

Report on an announced inspection of  
**HMYOI Cookham Wood**

14 - 18 November 2011

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

Crown copyright 2012

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

# Contents

<b>Introduction</b>	5
<b>Fact page</b>	7
<b>Healthy prison summary</b>	9
<b>1 Arrival in custody</b>	
<hr/>	
Courts, escorts and transfers	19
First days in custody	20
<b>2 Environment and relationships</b>	
<hr/>	
Residential units	23
Relationships between staff and children and young people	25
Personal officers	27
<b>3 Duty of care</b>	
<hr/>	
Safeguarding children	29
Child protection	30
Self-harm and suicide prevention	31
Bullying	33
Applications and complaints	34
Legal rights	36
Faith and religious activity	36
Substance use	38
<b>4 Diversity</b>	41
<hr/>	
<b>5 Health services</b>	45
<hr/>	
<b>6 Activities</b>	
<hr/>	
Time out of cell	51
Learning and skills	52
Physical education and health promotion	55
<b>7 Good order</b>	
<hr/>	
Behaviour management	57
Security	58
Rules and routines	58
Rewards and sanctions	58

Adjudications	59
Use of force	60
Care and separation	61

## **8 Services**

---

Catering	63
Prison shop	64

## **9 Resettlement**

---

Strategic management of resettlement	67
Training planning and remand management	68
Resettlement pathways	70

## **10 Recommendations, housekeeping points and good practice**

---

### **Appendices**

---

I Inspection team	83
II Prison population profile	84
III Summary of young people's questionnaires and interviews	87

# Introduction

This is the third in a series of inspections at Cookham Wood since it became a juvenile facility in 2008. The regularity of inspection is, in part, a reflection of serious concerns that the Youth Justice Board and this inspectorate have had about the establishment as it has sought to cope with the challenges of its changed responsibilities. This inspection was commissioned by the Youth Justice Board.

In 2009 we found a place that we described as frightening and unsafe. In 2010 we found improvements but characterised the establishment as being off the critical list but still needing intensive care. This inspection found that Cookham Wood was continuing to make good progress. We found that outcomes for young people were all now reasonably good across our four tests of a healthy prison.

Young people felt safer than they had when we last inspected and safer against comparators in similar establishments. The number of violent and anti-social incidents remained too high, but staff were now much more confident in using violence reduction and behaviour management procedures. There was good consultation with young people and a good and developing understanding of violence and bullying issues through the analysis of meaningful data. Mediation was increasingly being used and it was encouraging that use of force was reducing.

Developments in the Phoenix Unit, a facility for the most disruptive, which were still embryonic when we last visited, had progressed well. The unit had a greater clarity of purpose and the quality of individual case management was reasonable. Arrangements to support safeguarding and child protection were effective and robust but would have benefited from greater engagement by the local authority.

Accommodation at Cookham Wood remained far from ideal but wings were now cleaner and standards were better. Some of the limitations of the accommodation had been mitigated by better staff supervision and, despite some ambivalence among some young people, the quality of relationships between young people and staff were good. Staff were more confident and some innovative local training was developing their understanding of, and skills working with, young people. Regular surveys of young people, consultation forums and effective use of advocacy services were taken seriously and were also having a positive impact.

Work to support and promote diversity was generally good with a broad approach that demonstrated attention to all the key strands. Work with foreign national young people was improved with better cooperation with the UK Border Agency and innovative support on offer through a foreign national youth club. Complaints were well managed and health care, particularly mental health care, was much improved.

There had been a broad improvement in the quality of the regime on offer. Most young people had a reasonable amount of time out of cell, although arrangements for exercise in the open air were quite limited. Access to education and training was good and, for the individual, well planned. New courses had been introduced and standards were good. There was however, more scope to develop progression opportunities in learning, particularly as it applied to those held for longer periods of time. Access to PE was good.

Work to support resettlement was similarly improving. There was a need for better coordinated care planning for young people with substance misuse issues and for those young people

moving on to the adult estate. However, reintegration arrangements were generally based on effective needs analysis and sound training planning. The growing confidence with which the establishment was addressing resettlement issues was evident in work such as the development of an interesting resettlement consortium with local authorities aimed at the promotion of training and employment. There was also some effective use of temporary release to support reintegration and the appointment of a youth worker, again linked in to the community, was a creative way of supporting personal and social development.

This is an encouraging report. Cookham Wood has come a long way in three years but there is no room for complacency and further improvement is still required in all the areas we inspected. The establishment is, however, well led and has a renewed sense of confidence. The governor and her staff should be commended for what they have achieved so far.

**Nick Hardwick**  
**HM Chief Inspector of Prisons**

**January 2012**

# Fact page

## Task of the establishment

Male, sentenced and remanded young people

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

Public

## Region/Department

Kent and Sussex

## Number held

127

## Certified normal accommodation

143

## Operational capacity

131

## Date of last full inspection

October 2010

## Brief history

HMYOI Cookham Wood was until 2008 an adult female prison with a female juvenile unit. Following its re-role, it received the first male young people in May 2008. Numbers held were limited to 80 in 2009 following the first inspection but this had gradually been increased and the full operational capacity had been reinstated.

## Short description of residential units

There are three main residential units containing single accommodation. Ash and Beech units are based on three floors and have an operational capacity of 59 and 55 respectively. Cedar is a more modern 17 cell unit which incorporates the first night centre, which holds up to eight young people. The other nine cells are for enhanced young people and young people employed as orderlies.

The Phoenix unit is a 12 cell unit which houses young people who have been identified as having complex needs and/or challenging behaviour.

## Escort contractor

GeoAmey; Serco

## Health service commissioner and providers

NHS Medway  
HM Prison Service  
Cygnet Health Care

## Learning and skills providers

CFBT





# Healthy prison summary

## Introduction

---

HP1 Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons is an independent, statutory organisation which reports on the treatment and conditions of those detained in prisons, young offender institutions, immigration detention facilities and police custody.

HP2 All inspections carried out by HM Inspectorate of Prisons contribute to the UK's response to its international obligations under the UN Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (OPCAT). OPCAT requires that all places of detention are visited regularly by independent bodies – known as the National Preventive Mechanism (NPM) – which monitor the treatment of and conditions for detainees. HM Inspectorate of Prisons is one of several bodies making up the NPM in the UK.

HP3 All Inspectorate of Prisons young offender institution reports carry a summary of the conditions and treatment of children and young people, 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:

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

HP4 Under each test, we make an assessment of outcomes for children and young people and therefore of the establishment's overall performance against the test. In some cases, this performance will be affected by matters outside the establishment's direct control, which need to be addressed nationally.

**- outcomes for children and young people are good against this healthy prison test.**

There is no evidence that outcomes for children and young people are being adversely affected in any significant areas.

**- outcomes for children and young people are reasonably good against this healthy prison test.**

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

**- outcomes for children and young people are not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.**

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

**- outcomes for children and young people are poor against this healthy prison test.**

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

## Safety

---

HP5 Late arrivals undermined otherwise good reception and first night care. Induction had improved. Safeguarding and child protection were sound but the local authority was not engaging fully with safeguarding arrangements. Young people at risk of self-harm were well cared for despite some procedural frailties. Security was generally proportionate, apart from routine strip-searching of new arrivals. Staff supported the behaviour management policy and young people were motivated by age-appropriate incentives. Fights and assaults and adjudications remained high but there was robust governance. There had been a slight decrease in the use of force overall. The Phoenix Unit had developed well. There was low availability of illegal substances and mandatory drug testing (MDT) was carried out appropriately. There were a number of results in our survey which were significantly better than the previous inspection and national comparators in relation to safety. Overall, outcomes for young people were reasonably good with regard to this healthy prison test.

HP6 Late arrivals had been significant since the introduction of the new escort contracts. Many young people said that they had spent lengthy periods in vans, some more than four hours, without food or a toilet break. The distances they had to travel were generally not lengthy but the circuitous routes by which young people were brought to the establishment, combined with lengthy waits in court, inevitably resulted in unacceptably late arrivals. Detailed information was collected to monitor problems, and robust action had been taken to raise the issues with the escort providers but problems continued. Good efforts had been made to promote use of the video link.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> **Inspection methodology:** There are five key sources of evidence for inspection: observation; prisoner surveys; discussions with prisoners; discussions with staff and relevant third parties; and documentation. During inspections, we use a mixed-method approach to data gathering, applying both qualitative and quantitative methodologies. All findings and judgements are triangulated, which increases the validity of the data gathered. Survey results show the collective response (in percentages) from prisoners in the establishment being inspected compared with the collective response (in percentages) from respondents in all establishments of that type (the comparator figure). Where references to comparisons between these two sets of figures are made in the report, these relate to statistically significant differences only. Statistical significance is a way of estimating the likelihood that a difference between two samples indicates a real difference between the populations from which the samples are taken, rather than being due to chance. If a result is very unlikely to have arisen by chance, we say it is 'statistically significant'. The significance level is set at 0.05, which means that there is only a 5% chance that the difference in results is due to chance. (Adapted from Towel et al (eds), *Dictionary of Forensic Psychology*.)

- HP7 All new receptions were strip-searched which was inappropriate. Young people indicated that reception staff asked reassuring and helpful questions. Good arrangements were made to deal with late arrivals and they received a good level of attention from staff on the first night unit. Initial vulnerability assessments needed to be improved however. First night accommodation was good with en suite facilities but late arrivals did not always have the opportunity to make a telephone call before being locked up. The development of peer supporters was a good initiative and our survey indicated that young people felt safe on their first night. The induction programme was thorough and staff delivered relevant information in an interesting way. The inclusion of the Recode communication programme for young people on induction was innovative.
- HP8 The operational and safeguarding committees worked effectively using a wide range of data analysis. However, the lack of regular independent oversight by the local authority was a weakness. Staff had benefited from additional training and were alert to safeguarding concerns and used the appropriate reporting concerns system well. The weekly safer regimes meetings were well attended by a range of disciplines and carried out an important operational function in the management of the most vulnerable and disruptive young people.
- HP9 Child protection was managed robustly. Staff understood the referral system and made appropriate referrals. The local authority investigated referrals appropriately and the establishment carried out appropriate follow-up investigations when necessary.
- HP10 Quality assurance systems for ACCT (assessment, care in custody and teamwork) documentation were robust and had identified shortfalls in the quality of care maps and a lack of management checks, with which we concurred. The majority of staff observations showed regular engagement with young people. Some planning for reviews took place but they were not always chaired by the same manager and they were not always sufficiently multidisciplinary. Young people on ACCT received a good level of specialist support and were well cared for but the occasional use of the gated cell was inappropriate.
- HP11 Staff understood anti-bullying and violence reduction procedures and used them confidently. There were still a significant number of fights and assaults but young people felt safe and had confidence that staff would act swiftly to help them. Quarterly surveys undertaken by the establishment provided good information from young people about bullying and they generally did not describe high levels of bullying taking place. Specific issues highlighted were being tackled. Caseworkers managed individual young people who were perpetrators or victims of bullying well but there was more work to do to ensure that this was linked to other individual targets and aspects of care planning. A good number of staff had been trained in mediation and it was being used increasingly.
- HP12 Staff had confidence in the behaviour management policy which was underpinned by age-appropriate incentives, including a stamp system to encourage good behaviour and less formal sanctions for poor behaviour, such as the issue of yellow cards. A revised rewards and sanctions policy had introduced a more motivational approach but some aspects were not fully embedded. Individual work with young people on the basic level was suitably targeted.

- HP13 Dynamic security was good, supported by effective sharing of intelligence. Risk assessments were generally sound and there were efficient systems in place to inform arrangements such as keeping young people apart and restricted movements. However, many young people were assessed as unsuitable to attend workshop activities. Apart from routine strip-searching for new arrivals, all strip-searching was appropriately risk assessed and carried out rarely.
- HP14 There had been a reduction overall in the use of force since the previous inspection. Use of force documentation contained a good level of detail including effective de-escalation. Governance arrangements were very good and staff were routinely given feedback to address shortfalls and improve practice. Debriefing young people following the use of force was done well.
- HP15 There was a high level of adjudications but governance was thorough. There was good use of mediation following adjudications.
- HP16 There was greater clarity regarding the role and function of the care and separation unit (the Phoenix Unit). All young people located there had care plans and were subject to frequent multidisciplinary review. The quality of care plans had improved significantly since the previous inspection, although there was scope for further improvement.
- HP17 Establishment intelligence, our survey and discussions with young people confirmed low availability of drugs. MDT was appropriately intelligence led and did not involve strip-searching without the approval of a governor. Young people requiring a clinical detoxification were not sent to Cookham Wood but robust contingency plans were in place and had been used effectively.

## Respect

---

- HP18 Good efforts had been made to improve the environment but access to showers was inadequate. Relationships and staff supervision were good and cell bells were no longer used inappropriately. Some aspects of personal officer work were carried out well but the role needed strengthening. Complaints were generally well managed but applications were not so efficient. Support available to foreign nationals had been strengthened. The management of diversity had generally developed well but there were gaps in ethnic monitoring. Young people did not like the food but changes had been made following consultation with young people. Health care services had improved and health care provided a very good level of care. Overall, outcomes for young people were reasonably good with regard to this healthy prison test.
- HP19 The residential units were clean and tidy and had improved overall since the previous inspection. There were small amounts of graffiti in some cells and some windows needed repairing to improve ventilation. Young people were encouraged to maintain good standards of hygiene but were not always able to shower each day. Cell call bells were no longer used by young people simply to attract staff attention and staff responses were timely, which was a considerable improvement compared with the previous inspection. Good staff supervision mitigated risks associated with the poor design of the units. The young people's council was responsive to young people's reasonable requests for change.

- HP20 Some young people did not speak well of their relationships with staff but the majority were positive about the way that staff treated them and gave examples of a range of staff whom they could turn to for help. We observed relaxed and friendly relationships between staff and young people. Young people were encouraged to complete surveys regularly which, in addition to the consultation through the young people's council, helped to foster good communication. Staff demonstrated a good level of understanding of the young people on their residential units and some spoke enthusiastically of the bespoke training they had undertaken, which they felt had helped them to relate better to young people.
- HP21 Some aspects of personal officer work were carried out well, such as regular reviews with young people and efficient record keeping. However, personal officers mainly focused on day-to-day support and rarely attended meetings relating to the overall care of the young people they were responsible for and young people generally expressed mixed views about how helpful they were. More coordination between personal officers and caseworkers was needed.
- HP22 Young people reported significantly less favourably in our survey against the national comparator about fairness of the applications system and promptness of replies and there was no audit trail to ensure replies were timely. The complaints process was well managed, cross referenced with safeguarding and diversity issues and informed by detailed analysis. Replies to complaints were prompt and appeals were taken seriously.
- HP23 Young people were assessed for their need for legal services advice on arrival and received a good level of ongoing support from caseworkers, advocates and the foreign nationals coordinator, who was a trained legal services officer. Free telephone calls to legal advisers were available but not all young people we spoke to knew this.
- HP24 Opportunities for young people to dine out were too limited. The menu was varied with some healthy options, and meals were served on time. Young people were consistently negative about the quality of the food and our survey results were poor. Young people were regularly consulted about catering arrangements and some changes had been made in response, for example an increase in lunch and breakfast options. Ordering and delivery arrangements for the shop were efficient but some new arrivals had to wait too long to place an order. Young people had good opportunities to comment about the shop and the product list was reviewed regularly.
- HP25 Facilities for religious services were basic but adequate. All faiths were catered for, with some involvement with community groups. Arrangements to apply to attend religious services were too restrictive, although services were well attended. Chaplains had been involved in helping some young people prior to their release but did not attend many meetings in the establishment relating to the care of young people, for example ACCT and training planning reviews.
- HP26 The work of the equalities team was well publicised and the equalities officer was readily accessible. A number of young people had been trained as diversity representatives and were supported and used well. The equality action team met regularly, was well attended and included some community representatives. There was a sufficiently broad agenda covering all aspects of diversity. Ethnic monitoring covered all mandatory areas and also some local monitoring but there were some gaps. Discrimination incident report forms were dealt with well. Progress had been made in addressing the specific needs of gypsies and travellers, and youth workers

carried out some creative awareness work relating to sexuality. The disability liaison officer provided detailed guidance about a range of physical and mental disabilities and the special educational needs coordinator shared assessments of young people with learning difficulties, but it was unclear whether residential staff applied the information in their day-to-day care of young people.

- HP27 Foreign nationals received a good level of attention to their day-to-day needs although attendance at monthly foreign national committee meetings was poor. A commitment from the UK Border Agency to visit monthly was positive and Migrant Help offered valuable advice and support at fortnightly individual sessions with foreign nationals. The introduction of a youth club for foreign nationals was an innovative way to encourage them to meet as a group for support.
- HP28 Structural changes had improved the health care centre and a dedicated officer detailed daily to escort young people to their health care appointments had improved timeliness and missed appointments. Young people had easy access to a range of health services, including the GP and a wide variety of clinics. The staff skill mix had improved and met the needs of the population well. Mental health provision was particularly good. The delivery of mental health awareness training was thorough. The pharmacy provided a good level of service with access to a pharmacist when required. Dental services and health promotion were good.

## Purposeful activity

---

HP29 The majority of young people had adequate time out of cell engaged in purposeful activity. New courses had been introduced and standards of work were generally good. Levels of accreditation had increased since the last inspection and most young people gained some useful qualifications during their time in custody. There was scope to deliver higher level courses in all areas. Teaching had improved overall but there was still too much variation. Young people had good access to PE where they achieved well. Young people had good access to the well managed library. Overall, outcomes for young people were reasonably good with regard to this healthy prison test.

HP30 Time out of cell for individual young people varied and depended in the main on their behaviour, but overall the majority spent adequate time out of their cell and engaged in education or vocational training. Managers carried out checks each week to see how many young people were locked up during the day and the reasons for their lack of activity. All young people were offered exercise in the open air each day but this was limited to 30 minutes since young people associated in small groups for safety reasons which meant that there was only capacity for 30 minute slots. Exercise yards were stark and offered nothing for young people to do. Association was scheduled each day and cancelled only when there were staff shortages at short notice. The youth club was an excellent resource. Staff had been given the opportunity to train as youth workers and many were keen to do so. This was a creative way to improve the range and quality of enrichment activities.

HP31 The process of allocating young people to education or vocational training had been revised and was very effective. The curriculum had developed well, largely through the introduction of new courses such as motor vehicle engineering and creative media. Project based learning had also been introduced in an attempt to provide for

young people whose risk assessment prevented them from using the vocational workshops.

- HP32 Teaching and learning were variable but were good overall. Teaching and learning was significantly better in the vocational workshops than in education classrooms, where some lessons were too long. Young people's achievements were good and the levels of accreditation had improved, although there was scope to develop courses at higher levels in all areas. Most young people gained some form of accreditation, especially in the key areas of numeracy and literacy. The quality of the murals produced remained outstanding. Attendance was satisfactory and few young people refused to attend education. The small number of young people who were sent back to their unit for poor behaviour were quickly reintegrated. Despite the difficulties in moving young people to their activity safely, some aspects of punctuality needed improvement. Learning support assistants provided good support and young people spoke well of the support they received in ESOL (English for speakers of other languages) lessons.
- HP33 Young people had good access to the gym and PE facilities and the programme was well balanced. There was a very popular and successful PE course and good links with Charlton Athletic Football Club. Most of the PE curriculum was accredited and levels of accreditation were high. Very good use was made of release on temporary licence (ROTL) within the PE department. Facilities were adequate overall, although there were insufficient showers.
- HP34 Young people had good timetabled access to the library. There was a reasonable range of age-appropriate stock. Borrowing rates were high and a book delivery service was carried out in the evenings.

## Resettlement

---

- HP35 Some noteworthy improvements had been made to the resettlement policy and the committee was more effective. Training planning arrangements remained sound but transition arrangements for young people transferring to an adult prison lacked involvement from receiving prisons. The use of ROTL was excellent. Substance use services met young people's basic needs but required further development to meet the needs of young people requiring targeted services. Caseworkers and the advocacy service worked hard to help young people to find accommodation for their release. The independent living course provided valuable pre-release support. There was a good range of offending behaviour programmes. Some good work was done to promote family contact but access to telephones was inadequate. Overall, outcomes for young people were reasonably good with regard to this healthy prison test.
- HP36 A valuable independent needs analysis, using focus groups with young people, had been incorporated into the revised resettlement policy. The resettlement committee met regularly and it was becoming more effective with the involvement of some community agencies. Pathway leads had been designated and potentially useful longitudinal data was being collected to enable efficient evaluation of outcomes for young people. Recent work that had been carried out to establish a regional resettlement consortium was a very good example of effective collaborative work with relevant stakeholders. The introduction of a youth work service was proving to be

extremely beneficial both for individual young people and in developing the resettlement agenda.

- HP37 Caseworkers coordinated training planning arrangements well and successfully enabled young people to participate in their training planning reviews and set appropriate goals. However, attendance by relevant staff within the establishment was insufficient. All young people were assessed for ROTL at an early stage and ROTL was actively promoted and used well to motivate young people. Public protection arrangements were efficient and the needs of looked-after children were well met. Transition planning for young people transferring to the adult estate was underdeveloped.
- HP38 Accommodation problems were identified early and caseworkers and advocates worked together well to resolve the complex difficulties that some young people experienced. Useful follow-up work was carried out to check on suitability and sustainability of the accommodation that young people were released to. Discharge planning for young people's health needs was well organised.
- HP39 Young people received good initial advice and guidance with regard to education training and employment, including a good level of input from Connexions. Partnerships with external agencies had developed well and there were useful links with a small number of local employers and training providers. The use of ROTL for education training and employment opportunities had increased with the introduction of a specialist worker and there was a range of high quality placements. All young people received input on managing their finances from a range of sources, including an independent living course, Connexions<sup>2</sup> and NACRO.
- HP40 Some young people with substance use needs benefited from good individual work but there was a lack of coordinated care planning for young people with a high level of need. Health promotion with regard to substance use was underdeveloped and group work programmes were not facilitated efficiently or well attended by young people. There were good links with the local young people's substance misuse service but pre-release planning was inconsistent and the pre-release programme relating to substance use issues that was delivered previously, had ceased.
- HP41 All young people had access to a wide range of relevant short programmes, some involving community groups. A significant number of young people completed programmes. There was some local evaluation and feedback from young people was generally positive.
- HP42 Young people complained about delay in sending and receiving their mail and they did not always get the opportunity to make a telephone call each day.
- HP43 The long awaited visitors' centre was a welcome development and help on hand from youth offending team workers was proving to be a positive initiative. The visits area was comfortable but facilities for legal visits lacked sufficient privacy. Young people were still wearing coloured bands in visits despite wearing prison clothing. Young people who did not receive any visits were monitored so that caseworkers could offer assistance as required. Family days had recently been introduced and all young people were eligible but take up was generally low. ROTL was used well for family contact.

---

<sup>2</sup> Connexions is an advice and guidance service in England for all 13 to 19 year olds.  
HMYOI Cookham Wood



## Main concerns and recommendations

---

HP44 Concern: Late arrivals were an increasing problem. A considerable number of young people arrived at the establishment late after lengthy waits in court and circuitous journeys to the establishment.

**Recommendation: Key staff at the establishment, NOMS, the YJB and the escort providers should meet regularly, monitor and resolve problems relating to escort arrangements and ensure that young people arrive at the establishment in good time to be assessed and settled on their first night.**

HP45 Concern: The personal officer role was underdeveloped. Personal officers saw their main role as providing day-to-day support to young people and rarely attended important care planning meetings. They had frequent contact with young people and there was considerable potential to develop the role further with better coordination with caseworkers.

**Recommendation: The personal officer policy should be disseminated to all staff so that they are clear about their responsibilities, including attending important meetings relating to the care of the young people they are responsible for and collaborating appropriately with caseworkers.**

HP46 Concern: The lack of regular independent oversight by the local authority of otherwise efficient safeguarding arrangements within the establishment was a weakness.

**Recommendation: Further efforts should be made to increase the involvement of the Medway Safeguarding Children Board in the strategic management and oversight of all aspects of safeguarding children at Cookham Wood.**



# Section 1: Arrival in custody

## Courts, escorts and transfers

---

### Expected outcomes:

Children and young people travel in safe, decent conditions and in a timely way to and from court and between establishments. During travel the individual needs of young people are recognised and given proper attention. Children and young people travel separately from adults.

- 1.1 Young people continued to spend unnecessarily long periods of time in court cells after their hearing. This, combined with unnecessarily circuitous routes to the establishment, meant that late arrivals remained a serious problem. Prison staff made good efforts to draw attention to the problems but the escort providers were not engaging with them sufficiently well to resolve the concerns. There was good promotion of the use of the video link suite.
- 1.2 Young people we spoke to were reasonably positive about their treatment by escort staff when travelling to the prison, although in our survey only 42% of respondents said that they were treated well/very well by escort staff against the national comparator of 52%. The majority of young people were coming from London courts but frequently travelled with adult prisoners who were taken to their destinations first, resulting in young people experiencing circuitous routes to Cookham Wood. Young people were offered drinks on the vans but not food. In our survey, 17% of young people said they had spent more than four hours in the van against the national comparator of 7% and 34% said they had travelled with adults or someone from a different gender against the national comparator of 23%.
- 1.3 Many young people we spoke to said they had spent long periods of time in court cells after their cases had been dealt with and many had remained in court until 5pm, although their cases had been completed before midday. The high level of late arrivals continued to present a serious problem. Over the two-month period before the inspection there had been at least four or five arrivals each week after 9pm. During the inspection we observed two young people arriving around 10pm having travelled from London courts. Both returned to court very early the next morning. We were told that this was not unusual.
- 1.4 Meticulous records were kept of all late arrivals and the escort provider was notified promptly when this happened. Transport to and from the prison was provided by two companies, GeoAmey and Serco, and we were told that most of the difficulties stemmed from the service provided by Serco. The deputy governor had recently attended a meeting with them to try to resolve the problems. There had been some short-term improvement but young people continued to arrive late too often. Neither of the escort providers attended meetings at the prison to have a regular dialogue about the ongoing concerns.
- 1.5 The video conference suite was used two or three times a week, mainly for contact with youth offending teams (YOT) and inter-prison contact. Letters had recently been sent by the governor to 20 local courts to promote greater use of this facility by the courts.

# First days in custody

---

## Expected outcomes:

Children and young people feel and are safe on their reception and introduction to the establishment. Their individual needs, both during and on release from custody, are identified and effective plans developed to meet those needs. During induction into the establishment young people are helped to understand establishment routines, are told how to access available services, are given a clear idea of what is expected of them and are helped to cope with imprisonment.

1.6 Reception procedures were efficient and safety concerns were properly considered but the routine strip-searching of new arrivals was inappropriate. Young people were looked after well by staff in the first night centre. The accommodation was good and practical support was available from a recently introduced peer mentor scheme. Young people did not always get the opportunity to make a telephone call before being locked up on their first night. The quality of initial vulnerability assessments needed improvement. Following a recent review, the induction programme had been improved and young people found the DVD which had been made by young people particularly useful.

## Reception

---

- 1.7 The reception area was clean and tidy. Although only 55% of young people in our survey said they were treated well or very well in reception against the comparator of 67%, young people in our focus groups were positive about their reception experience and we observed young people being treated with respect and courtesy by reception staff. All new admissions were strip-searched when they arrived without a risk assessment, which was inappropriate. A quarterly analysis of data at the October 2011 safeguarding committee meeting had identified that only two finds had been made out of 729 strip-searches of young people (see also security section). The reception staffing rota ensured that reception officers were available until 10pm every night to enable all young people to be admitted properly. We observed that all young people were offered food and drink in reception, but there was no telephone for young people to use and they did not always get a telephone call on the first night unit.
- 1.8 Reception staff ensured that early attention was paid to safety concerns. In our survey, 40% of young people said reception staff had asked them if they needed protection from other young people and 48% said they had been asked if they were feeling low or needed someone to talk to against respective comparators of 24% and 38%.
- 1.9 Relevant background information, including ASSET<sup>3</sup> documentation, was usually available before a young person arrived at the prison and we observed staff using available information in advance. Young people occasionally arrived without any background information, usually at weekends when YOT staff were not on duty at court. There were efficient procedures for obtaining missing information promptly and young people remained at a heightened level of monitoring until it became available.

---

<sup>3</sup> Youth Justice Board assessment documentation completed by youth offending teams.  
HMYOI Cookham Wood

## Recommendation

---

- 1.10 New arrivals should not be routinely strip-searched.

## First night

---

- 1.11 Staff from the first night centre collected young people from reception as soon as the initial procedures had been completed and accompanied them to the first night centre on Cedar unit, which was a short walk from reception.
- 1.12 All young people received an initial health assessment including a mental health screening. First night staff completed initial vulnerability assessments following a private interview with the young person. In the sample we examined it was evident that information accompanying the young person had been read and incorporated into the assessment but the information was not being applied well in order to produce an individual risk management plan where necessary. The majority of risk management plans we examined followed a standard format and did not address individual concerns.
- 1.13 Staff on the first night centre related well to young people and were reassuring and helpful. We observed an evening staff handover and it was clear that staff paid sufficient attention to identifying the needs of newly admitted and vulnerable young people. However, young people who arrived late did not always get the opportunity to make a telephone call. In our survey, only 55% of young people said they were able to make a telephone call to their family when they first arrived against the national comparator of 75%.
- 1.14 Cedar Unit provided the best quality accommodation in the establishment. The cells were kept clean and were well maintained. They were well furnished and comfortable with en suite shower facilities. As well as newly admitted young people, the unit housed young people who were working out on release on temporary licence and four young people who had been trained as peer mentors. The mentors provided practical advice to new arrivals about prison rules and routines. Mentors were available until 9pm each night which meant that some late arrivals could not benefit from talking to them. The 9pm cut off seemed unnecessary since new arrivals and peer mentors were located on the same unit. Our survey indicated that first night safety had improved: 83% of young people said that they felt safe on their first night against the comparator of 71% at the previous inspection.

## Recommendations

---

- 1.15 The quality of initial vulnerability assessments and accompanying risk management plans should be improved, underpinned by a robust quality assurance procedure.
- 1.16 Young people should have the opportunity to make a telephone call before they are locked up on their first night.
- 1.17 Peer mentors should be available to assist late arrivals if required.

## Induction

---

- 1.18 The induction programme had recently been reviewed and reduced in length to a week, which meant that young people were less likely to spend time unoccupied in their cells. Induction was

delivered on Cedar, where two rooms had been designed for the purpose. Young people started the course on the first working day after they arrived. The programme covered all aspects of life in the establishment and was delivered by trained induction staff. The programme included input from advocates, caseworkers and chaplains. Small group discussions, personal interviews and presentations were used.

- 1.19 The induction programme included a session on communication skills known as 'Recode'. Staff had also been trained in the Recode programme and spoke highly of its benefits.
- 1.20 Young people were issued with an induction booklet which was written in a clear, straightforward style. A short DVD about the prison had been produced by staff and young people earlier in the year and young people said they found this particularly helpful. In our survey, 70% of young people said the induction course covered everything they needed to know about the establishment against the comparator of 56% at the previous inspection.

## Good practice

---

- 1.21 *The induction programme included a session on communication skills known as 'Recode'. Staff had also been trained in the Recode programme and spoke highly of its benefits.*

# Section 2: Environment and relationships

## Residential units

---

### Expected outcomes:

Children and young people live in a safe, clean, decent and stimulating environment within which they are encouraged to develop independent living skills and learn to live in, and participate positively to, the community.

2.1 Efforts had been made to improve the condition of the cells which were on the whole, clean and tidy, although repairs were needed to some ill-fitting windows. Young people no longer used cell bells simply to attract staff attention and staff responses were monitored and had improved. Supervision on the units remained difficult but movement was well managed and safe. Association areas were clean and adequately equipped and supervised. Young people were encouraged to maintain a good standard of hygiene but access to telephones and showers was limited. Although young people were given an adequate supply of clean prison kit, the quality needed to be improved. The young people's council was a very effective way of consulting with young people.

## Accommodation and facilities

---

- 2.2 All cells were single occupancy and were adequately furnished, although few had been personalised and some did not have a notice board for pictures and photographs. There was no offensive material on display in cells and we saw staff challenging the display of inappropriate material when they saw it. Cells had been redecorated but some contained small amounts of graffiti and too many windows were in need of repair to improve ventilation. Toilets and sinks were located in a recess ensuring adequate privacy. Some toilets were badly stained and required deep cleaning. All cells had a kettle but in-cell electricity was turned off at 10pm and flasks were not provided to enable young people to have a hot drink after their electricity had been turned off.
- 2.3 Cell call bells were used appropriately by young people during the inspection and this was a noteworthy improvement on the previous inspection. Staff responded promptly to call bells and the monitoring reports showed that the vast majority were answered within five minutes.
- 2.4 Young people were able to raise matters of interest or concern through the young people's council which was well attended by staff, including advocates and the youth worker, and young people who chaired the meetings. Discussions included safety, violence reduction and the rewards and sanctions scheme. Minutes were circulated to all those attending and were also placed on notice boards. There was evidence that issues raised by young people were being taken seriously and acted on. Young people were canvassed for their views on issues prior to the meeting. Although all young people were eligible to attend the young people's council meetings, some of the young people we spoke to said they did not know about them.
- 2.5 VOICE provided an independent advocacy service and worked with a large number of young people throughout the year. Their work and support varied from advocacy in relation to accommodation for looked-after children to attending adjudication hearings. Feedback from young people about the advocacy service was excellent.

- 2.6 Association areas were clean, tidy and adequately equipped and supervised. Notice boards around the units displayed a good range of age-appropriate information but there was little in languages other than English (see also diversity section).
- 2.7 There was an adequate number of telephones on each unit and their use was properly supervised. The telephones had privacy hoods but were located in noisy association rooms making it difficult for young people to hear their call. If a call went through to an answer machine, the young person had to wait 10 minutes before they were permitted to call again. This had been reduced from 30 minutes at the request of the young people's council. There was not enough time during association sessions to ensure that all young people who wished to make a telephone call could do so (see also children and families section).
- 2.8 Units and landings remained difficult to supervise due to their design. Movements were undertaken in a controlled manner and some young people who were known to be in conflict with others and therefore at risk during movement were moved separately to reduce the opportunity for conflict. Movement we observed was well supervised and governors in the establishment ensured that they were present during movements.

## Recommendation

---

- 2.9 Windows should be repaired to improve ventilation.

## Housekeeping points

---

- 2.10 Cells should be equipped with notice boards and young people should be encouraged to personalise their cells.
- 2.11 All graffiti should be quickly removed.
- 2.12 Toilets should be regularly deep cleaned.
- 2.13 Efforts should be made to better publicise the work of the young people's council and encourage participation by all young people.

## Clothing and possessions

---

- 2.14 Most cells had curtains but some were of poor quality or ill fitting. Young people did not have access to laundry facilities with the exception of those on Cedar, so laundry was sent out. A kit exchange system had been introduced, enabling young people to access clean clothes each week.
- 2.15 The facilities list was regularly reviewed by the young people's council. Each young person was allowed an adequate amount of clothing each week but they were not allowed to wear their own clothes, other than underwear, socks and training shoes. Prison issue clothing was not always of good quality and some was ill fitting.



## Recommendation

---

- 2.16 Young people should be permitted to wear their own clothes and have access to on site laundry facilities.

## Housekeeping point

---

- 2.17 Curtains and prison issue clothing should be of good quality and a proper fit.

## Hygiene

---

- 2.18 Young people were given adequate supplies of hygiene items. Only 43% said they could have a shower each day against the national comparator of 73%. The number of showers on Ash and Beech residential units was adequate and there were in-cell showers on Cedar. However, many young people said they could wait up to three days to have a shower, especially if they were on the lowest level of the rewards and sanctions scheme.
- 2.19 Young people were encouraged to keep their cell tidy and most of those we saw were well maintained. A weekly prize was awarded on each landing for the cleanest cell of the week. Young people had access to cleaning materials which were issued by staff.
- 2.20 Duvets, covers and pillow cases were provided. Sheets and pillow cases were washed weekly, but there was no system for washing duvets and some young people we spoke to complained that they were dirty or smelly. A system for washing duvets was about to be introduced. A mattress exchange programme was in place. It was difficult for young people to dry their towels in their cell which had no towel rail, although this was about to be addressed.

## Recommendation

---

- 2.21 Young people should have access to a shower each day.

# Relationships between staff and children and young people

---

### Expected outcomes:

Children and young people are treated with care and fairness by all staff, and are expected, encouraged and enabled to take responsibility for their own actions and decisions. Staff have high expectations of all children and young people and have a role in setting appropriate boundaries. They listen, give time and are genuine in their approach.

- 2.22 On the whole, young people had positive views of their treatment by staff. Interactions we observed between staff and young people were generally relaxed and friendly and managers were proactive in making contact with young people during movement times. Regular surveys

were a useful addition to the young people's council and helped to develop good communication. Staff demonstrated a good level of knowledge and understanding of young people in their care and spoke positively about the benefits of recent training. Entries on unit records lacked balance and focused mainly on poor behaviour and we observed inconsistent boundary setting by staff varying from very good to poor.

- 2.23 Young people expressed mixed views about their relationships with staff: some were very positive and described good relationships with staff and said that they were helpful, whereas others were critical of staff, citing examples of unprofessional behaviour such as swearing and inconsistent application of the rules. However, the majority view expressed in our focus groups was positive and young people cited a range of staff they found it easy to talk to including personal officers, caseworkers, the Independent Monitoring Board and the advocates.
- 2.24 Officers had their names displayed on their uniform and some included their first name. Most officers addressed young people by their first name. Senior managers were present during movement times to support staff and promote contact with the young people. We saw examples of managers taking this opportunity to check up on individual young people. Very good consultation arrangements with young people, including regular surveys and the young people's council, supported the development of good working relationships between staff and young people.
- 2.25 Staff commented positively on the bespoke training they had received, including 'Recode' and 'Working with Young People' which had enhanced their understanding of how to relate to young people (see also safeguarding and child protection sections). We saw examples of staff appropriately and confidently challenging poor behaviour. Conversely we observed a female member of staff being subjected to sexist insults by a group of young people which went unchallenged by other staff in the vicinity.
- 2.26 Staff we spoke to had a good level of knowledge of the young people on their residential unit but this was not reflected in unit files. We examined a sample of case files and found that, although entries were frequent, they were too often limited to descriptions of the young person's compliance with the regime rather than a balanced and comprehensive assessment of the young person's general progress or difficulties. Management checks of the unit records were not always evident.
- 2.27 The recently installed electronic unit information screens were a helpful addition to individual case files, providing accessible and basic up-to-date information about the young people located on the unit, for example an ongoing record of their whereabouts, young people on ACCT (assessment, care in custody and teamwork) monitoring and young people on the basic level of the rewards and sanctions scheme.

## Housekeeping point

---

- 2.28 Management checks of unit records should be carried out consistently and ensure that records are balanced and sufficiently comprehensive.

# Personal officers

---

## Expected outcomes:

**A designated officer is the central point of contact and support for each child and young person. This officer takes responsibility for their care and wellbeing by engaging with the child or young person and their network regularly.**

- 2.29 Young people expressed mixed views about the helpfulness of their personal officers. Personal officers rarely attended important meetings relating to the care of the young people they were responsible for but written records of contact were reasonably good and monthly reviews were taking place. The respective roles of personal officers and caseworkers were unclear.
- 2.30 Young people we spoke to knew their personal officer, but expressed mixed views about how helpful they found them. There was a personal officer policy, but personal officers we spoke to were not familiar with it. Personal officers whom we spoke to mostly described their role as providing the young person with day-to-day support on the residential unit but did not describe responsibilities outlined in the policy with regard to attending meetings relating to the care and management of the young people they were responsible for and collaborating with caseworkers to maintain contact with family members. There were some examples of collaborative work taking place between personal officers and caseworkers but this was not consistent and personal officers seldom attended meetings such as training planning reviews or ACCT reviews.
- 2.31 The written records by personal officers on unit files were reasonably good. Monthly reviews took place between personal officers and the young people they were responsible for and often covered targets set in the young person's training plan. In addition to the monthly review reports, there were more frequent, often weekly, contributions by personal officers in the form of prescribed behavioural reports.



# Section 3: Duty of care

## Safeguarding children

---

### Expected outcomes:

The establishment provides a safe and secure environment, which promotes the welfare of all children and young people, protects them from all kinds of harm or neglect, and provides services that seek to ensure safe and effective care. The establishment is open to external agencies and independent scrutiny, including consultation with and involvement from children and young people and their families and the wider community.

- 3.1 The strategic and operational management of safeguarding by the establishment was efficient. Attendance at safeguarding committee meetings by establishment staff was generally good but attendance by the local authority was disappointing. A good range of information and data analysis was submitted to the strategic and operational committees and appropriate action was taken. Staff were alert to safeguarding concerns and used the established reporting system well. There were effective weekly multidisciplinary discussions about the management of the most challenging young people in an effort to coordinate their care planning. Staff had benefited from specialist training with a specific focus on safeguarding.
- 3.2 The most recent safeguarding children policy had been ratified in March 2011 by the governor, regional custodial manager and the Medway Safeguarding Children Board (MSCB). The policy was comprehensive and covered all relevant safeguarding areas, with the exception of oversight of the use of separation in the Phoenix Unit (see section on care and separation). The policy included some useful information for staff including how MSCB would work with the establishment to manage child protection referrals. However, it did not cover how MSCB would work with the establishment on a strategic level to monitor the effectiveness of other safeguarding issues.
- 3.3 The establishment had commissioned a bespoke training programme of five modules on working with young people from an external team of training consultants who specialised in this area. Safeguarding was an integral component of the programme. Eighty-eight per cent of staff had completed module 1, 65% had completed module 2 and module 3 was due to start after the inspection. The intention was for all staff to complete the five modules by the end of the financial year. Staff we spoke to who had completed the programme were positive about the training and said it had increased their confidence in working with young people.
- 3.4 Quarterly safeguarding committee meetings took place with appropriate designated membership, including the local authority, although they had only attended one of the previous three meetings. Quarterly meetings were chaired by the governor and focussed appropriately on the strategic management of safeguarding. The monthly safeguarding subcommittee meetings, chaired by the safeguarding manager, monitored the operation of the function and the delivery of key safeguarding areas. Attendance at both meetings was generally good. They had relevant standing agenda and carefully considered data analysis on the use of force, strip-searching, adjudications, complaints, child protection referrals, antisocial behaviour, use of mediation, injuries, and incidents of self-harm. There was evidence that the safeguarding committee made appropriate policy changes as a result.

- 3.5 We attended the multidisciplinary weekly safer regimes meeting which monitored the management of vulnerable young people including all new receptions, all young people in the Phoenix unit and young people whose behaviour was particularly disruptive. The meetings were chaired by a senior manager and were well attended. There was a good level of discussion and a number of options for young people were discussed at these meetings. Depending on their particular problem they could be placed on a Cookham antisocial behaviour plan (CAB) or other support plan to help them. If a young person's behaviour was sufficiently complex, he could be considered for temporary location to the Phoenix unit.
- 3.6 Staff we spoke to knew how to raise a concern about a young person with the safeguarding team, using a safeguarding team information report. Three hundred and fifty had been submitted in 2011 and in the sample we examined all had been followed up by a member of the safeguarding team.

## Child protection

---

### Expected outcomes:

**The establishment protects children and young people from maltreatment by adults or others in a position of power or authority.**

- 3.7 Staff had good understanding of child protection procedures and the child protection policy was clear. Referrals were dealt with efficiently by the establishment and the local authority. There were good arrangements for ensuring that all staff had been properly trained in child protection and vetted to work with young people. Where appropriate, CCTV footage was used well to address identified concerns relating to staff, including further training where necessary.
- 3.8 The child protection policy described clearly the respective responsibilities of the establishment and the local authority in relation to child protection concerns. It also included some useful staff guidance about how to make a referral.
- 3.9 Referrals were made appropriately and all allegations of mistreatment by a member of staff were referred to the local authority, the majority of which related to excessive use of force. The child protection coordinator was well known around the establishment and attended appropriate committees, including safeguarding and the equality action team meetings. The whistle-blowing policy was clear that if a young person was believed to be at risk of harm, this should be referred immediately to the child protection coordinator or the duty governor. There was evidence from the referrals that staff were willing to raise concerns about their colleagues. The child protection coordinator also screened all complaints submitted by young people to check for child protection concerns.
- 3.10 The child protection log was held in a locked safe. It was checked by the regional custodial manager but not by the local authority, neither did the local authority regularly attend safeguarding meetings to maintain an overview of child protection matters (see also safeguarding section). The quarterly safeguarding committee considered data about the number and type of child protection referrals and the child protection coordinator presented comprehensive data on individual referrals to the monthly safeguarding sub-committee. In the 12 months prior to the inspection there had been 45 referrals to local authorities, mostly to Medway but a few to other local authorities if young people had disclosed historical abuse or complained about their treatment while in police or court custody.

- 3.11 A representative of the local authority with responsibility for allegations against staff visited the establishment to review CCTV footage and documents relating to the incident and usually interviewed the young person involved with the child protection coordinator present. None of the completed referrals in 2011 had been assessed as reaching the significant harm threshold by the local authority and most had resulted in a recommendation that internal action be considered. The MSCB informed young people of this outcome and the child protection coordinator, safeguarding manager and head of integrated children's services reviewed the case to determine the next steps. In relevant cases the CCTV footage was reviewed by the head of children's services with the member of staff concerned to identify learning points or they were referred for further Recode training (see section on induction). The local authority designated officer confirmed that the local authority maintained a list of child protection referrals and the child protection coordinator told us that the local authority raised it as a concern for investigation if the same member of staff featured in more than one referral.
- 3.12 The establishment had good arrangements to ensure that all staff had enhanced criminal records bureau clearance. All directly employed staff completed a 'working with young people' course (see safeguarding section). The course covered child protection within a custodial environment and the local authority had been involved in the development of the course. Health care and teaching staff received a briefing from the child protection coordinator about the establishment's child protection policy as part of their induction.

### Good practice

---

- 3.13 *In some cases, following a child protection referral arising from an incident of restraint, the CCTV footage was reviewed by the head of children's services with the member of staff concerned to identify learning points or they were referred for further Recode training.*

## Self-harm and suicide prevention

---

### Expected outcomes:

Children and young people at risk of self-harm and suicide are identified at an early stage, and supported through a care and support plan to meet their individual identified needs. Assessment of risk of self-harm and ongoing vulnerability is a continuous process which is informed by staff and children and young people. Children and young people who have self-harmed or been identified as at risk of self-harm are encouraged to participate in appropriate purposeful activity.

- 3.14 Levels of self-harm were low and were managed effectively in line with the published strategy. There was regular monitoring of self-harm data as well as quality assurance of ACCT documentation (assessment, care in custody and teamwork). Staff supported young people subject to self-harm monitoring well but reviews were not always well attended and some care maps were not of a sufficiently good standard. There were some gaps in staff training relevant to suicide and self-harm prevention. The use of a gated cell for constant observations of young people at risk of self-harm, although infrequent, was inappropriate.

- 3.15 A comprehensive suicide prevention and self-harm management strategy had been reviewed in June 2011. Data provided to the quarterly safeguarding meeting showed that 100 ACCT documents had been opened from January to October 2011. The majority were opened

following minor incidents of self-harm and some were opened because staff were concerned about a young person's potential for self-harm rather than because he had harmed himself.

- 3.16 The monthly safeguarding subcommittee monitored suicide and self-harm incidents and considered feedback on quality assurance of ACCTs from the suicide and self-harm lead in the safeguarding team. The establishment's quality assurance had identified shortcomings in the quality of care maps and in recorded management checks, with which we concurred. Monthly comparisons of self-harm incidents were considered but there were few identifiable patterns. Information available to the meeting included type and location of self-harm, day of the week, and ethnicity but did not include reasons why young people had self-harmed. A summary of the data was provided to the quarterly safeguarding meeting.
- 3.17 Young people subject to ACCT monitoring were well supported by specialist staff such as health care as well as residential staff. The majority of staff observations on ACCTs showed regular engagement with the young person. We saw some good entries in ACCTs from non-residential staff who worked with the young person during the day, but some night checks were too predictable. Night staff whom we spoke to knew about the young people in their care who were on open ACCTs and they all carried ligature knives. However they had not all been trained in first aid.
- 3.18 Family members or carers and YOTs were notified when a young person was placed on an open ACCT unless there was a good reason not to. In the sample of ACCTs that we examined, additional telephone calls to family members had been facilitated to support some young people. Young people on open ACCTs were also offered the use of a Childline telephone in their cell.
- 3.19 Reviews were completed within the required timescales but advance planning to ensure that staff with a useful contribution to make attended did not always take place. In most cases they were chaired by a senior officer and attended by a unit officer, the young person and sometimes a member of health care staff and/or a caseworker. Some reviews would have benefited from input from other disciplines. The chair of the review frequently changed which undermined consistency of management. At the monthly safeguarding committee meeting we attended, there was a useful discussion about the need to plan reviews and share information well in advance so that all appropriate disciplines could be present to contribute to the young person's care. Post-closure ACCT reviews were carried out appropriately.
- 3.20 The establishment had two gated cells, one on Ash and one on Phoenix, which were occasionally used for young people requiring a very high level of observation. The use of such accommodation was inappropriate for the care of a young person at significant risk of self-harm.
- 3.21 Figures provided by the establishment showed that, although training had been taking place throughout 2011, only 80% of staff had received suicide and self-harm training.

## Recommendations

---

- 3.22 Gated cells should not be used for young people requiring a high level of observation.
- 3.23 All staff should be suitably trained in suicide and self-harm prevention and first aid.



## Housekeeping points

---

- 3.24 The planning arrangements for ACCT reviews should take account of the availability of members of staff with a useful contribution to make so that they are able to attend. Planning should also ensure greater consistency of staff chairing the reviews.
- 3.25 Data collected and analysed should include reasons given by young people which caused them to self-harm.

## Bullying

---

### Expected outcomes:

There is an establishment culture that promotes mutual respect among staff and children and young people. Children and young people feel safe from bullying and victimisation. Active and fair systems to prevent and respond to bullying behaviour are known to staff, children and young people and visitors. Children and young people's views help to develop and promote a safe environment.

- 3.26 There were comprehensive anti-bullying and violence reduction policies. Related procedures were understood and used well by staff but quality assurance was not consistently applied or sufficiently robust. Young people were regularly consulted about bullying and victimisation and staff had a good understanding of the main concerns. Data were comprehensive and used well and demonstrated a significant number of fights and assaults. There were indications that incidents of bullying were reducing and young people reported that staff acted swiftly to deal with violence and bullying and they generally felt safe. Caseworkers managed young people well who were perpetrators or victims of bullying. There were good attempts to mediate between young people in conflict.
- 3.27 The anti-bullying and violence reduction policies and procedures were included in the overarching behaviour management and safeguarding procedures. Staff were familiar with the policies and they had more confidence to use them effectively to manage young people's behaviour than was evident at the previous inspection.
- 3.28 The establishment collected comprehensive data on bullying and violent incidents. Data continued to show a significant number of fights and assaults taking place with irregular peaks and troughs. The number of violent incidents involving young people had remained consistent over the past two years, although the number of assaults on staff had reduced, particularly in the previous few months. The establishment's analysis concluded that violence between young people rose when there were significant numbers in custody for short periods or when there was an increase in those on remand. This was reflected after the London riots in August 2011, when a number of settled young people had been moved from Cookham Wood to other establishments to make room for the rapid increase in the number of young people on remand.
- 3.29 In our focus groups, young people said they felt safe in the establishment and it was easy to avoid involvement in violent incidents. They said that staff acted swiftly to prevent the escalation of spontaneous violent incidents. In our survey, 23% of young people said they had

felt unsafe at Cookham Wood against the national comparator of 32% and the 2010 comparator of 44%.

- 3.30 Numbers of incidents of bullying had peaked at 26 in June 2011, but had been as low as three and stood at 11 in October 2011. There were no obvious patterns or trends. In our survey young people reported less victimisation than they reported at the previous inspection (15% against 33%) and less against the national comparator of 27%. Good efforts were made to gather information about the nature and extent of bullying, using a quarterly survey and monthly consultation meetings with young people. One area identified was name calling through cell doors and windows, although in our survey few young people reported this as a problem. Other concerns were the organisation of fight clubs, with some young people trying to persuade others to fight, and threats to young people to buy items from the canteen. Young people also told us that personal telephone calls were a potential source of bullying, with some young people forcing others to finish their calls before they were ready to do so. Staff were aware of these issues and were tackling them.
- 3.31 Staff reported bullying concerns by completing safeguarding team information reports (STIRs) and security information reports (SIRs), both of which were used well. STIRs and SIRs were scrutinised by the safeguarding team, and young people identified as victims or perpetrators were interviewed by a member of the team. Perpetrators were placed on an anti-bullying intervention which included target setting and regular observation throughout the day. Victims were given support and closely observed by staff. Anti-bullying documents that we examined showed a reasonable level of observation, although it was not always clear if young people were being assessed and reviewed against their targets. Many targets were too general and did not address the issues adequately. There was a system of quality assurance which was undertaken by the safeguarding team and principal officers on the residential units, but this was not applied consistently.
- 3.32 Interventions and support for victims and perpetrators were provided by the casework team, and files that we examined demonstrated good use of mediation and referrals to other interventions appropriate to the needs of the individual. However, these individual interventions were not clearly linked to other existing individual plans and targets, such as training plans.
- 3.33 Twenty-three staff had been trained in mediation and there were good efforts to encourage young people to engage in mediation when tensions or conflict arose. Establishment records indicated that between two and six formal mediation sessions were carried out each month, mainly involving young people who had been fighting.

### Housekeeping point

---

- 3.34 The interventions and support for perpetrators and victims of bullying should be linked to other existing individual plans and targets.

## Applications and complaints

---

### Expected outcomes:

Applications and complaints are taken seriously as demonstrated by the effective procedures that are in place, which are easy to access and use, with timely responses provided. Children and young people feel safe from repercussions when using these procedures and are aware of,

and know how to use, the appeal mechanisms that are available to them. Independent advocates are easily accessible and assist young people in making applications and complaints.

3.35 Complaints were well managed but young people were negative in their views about the management of applications. Good links between the complaints department, the safeguarding team and the equality manager were apparent. The quality of replies was variable and the quality assurance system needed strengthening. There was routine and detailed analysis of complaints and appeals were taken seriously. The involvement of advocates in supporting children and young people in making applications and complaints was helpful.

3.36 The system for making an application was clear and explained to the young people as part of induction. Almost all young people in our survey (94%) said they knew how to make an application. However, only 53% of young people said applications were dealt with fairly against the national comparator of 69% and only 42% felt responses were timely against the national comparator of 63%.

3.37 Application forms were freely available on the residential units and young people could also make applications verbally to unit staff. While replies were logged on the units, there was no system to ensure that they were issued to the young person immediately and no central log to monitor timeliness. The majority of young people knew how to make a complaint and our survey results were far more positive about timeliness, which was supported by our findings during the inspection.

3.38 Complaint forms and confidential envelopes were available on the units. There was an ongoing issue with young people using the confidential system unnecessarily and work was under way to address this. Complaint boxes were emptied each morning by the complaints clerk who logged each complaint and directed it to the relevant manager. A comprehensive database was used to track the type of complaints and the timeliness of the response and the young person signed to acknowledge receipt of the response to their complaint. Complaints were monitored for issues of bullying or racism and forwarded to the safeguarding manager and the equality officer accordingly. The number of complaints was increasing, with 619 in the previous 10 months compared to 441 in 2010. The most common reasons for complaints concerned property, finances and the regime. Complaints were analysed by managers on a monthly basis to identify issues requiring attention. Young people were consulted regularly about the applications and complaints systems through the young people's council.

3.39 Guidance had been issued to staff in 2010 which included a requirement for the member of staff dealing with the complaint to speak to the young person prior to completing their written reply. The quality of the replies we examined was mixed. Some dealt with the complaint in an open and positive manner while others were more defensive, and some did not address the reason for the complaint. The establishment's quality assurance system needed strengthening to ensure that it fed back such strengths and weaknesses. VOICE advocates were available to help young people complete applications or complaints. An appeals process was in place and the appeal had been upheld in three out of nine cases since the beginning of the year.

## Housekeeping point

---

3.40 The quality assurance of complaints should ensure that replies are of a good quality with staff making appropriate and clear responses.

## Legal rights

---

### Expected outcomes:

Children and young people understand their status and legal rights and can freely access legal services and exercise their rights.

- 3.41 All young people were seen on arrival and their need for legal services identified. Caseworkers, supported by VOICE advocates and the foreign nationals coordinator, who was a trained legal services officer, provided ongoing legal services support and there was an efficient system in place to ensure that timely plans were drawn up for young people on remand. Not all young people were aware of their entitlement to a free telephone call to their legal advisers.
- 3.42 The needs of young people with regard to legal services were assessed during reception and foreign national young people were seen by a duty caseworker. In the main, caseworkers dealt with bail matters and appeals. The foreign nationals officer was a trained legal services officer who was available to provide further advice to the caseworkers. The caseworkers and VOICE advocates provided support to young people on remand and those in the care of the local authority when they had difficulties with accommodation.
- 3.43 Relevant staff, including the in-house youth offending team (YOT) worker, met to draw up a remand management plan within 10 days for all remanded young people, with a clear focus on early assistance to promote their chances of bail. Although young people were permitted to make a free telephone call to their legal advisers during the core day, several young people we spoke to did not know this.
- 3.44 Some legal books were available in the library and others could be ordered through the caseworkers.
- 3.45 Legal visits were held in the main visits hall two days a week when there were no social visits. This afforded limited privacy.

### Recommendation

---

- 3.46 All young people should be advised that they are permitted to make a free telephone call to their legal adviser during the core day.

## Faith and religious activity

---

### Expected outcomes:

All children and young people are able to practise their religion fully and in safety. The chaplaincy plays a full part in prison life and contributes to the overall care, support and resettlement of all children and young people regardless of faith, including those of no faith.

- 3.47 Despite some restrictions on access, attendance at religious services was good and there was some involvement with community faith groups. Facilities for religious services were basic but

adequate. The chaplaincy team were readily available to provide support to young people but they rarely attended meetings relating to the care of individual young people.

- 3.48 The predominant faiths of young people who declared a religion were Islam and Christianity. The multi-faith team was led by a Methodist coordinating chaplain and comprised mainly Christian ministers. All members of the chaplaincy team were sessional, apart from the recently appointed full-time Muslim chaplain.
- 3.49 The chaplains provided a regular information session in the induction programme each week and a chaplain was available in the establishment most days. Young people were seen by a chaplain shortly after they arrived and were given written information about chaplaincy services. We were told that all faiths could be catered for. There had been difficulty obtaining the services of a Pagan chaplain, but efforts were being made to address this gap.
- 3.50 There were two Christian services on Sundays and Muslim prayers on Friday. Attendance at religious services was subject to approval by the security department. Young people were required to apply to attend at least two days in advance. On some residential units applications were required several days in advance. Late requests were not accepted, which was unnecessarily restrictive. Despite these restrictions, attendance at services was good, with approximately one third of the population present at each session. Any young person on the list to attend a service who failed to attend was visited by a chaplain the following week to ensure that there were no particular difficulties.
- 3.51 The coordinating chaplain was a member of the senior management team and attended the daily staff briefings which provided a useful means of identifying young people who could benefit from support from the chaplaincy.
- 3.52 There was no separate chapel or mosque and all organised worship took place in a large multi-faith room which was also sometimes used for staff training. There were no fixed religious artefacts in the room and it bore little resemblance to a traditional place of worship. However, there were suitable adjacent washing facilities which Muslim young people could use. Funding had been sought to create a dedicated facility.
- 3.53 Members of the chaplaincy team told us that approximately 60% of their time was spent on pastoral work which consisted of talking to young people on the landings or while they were on exercise, mainly about personal problems. The new Muslim chaplain's post had been designed so that 80% of his time was dedicated to generic duties across all faiths. Records showed that chaplains attended few meetings concerning the care of individual young people, such as ACCT reviews or training planning reviews.
- 3.54 A number of community based faith groups visited the prison and participated in communal singing at the religious services. The Muslim chaplain ran an Islamic study group and the Catholic sister a bible study class.
- 3.55 Rosary beads were available after attending Mass, and prayer mats and a copy of the Qur'an were available from the Muslim chaplain.
- 3.56 Some work was carried out by members of the chaplaincy to support young people on release. The Muslim chaplain had recently been contacted by a parent for help and was able to arrange for the young person to return to a Mosque in East London.

- 3.57 Reasonable steps were taken to permit young people to celebrate the major religious festivals and staff were provided with information about the requirements for these events. During Ramadan, timetables, clocks and guidance books were issued by the Muslim chaplain to every young person who was fasting and young people we spoke to were positive about the arrangements that had been made.

## Housekeeping point

---

- 3.58 Young people should not have to apply to attend religious services more than 24 hours in advance.

## Substance use

---

### Expected outcomes:

**Children and young people with substance-related needs are identified at reception and receive effective support and treatment throughout their stay in custody, including pre-release planning. All children and young people are safe from exposure to and the effects of substance use while in the establishment.**

- 3.59 An interim substance misuse strategy had been developed and local commissioners were undertaking a needs assessment on which to base future service provision. All young people received assessments and substance misuse awareness education, but there was a lack of care planning, care coordination and ongoing case work for those with a higher level of need. Drug availability within the establishment was low and supply reduction measures proportionate.
- 3.60 Quarterly drug strategy meetings were chaired by the deputy governor and attended by senior managers. The substance misuse policy included an annual action plan and the local DAAT (drug and alcohol action team) had commissioned a comprehensive needs analysis, which was under way. A clear and succinct interim substance misuse service agreement had recently been agreed with the DAAT, which now commissioned the service, but at the time of the inspection it had not been implemented.
- 3.61 The establishment did not accept young people who required clinical detoxification, but an appropriate contingency protocol was in place and health services staff were experienced in treating substance dependence. The skill mix also included dual diagnosis expertise. On the one occasion when a young person had needed alcohol detoxification, he was immediately transferred to the specialist unit at HMYOI Feltham. The care of young people with complex needs was coordinated at the weekly safer regimes meeting (see also safeguarding section) but substance misuse workers did not attend.
- 3.62 Young people were offered nicotine replacement therapy as part of their initial health screen at reception and again during their induction as part of wider health promotion information. During the previous six months, 73 young people had used the service and sufficient nurses were trained to offer smoking cessation support. There had been an overall improvement in the completion of substance misuse assessments and workers now undertook initial assessments within three days of young people's arrival. However, there were still gaps beyond 10 days for full assessments.

- 3.63 Substance misuse workers delivered the substance misuse awareness programme to all young people during induction or individually. Substance misuse workers were no longer part of the casework team. While the team leader of the integrated children's service provided line management support, workers did not receive casework supervision. Individual training needs were being addressed but a robust quality assurance framework was lacking.
- 3.64 While substance misuse workers saw all young people shortly after their arrival, they did not carry caseloads or monitor or coordinate their work. A rolling six-session group work programme had been introduced, which provided young people with substance-specific information. Attendance was low and selection criteria unclear. Although targets were entered on e-Asset, young people assessed as needing targeted interventions did not have individual care plans and there was little evidence of structured, care planned work. Substance misuse workers sent contributions to training planning meetings but rarely attended, and overall there was a lack of joined-up, integrated working with other services such as primary and mental health, PE and education. The lack of involvement with families of young people with substance misuse needs was a weakness.
- 3.65 Drug availability in the establishment was low, and finds typically involved very small amounts of cannabis and tobacco. In our survey, only 7% of young people said it was easy to get illegal drugs against the comparator of 19%. Few SIRs related to drugs and since April 2011, only two mandatory drug tests (MDT) had been completed. One test result was positive for cannabis and the other was outstanding. MDT was intelligence led and did not involve strip-searching without the approval of a governor. Security measures were appropriate and proportionate; the security department shared relevant SIRs with health services and with case workers; and both the head of health and the head of integrated children's services attended security meetings.

## Recommendations

---

- 3.66 The establishment, in partnership with commissioners, should ensure that the substance misuse service is robustly managed, monitored and coordinated. Substance misuse workers should be provided with appropriate supervision and support.
- 3.67 Young people with problematic substance use should have a substance misuse care plan, which is coordinated with health and casework teams, and have access to a range of interventions which meet individual need.





# Section 4: Diversity

## Diversity

---

### Expected outcomes:

All establishments should be aware of and meet the specific needs of minority groups and implement distinct policies or action plans, which aim to represent their views, meet their needs and offer peer support to ensure all children and young people have equal access to all facilities. Multiple diversity needs should be recognised and met.

4.1 Young people were regularly consulted on diversity matters and were represented at equality action team (EAT) meetings which were well attended and oversaw the management of diversity efficiently. The role of the equality team was widely advertised and the equality officer was well known around the establishment. Discrimination incident report forms (DIRFs) were freely available and incidents were dealt with well. Ethnic monitoring included some local issues in addition to mandatory areas but there were some omissions. Young people with disabilities were being identified but more work was needed to ensure that staff were aware of the implications for the care of individual young people. Good attention was paid to the day-to-day needs of foreign nationals and there were some innovative approaches to work with young people regarding sexual orientation. There was a good deal of development work under way with Gypsies and Travellers.

4.2 The equality policy had been revised following review in September 2011 and included all the equality strands. The full-time equality officer was well known to staff and young people and displays in each association area included photographs of staff involved in equality work. Young people had been trained for the role of equality representatives and attended the bi-monthly EAT meetings. These were chaired by the deputy governor and well attended by representatives from key areas of the establishment and community groups. The young people representatives were helped to prepare for the meetings by an advocate and the equality officer.

4.3 We attended an EAT meeting which covered the range of equality strands. The two young people representatives were encouraged to participate and their views were considered. During one useful discussion, they suggested that young people would be less reluctant to use DIRFs if they could be put in the general complaints box. Minutes of meetings demonstrated that SMART data were being used and out-of-range results were being investigated further. The establishment carried out local as well as mandatory monitoring, but there were some key omissions, including the use of the stamp rewards scheme and allocation to some activities, such as paid jobs. Monitoring data were published in a simplified form for the benefit of young people and displayed on notice boards in association areas.

4.4 The impact assessments carried out by the establishment included consultation with young people in surveys or focus groups with staff from different disciplines. Young people were able to contribute ideas for events such as Black History Month. There were effective displays of diversity material in the main corridors of the establishment.

4.5 A log was kept of young people with racist or other hate crime offences. The Recode training which young people took part in on induction helpfully covered the potential for conflict posed

by culture, language or disability (see section on induction). Seventy-four per cent of staff had completed Challenge It, Change It training.

## Recommendations

---

- 4.6 **Monitoring should be increased to include all aspects of the care and treatment of young people to ensure fairness, including the use of the stamp rewards scheme and allocation to activities, such as paid jobs. Monitoring should also include all equality strands such as religion.**
- 4.7 **All staff should receive diversity training.**

## Race equality

---

- 4.8 Seventy per cent of young people at Cookham Wood were from a black or minority ethnic group. Although we observed young people separating into distinct ethnic groups in the exercise areas, we did not see any evidence of racial tension.
- 4.9 Racist incident report forms (RIRFs) had recently been replaced with discrimination incident report forms (DIRFs) to cover all aspects of diversity. Forms and boxes for completed forms were placed around the establishment. Sixty-three RIRFs and one DIRF had been submitted between January and November 2011, mostly concerning the use of inappropriate or insulting language. These were thoroughly investigated by the equality officer or the foreign nationals coordinator in her absence. The one DIRF had had a homophobic component and external sources of support for the young person who was the victim had been identified. Completed RIRFs and DIRFs were signed off by the deputy governor and a sample were quality checked by a Connexions worker and a representative of Kent youth offending team (YOT).
- 4.10 The equality officer had worked with caseworkers and the in-reach team to address inappropriate language with young people. A recent trend for young people to use a particular expression of racist insult had been tackled by the equality officer who spoke to each young person about the offensiveness of the expression and issued a yellow card if appropriate (see rewards and sanctions section).
- 4.11 In our survey, 6% of young people said they considered themselves to be from a Gypsy or Traveller background but none was known to the establishment at the time of the inspection. Links had been made via Kent County Council with a community group to work with Gypsies and Travellers and some appropriate books and DVDs were available. The particular needs of young people from a Gypsy or Traveller background had been highlighted in impact assessments on resettlement and the use of release on temporary licence.

## Foreign nationals

---

- 4.12 A member of the casework team had been appointed foreign nationals liaison officer and undertook day-to-day contact with foreign national young people. The foreign nationals coordinator was responsible for policy and its application. The policy had been reviewed in October 2011. The bi-monthly EAT meeting provided a forum for strategic discussion of foreign nationals. There was a monthly foreign nationals committee but attendance from key areas of the establishment was poor. Young people representatives had been identified but had not yet been trained to take on the role. At the beginning of November 2011, there were 23 foreign

national young people in the establishment, 12 of whom were of potential interest to the UK Border Agency (UKBA) and the remainder had indefinite leave to remain or dual nationality and a British passport.

- 4.13 Written information for newly arrived young people had recently been translated into 12 languages but had not yet been printed. The canteen list was available in a range of languages. Some English for speakers of other languages provision was available.
- 4.14 Telephone interpretation services were available and the foreign national policy gave clear instructions to staff on how to access these services. We were told that there was rarely a need to use the service as most foreign national young people spoke English. There was a list of staff who spoke other languages and flash cards were used in reception which enabled the young person to identify his language and gave staff the relevant telephone interpretation number and language codes. We were not confident that staff always used interpretation and translation services when accuracy and confidentiality were factors. The local authority provided support to several foreign national young people who were looked-after children and brought an interpreter to review meetings. Young people were identified as foreign nationals on reception or by caseworkers during their induction interviews. Electronic notice boards in unit offices contained the names of foreign national young people and these were regularly updated by the foreign nationals liaison officer. They were entitled to receive a free five-minute call home each month and the liaison officer checked regularly with the finance department to ensure that credit had been added to the young people's accounts. Free weekly letters could be exchanged for airmail letters. Young people who had family visiting from overseas could accumulate visits and were exempt from the limits on access to private cash for making telephone calls. Attempts to hold meetings for foreign national young people had proved unsuccessful but the introduction of a youth club for foreign nationals had proved popular and was regularly attended. The club provided a relaxed forum to discuss issues and gave young people the opportunity to undertake activities with the youth workers.
- 4.15 The establishment had recently secured a commitment for an UKBA officer to visit monthly to hold surgeries with foreign national young people. This represented significant progress as did the involvement of Migrant Help with foreign national young people. They visited fortnightly for one-to-one sessions with young people needing assistance. The foreign national policy was explicit that if UKBA notified the establishment that they intended to detain a foreign national under the age of 18 once his sentence had expired, they would be advised that the establishment would release him on his scheduled release date.

## Housekeeping point

---

- 4.16 Attendance at the foreign nationals committee should be monitored to ensure that all relevant departments and young people representatives attend.

## Disability

---

- 4.17 The equality policy covered the management of young people with disabilities, including the completion of personal emergency evacuation plans (PEEPs). There was none in place at the time of the inspection and some staff on night duty we spoke to were not clear what the plans were or where they would find them.

- 4.18 Disability was a standing agenda item at the bimonthly EAT meetings. This provided some strategic direction which had previously been lacking but there was no monitoring of access to the regime by young people with a disability.
- 4.19 Screening for physical, mental and learning disabilities took place during reception and induction. The special educational needs coordinator (SENCO) also carried out a hidden disabilities screening as part of education and training induction. Information about young people with disabilities had recently been incorporated into one central database but it was not clear if staff were making good use of this information in their dealings with young people. Nomis records for young people with identified disabilities were updated by the disability liaison officer and guidance on how to prepare care plans for young people with a disability was available to all staff. This was a recent initiative and we did not see any completed care plans during the inspection. The SENCO had provided detailed guidance for staff on different learning difficulties and disabilities but more needed to be done to ensure that this informed the day-to-day management of individual young people.
- 4.20 In our survey, 10% of respondents said they had a disability. Their responses indicated that they felt less safe than other young people and felt that they were more likely to be victimised.

## Recommendation

---

- 4.21 **Young people with disabilities should have individual care plans to meet their assessed needs. Care plans should be subject to regular review involving appropriate staff, and individual care plans should be disseminated to all staff involved in the care of the young person.**

## Religion

---

- 4.22 The chaplaincy team were regularly represented at EAT meetings, although minutes of meetings during the six months prior to the inspection did not indicate much discussion of faith issues. The faith awareness course for staff had only been delivered once in 2011. There was no monitoring of access to the regime by faith.

## Sexual orientation

---

- 4.23 The youth club was undertaking some useful work with young people on awareness of difference in sexual orientation. Young people were asked about sexual orientation during induction and, although there were no support groups in the establishment, external sources of support for a young person who required them had been identified. It was made clear to young people during induction that homophobia was not acceptable and posters around the establishment reinforced this message.

## Section 5: Health services

### Expected outcomes:

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

5.1 Health care provision was very good and delivered by a conscientious team of well qualified staff. Young people had access to a dedicated health care forum which had been set up following the previous inspection. Clinical governance was sound. Physical health care services were comprehensive and appropriate for the child and adolescent population, as was health promotion. Pharmacy services were satisfactory but some areas needed attention. Dental services were very good with no significant waiting times for patients. Young people with mental health problems had access to very good mental health facilities.

### General

---

- 5.2 Health care services were commissioned by NHS Medway Primary Care Trust (PCT) with primary health care delivered by the Prison Service. The contract was still under review with a specification completed in readiness for new tenders early in 2012. The workforce remained anxious about the future arrangements but a stable group of staff was supported by a consistent use of regular agency staff. A mental health in-reach team was based on site with the service provided by Cygnet Health Care. Young people we spoke to were positive about the level of health care services provided. The health care centre on the first floor comprised a small suite of rooms used as offices, consultation rooms, a dental suite and newly equipped snoezelen<sup>4</sup> that was about to be commissioned. A treatment room and small pharmacy room were located on the ground floor where most of the patients were seen by the GP and medicine was administered. An additional treatment room on Cedar unit was used primarily for secondary screening. All rooms were clean and suited to the treatment and care of patients.
- 5.3 We were informed that a new health needs assessment was being produced to be used for the specification of services to be provided under the new contract. The partnership board for Cookham Wood and HMYOI Rochester met quarterly and was attended by the governor and head of health care. The agenda focused on the future commissioning of services and the health care delivery action plan. The head of health care was supported by a senior nurse as clinical manager who led the delivery of primary care and also held the role of disability liaison officer. The clinical manager had a very good relationship with the health care team and prison staff. Care was provided by a team of 10 nurses and health care assistants with two part-time administrators. Agency staff filled four vacancies which would be recruited for when the new contract had been awarded.
- 5.4 Young people had access to a good range of health care services with short waiting lists and a good level of attendance. Access for young people with mobility difficulties was limited in the main health care centre but adequate in areas where most patients were seen. There were no waiting facilities outside the main treatment room on the ground floor but most patients were escorted to appointments individually which limited the need for waiting facilities. One of the

---

<sup>4</sup> A room in a prison designed to deliver stimuli to various senses for young people with anxiety, anger or communication difficulties.  
HMYOI Cookham Wood

consultation rooms in the health care centre was used as a waiting room when required. The initial screening of young people took place in a dedicated health care room in reception. The room was well equipped for clinical assessments with access to electronic recording. There were no speech and language therapies available in house but we were told that young people who required this service were referred out to the community speech and language service.

## Clinical governance

---

- 5.5 Clinical governance arrangements were shared with HMYOI Rochester with a jointly chaired bimonthly meeting attended by senior health care staff, governors and representatives of the Independent Monitoring Board and PCT. The agenda covered relevant issues to inform the partnership board and manage the health care delivery action plan. Nursing staff were qualified to deliver the range of services provided for young people and, when necessary, visiting specialists delivered clinics. Mental health care services had developed well with additional staff and enhanced qualifications (see paragraph 5.26 and good practice 5.28).
- 5.6 Health care services were provided from 7am until 9pm throughout the week and from 8am until 8pm at the weekend. Specialist equipment and occupational aids were very rarely required but were easily available through the PCT. Despite the delays in establishing the new contract, there had been continued investment in the professional development of staff which was well managed by the lead clinical nurse. Clinical supervision was managed by an outside facilitator who regularly visited the establishment for one-to-one and group supervision as required.
- 5.7 A new contract for GP services had been drawn up over the previous year with three regular GPs providing four clinics on weekdays and one on Saturday in addition to the provision of an out-of-hours service. Pharmacy services were provided by HMYOI Rochester and the pharmacist visited monthly. A full-time registered pharmacy technician was employed at Cookham Wood for medicines management and was available to give advice to patients during medicine administration. Prescription items were supplied daily in a timely manner. The technician also ran a series of health care promotion clinics. Dental services were provided by NHS Medway PCT with a dentist and dental nurse delivering a clinic of one session each week. The PCT also provided holiday cover if required.
- 5.8 Emergency resuscitation equipment was located in a room next to the treatment room on the ground floor and in Cedar unit. The bags were sealed and checked weekly and following use. The equipment included automated external defibrillators and some discipline officers had been trained in their use. The defibrillators were checked daily. All checks of equipment were recorded appropriately.
- 5.9 The management of clinical records had improved since our previous inspection. SystmOne was used more and all paper records had been archived and all clinical records stored in accordance with the Data Protection Act and Caldicott guidelines. Clinical practice was informed by NICE (National Institute for Clinical Excellence) guidelines and NHS Frameworks, with a system in use to keep all staff informed.
- 5.10 Young people had access to a dedicated health care forum which had been set up following our last inspection. The forum met monthly and comprised a random selection of young people. Each event had a health care theme and provided the opportunity to discuss matters relating to health care delivery. The notes of meetings were distributed to all young people. Complaints were managed primarily through the general complaints system and there were very few. All were dealt with quickly and sensitively. Young people were told about the

availability of the Patient Advisory and Liaison Service. Policies and procedures for the management of communicable diseases were appropriate for young people and there was a range of screening and vaccination programmes, some of which were delivered by visiting specialists. The programme for professional development took into account the needs of the population and nursing staff were being trained to deliver more in-house clinics.

## Pharmacy

---

- 5.11 Medicines were administered at two sites from small treatment rooms over a half stable door. There were procedures to ensure that the delivery of care was in the interest of the patients, but these had not been signed by staff and staff training on standard operating procedures was not documented. Incidents were recorded and reviewed regularly by the pharmacist. An out-of-date medicine and some loose strips of tablets were found in the treatment room in Cedar unit.
- 5.12 The registered technician largely worked unsupported and had no face-to-face contact with the pharmacist. However, there was regular communication between the technician's line manager and the pharmacist to ensure that the advice given by the technician to patients was up to date.
- 5.13 Nursing staff administered medication twice a day from 7.45 to 8.15am and from 6.15 to 8pm depending on demand. They visited patients individually if medication was needed outside these times. This was well organised and consideration was given to patient confidentiality. Patients were able to access medication out of hours on the authority of the on-call doctor and/or nurse.
- 5.14 In-possession medication was limited to a few items such as antibiotics, creams, inhalers and antihistamines, which was appropriate for the population. In-possession risk assessments were regularly reviewed by nursing staff and by the pharmacist during visits. A limited list of medication was available to supply on special sick, such as small packs of paracetamol, ibuprofen and aqueous cream. Patient group directions were appropriate for the population and profile. A medicines and therapeutics committee met quarterly and was attended by representatives from the PCT and other establishments in the cluster, although prescribers did not always attend. Prescribing was in accordance with an established formulary. Controlled drugs were obtained via signed order using a duplicate book but there was no controlled drugs register. Records were kept in a ward administration book.

## Recommendation

---

- 5.15 A controlled drugs register should be put in place.

## Housekeeping points

---

- 5.16 Regular out-of-date checks should be carried out on all medicines and testing strips and stock items should be kept in the manufacturer's original packaging.
- 5.17 All policies and procedures, including those for controlled drugs management, should be read and signed by staff and training records maintained. Prescribers should attend medicines and therapeutics committee meetings.

## Dentistry

---

- 5.18 The dental suite was located in a large room in the health care centre and had been fully refurbished. All equipment was in good order and the suite was very well organised. The management of the control of infection was well maintained with clear separation of clean and dirty instruments. Emergency medicines in the surgery were all in date. Resuscitation kit was available with masks and tubing but there was no bottled oxygen.
- 5.19 At the time of our inspection, there were 26 patients on the waiting list and we were informed that this was higher than usual due to the vacancy for a dental nurse which had now been addressed. Despite this, patients usually waited less than four weeks for routine treatment and there was a good rate of attendance. Dental checks and treatment were equivalent to that provided in the community. Oral health promotion was provided during appointments and information leaflets were available. Young people that we spoke to were happy with the dental care provided.

## Recommendation

---

- 5.20 Bottled oxygen should be available in the dental suite.

## Primary care

---

- 5.21 An initial health care screen for all young people was carried out in reception. The electronic patient record was used with a standard screening tool adapted for young people. If a young person arrived late, a member of the health care team remained on site or returned to complete the health care screen. The following day all young people were seen for a secondary screen, referred to locally as the well man clinic, and were given the opportunity to see a GP. A comprehensive mental health assessment was completed during induction. Health care staff provided two sessions during induction to tell young people about the health care services and elements of health promotion were introduced. A leaflet was also given to each young person outlining the health care facilities.
- 5.22 The strategy for health promotion had improved since the previous inspection. It was more focused on the needs of young people and provided the opportunity to follow national campaign days. There were good links with the gymnasium. Health promotion notices in a range of languages were displayed around the site and in association rooms. Health promotion leaflets were available at some of the clinics. Smoking cessation clinics were delivered on a one-to-one basis by one of the health care team. Blood-borne virus clinics were well managed with regular screening and vaccination clinics, and sexual health clinics were provided by a visiting specialist. Young people were informed that condoms were available on request from the health care centre. Patients with life-long conditions were managed by nurses with appropriate qualifications.
- 5.23 Young people were able to access health care by using a health care application form which was placed in a health care box on each of the residential units. Nursing staff spent considerable time on the units and young people could ask discipline officers if they could see the nurse and an appointment was arranged. Patients were seen quickly at a nurse triage clinic and, if they needed to see a GP, this usually happened within 24 hours. Nurses had been triage trained and triage algorithms were available to ensure consistency of treatment. Both general nurses and mental health nurses visited all young people on the Phoenix unit every



day, with a GP attending three times weekly. We observed a good working relationship between health care and Phoenix unit staff.

## Housekeeping point

---

- 5.24 Health promotion leaflets should be made easily available to young people.

## Secondary care

---

- 5.25 One of the health care administrators managed the outside hospital appointments which were recorded on a paper calendar but were in the process of being transferred to the electronic record. Two escort opportunities were provided each weekday which was sufficient to meet the demand for appointments. Cancellation of appointments for security reasons was very rare. There was a good relationship with the local hospital where most appointments took place.

## Mental health

---

- 5.26 The on-site mental health team delivered primary and secondary mental health care. A small team comprising three mental health nurses and a forensic psychologist were available to young people during the week. One of the nurses was qualified in child and adolescent mental health. A psychiatrist specialising in attention deficit hyperactivity disorder and substance use was available for two full days each week. The team had an office and rooms for consultation in the health care centre. The caseload was 22 patients at the time of our inspection which we were informed was average. There were about seven referrals each week with an open referral system.
- 5.27 The team were very closely involved with many departments across the establishment and there was good multidisciplinary working in the care of patients. There were good links with the community and efforts were made to follow up patients immediately after their release. Counselling support was provided by one of the nurses and the chaplaincy. It was very rare for patients to transfer to secure mental health units although we were informed that in the past when needed, this had been managed very quickly. Mental health awareness training was very well managed. Discipline staff were trained as mental health champions on a monthly rolling programme and first night and induction staff were trained in mental health assessment.

## Good practice

---

- 5.28 *Mental health awareness training was very well managed. Discipline staff were trained as mental health champions on a monthly rolling programme and first night and induction staff were trained in mental health assessment.*



# Section 6: Activities

## Time out of cell

---

### Expected outcomes:

All children and young people are actively enabled and encouraged to engage in out of cell activities, and they are offered a timetable of regular and varied events.

- 6.1 The majority of young people had adequate time out of their cell and managers monitored time out of cell on a weekly basis. However, the tightly managed regime limited exercise in the open air to 30 minutes a day instead of one hour. Exercise areas provided nothing to occupy young people. The introduction of youth worker training for staff was impressive and had the potential to provide creative ways of enhancing activities for young people.
- 6.2 Time out of cell for the majority of young people was on the whole adequate. The establishment reported an average unlock time of over nine hours a day. Young people on Cedar unit were unlocked for the majority of the day. Others, especially those on loss of association and young people on the Phoenix unit, had significantly less than 10 hours out of cell each day. During our spot checks we found less than 10% of young people locked in their cell for a part of the core day and for valid reasons. Managers monitored times that young people were locked in their cells and the reasons for this each week. However, we encountered one young man who had experienced considerable time locked in his cell over a two-week period because of delays in allocating him to education or training following a period in the Phoenix unit. We were satisfied that this was an exception.
- 6.3 Association was only cancelled when there were unplanned staff shortages. Young people had association each evening during the week for about 90 minutes but some young people complained that it sometimes started late and we observed one session starting 10 minutes late. Association was provided during the day at weekends. On the evening that we observed association, staff we spoke to knew which young people were not associating and the reasons for this.
- 6.4 Association, dining and exercise took place by landing in groups of about 20 young people. Managers and residential staff were convinced that this had been the main factor in the improvement of young people's feelings of safety and staff feeling more in control. Supervising young people in smaller groups meant that young people only had 30 minutes' outdoor exercise each day instead of one hour. However, significantly more young people (84%) than at similar establishments (42%) said they received exercise each day. Recording of time out of cell was accurate but there was no central log of when exercise was cancelled.
- 6.5 Exercise yards were completely bare providing nothing for young people to do. One young person wrote in his survey: 'On exercise yards there is nothing to do and you are not even allowed to run'. Association sessions were well supervised but we did not observe much interaction with young people.
- 6.6 The youth club provided an excellent resource which was well managed by qualified youth workers with a range of recreational and educational activities. The introduction of training in youth work for staff was creative and offered the potential to increase the range of activities

available and improve engagement between staff and young people. Many staff were enthusiastic about this opportunity.

## Recommendations

---

- 6.7 Young people should be given the opportunity to spend at least one hour in the open air every day.
- 6.8 More activities should be available during outside exercise.

## Housekeeping point

---

- 6.9 Association should start on time.

## Good practice

---

- 6.10 *The introduction of training in youth work for staff was creative and offered the potential to increase the range of activities available during association and improve engagement between staff and young people.*

## Learning and skills

---

*Inspection of the provision of education and educational standards, as well as vocational training in YOIs for juveniles, is undertaken by the Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted) working under the general direction of HM Inspectorate of Prisons. For information on how Ofsted inspects education and training see the Ofsted framework and handbook for inspection.*

### Expected outcomes:

**Learning and skills are central to the regime of the establishment and all children and young people are engaged in good quality provision that meets their individual needs and enables them to achieve their full potential. Children and young people of statutory school age receive full-time education.**

6.11 Allocations to courses were very efficient and new courses had been introduced since the previous inspection. Good quality information, advice and guidance were provided. Learning support was generally good. Teaching and learning were good overall but significantly better in the vocational workshops, particularly the murals workshop. Teaching and learning were less successful in classroom based lessons. Standards of work were generally good. Levels of accreditation had increased and most young people left the establishment with a nationally recognised qualification, although there was scope to develop courses at higher levels. Attendance and punctuality were satisfactory and few young people were returned to the units for poor behaviour. Young people had good access to the library and borrowing rates were relatively high.

- 6.12 An initial assessment of young people's literacy and numeracy skills was carried out on their second day in custody. Good quality information, advice and guidance (IAG) was provided in a one-to-one interview which explored young people's short, medium and long-term goals to allocate them to appropriate courses. If young people could not follow their chosen pathway for

security reasons or if courses were full, they were not automatically referred back to the IAG service for guidance on other choices. A database of young people with learning difficulties and/or disabilities was maintained by the special educational needs coordinator and distributed to teachers and residential staff. This highlighted young people's specific needs with suggested strategies to support them. It was unclear how effectively this information was used.

- 6.13** The curriculum had developed well and new courses such as motor vehicle engineering and creative media had been introduced. Project based learning had been introduced for the significant number of young people whose risk assessment prevented them from attending vocational workshops (see also security section). The curriculum allowed most young people the opportunity to develop their literacy and numeracy skills and to gain useful vocational and work-based skills. The personal, health and social education course allowed young people to gain accreditation in social and life skills which linked well with the independent living skills course available to all young people. Not enough young people were able to work in the main kitchen to gain valuable work experience and catering staff were not trained to deliver or assess catering qualifications.
- 6.14** The timetable was planned relatively well, although some classroom based lessons were too long and young people's concentration and behaviour frequently deteriorated.
- 6.15** Given the complexity of moving young people around the establishment, punctuality to education was satisfactory. However, collection times of young people at the end of sessions were inconsistent and young people sometimes waited for too long in classrooms and workshops after the lesson had finished. Attendance was satisfactory. Very few young people refused to attend education and refusals were quickly followed up. Relatively few young people were returned to the residential units for poor behaviour and those that were, often came back to education later in the day.
- 6.16** Teaching and learning were variable but were good in the vocational workshops where tasks were challenging and young people were encouraged successfully to remain on task. Lessons had pace and relevance and there was a productive ethos which helped to prepare young people for the world of work. Young people took pride in their achievements and were able to speak articulately about their work. Young people worked enthusiastically in the prison gardens and looked forward to carrying out their formal assessments. The new creative media course gave young people the opportunity to produce complex media using a range of software. In brickwork, young people developed good skills and produced some complex structures, although these were not accredited above level 1. Young people made good progress in painting and decorating, independent living skills and cleaning. On the DIY course, young people of differing abilities made very good progress and developed some innovative work such as carved poppies for Remembrance Day and personal wooden name plates. The quality of the murals produced remained outstanding.
- 6.17** Teachers in the workshops demonstrated good coaching skills to ensure young people's understanding and to allow them to consider and solve problems for themselves. Relationships were very good and behaviour management was effective. Expectations of learning, progress and behaviour were high and young people lived up to these. Young people's progress in the murals workshop was outstanding and their confidence and self-esteem developed rapidly. In classroom based lessons, teaching and learning were less successful. Some young people failed to engage and too much time was spent not working. Tasks were sometimes uninspiring and simplistic and lacked structure, and young people did not always see their relevance. Poor behaviour was too often not managed well.

- 6.18 Young people's achievements were good. Levels of accreditation had improved and most young people left with some form of accreditation, especially in the key areas of numeracy and literacy where 250 full qualifications had been gained during the previous year. Levels of accreditation in vocational areas were good as were qualifications such as health and safety at work and personal study skills. Some qualifications were offered from entry level to level 2 but there was scope to develop courses at higher levels in all areas to provide clear progression routes for young people with longer sentences. Young people who had entered custody while they were studying for GCSEs were able to continue with some subjects and in the previous year 21 GCSEs had been awarded in subjects such as mathematics, English, history and science to eight young people.
- 6.19 Teachers provided good support in the more effective lessons by challenging young people to achieve well and to develop their confidence and skills. Learning support assistants provided good support for young people whose levels of literacy and/or numeracy required development. This consisted of individual support or a group lesson in the case of literacy. The individual sessions were ad hoc, taking place at times when the young person or teacher was free, and were not integrated into young people's timetables. Young people on vocational pathways had recently begun to receive additional support in some vocational workshops in the form of discrete literacy and numeracy lessons delivered in the context of their vocational work.
- 6.20 Young people whose first language was not English had two sessions of ESOL support per week (English for speakers of other languages) and young people reported that this helped them with their language development.
- 6.21 The education peer mentoring scheme had much potential to support vulnerable young people and it was regrettable that only three of the eight young people who had applied for the scheme had been approved by security. Young people on release on temporary licence (ROTL) visited schools to talk about crime and the criminal justice system and those involved spoke enthusiastically about their visits.
- 6.22 Progress had been made in the use of individual learning plans (ILPs), although there was still some inconsistency in the setting and use of targets to monitor progress. The introduction of 'ILP of the week' was a good initiative.
- 6.23 New resources had been developed and these were treated with respect by young people. Resources were adequate overall.
- 6.24 Young people did not have access to the internet which restricted their independent learning.
- 6.25 A lesson observation scheme was in place which had enabled managers to identify strengths and areas for development but there was not enough sharing of effective practice. The self-assessment reports were appropriately self critical, although on occasions descriptive rather than evaluative.

## **Recommendations**

---

- 6.26 Catering qualifications should be introduced.
- 6.27 Classroom based lessons should be reduced in length.
- 6.28 Young people should be collected from education on time.

- 6.29 The levels of accreditation should be increased and higher level qualifications should be available in all areas.
- 6.30 Behaviour management in classroom based lessons should be improved.
- 6.31 Additional one-to-one support sessions should be integrated into young people's timetables.
- 6.32 The quality of individual learning plans, particularly with regard to target setting, should be improved.
- 6.33 Young people should have supervised access to the internet to develop their independent learning skills.

### Housekeeping point

---

- 6.34 Young people who cannot follow their first choice of course should be referred back to information, advice and guidance for further support.

### Library

---

- 6.35 Young people had good timetabled access to the library which was also open at weekends. There was a book delivery service in the evenings. The library was located in a small room but contained a reasonable range of age-appropriate stock, including fiction and non-fiction, quick reads and graphic novels. DVDs were available for use in the library although there was no internet access. Foreign language texts were available in 17 languages and there were resources for Travellers. Prison Service Orders and Instructions were held but were rarely used. Borrowing rates were relatively high and loss rates were at the national average. Some newspapers were available but the range of magazines was too narrow. Library events included author events, library quizzes and the six book challenge.

### Housekeeping point

---

- 6.36 The range of magazines should be increased.

## Physical education and health promotion

---

### Expected outcomes:

PE is central to helping children and young people to become confident individuals, maintain a healthy lifestyle, use spare time constructively, develop skills and gain qualifications while in custody and on release back into the community. PE is enjoyable and inclusive for all, regardless of ability or previous experience. Programmes contain a variety of activities to meet the needs and interests of all children and young people.

- 6.37 Young people had good access to physical education activities and benefitted from a wide range of activities and gained useful qualifications. Attendance at PE was good and non-attendees were followed up. Young people behaved very well in PE. Good use was made of

ROTL for PE activities and there were valuable links with Charlton Athletic Football Club. The sports hall was not fit for purpose due to its low ceiling and the number of showers was inadequate.

- 6.38 Young people had good access to the gym and PE facilities. A minimum of three hours a week was available for core PE and recreational PE was available in the evenings and at weekends, giving young people a potential total of eight hours' PE a week. Attendance at recreational PE was very good. There was a popular, successful PE course for young people who wished to follow a career in the sport and leisure industries and there were effective links with Charlton Athletic Football Club. The quality of work, such as the 'TEAM' (Together We Achieve More), was high.
- 6.39 Young people had access to a well balanced programme of activities, including team sports, fitness training and minor games. The use of free weights was monitored. The department had organised some charity events such as the simulated rowing of the channel and the Army had visited the department to deliver a training day for young people and to provide advice on Army careers.
- 6.40 Facilities consisted of a sports hall, a fitness suite, an artificial pitch and a new three-quarter size football pitch. The sports hall had a very low ceiling and only one racquet sports court. Showers were of reasonable quality, but there were only 11 which was inadequate. Staff told us that young people preferred to shower when they returned to their residential units but in reality they did not always get the opportunity (see residential units section). There was no dedicated PE classroom and theory lessons were delivered in the sports hall which had no teaching resources and poor acoustics.
- 6.41 Young people enjoyed their time in PE where behaviour and relationships were very good. They benefited from purposeful, well planned sessions which were managed skilfully. Very few young people were returned to the residential units for poor behaviour in PE lessons and at the time of the inspection only two young people were on restricted access to PE.
- 6.42 Young people who did not attend PE were monitored, although it was unclear whether PE was compulsory. Most of the PE curriculum was accredited and levels of accreditation were high. Twenty-five young people were following the Duke of Edinburgh award.
- 6.43 There was significant use of ROTL in the PE department and during the previous year more than 20 young people had benefited from hill walking, mountain biking and rock climbing expeditions.
- 6.44 There were good links with health care in areas such as remedial PE, well man clinics and mental health.
- 6.45 Use of the gym and access to PE by different groups was monitored.

## **Recommendations**

---

- 6.46 **There should be a classroom available for the teaching of PE theory.**
- 6.47 **All young people under school-leaving age should attend PE.**



# Section 7: Good order

## Behaviour management

---

### Expected outcomes:

The primary method of maintaining a safe, well-ordered and constructive environment is the promotion and reward of good behaviour. Children and young people play an active part in developing and maintaining standards of conduct. Unacceptable behaviour is dealt with in an objective, fair and consistent manner as part of an establishment-wide behaviour management strategy, which is underpinned by restorative justice principles and good relationships between staff and young people. The application of disciplinary procedures, the use of force and care and separation are applied fairly and for good reason with good governance arrangements. They are minimised through preventative strategies and alternative approaches: they are not seen in isolation, but form part of the overall behaviour management strategy and have clear links with safeguarding arrangements and violence reduction strategies.

7.1 There was a comprehensive behaviour management policy which had the confidence of staff and was effectively implemented. It was underpinned by a rewards and sanctions scheme which was generally well managed and provided age-appropriate incentives. Dynamic security was very good, supported by effective sharing of intelligence and security systems were managed effectively. Risk assessments that we examined were sound, although many young people were prevented from attending workshop activities due to their risk assessments. Apart from inappropriate routine strip-searching for new arrivals, all strip-searching was risk assessed and rarely carried out. The use of force and adjudications were high but governance was sound and overall the use of force was reducing. Staff were given feedback to improve performance and debriefs of young people were carried out well. There was greater clarity regarding the role and function of the care and separation unit (the Phoenix unit). It was used appropriately and Phoenix staff were properly supervised. Young people were subject to frequent review and care plans had improved, although there was scope for further development.

7.2 There was a comprehensive and clear behaviour management policy, which described the behaviour expected from young people and how staff should address unacceptable behaviour. A full range of disciplinary procedures was described, with an emphasis on positive relationships, rewarding good behaviour and early intervention to try to prevent escalation into poor behaviour. Mechanisms to address unacceptable behaviour included the rewards and sanctions scheme, behaviour improvement plans, anti-bullying procedures and separation from normal location in the Phoenix unit. The policy clearly linked with other key areas, such as safeguarding, child protection and violence reduction.

7.3 Staff spoke of their confidence in the behaviour management policy, believing that it gave them the tools to address poor behaviour, and there was evidence that staff were prepared to try different approaches when sanctions did not have the required effect. There was recognition that for some young people, behaviour had to be assessed on a daily basis, and the use of behaviour improvement plans for young people on basic regime was a good example of this. We observed a number of staff effectively and informally addressing low levels of unacceptable behaviour, such as play fighting or breaking the dress code. There was a good level of informal information sharing among staff relating to young people whose behaviour was a major concern, and this was done particularly well at the safer regimes meetings (see

also safeguarding section). Young people understood what was expected of them and the rewards and sanctions they would receive. They appeared motivated to earn rewards through the stamps and green card systems, although complained that staff were far more inclined to award yellow cards for poor behaviour than to issue green cards for good behaviour.

- 7.4 Young people who were transferred in on the disruptive prisoner's protocol, or were known to be challenging from a previous stay at Cookham Wood, were discussed at the weekly safer regimes meetings and located in the establishment according to risk.

## Security

---

- 7.5 Security was proportionate and individual risk assessments that we examined were sound. However, a significant number of young people were excluded from participation in workshop activities for security reasons. The security department collected comprehensive information about evidence of involvement in gangs and kept an up-to-date list of young people who needed to be separated either because they had been involved in opposing gang activity in the community or had been involved in serious conflict with each other in the establishment. Mediation was used whenever possible to encourage young people to resolve conflicts and young people on the 'keep apart' list were regularly reviewed and removed from the list at the earliest opportunity.
- 7.6 The searching policy had recently been updated and apart from routine strip-searching of new arrivals, strip-searching was only undertaken after intelligence-led risk assessments. Thirteen intelligence led strip-searches had been recorded during the previous 11 months. The searching policy allowed for forcible strip-searching if the young person refused to comply but there was no record of forcible strip-searching having taken place in the 12 months prior to the inspection and senior staff could not recall the last time it had happened.
- 7.7 Dynamic security was very good and based upon sound relationships between staff and young people and good information sharing, both formal and informal. The new monthly security bulletin was a useful way of communicating security concerns to staff. Security information reports (SIRs) were acted on quickly by the security department. The security department carried out their own routine checks on observation books and had identified a number of areas where SIRs should have been generated and were working to remedy this.

## Rules and routines

---

- 7.8 The establishment's rules were published in an age-appropriate format and given to all young people. Young people said they understood the rules and we were told that staff helped young people with limited reading ability to understand them. Any changes to the rules or routines were sent out by the governor and given to all young people.

## Rewards and sanctions

---

- 7.9 At the time of the inspection, just over a third of young people were on the top level of the rewards and sanctions scheme and 14 were on the basic level. The policy was regularly reviewed with input from the young people's council and a new scheme had recently been introduced. It had clear criteria for the gold, silver and bronze levels. Young people were given written information about the scheme during induction and it was displayed on the units. Most young people we spoke to understood how it worked.

- 7.10 In our survey, 37% of young people said they had been treated fairly under the scheme against the national comparator of 47% and survey results for young people from black and minority ethnic groups were significantly worse in this regard than the comparator for their white counterparts. There were waiting lists for places on the enhanced units which meant that some young people on that level could not enjoy all the benefits, for example 24 hour in-cell electricity and increased association time, which caused understandable dissatisfaction.
- 7.11 Quality assurance was undertaken by residential managers. In the sample that we examined the scheme was applied fairly with reviews taking place promptly before demotion or promotion, supported by written reports from other departments. Demotion only occurred after repeated poor behaviour or a serious incident and a review involving the young person. Young people on basic were reviewed every seven days or earlier if their behaviour had improved. A behaviour improvement plan was drawn up for young people with recurring problems, but the objectives in the plans were too basic and did not always address the specific changes that the young person needed to make. A copy of the plans was not always kept in the unit records so that all staff could respond accordingly.
- 7.12 The new scheme was motivational and made creative use of instant rewards and daily points which were given as stamps and could be exchanged at the end of the week for items from the prison shop. Young people could gain stamps by simply complying with the regime. They could also acquire green cards for very good behaviour which contributed towards their promotion to enhanced level. Yellow cards were issued when behaviour dipped below expectations and young people who accumulated three yellow cards were subject to a review. There had been some teething problems with inconsistency of application in the issue of green cards but this was being addressed.

## Recommendations

---

- 7.13 Behaviour improvement plans for young people on the basic level of the rewards and sanctions scheme should contain individual targets aimed at improving behaviour.
- 7.14 All young people on the enhanced level of the rewards and sanctions scheme should receive equal rewards.

## Housekeeping point

---

- 7.15 A copy of the plan for young people on the basic level of the regime should be kept on file on the units.

## Adjudications

---

- 7.16 There was a very high level of adjudications with 780 adjudications in the six months from May to October 2011, of which 692 were proven. The majority of adjudications were for assaults or fights, and disobeying a lawful order. Governance arrangements were thorough and the adjudication performance review committee met quarterly to ensure that punishments were consistent and to examine data on the nature of issues referred for adjudication. However, attendance at the meetings had been poor with only about half the designated membership attending meetings in 2011.

- 7.17 The performance review committee had identified a number of offences that were not sufficiently serious for adjudication and were drawing up guidance to advise staff how to determine whether adjudication or a less formal procedure was appropriate. In the small sample of adjudication documentation that we examined, punishments were appropriate. Some punishments were suspended to give young people the opportunity to improve their behaviour.
- 7.18 Adjudications that we observed were managed well, with a good balance of formality and age-appropriate informality which helped to put young people at ease. Young people were given a clear explanation of the process. They were given good support and encouragement by staff on the Phoenix unit during the adjudication process. Young people were always offered the support of an advocate during their adjudication and the advocate played an active role in the proceedings we observed. Young people told us that they valued the presence and support provided by the advocates.
- 7.19 Adjudicators were alert to child protection concerns and made referrals appropriately. There was a good use of mediation following adjudications.

## Use of force

---

- 7.20 There was a comprehensive, up-to-date restraint minimisation strategy with a dedicated governor supporting its implementation. Governance of the strategy was managed by a restraint minimisation committee which met weekly and was well attended by key personnel, including the child protection coordinator. Comprehensive data were collected, including the type of restraint and the time taken to conclude an incident.
- 7.21 The vast majority of restraint was used to prevent fights and assaults between young people. Data showed that there had been a slight reduction in restraint overall since the previous inspection, but a significant reduction in the use of full control and restraint, with minimal restraint used instead. The use of restraint for non-compliance had also reduced significantly according to the establishment data, with 6% of restraint for non-compliance from July to September 2011, against 31% from January to March 2011. The establishment believed that there was some correlation between the reduction in restraint and the introduction of the Recode communication training for staff. We examined several records of non-compliance and found that all incidents had started with a refusal to comply with an instruction, which had in turn, escalated to violence or potential violence which had led to the restraint. We came across no examples of unnecessary use of force. During the six months from May to October 2011, there had been 28 reported injuries to young people following restraint. The majority had not required medical attention but nine had required minor attention, including two young people who had attended hospital. All injuries sustained during restraint were discussed at the quarterly safeguarding meeting.
- 7.22 The use of force documents that we examined were detailed and recorded attempts by staff to de-escalate situations. All documentation was scrutinised by the restraint minimisation committee and feedback was given to staff if documents had been poorly completed or restraint techniques used improperly. The committee used CCTV records and video recordings of planned removals well to examine practice and feed back to staff. The debriefing of young people following the use of force was done competently by members of the casework team, although some young people were not seen until over a week after the incident. Records of the sessions showed that young people were given the opportunity to talk about a range of issues and were referred to the casework team for appropriate interventions if required.

## Care and separation

---

- 7.23 The care and separation unit was a 12-bed unit known as the Phoenix unit. The environment was clean and ordered and cells that we checked were well kept and in a good state of repair. Young people were allocated two new personal officers from the Phoenix staff group as soon as they were located on the unit. There was a comprehensive policy outlining the aims and objectives of the unit, and unit staff had a clear understanding of the role and function of the unit and the selection criteria. Phoenix staff received fortnightly supervision from a psychologist, which was commendable. The unit was designated for young people who needed to be temporarily removed from normal location because of their behaviour. The majority of the young people located on the Phoenix unit had been involved in disruptive or violent behaviour. Other young people, defined as having complex needs, were temporarily located on the Phoenix unit because they struggled to cope for a variety of reasons and they were given a higher level of individual support on the Phoenix unit than would have been possible on normal location.
- 7.24 There were no ongoing records of young people who were located in the Phoenix unit for reasons other than disciplinary reasons so we were unable to ascertain the overall throughput. Records showed that between May and October 2011 there had been 94 incidents of separation for disciplinary reasons and the longest stay had been 14 days. In the sample of records that we examined, all the young people who had been placed on the unit for poor behaviour had been temporarily removed from their unit as a last resort after other sanctions had been tried.
- 7.25 All young people located on the Phoenix unit had care plans and were subject to multidisciplinary review each week on the unit as well as at the safer regimes meetings. The unit reviews were more comprehensive and involved the young person. The quality of care plans had improved significantly since the previous inspection but there was scope for further improvement: the role of staff in assisting young people to meet their targets was not always clear and neither was the record of the young person's progress. Care plans for young people with complex needs were informed by a psychological assessment, which included helpful guidance on how Phoenix staff could engage effectively with the young person. They were more comprehensive than those for young people who were placed in the unit for disciplinary reasons. Care plans included ways in which the young person could be successfully reintegrated to normal location. Disruptive young people returning from the Phoenix unit were often placed on a behaviour improvement plan by residential staff, but there was no evidence of assessments or existing care plans or reintegration plans from the Phoenix unit informing the behaviour improvement plan.
- 7.26 All young people received a psychological assessment unless they were on the unit for a very short time. They were risk assessed to decide if they could be involved in education as well as other aspects of the regime. During two spot checks, we found that the majority of young people on the unit were engaged in education off the unit, either in a designated class for the unit or integrated with other young people in mainstream classes. However, overall young people located on the Phoenix unit spent too much time in their cells and were only out of their cells during planned activities.

## Recommendations

---

- 7.27 Attendance at the adjudication performance review committee should be improved.

- 7.28 Young people's assessments and care plans on the Phoenix unit should be used to inform their behaviour improvement plans when they return to the residential units.
- 7.29 The regime on the Phoenix unit should allow young people to spend more time out of their cell.

### Housekeeping points

---

- 7.30 Use of force debrief interviews should take place as soon after the incident as possible unless there is a well evidenced assessment that it is in the best interests of the young person to delay the process.
- 7.31 The throughput of young people on the Phoenix unit should be analysed so that its use can be monitored by the safeguarding committee.

### Good practice

---

- 7.32 *Phoenix staff received fortnightly supervision from a psychologist to assist them in their work with the most problematic young people in the establishment.*
- 7.33 *All young people located on the Phoenix unit received a psychological assessment unless they were on the unit for a very short time.*

# Section 8: Services

## Catering

---

### Expected outcomes:

Children and young people are offered a sufficient choice of healthy and varied meals based on their individual requirements. The menu reflects the dietary needs of growing adolescents. Food is prepared and served according to religious, cultural and prevailing food safety and hygiene regulations.

- 8.1 The kitchen and the unit serveries were clean and tidy but some equipment was in need of attention. Young people's views of the food were very poor, although the menu was varied with some healthy options and meals were served on time. Breakfast packs were too small to satisfy adolescent appetites, but otherwise portions were adequate and young people were provided with a small snack mid-morning and evening. Young people ate in their cells for most meals. There was wide-ranging and ongoing consultation about food and there had been some additions to the menu as a result. Young people had been very positive about the catering arrangements for Ramadan.
- 8.2 In our survey, only 5% of young people said the food was good or very good. The food we sampled was of reasonable quality and adequate portions were served to all young people during the inspection week.
- 8.3 Young people complained that breakfast packs were too small, although more cereal options had recently been added including porridge. Young people received a mid-morning snack and a snack for the evening, although most said that they ate their evening snack with their evening meal.
- 8.4 The range of options for lunch had increased and now included noodles to provide a hot option. The four-week menu cycle provided a diverse range of food, and specialist diets were adequately catered for. Healthy options had been promoted but there had been no nutritional assessment of the menu. Young people adhering to Ramadan gave very positive feedback about the provision. The catering department made efforts to celebrate other cultural events, for example Black History Month.
- 8.5 Meals were served on time. Young people ate breakfast and lunch in their cell during the week. Lunch at weekends and the evening meal throughout the week were served in association other than for those who were temporarily not permitted to eat in association because they were on the basic level of the rewards and sanctions scheme or following an adjudication punishment. Young people ate in small groups of about 20 and a few staff usually chose to eat with them.
- 8.6 Temperatures were checked before food was served and logged in a book for the catering manager to review. One of the hot plates on the servery in the main kitchen was broken and had been for some time and one of the heated trolleys required repair. Some of the trolleys we inspected had been returned from the residential units in a very dirty condition.

- 8.7 The kitchen and the unit serveries were clean and tidy. Young people working in the serveries were appropriately dressed, had basic training and were well supervised. However, we observed that staff taking meals to cells for young people did not always wear gloves.
- 8.8 Consultation about the food was wide ranging through the young people's council, regular surveys and comments books. Changes had been made as a result, for example the addition of porridge to the breakfast cereals and a hot option for lunch.

## Recommendation

---

- 8.9 Young people should dine out for all meals.

## Housekeeping points

---

- 8.10 A nutritional review of the menu should be completed to ensure that it is sufficient for adolescents.
- 8.11 All catering equipment should be maintained in working order.
- 8.12 Trolleys should be thoroughly cleaned before they are returned to the kitchen.

## Prison shop

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 8.13 Ordering and delivery arrangements for the shop were efficient but some new arrivals had to wait too long to place an order. Young people had good opportunities to comment about the service they received through the shop and said the cost of items was too high and the shop did not sell a wide enough range of goods. The product list was reviewed regularly.
- 8.14 The shop was managed by DHL from another prison in the region. Young people were able to place an order each week but those arriving after Tuesday had to wait until the following Tuesday to place an order which they received on Saturday. They were given a reception pack but this was very limited. This had implications for bullying.
- 8.15 In our survey, only 33% of young people against the comparator of 46% said that the shop sold a wide enough range of goods. Young people also complained during the inspection about the high cost of some products. There was ongoing consultation through the young people's council and the local product list was reviewed regularly and changes made where possible. There was an adequate range of healthy options, including fresh fruit, and an adequate range of religious items.
- 8.16 The ordering and delivery arrangements were efficient and mistakes were generally rectified within a day by replacement or reimbursement. Orders were delivered to the young person's cell to reduce the potential for bullying. Staff were aware of the need to monitor young people to ensure they were not securing items from others by bullying or intimidation.



- 8.17 Young people could order newspapers, including one from their home area. However, magazines were not available and the range of catalogue items was limited to weight lifting gloves and CD players.
- 8.18 Young people could readily access the balance of their accounts and transfer an adequate amount into their expenditure account each week.

### **Recommendation**

---

- 8.19 New arrivals should be able to place an order with the prison shop within 24 hours of their arrival and the reception pack should be sufficient to meet their needs until they receive their first order.

### **Housekeeping point**

---

- 8.20 Young people should be able to order magazines and have access to a range of catalogues.



# Section 9: Resettlement

## Strategic management of resettlement

---

### Expected outcomes:

All areas of the establishment demonstrate a commitment to resettlement which ensures that children and young people are well prepared for release into the community. The resettlement strategy is informed by and developed in consultation with children and young people. Strategic partnerships, and youth offending teams (YOTs) in particular, plan for and provide timely access to resettlement opportunities for all children and young people on their release and, where appropriate, prior to release through the use of release on temporary licence (ROTL).

9.1 Improvements had been made to the resettlement policy and the resettlement committee operated effectively. Needs analysis data were being used and there were designated pathway leads. Strong strategic links had been made with relevant community agencies and innovative work was in hand to set up a regional resettlement consortium. Use of release on temporary licence (ROTL) was being promoted enthusiastically and the recently appointed youth worker was providing a useful service.

9.2 The resettlement policy had recently been updated and, although still in draft, was being implemented. The policy was comprehensive, although there was no reference to the specific resettlement needs of looked-after children or young people serving long sentences (see also training planning section). The policy was linked to a needs analysis which had derived from a series of focus groups carried out by the advocates earlier in the year. The resettlement committee had previously met quarterly, but a general lack of progress had led to the decision to convene the committee monthly. Attendance at meetings had recently improved and most departments in the establishment were represented. The advocates, the youth worker and the Independent Monitoring Board were also regular attendees and Connexions and the local youth offending team (YOT) managers attended from time to time.

9.3 Lead members of staff had been appointed for the resettlement pathways. Some innovative work was being carried out by the YOT manager and a member of the psychology department who examined ASSET scores pre and post release to track the progress of young people after they had left the establishment.

9.4 Since the previous inspection, the governor had established constructive links with senior local authority and community representatives and agreement had been reached to set up a resettlement consortium covering Kent and Medway. An initial meeting had taken place and it was intended that the consortium would discuss issues such as education, training and employment and the needs of looked-after children.

9.5 A qualified full-time youth worker had been appointed since the previous inspection. She delivered weekly personal and social development sessions which had included topics such as race and sexuality. With three or four other youth workers from the community, she also ran weekly youth club sessions during evening association and had been central to introducing a regular young people's awards evening as part of a wider initiative operated by Kent and Medway Council. The use of ROTL had been restricted to occasional town visits but an officer had recently been appointed to develop and support community placements. The range and number of community placements was increasing and the use of ROTL was being actively

promoted. Young people were told about ROTL opportunities during their induction and all young people who were eligible were considered for their suitability for ROTL through properly constituted boards involving the young person.

## Housekeeping point

---

- 9.6 The resettlement policy should include the specific resettlement needs of looked-after children and young people serving long sentences.

## Good practice

---

- 9.7 *Some innovative work was being carried out by the YOT manager and a member of the psychology department who examined ASSET scores pre and post release to track the progress of young people after they had left the establishment.*
- 9.8 *The governor had established constructive links with senior local authority and community representatives to set up a resettlement consortium covering Kent and Medway.*

## Training planning and remand management

---

### Expected outcomes:

Planning for a child or young person's release starts upon arrival. All children and young people contribute to the development of their own training or remand management plan, which is based on an individual assessment of risks and needs. This plan is a product of collaboration between the establishment, the young person, their parents or carers and their youth offending team. The plan is regularly reviewed and implemented throughout and after their time in custody to ensure a seamless transition to the community.

9.9 The role of caseworkers in the training planning process was clear and effective but attendance at training planning reviews by residential staff and other disciplines was poor. Young people were set appropriate targets in their training plans and referred to programmes to address identified needs. Discussions about ROTL and early release at training planning meetings were used motivationally. Cases involving young people who were subject to public protection procedures were dealt with efficiently. Transition arrangements for young people serving long sentences were underdeveloped but the needs of looked-after children were well met.

- 9.10 The same training planning process applied to sentenced and remanded young people and was led effectively by members of the casework team. Caseworkers efficiently scheduled and chaired all relevant meetings which usually took place within the required timescale unless the community YOT worker was unable to attend within the required timeframe. The caseworkers had good working relationships with young people and helped them to prepare thoroughly before their reviews. Appropriate individual targets were set and caseworkers made good use of the range of programmes that were available to meet identified need. Opportunities to gain early release and the use of ROTL were used consistently throughout the training planning process to motivate young people. In some of the case files that we examined, the documentation was not well ordered and it was difficult to track progress.

- 9.11 Reviews were held in suitable private rooms. Attendance was inadequate: personal officers and unit representatives seldom attended and there was limited attendance by members of staff from education and other specialist departments. Written contributions were not always supplied when requested. We were told that family members attended in approximately 30% of cases, although there were no formal records to support this. Caseworkers attended a small number of post-release reviews, if they regarded it as a priority and the meeting was within reasonable distance of the prison. Public protection arrangements were managed well and young people subject to public protection measures were identified on admission, following checks on the ASSET documentation. A monthly interdepartmental risk management meeting considered all new cases and made decisions to impose restrictions where necessary. All public protection cases were monitored continuously to accommodate any change in circumstances and, towards the end of their sentence, there was increasing focus on young people assessed as high risk. At the time of the inspection, 16 young people were subject to some form of restriction of whom three had been designated at either MAPPA (multi-agency public protection arrangements) level 2 or MAPPA level 3 status. A representative from the establishment usually attended case conferences held in the community for young people who had been classified in this way. In recent months attendance at the interdepartmental risk management meeting by some of the key participants, such as the police liaison officer and the security department, had been sporadic.
- 9.12 At the time of the inspection, approximately 14% of young people were serving sentences of two years or more. Young people serving long sentences tended to be allocated to one of the more experienced caseworkers. Transfers of these young people were discussed at the planning meetings, but in reality there were few available options. When young people transferred to the adult estate, there was little input from the receiving establishment which made it difficult to help young people make the necessary adjustment.
- 9.13 Young people who were looked-after children were managed by members of the casework team, some of whom had social work backgrounds. In our survey, 31% said they had been in local authority care and the establishment told us they had 35 looked-after children during the inspection. Letters sent to local authorities included useful information about their statutory responsibilities while the young person was in custody and arrangements for training planning meetings to which they would be invited. Local authorities were also asked to specify how they would support the young person while he was at Cookham Wood. The independent advocacy service provided valuable assistance if local authorities were reluctant to meet their obligations, including finding suitable accommodation for a looked-after child on release. Leaflets for young people described clearly what section 31 care orders, section 20 and section 17 meant in terms of the support they could expect from their local authority.

## Recommendations

---

- 9.14 **Staff involved in the care and management of young people should contribute to training planning meetings either by attending the meetings or submitting a written contribution if this is not possible.**
- 9.15 **Attendance at the interdepartmental risk management meetings should be improved.**

## Housekeeping point

---

- 9.16 Documentation associated with the training planning process should be properly maintained so that the young person's progress can be monitored.

# Resettlement pathways

---

## Expected outcomes:

The individual resettlement needs of children and young people are met through multi-agency working which promotes their successful reintegration at the end of their time in custody.

## Reintegration planning

---

9.17 Young people with accommodation problems were identified early and staff were assertive in trying to ensure that young people received the help they needed from community agencies. There was good provision of guidance and advice to young people in relation to education, training and employment and there were useful links with a small number of local training providers and employers. Good advice was available in relation to money management, and pre-discharge planning in relation to health care was efficient. There was a wide range of programmes and a significant number of young people participated. Pre-release support for young people with substance misuse needs was unreliable. Visits arrangements had improved with the introduction of a visitors' centre. The domestic visiting arrangements were sound but the facilities for legal visitors were restricted.

## Accommodation

---

9.18 The accommodation needs of young people were assessed by caseworkers as soon as they arrived. If problems with accommodation were identified, caseworkers collaborated with community YOT workers at an early stage to try to resolve them. If the caseworker was not satisfied with the availability or suitability of the accommodation proposed, advice was sought from one of the VOICE advocates whose role was to ensure that young people received the level of support they were entitled to. Despite these clear standards and work practices, it was not unusual for accommodation to be finalised at the last minute, particularly for looked-after children. Part of the work that was being carried out in relation to measuring Asset scores pre and post release involved checking young people's pre- and post-living arrangements but it was too soon to ascertain its value in informing reintegration planning in relation to the accommodation pathway (see also strategic management of resettlement).

## Education, training and employment

---

*For further details, see Learning and skills and work activities in Section 6*

9.19 Young people received good initial advice and guidance from staff and from Connexions. There were opportunities for young people to gain work and vocational skills and experience in the establishment and nearly all young people achieved good levels of accreditation which would help them on their release, although this needed further development and additional accreditation in some areas.

9.20 Young people benefited from the partnerships which had developed with external agencies such as IPS International and Octopus Productions which had made significant contributions to ROTL and the development of the motor vehicle engineering facility. There was very good use of ROTL for young people to gain qualifications and experience of working in a business environment. One young person had completed an engineering course with a local training provider and had secured an apprenticeship with a national car manufacturer.

## **Mental and physical health**

---

- 9.21 Discharge planning with the community was well organised. The health care team were informed two weeks in advance of young people to be released but they did not usually attend pre-release planning meetings. Letters describing care and treatment which had been delivered while the young person had been in custody were provided for GPs on release. The care programme approach was used for young people with enduring mental health problems. Palliative care policies were available.

## **Finance, benefit and debt**

---

- 9.22 All young people participated in an independent living course as part of the education curriculum, which included budgeting and finance. They received assistance with welfare benefits from the Connexions service, which was particularly good for young people from the Medway area. Young people from London received budgeting guidance from NACRO and Catch 22 through one-to-one and group sessions. Efforts were being made to reach agreement with a local bank to enable young people to open bank accounts as soon as they arrived at the prison.

## **Drugs and alcohol**

---

- 9.23 Substance misuse workers rarely attended training planning meetings and young people were not consistently provided with harm reduction and overdose prevention advice pre release. The 'Never Going Back' video which had previously been shown during induction was no longer included.
- 9.24 Substance misuse workers completed transfer and release plans for young people they had worked with, but this was not consistent. They sometimes liaised with YOT substance misuse workers and the local young people's drug and alcohol service which came into the establishment to see young people before release. However, there was no system in place to ensure the quality or consistency of pre-release planning and through care provision.

## **Recommendation**

---

- 9.25 **Harm reduction advice prior to release should be provided consistently, and post-release care should be properly planned and coordinated.**

## **Children and families of young people**

---

- 9.26 A visitors' centre had recently opened offering basic facilities in a portacabin where visitors could secure valuables in a locker and wait for their visit. The centre was staffed by YOT workers who engaged well with visitors and provided helpful advice and assistance on a range of prison issues, and a visitors' comment book had very recently been introduced. The YOT workers contacted gate staff as soon as a visitor arrived which helped to ensure that visits started promptly.
- 9.27 Domestic visits took place three times a week, during the day on Saturday and Sunday and on Wednesday evening. All sentenced young people were entitled to one domestic visit a week and young people on remand were entitled to three visits. Newly admitted young people could

organise an initial visit within the first few days by telephone. Caseworkers assisted young people who needed additional contact with their family for welfare reasons. ROTL was used well for family contact.

- 9.28 The visits hall was reasonably comfortable with sufficient capacity to accommodate the number of visits requested. Staff supervised visits discreetly. Although they wore prison clothing and were in close proximity to staff, young people were required to wear coloured bands in the visits area which was unnecessary. There were no closed visits.
- 9.29 There was an unstaffed play area for small children and vending machines selling hot and cold drinks and sweets. There was no opportunity to buy food or snacks.
- 9.30 Monthly family days had recently been introduced for which all young people were eligible. The family day that we attended was well managed and enjoyable but more needed to be done to encourage more young people and their families to participate in family days. A family/group worker was due to start work imminently and it was intended that they would reinstate at the earliest opportunity the previously run group work programme for young people who were fathers.
- 9.31 In our survey, 50% of young people said that they received one or more visits per week from their family and friends against the national comparator of 36%. Research carried out by the establishment had found that 11% of young people did not receive visits. Caseworkers had been tasked with working with young people who did not receive visits and their family to establish appropriate contact. Legal visits took place in the same area as domestic visits, which was unsatisfactory as it was an open space and did not afford privacy. Legal visit sessions were often busy and it was possible for confidential discussions to be overheard. We were told that a private room could be provided if the legal visitor asked in advance but this was not publicised.
- 9.32 Young people were entitled to two free letters a week. There was no opportunity for them to receive communications from family or friends by email.
- 9.33 In our survey, 56% of young people said that they had problems sending or receiving mail against the comparator of 40%. This was reinforced by comments made in our discussion groups with young people. Staff working in the mail office said that they followed standard prison procedures and were able to process mail on the same day they received it apart from weekends. About two or three times a week they received mail which was not correctly addressed and it was impossible to direct it correctly, but apart from these difficulties there was no explanation for the poor views held by young people about the handling of mail.
- 9.34 While the number of telephones available to young people was sufficient for the population, only 48% compared to 70% of young people in similar establishments said they could use the telephone every day.
- 9.35 Young people could only make a call during association and each person was allowed 10 minutes per call. Each association room held up to 20 young people which meant that not all young people were able to make a call if they all requested it and used their maximum time allowance. There was no guarantee that young people on loss of association would be unlocked to make a call each day.



## Recommendations

---

- 9.36 Young people should not be required to wear coloured bands in the visits hall.
- 9.37 Legal visits should be conducted in privacy.
- 9.38 All young people should have daily access to the telephone.

## Housekeeping points

---

- 9.39 Snacks should be available for visitors to purchase.
- 9.40 Young people should have access to email to maintain contact with their family and friends.
- 9.41 The negative perceptions of young people about the way mail is dealt with should be investigated.

## Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

---

- 9.42 The number and range of offending behaviour programmes had increased considerably since the previous inspection. A directory of interventions had been produced containing a brief description of the objectives and duration of each programme. This guidance was used by caseworkers when they were setting targets at training planning reviews. A significant number of young people completed programmes and post-programme feedback was generally very positive. The programmes were not accredited but some local evaluation was taking place. Programmes were mainly delivered by prison staff but some were delivered by community organisations such as Catch 22 and NACRO.



# 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 recommendation

To the governor, YJB and NOMS

---

- 10.1 Key staff at the establishment, NOMS, the YJB and the escort providers should meet regularly, monitor and resolve problems relating to escort arrangements and ensure that young people arrive at the establishment in good time to be assessed and settled on their first night. (HP44)

## Main recommendations

To the governor

---

- 10.2 The personal officer policy should be disseminated to all staff so that they are clear about their responsibilities, including attending important meetings relating to the care of the young people they are responsible for and collaborating appropriately with caseworkers. (HP45)
- 10.3 Further efforts should be made to increase the involvement of the Medway Safeguarding Children Board in the strategic management and oversight of all aspects of safeguarding children at Cookham Wood. (HP46)

## Recommendations

To the governor

---

### **First days in custody**

---

- 10.4 New arrivals should not be routinely strip-searched. (1.10)
- 10.5 The quality of initial vulnerability assessments and accompanying risk management plans should be improved, underpinned by a robust quality assurance procedure. (1.15)
- 10.6 Young people should have the opportunity to make a telephone call before they are locked up on their first night. (1.16)
- 10.7 Peer mentors should be available to assist late arrivals if required. (1.17)

### **Residential units**

---

- 10.8 Windows should be repaired to improve ventilation. (2.9)
- 10.9 Young people should be permitted to wear their own clothes and have access to on site laundry facilities. (2.16)
- 10.10 Young people should have access to a shower each day. (2.21)

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

---

- 10.11 Gated cells should not be used for young people requiring a high level of observation. (3.22)
- 10.12 All staff should be suitably trained in suicide and self-harm prevention and first aid. (3.23)

## **Legal rights**

---

- 10.13 All young people should be advised that they are permitted to make a free telephone call to their legal adviser during the core day. (3.46)

## **Substance use**

---

- 10.14 The establishment, in partnership with commissioners, should ensure that the substance misuse service is robustly managed, monitored and coordinated. Substance misuse workers should be provided with appropriate supervision and support. (3.66)
- 10.15 Young people with problematic substance use should have a substance misuse care plan, which is coordinated with health and casework teams, and have access to a range of interventions which meet individual need. (3.67)

## **Diversity**

---

- 10.16 Monitoring should be increased to include all aspects of the care and treatment of young people to ensure fairness, including the use of the stamp rewards scheme and allocation to activities, such as paid jobs. Monitoring should also include all equality strands such as religion. (4.6)
- 10.17 All staff should receive diversity training. (4.7)

## **Diversity: disability**

---

- 10.18 Young people with disabilities should have individual care plans to meet their assessed needs. Care plans should be subject to regular review involving appropriate staff, and individual care plans should be disseminated to all staff involved in the care of the young person. (4.21)

## **Health services: pharmacy**

---

- 10.19 A controlled drugs register should be put in place. (5.15)

## **Health services: dentistry**

---

- 10.20 Bottled oxygen should be available in the dental suite. (5.20)

## **Time out of cell**

---

- 10.21 Young people should be given the opportunity to spend at least one hour in the open air every day. (6.7)

10.22 More activities should be available during outside exercise. (6.8)

### **Learning and skills**

---

10.23 Catering qualifications should be introduced. (6.26)

10.24 Classroom based lessons should be reduced in length. (6.27)

10.25 Young people should be collected from education on time. (6.28)

10.26 The levels of accreditation should be increased and higher level qualifications should be available in all areas. (6.29)

10.27 Behaviour management in classroom based lessons should be improved. (6.30)

10.28 Additional one-to-one support sessions should be integrated into young people's timetables. (6.31)

10.29 The quality of individual learning plans, particularly with regard to target setting, should be improved. (6.32)

10.30 Young people should have supervised access to the internet to develop their independent learning skills. (6.33)

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

---

10.31 There should be a classroom available for the teaching of PE theory. (6.46)

10.32 All young people under school-leaving age should attend PE. (6.47)

### **Behaviour management: rewards and sanctions**

---

10.33 Behaviour improvement plans for young people on the basic level of the rewards and sanctions scheme should contain individual targets aimed at improving behaviour. (7.13)

10.34 All young people on the enhanced level of the rewards and sanctions scheme should receive equal rewards. (7.14)

### **Behaviour management: care and separation**

---

10.35 Attendance at the adjudication performance review committee should be improved. (7.27)

10.36 Young people's assessments and care plans on the Phoenix unit should be used to inform their behaviour improvement plans when they return to the residential units. (7.28)

10.37 The regime on the Phoenix unit should allow young people to spend more time out of their cell. (7.29)

## **Catering**

---

- 10.38 Young people should dine out for all meals. (8.9)

## **Prison shop**

---

- 10.39 New arrivals should be able to place an order with the prison shop within 24 hours of their arrival and the reception pack should be sufficient to meet their needs until they receive their first order. (8.19)

## **Training planning and remand management**

---

- 10.40 Staff involved in the care and management of young people should contribute to training planning meetings either by attending the meetings or submitting a written contribution if this is not possible. (9.14)
- 10.41 Attendance at the interdepartmental risk management meetings should be improved. (9.15)

## **Resettlement pathways: drugs and alcohol**

---

- 10.42 Harm reduction advice prior to release should be provided consistently, and post-release care should be properly planned and coordinated. (8.25)

## **Resettlement pathways: children and families of offenders**

---

- 10.43 Young people should not be required to wear coloured bands in the visits hall. (9.36)
- 10.44 Legal visits should be conducted in privacy. (9.37)
- 10.45 All young people should have daily access to the telephone. (9.38)

# Housekeeping points

---

## **Residential units**

---

- 10.46 Cells should be equipped with notice boards and young people should be encouraged to personalise their cells. (2.10)
- 10.47 All graffiti should be quickly removed. (2.11)
- 10.48 Toilets should be regularly deep cleaned. (2.12)
- 10.49 Efforts should be made to better publicise the work of the young people's council and encourage participation by all young people. (2.13)
- 10.50 Curtains and prison issue clothing should be of good quality and a proper fit. (2.17)

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

---

- 10.51 Management checks of unit records should be carried out consistently and ensure that records are balanced and sufficiently comprehensive. (2.28)

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

---

- 10.52 The planning arrangements for ACCT reviews should take account of the availability of members of staff with a useful contribution to make so that they are able to attend. Planning should also ensure greater consistency of staff chairing the reviews. (3.24)
- 10.53 Data collected and analysed should include reasons given by young people which caused them to self-harm. (3.25)

## **Bullying**

---

- 10.54 The interventions and support for perpetrators and victims of bullying should be linked to other existing individual plans and targets. (3.34)

## **Applications and complaints**

---

- 10.55 The quality assurance of complaints should ensure that replies are of a good quality with staff making appropriate and clear responses. (3.40)

## **Faith and religious activity**

---

- 10.56 Young people should not have to apply to attend religious services more than 24 hours in advance. (3.58)

## **Diversity: foreign nationals**

---

- 10.57 Attendance at the foreign nationals committee should be monitored to ensure that all relevant departments and young people representatives attend. (4.16)

## **Health services: pharmacy**

---

- 10.58 Regular out-of-date checks should be carried out on all medicines and testing strips and stock items should be kept in the manufacturer's original packaging. (5.16)
- 10.59 All policies and procedures, including those for controlled drugs management, should be read and signed by staff and training records maintained. Prescribers should attend medicines and therapeutics committee meetings. (5.17)

## **Health services: primary care**

---

- 10.60 Health promotion leaflets should be made easily available to young people. (5.24)

### **Time out of cell**

---

- 10.61 Association should start on time. (6.9)

### **Learning and skills**

---

- 10.62 Young people who cannot follow their first choice of course should be referred back to information, advice and guidance for further support. (6.34)

### **Library**

---

- 10.63 The range of magazines should be increased. (6.36)

### **Behaviour management: rewards and sanctions**

---

- 10.64 A copy of the plan for young people on the basic level of the regime should be kept on file on the units. (7.15)

### **Behaviour management: care and separation**

---

- 10.65 Use of force debrief interviews should take place as soon after the incident as possible unless there is a well evidenced assessment that it is in the best interests of the young person to delay the process. (7.30)
- 10.66 The throughput of young people on the Phoenix unit should be analysed so that its use can be monitored by the safeguarding committee. (7.31)

### **Catering**

---

- 10.67 A nutritional review of the menu should be completed to ensure that it is sufficient for adolescents. (8.10)
- 10.68 All catering equipment should be maintained in working order. (8.11)
- 10.69 Trolleys should be thoroughly cleaned before they are returned to the kitchen. (8.12)

### **Prison shop**

---

- 10.70 Young people should be able to order magazines and have access to a range of catalogues. (8.20)

### **Strategic management of resettlement**

---

- 10.71 The resettlement policy should include the specific resettlement needs of looked-after children and young people serving long sentences. (9.6)



## **Training planning and remand management**

---

- 10.72 Documentation associated with the training planning process should be properly maintained so that the young person's progress can be monitored. (9.16)

## **Resettlement pathways: children and families of young people**

---

- 10.73 Snacks should be available for visitors to purchase. (9.39)
- 10.74 Young people should have access to email to maintain contact with their family and friends. (9.40)
- 10.75 The negative perceptions of young people about the way mail is dealt with should be investigated. (9.41)

## **Examples of good practice**

---

### **First days in custody**

---

- 10.76 The induction programme included a session on communication skills known as 'Recode'. Staff had also been trained in the Recode programme and spoke highly of its benefits. (1.21)

### **Child protection**

---

- 10.77 In some cases, following a child protection referral arising from an incident of restraint, the CCTV footage was reviewed by the head of children's services with the member of staff concerned to identify learning points or they were referred for further Recode training. (3.13)

### **Mental health**

---

- 10.78 Mental health awareness training was very well managed. Discipline staff were trained as mental health champions on a monthly rolling programme and first night and induction staff were trained in mental health assessment. (5.28)

### **Time out of cell**

---

- 10.79 The introduction of training in youth work for staff was creative and offered the potential to increase the range of activities available during association and improve engagement between staff and young people. (6.10)

### **Care and separation**

---

- 10.80 Phoenix staff received fortnightly supervision from a psychologist to assist them in their work with the most problematic young people in the establishment. (7.32)

- 10.81 All young people located on the Phoenix unit received a psychological assessment unless they were on the unit for a very short time. (7.33)

### **Strategic management of resettlement**

---

- 10.82 Some innovative work was being carried out by the YOT manager and a member of the psychology department who examined ASSET scores pre and post release to track the progress of young people after they had left the establishment. (9.7)
- 10.83 The governor had established constructive links with senior local authority and community representatives to set up a resettlement consortium covering Kent and Medway. (9.8)

## Appendix I: Inspection team

---

Martin Lomas  
Fay Deadman  
Ian Macfadyen  
Angela Johnson  
Ian Thomson  
Sandra Fieldhouse

Deputy Chief Inspector  
Team leader  
Inspector  
Inspector  
Inspector  
Inspector

Mick Bowen  
Siggi Engelen  
Eileen Robson  
Huw Jenkins  
Martyn Rhowbotham

Health services inspector  
Substance use inspector  
Pharmacy inspector  
Care Quality Commission inspector  
Ofsted inspector

## Appendix II: Prison population profile

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

### Population breakdown by:

Status	Number of young people	%
Sentenced	88	71
Recalls	1	1
Convicted unsentenced	1	1
Remand	33	26
Detainee/other	1	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>100</b>

Age	Number of young people	%
15 years		
16 years		
17 years		
18 years		
<b>Total</b>		

Nationality	Number of young people	%
British	81	65
Foreign nationals	17	14
Not stated	26	21
<b>Total</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>100</b>

Ethnicity	Number of young people	%
<b>White</b>		
British	37	30
Irish	1	1
Other white	9	7
<b>Mixed</b>		
White and black Caribbean	4	3
White and black African	1	1
White and Asian	1	1
Other mixed	3	2
<b>Asian or Asian British</b>		
Indian		
Pakistani		
Bangladeshi	3	2
Other Asian	7	6
<b>Black or black British</b>		
Caribbean	19	15
African	18	14
Other black	13	11

<i>Chinese or other ethnic group</i>		
Chinese	1	1
Other ethnic group		
<i>Not stated</i>	7	6
<b>Total</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>100</b>

Religion	Number of young people	%
Baptist		
Church of England	6	5
Roman Catholic	12	10
Other Christian denominations	12	10
Muslim	40	32
Sikh		
Hindu		
Buddhist		
Jewish		
Other	21	18
No religion	33	26
<b>Total</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>101</b>

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

Length of stay	<1 mth	1–3 mths	3–6 mths	6–12 mths	1–2 yrs	2 yrs +	Total
<b>Age</b>							
15 years	2	4					6
16 years	10	11	2				23
17 years	9	15	13	8	1		46
18 years	2	3	4	2	2		13
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>		<b>88</b>

#### Unsentenced only – length of stay by age

Length of stay	<1 mth	1–3 mths	3–6 mths	6–12 mths	1–2 yrs	2 yrs +	Total
<b>Age</b>							
15 years	2						2
16 years	5	7	2		1		15
17 years	6	5	3	1			15
18 years	1	2	1				4
<b>Total</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>		<b>36</b>

Main offence	Number of young people	%
Violence against the person	21	17
Sexual offences	1	1
Burglary	22	18
Robbery	31	25
Theft and handling	7	5
Fraud and forgery	0	0
Drugs offences	2	2
Other offences	20	16
Offence not recorded/holding warrant	20	16
<b>Total</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>100</b>

Number of Section 53 (2)/91s (determinate sentences only) by age and sentence

Sentence	Under 2 yrs	2-3 yrs	3-4 yrs	4-5 yrs	5 yrs +	Total
Age						
15 years		1				1
16 years			1			1
17 years		5		1	2	8
18 years		1	1	1		3
<b>Total</b>		<b>7</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>13</b>

Number of DTOs by age and sentence (full sentence length including the time in the community)

Sentence	4 mths	6 mths	8 mths	10 mths	12 mths	18 mths	24 mths	Total
Age								
15 years			1	1	1	2	2	7
16 years	4	2	3	1	4	4	1	19
17 years	3	2	5	2	10	10	6	38
18 years	1					6	2	9
<b>Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>73</b>

Number of extended sentences under Section 228 (extended sentence for public protection)

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

Number of indeterminate sentences by age

Sentence	Section 90	Section 53 (1)	ISPPCJ03	Recall	HMP	Total
Age						
15 years						
16 years						
17 years				2		2
18 years						
<b>Total</b>				<b>2</b>		<b>2</b>

# Appendix III: Summary of young people's questionnaires and interviews

---

## **Survey methodology**

---

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

## **Choosing the sample size**

---

At the time of the survey on 11 October 2011, the population of young people at HMYOI Cookham Wood was 120. Questionnaires were offered to all young people.

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

Interviews were carried out with any respondents with literacy difficulties. In total, 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
- seal the questionnaire in the envelope provided and hand it to a member of staff, if they were agreeable, or
- seal the questionnaire in the envelope provided and leave it in their room for collection.

Respondents were not asked to put their names on their questionnaire, although their responses could be identified back to them in line with child protection requirements.

## **Response rates**

---

In total, 100 respondents completed and returned their questionnaires. This represented 83% of children and young people in the establishment at the time. The response rate from the sample was also 83%.

Four respondents refused to complete a questionnaire, six questionnaires were not returned and 10 were returned blank.

## Comparisons

---

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

Presented alongside the results from this survey are the comparator figures for all children and young people surveyed in young offender institutions. This comparator is based on all responses from surveys carried out in the other nine male establishments surveyed since 2010.

Also included are statistically significant differences between the responses of young people surveyed at HMYOI Cookham Wood in 2010 and the responses of this 2011 survey. It should be noted that, in order for statistical comparisons to be made between the most recent survey data and that of the previous survey, both sets of data have been coded in the same way. This may result in percentages from previous surveys looking higher or lower as some of our survey questions have changed. However, both percentages are true of the populations they were taken from, and the statistical significance is correct.

Additional documents show significant differences between the responses of young people from black and minority ethnic backgrounds, and young people from white backgrounds, significant differences between young Muslims and young non-Muslims, and significant differences between young people who consider themselves to have a disability and those who do not.

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. 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.

## Summary

---

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

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

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



# Survey results

## SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU

<b>Q1</b>	<b>How old are you?</b>	
	15.....	11 (11%)
	16.....	25 (26%)
	17.....	54 (55%)
	18.....	8 (8%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Are you a British citizen?</b>	
	Yes.....	95 (95%)
	No.....	5 (5%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>Is English your first language?</b>	
	Yes.....	89 (90%)
	No.....	10 (10%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>What is your ethnic origin?</b>	
	<i>White - British</i> .....	29 (30%)
	<i>White - Irish</i> .....	2 (2%)
	<i>White - other</i> .....	6 (6%)
	<i>Black or black British - Caribbean</i> .....	23 (24%)
	<i>Black or black British - African</i> .....	16 (16%)
	<i>Black or black British - other</i> .....	2 (2%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Indian</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Pakistani</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi</i> .....	4 (4%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - other</i> .....	1 (1%)
	<i>Mixed heritage - white and black Caribbean</i> .....	7 (7%)
	<i>Mixed heritage - white and black African</i> .....	1 (1%)
	<i>Mixed heritage - white and Asian</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Mixed heritage - other</i> .....	2 (2%)
	<i>Chinese</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Other ethnic group</i> .....	4 (4%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>What is your religion?</b>	
	<i>None</i> .....	23 (23%)
	<i>Church of England</i> .....	20 (20%)
	<i>Catholic</i> .....	17 (17%)
	<i>Protestant</i> .....	2 (2%)
	<i>Other Christian denomination</i> .....	6 (6%)
	<i>Buddhist</i> .....	1 (1%)
	<i>Hindu</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Jewish</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Muslim</i> .....	29 (30%)
	<i>Sikh</i> .....	0 (0%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?</b>	
	Yes.....	6 (6%)
	No.....	89 (93%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	1 (1%)

<b>Q7</b>	<b>Do you have any children?</b>	
	Yes.....	12 (12%)
	No.....	87 (88%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>Do you consider yourself to have a disability?</b>	
	Yes.....	10 (10%)
	No.....	86 (90%)
<b>Q10</b>	<b>Have you ever been in local authority care?</b>	
	Yes.....	30 (31%)
	No.....	68 (69%)

## SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Are you sentenced?</b>	
	Yes.....	68 (69%)
	No - unsentenced/on remand.....	31 (31%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>How long is your sentence (the full DTO sentence)?</b>	
	Not sentenced.....	31 (31%)
	Less than six months.....	13 (13%)
	Six to twelve months.....	20 (20%)
	More than twelve months, up to two years.....	24 (24%)
	More than two years.....	11 (11%)
	Indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP).....	0 (0%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>How long have you been in this establishment?</b>	
	Less than one month.....	17 (17%)
	One to six months.....	62 (63%)
	More than six months, but less than twelve months.....	12 (12%)
	Twelve months to two years.....	7 (7%)
	More than two years.....	0 (0%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?</b>	
	Yes.....	54 (55%)
	No.....	44 (45%)

## SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS

<b>Q1</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?</b>	
	Yes.....	44 (44%)
	No.....	44 (44%)
	Don't remember.....	11 (11%)
	Not applicable.....	0 (0%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?</b>	
	Yes.....	80 (81%)
	No.....	14 (14%)
	Don't remember.....	5 (5%)

<b>Q3</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, were there any adults (over 18) or people of a different gender, travelling with you?</b>	
	Yes .....	33 (34%)
	No.....	52 (53%)
	Don't remember .....	13 (13%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?</b>	
	Less than two hours .....	44 (44%)
	Two to four hours.....	35 (35%)
	More than four hours.....	17 (17%)
	Don't remember .....	4 (4%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?</b>	
	My journey was less than two hours .....	44 (44%)
	Yes .....	7 (7%)
	No.....	45 (45%)
	Don't remember .....	3 (3%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?</b>	
	My journey was less than two hours.....	44 (44%)
	Yes .....	18 (18%)
	No.....	35 (35%)
	Don't remember .....	2 (2%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, how did you feel you were treated by the escort staff?</b>	
	Very well.....	13 (13%)
	Well.....	29 (29%)
	Neither.....	39 (39%)
	Badly.....	10 (10%)
	Very badly.....	6 (6%)
	Don't remember .....	3 (3%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>Before you arrived, from court or another establishment, were you told that you would be coming here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	Yes, someone told me .....	80 (81%)
	Yes, I received written information.....	13 (13%)
	No, I was not told anything.....	19 (19%)
	Don't remember .....	6 (6%)

## SECTION 4: FIRST DAYS

<b>Q1</b>	<b>How long were you in reception?</b>	
	Less than two hours .....	78 (79%)
	Two hours or longer .....	15 (15%)
	Don't remember .....	6 (6%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>When you were searched, was this carried out in an understanding way?</b>	
	Yes .....	73 (74%)
	No.....	19 (19%)
	Don't remember .....	7 (7%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>Overall, how well did you feel you were treated in reception?</b>	
	Very well.....	10 (10%)
	Well.....	44 (44%)

Neither.....	30 (30%)
Badly.....	10 (10%)
Very badly.....	4 (4%)
Don't remember .....	1 (1%)

**Q4 When you first arrived here, did staff ask if you needed help or support with any of the following things? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**

Not being able to smoke.....	50 (52%)	Money worries.....	27 (28%)
Loss of property .....	24 (25%)	Feeling low/upset/needng someone to talk to .....	47 (48%)
Housing problems.....	21 (22%)	Health problems.....	68 (70%)
Needing protection from other young people.....	39 (40%)	Getting phone numbers .....	46 (47%)
Letting family know where you are .....	52 (54%)	Staff did not ask me about any of these.....	16 (16%)

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

Not being able to smoke.....	37 (40%)	Money worries.....	22 (24%)
Loss of property .....	21 (23%)	Feeling low/upset/needng someone to talk to .....	7 (8%)
Housing problems.....	20 (22%)	Health problems.....	17 (18%)
Needing protection from other young people.....	7 (8%)	Getting phone numbers .....	37 (40%)
Letting family know where you are .....	31 (33%)	I did not have any problems.....	18 (19%)

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

A reception pack.....	64 (65%)
The opportunity to have a shower.....	66 (67%)
Something to eat.....	81 (83%)
A free phone call to friends/family.....	54 (55%)
Information about the PIN telephone system.....	48 (49%)
Information about feeling low/upset.....	40 (41%)
Don't remember .....	5 (5%)
I was not given any of these.....	2 (2%)

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

Chaplain or religious leader .....	42 (45%)
Peer support/peer mentor/Listener/Samaritans.....	22 (24%)
The prison shop/canteen.....	9 (10%)
Don't remember .....	11 (12%)
I did not have access to any of these .....	33 (35%)

**Q8 Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a member of health care staff?**

Yes.....	71 (72%)
No.....	17 (17%)
Don't remember .....	10 (10%)

<b>Q9</b>	<b>Did you feel safe on your first night at this establishment?</b>	
	Yes .....	81 (83%)
	No.....	13 (13%)
	Don't remember .....	4 (4%)
<b>Q10</b>	<b>Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the establishment?</b>	
	<i>I have not been on an induction course</i> .....	4 (4%)
	Yes .....	66 (67%)
	No.....	23 (23%)
	Don't remember .....	5 (5%)

## SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?</b>			
	Yes .....	42 (43%)		
	No .....	53 (55%)		
	Don't know .....	2 (2%)		
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?</b>			
	Yes .....	31 (33%)		
	No.....	57 (61%)		
	Don't know .....	6 (6%)		
<b>Q3</b>	<b>What is the food like here?</b>			
	Very good.....	0 (0%)		
	Good.....	5 (5%)		
	Neither.....	23 (24%)		
	Bad.....	25 (26%)		
	Very bad.....	44 (45%)		
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?</b>			
	<i>I have not bought anything yet</i> .....	3 (3%)		
	Yes .....	32 (33%)		
	No.....	60 (62%)		
	Don't know .....	2 (2%)		
<b>Q5</b>	<b>How easy is it for you to attend religious services?</b>			
	<i>I don't want to attend religious services</i> .....	14 (15%)		
	Very easy .....	32 (33%)		
	Easy.....	24 (25%)		
	Neither.....	12 (13%)		
	Difficult.....	5 (5%)		
	Very difficult .....	4 (4%)		
	Don't know .....	5 (5%)		
<b>Q6</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions about religion:</b>			
		Yes	No	<i>Don't know/ not applicable</i>
	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	62 (65%)	13 (14%)	21 (22%)
	Can you speak to a religious leader in private if you want to?	64 (72%)	5 (6%)	20 (22%)

<b>Q7</b>	<b>Please answer the following about staff here:</b>		
		Yes	No
	Is there a member of staff you feel you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	55 (59%)	39 (41%)
	Do most staff treat you with respect?	54 (58%)	39 (42%)

## SECTION 6: HEALTH SERVICES

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Did you have a full health assessment the day after your arrival?</b>		
	Yes .....		72 (76%)
	No .....		14 (15%)
	Don't know .....		9 (9%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>What do you think of the overall quality of the health care?</b>		
	<i>I have not been to health care</i> .....		1 (1%)
	<i>Very good</i> .....		21 (22%)
	<i>Good</i> .....		37 (39%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....		23 (24%)
	<i>Bad</i> .....		9 (10%)
	<i>Very bad</i> .....		3 (3%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>Is it easy to see the following people if you need to?</b>		
		Yes	No
	The doctor .....	47 (49%)	35 (36%)
	The nurse .....	56 (58%)	29 (30%)
	The dentist .....	24 (25%)	59 (62%)
	The optician .....	22 (23%)	48 (51%)
	The pharmacist....	25 (26%)	38 (40%)
			<i>Don't know</i>
			14 (15%)
			11 (11%)
			12 (13%)
			25 (26%)
			32 (34%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep it in your cell?</b>		
	<i>I am not taking any medication</i> .....		37 (38%)
	Yes .....		27 (28%)
	No .....		19 (20%)
	Don't know .....		14 (14%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>Please answer the following about alcohol:</b>		
		Yes	No
	Did you have problems with alcohol when you first arrived here?	4 (4%)	92 (96%)
	Have you received any help with alcohol problems in this prison?	2 (2%)	94 (98%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>Please answer the following about drugs:</b>		
		Yes	No
	Did you have problems with drugs when you first arrived here?	27 (28%)	69 (72%)
	Do you have problems with drugs now?	11 (12%)	84 (88%)
	Have you received any help with drug problems in this prison?	10 (11%)	84 (89%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>How easy is it to get illegal drugs here?</b>		
	<i>Very easy</i> .....		4 (4%)
	<i>Easy</i> .....		3 (3%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....		5 (5%)

Difficult..... 1 (1%)  
 Very difficult ..... 18 (19%)  
 Don't know ..... 65 (68%)

**Q8 Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?**  
 Yes ..... 14 (14%)  
 No ..... 83 (86%)

**Q9 If you feel you have emotional or mental health problems, are you being helped by anyone here** (for example; a psychologist, doctor, counsellor, personal officer or another member of prison staff)?  
*I do not have any emotional or mental health problems*..... 83 (86%)  
 Yes ..... 9 (9%)  
 No ..... 5 (5%)

## SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS

**Q1 Do you know how to make an application?**  
 Yes ..... 88 (94%)  
 No ..... 6 (6%)

**Q2 Is it easy to make an application?**  
 Yes ..... 75 (80%)  
 No ..... 8 (9%)  
 Don't know ..... 11 (12%)

**Q3 Please answer the following questions about applications:**

	<i>I have not made one</i>	Yes	No
Do you feel applications are sorted out fairly?	20 (21%)	40 (42%)	36 (38%)
Do you feel applications are sorted out promptly? (Within seven days)	20 (21%)	31 (33%)	43 (46%)

**Q4 Do you know how to make a complaint?**  
 Yes ..... 82 (86%)  
 No ..... 13 (14%)

**Q5 Is it easy to make a complaint?**  
 Yes ..... 67 (71%)  
 No ..... 5 (5%)  
 Don't know ..... 23 (24%)

**Q6 Please answer the following questions about complaints:**

	<i>I have not made one</i>	Yes	No
Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	44 (46%)	20 (21%)	32 (33%)
Do you feel complaints are sorted out promptly? (Within seven days)	44 (47%)	24 (26%)	26 (28%)

**Q7 Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?**  
 Yes ..... 18 (19%)  
 No ..... 76 (81%)

<b>Q8</b>	<b>Can you speak to the following people when you need to?</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Don't know</b>
	A peer mentor/peer support/Listener	36 (39%)	18 (19%)	39 (42%)
	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)	28 (30%)	21 (23%)	44 (47%)
	An advocate (an outside person to help you)	33 (35%)	21 (23%)	39 (42%)

## SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE

<b>Q1</b>	<b>What level of the rewards and sanctions scheme are you on?</b>	
	<i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i> .....	2 (2%)
	<i>Enhanced (top)</i> .....	33 (35%)
	<i>Standard (middle)</i> .....	46 (48%)
	<i>Basic (bottom)</i> .....	11 (12%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	3 (3%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the rewards and sanctions scheme?</b>	
	<i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i> .....	2 (2%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	34 (37%)
	<i>No</i> .....	45 (48%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	12 (13%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>Do the different levels of the rewards and sanctions scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?</b>	
	<i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i> .....	2 (2%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	49 (52%)
	<i>No</i> .....	37 (39%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	6 (6%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Have you had a 'nicking' (adjudication) since you have been in this establishment?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	54 (57%)
	<i>No</i> .....	40 (43%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	0 (0%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>If you have had a 'nicking' (adjudication), was the process explained clearly to you?</b>	
	<i>I have not had an adjudication</i> .....	40 (43%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	43 (46%)
	<i>No</i> .....	10 (11%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>If you have been physically restrained (C and R), how many times has this happened since you have been in this establishment?</b>	
	<i>I have not been restrained</i> .....	63 (66%)
	<i>Once</i> .....	13 (14%)
	<i>Twice</i> .....	6 (6%)
	<i>Three times</i> .....	4 (4%)
	<i>More than three times</i> .....	9 (9%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>If you have spent a night in the care and separation unit (CSU), how were you treated by staff?</b>	
	<i>I have not been to the care and separation unit</i> .....	68 (74%)
	<i>Very well</i> .....	5 (5%)
	<i>Well</i> .....	6 (7%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....	6 (7%)



Badly..... 2 (2%)  
 Very badly..... 5 (5%)

## SECTION 9: SAFETY

**Q1 Have you ever felt unsafe in this establishment?**

Yes..... 21 (23%)  
 No..... 72 (77%)

**Q2 If you have ever felt unsafe, in which areas of this establishment do you/have you ever felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**

<i>Never felt unsafe</i> .....	72 (78%)	<i>At mealtimes</i> .....	7 (8%)
<i>Everywhere</i> .....	9 (10%)	<i>At health care</i> .....	3 (3%)
<i>Care and separation unit</i> .....	2 (2%)	<i>Visits area</i> .....	4 (4%)
<i>Association areas</i> .....	10 (11%)	<i>In wing showers</i> .....	7 (8%)
<i>Reception area</i> .....	4 (4%)	<i>In gym showers</i> .....	6 (7%)
<i>At the gym</i> .....	7 (8%)	<i>In corridors/stairwells</i> .....	8 (9%)
<i>In an exercise yard</i> .....	7 (8%)	<i>On your landing/wing</i> .....	5 (5%)
<i>At work</i> .....	5 (5%)	<i>In your cell</i> .....	3 (3%)
<i>At education</i> .....	9 (10%)		

**Q3 Has another young person or group of young people victimised you in this establishment? (E.g. insulted or assaulted you)**

Yes..... 13 (14%)  
 No..... 79 (86%)      **If No, go to question 6**

**Q4 If yes, what did the incidents involve/what were they about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**

<i>Insulting remarks (about you, your family or friends)</i> .....	7 (8%)	<i>Because of drugs</i> .....	0 (0%)
<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i> .....	7 (8%)	<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i> .....	3 (3%)
<i>Sexual abuse</i> .....	1 (1%)	<i>Because you were new here</i> .....	4 (4%)
<i>Because of your race or ethnic origin</i> .....	2 (2%)	<i>Because you are from a different part of the country</i> .....	2 (2%)
<i>Because of your religious beliefs</i> .....	0 (0%)	<i>Because of gang related issues</i> .....	2 (2%)
<i>Because you have a disability</i> .....	1 (1%)	<i>Because of my offence/crime</i> .....	1 (1%)

**Q6 Has a member of staff or group of staff victimised you in this establishment? (E.g. insulted or assaulted you)**

Yes..... 18 (20%)  
 No..... 71 (80%)      **If No, go to question 9**

**Q7 If yes, what did the incidents involve/what were they about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**

<i>Insulting remarks (about you, your family or friends)</i> .....	9 (10%)	<i>Because of drugs</i> .....	0 (0%)
<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i> .....	2 (2%)	<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i> .....	3 (3%)
<i>Sexual abuse</i> .....	1 (1%)	<i>Because you were new here</i> .....	6 (7%)
<i>Because of your race or ethnic origin</i> .....	3 (3%)	<i>Because you are from a different part of the country</i> .....	0 (0%)
<i>Because of your religious beliefs</i> .....	0 (0%)	<i>Because of gang related issues</i> .....	2 (2%)
<i>Because you have a disability</i> .....	0 (0%)	<i>Because of my offence/crime</i> .....	4 (5%)

<b>Q9</b>	<b>If you were being victimised who would you tell?</b>		
	<i>No one</i> .....	35 (42%)	<i>Teacher/education staff</i> ..... 3 (4%)
	<i>Personal officer</i> .....	22 (27%)	<i>Gym staff</i> ..... 5 (6%)
	<i>Wing officer</i> .....	17 (20%)	<i>Listener/Samaritan/Buddy</i> ..... 5 (6%)
	<i>Chaplain</i> .....	5 (6%)	<i>Another young person here</i> ..... 11 (13%)
	<i>Health care staff</i> .....	2 (2%)	<i>Family/friends</i> ..... 26 (31%)
<b>Q10</b>	<b>Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?</b>		
	<i>Yes</i> .....		26 (30%)
	<i>No</i> .....		35 (40%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....		27 (31%)
<b>Q11</b>	<b>Is shouting through the windows a problem here?</b>		
	<i>Yes</i> .....		29 (32%)
	<i>No</i> .....		53 (59%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....		8 (9%)
<b>Q12</b>	<b>Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?</b>		
	<i>Yes</i> .....		31 (34%)
	<i>No</i> .....		59 (66%)

## SECTION 10: ACTIVITIES

<b>Q1</b>	<b>How old were you when you were last at school?</b>		
	<i>14 or under</i> .....		32 (35%)
	<i>15 or over</i> .....		59 (65%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions about school:</b>		
		<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
		<i>Not applicable</i>	
	Have you ever been excluded from school?	82 (92%)	5 (6%)
	Did you used to truant from school?	54 (65%)	21 (25%)
		8 (10%)	
<b>Q3</b>	<b>Do you currently take part in any of the following activities? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>		
	<i>Education</i> .....		77 (87%)
	<i>A job in this establishment</i> .....		20 (22%)
	<i>Vocational or skills training</i> .....		24 (27%)
	<i>Offending behaviour programmes</i> .....		27 (30%)
	<i>I am not currently involved in any of these</i> .....		9 (10%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>If you have been involved in any of the following activities, in this establishment, do you think they will help you when you leave prison?</b>		
		<i>Not been involved</i>	<i>Yes</i>
		<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
	Education	5 (6%)	54 (61%)
	A job in this establishment	16 (22%)	30 (42%)
	Vocational or skills training	13 (19%)	31 (46%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	16 (23%)	20 (29%)
		17 (19%)	12 (14%)
		14 (19%)	12 (17%)
		11 (16%)	13 (19%)
		19 (28%)	14 (20%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>Do you usually have association every day?</b>		
	<i>Yes</i> .....		54 (61%)
	<i>No</i> .....		32 (36%)

Don't know ..... 2 (2%)

**Q6 How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?**

Don't want to go ..... 7 (8%)  
None ..... 10 (11%)  
One to two times ..... 44 (49%)  
Three to five times ..... 11 (12%)  
More than five times ..... 15 (17%)  
Don't know ..... 3 (3%)

**Q7 Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?**

Don't want to go ..... 5 (5%)  
Yes ..... 76 (84%)  
No ..... 8 (9%)  
Don't know ..... 2 (2%)

**SECTION 11: FAMILY AND FRIENDS**

**Q1 Are you able to use the telephone every day if you want to?**

Yes ..... 43 (48%)  
No ..... 45 (50%)  
Don't know ..... 2 (2%)

**Q2 Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?**

Yes ..... 50 (56%)  
No ..... 31 (35%)  
Don't know ..... 8 (9%)

**Q3 How easy is it for your family and friends to visit you here?**

Very easy ..... 13 (15%)  
Easy ..... 28 (31%)  
Neither ..... 19 (21%)  
Difficult ..... 15 (17%)  
Very difficult ..... 9 (10%)  
Don't know ..... 5 (6%)

**Q4 How many visits do you usually have each week, from family or friends?**

Not been here a week yet ..... 1 (1%)  
I don't get visits ..... 14 (15%)  
Less than one a week ..... 21 (23%)  
About one a week ..... 40 (44%)  
More than one a week ..... 5 (5%)  
Don't know ..... 10 (11%)

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

I don't get visits ..... 14 (16%)  
Yes ..... 23 (26%)  
No ..... 41 (47%)  
Don't know ..... 10 (11%)

**Q6 How are you and your family/friends usually treated by visits staff?**

I don't get visits ..... 14 (16%)  
Very well ..... 8 (9%)  
Well ..... 25 (28%)

<i>Neither</i> .....	20 (22%)
<i>Badly</i> .....	5 (6%)
<i>Very badly</i> .....	4 (4%)
<i>Don't know</i> .....	14 (16%)

## SECTION 12: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE

<b>Q1</b>	<b>When did you first meet your personal officer?</b>				
	<i>I still have not met him/her</i> .....	17	(19%)		
	<i>In your first week</i> .....	23	(26%)		
	<i>After your first week</i> .....	31	(34%)		
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	19	(21%)		
<b>Q2</b>	<b>How often do you see your personal officer?</b>				
	<i>I still have not met him/her</i> .....	17	(19%)		
	<i>At least once a week</i> .....	41	(47%)		
	<i>Less than once a week</i> .....	30	(34%)		
<b>Q3</b>	<b>Do you feel your personal officer has helped you?</b>				
	<i>I still have not met him/her</i> .....	17	(19%)		
	<i>Yes</i> .....	39	(44%)		
	<i>No</i> .....	32	(36%)		
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?</b>				
	<i>Yes</i> .....	39	(43%)		
	<i>No</i> .....	37	(41%)		
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	14	(16%)		
<b>Q5</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions about training plans, sentence plans or remand plans:</b>				
		<i>I don't have one</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
	Were you involved in the development of your plan?	37 (41%)	29 (32%)	3 (3%)	21 (23%)
	Do you understand the targets that have been set in your plan?	37 (42%)	31 (35%)	3 (3%)	18 (20%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>Has your YOT worker been in touch since you arrived at this establishment?</b>				
	<i>Yes</i> .....	72	(81%)		
	<i>No</i> .....	17	(19%)		
<b>Q7</b>	<b>Do you know how to get in touch with your YOT worker?</b>				
	<i>Yes</i> .....	58	(66%)		
	<i>No</i> .....	30	(34%)		
<b>Q8</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions about your release:</b>				
		<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>	
	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	30 (34%)	50 (57%)	8 (9%)	
	Are you planning on going to school or college after release?	57 (66%)	18 (21%)	11 (13%)	
	Do you have a job to go to on release?	17 (19%)	66 (74%)	6 (7%)	

- Q9 Do you know who to contact for help with any of the following problems, before your release? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**
- |  |          |
|--|----------|
| <i>Finding accommodation.....</i>          | 36 (42%) |
| <i>Getting into school or college.....</i> | 39 (45%) |
| <i>Getting a job .....</i>                 | 30 (35%) |
| <i>Help with money/finances .....</i>      | 25 (29%) |
| <i>Help with claiming benefits.....</i>    | 20 (23%) |
| <i>Continuing health services .....</i>    | 20 (23%) |
| <i>Opening a bank account.....</i>         | 26 (30%) |
| <i>Avoiding bad relationships .....</i>    | 21 (24%) |
| <i>I don't know who to contact.....</i>    | 36 (42%) |
- Q10 Do you think you will have a problem with any of the following things, when you are released? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**
- |  |          |
|--|----------|
| <i>Finding accommodation.....</i>          | 29 (35%) |
| <i>Getting into school or college.....</i> | 33 (39%) |
| <i>Getting a job .....</i>                 | 48 (57%) |
| <i>Money/finances .....</i>                | 41 (49%) |
| <i>Claiming benefits .....</i>             | 26 (31%) |
| <i>Continuing health services .....</i>    | 13 (15%) |
| <i>Opening a bank account.....</i>         | 21 (25%) |
| <i>Avoiding bad relationships .....</i>    | 18 (21%) |
| <i>I won't have any problems.....</i>      | 19 (23%) |
- Q11 What is most likely to stop you offending in the future? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**
- |   |          |   |          |
|---|----------|---|----------|
| <i>Not sentenced.....</i>                               | 31 (34%) | <i>Having a mentor (someone you can ask for advice) .....</i>       | 9 (10%)  |
| <i>Nothing, it is up to me .....</i>                    | 20 (22%) | <i>Having a YOT worker or social worker that I get on with.....</i> | 17 (19%) |
| <i>Making new friends outside.....</i>                  | 8 (9%)   | <i>Having children .....</i>  | 13 (14%) |
| <i>Going back to live with my family</i>                | 6 (7%)   | <i>Having something to do that isn't crime .....</i>                | 30 (33%) |
| <i>Getting a place of my own.....</i>                   | 27 (30%) | <i>This sentence .....</i>  | 20 (22%) |
| <i>Getting a job .....</i>                              | 36 (40%) | <i>Getting into school/college .....</i>                            | 24 (27%) |
| <i>Having a partner (girlfriend or boyfriend) .....</i> | 19 (21%) | <i>Talking about my offending behaviour with staff.....</i>         | 5 (6%)   |
| <i>Staying off alcohol/drugs .....</i>                  | 13 (14%) | <i>Anything else.....</i>   | 2 (2%)   |
- Q12 Do you want to stop offending?**
- |                            |          |
|----------------------------|----------|
| <i>Not sentenced .....</i> | 31 (35%) |
| <i>Yes .....</i>           | 50 (56%) |
| <i>No.....</i>             | 5 (6%)   |
| <i>Don't know .....</i>    | 3 (3%)   |
- Q13 Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you in this establishment, that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?**
- |                            |          |
|----------------------------|----------|
| <i>Not sentenced .....</i> | 31 (34%) |
| <i>Yes .....</i>           | 25 (27%) |
| <i>No.....</i>             | 35 (38%) |

## Survey responses from children and young people: HMYOI Cookham Wood 2011

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

### Key to tables

		HMYOI Cookham Wood	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Cookham Wood 2011	HMYOI Cookham Wood 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>100</b>	<b>839</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>105</b>
<b>SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU</b>					
1.1	Are you 18 years of age?	9%	14%	9%	5%
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	5%	6%	5%	7%
1.3	Is English your first language?	90%	89%	90%	86%
1.4	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other category)?	62%	39%	62%	57%
1.5	Are you Muslim?	30%	19%	30%	26%
1.6	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	6%	5%	6%	8%
1.7	Do you have any children?	12%	14%	12%	10%
1.8	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	10%	10%	10%	10%
1.9	Have you ever been in local authority care?	31%	27%	31%	30%
<b>SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE</b>					
2.1	Are you sentenced?	69%	75%	69%	63%
2.2	Is your sentence 12 months or less?	34%	36%	34%	31%
2.3	Have you been in this establishment for one month or less?	17%	20%	17%	20%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	55%	52%	55%	58%
<b>SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS</b>					
For your most recent journey, either to or from court or between prisons, we want to know:					
3.1	Was the van clean?	45%	42%	45%	47%
3.2	Did you feel safe?	81%	81%	81%	73%
3.3	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or anyone of a different gender?	34%	23%	34%	26%
3.4	Did you spend more than four hours in the van?	17%	7%	17%	8%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:					
3.5	Were you offered a toilet break if you needed it?	12%	14%	12%	8%
3.6	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	33%	32%	33%	14%
3.7	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	42%	52%	42%	46%
3.8	Before you arrived here (either from court or another establishment), were you told that you would be coming to this establishment?	81%	75%	81%	76%
3.9	Before you arrived here (either from court or another establishment), were you given written information about coming to this establishment?	13%	10%	13%	2%

## Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMYOI Cookham Wood	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Cookham Wood 2011	HMYOI Cookham Wood 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		100	839	100	105
<b>SECTION 4: YOUR FIRST FEW DAYS HERE</b>					
4.1	Were you in reception for less than two hours?	79%	79%	79%	78%
4.2	When you were searched was this carried out in an understanding way?	74%	79%	74%	74%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	55%	67%	55%	67%
When you first arrived, did staff ask if you needed help or support with any of the following:					
4.4a	Not being able to smoke?	52%	57%	52%	43%
4.4b	Loss of property?	25%	19%	25%	21%
4.4c	Housing problems?	22%	20%	22%	16%
4.4d	Needing protection from other young people?	40%	24%	40%	26%
4.4e	Letting family know where you are?	53%	59%	53%	64%
4.4f	Money worries?	28%	15%	28%	19%
4.4g	Feeling low/upset/needing someone to talk to?	48%	38%	48%	36%
4.4h	Health problems?	70%	56%	70%	58%
4.4i	Getting phone numbers?	47%	45%	47%	32%
4.5	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	80%	74%	80%	73%
When you first arrived, did you have problems with any of the following:					
4.5a	Not being able to smoke?	40%	49%	40%	36%
4.5b	Loss of property?	23%	14%	23%	27%
4.5c	Housing problems?	21%	15%	21%	22%
4.5d	Needing protection from other young people?	7%	9%	7%	7%
4.5e	Letting family know where you are?	33%	21%	33%	27%
4.5f	Money worries?	23%	19%	23%	32%
4.5g	Feeling low/upset/needing someone to talk to?	7%	18%	7%	20%
4.5h	Health problems?	18%	11%	18%	15%
4.5i	Getting phone numbers?	40%	31%	40%	36%
When you first arrived, were you given any of the following:					
4.6a	A reception pack?	65%	71%	65%	65%
4.6b	The opportunity to have a shower?	68%	35%	68%	46%
4.6c	Something to eat?	83%	78%	83%	83%
4.6d	A free phone call to friends/family?	55%	75%	55%	53%
4.6e	Information about the PIN telephone system?	49%	54%	49%	58%
4.6f	Information about feeling low/upset?	41%	30%	41%	30%

## Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMYOI Cookham Wood	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Cookham Wood 2011	HMYOI Cookham Wood 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		100	839	100	105
Within your first 24 hours, did you have access to the following people or services:					
4.7a	The chaplain or religious leader?	45%	44%	45%	34%
4.7b	A peer mentor, Listener or the Samaritans?	23%	21%	23%	20%
4.7c	Did you have access to the prison shop/canteen?	10%	16%	10%	8%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a member of health care staff?	73%	69%	73%	82%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	83%	78%	83%	71%
4.10	For those who have been on an induction course: did it cover everything you needed to know about the establishment?	70%	63%	70%	56%
<b>SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT</b>					
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	43%	73%	43%	42%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	33%	38%	33%	29%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	5%	20%	5%	7%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	33%	46%	33%	31%
5.5	Is it easy/very easy for you to attend religious services?	58%	57%	58%	46%
5.6a	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	64%	56%	64%	54%
5.6b	Can you speak to a religious leader in private if you want to?	72%	65%	72%	60%
5.7	Is there a member of staff you can turn to with a problem?	58%	65%	58%	51%
5.8	Do you feel that most of the staff here treat you with respect?	58%	63%	58%	55%
<b>SECTION 6: HEALTH SERVICES</b>					
6.1	Did you have a full health assessment the day after your arrival?	75%	62%	75%	66%
6.2	For those who have been to health care: do you think the overall quality is good/very good?	63%	61%	63%	60%
6.3a	Is it easy for you to see the doctor?	49%	53%	49%	39%
6.3b	Is it easy for you to see the nurse?	58%	75%	58%	57%
6.3c	Is it easy for you to see the dentist?	25%	33%	25%	21%
6.3d	Is it easy for you to see the optician?	23%	26%	23%	13%
6.3e	Is it easy for you to see the pharmacist?	26%	27%	26%	16%
6.4	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep it in your cell?	44%	33%	44%	23%
6.5a	Did you have any problems with alcohol when you first arrived?	4%	14%	4%	3%
6.5b	Have you received any help with any alcohol problems here?	2%	7%	2%	2%
6.6a	Did you have any problems with drugs when you first arrived?	28%	36%	28%	25%
6.6b	Do you have any problems with drugs now?	11%	9%	11%	10%
6.6c	Have you received any help with any drug problems here?	11%	22%	11%	6%
6.7	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs here?	7%	19%	7%	14%
6.8	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	15%	27%	15%	29%
6.9	If you feel you have emotional or mental health problems, are you being helped by anyone here?	65%	46%	65%	47%



## Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMYOI Cookham Wood	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Cookham Wood 2011	HMYOI Cookham Wood 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		100	839	100	105
<b>SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS</b>					
7.1	Do you know how to make an application?	94%	85%	94%	83%
7.2	Is it easy to make an application?	80%	75%	80%	68%
For those who have made an application:					
7.3a	Do you feel applications are sorted out fairly?	53%	69%	53%	43%
7.3b	Do you feel applications are sorted out promptly (within seven days)?	42%	63%	42%	37%
7.4	Do you know how to make a complaint?	86%	81%	86%	90%
7.5	Is it easy to make a complaint?	70%	62%	70%	66%
For those who have made a complaint:					
7.6a	Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	39%	35%	39%	22%
7.6b	Do you feel complaints are sorted out promptly (within seven days)?	48%	42%	48%	21%
7.7	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	20%	17%	20%	20%
Can you speak to the following people when you need to:					
7.8a	A peer mentor or Listener?	39%	31%	39%	25%
7.8b	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)	30%	26%	30%	32%
7.8c	An advocate (an outside person to help you)	36%	34%	36%	39%
<b>SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE</b>					
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	35%	27%	35%	25%
8.2	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	37%	47%	37%	38%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	52%	52%	52%	47%
8.4	Have you had a 'nicking' (adjudication) since you have been here?	58%	58%	58%	57%
8.5	Was the 'nicking' (adjudication) process explained clearly to you?	81%	83%	81%	78%
8.6	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	33%	38%	33%	39%
8.7	For those who had spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit: did the staff treat you well/very well?	45%	48%	45%	54%
<b>SECTION 9: SAFETY</b>					
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	23%	32%	23%	44%
9.3	Has another young person or group of young people victimised (insulted or assaulted) you here?	15%	27%	15%	33%
If you have felt victimised by another young person/group of young people, did the incident involve:					
9.4a	Insulting remarks?	7%	16%	7%	19%
9.4b	Physical abuse?	7%	11%	7%	15%
9.4c	Sexual abuse?	1%	1%	1%	6%
9.4d	Racial or ethnic abuse?	2%	4%	2%	4%
9.4e	Your religious beliefs?	0%	3%	0%	5%

## Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMYOI Cookham Wood	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Cookham Wood 2011	HMYOI Cookham Wood 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		100	839	100	105
9.4f	Your disability?	1%	1%	1%	2%
9.4g	Drugs?	0%	3%	0%	4%
9.4h	Having your canteen/property taken?	4%	7%	4%	10%
9.4i	Because you were new here?	5%	10%	5%	14%
9.4j	Being from a different part of the country than others?	2%	5%	2%	6%
9.4k	Gang related issues?	2%	6%	2%	13%
9.4l	Your offence/crime?	1%	4%	1%	6%
9.6	Has a member of staff or group of staff victimised (insulted or assaulted) you here?	21%	25%	21%	31%
If you have felt victimised by a member of staff/group of staff members, did the incident involve:					
9.7a	Insulting remarks?	10%	16%	10%	15%
9.7b	Physical abuse?	2%	5%	2%	9%
9.7c	Sexual abuse?	1%	1%	1%	5%
9.7d	Racial or ethnic abuse?	4%	4%	4%	13%
9.7e	Your religious beliefs?	0%	3%	0%	3%
9.7f	Your disability?	0%	1%	0%	2%
9.7g	Drugs?	0%	3%	0%	2%
9.7h	Having your canteen/property taken?	4%	3%	4%	3%
9.7i	Because you were new here?	7%	4%	7%	7%
9.7j	Being from a different part of the country than others?	0%	4%	0%	4%
9.7k	Gang related issues?	2%	1%	2%	0%
9.7l	Your offence/crime?	5%	3%	5%	1%
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?	58%	57%	58%	52%
9.10	If you did tell a member of staff that you were being victimised do you think it would be taken seriously?	30%	29%	30%	29%
9.11	Is shouting through the windows a problem here?	32%	43%	32%	38%
9.12	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	34%	35%	34%	40%
<b>SECTION 10: ACTIVITIES</b>					
10.1	Were you 14 or younger when you were last at school?	35%	38%	35%	30%
10.2a	Have you ever been excluded from school?	93%	87%	93%	91%
10.2b	Have you ever truanted from school?	65%	71%	65%	61%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:					
10.3a	Education?	87%	76%	87%	84%
10.3b	A job in this establishment?	22%	33%	22%	19%
10.3c	Vocational or skills training?	27%	20%	27%	16%

### Key to tables

		HMYOI Cookham Wood	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Cookham Wood 2011	HMYOI Cookham Wood 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>100</b>	<b>839</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>105</b>
<b>10.3d</b>	Offending behaviour programmes?	<b>30%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>18%</b>
For those who have taken part in the following activities while in this prison: do you think that they will help you when you leave prison?					
<b>10.4a</b>	Education?	<b>65%</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>47%</b>
<b>10.4b</b>	A job in this establishment?	<b>54%</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>39%</b>
<b>10.4c</b>	Vocational or skills training?	<b>56%</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>39%</b>
<b>10.4d</b>	Offending behaviour programmes?	<b>38%</b>	<b>51%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>39%</b>
<b>10.5</b>	Do you usually have association every day?	<b>61%</b>	<b>69%</b>	<b>61%</b>	<b>46%</b>
<b>10.6</b>	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	<b>17%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>14%</b>
<b>10.7</b>	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	<b>84%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>80%</b>
<b>SECTION 11: KEEPING IN TOUCH WITH FAMILY AND FRIENDS</b>					
<b>11.1</b>	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	<b>48%</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>51%</b>
<b>11.2</b>	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	<b>56%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>44%</b>
<b>11.3</b>	Is it easy/very easy for your family and friends to visit you here?	<b>46%</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>48%</b>
<b>11.4</b>	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	<b>50%</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>38%</b>
<b>11.5</b>	Do your visits start on time?	<b>26%</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>30%</b>
<b>11.6</b>	Are you and your visitors treated well/very well by visits staff?	<b>37%</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>40%</b>
<b>SECTION 12: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE</b>					
For those who have met their personal officer:					
<b>12.1</b>	Did you meet your personal officer within the first week?	<b>32%</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>34%</b>
<b>12.2</b>	Do you see your personal officer at least once a week?	<b>58%</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>53%</b>
<b>12.3</b>	Do you feel your personal officer has helped you?	<b>55%</b>	<b>57%</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>49%</b>
<b>12.4</b>	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	<b>44%</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>40%</b>
For those with a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan:					
<b>12.5a</b>	Were you involved in the development of your plan?	<b>55%</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>55%</b>
<b>12.5b</b>	Do you understand the targets set in your plan?	<b>60%</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>67%</b>
<b>12.6</b>	Has your YOT worker been in touch with you since your arrival here?	<b>81%</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>80%</b>
<b>12.7</b>	Do you know how to get in touch with your YOT worker?	<b>66%</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>65%</b>
Please answer the following about your preparation for release:					
<b>12.8</b>	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	<b>34%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>41%</b>
<b>12.8</b>	Are you going to school or college on release?	<b>66%</b>	<b>59%</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>69%</b>
<b>12.8</b>	Do you have a job to go to on release?	<b>19%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>12%</b>

**Key to tables**

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMYOI Cookham Wood	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Cookham Wood 2011	HMYOI Cookham Wood 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		100	839	100	105
Do you know who to contact for help with the following in preparation for your release:					
12.9	Finding accommodation	42%	37%	42%	34%
12.9	Getting into school or college	46%	45%	46%	44%
12.9	Getting a job	35%	41%	35%	31%
12.9	Help with money/finances	29%	32%	29%	28%
12.9	Help with claiming benefits	23%	27%	23%	23%
12.9	Continuing health services	23%	21%	23%	19%
12.9	Opening a bank account	30%	29%	30%	25%
12.9	Avoiding bad relationships	24%	24%	24%	18%
Do you think you will have a problem with the following, when you are released:					
12.10	Finding accommodation?	35%	25%	35%	38%
12.10	Getting into school or college?	40%	28%	40%	47%
12.10	Getting a job?	57%	49%	57%	60%
12.10	Help with money/finances?	49%	41%	49%	48%
12.10	Help with claiming benefits?	31%	27%	31%	35%
12.10	Continuing health services?	16%	13%	16%	15%
12.10	Opening a bank account?	25%	18%	25%	23%
12.10	Avoiding bad relationships?	22%	20%	22%	24%
For those who were sentenced:					
12.12	Do you want to stop offending?	86%	90%	86%	90%
12.13	Have you done anything or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?	42%	45%	42%	37%

## Diversity comparator (ethnicity/religion) HMYOI Cookham Wood 2011

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

### Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic young people	White young people	Muslim young people	Non-Muslim young people
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>60</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>69</b>
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	3%	5%	3%	6%
1.3	Is English your first language?	86%	98%	71%	98%
1.4	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?			97%	46%
1.5	Are you Muslim?	46%	2%		
1.6	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	0%	16%	0%	9%
1.9	Have you ever been in local authority care?	29%	36%	31%	29%
2.1	Are you sentenced?	66%	73%	77%	65%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	51%	61%	59%	53%
3.3	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or anyone of a different gender?	27%	42%	31%	34%
3.7	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	43%	38%	49%	41%
3.8	Before you arrived here, were you told that you would be coming to this establishment?	89%	70%	83%	79%
4.2	When you were searched was this carried out in an understanding way?	74%	74%	71%	73%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	53%	56%	54%	53%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a member of health care staff?	78%	61%	80%	69%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	89%	74%	83%	83%
4.10	Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the establishment?	72%	68%	71%	70%
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	36%	54%	34%	47%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	36%	29%	42%	29%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	3%	9%	0%	8%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	29%	40%	37%	32%

### Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic young people	White young people	Muslim young people	Non-Muslim young people
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>60</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>5.6a</b>	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	69%	57%	80%	60%
<b>5.7</b>	Is there a member of staff you can turn to with a problem?	53%	67%	50%	62%
<b>5.8</b>	Do you feel that most of the staff here treat you with respect?	54%	68%	56%	60%
<b>6.3a</b>	Is it easy for you to see the doctor?	45%	57%	49%	49%
<b>6.3b</b>	Is it easy for you to see the nurse?	59%	60%	63%	56%
<b>6.7</b>	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs here?	6%	12%	3%	9%
<b>6.8</b>	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	7%	28%	6%	18%
<b>7.2</b>	Is it easy to make an application?	81%	76%	76%	82%
<b>7.5</b>	Is it easy to make a complaint?	71%	69%	82%	68%
<b>8.1</b>	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	32%	36%	22%	39%
<b>8.2</b>	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	27%	50%	33%	39%
<b>8.3</b>	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	43%	62%	44%	56%
<b>8.4</b>	Have you had a 'nicking' (adjudication) since you have been here?	66%	43%	63%	54%
<b>8.6</b>	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	41%	23%	44%	29%
<b>9.1</b>	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	20%	26%	12%	29%
<b>9.3</b>	Has another young person or group of young people victimised (insulted or assaulted) you here?	11%	19%	7%	18%
If you have felt victimised by another young person/group of young people, did the incident involve:					
<b>9.4d</b>	Racial or ethnic abuse?	0%	5%	0%	3%
<b>9.4e</b>	Your religious beliefs?	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>9.6</b>	Has a member of staff or group of staff victimised (insulted or assaulted) you here?	28%	12%	29%	17%
If you have felt victimised by a member of staff/group of staff, did the incident involve:					
<b>9.5d</b>	Racial or ethnic abuse?	3%	2%	3%	3%

### Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic young people	White young people	Muslim young people	Non-Muslim young people
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>60</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>9.5e</b>	Your religious beliefs?	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>9.9</b>	If you were being victimised by another young person or a member of staff would you be able to tell anyone about it?	51%	66%	37%	66%
<b>9.10</b>	If you did tell a member of staff that you were being victimised do you think it would be taken seriously?	23%	36%	20%	34%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:					
<b>10.3a</b>	Education?	87%	85%	88%	85%
<b>10.3b</b>	A job in this establishment?	21%	25%	16%	26%
<b>10.3c</b>	Vocational or skills training?	36%	15%	31%	25%
<b>10.3d</b>	Offending behaviour programmes?	30%	33%	23%	32%
<b>10.5</b>	Do you usually have association everyday?	59%	68%	60%	60%
<b>10.6</b>	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	15%	18%	16%	18%
<b>10.7</b>	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	83%	85%	88%	83%
<b>11.1</b>	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	42%	56%	42%	49%
<b>11.2</b>	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	58%	54%	55%	56%
<b>11.3</b>	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	49%	49%	41%	55%
<b>12.3</b>	Do you feel your personal officer has helped you?	50%	62%	48%	59%
<b>12.4</b>	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	41%	51%	31%	47%
<b>12.5b</b>	Do you understand the targets set in your plan?	64%	56%	50%	61%
<b>12.6a</b>	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	32%	37%	27%	38%
<b>12.6b</b>	Are you going to school or college on release?	75%	49%	76%	64%
<b>12.14</b>	Have you done anything or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?	42%	45%	33%	48%

## Key questions (disability analysis) HMYOI Cookham Wood 2011

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

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	<b>Consider themselves to have a disability</b>	<b>Do not consider themselves to have a disability</b>
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>10</b>	<b>86</b>
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	0%	6%
1.3	Is English your first language?	100%	90%
1.4	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other category)?	33%	65%
1.5	Are you Muslim?	8%	31%
1.6	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	8%	6%
2.1	Are you sentenced?	83%	67%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	33%	57%
3.3	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or anyone of a different gender?	8%	35%
3.7	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	33%	46%
3.8	Before you arrived here, were you told that you would be coming to this establishment?	100%	80%
4.2	When you were searched was this carried out in an understanding way?	55%	76%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	42%	55%
4.4e	When you first arrived, did staff ask if you needed help or support with letting family know where you were?	42%	55%
4.4g	When you first arrived, did staff ask if you needed help or support with feeling low/upset/needing someone to talk to?	50%	47%
4.4h	When you first arrived, did staff ask if you needed help or support with health problems?	67%	69%
4.5	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	100%	79%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a member of health care staff?	58%	73%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	67%	84%
4.10	Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the establishment?	55%	71%



### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	<b>Consider themselves to have a disability</b>	<b>Do not consider themselves to have a disability</b>
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	33%	43%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	8%	36%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	0%	6%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	42%	31%
5.6a	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	42%	68%
5.7	Is there a member of staff you can turn to with a problem?	58%	57%
5.8	Do you feel that most of the staff here treat you with respect?	42%	59%
6.3a	Is it easy for you to see the doctor?	46%	49%
6.3b	Is it easy for you to see the nurse?	42%	59%
6.4	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep it in your cell?	42%	46%
6.8	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	42%	11%
6.9	If you feel you have emotional or mental health problems, are you being helped by anyone here?	80%	55%
7.2	Is it easy to make an application?	83%	81%
7.5	Is it easy to make a complaint?	67%	72%
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	33%	35%
8.4	Have you had a 'nicking' (adjudication) since you have been here?	67%	56%
8.6	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	42%	34%
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	64%	18%
9.3	Has another young person or group of young people victimised (insulted or assaulted) you here?	42%	11%
9.4f	Has another young person or group of young people victimised (insulted or assaulted) you because you have a disability?	8%	0%
9.6	Has a member of staff or group of staff victimised (insulted or assaulted) you here?	33%	19%

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	<b>Consider themselves to have a disability</b>	<b>Do not consider themselves to have a disability</b>
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>9.7f</b>	Has a member of staff or group of staff victimised (insulted or assaulted) you because you have a disability?		
<b>9.9</b>	If you were being victimised by another young person or a member of staff would you be able to tell anyone about it?	<b>50%</b>	<b>60%</b>
<b>9.10</b>	If you did tell a member of staff that you were being victimised do you think it would be taken seriously?	<b>33%</b>	<b>31%</b>
<b>9.12</b>	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	<b>50%</b>	<b>30%</b>
<b>10.3a</b>	Do you currently take part in education?	<b>100%</b>	<b>85%</b>
<b>10.3b</b>	Do you currently have a job in this establishment?	<b>42%</b>	<b>21%</b>
<b>10.3c</b>	Do you currently take part in vocational or skills training?	<b>42%</b>	<b>25%</b>
<b>10.3d</b>	Do you currently take part in offending behaviour programmes?	<b>50%</b>	<b>28%</b>
<b>10.5</b>	Do you usually have association every day?	<b>50%</b>	<b>62%</b>
<b>10.6</b>	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	<b>17%</b>	<b>17%</b>
<b>10.7</b>	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	<b>83%</b>	<b>83%</b>
<b>11.1</b>	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	<b>8%</b>	<b>51%</b>
<b>12.3</b>	If you have a personal officer, do you feel your personal officer has helped you?	<b>86%</b>	<b>51%</b>
<b>12.5a</b>	For those with a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan: were you involved in the development of your plan?	<b>56%</b>	<b>54%</b>
<b>12.5b</b>	For those with a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan: do you understand the targets set in your plan?	<b>75%</b>	<b>57%</b>
<b>12.8</b>	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	<b>42%</b>	<b>34%</b>