

Report on a full announced inspection of

HMYOI Castington

19–23 January 2009

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

Crown copyright 2009

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

Contents

Introduction	5
Fact page	7
Healthy prison summary	9
1 Arrival in custody	
<hr/>	
Courts, escorts and transfers	19
First days in custody	20
2 Environment and relationships	
<hr/>	
Residential units	25
Staff-prisoner relationships	28
Personal officers	29
3 Duty of care	
<hr/>	
Safeguarding	31
Bullying and violence reduction	32
Self-harm and suicide	35
Child protection	36
Diversity	38
Race equality	40
Foreign national prisoners	42
Applications and complaints	43
Legal rights	45
Substance use	47
4 Health services	
<hr/>	
	51
5 Activities	
<hr/>	
Learning and skills and work activities	61
Physical education and health promotion	65
Faith and religious activity	66
Time out of cell	67
6 Good order	
<hr/>	
Security and rules	69
Discipline	70
Incentives and earned privileges	75

7 Services

Catering	77
Prison shop	78

8 Resettlement

Strategic management of resettlement	81
Offender management and planning	82
Resettlement pathways	84

9 Oswald Unit

93

10 Recommendations, housekeeping points and good practice

97

Appendices

I Inspection team	111
II Prison population profiles – young adults and juveniles	112
III Summaries of prisoner questionnaires and interviews	116

Introduction

Castington young offender institution, in Northumberland, holds juveniles aged 15–17 and young adults aged 18–21 separately on the same site. We have frequently found that such split sites are difficult to manage, and it is commendable that this full announced inspection found many aspects of both sides of the establishment were performing reasonably well. However, we were also concerned to discover that an unacceptably high number of serious injuries had been suffered by young people in the deployment of use of force by staff.

Early days in custody were generally well managed, although detoxification procedures were underdeveloped. Aspects of safeguarding and child protection required reinforcement. Anti-bullying arrangements were generally effective, and the security department was taking a thoughtful and proportionate approach to risks posed by an increasing number of young people thought to be involved in gangs. Suicide and self-harm prevention paperwork was inconsistent and there were no Listeners. The separation and care unit had improved and the number of occasions when force was used was comparable to similar establishments.

However, our principal concern in this area was the discovery that, over a two-year period, the use of control and restraint techniques by staff had resulted in young people sustaining seven confirmed fractures and three suspected fractures. We have not previously come across so many serious injuries sustained in this way. We recognise that senior staff were themselves greatly concerned by these events, had rigorously investigated each occurrence, had pursued disciplinary issues where they thought this appropriate, and had sought national specialist advice. However, no coherent explanation had emerged for the scale and frequency of these injuries. Without a full and objective review of all these incidents, we cannot be assured that they will not recur.

Accommodation for both juveniles and young adults was generally good. Relationships between staff and young people were mixed, but the general atmosphere was relaxed. Diversity remained underdeveloped, but efforts to support black and minority ethnic and foreign national young people were adequate. The chaplaincy was well integrated into the work of the establishment, and health services were generally good.

The quantity and quality of purposeful activity for juveniles was very good, with plenty of time out of cell and good education and work opportunities. Provision for young adults was not as generous, with less time out of cell and fewer learning and skills spaces available to them.

The resettlement strategy needed to be strengthened. Juvenile casework was sound, with good quality training plans, although remand plans were more formulaic. The offender management model was effectively applied to all young adults, and sentence planning was generally sound. Resettlement services were generally good. Castington also housed Oswald Unit, a national resource housing serious juvenile offenders with long sentences. In many ways an impressive unit, it would benefit from being placed within a clear national strategy for the care and management of young people serving long sentences.

Managers at Castington deserve considerable credit for effectively managing their complicated split site, in which two challenging populations receive different levels of investment. In many ways, it is an establishment that is performing reasonably on most of our measures of a healthy prison. However, our judgment on safety was inevitably overshadowed by the worrying number of serious injuries suffered by young people as result of the use of force by staff. Managers had thoroughly examined each case but could offer no coherent explanation for the scale and frequency of these incidents. It is, therefore, essential that a further and

comprehensive review is undertaken by a senior figure independent of the establishment so that lessons can be learned and the possibility of any repetitions minimised.

Anne Owers
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

April 2009

Fact page

Task of establishment

A young offender and juvenile closed establishment

Area organisation

North East (young adults), Women and Young Person Group (juveniles)

Number held

334 (202 young adults, 132 juveniles)

Certified normal accommodation

400

Operational capacity

410

Last inspection

12–16 June 2006: full inspection of juveniles, and short follow-up inspection of young adults

Brief history

Originally a satellite of HMP Acklington, Castington became independent in 1983, when it was used to accommodate long-term offenders up to the age of 21. At the beginning of 1999, a further unit was opened to hold unconvicted young people, and in April 2000 was again re-roled to become part of the juvenile estate as well as a young offender prison. A section 91 unit was opened in August 2000 to hold up to 40 juvenile offenders and is a national resource.

Description of residential units

Young adults

Dunstan	First night centre and induction
Cuthbert	Remand and convicted
Bede	Sentenced
Edwin	Maximum 60; 'working unit' for sentenced prisoners, mostly enhanced

Juveniles

Finian	First night, induction and unconvicted
Godric	Convicted
Oswald	Juveniles convicted under section 91 (Powers of the Criminal Courts (Sentencing) Act 2000)

Hospital	Inpatient unit
Separation and care	Segregation unit

Healthy prison summary

Introduction

HP1 All inspection reports carry a summary of the conditions and treatment of prisoners, based on the four tests of a healthy prison that were first introduced in this inspectorate's thematic review Suicide is everyone's concern, published in 1999. The criteria 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.

... performing well against this healthy prison test.

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

... performing reasonably well 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.

... not performing sufficiently well 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.

... performing poorly 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.

Safety

HP3 Some young people had long and uncomfortable journeys to the establishment. Reception, first night and induction arrangements were generally good, especially induction for young adults. Quality assurance of most aspects of safeguarding needed improvement, and there were some concerns about child protection

procedures. The management of identified bullies was reasonable, but the quality of self-harm monitoring documents varied. There were no Listeners. Drug detoxification procedures were underdeveloped. Awareness of potential gang influences was developing, and security arrangements were generally proportionate. The segregation unit was well managed. A large number of young people had suffered broken wrists during the use of force, which was a serious concern. For both juveniles and young adults, Castington was not performing sufficiently well against our healthy prison test.

- HP4 Juvenile new arrivals were no longer routinely handcuffed between the secure transport and the reception area, nor were juveniles routinely double-cuffed on escort. Young adults and juveniles did not travel to and from court on the same vehicle, but continued to share vehicles on inter-prison escorts. Some young people experienced lengthy waits in court cells before they returned to Castington, and some had lengthy journeys to the prison, sometimes without toilet stops. Some juveniles who arrived on transfer during the inspection had to use plastic bags in which to urinate. The transport vehicles we inspected were clean, although had some graffiti.
- HP5 Reception was shared by young adults and juveniles, although there were separate holding rooms. Reception staff ensured that young people did not have lengthy waits there, and endeavoured to put them at ease. The environment was clean and holding rooms for new arrivals had TVs. A private interview room was available. All young people were strip searched each time they passed through reception.
- HP6 Most juveniles were located on Finian Unit on their first night and young adults on Dunstan. There were designated first night cells for young people new to custody. First night observation books ensured staff were able to identify and monitor those experiencing their first 24 hours in Castington. A member of staff interviewed all young people on the day of their arrival, which included a vulnerability assessment for juveniles. In our survey, however, the proportion of young adults who said they felt safe on their first night was significantly lower than the comparator.¹
- HP7 All young people remained on their first night centre for the first two days of induction. While this allowed staff from various departments to conduct interviews and ascertain immediate needs, young people spent significant amounts of time in their cell between sessions. A week-long induction programme followed, delivered in education for juveniles and the resettlement induction training zone (RITZ) for young adults. Induction in the RITZ was impressive. Young people engaged and participated actively on both programmes. Tracking systems were satisfactory and attendance records were maintained.
- HP8 The safeguards committee addressed all aspects of safeguarding, including child protection, violence reduction and bullying, and self-harm prevention. Good quality data was collected, but analysis was underdeveloped and did not identify patterns or trends. Quality assurance systems were insufficiently robust.
- HP9 A broad definition of child protection had been adopted and some good initiatives had been agreed with the local children's services. The child protection policy was comprehensive, but not being implemented. Although allegations against staff were referred to the local children's services, all initial child protection investigations were

¹ The comparator figure is calculated by aggregating all survey responses together and so is not an average across establishments.

carried out internally, without the involvement of the local children's services. This was inappropriate and not consistent with the procedures in the child protection policy. Neither the establishment nor the local children's services met their agreed responsibilities. The social worker had undertaken several good initiatives, including initial screening for all juvenile new arrivals and securing pay for looked-after children. Not all staff was trained in the juvenile awareness staff programme (JASP) and less than 50% had been Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) cleared.

- HP10 In the previous six months, 149 bullying alert forms had been raised but only 18 had resulted in the opening of anti-bullying cases. Although other means, including unit-based warnings and conciliation, were sometimes used to resolve issues, the approach was not clearly consistent. All investigations into allegations of bullying were undertaken by unit-based senior officers, but there was no system to ensure consistency. The three stage anti-bullying scheme included a four-session anti-bullying programme for bullies on level three, but the logging system for potential victims had been used only twice in the previous six months. In our survey, 45% of young adult respondents said that they had felt unsafe in the prison, which was significantly higher than the comparator at 31%. The number of recorded assaults was not excessive for the population.
- HP11 There was a reasonable suicide and self-harm prevention policy, with guidance to staff and some reference to juvenile-specific issues, although this was limited. A large number of assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) self-harm monitoring documents had been opened in the previous 12 months – 91 for juveniles and 159 for young adults – but many were precautionary and opened for short periods. Information on self-harm issues was submitted to the monthly safeguarding meeting, but analysis was underdeveloped. The quality of ACCTs varied considerably, and evidence of engagement with young people in ACCT processes was also limited. The prison had no Listener peer support scheme or equivalent on the juvenile side, which was a concern.
- HP12 The security department was busy and received an average of 54 security information reports (SIRs) a week from a wide range of disciplines. SIRs were processed efficiently. Recent concerns included gang issues, in particular, following the recent transfer in of juveniles from HMYOI Lancaster Farms. There had been 22 gang-related SIRs received in the first two months of 2009, compared with only two in the previous six months. There was a risk assessment system for the authorisation of juvenile strip searches, although we still found examples where these had been carried out without supporting intelligence. Security arrangements for both populations appeared appropriate and did not affect access to the regime.
- HP13 Adjudication standardisation meetings took place, and tariffs had been recently reviewed and were publicised to young people. Hearings were well conducted, although the hearings room for juveniles on Godric Unit was not sufficiently child friendly. Advocacy services were well publicised and explained on induction, but advocates did not see juveniles routinely before the hearing. A minor report system was well used on all units.
- HP14 Young people had sustained seven confirmed fractures and three suspected fractures to their wrists during use of force incidents in the previous two years. Senior managers had taken robust action to address this, and there had been some reduction since the start of 2008. Although investigations into these incidents had mostly proved inconclusive, we concluded that control and restraint (C&R) techniques

had not always been applied properly. However, use of force documentation was completed to a high standard, and young people were seen after incidents and debriefed by the orderly officer. There had been 280 C&R incidents in 2008, two-thirds involving juveniles, which was not excessive in view of the population.

- HP15 Unfurnished accommodation in the separation and care unit (SACU) was used rarely, although the length of stay there was sometime not justified by the evidence recorded in the monitoring documentation.
- HP16 Communal facilities in the SACU were generally satisfactory, and included exercise equipment in the exercise yard, but standards in cells varied. In-cell power had been recently installed. The staff group had been properly selected, and 50% had received mental health awareness training, but the quality of record keeping on unit history sheets needed to be developed further. Reintegration planning was not routine. Young adults and juveniles could not always be held separately, normally for legitimate operational reasons. Young people on the unit had daily access to exercise, but could only use showers and telephones on alternate days. Association was also offered subject to risk assessment. Education staff and officers from the juvenile units visited juveniles each day.
- HP17 In the previous six months, 24 young people had undergone detoxification. Prescribing regimes lacked flexibility and were not patient centred. For example, young people maintained on methadone in the community could not continue this treatment. Joint work between healthcare, the counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare (CARAT) service and the young people's substance misuse service (YPSMS) was developing but still not structured, and young people's care and support was not sufficiently coordinated. The year-to-date random mandatory drug testing positive rate was 3.3%, rising to 5.9% if positives for buprenorphine were included. In our survey, 36% of young adult respondents thought it was easy to get illegal drugs in the prison, against a comparator of 21%.

Respect

HP18 The quality and cleanliness of the environment on both the juvenile and young adult sides were good. Relationships between staff and young people were mixed, but the general atmosphere was relaxed. Race equality was promoted, although the number of black and minority ethnic young people was relatively small, and work on the broader diversity agenda was underdeveloped. Applications procedures were well managed, but responses to formal complaints needed improvement. There was an effective bail information scheme. The chaplaincy was active and appreciated by young people. The availability of primary health services was good, although facilities needed improvement. Castington was performing reasonably well against this healthy prison test for both juveniles and young adults.

HP19 Most cells on the young adult units were in a reasonable state, although some had graffiti and no toilet screens. Cells on the juvenile units were clean, but also had some graffiti. Only juveniles on Godric had access to privacy keys, and lockable cupboards were not provided. Communal areas on the young adult units were reasonably clean, but some areas needed redecoration. Communal areas on the juvenile units were clean and welcoming. External areas throughout the prison were clean. The number of telephones was below our expectations, although there were equitable booking

systems. Young people had good access to daily showers, and access to kit and cleaning materials was reasonable. There was no opportunity for young adults to dine out, although juveniles could dine out for breakfast and the evening meal. Few young people were able to wear their own clothes.

- HP20 The incentives and earned privileges (IEP) policy covered both populations. Reviews were six monthly, unless requested by a young person. Staff encouraged individuals to apply for enhanced status, although newly arrived young adults were unable to retain enhanced status acquired at other prisons. The routine use of minor reports diluted the importance of IEP as a motivational tool.
- HP21 Young people generally were sanguine about staff, although there were many positive views. The findings of a recent juvenile measuring the quality of prison life (MQPL) survey were also mixed, but generally positive. Our own observations suggested some encouraging engagement between individual staff and young people, but the quality of interaction during association was poor. The general atmosphere was, nevertheless, relaxed.
- HP22 Most young people were positive about their personal officer and could normally name them. Significantly more young adults surveyed than the comparator believed their personal officer was helpful. Personal officers made routine weekly entries in unit files, although the content and quality of assessments varied. Personal officers did not routinely attend meetings that concerned particular young people and were not well coordinated into sentence management structures.
- HP23 The kitchen was clean, as were the serveries. There was a reasonable menu cycle, but few culturally diverse options. The quality of food was good, and arrangements for the management of halal food were satisfactory. Complaint books were available to young people. The prison shop contract was due to move from Aramark to DHL. The current goods list had 370 items, including a reasonable selection for black and minority ethnic young people. The prisoner consultative committees considered the shop service, and there were few complaints from young people.
- HP24 There was no overarching diversity policy, and the current bi-monthly diversity meeting focused primarily on staff. There had been no young people's needs analysis. There was a disability policy. A recent policy on gay and bisexual young people had been developed, but was not widely circulated.
- HP25 A comprehensive race equality strategy covered both sides of the establishment. The race equality action team (REAT) met monthly and was appropriately constituted, including young people. Young people also had their own meeting the week before, which was a good opportunity for preparation. The black and minority ethnic population was only approximately 7%, although marginally higher on the juvenile side. There had been a high number of racist incident reports – 93 in the previous 12 months – although most were initiated by staff to challenge inappropriate comments and behaviour. Young people had submitted only four in the last six months.
- HP26 There were only 15 young foreign nationals, including two juveniles. A foreign nationals policy had been published and work was linked into the monthly REAT. There was a foreign nationals' coordinator on both the young adult and juvenile sides, but there were no young people's representatives or forum for peer support. The coordinators saw foreign nationals regularly, although some young people were

frustrated by the time taken to resolve immigration issues. Three young people were held beyond their sentence expiry date, one for 15 months.

- HP27 Applications were managed efficiently and young people were positive about how they were dealt with. Complaints were dealt with in a timely fashion, and there was a good audit trail and links with safer custody. The complaints quality assurance system was, however, ineffective. Many responses were curt and did not always address the issues raised, although there were some exceptions. The consultative committee meetings provided a good opportunity for young people to air grievances without resorting to formal complaints.
- HP28 There was a limited legal service, but the work had a low profile. The legal services officer on the juvenile units had no hours allocated for the role, although applications were referred to two trained staff. There were some profiled hours for the role on the young adult units, and this appeared to meet current demand. There was a good bail information service for young adults. Bail staff saw all newly remanded young adults, and bail was discussed with juveniles at initial remand meetings.
- HP29 The chaplaincy team included Christian chaplains supported by sessional chaplains for minority faiths. A Muslim chaplain attended on Fridays to lead prayers. The juvenile and young adult ecumenical services were well attended, and the chaplaincy had developed useful partnerships with faith-based community groups to support chaplaincy events, as well as the resettlement of some committed young people.
- HP30 Health services were good, including access to GPs and a range of nurse-led clinics. Staff were motivated and well qualified, and the skill mix included specialist children's and learning disability nurses. Dental services had minimal waiting lists for sentenced young people. Healthcare facilities were, however, inadequate and there were insufficient treatment and consultation areas in the department. Medicine administration was also unsatisfactory. The healthcare reception process identified new arrivals at risk, and admitted those who were vulnerable to the inpatient area for overnight observation. Access to external NHS appointments was restricted by escort staff rota. Mental health services provided primary interventions, as well as support for young people with enduring conditions.

Purposeful activity

HP31 Teaching and learning, as well as achievement, for juveniles were very good, as were education and training for young adults. There was a good range of vocational training, although there were insufficient activity places to meet the needs of young adults and too many were locked in their cells during the working day. Recreational PE was satisfactory for both populations, but attendance by young adults was low, and accredited PE work was limited. Time out of cell was good for juveniles, but more restricted for young adults. Young people generally had satisfactory access to association and exercise. Against this healthy prison test, the juvenile side of the establishment was performing well, and the young adult side reasonably well.

HP32 Newcastle College was the education provider for both juveniles and young adults. There were good achievements and standards for juveniles across a range of employability, living and basic skills. In 2008, over 96% of juveniles left Castington with at least one qualification, and most left with more. The standards of work in

vocational and practical areas were good, and in subjects such as catering and painting and decorating, young people were justifiably proud of their achievements. The curriculum was planned well and reviewed appropriately, and there was effective outreach to support basic skills in vocational contexts. Attendance and punctuality were good. Teaching and learning were good overall, as was behaviour in lessons generally. There was partnership working with other agencies to support young people, and overall management of learning provision for juveniles was good.

- HP33 Achievement of qualifications for young adults who completed their courses was good, although many were unable to complete what they started. As with juvenile provision, there was good leadership and management of learning and skills, and partnership arrangements were effective. However, there were insufficient purposeful activity places to occupy young adults fully, and learning and skills provision could only meet the needs of 68% of the population. The quality and range of vocational training were good and achievements high. Basic skills were also well supported in the vocational context. However, the separation of young adults and juveniles in the vocational workshops limited access for each group. For example, juveniles could not take up building skills, and young adults could not access motor mechanics skills. There were 203 activity places for young adults, but 113 of these were part time.
- HP34 The library was well managed, with good support for literacy, but more limited information about vocational courses. It was underused by education and vocational training courses and there was no time scheduled for juveniles, except the few on Oswald, to visit the library outside scheduled activity times.
- HP35 There was sufficient recreational PE to meet the needs of the population, although participation by young adults was low. The gymnasium was not useable when it rained due to a leaking roof. Some vocational PE courses were available, but were basic level and of limited appeal to anyone wishing to pursue a career in the sports or leisure industries.
- HP36 Juveniles who were fully engaged with the regime could achieve about 10 hours a day out of cell, but young adults could access a maximum of only eight hours, which fell short of our expectation. For many young adults who had only part-time activity, the real experience of unlock was more likely to be nearer four or five hours. Random roll checks during the inspection revealed that between 27% and 37% of young adults were locked up without purposeful activity during the working part of the day. Access to association for all young people was reasonable and rarely cancelled.

Resettlement

- HP37 The resettlement strategy was weak on the delivery of future developments in the resettlement pathways. All young people had sentence plans and offender supervision was generally good. Services for life-sentenced young people, particularly on the young adult side, needed further development. The role of the Oswald Unit needed greater clarity, although it did provide a positive environment for some difficult young people. Provision in most of the resettlement pathways was good, in particular, the children and families pathway. Castington was performing well against this healthy prison test for both juveniles and young adults.

- HP38 The resettlement strategy gave no context to explain its direction, and was not coordinated with a broader regional strategy. It outlined current and planned provision for each resettlement pathway, but action plans to develop services were limited. Reference to the specific needs of juveniles was also underdeveloped. There was active engagement with the voluntary and community sector, including the Prince's Trust, North East Prisoners' Aftercare Society and the New Bridge Trust.
- HP39 All juveniles, whether on remand or sentenced, were allocated a caseworker. Remand plans, however, tended to be formulaic. Training plans were better quality and review timescales were met. Engagement with families was reasonable. Juveniles on remand kept the same caseworker when sentenced. The offender management team dealt with all young adult cases, whether in scope of formal offender management or not. In-scope young adult cases had monthly contact, and there was also some planning for young adults on remand. Public protection protocols were generally satisfactory.
- HP40 There was no up-to-date lifer policy. There was a small but significant number of indeterminate-sentenced prisoners, with 16 young people serving indeterminate sentences for public protection (IPP) and a further four on life sentences. Juvenile lifers tended to have more supportive events with key agencies and families, which were not provided for young adults, although they were seen by a lifer manager. Key sentence planning milestones were generally met.
- HP41 The Oswald Unit was a national resource for juveniles serving long determinate and indeterminate sentences under sections 90/91 of Powers of Criminal Courts (Sentencing) Act 2000 and sections 226/228 of the Criminal Justice Act 2003. These young people were well looked after, with efforts to provide a regime that catered for their long-term needs. A significant number had committed high impact violent offences and had complex needs, including some who had sexually abused and received a specialist intervention from the Lucy Faithfull Foundation. Young people serving an indeterminate sentence had personal officers who were lifer trained, and individual assessments by psychology department staff. Apart from the Foundation's work, there were no evidence-based interventions to acknowledge the serious nature of the offences committed by these young people and the risk they posed when released. The lack of a national strategy for the management of young people serving long sentences, including the role of the Oswald Unit, inhibited the coherent development of the facility as a specialist national resource.
- HP42 There were limited specialist accommodation services. Offender supervisors and caseworkers tended to manage accommodation need, although 13% of young adults had been released with no fixed accommodation in the previous six months. A Citizens Advice Bureau (CAB) worker helped to close down tenancies, and Connexions also provided some assistance.
- HP43 There was some limited finance, benefit and debt advice, with some one-to-one support from Jobcentre Plus and the CAB on debt management. Jobcentre Plus also facilitated Fresh Start appointments and advice with benefit entitlements. The education department delivered a programme on budgeting and money management.
- HP44 There were good education, training and work opportunities for both juveniles and young adults. Release on temporary licence was limited and mainly used to attend project work, such as the Duke of Edinburgh awards. The education contractor provided information, advice and guidance (IAG). IAG workers were involved in

sentence planning and assisted with activity allocations, and regularly checked young people's progress and any changing needs.

- HP45 Healthcare staff saw all young people before their release, and maintained contact with hospitals, GP practices and other agencies as required. The mental health care team coordinated an ongoing approach with community teams for young people with enduring mental health problems.
- HP46 There was a detailed comprehensive drug strategy and a separate alcohol strategy, informed by a thorough needs analysis. The CARATs team carried an open caseload of 94 clients and offered groupwork modules as well as one-to-one work. Alcohol awareness was provided, but there was no alcohol programme. Young adults could access the short duration programme (SDP), which was well managed and on course to exceed completion targets. Initial assessments by YPSMS for juveniles and CARATs for young adults were achieved. YPSMS co-facilitated a substance misuse awareness module, but most of its work was with individuals.
- HP47 The visitors' centre provided a good service, and the governor visited it monthly to speak with families. A comments book was available and there had been a visitors' survey in October 2008. A single positive drug dog indication on a visitor resulted in a closed visit, even if there was no corroborating security intelligence. Father-child visits were offered quarterly, and New Bridge ran a family matters course. The prison had a family link worker and a well-used family links telephone line. Storybook Dads was available through the library.
- HP48 The psychology department had completed an attitudes, thinking and behaviour needs analysis at the end of 2008. Juveniles were not able to access nationally accredited programmes, and a range of locally approved programmes had been developed to address need. These included crime and consequence, peers and lifestyles, and managing emotions as well as one-to-one work on victim awareness. Young adults could access enhanced thinking skills and the drugs SDP.

Main recommendations

- HP49 There should be a comprehensive inquiry, led by a senior figure independent of the establishment, into the causes of injuries to young people subject to control and restraint over the past two years, so that lessons can be learned and the possibility of any repetitions minimised.
- HP50 The safeguarding strategy should be reviewed annually and jointly with the local safeguarding children board to ensure that it is up to date and outlines how the establishment and the LSCB have agreed to discharge their respective legislative and policy responsibilities.
- HP51 Prescribing regimes for substance-dependent young people should be flexible, based on individual need and adhere to national guidance.
- HP52 A Listeners scheme should be implemented.
- HP53 The establishment should develop a diversity policy and action plan to raise the profile of issues relating to minority groups in the young people's population.

- HP54 Healthcare accommodation and facilities should be of a suitable level to enable health professionals to deliver services comparable to those in the NHS.
- HP55 More activity should be provided for young adults.
- HP56 An offender management policy should be developed to reflect the different approaches to managing juveniles and young adults in Castington.
- HP57 There should be a national strategy for the care and management of children and young people serving long sentences, including the role of Oswald Unit. This should include staff recruitment, selection, training and support.

Section 1: Arrival in custody

Courts, escorts and transfers

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners travel in safe, decent conditions to and from court and between prisons. During movement prisoners' individual needs are recognised and given proper attention.

- 1.1 Young adults and juveniles travelled separately to and from court, but sometimes travelled together on inter-prison escorts. Some new arrivals arrived after 7pm, and others had long waits in court cells. Juveniles were no longer routinely double cuffed during escort.
- 1.2 The prison's catchment area had recently extended to include additional courts in North West England. The escort contractor was Global Solutions Limited (GSL), which appeared to have good relationships with the prison. GSL staff were members of the security committee and had a reasonable level of attendance. Staff from the prison also attended court user group meetings.
- 1.3 Young adults and juveniles travelled on separate transport to court, but they sometimes travelled together on inter-prison escorts. The contract manager had told the prison that this was for logistical reasons.
- 1.4 The van we inspected was clean, although there was some graffiti. Juveniles were no longer routinely handcuffed from the transport to the reception area, and double cuffs were no longer used as standard for escorting juveniles. We sampled some escort risk assessments for 2008 and found no occasion when double cuffs were used.
- 1.5 Reception was open from 6.30am to 8.30pm, Monday to Friday, including over lunchtime. Arrangements for discharging and receiving young people appeared efficient. There was a supply of clean age-appropriate clothes for young people who did not have suitable clothing for court. Their property and cash accompanied them to court.
- 1.6 Although most young people arrived before 7pm, this was not always the case. Reception records for November 2008 to the week before the inspection showed that approximately 34 young people had arrived after 7pm during this period. These included five juveniles, one of whom arrived at 9.50pm. During the inspection, three juveniles arrived very late in the evening after places could not be found for them in Wetherby.
- 1.7 In our survey, 69% of juvenile respondents, significantly below the comparator of 81%, said they knew where they were going when they left court or on transfer, and only 4% of young adult respondents, significantly below the comparator of 11%, said the comfort of vans was good. Juveniles who transferred in to the Oswald Unit experienced long journeys, and 28% of those surveyed said they had been in the van for four or more hours. However, 78% said they were treated well by escort staff.
- 1.8 Young adults who arrived on transfer during the inspection said they had been offered refreshments, but were provided with plastic bags to urinate in. We spoke to three young adults who had not been offered a toilet stop during a recent lengthy journey from court to the prison. Their escort records showed that they were seated on the transport at 3.25pm and

arrived at Castington at 7.25pm, and did not document any toilet stops. One of these young people had been sentenced at 12 noon.

- 1.9 The escort records we sampled included cases of young people who had experienced lengthy waits in court cells before returning to the prison. One juvenile was sentenced at 1.30pm, his placement order and warrant was received at 3.15pm, and he did not arrive at Castington until 7pm.
- 1.10 There were no comments or complaints books for young people to give feedback on their escort experience.
- 1.11 The prison had two court video-link suites. These had been used for 175 court appearances since November 2008.

Recommendations

- 1.12 **Juveniles should be transported separately from other prisoners.**
- 1.13 **Escort vans should provide sufficient toilet stops.**
- 1.14 **Young people should have the opportunity to comment and provide feedback about escorts.**

First days in custody

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners feel safe on their reception into prison and for the first few days. Their individual needs, both during and after custody, are identified and plans developed to provide help. During a prisoner's induction into the prison he/she is made aware of prison routines, how to access available services and how to cope with imprisonment.

- 1.15 Reception was a shared facility with separate holding rooms for young adults and juveniles. It was clean and welcoming. All young people were strip searched on each occasion they passed through reception. There were designated first night cells, and first night observation books for staff to identify and monitor new arrivals. Vulnerability assessments were completed to a reasonable standard, but quality assurance arrangements needed to be strengthened. New arrivals were locked in their cells when not engaged in induction sessions, particularly during their first two days in custody. Weekly induction programmes were multidisciplinary and young people participated actively.

Reception

- 1.16 Reception was a shared facility for young adults and juveniles, and staff endeavoured to keep them separate. We were told that there could be a delay if vans holding young adults and juveniles arrived at the same time.
- 1.17 The reception area had been refurbished and was bright and welcoming, with comfortable seating and some carpeted floors. There were two holding rooms, one for juveniles and one for young adults. Both had fixed seating, notice boards and were well maintained and decorated.

They also had a television and an information DVD, although staff said that new arrivals preferred to watch television. There were three further smaller holding rooms and a private healthcare interview room.

- 1.18 We observed efficient and timely reception procedures. Staff endeavoured to put new arrivals at ease and minimise the time they spent in reception. The senior officer saw all new arrivals in a private interview room, completed cell sharing risk assessments (CSRAs), and opened an induction booklet for the juveniles. Healthcare staff saw all new arrivals in a large private interview room. Reception staff had access to some translated material and to a telephone interpreting service.
- 1.19 In most cases, the relevant paperwork, such as placement authorisations, vulnerability alerts and ASSETs², arrived with juveniles, either electronically or in the secure escort folder. Records showed that 12 juveniles were received without the appropriate documentation between September and December 2008. Offender management staff promptly followed up any missing documentation.
- 1.20 Young people were asked if this was their first time in custody. The induction and first night policy stated that juveniles received with a vulnerability alert would be monitored, using a local observation pro forma, until they were seen by healthcare staff. This did not happen in practice. However, juvenile induction and development records showed that reception staff were aware of such alerts and used them to inform assessments.
- 1.21 Young people were strip searched each time they passed through reception, in addition to passing through a fixed metal detector and searched with a handheld detector. Strip searches of juveniles were not based on a risk assessment. Staff and managers said young people were not routinely required to squat during their reception search, although young people told us that they had been. In our survey, 68% of juvenile respondents, significantly worse than the comparator of 79%, said they were searched in an understanding way, and only 55%, against a comparator of 67%, said they were treated well in reception. Survey findings for young adults were more positive.
- 1.22 Reception had a selection of microwave meals. There were two showers, which were rarely used as new arrivals preferred to shower on the induction unit. All new arrivals were given personal identification telephone numbers (PINs) and £2 credit, and could buy a canteen pack, which contained sweets or tobacco for those aged 16 and over. There were no peer supporters in reception.

First night

- 1.23 Newly arrived young adults were taken to Dunstan Unit and juveniles to Finian Unit, and those transferred in for Oswald Unit were located straight there (see section 9).
- 1.24 There were designated first night cells, all single occupancy, on both Finian and Dunstan. These were used for young people spending their first night in custody. Young people who arrived on transfer were located in other cells on the first night units. First night cells were reasonably clean, but, apart from written induction information displayed on notice boards, there was little to differentiate them from other cells on the unit and they did not appear welcoming. The information channel on televisions in the juvenile cells was not working, and was not available in first night cells for young adults.

² Youth Justice Board assessment documentation completed by youth offending teams.

- 1.25 A designated first night officer on each unit, on duty until 9pm, conducted an initial interview to provide information, including access to the Samaritans telephone and use of the cell bell. Juveniles were given a first night pack with toiletries, biscuits, juice, writing material and stamps. Young adults were given writing material. All new arrivals were given an induction booklet.
- 1.26 The first night officer carried out vulnerability assessments for juveniles. The assessments we sampled were completed to a reasonable standard, although some risk management plans did not specify how policies such as the personal officer scheme would be applied to manage individual risks, and timescales for key action were often not indicated. The juvenile casework senior officer quality assured juvenile induction development records and vulnerability assessments. Although these arrangements ensured that induction records were fully completed, records did not include comments on completed vulnerability assessments and it was unclear how feedback was provided to staff. Night staff carried out vulnerability assessments for those who arrived after day staff had gone off duty.
- 1.27 First night observation books were opened for all young people on their first night, and they were monitored for a minimum of 24 hours. This period was extended if essential documentation had not arrived. Young people whose status had changed as a result of a court appearance or who were recalled into custody were also monitored. Although observations were carried out to the required level, those we sampled demonstrated little active engagement with young people, even if they were clearly awake.
- 1.28 In our survey, only 32% of young adult respondents, significantly worse than the comparator of 41%, said they were offered a shower on the day of their arrival. One of the juveniles who arrived very late in the evening during the inspection (see paragraph 1.6) had not yet had an opportunity to make a telephone call when we saw him the following morning.
- 1.29 In our survey, 73% of young adult respondents, significantly worse than the comparator of 80%, said they had felt safe on their first night, although those we spoke to during the inspection were more positive. There were no peer supporters on the juvenile units, but there were two on the young adult unit. They shared information with new arrivals and, if necessary, directed them to other sources of support in the prison.

Induction

- 1.30 All new arrivals spent the first two days of their induction programme on their residential unit. While this period allowed induction staff to conduct comprehensive individual interviews, and ensured that staff from other departments, such as the chaplaincy, could see new arrivals, young people were locked in their cells when they were not required for interview. We observed one interview between a young people's substance misuse (YPSM) worker and a juvenile carried out on the landing rather than in a private interview room. Very few staff from other departments signed the folder in the Finian induction office to indicate that they had completed their interview.
- 1.31 The induction interview provided additional general information about the prison and obtained further information about the young person. Onward referrals were made to other departments where necessary. Young people were asked to sign a number of compacts and complete an initial housing needs assessment. Induction staff also carried out a second day CSRA review.
- 1.32 Juveniles were informed of their allocated personal officer. Safer custody booklets were also issued. A senior officer checked completed juvenile induction booklets, which were filed with their secure escort folders in the induction office.

- 1.33 Following these first few days, all young people attended a five-day induction programme delivered off the unit. Young adult sessions took place in the resettlement induction training zone (RITZ) on a rolling programme. They were delivered by two trained officers, with multidisciplinary input from other departments. Young adults attended an education assessment, gym induction, library visit and a workshop taster session. There was a more streamlined timetable for young adults who had transferred from other prisons and those who had only recently been discharged. In our survey, only 79% of young adult respondents, against a comparator of 91%, said they had been on an induction course. RITZ staff had good systems to track individual progress and ensure all sessions were completed.
- 1.34 The juvenile induction programme was also delivered over five days, but through the education department with multidisciplinary input. Juveniles completed an education assessment, gym induction and attended various education taster sessions. The juvenile induction was not delivered as a rolling programme, and juveniles could have a further wait on the unit before they commenced it, although they could access learning support on the unit.
- 1.35 We observed sessions on both programmes and found that young people were engaged and actively participating. There were systems for obtaining feedback from young people about the induction programme.

Recommendations

- 1.36 Juveniles should not be routinely strip searched on arrival.
- 1.37 New arrivals should have access to peer supporters in reception.
- 1.38 Quality assurance of completed vulnerability assessments should record comments on findings and provide feedback to staff.
- 1.39 First night cells should be clean and welcoming.
- 1.40 First night observations and monitoring should demonstrate active staff engagement with young people.
- 1.41 All new arrivals should be offered a shower and free telephone call, whatever time they arrive.
- 1.42 Young people on induction should be unlocked when they are not actively involved in sessions.
- 1.43 The juvenile induction should be delivered as a rolling programme.
- 1.44 All induction interviews should be conducted in private interview rooms.

Housekeeping point

- 1.45 The television information channel in the juvenile cells should be repaired.

Section 2: Environment and relationships

Residential units

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners live in a safe, clean and decent environment within which they are encouraged to take personal responsibility for themselves and their possessions.

2.1 Cells and communal areas were generally clean and reasonably well maintained, but there was some graffiti. Few cells had curtains. Staff actively encouraged young people to maintain good standards of hygiene and cleanliness. External areas were very clean. Young people had good access to amenities such as showers, and responses to cell call bells were timely. Few young people wore their own clothes, and there were restrictions for those who chose to do so.

Accommodation and facilities

- 2.2 There were four units for young adults. Bede held convicted young adults, Cuthbert accommodated both unconvicted and convicted young adults, and Edwin held young adults who worked, most of whom were enhanced status. Dunstan was the first night and induction unit. The four units were identical in design, and each held a maximum of 60 young adults in single cell accommodation on two levels. There were four separate landings, two on each level, and a CCTV system aided staff supervision.
- 2.3 Most cells were reasonably decorated, although there was some graffiti on cell doors and frames. Some toilets were badly stained and required descaling, and toilet screens were missing from some cells. Some cells had wooden beds with damaged headboards or bases. Few cells had curtains, and we saw towels, and in some cases sheets, used as curtaining. Young adults on the standard and enhanced levels of the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme could buy their own curtains. Cells were suitably ventilated and heated. No young adults had privacy keys or lockable cupboards. We did not see any obscured observation panels.
- 2.4 Communal areas on the young adult units were generally well maintained, although some areas around stairs needed redecorating. All units had a ground floor association area with televisions, pool tables, table tennis and adequate comfortable seating. Equipment was in a reasonable condition, but the carpet on Cuthbert was torn. Cuthbert and Edwin had fitness suites with cardiovascular equipment, which could be used during association by young adults who worked. Each unit had a dining hall and servery. Only young adults on Edwin could dine in association, if staffing levels allowed. All units had two telephones fitted with privacy hoods and displayed information about call monitoring.
- 2.5 The three units for juveniles were Finian, which held unconvicted and convicted juveniles and was the first night and induction unit, Godric, which held predominantly convicted juveniles, and the separate Oswald Unit (see section 9). Finian and Godric were identical and both had an operational capacity of 64. Accommodation was on two floors, with good sight lines on the second galleried floor. All cells on both units were designed for single occupancy, although four cells on each had bunk beds and had been used for shared occupancy, although not for some time. Toilet screens in these cells were inadequate for shared occupancy.

- 2.6 Cells were of a good size and generally well maintained, although there was some graffiti on cell doors and frames. Courtesy keys were only available on Godric, and only issued after the young person had spent approximately a week on the unit. There were no lockable cupboards in cells. Few cells had curtains, although there were more on Godric. As on the young adult units, we saw towels used as curtains.
- 2.7 All communal areas were carpeted and were bright and clean. The ground floor association areas had comfortable seating, table tennis and table football. There were also pool tables for juveniles on enhanced status. Godric had a television but Finian did not. There was resistance training gym equipment in the association area on Finian and in the outdoor area of Godric. There were two telephones fitted with privacy screens on each unit. In our survey, 73% of juvenile respondents, significantly more than the comparator of 51%, said they could use the telephone every day. However, the number of telephones on each unit was below our expectations. There was no separate dining area, but there were a few tables and stools, and juveniles could dine in association for their breakfast and evening meal.
- 2.8 Most of the published information on notice boards in the young adult and juvenile accommodation was in English only. There was a well-enforced offensive material policy. In our survey, the responses from both young adults and juveniles about whether their cell call bell was answered within five minutes were better than the comparators, but for juveniles was significantly worse than in 2006. We observed cell call bells responded to in a timely manner across the prison, which concurred with the records of staff response times we sampled. Young people had access to hot water urns, and those on enhanced and standard levels could buy flasks from the prison shop. During our night visit, all areas were quiet. We saw some televisions switched on in staff offices, in one instance during the night visit.
- 2.9 In our survey, significantly more juvenile respondents than in 2006 said they had experienced problems in receiving mail. Incoming mail sometimes did not arrive at the prison until late morning, and it was not always delivered to young people on the day it was received. Managers were aware of the problem and had made some amendments to systems. The passive drug dog checked all mail.
- 2.10 There were monthly consultative committees. The committee for young adults was usually chaired by a unit senior officer, while juvenile meetings were usually chaired by a governor and appeared to be better attended. Minutes were published on unit notice boards.

Clothing and possessions

- 2.11 A prison-issue clothing policy had been introduced in January 2009. All new arrivals were given an outdoor coat and prison shirts, jeans, sweatshirt and tracksuit bottoms. Young people had to wear jeans when attending activities off their unit. Prison shirts had to be worn in the visits hall. Prison-issue kit was of reasonable quality, and young people were dressed in clean, suitably-sized clothing.
- 2.12 All young people could wear their own socks and underwear, irrespective of their IEP status. Unconvicted young people and those convicted and on enhanced status could wear their own clothes, but only on the unit during association at evening and weekends.
- 2.13 A published facilities list identified the items permitted in possession and how young people could access them. Some items could be handed in on visits and others posted in, while others had to be bought from the prison shop or through a catalogue.

- 2.14 Access to stored property was by application. Applications were processed by reception staff each weekend, and there was no backlog. In our survey of young adults, 54%, against a comparator of 34%, said they could normally get their stored property if they needed to. There had been four complaints about property in 2008, which resulted in compensation claims.

Hygiene

- 2.15 New arrivals were given bedding and two towels. Prison-issue clothing and bedding was exchanged weekly, and all young people could send their own clothes or bedding to the prison's laundry to be washed weekly. Some young people said that clothing sent to be laundered had not been returned, but this was not evidenced in formal complaints.
- 2.16 Staff actively encouraged young people to maintain good standards of cleanliness and hygiene. Unit managers made weekly cell inspections, and governors inspected on a rota, with cash awards to those young people who reached the highest standard or had demonstrated the most improvement. In our survey, 67% of young adult respondents, significantly better than the comparator of 56%, said they could normally get cell cleaning materials every week.
- 2.17 There were five showers in cubicles on the ground floor of the young adult units. Shower areas were clean, although there were some stains, and had stable doors to ensure effective staff supervision. There were four showers on each of the two landings on the juvenile units. Work was being completed during the week of the inspection to install cubicles for privacy. Staff ensured showers were adequately supervised. Access to showers was primarily during association, which was rarely cancelled. In our survey, 80% of juveniles and 87% of young adults said they were able to shower everyday, both significantly better than the comparators.
- 2.18 New arrivals were given a supply of toiletries, and further supplies were available on units, but they did not have access to the prison shop within their first 24 hours. Depending on the day they arrived, new arrivals could experience up to a week's delay before they could buy items from the shop. Young people could have a maximum of 12 toiletry products in possession.

Recommendations

- 2.19 All cells should be furnished with curtains.
- 2.20 Graffiti should be removed from cell doors and frames.
- 2.21 All in-cell toilets should be properly screened.
- 2.22 Lockable cupboards should be provided for all young people.
- 2.23 The number of telephones on units should be increased to at least one per 20 young people.
- 2.24 Published information on unit notice boards should be available in a range of languages.
- 2.25 All mail should be issued within 24 hours of being received.
- 2.26 All young people should have the opportunity to wear their own clothes.

- 2.27 Young people should have access to the prison shop within 24 hours of their arrival.
- 2.28 Communal showers should be well maintained and ventilated.

Housekeeping points

- 2.29 Damaged wooden bed bases should be replaced.
- 2.30 The torn carpet on Cuthbert Unit should be promptly replaced.
- 2.31 There should not be television sets in staff offices.

Staff-prisoner relationships

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners are treated respectfully by all staff, throughout the duration of their custodial sentence, and are encouraged to take responsibility for their own actions and decisions. Healthy prisons should demonstrate a well-ordered environment in which the requirements of security, control and justice are balanced and in which all members of the prison community are safe and treated with fairness.

- 2.32 Staff relationships with young people were generally good, with reasonable levels of constructive engagement. Staff were confident in working with young people.
- 2.33 In our survey, juvenile responses about staff treatment were the same as in 2006 and similar to the comparators, although only 46% of respondents said there was someone they could tell if they were being victimised, which was significantly worse than the 61% comparator. A recent measuring the quality of prison life (MQPL) survey among juveniles was, however, positive, and most juveniles identified staff as fair, kind and helpful, although some also saw staff as provocative.
- 2.34 In our young adults survey, 79% of respondents said there was a member of staff they could turn to if they had a problem, which was significantly better than the 69% comparator. Our survey indicated little evidence that young adults felt victimised or intimidated by staff.
- 2.35 In our discussions with young people, their views about staff were mixed, and tended to be more negative when expressed in groups than individually. Our own observations suggested some positive one-to-one encounters between staff and young people. Staff were confident and non-judgmental in their approach to young people, although we noted some lack of engagement during association, despite the survey response from 32% of young adults, significantly higher than the comparator of 22%, that staff normally spoke to them on association. Staff did not use of preferred names or titles in addressing either young adults or juveniles.
- 2.36 Staff made a reasonable attempt to record their knowledge of young people in unit history sheets. However, entries were predominately observational rather than evidencing engagement and a more rounded understanding of the individual. The evidence indicated that relationships were good, and that the atmosphere in the prison was relaxed and at ease.

Personal officers

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners' relationships with their personal officers are based on mutual respect, high expectations and support.

- 2.37 The personal officer scheme was well established, and young people appreciated their personal officer. The recording of contact with young people was regular, but needed to be improved. Staff training, management supervision, and the integration of caseworker and personal officer roles were underdeveloped.
- 2.38 The personal officer scheme had been updated in a policy document of November 2008. The scheme was well established, but there was no specific personal officer training, and staff said they had no ongoing supervision or guidance from managers about the task.
- 2.39 Young adults were allocated to a personal officer by their cell, whereas juveniles were allocated by the casework team. As a result, a juvenile retained his personal officer, while a young adult's officer could change if he moved cell. Allocation took place within 24 hours of the young person's arrival on the unit, and he was seen very quickly by their personal officer.
- 2.40 On young adult units, personal officers were responsible for a minimum of five young people, though due to staffing shortages – particularly on Bede – the ratio was far greater and officers were unable to give young people the level of support they required. On the juvenile units, personal officers had primary responsible for two to three young people and were shadow officers for a further two to three. Personal officers reported that these ratios worked well.
- 2.41 The details of personal and shadow officers were on cell doors, though the scheme was not openly advertised on the units and the only written information for young people was a very brief description in the induction pack.
- 2.42 Young people were positive about their personal officers, knew who they were and said that they were approachable. In our survey, 74% of young adult respondents said their personal officer was helpful, which was significantly better than the comparator of 62%. In our juvenile survey (excluding Oswald), 58% said their officer was helpful, and 69% of respondents on the Oswald Unit said they felt helped by their personal officers.
- 2.43 In most of the unit files we sampled, personal officers made a minimum weekly entry, though the quality of these varied. Only a few officers showed an insight into the young person's behaviour, and most just reported a positive or negative incident. However, unit files demonstrated that personal officers were active in dealing with small problems, and young people said that they often helped sort out everyday issues. There were regular management checks of unit history files, though they did not comment on the quality of the entry or the progress of the young person.
- 2.44 Personal officers did not routinely attend meetings involving their young person, although there were efforts on the juvenile units to include them in training planning meetings. Personal officers on all the units, apart from Oswald, said that they had little contact with outside agencies or families/careers, which they saw as a role for the central casework team. Although the policy document set out the different tasks of personal officers and caseworkers, there appeared to be a lack of integration between the two roles, and little information sharing.

Recommendations

- 2.45 Personal officers should receive specific training for the role.
- 2.46 Cell moves within wings should not result in a change in personal officer.
- 2.47 Managers should use regular supervision with personal officers to improve their performance in the role and discuss the needs of the individual young people for whom they are responsible.
- 2.48 Management checks of unit history files should comment on the quality of entries.
- 2.49 Personal officers should make a written contribution to the training planning process and attend planning meetings when they are on duty.

Housekeeping point

- 2.50 The personal officer scheme should be advertised on residential units.

Section 3: Duty of care

Safeguarding

Expected outcomes:

The safety of children and young people is a paramount consideration in the development of all policies and procedures. There is a clear safeguarding strategy drawing together key policies designed to keep children and young people safe.

- 3.1 The strategic management of safeguarding did not operate effectively. Good quality data was collected, but analysis was limited and not all safeguarding-related areas were monitored. Weekly checks by the safeguarding team were a useful addition to safeguarding procedures, but the quality assurance systems were insufficiently robust and there was little use of the information collected. There was no multidisciplinary care planning for the most vulnerable young people. Not all staff were Criminal Records Bureau checked.
- 3.2 A safeguarding strategy listed a range of legislative and policy requirements relating to the care of children in prison, but the policy did not describe how the requirements would be implemented in several important areas. The strategy was also out of date and based on previous structures, although the strategic management of safeguarding had been recently reviewed and revised (see main recommendation HP50).
- 3.3 Following the recent changes, two management committees monitored various aspects of safeguarding. The separate committees did not have clear terms of reference. One met monthly and we were told served an operational function, and the other met bi-monthly and was said to have a more strategic role. Attendance at previous safeguarding meetings had been inconsistent, and the meeting structure had been changed to remedy this. The new arrangements were not yet embedded, and it was too soon to assess whether the new initiative would bring about the necessary improvements. The designated membership of the strategic safeguards committee was appropriate and included the local authority designated officer, who attended regularly.
- 3.4 Good quality data was collected in relation to bullying, self-harm and child protection referrals, but regular reports were not prepared and analysis of the data was limited and did not extend to identifying patterns or trends. This affected the capacity of the strategic committee to oversee all aspects of safeguarding effectively. The remit of the safeguarding committees did include other related safeguarding areas, such as public protection. Although data on injuries sustained during restraint were collected for submission to the Youth Justice Board, there was no ongoing monitoring by either safeguarding committee.
- 3.5 The safeguarding team carried out weekly checks of some safeguarding procedures on all units. The checks included cell sharing risk assessments, assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) self-harm monitoring documentation and anti-bullying booklets, as well as basic safety checks on emergency response kits. The weekly checks were a potential useful addition to safeguarding procedures, but the quality assurance systems were insufficiently robust and there was little use of the information collected.
- 3.6 The recently formed operational safeguarding committee had begun to have case discussions about young people who gave cause for concern. There were no agreed criteria to trigger such

case discussion, which could be tabled by any member of the committee. Minutes did not indicate an in-depth discussion, and the process was not part of a coherent strategy to identify and case manage the most vulnerable young people at Castington.

- 3.7 Fewer than half of all staff had been subject to enhanced criminal records bureau (CRB) checks at the time of inspection, although all new recruits were now cleared and retrospective checks for all staff were scheduled to be completed within the following two months.
- 3.8 The governor was a member of the local safeguarding children board, and he or the head of safeguarding attended meetings regularly.

Recommendations

- 3.9 The safeguarding policy should cover the identification and management of children and young people identified as particularly vulnerable.
- 3.10 The committee structure to oversee the implementation of the safeguarding strategy should be underpinned by clear terms of reference, and kept under review to ensure that it is effective.
- 3.11 Regular reports on all relevant safeguarding areas should be submitted to the safeguards committee, and relevant data should be analysed to identify patterns and trends.
- 3.12 The remit of the safeguarding committees should include monitoring public protection issues and the use of force, and, in particular, injuries sustained during restraint.
- 3.13 Safer custody weekly checks and related quality assurance systems should be improved, and more use should be made of the information collected.
- 3.14 All staff should have enhanced criminal records bureau (CRB) clearance.

Bullying and violence reduction

Expected outcomes:

Everyone feels safe from bullying and victimisation (which includes verbal and racial abuse, theft, threats of violence and assault). Active and fair systems to prevent and respond to violence and intimidation are known to staff, prisoners and visitors, and inform all aspects of the regime.

3.15 Information relating to violence reduction and anti-bullying was collected each month, but this was not evaluated effectively over time and the opportunity to understand the extent of violence and bullying was not fully used. Bullying investigations varied in quality, there were no overarching quality assurance checks by the safer custody team, and sanctions awarded to identified bullies were inconsistent. The use of workbooks for young people subject to second and third stage anti-bullying logs was positive.

3.16 A senior officer based in the safer custody department undertook the roles of violence reduction coordinator and anti-bullying coordinator. The department covered both juveniles and young adults. The violence reduction strategy had been written in July 2008 and was

reasonably comprehensive. The document included the reporting and managing of violent incidents, and incorporated links to other aspects of safer custody, including anti-bullying and suicide and self-harm management.

- 3.17 All new arrivals were given information about safer custody at induction, including details of violence reduction and anti-bullying. All units displayed information about appropriate behaviour, and how young people's concerns would be managed. Young people we spoke to were aware of the anti-bullying policy and procedures, as well as general issues relating to maintaining safety. Monthly consultation meetings included violence reduction and anti-bullying as standing items, and minutes indicated that discussions were appropriate and detailed.
- 3.18 Since September 2008, the monthly violence reduction meetings had been incorporated into the wider safeguarding meetings. A wide range of data on violence reduction was collected and distributed to the monthly safeguarding meeting. In the previous six months, there had been 30 assaults among young adults and 49 among juveniles – an average of 13 a month for the year, compared with 17 in 2007. This figure did not appear to be excessive for the populations. Monthly data also examined patterns of assaults, including where and when they occurred, the type of assault, time and day of the week, as well as the age of the assailant and their victim(s). While useful, this information was only examined for the month concerned and, other than the overall figure, there was no trend analysis. This diminished the establishment's ability to address identified issues. There were similar problems with information relating to fights and unexplained injuries.
- 3.19 Despite the limitations in analysis of data, there was evidence of responses to some of the issues ongoing. Concerns had been identified in the 2007 safer custody questionnaire, and since, that the shower areas were potential hot spots for assaults, and there had been some recent changes to those on Finian and Godric units, as well as increased supervision of showers in the gym area. Despite this, in the safer custody survey in November 2008 (to which only 72 out of 338 young people responded), over 20% of respondents said that the showers were the main site for bullying. In our young adult survey, 45% of respondents, significantly above the comparator of 31%, said they had felt unsafe at some point at the prison.
- 3.20 The safer custody manager had a continuous improvement plan which, while appropriate, was not updated regularly and had yet to include actions from the 2008 safer custody questionnaire. There was no timetable for reviewing and updating the plan.
- 3.21 There was a detailed anti-bullying policy, which was widely publicised on all units. Bully alert forms submitted in 2008 across the establishment averaged 22 a month, a 24% reduction since 2007 (29). In the previous six months, there had been 149 alerts, 60 related to young adults and 89 to juveniles. Data collected monthly made only general comparisons with previous months, and there was no trend analysis, and consistent patterns of behaviour could be missed.
- 3.22 Although the number of bully alerts seemed high for the population, staff tended to submit such documents for a wide variety of reasons, including verbal disputes, perceived threats and claims of bullying, as well as actual assaults and fights. However, only 18 of the 149 alerts had resulted in an individual being placed on one of the three stages of the anti-bullying programme (seven young adults and 11 juveniles). Only six such alerts had been identified as not being bullying, although a further 32 (21%) resulted in no further action. Several alternatives to formal programmes were available, including a unit-based warning, which was used for 53 (36%). Mediation was also used occasionally (three times in the previous six months), although this was undertaken by unit staff rather than trained mediators.

- 3.23 All bullying allegations were investigated by unit-based senior officers, but the quality of these varied considerably. We looked at a random selection of investigations and found some that were perfunctory and/or did not examine issues in any detail, although others were comprehensive. Although the results of all investigations were copied to the anti-bullying coordinator, there was no overall quality control or examination of a sample each month. The inconsistency of investigation was compounded further by lack of clarity about the circumstances in which an individual became subject to an anti-bullying programme rather than a unit-based warning. Although the policy was clear that stage one was implemented if bullying was suspected, and stage two if there was evidence, this was not applied consistently, and the use of warning was not clearly defined.
- 3.24 The three-stage anti-bullying programme had been reasonably well developed. Stages one and two included daily monitoring, as well as a specific workbook for the young person. Young people on stage two were also subject to a basic regime. While the monitoring of bullies was limited, the implementation appeared to act as a deterrent, and those we spoke to understood why they were subject to the programme. The workbook also reinforced the points appropriately. Young people subject to stage three took a four-session one-to-one programme developed by the psychology department, which aimed to develop anti-bullying work further. Although 10 staff had been trained to deliver the programme, it was usually undertaken by psychology department staff or the anti-bullying coordinator.
- 3.25 Castington had also introduced a vulnerability monitoring log for young people regarded as vulnerable, although not necessarily subject to bullying. Although most victims of bullying said they did not want this intervention, the circumstances for its use were unclear. In the previous six months, only two young people had been subject to such support.

Recommendations

- 3.26 Issues relating to violence reduction and anti-bullying should be included in the continuous improvement plan and supported by an action plan.
- 3.27 There should be a quality assurance scheme to ensure the consistency of bullying investigations.
- 3.28 The sanctions for bullying and bullying-related behaviour should be clarified, and their use should be checked for consistency.
- 3.29 The role of the vulnerability log should be clarified, and its use should be checked for consistency.

Good practice

- 3.30 *The one-to-one programme developed by the psychology department for young people subject to stage three of the anti-bullying programme was a positive attempt to take anti-bullying work forward.*

Self-harm and suicide

Expected outcomes:

Prisons work to reduce the risks of self-harm and suicide through a whole-prison approach. Prisoners at risk of self-harm or suicide are identified at an early stage, and a care and support plan is drawn up, implemented and monitored. Prisoners who have been identified as vulnerable are encouraged to participate in all purposeful activity. All staff are aware of and alert to vulnerability issues, are appropriately trained and have access to proper equipment and support.

- 3.31 Although the number of young people subject to assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) self-harm monitoring was high, many cases were open for only a short time. A reasonable range of data was collected monthly, but was not effectively analysed for trends. The quality of ACCTs varied, and the quality assurance system was inadequate and had little impact on practice. The absence of a Listeners scheme was a significant omission.
- 3.32 Suicide and self-harm prevention was incorporated into the work of the wider safer custody team. A comprehensive policy, updated in October 2008, gave good guidance to staff. It also covered specific issues relating to juveniles, although this was limited to procedure and gave no specific guidance on the emotional and psychological differences that staff might expect to find between the two age groups in the establishment.
- 3.33 The suicide prevention coordinator was a main grade prison officer with limited experience in undertaking a coordinator's role. The role was not invested with the level of authority necessary to ensure consistently high standards of delivery or necessary development. The coordinator also coordinated child protection work, although this was due to be taken over by an additional member of the team.
- 3.34 In 2008, 250 assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) self-harm monitoring documents had been opened, 91 for juveniles and 159 for young adults. Although this appeared high for the population, Castington tended to err on the side of caution, and the number was consistent with the previous year, although monthly variations were considerable, and many plans were opened and closed within a short time.
- 3.35 The establishment had 31 ACCT assessors, with at least two scheduled to be on duty at a time. Information on young people subject to ACCT was widely publicised, and all staff were made aware of those young people within their sphere of responsibility at handover points. Most young people subject to ACCTs were managed on units, but there were also three safer cells in healthcare, which were covered by CCTV, and two non-camera safer cells in the separation and care unit, although the latter accommodation was rarely used. Young people were regularly accommodated in healthcare, but only following a review meeting and in consultation with healthcare staff. At the time of the inspection, one young adult was being gradually reintroduced to his unit and was spending nights in healthcare and days on the unit.
- 3.36 There were good links with the monthly and bi-monthly safeguarding meetings and, as with other aspects of safer custody, a reasonable range of information was collated. Although information covered age, place, time of day, day of week, it was only analysed for trends for the specific month. There was no evaluation over time or establishment of patterns, risk factors or reason/motivation that could be used to develop provision and support for young people. There was an annual collation of data at the end of December, but this lacked evaluation and

was not used to construct effective development objectives. Some ACCT cases were discussed in the monthly meetings, but usually only when there were specific concerns about a young person.

- 3.37 In 2008, there had been 107 actual acts of self-harm, involving 22 juveniles and 85 young adults. Again, although broad information on these incidents was collected, there was no analysis to help identify specific areas of concern, patterns or trends.
- 3.38 There was no effective quality assurance system for managing ACCTs. Although there were weekly safer custody quality checks on each unit, and information from these was collated into the monthly statistical report for the safeguarding meeting, it was not clear how actions identified were taken forward. In the previous six months, the same concerns were repeated in each report. Specific issues were not incorporated into the safer custody continuous improvement plan, and we saw examples of concerns raised in reports continuing to be repeated in practice – for example, predictable rather than varied night checks on young people subject to ACCTs.
- 3.39 We reviewed some recently closed ACCT documents, as well as those currently open. The quality of documents varied considerably. Some were appropriately constructed with appropriate reviews, but many had little or no link between the assessment and care maps, and objectives were often vague, had no named leads for implementation, and were rarely reviewed in meetings. Case managers often changed between reviews, and review meetings were rarely multidisciplinary. Although some young people who had been subject to an ACCT said interaction with staff had been reasonable, this was not reflected in files.
- 3.40 At the time of the inspection, five young people were subject to ACCTs – four young adults and the one juvenile accommodated in healthcare. We spoke with all these young people and they said that staff had been reasonably supportive, although two said that staff tended only to speak to them to 'check they were ok'. The files and our discussions with staff did not indicate much active engagement and support.
- 3.41 Castington did not have any Listeners or Listener suite (see main recommendation HP52). Although young people could telephone the Samaritans, those we spoke to did not realise they could also see them in person if they wished, as this was not widely advertised.

Recommendations

- 3.42 Information collated by the suicide and self-harm coordinator should be evaluated for trends over time and should be used to inform strategic development.
- 3.43 There should be an effective quality assurance scheme for assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) practice. General areas of concern and learning points should be disseminated, and an action plan developed to ensure implementation.

Child protection

Expected outcomes:

The establishment provides a safe and secure environment, which promotes the welfare of the children and young people in its care, protects them from all kinds of harm, and treats them with dignity and respect. There is an openness on the part of the establishment to external agencies and independent scrutiny, including openness with families and the wider community

- 3.44 The child protection policy was not being implemented. Child protection referrals were not analysed, and there was no independent oversight of investigations relating to allegations concerning staff. Neither the establishment nor the local children's services met their agreed responsibilities. Not all staff were trained in child protection, including those in key positions requiring such training. Some good initiatives had been agreed with the local children's services, including preventative work with young fathers and staff training. Services for looked-after children were well managed.
- 3.45 The establishment had adopted a broad definition of child protection, and had agreed some good initiatives with Northumberland's Children's Services, including preventative work with young fathers and supplementary child protection training for staff. The establishment's social worker held a caseload of 60 looked-after children and also screened all new arrivals for welfare concerns. She had developed her role well with regard to looked-after children and leaving care services. This included agreeing protocols with many local authorities to ensure that looked-after children received a regular weekly allowance from their home authority while they were held at Castington.
- 3.46 The child protection policy was comprehensive, but many aspects were not followed. This included the collection of aggregated data to inform policy and practice and as part of a reporting process to the local safeguarding children board (LSCB) and other relevant government departments. Importantly, procedures to ensure an appropriate level of independent scrutiny of all aspects of child protection were not adhered to.
- 3.47 The child protection coordinator maintained comprehensive, well-ordered records and ensured that all referrals were faxed to the local authority children's services within 24 hours. The criteria for a child protection referral were very broad, and in 2008 there had been 121 referrals to Northumberland's Children's Services and Child Protection Department. In addition to allegations of abuse by staff or young people or disclosures of historic abuse, referrals were sent to the local authority for all young people sentenced for sexual offences or monitored for public protection concerns.
- 3.48 Details of individual referrals were set out in the child protection log, including outcomes. However, the only analysis related to the ethnicity of the young person who was the subject of the referral. There was no analysis of referrals by type (see also paragraph 3.4). We carried out a simple analysis of the 121 referrals made in 2008. The largest category related to allegations of physical assault by a member of staff (26 referrals). There were a further 10 allegations that staff had used undue force during restraint. A few staff had been the subject of several allegations, although this had not been identified by the establishment through analysis of the data. Seven young people had withdrawn their allegation. While this might have been appropriate, there were no discussions following a withdrawal to ensure that the young person felt protected during the initial investigation.
- 3.49 There was no independent involvement in investigations concerning allegations against staff. The majority of referrals, including allegations against staff, had been investigated internally. The establishment social worker had been involved in some, but not all, investigations. Her involvement had been a recent departure from established practice following an initial policy decision that she should not have responsibilities associated with child protection investigations.
- 3.50 The police had investigated eight of the 36 allegations against staff, but there had been no section 47 investigations by Northumberland's Children's Services and Child Protection Department. In the procedure set out in the child protection policy, Northumberland's

Children's Services and Child Protection Department would carry out a brief initial assessment on receipt of a referral. This was to be followed by a joint decision with the establishment, and the police if appropriate, on the need for a strategy discussion. There had been no strategy discussions following any referrals.

- 3.51 Most investigations resulted in closure following a finding of no evidence to support the allegation. There had been no further discussions with the local authority designated officer (LADO) – as set out in the child protection policy – regarding the appropriateness of other action, such as internal disciplinary action, an investigation in line with Prison Service Order 1300 (investigations) or consideration of the guidance set out in *Working Together*. There had been only one internal investigation.
- 3.52 Although a brief record of the outcome of internal investigations was presented to the strategic safeguarding committee, of which the LADO was a member, we did not consider this to be adequate independent oversight of child protection referrals relating to allegations against staff.
- 3.53 Only 58% of staff overall had been trained in child protection. Although 87% of staff working with juveniles had been trained, many staff worked with both populations and there was some cross-deployment of untrained staff. Untrained staff also included duty governors, who made initial decisions about referrals, and those in key positions requiring at least awareness training, such as staff in reception and the separation and care unit who carried out strip searching.
- 3.54 There was no in-house specialist counselling service for young people who disclosed historic abuse.

Recommendations

- 3.55 There should be a robust system of initial screening of child protection referrals to ensure that they are appropriate. This should involve the establishment social worker, and the process should be regularly monitored by a representative from Northumberland's Children's Services and Child Protection Department.
- 3.56 The establishment should agree child protection referral and investigation procedures with Northumberland safeguarding children board (NSCB) to ensure that NSCB provides the necessary level of independent oversight by leading assessment, investigation and planning in consultation and partnership with the establishment.
- 3.57 Appropriate support should be provided to a child during the investigation stage following an allegation of abuse.

Diversity

Expected outcomes:

All prisoners should have equality of access to all prison facilities. All prisons should be aware of the specific needs of minority groups and implement distinct policies, which aim to represent their views, meet their needs and offer peer support.

- 3.58 There was no diversity policy or diversity group focused on the needs of young people. There had been some work in relation to disability and sexual orientation, but this was not effectively coordinated. Diversity training had recently been introduced and was due to cover all staff within two years.
- 3.59 There was no overarching diversity policy, young people's diversity strategy or meeting. The diversity group, which met monthly, was mainly aimed at staff, although it did discuss some issues relating to young people.
- 3.60 A senior officer had been identified as the disability champion, with 16 hours facility time a month recently agreed, but this work was just developing. A disability policy had been updated in 2007. Staff, including health staff, assessed new arrivals and entered the names of those with a disability on a database. The disability champion undertook a further interview and, where necessary, arranged help and support. However, it was unclear what the establishment classified as a disability. At the time of the inspection, seven young people were classified as having a disability (three juveniles and four young adults). Three of these had a learning difficulty, rather than a physical disability, and while the approach to include them might have been appropriate, it was not clear whether this was applied consistently.
- 3.61 There was only one adapted cell, which was on Oswald Unit. Given the specialist nature of this unit, this was of limited value. We were told that the cell had not been needed as an adapted cell for the last two years, and was generally occupied by young people without a disability.
- 3.62 In our disability survey of young adults, a significantly higher percentage of respondents who considered that they had a disability said they received help and support for feelings of depression and suicide in their first 24 hours (68% against 36% of respondents without a disability). However, 40% identifying themselves as disabled, against 22% who did not, said they had been victimised by another young person, and 44%, against 25%, said they had been threatened or intimidated by another young person.
- 3.63 A senior officer had recently undertaken some work in relation to gay and bisexual young people. A draft policy had been produced, but had yet to be agreed with the senior management team and had not yet been distributed to young people.
- 3.64 In the previous two weeks, Castington had begun to roll out the Prison Service diversity training programme for staff. The governor had made a commitment to ensure that all staff completed the two-hour programme within the next two years. Although short, the programme covered aspects of diversity appropriately, including race, ethnicity, disability and sexual orientation.

Recommendations

- 3.65 The establishment should establish a diversity group with an appropriately constituted membership to address the various aspects of diversity that affect young people.
- 3.66 The establishment should clarify its definition of disability, introduce effective means to identify young people with a disability, and ensure appropriate support is consistently available.
- 3.67 There should be at least one adapted cell on the main juvenile and young adult units.

Race equality

Expected outcomes:

All prisoners experience equality of opportunity in all aspects of prison life, are treated equally and are safe. Racial diversity is embraced, valued, promoted and respected.

3.68 Although only about 7% of the population classified themselves as black or minority ethnic, the prison had made considerable efforts to address some of their concerns. Despite this, the perceptions of black and minority ethnic young prisoners about their experience at Castington remained negative. Most racist incident complaints were submitted by staff, and investigations were managed appropriately, but patterns or trends in such incidents needed to be better understood and responded to appropriately. Work to address racist attitudes and behaviour needed to be developed.

Race equality

- 3.69 At the time of the inspection, there were only 13 black or minority ethnic young adults (6.5%) and 10 juveniles (7.5%). The race equality officer (REO) was part of the wider safer custody group, as race equality was seen as an integral part of the wider safety of the establishment. The race equality strategy was based on three documents: the race equality community engagement strategy, the race equality communications strategy, and the race equality action plan. These covered the key issues comprehensively, and set an appropriate direction and strategy for the establishment.
- 3.70 A wide range of information on race equality was displayed across the establishment, and was also available in files in 43 locations that could be accessed by staff and young people.
- 3.71 The race equality action team (REAT) met monthly and was chaired by the deputy governor. Attendance was usually reasonable and the minutes indicated that issues were discussed in detail. It received and analysed SMART (systematic monitoring and analysing of racist equality treatment) data based on the national data covering the use of force, incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme, activities, and the segregation unit, but did not include specific local monitoring. Given the low number of black and minority ethnic young people, it was easy for disproportionate variations to be identified. Despite this, however, there had been attempts to help young people's representatives understand the monitoring figures, and they were made available quarterly.
- 3.72 Black and minority ethnic young people had poor perceptions of the establishment. In our survey of juveniles, 23% of black and minority ethnic respondents said they felt victimised by other prisoners because of their race, and 20% said that they felt victimised by staff because of their race. These views were echoed by young people we spoke to during the inspection. Many black and minority ethnic young people were a long way from home, which appeared to compound their sense of isolation.
- 3.73 Although the establishment collected information relating to religion, this was not covered in SMART.

Managing racist incidents

- 3.74 In 2008, 93 racist incident forms (RIFs) had been logged. This figure was high for the population, but it was apparent from our review of the 53 submitted in the previous six months that most had been submitted by staff, with only four raised by a young person. These had related to incidents where a young person had made a racist comment or behaved in a racist manner. Although this level of reporting gave some weight to the negative perception of black and ethnic minority young people, it also indicated that the establishment took racial abuse seriously.
- 3.75 All RIFs were investigated by the REO or his deputy. All those we reviewed were completed appropriately and responded to in a respectful and timely manner. Some had resulted in a young person being subject to adjudication or a formal warning. Ten per cent of all race investigations were quality checked each month to ensure some consistency, although this was done internally. The establishment did not yet have any external verification or input. All racist incidents were discussed at the monthly safeguarding and race equality action team meetings, although details of patterns or trend were not included.

Race equality duty

- 3.76 Castington had identified a number of young people's race equality representatives. Although not all units were represented, primarily because of low numbers, there were five at the time of the inspection. These representatives held a separate young people's REAT meeting the week before the main REAT. This approach ensured that young people felt relatively comfortable in raising concerns. Our evaluation of minutes and discussions with representatives indicated that discussions at these meetings were reasonably comprehensive. Up to three young people's representatives attended the main REAT and were able, where appropriate, to make contributions and raise concerns from their own group. Despite this, some young people felt that representation was limited.
- 3.77 A number of activities had been undertaken for young people during black history month in October.
- 3.78 There was no database of young people convicted of racially motivated offences, although such information was included in cell share risk assessments. There was no programme or work to address such issues with the individuals concerned or those young people found guilty of a racially motivated offence in the establishment.

Recommendations

- 3.79 The establishment should aim to improve its understanding of the negative perceptions held by black and minority ethnic young people and establish a means to improve them.
- 3.80 SMART (systematic monitoring and analysing of racist equality treatment) monitoring should cover locally agreed as well as national areas.
- 3.81 The race equality action team (REAT) should include discussion of religion and religious belief, and receive data on religious monitoring from SMART or a suitable alternative.

- 3.82 There should be wider links with community race equality groups to enhance support for black and minority ethnic young people and provide an independent check of racist incident investigations and complaints.
- 3.83 Data on racist incidents should be analysed to establish patterns or trends and inform policy and practice development.
- 3.84 There should be appropriate work and programmes to address racially motivated offending, including young people committing such offences while in custody.

Foreign national prisoners

Expected outcomes:

Foreign national prisoners should have the same access to all prison facilities as other prisoners. All prisons are aware of the specific needs that foreign national prisoners have and implement a distinct strategy, which aims to represent their views and offer peer support.

- 3.85 There had been few foreign national young people in Castington in the previous year. Although there was a system to identify foreign nationals and their specific needs, there was limited ongoing support. There was no specific forum for foreign nationals, whose issues tended to be subsumed within the wider issue of race. Access to appropriate legal advice and support and the resolution of immigration issues were the key concerns for foreign nationals.
- 3.86 At the time of the inspection, there were 15 identified foreign nationals, of whom two were juveniles. This number had been consistent through the previous year, although had dropped to eight in May 2008.
- 3.87 There was a foreign national policy, which had been updated in June 2008. Although reasonably comprehensive, it was oriented to systems and processes. There was little or nothing to advise staff on helping this often vulnerable group, and no specific information about who young people could contact for help and advice. There were two foreign national coordinators, one for each side of the establishment.
- 3.88 New arrivals who were foreign nationals were identified at reception and through induction. They were given information in their first language covering Castington and general issues relating to custody. They were seen by one of the coordinators for an initial assessment and review and to identify any specific outstanding issues. Where possible, those from the same country or with a shared language were accommodated close to each other. All foreign national young people were also allocated an offender supervisor or caseworker, although the foreign national coordinator continued to see them each month, particularly if they had specific issues relating to immigration and the United Kingdom Border Agency (UKBA).
- 3.89 At the time of the inspection, three young people had been held at Castington beyond their sentence expiry date, the longest for 15 months, all of whom were considerably frustrated by this. Other young foreign nationals were also unclear about their nationality status and anxious that they might have the same experience. There were no foreign national surgeries at Castington, and it had been difficult to obtain immigration advice from local legal services.
- 3.90 Foreign national issues were a standing item in the REAT, which ensured that departments were updated on relevant issues. However, there was no specific forum for foreign national

young people. One representative on the young people's REAT was a foreign national, but was not able to represent the views of others. There had been no questionnaire to or survey of foreign nationals.

- 3.91 Issues of representation were sometimes compounded by language barriers. There was some informal translating by other young people, but this was not always reliable. However, the telephone interpretation service had been used 17 times in 2008.
- 3.92 There was no policy on free overseas telephone calls for foreign nationals. Such calls were logged in unit files and there was no central record. Although young people said they were offered calls home, one foreign national was not clear how often he could do so, and had to ask staff if he could make a call.
- 3.93 The library had a book lending service in which young people could borrow books in their own language from across the county, without significant cost to the establishment.

Recommendations

- 3.94 Newly arrived foreign national prisoners should be given information in their first language about the help and advice available to them.
- 3.95 There should be regular immigration surgeries to give foreign national young people appropriate legal advice on their status.
- 3.96 The establishment should facilitate contact with community-based specialist immigration solicitors.
- 3.97 There should be a foreign national group to offer advice and support to all foreign national young people.

Applications and complaints

Expected outcomes:

Effective application and complaint procedures are in place, are easy to access, easy to use and provide timely responses. Prisoners feel safe from repercussions when using these procedures and are aware of an appeal procedure.

- 3.98 Applications were managed efficiently and often informally, and young people were positive about how they were handled. Complaints were dealt with in a timely fashion, and there were good links with safer custody. The consultative committee meetings were an opportunity for young people to air grievances without resorting to formal complaints. Monitoring and analysis of complaints were not used to identify patterns and trends. Responses to complaints were often curt and did not address the complaint.
- 3.99 Young people were told how to make applications and complaints as part of their induction, and the induction booklet also included a section on applications, but not complaints. All applications were logged daily on each unit. When we checked, all applications had been logged and passed on to relevant departments by early afternoon on all units. Although the records indicated when and where applications were sent, there was no audit trail or record of the outcome of the application. Informal applications were also encouraged and staff generally

dealt with verbal requests when they could, requiring young people to submit written applications only when the formal approval of a manager was needed. In our survey, 77% of young adult respondents said that applications were dealt with fairly, which was significantly better than the comparator of 63%. Juveniles were not asked the same question, but most young people we spoke to were positive about the application system.

- 3.100** Notice boards on all residential units displayed information about how to make applications and complaints, although this was not always age-appropriate or accessible to young people with poor reading skills, and was in English only. In our survey of young people on the Oswald Unit, 55% said that it was easy to make a complaint, which was significantly better than the response of 32% for other juveniles at Castington.
- 3.101** Complaint forms, including confidential access forms, were readily accessible on all residential units. Not all units provided envelopes for confidential access complaints alongside the forms, although we were told that they were supplied on request. There were locked complaints boxes on all units, which the complaints clerk emptied daily. Unit staff had no access to complaints posted in boxes, although young people believed that they did.
- 3.102** Complaints were logged and processed within 24 hours. The log provided an audit trail that showed that responses were also timely. Complaints about bullying or those with child protection concerns were passed on to the safer custody team. The complaints clerk had received child protection awareness training.
- 3.103** In the sample that we examined, complaints had been dealt with quickly and responses were legible, but many replies were curt and did not always address the complaint sufficiently. It was rare for a response to be addressed to the young person personally, and few contained an apology, even when one was merited. There were, however, some noteworthy exceptions from healthcare, the education department and the health and safety department. There was a quality assurance system, but none of the shortcomings we identified had been documented. In our survey, 48% of young adult respondents said that complaints were dealt with fairly, against a comparator of 38%. On Oswald Unit, 36% of respondents said that complaints were dealt with fairly, which was significantly better than the response of 13% from other juveniles at Castington.
- 3.104** The consultative committee meetings mitigated the need for formal complaints to some extent, as they were a forum in which young people they could air their grievances with a range of staff. Juveniles also had frequent access to independent advocates and the Independent Monitoring Board.
- 3.105** There was some analysis of complaints by unit, timeliness and ethnicity, and this was discussed at senior management team meetings. However, there was no analysis by type and no trend analysis. It was not possible to ascertain how many complaints were upheld, as this data was not kept, but young people seldom appealed against responses to their complaints, and in the previous 12 months only seven complaints had gone beyond stage one. In our survey, only 20% of young adult respondents said that they had been given information about how to make an appeal, which was significantly worse than the comparator of 31%.

Recommendations

- 3.106** The induction booklet should include information about how to make a complaint.

- 3.107 Unit logs that record applications should have a complete audit trail, including a record of the outcome.
- 3.108 Information about applications and complaints should be reinforced through age-appropriate notices and posters that are easy to read and available in a range of languages.
- 3.109 The quality assurance of complaints should be improved to ensure that replies are respectful and clearly address the issues raised.
- 3.110 Complaints should be analysed by type, and patterns and trends should be monitored.
- 3.111 Young people should be given clear information about how to make an appeal against the response to a complaint, and assisted to do so if necessary.

Housekeeping point

- 3.112 There should be a readily accessible supply of envelopes for young people who wish to make a confidential complaint.

Legal rights

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners are told about their legal rights during induction, and can freely exercise these rights while in prison.

- 3.113 The legal aid officer working on the young adult units was given some time for the role, but this was not the case on the juvenile units, where the role appeared to have a low profile. Young adults on remand had access to a bail information service, and bail was discussed at initial juvenile remand meetings. Legal visits facilities were good, but there were many recorded cases where staff had opened mail from legal advisers in error.
- 3.114 There was one trained legal aid officer based on Cuthbert Unit, with facility time for legal aid work on the young adult units on Monday to Thursday mornings, although this task was sometimes not covered due to a lack of staff. Cover was provided where possible when the trained officer was not available.
- 3.115 Young adults could request help with legal matters through general applications, which were recorded in a log. The legal aid officer issued and explained legal paperwork, primarily appeal documentation, and the issue of such paperwork was also recorded. An examination of the log showed that relatively few applications were received. There no evidence of a backlog of applications, and the current demand for the service appeared to be met. During their induction, young adults were asked if they intended to appeal and if they required assistance, and referrals were forwarded to the legal aid officer. Some limited information on the legal service was displayed on unit notice boards.
- 3.116 Although two staff working on the juvenile units were trained in legal aid, there were no hours allocated to the work. We were told that juveniles made few applications, which the trained staff dealt with when they could find time in the daily routine. Staff facilitated access to the

telephone and issued additional letters if required. Juveniles received some information about the legal aid service during their induction, but the role appeared to have a low profile.

- 3.117 Young adults had access to a bail information service provided by two full-time staff, one officer and one probation service officer, located on the young adult first night unit. The service appeared well integrated, and bail staff said they felt supported by unit staff. All newly remanded young adults were seen within 48 hours of their arrival. Staff endeavoured to produce a bail report for each young adult, explored options such as electronic tagging, and communicated with young people's legal representatives to ensure a bail application was being pursued. There were comprehensive records, which showed that in the three months from September to November 2008, 67 bail reports were prepared and 37 young adults were bailed, approximately 73% of whom were bailed with a report. The service also made referrals to the Clearsprings bail accommodation and support service.
- 3.118 Bail for juveniles was discussed at an initial remand meeting, which took place within five days of their arrival. The juvenile casework team based on Finian prioritised the scheduling of these meetings to ensure bail could be discussed with the juvenile and his youth offending team (YOT) worker before his next court appearance. The YOT worker checked the juvenile's understanding of court processes, including bail options, and liaised with legal representatives as required. A bail package was prepared, if appropriate, and put before the court. Offender management unit (OMU) records showed that 12 juveniles had been bailed in the last three months of 2008. The contact details of juveniles' legal representative were not routinely recorded during the induction process or retained in unit files.
- 3.119 Twenty young adults were subject to licence recall at the time of the inspection. Recall packs were issued and returned in a timely manner.
- 3.120 Legal visits were held in the main visits area each weekday between 9am and 11.15 am and 1.45pm and 4pm. Seven booths were available. Visits had to be pre-booked on a dedicated telephone line. The visits policy did not provide for juveniles' family members to attend legal visits. All young people could spend time with their legal representatives before and after a video link appearance. The facility for legal conferences had been used 54 times from October to December 2008.
- 3.121 In our survey, 53% of young adult respondents, significantly more than the comparator of 39%, said staff had opened letters from their legal representative. Censors' staff who were responsible for processing incoming mail kept a log of mail opened in error. It was not clear from the log whether all mail recorded was actually opened, although we found 29 entries in 2008 where legal mail was opened in error, which was a high number.

Recommendations

- 3.122 All young people should have ready access to legal advice.
- 3.123 Details of juveniles' legal representatives should be obtained during first night procedures and retained in unit files.
- 3.124 Children should have the opportunity to have a family member or carer present during a legal visit.
- 3.125 Mail from solicitors or legal advisers should only be opened by staff in the presence of the prisoner.

Substance use

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners with substance-related needs, including alcohol, are identified at reception and receive effective treatment and support throughout their stay in custody. All prisoners are safe from exposure to and the effects of substance use while in prison.

3.126 Substance-dependent young people were seen by specialist GPs, but prescribing protocols lacked flexibility. Nurses had not been trained in managing substance misuse, and joint work with the counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare service (CARATs) and the young people's substance misuse service (YPSMS) was insufficient to enable effective integrated treatment and support. Mandatory drug testing (MDT) results showed that buprenorphine was the main drug of use, followed by cannabis.

Clinical management

- 3.127 New arrivals received health screening and were given first night symptom relief if opiate dependent. Alcohol and benzodiazepine detoxification started immediately. Those with complex physical or mental health problems were admitted as inpatients.
- 3.128 None of the nurses had been trained in the management of substance misuse, but the clinical director and another GP were specialists. They undertook comprehensive assessments of substance-dependent new arrivals the following day, and there was out-of-hours GP cover.
- 3.129 In the previous six months, 24 young people had detoxified (22 young adults and two juveniles). This had included 14 opiate, seven benzodiazepine and three alcohol regimes.
- 3.130 Prescribing regimes lacked flexibility and were not patient-centred. Detoxification using dihydrocodeine was the only treatment option for young people dependent on opiates, including those who had been maintained on methadone in the community. The establishment did not currently have the facilities to administer methadone safely, and this limited prescribing options. The service was described as 'safe but far from ideal'.
- 3.131 The clinical management protocols required updating in light of current national guidance, and did not specifically cover the treatment of children. The community specialist substance misuse service for young people could provide advice.
- 3.132 GPs did not work as part of a multidisciplinary team. There were no detailed care plans, and treatment reviews did not take place routinely. We were told that liaison between the health services department and the counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare service (CARATs) and the young people's substance misuse service (YPSMS) had improved with joint working protocols and named links in each team, but there was still no joint care planning and care coordination.
- 3.133 Young people undergoing detoxification on the units had twice-daily contact with nurses and were supported by CARATs and YPSMS workers, but this support was uncoordinated. Officers on the young adults' induction unit were not informed of those undergoing detoxification.

- 3.134 Young people with substance and mental health related problems had good access to the services of the mental health in-reach team, who were experienced in treating dual-diagnosis clients. CARATs and the YPSMS referred clients, but there were no multi-agency meetings to coordinate care effectively.
- 3.135 Two nurses had specialised in smoking cessation, and nicotine replacement therapy as well as one-to-one support was available to all young people. Juveniles received priority, but 20 young adults were on the waiting list. Joint health promotion initiatives with the YPSMS had not been developed.

Drug testing

- 3.136 The random mandatory drug testing (MDT) positive year-to-date rate was 3.3% against a target of 6.7%, but rose to 5.9% if young people testing positive for buprenorphine (Subutex) were included. Subutex was the most commonly used substance, followed by cannabis.
- 3.137 A quarter of security information reports (SIRs) were drug related. There had been 106 suspicion tests since April 2008, resulting in a positive rate of only 11.3%. We were told there had been difficulties staffing the MDT programme, but this had been addressed, and target tests were now conducted within 24 hours. It was also reported that the quality of SIRs varied.
- 3.138 Positive test results were slightly lower for juveniles. In the 2008 needs analysis, 32% of young adults and 29% of juveniles reported using illegal drugs while at Castington, and 11% of young adults and 7% of juveniles also said that medication was diverted. In our own survey, 36% of young adult respondents said it was easy to get illegal drugs in the establishment, against a comparator of 21%.
- 3.139 MDT facilities were not satisfactory but new premises had been identified and work was almost complete. All MDT officers had received child protection training, and procedures did not include strip searching.
- 3.140 There were appropriate security procedures to reduce supply. Drug dogs had been trained to detect Subutex, and closed visits were imposed if there was corroborating intelligence (there was one in January 2009). Four visitors had been banned. Finds in the last six months (29) confirmed Subutex and cannabis as the main substances of use.
- 3.141 Security and treatment services linked well. All young people who tested positive were referred to the CARAT or the YPSMS teams, and security staff attended drug strategy meetings. The supply reduction action plan was due to be finalised.

Recommendations

- 3.142 Nurses should undertake training in the clinical management of substance-dependent young people.
- 3.143 Nurses should inform officers on the young adults' induction unit of those undergoing detoxification.
- 3.144 Clinical management protocols should address the specific issues related to the treatment of children.

- 3.145 Individual care plans and reviews should be developed which demonstrate patient involvement.
- 3.146 Joint work between the health services department, the counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare service (CARATs), the young people's substance misuse service (YPSMS) and the mental health in-reach team should be developed to improve care planning and care coordination.
- 3.147 Nurses and YPSMS staff should jointly offer smoking cessation advice and support to young people.

Section 4: Health services

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners should be cared for by a health service that assesses and meets their health needs while in prison and which promotes continuity of health and social care on release. The standard of health service provided is equivalent to that which prisoners could expect to receive in the community.

4.1 Access to primary care services was generally good, especially access to GPs, but healthcare accommodation was poor and had delayed the development of clinical services. Dental services had improved following an increase in clinical sessions, and the routine waiting list was negligible, except for young people on remand. One cohesive mental health team provided support and education to young people and staff across the prison. The inpatient facility needed regular deployment of discipline staff. External appointments were rescheduled to suit escort officer availability.

General

- 4.2 Durham Primary Care Trust (PCT) commissioned health services from the Northumberland Care Trust, including other prisons in the region. The operational manager and head of healthcare was based in the adjacent HMP Acklington and managed both prisons. He had been in post for 14 months and provided strategic and professional support for the clinical team, with weekly meetings with the clinical team leader. He was a member of the senior management team and the prison partnership board, and represented the healthcare department on prison and PCT operational and clinical meetings. Other members of the health team attended various meetings in the prison, including safeguarding, child protection and the race equality action team.
- 4.3 The healthcare accommodation was inadequate. Juveniles and young adults could not be in the department at the same time because there was only one waiting room, and there was no opportunity to treat both groups of young people simultaneously. The main healthcare department was small and cramped, and the lack of suitable accommodation potentially compromised medical confidentiality. There were not enough consulting rooms to meet the healthcare needs of young people, and health professionals often had to meet in the main corridor to discuss general health issues, and sometimes patients. Despite our previous recommendations, nothing had been done to expand the healthcare facilities across the prison to progress healthcare services for young people, and this needed to be addressed urgently.
- 4.4 The overall cleanliness of the department was only adequate, and a trained cleaner was needed to work there full time. Currently, a general prison-employed cleaner spent an hour a day in the primary care department, and a young adult prisoner cleaned the inpatient unit. The PCT had completed a general infection control audit in 2008, which identified many deficiencies needing attention, although there were good handwashing facilities throughout the department.
- 4.5 The single waiting room was very small and could not accommodate more than 10 prisoners comfortably. It was sparse and uncomfortable with wooden bench seating. There was a patients' toilet next door.

- 4.6 The doctor's office was the only thoroughfare to the dispensary room, and access to the dispensary was limited during the GP's morning clinic. Health staff had to interrupt clinics to access the dispensary.
- 4.7 The dental surgery was in a good state of decoration. The standard of equipment was good, except for the malfunctioning suction equipment, which caused significant gaps in service provision. A temporary unit was in place. There were also problems with the maintenance of dental equipment by external contractors. Infection control measures appeared satisfactory, but there been no dental infection control audit for at least 10 years.
- 4.8 The dispensary was clean, tidy, secure and a reasonable size, with satisfactory secure storage. Current reference books were available. There were refrigerators in the dispensary and one of the treatment rooms, but temperature measurements were not recorded properly. The pharmacist date checked pharmacy stock but there was no evidence to support this. Most medication was supplied individually, but there was a large amount of stock medicines. Stock was not pre-labelled, and there was no provision to do so. Medicines were transported to the units in lockable boxes, and to the Oswald Unit in a locked medicine trolley, which was secured to the dispensary wall when not in use. We found some loose strips of medication in the trolley and the boxes. Controlled drugs were administered from the dispensary, but their use was minimal; record keeping was in accordance with regulations.
- 4.9 The inpatient area was visible from the primary care area. It was light and airy, but needed renovation, especially the bathroom and shower areas, which were difficult to keep clean. There were seven single inpatient cells, three of which were covered by camera and one of which had disabled access, and all had in-cell sanitation. No beds were included in the certified normal accommodation (CNA). There was a small kitchen and an association room, although this was used primarily for staff meetings. There were some board games, books and a television for inpatients. Storage facilities were cramped, and one of the cells was used to store equipment. Another cell was used to store old medical records; this was also cramped but well organised.
- 4.10 The two treatment rooms were adequate, but needed modernisation to meet NHS cleanliness and infection control guidelines. Some cabinet doors were loose and needed to be repaired. Administrative and office areas were very small and needed to be extended. The clinical team leader's office was very small with no natural light or ventilation.
- 4.11 There was no electronic medical information system, although wiring and hardware had been installed and the system was due to be functional within three months.
- 4.12 The reception medical room was large and well equipped, and provided a safe environment for staff and young people. Emergency bells were appropriately sited throughout the healthcare department and in reception.
- 4.13 There were no unit-based health facilities, although work had started in the young adult units to covert rooms into healthcare facilities. Oswald Unit had no facilities to deliver any form of healthcare, including medications, and urgently needed a suitable healthcare environment.

Clinical governance

- 4.14 Clinical governance arrangements included the management and accountability of staff. Despite the 24-hour nursing cover, staffing levels were too low to cover staff sickness or high volumes of clinical activity. There had been a period of staffing instability due to staff

restructuring and the negativity of some staff, but staff we spoke with were positive and keen to improve services for young people.

- 4.15 The PCT operational manager provided robust operational and clinical support to healthcare staff and was highly visible in the unit. The nurse establishment was 12 whole-time equivalent (WTE) registered nurses, including the clinical lead nurse and one healthcare assistant (HCA). Two staff were on long-term sick leave and one was unavailable for duty, and shortfalls were filled through bank nurses. The skill mix was good with a combination of registered general nurses (RGNs), a registered nurse for learning disabilities (RNLD), and a registered nurse with a diploma in children's nursing. Many nurses had additional qualifications, including British Sign Language and nurse triage. The clinical team leader was very experienced, well qualified and provided effective leadership. She was responsible for the day-to-day running of the department, as well as providing practice nurse skills to the patients and other nursing staff.
- 4.16 The team was supported by 1.5 WTE administrators, which was inadequate for the high volume of administrative work and data collection. The administrators managed clinical records and provided secretarial support to the GPs and nursing staff.
- 4.17 There were good arrangements for nursing staff to access professional training and clinical supervision. Mandatory training records were in place, and the monitoring and provision of training had improved since the introduction of a clinical lead nurse. There was clinical supervision for all staff, as well as resuscitation training and child protection training.
- 4.18 GP cover was good and of a high quality. The service was provided by a local GP practice and one of the GPs was in the prison every weekday morning. The same practice provided telephone support until 5pm, as well as the out-of-hours service.
- 4.19 The PCT funded the deployment of discipline officers to healthcare. An officer was allocated to inpatients every weekday from 7.30am until 5.30pm, but no regular cohort of prison officers was deployed. On one day, we observed that at least three different officers covered the day shift. Officers changed every day, and this presented some governance issues. Some officers clearly did not want to work in inpatients, and we noted very limited interaction with young people, except for one officer, who was not allocated there permanently. The lack of a dedicated team of discipline officers affected services for inpatients, who were often there for mental health support and would have benefited from continuity of officer care.
- 4.20 The PCT also funded the allocation of an officer to escort and supervise young people in the outpatient department between 1.30pm and 5pm, but this duty should be the responsibility of the prison not the PCT.
- 4.21 Dental services were provided by a visiting clinician who held two sessions a week. Twelve young people were treated at each session.
- 4.22 Resuscitation equipment was well maintained and easily available. Daily checks were recorded, but the defibrillator check needed to be added to the printed checklist. Specialist medical equipment was made available through the PCT.
- 4.23 Clinical records were orderly and held securely in the administrative office. Those we reviewed were well maintained with relevant entries. The signatures and designations of staff making entries were not always clear or in keeping with the professional bodies' guidelines. The Caldicott guardian (overseeing use and confidentiality of personal health information) was the North of Tyne medical director.

- 4.24 There was a comprehensive policy on communicable disease, and good links with local health protection agencies. A policy for parental consent for under 16 year olds had been implemented. There were extensive NHS and Prison Service clinical and operational policies for staff consultation.
- 4.25 There was no dedicated health forum for young people to discuss health-related matters with staff, although a member of health staff attended the general consultative committee meeting.
- 4.26 Complaints were dealt with by a PCT coordinator who replied to all complaints within NHS guidelines. There had been only three complaints to the PCT in 2008.

Primary care

- 4.27 There was a good range of primary care services, and this was confirmed in the positive survey responses for both young adults and juveniles. The head of healthcare had conducted a patient satisfaction questionnaire that corroborated our survey findings.
- 4.28 A nurse saw all young people returning from court, hospital appointments or release on temporary licence for a brief health check in reception. New arrivals received an initial health assessment and were informed verbally and in writing of all health services and how to access them. New arrivals presenting as anxious or vulnerable were carefully assessed to ensure that they would be able to settle on the unit over night. If the assessor had concerns about their physical or mental health, or if the young person requested it, they were admitted to healthcare for overnight observation, which could include initiating an ACCT. All young people given life sentences were offered the opportunity of spending their first night in healthcare. A young person's GP was contacted if there was any pre-existing condition or if he was on medication.
- 4.29 A secondary screening was undertaken the next day in the main healthcare department, and included a more comprehensive health assessment and routine checks of height and weight. Young people were also offered age-related and generic immunisations. Any young person who asked to see the doctor was seen within 48 hours or, where necessary, the same or next day. All young people on medication were seen by the GP.
- 4.30 Young people completed an application form (which was also pictorial) to access health services, and posted this in a dedicated secure health box on the unit, which was emptied by health staff every day. Nursing staff had 'adopted' units to provide better continuity of care for young people and to establish good working relationships with discipline staff, and this approach worked well. A nurse reviewed the applications and passed them to the relevant health professional. Nurses held triage clinics every day and, where necessary, referred the young person straight to the GP. They also carried out dental triage to determine the level of need. This ensured that young people were prioritised appropriately, but the system needed to be developed further.
- 4.31 The range of clinics included vaccinations, smoking cessation, asthma, sexual health and diabetes. Some clinical expertise was shared between Castington and Acklington. The asthma and diabetic nurse specialist was based in Acklington and managed diabetic young people on both sites. Diabetics were not allowed to have their insulin pens in possession for security reasons, although all young people had individual cells and, once risk assessed by health staff, should have been able to hold their insulin pens in possession or in secure medicine boxes.

- 4.32 Sexual health was managed by the lead GP and a specialist nurse, and there were plans to bring in a community specialist to ensure continuity of care. Other visiting professionals included a chiropodist, optician and physiotherapist. Specialist physiotherapy was also available through the local NHS.
- 4.33 One of the registered nurses was nominated as the lead nurse for foreign national young people. Interpretation services were used where necessary. Another nurse was the disability link.
- 4.34 Health promotion was developing well, and a health promotion forum involving Castington and Acklington met monthly. The forum included clinical and operational staff from both prisons, and a health promotion strategy and action plan had been published. There was no barrier protection policy and no facility for young adults to request advice or condoms.
- 4.35 The lack of a clinical IT system limited collation of data on clinical activity. We were unable to determine the number of young people who failed to turn up for appointments. We were told that non-attendance was manageable, except for dental clinics.
- 4.36 Healthcare staff visited the care and separation unit every day. The unit had no dedicated healthcare boxes for applications and complaints, but applications were put into sealed envelopes that were only opened by healthcare staff. Half of the unit staff had had mental health awareness training, and there was an ongoing training programme for the remainder. Mental health nurses visited the unit regularly.

Pharmacy

- 4.37 Pharmacy services were provided from a local pharmacy, with a satellite pharmacy in Acklington. Pharmacy staff from Acklington visited once a week. Orders were returned the next day, and the pharmacist monitored prescriptions.
- 4.38 Prescription and administration charts were held in the dispensary. Most were well maintained, but some charts had no diagnosis and length of treatment entries. Young people could have their medicines for up to 28 days in possession following a risk assessment and the signing of a medication compact. Most medicines were not given in possession, except for creams and inhalers. Patient information leaflets were supplied with medicines. Special sick medicines were supplied through a comprehensive set of patient group directions, but there needed to be easier access to simple remedies.
- 4.39 Medicines were administered at 8am, noon and 5pm. There were no dedicated facilities for the administration of medicines on any of the residential units, although rooms had been identified on the young adult units and were being converted into healthcare rooms. At the time of the inspection, unit offices were used to administer medications from the trolley; no prisoner movement was permitted during this time. These offices were unsuitable, and not all had handwashing facilities. The office doors had been given a hatch to provide a safe environment for young people to receive their medication, and confidentiality was generally good. Discipline officers were present throughout medicine administration, and we saw no evidence of inappropriate behaviour by young people. On Oswald Unit, medicines were administered in a corridor area. This was unsuitable and potentially unsafe for staff and patients. Young people were asked for identification before medicines were administered. Our observations of medicine administration showed that young people were generally compliant, and that health staff had developed good relationships with them.

- 4.40 A medicines management forum held jointly with Acklington met once a month, and included representatives from healthcare, security, the PCT and the pharmacist.

Dentistry

- 4.41 Dental services were good and the team worked well with healthcare. Non-urgent cases were triaged by nursing staff and, although this was covered by a protocol, further training was needed. Routine waiting lists were negligible, with only one sentenced young person on the current list. However, 24 young people on remand were on another list, which had a five-month wait for treatment. This was unacceptable, although work was under way to reduce this wait. Young people had access to a full range of NHS treatments, and oral health promotion was offered during treatment. There was no audit of why young people did not attend for appointments, and this needed to be investigated and an action plan developed to address this.
- 4.42 Dental records were appropriately maintained and clinical records were available during treatment. Clinical governance arrangements were satisfactory. Although oral health promotion was provided during treatment, there was no general oral health promotion.
- 4.43 There was an out-of-hours protocol, but there was no cover when the dentist was on leave. The dental contract was monitored by the PCT, but the dental surgery had not been inspected by the PCT dental adviser.

Inpatients

- 4.44 At the time of our visit, two juveniles were receiving inpatient care, one of whom was being integrated back to his unit. Bed occupancy averaged around 11 patients a month. We saw evidence of care planning with regular input from the nursing staff, and a named nurse was allocated to cover inpatients daily. A discipline officer was present in the unit when there were inpatients, but there was no continuity of discipline staff (see paragraph 4.19). There were no daycare services or structured activity for inpatients, and their only interaction or activity was through discipline or healthcare staff. We were told that there was rarely a need for use of force with inpatients, but there was no register to record such events.

Secondary care

- 4.45 Young people referred to NHS facilities often had their appointments rescheduled because of the escort officers' duty rota. Only one young person was allowed out in the morning and another in the afternoon. Administrative staff said that if an appointment was scheduled between 8.30am and 10.45am or 1.30pm and 3.30pm, they had difficulty in arranging escorts. In many cases, appointments had to be rescheduled to fit in with officers' rota, although we were not able to find the figures for this.
- 4.46 Administrative staff aimed to ensure that young people transferred in with outstanding NHS hospital appointments could attend these. They also placed young people on a medical hold, with their consent, if they were waiting to attend appointments locally.

Mental health

- 4.47 Northumberland, Tyne and Wear NHS Trust provided mental health services to Acklington and Castington. A review of mental health services at both prisons was under way, with the findings to be submitted to the north east offender health commissioning board by March 2009. Funding was needed to improve mental health services.
- 4.48 The mental health in-reach team comprised two full-time band 6 and 7 registered mental health nurses (RMNs) and three part-time band 7 RMNs. The team provided support to all young people in the prison. A child psychiatrist held one session a week, and a clinical psychologist was available from the trust as required. The mental health service was professional and cohesive. The team also provided training for prison staff, was fully involved with other prison departments as well as outside agencies, and was included in all healthcare activities and meetings in the healthcare department.
- 4.49 Referrals to the team could be made through any prison staff, and referrals were seen as soon as possible. There was no counselling service, but the team engaged with national children's organisations and the external counsellors used in Acklington to provide support to young people in Castington. There were no daycare facilities in the prison. One young person was being held overnight in inpatients but returned to his unit during the day. This provided a well-managed return to normal location, but there were few activities in the prison to support young people who found life in the prison difficult to cope with. The mental health team engaged well with young people, but lacked facilities to develop the service.
- 4.50 Mental health awareness training for staff was provided one day a month with an uptake of six to 12 staff per course. The team also assisted with the juvenile awareness staff programme. Team members wrote entries into the patient's clinical record to ensure that all healthcare staff had access to up-to-date mental health records. Transfers to secure units were easier to facilitate for juveniles than young adults. One young adult was currently waiting transfer to a secure unit.

Recommendations

- 4.51 Additional waiting areas should be identified in the healthcare department as a matter of urgency to allow both groups of young people to be in the department at the same time.
- 4.52 There should be a professional cleaning contract to ensure that healthcare facilities throughout the prison are cleaned professionally and regularly, and meet infection control guidelines.
- 4.53 The installation of the clinical information technology system should be expedited to improve clinical governance, including clinical records and data collection.
- 4.54 We again repeat our recommendation that there should be unit-based healthcare facilities, to include medicine administration, to ensure effective, safe and appropriate services to young people throughout the prison.
- 4.55 There should be a skill mix review to ensure there are sufficient appropriately qualified healthcare staff to deliver a comprehensive healthcare service. This should include administrative functions.

- 4.56 A dedicated team of discipline officers should be allocated to healthcare, with only suitable and willing officers deployed to the inpatient area, to provide continuity of care.
- 4.57 Entries in clinical records should be clear, and the name and designation of each health professional making an entry should be legible and in keeping with professional guidelines.
- 4.58 There should be a dedicated health forum for young people to allow direct dialogue with senior healthcare staff.
- 4.59 Following a comprehensive risk assessment, young diabetics should be allowed to hold their insulin in possession, or in identified secure boxes on residential units.
- 4.60 Barrier protection should be available to all young adults, supported by a comprehensive health promotion strategy.
- 4.61 Information on all cases where young people do not attend health appointments should be collated, and the reasons for non-attendance surveyed.
- 4.62 External NHS appointments should not be rescheduled to facilitate officers' duty rota.
- 4.63 Security and patient confidentiality should be maintained at all times while medicines are administered.
- 4.64 The special sick arrangements should include access to basic analgesia and homely remedies without reference to the GP.
- 4.65 Young people should have direct access to the pharmacist.
- 4.66 The PCT should carry out a full inspection of the dental surgery.
- 4.67 The inpatients showers and bathroom should be refurbished as a priority.
- 4.68 Daycare facilities should be available for all young people in the prison.
- 4.69 All staff on the care and separation unit should receive regular and ongoing mental health awareness training.
- 4.70 Qualified counsellors, including specialists, should be provided to improve psychological support to young people.

Housekeeping points

- 4.71 The medicine stock levels should be rationalised and supplied as dual-labelled pre-packs.
- 4.72 Medication should be kept in the packaging supplied by the pharmacy.
- 4.73 Prescription and administration charts should specify the diagnosis and the period of treatment.
- 4.74 There should be a healthcare application box in the care and separation unit.

- 4.75 A register of the use of force in the inpatient area should be maintained.
- 4.76 The record of daily checks of resuscitation equipment should include notation for the defibrillator check.
- 4.77 Maximum and minimum fridge temperatures should be monitored on a daily basis.
- 4.78 A new dental suction unit should be provided.
- 4.79 Dental equipment should be maintained by outside contractors.

Good practice

- 4.80 *Young people facing long sentences could spend their first night in healthcare.*
- 4.81 *The allocation of named nurses to residential units helped improve relationships between unit and health staff and provided better continuity of care for young people.*

Section 5: Activities

Learning and skills and work activities

Expected outcomes:

Learning and skills provision meets the requirements of the specialist education inspectorate's Common Inspection Framework (separately inspected by specialist education inspectors). Prisoners are encouraged and enabled to learn both during and after sentence, as part of sentence planning; and have access to good library facilities. Sufficient purposeful activity is available for the total prisoner population.

- 5.1 Most education for both juveniles and young adults was delivered by a single provider, and most young people were engaged in some form of learning. Facilities were generally good, as was the range of vocational and academic courses.
- 5.2 The head of learning and skills was responsible for education, training and work for all young people, and the establishment had a clear vision and direction for the development of education and training. Most education and training courses were subcontracted to Newcastle College, funded through the Offender Learning and Skills Service (OLASS) contract for young adults and through the Youth Justice Board (YJB) for juveniles. Almost all young people (98%) were engaged in education or vocational training, although not all were full time.
- 5.3 Facilities and resources for learning were good, with a good range of vocational and academic courses. Education classes included literacy, numeracy, English for speakers of other languages (ESOL), information technology (IT), healthy living, art and design and drama. Basic skills in literacy and numeracy were mainly delivered in the vocational training workshop classrooms, and contextualised to the relevant work area. Vocational courses included catering, industrial cleaning, construction trades, painting and decorating, motor vehicle maintenance, horticulture, IT and physical education (PE), although the motor vehicle and painting and decorating workshops were for juveniles only and the construction workshops for young adults. They provided good opportunities to gain skills and qualifications for future employment. There was good information, advice and guidance (IAG) (see paragraph 8.37).

Young adults

- 5.4 Learning and skills and work provision were good, as were teaching and learning, standards of prisoners' work and achievement of qualifications. Nearly all young adults were on accredited courses, although much of this was part-time. A range of learning and skills data was collected and analysed effectively, and used to develop the provision. Quality improvement arrangements were well established and systematic, and quality improvement action plans were monitored and updated.
- 5.5 All young adult new arrivals were satisfactorily assessed for their literacy, numeracy and language support needs, and allocated to courses within two weeks. Attendance on courses was good, as were achievements for those who completed the courses. Allocations to courses were fair and transparent and based on identified sentence planning needs. Prison and college managers met regularly to monitor attendance and achievements against the contracted

requirements, and systematically checked the quality and progress of teaching and learning. Teaching and learning were good for most courses. Quality improvement arrangements were well established and systematic, and improvement action plans for tutors observed as only satisfactory or worse were monitored and updated.

- 5.6 There were insufficient contracted education and training hours to provide full-time activity for all young adults, and courses were part time to allow as many young adults as possible to take part. This meant that up to 40% of young adults could be locked in their cells with no activities for part of the day (see paragraph 5.52). Even with part-time provision (113 places), the contract provided only a maximum of 203 places for a normal population of 240 young adults (see main recommendation HP55).
- 5.7 Young adult learners' progress was well monitored and progress reviews were well used to assess progress against targets. However, there was some poor recording of progress. All courses used individual learning plans (ILPs) to plan and monitor learning. ILPs were well used on most courses, although the level of completion was inconsistent across the various courses. Learners signed a learning compact agreement that specified expected behaviour levels and what they could expect from the course and from tutors. Levels of behaviour were generally good, although some learners were boisterous and sometimes aggressive. Tutors dealt with these issues well, and calmed potentially difficult situations.
- 5.8 Arrangements for additional learning support were very good. Dedicated and appropriately qualified tutors and learning support assistants (LSAs) provided intensive individual support to learners who were otherwise unlikely to access education, in some instances because of security reasons. In many cases, tutors improved learners' personal effectiveness while providing them with essential functional literacy and numeracy skills to support wider learning. Tutors and LSAs used their skills well to gain the confidence of young adults and raise their self-esteem.
- 5.9 A successful Toe-by-Toe reading mentoring scheme helped many young adults improve their reading skills. Arrangements for initial and diagnostic testing were well established and effective. Staff worked well with individual learners to identify learning needs, including difficulties related to dyslexia and mental health problems.

Juveniles

- 5.10 Achievements and standards were good, and young people gained qualifications in subjects that would help them into further training or employment on their release. Nearly all juveniles gained a qualification in literacy and numeracy, there were high achievements in information and communications technology, and juveniles also gained qualifications to support their independent living skills and personal development. A few juveniles had gained GCSEs in mathematics, English and other subjects, and over 96% of juveniles left Castington with at least one qualification, and most had more.
- 5.11 The standards of work in the vocational and practical areas were good, and in catering and painting and decorating young people were proud of their achievements and enthusiastic about their work. In these areas, there was a strong emphasis on helping young people develop useful employment skills. Attendance at education and punctuality were good, although the time that juveniles were collected from classes was too variable and prevented an effective end to lessons.

- 5.12 Teaching and learning were good overall, and generally more effective in the practical and vocational lessons, where expectations were high and young people worked hard and made good progress. Young people took responsibility for their own learning and behaved well. In the less effective lessons, tasks were sometimes unimaginative and learners sometimes lost concentration, and their behaviour deteriorated. Behaviour in lessons and relations between teachers and learners were generally good and respectful, but some of the larger classes would have benefited from a learning support assistant (LSA) to help young people to stay focused on their work.
- 5.13 Poor behaviour was usually managed well, and young people were only returned to their residential unit as a last resort. Juveniles whose behaviour was difficult in a particular lesson could be sent to the Green Room, where they had the opportunity to reflect on their actions and, with good support, consider the possible consequences. While some young people were returned to the units, most were reintegrated successfully into the lesson.
- 5.14 The curriculum was planned effectively, reviewed appropriately and frequently, and changes were implemented well. For example, the shortening of lessons had made a positive impact on learning and behaviour.
- 5.15 All juveniles studied literacy, numeracy, information and communications technology (ICT) and a range of personal, social and health education (PSHE) subjects. They could also choose a specialism from a vocational area, such as motor vehicle, painting and decorating or catering, or from other subjects, such as art and design, ICT or performing arts. Most subjects had progression routes to higher level qualifications, although the range of GCSEs for more able learners was relatively narrow. In vocational areas, literacy and numeracy were taught and assessed in a vocational context, which enabled young people to see the importance of maths and English in the workplace.
- 5.16 The induction programme included an effective initial assessment of young people's literacy and numeracy, as well as their preferred learning styles, any specific learning disabilities and any historical behavioural problems. Young people identified as needing additional learning support in literacy and numeracy had effective individual sessions, which also focused on other aspects, such as behaviour and personal development. These sessions had helped many young people to increase their reading age, in some cases very substantially.
- 5.17 The curriculum was enhanced by a range of projects, for example in drama and music, and by an innovative gardening/horticulture project on the Oswald Unit. The Every Child Matters themes were promoted well. Young people's achievements were celebrated through displays of young people's work throughout the prison and by the very successful celebration events that were valued greatly by young people and their parents/ carers.
- 5.18 Learning support assistants provided education in the separation and care unit and in healthcare. There was some education on the residential units, but there was no dedicated accommodation for this and learning was disrupted by noise and other distractions.
- 5.19 There was a clear vision and direction for the development of education and training. The department ran smoothly on a day-to-day basis, had a strong emphasis on teamwork, and promoted equality and diversity well. Relationships between the prison and the contractor were good. Lesson observations took place and there were appropriate procedures to improve inadequate teaching and learning. The self-assessment report was thorough and largely evaluative and accurate, although the proportion of good or better teaching reported was too high.

Library

- 5.20 There was one library for the whole establishment, with services provided by Northumberland County Council. It was welcoming and well managed by an experienced full-time library coordinator, supported by a library assistant for nine hours a week. The position of qualified librarian was vacant. Prisoners were not used as orderlies. A uniformed officer was in attendance at all times to supervise a maximum of 10 young people.
- 5.21 The library was in the education department and provided good access to young people attending classes, although education staff did not generally make use of timetabled sessions for groups in education. It was scheduled to open for 25 hours a week, including four evenings, but it was closed at lunchtime, Friday and the weekend.
- 5.22 Access was good for young adults, who were given regular times to visit the library and whose attendance was monitored and encouraged. However, there was no timetabled slot for juveniles to visit the library during the core week, which meant they were either taken out of lessons to visit or did not visit at all. Two of the three juvenile units could not use the library during the evening. Although young adults could access the library for 30 minutes a week, which met the Prison Service Order, juveniles could not. However, recent surveys indicated that the library was used by 75% of juveniles from the Oswald Unit.
- 5.23 Library resources were sufficient to support young people with additional learning needs, and the stock met literacy and numeracy needs through easy-reader and talking books. Adult and junior books were stocked together to remove the potential stigma for young adults of borrowing books from a junior section. There was a well-stocked fiction section and recreational and non-fiction books, but few books to support vocational learning. The librarian responded promptly to requests for books not stocked, and books ordered from Northumberland Library Services were delivered fortnightly.
- 5.24 There were limited resources to support the small number of foreign national young people for whom English was an additional language. There was a wide range of dictionaries, but these did not cover all the nationalities in the establishment, notably Chinese. There were few reading books in foreign languages.
- 5.25 The library held the full range of mandatory publications of legal textbooks and copies of Prison Service Orders, and these were accessible to the prisoners. Archbold was available as both a hard copy and also a CD for use on the library's five computers.
- 5.26 The library had an electronic security system to prevent unauthorised removal of books. This, together with procedures to recover books from the residential units, had reduced stock loss to 2.2%.
- 5.27 The library coordinator had set up Storybook Dads and had extended the service to enable young people to record readings for their children and younger siblings.

Recommendations

- 5.28 There should be an increase in the range of GCSE subjects.
- 5.29 All vocational workshops should be available to all young people.

- 5.30 All residential units should have dedicated accommodation for literacy and numeracy sessions.
- 5.31 There should be a library slot for juveniles in the core timetable, with additional sessions to avoid clashes with timetabled learning, and evening access for all juvenile units.

Physical education and health promotion

Expected outcomes:

Physical education and PE facilities meet the requirements of the specialist education inspectorate's Common Inspection Framework (separately inspected by specialist education inspectors). Prisoners are also encouraged and enabled to take part in recreational PE, in safe and decent surroundings.

- 5.32 Recreational physical education was satisfactory, but attendance by young adults was low, and accredited PE work was basic. Leaks to the gym roof had affected activities there for some time.
- 5.33 Young adults could use the PE facilities up to six times a week – two sessions during weekdays, two in the evening and two at weekends. Although there was not enough capacity to accommodate this potential use, actual take-up was low and did not restrict the number of sessions for users. Juveniles had a minimum of three hours a week of timetabled core PE, which covered a range of sports and activities, including minor games, with additional recreational PE available in the evenings and at weekends. Refusals to attend core PE were rare. Juveniles who refused to participate after appropriate encouragement were placed on a minor report. PE instructors restricted access to recreational PE for one session if a juvenile's behaviour was not up to standard.
- 5.34 Accredited courses for young adults included British Amateur Weight Lifting Association (BAWLA) and the Community Sport Leader Award (CSLA), which were part of sentence planning, but the range of courses was small. Juveniles gained accreditation for their induction to the department, and a 20-week PE course offered accreditation in physical exercise and health, diet and nutrition, stress management, BAWLA and CSLA. The core PE programme for juveniles was not accredited.
- 5.35 Recreational exercise was encouraged by staff, and posters around the establishment advertised the range of activities. As well as the gym and weights/cardiovascular rooms, there was a squash court, athletics area and a full size football pitch. The roof of the gym leaked, and planned activities had to be changed when it rained; this had been the situation for 18 months.
- 5.36 There was weekly five-a-side football for young adults, with a successful football team in the local league. The department ran a successful Duke of Edinburgh award scheme for juveniles, including camps and expeditions, some involving release on temporary licence.
- 5.37 The PE department had effective links with healthcare for referral PE. No PE was available for young people in the care and separation unit, although it had some cardiovascular equipment.

- 5.38 Gym or sports kit was issued for every visit. Young people were given two towels a week for general use and PE. There were only 11 showers in the gym, which was insufficient when the gym was used to its maximum capacity of 36, when users had to shower in shifts and their gym time was reduced. However, this happened infrequently. Records of accidents, injuries and assaults were regularly recorded, and necessary follow-up procedures were appropriately addressed.

Recommendations

- 5.39 The prison should improve young adult take-up of recreational PE.
- 5.40 There should be more opportunities for young people to gain health and leisure vocational awards at a higher level.
- 5.41 The core PE programme should be accredited, where appropriate.
- 5.42 The roof of the gym should be repaired.

Faith and religious activity

Expected outcomes:

All prisoners are able to practise their religion fully and in safety. The chaplaincy plays a full part in prison life and contributes to prisoners' overall, care, support and resettlement.

- 5.43 The chaplaincy team met the needs of young people, and provided a range of relevant services and faith-based groups. Ecumenical services for both juveniles and young adults were well attended. The chaplaincy also supported the wider work of the prison, and had some useful partnerships with faith-based community groups.
- 5.44 The chaplaincy team comprised three full-time Christian chaplains led by a Church of England coordinating chaplain, and was supported by sessional chaplains representing the minority faiths. A Muslim chaplain attended on Fridays to lead prayers and an Islamic study group that followed. The Muslim population was relatively small, with about five juveniles and four young adults at the time of the inspection, but there were plans to provide additional hours for the Muslim chaplain.
- 5.45 A chaplain saw all new arrivals individually during induction, and there were records to evidence this. In our survey, 34% of juvenile respondents said that they saw a chaplain within their first 24 hours, which was significantly worse than the 58% response at our 2006 inspection. Although 61% of young adult respondents said that they received information about the chaplaincy on their day of arrival, only 45% felt able to speak to a religious leader in private, which was significantly worse than the comparator of 55%. We could not explain these findings, and in our discussions, young people were positive about the chaplaincy and had confidence in the team.
- 5.46 The chaplaincy provided a range of weekly services and faith-based groups. The main Sunday services were ecumenical, but held separately for juveniles and young adults. Services were informal, and used music and a range of media to aid communication with a young congregation. Both services recorded attendance figures of more than 30, despite alternative regime options at the same time.

- 5.47 A range of faith-based groups was available during the week, some of which were supported by faith groups from the community. There had been links with the community for specific events, such as presentations by speakers who young people could relate to. Some community links were also used to assist in the resettlement of a few committed young people. For example, the organisation Reflex linked some young people to supportive churches on resettlement.
- 5.48 The chaplaincy was well sited in the activity area, and its facilities were good. The chapel was light and spacious, and the multi-faith room was comfortable and welcoming. The chaplaincy team was well integrated into the life of the establishment. The coordinating chaplain was a member of the senior management team and all the key management meetings, including safeguarding, the race equality action team and the resettlement group.

Time out of cell

Expected outcomes:

All prisoners are actively encouraged to engage in out of cell activities, and the prison offers a timetable of regular and varied extra-mural activities.

- 5.49 Time unlocked for juveniles was good and met our expectations, but the number of young adults in part-time activity meant time unlocked among this group varied greatly, and was often poor. Too many young adults were locked in cell during the working part of the day. Access to association and exercise for both populations was reasonable.
- 5.50 The establishment reported an overall time unlocked figure for all young people of 8.7 hours a day. However, this figure did not represent the broad reality for most young people. For juveniles fully engaged with the regime, time unlocked was about 10 hours a day, in keeping with our expectations. Similarly, a purposeful activity figure of more than 30 hours a week was reported. Random roll checks we undertook during the week suggested that only a handful of juveniles were locked up during the core day, and then for reasons that were individually justified.
- 5.51 The daily routine for juveniles began at 7.30am, permitted dining in association at breakfast and in the evening, and facilitated approximately two hours evening association, Monday to Friday. In our survey, 61% of juveniles said that they went on association more than five times a week, which was worse than our finding of 79% in 2006. This response was surprising as association was rarely cancelled. Association facilities were reasonable on all the juvenile units, and included pool tables, table tennis and multi-gyms.
- 5.52 In contrast, young adults could access only a maximum of about eight hours a day, which fell short of our expectation of 10 hours. For many young adults, who only had access to part-time activity, the real experience of unlock was likely to be nearer just four or five hours. Our random roll checks revealed that between 27% and 37% of young adults were locked up without purposeful activity during the working day, although this varied greatly between sessions. The overall purposeful activity figure for young adults was only about 22 hours a week. The young adults lack of access to regime was in the context of a comparatively low roll, and the situation could worsen if the establishment were full.
- 5.53 Access to association for young adults was reasonable and rarely cancelled. However, at 1.5 hours each evening, Monday to Thursday, it was much less than that offered to juveniles.

Association facilities for young adults were reasonable, although they were restricted to a comparatively confined space in all the units. In our survey, 73% of young adult respondents, significantly better than the comparator of 41%, said that they went on association more than five times a week.

- 5.54** Access to exercise outdoors for both young adults and juveniles was reasonable. Juveniles had two 30-minute exercise sessions, and 54% of juveniles surveyed said they could exercise daily, significantly better than the comparator of 27%. Young adults had just one exercise period, although in our survey 60% of respondents said they exercised more than three times a week, against the comparator of 39%.

Recommendations

- 5.55** All young adults should be unlocked for at least 10 hours a day.
- 5.56** Young adults not engaged in purposeful activity during the day should be allowed out of their cells.

Section 6: Good order

Security and rules

Expected outcomes:

Security and good order are maintained through positive staff-prisoner relationships based on mutual respect as well as attention to physical and procedural matters. Rules and routines are well-publicised, proportionate, fair and encourage responsible behaviour. Categorisation and allocation procedures are based on an assessment of a prisoner's risks and needs; and are clearly explained, fairly applied and routinely reviewed.

6.1 The security department was well run and had responded appropriately to potential threats related to gangs. Security information reports were submitted by a wide range of staff and were processed efficiently. Random search targets had been met. Not all authorised strip searches of juveniles were based on supportive intelligence. Overall security procedures were appropriate. Categorisation reviews of young adults were completed effectively, but they were not always sent to establishments where they could meet their offending behaviour targets.

Security

- 6.2 The security committee met monthly and was chaired by the head of security and operations. Meetings were well attended and occasionally included representatives from the escort contractor, Global Solutions Limited (GSL). The security and operations group included a deputy head of security and operations and a principal officer. The security department was staffed during the core day by a senior officer, two officers, administrative support and some operational support grade cover.
- 6.3 The establishment had recently started to hold young people on restricted status. Only one such young person was held at the time of inspection. The establishment had responded quickly to the draft and implement appropriate policies.
- 6.4 There had been a serious incident in October 2008 when staff had to withdraw from one of the young adult units following concerted indiscipline. Order was restored as staff quickly regrouped and re-entered the unit to assist a member of staff trapped in one of the offices.
- 6.5 The security department had received an average of 54 security information reports (SIRs) a week in the last six months of 2008; 26% of these were drug related. SIRs had been submitted from a wide range of disciplines in the establishment and many were not purely observational. The security department processed SIRs efficiently.
- 6.6 Gangs were the biggest security concern at the time of the inspection, following the decant of juveniles from YOI Lancaster Farms. In the first three weeks of 2009, the security department had already received 22 gang-related SIRs, compared with just two in the previous six months. Two gangs had been identified, the ringleaders segregated and members split between Godric and Finian units. The security department had also started to identify gang supporters from the general prisoner population, and liaised with the security department at Lancaster Farms.
- 6.7 Residential unit staff normally completed routine and target searches. There was a 12-week rota for routine searches on the young adult units, and this target had been met. All searches

of juveniles were target led. The quality of searches was monitored by unit managers who had a 10% target and recorded any observations on the search report.

- 6.8 Juveniles were only strip searched following a risk assessment, except in reception (see paragraph 1.21). Any such strip searches required the authority of a principal officer or above. However, we found examples where strip searches had been carried out on individuals without specific supporting intelligence.
- 6.9 There were four banned visitors at the time of inspection and one young person subject to closed visits. Restrictions were reviewed monthly. Overall security arrangements appeared proportionate, and did not affect the regime adversely.

Rules

- 6.10 The rules of the establishment were fully explained to new arrivals on induction and included in the compacts they were expected to sign.

Categorisation

- 6.11 A member of staff in the offender management unit completed categorisation of young adults. The establishment accepted young adults serving sentences of four years or more and also retained those with less than a month to serve after sentence. Young adults who received a sentence of up to 18 months were normally allocated to Northallerton, and those with sentences between 18 months and four years generally went to Deerbolt. Twenty-one young adults held (10%) were more than 100 miles from their home area.
- 6.12 Categorisation reviews took place every six months and were scheduled to coincide with the young adult's annual sentence plan review. The form used for completing categorisation reviews took into account the views of the offender supervisor and staff from security, residential units and other key departments. Final decisions were authorised by a governor. There were appropriate arrangements for appeals, although there had been none. There were no outstanding categorisation reviews at the time of the inspection. One young adult had been cleared for category D status, and his transfer to Thorn Cross was being arranged.
- 6.13 Arrangements to ensure that young adults were transferred to establishments that could address their offending behaviour targets were underdeveloped.

Recommendations

- 6.14 Juveniles should only be strip searched on the basis of specific supporting intelligence.
- 6.15 Young adults should be allocated to establishments where they can address their offending behaviour targets.

Discipline

Expected outcomes:

Disciplinary procedures are applied fairly and for good reason. Prisoners understand why they are being disciplined and can appeal against any sanctions imposed on them.

6.16 There were more adjudications for juveniles than young adults, although the number was not excessive. Hearings were conducted well and charges were fully investigated, but the adjudication room on Godric was not sufficiently child friendly. Minor reports were monitored and punishments were within the permitted scale. Juveniles had been made to undertake field runs as an unofficial punishment. The number of fractures and suspected fractures sustained by young people during use of force gave very serious cause for concern. The separation and care unit (SACU) was well used and young people were treated well. The regime for segregated young people included some association, but their access to showers and telephones was restricted inappropriately. Staff entries in SACU files were poor, and there was little evidence of active reintegration plans. The unfurnished cell was lightly used, but the time that young people were held there was not always justified by staff monitoring comments.

Disciplinary procedures

- 6.17 There were regular adjudication standardisation meetings as part of the seclusion monitoring and review group (SMARG) meetings. Punishment tariffs were not initially published to young people, but copies were made available to them in the library during the inspection. There had been 974 adjudications in the last six months of 2008, 321 for young adults and 653 for juveniles. Although high, the level for the juvenile population was not excessive alongside comparator establishments.
- 6.18 Adjudications were conducted in the separation and care unit (SACU) or Godric unit. The room in SACU was used for hearings for both populations. It was a good size, with ample natural light and a fixed alarm point. While laid out formally, it had comfortable chairs as well as curtains, pictures and pot plants. The room on Godric was used exclusively for juveniles. This room was also laid out formally and had comfortable chairs, but it was cramped, had bare walls and was not child friendly. Writing materials were not routinely provided to young people during adjudication hearings.
- 6.19 Hearings were run by staff from the SACU. Young people received a rub-down search before the hearing, and they were escorted by two staff. There were no attempts at intimidatory tactics during the hearing. Reporting officers attended if they were available. The hearings we observed were conducted fairly. The adjudicator put the young person at ease and addressed him by his first name. The young person was given every opportunity to challenge what was being said and put his version of events. The adjudicator also offered some advice about apologising to injured parties. If a charge was found proved, the young person was given advice on the appeal process.
- 6.20 The advocacy service for juveniles was provided by Barnardo's and was well publicised during induction and around the juvenile units. However, the service did not see young people routinely before an adjudication hearing, and young people were not asked at the hearing if they required the assistance of an advocate.
- 6.21 We randomly reviewed documentation from completed adjudications and found that, generally, charges had been fully investigated and records provided a full account of the hearing. Requests for witnesses had been considered and dealt with appropriately.
- 6.22 All units operated a minor report system, which was monitored at the SMARG meeting. There had been 493 minor reports during the last three months of 2008, the majority on the juvenile units. Minor reports seldom fell out of time, and punishments were not always at the higher end of the permitted range.

- 6.23 The minutes of consultative committee meetings in September and October 2008 referred to juveniles being made to complete field runs as punishment during PE sessions. Staff said the minutes were not an accurate reflection of the discussion, but we spoke independently to four juveniles who had attended these meetings and who gave convincing accounts that field runs had been used as unofficial punishments. In one example given, a football session was cancelled half way through because a couple of young people were fooling around, and the whole group were forced to complete field runs.

The use of force

- 6.24 There had been 364 use of force incidents in 2008, 280 involving use of control and restraint (C&R) – 114 with young adults and 166 with juveniles. While the number of incidents was proportionately much higher for the juvenile population, it was not excessive against comparator establishments. At the end of December 2008, 87.5% of staff had been trained in basic C&R refresher training against a target of 80%.
- 6.25 A significant number of C&R incidents had resulted in the fracture of young people's wrists, and on one occasion a knee. In the previous two years, there had been seven confirmed and three suspected fractures, split equally between young adults and juveniles. Senior managers had recognised this issue and been robust in trying to address it. Measures had included a visit from a national C&R instructor to review the local training, but nothing untoward was found. All such incidents had all been investigated, in one case by the police when a young person sustained fractures to both wrists. On another occasion, the area manager commissioned an investigation and an external investigation team was called in. The investigation reports we looked at were inconclusive in most cases. However, the number of such cases was unprecedented, in our experience, and led us to conclude that C&R had not always been applied correctly. This finding was consistent with the views expressed by young people in our groups. One of the C&R instructors also said that staff did not always take sufficient time during a live incident, and that injuries possibly occurred as they rushed to secure C&R locks.
- 6.26 The head of security and operations had been in post since April 2008 and had worked hard to address this issue. He had introduced a use of force committee and a system for reviewing documentation, and had started to monitor the names of staff regularly involved in C&R to see if there were any patterns. Concerns about the number of injuries sustained by young people during C&R were also reinforced during training sessions. It was unclear whether these measures alone had reduced the level of injuries sustained by young people, but the number had fallen to two since 1 April 2008.
- 6.27 Inspectors observed staff responding to an alarm bell in the education department following a fight. The matter was dealt with well, those involved stopped fighting when instructed to do so, and they were led away separately. No force was used.
- 6.28 The quality of use of force documentation was high. Staff statements were completed to a good standard and gave a full account of their involvement in the incident. An injury to inmate (F213) form was attached to all incident reports. Following an incident, the supervising officer spoke to the young person and explained what had happened and why force was necessary. This was well documented on the use of force paperwork. Planned incidents were video recorded. We reviewed several such tapes and saw nothing that gave cause for concern.

Segregation unit

- 6.29 The separation and care unit (SACU) had 17 normal and one unfurnished cell. Two of the normal cells had reduced risk fixtures and fittings, and one was gated to facilitate constant watches. There was also a holding room, staff office, adjudication room, prisoner showers, exercise yard and staff facilities.
- 6.30 The unit was well used. In 2008, 48 young adults had been segregated under rule 49 (which enables the governor to segregate young adults), 31 under good order or discipline (GOOD) and 17 for their own protection, and 41 juveniles had been segregated, 36 under GOOD and five for their own protection. A few young people had been held on the unit for long periods, and we found one example from each population of periods exceeding two months. All aspects of segregation were carefully monitored at quarterly meetings of the SMARG.
- 6.31 There was a published staff selection policy and the governor had authorised a pool of staff to work in the unit. The staff who we saw working in the SACU appeared suitable for their role, and 50% had also completed mental health awareness training.
- 6.32 All communal areas in the SACU were clean and well presented, but cell standards varied. Some had been repainted and were generally acceptable, but others, including the gated cell and the holding room, were dirty. Toilets needed descaling, and there was graffiti on doors and floors. All cells were a reasonable size with good levels of natural light and in-cell power. Cells, other than those for reduced risk, had stainless steel sanitation units positioned to provide adequate privacy. They also had a freestanding wooden table, chair and small locker. Cardboard furniture was only issued following a risk assessment.
- 6.33 At the time of inspection, there was roll of four – one young adult awaiting adjudication and three juveniles serving periods of removal from unit. We spoke to all these young people. They had no complaints and confirmed that they had received their entitlements.
- 6.34 Staff attempted to comply with the policy that young adults and juveniles should be held on opposite sides of the unit, but this was sometimes not possible because of operational factors (for example, that two of the same population had to be held apart for evidential purposes).
- 6.35 Young people were not routinely strip searched on their location into the unit. Staff saw them individually and completed a checklist to ensure that all procedures were followed, including giving them a copy of the unit rules. Exercise was offered daily, and young people could use a multi-gym in the yard. However, showers and telephone calls were only allowed on alternate days, which was inadequate. Staff from the education department attended daily and routinely saw all juveniles and any young adults who regularly attended education. Records of their attendance in the unit were poor, and they did not routinely see all young adults to offer in-cell work.
- 6.36 Young people held under rule 49 were also offered periods of association on alternate days during weekday evening and at weekends, subject to risk assessment, and could watch the television in the adjudication room. While this was occasionally cancelled due to staff redeployment, it was good practice.
- 6.37 Reviews were completed on segregated young people within prescribed timescales. They were chaired by a governor grade and routinely attended by residential unit and healthcare staff. The Independent Monitoring Board (IMB) only managed to attend around 50% of these

reviews. Although there were a few examples where young people had been allowed to participate in off-unit activities to aid reintegration to normal location, this was not routine, and there were no individual care plans for juveniles.

- 6.38 SACU staff made regular entries in the unit history files, but they were mainly observational and provided little evidence of positive engagement. Staff from their residential unit visited juvenile occupants most days, but this was not always evidenced in the unit files. Statutory visitors including a governor, chaplain and medical professional visited every day and signed the unit register. A member of the IMB and an advocate also attended regularly.
- 6.39 The one unfurnished cell in the SACU was clean with sufficient natural light. It had been used only five times in 2007 and four times in 2008. All uses in 2007 involved young adults and all those in 2008 were juveniles, two of whom were held overnight. In several cases, the length of stay in the unfurnished cell was not justified by the monitoring comments. Written authorisation for use of the unfurnished cell confirmed that young people were not routinely deprived of normal clothing.

Recommendations

- 6.40 The adjudication room on Godric should be more child friendly.
- 6.41 Juveniles should be able to speak to an advocate before an adjudication hearing.
- 6.42 Field runs should not be used as unofficial punishments.
- 6.43 Senior managers should continue to monitor patterns and trends relating to use of force incidents.
- 6.44 Standards of cleanliness in the separation and care unit (SACU) cells should be improved and maintained at a consistently high standard.
- 6.45 Cells in the SACU should be repainted and floor coverings replaced, and there should be measures to prevent graffiti.
- 6.46 Young people in the SACU should be allowed daily access to showers and telephones.
- 6.47 Subject to risk assessment, segregated young people should be encouraged to attend off-unit activities as part of an active reintegration plan.
- 6.48 Care plans should be introduced for juveniles in the SACU.
- 6.49 Staff from the education department should visit all young people held in the SACU to offer in-cell education.
- 6.50 Staff entries in SACU files should include evidence of their positive engagement with young people.
- 6.51 Young people should be removed from unfurnished accommodation at the earliest opportunity.

Housekeeping points

- 6.52 Writing materials should be provided to young people during adjudication hearings.
- 6.53 Staff from the education department who visit young people held in the separation and care unit (SACU) should sign the SACU register.
- 6.54 Staff from the juvenile units who visit their residents in the SACU should record evidence of this in the unit history file.

Good practice

- 6.55 *Young people segregated under rule 49 were offered periods of association.*

Incentives and earned privileges

Expected outcomes:

Incentives and earned privileges schemes are well-publicised, designed to improve behaviour and are applied fairly, transparently and consistently within and between establishments, with regular reviews.

- 6.56 The incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme was well embedded across all units and consistently applied and reviewed. In some instances, there was a high tolerance of misbehaviour, which did not result in an IEP review.
- 6.57 There was a single incentives and earned privileges (IEP) policy for both juveniles and young adults. It had a three-tier system, although young people were not permitted to be on the basic regime for longer than 28 days. The incentives included additional cash, visits, TV, the facility to wear own clothes, association and gym. We noted that only a few young people took up the opportunity to wear their own clothes. IEP facility lists were displayed on unit notice boards.
- 6.58 IEP reviews took place every six months or at the request of the young person. Young people on the basic level of the scheme had their status reviewed every seven days. We noted several examples in unit files where staff had encouraged young people to apply for an IEP review in recognition of improved behaviour or specific achievements. All young adult new arrivals on Dunstan Unit started on the standard level regardless of whether they had been on an enhanced level at another establishment.
- 6.59 During our inspection, 12 young people were on basic regime, 183 on standard and 120 on the enhanced level. This distribution appeared to have been reasonably consistent over the previous six months. There had been no appeals against IEP decisions. Unit senior officers collected weekly statistics, which were aggregated with monthly reports by the head of residence to identify trends.
- 6.60 In a small but significant number of unit files we noted a high degree of tolerance of delinquent behaviour that was managed through the minor reports system without referral for an IEP review. In several cases, poor behaviour had continued for several months before the young person was demoted to the basic regime, and there appeared to be some dislocation between

the use of minor reports and the IEP scheme. In our survey, 43% of juvenile respondents, against the comparator of 59%, said that the different levels of the scheme did not make them change their behaviour.

Recommendations

- 6.61 Young people transferring in who are on the enhanced level of the incentives and earned privilege (IEP) scheme should be able to maintain that status on arrival at Castington.
- 6.62 Staff should be issued with more guidance on when to refer a young person's inappropriate behaviour for an IEP review.

Section 7: Services

Catering

Expected outcomes:

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

- 7.1 The quality of food was generally good, but it was not culturally diverse. There were reasonable consultative arrangements, but the response from food surveys was poor and young people received no feedback from food comment books. Serveries were clean and workers had been appropriately trained. Most young adults had no opportunity to dine out of their cells, and juvenile facilities were restricted inappropriately.
- 7.2 The hub of the kitchen was cramped and poorly designed, although staff ensured it was clean and they made the best use of the available space. The kitchen was staffed by a catering manager and eight other catering staff, and employed up to 12 young adults. One of the young adult workers was undertaking a national vocational qualification (NVQ) and three others had just signed up to it. There had been no NVQ completions in 2008 due to staff shortages.
- 7.3 There was a three-week menu cycle. The range of choices was generally good and included four options for the lunch and the evening meals, although there needed to be more culturally diverse dishes. The menu was reviewed every six months to take account of findings from young people's surveys. The last survey had been in August 2008, and only 71 of the 400 forms had been returned. The catering manager also attended the young people's consultative committee regularly and took account of their comments. Each servery had a food comment book. These were well used, but there was little evidence of individual feedback to complainants.
- 7.4 Breakfast packs were issued every day, and fresh milk was available in the morning. Lunches on Tuesday and Thursday were sandwiches, with chips also provided, and there was a sandwich pack for one of the evening meals. All young people could have orange juice at breakfast, two portions of vegetables with main meals, and two items of fruit from the servery to make up their daily five portions of fruit and vegetables.
- 7.5 The food we sampled was generally good and portions were plentiful. In our survey, 30% of young adult respondents, against the comparator of 25%, said that the food was good, but only 19% of juveniles on Finian and Godric said the food was good, which was significantly worse than the finding of 42% in 2006.
- 7.6 Lunch was served from noon and the evening meal from 5pm. All serveries were clean, and food servers had been trained in food handling and were correctly dressed in clean protective clothing. Temperatures were checked before food was served and this was recorded on all units, except Bede. Separate colour-coded utensils were used to prepare and serve halal food, and there were good storage arrangements for halal food in the main kitchen.
- 7.7 Juveniles were able to dine out of their cell, but only for breakfast and the evening meal on Finian and Godric units. However, only 36 seats were available for a potential roll of up to 68, and those without seats had to dine in their cell. This had potential to lead to bullying. Young

adults had no opportunity to dine out, apart from the Edwin Unit where it was permitted occasionally.

Recommendations

- 7.8 There should be more culturally diverse dishes.
- 7.9 Young people should receive individual feedback to comments in the food comment books.
- 7.10 Young adults should be able to dine out of their cell, and there should be sufficient seats for all juveniles on Finian and Godric units to dine out.

Housekeeping point

- 7.11 Young people should be encouraged to complete catering surveys.

Prison shop

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners can purchase a suitable range of goods at reasonable prices to meet their diverse needs, and can do so safely, from an effectively managed shop.

- 7.12 The outgoing contractor was running down the shop stock and not all items on the product list were available. The service generally worked well and young people had few complaints. The arrangements under the new contractor had been well publicised.
- 7.13 The contractor for the prison shop was due to change from Aramark to DHL. Aramark had started to run down its stock to prepare for the handover, and some items were no longer available.
- 7.14 New arrivals over 18 were offered a smoker's or non-smoker's reception pack, valued at £2.73 and £2.03 respectively, and those under 18 had a non-smoker's pack. Shop order forms were given to young people on Friday and collected over the weekend. New arrivals who arrived after the weekly orders were collected could have their order faxed through. Prison staff delivered ordered goods the following Saturday. Orders were delivered in clear sealed bags to young people's cell doors, where they checked and signed for them. Aramark delivered some additional items in case of disputes over orders or brought a replacement item the following Wednesday. There were few problems and these arrangements worked well.
- 7.15 In our survey, 48% of young adult respondents, the same as the comparator, and 51% of juveniles, against the comparator of 45%, said that the prison shop sold a wide enough range of goods to meet their needs. The product list was the same for both populations and offered approximately 370 items, which was reasonable. It included a good level of items to meet black and minority ethnic needs. Healthy food, vegetarian, vegan and halal options were indicated. Hobby materials were available, and young people could buy newspapers and approved magazines.

- 7.16 There had been quarterly meetings with Aramark until August 2008, but none since then because of the pending change in contractor. The product list was regularly discussed at the consultative committee meetings for both populations. The new contractor had completed a site visit and the pending changes had been publicised on residential units.

Section 8: Resettlement

Strategic management of resettlement

Expected outcomes:

Resettlement underpins the work of the whole establishment, supported by strategic partnerships in the community and informed by assessment of prisoner risk and need.

- 8.1 There was an up-to-date, but limited, resettlement strategy, and regular and well-attended resettlement meetings. Arrangements to review progress on resettlement pathways were subject to drift. There were good links with the voluntary and community sector, although these were not part of a planned strategy.
- 8.2 There was a resettlement policy document for the business year. This outlined current and planned provision and activity for each resettlement pathway, but had no contextual background or strategic links to the North East reducing reoffending agenda. The document was also more weighted to the needs of the young adult than the juvenile population.
- 8.3 The resettlement committee had met four times in the business year to date, with a high degree of attendance from all departments. Meeting notes did not indicate formal reviews or updates of progress on activity, and a review of the strategy scheduled for November 2008 had been deferred. Work was better developed on some pathways than others, and that on the children and families, and attitudes, thinking and behaviour pathways was particularly strong.
- 8.4 The establishment had well-developed links with a range of voluntary and community groups, including some that had been formalised through service level agreements. It had produced a voluntary and community sector directory, which provided a useful guide for staff. However, the responsibility for the management of links with the voluntary and community sector had changed, and there did not appear to be a regular forum where these organisations could review their contribution to the reducing reoffending strategy or be updated on wider prison initiatives. There were some strong relationships with the Prince's Trust and New Bridge, which enhanced the range of provision for young people.

Recommendations

- 8.5 The resettlement policy document should include contextual links to the regional and national reducing reoffending policies.
- 8.6 The resettlement policy document and pathways should be equally weighted to reflect the needs of juveniles as well as young adults.
- 8.7 There should be regular opportunities for the voluntary and community sector partners to meet with the prison.

Offender management and planning

Expected outcomes:

All prisoners have a sentence or custody plan based upon an individual assessment of risk and need, which is regularly reviewed and implemented throughout and after their time in custody. Prisoners, together with all relevant staff, are involved with drawing up and reviewing plans.

8.8 There were established arrangements for remand and sentenced young people, and a high level of participation from the families of juveniles in sentence planning. All young adults were allocated an offender supervisor. Arrangements for public protection were largely satisfactory, but a disproportionate number of young people were designated unnecessarily as multi-agency public protection arrangement (MAPPA) level one cases. Arrangements for the management of indeterminate-sentenced young people varied between the juvenile and young adult populations, with a better quality service for juveniles.

Sentence planning and offender management

- 8.9 There was no offender management policy to differentiate the methods of assessment and management for juveniles and young adults (see main recommendation HP56).
- 8.10 The casework team for juveniles was managed by the head of resettlement. Juveniles were allocated caseworkers on arrival whether they were on remand or sentenced. The same caseworker retained responsibility for the juvenile once he was sentenced, which ensured continuity and consistency. Remand planning meetings took place within required timescales, but the objectives set appeared to be formulaic and not tailored to individual needs. Other documents relating to sentence planning were better, but tended to rely on frequently used objectives. There was a high level of engagement from families at planning meetings, and this was encouraged by the establishment. There appeared to be good transitional planning for juveniles who were about to turn 18, and several young adults remained on detention and training order (DTOs) in prison and continued to be managed from the juvenile casework team.
- 8.11 HMI Probation joined the prison inspection for a joint inspection of the arrangements for young adults subject to offender management. All young adults on remand were interviewed by bail support staff, who were responsible for developing a short remand plan focused on protecting their employment and accommodation and maintaining contact with family and friends. There was no formal review of remand plans, but bail information staff were readily accessible to young adults.
- 8.12 All sentenced young adults were allocated to an offender supervisor, whether or not they were in scope for offender management. At the time of our inspection, 30 young adults were in scope for phase two of offender management and 16 in scope for phase three. There were four offender supervisors, from a range of backgrounds, and one case administrator. Offender supervisors had caseloads of approximately 35 at the time of our inspection, but had carried as many as 50 in the past. Higher risk cases were allocated on the basis of numbers rather than to supervisors sufficiently experienced to manage them effectively, except for prolific and priority offenders, who were allocated to one member of staff. Staff in the offender management unit (OMU) played a key role in driving sentence planning arrangements with offender managers in the community. Offender manager participation in sentence planning was variable, but video conferencing facilities were available to support this.

- 8.13 Offender supervisors had monthly contact with young people in scope, but met less frequently with those not subject to offender management. Sentence planning for young adults was less likely to include participation from family members than the arrangements for juveniles. Offender supervisors had developed their own methods for recording sentence planning meetings and communicating their outcome to young adults. The letters to young people outlining sentence planning targets were not SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and time bound) and did not provide information on how interventions would be sequenced.
- 8.14 In our survey, 66% of young adult respondents said they had a sentence plan, which was higher than the comparator of 52%, and 91% believed they could achieve some or all of their sentence plan targets in Castington, against a comparator of 76%. Very few young people prisoners were released on home detention curfew. A reasonable number of young adults had been given resettlement day release (RDR) in 2008 to take part in large-scale inter-agency projects in the region. However, these projects had declined towards the end of the year, with a corresponding decrease in young adults released on RDR.

Public protection

- 8.15 All new arrivals were assessed on whether they should be managed as posing a risk of harm to others. A weekly filter meeting assessed new arrivals and determined whether they should be monitored via the monthly public protection meetings, which were designated as 'MAPPA' (multi-agency public protection arrangements) meetings, even though they were more of a risk management forum. Virtually all cases monitored were designated a nominal MAPPA level, which sometime did not reflect the MAPPA classification to be allocated on release. This meant that the number of perceived MAPPA cases was high.
- 8.16 Caseworkers and offender supervisors attended MAPPA meetings in the community where possible, and provided written reports when they were unable to attend. Written reports varied in style and content.
- 8.17 At the time of our inspection, 34 young people were designated as posing a risk to children, 20 were required to register on the sex offender register, and four were subject to prevention of harassment, including three on restraining orders.
- 8.18 Telephone and mail monitoring was managed through the security department, and all cases were appropriately authorised. Relationships between the OMU, discipline and security departments were reported as dynamic and positive.

Indeterminate-sentenced prisoners

- 8.19 There was no up-to-date lifer policy covering young people on indeterminate sentence. Seven juveniles were detained at Her Majesty's Pleasure and seven were sentenced to indeterminate sentences for public protection (IPP). Indeterminate-sentenced juveniles were held in Oswald Unit (see section 9). Young adults sentenced to indeterminate sentences were located throughout the establishment. There were specific events, such as family days, for juvenile lifers, but nothing similar for young adults.
- 8.20 An identified lifer manager had some one-to-one contact with young adults. An administrative officer oversaw the arrangements for ensuring lifer processes were carried out in a timely way. Multi-agency lifer risk assessment panel (MALRAP) and multi-agency risk action plan

(MARAP) meetings were usually timely, but it had been difficult to ensure external police attendance.

- 8.21 Fifty-six staff had been trained in lifer management, but none had yet attended the updated managing indeterminate sentences and risk (MISAR) training.
- 8.22 Psychology staff worked with a few young people serving indeterminate sentences, and contributed to parole assessment reports.

Recommendations

- 8.23 Families of young adults should be encouraged to attend their sentence planning assessments and reviews.
- 8.24 Case allocation of young adults should take account of risk and the experience of offender supervisors.
- 8.25 Interventions for young adults should be appropriately sequenced at sentence planning meetings.
- 8.26 The prison should increase the number of young adults released on home detention curfew.
- 8.27 There should be specific events, including family days, for young adults serving indeterminate and mandatory life sentences.
- 8.28 Staff should receive up-to-date training on managing indeterminate-sentenced prisoners.

Housekeeping points

- 8.29 Offender supervisors should use standardised paperwork to record sentence planning meetings with young adults.
- 8.30 The monthly MAPPA (multi-agency public protection arrangements) meeting should be redesignated as a risk management meeting.
- 8.31 Written contributions to MAPPA meetings should follow a standard format.

Good practice

- 8.32 *The same caseworker retained responsibility for a remand juvenile once he was sentenced, which ensured continuity and consistency.*

Resettlement pathways

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners' resettlement needs are met under the seven pathways outlined in the Reducing Reoffending National Action Plan. An effective multi-agency response is used to meet the

specific needs of each individual offender in order to maximise the likelihood of successful reintegration into the community.

Reintegration planning

8.33 A high number of young adults were released without accommodation, and work on accommodation support needed to be enhanced. There were good education, training and work opportunities, and education programmes were based on the need to improve young people's literacy and numeracy skills. Specialist services assisted young people to gain employment on release. Young people had access to finance, benefit and debt services, although many said they did not know who to contact for this provision. There was appropriate physical and mental health provision to support a return to the community, and all young people were seen before release.

Accommodation

8.34 Caseworkers assessed juveniles' immediate needs during their induction. Accommodation needs were managed on an individual basis, and in the previous six months, only two juveniles had been discharged without an address to go to.

8.35 A Citizens Advice Bureau (CAB) worker addressed the accommodation needs of newly arrived young adults, and assisted in closing down tenancies or applying for housing benefit where required. The CAB worker and offender supervisors could also help young adults to apply for local authority housing, but this was problematic, especially where proximity to release was imminent or where young adults had a poor record of managing placements in supported or independent accommodation. It also assumed that staff were aware of the legislative framework for homelessness and entitlement to accommodation. In the previous six months, 19 of the 144 young adults discharged were recorded as having no fixed accommodation (13%), which appeared high for this population.

8.36 Accommodation services for all North Eastern prisons were currently under review.

Education, training and employment

For further details, see Learning and skills and work activities in Section 5

8.37 There were good education, training and work opportunities. Education programmes were based on the needs of individuals to improve their literacy and numeracy skills and their personal and social development. As well as a needs analysis, young people were seen by information, advice and guidance (IAG) workers throughout their sentence to ensure their needs were met. Employment was focused on employability skills. Young people were allocated to a varied range of vocational opportunities, and could gain appropriate qualifications in the workshops.

8.38 New arrivals were informed about the services available in a clear induction programme, which made good use of visual DVD presentations, and young people had regular contact with dedicated IAG staff, employed by Newcastle College. IAG workers provided accurate information about the establishment's activities and helped young people to choose the most suitable options in line with their sentence plans. They also linked well with resettlement, Connexions and allocations staff and employers to plan young people's reintegration into the community.

- 8.39 Specialist services, such as Connexions, Jobcentre Plus, probation and a range of charitable organisations, helped young people to gain employment on release. There were good links with local employers to identify release on temporary licence (ROTL) and employment opportunities, although this was less effective where young people's homes were further away. ROTL was used to allow young people achieve the Duke of Edinburgh Awards, and become involved in projects that led to personal and social development and employability skills. There were also some paid employment opportunities.
- 8.40 Job preparation courses had been introduced, but were not yet fully developed. All young people received a Fresh Start appointment.

Finance, benefit and debt

- 8.41 Juveniles who had problems with finance, benefit and debt could seek advice from Connexions staff or their caseworker. In our survey, 51% of juvenile respondents said they had a Connexions adviser, against a comparator of 31%.
- 8.42 A range of services was available to young adults, including access to Jobcentre Plus to close down benefit claims on arrival and receive advice on claiming benefits such as community care grants and disability benefits. The CAB worker provided one-to-one help on debt management, lodging fines and dealing with creditors.
- 8.43 The education department provided modules on money management. An arrangement to enable young people to open bank accounts with Lloyds TSB had recently been terminated, but the establishment hoped to reinstate this provision with another bank. In our survey, only 21% of young adult respondents said they knew who to contact in the establishment to seek advice on money or finances on release, which was significantly worse than the comparator of 34%, although only 32%, against a comparator of 52%, thought they would have problems with money or finances on their release.

Mental and physical health

- 8.44 Healthcare staff saw all young people before their release, and staff liaised closely with the rest of the prison and maintained contact with hospitals, GP practices and other agencies where appropriate. There was a policy for palliative care, which involved local agencies as required. The mental health care team coordinated a care programme approach with community mental health teams for young people with enduring mental health problems.

Recommendations

- 8.45 There should be a specialist accommodation advice and referral service for young adults.
- 8.46 Release on temporary licence should be used to increase paid employment opportunities for young people.

Drugs and alcohol

- 8.47 The drug strategy was detailed and comprehensive. It had recently been reviewed, but there was not yet an action plan. There was a separate alcohol strategy, and both policies were informed by a thorough needs analysis. The annual delivery plan for the young people's substance misuse service had been agreed.
- 8.48 The drug and alcohol strategy coordinator was the head of the young people's substance misuse service (YPSMS) and a member of the senior management team. He managed the different strands of the strategy effectively and had built up good links with community planning groups. Alcohol and drug strategy meetings took place monthly and were well attended by appropriate departments.
- 8.49 The YPSMS consisted of the manager, a team leader and five workers, including two officers. Staff shortages due to long-term sick leave had reduced services over the last year. The team had focused on initial assessments and one-to-one work.
- 8.50 All new arrivals were seen within their first five days, and most within three days. In 2008, 454 assessments had been completed against a target of 425. All juveniles received substance misuse awareness input during their induction. This consisted of three one-hour sessions co-delivered with the education department.
- 8.51 Substance-specific groupwork modules had stopped and this work was undertaken on a one-to-one basis, using the 'better choices' range of interventions. Age-appropriate material was limited, and workers were keen to extend current resources. Each worker carried a caseload of 30 clients, who were allocated and reviewed in the team each week, and care plans were of good quality.
- 8.52 The YSPMS was well integrated into the establishment and represented at relevant multi-agency meetings, such as safeguarding and MAPPA. Named workers acted as key links with other departments, one had been trained as an ACCT assessor, and each took responsibility for a particular geographical area to facilitate throughcare.
- 8.53 A range of joint working protocols had been developed, but links with health services required further improvement. There was currently no system to plan and coordinate clients' care jointly, and support during detoxification lacked structure.
- 8.54 The YSPMS prioritised final training planning meetings and submitted progress reports if they could not attend. It had good links with YOTs and community agencies. Workers from five local resettlement and aftercare provision (RAP) teams visited regularly to plan post-release support. All juveniles had release plans, which were shared with their case manager, and were given overdose prevention advice and information before they left. YPSMS workers attended initial community reviews whenever possible. The team had not yet developed work with and support for the families and carers of their clients.
- 8.55 In our survey, 46% of young adult respondents said they had drug problems and 54% alcohol problems on arrival, against comparators of 16% and 13% respectively. However, 87% said they had received help with these problems, against the comparator of 25%.

- 8.56 The counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare (CARAT) service consisted of a half-time manager, a senior practitioner and two drug workers from Phoenix Futures, as well as three directly employed staff – two officers and one civilian. The team was well integrated and there were appropriate management and supervision arrangements. The service met the triage assessment target of 435 a year, but interview space on the units was very limited. Weekly induction input included group and one-to-one sessions, and the team received most of their referrals from induction officers with whom they had established close links.
- 8.57 Young adults could access a range of interventions. The open caseload stood at 94 with another 23 files suspended. There were short harm reduction and drug awareness sessions, as well as a three-session relapse prevention module, and a CARATs gym session was due to start.
- 8.58 A half-day alcohol awareness module had been developed but not yet validated. There was no more intensive intervention to deal with alcohol and offending, although the needs analysis had clearly identified this as a gap in service provision. Structured one-to-one work was supplemented with work packs and included young adults with primary alcohol problems. Young adults received a good level of support during detoxification, but this was not coordinated jointly with clinical staff.
- 8.59 The CARAT team was well integrated into the prison and had close links with unit officers, the short duration programme (SDP), the OMU and other departments. Workers contributed to sentence planning and reviews, completed transfer and release plans, and were represented at a wide range of multidisciplinary meetings.
- 8.60 There were good throughcare links with local drug intervention programme (DIP) teams, and DIP workers from four localities regularly visited clients at Castington. Community support for primary alcohol users varied, with dedicated services in some areas but not in others. Most DIP teams prioritised class A drug users.
- 8.61 Young adults with drug and alcohol (but not alcohol only) problems requiring structured intervention could access the SDP. The programme was well established and managed, with a target of 100 starts and 65 completions, which would be exceeded. The programme team consisted of a treatment manager and four facilitators, who had backgrounds in psychology or drug work. The programme received good institutional support and participants said they found the course helpful, but complained about the lack of work and education in the afternoon. They knew how to access counselling services, if required. Care plans, key working sessions and post-course reviews were of high quality, and programme staff worked closely with the CARATs team to ensure good throughcare arrangements. All participants had signed drug testing compacts and were tested twice during the programme.
- 8.62 Voluntary drug testing (VDT) was open to all young people independent of location. There were 150 compacts against a target of 130, made up of 71 juveniles (including 39 on Oswald Unit) and 79 young adults. Testing took place with the required frequency, but was carried out by a single officer only. The VDT coordinator, an officer on Oswald unit, did not have dedicated time for this task, and funding for this role was unclear. Oswald Unit had a dedicated testing suite, but facilities on other units were unsuitable. A budget for purpose-built VDT suites had been secured. VDT was not linked to IEP, but positive results had been passed on to the security department, which was inappropriate, and young people were not informed of this.

Recommendations

- 8.63 The drug strategy document should contain a detailed annual action plan.
- 8.64 The young people's substance misuse service (YPSMS) should re-introduce a range of groupwork modules.
- 8.65 The YPSMS should broaden its range of age-appropriate materials and resources for its client group.
- 8.66 The YPSMS should develop its work with families and carers.
- 8.67 The YPSMS and the counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare (CARAT) service should have access to appropriate interviewing facilities on the units to conduct initial assessments.
- 8.68 Alcohol services should be developed to include an alcohol and offending programme for young adults.
- 8.69 Young adults undertaking the short duration drug programme should not be excluded from work/or education activities in the afternoons.
- 8.70 The practice of single officer testing under the voluntary drug testing (VDT) programme should be avoided, and VDT results should not be communicated to the security department.

Children and families of offenders

- 8.71 Facilities in the visitors' centre were good, and the governor regularly visited it and met families. The visits room was newly refurbished and welcoming. A single drug dog indication resulted in a closed visit. There were interventions and services to support and encourage effective family links, and a family link worker and dedicated family links telephone offered support for families with concern. Father-child visits were available, as was a family matters course.
- 8.72 There had been a visitors' survey in October 2008 with mostly favourable responses, and most negative comments were about restrictions on property. Young people received information about visits on their first night and during induction.
- 8.73 The visitors' centre was shared with HMP Acklington. It was run by staff and volunteers from the North East Prisoners' Aftercare Society (NEPACS). They were very positive about the level of support from and interaction with prison staff, including the regular publicised visits by the governor to meet families at the centre. The centre was open from 12.30pm to 4.30pm. It was clean and welcoming with lockers, toilets and a well-equipped parent and child room. A small refreshment area offered sandwiches, hot and cold drinks, and a selection of snacks but limited healthy eating options. There was also a small play area. Centre staff ensured first-time visitors were given an information booklet produced by the safer custody team to provide help and advice for family and friends. The booklet was also available at court. There was a

comments book in the centre, and the NEPACS manager replied to comments in a timely manner. We saw some very positive comments by visitors.

- 8.74** Visits took place on Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday and weekend afternoons, and were booked for the full session, unless the young person was on basic and restricted to one-hour visits. Young people on remand could book three visits a week, including one at the weekend. Sunday afternoon sessions were for convicted young people only. There were no evening visits, although some families had stated a preference for these in the visitors' survey. Families had to book visits by telephone rather than by email or in person. We tried the booking line and got through on our third attempt. A local bus service from Newcastle stopped at the prison gate. Information about the assisted prison visits scheme was well publicised.
- 8.75** Visitors had to book in at the centre and were called across to the prison, with priority to those on reception visits, which could be booked within the first 72 hours of the young person's arrival. There was usually a drug dog in the searching area. A single positive drug dog indication resulted in the offer of a closed visit or that the visitors could leave and re-book. If the person indicated by the dog indicated chose to leave, the other visitors in the party could have an open visit.
- 8.76** The visits room had been newly refurbished and was spacious and welcoming with comfortable furniture. There was capacity for 36 open and four closed visits. Young people wore prison-issue shirts and jeans during visits and male visitors were required to wear a wrist band. There was a small children's play area staffed by play workers from NEPACS at weekends and during school holidays. A small refreshment bar sold hot and cold drinks. Young people on closed visits could not have refreshments. There was one young person on closed visits at the time of the inspection. Reviews were carried out monthly. Visitors under 18 were allowed if they were accompanied by an adult.
- 8.77** The head of safer custody was responsible for children and families resettlement pathway work. There was a family links worker who currently had additional responsibilities for other safer custody work, but who was due to be full time in the role. There was a family links telephone line, which was staffed by the family links worker and safer custody team on weekdays, with an answer service at weekends and out of hours. In 2008, this line had been used by families on 600 occasions for a variety of reasons, from concerns that a young person had not telephoned in a while, to passing on significant family information or queries about property. This line also received calls from social services, YOT workers and friends.
- 8.78** New Bridge delivered a three-day family matters course, designed specifically to deal with being a parent in prison. It was offered mainly to young adults, but there had been some courses for juveniles. Safer custody staff had introduced a pro forma, which new arrivals completed during induction, to identify young people with caring responsibilities who would benefit from the course.
- 8.79** Quarterly father-child visits had previously only been available to young adults who had completed the family matters course, but there were plans to extend these visits to juveniles. The father-child visit in December 2008 had been attended by five fathers and seven children. The visits were mainly staffed by the safer custody group and NEPACS. Food and themed activities were provided, and fathers could move around the visits room and play with their children. The prison was also due to introduce the Fathers Inside course, to be delivered by the education department, and Storybook Dads was available through the library (see paragraph 5.27).

- 8.80 During the week of the inspection, a learners' award ceremony was very well attended and supported by families. Families and carers were invited to attend initial training plan meetings and subsequent reviews, and their attendance was reasonable. Although the personal officer scheme included an objective to work closely with young people's families, there was little evidence of contact between personal officers and families.

Recommendations

- 8.81 Visitors should be able to book their next visit while they are at the establishment.
- 8.82 Evening visits should be available.
- 8.83 There should be no upper limit on the number of visits for young people on remand.
- 8.84 Closed visits should not be imposed as a result of a single drug dog indication without further intelligence.
- 8.85 Personal officers should have regular contact with young people's family and friends.

Housekeeping point

- 8.86 More healthy options should be available in the visitors' centre and visits room tea bar.

Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 8.87 The offending behaviour needs of the population were generally met through nationally accredited programmes and locally approved courses.
- 8.88 Castington offered a range of nationally and locally accredited programmes to meet the needs of young people. The most recent annual needs analysis had identified a need for a violence reduction course, and that staff around the prison required further information on the range of locally accredited programmes. The analysis had led to the proposal of motivation checks to increase the number of young people completing locally accredited programmes, and the need to improve selection processes.
- 8.89 Nationally accredited programmes included enhanced thinking skills and the short duration programme (see paragraph 8.61), which were only available to young adults. A range of locally accredited programmes could be accessed by all young people, and included managing emotions, peers and lifestyles, crime and consequences. These were short and appropriate for the needs of the population.
- 8.90 Young adults could also attend a victim awareness course, which had been run seven times in 2008. There were no routine victim awareness interventions for juveniles, but individual interventions were delivered where required.

Section 9: The Oswald Unit

The national role of the Oswald Unit

- 9.1 The Oswald Unit was a national resource, but an integral part of HMYOI Castington. The 40-bed unit housed juveniles with complex needs, serving long sentences for high impact violent offences. Six places were allocated for juveniles convicted of sex offences and 12 for those serving indeterminate sentences. However, at the time of the inspection there were 14 young people serving indeterminate sentences and eight sex offenders. A young person was usually only placed in the unit if he had at least one year left to serve before his 18th birthday.
- 9.2 Although no data was collected on where young people went when they left Oswald, we were told that only one young person in the previous year returned to the community from the unit, and that most were transferred to another YOI when they became 18.
- 9.3 Juveniles were referred to the unit individually by the Youth Justice Board's placement and casework service. It was common for the YJB to place some of the most behaviourally challenging young people in the young people's estate on Oswald Unit, so that they could benefit from its individual support enabling more effective management of their behaviour.
- 9.4 There was good communication between the YJB, Oswald Unit and the Castington casework team, which enabled full consideration of the appropriateness of each referral and final placement decision. This approach enabled consideration of the unit's ability to meet a young person's needs, as well as the overall balance of the population, particularly the mix of young people with challenging behaviour. Oswald Unit managers said that the allocation system worked well.

Arrival in custody

- 9.5 Oswald staff usually visited young people referred from secure children's homes and secure training centres before they were transferred, and gave them verbal and written information about what to expect from the unit. Those referred for sex offender treatment were also visited by specialist staff from the Lucy Faithfull Foundation, who delivered the sex offender treatment programme (SOTP) and assessed them before acceptance for transfer.
- 9.6 Moves to the Oswald Unit were planned by the YJB after discussion with the unit manager and the referring establishment. Many young people, including those coming from secure children's homes and secure training centres, were escorted individually in cars. As young people came from around the country, some had experienced very long journeys. In our survey, 28% of Oswald Unit respondents said that their journey had been longer than four hours, compared with 6% for other juveniles in Castington. However, all the young people we spoke to said that they had been treated well in reception and spent a very short time there before they were taken straight on to the unit. All new arrivals were strip searched in reception before they were taken to the Oswald Unit, which was inappropriate as they were strip searched before transfer in secure conditions (see recommendation 1.36).
- 9.7 First night procedures and vulnerability assessments were carried out on the unit, in accordance with establishment-wide policies. In our survey, 92% of Oswald respondents said they felt safe on their first night on the unit, which was significantly better than the 74% response from other juveniles in Castington.

- 9.8 Young people on Oswald undertook parts of the same induction programme as the other juveniles, though they also received a significant amount of individual attention from their personal officers as part of their broader induction to the unit. However, in our survey only 51% of Oswald respondents said that the induction process covered everything they needed to know about the establishment.

Environment

- 9.9 The unit was split into two 20-bed sections, and staffed with one senior officer and 10 prison officers during the day, and one senior officer and six prison officers in the evenings. We were told that, while officers occasionally undertook duties on other units, the need for high staffing levels was supported and unit activities had not been cancelled due to lack of staff.
- 9.10 The cells were clean and well maintained, though young people said that they were cold at night and that additional blankets were not always adequate. The cell ventilators did not close properly and cold air blew into the room. The young people said that, conversely, the cells were very hot in summer.
- 9.11 The communal spaces were clean, tidy, well maintained and well equipped. There were single showers and laundry facilities, which could be used twice a week, and private telephone kiosks. The young people were involved in keeping the unit clean, and we observed good interactions with staff during unit cleaning.
- 9.12 The notice boards were well maintained and displayed all the necessary information, although this was not age-appropriate or accessible to poor readers. We were told that information could be translated into other languages if required, though staff could not recall that this had been done.
- 9.13 Young people said they had good access to telephones each day. There was daily access to the showers, and suitable toiletries were provided.
- 9.14 Breakfast and evening meals were eaten communally, but young people were locked up at lunchtime for an hour to eat their meal. This was surprising given such high staffing levels.
- 9.15 There was a juvenile consultative committee meeting with good representation from all the juvenile units. However, the Oswald Unit did not have its own consultative committee, which could focus on the specific and distinctive issues relevant to a population serving long sentences within a unique national resource.

Relationships between staff and young people

- 9.16 Young people said that most staff treated them very well, and in our survey 72% of Oswald respondents said that most staff treated them with respect. The interactions we observed between staff and young people were mostly positive, and young people said that most officers were accessible, approachable and helpful. Officer engagement with young people during association was mixed – some officers were fully and appropriately involved with the young people, while others did not mix at all and kept to the sidelines.
- 9.17 The personal officer scheme worked well, and most young people said the contact with their personal officer was helpful. Personal officers on Oswald had frequent contact with outside agencies and families/carers. We spoke to a visiting external YOT officer who appreciated the contact with her young person's personal officer, and spoke highly of the unit's work.

- 9.18 Unit files were regularly completed by a range of residential staff and gave a good picture of the young person's life on the unit. There was good communication with the education department, who regularly contributed to individual unit history files. Comments were both positive and negative, though focused on reporting daily events in a factual way rather than giving any real insights into a young person's behaviour.

Addressing offending behaviour

(See also activities and resettlement sections)

- 9.19 Due to the serious nature of the offences and the length of time that young people generally resided on Oswald Unit, there was particular attention to addressing their individual risk of reoffending and long-term care. The psychology department had recently commenced regular monthly needs analyses of the young people on the unit. These highlighted their characteristics and the nature of their offences, and commented on the specialist work with sex offenders and psychological assessments of young people serving indeterminate sentences. However, there were gaps in services for young people who were not sex offenders or serving an indeterminate sentence. The current interventions did not address the risk or needs of most young people on the unit.
- 9.20 Although the needs analysis summary stated that the unit's regime 'provides structure and pattern as well as appropriate behaviour management by staff', the staff had not been specifically selected to work on the unit nor received any additional training or support for working with young people with such complex needs.
- 9.21 The Lucy Faithfull Foundation ran an assessment and intervention programme for six young people at a time. However, the Oswald Unit also accommodated a further two young people waiting for a space on the programme, which allowed for their planned integration into the life on the unit beforehand. The Foundation worker we spoke to was content with the selection process, and believed that the right young people were transferred to the unit for treatment.
- 9.22 Young people serving indeterminate sentences had an individualised service from the psychology department and their personal officers, who were all lifer trained. However, there were no interventions that could show evidence of a reduction in risk of reoffending, despite the requirement to provide such evidence to the Parole Board. We were also concerned that lifer planning documentation designed for adults continued to be used. This was a particular problem for young people serving indeterminate sentences transferring across all three sectors of the juvenile secure estate. The lack of interventions and appropriate planning documentation were national issues and not specific to the Oswald Unit.

Resettlement

- 9.23 The majority of young people on Oswald were transferred to the YOI estate at the age of 18. Consequently, their resettlement issues differed from those for the other juveniles in the establishment serving detention and training orders, who usually left Castington to return to the community. There were good links between the Oswald Unit, Castington's resettlement department and the YJB who jointly managed the transition between the unit and the receiving YOI, and many young people were moved to a YOI identified as suitable for their needs. However, moves for some young people, usually those with more complex needs, were difficult, as YOIs often refused to take them. As a result, these young people had been moved to a YOI that was unable to provide the services and interventions identified for them while they had been on Oswald.

- 9.24 Some young people were moved to the young adult side of Castington when they reached their 18th birthday to complete their education and vocational training. This worked effectively because all case management in Castington was the responsibility of one overarching resettlement department.
- 9.25 The training planning documentation we sampled showed that meetings were timely and well ordered, and well attended by families, YOT workers and personal officers. There were good objectives linked with activities organised by the education department, and a significant contribution in appropriate cases from the Lucy Faithfull Foundation worker and the psychology department, if the young person was a sex offender or serving an indeterminate sentence. The gaps in provision to address offending behaviour for those who were not sex offenders was evident in the records.

Recommendations

- 9.26 There should be age-appropriate sentence planning documentation for children and young people serving indeterminate sentences.
- 9.27 There should be a policy for the transition of young people from the juvenile to the young adult estate.
- 9.28 The Oswald Unit should have its own young people's consultative meeting.
- 9.29 Young people on the Oswald Unit should be consulted about the content of the induction programme, and their views should be taken into account in the development of the programme to ensure that it covers everything they need to know.
- 9.30 The information displayed on the Oswald Unit should be age-appropriate and available in a range of media so that key information is accessible to all.
- 9.31 Young people on the Oswald Unit should be able to eat their midday meal in the communal area.

Section 10: Recommendations, housekeeping points and good practice

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

Main recommendations

To the Youth Justice Board

-
- 10.1 More activity should be provided for young adults. (HP55)
 - 10.2 An offender management policy should be developed to reflect the different approaches to managing juveniles and young adults in Castington. (HP56)
 - 10.3 There should be a national strategy for the care and management of children and young people serving long sentences, including the role of Oswald Unit. This should include staff recruitment, selection, training and support. (HP57)

Main recommendation

To the area manager

-
- 10.4 Healthcare accommodation and facilities should be of a suitable level to enable health professionals to deliver services comparable to those in the NHS. (HP54)

Main recommendations

To the governor

-
- 10.5 There should be a comprehensive inquiry, led by a senior figure independent of the establishment, into the causes of injuries to young people subject to control and restraint over the past two years, so that lessons can be learned and the possibility of any repetitions minimised. (HP49)
 - 10.6 The safeguarding strategy should be reviewed annually and jointly with the local safeguarding children board to ensure that it is up to date and outlines how the establishment and the LSCB have agreed to discharge their respective legislative and policy responsibilities. (HP50)
 - 10.7 Prescribing regimes for substance-dependent young people should be flexible, based on individual need and adhere to national guidance. (HP51)
 - 10.8 A Listeners scheme should be implemented. (HP52)
 - 10.9 The establishment should develop a diversity policy and action plan to raise the profile of issues relating to minority groups in the young people's population. (HP53)

Recommendation

To the Youth Justice Board

-
- 10.10 There should be age-appropriate sentence planning documentation for children and young people serving indeterminate sentences. (9.26)

Recommendation**To the Youth Justice Board and NOMS**

- 10.11 There should be a policy for the transition of young people from the juvenile to the young adult estate. (9.27)

Recommendations**To NOMS**

Courts, escorts and transfers

- 10.12 Juveniles should be transported separately from other prisoners. (1.12)
- 10.13 Escort vans should provide sufficient toilet stops. (1.13)
- 10.14 Young people should have the opportunity to comment and provide feedback about escorts. (1.14)

Recommendation**To the area manager**

- 10.15 The roof of the gym should be repaired. (5.42)

Recommendations**To the governor**

First days in custody

- 10.16 Juveniles should not be routinely strip searched on arrival. (1.36)
- 10.17 New arrivals should have access to peer supporters in reception. (1.37)
- 10.18 Quality assurance of completed vulnerability assessments should record comments on findings and provide feedback to staff. (1.38)
- 10.19 First night cells should be clean and welcoming. (1.39)
- 10.20 First night observations and monitoring should demonstrate active staff engagement with young people. (1.40)
- 10.21 All new arrivals should be offered a shower and free telephone call, whatever time they arrive. (1.41)
- 10.22 Young people on induction should be unlocked when they are not actively involved in sessions. (1.42)
- 10.23 The juvenile induction should be delivered as a rolling programme. (1.43)
- 10.24 All induction interviews should be conducted in private interview rooms. (1.44)

Residential units

- 10.25 All cells should be furnished with curtains. (2.19)

- 10.26 Graffiti should be removed from cell doors and frames. (2.20)
- 10.27 All in-cell toilets should be properly screened. (2.21)
- 10.28 Lockable cupboards should be provided for all young people. (2.22)
- 10.29 The number of telephones on units should be increased to at least one per 20 young people. (2.23)
- 10.30 Published information on unit notice boards should be available in a range of languages. (2.24)
- 10.31 All mail should be issued within 24 hours of being received. (2.25)
- 10.32 All young people should have the opportunity to wear their own clothes. (2.26)
- 10.33 Young people should have access to the prison shop within 24 hours of their arrival. (2.27)
- 10.34 Communal showers should be well maintained and ventilated. (2.28)

Personal officers

- 10.35 Personal officers should receive specific training for the role. (2.45)
- 10.36 Cell moves within wings should not result in a change in personal officer. (2.46)
- 10.37 Managers should use regular supervision with personal officers to improve their performance in the role and discuss the needs of the individual young people for whom they are responsible. (2.47)
- 10.38 Management checks of unit history files should comment on the quality of entries. (2.48)
- 10.39 Personal officers should make a written contribution to the training planning process and attend planning meetings when they are on duty. (2.49)

Safeguarding

- 10.40 The safeguarding policy should cover the identification and management of children and young people identified as particularly vulnerable. (3.9)
- 10.41 The committee structure to oversee the implementation of the safeguarding strategy should be underpinned by clear terms of reference, and kept under review to ensure that it is effective. (3.10)
- 10.42 Regular reports on all relevant safeguarding areas should be submitted to the safeguards committee, and relevant data should be analysed to identify patterns and trends. (3.11)
- 10.43 The remit of the safeguarding committees should include monitoring public protection issues and the use of force, and, in particular, injuries sustained during restraint. (3.12)
- 10.44 Safer custody weekly checks and related quality assurance systems should be improved, and more use should be made of the information collected. (3.13)

10.45 All staff should have enhanced criminal records bureau (CRB) clearance. (3.14)

Bullying and violence reduction

10.46 Issues relating to violence reduction and anti-bullying should be included in the continuous improvement plan and supported by an action plan. (3.26)

10.47 There should be a quality assurance scheme to ensure the consistency of bullying investigations. (3.27)

10.48 The sanctions for bullying and bullying-related behaviour should be clarified, and their use should be checked for consistency. (3.28)

10.49 The role of the vulnerability log should be clarified, and its use should be checked for consistency. (3.29)

Self-harm and suicide

10.50 Information collated by the suicide and self-harm coordinator should be evaluated for trends over time and should be used to inform strategic development. (3.42)

10.51 There should be an effective quality assurance scheme for assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) practice. General areas of concern and learning points should be disseminated, and an action plan developed to ensure implementation. (3.43)

Child protection

10.52 There should be a robust system of initial screening of child protection referrals to ensure that they are appropriate. This should involve the establishment social worker, and the process should be regularly monitored by a representative from Northumberland's Children's Services and Child Protection Department. (3.55)

10.53 The establishment should agree child protection referral and investigation procedures with Northumberland safeguarding children board (NSCB) to ensure that NSCB provides the necessary level of independent oversight by leading assessment, investigation and planning in consultation and partnership with the establishment. (3.56)

10.54 Appropriate support should be provided to a child during the investigation stage following an allegation of abuse. (3.57)

Diversity

10.55 The establishment should establish a diversity group with an appropriately constituted membership to address the various aspects of diversity that affect young people. (3.65)

10.56 The establishment should clarify its definition of disability, introduce effective means to identify young people with a disability, and ensure appropriate support is consistently available. (3.66)

10.57 There should be at least one adapted cell on the main juvenile and young adult units. (3.67)

Race equality

- 10.58 The establishment should aim to improve its understanding of the negative perceptions held by black and minority ethnic young people and establish a means to improve them. (3.79)
- 10.59 SMART (systematic monitoring and analysing of racist equality treatment) monitoring should cover locally agreed as well as national areas. (3.80)
- 10.60 The race equality action team (REAT) should include discussion of religion and religious belief, and receive data on religious monitoring from SMART or a suitable alternative. (3.81)
- 10.61 There should be wider links with community race equality groups to enhance support for black and minority ethnic young people and provide an independent check of racist incident investigations and complaints. (3.82)
- 10.62 Data on racist incidents should be analysed to establish patterns or trends and inform policy and practice development. (3.83)
- 10.63 There should be appropriate work and programmes to address racially motivated offending, including young people committing such offences while in custody. (3.84)

Foreign national prisoners

- 10.64 Newly arrived foreign national prisoners should be given information in their first language about the help and advice available to them. (3.94)
- 10.65 There should be regular immigration surgeries to give foreign national young people appropriate legal advice on their status. (3.95)
- 10.66 The establishment should facilitate contact with community-based specialist immigration solicitors. (3.96)
- 10.67 There should be a foreign national group to offer advice and support to all foreign national young people. (3.97)

Applications and complaints

- 10.68 The induction booklet should include information about how to make a complaint. (3.106)
- 10.69 Unit logs that record applications should have a complete audit trail, including a record of the outcome. (3.107)
- 10.70 Information about applications and complaints should be reinforced through age-appropriate notices and posters that are easy to read and available in a range of languages. (3.108)
- 10.71 The quality assurance of complaints should be improved to ensure that replies are respectful and clearly address the issues raised. (3.109)
- 10.72 Complaints should be analysed by type, and patterns and trends should be monitored. (3.110)

- 10.73 Young people should be given clear information about how to make an appeal against the response to a complaint, and assisted to do so if necessary. (3.111)

Legal rights

- 10.74 All young people should have ready access to legal advice. (3.122)
- 10.75 Details of juveniles' legal representatives should be obtained during first night procedures and retained in unit files. (3.123)
- 10.76 Children should have the opportunity to have a family member or carer present during a legal visit. (3.124)
- 10.77 Mail from solicitors or legal advisers should only be opened by staff in the presence of the prisoner. (3.125)

Substance use

- 10.78 Nurses should undertake training in the clinical management of substance-dependent young people. (3.142)
- 10.79 Nurses should inform officers on the young adults' induction unit of those undergoing detoxification. (3.143)
- 10.80 Clinical management protocols should address the specific issues related to the treatment of children. (3.144)
- 10.81 Individual care plans and reviews should be developed which demonstrate patient involvement. (3.145)
- 10.82 Joint work between the health services department, the counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare service (CARATs), the young people's substance misuse service (YPSMS) and the mental health in-reach team should be developed to improve care planning and care coordination. (3.146)
- 10.83 Nurses and YPSMS staff should jointly offer smoking cessation advice and support to young people. (3.147)

Health services

- 10.84 Additional waiting areas should be identified in the healthcare department as a matter of urgency to allow both groups of young people to be in the department at the same time. (4.51)
- 10.85 There should be a professional cleaning contract to ensure that healthcare facilities throughout the prison are cleaned professionally and regularly, and meet infection control guidelines. (4.52)
- 10.86 The installation of the clinical information technology system should be expedited to improve clinical governance, including clinical records and data collection. (4.53)

- 10.87 We again repeat our recommendation that there should be unit-based healthcare facilities, to include medicine administration, to ensure effective, safe and appropriate services to young people throughout the prison. (4.54)
- 10.88 There should be a skill mix review to ensure there are sufficient appropriately qualified healthcare staff to deliver a comprehensive healthcare service. This should include administrative functions. (4.55)
- 10.89 A dedicated team of discipline officers should be allocated to healthcare, with only suitable and willing officers deployed to the inpatient area, to provide continuity of care. (4.56)
- 10.90 Entries in clinical records should be clear, and the name and designation of each health professional making an entry should be legible and in keeping with professional guidelines. (4.57)
- 10.91 There should be a dedicated health forum for young people to allow direct dialogue with senior healthcare staff. (4.58)
- 10.92 Following a comprehensive risk assessment, young diabetics should be allowed to hold their insulin in possession, or in identified secure boxes on residential units. (4.59)
- 10.93 Barrier protection should be available to all young adults, supported by a comprehensive health promotion strategy. (4.60)
- 10.94 Information on all cases where young people do not attend health appointments should be collated, and the reasons for non-attendance surveyed. (4.61)
- 10.95 External NHS appointments should not be rescheduled to facilitate officers' duty rota. (4.62)
- 10.96 Security and patient confidentiality should be maintained at all times while medicines are administered. (4.63)
- 10.97 The special sick arrangements should include access to basic analgesia and homely remedies without reference to the GP. (4.64)
- 10.98 Young people should have direct access to the pharmacist. (4.65)
- 10.99 The PCT should carry out a full inspection of the dental surgery. (4.66)
- 10.100 The inpatients showers and bathroom should be refurbished as a priority. (4.67)
- 10.101 Daycare facilities should be available for all young people in the prison. (4.68)
- 10.102 All staff on the care and separation unit should receive regular and ongoing mental health awareness training. (4.69)
- 10.103 Qualified counsellors, including specialists, should be provided to improve psychological support to young people. (4.70)

Learning and skills and work activities

- 10.104 There should be an increase in the range of GCSE subjects. (5.28)

- 10.105 All vocational workshops should be available to all young people. (5.29)
- 10.106 All residential units should have dedicated accommodation for literacy and numeracy sessions. (5.30)
- 10.107 There should be a library slot for juveniles in the core timetable, with additional sessions to avoid clashes with timetabled learning, and evening access for all juvenile units. (5.31)

Physical education and health promotion

- 10.108 The prison should improve young adult take-up of recreational PE. (5.39)
- 10.109 There should be more opportunities for young people to gain health and leisure vocational awards at a higher level. (5.40)
- 10.110 The core PE programme should be accredited, where appropriate. (5.41)

Time out of cell

- 10.111 All young adults should be unlocked for at least 10 hours a day. (5.55)
- 10.112 Young adults not engaged in purposeful activity during the day should be allowed out of their cells. (5.56)

Security and rules

- 10.113 Juveniles should only be strip searched on the basis of specific supporting intelligence. (6.14)
- 10.114 Young adults should be allocated to establishments where they can address their offending behaviour targets. (6.15)

Discipline

- 10.115 The adjudication room on Godric should be more child friendly. (6.40)
- 10.116 Juveniles should be able to speak to an advocate before an adjudication hearing. (6.41)
- 10.117 Field runs should not be used as unofficial punishments. (6.42)
- 10.118 Senior managers should continue to monitor patterns and trends relating to use of force incidents. (6.43)
- 10.119 Standards of cleanliness in the separation and care unit (SACU) cells should be improved and maintained at a consistently high standard. (6.44)
- 10.120 Cells in the SACU should be repainted and floor coverings replaced, and there should be measures to prevent graffiti. (6.45)
- 10.121 Young people in the SACU should be allowed daily access to showers and telephones. (6.46)

- 10.122 Subject to risk assessment, segregated young people should be encouraged to attend off-unit activities as part of an active reintegration plan. (6.47)
- 10.123 Care plans should be introduced for juveniles in the SACU. (6.48)
- 10.124 Staff from the education department should visit all young people held in the SACU to offer in-cell education. (6.49)
- 10.125 Staff entries in SACU files should include evidence of their positive engagement with young people. (6.50)
- 10.126 Young people should be removed from unfurnished accommodation at the earliest opportunity. (6.51)

Incentives and earned privileges

- 10.127 Young people transferring in who are on the enhanced level of the incentives and earned privilege (IEP) scheme should be able to maintain that status on arrival at Castington. (6.61)
- 10.128 Staff should be issued with more guidance on when to refer a young person's inappropriate behaviour for an IEP review. (6.62)

Catering

- 10.129 There should be more culturally diverse dishes. (7.8)
- 10.130 Young people should receive individual feedback to comments in the food comment books. (7.9)
- 10.131 Young adults should be able to dine out of their cell, and there should be sufficient seats for all juveniles on Finian and Godric units to dine out. (7.10)

Strategic management of resettlement

- 10.132 The resettlement policy document should include contextual links to the regional and national reducing reoffending policies. (8.5)
- 10.133 The resettlement policy document and pathways should be equally weighted to reflect the needs of juveniles as well as young adults. (8.6)
- 10.134 There should be regular opportunities for the voluntary and community sector partners to meet with the prison. (8.7)

Offender management and planning

- 10.135 Families of young adults should be encouraged to attend their sentence planning assessments and reviews. (8.23)
- 10.136 Case allocation of young adults should take account of risk and the experience of offender supervisors. (8.24)

- 10.137 Interventions for young adults should be appropriately sequenced at sentence planning meetings. (8.25)
- 10.138 The prison should increase the number of young adults released on home detention curfew. (8.26)
- 10.139 There should be specific events, including family days, for young adults serving indeterminate and mandatory life sentences. (8.27)
- 10.140 Staff should receive up-to-date training on managing indeterminate-sentenced prisoners. (8.28)

Resettlement pathways

- 10.141 There should be a specialist accommodation advice and referral service for young adults. (8.45)
- 10.142 Release on temporary licence should be used to increase paid employment opportunities for young people. (8.46)
- 10.143 The drug strategy document should contain a detailed annual action plan. (8.63)
- 10.144 The young people's substance misuse service (YPSMS) should re-introduce a range of groupwork modules. (8.64)
- 10.145 The YPSMS should broaden its range of age-appropriate materials and resources for its client group. (8.65)
- 10.146 The YPSMS should develop its work with families and carers. (8.66)
- 10.147 The YPSMS and the counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare (CARAT) service should have access to appropriate interviewing facilities on the units to conduct initial assessments. (8.67)
- 10.148 Alcohol services should be developed to include an alcohol and offending programme for young adults. (8.68)
- 10.149 Young adults undertaking the short duration drug programme should not be excluded from work/or education activities in the afternoons. (8.69)
- 10.150 The practice of single officer testing under the voluntary drug testing (VDT) programme should be avoided, and VDT results should not be communicated to the security department. (8.70)
- 10.151 Visitors should be able to book their next visit while they are at the establishment. (8.81)
- 10.152 Evening visits should be available. (8.82)
- 10.153 There should be no upper limit on the number of visits for young people on remand. (8.83)
- 10.154 Closed visits should not be imposed as a result of a single drug dog indication without further intelligence. (8.84)
- 10.155 Personal officers should have regular contact with young people's family and friends. (8.85)

The Oswald Unit

- 10.156 The Oswald Unit should have its own young people's consultative meeting. (9.28)
- 10.157 Young people on the Oswald Unit should be consulted about the content of the induction programme, and their views should be taken into account in the development of the programme to ensure that it covers everything they need to know. (9.29)
- 10.158 The information displayed on the Oswald Unit should be age-appropriate and available in a range of media so that key information is accessible to all. (9.30)
- 10.159 Young people on the Oswald Unit should be able to eat their midday meal in the communal area. (9.31)

Housekeeping points

First days in custody

- 10.160 The television information channel in the juvenile cells should be repaired. (1.45)

Residential units

- 10.161 Damaged wooden bed bases should be replaced. (2.29)
- 10.162 The torn carpet on Cuthbert Unit should be promptly replaced. (2.30)
- 10.163 There should not be television sets in staff offices. (2.31)

Personal officers

- 10.164 The personal officer scheme should be advertised on residential units. (2.50)

Applications and complaints

- 10.165 There should be a readily accessible supply of envelopes for young people who wish to make a confidential complaint. (3.112)

Health services

- 10.166 The medicine stock levels should be rationalised and supplied as dual-labelled pre-packs. (4.71)
- 10.167 Medication should be kept in the packaging supplied by the pharmacy. (4.72)
- 10.168 Prescription and administration charts should specify the diagnosis and the period of treatment. (4.73)
- 10.169 There should be a healthcare application box in the care and separation unit. (4.74)

- 10.170 A register of the use of force in the inpatient area should be maintained. (4.75)
- 10.171 The record of daily checks of resuscitation equipment should include notation for the defibrillator check. (4.76)
- 10.172 Maximum and minimum fridge temperatures should be monitored on a daily basis. (4.77)
- 10.173 A new dental suction unit should be provided. (4.78)
- 10.174 Dental equipment should be maintained by outside contractors. (4.79)

Discipline

- 10.175 Writing materials should be provided to young people during adjudication hearings. (6.52)
- 10.176 Staff from the education department who visit young people held in the separation and care unit (SACU) should sign the SACU register. (6.53)
- 10.177 Staff from the juvenile units who visit their residents in the SACU should record evidence of this in the unit history file. (6.54)

Catering

- 10.178 Young people should be encouraged to complete catering surveys. (7.11)

Offender management and planning

- 10.179 Offender supervisors should use standardised paperwork to record sentence planning meetings with young adults. (8.29)
- 10.180 The monthly MAPPA (multi-agency public protection arrangements) meeting should be redesignated as a risk management meeting. (8.30)
- 10.181 Written contributions to MAPPA meetings should follow a standard format. (8.31)

Resettlement pathways

- 10.182 More healthy options should be available in the visitors' centre and visits room tea bar. (8.86)

Examples of good practice

- 10.183 The one-to-one programme developed by the psychology department for young people subject to stage three of the anti-bullying programme was a positive attempt to take anti-bullying work forward. (3.30)
- 10.184 Young people facing long sentences could spend their first night in healthcare. (4.80)
- 10.185 The allocation of named nurses to residential units helped improve relationships between unit and health staff and provided better continuity of care for young people. (4.81)

10.186 Young people segregated under rule 49 were offered periods of association. (6.55)

10.187 The same caseworker retained responsibility for a remand juvenile once he was sentenced, which ensured continuity and consistency. (8.32)

Appendix I: Inspection team

Nigel Newcomen	Deputy Chief Inspector
Martin Lomas	Team leader
Fay Deadman	Inspector
Keith McInnis	Inspector
Steve Moffat	Inspector
Marie Orrell	Inspector
Ian Thomson	Inspector
Andrea Walker	Inspector
Sherelle Parke	Researcher
Michael Skidmore	Researcher
Rachel Murray	Research trainee

Specialist inspectors

Bridget McEvilly	Healthcare inspector
Mick Bowen	Healthcare inspector
Sigrid Engelen	Substance use inspector
Helen Dolan	Pharmacy inspector
Sharon Monks	Pharmacy inspector

Nigel Scarff	HMI Probation
John Grimmer	Ofsted
Martyn Rhowbotham	Ofsted

Appendix IIa: Prison population profile – young adults

(i) Status	Number of prisoners	%
Sentenced	122	100
Total	122	100

(ii) Sentence	Number of sentenced prisoners	%
Less than 6 months	14	12
6 months-less than 12 months	6	5
12 months-less than 2 years	23	19
2 years-less than 4 years	37	30
4 years-less than 10 years	22	18
Life and IPP	20	16
Total	122	100

(iii) Length of stay	Sentenced prisoners	
	Number	%
Less than 1 month	24	20
1 month to 3 months	17	14
3 months to 6 months	23	19
6 months to 1 year	23	19
1 year to 2 years	33	27
2 years to 4 years	2	1
Total	122	100

(iv) Main offence	Number of prisoners	%
Violence against the person	42	34.5
Sexual offences	4	3
Burglary	17	14
Robbery	25	20.5
Theft and handling	3	2.5
Drugs offences	1	1
Other offences	22	18
Offence not recorded/holding warrant	8	6.5
Total	122	100

(v) Age	Number of prisoners	%
18	25	20.5
19	36	29.5
20	56	46
21	5	4
Total	122	100

(vi) Home address	Number of prisoners	%
Within 50 miles of the prison	50	41
Between 50 and 100 miles of the prison	48	39
Over 100 miles from the prison	11	9
No fixed address	13	11
Total	122	100

(vii) Nationality	Number of prisoners	%
British	120	98
Foreign nationals	2	2
Total	122	100

(viii) Ethnicity	Number of prisoners	%
<i>White:</i>		
British	118	96.5
<i>Mixed:</i>		
White and Black African	1	1
Other mixed	1	1
<i>Black or Black British:</i>		
African	2	1.5
Total	122	100

(ix) Religion	Number of prisoners	%
Church of England	24	20
Roman Catholic	14	11.5
Other Christian denominations	2	1.5
Muslim	2	1.5
Buddhist	2	1.5
No religion	78	64
Total	122	100

Appendix IIb: Prison population profile – juveniles

(i) Status	Number of prisoners	%
Sentenced	116	88
Convicted but unsentenced	7	5
Remand	9	7
Total	132	100

(ii) Number of DTOs by age & sentence (full sentence length)	4 mths	6 mths	8 mths	10 mths	12 mths	18 mths	24 mths	Totals
15 years	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	3
16 years	2	1	3	1	1	3	8	19
17 years	4	6	3	2	8	6	5	34
18 years	0	1	1	1	1	3	3	10
Total	6	8	8	4	11	13	16	66

(iii) Number of Section 53 (2) / 91s by age & sentence	2-3yr	3-4yr	4-5yr	5yr+	Totals
15 years	1	1	1		3
16 years		7	1	5	13
17 years	2	4	2	11	19
18 years				1	1
Total	3	12	4	17	36

(iv) Number of extended sentences (Section 228) by age & sentence	2-3yr	3-4yr	4-5yr	5yr+	Totals
15 years	1	1			2
16 years	1	1		1	3
17 years		1		3	4
18 years				1	1
Total	2	3	0	5	10

(v) Number of indeterminate sentences by age	Sec 90	Life	ISPP	Totals
15 years			1	1
16 years	1		3	4
17 years	3	1	4	8
18 years				0
Total	4	1	8	13

(vi) Length of stay for unsentenced by age	<1m	1-3m	3-6m	6-12m	Totals
15 years		1			1
16 years	3	2			5
17 years	7	1		2	10
18 years	2				2
Total	12	4	0	2	18

(vii) Main offence	Number of prisoners	%
Violence against the person	43	33
Sexual offences	12	9
Burglary	13	10

Robbery	30	23
Theft and handling	3	2
Drugs offences	2	1
Driving offences	4	3
Other offences	24	18
Offence not recorded/holding warrant	1	1
Total	132	100

(viii) Age	Number of prisoners	%
15	8	6
16	42	32
17	69	52
18	13	10
Total	132	100

(ix) Home address	Number of prisoners	%
Within 50 miles of the prison	35	26.5
Between 50 and 100 miles of the prison	46	35
Over 100 miles from the prison	45	34
No fixed address	6	4.5
Total	132	100

(x) Nationality	Number of prisoners	%
British	130	98.5
Foreign nationals	2	1.5
Total	132	100

(xi) Ethnicity	Number of prisoners	%
<i>White:</i>		
British	122	92
<i>Mixed:</i>		
White and Black African	1	1
<i>Asian or Asian British:</i>		
Pakistani	2	1.5
Other Asian	1	1
<i>Black or Black British:</i>		
Caribbean	3	2
African	1	1
Other Black	2	1.5
Total	132	100

(xi) Religion	Number of prisoners	%
Church of England	27	20
Roman Catholic	17	13
Muslim	5	4
Buddhist	1	1
No religion	82	62
Total	132	100

Appendix IIIa: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews - young adults

A voluntary, confidential and anonymous survey of a representative proportion of the young adult population was carried out for this inspection. The results of this survey formed part of the evidence base for the inspection.

Choosing the sample size

The baseline for the sample size was calculated using a robust statistical formula provided by a government department statistician. Essentially, the formula indicates the sample size that is required and the extent to which the findings from a sample of that size reflect the experiences of the whole population.

At the time of the survey on 16 December 2008, the young adult population at HMYOI Castington was 181. The sample size was 91. Overall, this represented 50% of the young adult population.

Selecting the sample

Respondents were randomly selected from a LIDS young adult population printout using a stratified systematic sampling method. This basically means every second person is selected from a LIDS list, which is printed in location order, if 50% of the population is to be sampled.

Completion of the questionnaire was voluntary. Refusals were noted and no attempts were made to replace them. Three respondents refused to complete a questionnaire.

Interviews were carried out with any respondents with literacy difficulties. In total, one respondent was 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;
- to seal the questionnaire in the envelope provided and hand it to a member of staff, if they were agreeable; or
- to 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.

Response rates

In total, 85 respondents completed and returned their questionnaires. This represented 47% of the young adult population. The response rate was 93%. In addition to the three respondents

who refused to complete a questionnaire, one questionnaire was not returned and two were returned blank.

Comparisons

The following documents detail the results from the survey. Data from each establishment has been weighted, in order to mimic a consistent percentage sampled in each establishment.

Some questions have been filtered according to the response to a previous question. Filtered questions are clearly indented and preceded by an explanation as to which respondents are included in the filtered questions. Otherwise, percentages provided refer to the entire sample. All missing responses are excluded from the analysis.

The following analyses have been conducted:

- The current survey responses in 2008 against comparator figures for all young adults surveyed in young offender institutions. This comparator is based on all responses from young adult surveys carried out in 22 young offender institutions since April 2003.
- A comparison within the 2008 survey between those who are British nationals and those who are foreign nationals.
- A comparison within the 2008 survey between those who consider themselves to have a disability and those who do not.

In all the above documents, statistical significance is used to indicate whether there is a real difference between the figures, i.e. 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 young adults' background details.

Summary

In addition, a summary of the survey results is attached. This shows a breakdown of responses for each question as well as examples of comments made by young adults. 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 is excluded). The actual numbers will match up as the data is 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 has been weighted for comparison purposes.

Appendix IIIb: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews - juveniles

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 16 December 2008, the population of young people at HMYOI Castington was 121. Questionnaires were offered to 99 young people.

Completion of the questionnaire was voluntary. Refusals were noted and no attempts were made to replace them. Three respondents refused to complete a questionnaire.

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
- to seal the questionnaire in the envelope provided and hand it to a member of staff, if they were agreeable, or
- to 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, 90 respondents completed and returned their questionnaires. This represented 74% of children and young people in the establishment at the time. The response rate was 91%.

Three respondents refused to complete a questionnaire, three questionnaires were not returned and three 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 has 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 14 young people's establishments since 2005.

In addition four further comparative documents are attached:

- Statistically significant differences between the responses from young people in 2006 and those from young people in 2008 (responses from Oswald unit are excluded).
- Statistically significant differences between the responses of white young people and those from a black and minority ethnic group are shown
- Statistically significant differences between the responses from young people in the Oswald unit and young people in all other wings at Castington.
- Statistically significant difference between the responses of young people in the Oswald unit in 2006 and those from young people in the Oswald unit in 2008.

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, a summary of the survey results is attached. This shows a breakdown of responses for each question as well as examples of comments made by young people. 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 is excluded). The actual numbers will match up as the data is 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 has been weighted for comparison purposes.



Prisoner survey responses HMYOI Castington (young adults) 2008

Prisoner 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

		HMYOI Castington	All other Young Adult establishments
	Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better		
	Any percent highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percent highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		85	1866
SECTION 1: General Information			
2	Are you under 21 years of age?	95%	87%
3a	Are you sentenced?	63%	82%
3b	Are you on recall?	10%	6%
4a	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	11%	18%
4b	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	9%	1%
5	Do you have six months or less to serve?	26%	41%
6	Have you been in this prison less than a month?	16%	21%
7	Are you a foreign national?	16%	10%
8	Is English your first language?	87%	93%
9	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (including all those who did not tick White British, White Irish or White other categories)	9%	29%
10	Are you Muslim?	2%	18%
11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	1%	2%
12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	21%	11%
13	Is this your first time in prison?	36%	42%
14	Have you been in more than 5 prisons this time?	2%	3%
15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	31%	24%
SECTION 2: Transfers and Escorts			
For the most recent journey you have made either to or from court or between prisons:			
1a	Was the cleanliness of the van good/very good?	38%	35%
1b	Was your personal safety during the journey good/very good?	59%	57%
1c	Was the comfort of the van good/very good?	4%	11%
1d	Was the attention paid to your health needs good/very good?	30%	32%
1e	Was the frequency of toilet breaks good/very good?	8%	12%
2	Did you spend more than four hours in the van?	8%	6%
3	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	59%	65%
4a	Did you know where you were going when you left court or when transferred from another prison?	77%	79%
4b	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about what would happen to you?	30%	22%
4c	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	84%	86%

Key to tables

	Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better	HMYOI Castington	All other Young Adult establishments
	Any percent highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percent highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction			
1	In the first 24 hours, did staff ask you if you needed help/support with the following:		
1b	Problems with loss of property?	11%	16%
1c	Housing problems?	21%	32%
1d	Problems contacting employers?	15%	13%
1e	Problems contacting family?	68%	71%
1f	Problems ensuring dependants were looked after?	9%	14%
1g	Money problems?	12%	20%
1h	Problems of feeling depressed/suicidal?	43%	54%
1i	Health problems?	52%	71%
1j	Problems in needing protection from other prisoners?	13%	23%
1k	Problems accessing phone numbers?	60%	52%
2	When you first arrived:		
2a	Did you have any problems?	51%	57%
2b	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	13%	9%
2c	Did you have any housing problems?	21%	15%
2d	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	4%	4%
2e	Did you have any problems contacting family?	20%	21%
2f	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	4%	3%
2g	Did you have any money worries?	20%	20%
2h	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	16%	14%
2i	Did you have any health problems?	12%	9%
2j	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	9%	5%
2k	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	13%	18%
3a	Were you seen by a member of health services in reception?	91%	89%
3b	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	78%	69%
4	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	61%	63%
5	On your day of arrival, were offered any of the following information:		
5a	Information about what was going to happen to you?	54%	56%
5b	Information about what support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	61%	53%
5c	Information about how to make routine requests?	53%	43%
5d	Information about your entitlement to visits?	57%	56%
5e	Information about health services?	61%	62%
5f	Information about the chaplaincy?	61%	55%

Key to tables

	Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better	HMYOI Castington	All other Young Adult establishments
	Any percent highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percent highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued			
6	On your day of arrival, were you offered any of the following:		
6a	A smokers/non-smokers pack?	89%	82%
6b	The opportunity to have a shower?	32%	41%
6c	The opportunity to make a free telephone call?	86%	72%
6d	Something to eat?	76%	82%
7	Within the first 24 hours did you meet any of the following people:		
7a	The chaplain or a religious leader?	45%	49%
7b	Someone from health services?	70%	68%
7c	A listener/Samaritans?	12%	24%
8	Did you have access to the prison shop/canteen within the first 24 hours?	13%	20%
9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	73%	80%
10	Have you been on an induction course?	79%	91%
For those who have been on an induction course:			
11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	65%	64%
SECTION 4: Legal Rights and Respectful Custody			
1	In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:		
1a	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	49%	58%
1b	Attend legal visits?	72%	67%
1c	Obtain bail information?	43%	43%
2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	53%	39%
3	For the wing/unit you are currently on:		
3a	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	54%	53%
3b	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	87%	56%
3c	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	87%	82%
3d	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	67%	56%
3e	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	49%	41%
3f	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	64%	58%
3g	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	54%	34%
4	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	30%	25%
5	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	48%	48%
6a	Is it easy/very easy to get a complaints form?	77%	79%
6b	Is it easy/very easy to get an application form?	89%	84%
7	Have you made an application?	86%	76%

Key to tables

	Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better	HMYOI Castington	All other Young Adult establishments
	Any percent highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percent highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 4: Legal Rights and Respectful Custody continued			
For those who have made an application:			
8a	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	77%	63%
8b	Do you feel applications are dealt with promptly? (within 7 days)	53%	54%
9	Have you made a complaint?	24%	47%
For those who have made a complaint:			
10a	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	48%	38%
10b	Do you feel complaints are dealt with promptly? (within 7 days)	61%	40%
11	Have you ever been made to or encouraged to withdraw a complaint since you have been in this prison?	27%	26%
10c	Were you given information about how to make an appeal?	20%	31%
12	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	11%	24%
13a	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	43%	48%
13b	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	45%	55%
14	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	29%	50%
15a	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	79%	69%
15b	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	65%	66%
SECTION 5: Safety			
1	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	45%	31%
2	Do you feel unsafe in this prison at the moment?	20%	18%
4	Have you been victimised by another prisoner?	25%	23%
5	Since you have been here, has another prisoner:		
5a	Made insulting remarks made about you, your family or friends?	19%	13%
5b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	17%	10%
5c	Sexually abused you?	1%	1%
5d	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	2%	4%
5e	Victimised you because of drugs?	2%	2%
5f	Taken your canteen/property?	5%	5%
5g	Victimised you because you were new here?	10%	6%
5h	Victimised you because of your sexuality?	2%	2%
5i	Victimised you because you have a disability?	1%	2%
5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	1%	3%
5k	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	5%	6%
5l	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	5%	3%

Key to tables

	Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better	HMV OI Castington	All other Young Adult establishments
	Any percent highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percent highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 5: Safety continued			
6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	25%	23%
7	Since you have been here, has a member of staff:		
7a	Made insulting remarks made about you, your family or friends?	15%	13%
7b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	13%	4%
7c	Sexually abused you?	1%	1%
7d	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	1%	4%
7e	Victimised you because of drugs?	1%	1%
7f	Victimised you because you were new here?	10%	5%
7g	Victimised you because of your sexuality?	1%	1%
7h	Victimised you because you have a disability?	2%	2%
7i	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	1%	3%
7j	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	4%	5%
7k	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	4%	4%
For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:			
8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	27%	32%
9	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by another prisoner/ group of prisoners in here?	29%	26%
10	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by a member of staff in here?	21%	19%
11	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	36%	21%
SECTION 6: Healthcare			
1a	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	50%	41%
1b	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	60%	62%
1c	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	31%	12%
1d	Is it easy/very easy to see the optician?	24%	10%
2	Are you able to see a pharmacist?	46%	62%
For those who have been to the following services, do you think the quality of the health service from the following is good/very good:			
3a	The doctor?	75%	59%
3b	The nurse?	88%	66%
3c	The dentist?	55%	44%
3d	The optician?	56%	44%
4	The overall quality of health services?	71%	53%

Key to tables

	Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better	HMYOI Castington	All other Young Adult establishments
	Any percent highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percent highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Healthcare continued			
5	Are you currently taking medication?	22%	23%
For those currently taking medication:			
6	Are you allowed to keep possession of your medication in your own cell?	36%	58%
7	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	28%	31%
For those with emotional well being/mental health issues, are these being addressed by any of the following:			
8a	Not receiving any help?	43%	28%
8b	A doctor?	32%	28%
8c	A nurse?	43%	17%
8d	A psychiatrist?	32%	38%
8e	The Mental Health In-Reach Team?	27%	38%
8f	A counsellor?	10%	31%
9a	Did you have a drug problem when you came into this prison?	46%	16%
9b	Did you have an alcohol problem when you came into this prison?	54%	13%
10a	Have you developed a drug problem since you have been in this prison?	16%	5%
10b	Have you developed an alcohol problem since you have been in this prison?	6%	4%
For those with drug or alcohol problems:			
11	Do you know who to contact in this prison for help?	79%	74%
12	Have you received any help or intervention whilst in this prison?	87%	25%
For those who have received help or intervention with their drug or alcohol problem:			
13	Was this intervention or help useful?	76%	77%
14a	Do you think you will have a problem with drugs when you leave this prison? (Yes/don't know)	47%	26%
14b	Do you think you will have a problem with alcohol when you leave this prison? (Yes/don't know)	49%	26%
For those who may have a drug or alcohol problem on release, do you know who in this prison:			
15	Can help you contact external drug or alcohol agencies on release?	73%	46%
SECTION 7: Purposeful Activity			
1	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:		
1a	A prison job?	49%	34%
1b	Vocational or skills training?	11%	22%
1c	Education (including basic skills)?	20%	34%
1d	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	8%	7%

Key to tables

	Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better	HMYOI Castington	All other Young Adult establishments
	Any percent highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percent highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Purposeful Activity continued			
2ai	Have you had a job whilst in prison?	60%	71%
For those who have had a prison job whilst in prison:			
2aii	Do you feel the job will help you on release?	76%	52%
2bi	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training whilst in prison?	49%	65%
For those who have had vocational or skills training whilst in prison:			
2bii	Do you feel the vocational or skills training will help you on release?	67%	56%
2ci	Have you been involved in education whilst in prison?	55%	77%
For those who have been involved in education whilst in prison:			
2cii	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	79%	63%
2di	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes whilst in prison?	50%	60%
For those who have been involved in offending behaviour programmes whilst in prison:			
2dii	Do you feel the offending behaviour programme(s) will help you on release?	61%	59%
3	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	20%	29%
4	On average, do you go to the gym at least twice a week?	40%	49%
5	On average, do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	60%	39%
6	On average, do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	9%	9%
7	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	73%	41%
8	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	32%	22%
SECTION 8: Resettlement			
1	Do you have a personal officer?	70%	65%
For those with a personal officer:			
2	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	74%	62%
For those who are sentenced:			
3	Do you have a sentence plan?	66%	52%
For those with a sentence plan?			
4	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	72%	70%
5	Can you achieve some/all of you sentence plan targets in this prison?	91%	76%
6	Are there plans for you to achieve some/all your targets in another prison?	46%	48%
For those who are sentenced:			
7	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you address your offending behaviour whilst at this prison?	45%	27%
8	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	25%	13%
9	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	40%	39%
10	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	17%	31%
11	Did you have a visit in the first week that you were here?	51%	38%
12	Does this prison give you the opportunity to have the visits you are entitled to? (e.g. number and length of visit)	60%	67%

Key to tables

	Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better	HMYOI Castington	All other Young Adult establishments
	Any percent highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percent highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Resettlement continued			
13	Did you receive one or more visits in the last week?	53%	43%
14	Have you been helped to maintain contact with family/friends whilst in this prison?	56%	44%
15	Do you know who to contact within this prison to get help with the following:		
15b	Maintaining good relationships?	18%	16%
15c	Avoiding bad relationships?	16%	13%
15d	Finding a job on release?	35%	45%
15e	Finding accommodation on release?	26%	48%
15f	With money/finances on release?	21%	34%
15g	Claiming benefits on release?	25%	44%
15h	Arranging a place at college/continuing education on release?	18%	40%
15i	Accessing health services on release?	18%	40%
15j	Opening a bank account on release?	15%	35%
16	Do you think you will have a problem with any of the following on release from prison?		
16b	Maintaining good relationships?	23%	17%
16c	Avoiding bad relationships?	26%	18%
16d	Finding a job?	54%	58%
16e	Finding accommodation?	40%	39%
16f	Money/finances?	32%	52%
16g	Claiming benefits?	32%	34%
16h	Arranging a place at college/continuing education?	19%	46%
16i	Accessing health services?	13%	18%
16j	Opening a bank account?	17%	30%
For those who are sentenced:			
17	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here to make you less likely to offend in future?	52%	61%



Survey responses from children and young people HMYOI Castington (excluding Oswald) 2008

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 Castington (excl. Oswald) 2008	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Castington (excl. Oswald) 2008	HMYOI Castington (excl. Oswald) 2008
	Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better than the comparator				
	Any percent highlighted in blue is significantly worse than the comparator				
	Any percent highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		54	1088	54	51
SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU (Not tested for significance)					
1.1	Are you 18 years of age?	13%	10%	13%	16%
1.2	Do you usually live in this country?	99%	97%	99%	100%
1.3	Is English your first language?	94%	92%	94%	100%
1.4	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (including all those who did not tick White British, White Irish or White Other category)	6%	35%	6%	6%
1.5	Do you have any children?	12%	9%	12%	14%
1.6	Have you ever been in care? (either foster care or children's home)	32%	25%	32%	48%
1.7	Are you on a care order now?	12%	12%	12%	18%
SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE (Not tested for significance)					
2.2	Are you sentenced?	87%	78%	87%	82%
2.3	Is your sentence 12 months or less?	40%	41%	40%	50%
2.4	Do you have less than six months to serve?	68%	54%	68%	72%
2.5	Have you been in this prison less than a month?	10%	23%	10%	18%
2.6	Have you been to any other YOI during this sentence?	17%	29%	17%	26%
2.7	Is this the first time that you have been in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre before either sentenced or on remand?	32%	43%	32%	29%
SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS					
For your most recent journey, either to or from court, or between prisons, we want to know:					
3.1	Was the van clean?	38%	47%	38%	29%
3.2	Was the van comfortable?	4%	11%	4%	4%
3.3	Did you feel safe?	77%	73%	77%	58%
3.4	Did you have enough comfort breaks?	26%	17%	26%	9%
3.5	Were your health needs looked after?	57%	48%	57%	45%
3.6	Did you spend more than four hours in the van?	6%	8%	6%	2%
3.7	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	57%	61%	57%	55%
3.8	Did you know where you were going when you left court or when transferred from another establishment?	69%	81%	69%	86%
3.9	Did you receive written information about what would happen to you before you arrived?	27%	22%	27%	28%
SECTION 4: YOUR FIRST FEW DAYS HERE					
4.1	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	79%	72%	79%	81%
4.2	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	77%	80%	77%	88%
4.3	Were you told what you needed to know by the staff when you first arrived?	60%	73%	60%	73%
4.4	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	85%	79%	85%	90%
4.5	Were you seen by a member of healthcare staff in reception?	90%	88%	90%	100%
4.6	When you were searched was this carried out in an understanding way?	68%	79%	68%	84%
4.7	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	55%	67%	55%	60%
4.8	Were you able to make a telephone call to your family/friends on your first day here?	76%	84%	76%	78%

Key to tables

Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better than the comparator		HM YOI Castington (excl Oswald) 2008	young people's comparator	HM YOI Castington (excl Oswald) 2008	HM YOI Castington (excl Oswald) 2006
Any percent highlighted in blue is significantly worse than the comparator					
Any percent highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in background details					
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference					
Number of completed questionnaires returned		54	1088	54	51
Did you meet any of the following people within your first 24 hours?					
4.9a	The chaplain?	34%	37%	34%	58%
4.9b	Someone from healthcare?	43%	50%	43%	65%
4.9c	A Listener or The Samaritans?	8%	14%	8%	17%
4.9d	Did you have access to the prison shop/canteen within the first 24 hours of your arrival?	6%	15%	6%	21%
4.10	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	74%	84%	74%	81%
4.11	Did you go on an induction course within your first week?	55%	65%	55%	78%
4.12	Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	61%	55%	61%	59%
SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE HERE					
5.1	Is it easy/very easy for you to attend religious services?	49%	54%	49%	37%
5.2	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	51%	45%	51%	65%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	19%	22%	19%	42%
5.4	Have you talked to an advocate since you have been here (an outside person to help you with the authorities)?	30%	38%	30%	29%
5.5	Are you normally able to shower everyday if you want to?	80%	56%	80%	86%
5.6	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	39%	29%	39%	74%
SECTION 6: HEALTHCARE					
6.1	Do you think the overall quality of the healthcare is good/very good?	69%	60%	69%	56%
6.2a	Is it easy for you to see the Doctor?	50%	48%	50%	52%
6.2b	Is it easy for you to see the Nurse?	64%	68%	64%	65%
6.2c	Is it easy for you to see the Dentist?	27%	27%	27%	24%
6.2d	Is it easy for you to see the Optician?	22%	20%	22%	17%
6.3	Have you had any problems getting your medication?	15%	14%	15%	17%
6.4	Have you received any help with any alcohol problems?	25%	22%	25%	31%
6.5	Have you received any help with any drugs problems?	36%	34%	36%	44%
SECTION 7: REWARDS, SANCTIONS AND COMPLAINTS					
7.1	Are you on the enhanced (Top) level of the reward scheme?	23%	23%	23%	10%
7.2	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	43%	59%	43%	59%
7.3	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	54%	52%	54%	49%
7.4	Do you know how to make a complaint?	77%	77%	77%	87%
7.5	Is it easy to make a complaint?	32%	40%	32%	47%
7.6	Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	13%	16%	13%	16%
7.7	Have you ever been made to or encouraged to withdraw a complaint?	13%	10%	13%	4%
SECTION 8: DISCIPLINE AND RESPECT					
8.1	Have you had a 'nicking' (adjudication or minor report) since you have been here?	74%	58%	74%	76%
8.2	Have you been physically restrained (Cand R) since you have been here?	40%	28%	40%	30%
8.3	If you have spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit, did the staff treat you well/very well?	13%	10%	13%	19%
8.4	Do most staff treat you with respect?	68%	72%	68%	77%

Key to tables

		HMYOI Castrington (excl. Oswald) 2008	young people's comparator	HMYOI Castrington (excl. Oswald) 2008	HMYOI Castrington (excl. Oswald) 2006
	Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better than the comparator				
	Any percent highlighted in blue is significantly worse than the comparator				
	Any percent highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		54	1088	54	51
SECTION 9: SAFETY					
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	27%	27%	27%	28%
9.3	Has another young person or group of young people victimised (insulted or assaulted) you here?	20%	24%	20%	32%
If you have felt victimised by another young person/group of young people, did the incident involve:					
9.4a	Insulting remarks?	7%	13%	7%	10%
9.4b	Physical abuse?	7%	8%	7%	16%
9.4c	Sexual abuse?	2%	1%	2%	4%
9.4d	Racial or Ethnic abuse?	5%	3%	5%	4%
9.4e	Drugs?	7%	1%	7%	6%
9.4d	Having your canteen/property taken?	2%	4%	2%	6%
9.4e	Because you were new here?	5%	6%	5%	14%
9.4f	Being from a different part of the country than others?	2%	6%	2%	10%
9.6	Has a member of staff or group of staff victimised (insulted or assaulted) you here?	26%	19%	26%	22%
If you have felt victimised by a member of staff/group of staff members, did the incident involve:					
9.7a	Insulting remarks?	12%	12%	12%	10%
9.7b	Physical abuse?	6%	3%	6%	7%
9.7c	Sexual abuse?	0%	1%	0%	2%
9.7d	Racial or Ethnic abuse?	2%	3%	2%	0%
9.7e	Drugs?	5%	1%	5%	2%
9.7f	Having your canteen/property taken?	2%	2%	2%	5%
9.7g	Because you were new here?	5%	2%	5%	2%
9.7h	Being from a different part of the country than others?	6%	2%	6%	0%
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?	46%	61%	46%	52%
9.10	If you did tell a member of staff that you were being victimised do you think it would be taken seriously?	34%	37%	34%	39%
9.11	When you first arrived here did other young people shout through the windows at you?	25%	35%	25%	31%
9.12	Did you find this shouting threatening?	6%	10%	6%	4%
9.13	Do other young people shout through the windows at you now?	28%	28%	28%	24%
9.14	Do you find this threatening now?	6%	4%	6%	4%
9.15	Do you shout through the windows at others?	39%	28%	39%	21%
9.16	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	29%	36%	29%	21%
SECTION 10: ACTIVITIES					
10.1	Were you under the age of 14 when you were last at school?	55%	39%	55%	41%
10.2a	Have you ever been excluded from school?	92%	87%	92%	96%
10.2b	Have you ever truanted from school?	72%	70%	72%	75%
10.3	Are you doing any education here?	92%	84%	92%	87%
10.4	Is education helping you?	75%	58%	75%	62%
10.5	Do you feel you need help with reading, writing or maths?	45%	26%	45%	27%
10.6	Were the teachers understanding with any school problems when you first arrived?	59%	44%	59%	69%

Key to tables

		HMYOI Castington (excl Oswald) 2008	young people's comparator	HMYOI Castington (excl Oswald) 2008	HMYOI Castington (excl Oswald) 2006
	Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better than the comparator				
	Any percent highlighted in blue is significantly worse than the comparator				
	Any percent highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		54	1088	54	51
SECTION 10: ACTIVITIES cont.					
10.7a	Are you learning a skill or trade?	73%	52%	73%	51%
10.7b	Are you in a job here?	23%	29%	23%	23%
10.8	Do you go to the gym more than 5 times each week?	5%	9%	5%	9%
10.9	Do you go on association more than 5 times each week?	61%	48%	61%	79%
10.10	Can you go outside for exercise everyday?	54%	27%	54%	67%
SECTION 11: KEEPING IN TOUCH WITH FAMILY AND FRIENDS					
11.1	Are you able to use the telephone to speak to someone in your family every day?	73%	51%	73%	70%
11.2	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	42%	31%	42%	26%
11.3	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	43%	31%	43%	26%
11.4	Is it easy/very easy for your family and friends to get here to visit you?	40%	36%	40%	34%
11.5	Do you get 2 or more visits each month?	47%	48%	47%	42%
11.6	Do you arrive on time for a visit?	62%	64%	62%	75%
11.7	Are you and your family/friends treated well/very well by visits staff?	52%	57%	52%	63%
SECTION 12: RESETTLEMENT					
12.1	Did you meet your personal officer within your first week here?	43%	43%	43%	44%
12.2	Do you feel helped by your personal officer?	58%	51%	58%	51%
12.3	Do you know what targets you have been set in your training/sentence plan?	59%	58%	59%	65%
12.4	If you want, can you see your training/sentence plan?	42%	37%	42%	32%
12.5	Has your YOT/social worker/probation officer been in touch since you arrived here?	87%	82%	87%	85%
12.6	Do you know how to get in touch with your YOT/social worker/probation officer?	65%	57%	65%	67%
12.7	Do you want to stop offending?	70%	70%	70%	63%
12.9	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	48%	43%	48%	44%
12.10	When you are released will you be living with a family member?	64%	67%	64%	57%
12.11	Have you had help with finding accommodation?	27%	24%	27%	33%
12.12	Are you going to school or college on release?	27%	42%	27%	27%
12.13	Has anyone spoken to you about going to college on release?	31%	38%	31%	47%
12.14	Do you have a job to go to on release?	27%	24%	27%	25%
12.15	Have you done anything during your time here that you think will help you to get a job on release?	43%	46%	43%	49%
12.16	Has anyone from here spoken to you about getting a job on release or about New Deal?	22%	23%	22%	43%
12.17	Do you have a Connexions personal adviser?	51%	31%	51%	63%
12.18	Is there anything you would still like help with before you are released?	34%	38%	34%	33%
12.19	Have you done anything or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?	25%	38%	25%	33%



Survey responses from children and young people OSWALD UNIT (HMYOI Castington) 2008

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

		Oswald unit 2008	Castington 2008	Oswald unit 2008	Oswald unit 2006
Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better than the comparator					
Any percent highlighted in blue is significantly worse than the comparator					
Any percent highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in background details					
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference					
Number of completed questionnaires returned		36	54	36	19
SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU (Not tested for significance)					
1.1	Are you 18 years of age?	0%	13%	0%	15%
1.2	Do you usually live in this country?	100%	99%	100%	100%
1.3	Is English your first language?	93%	94%	93%	100%
1.4	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (including all those who did not tick White British, White Irish or White Other category)	22%	6%	22%	5%
1.5	Do you have any children?	9%	12%	9%	15%
1.6	Have you ever been in care? (either foster care or children's home)	11%	32%	11%	46%
1.7	Are you on a care order now?	7%	12%	7%	16%
SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE (Not tested for significance)					
2.2	Are you sentenced?	100%	87%	100%	100%
2.3	Is your sentence 12 months or less?	0%	40%	0%	0%
2.4	Do you have less than six months to serve?	15%	68%	15%	16%
2.5	Have you been in this prison less than a month?	2%	10%	2%	0%
2.6	Have you been to any other YOI during this sentence?	62%	17%	62%	54%
2.7	Is this the first time that you have been in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre before either sentenced or on remand?	43%	32%	43%	46%
SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS					
For your most recent journey, either to or from court, or between prisons, we want to know:					
3.1	Was the van clean?	57%	38%	57%	62%
3.2	Was the van comfortable?	45%	4%	45%	32%
3.3	Did you feel safe?	78%	77%	78%	84%
3.4	Did you have enough comfort breaks?	34%	26%	34%	22%
3.5	Were your health needs looked after?	60%	57%	60%	62%
3.6	Did you spend more than four hours in the van?	28%	6%	28%	5%
3.7	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	78%	57%	78%	84%
3.8	Did you know where you were going when you left court or when transferred from another establishment?	84%	69%	84%	90%
3.9	Did you receive written information about what would happen to you before you arrived?	37%	27%	37%	11%
SECTION 4: YOUR FIRST FEW DAYS HERE					
4.1	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	65%	79%	65%	57%
4.2	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	84%	77%	84%	73%
4.3	Were you told what you needed to know by the staff when you first arrived?	79%	60%	79%	90%
4.4	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	83%	85%	83%	74%
4.5	Were you seen by a member of healthcare staff in reception?	89%	90%	89%	90%
4.6	When you were searched was this carried out in an understanding way?	89%	68%	89%	85%
4.7	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	62%	55%	62%	80%
4.8	Were you able to make a telephone call to your family/friends on your first day here?	85%	76%	85%	95%

Key to tables

		Oswald unit 2008	Castington 2008	Oswald unit 2008	Oswald unit 2006
	Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better than the comparator				
	Any percent highlighted in blue is significantly worse than the comparator				
	Any percent highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		36	54	36	19
Did you meet any of the following people within your first 24 hours?					
4.9a	The chaplain?	43%	34%	43%	59%
4.9b	Someone from healthcare?	47%	43%	47%	80%
4.9c	A Listener or The Samaritans?	11%	8%	11%	10%
4.9d	Did you have access to the prison shop/canteen within the first 24 hours of your arrival?	26%	6%	26%	21%
4.10	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	92%	74%	92%	85%
4.11	Did you go on an induction course within your first week?	38%	55%	38%	31%
4.12	Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	51%	61%	51%	54%
SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE HERE					
5.1	Is it easy/very easy for you to attend religious services?	55%	49%	55%	54%
5.2	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	51%	51%	51%	36%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	57%	19%	57%	41%
5.4	Have you talked to an advocate since you have been here (an outside person to help you with the authorities)?	44%	30%	44%	36%
5.5	Are you normally able to shower everyday if you want to?	89%	80%	89%	85%
5.6	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	49%	39%	49%	69%
SECTION 6: HEALTHCARE					
6.1	Do you think the overall quality of the healthcare is good/very good?	69%	69%	69%	59%
6.2a	Is it easy for you to see the Doctor?	73%	50%	73%	41%
6.2b	Is it easy for you to see the Nurse?	80%	64%	80%	59%
6.2c	Is it easy for you to see the Dentist?	44%	27%	44%	31%
6.2d	Is it easy for you to see the Optician?	48%	22%	48%	27%
6.3	Have you had any problems getting your medication?	22%	15%	22%	15%
6.4	Have you received any help with any alcohol problems?	17%	25%	17%	31%
6.5	Have you received any help with any drugs problems?	22%	36%	22%	26%
SECTION 7: REWARDS, SANCTIONS AND COMPLAINTS					
7.1	Are you on the enhanced (Top) level of the reward scheme?	45%	23%	45%	38%
7.2	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	63%	43%	63%	73%
7.3	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	63%	54%	63%	50%
7.4	Do you know how to make a complaint?	94%	77%	94%	100%
7.5	Is it easy to make a complaint?	55%	32%	55%	46%
7.6	Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	36%	13%	36%	16%
7.7	Have you ever been made to or encouraged to withdraw a complaint?	15%	13%	15%	21%
SECTION 8: DISCIPLINE AND RESPECT					
8.1	Have you had a 'nicking' (adjudication or minor report) since you have been here?	74%	74%	74%	74%
8.2	Have you been physically restrained (Cand R) since you have been here?	47%	40%	47%	36%
8.3	If you have spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit, did the staff treat you well/very well?	22%	13%	22%	26%
8.4	Do most staff treat you with respect?	72%	68%	72%	78%

Key to tables

	Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better than the comparator				
	Any percent highlighted in blue is significantly worse than the comparator				
	Any percent highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
	Number of completed questionnaires returned	36	54	36	19
SECTION 9: SAFETY					
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	26%	27%	26%	21%
9.3	Has another young person or group of young people victimised (insulted or assaulted) you here?	28%	20%	28%	21%
If you have felt victimised by another young person/group of young people, did the incident involve:					
9.4a	Insulting remarks?	26%	7%	26%	15%
9.4b	Physical abuse?	17%	7%	17%	0%
9.4c	Sexual abuse?	0%	2%	0%	0%
9.4d	Racial or Ethnic abuse?	2%	5%	2%	0%
9.4e	Drugs?	2%	7%	2%	5%
9.4d	Having your canteen/property taken?	9%	2%	9%	5%
9.4e	Because you were new here?	9%	5%	9%	10%
9.4f	Being from a different part of the country than others?	2%	2%	2%	0%
9.6	Has a member of staff or group of staff victimised (insulted or assaulted) you here?	28%	26%	28%	21%
If you have felt victimised by a member of staff/group of staff members, did the incident involve:					
9.7a	Insulting remarks?	22%	12%	22%	15%
9.7b	Physical abuse?	6%	6%	6%	5%
9.7c	Sexual abuse?	2%	0%	2%	0%
9.7d	Racial or Ethnic abuse?	2%	2%	2%	5%
9.7e	Drugs?	0%	5%	0%	0%
9.7f	Having your canteen/property taken?	2%	2%	2%	5%
9.7g	Because you were new here?	2%	5%	2%	5%
9.7h	Being from a different part of the country than others?	2%	6%	2%	5%
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?	44%	46%	44%	60%
9.10	If you did tell a member of staff that you were being victimised do you think it would be taken seriously?	53%	34%	53%	57%
9.11	When you first arrived here did other young people shout through the windows at you?	47%	25%	47%	27%
9.12	Did you find this shouting threatening?	9%	6%	9%	10%
9.13	Do other young people shout through the windows at you now?	28%	28%	28%	11%
9.14	Do you find this threatening now?	7%	6%	7%	0%
9.15	Do you shout through the windows at others?	45%	39%	45%	26%
9.16	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	44%	29%	44%	44%
SECTION 10: ACTIVITIES					
10.1	Were you under the age of 14 when you were last at school?	62%	55%	62%	46%
10.2a	Have you ever been excluded from school?	89%	92%	89%	74%
10.2b	Have you ever truanted from school?	61%	72%	61%	78%
10.3	Are you doing any education here?	94%	92%	94%	100%
10.4	Is education helping you?	78%	75%	78%	80%
10.5	Do you feel you need help with reading, writing or maths?	26%	45%	26%	38%
10.6	Were the teachers understanding with any school problems when you first arrived?	69%	59%	69%	73%

Key to tables

	Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better than the comparator				
	Any percent highlighted in blue is significantly worse than the comparator				
	Any percent highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
	Number of completed questionnaires returned	36	54	36	19
SECTION 10: ACTIVITIES cont.					
10.7a	Are you learning a skill or trade?	49%	73%	49%	41%
10.7b	Are you in a job here?	17%	23%	17%	59%
10.8	Do you go to the gym more than 5 times each week?	23%	5%	23%	21%
10.9	Do you go on association more than 5 times each week?	71%	61%	71%	85%
10.10	Can you go outside for exercise everyday?	82%	54%	82%	68%
SECTION 11: KEEPING IN TOUCH WITH FAMILY AND FRIENDS					
11.1	Are you able to use the telephone to speak to someone in your family every day?	83%	73%	83%	90%
11.2	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	28%	42%	28%	21%
11.3	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	37%	43%	37%	46%
11.4	Is it easy/very easy for your family and friends to get here to visit you?	35%	40%	35%	36%
11.5	Do you get 2 or more visits each month?	37%	47%	37%	59%
11.6	Do you arrive on time for a visit?	74%	62%	74%	95%
11.7	Are you and your family/friends treated well/very well by visits staff?	58%	52%	58%	94%
SECTION 12: RESETTLEMENT					
12.1	Did you meet your personal officer within your first week here?	59%	43%	59%	59%
12.2	Do you feel helped by your personal officer?	69%	58%	69%	69%
12.3	Do you know what targets you have been set in your training/sentence plan?	60%	59%	60%	85%
12.4	If you want, can you see your training/sentence plan?	37%	42%	37%	21%
12.5	Has your YOT/social worker/probation officer been in touch since you arrived here?	94%	87%	94%	100%
12.6	Do you know how to get in touch with your YOT/social worker/probation officer?	73%	65%	73%	74%
12.7	Do you want to stop offending?	93%	70%	93%	95%
12.9	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	50%	48%	50%	54%
12.10	When you are released will you be living with a family member?	80%	64%	80%	74%
12.11	Have you had help with finding accommodation?	22%	27%	22%	15%
12.12	Are you going to school or college on release?	37%	27%	37%	21%
12.13	Has anyone spoken to you about going to college on release?	26%	31%	26%	21%
12.14	Do you have a job to go to on release?	28%	27%	28%	50%
12.15	Have you done anything during your time here that you think will help you to get a job on release?	57%	43%	57%	95%
12.16	Has anyone from here spoken to you about getting a job on release or about New Deal?	19%	22%	17%	22%
12.17	Do you have a Connexions personal adviser?	20%	51%	20%	50%
12.18	Is there anything you would still like help with before you are released?	37%	34%	37%	32%
12.19	Have you done anything or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?	58%	25%	58%	69%



Key question responses (ethnicity) HMYOI Castington (including Oswald Unit) 2008

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 and minority ethnic young people	white young people
	Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better than the responses from white young people		
	Any percent highlighted in blue is significantly worse than the responses from white young people		
	Any percent highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
	Number of completed questionnaires returned	11	78
2.2	Are you sentenced? Not tested for significance	93%	92%
2.6	Have you been to any other YOI during this sentence? Not tested for significance	80%	28%
1.6	Have you ever been in care? (foster care/children's home) Not tested for significance	7%	26%
1.7	Are you on a care order now? Not tested for significance	7%	10%
3.7	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	80%	63%
4.2	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	69%	82%
4.6	Please answer the following question about your first few days here: When you were searched was this carried out in an understanding way?	69%	78%
4.7	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	53%	58%
4.1	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	71%	83%
4.11	Did you go on an induction course within your first week?	47%	49%
5.1	Is it easy/very easy for you to attend religious services?	80%	48%
5.2	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	62%	49%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	47%	34%
6.1	Do you think the overall quality of the healthcare is good/very good?	47%	74%
8.1	Have you had a 'nicking' (adjudication or minor report) since you have been here?	80%	74%
8.2	Have you been physically restrained (Cand R) since you have been here?	53%	40%
8.3	If you have spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit, did the staff treat you well/very well?	39%	13%
5.4	Have you talked to an advocate since you have been here (an outside person to help you with the authorities)?	33%	35%
7.1	Are you on the enhanced (Top) level of the reward scheme?	36%	31%
7.3	Please answer the following question about the reward scheme: Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	53%	59%
7.6	Please answer the following question about complaints: Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	47%	18%
5.5	Are you normally able to shower everyday if you want to?	69%	86%
5.6	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	31%	44%
8.4	Do most staff treat you with respect?	64%	72%
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	29%	25%
9.3	Has another young person or group of young people victimised (insulted or assaulted) you here?	23%	22%
9.4d	If you have felt victimised by a prisoner/group of prisoners, what did the incident(s) involve: Racial or Ethnic abuse?	23%	1%
9.6	Has a member of staff or group of staff victimised (insulted or assaulted) you here?	29%	26%
9.7d	If you have felt victimised by a staff/group of staff, what did the incident(s) involve: Racial or Ethnic abuse?	20%	0%
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?	33%	46%

Key to tables

		black and minority ethnic young people	white young people
	Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better than the responses from white young people		
	Any percent highlighted in blue is significantly worse than the responses from white young people		
	Any percent highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
9.16	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	39%	34%
10.3	Are you doing any education here?	100%	92%
10.4	Is education helping you?	77%	76%
10.7	Are you learning a skill or trade?	71%	63%
10.7	Are you in a job here?	31%	20%
10.8	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	39%	8%
10.9	Do you go on association more than 5 times each week?	64%	66%
10.10	Can you go outside for exercise everyday?	69%	64%
11.2	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	47%	36%
11.3	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	47%	40%
11.5	Do you get 2 or more visits each month?	20%	46%
11.7	Are you and your family/friends treated well/very well by visits staff?	36%	56%
12.1	Did you meet your personal officer within your first week here?	39%	50%
12.2	Do you feel helped by your personal officer?	53%	63%
12.3	Do you know what targets you have been set in your training/sentence plan?	64%	60%
12.9	Please answer the following questions on preparation for release: Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	62%	49%
12.14	Please answer the following questions on preparation for release: Do you have a job to go to on release?	36%	27%
12.15	Please answer the following questions on preparation for release: Have you done anything during your time here that you think will help you to get a job on release?	47%	50%
12.18	Please answer the following questions on preparation for release: Is there anything you would still like help with before you are released?	47%	34%
12.19	Have you done anything. Or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?	36%	39%



Prisoner 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

		Foreign national prisoners	British national prisoners
	Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better		
	Any percent highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percent highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		12	66
1.3	Are you sentenced?	50%	66%
1.7	Are you a foreign national?		
1.8	Is English your first language?	59%	91%
1.9	Are you from a minority ethnic group? Including all those who did not tick White British, White Irish or White other categories.	17%	8%
1.10	Are you Muslim?	16%	0%
1.13	Is this your first time in prison?	58%	31%
2.3	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	59%	55%
2.4a	Did you know where you were going when you left court or when transferred from another prison?	71%	78%
3.2a	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	40%	52%
3.3a	Were you seen by a member of healthcare staff in reception?	81%	93%
3.3b	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	68%	79%
3.4	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	59%	61%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	54%	74%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	65%	81%
4.1a	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	50%	49%
4.3a	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	71%	52%

Key to tables

	Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better	Foreign national prisoners	British national prisoners
	Any percent highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percent highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
4.3b	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	100%	84%
4.3e	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	68%	47%
4.4	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	26%	28%
4.5	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	41%	46%
4.6a	Is it easy/very easy to get a complaints form?	81%	75%
4.6b	Is it easy/very easy to get an application form?	100%	87%
4.9	Have you made a complaint?	0%	27%
4.13a	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	24%	45%
4.13b	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	50%	46%
4.15a	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	91%	76%
4.15b	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	77%	63%
5.1	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	46%	44%
5.2	Do you feel unsafe in this prison at the moment?	17%	19%
5.4	Have you been victimised by another prisoner?	17%	26%
5.5d	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	0%	3%
5.5j	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	0%	2%
5.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	26%	27%
5.7d	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	0%	2%

	Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better	Foreign national prisoners	British national prisoners
	Any percent highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percent highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
5.7i	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	9%	0%
5.9	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by another prisoner/ group of prisoners in here?	10%	29%
5.10	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by a member of staff in here?	9%	23%
5.11	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	38%	37%
6.1a	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	54%	51%
6.1b	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	77%	59%
6.7	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	41%	27%
7.1a	Are you currently working in the prison?	29%	52%
7.1b	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	19%	9%
7.1c	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	19%	18%
7.1d	Are you currently taking part in an Offending Behaviour Programme?	10%	7%
7.3	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	19%	22%
7.4	On average, do you go to the gym at least twice a week?	50%	40%
7.6	On average, do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	0%	10%
7.7	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	59%	77%
7.8	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	32%	34%
8.1	Do you have a personal officer?	74%	71%
8.9	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	17%	45%
8.10	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	9%	20%
8.12	Does this prison give you the opportunity to have the visits you are entitled to? (e.g. number and length of visit)	90%	56%



Key questions (disability analysis) HMYOI Castington - young adults 2008

Prisoner 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

	Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	Any percent highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percent highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		10	66
1.9	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (including all those who did not tick White British, White Irish or White other categories)	11%	8%
2.1d	On the most recent journey you have made either to or from court or between prisons, how was the attention paid to your health needs? (good/very good)	34%	29%
2.3	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	64%	57%
2.4a	Did you know where you were going when you left court or when transferred from another prison?	76%	77%
3.1d	Did staff ask if you needed any help/support in dealing with problems contacting family within the first 24 hours?	82%	64%
3.1g	Did staff ask if you needed any help/support in dealing with problems of feeling depressed/suicidal within the first 24 hours?	68%	36%
3.1h	Did staff ask if you needed any help/support in dealing with health problems within the first 24 hours?	50%	52%
3.2a	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	66%	46%
3.4	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	64%	61%
3.7b	Did you have access to someone from healthcare within the first 24 hours?	77%	68%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	70%	74%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	84%	77%
4.3a	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	58%	52%
4.3b	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	89%	87%
4.3e	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	44%	51%
3.6a	Is it easy/very easy to get a complaints form?	64%	80%

Key to tables

	Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	Any percent highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percent highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
3.6b	Is it easy/very easy to get an application form?	70%	95%
3.9	Have you made a complaint?	11%	28%
3.14	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	23%	30%
3.15a	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	72%	80%
3.15b	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	58%	66%
5.1	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	55%	41%
5.2	Do you feel unsafe in this prison at the moment?	28%	17%
5.4	Have you been victimised by another prisoner?	40%	22%
5.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	28%	25%
5.9	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by another prisoner/ group of prisoners in here?	44%	25%
5.10	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by a member of staff in here?	17%	22%
6.1a	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	50%	50%
6.1b	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	68%	58%
6.2	Are you able to see a pharmacist?	37%	49%
6.5	Are you currently taking medication?	28%	21%
6.7	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health problems?	53%	21%
7.1a	Are you currently working in the prison?	17%	58%
7.1b	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	0%	14%
7.1c	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	36%	15%

Key to tables

	Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	Any percent highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percent highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
7.1d	Are you currently taking part in an Offending Behaviour Programme?	0%	10%
7.3	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	12%	22%
7.4	On average, do you go to the gym at least twice a week?	17%	46%
7.5	On average, do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	58%	61%
7.6	On average, do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	11%	9%
7.7	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	50%	79%
7.8	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association time?	11%	38%
8.1	Do you have a personal officer?	72%	69%
8.9	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	42%	39%
8.10	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	6%	20%
8.12	Does this prison give you the opportunity to have the visits you are entitled to? (e.g. number and length of visit)	47%	63%

