

Report on an unannounced short follow-up inspection of

# **HMYOI Wetherby**

9 – 13 August 2010

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

Crown copyright 2010

Printed and published by:  
Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons  
1st Floor, Ashley House  
Monck Street  
London SW1P 2BQ  
England

# Contents

	<b>Introduction</b>	5
	<b>Fact page</b>	7
<b>1</b>	Healthy prison assessment	9
<b>2</b>	Progress since the last report	17
<b>3</b>	Summary of recommendations	53
	<b>Appendices</b>	
	I Inspection team	58
	II Prison population profile	59
	III Summary of young people questionnaires and interviews	63

---



# Introduction

Wetherby young offender institution holds sentenced and unsentenced young men aged 15 to 18. When we last visited, it was undergoing extensive and disruptive building work but was, nevertheless, performing reasonably well in all key areas. On our return for this unannounced follow-up inspection, we found that Wetherby had sustained, or improved on, this solid performance and, with the building work completed, was a more settled establishment.

Wetherby remained an essentially safe place despite the challenging age profile of its population. Reception had been refurbished and early days continued to be well managed, although it was disappointing that routine strip searching remained in place. Safeguarding was generally effective, but there was scope to develop care planning and the loss of prison-based social workers had left an unfilled gap. Both self-harm prevention and anti-bullying arrangements had improved. Use of force remained high but managers were seeking ways to reduce it. Conditions in the separation and care unit remained unsatisfactory.

With the extensive building work completed, Wetherby now had a smarter and more settled environment. However, units remained large and this meant staggered unlocking and an inability to offer showers every day. Relationships between staff and young people continued to be very good. Race issues were well managed but other aspects of diversity remained underdeveloped. Health care had been further improved by new accommodation and mental health care was particularly impressive.

**Nick Hardwick**  
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

**October 2010**



# Fact page

## Task of the establishment

HMYOI Wetherby holds sentenced and unsentenced juveniles.

## Area organisation

Yorkshire and Humberside

## Number held

326

## Certified normal allocation

352

## Operational capacity

396

## Last inspection

The main site was inspected in 2008 and a separate inspection was conducted on Keppel unit in 2009.

## Brief history

A former naval base, Wetherby was introduced into the prison system in 1958 as a borstal. Since that time, there have been many changes in its role from an open youth custody centre, to a closed youth custody centre, to its current role as a dedicated male under -18 centre accommodating 360 young people aged between 15 and 18 years old.

## Description of residential units

All living accommodation is single occupancy. The residential areas are split into seven units, five with the capacity to house 60, Keppel and Anson with a capacity to house 48 young people.

Anson and Benbow are two brick-built units which opened in the 1970s. Collingwood, Drake, Exmouth and Frobisher are quick-build ready to use units erected in 1997. Keppel was opened in October 2008. Anson unit has a population of long-term determinate and life-sentenced young people. This unit looks after and sentence manages these young people towards release or transition to other establishments to serve their sentence.

Benbow unit is the first night facility and Collingwood unit houses young people on the gold level of the rewards scheme. Drake, Exmouth and Frobisher units are the standard level residential accommodation. Keppel unit is a dedicated enhanced supervision unit designed and commissioned to look after the most vulnerable young people in custody with behavioural, anti-social and self-harming histories. Keppel was not inspected on this occasion.





# Section 1: Healthy prison assessment

## Introduction

---

HP1 The purpose of this inspection was to follow up the recommendations made in our last full inspection of 2008 and examine progress achieved. We have commented where we have found significant improvements and where we believe little or no progress has been made and work remained to be done. All inspection reports include a summary of an establishment's performance against the model of a healthy prison. The four criteria of a healthy prison are:

**Safety** prisoners, even the most vulnerable, are held safely

**Respect** prisoners are treated with respect for their human dignity

**Purposeful activity** prisoners are able, and expected, to engage in activity that is likely to benefit them

**Resettlement** prisoners are prepared for their release into the community and helped to reduce the likelihood of reoffending.

HP2 Under each test, we make an assessment of outcomes for prisoners 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 by the National Offender Management Service.

**- outcomes for prisoners are good against this healthy prison test.**

There is no evidence that outcomes for prisoners are being adversely affected in any significant areas.

**- outcomes for prisoners are reasonably good against this healthy prison test.**

There is evidence of adverse outcomes for prisoners in only a small number of areas. For the majority, there are no significant concerns. Procedures to safeguard outcomes are in place.

**- outcomes for prisoners are not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.**

There is evidence that outcomes for prisoners are being adversely affected in many areas or particularly in those areas of greatest importance to the well being of prisoners. Problems/concerns, if left unattended, are likely to become areas of serious concern.

**- outcomes for prisoners are poor against this healthy prison test.**

There is evidence that the outcomes for prisoners are seriously affected by current practice. There is a failure to ensure even adequate treatment of and/or conditions for prisoners. Immediate remedial action is required.

HP3 This Inspectorate conducts unannounced follow-up inspections to assess progress against recommendations made in the previous full inspection. Follow-up inspections are proportionate to risk. Short follow-up inspections are conducted where the

previous full inspection and our intelligence systems suggest that there are comparatively fewer concerns. Sufficient inspector time is allocated to enable inspection of progress and, where necessary, to note additional areas of concern observed by inspectors. Inspectors draw up a brief healthy prison summary setting out the progress of the establishment in the areas inspected. From the evidence available they also concluded whether this progress confirmed or required amendment of the healthy prison assessment held by the Inspectorate on all establishments but only published since early 2004.

## Safety

---

- HP4 At our inspection in 2008, we found that Wetherby was performing reasonably well against this healthy prison test. We made 61 recommendations in this area of which 38 had been achieved, four partially achieved, 18 had not been achieved and four were no longer applicable. We have made a further six recommendations.
- HP5 Young people were no longer regularly transported to the establishment late at night. There were still occasions when young people arrived without documentation.
- HP6 The reception area had been refurbished and was a much more welcoming environment. Reception procedures remained efficient, but all young people who were admitted and discharged from the establishment were still routinely strip-searched without a risk assessment and despite the introduction of a BOSS (body orifice security scanner) chair and wand detector.
- HP7 The majority of young people said they felt safe on their first night. Work had been carried out to improve the quality of vulnerability assessments. There were sound arrangements to care for young people who arrived without documentation and missing information was obtained quickly.
- HP8 The induction programme remained comprehensive and well presented, but only a limited number of young people could complete the programme at a time, which made the process protracted and sometimes resulted in young people spending unnecessarily long periods of time locked in their cells during their early days in custody.
- HP9 The strategic management of safeguarding had generally improved, but individual case management of the most vulnerable young people still lacked coordinated care plans.
- HP10 The withdrawal of prison-based social workers had left a significant gap. The child protection coordinator and caseworkers managed the cases of looked-after children to the best of their ability, but lacked expertise in this specialised area.
- HP11 There had been improvements in the management of child protection referrals and better engagement with the local authority designated officer, but this still needed further development. Insufficient staff had received training in child protection and their general understanding in this area was quite low.
- HP12 Work practice and quality assurance to support young people being monitored for self-harm had improved with support from the psychology department. More staff

attended ACCT (assessment, care in custody and teamwork) reviews and young people were more involved in discussions about their care.

- HP13 Serious bullying was not widespread and procedures to manage bullying had improved, although not all staff had been trained to implement them. Work with victims and perpetrators of bullying needed further development.
- HP14 Formal disciplinary procedures had improved and the disciplinary incident report system had been abandoned since the previous inspection, but the number of formal adjudications remained high. The minor report system was used effectively and the number of young people involved was proportionate. Governance arrangements were particularly good. .
- HP15 There were effective systems for processing and analysing security information. The large number of security incident reports were processed efficiently and promptly by trained analysts. There were effective links between the security department and staff working in violence reduction and safeguarding.
- HP16 Living conditions in the separation and care unit (SCU) were poor and it continued to be an unsuitable location for young people. However, young people located in the SCU now had individual care plans. Relationships between staff and young people in the SCU were still very good and all residents we spoke to said that staff were kind and helpful. The quality of work carried out with young people in the SCU was not reflected in the records, which were generally poor.
- HP17 The SCU was not overused and the average length of stay was short. The introduction of robust cells on the wings had provided a sensible alternative to segregation for disruptive young people, but monitoring, management and safeguarding of these arrangements needed to be formalised.
- HP18 The number of recorded incidents of use of force remained high. The management and monitoring arrangements were good and there was evidence to show that de-escalation was being used as an integral part of the process. However, the use of force was not limited to situations where there was an immediate threat to safety and was still used to gain compliance.
- HP19 On the basis of this short follow-up inspection, we considered that outcomes for young people continued to be reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

## Respect

---

- HP20 At our previous inspection, we found that Wetherby was performing reasonably well against this healthy prison test. We made 61 recommendations in this area of which 40 had been achieved, 10 had been partially achieved and 11 had not been achieved. We have made a further two recommendations.
- HP21 The residential units continued to hold large numbers of young people which affected their access to daily showers, association and telephone calls. The living accommodation was generally clean and well maintained. The building work which was being carried out during the previous inspection had been completed and there was a more settled atmosphere across the establishment than was previously

evident. The cells which we inspected were clean and tidy and the system of weekly cell inspection ensured that reasonable standards were maintained.

- HP22 Young people still did not have access to showers every day. Improvements had been made to the laundry facilities on one wing where an innovative scheme was being piloted which had the potential to be used across the establishment, but young people on the other three units had to wash their own clothes in their sinks and dry them on the pipes in their cells which was unsatisfactory.
- HP23 We observed consistently positive, respectful relationships between staff and young people. Staff knew about the young people in their care and there was an appreciation of the fact that they were dealing with children. The role of the personal officer or residential support officer (RSO) still needed clarification. RSOs were allocated to young people soon after they arrived, but there was a lack of continuity if young people changed cells. Working relationships between RSOs and caseworkers continued to be distant. Consultation arrangements with young people continued to work effectively.
- HP24 Race equality was well managed, but diversity overall continued to be underdeveloped. Young people from a black and minority ethnic background were consulted regularly and data relating to ethnicity were gathered and examined to prevent discrimination. Some interesting work with diversity champions had been introduced, but little progress had been made in relation to disability or sexuality.
- HP25 The size of the foreign national population remained relatively small. There was no foreign national coordinator in post at the time of the inspection, but foreign national young people received their basic entitlements to telephone calls and letters and there had been some improvement in arrangements for translation for young people who did not speak English.
- HP26 The multi-faith chaplaincy team had a high profile throughout the establishment and ministers were easily accessible. Members of the team continued to provide good spiritual and pastoral care to young people. Improvements had been made to the accommodation in the multi-faith centre, which facilitated more flexible use of the space.
- HP27 In our survey, young people were critical of the standard of food, although we observed most young people eating sizeable portions at mealtimes.
- HP28 The rewards and sanctions scheme operated consistently across the house blocks. There was adequate differentiation between the levels, but the basic regime was too restricted and did not always allow young people to make daily telephone calls or take a shower.
- HP29 Quality assurance of the complaints system had improved and the quality of responses to formal complaints was generally very good. Replies were fair and respectful and, in most cases, addressed the issues directly.
- HP30 The standard of health care remained good. Young people had access to a comprehensive range of services equivalent to those in the community. The physical environment for inpatients had been improved and the regime was caring and therapeutic. There were some procedural flaws in the appointment system. Mental health care was excellent and the introduction of the innovative day care project, the

Endeavour unit was proving to be an extremely valuable resource. There was an effective pharmacy service, but there were still no direct consultations. The dentistry service had much improved and young people had access to a wide range of treatment.

HP31 On the basis of this short follow-up inspection, we considered that outcomes for young people were still reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

## Purposeful activity

---

HP32 At our previous inspection, we found that Wetherby was performing reasonably well against this healthy prison test. We made 19 recommendations in this area of which six had been achieved, eight had been partially achieved and five had not been achieved. We have made one further recommendation.

HP33 An average time of eight hours a day time out of cell was claimed and this appeared to be accurate. Young people still did not get association every day, but time available for exercise had increased significantly. Time out of cell at the weekend was poor.

HP34 The majority of young people were allocated to an education or vocational training place. Few young people refused to attend their allocated activity. A small number of young people were in full-time employment without accompanying accredited training. The initial assessment of learning needs was sound and punctuality at classes had improved. The risk assessment process had improved since the previous inspection and delays in referring young people to activities had reduced, although there were still some waiting lists for the most popular courses. The curriculum provided a suitable range of subjects and the number of higher level courses had been extended. Teaching and learning were good and learning support assistants were used very effectively. There was still no specific curriculum for children under school-leaving age.

HP35 There had been significant improvement in the delivery of vocational training. There were more resources for construction courses and more young people were able to participate. Achievement of accredited qualifications had improved since the previous inspection and these were now at a very high level.

HP36 Attendance at core PE had improved slightly, but was still poor and young people often arrived late. Attendance at recreational PE was better and access was fairer. There had been some improvement in the links between the PE department and health care to promote health and wellbeing, but more needed to be done. The shower facilities for young people participating in PE remained completely inadequate.

HP37 Young people had limited opportunity to use the library and, as reported at the previous inspection, there was no access in the evenings or at weekends.

HP38 On the basis of this short follow-up inspection, we considered that outcomes for young people were still reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

## Resettlement

---

- HP39 At our previous inspection, we found that Wetherby was performing reasonably well against this healthy prison test. We made 14 recommendations in this area of which seven had been achieved, two had been partially achieved and five had not been achieved. We have made a further two recommendations.
- HP40 Resettlement continued to be managed effectively. An up-to-date policy based on a local needs analysis was linked to relevant national developments. The resettlement committee met regularly and monitored application of the policy, but attendance by staff was erratic. Limited data were collected, which impeded the analysis of outcomes.
- HP41 A significant number of young people participated in a wide range of resettlement opportunities through release on temporary licence. The scheme was extensively promoted on each unit and young people we spoke to who had taken part had clearly valued the experience.
- HP42 There was an impressive range of life skills programmes. The referral systems for these were sound and take up was high. The Lucy Faithfull Foundation delivered a therapeutic programme to 18 young people who had been convicted of sexual abuse. However, a significant number of young people convicted of sexual offences received no therapeutic intervention. The public protection team carried out impressive work protecting young people in custody and in the community but links with the safeguarding committee remained weak.
- HP43 The training and remand management plans that we examined were timely and comprehensive. Caseworkers set clear targets, based on sound assessment of need. However, the coordination across departments of support for young people in achieving their targets needed improvement, particularly between caseworkers and residential staff. Training planning meetings were well attended by external agencies and families, but attendance by internal staff was inconsistent.
- HP44 Young people with substance misuse problems received good support from the young people's substance misuse service (YPSMS) team. The team was well integrated with other departments and delivered individual and group interventions. Members of the team maintained good working relationships with community youth offending team (YOT) workers which helped to ensure continuity of care after release.
- HP45 Young people who had accommodation problems were identified early in the training planning process and caseworkers had responsibility for ensuring that, where necessary, liaison took place with the community YOT.
- HP46 All young people were allocated a Connexions worker on induction, who assessed their needs and developed a post-release plan. Links were made with local YOTs and Connexions services to arrange suitable education, training and employment placements on release.
- HP47 There were robust procedures to effect a smooth transition to community health services. Health care staff had recently started to take responsibility for ensuring that young people were registered with a GP before their release. Young people

supervised by the child and adolescent mental health service team were carefully managed to ensure effective continuity of care when they transferred to the community.

- HP48 Young people still had poor access to telephones and their standard visit entitlement remained inadequate. Family days had recently been reinstated, but they continued to be accessible only to young people on the gold level of the regime.
- HP49 On the basis of this short follow-up inspection, we considered that outcomes for young people continued to be reasonably good in relation to this healthy prison test.





## Section 2: Progress since the last report

The paragraph reference number at the end of each recommendation below refers to its location in the previous inspection report.

### Main recommendations (from the previous report)

---

- 2.1 Children and young people should only be strip-searched on the basis of a thorough risk assessment that indicates that this procedure is necessary to protect them or others from harm. (HP43)

**Not achieved.** Strip-searches were still carried out without risk assessments. Routine strip-searching took place in reception for young people arriving and departing despite the introduction of a BOSS (body orifice security scanner) chair and wand detector in reception. We repeat the recommendation.

- 2.2 Residential units should hold no more than 40 young people at any time. (HP44)

**Partially achieved.** There were six residential units, five of which had the capacity for 60 young people. The unit for young people with long sentences had 48 beds, although occupancy had been capped at 24. The unit for young people on the highest level of the rewards and sanctions scheme was capped at 40 and the induction unit had operated at reduced occupancy, which allowed young people in both these units to have association every day. However, the other three units had consistently held between 50 and 60 young people who had association every other day and limited access to telephones and showers.

#### Further recommendation

- 2.3 Young people should be managed in small groups within the residential units so that all young people have daily access to association, telephones and showers.

- 2.4 Young people should not share cells which are designed for single occupancy. (HP45)

**Achieved.** There were four double cells on each unit apart from the induction and long-term units. We were advised that no young person had shared a cell during the previous 12 months.

- 2.5 Young people with language difficulties should have access to accredited translation and interpreting services, and these should be used for all assessments and reviews. (HP46)

**Achieved.** All staff that we spoke to during the inspection were aware of the translation services available. Conference call facilities had been installed in some parts of the establishment to enable telephone interpretation services to be used without having to pass a telephone handset between staff and the young person.

- 2.6 All assessments of young people should be coordinated within a comprehensive care plan. The care plan should be regularly reviewed by a multidisciplinary team of staff involved in the delivery of the care plan. Complex models of assessment and care should not be introduced until staff have been properly trained. (HP47)

**Partially achieved.** The safeguarding team facilitated multidisciplinary case reviews for some of the most vulnerable young people. These were usually attended by a wide representation of departments and also the young person. However, while actions were identified at these meetings, the different plans in place for vulnerable young people were still not coordinated. **We repeat the recommendation.**

**2.7 There should be sufficient activity places to provide a full and purposeful day for all young people. (HP48)**

**Achieved.** There were about 100 education and vocational training places in the morning and the same number in the afternoon which provided sufficient purposeful activity places for the size of the population. The small number of young people classed as unemployed at the time of the inspection were temporarily awaiting security decisions. The curriculum was planned appropriately to provide young people with a range of educational and vocational options. The range of higher level courses had increased, particularly for those serving longer sentences, for example some young people were following GCSE and AS level qualifications. However, work was needed to implement the recently revised curriculum to ensure that all young people had 15 hours of education and training.

## **Recommendations**

---

### **Courts, escorts and transfers**

---

**2.8 Essential background information should accompany all new arrivals. (1.7) (YJB)**

**Not achieved.** In most cases, background information was received in advance of the young person's arrival and was used to inform risk and vulnerability assessments. However, during the inspection we were made aware of two young people who had arrived in reception without documentation. There were procedures to ensure that missing documentation was reported and sought as soon as possible. There were good local arrangements to place young people without documentation on enhanced supervision until the documentation arrived to enable a full vulnerability assessment to be completed.

**2.9 Staffing arrangements in reception should ensure that young people are not held in cellular vehicles during staff breaks. (1.8)**

**Achieved.** Young people rarely arrived at the establishment during staff breaks. When the establishment was given advance notice of a young person's arrival during a break period, arrangements were made to ensure that staff were available in reception. The gate book for the preceding two months showed that cellular vehicles were rarely in the establishment for longer than 10 minutes.

### **First days in custody**

---

**2.10 The holding rooms in reception should be clean, free of graffiti and comfortable. (1.26)**

**Achieved.** The holding rooms had been refurbished, were free of graffiti and had comfortable seating. Some of the holding rooms had en suite toilet facilities.

**2.11 Young people being admitted to reception should have adequate access to useful information in a variety of different languages. (1.27)**

**Not achieved.** There was minimal information in reception. Young people spent very little time in reception before they moved to the first night accommodation on Benbow unit. Information in other languages was available on the unit and staff there had access to a laptop with a translation facility as well as telephone interpreting services. However, there was still a need to provide information to new arrivals to offer some reassurance, as well as to occupy them while they were there.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

**2.12 Trained Insiders should be available in reception, as well as on Benbow unit. (1.28)**

**Partially achieved.** One young person worked as an orderly in reception in the afternoons, but there were no trained insiders available in reception. There were insiders on Benbow unit, but they were not available after evening association had ended.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

**2.13 The private area should be used routinely for staff to speak to new arrivals when checking their court documents and discussing details of their offence and other personal matters. (1.29)**

**Achieved.** Two screened cubicles in reception were used for initial interviews. Staff told us that they felt they were unsuitable for in-depth interviews, for example first night assessments, as they were not fully insulated for sound. However, they did provide young people with a more private space to share personal information with staff.

**2.14 All staff required to complete vulnerability assessments (T1V forms) should receive suitable training so that assessments are completed to a consistently high standard. (1.30)**

**Achieved.** Staff training had been delivered by the Prison Service women's and young people's group. Managers carried out regular quality checks and the examples we saw were completed to a good standard.

**Additional information**

---

**2.15** The reception area had been refurbished since the previous inspection and was light and reasonably spacious with good sight lines. The property store had also been refurbished with new racks which made the storage of young people's property more organised and easier to access. Late arrivals were less frequent than they had been at the previous inspection and the majority of young people were in reception before 7.30pm. Reception procedures remained efficient, although showers were not offered in reception or on the first night unit if evening association had ended.

**2.16** First night procedures remained efficient. After the evening lock up, signs were placed outside the cells of young people who had just arrived, so that staff, but not young people, were aware of the location of new arrivals to remind them to be extra vigilant.

**2.17** New arrivals continued to benefit from a comprehensive and interactive induction programme which they started the day after their arrival. There were useful information sessions, but limits on the number of young people who could be accommodated on each session meant that some young people spent more time locked behind their doors on induction than at any other time.

## Further recommendation

- 2.18 Young people on induction should be fully occupied and not spend time locked in their cells because of a lack of spaces on induction activities.

### Residential units

---

- 2.19 Cell-sharing risk assessments should be reviewed at least weekly for young people who are required to share cells. (2.14)

**Achieved.** An initial cell-sharing risk assessment was completed for all young people by reception staff. If an assessment identified a young person as high risk, it was quality assured and countersigned by the duty manager. All assessments were checked by residential managers when a young person arrived on the unit. Although there had been no cell sharing for the previous 12 months, all cell-sharing risk assessments were reviewed and updated by the safeguarding team after any incidents of violence or self-harm.

- 2.20 Young people should have the option to wear their own clothing in preference to issued clothing. (2.15)

**Partially achieved.** All young people were allowed to wear their own trainers, underwear, socks and gym kit, but they had to wear prison issue outer garments. Young people serving long sentences on the Anson unit could wear their own clothes when they reached the highest level of the rewards and sanctions scheme.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

- 2.21 All young people who need prison clothing should be issued with clothing of the right size and in a good state of repair. (2.16)

**Achieved.** Adequate clothing in a range of sizes was available in the stores. We did not observe any young people poorly dressed and those we spoke to said that they were satisfied with the clothing issued to them. Clothing was not raised at the young people's monthly consultation meetings.

- 2.22 All units should have adequate laundry facilities. (2.17)

**Partially achieved.** All prison-issue clothing was washed each week and there were laundry facilities on the induction and long-term wings for young people's own clothes to be washed each week. A new scheme to enable young people to have their own clothes laundered was being piloted on Collingwood unit, but young people on the other three units had to wash their own clothes in their sinks and dry them on the pipes in their cells, which was unsatisfactory. The lack of proper laundry facilities had been raised by young people at the monthly consultation meetings.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

- 2.23 The centralised system for monitoring responses to call bells should be reintroduced. (2.18)

**Not achieved.** There was still no centralised system for monitoring the use of call bells, although young people we spoke to said that staff usually responded quickly to bells and it was not raised as an issue at young people's consultation meetings. In our survey, young people

indicated that the response to call bells had significantly improved since the previous inspection.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

**2.24 Young people should be able to shower on their unit each day. (2.19)**

**Not achieved.** Young people we spoke to during the inspection said they had no problems using the showers and on days when they did not have association, they could usually shower in the gym or on the wing after an activity. However, in our survey only 29% of young people said that they had daily access to showers, which, although a significant improvement on the finding of 14% in the survey carried out in 2009, was significantly worse than the national comparator of 81%. There were no showers on the long-term unit, so young people were taken in groups to use the eight showers beside the raptor project.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

**2.25 Young people should have lockable storage facilities in their cells. (2.20)**

**Not achieved.** There were still no lockable storage facilities in young people's cells.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

**2.26 Suitable outdoor clothing should be available. (2.21)**

**Achieved.** Suitable outdoor clothing was available on the units.

**2.27 All young people should be issued with a duvet, regardless of their level on the rewards and sanctions scheme. (2.22)**

**Not achieved.** Only young people on the gold level of the rewards and sanctions scheme were issued with a duvet, as possession of a duvet was considered to be a good motivator for young people to achieve the highest level. The establishment's action plan stated that consideration would be given to improving the bedding issued to young people, but there was no evidence that this had been done.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

**Additional information**

---

**2.28** Communal areas were generally clean and well maintained and cells that we looked at were also clean and well ordered, with the weekly cell inspection proving an effective way of ensuring that standards were maintained. However, young people we spoke to complained that they were not given proper materials to clean their cells and this was a recurring theme at the monthly consultation meetings.

**2.29** The monthly consultation meetings for unit representatives had an appropriate agenda and minutes of the meetings indicated that young people were able to raise issues of concern. However, they were not always well attended nor were all units always represented. Issues were fed back to senior managers and there was evidence that these were acted on satisfactorily.

**Further recommendations**

**2.30** Young people should be given adequate equipment to clean their cells.

2.31 Each unit should hold its own regular consultation meeting.

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

---

2.32 Staff should address young people by their preferred name. (2.26)

**Achieved.** Use of first or preferred names by staff was the norm during the inspection. All the staff we spoke to had detailed knowledge of the young people in their care. In our survey, 55% of young people felt that most staff treated them with respect, which was significantly worse than the national comparator of 72% and the comparator in the 2009 survey of 66%. However, the poor survey findings did not reflect our observations of consistently positive interactions between staff and young people during the inspection. It was notable that staff were familiar with the background of the individuals they were dealing with and had a good grasp of the developmental needs of young people in custody.

2.33 Staff should display their names on their uniform clearly. (2.27)

**Not achieved.** Some, but not all, staff had their names on their uniform.  
**We repeat the recommendation.**

### **Personal officers**

---

2.34 Residential support officers (RSOs) should be more involved in planning the care of the young people they are responsible for. (2.31)

**Not achieved.** Residential support officers (RSOs) still did not often attend training planning meetings for young people they were responsible for and we were told that they were not invited to attend when the meetings were scheduled. This led to some breakdown in communicating the targets set for young people to staff on the residential units who were closely involved in helping them meet those targets.  
**We repeat the recommendation.**

2.35 Young people should be allocated an RSO and back-up worker within 24 hours of their arrival. (2.32)

**Achieved.** Young people were allocated an RSO the day after they arrived at the establishment.

2.36 There should be continuity of care and young people should not experience unnecessary changes to their allocated RSO when they move cells. (2.33)

**Not achieved.** Young people were still likely to change RSOs when they moved cells on the same residential unit. We were shown a revised policy awaiting ratification, which provided for young people to retain the same RSO when they moved cells on the same wing.  
**We repeat the recommendation.**

2.37 RSOs and caseworkers should meet regularly to discuss and review the progress of the young people they are jointly responsible for. (2.34)

**Not achieved.** There was little evidence of RSOs and caseworkers meeting to discuss the needs and progress of the young people they were jointly responsible for. Use was being

made of P-NOMIS to record and share information, but this did not provide a substitute for discussion. In our survey, 44% of young people said they saw their RSO at least once a week and 50% said they felt their RSO had helped them, both of which were significantly worse than the national comparators of 69% and 62% respectively.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

## **Safeguarding children**

---

**2.38 The safeguarding children policy should be formally agreed with the Local Safeguarding Children Board as soon as possible. (3.9)**

**Achieved.** The safeguarding children policy had been reviewed and agreed by the Leeds Safeguarding Children Board in April 2009. The establishment had been requested to complete a self-audit of the policy by September 2010 prior to a formal review, but the policy did not clearly commit all parties to an annual review. The policy needed updating as it did not reflect the new safeguarding team and meetings structure nor how these new arrangements would ensure that the policy was properly implemented.

**2.39 Parents or carers should be informed when young people are involved in control and restraint and when they self-harm, in accordance with the safeguarding policy. (3.10)**

**Achieved.** Since the previous inspection, a policy and accompanying procedures had been introduced to inform parents or carers if a young person was involved in control and restraint or self-harm, to advise the young person of actions the establishment proposed to take and to seek the young person's views on contact with his family. The safeguarding children team was responsible for the management of the policy.

**2.40 Children and young people should be represented on the safeguarding children committee. (3.11)**

**Not achieved.** Young people did not contribute to any aspect of the safeguarding meetings.  
**We repeat the recommendation.**

**2.41 The Local Safeguarding Children Board should be asked to nominate a representative to attend the safeguarding children committee. (3.12)**

**Achieved.** The minutes of the 2010 meetings indicated that representatives of the Leeds Safeguarding Children Board, the police child protection unit and the local authority designated officer had attended meetings or had sent their apologies.

**2.42 There should be a code of conduct informing staff of their duty to raise legitimate concerns about the conduct of any member of staff in relation to the treatment of children within the establishment (a whistle-blowing procedure). (3.13)**

**Not achieved.** There was no whistle-blowing policy relating specifically to child protection issues.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

**2.43 The terms of reference and meeting structures for the separate committees that operate to oversee various safeguarding functions should be clarified. (3.14)**

**Achieved.** There were three safeguarding meetings, all of which now had terms of reference and a list of attendees. Meeting structures were generally clearer.

- 2.44 The weekly young person's safeguarding meeting assessed the needs of young people identified as vulnerable and agreed actions. Apart from an external representative from Leeds children and young people's social care who never attended, the designated attendees were all internal. However, they did not include the casework team responsible for training planning, which was an omission. Effective systems to ensure that the appropriate young people were referred to this meeting had been maintained. Comprehensive minutes were taken and the awareness and insight into the needs of the young people at the meeting we attended were impressive. Although actions were agreed and recorded, individual care plans were still not drawn up to facilitate ongoing assessment and review, which was contrary to the terms of reference (see paragraph 2.6).
- 2.45 The monthly internal safeguarding meeting was responsible for the management of safeguarding, including child protection, suicide and self-harm, bullying and violence reduction, the use of force, cell-sharing risk assessments and the use of segregation.
- 2.46 The terms of reference of the quarterly safeguarding children strategy meeting did not include monitoring the implementation of the safeguarding children policy, which was an omission reflected in the lack of discussion on a number of important aspects of the policy. Comprehensive reports on child protection were considered, including a review of all referrals, suicide and self-harm, bullying and violence reduction and the use of force.
- 2.47 All safeguarding meetings were well attended by representatives of the security department.

#### Further recommendation

- 2.48 The safeguarding children strategy meeting should monitor and review the implementation of the safeguarding children policy.

- 2.49 **Public protection should be included as part of the remit of the safeguarding committee. (3.15)**

**Not achieved.** The public protection team came within the management structure of resettlement, which coordinated the establishment's work with multi-agency public protection arrangements. All public protection cases were reviewed regularly by a multidisciplinary staff group chaired by the head of resettlement. However, the public protection team's impressive work in protecting individual young people subject to public protection measures, who were vulnerable in the community and potentially vulnerable in custody, was not included in the terms of reference of the monthly and quarterly safeguarding meetings.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

- 2.50 **Data regarding injuries sustained by young people should be routinely analysed for patterns or trends and monitored by the safeguards committee. (3.16)**

**Not achieved.** The safeguarding team was responsible for ensuring that unexplained injuries were logged and investigated, but there was no data collection or analysis provided for oversight by the safeguarding committee.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

- 2.51 **All staff should have enhanced level Criminal Records Bureau clearance. (3.17)**

**Not achieved.** We were advised that not all staff had received their CRB clearance.

**We repeat the recommendation.**



## **Bullying**

---

- 2.52 Bullying surveys should be carried out annually and should be used to inform the anti-bullying strategy. (3.27)**

**Achieved.** Bullying surveys were carried out annually by the psychology department. The survey results were used to produce a detailed report with supporting recommendations which were monitored at the safeguarding meetings and used to inform the annual review of the bullying strategy.

- 2.53 All anti-bullying monitoring logs should be reviewed by the anti-bullying coordinator to establish learning points and examples of good practice. (3.28)**

**Achieved.** Once they were closed, the anti-bullying monitoring logs were passed to the violence reduction coordinator who used a standard pro forma to check their quality. Relevant aspects, such as conflict based on geographical area, were identified and discussed at safeguarding meetings.

- 2.54 Management checks of anti-bullying monitoring logs should include comments on the quality of the work undertaken, as well as compliance with procedures. (3.29)**

**Achieved.** Frequent checks were carried out by the violence reduction co-ordinator on the quality of anti-bullying logs. A standard pro forma was used to identify key areas and achieve compliance with set standards. A summary of these findings was produced at the safeguarding meetings for discussion.

- 2.55 Young people identified at stage one or two of the anti-bullying strategy should have individual plans incorporating a range of interventions, including individual and group work, to address their behaviour. (3.30)**

**Not achieved.** Simple behavioural targets were set in anti-bullying logs but there were no plans setting out how young people would be supported to achieve their targets or interventions to address the behaviour of perpetrators of bullying.  
**We repeat the recommendation.**

- 2.56 Victims of bullying should be supported through an individual care plan. (3.31).**

**Not achieved.** When victims of bullying were identified, staff were supportive and extra vigilant about their welfare, but individual care plans were not produced.  
**We repeat the recommendation.**

- 2.57 All staff should undertake anti-bullying training. (3.32)**

**Not achieved.** New staff received a very basic introduction to anti-bullying procedures during their initial training, but no anti-bullying training had been undertaken since the previous inspection.  
**We repeat the recommendation.**

- 2.58 There should be anti-bullying coordinators/champions on all residential units. (3.33).**

**Achieved.** Two members of staff who acted as safeguarding representatives had been appointed to each of the residential areas. They were responsible for providing a link between

the residential function and the safeguarding group, raising awareness about bullying and identifying any concerns.

### **Additional information**

---

- 2.59 Eighty-five incidents of bullying had been reported in the six months prior to the inspection compared with 115 incidents over the same period in 2008. Six anti-bullying logs were open at the time of the inspection. There was no evidence that serious bullying was widespread and, when it was evident, staff dealt with it directly by monitoring the situation and, if necessary, moving the perpetrator. The most recent draft bullying policy had identified the need for planned support to both victims and perpetrators, but this had not yet been implemented.
- 2.60 The standard of bullying-related data gathering and analysis at the safeguarding meetings remained good. However, our survey results relating to bullying were all significantly worse than the comparator. Of particular concern was that only 30% of young people said that they thought they would be taken seriously if they told a member of staff they were being victimised, which was significantly worse than the national comparator of 42%.
- 2.61 A briefing document compiled by the night orderly officer had been introduced which provided details of any bullying issues to incoming duty managers and improved the quality of handovers.

### **Self-harm and suicide prevention**

---

- 2.62 **The suicide and self-harm policy should be revised to include the specific issues relating to the population of Wetherby. (3.44)**
- Achieved.** A revised policy had been completed in July 2009. The policy was now comprehensive and included issues relating specifically to the local population. There had been 150 reported incidents of self-harm over the previous six-month period. The majority of self-harm involved minor scratching injuries.
- 2.63 **The assistant to the suicide and self-harm coordinator should be trained and given profiled time to carry out his duties. (3.45)**
- Achieved.** Since the previous inspection, the suicide prevention coordinator had been assisted by a full-time child protection coordinator. They had both been trained in suicide prevention and child protection. The psychology department also provided assistance and produced a quarterly analysis of suicide and self-harm for the safeguarding team.
- 2.64 **Management checks should include checks on the quality of the records and also the management of the case overall and learning points should be used to inform good practice development. (3.46)**
- Achieved.** The suicide prevention coordinator carried out checks on the ACCT (assessment, care in custody and teamwork) documentation every day. Check lists were used to ensure that reviews were carried out on time, that handovers occurred and the quality of care maps was good. Any breaches of procedure or learning points were raised at the senior officers' meeting the following day. Monthly reports were produced for the safeguarding meeting, which contained feedback on the ACCT documentation.

- 2.65 **Assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) care maps should be specific measurable achievable realistic and time bound (SMART) and should be evaluated in all ACCT reviews. (3.47)**

**Achieved.** All staff involved in ACCT procedures had been issued with guidance on completing documentation. The care maps which we examined contained information in the SMART format and this material was used appropriately at the ACCT review which we observed. The new quality assurance arrangements were helping to improve the standard of care maps and how they were reviewed.

- 2.66 **ACCT reviews should be multidisciplinary and efforts should be made to increase the involvement of families when appropriate. (3.48)**

**Achieved.** Attendance at ACCT reviews was much improved and they were now well attended. As well as wing staff and representatives from the casework department, staff from chaplaincy, health care and substance misuse were usually present. Written guidance had been produced for ACCT case managers to advise them when family members should be involved. Whenever a young person became subject to ACCT procedures, a letter was sent to the parent or guardian inviting them to contact the safeguarding team. Young people were also actively involved in planning their care.

- 2.67 **Night checks regarding young people subject to ACCT documents should be undertaken at irregular intervals to reduce the risk of these becoming predictable. (3.49)**

**Achieved.** Management checks were carried out to ensure that this procedure was being undertaken properly and night checks were no longer carried out at predictable times.

- 2.68 **The child and adolescent mental health service should be involved in setting care map objectives and utilise unit staff support to reinforce this work, where appropriate. (3.50)**

**Achieved.** A representative from the unit staff attended all ACCT reviews and health care staff were usually present. CAMHS (child and adolescent mental health service) staff attended whenever they were working with a young person who was the subject of a review. Objectives in the care maps were set jointly and allocated to the appropriate member of staff.

- 2.69 **Care managers should hold responsibility for cases throughout the time that they are opened and plan review meetings to ensure their availability. (3.51)**

**Achieved.** The continuity of care management had improved since the previous inspection. More effort had been made to schedule reviews so that they were chaired by the same manager and in the sample that we examined this had occurred in most cases.

- 2.70 **All staff should be subject to regular refresher suicide and self-harm training, either internally or externally. (3.52)**

**Achieved.** All new staff received training in ACCT procedures. Refresher training in suicide and self-harm was delivered each month. Twenty-two staff had been trained as ACCT assessors and a further seven were waiting to receive this training.

### **Child protection**

---

- 2.71 **The child protection policy should be agreed with Leeds Social Care and the important role of the local authority designated officer (LADO) should be made explicit. (3.61)**

**Achieved.** A comprehensive child protection policy had been agreed with the Leeds Safeguarding Children Board in March 2009 and signed by the governor and a representative of the board. The policy included a description of the role of the local authority designated officer.

**2.72 The child protection policy should set out clear guidance for staff to help them to identify child protection concerns specific to children in custody. (3.62)**

**Achieved.** The child protection policy gave clear guidance to staff on how child protection concerns could be identified for children in custody. However, staff we spoke to were not familiar with the policy and unsure if a copy was held on the units.

**2.73 All staff should be trained in child protection, particularly in key posts working directly with children or making decisions concerning child protection referrals. Negotiations should take place with Leeds Social Care in an effort to resume a programme of joint training. (3.63)**

**Not achieved.** At the time of the inspection, only 62% of staff had received child protection training. Some key members of staff had attended generic child protection training with Leeds Social Care, but those we spoke to reported that much of it was irrelevant to their needs as workers in a custodial environment. There was no joint training organised with Leeds Social Care.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

**2.74 All allegations made by young people concerning any form of physical abuse by staff should be referred to the LADO within Leeds Social Care. (3.64)**

**Achieved.** The child protection cases that we examined were in good order and the internal procedures were sound. The child protection log confirmed that all cases involving an allegation of physical abuse by staff were referred to the LADO. The reports to the quarterly safeguarding children strategy meeting, attended by the LADO, confirmed the initial instructions given by the LADO and subsequent actions taken by the establishment. However, it was unclear how the responsibility of the LADO for regularly monitoring the progress of cases was carried out. During the first seven months of 2010, there had been 28 child protection referrals of which 20 were referred to the LADO. There had been no strategy meetings since 2006.

**Further recommendation**

**2.75** The establishment should approach the local authority to seek an agreement setting out how the full range of responsibilities of the LADO, as described in Working Together to Safeguard Children guidance, will be discharged.

**2.76 Internal investigations should be carried out when a decision is made, in consultation with Leeds Social Care, that a referral does not meet the threshold for a child protection investigation or following a decision by police not to proceed with a prosecution. (3.65)**

**Achieved.** Internal investigations had taken place appropriately and outcomes reported to Leeds Social Care.

- 2.77 All departments which are part of the designated membership should ensure that they are represented at the child protection committee meetings. (3.66)

**Achieved.** Child protection was discussed at monthly and quarterly safeguarding children meetings. Attendance was good and all relevant departments were represented.

- 2.78 The independent social work support should be strengthened. (3.67)

**Not achieved.** Since the previous inspection, funding for the social work post had been discontinued and there were no independent social workers in post. The responsibility for advising local social services departments of historical abuse and for the care of looked-after children now rested with the child protection coordinator and the casework team respectively. Statutory reviews for looked-after children took place only if instigated by the external social worker responsible for the young person. The child protection coordinator and the caseworkers managed aspects of the care of looked-after children to the best of their ability, but their understanding of how the young people should be properly managed by their local social services departments and their entitlements was limited. The establishment did not have a record of the number of looked-after children they held, although in a survey of the population in 2009, of the 260 valid returns 27% of young people said that they had been in care.

#### Further recommendation

- 2.79 There should be a procedure to ensure the early identification of looked-after children and appropriately trained staff should be designated to ensure that the specific needs of looked-after children are properly met.

#### Diversity

---

- 2.80 Staff in contact positions should receive diversity training and refresher training. (3.85)

**Partially achieved.** 'Challenge it, change it' training was being delivered to all staff and the establishment was on course to complete its programme of training within the timescale set by the National Offender Management Service (NOMS). At the time of the inspection, 42% of directly employed and 32% of non-directly employed staff had completed the training.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

- 2.81 The disability liaison role should have adequate profiled time to assess and provide appropriate services and facilities for young people with a disability. (3.86)

**Not achieved.** The disability liaison officer did not have regular profiled time. He met young people who were identified as having a disability to discuss what assistance might be needed. The majority of young people who had been identified as having a disability had a learning disability or difficulty. At the time of the inspection, a new special educational needs coordinator was due to take up post after a gap in provision.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

- 2.82 The disability questionnaire should be implemented and its use monitored by the race equality action team (REAT). (3.87)

**Achieved.** There were a number of opportunities for young people to disclose disabilities or to have them identified, including the first night health care screening with a nurse and a more in-

depth assessment with a doctor the following day. On the first day of induction, young people completed a form for the education department which included disability information. The education assessments which took place later in induction also enabled disabilities to be identified and in all instances the information was shared with the diversity manager who passed it to the disability liaison officer. Discussion of disability was a standing agenda item at the monthly diversity, race and equality action team (DREAT) meetings.

**2.83 There should be a programme of cultural events held at the establishment to celebrate diversity. (3.88)**

**Achieved.** The diversity manager regularly engaged young people, staff and the external community in diversity issues. A series of cultural events had taken place around the establishment. These had included celebration of Chinese New Year, Holocaust day, Gay awareness month, Gypsy and Traveller month and Buddhist awareness month. Age-appropriate posters were displayed around the establishment to celebrate diversity. A DVD explaining the significance of Ramadan to Muslims was available for young people to watch on their televisions.

**2.84 External community representatives should be encouraged to join the membership of the REAT. (3.89)**

**Achieved.** A local group, Hamara, had joined the DREAT and they quality assured racist incident report forms (RIRFs).

**2.85 Black and minority ethnic young people should be regularly consulted to ensure that their views are represented. (3.90)**

**Achieved.** The diversity manager held monthly meetings with black and minority ethnic wing representatives, who also attended DREAT meetings. The diversity manager was well known to young people and easily accessible.

**2.86 Complaints that have the racial element box ticked should be referred to the race equality officer (REO) to investigate the racial aspect of the complaint. (3.91)**

**Achieved.** Complaints with a racial element were referred to the diversity manager, although they did not occur frequently. They were discussed at the DREAT meeting alongside RIRFs.

**2.87 The REO should maintain a list of young people convicted of racially motivated/aggravated offences and cross-reference this with racist incident report forms (RIRFs) submitted. (3.92)**

**Achieved.** The diversity manager maintained a list of young people convicted of a racially motivated or aggravated offence and this was cross referenced with RIRFs.

**2.88 Interventions should be available to challenge young people about racism and promote cultural awareness. (3.93)**

**Achieved.** The diversity manager personally mediated in racist complaints and counselled young people on their inappropriate use of language or behaviour to try to foster an understanding of the impact and possible consequences. More stringent sanctions were available for young people who did not respond to this level of intervention. The establishment was developing other interventions to use with young people and were about to introduce a

pilot of a programme for young people who had a racial, or other hate crime component to their offence. The programme was in use at two other juvenile establishments.

**2.89 RIRFs should be analysed for trends and reported back to the REAT. (3.94)**

**Achieved.** Discussion of RIRFs was a standing agenda item at DREAT meetings where they were examined in detail. Fifty RIRFs had been submitted between January and June 2010, the majority of which concerned inappropriate language and name calling by young people.

**Additional information**

---

**2.90** There were up-to-date policies on race equality and disability and the establishment was working to a locally agreed timetable for completion of impact assessments. The monthly DREAT meetings, chaired by the deputy governor, were well attended and focussed on all aspects of diversity. The community champions remained in place, each working in a different area of diversity. RIRFs were readily available on the residential units and appropriately investigated by the diversity manager.

**2.91** Fifteen per cent of young people were from black and minority ethnic groups. In our survey, significantly more black and minority ethnic than white young people said they felt they had been fairly treated in the rewards and sanctions scheme, but significantly less said they had someone they could talk to if they were being victimised.

**Foreign nationals**

---

**2.92 Local policies and important information should be translated for foreign national young people. (3.105)**

**Achieved.** At the time of the inspection, 2% of the population were foreign national young people. Not all information was translated for young people who did not speak English, but the situation had improved. Induction material was available in other languages. Dictionaries for the languages most often needed were held in the first night unit, the library and education. Computer software was available to translate documents into a range of languages as required. The recently revised foreign nationals policy translation services and a list of staff who spoke languages other than English.

**2.93 Young people should not be detained in prison service custody solely on an immigration warrant when their sentence has expired. (3.106)**

**Achieved.** There were no young people at Wetherby held solely on an immigration warrant and we were told that this had not happened for at least six months.

**2.94 The foreign nationals coordinator should meet regularly with foreign national young people, both individually and as a group, to ensure that they are receiving their entitlements, are properly supported and that their specific needs are met. (3.107)**

**Partially achieved.** At the time of the inspection, the foreign nationals coordinator was changing post and there had been an interruption in contact with foreign national young people. Two young foreign nationals told us that they had not received any information or guidance on their status as foreign nationals, but records that we examined showed this was not typical and the outgoing foreign national coordinator had taken an active role in ensuring

that young people received their entitlements.  
**We repeat the recommendation.**

- 2.95 **Records should be kept regarding the applications made by foreign nationals to receive a free international telephone call, and individual files should record when and if they occur. (3.108)**

**Achieved.** The outgoing foreign nationals coordinator kept records of checks he had made to ensure that foreign national young people had received their free telephone calls and remedial action he had taken if they were not. Entries were made in young people's files of when the telephone calls took place.

### **Contact with the outside world**

---

- 2.96 **Young people should have daily access to the telephones. (3.124)**

**Not achieved.** In our survey, only 23% of young people said they could get access to a telephone every day, which was significantly worse than the comparator of 72%. Young people only had association every other day and, although there were occasional opportunities during the day for them to use a telephone, this was not guaranteed.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

- 2.97 **Visits entitlements should increase to one each week for sentenced young people, and, within reason, there should be no limit to the number of visits that unsentenced young people are permitted to have. (3.125)**

**Not achieved.** Young people who had been sentenced continued to receive two weekend visits a month and one midweek visit. Young people on remand received one visit a week. Neither entitlement was sufficient for children and young people.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

- 2.98 **Visitors who do not arrive within 15 minutes should be contacted and young people should not be left waiting in the visits hall unnecessarily. (3.126)**

**Achieved.** A notice had been issued to staff to ensure that, if visitors did not arrive, the young person was advised and not left waiting in the visits hall. Staff working in the visitors' centre were alert to anticipating problems and kept young people informed about any delays or difficulties associated with their visit.

- 2.99 **Family days should be organised at least four times each year. (3.127)**

**Achieved.** Family days took place quarterly, but only young people on the enhanced level of the rewards and sanctions scheme were eligible (see also rewards and sanctions section).

- 2.100 **Visitors should be encouraged to give regular feedback about visits by improved promotion of the suggestions book and regular surveys. (3.128)**

**Partially achieved.** Visitors could provide feedback in a suggestions book held in the visitors' centre. The vast majority of comments were positive, highlighting how helpful particular members of staff had been. A visitor survey had been carried out in March 2010, but the results had only just been analysed. Given the closure of Castington and the transfer of young people to Wetherby, this work needed to be updated.



## **Additional information**

---

- 2.101 It was not clear if the visits facilities were adequate to meet demand. The visits hall was extremely busy on a Saturday and Sunday and the 30 tables were usually fully booked. The midweek evening sessions were limited to 15 sets of visitors and were also busy. Staff working in the visits area told us that, since the transfer of young people from Castington earlier in the year, a significant number of visitors had had to travel quite long distances to reach the establishment. Visitors said that they found it inconvenient to visit midweek and said that it was difficult to use the telephone line for booking visits because it was only open from 9.30 to 11.30am each day.

## **Applications and complaints**

---

- 2.102 **All residential staff should receive guidance on how to consider and respond to a complaint from a young person. (3.135)**

**Achieved.** Written guidance to staff on how to deal with formal complaints had been published. Staff we spoke to were aware of its content and there was evidence that they used it when replying to complaints.

- 2.103 **A quality assurance system should be implemented to ensure that complaints are replied to fully and politely. (3.136)**

**Achieved.** Governance arrangements for recording, managing and investigating formal complaints had improved since the previous inspection. A nominated complaints clerk ensured that all formal complaints were logged and dispatched expeditiously to appropriate managers. Confidential complaints concerning young people's treatment by staff were logged separately and dealt with by the governor or other designated senior managers. Examination of complaints forms showed that allegations made by young people were taken seriously by managers, and there was evidence that they were fully investigated. Regular quality assurance checks were made by the senior residential governor and poor responses by staff were challenged. The overall quality of responses in the sample we examined was respectful and pertinent, and showed a marked improvement over the previous inspection.

## **Health services**

---

- 2.104 **The health care manager should be a member of the senior management team. (4.46)**

**Achieved.** The health care manager's title had been changed to city-wide area manager for the Leeds Primary Care Trust (PCT). The postholder was a senior qualified learning disability nurse with extensive experience in prison nursing. She was a member of the senior management team and attended meetings regularly.

- 2.105 The area manager was responsible for one other prison within the PCT, Wealstun. She had offices in both establishments and divided her time between the two, providing strong support to the nursing team. Health care was well established at Wetherby and staff enjoyed the robust support of the governor.

- 2.106 **The health care department should be refurbished and decorated in an age-appropriate manner. (4.47)**

**Achieved.** The department had been repainted and equipped with colourful soft furnishings which made the environment more comfortable for waiting patients.

2.107 Staff were developing an exercise room to enable inpatients to participate in exercise regimes. More equipment was needed to complete the project. There was a large association room which was comfortable and bright with a television, books and board games. The inpatient cells were rather stark and needed repainting. All cells were large with in-cell sanitation, and young people could have a television subject to a risk assessment.

2.108 **Young people should be able to submit applications for health services confidentially. (4.48)**

**Partially achieved.** Dedicated health care boxes had been ordered and were awaiting delivery and installation. In the meantime, it was still not possible to submit applications confidentially. **We repeat the recommendation.**

2.109 **Discipline staff should be available to supervise young people at the treatment hatches and ensure that only one young person is at the hatch at any time, to maintain confidentiality, escort young people to the health services department, and supervise young people in any area of the department. (4.49)**

**Partially achieved.** The number of young people requiring medication was very small and included those who needed to receive their medication (controlled drugs) in the secure health care department. Discipline officers were generally in attendance during the administration of medicines on the wings and in health care, but there was inconsistency in supporting health care in its other functions. Unlike the Endeavour unit (see paragraph 2.123), there was no regular supervision by full-time officers of waiting patients and inpatients, some of whom could be difficult to manage. Health care shared an officer with Endeavour, but only on a part-time basis. As a consequence, time out of cell for inpatients was often compromised.

#### Further recommendation

2.110 Discipline staff should be available to support all health care functions.

2.111 **All staff should have easy access to resuscitation equipment and a defibrillator. (4.50)**

**Achieved.** Resuscitation equipment was available in the treatment rooms servicing C/D and E/F wings and in the health care department. All equipment was tested and checked daily and recorded in a log. The equipment was appropriate and included oxygen, drugs and a defibrillator. All health care staff completed annual resuscitation training.

2.112 **Care plans should be written to support young people with identified medical problems, to ensure that their needs are fully met. (4.51)**

**Achieved.** Care plans were opened and maintained on all young people with a clinical need. Care plans were kept on the computerised clinical record, SystemOne. Plans that we reviewed were appropriate and well managed.

2.113 **All staff should have sufficient time, and the relevant skills and competencies, to care for young people at the establishment. (4.52)**

**Achieved.** The reconfiguration of resources within the PCT had led to changes in the staffing

structure and minor disruption to the delivery of health services. Nursing staff were appropriately qualified and recruitment was ongoing. The bandings and skill mix of staff were very good and included sick children's and mental health nurses. Two nurses were designated as looked-after children nurses. Staff we observed were enthusiastic and professional. Nurses and health care assistants were encouraged to improve relevant clinical skills. The PCT provided mobile specialist nurses across its prisons, including asthma, smoking cessation and diabetic specialists. Clinical supervision was well supported and two nurses were qualified as clinical supervisors. Nurses were allowed protected time for supervision. There were regular team meetings.

**2.114 Information about health services and health promotion material should be available in languages to meet the needs of the population. (4.53)**

**Partially achieved.** There was an abundance of health promotion material in the main department, but most of it was only in English. There was very little information on the wings on health issues. There were no restrictions on the use of Big Word translation services. **We repeat the recommendation.**

**2.115 Nurses should use triage algorithms when assessing young people; such assessment should take place in an appropriate environment. (4.54)**

**Achieved.** Triage protocols had been developed and were used whenever initial assessments were undertaken. Young people presenting as unwell on the wings were seen in health care and triage carried out. Any subsequent assessments or treatment were carried out in health care. If treatment was ongoing, it could be carried out in wing treatment rooms if appropriate.

**2.116 All prescriptions for controlled drugs should be written legally and include the quantity prescribed in both words and figures, with the date prescribed, and be signed by the prescriber. (4.55)**

**Achieved.** Controlled drug prescriptions were computer generated and monitored by senior nurses. Controlled drugs were rarely used and any that were were held securely in the health care department. A controlled drug register was completed whenever a controlled drug was administered. The system appeared robust and well managed.

**2.117 The introduction of patient group directions (PGDs) should be considered to enable more potent medication to be administered by nurses to avoid unnecessary consultations with the doctor. A copy of the original signed PGDs should be present in the treatment room and be read and signed by all relevant staff. (4.56)**

**Achieved.** Patient group directions (PGDs) had been developed and were used as necessary. The range of PGDs was appropriate to the population and copies were held in the treatment rooms.

**2.118 The contract to provide dental services should be restored as soon as possible and should meet the needs of the population. (4.57)**

**Achieved.** The dental contract had been renewed and a new dentist appointed. The dentist was assisted by a dental nurse and held two sessions a week. The dentist was gradually reducing waiting times which stood at up to eight weeks at the time of the inspection. Eight young people were seen at each session and a full range of NHS treatments offered. A dental triage form had been developed and was used by nurses to assess the level of urgency for young people to be seen by the dentist. Two dental hygienists from the community dental

service visited weekly to provide oral hygiene sessions which were popular with young people. In our survey, 24% of young people said it was easy to see the dentist, which was significantly worse than the comparator of 35%.

**2.119 The dental surgery and equipment should be fit for purpose and sufficient for the dentist to provide a full range of treatments at least equal to the standard of the NHS. (4.58)**

**Achieved.** The dental surgery was clean and well decorated. All equipment had been checked and the dentist reported that it was in good working order. A new washer/disinfector and x-ray developer had been installed. The dental surgery was fit for purpose and provided a service equivalent to that found in the community.

**2.120 The dental records should be appropriately annotated and stored. (4.59)**

**Achieved.** The dentist stored paper-based dental records in a locked filing cabinet. The dentist also entered treatment notes in every patient clinical record using SystemOne.

**2.121 Protocols should be developed to assist health services staff when dealing with dental emergencies in the absence of the dental team and for out-of-hours cover. (4.60)**

**Achieved.** In the absence of the dentist, emergency cases were seen by health care staff and referred to the GP. If appropriate dental treatment could not be provided on site, the young person was taken to the local dental hospital by prior arrangement and treated there. This did not happen frequently.

**2.122 Inpatients should have access to a range of constructive activities unless their clinical condition precludes it. (4.61)**

**Achieved.** Young people in the inpatient unit had access to a wide range of therapeutic activity. This included acupuncture and relaxation sessions, fitness regimes and leisure activity such as television and board games. They could also use the extensive facilities in the Endeavour unit if appropriate.

**2.123 There should be day care provision to support inpatients and young people finding it difficult to cope on the wings. (4.62)**

**Achieved.** Day care services had been provided by CAMHS for the previous 18 months and were open to all young people. The services were continually evolving and the caseload at the time of the inspection was approximately 40 young people, the majority of whom participated in day care activities within the Endeavour unit. CAMHS provided an extensive programme of interventions including art, drama and speech and language therapy. Group and one-to-one interventions were available. A (relaxation area) was being created to help defuse anxieties among young people and the team worked well with education and the gym. Living skills were promoted widely with facilities to cook and present meals. A full-time teacher based in the centre ensured that the educational curriculum was followed and learning assistants provided support where appropriate. The commitment and motivation of the staff were evident and it was clear from talking to young people that the unit was having a positive effect on them. The support of discipline officers, whose role was largely supervisory rather than therapeutic, was crucial to the success of the unit. However, different officers could be deployed there each day.

- 2.124 **Primary mental health nurses should have protected time to develop the provision for tiers one and two mental health problems and carry their own caseload of patients. (4.63)**

**Partially achieved.** Staff shortages had prevented the full implementation of this recommendation. We were assured that once the recruitment of additional mental health nurses had been completed, this would be achieved.

- 2.125 Meanwhile, the recruitment of three additional mental health nurses was needed. At the time of the inspection, mental health nurses had to undertake many general duties, including administration of medication, immunisations and other primary care tasks. This prevented them from holding regular mental health clinics. However, they risk assessed all young people referred to them and made sure they were supported wherever necessary. They worked well with the CAMHS team and referred young people to CAMHS as appropriate. There was evidence of effective joint working between the primary mental health nurse and the CAMHS team. Mental health nurses attended all ACCT reviews when notified, and wherever possible attended other relevant meetings, including safeguarding and training reviews.  
**We repeat the recommendation.**

- 2.126 **All staff should receive annual mental health awareness training. (4.64)**

**Achieved.** A dedicated mental health awareness training package had been developed for Wetherby and was delivered twice during each school term by the CAMHS training department. The two-day course was available to all staff and was generally well attended. The programme was supported by the governor and feedback from participants was positive. CAMHS provided input to training planning and C-NOMIS meetings and visited the separation and care unit every week to support staff, even if there were no young people in the unit.

- 2.127 **Health services staff should help young people to register with a GP before release. (4.65)**

**Achieved.** All young people were seen by a member of the health care team prior to release. If possible, they were seen two weeks before release so that proper checks could be made to help the young person reintegrate with their local health economy. Some young people were not registered with a GP and, if possible, staff liaised with the YOT health practitioner to ensure they were registered with a GP before release. A written discharge plan was drawn up and copied to the young person's YOT health practitioner. This included relevant health information, immunisation records and the name of the GP.

### **Additional information**

---

- 2.128 The pharmacy provider service had recently been changed and a new pharmacy technician was based at Wealstun. It was planned for the technician to visit Wetherby for two sessions each week, to include pharmacy clinics to allow young people face-to-face access to the pharmacist and/or technician. This new service was designed to improve young people's knowledge of pharmaceutical products and their use, and encourage them to manage their health care with expert advice.

## **Learning and skills**

---

**2.129 The amount of accreditation on construction courses should be increased. (5.19)**

**Achieved.** The construction courses had been relocated to a large brick building which offered improved resources and facilities for more young people. Achievement of accredited qualifications had improved significantly.

**2.130 Staff absences in construction lessons should always be covered. (5.20)**

**Achieved.** East Riding College continued to provide the training under contract to the Manchester College. Links with other local establishments ensured that cover for staff was provided by qualified and experienced trainers. Classes were rarely cancelled.

**2.131 Punctuality to lessons should be improved. (5.21)**

**Partially achieved.** Attendance and punctuality were generally satisfactory. Some class sizes were low, particularly English and mathematics, largely because young people were taken out for PE and library. The curriculum was being revised to ensure that 15 hours of education and training were delivered and young people were not taken out for other activities such as PE and library during this time, but this had not yet been implemented. Young people taking part in PE were often up to 25 minutes late for the first morning and first afternoon sessions.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

**2.132 The curriculum should meet the needs of young people who are under school-leaving age. (5.22)**

**Not achieved.** The establishment had not introduced a curriculum for young people under school-leaving age. They were integrated into the existing curriculum. Work with local authorities was well advanced to ensure that the 14-19 agenda would be addressed and a wider range of opportunities offered to young people under school-leaving age. There were 26 young people aged 15 held in the establishment at the time of the inspection.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

**2.133 The length of time taken to carry out risk assessments for young people entering work and vocational training should be reduced. (5.23)**

**Achieved.** The risk assessment process had improved and delays in referring young people to activities had reduced. However, there were still waiting lists for some courses and employment activities.

**2.134 Young people should not be employed full time without education and/or vocational training. (5.24)**

**Not achieved.** Some young people continued to be employed without opportunities for education and training, particularly those who were deemed red bands and/or cleaners.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

**2.135 Attendance by education staff at training planning meetings should be improved. (5.25)**

**Not achieved.** Education staff did not routinely attend training planning meetings. They relied on Connexions staff attending, but this did not always happen and the outcome of the planning

meetings was not routinely shared with education, training and PE staff. The absence of a special educational needs coordinator (SENCO) exacerbated the situation. Learning support assistants often attended training planning meetings for young people they supported on the wings.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

**2.136 Young people should have access to the library in the evenings and at weekends. (5.26)**

**Not achieved.** Young people still did not have access to the library in the evenings and at weekends. A library manager had been appointed for Leeds and Wealstun prisons and Wetherby, and there were plans to review the provision.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

**Physical education and health promotion**

---

**2.137 Attendance at core PE lessons should be improved. (5.32)**

**Partially achieved.** Attendance at core PE sessions had marginally improved, but remained low at 60%. Attendance at recreational PE was much better. The establishment had effective procedures on the wings to ensure equality of access.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

**2.138 The PE profile should be redesigned to ensure that there is a balance of recreational PE and skills acquisition and development. (5.33)**

**Achieved.** The PE department had redesigned the provision, and the range of courses had improved to include more skills acquisition and development. Activities contributing towards Duke of Edinburgh awards were integrated into programmes. Other awards which provided employability skills included Focus gym instructors and Active IQ which were well promoted and supported. PE staff supported community work through release on temporary licence (ROTL).

**2.139 Links with the health care department should be improved. (5.34)**

**Partially achieved.** Links with health care continued to develop, although more needed to be done. Some PE staff were qualified in upper and lower limb treatment and referrals were made from health care. Health care staff supported one-to-one exercise activities. PE staff sat in on psychology Access courses and provided appropriate PE activities to support the development of relationships, trust and coping skills. They made contributions to other courses, including Lifestyle substance misuse programmes. Information about young people's language, literacy and numeracy support needs was not routinely passed to staff and they were not always informed about young people's health conditions, such as asthma, diabetes or epilepsy. There was a tendency to rely on young people self assessing their health and declaring any concerns. Although staff had attended sexual health awareness courses, these were not being delivered at the time of the inspection due to a change in provider.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

**2.140 The quality of the showers should be improved and they should be cubicularised. (5.35)**

**Not achieved.** The quality of the showers had not improved and they had not been made into cubicles. Plans and tenders had been submitted, but this had not progressed.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

**2.141 The annual PE surveys and monitoring information should be used to improve practice. (5.36)**

**Achieved.** Staff had carried out a comprehensive survey to determine the most and least popular recreational and core PE activities. The surveys had been analysed and changes made to activities and courses. The monitoring of participation had improved to ensure that all young people wanting to participate were able to. PE staff were working closely with the education and training provider to maximise opportunities without compromising young people's entitlement to the 15 hours of education and training per week specified by the Youth Justice Board (YJB).

**Additional information**

---

- 2.142 There had been a change in education and training provider and staff, and the profile of the population had also changed including a number of young people at a greater distance from their home area and more young people serving long sentences. During this period of transition, education and training had continued to deliver an effective service with positive outcomes for most young people.
- 2.143 Initial assessment of learning needs was satisfactory and there was good support from Connexions and Prospects. Information from the initial assessment was not routinely passed to education, training and PE staff, resulting in some duplication. There had been no special education needs coordinator (SENCO) in post for several weeks and a new SENCO was due to start the week of the inspection.
- 2.144 Teaching and learning and the achievement of accredited qualifications were generally good. Interactive white boards enhanced the teaching and learning in the classrooms. Very effective use was made of LSAs and wing support was very well managed and delivered. In a few sessions that we observed, poor behaviour was not challenged effectively. Good judgements were made on sending young people out of class and in the majority of cases they were persuaded to return to class rather than to residential units. Two young people were categorised as refusers to attend activities. They had been interviewed to determine the reasons and encouraged to participate.
- 2.145 Young people were able to participate in an Army Cadet programme and to work in the raptor rescue area, both of which provided excellent opportunities for young people to develop interpersonal and practical skills. The bird rescue programme allowed young people the chance to visit local schools to promote the care of animals. Young people on both programmes were motivated and enjoyed the activities immensely. However, the establishment had no system to recognise and record the development of their confidence and self esteem or the improvement in their learning and team working.
- 2.146 Good use was made of ROTL. Approximately 10 young people were released into the community to support the WISE programme for older people or to work in charity shops, garages and hotels doing gardening and catering. Places at a local college were being sought for two young people. Connexions and Prospects provided a comprehensive, well managed service.
- 2.147 There were very good links with local authorities and work was progressing well to address the 14 -19 agenda.



## Further recommendation

- 2.148 Information about young people's language, literacy and numeracy support needs should be routinely passed to education, training and PE staff.

## Faith and religious activity

---

- 2.149 The establishment's regime should not clash with weekend worship, and young people should have the opportunity to attend worship as well as participate in the full regime. (5.46)

**Achieved.** There had been changes to the weekend regime and young people did not have to choose between corporate worship and other activities.

## Additional information

---

- 2.150 The chaplaincy was fully integrated into the establishment regime. We saw examples of members of the team working with young people and providing valuable support at times of bereavement and other personal crisis. A range of classes and groups continued to be delivered and the chaplains were visible and accessible on the residential units.

## Time out of cell

---

- 2.151 Movement to and from activities should occur consistently in accordance with the published routine. (5.56)

**Partially achieved.** Movement to and from activities was generally consistent with the published routine but there were some notable delays (see learning and skills section). Staff unlocked young people on time and encouraged them to attend their scheduled activity promptly.

- 2.152 A minimum of one hour a day in the fresh air should be provided every day for all young people. (5.57)

**Partially achieved.** All young people could now have 30 minutes of exercise every morning before breakfast. Many officers also allowed young people scheduled evening exercise during the summer months.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

- 2.153 Alternative activity should be provided for young people who are unoccupied and locked up because their scheduled activity is cancelled, they are unemployed or they are being educated on the unit. (5.58)

**Not achieved.** Although some staff occasionally allowed young people out of their cells to help with light cleaning when they were not otherwise occupied, alternative activities were not provided.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

- 2.154 Outside recreational areas should be equipped with outdoor activity and games equipment, with seating in a quiet area for young people to be able to talk to one another. (5.59)

**Partially achieved.** The exercise yards attached to residential units were small and had no recreational equipment. Benches had been installed since the previous inspection.  
**We repeat the recommendation.**

- 2.155 Time out of cell at weekends should be improved. (5.60)

**Partially achieved.** Young people spent much of their time locked up during the weekend. However, association was available to young people during part of the day on Saturday and Sunday. They also had access to exercise, visits, gym classes and some religious services during the day, but no other formal activity or library provision. There was no evening association at the weekend.  
**We repeat the recommendation.**

### **Additional information**

---

- 2.156 The daily routine (core day) was clearly displayed on all units. The core day allowed half the young people on each residential unit to associate at one time. However, many staff allowed more young people out following a risk assessment. In reality, the majority of young people had association every other evening. The core day contained very little domestic time and many young people we spoke to said that they could not easily access cleaning materials.
- 2.157 The establishment reported an average unlocked figure of 8.5 hours a day which we confirmed during the inspection, although there was slight slippage in the regime described in the published core day. During the inspection, we made one check in the middle of the core day which showed that less than 10% of the population were locked in their cells, the majority of whom were on the induction unit.

### **Security**

---

- 2.158 Strip-searches should not be carried out routinely and should only be authorised on the basis of a risk assessment which identifies that it is necessary to prevent the risk of harm to the young person and others. (6.6)

**Not achieved.** Young people were still subject to routine strip-searches with no risk assessment, particularly on admission and discharge, and during a mandatory drugs test.  
**We repeat the recommendation.**

### **Additional information**

---

- 2.159 The security department was effectively managed by senior officers who reported to a senior operational governor. The security committee was well attended by representatives from appropriate internal departments and external agencies, including the police intelligence officer. Monthly meetings were chaired by the deputy governor. The standing agenda was comprehensive and included security reports from all residential areas. An analysis of security information reports (SIRs) was presented by a security manager. The committee was particularly focussed upon safer custody issues and representatives from the violence reduction and drug strategy committee attended all meetings. Security objectives were agreed following consideration of intelligence, and progress was monitored and recorded.

- 2.160 There were almost 200 SIRs each month, which were processed and categorised by trained security collators. Information was analysed effectively and used to inform risk assessments, which were communicated to staff in all areas of the establishment.

### **Disciplinary procedures**

---

- 2.161 **Racist comments should be dealt with through the racist incidents complaints system and not through the discipline incident report. (6.27)**

No longer applicable. The discipline incident report (DIR) had been discontinued.

- 2.162 **Clearer guidance should be given to staff regarding the use of the DIRs as distinct from other sanctions. (6.28)**

No longer applicable.

- 2.163 **DIRs applied to inappropriate behaviour in education should be managed by education staff. (6.29)**

No longer applicable.

- 2.164 **A quality control system for the management of DIRs should be applied across units to ensure consistency. (6.30)**

No longer applicable.

- 2.165 **Information outlining the exact process of adjudication should be provided to young people in an age-appropriate format. (6.31)**

**Achieved.** Young people were given written information explaining the adjudication process. Staff issuing adjudication reports explained the process further and checked that the young person understood. Young people were offered support by an advocate before and during their adjudication. The adjudication hearings that we observed were well conducted, young people were put at their ease and addressed by their first name. During hearings, governors ensured that the young person understood the process at each stage. Hearings were usually held in a quiet room on the young person's residential unit.

- 2.166 **Mediation and restorative justice should be used as part of a behaviour management strategy which also aims to reduce the use of adjudications. (6.32)**

**Partially achieved.** There was some good use of informal mediation to resolve disputes between young people, and evidence that the number of formal sanctions at adjudications had reduced. However, there was still no use of restorative justice.

- 2.167 **When CCTV footage of an incident is available, it should always be used in adjudication proceedings. (6.33)**

**Achieved.** There was CCTV coverage of all communal areas in the residential units and the education department. Footage was often used as evidence during adjudications.

- 2.168 **Loss of earnings sanctions imposed at adjudications should not exceed 80%. (6.34)**

**Achieved.** There was no evidence in the records of adjudications that we examined that loss

of earnings sanctions had been used. Adjudication standardisation meetings took place quarterly and were usually chaired by the governor. They were well attended by adjudicating governors and senior officers. Punishment tariffs had been published and were used consistently at formal adjudication hearings and for minor reports.

**2.169 Young people should, as a matter of course, be interviewed post adjudication to ensure that they have understood what has happened and are offered assistance with the appeals process. (6.35)**

**Achieved.** Young people were interviewed by residential officers after their adjudication to ensure that they had understood the proceedings. The appeals process was explained after the formal hearing by the adjudicating governor and again by residential officers after the adjudication. The records of adjudications that we examined showed that hearings had been conducted fairly and charges had been fully investigated.

**Additional information**

---

2.170 Overall, there had been improvements in the use of formal disciplinary procedures since the previous inspection. However, the number of formal adjudications remained high at over 1,000 in the first six months of 2010 and some charges related to minor infringements of rules or childish behaviour, which could have been dealt with through less formal procedures.

2.171 There was a minor report system to deal with minor infringements of establishment rules. Charges were heard by trained senior officers and conducted informally during the evening in an office on the young person's unit. The records that we examined showed that hearings were conducted in an age-appropriate manner, and charges were thoroughly investigated. Punishments were minimal and there were examples of senior officers dismissing charges due to lack of evidence.

2.172 Monthly statistics on the number and nature of adjudications and minor reports were presented to the senior management team. Offences were noted, categorised and communicated to adjudicators to identify trends and address problem areas.

**Further recommendation**

2.173 Minor infringements of prison rules and childish behaviour should be dealt with through informal procedures.

**Use of force**

---

**2.174 The use of force should be monitored for patterns and trends over time. (6.36)**

**Achieved.** A restraint management committee met monthly to review all incidents and to identify and respond to emerging patterns and trends. A restraint reduction manager had been appointed to coordinate use of force protocols and to provide information to the restraint minimisation meeting for analysis. Information, including the nature of the incident, its location and the ethnicity of the young people involved, was collated each month and presented to the committee, who used it to inform changes in strategy. Minutes of the restraint management committee meetings demonstrated that action was taken as required. There were good communication protocols between the restraint reduction manager, the security department and the residential units and good links with the safeguarding committee. All incidents were

reviewed at the monthly security meetings and information was shared effectively through the use of regular security reports.

**2.175 The use of force should only be used as a last resort and where there is immediate risk to safety and not merely to obtain compliance. (6.37)**

**Not achieved.** Incidents involving the use of force remained high at 285 from January to the end of July 2010, which was comparable to 2009 figures and significantly higher than 2008. However, about 60% of reports of incidents of the use of force did not involve the full use of control and restraint techniques. About 70% of incidents of use of force related to low level fights and assaults. There was evidence of de-escalation being used to good effect during difficult situations and of managers encouraging this approach. However, 15% of incidents of the use of force had been to gain compliance with establishment rules.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

**2.176 All planned removals should be video recorded. (6.38)**

**Achieved.** Planned removals were video recorded. Tapes were kept as evidence and stored in the security department. Planned intervention was well organised and appropriately carried out and documentation was completed correctly. Proper authority was recorded and all incidents were appropriately supervised by senior staff. Accident report forms were completed in all cases regardless of whether injuries had been sustained. Young people were seen by health care staff immediately after an incident.

**2.177 A random sample of CCTV footage of use of force should be viewed by managers each month as part of the quality assurance process. (6.39)**

**Achieved.** Samples of CCTV footage were regularly checked by the restraint minimisation manager. All videos of planned removals were examined by the restraint minimisation committee and information used to determine any necessary action.

### **Separation and care unit**

---

**2.178 The rules and information about the separation and care unit should be available to young people in a format that they are able to understand. (6.40)**

**Not achieved.** Young people were still not given written information about the procedures and rules when they were admitted to the separation and care unit (SCU). Information displayed on the single notice board was not age appropriate.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

**2.179 All records for the SCU including the use of the special cell should be completed and up to date. (6.41)**

**Achieved.** The special cell in the SCU had not been used since January 2010. It had been used twice during 2009. Records that we examined showed that appropriate authority had been obtained, observation records had been completed and the special cell had been used for short periods of time as a last resort to deal with extreme behaviour.

**2.180 Governance arrangements for the use of the special cell should be clarified and published to staff. (6.42)**

**Achieved.** A governor's instruction setting out arrangements for the use of special accommodation had been published in January 2009 and was kept in the SCU. Staff we spoke to were aware of its content.

**2.181 Access to showers, telephone calls and exercise should not be determined by behavioural considerations and should be available daily. (6.43)**

**Partially achieved.** All young people had daily access to telephones and exercise. Showers were offered every other day.

**Further recommendation**

**2.182** All young people located in the separation and care unit should have access to a shower every day.

**2.183 All young people located in the SCU should have an individual care plan which addresses the problem behaviour. They should be subject to regular multidisciplinary reviews to ensure a staged reintegration to normal location as soon as possible.**

**Achieved.** Planning procedures to return segregated young people to normal location had developed well since the previous inspection. The SCU was not overused and the average length of time that young people remained in the SCU was approximately eight days. All individuals located in the SCU now had a care plan. Weekly reviews of all cases were completed on time and there was evidence that changes to behaviour due to the achievement of targets in individual care plans were monitored and acted upon. The written entries in the care plans did not reflect the high quality of the work carried out within the reviews.

**Additional information**

---

**2.184** Little had changed in the physical environment of the SCU and conditions were generally poor. Communal areas remained stark and cells were small, cramped and poorly ventilated.

**2.185** The unit was managed by two nominated senior officers supported by trained officers who all reported to the head of residence and his deputy. Daily visits were made by governors to ensure that the segregation of young people was properly monitored through regular case conferences and reviews.

**2.186** Staff interviewed all newly arriving young people in private to identify any immediate needs. They were searched thoroughly and respectfully and only strip-searched following a risk assessment authorised by a governor grade. Apart from in-cell education provided on request by the education department, there was little purposeful activity for longer-stay young people.

**2.187** Written observations in personal files were generally poor. Most focussed upon behaviour relating to the daily regime, such as access to exercise and showers. We did not see any comprehensive records to demonstrate that the emotional and mental wellbeing of young people was being effectively monitored. Despite this, relationships between staff and young people that we observed were good. Officers used appropriate levels of care and showed respect. There was extensive use of preferred names and titles and all young people that we spoke to said that the staff group were kind and helpful. Robust cells had been introduced on each of the residential areas since the previous inspection. They were built using strong fittings and had been designed to be used for disruptive young people for short periods of time. The

robust cells were a sensible alternative to locating young people in the SCU. They were being used effectively, but there were no formal monitoring arrangements.

#### **Further recommendations**

- 2.188 Living conditions in the separation and care unit should be improved.
- 2.189 The regime should be developed to include opportunities for purposeful activity.
- 2.190 There should be proper governance surrounding the use of the robust cells for separation purposes.

#### **Rewards and sanctions**

---

- 2.191 **Deprivation of family contact should not be used as part of a punishment and family days should be offered to all young people, regardless of regime level. (6.50)**

**Not achieved.** Family days were still only offered to young people on the gold level of the rewards and sanctions scheme. At the time of the inspection, 28% were on enhanced (gold), 67% were on the standard regime (silver), and 5% were on basic (red).  
**We repeat the recommendation.**

#### **Additional information**

---

- 2.192 The published rewards and sanctions policy had been updated in 2009. The revised scheme was not substantially different to the previous scheme.
- 2.193 Young people retained their status on transfer from another establishment and all new receptions were placed on the silver level. Written documentation showed that the scheme was implemented consistently across the residential units and young people were given stage one and two warning notices when appropriate.
- 2.194 There was evidence that staff used the scheme as a motivational tool and encouraged young people on silver level to apply for gold status when required thresholds had been met. Review boards generated agreed action plans for young people so that they could demonstrate changes in behaviour to achieve enhanced status or return to standard level from the basic regime. Young people were given written information on how to appeal if they disagreed with decisions and, on the whole, they knew how the system worked.

#### **Catering**

---

- 2.195 **All young people should eat their meals in an appropriate setting and not in their cells. (7.6)**  
**Not achieved.** Young people on basic level continued to eat their meals in their cell.  
**We repeat the recommendation.**
- 2.196 **Young people should receive five portions of fruit and vegetables each day. (7.7)**

**Achieved.** A new menu had been introduced which offered a more balanced diet and included five portions of fruit and vegetables each day.

**2.197 Lunch should include an option for hot food. (7.8)**

**Achieved.** Hot food was always offered as an option at lunchtime.

**2.198 Fish should not be offered as a vegetarian option, and all meals should include a vegetarian option. (7.9)**

**Achieved.** Fish was no longer treated as a vegetarian option. A vegetarian option was offered at every meal.

**Additional information**

---

**2.199** In our survey, only 16% of young people said that the food was either good or very good, which was significantly worse than the comparator of 23%. The catering allowance for each young person was £2.21 a day. The catering manager provided extras such as a biscuit and drink at supper time and a piece of fruit each day.

**2.200** Despite the survey results, we observed the majority of young people eating sizeable portions. Attempts had been made to make the food more appetising by using spices and introducing more unusual items. Catering staff had responded to consultations with young people by the addition of more baked potatoes and hot meals.

**Canteen/shop**

---

**2.201 Administration charges should not be incurred for goods ordered from catalogues. (7.15)**

**Achieved.** Despite restrictions imposed as a result of a national contract, young people were still able to purchase items from catalogues. They paid the same price as they would have paid in the community and administration charges were not incurred.

**Strategic management of resettlement**

---

**2.202 The resettlement policy should contain timescales and targets that allow progress to be measured. (8.11)**

**Achieved.** There was an up-to-date, comprehensive resettlement policy, based on a 2009 needs analysis/resettlement survey and relevant national developments. The policy covered all resettlement pathways and included a section on case management. There was a statement of the objectives of each pathway, the responsibilities of staff to deliver the pathway, a summary of current provision and future aspirations and key performance indicators. The section on future aspirations contained targets and dates for achieving them.

**2.203 The establishment should encourage representatives from relevant community-based organisations to attend the resettlement policy committee. (8.12)**

**Not achieved.** We were advised that community-based organisations had been approached, but had not attended the resettlement policy committee. Attendance by internal staff at



resettlement policy meetings needed improvement.  
We repeat the recommendation.

**2.204 The resettlement committee should routinely monitor reports relating to all resettlement pathways. (8.13)**

**Partially achieved.** The resettlement committee met monthly and received reports on all the pathways, but no decisions had been taken on what data should be collected in each resettlement area.

**Further recommendation**

**2.205 Data should be collected to inform the monitoring of services offered under each resettlement pathway.**

**2.206 The pre-release course should be revised and include specialist input covering housing advice, money and debt management. (8.14)**

**Not achieved.** There was no longer a pre-release course and there was no specialist housing or money management advice available. Caseworkers provided general advice about specific issues relevant to individual young people before they were released. They linked with Connexions to provide some money management advice and had contacts with a small number of housing providers (see also resettlement pathway section).

**2.207 A comprehensive analysis of the resettlement needs of the population should be carried out and the range of offending behaviour programmes should reflect identified need. (8.15)**

**Achieved.** A survey of young people had been carried out in 2009 to establish their resettlement needs. The survey focussed on accommodation, employment, learning and skills, offending behaviour, drugs and alcohol and family support. The survey showed that young people responded positively to family support and offending behaviour programmes, but there was a need to develop a more varied range of educational courses and to increase the opportunities for young people to work outside the establishment. A number of improvements resulting from the survey had been incorporated into the resettlement strategy.

**2.208 Provision for careers advice should be improved. (8.16)**

**Achieved.** Six Connexions workers were employed at the establishment, whose primary role was to find young people education, training and employment (ETE) placements on release. This was a new service and benefits had yet to be realised. All young people had an individual interview with a Connexions worker during or just after their induction and a resettlement plan was developed for their period in custody. Contacts were made with education and employment providers in the young person's local area, usually through the auspices of the local YOT or Connexions service.

**Additional information**

---

**2.209 The head of resettlement now chaired the NOMS regional resettlement meetings and was involved in the YJB assessment and interventions strategy and operational working group.**

- 2.210 Since the previous inspection, the establishment had made very good links with a significant number of voluntary agencies working with young people in custody and in the community. There was a comprehensive directory of this provision.
- 2.211 The comprehensive ROTL policy was being updated and significant resources were being put into developing opportunities for young people to use ROTL. The range of ROTL opportunities was impressive and records indicated that young people had experienced work placements, training opportunities, local town visits to improve family links, and visits to secure accommodation and ETE placements.
- 2.212 The Anson unit had re-opened in May 2010 as a 48-bed specialist unit for young people serving long sentences. The population had been capped at 24 young people until the refurbishment was completed and the staffing level rose to its full complement. The unit was managed by the senior manager with responsibility for the Keppel unit and experienced senior officers, who had been selected for the task. There was a ratio of one officer to eight young people, which was significantly better than other units on the main site.
- 2.213 Young people were placed in the Anson unit by the YJB placement and casework service. The unit had taken a significant number of young people from the Oswald unit at Castington, which had recently closed, and young people who were serving long sentences at Wetherby. Young people who were being placed from secure training centres or secure children's homes were visited and assessed by Anson unit staff before being transferred to Wetherby. It was intended that only young people who had at least one year to serve before their 18th birthday would be allocated to the unit. It was too early to assess whether the unit was performing the specialist function that it had been designated.

### **Training planning and remand management**

---

- 2.214 **Efforts should be made to try to increase the attendance of family members at planning reviews. (8.22)**

**Partially achieved.** The casework team had made significant efforts to encourage families to attend. The times of review meetings had been changed to the afternoon to allow families time to travel. However, the percentage of families attending review meetings remained at 60-70% and there was a need for the resettlement policy committee to monitor this.

- 2.215 **All relevant departments should be represented at planning reviews or send a detailed report in advance. (8.23)**

**Not achieved.** Internal representation at review meetings was poor, particularly from education and health care. Attendance by substance misuse workers was good.  
**We repeat the recommendation.**

- 2.216 **Targets set at planning reviews should be specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and time bound (SMART), and designed to meet the identified needs of the young person. (8.24)**

**Achieved.** The training plans that we examined were timely and comprehensive and reflected individual needs. Caseworkers had set clear targets based on sound assessments, but support for young people to achieve their targets was poorly coordinated. This was particularly evident for young people with behavioural targets, who needed coordinated support from caseworkers and residential staff.

## Substance use

---

- 2.217 The primary care trust, in partnership with the establishment, should appoint a substance misuse lead nurse. (8.47)

**Achieved.** Although there was no dedicated substance misuse nurse at the establishment, the health care manager had completed the RCGP Part 1 course in substance use and one of the GPs had completed the RCGP Part 2. In addition, there was easy access to the expertise found in the integrated drug treatment system team based in HMPs Leeds and Wealstun. Very few young people needed this expertise and it was evident that those needing support were well catered for in the establishment.

- 2.218 Comprehensive clinical management protocols should be developed, and more flexible prescribing options for opiate-dependent young people should be introduced. (8.48)

**Achieved.** Young people were questioned about substance use as part of the reception screening. If a young person showed signs of or admitted to using illegal substances or alcohol, a comprehensive assessment was undertaken and they were seen by the GP and ongoing management prescribed. Clinical protocols covering opiate, alcohol, amphetamine/crack cocaine and benzodiazepines were in place. The protocols included care plans, prescribing and resettlement pathways.

- 2.219 The establishment should publicise the availability of voluntary drug testing more widely. (8.49)

**Not achieved.** Voluntary drug testing (VDT) was not undertaken. There appeared to be confusion about who was responsible for conducting VDT. The YPSMS workers we spoke to told us that health care was responsible, but health care only conducted urine tests if they suspected a young person had or was using alcohol or drugs.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

## Additional information

---

- 2.220 The YPSMS was well established and comprised a team leader and 11 substance misuse workers, but no officers. Staff commented that there were insufficient computers, leading to delays in completing case notes. All young people were seen by a worker within 24 hours of arrival and an assessment completed. Any young person undergoing detoxification was seen every day, although there were very few. The team maintained links with external YOT and YPSMS teams throughout the young person's time in custody. The team attended the wings frequently so that young people could seek advice if necessary. They provided smoking cessation courses as well as the substance misuse awareness programme and delivered a half day drugs and alcohol programme. A four-day alcohol course was run in conjunction with the gym. The team attended community reviews with YOT workers.

- 2.221 Mandatory drug testing should not be used for children and young people under 18. (8.50)

**Not achieved.** There had been no changes in this practice since the previous inspection. The random mandatory drug testing rate was less than 1% and, although the self-contained suite provided suitable facilities for random testing and officers conducting the procedure had

received child protection training, all young people still had to undergo strip-searching as a matter of routine.

#### **Further recommendation**

- 2.222 Young people undergoing mandatory drug tests should not be strip-searched unless this is deemed necessary following a risk assessment.

#### **Accommodation**

---

- 2.223 The establishment was unable to provide detailed information about the accommodation young people went to on release. However, records showed that in April, May and June 2010, 98.6% of young people released went to settled accommodation.
- 2.224 In our survey, young people did not cite finding suitable accommodation as a problem, which reflected the results of the establishment's internal resettlement survey. There was no specialist accommodation adviser. Young people who had problems with accommodation were identified early in the training planning process and caseworkers liaised effectively with home YOTs in the young person's local area.
- 2.225 The establishment had made links with two voluntary sector housing projects which provided specialist housing for young people who were not able to return to their families.
- 2.226 The business development officer was involved in an initiative to provide accommodation for young people returning to Sheffield.

#### **Finance, benefit and debt**

---

- 2.227 Our survey indicated that the majority of young people had not been offered assistance with finance or debt, although caseworkers said that this was not a critical issue and they were able to give advice when required. An excellent booklet had been produced, which explained clearly how young people should manage their finances while in custody.
- 2.228 Arrangements were made by caseworkers and Connexions workers to set up bank accounts for young people going into an education or training placement so that they could receive an education maintenance allowance.

#### **Attitudes, thinking and behaviour**

---

- 2.229 There were four life skills programmes which addressed different attitudes and behaviours, all of which ran for a significant period to make an impact. The establishment ran the only accredited offending behaviour programme, JET (juvenile enhanced thinking), designed for young people under the age of 18 years. The referral system was effective and the psychology team ensured that the programmes delivered met the needs of young people. Take up of the programmes available was high.
- 2.230 Three Lucy Faithfull Foundation therapists delivered an individual therapeutic programme to 18 young people who had been convicted of sexual abuse. However, there were usually between 25 and 30 sex offenders in the establishment and a significant number of these had no therapeutic input.

## Section 3: Summary of recommendations

The following is a list of both repeated and further recommendations included in this report. The reference numbers in brackets refer to the paragraph location in the main report.

---

<b>Main recommendations</b>	<b>To the governor</b>
-----------------------------	------------------------

---

- |     |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 3.1 | Children and young people should only be strip-searched on the basis of a thorough risk assessment that indicates that this procedure is necessary to protect them or others from harm. (2.1)                                                                                                                                   |
| 3.2 | All assessments of young people should be coordinated within a comprehensive care plan. The care plan should be regularly reviewed by a multidisciplinary team of staff involved in the delivery of the care plan. Complex models of assessment and care should not be introduced until staff have been properly trained. (2.6) |

---

<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>To the Youth Justice Board</b>
-----------------------	-----------------------------------

---

### **Residential units**

---

- |     |                                                                                                                                                                      |
|-----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 3.3 | Young people should be managed in small groups within the residential units so that all young people have daily access to association, telephones and showers. (2.3) |
|-----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

---

<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>To the governor</b>
------------------------	------------------------

---

### **First days in custody**

---

- |     |                                                                                                                                                         |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 3.4 | Young people being admitted to reception should have adequate access to useful information in a variety of different languages. (2.11)                  |
| 3.5 | Trained Insiders should be available in reception, as well as on Benbow unit. (2.12)                                                                    |
| 3.6 | Young people on induction should be fully occupied and not spend time locked in their cells because of a lack of spaces on induction activities. (2.18) |

### **Residential units**

---

- |      |                                                                                                                                                                      |
|------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 3.7  | Young people should be managed in small groups within the residential units so that all young people have daily access to association, telephones and showers. (2.3) |
| 3.8  | All units should have adequate laundry facilities. (2.22)                                                                                                            |
| 3.9  | The centralised system for monitoring responses to call bells should be reintroduced. (2.23)                                                                         |
| 3.10 | Young people should be able to shower on their unit each day. (2.24)                                                                                                 |
| 3.11 | Young people should have lockable storage facilities in their cells. (2.25)                                                                                          |

- 3.12 All young people should be issued with a duvet, regardless of their level on the rewards and sanctions scheme. (2.27)
- 3.13 Young people should be given adequate equipment to clean their cells. (2.30)
- 3.14 Each unit should hold its own regular consultation meeting. (2.31)

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

---

- 3.15 Staff should display their names on their uniform clearly. (2.33)

### **Personal officers**

---

- 3.16 Residential support officers (RSOs) should be more involved in planning the care of the young people they are responsible for. (2.34)
- 3.17 There should be continuity of care and young people should not experience unnecessary changes to their allocated RSO when they move cells. (2.36)
- 3.18 RSOs and case workers should meet regularly to discuss and review the progress of the young people they are jointly responsible for. (2.37)

### **Safeguarding children**

---

- 3.19 Children and young people should be represented on the safeguarding children committee. (2.40)
- 3.20 There should be a code of conduct informing staff of their duty to raise legitimate concerns about the conduct of any member of staff in relation to the treatment of children within the establishment (a whistle-blowing procedure). (2.42)
- 3.21 The safeguarding children strategy meeting should monitor and review the implementation of the safeguarding children policy. (2.48)
- 3.22 Public protection should be included as part of the remit of the safeguarding committee. (2.49)
- 3.23 Data regarding injuries sustained by young people should be routinely analysed for patterns or trends and monitored by the safeguards committee. (2.50)
- 3.24 All staff should have enhanced level Criminal Records Bureau clearance. (2.51)

### **Bullying**

---

- 3.25 Young people identified at stage one or two of the anti-bullying strategy should have individual plans incorporating a range of interventions, including individual and group work, to address their behaviour. (2.55)
- 3.26 Victims of bullying should be supported through an individual care plan. (2.56)
- 3.27 All staff should undertake anti-bullying training. (2.57)

## **Child protection**

---

- 3.28 All staff should be trained in child protection, particularly in key posts working directly with children or making decisions concerning child protection referrals. Negotiations should take place with Leeds Social Care in an effort to resume a programme of joint training. (2.73)
- 3.29 The establishment should approach the local authority to seek an agreement setting out how the full range of responsibilities of the LADO, as described in Working Together to Safeguard Children guidance, will be discharged. (2.75)
- 3.30 There should be a procedure to ensure the early identification of looked-after children and appropriately trained staff should be designated to ensure that the specific needs of looked-after children are properly met. (2.79)

## **Diversity**

---

- 3.31 Staff in contact positions should receive diversity training and refresher training. (2.80)
- 3.32 The disability liaison role should have adequate profiled time to assess and provide appropriate services and facilities for young people with a disability. (2.81)

## **Foreign nationals**

---

- 3.33 The foreign nationals coordinator should meet regularly with foreign national young people, both individually and as a group, to ensure that they are receiving their entitlements, are properly supported and that their specific needs are met. (2.94)

## **Contact with the outside world**

---

- 3.34 Young people should have daily access to the telephones. (2.96)
- 3.35 Visits entitlements should increase to one each week for sentenced young people, and, within reason, there should be no limit to the number of visits that unsentenced young people are permitted to have. (2.97)

## **Health services**

---

- 3.36 Young people should be able to submit applications for health services confidentially. (2.108)
- 3.37 Discipline staff should be available to support all health care functions. (2.110)
- 3.38 Information about health services and health promotion material should be available in languages to meet the needs of the population. (2.114)
- 3.39 Primary mental health nurses should have protected time to develop the provision for tiers one and two mental health problems and carry their own caseload of patients. (2.124)

### **Learning and skills**

---

- 3.40 Punctuality to lessons should be improved. (2.131)
- 3.41 The curriculum should meet the needs of young people who are under school-leaving age. (2.132)
- 3.42 Young people should not be employed full time without education and/or vocational training. (2.134)
- 3.43 Attendance by education staff at training planning meetings should be improved. (2.135)
- 3.44 Young people should have access to the library in the evenings and at weekends. (2.136)

### **Physical education and health promotion**

---

- 3.45 Attendance at core PE lessons should be improved. (2.137)
- 3.46 Links with the health care department should be improved. (2.139)
- 3.47 The quality of the showers should be improved and they should be cubicularised. (2.140)
- 3.48 Information about young people's language, literacy and numeracy support needs should be routinely passed to education, training and PE staff. (2.148)

### **Time out of cell**

---

- 3.49 A minimum of one hour a day in the fresh air should be provided every day for all young people. (2.152)
- 3.50 Alternative activity should be provided for young people who are unoccupied and locked up because their scheduled activity is cancelled, they are unemployed or they are being educated on the unit. (2.153)
- 3.51 Outside recreational areas should be equipped with outdoor activity and games equipment, with seating in a quiet area for young people to be able to talk to one another. (2.154)
- 3.52 Time out of cell at weekends should be improved. (2.155)

### **Security**

---

- 3.53 Strip-searches should not be carried out routinely and should only be authorised on the basis of a risk assessment which identifies that it is necessary to prevent the risk of harm to the young person and others. (2.158)

### **Disciplinary procedures**

---

- 3.54 Minor infringements of prison rules and childish behaviour should be dealt with through informal procedures. (2.173)



### **Use of force**

---

- 3.55 The use of force should only be used as a last resort and where there is immediate risk to safety and not merely to obtain compliance. (2.175)

### **Separation and care unit**

---

- 3.56 The rules and information about the separation and care unit should be available to young people in a format that they are able to understand. (2.178)
- 3.57 All young people located in the separation and care unit should have access to a shower every day. (2.182)
- 3.58 Living conditions in the separation and care unit should be improved. (2.188)
- 3.59 The regime should be developed to include opportunities for purposeful activity. (2.189)
- 3.60 There should be proper governance surrounding the use of the robust cells for separation purposes. (2.190)

### **Rewards and sanctions**

---

- 3.61 Deprivation of family contact should not be used as part of a punishment and family days should be offered to all young people, regardless of regime level. (2.191)

### **Catering**

---

- 3.62 All young people should eat their meals in an appropriate setting and not in their cells. (2.195)

### **Strategic management of resettlement**

---

- 3.63 The establishment should encourage representatives from relevant community-based organisations to attend the resettlement policy committee. (2.203)
- 3.64 Data should be collected to inform the monitoring of services offered under each resettlement pathway. (2.205)

### **Training planning and remand management**

---

- 3.65 All relevant departments should be represented at planning reviews or send a detailed report in advance. (2.215)

### **Substance use**

---

- 3.66 The establishment should publicise the availability of voluntary drug testing more widely. (2.219)
- 3.67 Young people undergoing mandatory drug tests should not be strip-searched unless this is deemed necessary following a risk assessment (2.222)

## Appendix I: Inspection team

---

Ian Macfadyen  
Ian Thomson  
Angela Johnson  
Gordon Riach  
Bridget McEvilly  
Bob Cowdrey

Team leader  
Inspector  
Inspector  
Inspector  
Health care inspector  
Ofsted inspector

## Appendix II: Prison population profile <sup>1</sup>

Status	Number of juveniles	%
Sentenced	217	75.09
Convicted but unsentenced	8	0
Remand	62	21.45
Detainees (single power status)	0	0
Detainees (dual power status)	2	0.69
<b>Total</b>	<b>289</b>	<b>100</b>

### Number of DTOs by age & sentence (full sentence length inc. the time in the community)

Sentence	4 mths	6 mths	8 mths	10 mths	12 mths	18 mths	24 mths	Total
<b>Age</b>								
15 years	3	0	3	2	2	3	1	14
16 years	4	1	9	3	6	3	4	30
17 years	12	1	16	7	13	11	6	66
18 years	0	0	2	2	5	5	3	17
<b>Total</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>127</b>

### Number of SECTION 53 (2)//91s (determinate sentences only) by age & sentence

Sentence	Under 2 yrs	2-3 yrs	3-4 yrs	4-5 yrs	5 yrs +	Total
<b>Age</b>						
15 years	0	0	0	0	0	0
16 years	0	0	0	0	0	0
17 years	0	0	0	0	0	0
18 years	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

<sup>1</sup> Please note: the following figures were supplied by the establishment and any errors are the establishment's own.

Number of EXTENDED SENTENCES UNDER SECTION 228 (extended sentence for public protection)

Sentence	Under 2 yrs	2-3 yrs	3-4 yrs	4-5 yrs	5 yrs +	Total
Age						
15 years	0	0	0	0		0
16 years	2	0	0	0		2
17 years	2	0	0	0		2
18 years	1	0	0	0		1
Total	5	0	0	0		5

Number OF INDETERMINATE SENTENCES by age

Sentence	Section 90 (HMP)	Life sentence under section 91	Section 53 (1)	Section 226 (DPP)	Total
Age					
15 years	0	0	0	0	0
16 years	0	0	0	1	1
17 years	0	0	0	4	4
18 years	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0	5	5

LENGTH OF STAY for UNSENTENCED by age (including one detainee)

Length of stay	<1 mth	1-3 mths	3-6 mths	6-12 mths	1-2 yrs	2 yrs +	Total
Age							
15 years	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
16 years	0	5	4	1	0	0	10
17 years	0	10	1	0	0	0	11
18 years	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	18	5	1	0	0	24

Age	Number of juveniles	%
15 years	26	9.00
16 years	70	24.22
17 years	161	55.71

18 years	32	11.07
<b>Total</b>	<b>289</b>	<b>100</b>

Nationality	Number of juveniles	%
British	279	96.54
Foreign nationals	5	1.73
Not stated	5	1.73
<b>Total</b>	<b>289</b>	<b>100</b>

Ethnicity	Number of juveniles	%
<i>White</i>		
British	244	85.1
Irish		
Other white	2	0.7
<i>Mixed</i>		
White and black Caribbean	2	0.7
White and black African		
White and Asian		
Other mixed	13	4.3
<i>Asian or Asian British</i>		
Indian		
Pakistani	9	3.1
Bangladeshi	2	0.7
Other Asian	2	0.7
<i>Black or black British</i>		
Caribbean	7	2.4
African	4	1.4
Other black	1	0.3
<i>Chinese or other ethnic group</i>		
Chinese	1	0.3
Other ethnic group	1	0.35
<b>Total</b>	<b>289</b>	<b>100</b>

Religion	Number of juveniles	%
Baptist	0	0
Church of England	29	10.03
Roman Catholic	30	10.38
Other Christian denominations	11	3.81
Muslim	22	7.612
Sikh	0	0
Hindu	0	0
Buddhist	0	0
Jewish	0	0
Other	2	0.69
No religion	195	67.47
<b>Total</b>	<b>289</b>	<b>100</b>

# Appendix III: Summary of young people questionnaires and interviews

---

## **Survey methodology**

---

A voluntary, confidential and anonymous survey of a representative proportion of the population of children and young people (15–18 years) was carried out by HM Inspectorate of Prisons as part of an annual report on the young people's estate.

## **Choosing the sample size**

---

At the time of the survey on 28 June 2010, the population of young people at HMYOI Wetherby was 314. Questionnaires were offered to 209 young people.

Completion of the questionnaire was voluntary. Refusals were noted and no attempts were made to replace them.

Interviews were carried out with any respondents with literacy difficulties. In total, two respondents were interviewed.

## **Methodology**

---

Every attempt was made to distribute the questionnaires to each respondent on an individual basis. This gave researchers an opportunity to explain the independence of the Inspectorate and the purpose of the questionnaire, as well as to answer questions.

All completed questionnaires were confidential – only members of the Inspectorate saw them. In order to ensure confidentiality, respondents were asked to do one of the following:

- have their questionnaire ready to hand back to a member of the research team at a specified time
- seal the questionnaire in the envelope provided and hand it to a member of staff, if they were agreeable, or
- seal the questionnaire in the envelope provided and leave it in their room for collection.

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.

## **Response rates**

---

In total, 167 respondents completed and returned their questionnaires. This represented 53% of children and young people in the establishment at the time. The response rate from the sample was 80%.

Thirteen refused to complete a questionnaire, 15 questionnaires were not returned and 14 were returned blank.

## Comparisons

---

The following document details the results from the survey. All missing responses are excluded from the analysis. All data from each establishment have been weighted, in order to mimic a consistent percentage sampled in each establishment.

Presented alongside the results from this survey are the comparator figures for all children and young people surveyed in young offender institutions. This comparator is based on all responses from surveys carried out in all eight male establishments since 2009.

Also included are statistically significant differences between the responses of young people surveyed at HMYOI Wetherby in 2009 and the responses of this 2010 survey. It should be noted that, in order for statistical comparisons to be made between the most recent survey data and that of the previous survey, both sets of data have been coded in the same way. This may result in percentages from previous surveys looking higher or lower as some of our survey questions have changed. However, both percentages are true of the populations they were taken from, and the statistical significance is correct.

An additional document shows significant differences between the responses of young people from black and minority ethnic backgrounds and young people from white backgrounds, and significant differences between young Muslims and young non-Muslims.

Separate analyses for the specialist units Keppel and Anson have also been included.

In all the above documents, statistically significant differences are highlighted. Statistical significance merely indicates whether there is a real difference between the figures, that is the difference is not due to chance alone. Results that are significantly better are indicated by green shading, results that are significantly worse are indicated by blue shading, and where there is no significant difference there is no shading. Orange shading has been used to show a significant difference in demographic background details.

## Summary

---

In addition, summaries of the survey results have been included, which show a breakdown of responses for each question. Percentages have been rounded and therefore may not add up to 100%.

No questions have been filtered within the summary so all percentages refer to responses from the entire sample. The percentages to certain responses within the summary, for example 'not sentenced' options across questions, may differ slightly. This is due to different response rates across questions, meaning that the percentages have been calculated out of different totals (all missing data are excluded). The actual numbers will match up as the data are cleaned to be consistent.

Percentages shown in the summary may differ by 1 or 2% from that shown in the comparison data as the comparator data have been weighted for comparison purposes.



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



### Survey responses from children and young people: HMYOI Wetherby 2010

**Survey responses** (missing data has 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 2010	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Wetherby 2010	HMYOI Wetherby 2009
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better than the comparator				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse than the comparator				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in demographic details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		124	733	124	106
<b>SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU</b>					
1.1	Are you 18 years of age?	14%	11%	14%	10%
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	6%	4%	6%	0%
1.3	Is English your first language?	95%	92%	95%	98%
1.4	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other category)?	19%	32%	19%	20%
1.5	Are you Muslim?	10%	11%	10%	9%
1.6	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	5%	6%	5%	
1.7	Do you have any children?	16%	12%	16%	14%
1.8	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	9%	10%	9%	
1.9	Have you ever been in local authority care?	21%		21%	
<b>SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE</b>					
2.1	Are you sentenced?	75%	71%	75%	85%
2.2	Is your sentence 12 months or less?	41%	24%	41%	
2.3	Have you been in this establishment for one month or less?	24%	22%	24%	24%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	50%	42%	50%	44%
<b>SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS</b>					
For your most recent journey, either to or from court or between prisons, we want to know:					
3.1	Was the van clean?	47%	50%	47%	43%
3.2	Did you feel safe?	89%	76%	89%	81%
3.3	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or anyone of a different gender?	26%	31%	26%	33%
3.4	Did you spend more than four hours in the van?	2%	3%	2%	3%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:					
3.5	Were you offered a toilet break if you needed it?	14%	16%	14%	20%
3.6	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	40%	32%	40%	35%
3.7	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	54%	57%	54%	54%
3.8	Before you arrived here (either from court or another establishment), were you told that you would be coming to this establishment?	76%	81%	76%	
3.9	Before you arrived here (either from court or another establishment), were you given written information about coming to this establishment?	4%	4%	4%	

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

### Key to tables

		HMYOI Wetherby 2010	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Wetherby 2010	HMYOI Wetherby 2009
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better than the comparator				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse than the comparator				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in demographic details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		124	733	124	106
<b>SECTION 4: YOUR FIRST FEW DAYS HERE</b>					
<b>4.1</b>	Were you in reception for less than two hours?	75%	78%	75%	73%
<b>4.2</b>	When you were searched was this carried out in an understanding way?	76%	82%	76%	87%
<b>4.3</b>	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	69%	74%	69%	71%
When you first arrived, did staff ask if you needed help or support with any of the following:					
<b>4.4a</b>	Not being able to smoke?	69%	53%	69%	73%
<b>4.4b</b>	Loss of property?	16%	22%	16%	21%
<b>4.4c</b>	Housing problems?	13%	20%	13%	15%
<b>4.4d</b>	Needing protection from other young people?	16%	25%	16%	20%
<b>4.4e</b>	Letting family know where you are?	67%	64%	67%	53%
<b>4.4f</b>	Money worries?	16%	16%	16%	15%
<b>4.4g</b>	Feeling low/upset/needing someone to talk to?	47%	42%	47%	42%
<b>4.4h</b>	Health problems?	62%	57%	62%	51%
<b>4.4i</b>	Getting phone numbers?	45%	41%	45%	41%
<b>4.5</b>	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	80%	76%	80%	71%
When you first arrived, did you have problems with any of the following:					
<b>4.5a</b>	Not being able to smoke?	61%	49%	61%	52%
<b>4.5b</b>	Loss of property?	15%	14%	15%	7%
<b>4.5c</b>	Housing problems?	11%	14%	11%	5%
<b>4.5d</b>	Needing protection from other young people?	5%	4%	5%	1%
<b>4.5e</b>	Letting family know where you are?	19%	23%	19%	24%
<b>4.5f</b>	Money worries?	16%	17%	16%	9%
<b>4.5g</b>	Feeling low/upset/needing someone to talk to?	18%	15%	18%	17%
<b>4.5h</b>	Health problems?	9%	11%	9%	7%
<b>4.5i</b>	Getting phone numbers?	33%	26%	33%	23%
When you first arrived, were you given any of the following:					
<b>4.6a</b>	A reception pack?	88%	72%	88%	88%
<b>4.6b</b>	The opportunity to have a shower?	17%	39%	17%	12%
<b>4.6c</b>	Something to eat?	73%	85%	73%	81%
<b>4.6d</b>	A free phone call to friends/family?	78%	82%	78%	73%
<b>4.6e</b>	Information about the PIN telephone system?	47%	69%	47%	54%
<b>4.6f</b>	Information about feeling low/upset?	27%	39%	27%	33%

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

### Key to tables

		HMYOI Wetherby 2010	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Wetherby 2010	HMYOI Wetherby 2009
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better than the comparator				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse than the comparator				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in demographic details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		124	733	124	106
<b>SECTION 4: YOUR FIRST FEW DAYS HERE cont.</b>					
Within your first 24 hours, did you have access to the following people or services:					
<b>4.7a</b>	The chaplain or religious leader?	57%	47%	57%	51%
<b>4.7b</b>	A peer mentor, Listener or the Samaritans?	19%	25%	19%	17%
<b>4.7c</b>	Did you have access to the prison shop/canteen?	14%	16%	14%	13%
<b>4.8</b>	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a member of health care staff?	72%	66%	72%	
<b>4.9</b>	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	81%	82%	81%	82%
<b>4.10</b>	For those who have been on an induction course: did it cover everything you needed to know about the establishment?	65%	70%	65%	67%
<b>SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT</b>					
<b>5.1</b>	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	29%	81%	29%	14%
<b>5.2</b>	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	29%	34%	29%	19%
<b>5.3</b>	Do you find the food here good/very good?	16%	23%	16%	15%
<b>5.4</b>	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	39%	54%	39%	9%
<b>5.5</b>	Is it easy/very easy for you to attend religious services?	61%	61%	61%	58%
<b>5.6a</b>	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	48%	55%	48%	44%
<b>5.6b</b>	Can you speak to a religious leader in private if you want to?	61%	68%	61%	61%
<b>5.7</b>	Is there a member of staff you can turn to with a problem?	55%	76%	55%	65%
<b>5.8</b>	Do you feel that most of the staff here treat you with respect?	55%	72%	55%	66%
<b>SECTION 6: HEALTH SERVICES</b>					
<b>6.1</b>	Did you have a full health assessment the day after your arrival?	62%	57%	62%	
<b>6.2</b>	For those who have been to health care: do you think the overall quality is good/very good?	53%	68%	53%	58%
<b>6.3a</b>	Is it easy for you to see the doctor?	53%	54%	53%	45%
<b>6.3b</b>	Is it easy for you to see the nurse?	65%	79%	65%	63%
<b>6.3c</b>	Is it easy for you to see the dentist?	24%	35%	24%	12%
<b>6.3d</b>	Is it easy for you to see the optician?	21%	28%	21%	17%
<b>6.3e</b>	Is it easy for you to see the pharmacist?	29%	31%	29%	24%
<b>6.4</b>	If you are taking medication, have you had any problems getting your medication?	36%	33%	36%	36%
<b>6.5a</b>	Did you have any problems with alcohol when you first arrived?	19%	15%	19%	20%
<b>6.5b</b>	Have you received any help with any alcohol problems here?	14%	12%	14%	20%
<b>6.6a</b>	Did you have any problems with drugs when you first arrived?	42%	35%	42%	42%
<b>6.6b</b>	Do you have any problems with drugs now?	13%	6%	13%	10%
<b>6.6c</b>	Have you received any help with any drug problems here?	31%	26%	31%	27%
<b>6.7</b>	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs here?	26%	16%	26%	33%
<b>6.8</b>	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	22%	21%	22%	28%
<b>6.9</b>	If you feel you have emotional or mental health problems, are you being helped by anyone here?	40%	73%	40%	

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

### Key to tables

		HMYOI Wetherby 2010	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Wetherby 2010	HMYOI Wetherby 2009
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better than the comparator				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse than the comparator				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in demographic details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		124	733	124	106
<b>SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS</b>					
7.1	Do you know how to make an application?	84%	90%	84%	86%
7.2	Is it easy to make an application?	73%	84%	73%	75%
For those who have made an application:					
7.3a	Do you feel applications are sorted out fairly?	77%	66%	77%	70%
7.3b	Do you feel applications are sorted out promptly (within seven days)?	71%	57%	71%	58%
7.4	Do you know how to make a complaint?	82%	86%	82%	87%
7.5	Is it easy to make a complaint?	64%	68%	64%	75%
For those who have made a complaint:					
7.6a	Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	27%	41%	27%	35%
7.6b	Do you feel complaints are sorted out promptly (within seven days)?	46%	46%	46%	43%
7.7	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	17%	22%	17%	
Can you speak to the following people when you need to:					
7.8a	A peer mentor or Listener?	29%	38%	29%	31%
7.8b	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)	26%	33%	26%	28%
7.8c	An advocate (an outside person to help you)	36%	40%	36%	45%
<b>SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE</b>					
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	28%	28%	28%	30%
8.2	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	52%	55%	52%	61%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	57%	60%	57%	51%
8.4	Have you had a 'nicking' (adjudication) since you have been here?	50%	54%	50%	62%
8.5	Was the 'nicking' (adjudication) process explained clearly to you?	75%	88%	75%	91%
8.6	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	35%	30%	35%	26%
8.7	For those who had spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit: did the staff treat you well/very well?	75%	41%	75%	33%

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

### Key to tables

		HMYOI Wetherby 2010	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Wetherby 2010	HMYOI Wetherby 2009
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better than the comparator				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse than the comparator				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in demographic details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		124	733	124	106
<b>SECTION 9: SAFETY</b>					
<b>9.1</b>	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	26%	29%	26%	26%
<b>9.3</b>	Has another young person or group of young people victimised (insulted or assaulted) you here?	25%	24%	25%	18%
If you have felt victimised by another young person/group of young people, did the incident involve:					
<b>9.4a</b>	Insulting remarks?	15%	14%	15%	9%
<b>9.4b</b>	Physical abuse?	11%	11%	11%	7%
<b>9.4c</b>	Sexual abuse?	2%	1%	2%	1%
<b>9.4d</b>	Racial or ethnic abuse?	3%	2%	3%	2%
<b>9.4e</b>	Your religious beliefs?	1%	1%	1%	3%
<b>9.4f</b>	Your disability?	2%	2%	2%	0%
<b>9.4g</b>	Drugs?	4%	3%	4%	1%
<b>9.4h</b>	Having your canteen/property taken?	4%	5%	4%	0%
<b>9.4i</b>	Because you were new here?	7%	9%	7%	3%
<b>9.4j</b>	Being from a different part of the country than others?	5%	6%	5%	3%
<b>9.4k</b>	Gang related issues?	9%	5%	9%	4%
<b>9.4l</b>	Your offence/crime?	4%	3%	4%	2%
<b>9.6</b>	Has a member of staff or group of staff victimised (insulted or assaulted) you here?	29%	25%	29%	18%
If you have felt victimised by a member of staff/group of staff members, did the incident involve:					
<b>9.7a</b>	Insulting remarks?	20%	15%	20%	11%
<b>9.7b</b>	Physical abuse?	11%	5%	11%	2%
<b>9.7c</b>	Sexual abuse?	0%	1%	0%	0%
<b>9.7d</b>	Racial or ethnic abuse?	4%	4%	4%	0%
<b>9.7e</b>	Your religious beliefs?	4%	2%	4%	1%
<b>9.7f</b>	Your disability?	3%	1%	3%	0%
<b>9.7g</b>	Drugs?	4%	2%	4%	0%
<b>9.7h</b>	Having your canteen/property taken?	2%	3%	2%	1%
<b>9.7i</b>	Because you were new here?	4%	4%	4%	2%
<b>9.7j</b>	Being from a different part of the country than others?	4%	2%	4%	0%
<b>9.7k</b>	Gang related issues?	3%	3%	3%	1%
<b>9.7l</b>	Your offence/crime?	1%	3%	1%	2%
<b>9.9</b>	If you were being victimised by another young person or a member of staff would you be able to tell anyone about it?	65%	66%	65%	60%
<b>9.10</b>	If you did tell a member of staff that you were being victimised do you think it would be taken seriously?	30%	42%	30%	37%

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

### Key to tables

		HMYOI Wetherby 2010	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Wetherby 2010	HMYOI Wetherby 2009
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better than the comparator				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse than the comparator				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in demographic details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		124	733	124	106
<b>SECTION 9: SAFETY cont.</b>					
<b>9.11</b>	Is shouting through the windows a problem here?	57%	40%	57%	45%
<b>9.12</b>	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	28%	44%	28%	36%
<b>SECTION 10: ACTIVITIES</b>					
<b>10.1</b>	Were you 14 or younger when you were last at school?	45%	40%	45%	44%
<b>10.2a</b>	Have you ever been excluded from school?	87%	88%	87%	90%
<b>10.2b</b>	Have you ever truanted from school?	72%	72%	72%	78%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:					
<b>10.3a</b>	Education?	59%	76%	59%	59%
<b>10.3b</b>	A job in this establishment?	55%	28%	55%	59%
<b>10.3c</b>	Vocational or skills training?	21%	24%	21%	22%
<b>10.3d</b>	Offending behaviour programmes?	20%	20%	20%	24%
For those who have taken part in the following activities while in this prison: do you think that they will help you when you leave prison?					
<b>10.4a</b>	Education?	62%	72%	62%	67%
<b>10.4b</b>	A job in this establishment?	62%	61%	62%	68%
<b>10.4c</b>	Vocational or skills training?	56%	60%	56%	79%
<b>10.4d</b>	Offending behaviour programmes?	54%	49%	54%	72%
<b>10.5</b>	Do you usually have association every day?	16%	79%	16%	10%
<b>10.6</b>	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	11%	9%	11%	10%
<b>10.7</b>	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	34%	44%	34%	5%
<b>SECTION 11: KEEPING IN TOUCH WITH FAMILY AND FRIENDS</b>					
<b>11.1</b>	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	23%	72%	23%	13%
<b>11.2</b>	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	34%	39%	34%	33%
<b>11.3</b>	Is it easy/very easy for your family and friends to visit you here?	46%	51%	46%	49%
<b>11.4</b>	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	39%	38%	39%	
<b>11.5</b>	Do your visits start on time?	48%	49%	48%	41%
<b>11.6</b>	Are you and your visitors treated well/very well by visits staff?	47%	52%	47%	52%
<b>SECTION 12: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE</b>					
For those who have met their personal officer:					
<b>12.1</b>	Did you meet your personal officer within the first week?	54%	48%	54%	56%
<b>12.2</b>	Do you see your personal officer at least once a week?	44%	69%	44%	58%
<b>12.3</b>	Do you feel your personal officer has helped you?	50%	62%	50%	45%

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

### Key to tables

		HM YOI Wetherby 2010	Young people's comparator	HM YOI Wetherby 2010	HM YOI Wetherby 2009
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better than the comparator				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse than the comparator				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in demographic details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		124	733	124	106
<b>SECTION 12: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE cont.</b>					
<b>12.4</b>	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	51%	62%	51%	
For those with a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan:					
<b>12.5a</b>	Were you involved in the development of your plan?	51%	63%	51%	
<b>12.5b</b>	Do you understand the targets set in your plan?	62%	77%	62%	
<b>12.6</b>	Has your YOT worker been in touch with you since your arrival here?	80%	81%	80%	81%
<b>12.7</b>	Do you know how to get in touch with your YOT worker?	57%	59%	57%	58%
Please answer the following about your preparation for release:					
<b>12.8</b>	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	43%	41%	43%	45%
<b>12.8</b>	Are you going to school or college on release?	57%	67%	57%	54%
<b>12.8</b>	Do you have a job to go to on release?	21%	22%	21%	21%
Do you know who to contact for help with the following in preparation for your release:					
<b>12.9</b>	Finding accommodation	36%	43%	36%	48%
<b>12.9</b>	Getting into school or college	43%	59%	43%	49%
<b>12.9</b>	Getting a job	41%	55%	41%	54%
<b>12.9</b>	Help with money/finances	33%	42%	33%	40%
<b>12.9</b>	Help with claiming benefits	31%	36%	31%	37%
<b>12.9</b>	Continuing health services	21%	28%	21%	31%
<b>12.9</b>	Opening a bank account	29%	40%	29%	38%
<b>12.9</b>	Avoiding bad relationships	28%	30%	28%	29%
Do you think you will have a problem with the following, when you are released:					
<b>12.10</b>	Finding accommodation?	19%	26%	19%	20%
<b>12.10</b>	Getting into school or college?	18%	23%	18%	26%
<b>12.10</b>	Getting a job?	43%	47%	43%	47%
<b>12.10</b>	Help with money/finances?	30%	37%	30%	28%
<b>12.10</b>	Help with claiming benefits?	21%	25%	21%	19%
<b>12.10</b>	Continuing health services?	11%	11%	11%	10%
<b>12.10</b>	Opening a bank account?	13%	13%	13%	12%
<b>12.10</b>	Avoiding bad relationships?	16%	19%	16%	19%
For those who were sentenced:					
<b>12.12</b>	Do you want to stop offending?	90%	93%	90%	91%
<b>12.13</b>	Have you done anything or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?	38%	49%	38%	50%

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



### Survey responses from children and young people: Keppel unit 2010

**Survey responses** (missing data has 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 2010	HMYOI Wetherby 2010	Keppel unit 2010	Keppel unit 2009
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better than the comparator				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse than the comparator				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in demographic details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		24	124	24	42
<b>SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU</b>					
1.1	Are you 18 years of age?	29%	14%	29%	9%
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	0%	6%	0%	5%
1.3	Is English your first language?	100%	95%	100%	96%
1.4	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other category)?	9%	19%	9%	9%
1.5	Are you Muslim?	9%	10%	9%	7%
1.6	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	12%	5%	12%	
1.7	Do you have any children?	18%	16%	18%	13%
1.8	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	38%	9%	38%	
1.9	Have you ever been in local authority care?	41%	21%	41%	
<b>SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE</b>					
2.1	Are you sentenced?	97%	75%	97%	83%
2.2	Is your sentence 12 months or less?	24%	41%	24%	
2.3	Have you been in this establishment for one month or less?	0%	24%	0%	18%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	76%	50%	76%	29%
<b>SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS</b>					
For your most recent journey, either to or from court or between prisons, we want to know:					
3.1	Was the van clean?	50%	47%	50%	48%
3.2	Did you feel safe?	78%	89%	78%	73%
3.3	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or anyone of a different gender?	29%	26%	29%	36%
3.4	Did you spend more than four hours in the van?	9%	2%	9%	15%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:					
3.5	Were you offered a toilet break if you needed it?	20%	14%	20%	12%
3.6	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	22%	40%	22%	43%
3.7	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	76%	54%	76%	70%
3.8	Before you arrived here (either from court or another establishment), were you told that you would be coming to this establishment?	62%	76%	62%	
3.9	Before you arrived here (either from court or another establishment), were you given written information about coming to this establishment?	0%	4%	0%	



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

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better than the comparator	Keppel unit 2010	HMV01 Wetherby 2010	Keppel unit 2010	Keppel unit 2009
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse than the comparator				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in demographic details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		24	124	24	42
<b>SECTION 4: YOUR FIRST FEW DAYS HERE</b>					
<b>4.1</b>	Were you in reception for less than two hours?	68%	75%	68%	57%
<b>4.2</b>	When you were searched was this carried out in an understanding way?	82%	76%	82%	80%
<b>4.3</b>	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	82%	69%	82%	62%
When you first arrived, did staff ask if you needed help or support with any of the following:					
<b>4.4a</b>	Not being able to smoke?	47%	69%	47%	69%
<b>4.4b</b>	Loss of property?	38%	16%	38%	20%
<b>4.4c</b>	Housing problems?	23%	13%	23%	13%
<b>4.4d</b>	Needing protection from other young people?	28%	16%	28%	20%
<b>4.4e</b>	Letting family know where you are?	77%	67%	77%	63%
<b>4.4f</b>	Money worries?	28%	16%	28%	20%
<b>4.4g</b>	Feeling low/upset/needing someone to talk to?	72%	47%	72%	42%
<b>4.4h</b>	Health problems?	62%	62%	62%	47%
<b>4.4i</b>	Getting phone numbers?	57%	45%	57%	53%
<b>4.5</b>	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	77%	80%	77%	91%
When you first arrived, did you have problems with any of the following:					
<b>4.5a</b>	Not being able to smoke?	55%	61%	55%	70%
<b>4.5b</b>	Loss of property?	23%	15%	23%	19%
<b>4.5c</b>	Housing problems?	23%	11%	23%	16%
<b>4.5d</b>	Needing protection from other young people?	10%	5%	10%	19%
<b>4.5e</b>	Letting family know where you are?	32%	19%	32%	40%
<b>4.5f</b>	Money worries?	13%	16%	13%	16%
<b>4.5g</b>	Feeling low/upset/needing someone to talk to?	42%	18%	42%	44%
<b>4.5h</b>	Health problems?	42%	9%	42%	21%
<b>4.5i</b>	Getting phone numbers?	23%	33%	23%	47%
When you first arrived, were you given any of the following:					
<b>4.6a</b>	A reception pack?	76%	88%	76%	71%
<b>4.6b</b>	The opportunity to have a shower?	41%	17%	41%	44%
<b>4.6c</b>	Something to eat?	76%	73%	76%	80%
<b>4.6d</b>	A free phone call to friends/family?	91%	78%	91%	76%
<b>4.6e</b>	Information about the PIN telephone system?	68%	47%	68%	53%
<b>4.6f</b>	Information about feeling low/upset?	53%	27%	53%	53%

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

### Key to tables

		Keppel unit 2010	HMV01 Wetherby 2010	Keppel unit 2010	Keppel unit 2009
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better than the comparator				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse than the comparator				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in demographic details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		24	124	24	42
<b>SECTION 4: YOUR FIRST FEW DAYS HERE cont.</b>					
Within your first 24 hours, did you have access to the following people or services:					
<b>4.7a</b>	The chaplain or religious leader?	79%	57%	79%	70%
<b>4.7b</b>	A peer mentor, Listener or the Samaritans?	41%	19%	41%	49%
<b>4.7c</b>	Did you have access to the prison shop/canteen?	29%	14%	29%	30%
<b>4.8</b>	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a member of health care staff?	71%	72%	71%	
<b>4.9</b>	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	59%	81%	59%	75%
<b>4.10</b>	For those who have been on an induction course: did it cover everything you needed to know about the establishment?	75%	65%	75%	73%
<b>SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT</b>					
<b>5.1</b>	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	100%	29%	100%	98%
<b>5.2</b>	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	59%	29%	59%	53%
<b>5.3</b>	Do you find the food here good/very good?	18%	16%	18%	32%
<b>5.4</b>	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	62%	39%	62%	20%
<b>5.5</b>	Is it easy/very easy for you to attend religious services?	79%	61%	79%	63%
<b>5.6a</b>	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	91%	48%	91%	71%
<b>5.6b</b>	Can you speak to a religious leader in private if you want to?	90%	61%	90%	81%
<b>5.7</b>	Is there a member of staff you can turn to with a problem?	76%	55%	76%	80%
<b>5.8</b>	Do you feel that most of the staff here treat you with respect?	79%	55%	79%	92%
<b>SECTION 6: HEALTH SERVICES</b>					
<b>6.1</b>	Did you have a full health assessment the day after your arrival?	71%	62%	71%	
<b>6.2</b>	For those who have been to health care: do you think the overall quality is good/very good?	96%	53%	96%	70%
<b>6.3a</b>	Is it easy for you to see the doctor?	88%	53%	88%	77%
<b>6.3b</b>	Is it easy for you to see the nurse?	97%	65%	97%	83%
<b>6.3c</b>	Is it easy for you to see the dentist?	55%	24%	55%	14%
<b>6.3d</b>	Is it easy for you to see the optician?	55%	21%	55%	24%
<b>6.3e</b>	Is it easy for you to see the pharmacist?	43%	29%	43%	41%
<b>6.4</b>	If you are taking medication, have you had any problems getting your medication?	37%	36%	37%	18%
<b>6.5a</b>	Did you have any problems with alcohol when you first arrived?	32%	19%	32%	28%
<b>6.5b</b>	Have you received any help with any alcohol problems here?	30%	14%	30%	19%
<b>6.6a</b>	Did you have any problems with drugs when you first arrived?	59%	42%	59%	44%
<b>6.6b</b>	Do you have any problems with drugs now?	0%	13%	0%	16%
<b>6.6c</b>	Have you received any help with any drug problems here?	53%	31%	53%	46%
<b>6.7</b>	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs here?	22%	26%	22%	30%
<b>6.8</b>	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	38%	22%	38%	57%
<b>6.9</b>	If you feel you have emotional or mental health problems, are you being helped by anyone here?	91%	40%	91%	

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

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better than the comparator	Keppel unit 2010	HMYOI Wetherby 2010	Keppel unit 2010	Keppel unit 2009
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse than the comparator				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in demographic details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		24	124	24	42
<b>SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS</b>					
7.1	Do you know how to make an application?	100%	84%	100%	96%
7.2	Is it easy to make an application?	97%	73%	97%	91%
For those who have made an application:					
7.3a	Do you feel applications are sorted out fairly?	90%	77%	90%	66%
7.3b	Do you feel applications are sorted out promptly (within seven days)?	74%	71%	74%	66%
7.4	Do you know how to make a complaint?	97%	82%	97%	84%
7.5	Is it easy to make a complaint?	88%	64%	88%	71%
For those who have made a complaint:					
7.6a	Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	74%	27%	74%	52%
7.6b	Do you feel complaints are sorted out promptly (within seven days)?	70%	46%	70%	54%
7.7	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	18%	17%	18%	
Can you speak to the following people when you need to:					
7.8a	A peer mentor or Listener?	59%	29%	59%	52%
7.8b	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)	76%	26%	76%	49%
7.8c	An advocate (an outside person to help you)	66%	36%	66%	63%
<b>SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE</b>					
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	38%	28%	38%	33%
8.2	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	59%	52%	59%	62%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	62%	57%	62%	52%
8.4	Have you had a 'nicking' (adjudication) since you have been here?	76%	50%	76%	63%
8.5	Was the 'nicking' (adjudication) process explained clearly to you?	96%	75%	96%	85%
8.6	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	66%	35%	66%	36%
8.7	For those who had spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit: did the staff treat you well/very well?	25%	75%	25%	25%

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

### Key to tables

		Keppel unit 2010	HMV01 Wetherby 2010	Keppel unit 2010	Keppel unit 2009
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better than the comparator				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse than the comparator				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in demographic details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		24	124	24	42
<b>SECTION 9: SAFETY</b>					
<b>9.1</b>	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	29%	26%	29%	38%
<b>9.3</b>	Has another young person or group of young people victimised (insulted or assaulted) you here?	44%	25%	44%	44%
If you have felt victimised by another young person/group of young people, did the incident involve:					
<b>9.4a</b>	Insulting remarks?	34%	15%	34%	32%
<b>9.4b</b>	Physical abuse?	9%	11%	9%	18%
<b>9.4c</b>	Sexual abuse?	3%	2%	3%	3%
<b>9.4d</b>	Racial or ethnic abuse?	3%	3%	3%	5%
<b>9.4e</b>	Your religious beliefs?	9%	1%	9%	11%
<b>9.4f</b>	Your disability?	9%	2%	9%	3%
<b>9.4g</b>	Drugs?	3%	4%	3%	11%
<b>9.4h</b>	Having your canteen/property taken?	3%	4%	3%	5%
<b>9.4i</b>	Because you were new here?	13%	7%	13%	18%
<b>9.4j</b>	Being from a different part of the country than others?	13%	5%	13%	21%
<b>9.4k</b>	Gang related issues?	0%	9%	0%	21%
<b>9.4l</b>	Your offence/crime?	9%	4%	9%	8%
<b>9.6</b>	Has a member of staff or group of staff victimised (insulted or assaulted) you here?	39%	29%	39%	18%
If you have felt victimised by a member of staff/group of staff members, did the incident involve:					
<b>9.7a</b>	Insulting remarks?	22%	20%	22%	8%
<b>9.7b</b>	Physical abuse?	0%	11%	0%	8%
<b>9.7c</b>	Sexual abuse?	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>9.7d</b>	Racial or ethnic abuse?	0%	4%	0%	3%
<b>9.7e</b>	Your religious beliefs?	0%	4%	0%	3%
<b>9.7f</b>	Your disability?	3%	3%	3%	0%
<b>9.7g</b>	Drugs?	9%	4%	9%	3%
<b>9.7h</b>	Having your canteen/property taken?	3%	2%	3%	3%
<b>9.7i</b>	Because you were new here?	0%	4%	0%	3%
<b>9.7j</b>	Being from a different part of the country than others?	0%	4%	0%	3%
<b>9.7k</b>	Gang related issues?	3%	3%	3%	0%
<b>9.7l</b>	Your offence/crime?	18%	1%	18%	3%
<b>9.9</b>	If you were being victimised by another young person or a member of staff would you be able to tell anyone about it?	78%	65%	78%	64%
<b>9.10</b>	If you did tell a member of staff that you were being victimised do you think it would be taken seriously?	59%	30%	59%	50%

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

### Key to tables

		Keppel unit 2010	HMYOI Wetherby 2010	Keppel unit 2010	Keppel unit 2009
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better than the comparator				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse than the comparator				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in demographic details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		24	124	24	42
<b>SECTION 9: SAFETY cont.</b>					
<b>9.11</b>	Is shouting through the windows a problem here?	56%	57%	56%	44%
<b>9.12</b>	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	66%	28%	66%	74%
<b>SECTION 10: ACTIVITIES</b>					
<b>10.1</b>	Were you 14 or younger when you were last at school?	71%	45%	71%	39%
<b>10.2a</b>	Have you ever been excluded from school?	87%	87%	87%	98%
<b>10.2b</b>	Have you ever truanted from school?	77%	72%	77%	81%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:					
<b>10.3a</b>	Education?	100%	59%	100%	95%
<b>10.3b</b>	A job in this establishment?	49%	55%	49%	33%
<b>10.3c</b>	Vocational or skills training?	22%	21%	22%	28%
<b>10.3d</b>	Offending behaviour programmes?	66%	20%	66%	48%
For those who have taken part in the following activities while in this prison: do you think that they will help you when you leave prison?					
<b>10.4a</b>	Education?	100%	62%	100%	72%
<b>10.4b</b>	A job in this establishment?	96%	62%	96%	92%
<b>10.4c</b>	Vocational or skills training?	72%	56%	72%	90%
<b>10.4d</b>	Offending behaviour programmes?	72%	54%	72%	88%
<b>10.5</b>	Do you usually have association every day?	91%	16%	91%	85%
<b>10.6</b>	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	9%	11%	9%	5%
<b>10.7</b>	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	82%	34%	82%	46%
<b>SECTION 11: KEEPING IN TOUCH WITH FAMILY AND FRIENDS</b>					
<b>11.1</b>	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	91%	23%	91%	98%
<b>11.2</b>	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	29%	34%	29%	46%
<b>11.3</b>	Is it easy/very easy for your family and friends to visit you here?	50%	46%	50%	38%
<b>11.4</b>	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	38%	39%	38%	
<b>11.5</b>	Do your visits start on time?	53%	48%	53%	28%
<b>11.6</b>	Are you and your visitors treated well/very well by visits staff?	62%	47%	62%	33%
<b>SECTION 12: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE</b>					
For those who have met their personal officer:					
<b>12.1</b>	Did you meet your personal officer within the first week?	97%	54%	97%	78%
<b>12.2</b>	Do you see your personal officer at least once a week?	100%	44%	100%	95%
<b>12.3</b>	Do you feel your personal officer has helped you?	77%	50%	77%	80%

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

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better than the comparator	Keppel unit 2010	HMYOJ Wetherby 2010	Keppel unit 2010	Keppel unit 2009
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse than the comparator				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in demographic details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		24	124	24	42
<b>SECTION 12: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE cont.</b>					
<b>12.4</b>	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	68%	51%	68%	
For those with a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan:					
<b>12.5a</b>	Were you involved in the development of your plan?	78%	51%	78%	
<b>12.5b</b>	Do you understand the targets set in your plan?	89%	62%	89%	
<b>12.6</b>	Has your YOT worker been in touch with you since your arrival here?	97%	80%	97%	98%
<b>12.7</b>	Do you know how to get in touch with your YOT worker?	88%	57%	88%	75%
Please answer the following about your preparation for release:					
<b>12.8</b>	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	76%	43%	76%	49%
<b>12.8</b>	Are you going to school or college on release?	76%	57%	76%	73%
<b>12.8</b>	Do you have a job to go to on release?	30%	21%	30%	32%
Do you know who to contact for help with the following in preparation for your release:					
<b>12.9</b>	Finding accommodation	68%	36%	68%	33%
<b>12.9</b>	Getting into school or college	74%	43%	74%	58%
<b>12.9</b>	Getting a job	65%	41%	65%	36%
<b>12.9</b>	Help with money/finances	50%	33%	50%	50%
<b>12.9</b>	Help with claiming benefits	55%	31%	55%	39%
<b>12.9</b>	Continuing health services	55%	21%	55%	33%
<b>12.9</b>	Opening a bank account	68%	29%	68%	28%
<b>12.9</b>	Avoiding bad relationships	65%	28%	65%	30%
Do you think you will have a problem with the following, when you are released:					
<b>12.10</b>	Finding accommodation?	38%	19%	38%	24%
<b>12.10</b>	Getting into school or college?	38%	18%	38%	46%
<b>12.10</b>	Getting a job?	77%	43%	77%	51%
<b>12.10</b>	Help with money/finances?	53%	30%	53%	51%
<b>12.10</b>	Help with claiming benefits?	43%	21%	43%	33%
<b>12.10</b>	Continuing health services?	23%	11%	23%	16%
<b>12.10</b>	Opening a bank account?	23%	13%	23%	16%
<b>12.10</b>	Avoiding bad relationships?	53%	16%	53%	36%
For those who were sentenced:					
<b>12.12</b>	Do you want to stop offending?	96%	90%	96%	94%
<b>12.13</b>	Have you done anything or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?	75%	38%	75%	69%

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



**Survey responses from children and young people:  
Anson unit 2010**

**Survey responses** (missing data has 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**

		Anson unit 2010	HMYOI Wetherby 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better than the comparator		
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse than the comparator		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in demographic details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>19</b>	<b>124</b>
<b>SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU</b>			
1.1	Are you 18 years of age?	13%	14%
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	5%	6%
1.3	Is English your first language?	96%	95%
1.4	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other category)?	33%	19%
1.5	Are you Muslim?	13%	10%
1.6	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	4%	5%
1.7	Do you have any children?	13%	16%
1.8	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	4%	9%
1.9	Have you ever been in local authority care?	25%	21%
<b>SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE</b>			
2.1	Are you sentenced?	100%	75%
2.2	Is your sentence 12 months or less?	4%	41%
2.3	Have you been in this establishment for one month or less?	0%	24%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	50%	50%
<b>SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS</b>			
For your most recent journey, either to or from court or between prisons, we want to know:			
3.1	Was the van clean?	17%	47%
3.2	Did you feel safe?	79%	89%
3.3	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or anyone of a different gender?	33%	26%
3.4	Did you spend more than four hours in the van?	0%	2%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:			
3.5	Were you offered a toilet break if you needed it?	6%	14%
3.6	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	47%	40%
3.7	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	42%	54%
3.8	Before you arrived here (either from court or another establishment), were you told that you would be coming to this establishment?	79%	76%
3.9	Before you arrived here (either from court or another establishment), were you given written information about coming to this establishment?	0%	4%

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

### Key to tables

		Anson unit 2010	HMYOI Wetherby 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better than the comparator		
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse than the comparator		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in demographic details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>19</b>	<b>124</b>
<b>SECTION 4: YOUR FIRST FEW DAYS HERE</b>			
<b>4.1</b>	Were you in reception for less than two hours?	35%	75%
<b>4.2</b>	When you were searched was this carried out in an understanding way?	61%	76%
<b>4.3</b>	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	50%	69%
When you first arrived, did staff ask if you needed help or support with any of the following:			
<b>4.4a</b>	Not being able to smoke?	50%	69%
<b>4.4b</b>	Loss of property?	25%	16%
<b>4.4c</b>	Housing problems?	14%	13%
<b>4.4d</b>	Needing protection from other young people?	20%	16%
<b>4.4e</b>	Letting family know where you are?	50%	67%
<b>4.4f</b>	Money worries?	30%	16%
<b>4.4g</b>	Feeling low/upset/needing someone to talk to?	38%	47%
<b>4.4h</b>	Health problems?	38%	62%
<b>4.4i</b>	Getting phone numbers?	30%	45%
<b>4.5</b>	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	55%	80%
When you first arrived, did you have problems with any of the following:			
<b>4.5a</b>	Not being able to smoke?	25%	61%
<b>4.5b</b>	Loss of property?	5%	15%
<b>4.5c</b>	Housing problems?	14%	11%
<b>4.5d</b>	Needing protection from other young people?	0%	5%
<b>4.5e</b>	Letting family know where you are?	20%	19%
<b>4.5f</b>	Money worries?	14%	16%
<b>4.5g</b>	Feeling low/upset/needing someone to talk to?	14%	18%
<b>4.5h</b>	Health problems?	5%	9%
<b>4.5i</b>	Getting phone numbers?	5%	33%
When you first arrived, were you given any of the following:			
<b>4.6a</b>	A reception pack?	71%	88%
<b>4.6b</b>	The opportunity to have a shower?	29%	17%
<b>4.6c</b>	Something to eat?	71%	73%
<b>4.6d</b>	A free phone call to friends/family?	59%	78%
<b>4.6e</b>	Information about the PIN telephone system?	29%	47%
<b>4.6f</b>	Information about feeling low/upset?	18%	27%



Key to tables

Comparison with young people's comparator and previous survey results

		Anson unit 2010	HMYOI Wetherby 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better than the comparator		
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse than the comparator		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in demographic details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>19</b>	<b>124</b>
<b>SECTION 4: YOUR FIRST FEW DAYS HERE cont.</b>			
Within your first 24 hours, did you have access to the following people or services:			
<b>4.7a</b>	The chaplain or religious leader?	<b>50%</b>	<b>57%</b>
<b>4.7b</b>	A peer mentor, Listener or the Samaritans?	<b>20%</b>	<b>19%</b>
<b>4.7c</b>	Did you have access to the prison shop/canteen?	<b>14%</b>	<b>14%</b>
<b>4.8</b>	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a member of health care staff?	<b>64%</b>	<b>72%</b>
<b>4.9</b>	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	<b>95%</b>	<b>81%</b>
<b>4.10</b>	For those who have been on an induction course: did it cover everything you needed to know about the establishment?	<b>79%</b>	<b>65%</b>
<b>SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT</b>			
<b>5.1</b>	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	<b>71%</b>	<b>29%</b>
<b>5.2</b>	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	<b>25%</b>	<b>29%</b>
<b>5.3</b>	Do you find the food here good/very good?	<b>14%</b>	<b>16%</b>
<b>5.4</b>	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	<b>18%</b>	<b>39%</b>
<b>5.5</b>	Is it easy/very easy for you to attend religious services?	<b>52%</b>	<b>61%</b>
<b>5.6a</b>	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	<b>62%</b>	<b>48%</b>
<b>5.6b</b>	Can you speak to a religious leader in private if you want to?	<b>74%</b>	<b>61%</b>
<b>5.7</b>	Is there a member of staff you can turn to with a problem?	<b>47%</b>	<b>55%</b>
<b>5.8</b>	Do you feel that most of the staff here treat you with respect?	<b>33%</b>	<b>55%</b>
<b>SECTION 6: HEALTH SERVICES</b>			
<b>6.1</b>	Did you have a full health assessment the day after your arrival?	<b>64%</b>	<b>62%</b>
<b>6.2</b>	For those who have been to health care: do you think the overall quality is good/very good?	<b>38%</b>	<b>53%</b>
<b>6.3a</b>	Is it easy for you to see the doctor?	<b>62%</b>	<b>53%</b>
<b>6.3b</b>	Is it easy for you to see the nurse?	<b>74%</b>	<b>65%</b>
<b>6.3c</b>	Is it easy for you to see the dentist?	<b>26%</b>	<b>24%</b>
<b>6.3d</b>	Is it easy for you to see the optician?	<b>26%</b>	<b>21%</b>
<b>6.3e</b>	Is it easy for you to see the pharmacist?	<b>32%</b>	<b>29%</b>
<b>6.4</b>	If you are taking medication, have you had any problems getting your medication?	<b>55%</b>	<b>36%</b>
<b>6.5a</b>	Did you have any problems with alcohol when you first arrived?	<b>14%</b>	<b>19%</b>
<b>6.5b</b>	Have you received any help with any alcohol problems here?	<b>14%</b>	<b>14%</b>
<b>6.6a</b>	Did you have any problems with drugs when you first arrived?	<b>25%</b>	<b>42%</b>
<b>6.6b</b>	Do you have any problems with drugs now?	<b>5%</b>	<b>13%</b>
<b>6.6c</b>	Have you received any help with any drug problems here?	<b>26%</b>	<b>31%</b>
<b>6.7</b>	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs here?	<b>24%</b>	<b>26%</b>
<b>6.8</b>	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	<b>5%</b>	<b>22%</b>
<b>6.9</b>	If you feel you have emotional or mental health problems, are you being helped by anyone here?	<b>100%</b>	<b>40%</b>

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

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better than the comparator	<b>Anson unit 2010</b>	<b>HMYOI Wetherby 2010</b>
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse than the comparator		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in demographic details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>19</b>	<b>124</b>
<b>SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS</b>			
<b>7.1</b>	Do you know how to make an application?	<b>95%</b>	<b>84%</b>
<b>7.2</b>	Is it easy to make an application?	<b>82%</b>	<b>73%</b>
For those who have made an application:			
<b>7.3a</b>	Do you feel applications are sorted out fairly?	<b>72%</b>	<b>77%</b>
<b>7.3b</b>	Do you feel applications are sorted out promptly (within seven days)?	<b>63%</b>	<b>71%</b>
<b>7.4</b>	Do you know how to make a complaint?	<b>95%</b>	<b>82%</b>
<b>7.5</b>	Is it easy to make a complaint?	<b>80%</b>	<b>64%</b>
For those who have made a complaint:			
<b>7.6a</b>	Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	<b>29%</b>	<b>27%</b>
<b>7.6b</b>	Do you feel complaints are sorted out promptly? (within seven days)?	<b>39%</b>	<b>46%</b>
<b>7.7</b>	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	<b>18%</b>	<b>17%</b>
Can you speak to the following people when you need to:			
<b>7.8a</b>	A peer mentor or Listener?	<b>32%</b>	<b>29%</b>
<b>7.8b</b>	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)	<b>17%</b>	<b>26%</b>
<b>7.8c</b>	An advocate (an outside person to help you)	<b>28%</b>	<b>36%</b>
<b>SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE</b>			
<b>8.1</b>	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	<b>58%</b>	<b>28%</b>
<b>8.2</b>	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	<b>53%</b>	<b>52%</b>
<b>8.3</b>	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	<b>42%</b>	<b>57%</b>
<b>8.4</b>	Have you had a 'nicking' (adjudication) since you have been here?	<b>42%</b>	<b>50%</b>
<b>8.5</b>	Was the 'nicking' (adjudication) process explained clearly to you?	<b>67%</b>	<b>75%</b>
<b>8.6</b>	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	<b>32%</b>	<b>35%</b>
<b>8.7</b>	For those who had spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit: did the staff treat you well/very well?	<b>50%</b>	<b>75%</b>

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

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better than the comparator	<b>Anson unit 2010</b>	<b>HMYOI Wetherby 2010</b>
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse than the comparator		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in demographic details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>19</b>	<b>124</b>
<b>SECTION 9: SAFETY</b>			
<b>9.1</b>	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	<b>22%</b>	<b>26%</b>
<b>9.3</b>	Has another young person or group of young people victimised (insulted or assaulted) you here?	<b>21%</b>	<b>25%</b>
If you have felt victimised by another young person/group of young people, did the incident involve:			
<b>9.4a</b>	Insulting remarks?	<b>0%</b>	<b>15%</b>
<b>9.4b</b>	Physical abuse?	<b>0%</b>	<b>11%</b>
<b>9.4c</b>	Sexual abuse?	<b>5%</b>	<b>2%</b>
<b>9.4d</b>	Racial or ethnic abuse?	<b>16%</b>	<b>3%</b>
<b>9.4e</b>	Your religious beliefs?	<b>5%</b>	<b>1%</b>
<b>9.4f</b>	Your disability?	<b>0%</b>	<b>2%</b>
<b>9.4g</b>	Drugs?	<b>0%</b>	<b>4%</b>
<b>9.4h</b>	Having your canteen/property taken?	<b>5%</b>	<b>4%</b>
<b>9.4i</b>	Because you were new here?	<b>0%</b>	<b>7%</b>
<b>9.4j</b>	Being from a different part of the country than others?	<b>16%</b>	<b>5%</b>
<b>9.4k</b>	Gang related issues?	<b>0%</b>	<b>9%</b>
<b>9.4l</b>	Your offence/crime?	<b>5%</b>	<b>4%</b>
<b>9.6</b>	Has a member of staff or group of staff victimised (insulted or assaulted) you here?	<b>44%</b>	<b>29%</b>
If you have felt victimised by a member of staff/group of staff members, did the incident involve:			
<b>9.7a</b>	Insulting remarks?	<b>22%</b>	<b>20%</b>
<b>9.7b</b>	Physical abuse?	<b>17%</b>	<b>11%</b>
<b>9.7c</b>	Sexual abuse?	<b>6%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.7d</b>	Racial or ethnic abuse?	<b>6%</b>	<b>4%</b>
<b>9.7e</b>	Your religious beliefs?	<b>0%</b>	<b>4%</b>
<b>9.7f</b>	Your disability?	<b>0%</b>	<b>3%</b>
<b>9.7g</b>	Drugs?	<b>0%</b>	<b>4%</b>
<b>9.7h</b>	Having your canteen/property taken?	<b>0%</b>	<b>2%</b>
<b>9.7i</b>	Because you were new here?	<b>0%</b>	<b>4%</b>
<b>9.7j</b>	Being from a different part of the country than others?	<b>17%</b>	<b>4%</b>
<b>9.7k</b>	Gang related issues?	<b>0%</b>	<b>3%</b>
<b>9.7l</b>	Your offence/crime?	<b>22%</b>	<b>1%</b>
<b>9.9</b>	If you were being victimised by another young person or a member of staff would you be able to tell anyone about it?	<b>33%</b>	<b>65%</b>
<b>9.10</b>	If you did tell a member of staff that you were being victimised do you think it would be taken seriously?	<b>21%</b>	<b>30%</b>

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

### Key to tables

		Anson unit 2010	HMYOI Wetherby 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better than the comparator		
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse than the comparator		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in demographic details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>19</b>	<b>124</b>
<b>SECTION 9: SAFETY cont.</b>			
<b>9.11</b>	Is shouting through the windows a problem here?	22%	57%
<b>9.12</b>	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	26%	28%
<b>SECTION 10: ACTIVITIES</b>			
<b>10.1</b>	Were you 14 or younger when you were last at school?	58%	45%
<b>10.2a</b>	Have you ever been excluded from school?	79%	87%
<b>10.2b</b>	Have you ever truanted from school?	65%	72%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:			
<b>10.3a</b>	Education?	35%	59%
<b>10.3b</b>	A job in this establishment?	50%	55%
<b>10.3c</b>	Vocational or skills training?	6%	21%
<b>10.3d</b>	Offending behaviour programmes?	44%	20%
For those who have taken part in the following activities while in this prison: do you think that they will help you when you leave prison?			
<b>10.4a</b>	Education?	67%	62%
<b>10.4b</b>	A job in this establishment?	93%	62%
<b>10.4c</b>	Vocational or skills training?	67%	56%
<b>10.4d</b>	Offending behaviour programmes?	69%	54%
<b>10.5</b>	Do you usually have association every day?	79%	16%
<b>10.6</b>	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	21%	11%
<b>10.7</b>	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	58%	34%
<b>SECTION 11: KEEPING IN TOUCH WITH FAMILY AND FRIENDS</b>			
<b>11.1</b>	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	79%	23%
<b>11.2</b>	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	53%	34%
<b>11.3</b>	Is it easy/very easy for your family and friends to visit you here?	26%	46%
<b>11.4</b>	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	32%	39%
<b>11.5</b>	Do your visits start on time?	53%	48%
<b>11.6</b>	Are you and your visitors treated well/very well by visits staff?	53%	47%
<b>SECTION 12: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE</b>			
For those who have met their personal officer:			
<b>12.1</b>	Did you meet your personal officer within the first week?	32%	54%
<b>12.2</b>	Do you see your personal officer at least once a week?	44%	44%
<b>12.3</b>	Do you feel your personal officer has helped you?	22%	50%

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

### Key to tables

		Anson unit 2010	HMVOT Wetherby 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better than the comparator		
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse than the comparator		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in demographic details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>19</b>	<b>124</b>
<b>SECTION 12: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE cont.</b>			
<b>12.4</b>	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	<b>79%</b>	<b>51%</b>
For those with a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan:			
<b>12.5a</b>	Were you involved in the development of your plan?	<b>67%</b>	<b>51%</b>
<b>12.5b</b>	Do you understand the targets set in your plan?	<b>69%</b>	<b>62%</b>
<b>12.6</b>	Has your YOT worker been in touch with you since your arrival here?	<b>84%</b>	<b>80%</b>
<b>12.7</b>	Do you know how to get in touch with your YOT worker?	<b>58%</b>	<b>57%</b>
Please answer the following about your preparation for release:			
<b>12.8</b>	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	<b>28%</b>	<b>43%</b>
<b>12.8</b>	Are you going to school or college on release?	<b>69%</b>	<b>57%</b>
<b>12.8</b>	Do you have a job to go to on release?	<b>24%</b>	<b>21%</b>
Do you know who to contact for help with the following in preparation for your release:			
<b>12.9</b>	Finding accommodation	<b>27%</b>	<b>36%</b>
<b>12.9</b>	Getting into school or college	<b>40%</b>	<b>43%</b>
<b>12.9</b>	Getting a job	<b>40%</b>	<b>41%</b>
<b>12.9</b>	Help with money/finances	<b>33%</b>	<b>33%</b>
<b>12.9</b>	Help with claiming benefits	<b>33%</b>	<b>31%</b>
<b>12.9</b>	Continuing health services	<b>27%</b>	<b>21%</b>
<b>12.9</b>	Opening a bank account	<b>33%</b>	<b>29%</b>
<b>12.9</b>	Avoiding bad relationships	<b>40%</b>	<b>28%</b>
Do you think you will have a problem with the following, when you are released:			
<b>12.10</b>	Finding accommodation?	<b>50%</b>	<b>19%</b>
<b>12.10</b>	Getting into school or college?	<b>31%</b>	<b>18%</b>
<b>12.10</b>	Getting a job?	<b>50%</b>	<b>43%</b>
<b>12.10</b>	Help with money/finances?	<b>31%</b>	<b>30%</b>
<b>12.10</b>	Help with claiming benefits?	<b>23%</b>	<b>21%</b>
<b>12.10</b>	Continuing health services?	<b>23%</b>	<b>11%</b>
<b>12.10</b>	Opening a bank account?	<b>23%</b>	<b>13%</b>
<b>12.10</b>	Avoiding bad relationships?	<b>23%</b>	<b>16%</b>
For those who were sentenced:			
<b>12.12</b>	Do you want to stop offending?	<b>94%</b>	<b>90%</b>
<b>12.13</b>	Have you done anything or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?	<b>44%</b>	<b>38%</b>

## Children and Young People: Diversity Analysis



### Diversity comparator: ethnicity/religion HMYOI Wetherby 2010

**Survey responses** (missing data has 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 & minority ethnic young people	White young people	Muslim young people	Non-Muslim young people
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better than the comparator				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse than the comparator				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in demographic details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>32</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>145</b>
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	20%	2%	13%	4%
1.3	Is English your first language?	76%	100%	80%	98%
1.4	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other category)?			93%	10%
1.5	Are you Muslim?	52%	1%		
1.9	Have you ever been in local authority care?	20%	25%	8%	26%
2.1	Are you sentenced?	72%	81%	80%	80%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	64%	50%	63%	52%
3.3	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or anyone of a different gender?	28%	27%	36%	25%
3.7	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	57%	55%	57%	57%
3.8	Before you arrived here, were you told that you would be coming to this establishment?	73%	75%	67%	75%
4.2	When you were searched was this carried out in an understanding way?	73%	76%	63%	77%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	79%	67%	83%	69%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a member of healthcare staff?	60%	74%	39%	75%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	73%	80%	54%	81%
4.10	Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the establishment?	79%	64%	71%	66%
5.1	Can you normally have a shower everyday if you want to?	46%	39%	50%	40%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	21%	34%	27%	31%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	10%	17%	7%	17%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	34%	41%	12%	41%
5.6a	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	74%	49%	92%	50%
5.7	Is there a member of staff you can turn to with a problem?	64%	56%	50%	58%
5.8	Do you feel that most of the staff here treat you with respect?	58%	56%	50%	56%
6.3a	Is it easy for you to see the doctor?	45%	60%	38%	59%
6.3b	Is it easy for you to see the nurse?	62%	70%	55%	69%
6.7	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs here?	13%	28%	11%	28%
6.8	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	28%	21%	43%	20%
7.2	Is it easy to make an application?	73%	76%	66%	77%
7.5	Is it easy to make a complaint?	70%	67%	60%	68%

## Children and Young People: Diversity Analysis

### Key to tables

		Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better than the comparator	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse than the comparator	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in demographic details	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		Black & minority ethnic young people	White young people	Muslim young people	Non-Muslim young people
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>							32	135	16	145
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	44%	28%				41%	31%	41%	31%
8.2	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	66%	50%				76%	50%	76%	50%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?						68%	54%	63%	54%
8.4	Have you had a 'nicking' (adjudication) since you have been here?						54%	52%	70%	56%
8.6	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?						38%	39%	48%	37%
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?						26%	26%	56%	24%
9.3	Has another young person or group of young people victimised (insulted or assaulted) you here?						20%	29%	22%	28%
If you have felt victimised by another young person/group of young people, did the incident involve:										
9.4d	Racial or ethnic abuse?						9%	3%	7%	3%
9.4e	Your religious beliefs?						2%	2%	0%	2%
9.6	Has a member of staff or group of staff victimised (insulted or assaulted) you here?						31%	31%	56%	29%
If you have felt victimised by a member of staff/group of staff, did the incident involve:										
9.5d	Racial or ethnic abuse?						13%	1%	22%	1%
9.5e	Your religious beliefs?						4%	3%	7%	3%
9.9	If you were being victimised by another young person or a member of staff would you be able to tell anyone about it?						49%	67%	54%	65%
9.10	If you did tell a member of staff that you were being victimised do you think it would be taken seriously?						30%	33%	31%	31%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:										
10.3a	Education?						54%	65%	48%	63%
10.3b	A job in this establishment?						49%	55%	54%	54%
10.3c	Vocational or skills training?						18%	21%	15%	21%
10.3d	Offending behaviour programmes?						5%	32%	11%	29%
10.5	Do you usually have association everyday?						29%	29%	22%	31%
10.6	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	21%	9%						7%	11%
10.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?						52%	39%	54%	41%
11.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?						39%	33%	39%	34%
11.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?						29%	36%	32%	34%
11.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?						34%	39%	40%	39%
12.3	Do you feel your personal officer has helped you?						55%	51%	56%	51%
12.4	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?						52%	56%	56%	57%
12.5b	Do you understand the targets set in your plan?						66%	66%	100%	66%
12.6a	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?						51%	45%	48%	46%
12.6b	Are you going to school or college on release?						65%	59%	57%	60%
12.14	Have you done anything or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?						35%	46%	53%	44%