

Report on an unannounced inspection of

HMYOI Cookham Wood

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

7-17 May 2013

Glossary of terms

We try to make our reports as clear as possible, but if you find terms that you do not know, please see the Glossary of terms on our website at:
http://www.justice.gov.uk/downloads/about/hmipris/Glossary-for-web-rps_.pdf

Crown copyright 2013

You may re-use this information (excluding logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, visit <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/> or email: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk

Where we have identified any third party copyright material you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at the address below or:
hmiprisons.enquiries@hmiprisons.gsi.gov.uk

This publication is available for download at: <http://www.justice.gov.uk/about/hmi-prisons>

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

Contents

Introduction	5
Fact page	7
About this inspection and report	9
Summary	11
Section 1. Safety	17
Section 2. Respect	31
Section 3. Purposeful activity	43
Section 4. Resettlement	51
Section 5. Summary of recommendations and housekeeping points	59
Section 6. Appendices	67
Appendix I: Inspection team	67
Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report	69
Appendix III: Establishment population profile	75
Appendix IV: Summary of children and young people questionnaires and interviews	79

Introduction

Cookham Wood, located in Kent, is a closed custodial facility holding both remanded and sentenced boys under 18. With a catchment area that has been expanded to cover much of southern England, including the South West, it holds just over 130 young people in an ageing facility dating from the 1970s. At the time of our inspection, significant redevelopment was taking place with new accommodation due to open in late 2013.

When we last inspected in late 2011, we found an institution that was much improved from the very low base observed when Cookham first started accepting juveniles in 2008. This inspection found that improvements had been sustained and built upon. Cookham Wood is a well-led institution ensuring at least reasonable or better outcomes across our four tests of a healthy prison.

Overall we found Cookham to be a reasonably safe institution, although arguably this was the area where least progress had been made. The challenges posed by this client group are not underestimated, and although there was evidence of some reduction in the level of violence, and relatively little was serious, it remained too high. The institution's own analysis suggested a growth in the throughput of young people had contributed greatly to this challenge, but it had not remained passive. Structures to promote safety, ranging from violence reduction and anti-bullying to safeguarding and child protection, were deeply embedded and effective. Young people were received well into the institution and, as well as traditional strategies to promote safety, it was also trying out creative and innovative ideas, sometimes engaging peer support. There will be value in seeking to develop and evaluate these initiatives to go forward.

An exception to this positive picture were the measures to prevent suicide and self-harm. Despite the tragic death of a young person in 2012, some arrangements were surprisingly lacklustre and needed improvement. Use of force remained high, reflecting the levels of violence, but in many incidents it was used minimally, and overall supervision was good. Separation was managed through the Phoenix unit, and young people were reasonably well supported there. Supervision was multidisciplinary, care planning was developing and relationships were constructive. And yet there were limitations to the support the unit could offer, and some young people spent too long separated with a limited regime. Services to address substance misuse were poor, although demand was not great.

Cookham is a respectful institution with that quality modelled from the top. The environment is not ideal but standards were generally adequate and access to amenities reasonable. Relationships between young people were mostly good, supported by meaningful consultation, although of concern was the evidence to suggest that young people felt less respected. Arrangements to promote diversity were generally adequate, and provision of health care was good. The quality of food was not appreciated by young people, with some justification, and arrangements for how it was served required improvement.

Outcomes concerning the provision of work and education remained reasonably good, although improvements in management were required. There was sufficient activity for all but some was underused, and poor behaviour in education was limiting some progress. The curriculum was, however, broad and relevant, and overall success rates were good. Workshops were well resourced and the quality of learning in vocational training was good.

The institution's resettlement work, which we commended when we last inspected, had improved further and was impressive. Young people were engaged in the planning of their sentences, and all arrangements were focused and predicated meaningfully on individual need. An overarching analysis of need informed provision and ensured resettlement services were coherent. Release on temporary licence was used confidently to support resettlement and, commendably, the institution had made some attempt to measure the outcomes in the community post-release.

This is a good report about an institution that has made real progress, despite needing to manage challenging young people in a poor environment. The redevelopment of Cookham Wood is a great opportunity and we endorse the institution's plans that clearly envisage old accommodation closing as new is opened. Cookham Wood is led by a thoughtful and responsive management team. It is focused on the needs of young people, is creative and values-led. Importantly, it is optimistic about what can be done, which ensures staff retain high expectation of young people.

Nick Hardwick
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

July 2013

Fact page

Task of the establishment

HMYOI Cookham Wood holds male sentenced and remanded young people.

Establishment status

Public

Region

Kent, Surrey and Sussex

Number held

131

Certified normal accommodation

131

Operational capacity

131

Date of last full inspection

November 2011

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 has gradually increased and the full operational capacity has now 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.

Name of governor

Emily Thomas

Escort contractor

GEOAmey

Health service commissioner and provider

Commissioner: NHS England

Provider: HM Prison Service

Learning and skills provider

CfBT Education Trust

Independent Monitoring Board chair

Carol Thomson

About this inspection and report

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.

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

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

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

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 prisoners 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.

Our assessments might result in one of the following:

- **recommendations:** will require significant change and/or new or redirected resources, so are not immediately achievable, and will be reviewed for implementation at future inspections
- **housekeeping points:** achievable within a matter of days, or at most weeks, through the issue of instructions or changing routines
- **examples of good practice:** impressive practice that not only meets or exceeds our expectations, but could be followed by other similar establishments to achieve positive outcomes for children and young people.

Five key sources of evidence are used by inspectors: observation; children and young people surveys; discussions with children and young people; discussions with staff and relevant third parties; and documentation. During inspections we use a mixed-method approach to data gathering and analysis, applying both qualitative and quantitative methodologies. Evidence from different sources is triangulated to strengthen the validity of our assessments.

Since April 2013, the majority of our inspections have been full follow-ups of previous inspections, with most unannounced. Previously, inspections were either full (a new inspection of the establishment), full follow-ups (a new inspection of the establishment with an assessment of whether recommendations at the previous inspection had been achieved and investigation of any areas of serious concern previously identified) or short follow-ups (where there were comparatively fewer concerns and establishments were assessed as making either sufficient or insufficient progress against the previous recommendations).

This report

This explanation of our approach is followed by a summary of our inspection findings against the four healthy prison tests. There then follow four sections each containing a detailed account of our findings against our *Expectations. Criteria for assessing the treatment of children and young people and conditions in prisons*. The reference numbers at the end of some recommendations indicate that they are repeated, and provide the paragraph location of the previous recommendation in the last report. Section 5 collates all recommendations, housekeeping points and examples of good practice arising from the inspection. Appendix II lists the recommendations from the previous inspection, and our assessment of whether they have been achieved.

Details of the inspection team and the establishment population profile can be found in Appendices I and III respectively.

Findings from the survey of children and young people and a detailed description of the survey methodology can be found in Appendix IV of this report. Please note that we only refer to comparisons with other comparable establishments or previous inspections when these are statistically significant.¹

¹ The significance level is set at 0.05, which means that there is only a 5% chance that the difference in results is due to chance.

Summary

Safety

- S1 *Early days procedures were good and the safeguarding and child protection arrangements had improved. Although the incidence of self-harm was low, improvements were required to the documentation and the level of training provided. Apart from some routine strip-searching, security measures were proportionate. The level of violence remained high, but there were few serious injuries and little bullying took place. A creative approach was being developed towards managing behaviour and tackling violence. Use of force was high but it was well governed. Aspects of the Phoenix unit remained good but some of the procedures needed to be improved. Substance misuse services were inadequate. **Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***
- S2 *At the last inspection in November 2011, we found that outcomes for children and young people at HMYOI Cookham Wood were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 15 recommendations about safety. At this follow-up inspection, we found that four of the recommendations had been achieved, three had been partially achieved and eight had not been achieved.*
- S3 Young people spent too long on escort vehicles and late arrivals continued to be a significant problem. The reception area and the first night centre provided a welcoming environment and helped create an appropriate atmosphere for new arrivals. All newly admitted young people were routinely strip-searched.
- S4 The first night procedures were comprehensive and there was an appropriate emphasis on assessing risk, with good handover arrangements to ensure continuity of care. Induction was interactive, run at the right pace and covered everything young people needed to know about Cookham Wood.
- S5 Working relationships between the establishment and the local authority social services department were good.
- S6 Data collection and analysis relating to safeguarding were efficient and this material was used effectively at quarterly and monthly safeguarding meetings. The safer regimes meeting provided a regular opportunity for multidisciplinary discussions about young people who were causing most concern. The team around the child approach to care planning was still in the early stages of development but was a promising initiative.
- S7 The arrangements to make child protection referrals to the relevant local authority were robust and young people were always informed of the outcome. If the local authority decided not to pursue a referral, internal investigations were carried out appropriately and, where necessary, the governor took robust action.
- S8 The incidence of bullying was low and, although few support documents were opened, the actions taken to protect victims were reasonable. The level of fights and assaults remained high but there was evidence of a reduction since the last inspection. The number of serious incidents and serious injuries was low. The keep-apart list was used effectively to help reduce conflict, and some young people told us that it made them feel safer. The attempts to reduce violence using some creative and thoughtful initiatives, including the violence interrupters,

Surviving Our Streets and team around the child, were commendable. Although it was too early to make a judgement about their effectiveness, the early signs were positive.

- S9 Little self-harm took place. Young people who had been on ACCTs (assessment, care in custody and teamwork) expressed mixed views about their experience and some said they felt uncared for and unsupported. We were concerned that levels of staff training in safer custody were low and that the quality of some of the ACCT documentation was not good enough. Emergency procedures were reinforced positively but not all staff were prepared to enter cells in patrol state to preserve life.
- S10 Given the fairly recent self-inflicted death, the increase in use of constant supervision was understandable. The environment and care that we observed during this procedure remained a concern.
- S11 There was an extensive behaviour management strategy but it was too complicated. The rules of the establishment were explained thoroughly to young people and reinforced. There was some evidence of unofficial short-term punishments involving the removal of televisions and other losses. These measures were subject only to staff discretion and there was no proper managerial oversight.
- S12 Young people expressed mixed views about how motivational the rewards and sanctions scheme was. The scheme was very complicated and needed to be streamlined. Steps were being taken to review these arrangements.
- S13 There was a clear focus throughout the establishment on trying to make the prison a safe place and staff in the security department worked well with other departments to achieve this. Security measures were broadly proportionate. High levels of security information were processed efficiently but the required actions were often not completed within the deadlines set.
- S14 The number of adjudications was high. Young people felt they were dealt with fairly and the records sampled reinforced this view.
- S15 Use of force remained high, although much of it consisted of low-level physical coercion and reflected the high number of violent incidents. Impressive amounts of data were collated and used to identify trends and patterns. There was good oversight of the use of force, although some of the records sampled lacked sufficient detail. Planned interventions were managed well and CCTV footage indicated that staff responded appropriately to incidents.
- S16 The Phoenix unit was where young people were located for care and separation, and some elements of it worked well. Its dual purpose was complex and elements of it worked well. Staff on the unit dealt patiently and kindly with some challenging young people and each young person had a basic care plan. However, the regime was limited and some young people experienced extended stays on the unit which we were not confident were necessary in every case.
- S17 The substance misuse service was poor. Although the level of need was mostly low, outcomes for young people with both drug- and alcohol-related problems were not good enough. We were, however, satisfied that suitable new service provision would be introduced within the next few weeks.

Respect

*S18 Despite the poor design of the buildings, the living environment was adequate. Young people had sufficient access to showers and telephones. The relationships young people had with staff were good and particularly good with some specialist staff, such as the caseworkers. The consultation arrangements were extremely good but young people had little faith in the applications and complaints procedures. Matters relating to diversity were managed effectively. Young people had access to very good health care services. The quality of the food was poor. **Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***

S19 At the last inspection in November 2011, we found that outcomes for children and young people at HMYOI Cookham Wood were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 12 recommendations about respect.² At this follow-up inspection we found that three of the recommendations had been achieved, two had been partially achieved and seven had not been achieved.

S20 Communal areas were grubby and required maintenance. Most cells were clean but some contained graffiti and displays of offensive material. Young people had better access to showers and telephones than at the last inspection. Applications were frequently not responded to and often took too long. Young people on remand were not able to wear their own clothes.

S21 Staff knew the young people well and the interactions we observed between officers and young people were generally good. However, on a few occasions staff failed to challenge young people who used inappropriate language. The young people's council worked well, was taken seriously and had the confidence of young people. Young people considered their caseworker, rather than their personal officer, as the person they could approach to discuss personal issues and these arrangements worked effectively.

S22 Equality action team meetings took place regularly. Due attention was paid to the SMART data and out-of-range results were always examined. In our survey, 14% of black and minority ethnic young people said they had been victimised by staff because of their race or ethnic origin and some young people told us that they perceived some staff to be racist. We did not find any evidence of discrimination by staff, but managers planned to understand and address the issues behind the negative views of black and minority ethnic young people. Foreign national young people were identified quickly following their admission. Links with the UK Border Agency (now known as Home Office Immigration Enforcement) had improved and a representative now attended the establishment regularly to speak to young people. Identification of young people with disabilities had improved and information about young people with disabilities and their needs was now available to all staff.

S23 The chaplains worked well as a team to share and make use of the resources available to them. Despite staff shortages, they continued to be visible around the establishment and young people were positive about their contribution.

S24 The number of complaints had reduced since our last inspection but some of the issues raised could have been dealt with through less formal methods. Responses to complaints were timely and appropriate.

² This included recommendations about the incentives and earned privileges scheme which, in our updated Expectations (Version 4, 2012), now appear under the healthy prison area of safety.

- S25 Young people had free and confidential access to their legal advisers through telephone calls and legal visits, though the facility for confidential legal visits was still not properly advertised. There were arrangements in place to ensure that young people had a clear understanding about the nature of their sentence.
- S26 Young people generally expressed satisfaction with the health care services. Although the health needs analysis was out of date, the local initiative to assess the need for speech and language therapy was commendable. Clinical governance was effective but the health care environment was congested and the range of activities being delivered had outgrown the space available. Reception health screening included learning disability, which was good. There was prompt access to a broad range of age-appropriate clinics with exceptionally short waiting times, and an assertive approach to vaccination and health promotion. There was a low did-not-attend rate for clinics. Pharmacy and dental services were very good and mental health services were particularly good.
- S27 Food was very unpopular with young people and we agreed that the quality was poor. Young people felt that being served some of their meals at the cell door was disrespectful.

Purposeful activity

- S28 *Allocation procedures were efficient and the curriculum was broad. Not all teaching was planned well enough. Behaviour in class was mostly managed well but, despite this, poor behaviour did limit the progress young people could make. The quality of learning in vocational training was good. Achievement rates were also good. Young people continued to have good access to PE but opportunities to spend time in the library had reduced. **Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***
- S29 *At the last inspection in November 2011, we found that outcomes for children and young people at HMYOI Cookham Wood were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 12 recommendations about purposeful activity. At this follow-up inspection we found that seven of the recommendations had been achieved, one had been partially achieved, three had not been achieved and one was no longer relevant.*

- S30 The introduction of a standardised core day had resulted in a more complex daily timetable, but most young people had over eight hours out of their cell each day. During checks we found few young people locked in their cells during the day. Time unlocked was less at the weekend for all young people and the regime for young people on loss of association and dining out was very restricted, with some individuals only having two hours out of their cell each day. Exercise was limited to 30 minutes a day during the week, which was not enough.
- S31 There had been some recent positive changes in education, including the introduction of functional skills in English and maths and staff training to differentiate learning activities, to meet the wide range of abilities. Quality improvement processes across learning and skills remained undeveloped. The management of data was good, with standardised systems to collect and analyse a wide range of data that were used to review performance and set improvement targets.
- S32 Young people had access to a broad and relevant curriculum. The range and levels of qualifications had improved since the last inspection, providing qualifications from entry to level 3 in some subjects. However, English for speakers of other languages provision for the small number of young people requiring it was insufficient. Vocational training provided young people with a suitably wide choice of subjects to meet their needs and interests.

Allocation to activity was efficient and almost all young people were placed in one of their chosen pathways.

- S33 The quality of learning sessions in vocational training was good. Sessions were well planned and close attention by the tutor ensured that the individual needs and abilities of young people were met effectively. The behaviour in these sessions was very good.
- S34 In education, a high number of young people had complex needs and displayed very challenging behaviour. Most teachers tried to manage and challenge poor behaviour but their efforts were not always successful. Young people were excluded from lessons as a last resort and most were only excluded for a day. Good use of mediation encouraged young people to reflect on their behaviour and helped them to agree on strategies to improve, which enabled them to return to classes.
- S35 Not all teachers planned sufficiently well to provide differentiated activities to meet all abilities, particularly for the least able young people who became frustrated in lessons. Individual learning plans were mostly used well to set specific achievement targets but not enough teachers set improvement targets relating to the young person's social skills and behaviour. Young people with additional learning needs benefited from in-class support to help them improve. However, teachers did not direct the learning support assistants well enough.
- S36 Overall success rates were good. For many young people, some of the low-level unit awards they achieved initially were motivational and represented their first educational success. Achievement of vocational qualifications was good. The quality of work in vocational training was good and most young people made good progress. In classroom based lessons, poor behaviour had a direct impact on the progress young people made.
- S37 The library provided an adequate service, but opening times were too limited. Access to recreational PE was good and young people had up to six hours in the gym during the week and at weekends. Those on full-time PE courses had over 16 hours. The range of activities was varied and engaged young people well.

Resettlement

S38 *Resettlement had improved and was now impressive. The planning arrangements were well integrated and focused on the needs of young people. Good use was made of release on temporary licence. Young people were able to participate in a range of relevant offending behaviour programmes. Young people received effective support under each of the resettlement pathways, and their accommodation needs were particularly well addressed. **Outcomes for children and young people were good against this healthy prison test***

S39 *At the last inspection in November 2011, we found that outcomes for children and young people at HMYOI Cookham Wood were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made six recommendations about resettlement. At this follow-up inspection we found that two of the recommendations had been achieved, three had been partially achieved, and one had not been achieved.*

S40 There was a comprehensive, coherent resettlement policy, action plan and needs analysis which enabled an effective resettlement service to be delivered. Members of the casework team carried out most of the resettlement pathway work. The regular multidisciplinary meetings performed an important function and there was good coordination between the

caseworkers and the staff delivering interventions to young people. Young people's risk and resettlement needs were quickly identified on arrival and throughout the sentence there was an appropriate focus on preventing re-offending. The use of release on temporary licence was properly integrated into the work of the establishment.

- S41 Training planning and remand management plans were based on young people's needs and were usually detailed. The vast majority of young people in our survey said that they were involved in the development of their plans and understood their targets. Review meetings were timely and there was good attendance by community youth offending teams, but attendance by internal departments was poor. The meetings we attended demonstrated that the caseworker had a good rapport with the young person and that there was a clear reintegration plan in place to support the young person on release.
- S42 Public protection was well managed. There were good systems in place to identify young people with looked-after status. Caseworkers liaised effectively with local authorities to ensure they met their obligations.
- S43 Young people's accommodation needs were identified early in the sentence and we saw significant efforts to ensure that community agencies provided suitable accommodation for young people who were not returning home. No young person had been released in the last 12 months without an address, though, despite the establishment's best efforts, some young people did not know their address until just before release. The education department offered courses for young people to help them manage their money and deal with debt.
- S44 The visits room provided a decent environment and visitors felt that the visits experience was a positive one. Initiatives to help young people maintain contact with their family, such as family days and parenting courses, were appreciated by young people.
- S45 The Kinetic youth work project provided an effective professional youth service. There was a wide range of offending behaviour and life skills programmes but more needed to be done to evaluate their effectiveness and reinforce the learning taking place.

Main concern and recommendation

- S46 **Concern:** We were not confident that all young people at risk of self-harm were receiving the best possible care. The quality of some of the documentation associated with the ACCT process was poor and about half the young people we spoke to who had been subject to these procedures said they felt uncared for. Young people on constant watch were looked after in an unsuitable location and there were serious flaws in the way this procedure was carried out.

Recommendation: The support of young people at risk of suicide and self-harm should be strengthened, including ACCT training, quality of ACCT documents and consistency of case management. The environment for young people under constant supervision, and engagement with them by staff, should be improved.

Section 1. Safety

Courts, escorts and transfers

Expected outcomes:

Children and young people transferring to and from the establishment are treated safely, decently and efficiently.

- 1.1 *Some young people felt unsafe on escort vehicles and many travelled long distances. Late arrivals continued to be a significant problem.*
- 1.2 The catchment area for Cookham Wood had expanded and now included the south-west region. A significant number of young people travelled long distances, many after long delays waiting in court cells. Many young people travelled on vehicles with adult prisoners, which was inappropriate. In our survey, only 73% of young people against the comparator of 83% said they felt safe on escort vehicles.
- 1.3 Young people told us that escort staff were friendly and vehicles were clean and well equipped, with water and food supplied. Vehicles entered the establishment quickly and young people were admitted promptly. Young people were not handcuffed between the vans and reception, which was appropriate. Late arrivals continued to be a significant problem and young people experienced multiple stops en route for adult prisoners to disembark, which was unacceptable.

Recommendation

- 1.4 **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.** (Repeated recommendation HP44)

Early days in custody

Expected outcomes:

Children and young people are treated with respect and feel safe on their arrival into prison and for the first few days in custody. Children and young people's individual needs are identified and addressed, and they feel supported on their first night. During a young person's induction he/she is made aware of the establishment routines, how to access available services and how to cope with being in custody.

- 1.5 *Reception and the first night centre were welcoming environments and young people were treated well on arrival. The initial assessment procedures were thorough. Young people who arrived late could not see a peer mentor or make a free telephone call. The induction programme was comprehensive.*

- I.6 Reception was clean, bright and welcoming. Young people in our discussion groups were positive about their experience of reception and said that they felt safe on arrival at Cookham Wood. Interactions that we observed were very good and staff put young people at ease. With the exception of transfers from other establishments, all new arrivals were strip-searched without a risk assessment, which was unnecessary. New arrivals spent less than an hour in reception. An initial comprehensive risk assessment was conducted, from which an early days management plan was produced. The health care team carried out a private health screening. A free reception pack and food and drink were offered before new arrivals moved to the first night centre.
- I.7 New arrivals were located on Cedar unit which provided a clean, welcoming environment with first night accommodation which had been properly prepared. A trained peer supporter who lived on Cedar saw all new arrivals before 7.30pm. In our survey, only 7% of young people against the comparator of 15% said they could see a peer mentor when they first arrived. Newly arrived young people could make a free telephone call on the unit unless they arrived after 9pm. This had happened on a number of occasions in the six months prior to our inspection. In our survey, only 64% of young people against the comparator of 82% said they were given a free telephone call on arrival. All cells on the first night unit had en suite showers. There were good handover arrangements between day and night staff and all new arrivals were observed hourly throughout their first 24 hours at the prison. The day after arrival staff talked to young people at unlock to assess how they were coping.
- I.8 The induction programme started the day after arrival. The first day was spent learning about life at Cookham Wood. The session that we observed covered bullying and peer pressure: it was interactive and delivered at the correct pace. The following five-day induction included education assessments and a motivational session on communication skills called Recode. Overall, the induction programme covered everything young people needed to know about how things worked in the prison.

Recommendations

- I.9 **Young people should only be strip-searched on the basis of intelligence or specific suspicion.**
- I.10 **Young people should have the opportunity to make a telephone call before they are locked up on their first night.**
- I.11 **Peer mentors should be available to assist late arrivals if required.**

Care and protection of children and young people

Safeguarding

Expected outcomes:

The establishment promotes the welfare of children and young people, particularly those most at risk, and protects them from all kinds of harm and neglect.

- I.12 *Links between the establishment and the local authority had improved. Collection and use of safeguarding data were good. The committee structure worked well and helped to ensure that staff knew what they needed to about safeguarding issues.*

- I.13 Links with the local safeguarding children board (LSCB) had been strengthened since the previous inspection, not least by the appointment of on-site social workers to the safeguarding team. The safeguarding strategy and associated policies were agreed with the LSCB following annual reviews. The establishment continued to use its own bespoke training for staff working with young people, but were also using the NOMS 'Working with young people' training.
- I.14 Any member of staff who had a safeguarding concern about a young person could report it to the safeguarding team using a safeguarding team integrated information report (STIIR) form. Matters raised included disputes between young people, safety concerns raised by family members, and peer pressure. In the previous six months, 336 STIIRs had been submitted which were logged and dealt with by a member of the small safeguarding team. The officer responsible for the STIIRs was required to undertake generic officer duties when there were staffing difficulties in the establishment, which meant that STIIRs were not always followed up quickly. An internal quality assurance procedure for the management of STIIRs was being introduced. The quality of investigations carried out under the STIIR process was variable.
- I.15 Safeguarding meetings took place regularly. A quarterly meeting to oversee the strategic management of safeguarding was chaired by the governor and attended by appropriate members of the senior management team and a representative of the local authority. The head of safeguarding also chaired a monthly safeguarding meeting at which safeguarding data and issues were discussed. At the meeting we attended, key areas of the establishment were represented, but some attendees were substitutes and reports from functional areas were not available. Discussion focused on the very good range of data and analysis prepared by the safeguarding lead.
- I.16 The weekly safer regimes meeting, chaired by a governor, was a multidisciplinary forum to discuss young people who were causing particular concern. The meeting we observed was well attended, those present were well informed about young people and there was detailed discussion of how to meet their needs. We saw clear evidence during the week that actions agreed at the meeting were taken forward promptly, although not all the young people had a care plan.
- I.17 The safeguarding team collated impressive amounts of data on violent and antisocial behaviour which were analysed at safeguarding meetings and used by the weekly safer regimes meeting to try to keep young people safe. Minutes of safeguarding meetings were poor and did not reflect the quality of the discussions taking place. The establishment had identified a possible correlation between levels of violence and the regular and high turnover of the population.

Recommendations

- I.18 **The quality of investigations of safeguarding team integrated information reports and formal monitoring documents should be improved.**
- I.19 **All young people for whom interventions or support are agreed should have a care plan.**

Housekeeping points

- I.20 Safeguarding team staff should be allocated sufficient time for their safeguarding work.

- I.21 Staff who attend safeguarding meetings should all be fully briefed and should have completed written reports where appropriate.
- I.22 Minutes of safeguarding meetings should reflect discussions and record actions required.

Child protection

Expected outcomes:

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

I.23 *The child protection policy was clear and up to date. Referrals within the prison were dealt with appropriately and communication with the local authority had improved. Investigations were thorough.*

I.24 The child protection policy was reviewed annually, most recently in June 2012, and ratified by the LSCB. Staff we spoke to were aware of how to make referrals and how they should be handled.

I.25 There had been 21 child protection referrals during the six months before the inspection. Since the previous inspection a seconded social worker had been allocated responsibility for child protection and communication with the local authority was now better. Both the quality and timeliness of referrals to the local authority had improved. Information was held securely and complaints about staff were referred out, principally to Medway but a few to other local authorities if the young person had disclosed historical abuse or concern for siblings or had complained about treatment in other places of custody.

I.26 Young people who had made a complaint about a member of staff were interviewed by a representative of the local authority with responsibility for allegations against staff; they also reviewed documentation and CCTV footage. Few referrals were considered to have reached the significant harm threshold and most were returned to the establishment with a recommendation for internal action. The young person who had generated the complaint was informed of the decision by the local authority. Internal action could involve advice and guidance to the member of staff, refresher training or an internal investigation. One internal investigation was concluding at the time of the inspection, and a member of staff had been suspended while this took place. The local authority designated officer confirmed that the local authority was kept informed of the outcome of internal investigations.

Victims of bullying and intimidation

Expected outcomes:

Everyone feels safe from bullying and victimisation. Children and young people at risk/subject to victimisation are protected through active and fair systems known to staff, young people and visitors which inform all aspects of the regime.

I.27 *There were few incidents of bullying. Young people at risk were supported through formal monitoring, and actions to protect victims were reasonable.*

- I.28 All incidents of bullying and violence were reported through the STIIR system. There were few incidents of bullying and we were assured that reasonable actions were taken to protect young people at risk, including initial assessments of vulnerability, change of location for perpetrators and use of the keep-apart list. Few young people were monitored formally under 'team around the child' and some of the support documents that we sampled were inadequate (see section on bullying and violence reduction).

Suicide and self-harm prevention

Expected outcomes:

The establishment provides a safe and secure environment which reduces the risk of self-harm and suicide. Children and young people are identified at an early stage and given the necessary support. All staff are aware of and alert to vulnerability issues, are appropriately trained and have access to proper equipment and support.

- I.29 *The incidence of self-harm was low. The quality of some ACCT (assessment, care in custody and teamwork) documents was poor and some young people felt uncared for. Arrangements for young people most at risk needed improvement.*

- I.30 The safeguarding team managed suicide and self-harm prevention and maintained an impressive database of information. Trends and patterns were analysed at regular safeguarding meetings. In the six months to March 2013, 50 ACCT documents had been opened and there had been 38 incidents of self-harm. Most were superficial but one young person had needed outside hospital treatment after banging his head.
- I.31 There had been a self-inflicted death in 2012 and we were surprised to find lack of attention to key areas of safer custody, particularly some that had been highlighted by the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman in his investigation into the death. Over 100 staff had not received up-to-date ACCT training and the quality of some ACCT documents was poor; care maps were inadequate, records did not indicate meaningful engagement and observations were sometimes not at the required frequency. We found evidence in ACCTs of a punitive approach to addressing poor or challenging behaviour, such as the removal of televisions, and no consideration of the individual care needs of the young people. Most case reviews were multidisciplinary but case management was inconsistent. Quality assurance was regular but ineffective and did not consistently address the shortfalls highlighted. About half the young people we spoke to who had been on an ACCT told us they felt uncared for and unsupported. Although emergency procedures were positively reinforced, some night staff told us that they would not enter a cell alone in patrol state to preserve life.
- I.32 The increased use of constant supervision since the death was understandable but the environment and care for the six young people subject to constant supervision in the previous six months were sometimes inadequate. Gated cells in Ash and Phoenix units were used to house high-risk young people. They were encouraged to participate in the regime, but we saw one boy who had been on constant watch for several days in a stark cell and did not have his personal possessions with him. Supervision was undertaken by nurses, often agency staff, who did not carry keys and could not enter the cell immediately if the young person was attempting suicide or self-harm. Nurses had limited knowledge of the boys they were observing and we saw minimal engagement.

Behaviour management

Expected outcomes:

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

I.33 *The behaviour management strategy was too complicated. Young people with the most challenging behaviour were managed well by the safer regimes committee. Rules were explained thoroughly but there was some evidence of unofficial punishments.*

I.34 The behaviour management strategy was linked to violence reduction and rewards and sanctions, but it contained too much information and was difficult to understand. Young people with the most challenging behaviour were managed well through the weekly safer regimes committee.

I.35 Local rules and routines were explained during induction and reinforced subsequently. Rules were fair and understood by young people but we found evidence of staff applying unofficial punishments, including the removal of televisions, and we were not confident of consistent managerial oversight of this. Staff dealt with adolescent behaviour sensibly, but we saw some use of inappropriate language going unchallenged (see section on relationships between staff and young people).

Recommendation

I.36 **All strands of behaviour management should be combined in an overarching strategy that is fully explained to staff and young people and monitored consistently.**

Rewards and sanctions

Expected outcomes:

Children and young people are motivated by an incentives scheme which rewards effort and good behaviour and applies sanctions appropriately for poor behaviour. The scheme is applied fairly, transparently and consistently, and is motivational.

I.37 *The rewards and sanctions scheme was not a standard model and consisted of three different elements. Young people expressed mixed views about the scheme and were positive about the privileges, but negative about some aspects of its administration.*

I.38 The rewards and sanctions scheme had three components: an incentives and earned privileges scheme with basic, standard and enhanced levels; a daily stamp; and green and yellow cards. These were explained to young people during induction.

I.39 In our survey, 31% of young people against a comparator of 52% said they had been treated fairly in their experience of the rewards scheme, and in groups young people talked about what they saw as the unfairness of the yellow card scheme which carried immediate penalties, for example loss of association that evening or loss of television for a night. They

were concerned that, even if they successfully appealed against a yellow card, the penalty may already have been served. None of the young people we spoke to mentioned the benefits of an instant reward if a green card was awarded. Monitoring of the issue of green and yellow cards needed improvement; this was being addressed in the establishment's review of the policy.

- I.40 Young people were more positive about the benefits of being on enhanced level and those who achieved it did not want to lose it. Young people who transferred from other establishments on enhanced level retained that status and those on standard could apply for enhanced after 28 days of continuous good behaviour. There was also a fast track promotion to enhanced for exceptional behaviour. The stamp scheme provided daily recognition of behaviour of the required standard.
- I.41 Yellow card warnings for poor behaviour were recorded on individual electronic case note files. If a young person had received three warnings or had been involved in an act of violence, his level on the scheme was reviewed.
- I.42 At the time of the inspection, 14 young people were on basic level. They had been given targets in order to return to standard level at their next review. Some of the targets were not precise and it was not clear how young people would be supported to achieve them. A review to move off basic level after three days could be carried out if the young person's behaviour warranted it, and all young people were reviewed at seven-day periods. Few remained on basic for extended lengths of time.

Recommendation

- I.43 **Monitoring of the use of green and yellow cards should be strengthened and data reviewed regularly by senior managers.**

Housekeeping point

- I.44 Quality assurance of targets should be introduced to help young people progress from basic level.

Security and disciplinary procedures

Expected outcomes:

Security and good order are maintained through an attention to physical and procedural matters, including effective security intelligence as well as positive relationships between staff and children and young people. Disciplinary procedures are applied fairly and for good reason. Children and young people understand why they are being disciplined and can appeal against any sanctions imposed on them.

- I.45 *Security was focused, proportionate and not over restrictive. Drug testing arrangements were poor. The number of adjudications remained high; most adjudications were for violent or antisocial offences. Records of adjudications were of a good standard and advocates were used appropriately.*

- I.46 The security department focused on making the prison safe and worked well with other departments and the police to try to achieve this. However, the incidence of violence remained high (see section on bullying and violence reduction).

- I.47 Security arrangements were not unnecessarily restrictive. With the exception of some inappropriate strip-searching at reception (see section on early days in custody), security was proportionate. A log of strip-searches was maintained but it was not always completed and we found evidence in use of force documentation of a strip-search conducted under restraint which had not been logged.
- I.48 A high volume of security information reports (SIRs) was processed efficiently but actions such as suspicion drug tests and searches were not always carried out within required timeframes. Information was analysed by the security committee which set and monitored security objectives appropriately; tackling violence and the trafficking of unauthorised articles were priorities at the time of the inspection. Measures to monitor and manage gang affiliation were appropriate.
- I.49 The number of drug finds was low, but Class A drugs had been found on three separate occasions in the past six months. Mandatory drug testing (MDT) on reasonable suspicion was the only drug testing regime in place, but it was inadequately staffed and did not provide an accurate measure of drug use in the jail or a deterrent to drug use. During the six months to March 2013, only one of 23 target test requests had been completed. The MDT suite was untidy and needed cleaning.
- I.50 The number of adjudications had reduced since our last inspection but remained high and was indicative of the high levels of violence and other antisocial behaviour in the establishment. During the six months before the inspection, there had been 624 adjudications. Young people told us that adjudications were dealt with fairly. Use of advocates was encouraged and young people were helped to put forward their case. Sampled records reflected reasonable engagement and investigation before a finding of guilt. Punishments were in line with the published tariffs. Although young people were not segregated pending adjudication, there was regular use of removal from unit.

Recommendation

- I.51 **The mandatory drug testing (MDT) programme should be adequately resourced to undertake all requested suspicion tests.**

Housekeeping points

- I.52 The log of strip-searches should be fully maintained.
- I.53 The MDT suite should be kept clean and tidy to provide a respectful testing environment.

Bullying and violence reduction

Expected outcomes:

Active and fair systems to prevent and respond to bullying behaviour are known to staff, children and young people and visitors.

- I.54 *A casework approach to individual young people was being developed but it was not yet well embedded. Good levels of data on violence were analysed and, although the level of violence had reduced, it remained high. Creative interventions were used to tackle violence and early signs were positive.*

- I.55 The 'team around the child' (TAC) initiative had been introduced in February 2013 which used a caseworker to lead on managing and addressing all issues relevant to individual young people, including challenging perpetrators and supporting victims of violence and bullying and some elements of behaviour management. More work was needed to embed and bring consistency to the initiative and to evaluate its effectiveness.
- I.56 Incidents of violence, bullying and antisocial behaviour were reported through the STIIR but subsequent investigations were sometimes limited. At the time of the inspection, TAC support dossiers were primarily used to monitor young people involved in violent and antisocial behaviour. Targets were often crude but they were monitored and it was evident that young people were involved in reviews. Daily records were often incomplete or blank.
- I.57 Levels of violence remained high but had reduced since the last inspection. In the six months to March 2013, there had been 62 fights involving 89 young people and 68 assaults, including 13 on staff. Minor injuries had been sustained by 56 of the young people but three had required hospital treatment, including one for a broken nose. Despite this, young people we spoke to did not report feeling unsafe. Levels of bullying were low (see section on victims of bullying and intimidation).
- I.58 A keep-apart list was managed by the safeguarding team with input from security and other departments, and young people were placed on the list following an act of violence. Some young people told us that the keep-apart list made them feel safer. The list had previously included more than 40 young people but it was subject to constant review and at the time of the inspection there were 16 on the list. Young people on the list were put on basic level and their movements were restricted. They could be removed from the list if they engaged with interventions such as mediation, and there was evidence to suggest that many engaged well.
- I.59 Some creative initiatives had been introduced in an attempt to reduce violence. Surviving Our Streets (SOS), a charity, had trained 28 young people in a programme called 'violence interrupters'. The most prolific violent offenders were trained in mediation and conflict resolution and encouraged to change their behaviour and assert their influence to identify and address conflict in the prison. SOS and violence interrupters had completed 80-90 mediations since October 2012 with some success, but it was too early to determine the effectiveness of these interventions.

Recommendations

- I.60 **The 'team around the child' approach should be embedded and evaluated to measure its effectiveness.**
- I.61 **The Surviving Our Streets and violence interrupters interventions should be evaluated to measure their effectiveness.**

The use of force

Expected outcomes:

Force is used only as a last resort and if applied is used legitimately and safely by trained staff. The use of force is minimised through preventive strategies and alternative approaches and this is monitored through robust governance arrangements.

I.62 *Oversight of the use of force was sound. The incidence of use of force was high but many incidents did not involve full use of control and restraint (C&R). There was some use of pain compliance. Some records that we sampled were not detailed enough and we were not confident that all use of force was necessary or deployed as a last resort. Planned interventions were managed well.*

I.63 There was close oversight of the use of force and data were used well to inform safeguarding meetings. All incidents where force was used were scrutinised at the weekly restraint minimisation meeting where there was a clear focus on reducing force, promoting de-escalation and learning lessons from incidents.

I.64 The use of force was high and reflected the number of violent and antisocial incidents. In our survey, 48% of respondents said they had had C&R used on them against the comparator of 30%. In the six months to March 2013, there had been 250 incidents involving the use of force, ranging from 69 involving low-level physical coercion with force but no C&R, to 47 involving full use of C&R. Pain compliance in the form of the mandibular angle technique (in which pressure is applied at a point below the ear) had been applied on at least three occasions. The use of pain compliance on children is inappropriate.

I.65 Force was mostly used appropriately to split up fights or prevent assaults but occasionally it was used inappropriately to gain compliance from young people. Records and conversations with staff and young people did not confirm that force was used as a last resort on these occasions. Some records that we examined lacked detail and, while many situations had clearly been de-escalated, efforts to communicate with young people were not always fully recorded. Most young people returned to their cells following the use of force and handcuffs were not applied routinely. F213s (forms used to report injuries to prisoners) and de-briefs were not always fully completed and there were sometimes significant delays in their completion. Child protection issues arising from the use of force were dealt with quickly and thoroughly by the safeguarding team.

I.66 Planned interventions were filmed and reviewed with CCTV footage. Filmed incidents that we watched were managed well, staff responded appropriately and often put their own safety at risk to prevent injuries to young people.

Recommendations

I.67 **Pain inducement techniques should not be used during use of force.**

I.68 **Force should only be used as a last resort and not to gain compliance.**

Housekeeping point

I.69 Use of force records should include a fully completed F213 and debrief and should be completed in a reasonable time after the incident.

Separation/removal from normal location

Expected outcomes:

Children and young people are only separated from their peers with the proper authorisation, safely, in line with their individual needs, for appropriate reasons and not as a punishment.

1.70 Relationships between staff and young people on the Phoenix unit were good and multidisciplinary care planning was developing well. Most young people on the unit eventually returned to mainstream accommodation but some remained on the unit for too long. There was not enough constructive activity available.

- 1.71 The Phoenix unit served the dual purpose of a segregation unit and a complex needs unit. The use of the unit for segregation had reduced since the last inspection to 70 instances in the previous six months but remained the primary reason for young people being located there. Length of stay for disciplinary reasons averaged seven days. Some segregated young people became residents of the assessment (complex needs) unit. Between January and April 2013, 21 young people had been located in the unit with complex needs, including poor behaviour and mental health conditions. Length of stay for these reasons was generally much longer and one young person had resided on the unit for 80 days. At the time of the inspection, there were seven residents of whom one was there for disciplinary reasons; the longest stay was 55 days.
- 1.72 Governance of young people on Phoenix for disciplinary reasons was thorough; good order reviews were timely and multidisciplinary but documentation did not indicate that all young people remained there for the shortest possible time. Targets were set but they did not always reflect multidisciplinary care planning arrangements for Phoenix residents.
- 1.73 The safer regimes meeting initially determined the location of young people with complex needs on Phoenix, and the establishment's vision to support the most challenging young people in a structured way was commendable. Weekly multidisciplinary care planning meetings took place but, despite this, some residents appeared to stay there for unnecessarily long periods, which was concerning. This view was shared by some young people who said they did not understand why they remained on the unit for so long. Governance for these young people was not as robust as for segregated young people. Checks and balances of the management of Phoenix were not rigorous enough for a unit which isolated young people from a normal regime and felt like a segregation unit to them.
- 1.74 The unit was clean but shabby and lacked natural light. Many cells contained graffiti and dirty toilets. All young people were offered daily access to showers, telephones and 30 minutes of exercise. Some young people were allowed to leave the unit to attend activities, including gym and education, but many remained on the unit and were encouraged to engage with education. Few young people were allowed to associate together but they all had informal one-to-one sessions with unit staff in one of the comfortable interview or association rooms. Some young people had televisions in their cells. Some young people had as little as two hours a day out of their cells if they were subject to losses through adjudications or punishments given by staff for poor behaviour (see section on behaviour management).
- 1.75 Care planning arrangements were developing and all young people on the unit had a care plan which included a list of rules and expected standards of behaviour. Despite weekly multidisciplinary care planning meetings, most care plans were not focused enough on the young person and did not always reflect the work that was being done or progress made. Recent efforts to formalise reintegration plans were encouraging and most young people returned to locations in the establishment. Care planning on Phoenix was not sufficiently integrated with the new TAC system or with good order reviews.
- 1.76 Relationships between young people and staff on the unit were good. Officers were familiar with the circumstances of the young people and dealt patiently and kindly with some challenging young people. Records of contact did not reflect this positive engagement.

- I.77 Staff no longer received supervision from a psychologist but attended a weekly reflective practice meeting.

Recommendation

- I.78 **Young people should spend the minimum time possible on Phoenix unit where they should experience a broad regime and a good amount of time out of cell.**

Housekeeping points

- I.79 Care planning on Phoenix should be further developed, more specific to each young person and better integrated with other systems.
- I.80 Written records of contact with Phoenix residents should accurately reflect engagement with staff.

Substance misuse

Expected outcomes:

Children and young people with drug and/or alcohol problems are identified at reception and receive effective treatment and support throughout their stay in custody.

- I.81 *The substance misuse service was not fit for purpose. Levels of need were not high, but outcomes for young people were not good enough. Drug finds were few, but included some Class A drugs. Suspicion testing was ineffective because of inadequate staff resources. The MDT suite was messy.*

- I.82 The establishment did not admit 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 included dual diagnosis expertise.
- I.83 The substance misuse service (SMS) staff team was seriously depleted following the departure of the manager and the long-term sickness of one worker. Two part-time workers remained, completing assessments and delivering some one-to-one sessions to the young people assessed to be in the greatest need. Without direct line management, there was no supervision of casework or quality assurance of the SMS. The quality of care planning and record keeping was poor.
- I.84 The drug and alcohol knowledge and skills basic awareness group work programme had not been delivered since the end of March 2013. The lack of SMS involvement with families of young people with substance misuse needs was a weakness. The SMS largely worked independently, with little joint working with health care, mental health services or caseworkers. No substance use awareness information was visible on the wings or in communal areas.
- I.85 Although levels of need were generally not high, this inadequate service affected outcomes for young people. In our survey, only 1% of young people against the comparator of 7% said they had received help for an alcohol problem. This was a serious shortcoming given that addressing alcohol-related behaviour was almost universally cited by staff and young people as one of the most pressing substance misuse issues.

- I.86 Despite these shortcomings, we saw evidence that the local authority, Medway Council, and the National Commissioning Board had well-advanced plans to introduce a competent service from June 2013.
- I.87 In our survey, 14% of young people said it was easy to get drugs in the establishment. The number of drug finds was low, but this had included three separate occasions in the past six months when Class A drugs had been found.
- I.88 MDT on 'reasonable suspicion testing' was the only drug testing regime in place and it did not provide a meaningful measure of drug use in the establishment or a deterrent to drug use. There had been 23 target test requests in the six months to March 2013, but only one had been completed and that had been negative. The MDT suite was untidy and in need of cleaning.

Recommendations

- I.89 **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.** (Repeated recommendation 3.66)
- I.90 **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.** (Repeated recommendation 3.67)
- I.91 **The establishment should ensure that the MDT programme is adequately resourced to undertake all requested suspicion tests.**

Housekeeping point

- I.92 The MDT suite should be kept clean and tidy to maintain a suitable and respectful testing environment.

Section 2. Respect

Residential units

Expected outcomes:

Children and young people live in a safe, clean and decent environment which is in a good state of repair and suitable for adolescents.

- 2.1 *Cells were clean and adequately furnished, although some contained graffiti and offensive displays. Communal living areas were noisy and dirty and the facilities for association were inadequate. Access to showers and telephones had improved. Young people on remand had to wear prison clothes, which was inappropriate. The applications system required improvement.*
- 2.2 Outside areas were clean but internal areas were grubby and needed maintenance. Wings were of a poor design, difficult to supervise and very noisy, particularly at night. The association rooms were too small and were not equipped to keep all young people occupied.
- 2.3 All cells were single occupancy and were adequately furnished; few had been personalised. Young people were able to use cleaning materials and their cells were generally clean. A weekly prize was awarded on each landing for the cleanest cell. Some cells had broken windows, graffiti and displays of offensive material. In-cell toilets were in a recess and provided adequate privacy.
- 2.4 In our survey, only 26% of young people said that their cell call bell was answered within five minutes against the comparator of 42%. However, during the inspection, bells were answered promptly and monitoring reports showed that most were answered within five minutes. There was a good quality assurance system in place.
- 2.5 More young people said they had access to daily showers and telephones than at our last inspection. There were enough showers with adequate privacy screens on each unit. Although the time allocated to shower each day was short, all young people had the opportunity to shower. There were two telephones in each association room but the rooms were noisy and privacy was a problem.
- 2.6 New accommodation under construction at the time of inspection was due for completion in November 2013.
- 2.7 All young people had to wear prison clothes, which was inappropriate for those on remand. Clean prison clothes and sheets were available each week.
- 2.8 In our survey, only 44% of young people said that applications were dealt with fairly and only 25% said they were dealt with quickly against respective comparators of 72% and 65%. Young people in our discussion groups were consistently negative about the application system and said they resorted to the complaints system to get a response. Many applications were not responded to and those that were took too long.
- 2.9 Young people in our survey and in groups were negative about access to stored property and mail. Problems with stored property had recently been resolved and there was no backlog at the time of inspection. Mail was delivered to young people on the day it arrived in the establishment.

Recommendations

- 2.10 **All communal areas should be clean and well maintained.**
- 2.11 **Young people on remand should not have to wear prison clothes.**
- 2.12 **Applications should be responded to promptly and appropriately.**

Housekeeping point

- 2.13 All graffiti and displays of offensive material should be removed.

Relationships between staff and children and young people

Expected outcomes:

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

2.14 *Staff knew the young people well and we generally observed good interactions between officers and young people. Staff sometimes failed to challenge inappropriate language. Young people approached their caseworkers to discuss personal issues and these arrangements worked effectively. The young people's council worked well, it was taken seriously and young people had confidence in it.*

- 2.15 In our survey, 60% of young people said that staff treated them with respect, against the national comparator of 73% and 82% at Cookham Wood in October 2012. Staff, including senior managers, knew the individual circumstances of young people and we mostly observed exchanges where staff spoke to young people in a respectful and friendly manner. However, we also heard inappropriate language go unchallenged by staff.
- 2.16 The young people's council worked well and was a good forum for representing the concerns of young people. The six young people on the council met regularly with an independent youth worker, to discuss issues raised by young people and develop an agenda for a six-weekly meeting with managers from across the establishment. This meeting was well attended and minutes showed that concerns were followed up. Council members said they had confidence in the process and that their concerns were taken seriously and changes made when it was practicable. They appreciated the fact that staff explained clearly if it was not possible to deliver the changes requested.
- 2.17 Caseworkers, rather than personal officers, carried out the role of key worker. All young people were allocated a caseworker and they provided the first point of contact. Young people said they knew who their caseworkers were and found them accessible and helpful. The role of the personal officer was to supplement the work carried out by the caseworker and this arrangement worked well.

Equality and diversity

Expected outcomes:

The establishment demonstrates a clear and coordinated approach to eliminating discrimination, promoting equitable outcomes and fostering good relations, and ensures that no child or young person is unfairly disadvantaged. This is underpinned by effective processes to identify and resolve any inequality. The diverse needs of each young person are recognised and addressed: these include, but are not restricted to, race equality, nationality, religion, disability (including mental, physical and learning disabilities and difficulties), gender, transgender issues and sexual orientation.

2.18 *There was a comprehensive equalities policy which needed updating. The equality action team met regularly to oversee diversity work. Black and minority ethnic young people had more negative perceptions in some key areas. Work on disability and foreign nationals continued to progress well.*

Strategic management

- 2.19 A full-time diversity and equalities officer was in post, but she was often required to undertake generic officer duties. Equality action team meetings took place every two months and were chaired by a member of the senior management team. Most departments were represented and minutes showed that issues raised were followed up and some were carried over to the next meeting. The diversity and equalities policy covered all the relevant protected characteristics, but it had not been reviewed since 2011 and some details of the strategic management of diversity were out of date.
- 2.20 A number of young people had been trained to act as diversity representatives. They did not meet as a group except at the young people's council which was the main forum for the discussion of diversity issues. There was a high turnover of trained diversity representatives and they had not attended an equality action team meeting since January 2013.
- 2.21 Discrimination incident report forms (DIRFs) were readily available to young people. Forty-three had been submitted so far in 2013, most of which concerned race and use of inappropriate language. DIRFs had been investigated well enough and a percentage was quality assured by a representative of an external organisation that provided advice and guidance to young people. There were no interventions to address racist or other discriminatory behaviour which were dealt with by rewards and sanctions or adjudications.

Recommendation

- 2.22 **Interventions should be introduced to address discriminatory behaviour.**

Housekeeping points

- 2.23 The diversity and equality officer should have sufficient time for the work.
- 2.24 The equality policy should be updated.
- 2.25 Young people representatives should attend equality action team meetings.

Diverse needs

- 2.26 At the time of the inspection, 57% of young people were of black and minority ethnic origin compared with 65% in October 2012. Managers believed that this reduction was due to a change in the establishment's catchment area.
- 2.27 In our survey, 14% of black and minority ethnic young people said that they had been victimised by staff because of their race compared with no white young people. Black and minority ethnic young people were also significantly more negative in other respects, including feeling safe on their first night, access to daily showers and vocational training. However, they were more positive about respect for their religious beliefs, access to gym and having regular visits. Black and minority ethnic young people discussed their negative perceptions in our focus group. They told us that not all staff were committed to equality and diversity and described what they saw as different responses when young people were messing around during exercise, with staff more likely to intervene when black and minority ethnic young people were involved. We did not find any evidence of direct discrimination during the inspection. Managers we spoke to were aware of the negative views of some black and minority ethnic young people and had work planned to explore and address the reasons for those perceptions.
- 2.28 Ethnic monitoring data were discussed at equality action team meetings. Out-of-range results on the SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and time-bound) data were interrogated and no areas had been consistently out of range in recent months. Complaints and assaults were monitored locally and a more detailed investigation of the incidence of fights by young people of different ethnicities had been completed in autumn 2012.
- 2.29 In our survey, seven young people said they regarded themselves as Gypsy, Romany or Traveller. The establishment were aware of three young people from this background and told us of other young people who spent time with Gypsy, Romany or Traveller communities. There was no support for this small group of young people.
- 2.30 A Home Office Immigration Enforcement representative attended the establishment regularly. A meeting took place each month to discuss the management of foreign national young people, of whom there were 16 at the time of the inspection. A young people's representative attended but there were no meetings for foreign nationals as a group. Migrant Help, a voluntary organisation offering support to migrants and victims of trafficking, visited regularly, but there were ongoing difficulties in identifying free legal assistance for young people. Lists of foreign national young people were kept on notice boards in wing offices, and telephone and face-to-face interpreters were used when needed. All foreign national young people or those with parents/carers living overseas received credit for a five-minute telephone call each month irrespective of whether they had visits from other people.
- 2.31 In our survey, 21 young people considered themselves to have a disability. Their perceptions were generally similar to other young people at Cookham Wood with just a few areas where they reported less favourably. Health care staff carried out disability screening with young people when they arrived. The disability database recorded 15 young people, none with physical disabilities. There were no care plans or personal emergency evacuation plans (PEEPs) in place at the time of the inspection, but these were drawn up by unit staff when needed. We looked at examples of previous PEEPs which were adequate. Helpful guidance was available to staff on how disability might affect behaviour and the need to inform care planning.
- 2.32 There was no monitoring of access to regime activities and services by religion. In our survey, 52% of Muslim young people said they were treated well or very well in reception

against 74% of white young people, but there were no other significant differences. There was no faith awareness training.

- 2.33 Posters depicting positive images of gay culture were displayed on notice boards around the establishment and two groups in the Medway area were willing to provide support to gay or bisexual young people. Homophobic behaviour was not tolerated and one young person had recently been removed as a diversity representative for using inappropriate language. No gay or transgender young people had identified themselves to the equalities department.

Recommendations

- 2.34 **The negative perceptions of black and minority ethnic young people should be investigated further and acted on.**
- 2.35 **Monitoring by characteristics other than race should be undertaken to check that other minority groups are not at a disadvantage.**

Housekeeping point

- 2.36 Minority groups should be able to meet to discuss issues of shared interest.

Faith and religious activity

Expected outcomes:

All children and young people are able to practise their religion. The chaplaincy plays a full part in establishment life and contributes to young people's overall care, support and resettlement.

- 2.37 *There were good arrangements for religious observance except for Roman Catholic young people. The chaplaincy provided good pastoral care.*

- 2.38 Most young people who declared a faith were Christian or Muslim. The multi-faith chaplaincy comprised a managing chaplain who was shared with a nearby adult prison, Church of England and Muslim chaplains and a Pentecostal minister. The Catholic chaplain had left almost a year earlier and a replacement was due to start in June 2013. Ministers from other faiths attended when needed. The team had been depleted for several months and had given priority to meeting new arrivals, supporting young people who needed help and conducting corporate worship. In our survey, 60% of young people said that they could speak to a chaplain of their own faith in private against the comparator of 73%, and chaplains described the difficulty they sometimes experienced in finding somewhere private to talk to young people.
- 2.39 Chaplains saw new arrivals during induction, but regretted that young people were not able to visit the multi-faith room during induction. A chaplain was available each day to check on young people on ACCTs (assessment, care in custody and teamwork) and to see other young people who wanted to talk to them.
- 2.40 In our survey, 48% of young people said it was easy to attend religious services against the comparator of 63%. There was a weekly service for Christians and weekly prayers for Muslims. In the absence of a Catholic chaplain, a full mass could not be celebrated and the

weekly Sunday service was ecumenical. Special arrangements had been made to ensure that a Roman Catholic priest was available to young people at Christmas. All services took place in the one multi-faith room which had no permanent religious artefacts and was suitably customised when services took place. The chaplains were flexible and understanding of different faith needs. There were good ablution facilities for Muslim young people. A new chaplaincy facility had been included in the new building programme.

- 2.41 Young people had to apply to attend services at least two days in advance and names were checked by security to ensure that young people who wished to attend could do so without undue risk. Chaplains said that they had queried the list of attendees for services if a young person they knew wished to attend was not on the list. Individual worship was facilitated for young people who were not able to attend group worship.
- 2.42 No religious classes were being offered at the time of the inspection. Chaplains attended a range of meetings around the establishment, including some for individual young people they had been working with.

Complaints

Expected outcomes:

Effective complaints procedures are in place for children and young people, which are easy to access and use and provide timely responses. Children and young people are provided with the help they need to make a complaint. Children and young people feel safe from repercussions when using these procedures and are aware of an appeal procedure.

2.43 *Many young people had negative views about the complaints procedure. Responses to complaints were generally good.*

- 2.44 In our survey, only 55% of young people said it was easy to make a complaint against 70% at the previous inspection and only 19%, against 48%, said that responses were sorted out quickly. Complaint forms were freely available on the wings and the confidential locked boxes were emptied each day. In the previous six months, there had only been nine late responses from a total of 180 complaints.
- 2.45 The number of complaints had reduced significantly from the last inspection and some complaints that we examined could have been dealt with less formally. The most common causes for complaint were residential issues and staff. All complaints about staff were forwarded to the local safeguarding authority to consider child protection implications.
- 2.46 Responses to complaints were generally polite and focused and at an appropriate level for a young person. Regular quality assurance of 10% of complaints identified poor practice, and we saw evidence of improvement as a result. Nearly a third of all complaints had been upheld. The complaints clerk raised any emerging trends or patterns with the deputy governor. Advocates from an independent child advocacy service were available to help young people complete complaints.

Legal rights

Expected outcomes:

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

2.47 *There were good systems in place to ensure that young people understood the nature of their sentence or remand status. Young people had free, confidential access to their legal advisers through telephone and video calls and legal visits. The facility for confidential legal visits was still not properly advertised.*

2.48 Legal rights were explained to young people at their initial meeting with their caseworker. Young people said that they were advised of their sentence or remand status and those on remand said they had been helped to make a bail application. The internal advocacy service also provided advice and we saw evidence that sentence or remand status was explained at the initial training planning meeting.

2.49 Young people were able to make free, confidential telephone or video calls to their legal advisers and young people on remand could discuss bail applications with their community youth offending team worker and legal adviser. Legal advisers attended legal visits in the visits hall and there was a facility for confidential interviews, although this was still not properly advertised

Housekeeping point

2.50 The facility for confidential legal visits should be properly advertised.

Health services

Expected outcomes:

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

2.51 *There was easy access to age-appropriate health services, including the GP and primary care clinics. Waiting times were exceptionally low. There was an assertive approach to immunisation and vaccination, and sustained health promotion. The pharmacy service was very good and there were short waiting lists for dental services. Mental health services were particularly good.*

Governance arrangements

2.52 Health services were commissioned by NHS England – Kent, Surrey and Sussex and were provided by the Prison Service. A protracted tendering process was affecting efficiency, for example the health needs assessment 2011 had not been updated and recruitment for vacant posts had been suspended. The commissioner had begun to address the requirement for a health needs assessment.

- 2.53 Kent and Medway prisons health partnership board met quarterly and was well attended. There was a focused prison health delivery plan, and a clinical governance monitoring group which monitored performance data. There had been three serious errors of medicines management in the past year which had been responded to appropriately.
- 2.54 Young people were generally satisfied with health services. There was a patient forum with representation from the wings but staff said that young people had to be prompted to contribute. There had only been four complaints in the past year, two of which concerned external services, and staff had helped young people to challenge their treatment. Responses were focused and polite. Young people had access to the Independent Complaints Advocacy Service.
- 2.55 The head of health care was a senior nurse and there was a team of registered nurses, health care assistants and administrators. Long-term agency nurses filled four vacancies. There was sufficient capacity to run clinics in health care and on the Cedars unit, the first night centre, each day between 7.45am and 8.45pm. Staff training was up to date and staff received clinical supervision; agency staff enjoyed the same development opportunities.
- 2.56 Care planning was used for long-term and complex conditions, which reflected national clinical guidance. Clinical records were subject to monthly audit.
- 2.57 Systems were in place for the prevention of communicable diseases and information was shared by consent. There was no protocol, but health care shared relevant information with prison groups as appropriate.
- 2.58 In our survey, 69% of young people said it was easy/very easy to see a nurse against a comparator of 79%. We observed young people receiving triage at easy access clinics twice a day.
- 2.59 The health care rooms on the first floor, ground floor and Cedars unit were adequate but the range of services had outgrown the space. Infection control compliance was high and cleanliness good. There were plans to reconfigure health care later in 2013.
- 2.60 We were told of a recent occasion when a clinician had requested an emergency ambulance with a less than rapid response. Prison officers trained in the use of automated external defibrillators (AEDs) were on duty each shift; AEDs were strategically placed throughout the prison and regularly checked. Some of the contents of the first aid boxes on the wings were out of date.
- 2.61 We saw skilled and good humoured interactions between staff and young people with complex needs and young people commented on how polite the nurses were. Young people were given pictorial information about health services at reception and during induction. We were told that leaflets in other languages could be obtained at short notice but had not been required. There was a confidential health application system.
- 2.62 Health promotion was very good with age-appropriate campaigns on physical wellbeing, mental wellbeing, smoking cessation and sexual health. There was an assertive approach to communicable disease prevention, including hepatitis B and C, meningitis C and measles. Young people needing treatment for blood-borne viruses visited local specialists. Barrier protection was available but not well advertised.

Recommendations

- 2.63 **There should be an up-to-date health needs assessment.**

- 2.64 **The governor and NHS England – Kent, Surrey and Sussex should ensure that calls from clinicians to the ambulance service for emergency assistance receive unfettered responses.**

Housekeeping points

- 2.65 The contents of wing first aid boxes should be in date.
- 2.66 The availability of barrier protection should be made known to young people.

Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.67 Reception health screening was prompt and covered learning disability. Comprehensive health assessments included mental health conditions. Young people arriving after 9pm were seen by the on-call GP. Young people with clinical substance misuse needs were sometimes sent to Cookham Wood inappropriately, as only symptomatic relief was available.
- 2.68 An administrator saw each young person following reception to seek consent to acquire information from elsewhere. Staff explained health care to young people in an age-appropriate way. Long-term conditions such as asthma and diabetes were well managed. Young people had access to a good range of health care clinics with short waiting lists. 'Did-not-attend' rates were low for most clinics, for example 7% for the GP but 38% for the optician. Access to secondary care was good and the potential for further in-house diagnostic services was under consideration.

Recommendation

- 2.69 **Young people with clinical substance misuse needs should not be sent to Cookham Wood.**

Housekeeping point

- 2.70 Good management of 'did-not-attend' rates should be extended to all clinics.

Pharmacy

- 2.71 Medicines were supplied by HMP Rochester and the pharmacist and pharmacy technician visited each month. The pharmacist had previously offered clinics, but the take-up had been low and they had ceased. Medicines were stored appropriately, although the trolley on Cedars unit was not secured to the wall. A small quantity of stock medicines was available and well managed. Medicines administration was carried out efficiently twice a day. Some medicines were available as 'special sick' (for immediate treatment without an appointment), but one of these was not appropriate. Reference books were out of date.
- 2.72 Most medicines were given as supervised doses, though some young people had in-possession medicines; risk assessments were available on SystmOne (electronic case records). A new controlled drug register had arrived which complied with requirements and was due to be used imminently.

- 2.73 Patient group directions (authorising appropriate health care professionals to supply and administer prescription-only medicine) were not deployed but there was a nurse prescriber in primary care.
- 2.74 Medicines and therapeutics committee meetings were held each quarter with good attendance. Prescribing data were not monitored.

Recommendation

- 2.75 **All procedures and policies should be formally reviewed and adopted by the medicines and therapeutics committee. All staff should read and sign these procedures.**

Housekeeping points

- 2.76 The medicines trolley should be secured in the Cedars treatment room when not in use.
- 2.77 Only the most recent reference books should be retained.
- 2.78 Prescribing data should be used to demonstrate value for money and to promote effective medicines management.

Dentistry

- 2.79 Young people had access to dental checks and treatment and oral hygiene promotion, with a short waiting time of two weeks for non-urgent treatment. The same dentist offered emergency treatment out of hours. The dental surgery was equipped to a high standard and had been subject to the required checks of X-ray equipment and infection control; compliance with expected standards was high. Clinical waste management was good.

Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.80 In our survey, 32% of young people said they had had mental health or emotional difficulties while at Cookham Wood against a national comparator of 19%. Cygnet Health Care provided an integrated primary and secondary mental health service with nurses, clinical psychology and psychiatric sessions. There was good multidisciplinary working. There were 22 patients at the time of the inspection with about five referrals each week from an open referral system. Psychological approaches were conventional as well as innovative. Counselling support was provided by the chaplaincy. The mental health team worked with other departments across the establishment and was said to be valued.
- 2.81 There were good links with the community and efforts were made to provide through care immediately after a young person's release, including the use of the care programme approach (CPA)³ for those with complex needs. It was very rare for young people to transfer to secure mental health units and previous transfers had been managed very quickly.
- 2.82 Most uniformed staff had received some mental health awareness training during the juvenile awareness staff programme, or mental health champion training. Mental health champions on

³ The delivery of community mental health services to individuals diagnosed with a mental illness

the wings were an excellent resource. They ensured that young people who were struggling to cope were identified and appropriately referred.

Good practice

- 2.83 *Wing-based mental health champions were able to identify young people who were struggling to cope, arrange for further assessment and support, and provide advice to other wing staff.*

Catering

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.84 *Most young people did not like the food. Some meals were issued at the cell door, which was disrespectful. Consultation arrangements were inadequate.*

- 2.85 In our survey, only 9% of young people said that the food was good or very good, against the comparator of 18%. Most young people were negative about the quantity and quality of food. We found that portion sizes were of a decent standard but some food which should have been served hot was tepid and unappetising. Breakfast packs were issued at the cell door on the day of consumption, with the exception of young people on Cedar wing who collected breakfast from the servery. A cold lunch was issued at the cell door, which young people said was disrespectful and we agreed. An average of 20 young people were on loss of dining in association and all their meals were issued at their cell door. These young people were served last and the quality of hot food had deteriorated by the time they received it. Young people could dine in small association rooms in groups of 20 for the evening meal and for all meals at the weekend.
- 2.86 A varied menu operated on a four-week cycle and broadly met the needs of the population, including vegetarians, vegans, religious and medical diets. Fresh fruit and vegetables were available each day. There had been no nutritional assessment of the menu.
- 2.87 Wing serveries and food trolleys were clean and young people serving food were appropriately dressed in whites. The kitchen was small and grubby and had standing water on the floor in some places. Young people cleaned the kitchen and prepared breakfast packs but did no cooking, which was a missed opportunity.
- 2.88 Consultation arrangements were inadequate. A food survey was carried out every six months but return rates were low. A young person attended the catering meeting but records indicated that his contribution was minimal and no action had been taken on points he had raised. No representative of the catering team attended the youth council where issues concerning food were often raised.

Recommendations

- 2.89 **All meals should be issued at the servery and eaten in association.**

- 2.90 **Young people should be employed to prepare food so that they can achieve related qualifications.**
- 2.91 **Consultation arrangements should be improved.**

Housekeeping points

- 2.92 The menu should be assessed for nutritional content.
- 2.93 The kitchen should be kept clean.

Purchases

Expected outcomes:

Children and young people can purchase a suitable range of goods at reasonable prices to meet their diverse needs, and can do so safely.

2.94 *Some young people had to wait too long for their first canteen order. Young people could buy additional items from the prison or have them posted.*

- 2.95 New arrivals were given a free pack in reception with limited contents and had to wait for over 10 days for their first shop order, depending on the day they arrived. There was a facility to buy an emergency pack but this was not publicised and many young people were not aware of it.
- 2.96 The range of goods sold broadly met the needs of the population. Young people told us that they did not know how to make changes to the canteen list, although records showed that amendments to the product list were discussed at the youth council each quarter.
- 2.97 There was no access to catalogues but the establishment had a number of staple items available to purchase and families could post a limited number of items in. Hobby items were available from the canteen but were also provided free of charge by the establishment. Newspapers and periodicals could be ordered from a local newsagent.

Recommendation

- 2.98 **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.** (Repeated recommendation. 2.99)

Section 3. Purposeful activity

Time out of cell

Expected outcomes:

Children and young people spend most of their time out of their cell, engaged in activities such as education, leisure and cultural pursuits, seven days a week.⁴

- 3.1 *Most young people had adequate time out of their cell during the week, but less at the weekend. A few young people on the Phoenix unit received very little time unlocked. Young people did not have enough time outside. Most young people had association every day.*
- 3.2 The establishment was using the standardised core day for young people which provided a maximum of 9.5 hours unlocked each day. The controlled movement to and from activities encroached on the core day, but we estimated that most young people had more than 8.5 hours out of cell each weekday. Young people who had losses of association and/or dining out fared worse and a few young people on the Phoenix unit spent over 21 hours a day during the week locked up. Time out of cell at weekends was more limited for all young people, with lock-up at 5.15pm. Young people who were denied access to association and dining out for disciplinary reasons could have less than two hours a day out of cell at weekends.
- 3.3 We found very few young people in their cells during our roll checks, and during the week found that most young people were consistently out of cell doing something useful during the day. The few young people who were in their cells were awaiting adjudication or mediation, had been involved in a fight, excluded or returned from group education, or had refused activity.
- 3.4 Association was timetabled on weekday evenings and during the day at weekends. In our survey, just over two-thirds of young people said they had association each day which was similar to the previous inspection. During the inspection, association was cancelled one night on one landing because there were no staff to supervise. We were told that in these circumstances the loss of association was rotated across the landings. The association sessions that we observed were reasonably relaxed, although facilities were limited. Staff tended to supervise rather than join in activities with young people; a survey of young people carried out by the establishment in 2012 had indicated that most young people did not want more staff involvement in association. The youth club was highly valued by young people and we observed useful, lively sessions during the inspection.
- 3.5 In our survey, 48% of young people said they usually went outside for exercise each day compared with 85% at the last inspection. Time in the core day for outside exercise during the week was limited to 30 minutes and we were not confident that all young people were being given this opportunity every day. We saw some young people in the exercise area each day during the inspection with appropriate outdoor clothing. There was nothing for them to do except walk and talk and we saw young people standing in groups as far from staff as possible. The core day provided little other opportunity for young people to have fresh air; most movement to and from activity took place inside and the classrooms did not have any windows.

⁴ Time out of cell, in addition to formal 'purposeful activity', includes any time children and young people are out of their cells to associate or use communal facilities to take showers or make telephone calls.

Recommendations

- 3.6 **All young people should spend a minimum of 10 hours every day out of their cell.**
- 3.7 **Young people should be given the opportunity to spend at least one hour in the open air every day.** (Repeated recommendation, 6.7)
- 3.8 **More activities should be available during outside exercise.** (Repeated recommendation, 6.8)

Housekeeping point

- 3.9 There should be a wider range of activities for young people to participate in during association.

Education, learning and skills

Inspection of the provision of education and educational standards, as well as vocational training in YOIs for young people, is undertaken by the Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted⁵) 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:

All children and young people engage well in education, learning and skills that enable them to gain confidence and experience success. Expectations of children and young people are high. Children and young people are encouraged and enabled to make progress in their learning and their personal and social development to increase their employability and help them to be successful learners on their return to the wider community. Education, learning and skills are of high quality, provide sufficient challenge to children and young people and enable them to gain meaningful qualifications.

- 3.10 *The management of learning and skills required improvement. The education provision was well run and had improved since the previous inspection. Quality improvement procedures were inconsistent and quality improvement groups operated independently, reducing the opportunity to effect improvements across the board. There were enough activity places for the population but they were underused. The curriculum was wide ranging and relevant. The quality of vocational training sessions was good but the poor behaviour of young people in education limited progress for some young people. Overall, success rates were good and had increased significantly over the two years from 2010 to 2012. The library offered an adequate service but young people were not given enough time to use the facility. Young people had good access to a well run PE department.*

⁵ Ofsted is the Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills. It reports directly to the UK Parliament and is independent and impartial. It (inter alia) inspects and regulates services that provide education and skills for all ages, including those in custody. For information on Ofsted's inspection framework, please visit: <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk>.

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

<i>Outcomes for children and young people engaged in learning and skills and work activities:</i>	<i>Good</i>
<i>Quality of learning and skills and work activities, including the quality of teaching, training, learning and assessment:</i>	<i>Good</i>
<i>Effectiveness of leadership and management of learning and skills and work activities:</i>	<i>Requires improvement</i>

Management of education and learning and skills

- 3.12 The management of learning and skills required improvement. Education was provided under OLASS (Offenders' Learning and Skills Services) provision by CfBT, a large educational charity. The service was well run and the frequent turnover of teaching staff identified at the last inspection had stabilised. A newly recruited education manager had made some positive changes, for example introducing to the curriculum functional skills in English and mathematics and training staff to deliver this provision. Other recent staff training had included differentiating learning activities to meet the wide range of abilities and improving the management of poor behaviour in class. Most staff were well qualified in their subject and held or were working towards a teaching qualification.
- 3.13 Quality improvement procedures across learning and skills remained undeveloped. Two quality improvement groups, one for OLASS and one for prison provision, operated independently, reducing the opportunity to meet the objectives in the learning and skills strategy. The OLASS provider was refining the quality improvement procedures but the evaluation of prison provision was not well developed and did not identify trends to inform improvement of activities and targets. All areas produced an annual self-assessment report but these were not collated into a prison-wide document on the quality of provision. The OLASS observation of teaching and learning, managed by an area quality and curriculum manager, identified the quality of individual lessons effectively and informed staff development activities. Teaching and learning observation for prison activities were not applied to measure the quality of provision.
- 3.14 The management of data was good and a wealth of data across learning and skills were collected and analysed. The OLASS provider used the data well to set performance targets which were monitored regularly.
- 3.15 Interruptions to the regime affected learning adversely, particularly in vocational training.

Recommendation

- 3.16 **Quality improvement procedures should be applied strategically across the prison to review and develop provision, identify and share good practice and produce an action plan to improve poor practice.**

Housekeeping point

- 3.17 The management of the regime should be reviewed to minimise disruptions to learning activities.

Provision of activities

- 3.18 There were sufficient places for the population but they were not used to capacity because of the complex regime, for example keeping young people apart for safety reasons and limiting access to activities for young people with a high security risk. There were about 100 places in the morning and afternoon in education and the prison provided a further 78 places. The curriculum was broad ranging and relevant. Young people could gain qualifications in functional English and maths, information and communications technology, business studies, project-based and distance learning, catering, brickwork, painting and decorating, and multi-skills provided by CfBT. The prison provided a range of complementary activities, including independent living, cleaning, a murals workshop, prison radio, gardens and an introduction to mechanics. The range and level of qualifications had improved since the last inspection: from entry level to level 2 and some level 3 provision through distance learning. Young people who had very short detention orders were able to achieve unit credits. An imminent curriculum review was intended to broaden the curriculum further. English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) provision for a few young people was insufficient, at one hour a week.
- 3.19 Young people who had been entered for GCSEs at school were supported to sit their examinations. One young person was completing an A Level in religious studies.
- 3.20 Induction provided good information and detailed guidance about the activity pathways available. Young people's literacy, numeracy and other educational needs were assessed and considered when agreeing targets for their action plan. All staff had access to action plans on the prison electronic system.
- 3.21 Activity was allocated efficiently and nearly all young people were allocated one of their chosen pathways. Security risk assessments dictated the suitability of young people for specific activities. Those assessed as high risk were re-assessed within a reasonable time and records showed that good behaviour lowered the risk category and provided access to a wider range of activities. On occasions, staff shortages had caused delays in the risk assessment process.

Recommendation

- 3.22 **The time allocated to ESOL should be extended to enable young people to improve their spoken and written English more quickly.**

Quality of provision

- 3.23 Workshops were well resourced. The quality of learning sessions in vocational training was good. Sessions were planned well and the tutor ensured that the individual needs and abilities of young people were met effectively. Behaviour in these sessions was very good. Young people were respectful, engaged well in their allocated tasks and enjoyed learning. In the painting and decorating class, the tutor used a short micro-theory teaching session particularly well during practical activities to develop learning points for literacy and numeracy, applied in a vocational context. Young people applied the principles learned to their practical work effectively. In a brickwork class, young people were given aspirational goals to develop skills that would serve them well in employment. In catering, very good attention was paid to health and safety and the tutor used questioning techniques well to check learning and understanding. The motor mechanics and prison radio sessions were well planned and young people developed good skills. In the independent living class, activities

were not timed well enough and too much time was spent at the end of the session playing board games to fill time.

- 3.24 In class-based education, many young people had complex needs and displayed very challenging behaviour. Most were unable to attend vocational training because of their high-risk category. Most teachers tried to manage and challenge poor behaviour but were not always successful. A no-tolerance poor behaviour policy had been adopted and young people were only excluded from lessons as a last resort and mostly only for a day. However, no cool-down area was available in education as an interim measure prior to exclusion. Good use of mediation encouraged young people to reflect on their behaviour and agree strategies to improve which enabled them to return to classes. However, sometimes there were delays in mediation which prevented them from returning quickly enough.
- 3.25 In the best lessons, teachers planned carefully to provide interesting topics using relevant materials. Activities were changed frequently and young people remained engaged and focused. In these sessions, good use was made of questioning to stretch and challenge learners and group discussions were managed well. However, not all teachers provided differentiated activities to meet all abilities, particularly for the least able young people who became frustrated and badly behaved.
- 3.26 The assessment of young people's work was adequate, but spelling and grammar errors in written work were not corrected and not enough information was given on how young people could improve. Individual learning plans were used well and set specific achievement targets which were regularly reviewed. However, too few teachers set improvement targets for the young person's social skills and behaviour.
- 3.27 Young people with additional learning needs benefited from in-class support to help them improve. However, teachers did not plan for or direct the learning support assistants well enough. No additional support was provided in prison vocational training, which potentially put these young people at a disadvantage.
- 3.28 The newly appointed special educational needs coordinator was refining procedures to ensure they met the full range of young people's needs. Assessment tools were used well to identify need. Weekly review meetings were starting to evaluate the effectiveness of support processes. Information on young people was shared well with teaching staff, but teachers needed clearer guidelines on deploying teaching strategies to engage young people with learning difficulties and disabilities.

Recommendations

- 3.29 **Further support should be given to help tutors plan learning activities to meet the diverse range of abilities in their classes.**
- 3.30 **Tutors should correct spelling and grammar errors in young people's written work and give detailed feedback on how they can improve their work.**

Housekeeping points

- 3.31 Learning sessions in the independent living programme should be planned more effectively so that the time available is used to develop young people's skills.
- 3.32 The targets in young people's individual learning plans should include social skills and behaviour targets.

- 3.33 Tutors should direct learning support assistants during lessons to ensure that they know what skills the tutor requires the young person to develop.

Education and vocational achievements

- 3.34 Overall success rates were good. The achievement of qualifications had increased significantly from 2010 to 2012. For many young people, initial low-level unit awards were motivational and their first educational achievements. Vocational qualification achievement was good. Some learners who were assessed at below level 1 in English and maths increased their skills by at least one level, but there were no measures in place to assess gains made by young people who were in custody for a short time. Since the introduction of functional skills in March 2013, 15 young people had completed their awards.
- 3.35 When learners were focused in class, they achieved well but poor behaviour restricted progress in many classes. In vocational training, young people made very good progress and produced good quality work.

Housekeeping point

- 3.36 Systems should be developed to measure the educational improvements of young people who only have a short time in custody.

Library

- 3.37 The library, provided by Medway Council, was located in a small room in the education block. Opening times were limited to all day Monday and half a day on Tuesday and Wednesday. Twenty minutes was allowed per visit which was not enough for young people to read the small range of newspapers and magazines or use the CD ROMs. An evening trolley service had been discontinued.
- 3.38 The book stock was sufficient for the population and suitable for the age range. Stock was replaced and updated annually and stock loss was relatively low. The range of easy and emergent reader books was good. A small range of texts were available in other languages and more could be obtained from the main lending library. A monthly newsletter and a range of promotional events such as author visits helped to promote literacy. A small stock of books was held on the Phoenix unit and other texts could be supplied on request.

Recommendation

- 3.39 **Library visits should be extended to give young people enough time to use the facilities.**

Physical education and healthy living

Expected outcomes:

All children and young people understand the importance of healthy living, and are encouraged and enabled to participate in and enjoy physical education in safety, regardless of their ability. The programme of activities is inclusive and well planned. It is varied and includes indoor and outdoor activities.

3.40 *Access to recreational PE was good and the facilities were adequate. Staff provided a range of activities which engaged young people well. The range and level of accredited courses had increased and gave young people on short and long stays good access to accredited programmes. Achievement of units and qualifications was good. Health and fitness was well promoted. Release on temporary licence (ROTL) opportunities were used well to develop interest in a range of sports. Shower facilities and the sports hall roof were in need of repair.*

3.41 PE was staffed by eight full-time qualified instructors, supported by six orderlies. Access to recreational PE was good and young people had up to six hours in the gym during the week and at weekends.

3.42 Facilities included a sports hall, a fitness room with resistance and weight training equipment and a refurbished all-weather outdoor pitch. The range of activities was varied and engaged young people well. The equipment in the fitness room was in good order, but showers needed maintenance and there were only two toilets, one of which was out of order. The roof of the sports hall was in need of repair and during heavy rain it leaked and flooded the sports hall. The new build, due to open in November 2013, did not include any additional sports facilities and the existing facilities would not be able to deliver the range of recreational PE or accredited courses to meet the anticipated increase in population.

3.43 The range and level of accredited courses had increased and gave young people on short- and long-term stays good access to accredited programmes from basic level 1 units up to levels 1 and 2 sports leader and weight training qualifications. Achievement of units and qualifications was good. At the well planned, thorough induction, young people completed a range of health and safety qualifications including Heart Start, manual handling, team building and safe use of exercise and weight training equipment.

3.44 PE staff worked successfully with prison staff to integrate young people with behavioural problems into gym activities. PE staff worked well with young people who refused to attend gym and interviewed them to resolve their concerns and encourage attendance. Overall attendance at the gym was good at an average of 83%.

3.45 Promotion of health and fitness was good. At induction, young people were screened to ensure that they were fit to participate in gym activities. Health care staff attended the gym twice a week to run fitness clinics and PE staff provided three sessions of remedial gym each week.

3.46 ROTL opportunities were used well to develop interest in a range of sports. Annual events were held with the Army who ran activity days. A range of activities raised money for charities.

Recommendation

3.47 **Maintenance should be carried out to repair the showers, toilets and leaking roof in the sports hall.**

Section 4. Resettlement

Pre-release and resettlement

Expected outcomes:

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

- 4.1 *The strategic governance of resettlement was good and services were extremely well coordinated by the casework team. Resettlement needs were identified early and there was an appropriate focus on preventing reoffending. The use of release on temporary licence (ROTL) was properly integrated into the work of the establishment.*
- 4.2 The establishment resettlement needs analysis, delivery plan and resettlement policy formed a coherent framework to deliver an effective resettlement service. Actions required to deliver each of the resettlement pathways had been identified and those that had been or remained to be implemented were clearly indicated. The establishment had assessed that they had met most of their targets in most areas, but had identified actions still needed to deliver the finance, benefit and debt pathway. The resettlement delivery plan was supported by a monthly resettlement meeting, which was well attended by community organisations, including the Medway and Kent youth offending services, but erratically attended from within the establishment. The standing agenda included the resettlement pathways and ROTL and, importantly, a review of young people released and outstanding issues for young people due to leave.
- 4.3 Reoffending outcomes had been collated for young people released from the establishment from April 2012 to March 2013. These showed that of the 216 young people released, 61% (133) had not reoffended, 16% (34) had reoffended or been recalled to prison, and the establishment had been unable to trace the outcomes for 23% (49).
- 4.4 The delivery of resettlement services was extremely well coordinated by the casework team. Casework was managed by a governor, and an experienced youth offending team (YOT) manager led the operations and staff supervision. The team consisted of qualified social workers and YOT workers employed by Medway council and prison officers. This blend of professional experience gave the team a good balance of community and custodial knowledge and young people were allocated to a caseworker, who it was thought would best meet their needs. The team included a senior practitioner who was trained and experienced in work with young people who had sexually abused others. Work with this group of young people was strengthened by a senior social worker, also trained and experienced, and a therapist from the Lucy Faithfull Foundation. Confidence that the needs of young people who sexually abuse were being met at the establishment was realistic.
- 4.5 Risk and resettlement needs were identified soon after arrival and there was an appropriate focus on preventing reoffending, including access to life skills programmes, and programmes to address street violence and knife crime. A range of services helped to prepare young people to return to the community, find accommodation, facilitate family contact, and understand finance. However, in our survey, although the number of young people who knew where to get help with resettlement pathways was similar to the comparator, it was

still small and, on issues such as getting into school and college and opening a bank account, significantly less than at our last inspection.

- 4.6 There was a good system to assess young people eligible for release on temporary licence (ROTL) and the establishment reported 393 placements, involving 15 young people, in the six months before the inspection. In the past 12 months, 31 young people had completed successful ROTL placements. The establishment provided an excellent range of placements, including community reparation, work experience, college placements and visits to promote family contact. Some bespoke placements had been set up to meet a young person's specific needs.

Recommendation

- 4.7 **Relevant internal departments should regularly attend the resettlement management meeting.**

Training planning and remand management

Expected outcomes:

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

- 4.8 *Training and remand management plans were detailed and based on young people's needs. The vast majority of young people said that they were involved in their plans and understood their targets. There was good provision for remanded young people. Review meetings were child focused and timely, though poorly attended by establishment staff other than the casework team. There were no problems with arranging transitions to the young adult estate, but young people were not well enough prepared for the move. Public protection was well managed and looked-after children received a good service.*

- 4.9 All young people were allocated a caseworker on arrival who was responsible for the management of individual training plans. Sentenced and remanded young people were contacted quickly by a relevant worker, and initial training and remand management plans were developed within appropriate time scales. There was evidence in the plans of a cycle of assessment, planning and review, and the daily casework team meeting ensured that work was properly coordinated across all departments. Training plans that we scrutinised were of good quality and demonstrated that caseworkers were central to the sentence and resettlement planning process and a whole-establishment approach to reducing reoffending. There were examples of caseworkers and other staff devoting much time to young people and keeping their families informed. Multidisciplinary meetings, attended by community YOTs and social workers, were regularly convened to discuss young people with complex needs. The meeting that we attended demonstrated excellent communication and joint working across custodial and community services, as they planned for the release of a young person who was clearly a high risk to the public. Sentence plans were drawn up in a collaborative way and, in our survey, 91% of young people said they were involved in the development of their plan and 88% said that they understood the targets they had been set.

- 4.10 Remanded young people were able to make a bail application, and records indicated that caseworkers helped to facilitate young people's contact with their legal advisers and community YOT worker. This was confirmed by a small group of young people who had been on remand. Initial remand meetings and remand review meetings were timely and there was good attendance by community YOTs. Young people on remand had training plans and could use the same services as sentenced young people.
- 4.11 Training planning and remand management meetings were well organised and timely, and attendance by community YOTs and family members was good. However, attendance by internal departments, especially education and residential units, was very poor. Caseworkers chairing the meetings collected information from relevant departments, but their absence at the meetings prevented most young people from receiving the most comprehensive feedback and talking to relevant staff. The planning meetings that we observed were child focused and showed that the caseworker had a good rapport with the young person. Up-to-date information about the young person's progress was brought to the meeting and there was appropriate focus on the young person's reintegration plans.
- 4.12 Organising the transition of 18-year-old young people to the adult estate was not a problem, though some of the more complex cases had to be organised by governors. Young people serving detention and training orders were not automatically transferred at the age of 18, unless they had requested the move or were a risk to children. Young people serving long sentences were moved as soon as possible after their 18th birthday, but were able to finish courses before their move. Young people did not receive any information about young adult establishments, so their understanding of where they were going was limited. There had been some liaison with Rochester prison to ease the transfer of individual young people but this practice required further development.

Recommendation

- 4.13 **Links should be developed with prisons to which young people are most often transferred, so that transitions can be properly planned by the two participating establishments.**

Housekeeping point

- 4.14 Young people should receive information about the prison they are being transferred to at the age of 18 years.

Good practice

- 4.15 *The daily meetings of the casework team facilitated an effective, coordinated response to young people's resettlement and behavioural needs.*

Public protection

- 4.16 There was a comprehensive public protection policy, which was under review. The monthly interdepartmental risk management meeting had been reinstated in April 2013 after a short lapse and was now well attended. Minutes of the meetings indicated thorough discussion of young people considered to be a risk and an appropriate emphasis on monitoring release arrangements and the suitability of accommodation. External statutory agencies were contacted if concerns were raised.

- 4.17 There were clear criteria for determining who might present a risk to the public and a good system for early identification. Young people considered to be a risk were allocated a caseworker, placed on a database and discussed at the earliest interdepartmental meeting. Young people who needed consideration by external multi-agency public protection panels (MAPPAs) were identified, and reports submitted to MAPPA meetings. Attendance by caseworkers at external meetings was poor, though there were plans to improve this.
- 4.18 There were appropriate procedures for identifying young people who were assessed as being a risk to children in the community, and reasonable restrictions were put in place to ensure that contact was properly risk assessed. Decisions about whom young people had contact with were made by senior managers and caseworkers and regularly reviewed, and we found that restrictions were proportionate and defensible. Very few young people had their mail and telephone calls monitored and these were regularly reviewed and restrictions lifted when it was felt that the risks had reduced and the monitoring was no longer required.

Looked-after children

- 4.19 In our survey, 30% of young people said that they had been in the care of the local authority. At the time of the inspection, 44 young people had looked-after status, six of whom were on full care orders, 14 on voluntary orders and 24 remanded into custody.
- 4.20 The establishment's seconded senior social worker focused on the needs of young people with looked-after status. A separate policy on looked-after children was in draft. The senior social worker and allocated caseworker scrutinised all documentation accompanying young people into custody to identify those who had been looked after.
- 4.21 All local authorities were sent an information booklet outlining their responsibilities to looked-after children. The establishment recommended financial support of between £5 and £10 a week. Appropriate support had been secured in some cases, but a number of children who had been on a voluntary care order were not receiving any financial support from their home local authority. Data on looked-after children, such as the number of statutory reviews and statutory visits, were not collected systematically and it was unclear how many young people were not receiving support.
- 4.22 Work carried out by caseworkers to secure accommodation for looked-after children was impressive and we saw evidence of concerted efforts to ensure that local authorities fulfilled their responsibilities. If caseworkers were unable to secure accommodation in good time, the independent advocate escalated matters and accommodation was provided in all cases.
- 4.23 Good efforts were made to ensure that looked-after children were reviewed by their local authority while in custody. We were advised that in the four months from October 2012 to January 2013, 25 looked-after reviews had taken place, although it was not clear how many there should have been.

Housekeeping point

- 4.24 Comprehensive, up-to-date data should be kept on looked-after children.

Reintegration planning

Expected outcomes:

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

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

4.25 *Release plans for high-risk young people were comprehensive, and practical release arrangements were adequate. There were very good systems to ensure that young people had an address to go to on release, and education, training and employment arrangements were good. Pre-discharge arrangements were limited to young people with drug and alcohol problems. The education department delivered courses in money management, but benefits advice was limited. Visiting arrangements were good and family days and parenting courses were appreciated by young people. There was a good range of offending behaviour and life skills courses but more needed to be done to evaluate the effectiveness of the courses and to reinforce learning.*

4.26 All young people had a release plan prepared by their community YOT worker. The plans that we scrutinised were comprehensive and indicated where the young person was going to live and what was expected of him while on supervision. Young people who were assessed as being at high risk of reoffending were intensively supervised in the community and there were some imaginative schemes to encourage young people to engage with education and training on release.

4.27 Practical release arrangements were adequate; young people had access to their money and were given a holdall to carry their belongings. Young people could have their clothes laundered prior to release, but most young people did not know about this. If young people had grown out of their clothes, caseworkers arranged to have new clothes bought.

Housekeeping point

4.28 All young people should be able to leave the establishment with freshly laundered clothes.

Accommodation

4.29 In our survey, 29% of young people said they would have a problem with accommodation when they were released. Accommodation needs were assessed early and updated throughout the young person's sentence. Specific attention was paid to young people who were considered a risk to the public. Caseworkers assessed and recorded whether they thought that accommodation was suitable and during the year to May 2013 they identified that eight young people had had to be released to unsuitable accommodation, such as a hostel or bed and breakfast. These were 18 year olds, who were not known to their local authority. Records for the past year showed that no young person had been released without an address. However, despite the best efforts of staff, some young people did not know their address until just before release.

4.30 Case managers pursued responsible local authorities and YOTs rigorously, when they considered that a young person was not going to suitable accommodation. They escalated the needs of hard-to-place young people, using the internal advocates and legal representation when required. The internal advocate said that she had had to intervene in 59

cases in the previous year to remind local authorities of their responsibility to house young people.

Education, training and employment

- 4.31 Staff reviewed the achievements, needs and interests identified in young people's action plans when they were nearing release to help them plan for the future and to qualify for ROTL.
- 4.32 Sessions were delivered to develop CV and job application skills and to improve employability. Some young people complained that the work was too low level. The absence of internet and virtual campus facilities severely limited the opportunity for young people to research job vacancies which would have added context to employability training.
- 4.33 ROTL opportunities were used very well to access a wide range of community projects and placements. Six young people were participating in community and work placements. The progress of young people released on licence was reviewed at one, six and twelve-month intervals, but the collection and analysis of this information had yet to be evaluated. PE staff used ROTL to develop young people's skills in fishing, mountain biking and swimming in which they could gain accredited qualifications. Young people participated in projects organised by the police to talk about prison life to young people in the community who were at risk of offending.

Recommendation

- 4.34 **Young people should have access to the internet or the virtual campus to aid their research skills and employability activities.**

Health care

- 4.35 Pre-discharge preparation by health care was good. Nurses helped young people to locate GPs, and letters for GPs, harm minimisation packs and take-home medications were supplied as appropriate. Young people subject to the care programme approach received coordinated care. There was a palliative care policy which was out of date and had never been used.

Housekeeping point

- 4.36 The palliative care policy should be kept up to date.

Drugs and alcohol

- 4.37 Reintegration planning for young people with drug and alcohol problems was limited to the delivery of harm reduction advice by the substance misuse service (SMS) and the sharing of information with YOTs. There was no evidence that the SMS worked with case managers and other departments on post-release care arrangements.

Recommendation

- 4.38 Harm reduction advice prior to release should be provided consistently, and post-release care should be properly planned and coordinated with caseworkers.**
(Repeated recommendation 8.25)

Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.39 When they reached 18, young people were able to receive benefit advice from the advocates and caseworkers, but this service had not been formalised or properly publicised. In our survey, only 18% of young people said that they knew where to get help with claiming benefits. Caseworkers helped young people to manage their money by using the canteen appropriately. Young people were not helped to open bank accounts, which was an omission.
- 4.40 The education department provided opportunities for young people to learn about financial matters through training in personal and domestic finance, including loan repayments and managing debt, saving and borrowing and planning for the future. There was also a course on economic wellbeing and financial capability.

Recommendations

- 4.41 Young people should be given advice on how to claim benefits.**
- 4.42 Young people should be helped to open bank accounts.**

Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.43 The visitors' centre was staffed by the YOT, who provided a very good service to families, including additional visits when required. The centre was open before and after each visits session and provided free refreshments to visitors.
- 4.44 More young people than at our last inspection said that visits started on time and this was confirmed by visitors. Visitors said that staff treated them respectfully and that they were searched sensitively. The visits room was a good facility with an unstaffed crèche area and refreshment machines, but no hot drinks or snacks.
- 4.45 Domestic visits took place three times a week, during the day on Saturday and Sunday and on Wednesday evening. Newly arrived young people could have a visit within the first few days and those on remand could have three visits a week. Young people were required to wear a coloured band during their visit, which was unnecessary.
- 4.46 Family days and a 'young dads' course were appreciated by young people. Family days were open to all young people and appropriately concentrated on maintaining family ties. Young people who did not receive visits focused with caseworkers during training planning meetings on establishing appropriate family contact.

Recommendation

- 4.47 Young people should not be required to wear coloured bands in the visits hall.**

Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.48 Young people had access to a range of life skills and offending behaviour programmes. There was a good referral process through the casework team, who were effectively integrated with other areas, such as the safer regimes meeting, where potential programmes for young people were discussed. Allocation to programmes was effectively coordinated by the full-time group worker and the number of completions was impressive.
- 4.49 Many young people said that they benefited from the programmes, but also said that they found those delivered by 'credible messengers' such as the violence reduction programme delivered by the organisation 'Surviving Our Streets', to be the most relevant. In our survey, a creditable 54% of young people said they thought that offending behaviour programmes would help them when they were released from prison.
- 4.50 Young people had the opportunity to comment on the programmes at the end of the sessions and many gave positive feedback. However, there was no formal evaluation, which was a weakness. The learning from programmes needed to be reinforced by other staff, particularly on residential units.
- 4.51 The Kinetic youth work project delivered an effective youth service which was integrated with the establishment caseworkers and provided escorted ROTL opportunities for young people from north Kent and the borough of Lewisham. The youth club, which young people could attend every two weeks, was well received and offered opportunities for informal learning.

Recommendations

- 4.52 **Programmes should be evaluated to assess their effectiveness.**
- 4.53 **Learning from programmes should be reinforced by staff across the establishment.**

Section 5. Recommendations and housekeeping points

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

Main recommendation

To the governor

- 5.1 The support of young people at risk of suicide and self-harm should be strengthened, including ACCT training, quality of ACCT documents and consistency of case management. The environment for young people under constant supervision, and engagement with them by staff, should be improved. (S46)

Recommendation

To the Youth Justice Board, NOMS, escort contractor and governor

Courts, escorts and transfers

- 5.2 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. (1.4, repeated recommendation HP44)

Recommendation

To the Youth Justice Board

- 5.3 Young people with clinical substance misuse needs should not be sent to Cookham Wood. (2.69)

Recommendations

To the governor

Early days in custody

- 5.4 Young people should only be strip-searched on the basis of intelligence or specific suspicion. (1.9)
- 5.5 Young people should have the opportunity to make a telephone call before they are locked up on their first night. (1.10, repeated recommendation 1.16)
- 5.6 Peer mentors should be available to assist late arrivals if required. (1.1)

Care and protection of children and young people

- 5.7 The quality of investigations of safeguarding team integrated information reports and formal monitoring documents should be improved. (1.18)

- 5.8 All young people for whom interventions or support are agreed should have a care plan. (1.19)

Behaviour management

- 5.9 All strands of behaviour management should be combined in an overarching strategy that is fully explained to staff and young people and monitored consistently. (1.36)
- 5.10 Monitoring of the use of green and yellow cards should be strengthened and data reviewed regularly by senior managers. (1.43)
- 5.11 The mandatory drug testing (MDT) programme should be adequately resourced to undertake all requested suspicion tests. (1.51)
- 5.12 The 'team around the child' approach should be embedded and evaluated to measure its effectiveness. (1.60)
- 5.13 The Surviving Our Streets and violence interrupters interventions should be evaluated to measure their effectiveness. (1.61)
- 5.14 Pain inducement techniques should not be used during use of force. (1.67)
- 5.15 Force should only be used as a last resort and not to gain compliance. (1.68)
- 5.16 Young people should spend the minimum time possible on Phoenix unit where they should experience a broad regime and a good amount of time out of cell. (1.78)

Substance misuse

- 5.17 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. (1.89, repeated recommendation 3.66)
- 5.18 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. (1.90, repeated recommendation 3.67)
- 5.19 The establishment should ensure that the MDT programme is adequately resourced to undertake all requested suspicion tests. (1.91)

Residential units

- 5.20 All communal areas should be clean and well maintained. (2.10)
- 5.21 Young people on remand should not have to wear prison clothes. (2.11)
- 5.22 Applications should be responded to promptly and appropriately. (2.12)

Equality and diversity

- 5.23 Interventions should be introduced to address discriminatory behaviour. (2.22)

- 5.24 The negative perceptions of black and minority ethnic young people should be investigated further and acted on. (2.34)
- 5.25 Monitoring by characteristics other than race should be undertaken to check that other minority groups are not at a disadvantage. (2.35)

Health services

- 5.26 There should be an up-to-date health needs assessment. (2.63)
- 5.27 The governor and NHS England – Kent, Surrey and Sussex should ensure that calls from clinicians to the ambulance service for emergency assistance receive unfettered responses. (2.64)
- 5.28 All procedures and policies should be formally reviewed and adopted by the medicines and therapeutics committee. All staff should read and sign these procedures. (2.75)

Catering

- 5.29 All meals should be issued at the servery and eaten in association. (2.89)
- 5.30 Young people should be employed to prepare food so that they can achieve related qualifications. (2.90)
- 5.31 Consultation arrangements should be improved. (2.91)

Purchases

- 5.32 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. (2.98, repeated recommendation. 2.99)

Time out of cell

- 5.33 All young people should spend a minimum of 10 hours every day out of their cell. (3.6)
- 5.34 Young people should be given the opportunity to spend at least one hour in the open air every day. (3.7, repeated recommendation 6.7)
- 5.35 More activities should be available during outside exercise. (3.8, repeated recommendation 6.8)

Education, learning and skills

- 5.36 Quality improvement procedures should be applied strategically across the prison to review and develop provision, identify and share good practice and produce an action plan to improve poor practice. (3.16)
- 5.37 The time allocated to ESOL should be extended to enable young people to improve their spoken and written English more quickly. (3.22)
- 5.38 Further support should be given to help tutors plan learning activities to meet the diverse range of abilities in their classes. (3.29)

- 5.39 Tutors should correct spelling and grammar errors in young people's written work and give detailed feedback on how they can improve their work. (3.30)
- 5.40 Library visits should be extended to give young people enough time to use the facilities. (3.39)

Physical education and healthy living

- 5.41 Maintenance should be carried out to repair the showers, toilets and leaking roof in the sports hall. (3.47)

Pre-release and resettlement

- 5.42 Relevant internal departments should regularly attend the resettlement management meeting. (4.7)

Training planning and remand management

- 5.43 Links should be developed with prisons to which young people are most often transferred, so that transitions can be properly planned by the two participating establishments. (4.13)

Reintegration planning

- 5.44 Young people should have access to the internet or the virtual campus to aid their research skills and employability activities. (4.34)
- 5.45 Harm reduction advice prior to release should be provided consistently, and post-release care should be properly planned and coordinated with caseworkers. (4.38, repeated recommendation 8.25)
- 5.46 Young people should be given advice on how to claim benefits. (4.41)
- 5.47 Young people should be helped to open bank accounts. (4.42)
- 5.48 Young people should not be required to wear coloured bands in the visits hall. (4.47)
- 5.49 Programmes should be evaluated to assess their effectiveness. (4.52)
- 5.50 Learning from programmes should be reinforced by staff across the establishment. (4.54)

Housekeeping points

Care and protection of children and young people

- 5.51 Safeguarding team staff should be allocated sufficient time for their safeguarding work. (1.20)
- 5.52 Staff who attend safeguarding meetings should all be fully briefed and should have completed written reports where appropriate. (1.21)
- 5.53 Minutes of safeguarding meetings should reflect discussions and record actions required. (1.22)

Behaviour management

- 5.54 Quality assurance of targets should be introduced to help young people progress from basic level. (1.44)
- 5.55 The log of strip-searches should be fully maintained. (1.52)
- 5.56 The MDT suite should be kept clean and tidy to provide a respectful testing environment. (1.53)
- 5.57 Use of force records should include a fully completed F213 and debrief and should be completed in a reasonable time after the incident. (1.69)
- 5.58 Care planning on Phoenix should be further developed, more specific to each young person and better integrated with other systems. (1.79)
- 5.59 Written records of contact with Phoenix residents should accurately reflect engagement with staff. (1.80)

Substance misuse

- 5.60 The MDT suite should be kept clean and tidy to maintain a suitable and respectful testing environment. (1.92)

Residential units

- 5.61 All graffiti and displays of offensive material should be removed. (2.13)

Equality and diversity

- 5.62 The diversity and equality officer should have sufficient time for the work. (2.23)
- 5.63 The equality policy should be updated. (2.24)
- 5.64 Young people representatives should attend equality action team meetings. (2.25)
- 5.65 Minority groups should be able to meet to discuss issues of shared interest. (2.36)

Legal rights

- 5.66 The facility for confidential legal visits should be properly advertised. (2.50)

Health services

- 5.67 The contents of wing first aid boxes should be in date. (2.65)
- 5.68 The availability of barrier protection should be made known to young people. (2.66)
- 5.69 Good management of 'did-not-attend' rates should be extended to all clinics. (2.70)
- 5.70 The medicines trolley should be secured in the Cedars treatment room when not in use. (2.76)

- 5.71 Only the most recent reference books should be retained. (2.77)
- 5.72 Prescribing data should be used to demonstrate value for money and to promote effective medicines management. (2.78)

Catering

- 5.73 The menu should be assessed for nutritional content. (2.92)
- 5.74 The kitchen should be kept clean. (2.93)

Time out of cell

- 5.75 There should be a wider range of activities for young people to participate in during association. (3.9)

Education, learning and skills

- 5.76 The management of the regime should be reviewed to minimise disruptions to learning activities. (3.17)
- 5.77 Learning sessions in the independent living programme should be planned more effectively so that the time available is used to develop young people's skills. (3.31)
- 5.78 The targets in young people's individual learning plans should include social skills and behaviour targets. (3.32)
- 5.79 Tutors should direct learning support assistants during lessons to ensure that they know what skills the tutor requires the young person to develop. (3.33)
- 5.80 Systems should be developed to measure the educational improvements of young people who only have a short time in custody. (3.36)

Training planning and remand management

- 5.81 Young people should receive information about the prison they are being transferred to at the age of 18 years. (4.14)
- 5.82 Comprehensive, up-to-date data should be kept on looked-after children. (4.24)

Reintegration planning

- 5.83 All young people should be able to leave the establishment with freshly laundered clothes. (4.28)
- 5.84 The palliative care policy should be kept up to date. (4.36)

Examples of good practice

- 5.85 Wing-based mental health champions were able to identify young people who were struggling to cope, arrange for further assessment and support, and provide advice to other wing staff. (2.83)

- 5.86 The daily meetings of the casework team facilitated an effective, coordinated response to young people's resettlement and behavioural needs. (4.15)

Section 6. Appendices

Appendix I: Inspection team

Martin Lomas	Deputy Chief inspector
Ian Macfadyen	Team leader
Andy Lund	Inspector
Angela Johnson	Inspector
Ian Thomson	Inspector
Kellie Reeve	Inspector
Sarah Cutler	Inspector observer
Catherine Shaw	Head of research, development and thematics
Caroline Elwood	Research trainee
Mark McClenaghan	Observer

Specialist inspectors

Paul Roberts	Substance misuse inspector
Paul Tarbuck	Health services inspector
Simon Denton	Pharmacist
Sheila Willis	Ofsted inspector

Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report

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

Safety

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

At the last inspection in 2011, 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 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. Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendations

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)

Not achieved (repeated recommendation, 1.4)

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)

Achieved

Recommendations

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

Not achieved

The quality of initial vulnerability assessments and accompanying risk management plans should be improved, underpinned by a robust quality assurance procedure. (1.15)

Achieved

Young people should have the opportunity to make a telephone call before they are locked up on their first night. (1.16)

Not achieved (repeated recommendation, paragraph 1.10)

Peer mentors should be available to assist late arrivals if required. (1.17)

Not achieved (repeated recommendation, 1.11)

Gated cells should not be used for young people requiring a high level of observation. (3.22)

Not achieved

All staff should be suitably trained in suicide and self-harm prevention and first aid. (3.23)

Not achieved

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)

Partially achieved

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

Achieved

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

Achieved

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)

Partially achieved

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

Partially achieved

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)

Not achieved (repeated recommendation, 1.89)

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)

Not achieved (repeated recommendation, 1.90)

Respect

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

At the last inspection in 2011, 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. Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

Main 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. (HP45)

Not achieved

Recommendations

Windows should be repaired to improve ventilation. (2.9)

Not achieved

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

Not achieved

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

Achieved

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)

Not achieved

All staff should receive diversity training. (4.7)

Not achieved.

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)

Partially achieved

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)

Achieved

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

Partially achieved

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

Achieved

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

Not achieved

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)

Not achieved (repeated recommendation, 2.99)

Purposeful activity

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

At the last inspection in 2011, 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. Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

Recommendations

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

Not achieved (repeated recommendation, 3.7)

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

Not achieved (repeated recommendation, 3.8)

Catering qualifications should be introduced. (6.26)

No longer applicable

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

Achieved

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

Achieved

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

Achieved

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

Partially achieved

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

Achieved

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

Achieved

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

Not achieved

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

Achieved

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

Achieved

Resettlement

Children and young people are effectively helped to prepare for their release back into the community and to reduce the likelihood of reoffending.

At the last inspection in 2011, 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. Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

Recommendations

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)

Partially achieved

Attendance at the interdepartmental risk management meetings should be improved. (9.15)

Achieved

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

Partially achieved (repeated recommendation, 4.39)

Young people should not be required to wear coloured bands in the visits hall. (9.36)

Not achieved (repeated recommendation, 4.48)

Legal visits should be conducted in privacy. (9.37)

Partially achieved

All young people should have daily access to the telephone. (9.38)

Achieved

Appendix III: Establishment population profile

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

Status	Number of young people	%
Sentenced	83	76.9
Recalls	2	1.9
Convicted unsentenced	0	0
Remand	23	21.3
Detainee	0	0
Total	108	100

Age	Number of young people	%
15 years	4	3.7
16 years	30	27.8
17 years	62	57.4
18 years	12	11.1
Total	108	100

Nationality	Number of young people	%
British	83	76.9
Foreign nationals	15	13.9
Total	108	100

Ethnicity	Number of young people	%
<i>White</i>		
British	40	37
Irish	0	0
Other white	6	5.6
<i>Mixed</i>		
White and Black Caribbean	9	8.3
White and Black African	4	3.7
White and Asian	0	0
Other mixed	2	1.9
<i>Asian or Asian British</i>		
Indian	0	0
Pakistani	1	0.9
Bangladeshi	0	0
Other Asian	0	0
<i>Black or black British</i>		
Caribbean	20	18.5
African	18	16.7
Other Black	6	5.6
Total	108	100

Religion	Number of young people	%
Baptist	1	0.9
Church of England	3	2.8
Roman Catholic	13	12
Other Christian denominations	16	14.8
Muslim	29	26.9
Jewish	1	0.9

Other	11	9.9
No religion	36	33.3
Not stated	9	8.3
Total	108	100

Other demographics	Number of young people	%
Gypsy/Romany/ traveller	2	1.9
Total	2	1.9

Sentenced only – length of stay by age

Length of stay	<1 mth	1–3 mths	3–6 mths	6–12 mths	1–2 yrs	2 yrs +	4 yrs +	Total %
Age								
15 years	0	2	0	0	0	0		2.4
16 years	3	11	6	2	0	0		26.2
17 years	3	15	12	15	5	0		59.5
18 years	2	1	3	3	1	0		11.9
Total	8	29	21	20	6	0		100

Unsentenced only – length of stay by age

Length of stay	<1 mth	1–3 mths	3–6 mths	6–12 mths	1–2 yrs	2 yrs+	4 yrs +	Total %
Age								
15 years	1	1	0	0	0	0		8.3
16 years	3	3	2	0	0	0		33.3
17 years	3	3	5	1	0	0		50
18 years	0	0	1	1	0	0		28.3
Total	7	7	8	2	0	0		100

Main offence	Number of young people	%
Violence against the person	27	25
Sexual offences	6	5.5
Burglary	21	19.4
Robbery	28	25.9
Theft and handling	4	3.7
Fraud and forgery		
Drugs offences	12	11.1
Other offences	6	5.5
Offence not recorded / holding warrant	4	3.7
Total	108	100

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

Sentence	4 mths	6 mths	8 mths	10 mths	12 mths	18 mths	24 mths	Recall	Total %
Age									
15 years	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.9
16 years	3	0	1	2	3	3	2	1	28.8
17 years	3	0	3	2	5	10	2	4	55.8
18 years	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	1	13.5
Total	6	0	4	4	11	16	5	6	100

Number of Section 91s, (determinate sentences only) by age and length of sentence

Sentence	Under 2 yrs	2–3 yrs	3–4 yrs	4–5 yrs	5 yrs +	Recall	Total %
Age							
15 years	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16 years	1	0	0	0	0	0	50
17 years	1	0	0	0	0	0	50
18 years	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	2	0	0	0	0	0	100

Number of extended sentences under Section 228 (extended sentence for public protection) by age and full sentence length, including the time in the community

Sentence	Under 2 yrs	2–3 yrs	3–4 yrs	4–5 yrs	5 yrs +	Recall	Total %
Age							
15 years	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16 years	1	0	0	0	0	0	20
17 years	3	0	0	0	0	0	60
18 years	1	0	0	0	0	0	20
Total	5	0	0	0	0	0	100

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

Sentence	Under 2 yrs	2–5 yrs	5 - 10 yrs	10 – 15 yrs	15 – 20 yrs	Recall	Total
Age							
15 years	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16 years	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
17 years	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
18 years	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Number of mandatory life sentences under Section 90 by age and length of tariff

Sentence	Under 2 yrs	2–5 yrs	5 - 10 yrs	10 – 15 yrs	15 – 20 yrs	20yrs +	Total
Age							
15 years	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16 years	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
17 years	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
18 years	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Survey methodology

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

Sampling

Questionnaires were offered to all young people.

Distributing and collecting questionnaires

Every attempt was made to distribute the questionnaires to respondents individually. This gave researchers an opportunity to explain the purpose of the survey and to answer respondents' questions. We also stressed the voluntary nature of the survey and provided assurances about confidentiality and the independence of the Inspectorate. This information is also provided in writing on the front cover of the questionnaire.

Interviews were offered to any young person who could not read or write in English, or who had literacy difficulties.

Respondents were not asked to put their names on their questionnaire, although their responses could be identified back to them in line with child protection requirements. In order to ensure confidentiality, respondents were asked to seal their completed questionnaire in the envelope provided and either hand it back to a member of the research team at a specified time or leave it in their room for collection.

Refusals were noted and no attempts were made to replace them.

Survey response

At the time of the survey on 7 May 2013 the young person population at HMYOI Cookham Wood was 109. Using the method described above, questionnaires were distributed to all 109 young people.

We received a total of 81 completed questionnaires, a response rate of 74%. This included one questionnaire completed via interview. Eight respondents refused to complete a questionnaire, 12 questionnaires were not returned and eight were returned blank.

Wing/Unit	Number of completed survey returns
Ash	37
Beech	32
Cedar	5
Phoenix	7

Presentation of survey results and analyses

Over the following pages we present the survey results for HMYOI Cookham Wood.

First a full breakdown of responses is provided for each question. In this full breakdown all percentages, including those for filtered questions, refer to the full sample. Percentages have been rounded and therefore may not add up to 100%.

We also present a number of comparative analyses. In all the comparative analyses that follow, statistically significant⁶ differences are indicated by shading. Results that are significantly better are indicated by green shading, results that are significantly worse are indicated by blue shading. If the difference is not statistically significant there is no shading. Orange shading has been used to show a statistically significant difference in young peoples' background details.

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

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

The following comparative analyses are presented:

- The current survey responses from HMYOI Cookham Wood in 2013 compared with responses from young people surveyed in all other young offender institutions. This comparator is based on all responses from young people surveys carried out in eight YOIs since May 2012.
- The current survey responses from HMYOI Cookham Wood in 2013 compared with the responses of young people surveyed at HMYOI Cookham Wood in 2011.
- A comparison within the 2013 survey between the responses of white young people and those from a black and minority ethnic group.
- A comparison within the 2013 survey between the responses of Muslim young people and non-Muslim young people.
- A comparison within the 2013 survey between the responses of young people who consider themselves to have a disability and those who do not consider themselves to have a disability.

⁶ A statistically significant difference between the two samples is one that is unlikely to have arisen by chance alone, and can therefore be assumed to represent a real difference between the two populations. Our significance level is set at 0.05 which means that there is only a 5% likelihood that the difference is due to chance.

Survey summary

SECTION I: ABOUT YOU

Q1	How old are you?	
	15	4 (5%)
	16	19 (24%)
	17	49 (61%)
	18	8 (10%)
Q2	Are you a British citizen?	
	Yes	75 (95%)
	No	4 (5%)
Q3	Do you understand spoken English?	
	Yes	79 (100%)
	No	0 (0%)
Q4	Do you understand written English?	
	Yes	75 (100%)
	No	0 (0%)
Q5	What is your ethnic origin?	
	White - British	28 (35%)
	White - Irish	0 (0%)
	White - other	3 (4%)
	Black or black British - Caribbean	18 (23%)
	Black or black British - African	14 (18%)
	Black or black British - other	1 (1%)
	Asian or Asian British - Indian	0 (0%)
	Asian or Asian British - Pakistani	1 (1%)
	Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi	0 (0%)
	Asian or Asian British - Chinese	0 (0%)
	Asian or Asian British - other	0 (0%)
	Mixed race - white and black Caribbean	7 (9%)
	Mixed race - white and black African	3 (4%)
	Mixed race - white and Asian	0 (0%)
	Mixed race - other	1 (1%)
	Arab	3 (4%)
	Other ethnic group	1 (1%)
Q6	What is your religion?	
	None	24 (31%)
	Church of England	16 (21%)
	Catholic	7 (9%)
	Protestant	1 (1%)
	Other Christian denomination	7 (9%)
	Buddhist	1 (1%)
	Hindu	0 (0%)
	Jewish	0 (0%)
	Muslim	21 (27%)
	Sikh	0 (0%)

Q7	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	
	Yes	7 (9%)
	No	66 (84%)
	Don't know	6 (8%)
Q8	Do you have any children?	
	Yes	6 (8%)
	No	71 (92%)
Q9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability? (i.e. do you need help with any long-term physical, mental or learning needs)	
	Yes	21 (27%)
	No	56 (73%)
Q10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	
	Yes	23 (30%)
	No	54 (70%)

SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE

Q1	Are you sentenced?	
	Yes	61 (76%)
	No - unsentenced/on remand	19 (24%)
Q2	How long is your sentence (the full DTO sentence)?	
	Not sentenced	19 (24%)
	Less than 6 months	10 (13%)
	6 to 12 months	12 (15%)
	More than 12 months, up to 2 years	12 (15%)
	More than 2 years	26 (33%)
	Indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP)	0 (0%)
Q3	How long have you been in this establishment?	
	Less than 1 month	11 (14%)
	1 to 6 months	38 (48%)
	More than 6 months, but less than 12 months	20 (25%)
	12 months to 2 years	7 (9%)
	More than 2 years	3 (4%)
Q4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	
	Yes	35 (44%)
	No	44 (56%)

SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS

Q1	On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?	
	Yes	57 (73%)
	No	9 (12%)
	Don't remember	12 (15%)
Q2	On your most recent journey here, were there any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females travelling with you?	
	Yes	25 (32%)
	No	43 (55%)
	Don't remember	10 (13%)

Q3	On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	33 (42%)
	<i>2 to 4 hours</i>	33 (42%)
	<i>More than 4 hours</i>	7 (9%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	5 (6%)
Q4	On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?	
	<i>My journey was less than 2 hours</i>	33 (42%)
	<i>Yes</i>	4 (5%)
	<i>No</i>	31 (40%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	10 (13%)
Q5	On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?	
	<i>My journey was less than 2 hours</i>	33 (42%)
	<i>Yes</i>	19 (24%)
	<i>No</i>	20 (26%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	6 (8%)
Q6	On your most recent journey here, how did you feel you were treated by the escort staff?	
	<i>Very well</i>	8 (10%)
	<i>Well</i>	29 (37%)
	<i>Neither</i>	24 (31%)
	<i>Badly</i>	2 (3%)
	<i>Very badly</i>	3 (4%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	12 (15%)
Q7	Before you arrived here, did you receive any information to help you prepare for coming here?	
	<i>Yes - and it was helpful</i>	11 (14%)
	<i>Yes - but it was not helpful</i>	10 (13%)
	<i>No - I received no information</i>	48 (62%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	9 (12%)

SECTION 4: FIRST DAYS

Q1	How long were you in reception?	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	64 (82%)
	<i>2 hours or longer</i>	4 (5%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	10 (13%)
Q2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	
	<i>Yes</i>	61 (78%)
	<i>No</i>	12 (15%)
	<i>Don't remember/Not applicable</i>	5 (6%)
Q3	How well did you feel you were treated in reception?	
	<i>Very well</i>	16 (21%)
	<i>Well</i>	37 (47%)
	<i>Neither</i>	16 (21%)
	<i>Badly</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Very badly</i>	2 (3%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	6 (8%)
Q4	When you first arrived here, did staff ask if you needed help or support with any of the following things? (Please tick all that apply to you)	
	<i>Not being able to smoke</i> 33 (44%) <i>Money worries</i>	18 (24%)

Loss of property	14 (19%)	Feeling worried/upset/need- ing someone to talk to	22 (29%)
Feeling scared	22 (29%)	Health problems	43 (57%)
Gang problems	36 (48%)	Getting phone numbers	29 (39%)
Contacting family	34 (45%)	Staff did not ask me about any of these	14 (19%)

**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	25 (35%)	Money worries	11 (15%)
Loss of property	10 (14%)	Feeling worried/upset/need- ing someone to talk to	3 (4%)
Feeling scared	4 (6%)	Health problems	8 (11%)
Gang problems	11 (15%)	Getting phone numbers	20 (28%)
Contacting family	20 (28%)	I did not have any problems	19 (27%)

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

Toiletries/basic items	56 (72%)
The opportunity to have a shower	61 (78%)
Something to eat	64 (82%)
A free phone call to friends/family	50 (64%)
PIN phone credit	45 (58%)
Information about feeling worried/upset	20 (26%)
Don't remember	4 (5%)
I was not given any of these	4 (5%)

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

Chaplain	21 (28%)
Peer mentor	5 (7%)
Childline/Samaritans	10 (14%)
The prison shop/canteen	4 (5%)
Don't remember	18 (24%)
I did not have access to any of these	30 (41%)

Q8 Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?

Yes	63 (80%)
No	11 (14%)
Don't remember	5 (6%)

Q9 Did you feel safe on your first night here?

Yes	61 (77%)
No	9 (11%)
Don't remember	9 (11%)

Q10 Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the establishment?

I have not been on an induction course	6 (8%)
Yes	42 (53%)
No	16 (20%)
Don't remember	15 (19%)

SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT

Q1 Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?

Yes	54 (68%)
No	22 (28%)

	<i>Don't know</i>	3 (4%)
Q2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	
	Yes	20 (26%)
	No	53 (68%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	5 (6%)
Q3	What is the food like here?	
	<i>Very good</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Good</i>	7 (9%)
	<i>Neither</i>	17 (22%)
	<i>Bad</i>	26 (33%)
	<i>Very bad</i>	29 (37%)
Q4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	
	<i>I have not bought anything yet/Don't know</i>	5 (6%)
	Yes	35 (45%)
	No	38 (49%)
Q5	How easy is it for you to attend religious services?	
	<i>I don't want to attend religious services</i>	14 (18%)
	<i>Very easy</i>	19 (25%)
	<i>Easy</i>	18 (23%)
	<i>Neither</i>	5 (6%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	6 (8%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	6 (8%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	9 (12%)
Q6	Are your religious beliefs respected?	
	Yes	41 (53%)
	No	14 (18%)
	<i>Don't know/Not applicable</i>	22 (29%)
Q7	Can you speak to a chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?	
	Yes	46 (60%)
	No	6 (8%)
	<i>Don't know/Not applicable</i>	25 (32%)
Q8	Can you speak to a peer mentor when you need to?	
	Yes	19 (25%)
	No	14 (18%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	43 (57%)
Q9	Can you speak to a member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board) when you need to?	
	Yes	14 (18%)
	No	20 (26%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	43 (56%)
Q10	Can you speak to an advocate (an outside person to help you) when you need to?	
	Yes	32 (42%)
	No	14 (18%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	31 (40%)

SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF

Q1	Do most staff treat you with respect?		
	Yes		46 (60%)
	No		31 (40%)
Q2	If you had a problem, who would you turn to? (Please tick all that apply)		
	No-one	21 (27%)	Social worker 11 (14%)
	Personal officer	15 (19%)	Health services staff 8 (10%)
	Wing Officer	17 (22%)	Peer mentor 2 (3%)
	Teacher/education staff	5 (6%)	Another young person here 11 (14%)
	Gym staff	8 (10%)	Caseworker 34 (44%)
	Chaplain	5 (6%)	Advocate 7 (9%)
	Independent Monitoring Board (IMB)	2 (3%)	Family/friends 31 (40%)
	YOT worker	18 (23%)	Childline/Samaritans 3 (4%)
Q3	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?		
	Yes		25 (32%)
	No		53 (68%)
Q4	When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?		
	<i>I still have not met him/her</i>		32 (41%)
	In your first week		13 (17%)
	After your first week		11 (14%)
	Don't remember		22 (28%)
Q5	How often do you see your personal (named) officer?		
	<i>I still have not met him/her</i>		32 (46%)
	At least once a week		17 (25%)
	Less than once a week		20 (29%)
Q6	Do you feel your personal (named) officer tries to help you?		
	<i>I still have not met him/her</i>		32 (45%)
	Yes		24 (34%)
	No		15 (21%)

SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS

Q1	Is it easy to make an application?		
	Yes		59 (76%)
	No		14 (18%)
	Don't know		5 (6%)
Q2	Are applications sorted out fairly?		
	<i>I have not made an application</i>		20 (26%)
	Yes		25 (32%)
	No		32 (42%)
Q3	Are applications sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?		
	<i>I have not made an application</i>		20 (26%)
	Yes		14 (18%)
	No		43 (56%)
Q4	Is it easy to make a complaint?		
	Yes		43 (55%)
	No		16 (21%)
	Don't know		19 (24%)

Q5	Are complaints sorted out fairly?	
	<i>I have not made a complaint</i>	34 (44%)
	Yes	13 (17%)
	No	31 (40%)
Q6	Are complaints sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	
	<i>I have not made a complaint</i>	34 (45%)
	Yes	8 (11%)
	No	34 (45%)
Q7	Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint?	
	Yes	7 (9%)
	No	50 (65%)
	Never needed to make a complaint	20 (26%)

SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE

Q1	What level of the rewards and sanctions scheme are you on?	
	<i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i>	3 (4%)
	Enhanced (top)	28 (36%)
	Standard (middle)	38 (49%)
	Basic (bottom)	4 (5%)
	Don't know	4 (5%)
Q2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the rewards and sanctions scheme?	
	<i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i>	3 (4%)
	Yes	24 (32%)
	No	32 (42%)
	Don't know	17 (22%)
Q3	Do the different levels of the rewards and sanctions scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	
	<i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i>	3 (4%)
	Yes	36 (48%)
	No	31 (41%)
	Don't know	5 (7%)
Q4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	
	Yes	34 (45%)
	No	25 (33%)
	Don't know	17 (22%)
Q5	If you have had a minor report, was the process explained clearly to you?	
	<i>I have not had a minor report</i>	42 (56%)
	Yes	22 (29%)
	No	11 (15%)
Q6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	
	Yes	54 (70%)
	No	21 (27%)
	Don't know	2 (3%)
Q7	If you have had an adjudication ('nicking'), was the process explained clearly to you?	
	<i>I have not had an adjudication</i>	23 (30%)
	Yes	43 (57%)
	No	10 (13%)

Q8	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	
	Yes	37 (48%)
	No	34 (44%)
	Don't know	6 (8%)
Q9	If you have spent a night in the care and separation unit (CSU), how were you treated by staff?	
	<i>I have not been to the care and separation unit</i>	53 (75%)
	Very well	3 (4%)
	Well	5 (7%)
	Neither	2 (3%)
	Badly	4 (6%)
	Very badly	4 (6%)

SECTION 9: SAFETY

Q1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	
	Yes	27 (36%)
	No	49 (64%)
Q2	Do you feel unsafe now?	
	Yes	9 (12%)
	No	65 (88%)
Q3	In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply)	
	<i>Never felt unsafe</i>	49 (67%)
	Everywhere	5 (7%)
	Care and separation unit	2 (3%)
	Association areas	6 (8%)
	Reception area	2 (3%)
	At the gym	8 (11%)
	In an exercise yard	6 (8%)
	At work	2 (3%)
	At education	6 (8%)
	At religious services	1 (1%)
	At meal times	5 (7%)
	At healthcare	1 (1%)
	Visits area	6 (8%)
	In wing showers	5 (7%)
	In gym showers	5 (7%)
	In corridors/stairwells	6 (8%)
	On your landing/wing	6 (8%)
	During movement	7 (10%)
	In your cell	4 (5%)
Q4	Have you ever been victimised by another young person/group of young people here? (e.g. insulted or assaulted you)	
	Yes	23 (30%)
	No	54 (70%)
Q5	If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply)	
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you, your family or friends)</i>	10 (13%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	12 (16%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i>	2 (3%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	7 (9%)

	<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i>	3 (4%)
	<i>Medication</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Debt</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Drugs</i>	3 (4%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	3 (4%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	3 (4%)
	<i>Your nationality</i>	3 (4%)
	<i>You are from a different part of the country to others</i>	3 (4%)
	<i>You are from a Traveller community</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Your sexuality</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Your age</i>	3 (4%)
	<i>You having a disability</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>You were new here</i>	5 (6%)
	<i>Your offence/crime</i>	3 (4%)
	<i>Gang related issues</i>	6 (8%)
Q7	Have you ever been victimised by staff here? (e.g. insulted or assaulted you)	
	Yes	23 (32%)
	No	50 (68%)
Q8	If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? tick all that apply)	(Please
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you, your family or friends)</i>	9 (12%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	7 (10%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	3 (4%)
	<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i>	5 (7%)
	<i>Medication</i>	2 (3%)
	<i>Debt</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Drugs</i>	2 (3%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	7 (10%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your nationality</i>	2 (3%)
	<i>You are from a different part of the country to others</i>	3 (4%)
	<i>You are from a Traveller community</i>	2 (3%)
	<i>Your sexuality</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your age</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>You having a disability</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>You were new here</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Your offence/crime</i>	2 (3%)
	<i>Gang related issues</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Because you made a complaint</i>	5 (7%)
Q10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	
	Yes	17 (25%)
	No	40 (59%)
	Don't know	11 (16%)
Q11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	
	Yes	19 (27%)
	No	27 (38%)
	Don't know	25 (35%)
Q12	Is shouting through the windows a problem here?	
	Yes	24 (33%)
	No	39 (53%)
	Don't know	10 (14%)

SECTION 10: HEALTH SERVICES

Q1	Is it easy to see the following people if you need to?		
		Yes	No
	The doctor	40 (56%)	20 (28%)
	The nurse	49 (69%)	12 (17%)
	The dentist	25 (36%)	26 (38%)
			Don't know
			12 (17%)
			10 (14%)
			18 (26%)
Q2	What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?		
	<i>I have not been</i>		9 (12%)
	Very good		14 (19%)
	Good		23 (32%)
	Neither		12 (16%)
	Bad		7 (10%)
	Very bad		8 (11%)
Q3	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/all of it in your room?		
	<i>I am not taking any medication</i>		28 (39%)
	Yes, all of my meds		5 (7%)
	Yes, some of my meds		12 (17%)
	No		26 (37%)
Q4	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?		
	Yes		23 (32%)
	No		49 (68%)
Q5	Are you being helped by anyone here with your emotional or mental health problems? (e.g. a psychologist, doctor, counsellor, personal officer or another member of staff)		
	<i>I do not have any emotional or mental health problems</i>		49 (68%)
	Yes		15 (21%)
	No		8 (11%)
Q6	Did you have problems with alcohol when you first arrived here?		
	Yes		3 (4%)
	No		69 (96%)
Q7	Have you received any help with alcohol problems here?		
	Yes		1 (1%)
	No		73 (99%)
Q8	Did you have problems with drugs when you first arrived here?		
	Yes		26 (36%)
	No		47 (64%)
Q9	Do you have problems with drugs now?		
	Yes		8 (11%)
	No		64 (89%)
Q10	Have you received any help with drugs problems here?		
	Yes		12 (16%)
	No		61 (84%)
Q11	How easy or difficult is it to get illegal drugs here?		
	Very easy		4 (6%)
	Easy		6 (8%)
	Neither		4 (6%)

Difficult	2 (3%)
Very difficult	9 (13%)
Don't know	47 (65%)

SECTION 11: ACTIVITIES

Q1	How old were you when you were last at school?				
	14 or under			30 (40%)	
	15 or over			45 (60%)	
Q2	Have you ever been excluded from school?				
	Yes			61 (81%)	
	No			9 (12%)	
	Not applicable			5 (7%)	
Q3	Did you ever skip school before you came into custody?				
	Yes			49 (66%)	
	No			21 (28%)	
	Not applicable			4 (5%)	
Q4	Do you CURRENTLY take part in any of the following activities? (Please tick all that apply)				
	Education			56 (76%)	
	A job in this establishment			11 (15%)	
	Vocational or skills training			12 (16%)	
	Offending behaviour programmes			24 (32%)	
	I am not currently involved in any of these			10 (14%)	
Q5	If you have been involved in any of the following activities here, do you think they will help you when you leave prison?				
		Not been involved	Yes	No	Don't know
	Education	1 (1%)	44 (65%)	14 (21%)	9 (13%)
	A job in this establishment	12 (23%)	17 (33%)	14 (27%)	9 (17%)
	Vocational or skills training	9 (20%)	21 (47%)	7 (16%)	8 (18%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	8 (15%)	24 (46%)	13 (25%)	7 (13%)
Q6	Do you usually have association every day?				
	Yes			51 (69%)	
	No			23 (31%)	
Q7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?				
	Don't want to go			5 (7%)	
	Yes			35 (48%)	
	No			33 (45%)	
Q8	How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?				
	Don't want to go			3 (4%)	
	None			10 (14%)	
	One to two times			32 (45%)	
	Three to five times			10 (14%)	
	More than five times			16 (23%)	

SECTION 12: FAMILY AND FRIENDS

Q1	Are you able to use the telephone every day, if you want to?	
	Yes	51 (70%)

	No	18 (25%)
	Don't know	4 (5%)
Q2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?	
	Yes	39 (53%)
	No	29 (39%)
	Don't know	6 (8%)
Q3	How many visits do you usually have each week, from family or friends?	
	I don't get visits	20 (25%)
	Less than one a week	15 (19%)
	About one a week	27 (34%)
	More than one a week	11 (14%)
	Don't know	7 (9%)
Q4	How easy is it for your family and friends to visit you here?	
	I don't get visits	20 (28%)
	Very easy	8 (11%)
	Easy	19 (26%)
	Neither	9 (13%)
	Difficult	5 (7%)
	Very difficult	9 (13%)
	Don't know	2 (3%)
Q5	Do your visits usually start on time?	
	I don't get visits	20 (27%)
	Yes	32 (43%)
	No	17 (23%)
	Don't know	5 (7%)

SECTION 13: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE

Q1	Do you think you will have a problem with any of the following things, when you are released? (Please tick all that apply)	
	Finding accommodation	20 (29%)
	Getting into school or college	25 (37%)
	Getting a job	41 (60%)
	Money/finances	28 (41%)
	Claiming benefits	13 (19%)
	Continuing health services	7 (10%)
	Opening a bank account	10 (15%)
	Avoiding bad relationships	15 (22%)
	I won't have any problems	14 (21%)
Q2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan? (i.e. a plan that is discussed in your DTO/planning meetings, which sets out your targets)	
	Yes	35 (49%)
	No	17 (24%)
	Don't know	20 (28%)
Q3	Were you involved in the development of your plan?	
	I don't have a plan/don't know if I have a plan	37 (54%)
	Yes	29 (42%)
	No	3 (4%)
Q4	Do you understand the targets that have been set in your plan?	
	I don't have a plan/don't know if I have a plan	37 (54%)

	Yes		28 (41%)
	No		4 (6%)
Q5	Do you have a caseworker here?		
	Yes		63 (89%)
	No		5 (7%)
	Don't know		3 (4%)
Q6	Has your caseworker helped to prepare you for release?		
	<i>I don't have a caseworker</i>		8 (12%)
	Yes		29 (43%)
	No		20 (29%)
	Don't know		11 (16%)
Q7	Has your social worker been to visit you since you have been here?		
	<i>I don't have a social worker</i>		22 (32%)
	Yes		32 (46%)
	No		15 (22%)
Q8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?		
	Yes		27 (38%)
	No		35 (49%)
	Don't know		9 (13%)
Q9	Do you know who to contact for help with any of the following problems, before your release? (Please tick all that apply)		
	<i>Finding accommodation</i>		17 (27%)
	<i>Getting into school or college</i>		15 (24%)
	<i>Getting a job</i>		19 (31%)
	<i>Help with money/finances</i>		13 (21%)
	<i>Help with claiming benefits</i>		11 (18%)
	<i>Continuing health services</i>		9 (15%)
	<i>Opening a bank account</i>		10 (16%)
	<i>Avoiding bad relationships</i>		11 (18%)
	<i>I don't know who to contact</i>		36 (58%)
Q10	What is most likely to stop you offending in the future? (Please tick all that apply to you)		
	Not sentenced	19 (28%)	<i>Having a mentor (someone you can ask for advice)</i> 4 (6%)
	<i>Nothing, it is up to me</i>	21 (30%)	<i>Having a YOT worker or social worker that I get on with</i> 11 (16%)
	<i>Making new friends outside</i>	11 (16%)	<i>Having children</i> 13 (19%)
	<i>Going back to live with my family</i>	4 (6%)	<i>Having something to do that isn't crime</i> 11 (16%)
	<i>Getting a place of my own</i>	18 (26%)	<i>This sentence</i> 9 (13%)
	<i>Getting a job</i>	27 (39%)	<i>Getting into school/college</i> 14 (20%)
	<i>Having a partner (girlfriend or boyfriend)</i>	13 (19%)	<i>Talking about my offending behaviour with staff</i> 1 (1%)
	<i>Staying off alcohol/drugs</i>	13 (19%)	<i>Anything else</i> 2 (3%)
Q11	Do you want to stop offending?		
	Not sentenced		19 (26%)
	Yes		45 (62%)
	No		3 (4%)
	Don't know		6 (8%)

Q12	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here, that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?	
	Not sentenced	19 (26%)
	Yes	20 (27%)
	No	34 (47%)

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



Survey responses from children and young people: HMYOI Cookham Wood 2013 Main Comparator (last inspection)

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

		2013 Cookham Wood	Young people comparator	2013 Cookham Wood	2011 Cookham Wood (last inspection)
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		81	845	81	100
SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU					
1.1	Are you 18 years of age?	10%	16%	10%	9%
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	5%	4%	5%	5%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%	100%	
1.4	Do you understand written English?	100%	98%	100%	
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other category.	61%	43%	61%	62%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	27%	21%	27%	30%
1.7	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	9%	5%	9%	6%
1.8	Do you have any children?	7%	10%	8%	12%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	27%	16%	27%	10%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	30%	33%	30%	31%
SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE					
2.1	Are you sentenced?	76%	83%	76%	69%
2.2	Is your sentence 12 months or less?	28%	35%	28%	34%
2.3	Have you been in this establishment for one month or less?	14%	15%	14%	17%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	44%	57%	44%	55%
SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS					
On your most recent journey here:					
3.1	Did you feel safe?	73%	83%	73%	81%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	32%	38%	32%	34%
3.3	Did you spend more than 4 hours in the van?	9%	10%	9%	17%
For those who spent 2 or more hours in the escort van:					
3.4	Were you offered a toilet break if you needed it?	8%	15%	8%	12%
3.5	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	43%	33%	43%	33%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	48%	54%	48%	42%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	14%	17%	14%	

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

Key to tables

		2013 Cookham Wood	Young people comparator	2013 Cookham Wood	2011 Cookham Wood (last inspection)
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		81	845	81	100
SECTION 4: YOUR FIRST FEW DAYS HERE					
4.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	82%	82%	82%	79%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	78%	83%	78%	
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	68%	68%	68%	55%
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?	44%	54%	44%	52%
4.4b	Loss of property?	19%	21%	19%	25%
4.4c	Feeling scared?	29%	29%	29%	
4.4d	Gang problems?	48%	48%	48%	
4.4e	Contacting family?	46%	58%	46%	53%
4.4f	Money worries?	24%	20%	24%	28%
4.4g	Feeling worried/upset/needling someone to talk to?	29%	38%	29%	
4.4h	Health problems?	57%	54%	57%	70%
4.4i	Getting phone numbers?	39%	47%	39%	47%
4.5	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	73%	71%	73%	80%
When you first arrived, did you have problems with any of the following:					
4.5a	Not being able to smoke?	35%	48%	35%	40%
4.5b	Loss of property?	15%	11%	15%	23%
4.5c	Feeling scared?	5%	8%	5%	
4.5d	Gang problems?	16%	10%	16%	
4.5e	Contacting family?	28%	23%	28%	33%
4.5f	Money worries?	16%	15%	16%	23%
4.5g	Feeling worried/upset/needling someone to talk to?	4%	10%	4%	
4.5h	Health problems?	12%	9%	12%	18%
4.5i	Getting phone numbers?	28%	25%	28%	40%
When you first arrived, were you given any of the following:					
4.6a	Toiletries/basic items?	72%	83%	72%	
4.6b	The opportunity to have a shower?	78%	52%	78%	68%
4.6c	Something to eat?	82%	86%	82%	83%
4.6d	A free phone call to friends/family?	64%	82%	64%	55%
4.6e	PIN phone credit?	58%	64%	58%	
4.6f	Information about feeling worried/upset?	26%	36%	26%	

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

Key to tables

		2013 Cookham Wood	Young people comparator		
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better			2013 Cookham Wood	2011 Cookham Wood (last inspection)
	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		81	845	81	100
Within your first 24 hours, did you have access to the following people or services:					
4.7a	A chaplain?	28%	49%	28%	45%
4.7b	A peer mentor?	7%	15%	7%	
4.7c	Childline/Samaritans	14%	18%	14%	
4.7d	The prison shop/canteen?	5%	16%	5%	10%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	79%	74%	79%	73%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	77%	83%	77%	83%
4.10	For those who have been on an induction course: did it cover everything you needed to know about the establishment	58%	63%	58%	70%
SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT					
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	68%	72%	68%	43%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	26%	42%	26%	33%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	9%	18%	9%	5%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	45%	51%	45%	33%
5.5	Is it easy/very easy for you to attend religious services?	48%	63%	48%	58%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	53%	60%	53%	64%
Can you speak to:					
5.7	A chaplain of your faith in private?	60%	73%	60%	72%
5.8	A peer mentor?	25%	39%	25%	
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	18%	30%	18%	30%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	41%	47%	41%	36%
SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF					
6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	60%	73%	60%	58%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	27%	25%	27%	
6.3	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	32%	43%	32%	34%
For those who have met their personal officer:					
6.4	Did you meet your personal (named) officer within the first week?	29%	42%	29%	32%
6.5	Do you see your personal (named) officer at least once a week?	46%	61%	46%	58%
6.6	Do you feel your personal (named) officer tries to help you?	62%	73%	62%	

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

Key to tables

		2013 Cookham Wood	Young people comparator	2013 Cookham Wood	2011 Cookham Wood (last inspection)
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		81	845	81	100
SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS					
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	76%	80%	76%	80%
For those who have made an application:					
7.2	Do you feel applications are sorted out fairly?	44%	72%	44%	53%
7.3	Do you feel applications are sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	25%	65%	25%	42%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	55%	55%	55%	70%
For those who have made a complaint:					
7.5	Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	30%	39%	30%	39%
7.6	Do you feel complaints are sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	19%	42%	19%	48%
7.7	Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint?	9%	10%	9%	
SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE					
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	37%	31%	37%	35%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	31%	52%	31%	37%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	48%	53%	48%	52%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	45%	52%	45%	
For those who have had a minor report:					
8.5	Was the process explained clearly to you?	67%	78%	67%	
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	70%	61%	70%	58%
For those who have had an adjudication ('nicking'):					
8.7	Was the process explained clearly to you?	81%	86%	81%	81%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (Cand R) since you have been here?	48%	30%	48%	33%
8.9	For those who had spent a night in the care and separation unit: did the staff treat you well/very well?	44%	48%	44%	45%
SECTION 9: SAFETY					
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	35%	29%	35%	23%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	12%	11%	12%	

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

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		2013 Cookham Wood	Young people comparator			2013 Cookham Wood	2011 Cookham Wood (last inspection)
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		81	845	81	100		
9.4	Have you ever been victimised by other young people here?	30%	22%	30%	15%		
Since you have been here, have other young people:							
9.5a	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	14%	10%	14%	7%		
9.5b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	15%	10%	15%	7%		
9.5c	Sexually abused you?	3%	1%	3%	1%		
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	9%	7%	9%			
9.5e	Taken your canteen/property?	4%	4%	4%	4%		
9.5f	Victimised you because of medication?	1%	1%	1%			
9.5g	Victimised you because of debt?	1%	2%	1%			
9.5h	Victimised you because of drugs?	4%	1%	4%	0%		
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	4%	2%	4%	2%		
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	4%	2%	4%	0%		
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	4%	1%	4%			
9.5l	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	4%	2%	4%	2%		
9.5m	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	1%	1%	1%			
9.5n	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	1%	1%	1%			
9.5o	Victimised you because of your age?	4%	1%	4%			
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	1%	2%	1%	1%		
9.5q	Victimised you because you were new here?	7%	6%	7%	5%		
9.5r	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	4%	3%	4%	1%		
9.5s	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	8%	4%	8%	2%		

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	2013 Cookham Wood	Young people comparator			2013 Cookham Wood	2011 Cookham Wood (last inspection)
	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		81	845	81	100		
9.7	Have you ever been victimised by a member of staff here?	31%	23%	31%	21%		
Since you have been here, have staff:							
9.8a	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	12%	13%	12%	10%		
9.8b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	9%	4%	9%	2%		
9.8c	Sexually abused you?	0%	1%	0%	1%		
9.8d	Threatened or intimidated you?	4%	7%	4%			
9.8e	Taken your canteen/property?	7%	3%	7%	4%		
9.8f	Victimised you because of medication?	3%	1%	3%			
9.8g	Victimised you because of debt?	1%	0%	1%			
9.8h	Victimised you because of drugs?	3%	1%	3%	0%		
9.8i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	9%	3%	9%	4%		
9.8j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	2%	0%	0%		
9.8k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	3%	1%	3%			
9.8k	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	4%	2%	4%	0%		
9.8m	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	3%	1%	3%			
9.8n	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	0%	0%			
9.8o	Victimised you because of your age?	1%	1%	1%			
9.8p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	1%	1%	1%	0%		
9.8q	Victimised you because you were new here?	1%	2%	1%	7%		
9.8r	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	3%	2%	3%	5%		
9.8s	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	1%	1%	1%	2%		
9.8t	Victimised you because you made a complaint?	7%	5%	7%			
9.10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	25%	29%	25%			
9.11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	27%	31%	27%	30%		
9.12	Is shouting through the windows a problem here?	33%	34%	33%	32%		

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	2013 Cookham Wood	Young people comparator	2013 Cookham Wood	2011 Cookham Wood (last inspection)
	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		81	845	81	100
SECTION 10: HEALTH SERVICES					
10.1a	Is it easy for you to see the doctor?	56%	64%	56%	49%
10.1b	Is it easy for you to see the nurse?	69%	79%	69%	58%
10.1c	Is it easy for you to see the dentist?	37%	44%	36%	25%
10.2	For those who have been to health services: Do you think the overall quality is good/very good?	58%	60%	58%	63%
10.3	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/all of it in your cell?	40%	52%	40%	
10.4	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?	32%	19%	32%	15%
10.5	If you have emotional or mental health problems, are you being helped by anyone here?	65%	68%	65%	65%
10.6	Did you have any problems with alcohol when you first arrived?	4%	10%	4%	4%
10.7	Have you received any help with any alcohol problems here?	1%	7%	1%	2%
10.8	Did you have any problems with drugs when you first arrived?	36%	34%	36%	28%
10.9	Do you have a problem with drugs now?	11%	8%	11%	11%
10.10	Have you received any help with any drug problems here?	16%	24%	16%	11%
10.11	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs here?	14%	18%	14%	7%
SECTION 11: ACTIVITIES					
11.1	Were you 14 or younger when you were last at school?	40%	38%	40%	35%
11.2	Have you ever been excluded from school?	81%	86%	81%	93%
11.3	Did you ever skip school before you came into custody?	66%	75%	66%	
Do you currently take part in any of the following:					
11.4a	Education?	76%	79%	76%	87%
11.4b	A job in this establishment?	15%	29%	15%	22%
11.4c	Vocational or skills training?	16%	17%	16%	27%
11.4d	Offending behaviour programmes?	32%	24%	32%	30%
11.4e	Nothing	14%	10%	14%	10%

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

Key to tables

		2013 Cookham Wood	Young people comparator	2013 Cookham Wood	2011 Cookham Wood (last inspection)
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		81	845	81	100
For those who have taken part in the following activities while in this establishment, do you think that they will help you when you leave prison:					
11.5a	Education?	66%	66%	66%	65%
11.5b	A job in this establishment?	43%	56%	43%	54%
11.5c	Vocational or skills training?	58%	52%	58%	56%
11.5d	Offending behaviour programmes?	54%	51%	54%	38%
11.6	Do you usually have association every day?	69%	76%	69%	63%
11.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	48%	40%	48%	85%
11.8	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	23%	8%	23%	17%
SECTION 12: KEEPING IN TOUCH WITH FAMILY AND FRIENDS					
12.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	70%	70%	70%	48%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	53%	37%	53%	56%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	47%	36%	47%	50%
12.4	Is it easy/very easy for your family and friends to visit you here?	37%	34%	37%	
12.5	Do your visits start on time?	43%	46%	43%	26%
SECTION 13: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE					
Do you think you will have a problem with the following, when you are released:					
13.1a	Finding accommodation?	29%	25%	29%	35%
13.1b	Getting into school or college?	37%	30%	37%	40%
13.1c	Getting a job?	60%	55%	60%	57%
13.1d	Money/finances?	41%	37%	41%	49%
13.1e	Claiming benefits?	20%	22%	20%	31%
13.1f	Continuing health services?	10%	9%	10%	16%
13.1g	Opening a bank account?	15%	16%	15%	25%
13.1h	Avoiding bad relationships?	22%	17%	22%	22%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	49%	54%	49%	
For those with a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan:					
13.3	Were you involved in the development of your plan?	91%	85%	91%	
13.4	Do you understand the targets set in your plan?	88%	96%	88%	
13.5	Do you have a caseworker here?	89%	81%	89%	
13.6	Has your caseworker helped to prepare you for release?	48%	51%	48%	
For those with a social worker:					
13.7	Has your social worker been to visit you since you have been here?	68%	62%	68%	
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	38%	41%	38%	34%

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

Key to tables

		2013 Cookham Wood		Young people comparator		2013 Cookham Wood		2011 Cookham Wood (last inspection)	
Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better									
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse									
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details									
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference									
Number of completed questionnaires returned		81	845	81	100				
If you have a problem with any of the following, do you know who to ask for help?									
13.9a	Finding accommodation	27%	26%	27%	42%				
13.9b	Getting into school or college	24%	26%	24%	46%				
13.9c	Getting a job	31%	33%	31%	35%				
13.9d	Help with money/finances	21%	22%	21%	29%				
13.9e	Help with claiming benefits	18%	20%	18%	23%				
13.9f	Continuing health services	14%	14%	14%	23%				
13.9g	Opening a bank account	17%	19%	17%	30%				
13.9h	Avoiding bad relationships	18%	15%	18%	24%				
For those who were sentenced:									
13.11	Do you want to stop offending?	84%	91%	84%	86%				
13.12	Have you done anything or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future	37%	50%	37%	42%				

Diversity analysis



Key question responses (ethnicity/religion) HMYOI Cookham Wood 2013

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

Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic young people	White young people	Muslim young people	Non-Muslim young people
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		49	31	21	56
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	8%	0%	18%	0%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)			90%	50%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	41%	7%		
1.5	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	0%	22%	0%	11%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	21%	40%	14%	32%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	29%	31%	33%	27%
2.1	Are you sentenced?	77%	74%	76%	79%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	48%	38%	30%	50%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	29%	37%	19%	37%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	44%	54%	38%	53%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	14%	13%	10%	16%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	71%	90%	76%	80%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	60%	80%	52%	74%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	83%	74%	89%	75%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	69%	91%	56%	84%
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	60%	81%	56%	71%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	19%	36%	19%	27%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	8%	10%	4%	11%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	48%	40%	46%	45%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	66%	34%	67%	48%
Can you speak to:					
5.7	A chaplain of your faith in private?	64%	54%	70%	56%
5.8	A peer mentor?	25%	23%	19%	28%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	19%	17%	15%	21%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	44%	37%	44%	43%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic young people	White young people	Muslim young people	Non-Muslim young people
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		49	31	21	56
6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	55%	67%	54%	64%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	25%	30%	33%	26%
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	70%	83%	67%	78%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	56%	55%	50%	58%
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	37%	37%	33%	39%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	30%	37%	19%	39%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	43%	59%	44%	51%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	51%	37%	58%	39%
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	74%	63%	70%	69%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	50%	46%	44%	49%
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	42%	23%	41%	34%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	15%	8%	15%	12%
9.4	Have you been victimised by other young people here?	32%	23%	30%	28%
Since you have been here, have other young people:					
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	11%	3%	11%	7%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	7%	0%	4%	4%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	7%	0%	4%	4%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	7%	0%	4%	4%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	2%	0%	0%	1%
9.7	Have you been victimised by staff here?	35%	23%	31%	29%
Since you have been here, have staff:					
9.8d	Threatened or intimidated you?	5%	3%	4%	4%
9.8i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	14%	0%	15%	4%
9.8j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	0%	0%	0%
9.8k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	5%	0%	4%	1%
9.8p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	2%	0%	0%	1%
9.10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	20%	33%	17%	28%
9.11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	19%	40%	17%	30%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic young people	White young people	Muslim young people	Non-Muslim young people
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		49	31	21	56
10.1a	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the doctor?	51%	63%	44%	62%
10.1b	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the nurse?	68%	70%	61%	73%
10.4	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	32%	31%	28%	34%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:					
11.4a	Education?	76%	73%	64%	78%
11.4b	A job in this establishment?	14%	17%	15%	13%
11.4c	Vocational or skills training?	9%	27%	15%	16%
11.4d	Offending behaviour programmes?	24%	46%	20%	38%
11.4e	Nothing?	14%	13%	27%	10%
11.6	Do you usually have association every day?	66%	73%	80%	66%
11.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	55%	35%	54%	44%
11.8	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	32%	10%	38%	17%
12.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	74%	62%	67%	68%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	62%	40%	63%	51%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	59%	29%	48%	45%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	40%	62%	38%	55%
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	29%	49%	22%	44%



Diversity analysis - disability

Key question responses (disability analysis) HMYOI Cookham Wood 2013

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		21	56
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	0%	7%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	100%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	100%	100%
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	48%	70%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	15%	33%
1.5	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	10%	7%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	38%	26%
2.1	Are you sentenced?	71%	79%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	38%	45%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	24%	37%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	43%	49%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	18%	12%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	82%	78%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	68%	69%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	82%	78%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	90%	73%
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	76%	69%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	19%	29%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	0%	12%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	41%	47%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	32%	62%
Can you speak to:			

Diversity analysis - disability

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
5.7	A chaplain of your faith in private?	52%	64%

Diversity analysis - disability

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
5.8	A peer mentor?	29%	25%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	10%	22%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	43%	43%
6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	62%	61%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	26%	27%
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	71%	80%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	48%	59%
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	26%	43%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	20%	38%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	36%	54%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	44%	44%
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	82%	64%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	70%	39%
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	44%	31%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	15%	10%
9.4	Have you been victimised by other young people here?	33%	28%
Since you have been here, have other young people:			
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	11%	7%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	11%	1%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	11%	1%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	11%	1%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	4%	0%
9.7	Have you been victimised by staff here?	33%	29%
Since you have been here, have staff:			
9.8d	Threatened or intimidated you?	4%	4%
9.8i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	4%	10%

Diversity analysis - disability

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
9.8j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	0%

Diversity analysis - disability

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
9.8k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	4%
9.8p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	4%	0%
9.10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	27%	26%
9.11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	20%	30%
10.1a	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the doctor?	46%	61%
10.1b	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the nurse?	59%	75%
10.4	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	74%	12%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:			
11.4a	Education?	80%	74%
11.4b	A job in this establishment?	15%	16%
11.4c	Vocational or skills training?	15%	16%
11.4d	Offending behaviour programmes?	31%	35%
11.4e	Nothing?	4%	17%
11.6	Do you usually have association every day?	50%	77%
11.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	50%	48%
11.8	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	17%	27%
12.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	67%	74%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	50%	52%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	41%	48%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	67%	42%
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	46%	35%