried/upset.....	15 (42%)	
	Don't remember.....	2 (6%)	
	I was not given any of these.....	1 (3%)	
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.....	15 (44%)	
	Peer mentor.....	3 (9%)	
	Childline/Samaritans.....	5 (15%)	
	The prison shop/canteen.....	3 (9%)	
	Don't remember.....	7 (21%)	
	I did not have access to any of these.....	11 (32%)	
Q8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?		
	Yes.....	26 (70%)	
	No.....	7 (19%)	
	Don't remember.....	4 (11%)	
Q9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?		
	Yes.....	22 (59%)	
	No.....	14 (38%)	
	Don't remember.....	1 (3%)	

Q10	Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the establishment?	
	<i>I have not been on an induction course</i>	8 (24%)
	Yes	15 (44%)
	No.....	3 (9%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	8 (24%)

SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT

Q1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	
	Yes	36 (97%)
	No	1 (3%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	0 (0%)
Q2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	
	Yes	10 (27%)
	No.....	22 (59%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	5 (14%)
Q3	What is the food like here?	
	<i>Very good</i>	1 (3%)
	<i>Good</i>	8 (22%)
	<i>Neither</i>	14 (38%)
	<i>Bad</i>	8 (22%)
	<i>Very bad</i>	6 (16%)
Q4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	
	<i>I have not bought anything yet/Don't know</i>	4 (11%)
	Yes	18 (49%)
	No.....	15 (41%)
Q5	How easy is it for you to attend religious services?	
	<i>I don't want to attend religious services</i>	11 (30%)
	<i>Very easy</i>	7 (19%)
	<i>Easy</i>	7 (19%)
	<i>Neither</i>	2 (5%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	6 (16%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	4 (11%)
Q6	Are you religious beliefs respected?	
	Yes	17 (49%)
	No.....	4 (11%)
	<i>Don't know/Not applicable</i>	14 (40%)
Q7	Can you speak to a Chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?	
	Yes	25 (68%)
	No.....	1 (3%)
	<i>Don't know/Not applicable</i>	11 (30%)
Q8	Can you speak to a peer mentor when you need to?	
	Yes	13 (37%)
	No.....	4 (11%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	18 (51%)

Q9	Can you speak to a member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board) when you need to?	
	Yes	13 (36%)
	No	4 (11%)
	Don't know	19 (53%)
Q10	Can you speak to an advocate (an outside person to help you) when you need to?	
	Yes	20 (56%)
	No.....	4 (11%)
	Don't know	12 (33%)

SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF

Q1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	
	Yes	30 (83%)
	No.....	6 (17%)
Q2	If you had a problem, who would you turn to? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	No-one.....	3 (8%)
	Personal officer.....	18 (49%)
	Wing Officer	15 (41%)
	Teacher/education staff.....	7 (19%)
	Gym staff	3 (8%)
	Chaplain	8 (22%)
	Independent Monitoring Board (IMB) ..	3 (8%)
	YOT worker	13 (35%)
	Social worker	13 (35%)
	Health services staff	4 (11%)
	Peer mentor	2 (5%)
	Another young person here.....	10 (27%)
	Case worker.....	21 (57%)
	Advocate.....	5 (14%)
	Family/friends.....	22 (59%)
	Childline/Samaritans	1 (3%)
Q3	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	
	Yes	25 (68%)
	No.....	12 (32%)
Q4	When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?	
	I still have not met him/her	7 (19%)
	In your first week	16 (44%)
	After your first week.....	5 (14%)
	Don't remember	8 (22%)
Q5	How often do you see your personal (named) officer?	
	I still have not met him/her	7 (19%)
	At least once a week	24 (67%)
	Less than once a week.....	5 (14%)
Q6	Do you feel your personal (named) officer tries to help you?	
	I still have not met him/her.....	7 (19%)
	Yes	25 (69%)
	No.....	4 (11%)

SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS

Q1	Is it easy to make an application?	
	Yes	22 (63%)
	No.....	4 (11%)
	Don't know	9 (26%)

Q2	Are applications sorted out fairly?	
	<i>I have not made an application</i>	8 (29%)
	Yes	15 (54%)
	No.....	5 (18%)
Q3	Are applications sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	
	<i>I have not made an application</i>	8 (28%)
	Yes	10 (34%)
	No.....	11 (38%)
Q4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	
	Yes	18 (51%)
	No.....	3 (9%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	14 (40%)
Q5	Are complaints sorted out fairly?	
	<i>I have not made a complaint</i>	14 (47%)
	Yes	5 (17%)
	No.....	11 (37%)
Q6	Are complaints sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	
	<i>I have not made a complaint</i>	14 (45%)
	Yes	3 (10%)
	No.....	14 (45%)
Q7	Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint?	
	Yes	5 (14%)
	No.....	19 (53%)
	<i>Never needed to make a complaint</i>	12 (33%)

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>	4 (11%)
	<i>Enhanced (top)</i>	9 (25%)
	<i>Standard (middle)</i>	13 (36%)
	<i>Basic (bottom)</i>	8 (22%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	2 (6%)
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>	4 (11%)
	Yes	21 (58%)
	No.....	9 (25%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	2 (6%)
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>	4 (11%)
	Yes	18 (50%)
	No.....	11 (31%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	3 (8%)
Q4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	
	Yes	18 (50%)
	No.....	13 (36%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	5 (14%)

Q5	If you have had a minor report, was the process explained clearly to you?	
	<i>I have not had a minor report.....</i>	18 (51%)
	<i>Yes.....</i>	13 (37%)
	<i>No.....</i>	4 (11%)
Q6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	
	<i>Yes.....</i>	15 (43%)
	<i>No.....</i>	18 (51%)
	<i>Don't know.....</i>	2 (6%)
Q7	If you have had an adjudication ('nicking'), was the process explained clearly to you?	
	<i>I have not had an adjudication.....</i>	20 (57%)
	<i>Yes.....</i>	14 (40%)
	<i>No.....</i>	1 (3%)
Q8	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	
	<i>Yes.....</i>	11 (31%)
	<i>No.....</i>	22 (61%)
	<i>Don't know.....</i>	3 (8%)
Q9	If you have spent a night in the segregation unit (CSU), how were you treated by staff?	
	<i>I have not been to the segregation unit.....</i>	26 (76%)
	<i>Very well.....</i>	2 (6%)
	<i>Well.....</i>	1 (3%)
	<i>Neither.....</i>	1 (3%)
	<i>Badly.....</i>	2 (6%)
	<i>Very badly.....</i>	2 (6%)

SECTION 9: SAFETY

Q1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	
	<i>Yes.....</i>	21 (58%)
	<i>No.....</i>	15 (42%)
Q2	Do you feel unsafe now?	
	<i>Yes.....</i>	10 (29%)
	<i>No.....</i>	24 (71%)

Q3	In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Never felt unsafe	15 (42%)
	Everywhere	6 (17%)
	Segregation unit	0 (0%)
	Association areas	4 (11%)
	Reception area	0 (0%)
	At the gym	3 (8%)
	In an exercise yard	9 (25%)
	At work.....	0 (0%)
	At education	6 (17%)
	At religious services.....	2 (6%)
	At meal times	4 (11%)
	At healthcare	1 (3%)
	Visits area	6 (17%)
	In wing showers.....	0 (0%)
	In gym showers	0 (0%)
	In corridors/stairwells.....	3 (8%)
	On your landing/wing	7 (19%)
	During movement.....	5 (14%)
	In your cell	5 (14%)
Q4	Have you ever been victimised by another young person/group of young people here (e.g. insulted or assaulted you)?	
	Yes	13 (37%)
	No.....	22 (63%)
Q5	If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Insulting remarks (about you, your family or friends)	8 (23%)
	Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted).....	4 (11%)
	Sexual abuse.....	0 (0%)
	Feeling threatened or intimidated	6 (17%)
	Having your canteen/property taken	3 (9%)
	Medication	0 (0%)
	Debt.....	1 (3%)
	Drugs.....	0 (0%)
	Your race or ethnic origin.....	2 (6%)
	Your religion/religious beliefs.....	2 (6%)
	Your nationality	1 (3%)
	You are from a different part of the country to others	3 (9%)
	You are from a Traveller community.....	0 (0%)
	Your sexuality	1 (3%)
	Your age.....	0 (0%)
	You having a disability	0 (0%)
	You were new here	5 (14%)
	Your offence/crime.....	3 (9%)
	Gang related issues.....	1 (3%)
Q7	Have you ever been victimised by staff here (e.g. insulted or assaulted you)?	
	Yes	8 (23%)
	No.....	27 (77%)

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>	3 (9%)
<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	2 (6%)
<i>Sexual abuse</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	2 (6%)
<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Medication</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Debt</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Drugs</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Your nationality</i>	0 (0%)
<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>	1 (3%)
<i>Your age</i>	0 (0)
<i>You having a disability</i>	1 (3%)
<i>You were new here</i>	2 (6%)
<i>Your offence/crime</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Gang related issues</i>	1 (3%)
<i>Because you made a complaint</i>	0 (0%)

Q10 If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?

<i>Yes</i>	20 (59%)
<i>No</i>	11 (32%)
<i>Don't know</i>	3 (9%)

Q11 Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?

<i>Yes</i>	18 (50%)
<i>No</i>	6 (17%)
<i>Don't know</i>	12 (33%)

Q12 Is shouting through the windows a problem here?

<i>Yes</i>	21 (58%)
<i>No</i>	11 (31%)
<i>Don't know</i>	4 (11%)

SECTION 10: HEALTH SERVICES**Q1 Is it easy to see the following people if you need to?**

	Yes	No	Don't know
The doctor	23 (64%)	4 (11%)	9 (25%)
The nurse	27 (77%)	1 (3%)	7 (20%)
The dentist	17 (50%)	7 (21%)	10 (29%)

Q2 What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?

<i>I have not been</i>	4 (11%)
<i>Very good</i>	13 (36%)
<i>Good</i>	10 (28%)
<i>Neither</i>	3 (8%)
<i>Bad</i>	4 (11%)
<i>Very bad</i>	2 (6%)

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>	14 (39%)
	<i>Yes, all of my meds</i>	1 (3%)
	<i>Yes, some of my meds</i>	5 (14%)
	<i>No</i>	16 (44%)
Q4	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?	
	<i>Yes</i>	20 (57%)
	<i>No</i>	15 (43%)
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>	15 (44%)
	<i>Yes</i>	12 (35%)
	<i>No</i>	7 (21%)
Q6	Did you have problems with alcohol when you first arrived here?	
	<i>Yes</i>	7 (19%)
	<i>No</i>	29 (81%)
Q7	Have you received any help with alcohol problems here?	
	<i>Yes</i>	5 (14%)
	<i>No</i>	31 (86%)
Q8	Did you have problems with drugs when you first arrived here?	
	<i>Yes</i>	16 (46%)
	<i>No</i>	19 (54%)
Q9	Do you have problems with drugs now?	
	<i>Yes</i>	2 (6%)
	<i>No</i>	32 (94%)
Q10	Have you received any help with drugs problems here?	
	<i>Yes</i>	13 (37%)
	<i>No</i>	22 (63%)
Q11	How easy or difficult is it to get illegal drugs here?	
	<i>Very easy</i>	7 (21%)
	<i>Easy</i>	4 (12%)
	<i>Neither</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	1 (3%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	5 (15%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	17 (50%)

SECTION II: ACTIVITIES

Q1	How old were you when you were last at school?	
	<i>14 or under</i>	15 (43%)
	<i>15 or over</i>	20 (57%)
Q2	Have you ever been excluded from school?	
	<i>Yes</i>	33 (92%)
	<i>No</i>	3 (8%)
	<i>Not applicable</i>	0 (0%)

Q3	Did you ever skip school before you came into custody?				
	Yes	29	(81%)		
	No.....	6	(17%)		
	Not applicable.....	1	(3%)		
Q4	Do you CURRENTLY take part in any of the following activities? (Please tick all that apply to you.)				
	Education	27	(75%)		
	A job in this establishment.....	2	(6%)		
	Vocational or skills training	5	(14%)		
	Offending behaviour programmes	13	(36%)		
	I am not currently involved in any of these.....	7	(19%)		
Q5	If you have been involved in any of the following activities here, do you think they will help you when you leave prison?				
		<i>Not been involved</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
	Education	1 (3%)	22 (65%)	6 (18%)	5 (15%)
	A job in this establishment	8 (38%)	5 (24%)	3 (14%)	5 (24%)
	Vocational or skills training	8 (33%)	8 (33%)	3 (13%)	5 (21%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	4 (17%)	13 (54%)	3 (13%)	4 (17%)
Q6	Do you usually have association every day?				
	Yes	26	(76%)		
	No.....	8	(24%)		
Q7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?				
	Don't want to go.....	7	(20%)		
	Yes.....	25	(71%)		
	No.....	3	(9%)		
Q8	How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?				
	Don't want to go.....	3	(9%)		
	None.....	4	(11%)		
	One to two times	22	(63%)		
	Three to five times.....	6	(17%)		
	More than five times	0	(0%)		

SECTION 12: FAMILY AND FRIENDS

Q1	Are you able to use the telephone every day, if you want to?				
	Yes	31	(91%)		
	No.....	2	(6%)		
	Don't know	1	(3%)		
Q2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?				
	Yes	10	(28%)		
	No.....	22	(61%)		
	Don't know	4	(11%)		
Q3	How many visits do you usually have each week, from family or friends?				
	I don't get visits	7	(21%)		
	Less than one a week.....	10	(29%)		
	About one a week.....	9	(26%)		
	More than one a week.....	1	(3%)		
	Don't know	7	(21%)		

Q4	How easy is it for your family and friends to visit you here?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	7 (19%)
	<i>Very easy</i>	5 (14%)
	<i>Easy</i>	6 (17%)
	<i>Neither</i>	6 (17%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	5 (14%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	3 (8%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	4 (11%)

Q5	Do your visits usually start on time?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	7 (20%)
	<i>Yes</i>	12 (34%)
	<i>No</i>	8 (23%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	8 (23%)

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>	9 (26%)
	<i>Getting into school or college</i>	11 (31%)
	<i>Getting a job</i>	19 (54%)
	<i>Money/finances</i>	14 (40%)
	<i>Claiming benefits</i>	11 (31%)
	<i>Continuing health services</i>	8 (23%)
	<i>Opening a bank account</i>	8 (23%)
	<i>Avoiding bad relationships</i>	12 (34%)
	<i>I won't have any problems</i>	9 (26%)

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)?	
	<i>Yes</i>	16 (46%)
	<i>No</i>	5 (14%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	14 (40%)

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>	19 (56%)
	<i>Yes</i>	14 (41%)
	<i>No</i>	1 (3%)

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>	19 (56%)
	<i>Yes</i>	14 (41%)
	<i>No</i>	1 (3%)

Q5	Do you have a caseworker here?	
	<i>Yes</i>	35 (100%)
	<i>No</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	0 (0%)

Q6	Has your caseworker helped to prepare you for release?	
	<i>I don't have a caseworker</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Yes</i>	21 (60%)
	<i>No</i>	8 (23%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	6 (17%)

Q7	Has your social worker been to visit you since you have been here?			
	<i>I don't have a social worker</i>	9 (26%)		
	<i>Yes</i>	16 (47%)		
	<i>No</i>	9 (26%)		
Q8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?			
	<i>Yes</i>	14 (41%)		
	<i>No</i>	11 (32%)		
	<i>Don't know</i>	9 (26%)		
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>	11 (34%)		
	<i>Getting into school or college</i>	10 (31%)		
	<i>Getting a job</i>	14 (44%)		
	<i>Help with money/finances</i>	10 (31%)		
	<i>Help with claiming benefits</i>	7 (22%)		
	<i>Continuing health services</i>	9 (28%)		
	<i>Opening a bank account</i>	14 (44%)		
	<i>Avoiding bad relationships</i>	10 (31%)		
	<i>I don't know who to contact</i>	11 (34%)		
Q10	What is most likely to stop you offending in the future? (Please tick all that apply to you.)			
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	7 (20%)	<i>Having a mentor (someone you can ask for advice)</i>	4 (11%)
	<i>Nothing, it is up to me</i>	3 (9%)	<i>Having a YOT worker or social worker that I get on with</i>	10 (29%)
	<i>Making new friends outside</i>	6 (17%)	<i>Having children</i>	9 (26%)
	<i>Going back to live with my family</i>	17 (49%)	<i>Having something to do that isn't crime</i>	17 (49%)
	<i>Getting a place of my own</i>	8 (23%)	<i>This sentence</i>	17 (49%)
	<i>Getting a job</i>	16 (46%)	<i>Getting into school/college</i>	15 (43%)
	<i>Having a partner (girlfriend or boyfriend)</i>	15 (43%)	<i>Talking about my offending behaviour with staff</i>	5 (14%)
	<i>Staying off alcohol/drugs</i>	13 (37%)	<i>Anything else</i>	2 (6%)
Q11	Do you want to stop offending?			
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	7 (21%)		
	<i>Yes</i>	25 (74%)		
	<i>No</i>	1 (3%)		
	<i>Don't know</i>	1 (3%)		
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>	7 (21%)		
	<i>Yes</i>	18 (55%)		
	<i>No</i>	8 (24%)		

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



Survey responses from children and young people: HMYOI Wetherby 2017

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 Wetherby 2017	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Wetherby 2017	HMYOI Wetherby 2016
	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		188	412	188	201
SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU					
1.1	Are you 18 years of age?	14%	13%	14%	17%
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	7%	9%	7%	5%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	99%	99%	99%	100%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	99%	99%	99%	100%
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other category.)	37%	53%	37%	32%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	17%	25%	17%	15%
1.7	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	7%	8%	7%	4%
1.8	Do you have any children?	13%	8%	13%	7%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	18%	20%	18%	17%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	40%	43%	40%	29%
SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE					
2.1	Are you sentenced?	82%	80%	82%	82%
2.2	Is your sentence 12 months or less?	26%	35%	26%	31%
2.3	Have you been in this establishment for one month or less?	13%	17%	13%	10%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	56%	57%	56%	65%
SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS					
On your most recent journey here:					
3.1	Did you feel safe?	83%	78%	83%	76%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	32%	35%	32%	37%
3.3	Did you spend more than 4 hours in the van?	7%	8%	7%	9%
For those who spent 2 or more hours in the escort van:					
3.4	Were you offered a toilet break if you needed it?	13%	12%	13%	16%
3.5	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	48%	50%	48%	44%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	57%	55%	57%	53%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	12%	11%	12%	10%

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

Key to tables

		HMYOI Wetherby 2017	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Wetherby 2017	HMYOI Wetherby 2016
	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		188	412	188	201
SECTION 4: YOUR FIRST FEW DAYS HERE					
4.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	79%	78%	79%	72%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	84%	76%	84%	81%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	71%	65%	71%	64%
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?	68%	46%	68%	49%
4.4b	Loss of property?	23%	16%	23%	23%
4.4c	Feeling scared?	31%	27%	31%	27%
4.4d	Gang problems?	37%	51%	37%	27%
4.4e	Contacting family?	55%	57%	55%	49%
4.4f	Money worries?	23%	16%	23%	15%
4.4g	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	35%	28%	35%	34%
4.4h	Health problems?	58%	55%	58%	50%
4.4i	Getting phone numbers?	45%	45%	45%	31%
4.5	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	79%	77%	79%	77%
When you first arrived, did you have problems with any of the following:					
4.5a	Not being able to smoke?	51%	40%	51%	53%
4.5b	Loss of property?	8%	14%	8%	11%
4.5c	Feeling scared?	14%	13%	14%	15%
4.5d	Gang problems?	11%	16%	11%	8%
4.5e	Contacting family?	31%	34%	31%	29%
4.5f	Money worries?	16%	17%	16%	13%
4.5g	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	16%	16%	16%	16%
4.5h	Health problems?	16%	15%	16%	10%
4.5i	Getting phone numbers?	34%	37%	34%	30%
When you first arrived, were you given any of the following:					
4.6a	Toiletries/basic items?	87%	81%	87%	85%
4.6b	The opportunity to have a shower?	21%	64%	21%	22%
4.6c	Something to eat?	82%	81%	82%	78%
4.6d	A free phone call to friends/family?	81%	73%	81%	76%
4.6e	PIN phone credit?	59%	51%	59%	52%
4.6f	Information about feeling worried/upset?	32%	31%	32%	24%

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

Key to tables

		HMYOI Wetherby 2017	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Wetherby 2017	HMYOI Wetherby 2016
	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		188	412	188	201
Within your first 24 hours, did you have access to the following people or services:					
4.7a	A chaplain?	48%	43%	48%	47%
4.7b	A peer mentor?	11%	11%	11%	9%
4.7c	Childline/Samaritans	16%	18%	16%	12%
4.7d	The prison shop/canteen?	13%	10%	13%	6%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	77%	71%	77%	71%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	74%	74%	74%	76%
4.10	For those who have been on an induction course: did it cover everything you needed to know about the establishment?	47%	53%	47%	55%
SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT					
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	61%	76%	61%	89%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	11%	31%	11%	11%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	14%	16%	14%	16%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	52%	46%	52%	41%
5.5	Is it easy/very easy for you to attend religious services?	53%	39%	53%	51%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	49%	56%	49%	57%
Can you speak to:					
5.7	A chaplain of your faith in private?	67%	58%	67%	69%
5.8	A peer mentor?	25%	26%	25%	22%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	14%	19%	14%	9%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	34%	35%	34%	26%
SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF					
6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	74%	62%	74%	58%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	24%	23%	24%	23%
6.3	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	34%	35%	34%	26%
For those who have met their personal officer:					
6.4	Did you meet your personal (named) officer within the first week?	31%	35%	31%	26%
6.5	Do you see your personal (named) officer at least once a week?	49%	45%	49%	48%
6.6	Do you feel your personal (named) officer tries to help you?	67%	59%	67%	53%

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

Key to tables

		HMYOI Wetherby 2017	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Wetherby 2017	HMYOI Wetherby 2016
	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		188	412	188	201
SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS					
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	71%	69%	71%	60%
For those who have made an application:					
7.2	Do you feel applications are sorted out fairly?	64%	48%	64%	40%
7.3	Do you feel applications are sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	48%	33%	48%	50%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	51%	49%	51%	45%
For those who have made a complaint:					
7.5	Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	28%	25%	28%	28%
7.6	Do you feel complaints are sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	18%	23%	18%	24%
7.7	Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint?	11%	10%	11%	18%
SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE					
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	31%	23%	31%	28%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	44%	37%	44%	38%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	45%	42%	45%	44%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	53%	43%	53%	60%
For those who have had a minor report:					
8.5	Was the process explained clearly to you?	59%	67%	59%	53%
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	59%	69%	59%	61%
For those who have had an adjudication ('nicking'):					
8.7	Was the process explained clearly to you?	87%	84%	87%	69%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (Cand R) since you have been here?	41%	45%	41%	39%
8.9	For those who had spent a night in the care and separation unit: did the staff treat you well/very well?	54%	31%	54%	49%
SECTION 9: SAFETY					
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	38%	39%	38%	41%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	18%	15%	18%	17%

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

Key to tables

		HMYOI Wetherby 2017	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Wetherby 2017	HMYOI Wetherby 2016
	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		188	412	188	201
9.4	Have you ever been victimised by other young people here?	32%	26%	32%	31%
Since you have been here, have other young people:					
9.5a	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	22%	14%	22%	17%
9.5b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	10%	11%	10%	12%
9.5c	Sexually abused you?	1%	1%	1%	1%
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	12%	8%	12%	15%
9.5e	Taken your canteen/property?	8%	2%	8%	10%
9.5f	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	0%	0%	1%
9.5g	Victimised you because of debt?	3%	2%	3%	3%
9.5h	Victimised you because of drugs?	2%	1%	2%	3%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	6%	4%	6%	6%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	4%	2%	4%	3%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	3%	2%	3%	2%
9.5l	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	3%	2%	3%	6%
9.5m	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	1%	1%	1%	2%
9.5n	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	1%	1%	1%	1%
9.5o	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	1%	0%	1%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	1%	0%	1%
9.5q	Victimised you because you were new here?	10%	7%	10%	8%
9.5r	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	3%	2%	3%	4%
9.5s	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	7%	7%	7%	6%

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

Key to tables

		HMYOI Wetherby 2017	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Wetherby 2017	HMYOI Wetherby 2016
	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		188	412	188	201
9.7	Have you ever been victimised by a member of staff here?	31%	27%	31%	34%
Since you have been here, have staff:					
9.8a	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	16%	15%	16%	15%
9.8b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	8%	7%	8%	10%
9.8c	Sexually abused you?	1%	1%	1%	0%
9.8d	Threatened or intimidated you?	7%	7%	7%	11%
9.8e	Taken your canteen/property?	1%	4%	1%	5%
9.8f	Victimised you because of medication?	1%	1%	1%	1%
9.8g	Victimised you because of debt?	1%	0%	1%	0%
9.8h	Victimised you because of drugs?	2%	1%	2%	1%
9.8i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	4%	6%	4%	5%
9.8j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	3%	3%	3%	3%
9.8k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	1%	1%	1%	1%
9.8k	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	1%	1%	1%	3%
9.8m	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	1%	1%	1%	1%
9.8n	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	1%	0%	0%
9.8o	Victimised you because of your age?	1%	4%	1%	1%
9.8p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	1%	0%	1%	1%
9.8q	Victimised you because you were new here?	3%	2%	3%	3%
9.8r	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	2%	3%	2%	1%
9.8s	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	2%	0%	1%
9.8t	Victimised you because you made a complaint?	5%	7%	5%	4%
9.10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	21%	31%	21%	29%
9.11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	24%	29%	24%	18%
9.12	Is shouting through the windows a problem here?	49%	39%	49%	43%

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

Key to tables

		HMYOI Wetherby 2017	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Wetherby 2017	HMYOI Wetherby 2016
	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		188	412	188	201
SECTION 10: HEALTH SERVICES					
10.1a	Is it easy for you to see the doctor?	58%	57%	58%	48%
10.1b	Is it easy for you to see the nurse?	71%	70%	71%	61%
10.1c	Is it easy for you to see the dentist?	31%	38%	31%	24%
10.2	For those who have been to health services: Do you think the overall quality is good/very good?	49%	55%	49%	46%
10.3	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/all of it in your cell?	46%	48%	46%	57%
10.4	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?	28%	27%	28%	22%
10.5	If you have emotional or mental health problems, are you being helped by anyone here?	56%	53%	56%	51%
10.6	Did you have any problems with alcohol when you first arrived?	7%	8%	7%	6%
10.7	Have you received any help with any alcohol problems here?	4%	5%	4%	4%
10.8	Did you have any problems with drugs when you first arrived?	38%	28%	38%	36%
10.9	Do you have a problem with drugs now?	9%	7%	9%	8%
10.10	Have you received any help with any drug problems here?	24%	18%	24%	24%
10.11	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs here?	32%	17%	32%	27%
SECTION 11: ACTIVITIES					
11.1	Were you 14 or younger when you were last at school?	43%	41%	43%	38%
11.2	Have you ever been excluded from school?	93%	88%	93%	86%
11.3	Did you ever skip school before you came into custody?	77%	74%	77%	71%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:					
11.4a	Education?	74%	73%	74%	77%
11.4b	A job in this establishment?	12%	12%	12%	17%
11.4c	Vocational or skills training?	6%	8%	6%	8%
11.4d	Offending behaviour programmes?	27%	19%	27%	17%
11.4e	Nothing	20%	21%	20%	17%

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

Key to tables

		HMYOI Wetherby 2017	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Wetherby 2017	HMYOI Wetherby 2016
	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		188	412	188	201
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?	62%	63%	62%	54%
11.5b	A job in this establishment?	41%	41%	41%	36%
11.5c	Vocational or skills training?	43%	37%	43%	31%
11.5d	Offending behaviour programmes?	54%	47%	54%	40%
11.6	Do you usually have association every day?	48%	51%	48%	64%
11.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	71%	63%	71%	54%
11.8	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	1%	3%	1%	1%
SECTION 12: KEEPING IN TOUCH WITH FAMILY AND FRIENDS					
12.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	54%	75%	54%	81%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	48%	42%	48%	55%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	32%	35%	32%	32%
12.4	Is it easy/very easy for your family and friends to visit you here?	28%	35%	28%	23%
12.5	Do your visits start on time?	46%	38%	46%	39%
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%	29%	23%	22%
13.1b	Getting into school or college?	25%	34%	25%	31%
13.1c	Getting a job?	43%	48%	43%	49%
13.1d	Money/finances?	34%	30%	34%	36%
13.1e	Claiming benefits?	19%	13%	19%	14%
13.1f	Continuing health services?	7%	10%	7%	5%
13.1g	Opening a bank account?	12%	15%	12%	16%
13.1h	Avoiding bad relationships?	17%	17%	17%	12%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	45%	40%	45%	58%
For those with a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan:					
13.3	Were you involved in the development of your plan?	83%	85%	83%	89%
13.4	Do you understand the targets set in your plan?	90%	93%	90%	91%
13.5	Do you have a caseworker here?	98%	94%	98%	91%
13.6	Has your caseworker helped to prepare you for release?	48%	49%	48%	44%
For those with a social worker:					
13.7	Has your social worker been to visit you since you have been here?	72%	69%	72%	73%
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	39%	42%	39%	35%

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMYOI Wetherby 2017	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Wetherby 2017	HMYOI Wetherby 2016
	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		188	412	188	201
Do you know who to contact for help with the following problems?					
13.9a	Finding accommodation	31%	33%	31%	25%
13.9b	Getting into school or college	26%	36%	26%	24%
13.9c	Getting a job	34%	35%	34%	26%
13.9d	Help with money/finances	26%	25%	26%	22%
13.9e	Help with claiming benefits	24%	18%	24%	17%
13.9f	Continuing health services	22%	20%	22%	14%
13.9g	Opening a bank account	27%	23%	27%	20%
13.9h	Avoiding bad relationships	21%	18%	21%	14%
For those who were sentenced:					
13.11	Do you want to stop offending?	91%	88%	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?	47%	55%	47%	46%

Diversity analysis



Key question responses (ethnicity and religion) HMYOI Wetherby 2017

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

		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		68	117	30	153
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	12%	5%	3%	8%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	98%	100%	98%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	100%	99%	100%	99%
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?	43%	1%		
1.5	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	1%	10%	0%	8%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	13%	21%	9%	19%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	31%	46%	20%	44%
2.1	Are you sentenced?	80%	83%	83%	81%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	63%	52%	71%	53%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	31%	32%	27%	33%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	55%	58%	44%	59%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	8%	15%	9%	13%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	83%	85%	76%	86%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	67%	73%	73%	71%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	80%	74%	71%	78%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	71%	77%	60%	78%
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	48%	70%	55%	62%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	11%	12%	18%	10%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	8%	18%	9%	15%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	41%	58%	37%	56%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	65%	40%	66%	46%
Can you speak to:					
5.7	A chaplain of your faith in private?	78%	62%	91%	63%
5.8	A peer mentor?	19%	28%	17%	27%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	7%	19%	6%	15%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	32%	35%	40%	34%

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		68	117	30	153
6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	66%	78%	63%	75%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	39%	14%	34%	22%
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	79%	66%	74%	70%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	56%	49%	69%	48%
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	31%	30%	37%	30%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	34%	49%	40%	45%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	40%	47%	40%	46%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	52%	54%	57%	51%
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	72%	53%	73%	56%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	52%	35%	52%	38%
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	35%	41%	41%	38%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	22%	16%	27%	15%
9.4	Have you been victimised by other young people here?	25%	35%	35%	31%
Since you have been here, have other young people:					
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	7%	16%	9%	13%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	14%	1%	30%	1%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	10%	2%	21%	1%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	7%	0%	15%	0%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	0%	0%	0%
9.7	Have you been victimised by staff here?	34%	30%	38%	29%
Since you have been here, have staff:					
9.8d	Threatened or intimidated you?	13%	4%	18%	5%
9.8i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	11%	1%	15%	2%
9.8j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	8%	0%	18%	0%
9.8k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	3%	0%	6%	0%
9.8p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	1%	1%	0%	1%
9.10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	9%	27%	7%	24%
9.11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	14%	29%	9%	27%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic young people	White young people	Muslim young people	Non-Muslim young people
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		68	117	30	153
10.1a	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the doctor?	49%	64%	46%	60%
10.1b	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the nurse?	71%	73%	73%	72%
10.4	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	19%	33%	24%	27%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:					
11.4a	Education?	71%	76%	75%	74%
11.4b	A job in this establishment?	11%	13%	9%	13%
11.4c	Vocational or skills training?	4%	7%	3%	6%
11.4d	Offending behaviour programmes?	31%	25%	25%	27%
11.4e	Nothing?	23%	18%	19%	20%
11.6	Do you usually have association every day?	40%	52%	49%	49%
11.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	74%	70%	76%	70%
11.8	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	1%	1%	3%	1%
12.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	47%	58%	49%	55%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	60%	41%	62%	45%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	23%	36%	27%	34%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	48%	43%	59%	41%
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	41%	39%	41%	39%

Diversity analysis - disability



Key question responses (disability analysis) HMYOI Wetherby 2017

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		33	151
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	0%	9%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	98%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	100%	99%
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	26%	39%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	9%	18%
1.5	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	8%	6%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	74%	33%
2.1	Are you sentenced?	74%	84%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	26%	63%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	32%	32%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	54%	58%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	8%	13%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	87%	84%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	61%	74%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	81%	75%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	68%	75%
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	58%	63%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	5%	13%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	14%	15%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	57%	51%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	58%	47%
Can you speak to:			
5.7	A chaplain of your faith in private?	81%	65%
5.8	A peer mentor?	32%	24%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	32%	11%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	45%	32%

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?	67%	76%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	16%	25%
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	68%	71%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	51%	50%
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	26%	32%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	40%	45%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	46%	46%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	61%	50%
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	61%	58%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	41%	40%
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	55%	36%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	40%	14%
9.4	Have you been victimised by other young people here?	43%	29%
Since you have been here, have other young people:			
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	28%	9%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	5%	6%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	8%	4%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	3%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	0%
9.7	Have you been victimised by staff here?	49%	27%
Since you have been here, have staff:			
9.8d	Threatened or intimidated you?	3%	8%
9.8i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	6%	4%
9.8j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	3%	3%
9.8k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	1%
9.8p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	6%	0%
9.10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	29%	20%
9.11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	22%	25%

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?	57%	58%
10.1b	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the nurse?	78%	71%
10.4	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	68%	18%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:			
11.4a	Education?	60%	77%
11.4b	A job in this establishment?	17%	12%
11.4c	Vocational or skills training?	9%	6%
11.4d	Offending behaviour programmes?	24%	28%
11.4e	Nothing?	37%	16%
11.6	Do you usually have association every day?	57%	48%
11.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	74%	71%
11.8	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	0%	1%
12.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	63%	52%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	46%	48%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	16%	36%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	38%	47%
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	37%	40%

Diversity analysis



Key question responses (local authority care analysis) HMYOI Wetherby 2017

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		73	110
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	3%	10%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	99%	98%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	100%	98%
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	29%	43%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	8%	23%
1.5	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	10%	5%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	33%	8%
2.1	Are you sentenced?	79%	84%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	38%	69%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	35%	29%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	57%	57%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	11%	13%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	90%	81%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	74%	69%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	83%	71%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	82%	68%
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	68%	58%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	10%	13%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	9%	19%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	57%	48%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	46%	50%
Can you speak to:			
5.7	A chaplain of your faith in private?	69%	66%
5.8	A peer mentor?	30%	21%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	19%	11%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	46%	27%

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?	84%	69%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	21%	25%
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	76%	67%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	46%	53%
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	22%	36%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	49%	40%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	46%	44%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	54%	51%
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	56%	60%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	40%	42%
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	44%	36%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	25%	14%
9.4	Have you been victimised by other young people here?	31%	32%
Since you have been here, have other young people:			
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	21%	6%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	6%	6%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	6%	4%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	1%	3%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	0%
9.7	Have you been victimised by staff here?	36%	27%
Since you have been here, have staff:		6%	8%
9.8d	Threatened or intimidated you?	4%	5%
9.8i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	3%	3%
9.8j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	1%	1%
9.8k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	3%	0%
9.8p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	2%	0%
9.10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	22%	20%
9.11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	28%	21%

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?	71%	49%
10.1b	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the nurse?	78%	68%
10.4	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	41%	20%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:			
11.4a	Education?	70%	76%
11.4b	A job in this establishment?	10%	14%
11.4c	Vocational or skills training?	9%	4%
11.4d	Offending behaviour programmes?	29%	25%
11.4e	Nothing?	26%	17%
11.6	Do you usually have association every day?	59%	43%
11.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	78%	67%
11.8	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	1%	1%
12.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	65%	47%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	49%	46%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	27%	36%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	49%	42%
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	45%	35%

Wing comparator



Survey responses from children and young people: HMYOI Wetherby 2017

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	B wing	C, D, E and F wings
	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		32	151
SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU			
1.1	Are you 18 years of age?	9%	15%
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	9%	6%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	100%	99%
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other category.)	56%	32%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	19%	14%
1.7	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	3%	8%
1.8	Do you have any children?	9%	14%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	9%	19%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	21%	44%
SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE			
2.1	Are you sentenced?	95%	79%
2.2	Is your sentence 12 months or less?	3%	31%
2.3	Have you been in this establishment for one month or less?	0%	17%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	67%	54%
SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS			
On your most recent journey here:			
3.1	Did you feel safe?	78%	86%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	49%	30%
3.3	Did you spend more than 4 hours in the van?	3%	8%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	50%	59%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	14%	12%

Wing comparator

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	B wing	C, D, E and F wings
	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		32	151
SECTION 4: YOUR FIRST FEW DAYS HERE			
4.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	72%	82%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	64%	90%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	42%	76%
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?	47%	72%
4.4b	Loss of property?	23%	23%
4.4c	Feeling scared?	27%	32%
4.4d	Gang problems?	23%	39%
4.4e	Contacting family?	23%	60%
4.4f	Money worries?	20%	23%
4.4g	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	40%	34%
4.4h	Health problems?	47%	61%
4.4i	Getting phone numbers?	30%	46%
4.5	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	70%	81%
When you first arrived, did you have problems with any of the following:			
4.5a	Not being able to smoke?	23%	57%
4.5b	Loss of property?	10%	8%
4.5c	Feeling Scared?	20%	13%
4.5d	Gang Problems?	3%	13%
4.5e	Contacting Family?	30%	30%
4.5f	Money worries?	10%	16%
4.5g	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	20%	16%
4.5h	Health problems?	20%	15%
4.5i	Getting phone numbers?	40%	33%
When you first arrived, were you given any of the following:			
4.6a	Toiletries/basic items?	74%	89%
4.6b	The opportunity to have a shower?	26%	21%
4.6c	Something to eat?	81%	82%
4.6d	A free phone call to friends/family?	81%	82%
4.6e	PIN phone credit?	48%	61%
4.6f	Information about feeling worried/upset?	23%	32%

Wing comparator

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	B wing	C, D, E and F wings
	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		32	151
Within your first 24 hours, did you have access to the following people or services:			
4.7a	A chaplain?	48%	48%
4.7b	A peer mentor?	7%	12%
4.7c	Childline/Samaritans	21%	14%
4.7d	The prison shop/canteen?	24%	11%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	77%	78%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	79%	74%
SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT			
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	50%	63%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	9%	12%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	6%	16%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	29%	56%
5.5	Is it easy/very easy for you to attend religious services?	52%	54%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	52%	49%
Can you speak to:			
5.7	A Chaplain of your faith in private?	70%	67%
5.8	A peer mentor?	24%	26%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	9%	15%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	18%	37%
SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF			
6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	71%	75%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	28%	22%
6.3	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	35%	32%
SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS			
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	79%	69%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	52%	50%
7.7	Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint?	9%	11%

Wing comparator

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	B wing	C, D, E and F wings
	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		32	151
SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE			
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	52%	28%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	44%	44%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	18%	52%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	70%	49%
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	74%	55%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (Cand R) since you have been here?	60%	35%
SECTION 9: SAFETY			
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	32%	40%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	9%	19%
9.4	Have you ever been victimised by other young people here?	29%	31%
Since you have been here, have other young people:			
9.5a	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	23%	22%
9.5b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	10%	10%
9.5c	Sexually abused you?	0%	1%
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	10%	13%
9.5e	Taken your canteen/property?	7%	8%
9.5f	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	0%
9.5g	Victimised you because of debt?	3%	3%
9.5h	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	2%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	3%	5%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	3%	4%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	2%
9.5l	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	3%	4%
9.5m	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%	1%
9.5n	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	1%
9.5o	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	0%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	0%
9.5q	Victimised you because you were new here?	16%	10%
9.5r	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	3%	4%
9.5s	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	7%	6%

Wing comparator

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	B wing	C, D, E and F wings
	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		32	151
9.7	Have you ever been victimised by a member of staff here?	26%	31%
Since you have been here, have staff:			
9.8a	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	10%	18%
9.8b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	7%	8%
9.8c	Sexually abused you?	0%	1%
9.8d	Threatened or intimidated you?	10%	6%
9.8e	Taken your canteen/property?	0%	1%
9.8f	Victimised you because of medication?	3%	0%
9.8g	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	1%
9.8h	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	2%
9.8i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	7%	4%
9.8j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	3%
9.8k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	1%
9.8k	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	0%	1%
9.8m	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%	1%
9.8n	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	0%
9.8o	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	1%
9.8p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	1%
9.8q	Victimised you because you were new here?	0%	3%
9.8r	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	0%	2%
9.8s	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	0%
9.8t	Victimised you because you made a complaint?	0%	6%
9.10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	3%	24%
9.11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	22%	25%
9.12	Is shouting through the windows a problem here?	50%	48%
SECTION 10: HEALTH SERVICES			
10.1a	Is it easy for you to see the doctor?	72%	56%
10.1b	Is it easy for you to see the nurse?	81%	70%
10.1c	Is it easy for you to see the dentist?	22%	33%
10.4	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?	15%	31%
10.6	Did you have any problems with alcohol when you first arrived?	3%	8%
10.7	Have you received any help with any alcohol problems here?	3%	4%
10.8	Did you have any problems with drugs when you first arrived?	15%	44%
10.9	Do you have a problem with drugs now?	0%	11%
10.10	Have you received any help with any drug problems here?	9%	27%
10.11	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs here?	30%	33%

Wing comparator

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	B wing	C, D, E and F wings
	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		32	151
SECTION 11: ACTIVITIES			
11.1	Were you 14 or younger when you were last at school?	67%	39%
11.2	Have you ever been excluded from school?	97%	92%
11.3	Did you ever skip school before you came into custody?	82%	77%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:			
11.4a	Education?	79%	74%
11.4b	A job in this establishment?	6%	14%
11.4c	Vocational or skills training?	3%	7%
11.4d	Offending behaviour programmes?	46%	24%
11.4e	Nothing	15%	20%
11.6	Do you usually have association every day?	36%	50%
11.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	69%	72%
11.8	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	3%	1%
SECTION 12: KEEPING IN TOUCH WITH FAMILY AND FRIENDS			
12.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	38%	55%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	62%	43%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	24%	34%
12.4	Is it easy/very easy for your family and friends to visit you here?	36%	28%
12.5	Do your visits start on time?	50%	46%
SECTION 13: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE			
Do you think you will have a problem with the following, when you are released:			
13.1a	Finding accommodation?	22%	23%
13.1b	Getting into school or college?	22%	26%
13.1c	Getting a job?	53%	42%
13.1d	Money/finances?	36%	34%
13.1e	Claiming benefits?	15%	20%
13.1f	Continuing health services?	6%	8%
13.1g	Opening a bank account?	9%	13%
13.1h	Avoiding bad relationships?	15%	18%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	53%	42%
13.5	Do you have a caseworker here?	97%	98%
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	18%	44%

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



Survey responses from children and young people: Keppel Unit 2017

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

		Keppel Unit 2017	Young people's comparator	Keppel Unit 2017	Keppel Unit 2016
	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		37	563	37	38
SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU					
1.1	Are you 18 years of age?	17%	13%	17%	24%
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	5%	8%	5%	7%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%	100%	98%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	100%	99%	100%	91%
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other category.	14%	50%	14%	7%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	2%	24%	2%	3%
1.7	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	5%	7%	5%	17%
1.8	Do you have any children?	17%	9%	17%	18%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	60%	16%	60%	53%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	54%	41%	54%	43%
SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE					
2.1	Are you sentenced?	81%	81%	81%	76%
2.2	Is your sentence 12 months or less?	30%	33%	30%	26%
2.3	Have you been in this establishment for one month or less?	17%	16%	17%	17%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	59%	57%	59%	56%
SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS					
On your most recent journey here:					
3.1	Did you feel safe?	76%	80%	76%	71%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	51%	33%	51%	19%
3.3	Did you spend more than 4 hours in the van?	17%	7%	17%	14%
For those who spent 2 or more hours in the escort van:					
3.4	Were you offered a toilet break if you needed it?	31%	11%	31%	12%
3.5	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	70%	47%	70%	50%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	62%	55%	62%	55%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	24%	10%	24%	24%

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

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		Keppel Unit 2017	Young people's comparator	Keppel Unit 2017	Keppel Unit 2016
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		37	563	37	38
SECTION 4: YOUR FIRST FEW DAYS HERE					
4.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	70%	79%	70%	71%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	83%	79%	83%	79%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	64%	67%	64%	52%
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%	54%	41%	37%
4.4b	Loss of property?	17%	18%	17%	15%
4.4c	Feeling scared?	38%	28%	38%	33%
4.4d	Gang problems?	26%	48%	26%	21%
4.4e	Contacting family?	60%	56%	60%	54%
4.4f	Money worries?	24%	17%	24%	8%
4.4g	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	49%	29%	49%	31%
4.4h	Health problems?	45%	57%	45%	59%
4.4i	Getting phone numbers?	49%	45%	49%	41%
4.5	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	83%	77%	83%	92%
When you first arrived, did you have problems with any of the following:					
4.5a	Not being able to smoke?	48%	43%	48%	65%
4.5b	Loss of property?	3%	12%	3%	18%
4.5c	Feeling scared?	38%	12%	38%	21%
4.5d	Gang problems?	15%	14%	15%	5%
4.5e	Contacting family?	35%	33%	35%	32%
4.5f	Money worries?	15%	17%	15%	24%
4.5g	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	43%	14%	43%	32%
4.5h	Health problems?	23%	15%	23%	38%
4.5i	Getting phone numbers?	38%	36%	38%	29%
When you first arrived, were you given any of the following:					
4.6a	Toiletries/basic items?	83%	83%	83%	86%
4.6b	The opportunity to have a shower?	59%	50%	59%	51%
4.6c	Something to eat?	81%	82%	81%	62%
4.6d	A free phone call to friends/family?	81%	75%	81%	73%
4.6e	PIN phone credit?	61%	53%	61%	56%
4.6f	Information about feeling worried/upset?	42%	30%	42%	34%

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Keppel Unit 2017	Young people's comparator	Keppel Unit 2017	Keppel Unit 2016
	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		37	563	37	38
Within your first 24 hours, did you have access to the following people or services:					
4.7a	A chaplain?	44%	45%	44%	50%
4.7b	A peer mentor?	8%	11%	8%	5%
4.7c	Childline/Samaritans	15%	17%	15%	5%
4.7d	The prison shop/canteen?	8%	11%	8%	10%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	70%	73%	70%	78%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	60%	75%	60%	70%
4.10	For those who have been on an induction course: did it cover everything you needed to know about the establishment?	57%	51%	57%	43%
SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT					
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	98%	70%	98%	100%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	26%	25%	26%	20%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	24%	14%	24%	20%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	49%	47%	49%	53%
5.5	Is it easy/very easy for you to attend religious services?	38%	44%	38%	50%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	48%	54%	48%	56%
Can you speak to:					
5.7	A chaplain of your faith in private?	67%	61%	67%	73%
5.8	A peer mentor?	38%	25%	38%	25%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	37%	17%	37%	20%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	56%	33%	56%	30%
SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF					
6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	83%	65%	83%	74%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	7%	24%	7%	8%
6.3	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	67%	33%	67%	45%
For those who have met their personal officer:					
6.4	Did you meet your personal (named) officer within the first week?	55%	32%	55%	29%
6.5	Do you see your personal (named) officer at least once a week?	82%	44%	82%	54%
6.6	Do you feel your personal (named) officer tries to help you?	85%	59%	85%	72%

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Keppel Unit 2017	Young people's comparator	Keppel Unit 2017	Keppel Unit 2016
	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		37	563	37	38
SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS					
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	63%	70%	63%	53%
For those who have made an application:					
7.2	Do you feel applications are sorted out fairly?	74%	52%	74%	54%
7.3	Do you feel applications are sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	46%	37%	46%	42%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	53%	49%	53%	32%
For those who have made a complaint:					
7.5	Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	32%	25%	32%	13%
7.6	Do you feel complaints are sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	16%	22%	16%	13%
7.7	Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint?	15%	10%	15%	18%
SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE					
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	24%	25%	24%	37%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	59%	38%	59%	37%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	50%	42%	50%	36%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	50%	46%	50%	65%
For those who have had a minor report:					
8.5	Was the process explained clearly to you?	75%	63%	75%	54%
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	43%	67%	43%	68%
For those who have had an adjudication ('nicking'):					
8.7	Was the process explained clearly to you?	94%	84%	94%	84%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (Cand R) since you have been here?	31%	45%	31%	45%
8.9	For those who had spent a night in the care and separation unit: did the staff treat you well/very well?	33%	39%	33%	25%
SECTION 9: SAFETY					
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	59%	38%	59%	69%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	29%	15%	29%	12%

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Keppel Unit 2017	Young people's comparator	Keppel Unit 2017	Keppel Unit 2016
	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		37	563	37	38
9.4	Have you ever been victimised by other young people here?	38%	27%	38%	50%
Since you have been here, have other young people:					
9.5a	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	23%	16%	23%	32%
9.5b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	13%	11%	13%	29%
9.5c	Sexually abused you?	0%	1%	0%	5%
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	18%	9%	18%	21%
9.5e	Taken your canteen/property?	8%	4%	8%	8%
9.5f	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	0%	0%	5%
9.5g	Victimised you because of debt?	3%	2%	3%	3%
9.5h	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	2%	0%	3%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	5%	4%	5%	8%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	5%	3%	5%	5%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	3%	2%	3%	3%
9.5l	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	8%	2%	8%	8%
9.5m	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%	1%	0%	16%
9.5n	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	3%	1%	3%	5%
9.5o	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	1%	0%	3%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	1%	0%	5%
9.5q	Victimised you because you were new here?	15%	8%	15%	16%
9.5r	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	8%	2%	8%	18%
9.5s	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	3%	7%	3%	8%

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

Key to tables

		Keppel Unit 2017	Young people's comparator	Keppel Unit 2017	Keppel Unit 2016
	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		37	563	37	38
9.7	Have you ever been victimised by a member of staff here?	23%	29%	23%	38%
Since you have been here, have staff:					
9.8a	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	8%	16%	8%	18%
9.8b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	5%	8%	5%	18%
9.8c	Sexually abused you?	0%	1%	0%	0%
9.8d	Threatened or intimidated you?	5%	7%	5%	8%
9.8e	Taken your canteen/property?	0%	4%	0%	0%
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?	0%	1%	0%	0%
9.8i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	6%	0%	0%
9.8j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	3%	0%	0%
9.8k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	1%	0%	0%
9.8k	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	0%	1%	0%	0%
9.8m	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%	1%	0%	3%
9.8n	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	3%	1%	3%	0%
9.8o	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	3%	0%	0%
9.8p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	3%	0%	3%	0%
9.8q	Victimised you because you were new here?	5%	2%	5%	0%
9.8r	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	0%	3%	0%	3%
9.8s	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	3%	1%	3%	0%
9.8t	Victimised you because you made a complaint?	0%	6%	0%	3%
9.10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	59%	25%	59%	31%
9.11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	50%	26%	50%	24%
9.12	Is shouting through the windows a problem here?	59%	41%	59%	51%

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

Key to tables

		Keppel Unit 2017	Young people's comparator	Keppel Unit 2017	Keppel Unit 2016
	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		37	563	37	38
SECTION 10: HEALTH SERVICES					
10.1a	Is it easy for you to see the doctor?	63%	57%	63%	61%
10.1b	Is it easy for you to see the nurse?	78%	70%	78%	72%
10.1c	Is it easy for you to see the dentist?	50%	34%	50%	37%
10.2	For those who have been to health services: Do you think the overall quality is good/very good?	72%	52%	72%	37%
10.3	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/all of it in your cell?	28%	49%	28%	15%
10.4	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?	58%	25%	58%	66%
10.5	If you have emotional or mental health problems, are you being helped by anyone here?	64%	53%	64%	75%
10.6	Did you have any problems with alcohol when you first arrived?	20%	7%	20%	19%
10.7	Have you received any help with any alcohol problems here?	15%	4%	15%	11%
10.8	Did you have any problems with drugs when you first arrived?	45%	30%	45%	51%
10.9	Do you have a problem with drugs now?	5%	8%	5%	19%
10.10	Have you received any help with any drug problems here?	38%	19%	38%	36%
10.11	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs here?	33%	21%	33%	35%
SECTION 11: ACTIVITIES					
11.1	Were you 14 or younger when you were last at school?	43%	42%	43%	46%
11.2	Have you ever been excluded from school?	93%	90%	93%	82%
11.3	Did you ever skip school before you came into custody?	81%	75%	81%	73%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:					
11.4a	Education?	76%	73%	76%	89%
11.4b	A job in this establishment?	5%	12%	5%	19%
11.4c	Vocational or skills training?	15%	7%	15%	16%
11.4d	Offending behaviour programmes?	37%	20%	37%	33%
11.4e	Nothing	20%	21%	20%	11%

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

Key to tables

		Keppel Unit 2017	Young people's comparator	Keppel Unit 2017	Keppel Unit 2016
	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		37	563	37	38
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?	66%	62%	66%	66%
11.5b	A job in this establishment?	40%	41%	40%	50%
11.5c	Vocational or skills training?	50%	38%	50%	44%
11.5d	Offending behaviour programmes?	65%	48%	65%	61%
11.6	Do you usually have association every day?	77%	49%	77%	64%
11.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	73%	65%	73%	64%
11.8	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	0%	3%	0%	0%
SECTION 12: KEEPING IN TOUCH WITH FAMILY AND FRIENDS					
12.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	92%	67%	92%	72%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	27%	45%	27%	47%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	29%	34%	29%	19%
12.4	Is it easy/very easy for your family and friends to visit you here?	31%	33%	31%	25%
12.5	Do your visits start on time?	35%	41%	35%	17%
SECTION 13: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE					
Do you think you will have a problem with the following, when you are released:					
13.1a	Finding accommodation?	25%	27%	25%	34%
13.1b	Getting into school or college?	33%	31%	33%	37%
13.1c	Getting a job?	55%	46%	55%	63%
13.1d	Money/finances?	40%	31%	40%	50%
13.1e	Claiming benefits?	33%	13%	33%	34%
13.1f	Continuing health services?	23%	8%	23%	28%
13.1g	Opening a bank account?	23%	13%	23%	31%
13.1h	Avoiding bad relationships?	35%	16%	35%	34%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	45%	41%	45%	63%
For those with a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan:					
13.3	Were you involved in the development of your plan?	94%	83%	94%	100%
13.4	Do you understand the targets set in your plan?	94%	92%	94%	95%
13.5	Do you have a caseworker here?	100%	95%	100%	94%
13.6	Has your caseworker helped to prepare you for release?	60%	48%	60%	53%
For those with a social worker:					
13.7	Has your social worker been to visit you since you have been here?	64%	70%	64%	69%
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	41%	41%	41%	41%

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Keppel Unit 2017	Young people's comparator	Keppel Unit 2017	Keppel Unit 2016
	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		37	563	37	38
Do you know who to contact for help with the following problems?					
13.9a	Finding accommodation	35%	32%	35%	30%
13.9b	Getting into school or college	31%	33%	31%	30%
13.9c	Getting a job	43%	34%	43%	36%
13.9d	Help with money/finances	31%	25%	31%	30%
13.9e	Help with claiming benefits	22%	20%	22%	21%
13.9f	Continuing health services	28%	20%	28%	18%
13.9g	Opening a bank account	43%	32%	43%	18%
13.9h	Avoiding bad relationships	31%	18%	31%	3%
For those who were sentenced:					
13.11	Do you want to stop offending?	94%	89%	94%	85%
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?	70%	51%	70%	70%

Diversity analysis - disability



**Key question responses (disability analysis)
Keppel Unit 2017**

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		22	15
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	4%	6%
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.)	12%	12%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	4%	0%
1.5	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	4%	6%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	56%	50%
2.1	Are you sentenced?	72%	94%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	56%	63%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	60%	41%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	56%	72%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	19%	35%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	81%	88%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	56%	82%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	72%	65%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	50%	72%
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	96%	100%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	19%	41%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	28%	18%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	36%	65%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	39%	59%
Can you speak to:			
5.7	A chaplain of your faith in private?	64%	72%
5.8	A peer mentor?	26%	53%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	29%	47%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	54%	59%

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?	75%	94%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	12%	0%
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	50%	82%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	44%	59%
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	21%	35%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	46%	72%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	46%	53%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	54%	47%
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	39%	47%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	29%	35%
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	63%	53%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	44%	6%
9.4	Have you been victimised by other young people here?	38%	38%
Since you have been here, have other young people:			
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	29%	0%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	8%	0%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	8%	0%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	4%	0%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	0%
9.7	Have you been victimised by staff here?	26%	18%
Since you have been here, have staff:			
9.8d	Threatened or intimidated you?	9%	0%
9.8i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	0%
9.8j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	0%
9.8k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	0%
9.8p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	4%	0%
9.10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	50%	69%
9.11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	42%	59%

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?	67%	59%
10.1b	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the nurse?	79%	69%
10.4	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	70%	41%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:			
11.4a	Education?	67%	88%
11.4b	A job in this establishment?	0%	12%
11.4c	Vocational or skills training?	21%	6%
11.4d	Offending behaviour programmes?	25%	53%
11.4e	Nothing?	29%	6%
11.6	Do you usually have association every day?	77%	72%
11.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	57%	94%
11.8	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	0%	0%
12.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	91%	94%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	29%	29%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	25%	40%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	29%	69%
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	46%	33%

Diversity analysis



Key question responses (local authority care analysis) Keppel Unit 2017

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		19	17
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.)	23%	0%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	5%	0%
1.5	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	10%	0%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	64%	58%
2.1	Are you sentenced?	77%	90%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	41%	83%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	64%	42%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	64%	65%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	36%	11%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	86%	90%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	68%	58%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	96%	42%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	68%	53%
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	100%	95%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	23%	35%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	10%	42%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	48%	53%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	32%	72%
Can you speak to:			
5.7	A chaplain of your faith in private?	64%	70%
5.8	A peer mentor?	33%	44%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	33%	42%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	38%	75%

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?	76%	90%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	0%	16%
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	55%	74%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	38%	68%
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	10%	42%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	62%	58%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	45%	58%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	50%	53%
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	47%	42%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	38%	25%
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	62%	53%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	29%	28%
9.4	Have you been victimised by other young people here?	30%	42%
Since you have been here, have other young people:			
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	11%	25%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	5%	5%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	5%	5%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	5%	0%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	0%
9.7	Have you been victimised by staff here?	25%	16%
Since you have been here, have staff:			
9.8d	Threatened or intimidated you?	5%	5%
9.8i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	0%
9.8j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	0%
9.8k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	0%
9.8p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	5%	0%
9.10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	50%	65%
9.11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	50%	53%

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?	62%	70%
10.1b	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the nurse?	71%	84%
10.4	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	70%	47%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:			
11.4a	Education?	71%	84%
11.4b	A job in this establishment?	5%	5%
11.4c	Vocational or skills training?	10%	16%
11.4d	Offending behaviour programmes?	38%	35%
11.4e	Nothing?	24%	11%
11.6	Do you usually have association every day?	75%	83%
11.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	71%	68%
11.8	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	0%	0%
12.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	90%	94%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	29%	30%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	16%	42%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	47%	47%
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	26%	53%

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



Survey responses from children and young people: Wetherby and Keppel Unit 2017

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

		Keppel Unit 2017	HMYOI Wetherby 2017
	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		37	188
SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU			
1.1	Are you 18 years of age?	17%	14%
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	5%	7%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	100%	99%
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other category.)	14%	37%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	2%	17%
1.7	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	5%	7%
1.8	Do you have any children?	17%	13%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	60%	18%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	54%	40%
SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE			
2.1	Are you sentenced?	81%	82%
2.2	Is your sentence 12 months or less?	30%	26%
2.3	Have you been in this establishment for one month or less?	17%	13%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	59%	56%
SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS			
On your most recent journey here:			
3.1	Did you feel safe?	76%	83%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	51%	32%
3.3	Did you spend more than 4 hours in the van?	17%	7%
For those who spent 2 or more hours in the escort van:			
3.4	Were you offered a toilet break if you needed it?	31%	13%
3.5	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	70%	48%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	62%	57%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	24%	12%

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Keppel Unit 2017	HMV OI Wetherby 2017
	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		37	188
SECTION 4: YOUR FIRST FEW DAYS HERE			
4.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	70%	79%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	83%	84%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	64%	71%
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%	68%
4.4b	Loss of property?	17%	23%
4.4c	Feeling scared?	38%	31%
4.4d	Gang problems?	26%	37%
4.4e	Contacting family?	60%	55%
4.4f	Money worries?	24%	23%
4.4g	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	49%	35%
4.4h	Health problems?	45%	58%
4.4i	Getting phone numbers?	49%	45%
4.5	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	83%	79%
When you first arrived, did you have problems with any of the following:			
4.5a	Not being able to smoke?	48%	51%
4.5b	Loss of property?	3%	8%
4.5c	Feeling scared?	38%	14%
4.5d	Gang problems?	15%	11%
4.5e	Contacting family?	35%	31%
4.5f	Money worries?	15%	16%
4.5g	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	43%	16%
4.5h	Health problems?	23%	16%
4.5i	Getting phone numbers?	38%	34%
When you first arrived, were you given any of the following:			
4.6a	Toiletries/basic items?	83%	87%
4.6b	The opportunity to have a shower?	59%	21%
4.6c	Something to eat?	81%	82%
4.6d	A free phone call to friends/family?	81%	81%
4.6e	PIN phone credit?	61%	59%
4.6f	Information about feeling worried/upset?	42%	32%

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Keppel Unit 2017	HMYOJ Wetherby 2017
	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		37	188
Within your first 24 hours, did you have access to the following people or services:			
4.7a	A chaplain?	44%	48%
4.7b	A peer mentor?	8%	11%
4.7c	Childline/Samaritans	15%	16%
4.7d	The prison shop/canteen?	8%	13%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	70%	77%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	60%	74%
4.10	For those who have been on an induction course: did it cover everything you needed to know about the establishment?	57%	47%
SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT			
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	98%	61%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	26%	11%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	24%	14%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	49%	52%
5.5	Is it easy/very easy for you to attend religious services?	38%	53%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	48%	49%
Can you speak to:			
5.7	A chaplain of your faith in private?	67%	67%
5.8	A peer mentor?	38%	25%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	37%	14%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	56%	34%
SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF			
6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	83%	74%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	7%	24%
6.3	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	67%	34%
For those who have met their personal officer:			
6.4	Did you meet your personal (named) officer within the first week?	55%	31%
6.5	Do you see your personal (named) officer at least once a week?	82%	49%
6.6	Do you feel your personal (named) officer tries to help you?	85%	67%

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Keppel Unit 2017	HMYOI Wetherby 2017
	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		37	188
SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS			
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	63%	71%
For those who have made an application:			
7.2	Do you feel applications are sorted out fairly?	74%	64%
7.3	Do you feel applications are sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	46%	48%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	53%	51%
For those who have made a complaint:			
7.5	Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	32%	28%
7.6	Do you feel complaints are sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	16%	18%
7.7	Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint?	15%	11%
SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE			
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	24%	31%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	59%	44%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	50%	45%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	50%	53%
For those who have had a minor report:			
8.5	Was the process explained clearly to you?	75%	59%
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	43%	59%
For those who have had an adjudication ('nicking'):			
8.7	Was the process explained clearly to you?	94%	87%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (Cand R) since you have been here?	31%	41%
8.9	For those who had spent a night in the care and separation unit: did the staff treat you well/very well?	33%	54%
SECTION 9: SAFETY			
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	59%	38%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	29%	18%

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Keppel Unit 2017	HMYOI Wetherby 2017
	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		37	188
9.4	Have you ever been victimised by other young people here?	38%	32%
Since you have been here, have other young people:			
9.5a	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	23%	22%
9.5b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	13%	10%
9.5c	Sexually abused you?	0%	1%
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	18%	12%
9.5e	Taken your canteen/property?	8%	8%
9.5f	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	0%
9.5g	Victimised you because of debt?	3%	3%
9.5h	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	2%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	5%	6%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	5%	4%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	3%	3%
9.5l	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	8%	3%
9.5m	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%	1%
9.5n	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	3%	1%
9.5o	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	0%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	0%
9.5q	Victimised you because you were new here?	15%	10%
9.5r	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	8%	3%
9.5s	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	3%	7%

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Keppel Unit 2017	HMYOI Wetherby 2017
	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		37	188
9.7	Have you ever been victimised by a member of staff here?	23%	31%
Since you have been here, have staff:			
9.8a	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	8%	16%
9.8b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	5%	8%
9.8c	Sexually abused you?	0%	1%
9.8d	Threatened or intimidated you?	5%	7%
9.8e	Taken your canteen/property?	0%	1%
9.8f	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	1%
9.8g	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	1%
9.8h	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	2%
9.8i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	4%
9.8j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	3%
9.8k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	1%
9.8k	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	0%	1%
9.8m	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%	1%
9.8n	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	3%	0%
9.8o	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	1%
9.8p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	3%	1%
9.8q	Victimised you because you were new here?	5%	3%
9.8r	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	0%	2%
9.8s	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	3%	0%
9.8t	Victimised you because you made a complaint?	0%	5%
9.10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	59%	21%
9.11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	50%	24%
9.12	Is shouting through the windows a problem here?	59%	49%

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Keppel Unit 2017	HMYOI Wetherby 2017
	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		37	188
SECTION 10: HEALTH SERVICES			
10.1a	Is it easy for you to see the doctor?	63%	58%
10.1b	Is it easy for you to see the nurse?	78%	71%
10.1c	Is it easy for you to see the dentist?	50%	31%
10.2	For those who have been to health services: Do you think the overall quality is good/very good?	72%	49%
10.3	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/all of it in your cell?	28%	46%
10.4	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?	58%	28%
10.5	If you have emotional or mental health problems, are you being helped by anyone here?	64%	56%
10.6	Did you have any problems with alcohol when you first arrived?	20%	7%
10.7	Have you received any help with any alcohol problems here?	15%	4%
10.8	Did you have any problems with drugs when you first arrived?	45%	38%
10.9	Do you have a problem with drugs now?	5%	9%
10.10	Have you received any help with any drug problems here?	38%	24%
10.11	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs here?	33%	32%
SECTION 11: ACTIVITIES			
11.1	Were you 14 or younger when you were last at school?	43%	43%
11.2	Have you ever been excluded from school?	93%	93%
11.3	Did you ever skip school before you came into custody?	81%	77%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:			
11.4a	Education?	76%	74%
11.4b	A job in this establishment?	5%	12%
11.4c	Vocational or skills training?	15%	6%
11.4d	Offending behaviour programmes?	37%	27%
11.4e	Nothing	20%	20%

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Keppel Unit 2017	HMYOI Wetherby 2017
	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		37	188
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?	66%	62%
11.5b	A job in this establishment?	40%	41%
11.5c	Vocational or skills training?	50%	43%
11.5d	Offending behaviour programmes?	65%	54%
11.6	Do you usually have association every day?	77%	48%
11.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	73%	71%
11.8	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	0%	1%
SECTION 12: KEEPING IN TOUCH WITH FAMILY AND FRIENDS			
12.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	92%	54%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	27%	48%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	29%	32%
12.4	Is it easy/very easy for your family and friends to visit you here?	31%	28%
12.5	Do your visits start on time?	35%	46%
SECTION 13: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE			
Do you think you will have a problem with the following, when you are released:			
13.1a	Finding accommodation?	25%	23%
13.1b	Getting into school or college?	33%	25%
13.1c	Getting a job?	55%	43%
13.1d	Money/finances?	40%	34%
13.1e	Claiming benefits?	33%	19%
13.1f	Continuing health services?	23%	7%
13.1g	Opening a bank account?	23%	12%
13.1h	Avoiding bad relationships?	35%	17%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	45%	45%
For those with a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan:			
13.3	Were you involved in the development of your plan?	94%	83%
13.4	Do you understand the targets set in your plan?	94%	90%
13.5	Do you have a caseworker here?	100%	98%
13.6	Has your caseworker helped to prepare you for release?	60%	48%
For those with a social worker:			
13.7	Has your social worker been to visit you since you have been here?	64%	72%
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	41%	39%

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Keppel Unit 2017	HMYOI Weatherby 2017
	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		37	188
Do you know who to contact for help with the following problems?			
13.9a	Finding accommodation	35%	31%
13.9b	Getting into school or college	31%	26%
13.9c	Getting a job	43%	34%
13.9d	Help with money/finances	31%	26%
13.9e	Help with claiming benefits	22%	24%
13.9f	Continuing health services	28%	22%
13.9g	Opening a bank account	43%	27%
13.9h	Avoiding bad relationships	31%	21%
For those who were sentenced:			
13.11	Do you want to stop offending?	94%	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?	70%	47%