

Report on an unannounced full follow-up  
inspection of

**HMYOI Feltham**  
**(young people under 18)**

18 - 22 July 2011

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

Crown copyright 2011

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

# Contents

Introduction	5
Fact page	7
<b>1</b> Healthy prison summary and progress on main recommendations	9
<hr/>	
<b>2</b> Progress on other recommendations	
<hr/>	
1 Arrival in custody	25
2 Environment and relationships	31
3 Duty of care	37
4 Diversity	51
5 Health services	61
6 Activities	71
7 Good order	79
8 Services	85
9 Resettlement	87
<b>3</b> Summary of recommendations	97
<hr/>	
<b>4</b> Appendices	
<hr/>	
I Inspection team	107
II Prison population profile	108
III Summary of young people's questionnaires and interviews	111



# Introduction

Feltham is a complex institution that holds a mixture of remanded and sentenced young people. It is managed as a single facility but divided into two separate components: one that holds young adults aged 18 to 21 and the other holding children and young people aged 15 to 18. When we last visited Feltham in 2010, we carried out a full announced inspection on both sides of the institution and commended the slow but consistent progress made in recent years. This unannounced full follow-up inspection focused solely on the side for the younger age group. It found some useful and effective work but also deterioration in provision for young people.

Feltham remained fundamentally safe, despite some negative perceptions among new arrivals, almost two-thirds of whom were new to custody. The induction process needed development. Safeguarding arrangements had improved and incidents of self-harm had reduced. Levels of violence and some negative perceptions among young people about their safety remained a concern, but we were confident that staff responded appropriately to incidents and that the institution had interventions in place to tackle bullying. Feltham was also working to address the complex issue of gangs. The work being undertaken by a dedicated behaviour management group, with the most challenging young people, was particularly noteworthy.

In our survey, young people who had spent time in the segregation unit had significantly poorer perceptions of staff treatment than the national comparator. The quality of regime was unsatisfactory and individual care planning was limited. Usage had, however, fallen, which was to be commended. Use of force remained high but staff dealt well with incidents, apart from on two occasions when batons were drawn which, in our view, could not be justified for this age group.

The use of illicit drugs in Feltham appeared very low and detoxification protocols and drug interventions for those arriving with drug dependence were generally effective.

Our overall judgement on respect at Feltham had reduced since we last inspected although it remained reasonably good. Standards of cleanliness had declined and the prison had failed to address our concerns about applications and complaints. There had been a loss of focus in addressing issues of equality and diversity. Work to support young people with disabilities was underdeveloped and provision for foreign nationals was inadequate. It was disappointing that the network of equality peer representatives had not been maintained. More positively there had been some commendable work to support Travellers and Gypsies, as well as young people who were gay or bisexual.

Nearly three-quarters of young people we surveyed felt respected by staff, which was better than in similar establishments. The quality of relationships we observed was impressive and staff had a good knowledge and understanding of young people, although more needed to be done to improve the personal officer scheme.

Despite some dirty facilities the quality of health care was good. There had been some meaningful consultation with young people and inpatient facilities had improved. Mental health services were good and age-appropriate, and transfer to secure mental health facilities was properly expedited.

Of greatest concern was the deterioration in the quality of activity provision at Feltham. Previously we had described provision as good but overall our judgement was that it was now poor. Much of the teaching was unsatisfactory and learners' achievements were low.

Attendance at education and standards of discipline were poor and many young people were returned to their cells or excluded because of disruptive behaviour. We found about a fifth of all young people locked in cell during the working day. Attendance at vocational training was better but accreditation was limited. Young people had daily access to association and exercise but time unlocked was not well managed or reliable and did not reach the levels indicated in the institution's core day routine. Physical education, in contrast, provided good levels of access, and football and rugby projects run in partnership with professional clubs were impressive.

Resettlement work was mixed and a lack of analysis of resettlement need, as well as limitations in addressing some of the pathways, created significant gaps. The institution's approach to training planning and remand management, however, ensured that there was meaningful engagement with young people supported by some impressive work undertaken by offender supervisors. There were individualised targets for young people and examples of good collaboration with youth offending teams. The Heron Unit provided a purposeful approach to working with a small number of motivated young people but this work was about to lose its funding before a proper evaluation of its effectiveness. Early release was used well to motivate young people in addressing their training planning targets.

This report describes an establishment that continues to operate reasonably well, working with often volatile young people in a challenging environment. This does not however, negate the fact that the progress and improvement we have previously described has stopped, and in significant areas regressed. There is a clear need to re-focus the prison's work on equality within a diverse population, basic standards of cleanliness require improvement and there is a need to re-energise elements of the resettlement strategy. Most importantly, and as a minimum when addressing the needs of young people, there must be access to good quality activity and education which will engage young people and equip them for the future.

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

**September 2011**

# Fact page

## **Task of the establishment**

To keep in custody young people from the age of 15 to 18 deemed unsuitable for or not warranting secure local authority accommodation and young adults from the age of 18-21 placed in custody by the courts.

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

Public

## **Region/Department**

Greater London

## **Number held**

229 (18 July 2011)

## **Certified normal accommodation**

240

## **Operational capacity**

240

## **Date of last full inspection**

January 2010

## **Brief history**

Built in 1854 as an industrial school, Feltham was taken over in 1910 by the Prison Commissioners as their second Borstal institution. The existing building opened as a remand centre in March 1988. The current HM Prison and Young Offender Institution Feltham was formed by the amalgamation of Ashford Remand Centre and Feltham Borstal in 1990/91. In the year 2000 the establishment split into Feltham A which held young people under the age of 18 and Feltham B which held young adults between the ages of 18 and 21. Young people between the ages of 15 to 18 years accommodated in Feltham A continue to be managed under a distinct regime commissioned by the Youth Justice Board.

## **Short description of residential units**

Young adults and young people under 18 occupy separate residential units. There are currently eight units for the under 18 population, each holding 30 young people. Almost all the cells are for single occupancy. All cells have integral sanitation and televisions, in accordance with the incentives scheme.

## **Feltham A units**

Bittern – first night and induction

Dunlin – intervention unit

Heron – residential 30-bed unit with a regime which focuses on education, training and employment for young people serving detention and training orders who have been selected because they have demonstrated a strong commitment to turning their lives around. The initiative is funded by a partnership of the Ministry of Justice, Youth Justice Board, London Development Agency and the Metropolitan Police Service. The young people are from a variety of London boroughs.

Curlew – residential unit

Eagle – residential unit

Falcon – residential unit

Grebe – residential unit

Jay – residential unit

Ibis – segregation unit

**Escort contractor**

Reliance, GSL, Serco

**Health service commissioner and providers**

The commissioning body is NHS Hounslow.

The provider services are:

CNWL	Central and North West London NHS Trust, lead contractor responsible for primary care and substance misuse
WLMHT	West London Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust, mental health services
Medacs	GP consortium
THT	Terrence Higgins Trust, sexual health

**Learning and skills providers**

Kensington and Chelsea College



# Healthy prison summary

## Introduction

---

HP1 All inspection reports include a summary of an establishment's performance against the model of a healthy prison. The four criteria of a healthy prison are:

**Safety** young people, even the most vulnerable, are held safely

**Respect** young people are treated with respect for their human dignity

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

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

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

**- outcomes for young people are good against this healthy prison test (previously... performing well against this healthy prison test).**

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

**- outcomes for young people are reasonably good against this healthy prison test (previously... performing reasonably well against this healthy prison test).**

There is evidence of adverse outcomes for 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 young people are not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test (previously... not performing sufficiently well against this healthy prison test.)**

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

**- outcomes for young people are poor against this healthy prison test (previously... performing poorly against this healthy prison test).**

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

- HP3 The Inspectorate conducts unannounced follow-up inspections to assess progress against recommendations made in the previous full inspection. Follow-up inspections are proportionate to risk. In full follow-up inspections sufficient inspector time is allocated to enable an assessment of progress and also to allow in-depth analysis of areas of serious concern identified in the previous inspection, particularly on safety and respect, or matters of concern subsequently drawn to the attention of the Chief Inspector. Inspectors use the findings of young people surveys (where available), young people focus groups, research analysis of prison data and observation<sup>1</sup>. This enables a reassessment of previous healthy prison assessments held by the Inspectorate on all establishments, and published in reports from 2004 onwards.
- HP4 This is a report of a follow-up inspection of the recommendations that were made in the previous inspection which related to the under 18 population. Recommendations which were made in relation to the over 18 population will be the subject of a separate inspection. In general the report uses the generic term young people but where there was a need to differentiate between the two different age groups of young people in this report, the over 18 population were generally referred to as young adults and the under 18 population were referred to as young people under 18.
- HP5 At the last inspection in January 2010 in relation to the young people under 18 population we found that outcomes for young people were reasonably good against the healthy prison test of safety. We made 33 recommendations, of which 10 had been achieved, nine had been partially achieved, 14 had not been achieved. We have made 15 further recommendations.
- HP6 In January 2010 in relation to the young people under 18 population we found that outcomes for young people were good against the healthy prison test of respect. We made 61 recommendations, of which 25 had been achieved, eight had been partially achieved, 25 had not been achieved and three were no longer relevant. We have made 15 further recommendations.
- HP7 In January 2010 in relation to the young people under 18 population we found that outcomes for young people were good against the healthy prison test of purposeful activity. We made nine recommendations, of which two had been achieved, two had been partially achieved, five had not been achieved. We have made eight further recommendations.

---

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

HP8 In January 2010 in relation to the young people under 18 population we found that outcomes for young people were reasonably good against the healthy prison test of resettlement. We made 20 recommendations, of which nine had been achieved, four had been partially achieved, seven had not been achieved. We have made 10 further recommendations.

## Safety

---

HP9 The effective reception and first night procedures that we reported on previously remained in place but the induction programme did not meet young people's needs and they generally reported less favourably on their early days experiences than previously. Safeguarding arrangements were sound and involvement with the local authority in child protection and safeguarding arrangements overall had improved. Self-harm had reduced significantly and generally young people at risk of self-harm were well cared for. Levels of violence remained high but staff responded well. There was less use of segregation but it was still used for punishment, which was inappropriate. The work of the dedicated behaviour management group was proving effective. On the basis of this full follow-up inspection, we considered that outcomes for young people were reasonably good in relation to this healthy prison test.

HP10 Few young people experienced long journeys and late arrivals had decreased since the previous inspection. However, young people continued to spend lengthy periods waiting in court cells. The video link suite was an excellent facility and staff did what they could to promote its use. All young people were routinely strip-searched on reception and in our survey they reported negatively about their experience of reception overall. The reception process that we observed was efficient and staff were friendly and helpful and we observed a young person effectively offering peer support to two new arrivals before they were locked up on their first night.

HP11 Young people were offered a shower if they arrived early enough but those who arrived late often did not get the opportunity. All young people were offered a telephone call before they were locked up for the night. Night staff were suitably briefed about new arrivals. They spoke to young people when they came on duty and suitable monitoring arrangements were in place but none of the staff we spoke to on the first night unit had completed mental health awareness training as we had previously recommended. The number of new receptions who were experiencing their first time in custody had increased from 35% at the previous inspection to 61% and considerably fewer young people against the national comparator said that they felt safe on their first night. Young people spent five days completing an induction programme but less than half said that it informed them of what they needed to know. The induction programme did not fully occupy young people and they spent too long locked up during their first few days in custody.

HP12 The safeguarding policy had been suitably updated and covered all safeguarding areas appropriately. Attendance at the safeguarding committee meetings was usually good, with the exception of education and security. Representation by the local authority designated officer (LADO) was excellent. A good range of data and accompanying reports were presented to the safeguarding committee which routinely examined all relevant safeguarding areas and effectively monitored any emerging patterns and trends. The weekly vulnerable young people meeting was a very effective multidisciplinary forum to share information and discuss the care of the most

vulnerable young people, but subsequent individual care planning was fragmented. Procedures had been developed to identify and manage the needs of looked-after children. Discussions were under way with the local authority to appoint at least three social workers to assist with safeguarding young people at Feltham.

- HP13 A formal agreement had been implemented since the previous inspection to secure the cooperation of the LADO to improve child protection arrangements. The majority of child protection referrals related to allegations of excessive use of force. Referrals were processed efficiently internally and appropriately dealt with by the local child protection agencies. There was good oversight of child protection referrals involving the LADO and all were signed off by the governor. Internal investigations were carried out robustly. Criminal Records Bureau checks were rigorous but some staff had not had child protection training.
- HP14 The extent of self-harm had reduced significantly since the previous inspection. There was good data collection, monitoring and analysis but reasons for self-harm incidents were not monitored, which was an important omission. The monthly suicide and self-harm prevention meetings were well attended overall but education did not attend which was a gap. Assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) assessments were reasonably detailed but care maps varied in quality, despite a range of quality assurance arrangements. Attendance at reviews was generally too limited but some good efforts were made to involve families. Staff monitoring records were detailed and indicated a good level of meaningful interaction with the young person, and young people we spoke to said that they were well cared for. However we were concerned that some young people at risk of self-harm spent too much time locked up. Apart from routine strip-searching on reception and discharge, the practice was now intelligence led. Searching procedures sometimes included squatting which was unacceptable. There was good dynamic security and staff used observation books and security information reports well. The behaviour management group interviewed all new arrivals who were known to have been disruptive in previous establishments which provided useful information for the prison but was also intended to help the young person to settle in.
- HP15 Young people were clear about the rules, which were simply written and fair. There was no use of minor reports and the use of adjudications was high, although they were used appropriately in the sample that we examined and young people confirmed that the process had been explained clearly to them. Punishments were consistent but there was no use of restorative justice or mediation instead of a punishment.
- HP16 In our survey, 46% of young people said that they had felt unsafe at some point at Feltham against the national comparator of 25% and 30% reported in the previous survey. Gang issues were a considerable management task and involved some multi-agency work. Good efforts were made to consult young people about the extent and nature of bullying but it was clear that young people remained reluctant to be completely open about bullying and intimidation. Staff were quick to respond appropriately when incidents came to their attention and this was confirmed in our safety interviews with individual young people<sup>2</sup>, but some young people expressed a lack of confidence that staff had the ability to tackle bullying. There were good

---

<sup>2</sup> We conducted 21 individual interviews with randomly selected young people across the young people under 18 wings. Young people were asked about various aspects of their feelings of safety in the establishment and responses were analysed. Participation was voluntary.

interventions for young people who bullied others and for victims of bullying but they were not consistently implemented across the wings. Some very good work was being carried out by a dedicated behaviour management group with a small number of very problematic young people, including some involved in gang violence, and early indications were that interventions had been effective in changing behaviour in some cases.

- HP17 Over 12% of young people were on the basic level of the incentives and earned privileges scheme but young people said that the lack of differentials between the levels did not motivate them to change their behaviour. Young people on basic who were also excluded from education could have as little as two hours a day unlocked, which was unacceptable. Reviews did not consistently involve young people in discussions about their behaviour so that they were clear about what behavioural changes they needed to make to progress. The scheme needed an overall review.
- HP18 The use of Ibis, the segregation unit, had declined gradually since the previous inspection and it was now monitored by the safeguarding committee. However, the use of segregation remained high and it was still used for punishment. The environment was poor and young people who were segregated spent most of their time locked up with little to do. While this served to punish them, they did not have individual intervention plans aimed at addressing their problematic behaviour to work towards a swift reintegration to normal location. In our survey, 19% of young people who had spent a night in Ibis said that staff had treated them well or very well against the national comparator of 58%.
- HP19 Violence was an ongoing problem and the use of restraint remained high with a number of peaks and troughs. The vast majority of incidents of restraint involved separating young people from fights or assaults. In our examination of a sample of use of force documentation, records were clear and detailed and demonstrated appropriate use of restraint and good de-escalation. Quality assurance arrangements were good. Video recordings and our observations during the inspection also showed that staff frequently went to great lengths to prevent young people from fighting, often putting themselves at risk to do so. Although rare, batons had been drawn which was unacceptable. There was a wide range of data analysis in relation to restraint which was efficiently monitored by the violence reduction committee and overseen by the safeguarding committee. There had been no use of the special cell for eight months.
- HP20 The mandatory drug testing (MDT) rate suggested a low level of drugs availability and MDT procedures were appropriate. Few young people arrived in need of clinical detoxification but there were arrangements in place for those who did. The Wren unit provided an appropriate therapeutic regime but the cells were dirty and did not therefore provide an appropriate clinical environment for young people in treatment.

## Respect

---

- HP21 There had been some recent improvements to environmental standards but they continued to fluctuate and there had been deterioration in the general state of the cells and the cleanliness of the communal areas, and particularly showers, since the previous inspection. Young people now ate all their meals in their cells. Relationships between staff and young people had improved considerably and young people reported much higher levels of trust and respectful treatment. Some good work had

been done with some aspects of diversity but the management of equality and diversity had recently lost focus and work with foreign nationals had deteriorated. Chaplains continued to provide good support to young people. Our previous criticisms regarding complaints were unchanged. Health care had improved and there was some good practice. On the basis of this full follow-up inspection, we considered that outcomes for young people were reasonably good in relation to this healthy prison test.

- HP22 Daily cell checks were carried out and there were incentives to encourage cell cleanliness which was effective for some, but not all, young people. Efforts were made to eliminate graffiti as soon as possible and there were no offensive displays. Cells were properly equipped but overall they were shabby. Access to telephones and showers was good. The design of the communal areas offered good sight lines and responses to cell bells were prompt, but the state of cleanliness was poor, particularly the showers. Exercise yards had been refurbished but they remained austere. Young people were able to wear their own clothes and also had a decent supply of kit.
- HP23 In our survey, 71% of young people said that most staff treated them with respect against the national comparator of 62% and 60% in the previous survey. We saw plenty of examples of staff interacting well with young people. During evening association we observed staff organising activities, managing access to telephones and showers and engaging well with young people in a naturally boisterous but safely controlled atmosphere. Wing file entries demonstrated good interaction between staff and young people and a good knowledge of their individual circumstances. In our survey, 71% of young people said that there was a member of staff they could turn to with a problem against 52% in the previous survey. There were still no designated wing representatives for the consultation meetings.
- HP24 Personal officers maintained regular, although not always very frequent, contact with the young people they were responsible for. In general it was less than the weekly contact we described at the previous inspection. Personal officers attended some but not all meetings relating to the care of their young people. Personal officer work was much better on the Heron unit.
- HP25 Long-term staffing difficulties and competing priorities had affected the management of equality and diversity issues, which had recently lost focus. However, the equalities team were well known to staff and young people and they were accessible. The equality action team (EAT) met regularly but representation from key departments was not consistent and action points were not always dealt with satisfactorily. The EAT covered a wide range of diversity strands, including commendably Gypsies and Travellers. More needed to be done to monitor discrimination by religion. We previously recommended that young people representatives to the race equality action team should be given greater support as they were carrying out an important function, so it was concerning that there were no longer any young people diversity representatives. All young men were told on induction about the Pride gay support group which was an excellent way of finding out about sexual orientation. There were effective procedures in place to identify young people who had a disability and some received valuable support from the speech and language therapist. Information about young people with disabilities was passed to wings but there was little evidence that it was picked up and used appropriately by residential staff to ensure that the needs of young people with a disability were met. Excellent events had been put on to

celebrate lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender and Gypsy and Traveller history months.

- HP26 Racial complaints were low and investigations were thorough. There were no interventions for young people who perpetrated racist abuse but the equalities officer usually addressed issues raised directly with the perpetrator. External monitoring arrangements were in abeyance pending the replacement of Hounslow Equalities Council with the Zahid Mubarek Trust. Ethnic monitoring had identified some anomalies which had been raised for discussion at the EAT, including over-representation of young people from black and minority ethnic groups in the use of restraint. However, minutes did not demonstrate an appropriate level of interrogation of the concerns or suggested actions. Young people convicted of racially motivated offences were properly identified. There were efficient daily briefings to monitor young people convicted of arson but not those convicted of racist and other hate crime.
- HP27 The provision for foreign nationals had deteriorated since the previous inspection. The policy was out of date and there had been no needs analysis. In our focus group with foreign nationals, none knew the identity of the foreign nationals coordinator and awareness of her role across the establishment was generally poor. The procedures for identifying foreign nationals were not effective. Staff were confused about the use of telephone interpretation services which meant they were not effectively used. Foreign nationals who did not speak English were isolated and the English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) classes no longer ran. The foreign nationals coordinator had ad hoc meetings with foreign nationals but there was no regular staff or peer support. There was no longer regular contact with independent immigration advice agencies since the Detention Advice Service had had their funding withdrawn. However, there was regular liaison with the UK Border Agency.
- HP28 There was a well resourced chaplaincy team catering for all faiths and they provided excellent pastoral care to young people. The chapel and the mosque were attractive and washing facilities had been installed next to the mosque since our previous inspection. Access to religious services was good and they were well attended. Chaplains offered a good range of faith-based classes but there were clashes with the education timetable.
- HP29 Serveries were well maintained and kitchens were left in a pristine condition overnight. Young people ate all their meals in their cells and meals were served too early. Young people were reasonably satisfied with the quality of food but complained that they were not given enough to eat, although a nutritionist had confirmed that the quantity of food provided was sufficient. Links between the catering department, PE, substance use services and health care to promote healthy lifestyles were good. The shop sold a good range of products but our survey indicated that young people from black and minority ethnic backgrounds were significantly less satisfied than their white counterparts. Some young people had to wait up to 11 days for their first order depending on the day they arrived, and this had implications for bullying.
- HP30 The applications system was confusing and operated inconsistently between units. Young people said they did not find it easy to make a complaint and they were generally unhappy with the way that complaints were dealt with. Replies were timely but responses to complaints which we examined varied in quality from polite and helpful to curt and disingenuous and quality assurance was not consistent. Complaints were still not properly analysed for patterns and trends.

- HP31 Offender supervisors dealt effectively with legal services and bail information and young people received relevant guidance and advice at remand planning reviews. Young people could make free telephone calls to their legal advisers if they had no credit but sometimes had to pay themselves, which was inappropriate.
- HP32 There had been no health needs assessment but one had been commissioned. The health care environment was relatively modern but several rooms would have failed an infection control audit, and they were dirty. The primary care appointments system had been improved and there was a wider range of clinics than at the last inspection. There were GP clinics seven days a week. The failure to attend appointments rate was high but improving. Pharmacy services were very good as was dentistry which had improved since the last inspection. The inpatient unit had relocated to a different wing and the environment was generally better than before, although standards of cleanliness required improvement. Mental health services were very good. There was a wide range of therapeutic options and forensic child and adolescent mental health service were on site, ensuring rapid transfers to secure mental health beds when required.

## Purposeful activity

---

HP33 Time out of cell varied considerably for individual young people but was generally inadequate and was unacceptable for some. Previously we reported that education and vocational training provision, young people's behaviour in classes and achievements and standards were very good. The Phoenix room had been a good resource for young people who needed additional support. Much had changed. The range of courses remained satisfactory but too much teaching was unsatisfactory and achievements and standards in education were poor. Behaviour was good in the vocational workshops and in the gym but poor in education classes. Levels of accreditation were low. A high number of young people were regularly excluded from education or refused to attend and many classes had been cancelled. The Phoenix room was no longer operational and learning support was inadequate, as was information, advice and guidance. Young people still had good access to high quality PE and good library provision. On the basis of this full follow-up inspection, we considered that outcomes for young people were poor in relation to this healthy prison test.

HP34 Association and exercise was offered daily but the time unlocked as described in the core day was not adhered to. Many young people had considerably less time out of cell than the average claimed, for example those located in the segregation unit or the first night unit, young people not attending education for a variety of reasons and young people on the basic level of the incentives scheme. When we carried out checks on two different days, 18% of young people were locked up in the morning and a similar number in the afternoon. In the main this was due to being sent back from education, a longer-term exclusion or the young person refusing to attend education. Young people who did attend education or vocational training for half of their day were not always purposefully occupied for the other part since the officer-led programmes that were previously delivered during the day which supplemented the learning and skills programme had ceased. Young people in segregation and those on basic who did not attend education could spend as much as 22 hours locked up and had very little interaction with their peers when they did come out of their cells. In



great contrast, young people on Heron unit (see fact page) spent a good deal of time out of their cell.

- HP35 Young people received an initial assessment of their abilities in literacy and numeracy as part of their induction to education. Results were passed to teachers but it was unclear how these were used effectively. The special educational needs coordinator had compiled a very useful special educational needs register of 37 young people but there was inadequate learning support available to meet their needs as well as the significant number of young people who required additional learning support on their courses.
- HP36 Punctuality to learning and skills activities was satisfactory but attendance to education was poor. Too many young people refused to attend. In the previous six months there had been 299 refusals. The Phoenix room, which had previously provided support for young people reluctant to attend mainstream education, was no longer operational. Over 170 classes had been cancelled in the previous six months.
- HP37 Too many young people were sent back to their units for poor behaviour in education classes. In the previous four months 98 young people had been sent back to their unit for poor behaviour. The rates of longer-term exclusions were also very high. Work on units for young people who did not attend education classes was little more than half an hour each day.
- HP38 Some young people who did not cope well in education were able to access an effective 'Reflective Learning' course as part of their reintegration into education. In the previous six months 147 young people had taken this course of which 127 were reintegrated successfully. The range of education courses was satisfactory and there was a good range of vocational subjects on offer. While young people had some choice about the courses they attended, information advice and guidance were inadequate. Individual learning plans were poor.
- HP39 Although there was some good teaching in the vocational workshops, the quality of teaching and learning was very variable and overall there was too much unsatisfactory teaching. In too many lessons observed, young people did not make the progress they were capable of and behaved badly. Overall behaviour was better in vocational workshops than in classrooms where many altercations between young people took place.
- HP40 Some work based learning was available in the kitchens and the mess and in the prison grounds where a small number of young people acquired useful skills but there was scope to increase work based learning.
- HP41 Young people who entered custody while studying GCSEs were able to continue with their studies and some had gained GCSE passes. However overall there were too few higher level courses available for more able young people and some repeated courses they had already completed. Levels of accreditation achieved by young people were poor and they did not achieve the number, and in some cases the levels, of qualifications they were capable of.
- HP42 Standards of young people's work varied considerably. In the vocational workshops young people generally produced good standards of work but in classroom-based lessons work produced was often poor.

- HP43 Young people had good access to a high quality core PE programme, and accreditation was available in most areas of PE provision. However PE was not compulsory and not all young people attended. Young people under 18 and young adults worked alongside each other in the prison's successful football, rugby and cricket teams, all of which played fixtures against visiting teams. The sports squads were complemented well by the 'Football for Change' and 'Rugby for Change' projects run in partnership with professional clubs which contributed significantly to personal and social development. Young people behaved well in the gym. There were good links with health care and the young people's substance misuse service, and remedial PE was available.
- HP44 Young people had good access to the well managed library and they enjoyed their visits. Stock levels were good and were age appropriate. There was an excellent range of magazines and a good range of foreign newspapers and texts. Materials had been provided by the library to support the Gypsy and Travellers' group.

## Resettlement

---

- HP45 Weaknesses in the overall resettlement strategy, including the lack of an up-to-date needs analysis and some gaps in the resettlement pathways, were mitigated in practice by the good work being carried out by the offender supervisors and well organised training planning and remand management arrangements. The Heron unit offered impressive resettlement resources. Some improvements were needed to visiting arrangements but staff were helpful to families. Substance use services were developing well following the merger of the young people's substance misuse service and the offender management unit. On the basis of this full follow-up inspection, we considered that outcomes for young people were reasonably good in relation to this healthy prison test.
- HP46 There had been a lack of continuity in the management of resettlement since the previous inspection and it was not well coordinated. The policy was not up to date and a needs analysis had still not been carried out. There was an action plan but it lacked relevant data to allow progress to be measured in relation to resettlement pathways.
- HP47 Until recently the resettlement committee had not been meeting regularly. There had been a lack of engagement from community agencies in developing the resettlement strategy, although the offender supervisor manager attended a number of relevant regional and national youth justice forums.
- HP48 Despite the frailties in the strategic management of resettlement, young people received a high level of support from offender supervisors. Training planning and remand management reviews were very well managed. Offender supervisors played a key role gathering information, preparing young people for the meetings and helping them to participate. They also ensured that individual training planning targets were monitored and reviewed. Early release was being used motivationally. Public protection was well managed. The Community Chaplaincy Trust provided useful through-the-gate support for some young people.
- HP49 The support and opportunities that young people were offered on the Heron unit were impressive, including release on temporary licence which needed to be extended to

all young people. The independent evaluation of the Heron pilot had been favourable. It was disappointing that funding was shortly to be discontinued.

- HP50 Young people received help with housing from the external youth offending team in collaboration with offender supervisors. It was rare for young people to be released without any accommodation planned. However, there was no follow-up work on the suitability or sustainability of accommodation provided to young people. Some work had recently been carried out as a pilot project for young people who needed help with their finances and there was some modular input by education but the support was not well coordinated.
- HP51 Pre-release planning for health care services had improved since the previous inspection and was monitored by the primary care trust.
- HP52 The JETS (juvenile enhanced thinking skills) programme had become well established for young people on Heron and was running effectively with 25 completions in the previous six months. Young people we spoke to said that they had learnt a lot from taking part in the JETS programme. There were also a series of relevant non-accredited programmes delivered on Heron. A wide range of work was carried out in the interventions suite but it was not well integrated with wider programme work and it was not clear if the large amount of resources was being effectively targeted. An effective reflective learning course helped young people who had struggled with mainstream education to reintegrate. Education advice and guidance provision had declined since the previous inspection. There was no careers advice available for young people and initial advice and guidance were inadequate. Good efforts had been made to organise trade specific employment days.
- HP53 A comprehensive and robust system was in place for screening and assessing young people's substance related needs. Health promotion and preventative work relating to substance use was accessible to all young people. Good levels of joint working existed between clinical and psychosocial staff involving multidisciplinary meetings and assessments, and care plans were shared appropriately. There was a wide range of psychosocial programmes to meet assessed needs.
- HP54 Visits entitlements for remanded young people were good but were inadequate for sentenced young people. There was sufficient capacity to cater for the visits that young people were entitled to and booking arrangements were efficient. Closed visits were imposed appropriately and they were reviewed regularly. The visitors' centre was a useful facility and the staff were helpful to families. Refreshments were available in the visits hall and supervision was effective. The visits facility looked neglected: some chairs were worn and damaged and there were examples of graffiti, including on the desk in the searching area. We were told that family days took place three or four times a year but the last family day had taken place six months ago and was only attended by six young people. Family days were still restricted to young people on enhanced, which was inappropriate. There was no systematic support for young people who were fathers. An annual visitors' survey had been conducted and findings appropriately acted on. Visitors were generally positive about the visiting arrangements and complimentary about the visits staff. Families could communicate with young people by email which was an excellent addition to contact arrangements.

## Main concerns and recommendations

---

HP55 Concern: The number of new receptions who were experiencing their first time in custody had increased. Young people reported less favourably on many aspects of their early days in custody compared with the previous inspection and the national comparators. Young people spent too much time locked up during their induction and this contributed to their overall feelings of being unsafe.

**Recommendation: Young people should be kept fully occupied in their first few days in custody through a comprehensive, structured and multidisciplinary induction programme that is age appropriate and covers all that they need to know, including sources of help and support available to them if they are feeling low or upset. The induction programme should include a regular review of young people's feelings about their safety during their early days in custody.**

HP56 Concern: Many areas of the establishment had poor standards of cleanliness, including residential units and cells, the grounds, the Wren unit, the segregation unit and health care.

**Recommendation: All areas of the establishment should be maintained to a good standard of cleanliness.**

HP57 Concern: The provision for foreign nationals was poor on all levels. The policy was out of date and there had been no needs analysis. Procedures for identifying foreign nationals were ineffective and there was little awareness of the role of the foreign nationals coordinator among staff or young people. There was no regular peer support for foreign nationals and non-English speakers were particularly isolated. There was no longer regular contact with independent immigration advice agencies.

**Recommendation: There should be an up-to-date foreign nationals policy based on a detailed needs analysis of the foreign national population. The policy should include robust systems for identification on arrival, the provision of independent immigration advice and regular peer support, with a particular emphasis on specific support for non-English speakers.**

HP58 Concern: Time out of cell was generally inadequate and particularly poor for some young people.

**Recommendation: All young people should have access to a timetable of regular and varied activities that purposefully occupies them and ensures that they spend as much of their day as possible out of their cell. Young people who lose association as a punishment should be monitored so that they also have adequate time out of their cell.**

HP59 Concern: Learning and skills provision had declined significantly since the previous inspection. Behaviour was not managed well, too much teaching was unsatisfactory and achievements and standards in education were poor. A high number of young people were regularly excluded from education or refused to attend and many classes had been cancelled.

**Recommendation: There should be a strategy to improve the quality of learning and skills provision with the aim of raising young people's achievements and standards of work. Robust action should be taken to**

**address the significant number of cancelled classes and refusals to attend education and reduce the number of young people returned to the units for poor behaviour.**

# Progress on main recommendations since the previous report

(The paragraph numbers at the end of each main recommendation refer to its location in the previous inspection report)

## Main recommendations

---

**MR1 Force should only be used as a last resort where meaningful attempts at de-escalation have failed. (HP50)**

**Achieved.** Staff used de-escalation well. Although the use of force remained high, it was used almost entirely to restrain young people who were fighting or assaulting each other. At our previous inspection, 70% of force had been used to break up fights, with the remainder for non-compliance with staff instructions. The head of young people reviewed all incidents of force used for non-compliance and there was evidence of robust action when a member of staff had used force inappropriately.

**MR2 Special accommodation should be used only in extreme circumstances, and its use should always be properly authorised and monitored. (HP51)**

**Achieved.** It was a function of the safeguarding committee to monitor the use of the special accommodation but its use for young people under 18 was rare and it had not been used for a young person under 18 in the previous eight months.

**MR3 There should be a review of working arrangements between the establishment and the local authority to ensure that the role of the local authority designated officer is made explicit, and appropriate independent oversight of child protection policy and practice is properly established. (HP52)**

**Achieved.** The last annual review of the child protection policy had taken place in January 2011 with Hounslow Safeguarding Children Board, and the role of the local authority designated officer (LADO) had been clarified in the policy. A more detailed document agreed between the safeguarding manager and the LADO in April 2011 set out the role of the local authority in relation to allegations against members of staff and overall oversight of child protection referrals.

**MR4 There should be a robust quality assurance scheme for complaints, which ensures promised action is taken and patterns or trends identified for remedial action. (HP53)**

**Not achieved.** A quality assurance scheme had been established but it was not sufficiently robust. In the sample of complaints that we examined most responses addressed the issues and some were polite and helpful but this was not consistently the case and some responses were curt and disingenuous. Complaints were checked by the head of young people under 18 for child protection concerns and an overview of complaints was considered at the quarterly safeguarding meetings. However, there was no detailed analysis of complaints and there was little evidence of patterns or trends being investigated or acted upon.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

MR5 **The reducing reoffending strategy should be based on a needs analysis of the population and should have separate action plans for each resettlement pathway. (HP54)**

**Not achieved.** The most recent reducing reoffending strategy was out of date. It covered the period 2009-2010 and was not based on a needs analysis. There was a single action plan written in very general terms covering both the young adult and young people under 18 populations which made reference to each of the pathways. However, the action plan was inadequate in that it lacked detail and did not facilitate separate performance monitoring under each of the resettlement pathways.

**We repeat the recommendation.**





# Progress on recommendations since the last report

## Section 1: Arrival in custody

### Courts, escorts and transfers

---

#### Expected outcomes:

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

**1.1 Young people should be held in court cells for the minimum possible period. (1.11)**

**Not achieved.** We received numerous accounts from staff and young people that young people continued to spend unnecessarily long periods at court. It was not unusual for a case to be dealt with and completed before lunchtime, but the young person frequently remained in court cells until the end of the day before starting his journey back to the prison.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

**1.2 Young people should arrive at the establishment before 7pm. (1.12)**

**Not achieved.** The problems associated with late arrivals had abated since the previous inspection and it was now unusual for a young person to arrive after 10pm as had previously been the case. While the majority of young people arrived at the establishment before 7pm, reception staff told us that a significant number still arrived later than that. Records of the number involved were not kept but from anecdotal information, we estimated that up to one-third of admissions arrived after 7pm.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

**1.3 Young people should not experience lengthy waits on escort vehicles after arriving at the establishment. (1.13)**

**Achieved.** Young people disembarked from escort vehicles quickly after arrival at the prison. We received no complaints from young people about remaining on escort vehicles for lengthy periods after they had arrived.

**1.4 The establishment should continue to promote the use of the video links with the courts. (1.14)**

**Achieved.** Use of video link facilities in general had increased since the previous inspection. The technology in the video suite had been upgraded and was now of an extremely high standard. Additional staff had been allocated to work in this area. There were four booths for court work and a fifth for contact with youth offending teams (YOTs). Most of the work associated with the video link concerned the young adults and over the course of the previous week it had been used on 47 occasions for young adults and on four occasions for young people under 18.

### **Additional information**

---

- 1.5 There were no records of young people sharing transport with adult prisoners and staff were not aware that this was a problem, although in our survey 26% of young people reported that they had travelled with adults.
- 1.6 The three vans which we examined were all grubby and had graffiti. Journeys undertaken by young people were generally short. Reception staff asked young people how they were treated while being transported and told us that no serious issues had been reported to them.
- 1.7 Reception staff were sensitive to the needs of young people who might have been anxious about arriving at or departing from the prison. They received placement details electronically in advance if YOT staff considered the young person might be vulnerable. The offender management unit contacted reception staff if they had concerns about a young person who was due to leave the prison.
- 1.8 A store of clean clothing was held in the reception area from which young people could select jeans, sweaters and trainers to wear at court or when they arrived back at the prison.
- 1.9 Young people could take library books with them to court which they left in a box in the searching area when they returned, where they were collected two or three times a week by library staff. We observed several young people benefitting from this initiative who seemed to welcome doing something useful while waiting at court.
- 1.10 Breakfast was not served in the reception area and young people were expected to eat breakfast before they left the wing.

### **Further recommendation**

- 1.11 Young people should not travel with adult prisoners.

### **Housekeeping point**

- 1.12 Vehicles used to transport young people should be clean and free from graffiti.

### **Good practice**

- 1.13 *The opportunity given to young people to take reading material to court was a good initiative.*

## **First days in custody**

---

### **Expected outcomes:**

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

## Reception

---

**1.14 All interviews with new arrivals should take place in private. (1.47)**

**Achieved.** Although young people were seen individually in reception, they could not speak privately as they were interviewed by the reception senior officer at a desk in a busy and noisy open plan area. However all new arrivals were interviewed in private on the first night wing.

**1.15 All new arrivals should be offered a shower on their first night whatever time they arrive. (1.49)**

**Not achieved.** In our survey, only 11% of young people said that they were offered a shower when they first arrived against the national comparator of 40%. Although they were not offered a shower in reception, new arrivals were offered a shower when they arrived on the wing. However, a significant number of young people arrived on the wing after the lock-up time of 8pm and were not offered a shower.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

**1.16 Juveniles should not be routinely strip-searched in reception. (1.50)**

**Not achieved.** Young people continued to be routinely strip-searched on arrival and departure. They were also given a rub-down search and were required to sit in the BOSS (body orifice security scanner) chair.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

### **Additional information**

---

1.17 The holding rooms in the reception area were grubby and untidy but this improved towards the end of the inspection. There was an attractive mural on the wall at the entrance to the reception area and some useful general information about prison routines was on display.

1.18 Reception procedures were efficient. Reception staff usually received background information electronically in advance of a young person's arrival. This included the Youth Justice Board placement form, the ASSET and the post-court report. It was clear that staff read the material before interviewing new admissions. Photocopies of the information were sent with the young person to the first night centre.

1.19 When we observed young people being admitted to reception, the process was thorough and the staff were friendly and helpful. However, only 58% of young people said they were treated well or very well in reception against the national comparator of 70%. Some young people whom we spoke to said that staff they had encountered in reception had been brusque and unhelpful.

1.20 During their initial interview, young people were asked if they had any form of disability and this information was passed to the disability liaison officer. Nicotine patches were available for new arrivals who needed them but those arriving after 5pm when the doctor had left waited until the following day.

1.21 Young people were offered ready-made microwavable food in reception and all of the young people we spoke to complained about the quality. They were not offered a telephone call as this was part of the first night procedures which took place on Bittern unit.

- 1.22 The young people under 18 reception area closed each day between 8.30am and 4pm and all young people being discharged went through the young adult reception area. This measure had been introduced to enable more staff to run the video suite facility. Staff told us that it could be difficult to keep young people under 18 separate from young adults.

#### Further recommendation

- 1.23 Young people under 18 being discharged through the young adult reception area should be closely supervised.

### First night

---

- 1.24 **All first night staff should undergo mental health awareness training. (1.53)**

**Not achieved.** None of the staff whom we spoke to on the first night centre had received mental health awareness training.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

#### Additional information

---

- 1.25 Staff working on the first night centre (Bittern unit) were aware of the potential vulnerability of new arrivals and were methodical in dealing with them. Interviews were held in private and staff questioned young people about all aspects of their welfare using a pro forma. Staff dealt with late arrivals efficiently and trained first night staff were on duty every night until 10pm. First night staff whom we spoke to said they would not hesitate to unlock a distressed young person after evening lock up to alleviate his concerns.
- 1.26 The initial vulnerability assessments (T1Vs) were undertaken by reception staff and subsequent reviews were completed by the offender supervisors. The assessments were detailed and if necessary contained appropriate plans to manage any risks. We observed good use being made of peer supporters on the first night centre. They were introduced to newly admitted young people on the wing and, as well as offering general reassurance, helped them to complete menu orders and explained how the PIN phone system worked.
- 1.27 Young people were issued with a leaflet giving information about their first few days. They were given £2 free phone credit, a hygiene pack and a confectionery pack. Young people were charged £3.50 for the latter which they had to pay back at £1 a week.
- 1.28 Newly admitted young people did not share accommodation on the first night centre. The cells for first night use were clean with fresh sheets on the bed. There was a small amount of graffiti in one of the cells being used to accommodate new arrivals.
- 1.29 Only 59% of young people said they felt safe on their first night against the national comparator of 81%. In the previous inspection, 35% of young people surveyed reported being in custody for the first time; this figure had now risen considerably to 61%.
- 1.30 In our survey, 18% of young people said that they needed protection from other young people against the national comparator of 7%. The survey also suggested that staff were more proactive at asking young people if they needed protection from other young people than at comparator establishments.

- 1.31 Language Line was used to assist in the first night process if young people had difficulty communicating in English, although we were told it was not used frequently. During our night visit we noted that a young person from Algeria was given informal help to settle in by another Algerian young person who had been located elsewhere in the establishment and this informal arrangement appeared to work well.
- 1.32 Night staff were well briefed about new admissions and young people subject to assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) procedures, and suitable monitoring procedures were in place for new arrivals. Night staff took the trouble to introduce themselves to young people at their doors as part of routine handover duties. Not all night staff carried ligature shears and not all had completed first aid training.

#### Further recommendation

- 1.33 All night staff should receive first aid training and carry ligature shears.

## Induction

---

### 1.34 Evening association should be available on the juvenile induction unit. (1.57)

**Not achieved.** Young people located on the Bittern induction unit still did not receive any evening association and were locked up shortly after 5pm after they had received their evening meal. There was one long-term resident occupying a restricted status cell on the unit for whom the lack of evening association was particularly detrimental (see also residential section).

**We repeat the recommendation.**

### 1.35 Peer supporters should be easily identifiable and accessible during the day. (1.58)

**Partially achieved.** Peer supporters wore distinctive black T shirts and were easily identifiable. They were located on Heron unit and were fully occupied during the day and therefore were only made available to newly admitted young people on Bittern between 6 and 8pm. In our survey, only 16% of young people against the comparator of 24% said they were given access to a peer mentor within the first 24 hours.

#### Further recommendation

- 1.36 Peer supporters should be accessible to newly admitted young people at suitable times during the day.

#### Additional information

---

- 1.37 Only 45% of young people completing the induction programme felt it covered everything they needed to know against the national comparator of 68%.
- 1.38 The five-day induction course was a rolling programme and young people started it on the first working day after they had arrived. Most of the induction sessions were delivered by trained induction officers supplemented by contributions from staff covering specialist areas, for example substance use and chaplaincy services. Neither staff nor young people were enthusiastic about the programme and it was recognised that it was too long and the content

uninteresting. Although the published programme contained a full schedule, staff estimated that in reality young people on induction spent up to a third of their time locked in their cells.

- 1.39 The induction manual was known as the 'Feltham Rough Guide'. It had been designed for both the young people under 18 and young adult populations. The guide did not address the needs of the younger age group and was not written in an age-appropriate style.
- 1.40 Only 20% of young people in our survey against the national comparator of 32% said that they had been given information about what to do if they were feeling low or upset and this was not an obvious part of the reception or induction procedures.

# Section 2: Environment and relationships

## Residential units

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

### Accommodation and facilities, clothing and possessions, hygiene

---

**2.1 Cell furniture should be maintained to an acceptable standard, and broken items should be replaced (2.19)**

**Achieved.** Daily cell fabric checks were undertaken and broken furniture was identified and replaced.

**2.2 All double cells should have adequate toilet privacy screens. (2.20)**

**Achieved.** The small number of double cells had privacy screens around the toilets.

**2.3 Double cells should have lockable cupboards. (2.21)**

**Not achieved.** A trial of providing lockable cupboards had been carried out on the young adult site but they had not been provided for the young people under 18 site. However, since the pilot, lockable cupboards had been ordered for all double cells in the establishment.

**2.4 Staff should answer cell call bells within five minutes. (2.22)**

**Achieved.** There was no electronic monitoring of response times, but observation during the inspection showed a prompt response by staff to cell bells. In our survey, 46% of young people said that staff answered cell bells within five minutes against the comparator of 33%.

**2.5 Consultation arrangements with young people should ensure that there is representation from all wings, and that concerns raised are properly dealt with in a timely fashion at regular meetings. (2.25)**

**Not achieved.** Consultation meetings continued to take place monthly, but there was still no consistency over which young people attended and there were no designated wing representatives to ensure that all wings were represented. Issues that were regularly discussed included education, gym, food, canteen, association and exercise. Violence and fights were also often discussed, usually in connection with education. Some issues raised by young people were dealt with and reported back at subsequent meetings but other important issues, for example education not meeting young people's needs, were raised repeatedly with no apparent action having been taken to address the issues raised.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

## **Additional information**

---

- 2.6 Incentives to encourage young people to keep their cells clean and tidy were more effective for some than others and cells generally looked shabby. Graffiti was removed quickly when identified, but many cell windows were badly scratched. Many toilets were badly stained and needed deep cleaning.
- 2.7 Cells were adequately equipped with a bed, cupboard, table and chair. Young people were issued with a duvet, television, radio and kettle but not all had curtains. They were able to personalise their cell with pictures and cards and the offensive displays policy was adhered to. There was one double cell on each of the eight residential units which was large enough and properly equipped for two young people to share. Two cells had been adapted to accommodate young people placed on restricted status by the high security directorate.
- 2.8 Association areas were equipped with soft chairs, television, table tennis and table football and a few board games. Some of the furniture and carpets in communal areas were in a poor state of cleanliness. The unit desks were located centrally on the units which provided good sight lines for staff and gave young people easy access to staff when they wanted to talk to them. Notice boards contained useful information for young people, although some was out of date, for example membership of the diversity team.
- 2.9 Exercise areas had been refurbished but remained bleak and provided little opportunity for activity other than standing or sitting while talking to other young people and staff. The condition of the prison grounds varied. Some areas were reasonably well maintained while others were overgrown with weeds and we saw rubbish thrown out of windows lying around the site in various places, notably outside the windows of classrooms in the education block.
- 2.10 Young people reported more favourably in our survey on access to telephones and showers than at comparator establishments. Arrangements were in place to make sure that young people excluded from association for disciplinary reasons were offered a shower at another time. CCTV was still in use in the shower areas but was positioned to provide privacy. Notices on the units warned young people that they were visible on CCTV when outside their individual cubicles. Each residential unit had two hooded telephones, located sufficiently far away from the main association area to afford privacy. There was evidence that young people without telephone credit were sometimes granted a free telephone call to their family if this was warranted.
- 2.11 Incoming mail was handed out at tea time and outgoing mail was handed to staff at breakfast. The security department provided a daily list of young people whose mail was subject to checking and a 5% random sampling of incoming mail was carried out. Incoming parcels were held in reception for young people. New arrangements ensured that two afternoons each week were set aside for young people who wanted access to their property, including parcels, to go to reception.
- 2.12 Young people had access to cleaning materials, but some cells were cleaner than others. In general, levels of cleanliness had deteriorated in communal areas since the previous inspection and the residential units were showing signs of wear. Showers on some units were particularly poor and required deep cleaning and repair work for cracked walls, lifting floors, blocked drainage points and badly flaking paint on the ceiling. In one shower we saw an infestation emerging from one of the drains and some bloodspots on the door.



- 2.13 Most young people wore prison-issue clothing despite being able to wear their own clothing on their unit. Staff said they thought young people preferred not to stand out from others and that they liked to keep their nicest clothes for visits. Kit change, including bedding, took place weekly and young people were wearing kit that fitted them and was in a decent condition. Young people had weekly access to unit-based laundries but some were concerned about clothes going missing even though they were washed in mesh bags, and this was a frequent source of complaints (see also complaints section). Toiletry products were available on the units and young people could buy alternative toiletry items from the canteen.

#### **Further recommendation**

- 2.14 The exercise yards should be suitably equipped to encourage young people to be involved in activities during their scheduled time in the open air.

#### **Housekeeping points**

- 2.15 All cells should have curtains.
- 2.16 Young people's concerns about items going missing from the unit-based laundry machines should be investigated and responded to.

## Relationships between staff and children and young people

---

#### **Expected outcomes:**

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

- 2.17 **Managers should ensure that unit history sheets include entries from all departments that have contact with a young person. (2.37)**

**Partially achieved.** Nomis records contained good quality entries from wing staff, offender supervisors, chaplains and substance misuse staff, but entries from health care and education staff were still rare. Entries made by staff who worked with young people demonstrated genuine engagement rather than simply observation of behaviour and some included praise for achievements.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

#### **Additional information**

---

- 2.18 In our survey, 71% of young people said that most staff treated them with respect against the comparator of 62% and 60% in the last survey. Unusually, we were told by a number of young people from different wings that their wing had the best staff and in our survey 71% of young people said they had a member of staff they could turn to with a problem compared with 52% in the previous survey.

- 2.19 We observed good interaction between staff and young people. During association staff organised activities, supervised access to showers and telephones and generally engaged well with young people in an atmosphere that was controlled but spontaneous. Young people did not hesitate to approach staff when they needed something and staff appeared to know the young people on their wings well and used preferred names when addressing them. Although we saw a few instances of difficult exchanges between staff and young people, conversations between them were mostly mutually respectful. Not all staff displayed their names on their shirts which had implications for safety. Some unit staff had trained as sports and games officers so that they could supervise some minor games on the sports field and gym activities with small groups of young people which helped to build good relationships.

#### Further recommendation

- 2.20 All staff should wear their names on their uniform.

## Personal officers

---

#### Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.21 **Managers should ensure that all personal officers on the juvenile induction unit have at least one substantial interview with the arrival allocated to them and record this in detail on wing files. (2.49)**

**Partially achieved.** There were records of a substantial interview with their personal officer for some, but not all, new arrivals on the induction unit. There was evidence of management checks reminding personal officers of their responsibilities to make early contact with new arrivals when this had not taken place and appropriate action being taken by personal officers as a result. Not all of the young people we spoke to knew who their personal officer was and in our survey 25% of respondents said that they had not yet met their personal officer.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

- 2.22 **Managers should ensure that personal officers receive training in developing appropriate behaviour management targets for juveniles. (2.50)**

**Not achieved.** Personal officers had not received training in developing behaviour management targets for young people. There were still general targets on young people's records which did not relate to their personal development or problematic behaviour, for example 'don't shout out' and 'get everything you need during time out'. One young person had had three targets set in one week: to keep his room clean and tidy, be polite to all staff and follow all lawful instructions. These targets were simply the rules of the establishment and were not designed to address individual problematic behaviour. The personal officer's entry the following week recorded that he had met all his targets with ease, but no new targets had been agreed.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

- 2.23 **Managers should ensure that where necessary personal officers for juveniles provide information on their charges to training planning meetings and ACCT reviews. (2.51)**

**Partially achieved.** Personal officers attended some but not all training planning meetings and ACCT reviews. Not all personal officers provided information to the meetings they could not attend despite the emphasis placed on involvement with training planning meetings in the personal officer policy statement.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

#### **Additional information**

---

- 2.24 A personal officer and a co-personal officer were allocated to each young person as they moved on to a residential unit. The personal officer policy clearly set out the expectations of personal officers, including at least one entry each week on the young person's Nomis record. In the records that we reviewed we found that one entry each week was the norm but for some young people the gaps between entries were longer than a week, which was worse than at the previous inspection. Some records showed a good level of engagement with young people, including praise for achievements and understanding of their needs and family circumstances. Personal officer work remained strongest on Heron unit.
- 2.25 Personal officers did not keep in touch with the young people they were responsible for when they were temporarily located in the segregation unit when they needed their support even more. Young people kept the same personal officer if they moved cells on a unit, but had to change if they moved wings. Unit managers carried out checks on records and reminded staff when contact was too infrequent, but some omissions were not picked up.

#### **Further recommendation**

- 2.26 Personal officers should maintain regular contact with young people they are responsible for when they are temporarily located in the segregation unit.

#### **Housekeeping point**

- 2.27 Personal officers should make at least one good quality entry on young people's Nomis records each week.



# Section 3: Duty of care

## Safeguarding children

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 3.1 **The safeguarding policy should provide clarity that concerns about staff misconduct that relate to young people should be reported through the agreed child protection procedures and also describe how staff who report such professional misconduct will be supported. (3.23)**

**Partially achieved.** The safeguarding policy was clear that concerns about staff misconduct relating to young people should be reported to the child protection coordinator, but a subsequent section in the policy on whistle blowing referred staff to the local professional standards policy as the route to raise concerns. This was confusing and had the potential to circumvent the child protection referral procedures.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

- 3.2 **The remit of the safeguarding committee should be extended to cover monitoring use of the Ibis unit. (3.24)**

**Achieved.** The use of Ibis unit had been added to the standing agenda for the safeguarding committee meeting in January 2011.

- 3.3 **Long-term funding arrangements for social work support should be agreed. (3.25)**

**Achieved.** The establishment had been promised funding for at least three social work posts. Discussions with the local authority on how these posts would be filled took place during the inspection.

- 3.4 **Young people identified as particularly vulnerable should have an individual care plan to address their assessed needs. (3.26)**

**Not achieved.** Young people identified as particularly vulnerable were discussed at the weekly multidisciplinary vulnerability meeting which was usually well attended by health care, the offender management unit, the advocacy service and education. Attendance by residential staff and anti-bullying coordinators and suicide prevention coordinators was not so good. Young people at risk of self-harm, new arrivals, young people involved in bullying or assaults, 15-year olds, and looked-after children were routinely considered for discussion and referrals came from a variety of sources. Actions to support young people discussed at the vulnerability meetings were agreed and entered in the Nomis record. Some of the young people were managed on the safe systems of work procedure which generally required them to be escorted to their activities separately from others to keep them safe. Others were managed through a system of individual support plans (ISPs). There were two types of ISP – one for disruptive young people (ISPD) and one for vulnerable young people (ISPV). Nine ISPVs had been

opened in the previous six months and there was only one young person on an ISPV at the time of the inspection which suggested a considerable underuse of ISPs for vulnerable young people. It was not clear how the systems of ISPs and safe systems of work were coordinated or how the various elements of care planning and risk management of other young people discussed at the weekly meetings who were not subject to ISP were pulled together and shared with relevant staff. The only current ISPV included a good assessment of the young person's needs but the plan for his care was based on targets for him to achieve with no detail of support to be provided by staff to assist him with his difficulties. The plan was not coordinated with other plans related to the young person's care, for example, his training plan or his individual learning plan.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

**3.5 The safeguarding committee should routinely monitor the attendance of its designated membership and take appropriate action for failures to attend. (3.27)**

**Partially achieved.** Attendance at the quarterly meetings was generally good. However, in the four meetings from August 2010 to April 2011, education and security had only been represented once and there was no evidence that action had been taken to address this. Attendance by other departments was better and particularly good by the local authority representative who had attended all four meetings.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

**Additional information**

---

- 3.6 The comprehensive safeguarding strategy was reviewed annually, with input from Hounslow Safeguarding Children Board (HSCB). The governor and safeguarding manager attended meetings of the HSCB.
- 3.7 The safeguarding policy was linked to all associated policies and set out arrangements for consideration of safeguarding across the establishment by a safeguarding committee which was chaired by the governor. The safeguarding committee agenda was comprehensive. A range of information continued to be presented to the committee, including data on child protection referrals, violence reduction, incidents of self-harm, use of force, assaults, unexplained injuries, use of good order or discipline, complaints, public protection, use of the segregation unit and use of special accommodation. The data enabled informed discussion to take place. There was cross membership between the safeguarding and violence reduction meetings. Staff recruitment, vetting and training were standard agenda items at safeguarding committee meetings and all staff had been Criminal Records Bureau cleared to enhanced level.
- 3.8 Thirty-one young people were recorded as having looked-after status at the time of the inspection. In the absence of dedicated social work posts, the child protection coordinator took the lead in identifying young people who were looked-after children. She alerted the relevant local authority to their arrival with a reminder about their statutory responsibilities while the young person was in custody. Although the establishment had been successful in identifying a named social worker and contact details for most looked-after children at Feltham, the level of support they received from their local authority varied. Attempts were made to encourage local authorities to arrange statutory reviews for the same day as training planning meetings but we were told that some local authorities did not hold the statutory reviews and some did not provide financial support for their young people. It was intended that this would be a main responsibility of the social workers shortly to be appointed.

# Child protection

---

## Expected outcomes:

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

### 3.9 **All staff who come into contact with children should have suitable child protection training. (3.37)**

**Not achieved.** Figures provided during the inspection showed that 86% of staff had received young people under 18 awareness staff programme (JASP) level 1 training and 75% had received JASP level 2 training. Although the child protection policy referred to the need for all staff working with young people to receive adequate training in child protection, it was not explicit as to how this would be achieved and monitored. The establishment had commendably developed its own refresher training for staff with involvement from the local police child abuse investigation team. This had only been delivered to one group of staff prior to the inspection but it was a promising initiative, enhanced by the involvement of an external, independent perspective.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

#### **Additional information**

---

- 3.10 Child protection referrals were dealt with efficiently. In the first six months of 2011, 25 referrals had been made from the young people under 18 side of the establishment. Fourteen referrals related to the use of force. The other referrals were a mixture of concerns about children in the community, complaints about Serco, police treatment or an event that had taken place in a previous establishment. Referrals came from a good range of sources, including young people, staff and advocates. Screening arrangements to pick up referrals from complaints submitted by young people were effective.
- 3.11 All referrals involving a member of staff were referred promptly to the local authority and local police child abuse investigation team. Young people were appropriately told what would happen and kept informed as events unfolded. Referrals were usually responded to by telephone and followed up in writing. Investigations were carried out as necessary by the local child protection agencies. There had been one strategy discussion in 2011 relating to a young person who had reported that he had been assaulted by court staff in a court cell.
- 3.12 All referrals involving staff which were not taken further by the police or local authority were considered for an internal investigation, in consultation with the deputy governor. Investigations were robust and some had led to disciplinary proceedings against staff. Criminal Records Bureau checks were rigorous.
- 3.13 The local authority designated officer kept a watching brief for all cases investigated internally and checked a sample of completed referrals on a quarterly basis. The child protection coordinator, safeguarding manager and governor met monthly to review progress on referrals, and all completed referrals were signed off by the governor. A formal record was kept of decisions made at these meetings. The deputy custody manager for London also checked completed referrals on his visits to the establishment. There was good collection of data relating to child protection referrals which enabled potential patterns or trends to be identified and investigated. There was robust monitoring through the data analysis to identify potential concerns about individual members of staff. The safeguarding manager also regularly provided the deputy governor with the names of staff from the young adult site at Feltham who had been

mentioned in connection with child protection referrals, for example when they staffed visits or when young people were moving around the site. Child protection was a standing agenda item at the quarterly safeguarding meeting and monthly reports were provided to the senior management team.

## Self-harm and suicide prevention

---

### Expected outcomes:

**Children and young people at risk of self-harm and suicide are identified at an early stage, and supported through a care and support plan to meet their individual identified needs.**

**Assessment of risk of self-harm and ongoing vulnerability is a continuous process which is informed by staff and children and young people. Children and young people who have self-harmed or been identified as at risk of self-harm are encouraged to participate in appropriate purposeful activity.**

### 3.14 **Managers should ensure a consistently high standard of documentation for ACCT reviews. (3.49)**

**Partially achieved.** ACCT (assessment, care in custody and teamwork) documents were quality checked each week by a manager of governor grade and by the suicide prevention coordinator who recorded comments in the 'ACCT suicide prevention coordinator quality assurance check' document. If a deficiency identified was urgent, the appropriate member of staff was spoken to to ensure it was followed up. If not, the check list was emailed to the relevant unit manager for action and followed up in subsequent quality assurance reviews. The standard of assessments and documentation for ACCT reviews was reasonably good but care maps were variable and we came across one example where there was no care map. Few care maps demonstrated additional interventions and most simply signposted young people to standard services that were already available, for example visits, telephones, Samaritans and the chaplaincy. A notable exception to this was one case we came across where the young person had been referred to the mental health, counselling and substance misuse teams. The quality of ongoing observations was good and most were detailed and recorded meaningful interactions. Night observations were frequent but suitably unpredictable.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

### 3.15 **There should be multidisciplinary attendance at ACCT reviews. (3.50)**

**Not achieved.** The suicide prevention coordinator had taken steps to encourage a wider range of staff to attend ACCT reviews by monitoring attendance and raising the issue in his monthly reports to the suicide prevention meetings. However there was no advance planning of reviews to ensure that staff with a suitable contribution to make attended and they were not sufficiently multidisciplinary. Almost all those that we examined involved only two members of staff: a senior officer and a unit officer. We attended a case review chaired by a senior officer from a neighbouring wing who was not familiar with the young person and asked leading questions such as 'You're feeling a lot better now?'. A member of the substance misuse team attended but the personal officer did not attend until halfway through the review. There was no discussion of substance and the review failed to ascertain the young person's feelings.

**We repeat the recommendation.**



## Additional information

---

- 3.16 There had been a significant reduction in incidents of self-harm since the previous inspection. In the previous 12 months, there had been 61 incidents of self-harm, 17 of which related to one individual. During the year before the previous inspection, there had been approximately 140 incidents. The number of ACCT documents opened had halved: during the six months before our previous inspection, 115 ACCTs had been opened but only 54 had been opened over a similar period in 2011. On the first day of our inspection there were five open ACCTs. The daily staff briefing recorded the number of young people on open ACCTs and case reviews and post-closure reviews taking place.
- 3.17 The suicide prevention and self-harm management policy, recently updated, was comprehensive and set out in practical terms how young people at risk of suicide and self-harm should be cared for, and there was good overall management oversight. The head of safeguarding had overall responsibility for caring for those at risk. She was supported by child protection, violence reduction and suicide prevention coordinators. The monthly suicide prevention meetings were well attended but education staff did not attend, which was an omission. The meetings were minuted and underpinned by a continuous improvement plan. Actions were discussed and progressed. Young people at risk of suicide and self-harm were also discussed at the quarterly safeguarding meeting and the weekly vulnerability meetings (see section on safeguarding children).
- 3.18 The monthly self-harm summary report failed to capture the reasons why young people self-harmed and staff told us they would start collecting these data forthwith. Data collection was otherwise good. Data were analysed over a 12-month period by location, method, ethnicity, time of incident, and length of time between arrival and first incident of self-harm. Other data recorded included the number of ACCTs opened and closed, use of anti-ligature clothing and contacts with next of kin. The suicide prevention coordinator analysed the data and noted trends and themes in his monthly report. Approximately half the ACCTs were opened following self-harm and the remainder due to staff concerns or threats of self-harm. The majority of self-harm was by white British boys, although they comprised less than a third of the population.
- 3.19 Records of staff observations demonstrated caring interactions with young people who told us that staff were supportive. However, there was insufficient focus on ensuring that young people at risk of self-harm were given enough to do and they often spent too much time locked up. Two young people on ACCTs told us that they regularly ran out of phone credit and were unable to contact their families for days at a time.
- 3.20 There was a Samaritans telephone, but its use was not recorded centrally. Samaritans attended the prison and met young people on the units. Staff told us that there was a stigma among young people about seeing a Samaritan because they were perceived as weak. The suicide prevention coordinator met the Samaritans monthly. Parents and carers were informed if their child self-harmed and, although they did not regularly attend ACCT reviews, we found one case where the mother and grandmother had been encouraged to attend and had attended.
- 3.21 The establishment aimed to provide frontline staff with ACCT refresher training every three years but at the time of the inspection refresher training was overdue for 30% of required staff. There were 40 trained ACCT assessors working across the young people under 18 and young adult sites. A rota was updated weekly and listed approximately eight members of staff each day who could act as ACCT assessors. Three members of staff were qualified as ACCT trainers. Not all staff had received refresher first aid training.

### Further recommendations

- 3.22 A member of the education department should attend the monthly suicide prevention meetings.
- 3.23 Young people at risk of self-harm should be fully occupied with purposeful activities to meet their individual needs.
- 3.24 Staff training in relation to suicide and self-harm prevention and first aid should be up to date.

### Housekeeping point

- 3.25 Data on the reasons why young people self-harm should be collated, monitored and acted on.

## Bullying

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 3.26 **There should be greater use of formal interventions to deal with individuals who bully and to support victims. (3.11)**

**Partially achieved.** All referrals indicating concerns about bullying were sent to the anti-bullying coordinator who ensured that they were investigated by a senior officer. In some cases a formal warning was issued to young people who had been identified as bullying others, but if their behaviour warranted further action, they were asked to sign an anti-bullying compact, were subject to ongoing monitoring, and participated in three sessions with their personal officers, examining the reasons for their behaviour and its consequences for others. Although there was a well designed and comprehensive intervention pack for young people who bullied others, it was not delivered consistently. Staff had not been trained to use it and there had been no evaluation of its effectiveness.

- 3.27 Some young people who had been identified as bullies were supervised by a dedicated behaviour management group through an individual support plan (ISP) (see also safeguarding section). Although the ISPs lacked clear assessments and detailed planning to specifically address problematic behaviour they reflected good engagement between the young people and the staff from the behaviour management group. Young people subject to ISPs were reviewed weekly by an effective multidisciplinary group. As we reported at the previous inspection, information about the progress of the young people on ISPs continued to be held in a number of different places, such as wing files, observation books, training planning documentation and bullying observation sheets and this resulted in a lack of coordination of the work overall. There was also an intervention for victims of bullying, but records indicated that this was still not being delivered to the vast majority of victims, because many young people who had been victims of bullying did not want to participate or staff did not have the time to deliver sessions.

## Further recommendation

3.28 The formal work carried out with young people who bully others should be evaluated for effectiveness. The evaluation should support an ongoing review of the programme content and identify any staff training required.

### 3.29 **Anti-bullying coordinators should have sufficient time to carry out their duties. (3.12)**

**Achieved.** There was one full-time anti-bullying coordinator for both young adults and young people under 18. The anti-bullying coordinator said that she had sufficient time to carry out her role.

### 3.30 **Regular bullying surveys should be conducted and the results should help inform policy development. (3.13)**

**Achieved.** Bi-annual bullying surveys were now conducted which were discussed at the monthly violence reduction meeting and the findings used to update the violence reduction policy. Focus groups were held every month and all young people were invited to take part in an exit survey. All findings were reported to the violence reduction meeting. However, despite good efforts to consult young people on the extent and nature of bullying, it was clear from our survey, focus groups and individual safety surveys that they remained reluctant to be open about bullying and intimidation.

## Additional information

---

3.31 There were comprehensive anti-bullying and violence reduction policies, although the latter needed updating. The anti-bullying policy was clearly understood by staff but, although there had been a recent increase in the number of security information reports (SIRs) relating to bullying, senior managers said they were not yet satisfied that staff were noting some of the more subtle signs of bullying. The violence reduction meeting chaired by the deputy governor continued to address all relevant issues across the establishment and was very well attended.

3.32 A wide range of data was collected by the violence reduction and anti-bullying coordinator, which enabled the identification of patterns and trends in behaviour and the areas where violence and bullying were more likely to occur. In the first six months of 2011 there had been 376 fights and 82 assaults involving young people. There had been 21 assaults on staff and five involving visitors. The most common types of bullying involved gambling and intimidating victims to buy items from the canteen.

3.33 New arrivals continued to be given a clear message that violence would not be tolerated and told how the establishment would respond to violent incidents. Information about punishment and support was provided during induction and in age-appropriate leaflets and posters available throughout the establishment.

3.34 In our survey, 46% of young people said they had felt unsafe at some point at Feltham against the national comparator of 25% and 30% in the previous survey. It was evident that gang issues were a considerable management task. In interviews for our safety survey young people told us that mutual aggression was the issue that made them feel the most unsafe. Commonly mentioned were 'arguments' and 'fights' which started for a number of reasons, with boredom and earning respect the key triggers. One young person said: *'It happens all the time. There are a lot of gang issues and people trying to earn respect from each other. It's all down to how*

*long we're banged up – there's a lot of shouting through the doors and it winds people up which leads to fights'. One young person we interviewed told us: 'It depends what area you are from, problems can come in from the outside. You can keep your head down if you want to and staff will try to keep you away from them but there is still the risk that you will see them on social visits. Staff are aware. Really it's an accepted part of prison life.'* A number of young people told us they would be prepared to undertake mediation. However, they said that this would only be possible for conflicts that arose in the prison and conflict caused by external gang issues could not be resolved by mediation and they would always assault rival gang members if they came across them.

- 3.35 Staff were quick to respond appropriately when incidents came to their attention. This was confirmed by the majority of young people in our safety interviews, although opinions about the ability of staff to tackle bullying varied.
- 3.36 The behaviour management group consisting of a senior officer and four officers working to the head of safeguarding. It had been operating for approximately 12 months and was tasked to identify the most challenging young people and provide individual packages of intervention and support to change their behaviour. More recently, the team had been working more intensively with a maximum of 10 young people who had been identified for more targeted intervention. These young people were located on the Dunlin unit. The behaviour management group worked with Dunlin unit staff and the young people who had been targeted for intervention participated in an intensive six-week programme. The behaviour management group continued to support the young people after the completion of the programme and their relocation to another wing to help them to reintegrate.
- 3.37 The work of the behaviour management group and the Dunlin unit was part of a three-month pilot project to assess whether intensive contact and regular interventions would reduce aggression and disruptive behaviour. Early indications showed success in helping young people to progress and young people we spoke to said the programme was having a positive impact on their behaviour.
- 3.38 The intervention programme included some community involvement and outside speakers to address gang issues. The behaviour management group had developed extensive knowledge of gang culture and worked closely with the security department and other residential units to manage gang-related problems within the establishment.

## Applications and complaints

---

### **Expected outcomes:**

**Applications and complaints are taken seriously as demonstrated by the effective procedures that are in place, which are easy to access and use, with timely responses provided. Children and young people feel safe from repercussions when using these procedures and are aware of, and know how to use, the appeal mechanisms that are available to them. Independent advocates are easily accessible and assist young people in making applications and complaints.**

### **Additional information**

---

- 3.39 In our survey, 53% of young people said that it was easy to make a complaint against a national comparator of 67%. Complaint forms were not easily accessible to young people in some units since they had been placed at heights which were out of the reach of some. The

supply of confidential access complaint forms had run out on some units and copies had been made on dark red paper which rendered them illegible.

- 3.40 Responses to complaints were timely and complaints were investigated well but young people told us they had little faith in the complaints process. The majority of complaints related to lost property, either in transit from one establishment to another or in the laundry. We came across some responses to complaints about clothing lost in the laundry which said 'you were told that it was at your own risk'. It was therefore unsurprising that young people were not satisfied with the way their complaints were dealt with. The advocacy service provided information to young people about complaints in general and staff told us that they sometimes referred young people who were not happy with the outcome of their complaint to the advocacy service to help them with an appeal. Monitoring data indicated that just over half the complaints received were upheld, but we examined several where it was unclear if the complaint had been upheld or rejected, including one that had been investigated by the Independent Monitoring Board.
- 3.41 The applications system appeared confusing and operated differently according to individual unit practice and staff preferences. There was a wide range of different forms for applications and young people told us that they found this confusing and staff said they had some sympathy with this view. In our survey, 55% of young people thought it was easy to make an application against the comparator of 81%. Survey responses relating to understanding the application process and timeliness of responses were also significantly worse than the national comparator.
- 3.42 Many applications were appropriately dealt with informally between young people and staff, but there was no system for checking that verbal or written applications had been dealt with.
- 3.43 At the time of the inspection, the applications and complaints system was being revised.

#### **Further recommendation**

- 3.44 The applications system should be implemented consistently across units and include an audit trail and robust quality assurance arrangements to ensure that the application has been dealt with.

#### **Housekeeping point**

- 3.45 Complaint forms should be accessible to all young people and printed legibly.

## **Legal rights**

---

### **Expected outcomes:**

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

- 3.46 **Adequate staff should be trained in legal and bail information. (3.68)**

**Not achieved.** No staff in the establishment had been trained to carry out this work. However offender supervisors collaborated with community youth offending teams (YOTs) and specifically the services of YOT bail support workers to ensure that young people received the advice and guidance on legal rights that they required.

3.47 **Young people should be able to make free telephone calls to their legal representatives. (3.69)**

**Not achieved.** Young people could seek help from their offender supervisors to make free telephone calls to their legal advisers. However, if they had telephone credit, they were sometimes required to use their own resources to make calls.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

**Additional information**

---

- 3.48 All unconvicted young people were subject to the remand planning process which covered legal rights in general (see section on training planning and remand management). We observed one meeting where the community YOT worker dealt effectively with all matters relating to bail and legal advice. Legal visits took place every week day and young people had easy access to their solicitors. Private rooms were available for legal interviews.
- 3.49 Young people had access to a suitable range of legal texts in the library.

## Faith and religious activity

---

**Expected outcomes:**

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

**Additional information**

---

- 3.50 An active multi-faith chaplaincy team was managed by a full-time Muslim chaplain and consisted of full-time Church of England and Roman Catholic chaplains, supported by a team of part-time chaplains and volunteers. Part-time chaplains included Jewish, Sikh, Hindu, Salvation Army, Jehovah's Witness, Buddhist, Orthodox and Quaker.
- 3.51 Provision for religious observance and young people's pastoral needs was good. A large number of young people attended services and received pastoral support from the chaplaincy. There were several regular classes for preparing young people to practise their faith. The volunteers represented community religious organisations. They helped with prayers and services, led groups and classes and provided additional pastoral support.
- 3.52 Young people were asked about their faith during induction and were given a leaflet containing the names of the chaplaincy team and information about the time and location of services and religious activities. We were told that a member of the chaplaincy visited each young person within 24 hours of his arrival, although our survey results suggested that this was not consistent.
- 3.53 The chaplaincy team was well integrated into the life of the establishment and was highly respected by young people and staff. They regularly attended management meetings including the equalities action team (EAT), violence reduction, reducing re-offending, suicide prevention and daily governor's briefings. A chaplain occasionally attended training planning meetings and ACCT reviews. The chaplaincy worked closely with the EAT to provide a regular support group for Gypsies, Roma and Travellers, and a group for young people from Eastern Europe.

- 3.54 Facilities for religious observance were good. There were separate Church of England and Roman Catholic chapels and a Mosque, which were all attractively furnished and provided an environment that was conducive to worship and reflection. The Mosque had capacity for 100 people and, as there were 240 young people registered as Muslim at the time of the inspection, prayers were held twice each Friday. The Mosque had recently been equipped with washing facilities. Hindu and Sikh services were conducted regularly.
- 3.55 Young people wishing to attend prayers or services made an application the previous day which enabled staff to ensure that young people who had been involved in conflicts with each other attended at different times. However, this did not prevent young people who had not made advance application from attending a service if they made an application on the day. Staff on residential units told us that if a young person had not applied the day before but wanted to attend prayers or a service, they were generally able to make the necessary arrangements.
- 3.56 Young people in the care and separation unit who could not attend religious services had the opportunity to see a chaplain who visited the unit each day, and could take part in religious observance, including communion, in their cell. Young people excluded from attending religious services for disciplinary reasons could request a visit from the chaplaincy team. We were told that it was very rare for a young person to be excluded from religious services for more than a week. In our survey, 75% of young people said they could speak to a religious leader in private if they wanted to against the comparator of 65%.
- 3.57 There were timetable clashes between some religious classes and groups provided by the chaplaincy and education classes and we were told that young people were required to attend education classes as a priority.
- 3.58 The Feltham Community Chaplaincy Trust continued to provide 'through the gate' pastoral support to young people leaving Feltham. Volunteers from the young person's home community offered general support, including occasionally providing help with finding employment.

#### Housekeeping point

- 3.59 The timetables for faith classes and education classes should be coordinated so that young people are able to attend classes that meet their needs and take proper account of their preferences.

## Substance use

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 3.60 **The establishment should ensure that mandatory drug testing (MDT) officers undertake child protection training. (3.98)**

**Not achieved.** None of the current MDT officers had been trained in child protection and we were told that they were on the waiting list for the course.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

**3.61 The drug and alcohol strategy document should contain detailed action plans and performance measures. (9.105)**

**Not achieved.** A strategic substance misuse action plan was in place, which was reviewed at the bimonthly drug strategy meetings. The strategy had been informed by a recent IDTS (integrated drug treatment system) needs analysis, but this related principally to the young adult site and made no mention of the needs of young people under 18 who were clients of the substance misuse offender supervisors (SMOS) service.

**3.62 The young people's substance misuse service (YPSMS) and the CARAT service should ensure that joint care planning and care coordination focus on young people receiving specialist care and are also extended to service users requiring targeted interventions. (9.107)**

**Achieved.** A multidisciplinary team meeting was held weekly involving SMOS workers, health care, substance misuse unit nurses and, when appropriate, mental health workers, YOT workers, and parents or carers. Young people's needs and all interventions relating to their substance use, health or training plan were discussed at these meetings. Assessments and care plans were shared on the e-Asset networked database.

**Additional information**

---

3.63 The previous young people's substance misuse service (YPSMS) and the offender management unit had merged in November 2010. The previous YPSMS had been replaced by the SMOS and this service was well integrated with the health care and clinical substance misuse nursing team. The change had been positive for the majority of young people whose substance misuse problems were at a relatively low level. In our survey, 6% of young people said they had received help for drug problems and 0% for alcohol problems, against respective comparators of 25% and 10%. However, young people we spoke to said that the service was improving and good interventions were available.

3.64 A comprehensive and robust system was in place for screening and assessing young people's substance related needs. Young people were initially given a general health care screening in reception. If a drug or alcohol problem was disclosed, a substance misuse nurse conducted a more in-depth initial screening.

3.65 If the assessed need indicated the need for detoxification, the young person was taken to the Wren unit where a comprehensive assessment was conducted. The specialist GP saw young people the same day and initiated any appropriate clinical treatment. An appropriate range of pharmaceutical therapies was available for young people who presented with a need for symptomatic relief for drug or alcohol problems. During the period January to June 2011, the need for detoxification and other clinical interventions had been relatively low among young people, consisting of one complicated alcohol detoxification, one symptomatic relief alcohol treatment, one symptomatic relief heroin treatment and one methadone maintenance.

3.66 All young people received a psychosocial screening by an SMOS which determined the level of psychosocial need as targeted high, targeted low or universal for young people with no substance use issues. Residents on the Wren unit were targeted high by default.

3.67 The SMOS assessments were conducted on all young people within a target time of five days of their arrival at the establishment, although in reality the majority of assessments were



completed within 24 hours. All young people, regardless of their target level, received the substance misuse awareness programme, a one-hour session delivered during induction.

- 3.68 SMOS caseloads stood at 20 targeted high need and 128 targeted low need. A further 51 young people remained unassigned.
- 3.69 As young people's training plans were established and reviewed, any emerging drug/alcohol issues were dealt with on a one-to-one basis, for example brief alcohol interventions delivered by substance misuse unit nurses, using in-cell work packs or, if appropriate, group work. Groups included a 'high-end' skunk cannabis group, drug-related offending group, alcohol awareness group, Alcoholics Anonymous and Narcotics Anonymous, and the IDTS 28-day psychosocial group-work programme modules.
- 3.70 A short questionnaire had been circulated among young people to gather their views on the development of the service. Results were still being collated and analysed at the time of the inspection. Information on the service was visible at key locations around the establishment.
- 3.71 Gym staff provided input on the dangers of steroids but this was not coordinated with SMOS or health care unless a specific issue came to light, in which case gym staff referred young people to the relevant service.
- 3.72 The detoxification unit was located on the 14-bed Wren unit, which held young people under 18 and young adults together following a risk assessment. Young people under 18 were allocated an SMOS case manager. Each patient had a single cell and group sessions involved all patients on the unit. These sessions were co-facilitated by nurses and CARAT workers. The maximum length of stay was generally 42 days, although young people could stay longer if necessary. The unit was very well staffed with 10 nurses. A minimum of two were on duty at any one time, providing 24-hour cover. Medication was administered from a clean, tidy and appropriately equipped treatment room on the unit. The regime and programme of clinical and psychosocial interventions were both of high quality, but the unit did not provide a sufficiently clean clinical environment. Some cells and corridors were dirty, with toilets left unflushed and some areas showing long-term neglect.
- 3.73 We were told by health care staff that the smoking policy allowed residents on Wren unit to smoke up to three cigarettes a day at designated times in a designated place outside. The arrangements were properly monitored. Breach of the smoking policy did not necessarily lead to removal from the unit and an appropriate response was followed through discussion and support. Young people who wanted to stop smoking were given a course of nicotine patches and appropriate smoking cessation support from nurses. During the inspection, health care staff told us these arrangements applied to under 18 year olds; after the inspection we were told emphatically by managers that this was not the case.
- 3.74 Rub-down searches were conducted for all mandatory drug tests (MDTs). Strip-searches were only conducted following intelligence and when authorised by a governor. No strip-searches had been conducted for MDT in the six months from January to June 2011.
- 3.75 The random positive MDT rate for this period was 1.67%, from a total of 61 tests with one positive. The suspicion test positive rate had been 22.2% for the previous six months from a total of nine tests, with two positives. In our survey, 12% against a comparator of 21% said it was easy or very easy to get drugs. Overall, these data suggested a low level of drugs availability in the establishment.

**Further recommendation**

3.76 All areas of the Wren unit should be deep cleaned and maintained in a clinically clean, tidy state.

**Housekeeping point**

3.77 An annual needs analysis should be conducted to ensure that the SMOS is meeting the substance use needs of all young people under 18.

# Section 4: Diversity

## Expected outcomes:

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

### 4.1 Each strand of diversity should be covered by an up-to-date policy. (4.12)

**Partially achieved.** There was an up-to-date overarching diversity strategy which addressed all the diversity strands. However, the document was a somewhat unclear mixture of guidance, strategy and general information. Some areas, such as faith and religion, received only scant attention. There was a separate race and equalities action plan and progress in implementing it was monitored by the equalities action team (EAT).

### 4.2 There should be a full-time race equality officer. (4.13)

**Achieved.** The post holder was the equalities senior officer whose role included development work, liaison with community organisations and the investigation of racist incident report forms. The equalities team were well known to staff and young people.

### 4.3 The role of prisoner representatives should be clearly defined, and their work monitored by the diversity team. (4.14)

**Not achieved.** There were no young people diversity representatives at the time of the inspection and there were plans to change the previous role to that of diversity orderlies operating only on reception and in the induction unit. The loss of unit diversity representatives had left young people with no systematic means of contributing to the promotion of diversity through participation at the EAT meetings. It also had the potential to undermine the sustainability of commendable diversity initiatives such as the celebration of Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender History Month, and Gypsy Roma Traveller History Month.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

### 4.4 Equality impact assessments should be carried out for all areas of diversity. (4.15)

**Partially achieved.** A programme of equality impact assessments had been in place in 2010 but none had been produced so far in 2011. The 2010 assessments were relevant and there had been good consultation with young people.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

### 4.5 There should be monitoring to assess the impact of young people's religion, disability and/or foreign national status on their participation in the regime. (4.16)

**Partially achieved.** SMART monitoring data were used to monitor participation by ethnicity and religion but not by other areas of diversity. Staff told us they were awaiting the rollout of a new version of the SMART monitoring tool, which they expected would help them extend the scope of the current monitoring arrangements to include these additional strands.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

## Additional information

---

- 4.6 The post of head of equalities was vacant at the time of the inspection and the equalities team were struggling to meet the demands placed on them. Long-term staffing difficulties and competing priorities had adversely affected the management of diversity and equality and there had been a loss of focus since the 2010 inspection.
- 4.7 The EAT met monthly chaired by the governor. The designated membership included all relevant departments, but it was rare to have full attendance. There had been only one EAT meeting since January 2011 at which young people's representatives had been present. Hounslow Race Equality Council had stopped attending the EAT and had not been replaced. There was regular discussion of SMART monitoring data on ethnicity and religion, and reasons for some statistics being out of the normal range were explored. However, minutes of EAT meetings showed that matters were often repeatedly carried over for discussion in subsequent meetings, with little effective action noted as having been taken.
- 4.8 We were not satisfied that SMART monitoring data were used effectively to inform further interrogation of the data, and minutes of the EAT did not always indicate that enquiries had been carried out robustly. For example the overrepresentation of black and minority ethnic young people in the use of force had been highlighted by SMART data that clearly indicated the extent of the concern. The agreed action was to conduct a focus group with young people. The young people involved in the focus group had said they did not think it was a problem, and the conclusion was that there was no need to address the concern further. SMART data also showed that adjudications of black and minority ethnic young people were out of range: they were more likely than white young people to be found guilty on adjudication. Similarly, they were more likely to be on basic level in the incentives and earned privileges scheme. There was no evidence that these findings had been satisfactorily investigated. EAT minutes suggested that other areas of concern indicated by SMART data were not always followed up, as statistics that were out of range were often considered to be exceptional. Where it was agreed that further investigation was needed, subsequent minutes often failed to record whether or not effective action had been taken. Similarly, it was often difficult to establish if actions listed in the race equalities action plan had been satisfactorily completed.
- 4.9 The EAT gave good attention to the situation of gay or disabled young people. Some additional sources of information, such as that derived from disability assessments, were discussed and implications for the regime were considered.
- 4.10 Posters on wings about diversity staff were several months out of date. Publication of the monthly diversity newsletter *Mosaic*, which had been cited in the 2010 inspection report as an example of good practice, had ceased.

### Further recommendations

- 4.11 Robust action should be taken to ensure that the equalities action team meetings are attended by representatives of all departments who form part of the designated membership.
- 4.12 Concerns raised by SMART monitoring data about poorer outcomes for particular groups of young people should be fully investigated. There should be a clear action plan to address any concerns and progress should be monitored.

## Housekeeping point

- 4.13 Posters about the equality action team should be updated whenever there are changes in personnel.

## Race equality

---

- 4.14 **Feltham should ensure that any areas of disparity identified in ethnic monitoring are investigated, and that necessary remedial action taken is monitored through the race equality action team. (4.29)**

**Not achieved.** SMART data were used appropriately to identify areas of disparity among ethnic minority groups, but there was little evidence of effective action to address concerns. **We repeat the recommendation.**

- 4.15 **SMART (systematic monitoring and analysing of race equality treatment) ethnic monitoring data should include information over the previous 12 months to ensure that patterns can be easily identified. (4.30)**

**Achieved.** Data for the previous year had been routinely analysed and presented to the equality action team. .

- 4.16 **The establishment should ensure a consistent model of quality assurance for racist incident report forms. (4.31)**

**Not achieved.** Racist incident report forms (RIRFs) were thoroughly investigated and many helpful responses were provided to young people by the equalities senior officer. Some quality assurance was in place. However, independent scrutiny of RIRFs by Hounslow Race Equality Council had lapsed in 2010. The Zahid Mubarek Trust had been commissioned to provide external scrutiny and the new arrangement was expected to be in place imminently. It was unclear whether or not the Trust would be qualified to provide scrutiny of the newer diversity investigation report forms (DIRFs) that might concern discrimination other than racism. **We repeat the recommendation.**

- 4.17 **An analysis of patterns and trends in racist incident reports should be provided to the race equality action team. (4.32)**

**Achieved.** Data on patterns and trends were provided to the equality action team and discussions were minuted.

- 4.18 **The establishment should develop and implement a programme to challenge racist and discriminatory prisoner behaviour at Feltham as soon as possible. (4.33)**

**Not achieved.** We were told it would not be practicable to develop such a programme at Feltham due to the high turnover of young people. Nevertheless, the equalities senior officer provided examples of informal resolution of racist incidents and where she had spoken to perpetrators. **We repeat the recommendation.**

## Additional information

---

- 4.19 The number of RIRFs submitted in the most recent year was 200, a slight increase on the 176 submitted in 2010. Most RIRFs were allegations of racist remarks or differential treatment by staff on the basis of race. Staff were using RIRFs to report allegedly racist behaviour by young people, which was not an appropriate use of the system. There was a programme of 'Challenge it Change it' training in progress for staff. At the time of the inspection, 66% of staff (including administrative and operational staff) had attended the half-day training event, and all new staff received it as part of their induction.
- 4.20 A process was in place for putting alerts on the C-Nomis system so that anyone accessing a young person's file could see if they had convictions for racist offences. However, this depended on staff taking the time to check each file. A daily briefing was issued alerting all staff to any young people who had convictions for arson. There was potential for the briefings to be extended to include young people convicted of racist offences and other hate crime, including homophobia.
- 4.21 Some eye-catching posters about race issues were displayed on all the residential units.
- 4.22 The equalities officer worked with the chaplaincy team to facilitate a weekly support group for Gypsy, Roma and Traveller young people and some very positive work had been undertaken for the celebration of Gypsy Roma Traveller History Month.

### Further recommendation

- 4.23 Regular briefings issued to alert staff to young people convicted of arson should be extended to include those convicted of racist and other hate crime, including homophobic offences.

### Good practice

- 4.24 *The equalities officer worked with the chaplaincy team to facilitate a weekly support group for gypsy, Roma and traveller young people and some very positive work had been undertaken for the celebration of Gypsy Roma Traveller History Month.*

## Foreign nationals

---

- 4.25 **All foreign national new arrivals should have their specific needs identified, and there should be support systems to meet these needs. This information should be used to develop a needs analysis of foreign nationals and appropriate services to meet these. (4.48)**

**Not achieved.** Mechanisms to identify foreign nationals were inadequate. All new arrivals were asked to complete an equality questionnaire on arrival which did not directly identify foreign nationals but asked whether the respondent was born in another country. The questionnaire identified some needs of foreign nationals, for example it asked if the young person required immigration advice and had difficulties reading or speaking English. Foreign national young people were not asked if their family were located abroad or in the UK. The foreign national coordinator identified foreign nationals from the Prison Service computer records (C-Nomis). Information on C-Nomis was updated by reception, induction and prisoner records staff. Some young people we spoke to, who had been identified to us by the

establishment as foreign nationals, told us that they were British and it was clear in our conversations with the young people that they were confused about their status. A needs analysis of the foreign national population had not taken place.

**4.26 Foreign national representatives should be identified, and there should be specific forums to ensure the needs of these young people are effectively represented and pursued by the establishment. (4.49)**

**Not achieved.** There were no foreign national representatives. Foreign national group meetings were held monthly but they were poorly attended with approximately five young people on average. The foreign national coordinator attended but no other members of staff. A handwritten note was made of the meeting but there were no formal minutes. Actions agreed were not recorded and it was not possible to track progress.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

**4.27 NOMS should work with UKBA to ensure that foreign national detainees are not held at Feltham. (4.50)**

**Not achieved.** The foreign national coordinator confirmed that an immigration detainee who was aged under 18 had been held post sentence within the last six months.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

**Additional information**

---

4.28 Provision for foreign nationals had deteriorated since our last inspection. On the first day of the inspection, 36 young foreign nationals were held in the establishment, equating to 16% of the young people under 18 population. The foreign national coordinator was responsible for other equality strands, including race, and was unable to dedicate herself full time to the needs of foreign nationals. In our foreign national focus group, none knew the identity of the foreign national coordinator and awareness of her role among staff and young people across the establishment was generally poor. Photographs of the foreign national coordinator were not displayed. The foreign national policy issued in 2010 required updating and had not been reviewed in January 2011 as scheduled. It referred to the Immigration and Nationality Directorate which had been replaced in 2007 and the defunct Refugee Legal Centre and Immigration Advisory Service. Moreover, some technical facts were incorrect which could have led to serious consequences for young people. For example, the document stated that an appeal against a deportation notice should be lodged within 14 days of receipt when the deadline was five working days. A failure to lodge an appeal could have led to a young person being deported from the UK.

4.29 Foreign national issues were discussed at the monthly EAT meeting but on many occasions minutes recorded the number of nationalities and foreign young people in the establishment with no discussion of their needs. The meetings were underpinned by the EAT action plan, but there were few actions relating to foreign nationals.

4.30 There was no regular contact with independent immigration advice agencies. The Detention Advice Service had had their funding withdrawn and no longer provided services in the establishment. Young people seeking immigration advice were given a list of immigration lawyers by the foreign national coordinator, but it was not clear if these lawyers were prepared to travel to Feltham to provide immigration advice.

4.31 An immigration officer from the UK Border Agency's (UKBA) criminal casework directorate attended the establishment each week to interview young people and progress deportations.

Young people wishing to see the immigration officer could make an application to the foreign national coordinator who liaised with UKBA.

- 4.32 Foreign nationals were able to keep in contact with family abroad. Young people who had not received a visit in the previous month were credited with a five-minute telephone call to their country of origin. The foreign nationals policy stated that young people with family abroad could save their visiting orders for longer accumulated visits. The policy also allowed young people on remand two free airmail envelopes a week and convicted young people one.
- 4.33 There was insufficient use of interpretation and translation services. In the six months prior to our inspection, 193 calls had been made using telephone interpreters across both the young people under 18 and young adult establishments. Most calls on the young people under 18 side were made on the induction unit, Bittern. Some staff were unaware that all units were able to use telephone interpreting services and one officer told us that young people were taken to the induction wing for this purpose. We spoke to two Vietnamese young people who could not speak English who told us that, apart from on reception and with UKBA, no-one had spoken to them using an interpreter. The young people felt safe but isolated and were confused about their options in relation to their immigration status. There were few translated notices around the establishment. The library held foreign language versions of the Prison Reform Trust's booklet 'Information and Advice for Foreign Nationals', but this had been published in 2004.
- 4.34 The library contained a reasonable selection of foreign language books, but there was not enough provision for eastern European or Vietnamese young people. There was a good selection of foreign national newspapers and young people could take old copies back to their cells. Foreign language CDs, story books and DVDs had been withdrawn from the library because they were being damaged. The library had a good selection of dictionaries.
- 4.35 English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) provision for foreign nationals was poor. ESOL classes had ceased and a tutor visited the units to give one-to-one tutoring to foreign nationals who could not speak English. Students were not able to practise English in groups.

#### Further recommendations

- 4.36 Young foreign nationals should have regular access to independent accredited immigration advice agencies.
- 4.37 Telephone interpretation should be used routinely when accuracy or confidentiality are required to communicate with young people who do not speak English.

## Disability

---

- 4.38 **All young people with disabilities should have care plans outlining their specific needs and how they will be met. Arrangements should be multidisciplinary and involve all departments engaged in work related to that person's disability. (4.58)**

**Not achieved.** The disability liaison officer interviewed all young people who had been identified as having a disability on reception. She notified residential units and other departments of any special needs and adaptations required, but we found that this information was not being picked up by staff on the residential units. Residential staff we spoke to had not seen any disability assessments or care plans, and there were no copies of these in the young people's files that we examined. Although health care and education staff sometimes identified



young people with disabilities, it was unclear how such information was conveyed to other departments. Care plans completed by health care staff for a young person with a physical disability were not shared with residential staff.

- 4.39 We were told that the needs of disabled young people might be addressed in multidisciplinary forums such as the vulnerability group, but this was not consistent and the vulnerability group meeting we attended did not discuss any disabled young people and there were no references to disability in the minutes of its recent meetings. Not all the residential staff with whom we spoke on the night visit knew who disabled young people were, and some had not heard of personal emergency evacuation plans (PEEPs).  
**We repeat the recommendation.**

- 4.40 **Adapted cells should be provided on Feltham A (juveniles) to match the provision available for young adults. (4.59)**

**Not achieved.** There were no adapted cells on Feltham A.  
**We repeat the recommendation.**

- 4.41 **The establishment should identify disabled prisoner representatives and develop a forum for young people with disabilities in which to raise their concerns. (4.60)**

**Not achieved.** The establishment did not accept the feasibility of disabled prisoner representatives and there was no systematic means of ensuring that the views of disabled young people were heard.  
**We repeat the recommendation.**

#### **Additional information**

---

- 4.42 There was no action plan for implementing improvements in provision for disabled young people. Our survey indicated that disabled young people felt significantly less safe at Feltham and were less likely than non-disabled young people to ask for help.
- 4.43 There were few posters on display in a suitable format for young people with a learning disability.
- 4.44 A speech and language therapist had been appointed, which was a very valuable resource for young people with communication difficulties (see also health care section).

## **Religion**

---

#### **Additional information**

---

- 4.45 No actions to tackle religious discrimination were specified in the diversity strategy, despite the document containing information about the proportions of young people at Feltham identifying with the three main religions, Muslim, Church of England and Roman Catholic. An equalities impact assessment about religious provision at Feltham had been completed in July 2010. The document unhelpfully conflated race with religion, there was little analysis of SMART data, and the accompanying action plan focused solely on the Muslim faith with no explicit rationale for that.

- 4.46 While SMART data included information about the proportion of young people identifying themselves as Muslim, Church of England and Roman Catholic, there was little analysis of the extent to which young people of different faiths were able to benefit from equal access to the regime. Data about religion were collected, but were not routinely used to identify trends and achieve a clear picture of how religion might be a factor in young people's participation. For example, it was known that black and minority ethnic young people were regularly over-represented on the basic level of the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme, yet data about the relative position of Muslim young people in the IEP scheme, who at the time of the inspection represented 33% of Feltham's population, did not seem to have received attention.
- 4.47 The chaplain attended the EAT. Faith, religion and belief were a regular item on the EAT agenda, but discussion seemed limited to the planning of religious events.

---

#### Further recommendation

- 4.48 The diversity strategy should specify how discrimination on the grounds of religion will be monitored and dealt with.

---

## Gender

---

#### Additional information

- 4.49 A transgender young person who arrived during the inspection was interviewed on the day of his arrival by the liaison officer to assess and address his needs. He was placed on a unit with a higher than average staffing level to address his support needs. Staff told us that they had previously put in place a programme of support for transgender young people, including the opportunity to wear suitable clothing for their preferred gender.

---

## Sexual orientation

- 4.50 **The establishment should identify a lead officer for work with gay and bisexual young people. (4.65)**

**Achieved.** The equalities manager was responsible for sexual orientation and transgender. Some impressive work had been undertaken to support gay and bisexual young people and to raise awareness of issues among young people and staff.

- 4.51 **Positive gay and bisexual images should be displayed across the establishment, as well as information about sources of support and help. (4.66)**

**Not achieved.** There was still a lack of positive images of same sex relationships around the establishment. We were told that plans to display the Stonewall '*Some people are gay. Get over it*' posters had been opposed by some staff.

### **Further recommendation**

- 4.52 Positive images of same-sex relationships should be displayed across the establishment, as well as posters drawing attention to the unacceptability of homophobia and information about sources of support.

### **Additional information**

---

- 4.53 A support group for gay young people, PRIDE, had been established which met whenever there were young people who wanted to attend it. All young people were told about it on induction, which provided an opportunity for young people to offer information about their sexual orientation if they wished.

### **Good practice**

- 4.54 *The PRIDE support group for gay young people, and the information given to young people about it during induction, was an excellent initiative.*



# Section 5: Health services

## Expected outcomes:

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

## General

---

**5.1 The Ministry of Justice should expedite all warrants for transfers to mental health secure beds to avoid unnecessary delays to patients. (5.86)**

**Achieved.** The Ministry of Justice had engaged with the Department of Health to produce revised transfer guidelines, including a revised transfer target of 14 days, and the target had been adopted for monitoring purposes at Feltham. Transfers of young people to mental health secure beds were completed within two to three days. Hounslow Primary Care Trust (PCT) was monitoring performance on a monthly basis.

**5.2 The partnership board should investigate the reasons for young people's poor perceptions of health services and take steps to address them. (5.63)**

**Achieved.** The partnership board had agreed that the health care department should investigate the poor perceptions of young people of health care services. The health care department had conducted user surveys, and focus groups had been held earlier in 2011 to determine the perceptions of young people. Young people indicated that they believed the health care applications system was not working and that waiting times to see the GP and allied health care professionals were too long. Actions had been taken to address these issues, including young people being involved in the redesign of the application system, and advice on improving communications had been provided by the speech and language therapist. Other improvements included: pictorial application forms; dedicated health application post boxes; daily collection of application slips and triage of applications by the nurses and/or dentist; appointments made on SystmOne; and patients' appointment slips delivered by hand the day before. Complaints about the applications system had substantially reduced. The waiting time to see a doctor was less than one day and young people could see a dentist within two weeks.

**5.3 A health and wellbeing open day had taken place in June 2011. The purpose of the day was to familiarise young people with health care and associated services. The day included a competition in which young people had designed posters to inform others about health care. Over 200 young people from both populations in the prison had attended.**

**5.4 Our latest survey findings were similarly poor to the previous survey as only 37% of young people found the quality of health care to be good or very good against the national comparator of 67%.**

**5.5 The health needs assessment should distinguish between the needs of juveniles and young adults. (5.64)**

**Not achieved.** There was no health needs assessment (HNA), although one had been commissioned with a delivery date of 30 September 2011. The commission specified that the

HNA should distinguish between the needs of young people under 18 and young adults. There was no prison health development plan but the prison health performance and quality indicators and Feltham integrated health services performance management reports were being used to guide developments.

**5.6 The inpatient association area should be cleaned, decorated and made more welcoming and age appropriate. (5.65)**

**No longer relevant.** The inpatient area had been relocated from Lapwing to Albatross. The association area on Albatross was reasonably clean, recently decorated, welcoming and age appropriate.

**5.7 The disabled-access facilities in the inpatient unit should not be used for de-escalation. (5.66)**

**No longer relevant.** The inpatient area had been relocated from Lapwing to Albatross and was not used for de-escalation purposes.

**5.8 Clinical governance reporting arrangements should be consistent across providers. (5.67)**

**Achieved.** There was an integrated governance reporting structure with monthly detailed reports supplied to the integrated clinical governance group.

**5.9 There should be an overarching, collective record of health services staff training and continual professional development. (5.68)**

**Achieved.** There was a collective record of health services staff training which included mandatory and continuing professional development components. A training matrix was used to inform staff of what was available and/or required. Several staff members were undertaking higher educational and professional studies. There was a monthly academic programme with external speakers to which all health care personnel were invited. During the inspection an academic meeting took place, the subject of which was cognitive behavioural therapy for depression.

**5.10 All staff should have child protection training. (5.69)**

**Achieved.** All health care staff received child protection training to level 2 as part of the Central and North West London NHS Trust (CNWL) mandatory training programme. Level 3 training was not available which would have been useful for a limited number of health personnel.

**Housekeeping point**

**5.11 CNWL should assess the child protection training requirements of their personnel at Feltham to reassure themselves that the level of training is adequate to meet the demands.**

**5.12 All staff should have annual resuscitation training. (5.70)**

**Partially achieved.** Resuscitation training was a component of CNWL mandatory training for clinicians at Feltham. Not all staff were in date for training, although they were programmed to

receive training in the near future. Resuscitation kit, oxygen and automated external defibrillators were strategically placed and were checked regularly.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

**5.13 Young people should be cared for by nurses with the appropriate range of skills, including registered sick children's nurses. (5.71)**

**Achieved.** The service model had been revised since the previous inspection and a skills mix analysis had been carried out to align staff competencies with service requirements. More work was still to be done in some areas following the required health needs assessment which was the responsibility of the PCT. It had proved difficult to recruit a registered sick children's nurse (RSCN), although all job advertisements invited RSCNs in particular to apply. Health care staff were receiving additional training, as necessary, to enable them to assist young people with their health and wellbeing requirements.

**5.14 There should be formal arrangements for the loan of occupational therapy equipment and specialist advice as required. (5.72)**

**Achieved.** Young people could be referred to the community occupational therapy team for assessment, and equipment could be obtained from the NHS Hounslow store or be purchased.

**5.15 All complaints about health services should be answered in an age-appropriate and understandable manner, and addressed to the complainant. (5.73)**

**Achieved.** There had been 61 health care complaints in the year ending May 2011. The main areas of complaint were the quality of interactions with GPs and nurses [which had peaked in June (five complaints) and August (four complaints) 2010 and was now less than one per month in 2011] and appointments and referrals. The responses to complaints that we sampled were answered in an age-appropriate manner and were addressed to the complainant. The speech and language therapist had helpfully been giving advice to the health care team on improving the written outputs from health care to better match the average reading age and understanding of the population.

**5.16 All health services staff should be easily identifiable by an easy-to-read name badge. (5.74)**

**Achieved.** All health services staff wore easy-to-read name badges.

**5.17 Primary care nurses should wear their uniform correctly at all times. (5.75)**

**Achieved.** New uniforms had been issued to staff since our last inspection. Primary care nurses wore their uniforms correctly.

**5.18 Health services staff should provide a range of basic remedies. (5.76)**

**Not achieved.** As previously reported, soluble paracetamol, Mucogel for indigestion and a sunscreen could be provided by nursing staff as special sick but all other basic medication had to be prescribed by a doctor. A limited range of over-the-counter medication for external use was available to purchase from the canteen list.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

**5.19 Meningitis C vaccinations should be offered to all young people. (5.77)**

**Not achieved.** Meningitis C vaccinations were available but not offered to all young people. None had been administered in the last year. The commissioner and provider had proposed that the use of meningitis C vaccine, subject to informal risk assessment, should in future be subject to formal risk assessment.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

- 5.20 **The medicines management committee should review the procedures for monitoring and recording the supply of prescribed medicines out of hours and for ordering repeatable medications to avoid a duplication of supply and wastage. (5.78)**

**Achieved.** The out-of-hours policy had been reviewed since the last inspection and supplies were appropriately recorded and monitored by the pharmacy staff.

- 5.21 **Records of medication supplied to patients from stock should be added to the patient medication records (PMR) at the pharmacy. (5.79)**

**No longer relevant.** There was no in-house pharmacy or associated patient medication record system and, although records of patient named medication dispensed by the external pharmacy supplier were held on the pharmacy PMR system, supplies made from stock or special sick were not recorded. However, SystemOne (electronic clinical record) had recently been introduced at the establishment allowing prescribed medication or supplies of special sick to be recorded on the patient's electronic record and manually on the prescription and administration charts, thus providing a complete and accurate record of medication supplied.

- 5.22 **The skills of the nurse prescriber should be used to enhance the availability of prescription-only medicines to young people in the absence of a doctor. (5.80)**

**Not achieved.** There was no nurse prescriber. Following the establishment of a revised GP service contract, there was a plan to begin training two nurse prescribers from September 2011.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

- 5.23 **An up-to-date controlled drugs register should be put in place, in accordance with current legislative requirements. (5.81)**

**Not achieved.** Controlled drugs were held on Albatross and Wren units. Registers at both locations were not strictly compliant with current legislation since the controlled drugs registers recording stock into the prison did not comply with the revised regulations which came into force on 1 February 2008. However, record keeping was good.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

- 5.24 **A written, signed and dated medical history questionnaire should be completed for all dental patients. (5.82)**

**Achieved.** Dental records we sampled contained completed medical history questionnaires.

- 5.25 **A protocol should be developed for dental out-of-hours cover. (5.83)**

**Achieved.** There was a protocol for out-of-hours dental cover, including the attendance of a dentist for problems that could not be resolved by a nurse or GP. A dentist had attended out of hours on one occasion since the previous inspection.

- 5.26 **The full range of NHS dental treatments should be available. (5.84)**



**Achieved.** A full range of NHS dental treatments was available.

**5.27 Young people requiring child and adolescent mental health service (CAMHS) tier four or secondary care services should be seen within seven days and transferred without delay. (5.85)**

**Achieved.** Clinicians from the local CAMHS forensic service were based on site. Young people requiring assessment were seen promptly and, if necessary, transferred to external CAMHS services within two or three days.

**Additional information**

---

- 5.28 Health services were commissioned by NHS Hounslow and had been provided as an integrated service since June 2010 by CNWL.
- 5.29 The waiting room in the health centre was well maintained and appreciated by patients. The rest of the health centre was modern and well equipped though there were lapses in standards of cleanliness such as dust and grime, soiled examination couches and unsealed flooring. In other health care facilities, examination couches were torn and paddle taps were absent or incomplete. Several rooms required deep cleaning. Generally, it was difficult to guarantee clinical cleanliness and several aspects of the health care environment did not comply with contemporary infection control standards. The health centre manager had undertaken an infection control audit and was seeking to address the underlying problems of incomplete works and social cleanliness.

**Further recommendation**

- 5.30 The clinical cleanliness of the health care environment should be properly maintained by daily cleaning and checks and deep cleaning as necessary.

**Clinical governance**

---

- 5.31 Since the previous inspection, a new staffing model had been introduced with a senior manager who was a clinician and clinical teams for primary care, inpatient care, primary mental health, secondary mental health and IDTS. Each team had a clinical lead and registered nurses and some had health care assistants. There was an extensive range of allied health professionals including an art therapist, clinical psychology staff, music therapist and a full-time speech and language therapist. There were several administrative staff. Young people were involved in interviewing prospective new staff. New starters told us of frustrating interview-to-start dates of up to eight months due to security clearance times. Lines of accountability were clear. Clinical supervision was well organised and properly recorded.
- 5.32 SystmOne had been introduced in March 2011 and, during the inspection, work was completed to enable SystmOne to receive laboratory reports directly, which made health care more efficient. Staff commented that SystmOne had improved continuity of care by allowing direct access to the clinical records of young people transferred from other establishments. A discussion was under way to incorporate dental records in SystmOne.
- 5.33 A regular programme of clinical audits, including aspects of care planning and consent, had been undertaken in the year to May 2011.

- 5.34 The policy for the outbreak of communicable diseases had been subject to a table-top exercise about a hypothetical local outbreak of the norovirus. Participants included external agencies, including the PCT and ambulance service. Learning acquired from the exercise had been used to make the communicable diseases contingency plans and procedures more effective. This was excellent practice. On Albatross, the mental health inpatient unit, we found three versions of the infection control policy - two different editions of the CNWL policy and one version by another provider - which was confusing for staff.
- 5.35 An information-sharing protocol was in place.
- 5.36 Since the previous inspection, a health promotion group, with young people representation, had been introduced and was being used to involve young people in health care developments.

#### Housekeeping point

- 5.37 There should be only one, up-to-date infection control policy throughout health care.

#### Good practice

- 5.38 *The table-top exercise to test the communicable diseases policy and procedures included participants from external agencies. This enabled wider learning and external scrutiny of Feltham's policy and procedures.*
- 5.39 *The involvement of young people in interviewing prospective new staff members enabled the interactions between potential new employees and young people to be tested.*

## Primary care

---

- 5.40 CNWL provided the primary care services and GP services were subcontracted to Medacs. Medacs provided all medical personnel and out-of-hours cover.
- 5.41 There was a good reception health screen and comprehensive health assessment, both of which were incorporated into SystemOne. Interpreting services were available by telephone if required but usage was very low.
- 5.42 The most common reason for self-referral by young people and young adults from December 2010 to May 2011 was headache followed by a request to see the dentist. Nurses used triage algorithms to aid decision making about the appropriate treatment of patients. Following triage, nurses treated the patients or listed them on SystemOne for further assessment at primary care clinics.
- 5.43 A wider range of timetabled clinics was available to patients than at the previous inspection, with active programmes of hepatitis B and MMR immunisations and chlamydia screening. The lifelong conditions register was extensive, including thalassaemia and sickle cell disease. There were daily GP clinics, including Saturdays and Sundays. The failure to attend rate had been high in the previous 12 months and, although still high at 23%, had been falling over the last three months. There were weekly genitourinary medicine clinics and the Terrence Higgins Trust visited weekly to give guidance on sexual health protection and associated matters. Initial thought was being given to the introduction of a plaster clinic which would enable better access to minor trauma services. The lead doctor was a minor trauma specialist.

## Pharmacy

---

- 5.44 The contract for the provision of pharmacy services was held by CNWL and medication was supplied by a local pharmacy supplier. A full-time pharmacist and a part-time registered pharmacy technician were employed by the Trust and undertook medicines management responsibilities. They were not routinely involved in the administration of medicines but were available to give advice. The pharmacist assisted with a regular asthma clinic and occasionally undertook medication use reviews. The technician was undergoing training to provide smoking cessation services. The Children's British National Formulary was available on the units for clinical staff to refer to. The level of prescribing for young people was low and appropriate to the population. Medications management was very good.
- 5.45 The majority of medication was supplied to patients as in possession and the policy had recently been reviewed. Risk assessments were based on a point score system and undertaken by the doctor, although the intention was to expand this to allow nursing staff to complete them. The prescription and administration charts indicated whether medication was held in possession and it was also recorded on SystemOne. There was a compact for patients to sign but this had not been fully implemented and it was unclear how frequently risk assessments were reviewed.
- 5.46 Most medication was distributed from the first night and induction unit; a locked medication trolley was kept in the treatment room and used to administer to patients on different units. Occasional loose strips and patient's own medication were seen in the trolleys which apparently had been assessed by nursing staff as suitable for use.
- 5.47 Patient group directions allowed nursing staff to supply a limited range of more potent medication for substance misuse and sexual health in the absence of a doctor.

### Housekeeping points

- 5.48 In-possession risk assessments should be reviewed regularly and patients should sign the associated in-possession medication agreement or compact.
- 5.49 Loose strips and unlabelled inhalers should not be present in the medication trolleys.
- 5.50 Patient's own medication held in stock should be marked to show that it had been assessed by a member of the health care team as suitable for continued use.

## Dentistry

---

- 5.51 The dental surgery had an impressive array of equipment with separate decontamination facilities. There was no computer for accessing SystemOne. The dentist undertook triage during his sessions. As an oral surgery specialist, he performed minor dental surgery in addition to community dentistry.

### Housekeeping point

- 5.52 There should be a SystemOne computer terminal in the dental surgery.

## Inpatient care

---

- 5.53 The inpatient unit had relocated from Lapwing to Albatross since the previous inspection. It had 10 beds which did not form part of the certified normal location. It was a shared facility between the young people under 18 and young adult populations. We were informed that bed occupancy could be as much as 90%; it usually ran at 50 to 60% but there was usually only one young person under 18-inpatient at any one time. There were no young people under 18-inpatients at the time of the inspection.
- 5.54 The environment was generally good although some aspects of cleanliness required attention such as the cleaning of toilets. The unit was staffed by West London Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust (WLMHT) via a subcontract from CNWL and there were two registered nurses on duty at all times. There was good support from uniformed officers who engaged meaningfully with inpatients. Care planning was completed to a good standard and recorded on SystemOne, and care plans contained goals and review dates. There was an extensive therapeutic programme which included art and music therapies, education and group activities. We observed patients spending a good period of time out of their cells and in association, including communal dining.

### Housekeeping point

- 5.55 The cleanliness of the inpatient unit should be subject to daily checking and prompt action should be taken to rectify non-compliance issues.

## Secondary care

---

- 5.56 The primary care administrator continued to have good systems for ensuring that young people were able to attend outside hospital appointments, including the local acute trust and hospitals further afield. Appointments were rarely cancelled.

## Mental health

---

- 5.57 Primary mental health services were provided by CNWL staff and secondary services by WLMHT staff. Primary and secondary care staff worked in an integrated and flexible way within a tiered model of service. Staff used their personal skills to assist young people and there was clarity about role and function of the respective teams.
- 5.58 There were up to 20 patients in therapy with the primary mental team at any one time and this usually included a small number of young people under 18. It was planned to enhance the primary mental care functions in the coming months to create a wider range of therapeutic opportunities. Young people continued to have access to Hounslow Youth Counselling Service.
- 5.59 Approximately 12 to 15 patients with serious mental health problems were in contact with the secondary mental health multidisciplinary team at any one time although the majority were young adults. The team had been enhanced since the previous inspection by specialists in art therapy, music therapy and speech and language therapy. Members of the team were on site throughout the week. Staff members were clearly identifiable by their name badges.

- 5.60 The Feltham mental health risk assessment was comprehensive and simple to use. It informed care planning and enabled measurement of change over time.
- 5.61 Recruitment to a new learning disability clinical team, led by a clinical psychologist, was under way. The objective was to create a clinical assessment and pathway for young people with learning disability at Feltham.



# Section 6: Activities

## Time out of cell

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 6.1 **Juveniles on the basic level of the incentives and earned privileges scheme should receive adequate time out of their cells. (6.94)**

**Not achieved.** Young people who were on the basic level of the incentives and earned privileges scheme who were also excluded from education received one hour each day out of their cell in which to shower, take outside exercise and make telephone calls. This was the only period out of cell each day apart from collecting meals and one session of approximately 30 minutes of on-unit education. Young people on basic who were able to attend group education fared better, with a morning or afternoon session of education.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

- 6.2 **The opportunity to take outside exercise should be promoted more actively and, where appropriate, juveniles should be given the option of using outdoor clothing. (6.95)**

**Partially achieved.** Exercise formed part of the core day and we observed groups of young people in the exercise areas. Nylon jackets were provided for use in inclement weather. In our survey, nearly half of young people said they had exercise each day which was a significant improvement on the previous inspection. Some young people on basic did not take the opportunity to exercise which in reality meant sitting or standing outside in an empty yard with no other young people for company. Although the yards had been refurbished to meet Youth Justice Board standards, no outdoor activities were provided. A few members of staff had been trained as sports and games officers, but could only use these skills with young people in the gym or on the sports field.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

### Additional information

---

- 6.3 The published core day on weekdays started with breakfast at 7.45am and ended at 7.45pm with roll check lock-up periods of 1 hour 15 minutes. However, the majority of young people did not enjoy the full core day unlock time and the establishment reported an average of 7.5 hours unlocked which was less than at the previous inspection. Time out of cell at weekends was even more restricted with at best just over six hours available.

- 6.4 During the inspection we observed slippage at mealtimes. Young people did not have the 15 minutes out of their cells in the morning to collect their breakfast or 30 minutes to collect their lunch and tea that the published core day suggested. We observed young people out of their cells for five minutes to get their meal which they ate locked in their cell. On some occasions they did not even get that time unlocked, with breakfast and lunch taken to their cells by staff. On some units we observed the evening meal being served 20 minutes before the time advertised in the core day which increased the time that some young people were locked up.

- 6.5 Young people who were scheduled to attend education did so for the morning or the afternoon. The other half of the day was timetabled for sessions for the gym, library, personal officer work, or education, training and personal development (ETPD). In reality the sessions as described in the core day did not take place as described and many young people were locked up when they were not in education. ETPD had previously consisted of constructive group work led by officers, but we were told by staff that these sessions rarely ran because many young people had been through the whole programme and new material was needed. Plans to introduce new sessions were at an advanced stage. Staff also told us that young people could be locked in their cells after they had seen their personal officer for a short period rather than being unlocked for the whole session as the core day suggested.
- 6.6 Young people located on the Heron unit spent most of their day unlocked but when we carried out checks across other wings at 10.30am and 3.30pm on different weekdays in the afternoon and in the morning, we found approximately 18% of young people were locked up. Many were locked up because they had been excluded from education (see learning and skills section). In our safety interview, one young person told us: *'We have bang up too often, people stress in their room as they have too much time to think. You can forget about it when out and talking to other people. Saturdays and Sundays are the worst.'*
- 6.7 In our survey, 85% of young people said that they usually had association every day against the comparator of 65%. Young people on basic, located on the first night unit or the segregation unit did not have evening association. We were told that evening association was very rarely cancelled and, if it appeared that evening association was at risk due to staff shortages, young people were given association in the afternoon instead of the scheduled personal officer or ETPD work. We observed this on one unit. Association was lively and relaxed with effective staff supervision and young people took part in the available activities. Young people who did not come out for activities were checked on by staff and, if this continued, they were referred to the weekly vulnerability meeting.

## Learning and skills

---

*Inspection of the provision of education and educational standards, as well as vocational training in YOIs for young people under 18, is undertaken by the Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted) working under the general direction of HM Inspectorate of Prisons. For information on how Ofsted inspects education and training see the Ofsted framework and handbook for inspection.*

### **Expected outcomes:**

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

### **6.8 The quality of teaching and learning should be raised to that of the best. (6.58)**

**Not achieved.** The quality of teaching and learning was variable. Too much teaching was unsatisfactory and failed to stimulate or engage young people. In classroom-based lessons, young people spent too long not working and some frequently left their seats to wander around the room or stand at the window. Behaviour management was ineffective.

### **6.9 Attendance by education staff at training planning meetings should be improved. (6.59)**

**Not achieved.** Attendance by education staff at training planning meetings remained poor.



**We repeat the recommendation.**

**6.10 The quality of individual learning plans should be improved to reflect the needs of individual young people. (6.60)**

**Not achieved.** Individual learning plans contained vague targets, which often just referred to the name of the course the young person was following. Review dates were not recorded.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

**6.11 The education curriculum should be improved to meet the needs of young people under school-leaving age. (6.61)**

**Achieved.** The curriculum met the needs of young people under school leaving age satisfactorily.

**6.12 There should be an area in education where young people can 'cool off' before returning to lessons. (6.62)**

**Not achieved.** A 'cooling-off' facility had not been established. Too many young people were returned to the units for poor behaviour. On too many occasions there were confrontations in the education corridor which were highly disruptive.

**Additional information**

---

6.13 Young people received an initial assessment of their abilities in literacy and numeracy as part of their induction to education, if no up-to-date assessment was available. The results of the assessment were used to 'stream' young people into different classes. Results of the assessments were passed to teachers but it was unclear how they were used or monitored to ensure that work set matched young people's needs, abilities and aspirations. A communication screening was available when required and, at the time of the inspection, 12 young people were benefitting from the support of a qualified speech and language therapist. A 'hidden disabilities' questionnaire was also completed when required.

6.14 The special educational needs coordinator had compiled a very useful special educational needs register of 37 young people, including five young people who had a formal statement of special educational needs. However, past and present staffing levels made it impossible to meet the needs of these young people as well as the significant number of young people who required additional learning support on their courses. While volunteers made a valuable contribution to supporting young people, this was insufficient. The Phoenix room which had previously provided additional support for young people who did not cope well in mainstream classes was no longer operational. Provision for young people whose first language was not English was also inadequate.

6.15 Young people who did not attend mainstream education for a variety of reasons received some individual work on the units. This was very limited and insufficient to enable young people to make progress in the key areas of literacy and numeracy as the time the teacher had to spend with them did not allow for consolidation of learning. Overall, educational support for young people was inadequate.

6.16 The range of courses available to young people generally met their needs satisfactorily. Courses at level 2 had been introduced in some, though not all, areas but there were no level 3 courses available for more able young people or for those who showed a particular talent in an area. With the exception of GCSEs for a small proportion of the population, there was little

opportunity for young people to establish clear progression routes. We were told that some young people repeated courses because there were no higher level courses available in particular areas.

- 6.17 A good range of vocational subjects were offered, including brickwork, motor vehicle maintenance, painting and decorating and industrial cleaning. Young people could also take a range of innovative and creative courses in the Unit 5 community arts workshop, where some good links with external partners, including the National Gallery, had been established, which played a major role in broadening the curriculum. There was scope to increase the levels of accreditation in the vocational workshops.
- 6.18 A small amount of work-based learning was available. Young people worked successfully towards national vocational qualifications in the kitchen in the officers' mess. A small number of young people worked in the prison grounds where they learned valuable horticulture skills. There was significant scope to increase the quantity of work-based learning.
- 6.19 While young people had some choice about the courses they attended, there were insufficient qualified staff to provide initial advice and guidance and this important aspect of support for young people was inadequate.
- 6.20 In too many lessons, young people did not make the progress they were capable of and spent far too long off task. Ineffective techniques were employed to try to re-engage them. Expectations were too low and many tasks and activities failed to stimulate young people, who did not see their relevance. There was an over-reliance on the use of printed worksheets and little evidence of tasks being planned to accommodate the varying abilities of individual young people.
- 6.21 In the better lessons, particularly the vocational workshops, there were high expectations of achievement and behaviour and a strong sense of purpose. Activities were challenging. Good coaching occurred and young people were questioned well to ensure their understanding. They were encouraged to evaluate their work and to think of ways to improve. In a successful brickwork lesson, young people worked on a range of tasks that had been designed with their previous experience and abilities in mind. The lesson included a very good discussion of their achievements and what they had learned before they completed the relevant documentation enthusiastically, to record their learning and progress.
- 6.22 Levels of accreditation achieved by young people were poor and they did not achieve the number, and in some cases the levels, of qualifications they were capable of. However others gained more substantial qualifications which could be of value to them when they returned to education, training or employment on discharge to the community.
- 6.23 Young people who entered custody while studying GCSEs were successfully helped to continue with their studies and 20 GCSEs had been gained by young people during the previous year, including some higher grades, which was creditable.
- 6.24 The standards of young people's work varied considerably. In the vocational workshops they produced good and often very good work and were justifiably proud of their achievements. For example in the Unit 5 community arts workshop young people produced sophisticated artwork to a high standard, having had little or no previous experience. In brickwork and cookery they produced good standards of work and were able to speak enthusiastically about how they had achieved these high standards.

- 6.25 In too many classroom-based lessons, young people's written work was not of a good standard and they paid too little attention to the presentation of their work. In some lessons, young people found one and a half hours too long and their concentration and behaviour deteriorated.
- 6.26 Behaviour in education was variable. In the vocational workshops, young people's behaviour was very good and often exemplary. However, in some other lessons, while there was little confrontational behaviour towards staff, too many young people ignored instructions given by teachers and spent too long chatting to their friends. Most altercations between young people took place in the education classrooms.
- 6.27 Attendance to education was poor. Between January and the end of June 2011, attendance to education fluctuated between 61% and 78%. The number of cancelled classes was very concerning - between January and June 2011 over 170 classes had been cancelled. Too many young people refused to attend education.
- 6.28 In the first six months of 2011 there had been 299 refusals and 98 young people had been sent back to their unit for poor behaviour from April to July. The rate of exclusions was very high. Standards overall had fallen since the previous inspection and attempts to address this decline had been unsuccessful. Leadership and management were inadequate.
- 6.29 Punctuality to education was satisfactory, given the complexities of moving young people around the large site.
- 6.30 The current self-assessment cycle was still under way, but the prison acknowledged that teaching provision was unsatisfactory and levels of accreditation and support were inadequate. The number of refusals and the number of young people being returned to the units for poor behaviour required further analysis to identify trends and reasons. Importantly, leaders and managers were aware of their areas of strength and future plans to share good practice were seen as a way forward. A lesson observation scheme was in place, but required further development since the quality of teaching and learning recorded in observations was not confirmed by our inspection. The observations focused too much on teaching and too little on learning and young people's progress. Some aspects recorded as strengths were standard practice.
- 6.31 Resources were adequate, and some workshops were well resourced. In general, classrooms and resources were treated with respect by young people.
- 6.32 Young people had good access to the well managed library and they enjoyed their visits. The library was bright, airy and welcoming and contained comfortable chairs for leisure reading. Technical issues had prevented the computers for young people from being used and data could not be printed off. Stock levels were good and age appropriate. There was an excellent range of magazines and a good range of foreign newspapers. Quick reads were also held as were legal texts and Prison Service Instructions. There were no DVDs available. Foreign language texts were also held and these were reviewed frequently to ensure they met the needs of the changing population. Funding had been obtained to deliver a series of poetry events, and materials had been provided by the library to support the Travellers group. Equality and diversity were promoted well in the library.

### Further recommendations

- 6.33 The levels of learning support for young people should be improved, especially with regard to literacy, numeracy and ESOL.
- 6.34 More work-based learning should be introduced to the education curriculum.
- 6.35 Good quality initial advice and guidance should be provided to young people.
- 6.36 Additional higher level courses to meet the needs of more able young people should be introduced.

## Physical education and health promotion

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 6.37 **The proportion of the population who access the gymnasium should be monitored more effectively. (6.69)**

**Achieved.** The number of young people attending the gymnasium was monitored each month.

- 6.38 **Juveniles under school-leaving age should receive their entitlement to PE. (6.71)**

**Partially achieved.** Young people under school-leaving age had a good entitlement to time in the gymnasium but not all took it up as PE was deemed to be voluntary.

### Further recommendation

- 6.39 PE should be compulsory for all young people.

### Additional information

---

- 6.40 Young people's access to high quality core PE at up to six hours a week was good. However not all young people attended PE as it was not compulsory. Recreational PE was available at the weekend, but there was no evening provision. Very good use was made of sports and games officers, for example the early morning sessions for young people on the Heron unit who were following a Duke of Edinburgh Award.
- 6.41 The core PE programme was well planned with a good range of team sports, personal fitness training and minor games and a good balance of indoor and outdoor activities. Accreditation was available in most areas of PE provision, including Active IQ, Football Association coaching awards, the community sports leaders' award and individual sports. Young people participated with great enthusiasm. In a rugby coaching session run by professionals from

Saracens Rugby Football Club, young people worked extremely well together and their skill acquisition and development were very good.

- 6.42 Following risk assessments, young people under 18 worked successfully alongside young adults and some prison staff also attended these courses. Young people under 18 and young adults also participated together in the prison's successful football, rugby and cricket teams, all of which played fixtures against visiting teams. These sports squads enjoyed high status in the establishment and the fixtures with external teams enhanced young people's contact with the outside world.
- 6.43 The sports squads were complemented by the 'Football for Change' and 'Rugby for Change' projects run in partnership with professional clubs. These initiatives demonstrated the contribution that PE made to raising young people's levels of confidence and self-esteem and addressing their offending behaviour.
- 6.44 Behaviour was good in the gym. Poor behaviour was addressed quickly and effectively and few young people were returned to the units for poor behaviour.
- 6.45 The department had adopted an innovative approach to prevent overuse of weights. Young people did not use the weights room but instead participated in 'Exercise to Music' which was appropriate for this age group and reinforced the department's sound philosophy on inclusion. The PE compact was an effective tool for helping young people return to PE after serious incidents.
- 6.46 The PE department had good links with health care and the young people's substance misuse service and remedial PE was available when required.
- 6.47 Surveys of young people's views on education were carried out from time to time and there was scope to increase the regularity and frequency of these.
- 6.48 There were sufficient showers which had modesty screens and included a shower for young people with mobility difficulties. The gym was clean and tidy and any accidents were reported appropriately. Facilities were good and included two sports halls, a fitness suite, two football pitches, a rugby pitch, a cricket square and a climbing wall.

#### **Further recommendation**

- 6.49 Recreational PE should be available in the evenings.



# Section 7: Good order

## Behaviour management

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

### Security

---

#### Additional information

---

- 7.1 The security committee continued to manage all aspects of security effectively. Liaison with the police was good and particularly effective in helping to identify young people who were members of rival gangs who were likely to assault each other in custody. There was good dynamic security. A large number of security information reports (SIRs) were generated but the security department was concerned that insufficient information was being reported. In a commendable recent initiative, when checks were carried out, security staff had found that during two weeks in May 2011 only 36% of incidents reported in observation books had been properly translated into an SIR. After further work with staff, they had found that throughout June 2011 78 of 110 incidents in observation books had been appropriately reported in an SIR, an improvement to 71%. The security department were generally satisfied with the quality of SIRs.
- 7.2 The security department was becoming increasingly effective at identifying young people who needed to be separated from each other, usually as a result of external gang activity. They had recently implemented a 'known conflict' list which had replaced the previous 'keep apart' list. The list was accessible to all relevant staff and could be updated by different departments. It also identified young people who were no longer in conflict because of effective mediation. The 'known conflict' list had been in operation for approximately four weeks at the time of the inspection and there were 63 young people named on it, which indicated the extent of the problem. The security department had effective links with the behaviour management group and allocations department, with whom they pooled information to try to ensure that young people could access areas of the establishment without the risk of being assaulted.
- 7.3 The behaviour management group interviewed all new arrivals who were known to have been disruptive in previous establishments, which provided useful information for the establishment but was also intended to help the young person settle in.
- 7.4 All strip-searching was now intelligence led apart from continued routine practice on reception and discharge. Records showed that there had been a steady decrease in the number of

intelligence-led strip-searches over the previous six months although there had been a slight increase in June 2011. There had been no searches under restraint for over eight months.

- 7.5 Searching procedures sometimes included squatting, which was highly inappropriate. We found an example of one young person who had been strip-searched three times within a very short period and it had been recorded that this was because he would not squat properly.
- 7.6 Despite the number of violent incidents and young people who had to be kept apart, the establishment was making effective efforts to ensure that security measures were proportionate and that suitable risk assessments ensured that all young people had access to all parts of the regime where possible.

### Good practice

- 7.7 *The behaviour management group interviewed all new arrivals who were known to have been disruptive in previous establishments, which provided useful information for the establishment but was also intended to help the young person settle in.*

### Rules and routines

---

- 7.8 Prison Service and local rules were published and displayed on notice boards on all residential units and young people were required to sign compacts which acknowledged their receipt and understanding of the rules. Young people understood the rules, which were clearly written and fair.

### Incentives and earned privileges

---

- 7.9 **Young people on basic regime should be allowed periods of association and access to telephones in the evening. (7.42)**

**Partially achieved.** All young people on basic regime were allowed an hour out of their cell each day when they were able to have a shower and use the telephone. Staff we spoke to said that this happened at any convenient time of the day and not necessarily during the evening. If a young person did not want a shower or telephone call, he was not allowed out (see also time out of cell section).

- 7.10 **All young people should be able to attend their incentives and earned privileges (IEP) level reviews. (7.43)**

**Not achieved.** Review boards took place for each of the three levels of the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme, but it was unclear if they operated as formally as laid out in the policy. Both staff and young people gave different reports about attendance at reviews, particularly for young people on standard and enhanced level for whom attendance was not standard practice. It was reported that reviews were irregular and often very informal and took place only with the young person's personal officer. They were not scheduled as a matter of routine to discuss the young person's behaviour and progress. Formal reviews took place if a young person was likely to move up or down a level. The weekly reviews of young people on basic level were more formal and were led by the unit senior officer, but they were not always attended by the young person.

**We repeat the recommendation.**



## Additional information

---

- 7.11 The IEP policy had been reviewed and published in December 2010. It was written in simple language and clearly set out the aims and objectives, its operational focus and the key privileges that young people could earn. The scheme was fully explained to young people and was well publicised on the residential units. Copies of the document were available during induction and were found in all the residential units.
- 7.12 New arrivals were generally placed on the standard level unless they had come from another establishment on enhanced when they were able to remain on this level. A facilities list of privileges available at each level was published and staff and young people were familiar with it. There was very little difference in privileges between standard and enhanced level and, in our survey, only 45% of young people said that the different levels made them want to change their behaviour against the national comparator of 56%. IEP targets were often generic and did not break down the ultimate goals to enable the young person to achieve the desired outcome and change in behaviour in manageable stages.
- 7.13 At the time of the inspection, over 12% of young people were on the basic level of the incentives and earned privileges scheme, the majority of whom had been involved in fighting which resulted in seven days on basic. Young people on basic were risk assessed in order to continue with their activities such as education, PE and library. The majority of young people said they thought the scheme was fairly administered. All warnings had to be authorised by the unit senior officer. After three warnings, a review board decided whether a young person should move down a level. Demotion was not inevitable and review boards sometimes suspended demotion to give the young person the opportunity to improve his behaviour. IEP levels were formally discussed at training planning meetings.

### Further recommendations

- 7.14 Young people should be kept up to date with their progress in relation to the incentives and earned privileges scheme through engagement in their reviews which are supported and informed by suitable staff.
- 7.15 The differentials between the different levels of the incentives and earned privileges scheme should be revised in consultation with young people so that they motivate them to change their behaviour.

## Adjudications

---

- 7.16 **Minor infringements of prison rules and childish behaviour should be dealt with using less formal procedures. (7.31)**

**Partially achieved.** Minor reports were not used and the number of adjudications remained high. There had been a slight reduction in the number of adjudications overall in the previous 12 months compared with the 12 months prior to the last inspection, but there had also been a gradual increase over the most recent six months. However, in the sample that we examined we found that the vast majority of adjudications had been used appropriately for serious matters, usually for fights and assaults. In one case where an adjudication was inappropriate and the incident could have been handled within the IEP scheme, the adjudicating governor had appropriately suspended all the punishments.

- 7.17 Restorative justice or mediation were not often used to address less serious behaviour. In the sample we examined we came across one case of a young person who had verbally abused a member of staff, when restorative justice could have been more constructive for both parties, but there was no indication that this had been considered.
- 7.18 A minor reports policy was in draft but it had been held in abeyance pending a detailed behaviour management review that was due to take place.

### **Additional information**

---

- 7.19 There was no behaviour management policy, but the restraint minimisation strategy covered how the range of disciplinary procedures should be implemented and rightly emphasised the development of individual support plans for some young people, which were to a limited extent already in place through the work of the behaviour management group.
- 7.20 Adjudications continued to take place in a designated room on Ibis, the segregation unit, and were carried out by a number of managers from across the establishment. Some young people who had been segregated as a punishment following an adjudication said that the punishment had no positive effect on them and, in a number of cases, had made them angry and more determined to be disruptive. This contrasted with the positive comments made by young people on the Dunlin unit who were supervised by the behaviour management group.
- 7.21 In our survey, 91% of young people who had been subject to adjudication confirmed that the process had been explained clearly to them against the national comparator of 82% and 74% in the previous survey. Adjudication documents showed that young people were given every opportunity to express their views about the incident, and on the very rare occasions when a young person pleaded not guilty, video evidence was often used to establish the facts.
- 7.22 None of the sample of adjudications that we examined included an advocate. Advocates contacted the residential wings daily to ascertain whether any young person facing an adjudication had asked for the assistance of an advocate, but this was rarely the case. It was unclear to what extent the advocacy service in relation to adjudications was actively promoted or understood by young people.

### **Further recommendation**

- 7.23 The role of the advocacy service in relation to adjudication hearings should be explained to young people when they are given information about their charge. They should be asked if they would like to have an advocate present at their adjudication well in advance of the proceedings.

## **Use of force**

---

- 7.24 **There should be a strategy to reduce incidents where use of force is required. (7.33)**

**Partially achieved.** The restraint minimisation policy was comprehensive and indicated a clear commitment by the establishment to reduce the use of restraint. However, some aspects were not fully developed and it was not yet being fully implemented. The rigorous monitoring arrangements and good discussion of issues at relevant meetings that existed at the previous inspection continued to take place. A wide range of data analysis in relation to restraint was efficiently monitored by the violence reduction committee and overseen by the safeguarding

committee. It was evident from the monthly trend analysis that there were a number of peaks and troughs and reasons for changes were properly explored. Restraint was used in the main to separate or prevent young people from fighting and the majority of restraint incidents took place in the education block. Through the work of the behaviour management group, the establishment was putting significant effort into working effectively with the most disruptive young people in order to change their behaviour and in turn reduce the need for the use of force.

### **Additional information**

---

- 7.25 The use of force remained high. There had been 429 recorded incidents of restraint in the previous six months, 147 of which had been full control and restraint. We examined a sample of use of force documents which were clear and detailed and the majority showed appropriate use of restraint and good de-escalation. We spoke to a number of young people who had been restrained and all said they felt they had had a chance to comply with instructions not to fight prior to restraint and the vast majority said that an appropriate level of force had been used to resolve the situation. The head of young people under 18 carried out a monthly quality assurance review of 5% of all use of force documentation and gave feedback to senior officers and sometimes individual officers involved in incidents.
- 7.26 We examined video records which demonstrated that staff were often required to separate fights at considerable risk to themselves.
- 7.27 Batons had been drawn against young people, which although rare, was unacceptable.
- 7.28 Young people were formally debriefed after all incidents involving restraint. However, debrief interviews were not always timely, with some taking place three or four days after the event. In the debrief documents that we sampled, we found that staff usually spent between 15 and 30 minutes with young people, but some forms were incomplete and the action plan was rarely used as intended to help young people to learn from the experience.

### **Further recommendation**

- 7.29 Batons should not be drawn against young people under 18.

## **Care and separation**

---

- 7.30 **Segregation should not be used solely for punishment for juveniles. (7.32)**

**Not achieved.** Young people were still being segregated solely as a punishment which was inappropriate. During the six months prior to the inspection, 136 young people had been segregated solely for punishment. The average length of stay was six days.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

- 7.31 **The number of young people segregated should be reduced. (7.34)**

**Partially achieved.** The use of Ibis, the segregation unit, had declined gradually since the previous inspection and was monitored by the safeguarding committee. During the six months prior to our 2010 inspection, 301 young people had been segregated for a variety of reasons. Over the same period in 2011, 254 young people had been segregated, 21 on good order or discipline and 136 on removal from their unit for punishment. The remainder had spent some

time in the segregation unit awaiting adjudication or for a brief period after an incident. In the records that we examined, we found that all but one of the young people had spent a night on Ibis prior to an adjudication hearing the following day.

7.32 Young people segregated for good order or discipline were formally reviewed at a weekly multidisciplinary meeting, although the head of young people under 18 reviewed cases much more regularly. The meetings were well attended and there was usually representation from chaplaincy, the Independent Monitoring Board and residential staff. Representation from health care and education were generally not so good.

7.33 In the previous six months the average length of stay in segregation had been 4.7 days, the shortest two days and the longest 22 days. Only four young people had been segregated for seven days or more and had all received multidisciplinary reviews.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

7.34 **All segregation cells should be clean, well ventilated, and free from graffiti. (7.35)**

**Not achieved.** The physical environment in the segregation unit was very poor. Several cells were dirty with graffiti on the walls and in some the ventilation was very poor. Young people we spoke to who had been segregated described the cells as 'disgusting' which reflected our view. We found one young person in an unacceptably dirty and damp cell, with broken skirting boards and a long damp patch around the edges of the floor. This cell was immediately taken out of use when conditions were pointed out to senior staff who were also suitably appalled. A cleaning and painting programme for the Ibis unit started towards the end of the inspection.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

#### **Additional information**

---

7.35 In our survey, 19% of young people who had spent a night in Ibis said that staff had treated them well or very well against the national comparator of 58%. Young people in the segregation unit had very little to do and spent most of their time locked up. All were allowed to make a daily telephone call but showers were limited to three a week according to the policy and records confirmed that not all young people had a daily shower or exercise. Young people said that they were not routinely offered exercise and they rarely went outside which we found unsurprising when we inspected the small and extremely austere exercise yard.

7.36 Young people had very generic behaviour targets and no individual intervention plans to address their behaviour and work towards a swift reintegration to normal location. Although segregated young people were permitted to attend activities off the unit and education subject to risk assessment, staff confirmed that this was rare. Staff from the education department generally pushed worksheets under cell doors and young people said that they had very little interaction with teachers. Young people received ad hoc visits from staff from their wings, but in the absence of individual plans these visits did not form part of an integrated effort to engage effectively with the young person to help him to change his behaviour.

#### **Further recommendation**

7.37 Young people located in the segregation unit should have individual plans to address their behaviour and work towards a swift reintegration to normal location.

# Section 8: Services

## Catering

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

#### 8.1 Lunch should not be served before noon and dinner not before 5pm. (8.10)

**Not achieved.** Lunch and dinner were served too early at 11.45am and 4.40pm respectively. Breakfast packs were handed out each morning.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

#### 8.2 All wing serveries should be kept clean. (8.11)

**Achieved.** Unit serveries were well maintained and the kitchen was spotlessly clean on the night we inspected it.

#### 8.3 All young people should have the opportunity to dine out. (8.12)

**Not achieved.** Young people had to eat all their meals in their cells which was worse than the limited dining out opportunities we reported on at the last inspection.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

#### 8.4 The food consultation arrangements should be strengthened. (8.13)

**Partially achieved.** Some focus groups had been held with young people about food, but these were irregular and there were too few representatives from each unit to enable a suitable range of young people's views to be heard. The catering manager or his deputy attended most, but not all, of the focus groups which were minuted. The catering manager provided examples of where changes had been made to the menu as a result of consultation with young people.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

### Additional information

---

8.5 Young people we spoke to were reasonably satisfied with the quality of the food but told us they had too little to eat and we observed some meals being served which did appear to have small portion sizes for growing adolescent boys. However, the catering officer had had the menus and the portion sizes checked by the head of nutrition at the local primary care trust and they had been deemed sufficient. The amount available to spend on food per young person per day had reduced recently, resulting in the withdrawal of fruit juice, although apples and oranges were still available on each unit. The catering officer told us that savings had been made by reducing food wastage and stopping fruit juice and not by reducing portion sizes. There was good variety in the menus and young people had plenty of choice, including good choices for those on special diets.

- 8.6 Catering staff worked well with other departments such as PE, substance use and health care to promote healthy lifestyles. Special menus were provided to celebrate a wide range of religious festivals.

## Prison shop

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 8.7 **All new arrivals should be able to buy items from the establishment shop within their first 24 hours. (8.21)**

**Not achieved.** A leaflet explaining how the shop worked had recently been produced and was given to each young person on induction. Depending on the day of their arrival, some young people had to wait up to 11 days to receive their first delivery from the shop. This had implications for bullying.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

- 8.8 **Young people should be formally consulted on the items available on the shop list and their views should be taken into account. (8.22)**

**Achieved.** Focus groups had recommended changes to the list of shop items available and we were told that numerous changes had been made to the list as a result. However, because changes were made only once every three months, many young people would not see their choices reflected in the list during their time at Feltham.

- 8.9 **The method of reviewing the range of shop items available should be made explicit and the procedure followed. (8.23)**

**Achieved.** A leaflet for young people had recently been produced, to be given to them during induction. It described how the shop worked and how young people could influence the choice of items.

### Additional information

---

- 8.10 The shop sold a good range of items but young people thought the prices were very expensive compared to supermarkets. In our survey, 35% of black and minority ethnic young people were satisfied with the range of goods offered against 51% of white young people.
- 8.11 The shop list contained only a very small number of healthy snacks and the only fruit available was apples and oranges, which were already freely provided to young people on the young people under 18-residential units. Shop deliveries were designed to minimise theft and bullying: orders were handed individually to young people in their cells and they opened them and checked the contents in the presence of staff. We were told that mistakes were rarely made and that if they occurred, they were always rectified in the next order. Young people could obtain access to their private cash account at computer terminals on the residential units, and could obtain a printed statement free of charge.

# Section 9: Resettlement

## Strategic management of resettlement

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 9.1 The reducing reoffending strategy should reflect the evidenced needs of the population, and make reference to the aims of the Heron unit. (9.7)

**Not achieved.** The strategy covered the young people under 18 and young adults' sites. It was a generic document which did not pay sufficient attention to the distinctive needs of the young people under 18 population. It contained no reference to the Heron unit.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

- 9.2 The reducing re-offending committee should meet as described in the terms of reference. (9.9)

**Achieved.** The reducing re-offending committee was scheduled to meet bimonthly. There had been three meetings in the previous six months which had been reasonably well attended.

### Additional information

---

- 9.3 There had been three changes of manager in three years and management of resettlement had lacked continuity over that period. The resettlement strategy was largely descriptive and no clear indicators had been identified to measure progress. There had been little involvement with community agencies in developing the strategy. The minutes of the reducing reoffending committee meetings reflected a lack of action planning and there was little evidence that points raised at earlier meetings were being properly followed through.
- 9.4 Most of the pathway leads had been allocated to a single member of staff. This was too large a task for one person and, as a result, there had been no active management of these activities. A new head of reducing reoffending had recently been appointed with a clear remit to undertake a needs analysis, update the reducing reoffending policy and allocate designated leads for individual pathways.
- 9.5 Some collaborative links had been established with professionals in the community. At a strategic level, the offender supervisor manager responsible for young people attended external quarterly meetings to review the implementation of e-Asset, and met members of the prison placements team regularly. A worker from Lambeth youth offending team (YOT) spent a day in the prison each week dealing with Lambeth YOT cases and speaking to staff. This was an example of good operational collaboration and an efficient way of establishing genuine working partnerships

- 9.6 Early release was used effectively to motivate young people to work towards achieving the targets set at their training planning meetings. A recommendation was made at the review and the deputy governor examined each case before making a decision. Approximately half to three-quarters of eligible young people had been granted early release.
- 9.7 Public protection was well managed. Young people who were subject to public protection measures were identified on admission by the public protection clerk. Since the previous inspection, responsibility for public protection had moved from security to a resettlement function. All new cases were considered at a monthly committee meeting, which was chaired by the head of the offender management unit. Restrictions on mail, visits and telephone calls were routinely considered and applied or removed in the light of changing circumstances. At the time of the inspection, 20 young people were subject to MAPPA (multi-agency public protection arrangements) procedures and the risks involved in these cases were reviewed prior to release. A representative from the establishment attended all initial reviews in the community for young people who had been released and assessed as either level 2 or level 3 cases.
- 9.8 Heron unit provided a high quality service to 30 young people serving detention and training orders who had been assessed as 'motivated to change'. A central feature of the work on Heron was the role played by the resettlement brokers, who provided intensive support to young people preparing for release and follow up support post discharge. Staffing levels on Heron were higher than on the other residential units. Officers could spend more time with young people and relationships between staff and young people were mutually courteous. There was a positive ethos in the unit where young people were encouraged to take advantage of a wide range of constructive activities, including work in a music studio and participating in the Duke of Edinburgh Award scheme.
- 9.9 An early evaluation had been carried out which had reported positively on the work that had been carried out with the young people on Heron unit. Anecdotally, we were told that reoffending rates for young people were low and significantly better than the average but there had been no formal evaluation of re-offending rates.

## Training planning and remand management

---

### **Expected outcomes:**

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

- 9.10 **Personal targets for juveniles set by staff from different disciplines should be agreed with the offender supervisor and amalgamated into one training plan. (9.48)**

**Achieved.** Training planning meetings were chaired by the offender supervisors who were responsible for setting all the targets agreed at the meetings. This arrangement worked well.

- 9.11 **Personal officers and teachers should attend training planning meetings and make a written contribution if they cannot. (9.49)**



**Partially achieved.** Personal officers attended approximately half the training planning meetings but education staff did not attend. If the personal officer was not present, another member of staff representing the wing always attended and they were well briefed. Written contributions by personal officers and teachers were sometimes supplied.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

**9.12 The offender management unit should develop an action plan to encourage families and carers to attend training planning meetings. (9.50)**

**Achieved.** At the end of each review, family members or carers were sent a letter containing the dates of the next five planning meetings. Family members attended approximately half the training planning reviews.

**Additional information**

---

9.13 The training planning and remand management arrangements were efficient and reviews usually took place within the scheduled timescales. All young people were subject to the same planning arrangements, regardless of their legal status or length of sentence. As a result of staff shortages, a decision had been taken to hold remand planning meetings bimonthly rather than monthly as a short term arrangement for young people assessed as low risk. It was anticipated that monthly meetings would resume in August 2011, when additional staff were available.

9.14 The reviews took place in offices on the wings where the young person resided. We observed several examples of extremely well run planning reviews. These were chaired skilfully by the offender supervisors and young people were placed firmly at the centre of the discussion and helped to play an active part. Despite this, only 21% of young people in our survey said they had a say in what would happen to them when they were released against the comparator of 47%.

9.15 The offender supervisors played a key role in the planning arrangements. They gathered all relevant background information and spoke to young people in advance to prepare them for the meetings. They maintained up-to-date files and ensured that targets were monitored and reviewed. Targets were reasonably individualised but the quality of the documentation did not reflect the standard of discussion at the reviews. We were impressed to see that the personal officer spent time debriefing the young person after a particularly difficult planning meeting to make sure he had understood everything that had been discussed.

9.16 Reviews on Heron unit were frequently attended by external resettlement brokers. Staff on Heron unit also attended the first review in the community in about three-quarters of cases. Staff on the mainstream units no longer attended any first reviews in the community since it was no longer a Youth Justice Board national standard.

# Resettlement pathways

---

## Expected outcomes:

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

## Reintegration planning

---

### Accommodation

---

### Additional information

---

- 9.17 There was no specialist help available on site for young people with housing difficulties. The reducing re-offending strategy stated that it was the responsibility of the community YOT to support young people in custody who had housing problems.
- 9.18 Problems with accommodation were identified at an early stage by the offender supervisors who were assertive in trying to ensure that the home-based YOT workers discharged their responsibilities.
- 9.19 We were informed that it was rare for any young person to be discharged as of no fixed abode and that this had only occurred once in the previous six months. However, no routine check was carried out on suitability or sustainability of the accommodation that young people were provided with.

### Further recommendation

- 9.20 Pre-release planning should include an assessment of the suitability and sustainability of the accommodation which young people are to be discharged to. Post-release follow-up work should be carried out and used to inform the ongoing development of the accommodation pathway.

## Education, training and employment

---

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

- 9.21 **The information, advice and guidance work for juveniles should be managed appropriately so that more can benefit from the Connexions service. (9.83)**

**Not achieved.** Connexions were no longer operating in the establishment and the replacement service had yet to be instigated. Careers, information, advice and guidance work was inadequate. Good efforts had been made to organise some trade specific employment days.

Use of ROTL had increased since the previous inspection but it was restricted to young people who were located on Heron unit where 40 young people had benefitted from ROTL in the previous six months. At the beginning of the year a decision had been made to restrict the availability of ROTL further to young people on the Heron unit only if they were on the

enhanced level of the incentives and earned privileges scheme. This had caused a considerable decrease in the number of ROTLs granted and the decision had very recently been reversed. The majority of young people on ROTL were involved in outward-bound style activities, voluntary work in the community or housing or college interviews.

#### **Further recommendations**

- 9.22 Good quality careers information, advice and guidance should be established to ensure that the needs of young people are met.
- 9.23 Release on temporary licence (ROTL) should be a key part of the reducing reoffending strategy and all young people should be considered for eligibility for ROTL as part of their training plan regardless of their location in the establishment or their status on the incentives and earned privileges scheme.

#### **Mental and physical health**

---

- 9.24 **Health services staff should be represented at the reducing reoffending committee. (9.84)**

**Achieved.** Health services were usually represented at the reducing reoffending committee.

- 9.25 **Primary health services staff should attend juvenile training planning meetings and have direct contact with YOT health workers. (9.85)**

**Not achieved.** Several health services personnel stated that they attended training planning meetings and had contact with YOT health workers as appropriate, but records indicated that this was not the case.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

- 9.26 **All young people should be given advice and support on how to access community health services on release. (9.86)**

**Achieved.** There were daily pre-discharge clinics. Health services monitored the release/transfer list of young people and saw the young person at a pre-discharge clinic two days before release. GP letters, advice on accessing services, health promotion materials and, if required, take-home medications were supplied.

#### **Additional information**

---

- 9.27 There was no palliative care pathway or guidance. During the inspection the service manager began the process of adapting the Central and North West London NHS Trust guidance when this was brought to his attention. Secondary mental health staff acted as case managers for the purposes of the care programme approach.

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

---

- 9.28 **The establishment should develop an action plan to ensure that all young people's financial needs are properly assessed and those who need advice are referred to the appropriate advisers. (9.87)**

**Not achieved.** In our survey, 28% of young people said they had money worries when they first arrived against the national comparator of 16%, and only 11% said they had been asked if they needed help with money worries at that point against a national comparator of 19%. There was no systematic way of identifying young people with financial difficulties and no clear route for them to follow to seek advice. Structured work on finance, benefit and debt had previously been carried out with groups of young people on the wings by trained offender supervisors, but this no longer took place. There was some modular input in education on money management, and work on finance was carried out by staff in the interventions suite. Occasional presentations on financial awareness were delivered to young people by a representative from a national bank.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

9.29 **Up-to-date information on the financial and benefits services should be displayed in residential units. (9.88)**

**Not achieved.** There was no information on display in the residential units about finance, benefit and debt.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

## **Drugs and alcohol**

### **Additional information**

---

- 9.30 All young people received pre-release drug and alcohol harm reduction information, and substance misuse offender supervisors arranged community discharge planning meetings to be held 10 days prior to release. Attendance by YOT staff at these meetings was consistent. Where necessary, Wren unit nursing staff liaised with YOT substance misuse workers to arrange ongoing clinical support in the community.

## **Children and families of offenders**

---

9.31 **The visitors' centre should display easy-to-read information about who visitors should contact if they have concerns about a young person's safety. (9.124)**

**Achieved.** Easy-to-read notices were displayed in the visitors' centre and hall alerting visitors to the safeguarding hotline, and leaflets were available in the visitors' centre. The safeguarding hotline was not responded to quickly enough. We rang the hotline during our inspection and left a message asking to be contacted immediately. We were not contacted until six days later. The hotline was only checked from Tuesdays to Thursdays which could have led to unnecessary delays in an emergency.

### **Further recommendation**

- 9.32 The safeguarding hotline should be checked and acted on daily.

9.33 **Family support assistants should receive child protection training as part of a structured personal development plan to equip them for the role. (9.125)**

**Achieved.** The three family support assistants had undertaken child protection training. All three had structured personal development plans.

- 9.34 **The time visitors have to wait for a young person to arrive for their visit should be reduced, and visitors should be kept informed of the reasons why young people do not attend promptly for visits. (9.126)**

**Partially achieved.** The time visitors had to wait for a young person to arrive for their visit had not reduced. In our survey, less young people (29%) than the comparator (48%) said that their visit started on time. Young people, visits staff and visitors all confirmed that it was not unusual for visits to be delayed. Visits staff informed visitors if a delay was likely to occur and, if a visit was excessively delayed, the young person was allowed an extended visit in the future. Records indicated that this occurred frequently.

**Further recommendation**

9.35 Visits should start on time.

- 9.36 **The toilets in the visitors' waiting room should always be available, clean and properly equipped. (9.127)**

**Partially achieved.** The male and female toilets in the visitors' waiting room were available but not clean. The male toilet required deep cleaning, especially the floor, and equipment to keep the toilets clean and tidy was not fit for purpose.

**Housekeeping point**

9.37 The toilets in the visitors' waiting room should be clean and properly equipped.

- 9.38 **Children's activity areas should be supervised by trained staff during all visits. (9.128)**

**Partially achieved.** Young people could play with visiting children in a designated play area but a trained nursery worker was only available to supervise children visiting during weekends. A list of young people who were a risk to children and banned from receiving visits from children under the age of 18 was available to all visits staff.

- 9.39 **Places on family days should be allocated according to need and be part of a young person's sentence/training plan. (9.129)**

**Not achieved.** Family days were not allocated according to need. Young people still had to be on the enhanced level of the incentives and earned privileges scheme to participate. Family days did not form part of sentence or training plans. The most recent family day had occurred more than six months prior to the inspection and only six young people had taken part. We were not provided with numbers of unsuccessful applicants.

- 9.40 **Families should be given sufficient notice of when family days are due to take place, and there should be written information about what happens at them. (9.130)**

**Achieved.** Written information was sent to families before the family day with details of what was to happen. The next family day was to be held in the mid-term October school holiday to enable as many families as possible to attend. This had yet to be advertised to young people.

## Additional information

---

- 9.41 Visits entitlements for remanded young people were good but inadequate for sentenced young people. There were no restrictions on the number of visits that unconvicted young people could receive and their visitors did not require a visits order. Convicted young people were allowed one visit every two weeks. There was sufficient capacity to accommodate the visits requested. There was no system to monitor young people's visits which made it difficult to provide help or support for young people not receiving visits.
- 9.42 Young people had good access to telephones. In our survey, more young people (73%) than the comparator (63%) said that they could use the telephone every day. Families and friends could use the email a prisoner scheme, which cost 30p. Emails were checked by security, printed and handed to the young person, sometimes on the same day. A helpful leaflet in different languages promoting the service was available in the visitors' centre.
- 9.43 There were good transport links to the prison. Buses ran from the local underground and train stations every 20 minutes from Monday to Friday and 30 minutes on Sundays and Bank Holidays. The well-resourced visitors' centre was open daily and staffed by three family support assistants who assisted visiting family members. The centre contained information leaflets, notices, toilets, a baby changing room, television, public telephone, vending machines, children's toys and books. There were insufficient lockers for visitors to store their property. We observed visitors being searched before a visit and these searches were conducted proportionately and sensitively.
- 9.44 The staff desk in the cramped searching area contained graffiti. Visitors waited in a large clean waiting area where they could buy snacks, cold drinks and sandwiches to share with young people. There was sufficient capacity for the visits that young people were entitled to. We telephoned the visits booking line on the Thursday and were told that visits could be booked for the Saturday morning, the next day for visits. Visitors could book their next visit on their way out at the visitors' centre. An annual visitors' survey was conducted and findings incorporated into an action plan. Visitors we spoke to were positive about the booking arrangements and complimentary about the visits staff.
- 9.45 The atmosphere in the visits hall was relaxed and staff supervision proportionate. The interactions that we observed between staff, young people and visitors were respectful. The visits hall looked neglected: some chairs were worn and damaged and there were examples of graffiti. The visits policy had been published in 2009 but remained up to date. All young people attending and leaving a visit were subject to a rub-down search. Young people who were deemed an escape risk or classified as restricted status were strip-searched. Other young people could be strip-searched if intelligence suggested it was necessary. A log of strip-searches was kept which indicated that use of strip-searching was minimal and proportionate. Decisions to impose closed visits or ban visitors were based on good intelligence and proportionate to risk. Visitors could be banned for life or a finite period of time. Shortly before our inspection, five visitors had been banned for six months and 12 for life. Other than life bans, if a ban was imposed for longer than three months, it was reviewed at monthly intervals. On the second day of our inspection, seven young people were on closed visits, six because of assaults and one for his own protection under the safe systems at work arrangements. Young people on closed visits were reviewed regularly to assess the possibility of normal visits. The closed visits room accommodated six young people at a time but it was the establishment's policy not to allow more than one young person in the closed visits area at a time.

- 9.46 There was no log of young people who were fathers and there was no longer a parenting course for them. The helpful 'Big Boyz Talk' scheme run by the library which gave young people the opportunity to read and record a story for children at home was no longer available. The recording facilities were in a small room which was unsuitable for a female member of staff to be located with a young person for a long period with no other supervision. The establishment planned to place a glass panel in the door of the room and restart the scheme later in the year.

#### **Further recommendations**

- 9.47 Sentenced young people should be entitled to one visit each week.
- 9.48 The visits hall and searching area should be clean and free of graffiti, and furniture should be in good order.
- 9.49 Young people who are fathers should have targeted support to help them to build and maintain contact with their children and develop good parenting skills.
- 9.50 There should be a system to identify young people who do not receive visits to provide them with appropriate support.

#### **Housekeeping point**

- 9.51 There should be sufficient lockers in the visitors' centre for visitors to store their property.

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

---

- 9.52 **The establishment should conduct a regular needs analysis of the population and commission appropriate interventions. (9.136)**

**Not achieved.** No needs analysis had been carried out but a wide range of programme work was carried out in the interventions suite by staff from the independent sector. However, this was not integrated with other activities in the establishment and the link between the programmes unit and the offender management unit was very weak. It was therefore unclear how young people were targeted for interventions which met their needs.

**We repeat the recommendation.**

#### **Additional information**

---

- 9.53 The juvenile enhanced thinking skills (JETS) programme had been introduced in Heron unit at the beginning of the year and had become well established with 25 completions so far.
- 9.54 A series of non-accredited programmes were also delivered on Heron. The content of these courses appeared relevant and covered subjects such as social skills and preparation for release. Young people who had taken part in the course said they had learnt a lot from it.
- 9.55 Young people who did not cope well in education were able to access an effective 'Reflective Learning' course as part of their reintegration into education. In the previous six months 147 young people had taken this course of which 127 had been reintegrated successfully.





# Section 10: Summary of recommendations, housekeeping points and good practice

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

## Main recommendations

To the governor

- 
- 10.1 Young people should be kept fully occupied in their first few days in custody through a comprehensive, structured and multidisciplinary induction programme that is age appropriate and covers all that they need to know, including sources of help and support available to them if they are feeling low or upset. The induction programme should include a regular review of young people's feelings about their safety during their early days in custody. (HP55)
  - 10.2 All areas of the establishment should be maintained to a good standard of cleanliness. (HP56)
  - 10.3 There should be an up-to-date foreign nationals policy based on a detailed needs analysis of the foreign national population. The policy should include robust systems for identification on arrival, the provision of independent immigration advice and regular peer support, with a particular emphasis on specific support for non-English speakers. (HP57)
  - 10.4 All young people should have access to a timetable of regular and varied activities that purposefully occupies them and ensures that they spend as much of their day as possible out of their cell. Young people who lose association as a punishment should be monitored so that they also have adequate time out of their cell. (HP58)
  - 10.5 There should be a strategy to improve the quality of learning and skills provision with the aim of raising young people's achievements and standards of work. Robust action should be taken to address the significant number of cancelled classes and refusals to attend education and reduce the number of young people returned to the units for poor behaviour. (HP59)

## Recommendations

To the Youth Justice Board and NOMS

---

### Courts, escorts and transfers

---

- 10.6 Young people should be held in court cells for the minimum possible period. (1.1)
- 10.7 Young people should arrive at the establishment before 7pm. (1.2)
- 10.8 Young people should not travel with adult prisoners. (1.11)

## Recommendations

To the governor

---

### First days in custody

---

- 10.9 All new arrivals should be offered a shower on their first night whatever time they arrive. (1.15)

- 10.10 Young people under 18 should not be routinely strip-searched in reception. (1.16)
- 10.11 Young people under 18 being discharged through the young adult reception area should be closely supervised. (1.23)
- 10.12 All first night staff should undergo mental health awareness training. (1.24)
- 10.13 All night staff should receive first aid training and carry ligature shears. (1.33)
- 10.14 Evening association should be available on the young people under 18 induction unit. (1.34)
- 10.15 Peer supporters should be accessible to newly admitted young people at suitable times during the day. (1.36)

### **Residential units**

---

- 10.16 Consultation arrangements with young people should ensure that there is representation from all wings, and that concerns raised are properly dealt with in a timely fashion at regular meetings. (2.5)
- 10.17 The exercise yards should be suitably equipped to encourage young people to be involved in activities during their scheduled time in the open air. (2.14)

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

---

- 10.18 Managers should ensure that unit history sheets include entries from all departments that have contact with a young person. (2.17)
- 10.19 All staff should wear their names on their uniform. (2.20)

### **Personal officers**

---

- 10.20 Managers should ensure that all personal officers on the young people under 18 induction unit have at least one substantial interview with the arrival allocated to them and record this in detail on wing files. (2.21)
- 10.21 Managers should ensure that personal officers receive training in developing appropriate behaviour management targets for young people under 18. (2.22)
- 10.22 Managers should ensure that where necessary personal officers for young people under 18 provide information on their charges to training planning meetings and ACCT reviews. (2.23)
- 10.23 Personal officers should maintain regular contact with young people they are responsible for when they are temporarily located in the segregation unit. (2.26)

### **Safeguarding children**

---

- 10.24 The safeguarding policy should provide clarity that concerns about staff misconduct that relate to young people should be reported through the agreed child protection procedures and also describe how staff who report such professional misconduct will be supported. (3.1)

- 10.25 Young people identified as particularly vulnerable should have an individual care plan to address their assessed needs. (3.4)
- 10.26 The safeguarding committee should routinely monitor the attendance of its designated membership and take appropriate action for failures to attend. (3.5)

### **Child protection**

---

- 10.27 All staff who come into contact with children should have suitable child protection training. (3.9)

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

---

- 10.28 Managers should ensure a consistently high standard of documentation for ACCT reviews. (3.14)
- 10.29 There should be multidisciplinary attendance at ACCT reviews. (3.15)
- 10.30 A member of the education department should attend the monthly suicide prevention meetings. (3.22)
- 10.31 Young people at risk of self-harm should be fully occupied with purposeful activities to meet their individual needs. (3.23)
- 10.32 Staff training in relation to suicide and self-harm prevention and first aid should be up to date. (3.24)

### **Bullying**

---

- 10.33 The formal work carried out with young people who bully others should be evaluated for effectiveness. The evaluation should support an ongoing review of the programme content and identify any staff training required. (3.28)

### **Applications and complaints**

---

- 10.34 There should be a robust quality assurance scheme for complaints, which ensures promised action is taken and patterns or trends identified for remedial action. (MR4)
- 10.35 The applications system should be implemented consistently across units and include an audit trail and robust quality assurance arrangements to ensure that the application has been dealt with. (3.44)

### **Legal rights**

---

- 10.36 Young people should be able to make free telephone calls to their legal representatives. (3.47)

### **Substance use**

---

- 10.37 The establishment should ensure that mandatory drug testing (MDT) officers undertake child protection training. (3.60)

- 10.38 All areas of the Wren unit should be deep cleaned and maintained in a clinically clean, tidy state. (3.76)

## **Diversity**

---

- 10.39 The role of prisoner representatives should be clearly defined, and their work monitored by the diversity team. (4.3)
- 10.40 Equality impact assessments should be carried out for all areas of diversity. (4.4)
- 10.41 There should be monitoring to assess the impact of young people's religion, disability and/or foreign national status on their participation in the regime. (4.5)
- 10.42 Robust action should be taken to ensure that the equalities action team meetings are attended by representatives of all departments who form part of the designated membership. (4.11)
- 10.43 Concerns raised by SMART monitoring data about poorer outcomes for particular groups of young people should be fully investigated. There should be a clear action plan to address any concerns and progress should be monitored. (4.12)
- 10.44 Feltham should ensure that any areas of disparity identified in ethnic monitoring are investigated, and that necessary remedial action taken is monitored through the race equality action team. (4.14)
- 10.45 The establishment should ensure a consistent model of quality assurance for racist incident report forms. (4.16)
- 10.46 The establishment should develop and implement a programme to challenge racist and discriminatory prisoner behaviour at Feltham as soon as possible. (4.18)
- 10.47 Regular briefings issued to alert staff to young people convicted of arson should be extended to include those convicted of racist and other hate crime, including homophobic offences. (4.23)
- 10.48 Foreign national representatives should be identified, and there should be specific forums to ensure the needs of these young people are effectively represented and pursued by the establishment. (4.26)
- 10.49 NOMS should work with UKBA to ensure that foreign national detainees are not held at Feltham. (4.27)
- 10.50 Young foreign nationals should have regular access to independent accredited immigration advice agencies. (4.36)
- 10.51 Telephone interpretation should be used routinely when accuracy or confidentiality are required to communicate with young people who do not speak English. (4.37)
- 10.52 All young people with disabilities should have care plans outlining their specific needs and how they will be met. Arrangements should be multidisciplinary and involve all departments engaged in work related to that person's disability. (4.38)
- 10.53 Adapted cells should be provided on Feltham A (young people under 18) to match the provision available for young adults. (4.40)

- 10.54 The establishment should identify disabled prisoner representatives and develop a forum for young people with disabilities in which to raise their concerns. (4.41)
- 10.55 The diversity strategy should specify how discrimination on the grounds of religion will be monitored and dealt with. (4.48)
- 10.56 Positive images of same-sex relationships should be displayed across the establishment, as well as posters drawing attention to the unacceptability of homophobia and information about sources of support. (4.52)

### **Health services**

---

- 10.57 All staff should have annual resuscitation training. (5.12)
- 10.58 Health services staff should provide a range of basic remedies. (5.18)
- 10.59 Meningitis C vaccinations should be offered to all young people. (5.19)
- 10.60 The skills of the nurse prescriber should be used to enhance the availability of prescription-only medicines to young people in the absence of a doctor. (5.22)
- 10.61 An up-to-date controlled drugs register should be put in place, in accordance with current legislative requirements. (5.23)
- 10.62 The clinical cleanliness of the health care environment should be properly maintained by daily cleaning and checks and deep cleaning as necessary. (5.30)

### **Time out of cell**

---

- 10.63 Young people under 18 on the basic level of the incentives and earned privileges scheme should receive adequate time out of their cells. (6.1)
- 10.64 The opportunity to take outside exercise should be promoted more actively and, where appropriate, young people under 18 should be given the option of using outdoor clothing. (6.2)

### **Learning and skills**

---

- 10.65 Attendance by education staff at training planning meetings should be improved. (6.9)
- 10.66 The quality of individual learning plans should be improved to reflect the needs of individual young people. (6.10)
- 10.67 The levels of learning support for young people should be improved, especially with regard to literacy, numeracy and ESOL. (6.33)
- 10.68 More work-based learning should be introduced to the education curriculum. (6.34)
- 10.69 Good quality initial advice and guidance should be provided to young people. (6.35)
- 10.70 Additional higher level courses to meet the needs of more able young people should be introduced. (6.36)

## **Physical education and health promotion**

---

- 10.71 PE should be compulsory for all young people. (6.39)
- 10.72 Recreational PE should be available in the evenings. (6.49)

## **Behaviour management**

---

- 10.73 All young people should be able to attend their incentives and earned privileges (IEP) level reviews. (7.10)
- 10.74 Young people should be kept up to date with their progress in relation to the incentives and earned privileges scheme through engagement in their reviews which are supported and informed by suitable staff. (7.14)
- 10.75 The differentials between the different levels of the incentives and earned privileges scheme should be revised in consultation with young people so that they motivate them to change their behaviour. (7.15)
- 10.76 The role of the advocacy service in relation to adjudication hearings should be explained to young people when they are given information about their charge. They should be asked if they would like to have an advocate present at their adjudication well in advance of the proceedings. (7.23)
- 10.77 Batons should not be drawn against young people under 18. (7.29)
- 10.78 Segregation should not be used solely for punishment for young people under 18. (7.30)
- 10.79 The number of young people segregated should be reduced. (7.31)
- 10.80 All segregation cells should be clean, well ventilated, and free from graffiti. (7.34)
- 10.81 Young people located in the segregation unit should have individual plans to address their behaviour and work towards a swift reintegration to normal location. (7.37)

## **Catering**

---

- 10.82 Lunch should not be served before noon and dinner not before 5pm. (8.1)
- 10.83 All young people should have the opportunity to dine out. (8.3)
- 10.84 The food consultation arrangements should be strengthened. (8.4)

## **Prison shop**

---

- 10.85 All new arrivals should be able to buy items from the establishment shop within their first 24 hours. (8.7)

## **Strategic management of resettlement**

---

- 10.86 The reducing reoffending strategy should be based on a needs analysis of the population and should have separate action plans for each resettlement pathway. (MR5)
- 10.87 The reducing reoffending strategy should reflect the evidenced needs of the population, and make reference to the aims of the Heron unit. (9.1)

## **Training planning and remand management**

---

- 10.88 Personal officers and teachers should attend training planning meetings and make a written contribution if they cannot. (9.11)

## **Resettlement pathways**

---

- 10.89 Pre-release planning should include an assessment of the suitability and sustainability of the accommodation which young people are to be discharged to. Post-release follow-up work should be carried out and used to inform the ongoing development of the accommodation pathway. (9.20)
- 10.90 Good quality careers information, advice and guidance should be established to ensure that the needs of young people are met. (9.22)
- 10.91 Release on temporary licence (ROTL) should be a key part of the reducing reoffending strategy and all young people should be considered for eligibility for ROTL as part of their training plan regardless of their location in the establishment or their status on the incentives and earned privileges scheme. (9.23)
- 10.92 Primary health services staff should attend young people under 18 training planning meetings and have direct contact with YOT health workers. (9.25)
- 10.93 The establishment should develop an action plan to ensure that all young people's financial needs are properly assessed and those who need advice are referred to the appropriate advisers. (9.28)
- 10.94 Up-to-date information on the financial and benefits services should be displayed in residential units. (9.29)
- 10.95 The safeguarding hotline should be checked and acted on daily. (9.32)
- 10.96 Visits should start on time. (9.35)
- 10.97 Sentenced young people should be entitled to one visit each week. (9.47)
- 10.98 The visits hall and searching area should be clean and free of graffiti, and furniture should be in good order. (9.48)
- 10.99 Young people who are fathers should have targeted support to help them to build and maintain contact with their children and develop good parenting skills. (9.49)

10.100 There should be a system to identify young people who do not receive visits to provide them with appropriate support. (9.50)

10.101 The establishment should conduct a regular needs analysis of the population and commission appropriate interventions. (9.52)

## Housekeeping point

To the Youth Justice Board and NOMS

---

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

---

10.102 Vehicles used to transport young people should be clean and free from graffiti. (1.12)

## Housekeeping points

To the governor

---

### **Residential units**

---

10.103 All cells should have curtains. (2.15)

10.104 Young people's concerns about items going missing from the unit-based laundry machines should be investigated and responded to. (2.16)

### **Personal officers**

---

10.105 Personal officers should make at least one good quality entry on young people's Nomis records each week. (2.27)

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

---

10.106 Data on the reasons why young people self-harm should be collated, monitored and acted on. (3.25)

### **Applications and complaints**

---

10.107 Complaint forms should be accessible to all young people and printed legibly. (3.45)

### **Faith and religious activity**

---

10.108 The timetables for faith classes and education classes should be coordinated so that young people are able to attend classes that meet their needs and take proper account of their preferences. (3.59)

### **Substance use**

---

10.109 An annual needs analysis should be conducted to ensure that the SMOS is meeting the substance use needs of all young people under 18. (3.77)



## **Diversity**

---

10.110 Posters about the equality action team should be updated whenever there are changes in personnel. (4.13)

## **Health services**

---

10.111 CNWL should assess the child protection training requirements of their personnel at Feltham to reassure themselves that the level of training is adequate to meet the demands. (5.11)

10.112 There should be only one, up-to-date infection control policy throughout health care. (5.37)

10.113 In-possession risk assessments should be reviewed regularly and patients should sign the associated in-possession medication agreement or compact. (5.48)

10.114 Loose strips and unlabelled inhalers should not be present in the medication trolleys. (5.49)

10.115 Patient's own medication held in stock should be marked to show that it had been assessed by a member of the health care team as suitable for continued use. (5.50)

10.116 There should be a SystemOne computer terminal in the dental surgery. (5.52)

10.117 The cleanliness of the inpatient unit should be subject to daily checking and prompt action should be taken to rectify non-compliance issues. (5.55)

## **Resettlement pathways**

---

10.118 The toilets in the visitors' waiting room should be clean and properly equipped. (9.37)

10.119 There should be sufficient lockers in the visitors' centre for visitors to store their property. (9.51)

# Examples of good practice

---

## **Courts, escorts and transfers**

---

10.120 The opportunity given to young people to take reading material to court was a good initiative. (1.13)

## **Diversity**

---

10.121 The equalities officer worked with the chaplaincy team to facilitate a weekly support group for gypsy, Roma and traveller young people and some very positive work had been undertaken for the celebration of Gypsy Roma Traveller History Month. (4.24)

10.122 The PRIDE support group for gay young people, and the information given to young people about it during induction, was an excellent initiative. (4.54)

## **Health services**

---

- 10.123 The table-top exercise to test the communicable diseases policy and procedures included participants from external agencies. This enabled wider learning and external scrutiny of Feltham's policy and procedures. (5.38)
- 10.124 The involvement of young people in interviewing prospective new staff members enabled the interactions between potential new employees and young people to be tested. (5.39)

## **Behaviour management**

---

- 10.125 The behaviour management group interviewed all new arrivals who were known to have been disruptive in previous establishments, which provided useful information for the establishment but was also intended to help the young person settle in. (7.7)

## Appendix I: Inspection team

---

Nick Hardwick	Chief Inspector
Fay Deadman	Team leader
Ian Thomson	Inspector
Ian Macfadyen	Inspector
Peter Dunn	Inspector
Angela Johnson	Inspector
Colin Carroll	Inspector
Louise Falshaw	Senior researcher
Hayley Cripps	Researcher
<b>Specialist inspectors</b>	
Paul Roberts	Drugs inspector
Paul Tarbuck	Health services inspector
Sharon Monks	Pharmacist
Martyn Rhowbotham	Ofsted inspector
Sue Berelowitz	Deputy Children's Commissioner
Kathryn Hyde-Bales	Visitor

## Appendix II: Prison 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	90	39.3
Recalls	0	0
Convicted unsentenced	44	19.2
Remand	95	41.5
Detainee	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>229</b>	<b>100</b>

Age	Number of young people	%
15 years	19	8.3
16 years	65	28.4
17 years	142	62
18 years	3	1.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>229</b>	<b>100</b>

Nationality	Number of young people	%
British	192	83.8
Foreign nationals	37	16.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>229</b>	<b>100</b>

Ethnicity	Number of young people	%
White		
British	38	16.6
Irish	3	1.3
Other white	8	3.5
Mixed		
White and black Caribbean	17	7.4
White and black African	10	4.4
White and Asian	3	1.3
Other mixed	1	0.4
Asian or Asian British		
Indian	1	0.4
Pakistani	1	0.4
Bangladeshi	12	5.3
Other Asian	4	1.7
Black or black British		
Caribbean	59	25.8
African	48	21
Other black	7	3.1
Chinese or other ethnic group		
Chinese	0	0
Other ethnic group	1	0.4

Not stated	16	7
<b>Total</b>	<b>229</b>	<b>100</b>

Religion	Number of young people	%
Baptist	0	0
Church of England	31	13.6
Roman Catholic	42	18.4
Other Christian denominations	34	14.8
Muslim	83	36.2
Sikh	1	0.4
Hindu	0	0
Buddhist	1	0.4
Jewish	0	0
Other	6	2.6
No religion	31	13.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>229</b>	<b>100</b>

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

Length of stay	<1 mth	1–3 mths	3–6 mths	6–12 mths	1–2 yrs	2 yrs +	Total
<b>Age</b>							
15 years		1	2	1			4
16 years	2	8	15	1	1	1	28
17 years	6	20	19	9	2		56
18 years		1		1			2
<b>Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>90</b>

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

Length of stay	<1 mth	1–3 mths	3–6 mths	6–12 mths	1–2 yrs	2 yrs +	Total
<b>Age</b>							
15 years	6	6	3				15
16 years	11	15	10	1			37
17 years	28	33	21	3	1		86
18 years			1				1
<b>Total</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>139</b>

#### Unsentenced: remanded for an alleged offence of murder (length of stay by age)

Length of stay	<1 mth	1–3 mths	3–6 mths	6–12 mths	1–2 yrs	2 yrs +	Total
<b>Age</b>							
15 years	1						1
16 years		2	2	1			5
17 years		4			1		5
18 years			1				1
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12</b>

Main offence	Number of young people	%
Violence against the person	68	29.7
Sexual offences	6	2.6
Burglary	24	10.5
Robbery	72	31.4

Theft and handling	10	4.4
Fraud and forgery	0	0
Drugs offences	23	10
Other offences	26	11.4
Offence not recorded/holding warrant	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>229</b>	<b>100</b>

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

Sentence	Under 2 yrs	2-3 yrs	3-4 yrs	4-5 yrs	5 yrs +	Total
<b>Age</b>						
15 years				1		1
16 years		1	2			3
17 years		3	3	2	1	9
18 years						0
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>13</b>

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

Sentence	4 mths	6 mths	8 mths	10 mths	12 mths	18 mths	24 mths	Total
<b>Age</b>								
15 years						2		2
16 years	2	1	6		7	3	2	21
17 years	2	7	6	4	13	7	3	42
18 years		1					1	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>67</b>

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

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

**Number of indeterminate sentences by age**

Sentence	Section 90	DPP CJ Act 2003	Recall	Total
<b>Age</b>				0
15 years				0
16 years				0
17 years				0
18 years				0
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

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

---

### **Prisoner survey methodology**

---

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

### **Choosing the sample size**

---

At the time of the survey on 12 July 2011, the population of young people at HMYOI Feltham was 211–181 on the main units and 30 on the Heron Unit. The Heron Unit was sampled separately with questionnaires offered to all 30 young people on the unit. Questionnaires were offered to 120 young people across the other main young people units.

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

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

### **Methodology**

---

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

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

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

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

### **Response rates**

---

In total, 138 respondents completed and returned their questionnaires, 110 from Feltham and 28 from the Heron Unit. This represented 65% of children and young people in the establishment at the time. The response rate from the sample was 92% at Feltham and 93% at the Heron Unit. Two surveys were not returned.

Three respondents refused to complete a questionnaire and nine questionnaires were not returned.

## **Comparisons**

---

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

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

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

Also included are statistically significant differences between the responses of young people surveyed at HMYOI Feltham in 2010 and the responses of this 2011 survey.

An additional comparator shows significant differences in responses from the Heron Unit in 2011 and the Heron Unit in 2010 and also those between the Heron Unit and Feltham 2011.

In all the above documents, statistically significant differences are highlighted. Statistical significance merely indicates whether there is a real difference between the figures; that is the difference is not due to chance alone. Results that are significantly better are indicated by green shading, results that are significantly worse are indicated by blue shading, and where there is no significant difference there is no shading. Orange shading has been used to show a significant difference in demographic background details. Some questions have been filtered according to the response to a previous question. Filtered questions are clearly indented and preceded by an explanation as to which respondents are included in the filtered questions. Otherwise, percentages provided refer to the entire sample. All missing responses are excluded from the analysis.

## **Summary**

---

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

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

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



# Survey results - Feltham

## SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU

<b>Q1</b>	<b>How old are you?</b>	
	15.....	5 (5%)
	16.....	30 (28%)
	17.....	68 (63%)
	18.....	5 (5%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Are you a British citizen?</b>	
	Yes.....	98 (92%)
	No.....	8 (8%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>Is English your first language?</b>	
	Yes.....	81 (75%)
	No.....	27 (25%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>What is your ethnic origin?</b>	
	<i>White - British</i> .....	12 (11%)
	<i>White - Irish</i> .....	1 (1%)
	<i>White - other</i> .....	5 (5%)
	<i>Black or black British - Caribbean</i> .....	29 (27%)
	<i>Black or black British - African</i> .....	29 (27%)
	<i>Black or black British - other</i> .....	1 (1%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Indian</i> .....	1 (1%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Pakistani</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi</i> .....	5 (5%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - other</i> .....	2 (2%)
	<i>Mixed heritage - white and black Caribbean</i> .....	8 (7%)
	<i>Mixed heritage - white and black African</i> .....	4 (4%)
	<i>Mixed heritage - white and Asian</i> .....	5 (5%)
	<i>Mixed heritage - other</i> .....	3 (3%)
	<i>Chinese</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Other ethnic group</i> .....	2 (2%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>What is your religion?</b>	
	<i>None</i> .....	11 (10%)
	<i>Church of England</i> .....	33 (31%)
	<i>Catholic</i> .....	14 (13%)
	<i>Protestant</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Other Christian denomination</i> .....	7 (6%)
	<i>Buddhist</i> .....	1 (1%)
	<i>Hindu</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Jewish</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Muslim</i> .....	42 (39%)
	<i>Sikh</i> .....	0 (0%)

<b>Q6</b>	<b>Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?</b>	
	Yes .....	3 (3%)
	No .....	95 (93%)
	Don't know .....	4 (4%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>Do you have any children?</b>	
	Yes .....	13 (12%)
	No .....	93 (88%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>Do you consider yourself to have a disability?</b>	
	Yes .....	10 (10%)
	No .....	95 (90%)
<b>Q10</b>	<b>Have you ever been in local authority care?</b>	
	Yes .....	18 (17%)
	No .....	89 (83%)

## SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Are you sentenced?</b>	
	Yes .....	39 (35%)
	No - unsentenced/on remand .....	71 (65%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>How long is your sentence (the full DTO sentence)?</b>	
	<i>Not sentenced</i> .....	71 (65%)
	<i>Less than six months</i> .....	4 (4%)
	<i>Six to twelve months</i> .....	14 (13%)
	<i>More than twelve months, up to two years</i> .....	9 (8%)
	<i>More than two years</i> .....	10 (9%)
	<i>Indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP)</i> .....	1 (1%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>How long have you been in this establishment?</b>	
	<i>Less than one month</i> .....	20 (18%)
	<i>One to six months</i> .....	65 (59%)
	<i>More than six months, but less than twelve months</i> .....	20 (18%)
	<i>Twelve months to two years</i> .....	5 (5%)
	<i>More than two years</i> .....	0 (0%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?</b>	
	Yes .....	67 (61%)
	No .....	43 (39%)

## SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS

<b>Q1</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?</b>	
	Yes .....	46 (42%)
	No .....	41 (38%)
	Don't remember .....	20 (18%)
	Not applicable .....	2 (2%)

<b>Q2</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?</b>	
	Yes .....	85 (77%)
	No .....	17 (15%)
	Don't remember.....	8 (7%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, were there any adults (over 18) or people of a different gender, travelling with you?</b>	
	Yes .....	28 (26%)
	No .....	68 (63%)
	Don't remember.....	12 (11%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?</b>	
	Less than two hours .....	56 (51%)
	Two to four hours .....	48 (44%)
	More than four hours .....	0 (0%)
	Don't remember.....	5 (5%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?</b>	
	<b>My journey was less than two hours</b> .....	56 (51%)
	Yes .....	7 (6%)
	No .....	43 (39%)
	Don't remember.....	3 (3%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?</b>	
	<b>My journey was less than two hours</b> .....	56 (51%)
	Yes .....	9 (8%)
	No .....	43 (39%)
	Don't remember.....	1 (1%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, how did you feel you were treated by the escort staff?</b>	
	Very well.....	9 (8%)
	Well .....	44 (41%)
	Neither .....	40 (37%)
	Badly.....	9 (8%)
	Very badly .....	4 (4%)
	Don't remember.....	2 (2%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>Before you arrived, from court or another establishment, were you told that you would be coming here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	Yes, someone told me .....	87 (80%)
	Yes, I received written information .....	8 (7%)
	No, I was not told anything.....	19 (17%)
	Don't remember.....	4 (4%)

## SECTION 4: FIRST DAYS

<b>Q1</b>	<b>How long were you in reception?</b>	
	Less than two hours .....	93 (85%)

<i>Two hours or longer</i> .....	6 (5%)
<i>Don't remember</i> .....	11 (10%)

**Q2 When you were searched, was this carried out in an understanding way?**

<i>Yes</i> .....	81 (74%)
<i>No</i> .....	20 (18%)
<i>Don't remember</i> .....	9 (8%)

**Q3 Overall, how well did you feel you were treated in reception?**

<i>Very well</i> .....	12 (11%)
<i>Well</i> .....	52 (47%)
<i>Neither</i> .....	38 (35%)
<i>Badly</i> .....	4 (4%)
<i>Very badly</i> .....	1 (1%)
<i>Don't remember</i> .....	3 (3%)

**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> .....	47 (45%)	<i>Money worries</i> .....	11 (11%)
<i>Loss of property</i> .....	16 (15%)	<i>Feeling low/upset/needing someone to talk to</i> .....	28 (27%)
<i>Housing problems</i> .....	12 (12%)	<i>Health problems</i> .....	52 (50%)
<i>Needing protection from other young people</i> .....	37 (36%)	<i>Getting phone numbers</i> .....	32 (31%)
<i>Letting family know where you are</i> .....	61 (59%)	<b><i>Staff did not ask me about any of these</i></b> .....	19 (18%)

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

<i>Not being able to smoke</i> .....	45 (45%)	<i>Money worries</i> .....	28 (28%)
<i>Loss of property</i> .....	18 (18%)	<i>Feeling low/upset/needing someone to talk to</i> .....	14 (14%)
<i>Housing problems</i> .....	19 (19%)	<i>Health problems</i> .....	9 (9%)
<i>Needing protection from other young people</i> .....	18 (18%)	<i>Getting phone numbers</i> .....	42 (42%)
<i>Letting family know where you are</i> .....	18 (18%)	<b><i>I did not have any problems</i></b>	21 (21%)

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

<i>A reception pack</i> .....	58 (54%)
<i>The opportunity to have a shower</i> .....	12 (11%)
<i>Something to eat</i> .....	89 (82%)
<i>A free phone call to friends/family</i> .....	79 (73%)
<i>Information about the PIN telephone system</i> .....	60 (56%)
<i>Information about feeling low/upset</i> .....	22 (20%)
<i>Don't remember</i> .....	4 (4%)
<b><i>I was not given any of these</i></b> .....	3 (3%)

<b>Q7</b>	<b>Within your first 24 hours here, did you have access to the following people or services? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Chaplain or religious leader</i> .....	39 (38%)
	<i>Peer support/peer mentor/Listener/Samaritans</i> .....	17 (16%)
	<i>The prison shop/canteen</i> .....	17 (16%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	18 (17%)
	<b><i>I did not have access to any of these</i></b> .....	41 (39%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a member of health care staff?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	55 (51%)
	<i>No</i> .....	35 (32%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	18 (17%)
<b>Q9</b>	<b>Did you feel safe on your first night at this establishment?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	63 (59%)
	<i>No</i> .....	30 (28%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	13 (12%)
<b>Q10</b>	<b>Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the establishment?</b>	
	<b><i>I have not been on an induction course</i></b> .....	6 (6%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	46 (43%)
	<i>No</i> .....	33 (31%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	23 (21%)

## SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	89 (82%)
	<i>No</i> .....	18 (17%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	2 (2%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	49 (46%)
	<i>No</i> .....	47 (44%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	11 (10%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>What is the food like here?</b>	
	<i>Very good</i> .....	1 (1%)
	<i>Good</i> .....	15 (14%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....	39 (36%)
	<i>Bad</i> .....	30 (28%)
	<i>Very bad</i> .....	24 (22%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?</b>	
	<b><i>I have not bought anything yet</i></b> .....	3 (3%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	35 (32%)
	<i>No</i> .....	69 (63%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	2 (2%)

<b>Q5</b>	<b>How easy is it for you to attend religious services?</b>		
	<i>I don't want to attend religious services</i> .....		7 (6%)
	<i>Very easy</i> .....		30 (28%)
	<i>Easy</i> .....		33 (30%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....		18 (17%)
	<i>Difficult</i> .....		16 (15%)
	<i>Very difficult</i> .....		2 (2%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....		3 (3%)

<b>Q6</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions about religion:</b>			
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Don't know/ Not applicable</b>
	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	78 (72%)	12 (11%)	18 (17%)
	Can you speak to a religious leader in private if you want to?	77 (75%)	1 (1%)	25 (24%)

<b>Q7</b>	<b>Please answer the following about staff here:</b>		
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
	Is there a member of staff you feel you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	76 (71%)	31 (29%)
	Do <b>most</b> staff treat you with respect?	75 (71%)	30 (29%)

## SECTION 6: HEALTH SERVICES

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Did you have a full health assessment the day after your arrival?</b>		
	<i>Yes</i> .....		52 (49%)
	<i>No</i> .....		31 (29%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....		23 (22%)

<b>Q2</b>	<b>What do you think of the overall quality of the health care?</b>		
	<i>I have not been to health care</i> .....		8 (7%)
	<i>Very good</i> .....		9 (8%)
	<i>Good</i> .....		28 (26%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....		25 (23%)
	<i>Bad</i> .....		22 (21%)
	<i>Very bad</i> .....		15 (14%)

<b>Q3</b>	<b>Is it easy to see the following people if you need to?</b>			
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Don't know</b>
	The doctor .....	30 (29%)	52 (50%)	22 (21%)
	The nurse .....	67 (65%)	20 (19%)	16 (16%)
	The dentist .....	13 (13%)	52 (51%)	36 (36%)
	The optician .....	5 (5%)	47 (47%)	48 (48%)
	The pharmacist.....	6 (6%)	43 (43%)	50 (51%)

<b>Q4</b>	<b>If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep it in your cell?</b>		
	<i>I am not taking any medication</i> .....		54 (50%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....		14 (13%)

No ..... 18 (17%)  
 Don't know ..... 21 (20%)

**Q5 Please answer the following about alcohol:**

	Yes	No
Did you have problems with alcohol when you first arrived here?	7 (7%)	99 (93%)
Have you received any help with alcohol problems in this prison?	0 (0%)	106 (100%)

**Q6 Please answer the following about drugs:**

	Yes	No
Did you have problems with drugs when you first arrived here?	19 (18%)	88 (82%)
Do you have problems with drugs now?	6 (6%)	100 (94%)
Have you received any help with drug problems in this prison?	6 (6%)	101 (94%)

**Q7 How easy is it to get illegal drugs here?**

Very easy .....	8 (8%)
Easy .....	5 (5%)
Neither .....	4 (4%)
Difficult .....	4 (4%)
Very difficult .....	14 (13%)
Don't know .....	71 (67%)

**Q8 Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?**

Yes .....	24 (22%)
No .....	83 (78%)

**Q9 If you feel you have emotional or mental health problems, are you being helped by anyone here (for example; a psychologist, doctor, counsellor, personal officer or another member of prison staff)?**

<b>I do not have any emotional or mental health problems</b> .....	83 (79%)
Yes .....	8 (8%)
No .....	14 (13%)

**SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS**

**Q1 Do you know how to make an application?**

Yes .....	74 (69%)
No .....	33 (31%)

**Q2 Is it easy to make an application?**

Yes .....	58 (55%)
No .....	14 (13%)
Don't know .....	34 (32%)

<b>Q3</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions about applications:</b>			
		<b><i>I have not made one</i></b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
	Do you feel applications are sorted out fairly?	52 (50%)	29 (28%)	24 (23%)
	Do you feel applications are sorted out promptly? (Within seven days)	52 (50%)	16 (16%)	35 (34%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Do you know how to make a complaint?</b>			
	Yes .....			79 (77%)
	No .....			24 (23%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>Is it easy to make a complaint?</b>			
	Yes .....			55 (53%)
	No .....			13 (13%)
	Don't know .....			36 (35%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions about complaints:</b>			
		<b><i>I have not made one</i></b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
	Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	57 (55%)	14 (14%)	32 (31%)
	Do you feel complaints are sorted out promptly? (Within seven days)	57 (55%)	15 (15%)	31 (30%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?</b>			
	Yes .....			13 (13%)
	No .....			87 (87%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>Can you speak to the following people when you need to?</b>			
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Don't know</b>
	A peer mentor/peer support/Listener	22 (21%)	25 (24%)	56 (54%)
	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)	18 (17%)	25 (24%)	60 (58%)
	An advocate (an outside person to help you)	15 (14%)	25 (24%)	64 (62%)

## SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE

<b>Q1</b>	<b>What level of the rewards and sanctions scheme are you on?</b>	
	<b><i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i></b> .....	6 (6%)
	<b><i>Enhanced (top)</i></b> .....	18 (17%)
	<b><i>Standard (middle)</i></b> .....	70 (67%)
	<b><i>Basic (bottom)</i></b> .....	8 (8%)
	<b><i>Don't know</i></b> .....	2 (2%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the rewards and sanctions scheme?</b>	
	<b><i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i></b> .....	6 (6%)
	Yes .....	47 (46%)
	No .....	34 (33%)
	Don't know .....	16 (16%)



**Q3 Do the different levels of the rewards and sanctions scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?**

*Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is* ..... 6 (6%)  
 Yes ..... 46 (45%)  
 No ..... 41 (40%)  
 Don't know ..... 10 (10%)

**Q4 Have you had a 'nicking' (adjudication) since you have been in this establishment?**

Yes ..... 67 (64%)  
 No ..... 37 (36%)  
 Don't know ..... 0 (0%)

**Q5 If you have had a 'nicking' (adjudication), was the process explained clearly to you?**

*I have not had an adjudication* ..... 37 (36%)  
 Yes ..... 61 (59%)  
 No ..... 6 (6%)

**Q6 If you have been physically restrained (C and R), how many times has this happened since you have been in this establishment?**

*I have not been restrained* ..... 59 (57%)  
 Once ..... 20 (19%)  
 Twice ..... 11 (11%)  
 Three times ..... 2 (2%)  
 More than three times ..... 12 (12%)

**Q7 If you have spent a night in the care and separation unit (CSU), how were you treated by staff?**

*I have not been to the care and separation unit* ..... 77 (75%)  
 Very well ..... 1 (1%)  
 Well ..... 4 (4%)  
 Neither ..... 7 (7%)  
 Badly ..... 5 (5%)  
 Very badly ..... 9 (9%)

## SECTION 9: SAFETY

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

Yes ..... 48 (46%)  
 No ..... 56 (54%)

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

<i>Never felt unsafe</i> ..... 56 (55%)	<i>At mealtimes</i> ..... 3 (3%)
<i>Everywhere</i> ..... 7 (7%)	<i>At health care</i> ..... 3 (3%)
<i>Care and separation unit</i> ..... 6 (6%)	<i>Visits area</i> ..... 21 (21%)
<i>Association areas</i> ..... 9 (9%)	<i>In wing showers</i> ..... 12 (12%)
<i>Reception area</i> ..... 11 (11%)	<i>In gym showers</i> ..... 9 (9%)

<i>At the gym</i> .....	5 (5%)	<i>In corridors/stairwells</i> .....	16 (16%)
<i>In an exercise yard</i> .....	7 (7%)	<i>On your landing/wing</i> .....	4 (4%)
<i>At work</i> .....	4 (4%)	<i>In your cell</i> .....	3 (3%)
<i>At education</i> .....	26 (25%)		

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

Yes.....	23 (22%)
No.....	80 (78%)

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

<i>Insulting remarks (about you, your family or friends)</i> .....	14 (14%)	<i>Because of drugs</i> .....	1 (1%)
<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i> .....	8 (8%)	<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i> .....	8 (8%)
<i>Sexual abuse</i> .....	0 (0%)	<i>Because you were new here</i> ..	6 (6%)
<i>Because of your race or ethnic origin</i> .....	5 (5%)	<i>Because you are from a different part of the country</i> ....	3 (3%)
<i>Because of your religious beliefs</i> .....	4 (4%)	<i>Because of gang related issues</i> .....	11 (11%)
<i>Because you have a disability</i>	1 (1%)	<i>Because of my offence/crime</i> ..	2 (2%)

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

Yes.....	17 (17%)
No.....	85 (83%)

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

<i>Insulting remarks (about you, your family or friends)</i> .....	11 (11%)	<i>Because of drugs</i> .....	2 (2%)
<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i> .....	2 (2%)	<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i> .....	1 (1%)
<i>Sexual abuse</i> .....	0 (0%)	<i>Because you were new here</i> ....	5 (5%)
<i>Because of your race or ethnic origin</i> .....	6 (6%)	<i>Because you are from a different part of the country</i> .....	2 (2%)
<i>Because of your religious beliefs</i> .....	2 (2%)	<i>Because of gang related issues</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Because you have a disability</i>	2 (2%)	<i>Because of my offence/crime</i> ....	1 (1%)

**Q9 If you were being victimised who would you tell?**

<i>No one</i> .....	44 (48%)	<i>Teacher/education staff</i> .....	4 (4%)
<i>Personal officer</i> .....	20 (22%)	<i>Gym staff</i> .....	2 (2%)
<i>Wing officer</i> .....	11 (12%)	<i>Listener/Samaritan/Buddy</i> .....	8 (9%)
<i>Chaplain</i> .....	9 (10%)	<i>Another young person here</i> ....	19 (21%)
<i>Health care staff</i> .....	2 (2%)	<i>Family/friends</i> .....	22 (24%)

<b>Q10</b>	<b>Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?</b>		
	Yes .....	22	(21%)
	No .....	39	(38%)
	Don't know .....	42	(41%)
<b>Q11</b>	<b>Is shouting through the windows a problem here?</b>		
	Yes .....	34	(34%)
	No .....	52	(51%)
	Don't know .....	15	(15%)
<b>Q12</b>	<b>Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?</b>		
	Yes .....	25	(25%)
	No .....	74	(75%)

## SECTION 10: ACTIVITIES

<b>Q1</b>	<b>How old were you when you were last at school?</b>			
	14 or under .....	24	(24%)	
	15 or over .....	78	(76%)	
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions about school:</b>			
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>
	Have you ever been excluded from school?	88 (86%)	13 (13%)	1 (1%)
	Did you used to truant from school?	60 (60%)	35 (35%)	5 (5%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>Do you CURRENTLY take part in any of the following activities? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>			
	Education .....	66	(65%)	
	A job in this establishment .....	24	(24%)	
	Vocational or skills training .....	12	(12%)	
	Offending behaviour programmes .....	16	(16%)	
	<b>I am not currently involved in any of these</b> .....	20	(20%)	
<b>Q4</b>	<b>If you have been involved in any of the following activities, in this establishment, do you think they will help you when you leave prison?</b>			
		<b>Not been involved</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
	Education	10 (11%)	37 (39%)	41 (43%)
	A job in this establishment	17 (21%)	30 (37%)	22 (27%)
	Vocational or skills training	22 (31%)	21 (29%)	18 (25%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	23 (30%)	17 (22%)	16 (21%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>Do you usually have association every day?</b>			
	Yes .....	89	(85%)	

No ..... 13 (12%)  
 Don't know ..... 3 (3%)

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

**Don't want to go** ..... 8 (8%)  
 None ..... 13 (12%)  
 One to two times ..... 15 (14%)  
 Three to five times ..... 61 (58%)  
 More than five times ..... 3 (3%)  
 Don't know ..... 5 (5%)

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

**Don't want to go** ..... 1 (1%)  
 Yes ..... 51 (49%)  
 No ..... 45 (43%)  
 Don't know ..... 8 (8%)

**SECTION 11: FAMILY AND FRIENDS**

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

Yes ..... 77 (73%)  
 No ..... 24 (23%)  
 Don't know ..... 5 (5%)

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

Yes ..... 45 (42%)  
 No ..... 49 (46%)  
 Don't know ..... 13 (12%)

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

Very easy ..... 16 (16%)  
 Easy ..... 30 (29%)  
 Neither ..... 22 (22%)  
 Difficult ..... 18 (18%)  
 Very difficult ..... 9 (9%)  
 Don't know ..... 7 (7%)

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

**Not been here a week yet** ..... 2 (2%)  
 I don't get visits ..... 18 (18%)  
 Less than one a week ..... 32 (31%)  
 About one a week ..... 28 (27%)  
 More than one a week ..... 15 (15%)  
 Don't know ..... 7 (7%)

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

**I don't get visits** ..... 18 (17%)  
 Yes ..... 30 (29%)  
 No ..... 40 (39%)  
 Don't know ..... 15 (15%)

<b>Q6</b>	<b>How are you and your family/friends usually treated by visits staff?</b>	
	<i>I don't get visits</i> .....	18 (18%)
	<i>Very well</i> .....	7 (7%)
	<i>Well</i> .....	33 (32%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....	26 (25%)
	<i>Badly</i> .....	4 (4%)
	<i>Very badly</i> .....	3 (3%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	11 (11%)

## SECTION 12: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE

<b>Q1</b>	<b>When did you first meet your personal officer?</b>	
	<i>I still have not met him/her</i> .....	25 (25%)
	<i>In your first week</i> .....	37 (36%)
	<i>After your first week</i> .....	25 (25%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	15 (15%)

<b>Q2</b>	<b>How often do you see your personal officer?</b>	
	<i>I still have not met him/her</i> .....	25 (25%)
	<i>At least once a week</i> .....	42 (42%)
	<i>Less than once a week</i> .....	34 (34%)

<b>Q3</b>	<b>Do you feel your personal officer has helped you?</b>	
	<i>I still have not met him/her</i> .....	25 (25%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	39 (39%)
	<i>No</i> .....	37 (37%)

<b>Q4</b>	<b>Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	26 (25%)
	<i>No</i> .....	61 (60%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	15 (15%)

<b>Q5</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions about training plans, sentence plans or remand plans:</b>				
		<i>I don't have one</i>	Yes	No	<i>Don't know</i>
	Were you involved in the development of your plan?	61 (60%)	21 (21%)	0 (0%)	19 (19%)
	Do you understand the targets that have been set in your plan?	61 (60%)	25 (25%)	0 (0%)	15 (15%)

<b>Q6</b>	<b>Has your YOT worker been in touch since you arrived at this establishment?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	83 (84%)
	<i>No</i> .....	16 (16%)

<b>Q7</b>	<b>Do you know how to get in touch with your YOT worker?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	37 (37%)
	<i>No</i> .....	63 (63%)

**Q8 Please answer the following questions about your release:**

	Yes	No	Don't know
Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	22 (22%)	53 (52%)	27 (26%)
Are you planning on going to school or college after release?	71 (69%)	15 (15%)	17 (17%)
Do you have a job to go to on release?	23 (23%)	69 (68%)	9 (9%)

**Q9 Do you know who to contact for help with any of the following problems, before your release? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**

<i>Finding accommodation</i> .....	32 (34%)
<i>Getting into school or college</i> .....	40 (43%)
<i>Getting a job</i> .....	32 (34%)
<i>Help with money/finances</i> .....	30 (32%)
<i>Help with claiming benefits</i> .....	20 (21%)
<i>Continuing health services</i> .....	15 (16%)
<i>Opening a bank account</i> .....	20 (21%)
<i>Avoiding bad relationships</i> .....	12 (13%)
<b><i>I don't know who to contact</i></b> .....	41 (44%)

**Q10 Do you think you will have a problem with any of the following things, when you are released? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**

<i>Finding accommodation</i> .....	35 (38%)
<i>Getting into school or college</i> .....	40 (43%)
<i>Getting a job</i> .....	49 (53%)
<i>Money/finances</i> .....	36 (39%)
<i>Claiming benefits</i> .....	28 (30%)
<i>Continuing health services</i> .....	11 (12%)
<i>Opening a bank account</i> .....	17 (18%)
<i>Avoiding bad relationships</i> .....	19 (20%)
<b><i>I won't have any problems</i></b> .....	25 (27%)

**Q11 What is most likely to stop you offending in the future? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**

<b><i>Not sentenced</i></b> .....	71 (66%)	<i>Having a mentor (someone you can ask for advice)</i> .....	4 (4%)
<i>Nothing, it is up to me</i> .....	13 (12%)	<i>Having a YOT worker or social worker that I get on with</i> .....	11 (10%)
<i>Making new friends outside</i> ....	6 (6%)	<i>Having children</i> .....	8 (7%)
<i>Going back to live with my family</i> .....	6 (6%)	<i>Having something to do that isn't crime</i> .....	14 (13%)
<i>Getting a place of my own</i> .....	11 (10%)	<i>This sentence</i> .....	7 (7%)
<i>Getting a job</i> .....	15 (14%)	<i>Getting into school/college</i> .....	16 (15%)
<i>Having a partner (girlfriend or boyfriend)</i> .....	8 (7%)	<i>Talking about my offending behaviour with staff</i> .....	1 (1%)
<i>Staying off alcohol/drugs</i> .....	7 (7%)	<i>Anything else</i> .....	1 (1%)

**Q12 Do you want to stop offending?**

<b><i>Not sentenced</i></b> .....	71 (67%)
-----------------------------------	----------

Yes .....	26 (25%)
No .....	2 (2%)
Don't know .....	7 (7%)

**Q13** Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you in this establishment, that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?

<b>Not sentenced</b> .....	71 (66%)
Yes .....	7 (7%)
No .....	29 (27%)

# Survey results – Heron Unit

## SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU

<b>Q1</b>	<b>How old are you?</b>	
	15.....	1 (4%)
	16.....	8 (30%)
	17.....	18 (67%)
	18.....	0 (0%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Are you a British citizen?</b>	
	Yes.....	25 (93%)
	No.....	2 (7%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>Is English your first language?</b>	
	Yes.....	24 (92%)
	No.....	2 (8%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>What is your ethnic origin?</b>	
	<i>White - British</i> .....	9 (32%)
	<i>White - Irish</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>White - other</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Black or black British - Caribbean</i> .....	6 (21%)
	<i>Black or black British - African</i> .....	7 (25%)
	<i>Black or black British - other</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Indian</i> .....	1 (4%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Pakistani</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi</i> .....	2 (7%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - other</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Mixed heritage - white and black Caribbean</i> .....	2 (7%)
	<i>Mixed heritage - white and black African</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Mixed heritage - white and Asian</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Mixed heritage - other</i> .....	1 (4%)
	<i>Chinese</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Other ethnic group</i> .....	0 (0%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>What is your religion?</b>	
	<i>None</i> .....	6 (22%)
	<i>Church of England</i> .....	6 (22%)
	<i>Catholic</i> .....	1 (4%)
	<i>Protestant</i> .....	1 (4%)
	<i>Other Christian denomination</i> .....	1 (4%)
	<i>Buddhist</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Hindu</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Jewish</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Muslim</i> .....	11 (41%)
	<i>Sikh</i> .....	1 (4%)



<b>Q6</b>	<b>Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?</b>	
	Yes .....	0 (0%)
	No .....	23 (88%)
	Don't know .....	3 (12%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>Do you have any children?</b>	
	Yes .....	3 (11%)
	No .....	24 (89%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>Do you consider yourself to have a disability?</b>	
	Yes .....	2 (7%)
	No .....	25 (93%)
<b>Q10</b>	<b>Have you ever been in local authority care?</b>	
	Yes .....	4 (15%)
	No .....	23 (85%)

## SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Are you sentenced?</b>	
	Yes .....	28 (100%)
	No - unsentenced/on remand .....	0 (0%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>How long is your sentence (the full DTO sentence)?</b>	
	<i>Not sentenced</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Less than six months</i> .....	9 (32%)
	<i>Six to twelve months</i> .....	12 (43%)
	<i>More than twelve months, up to two years</i> .....	7 (25%)
	<i>More than two years</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP)</i> .....	0 (0%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>How long have you been in this establishment?</b>	
	<i>Less than one month</i> .....	3 (11%)
	<i>One to six months</i> .....	21 (75%)
	<i>More than six months, but less than twelve months</i> .....	1 (4%)
	<i>Twelve months to two years</i> .....	3 (11%)
	<i>More than two years</i> .....	0 (0%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?</b>	
	Yes .....	12 (43%)
	No .....	16 (57%)

## SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS

<b>Q1</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?</b>	
	Yes .....	9 (32%)
	No .....	9 (32%)
	Don't remember .....	10 (36%)
	Not applicable .....	0 (0%)

<b>Q2</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?</b>	
	Yes .....	24 (86%)
	No .....	3 (11%)
	Don't remember .....	1 (4%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, were there any adults (over 18) or people of a different gender, travelling with you?</b>	
	Yes .....	6 (21%)
	No .....	18 (64%)
	Don't remember .....	4 (14%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?</b>	
	Less than two hours .....	19 (68%)
	Two to four hours .....	8 (29%)
	More than four hours .....	0 (0%)
	Don't remember .....	1 (4%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?</b>	
	<b>My journey was less than two hours</b> .....	19 (70%)
	Yes .....	0 (0%)
	No .....	7 (26%)
	Don't remember .....	1 (4%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?</b>	
	<b>My journey was less than two hours</b> .....	19 (68%)
	Yes .....	3 (11%)
	No .....	5 (18%)
	Don't remember .....	1 (4%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, how did you feel you were treated by the escort staff?</b>	
	Very well .....	2 (7%)
	Well .....	11 (39%)
	Neither .....	11 (39%)
	Badly .....	2 (7%)
	Very badly .....	0 (0%)
	Don't remember .....	2 (7%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>Before you arrived, from court or another establishment, were you told that you would be coming here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	Yes, someone told me .....	18 (67%)
	Yes, I received written information .....	4 (15%)
	No, I was not told anything .....	7 (26%)
	Don't remember .....	0 (0%)

## SECTION 4: FIRST DAYS

<b>Q1</b>	<b>How long were you in reception?</b>	
	Less than two hours .....	24 (86%)
	Two hours or longer .....	1 (4%)

Don't remember ..... 3 (11%)

**Q2 When you were searched, was this carried out in an understanding way?**

Yes ..... 21 (75%)  
No ..... 4 (14%)  
Don't remember ..... 3 (11%)

**Q3 Overall, how well did you feel you were treated in reception?**

Very well ..... 0 (0%)  
Well ..... 12 (43%)  
Neither ..... 11 (39%)  
Badly ..... 4 (14%)  
Very badly ..... 0 (0%)  
Don't remember ..... 1 (4%)

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

Not being able to smoke ..... 15 (56%)	Money worries ..... 3 (11%)
Loss of property ..... 5 (19%)	Feeling low/upset/needing someone to talk to ..... 6 (22%)
Housing problems ..... 8 (30%)	Health problems ..... 13 (48%)
Needing protection from other young people ..... 6 (22%)	Getting phone numbers ..... 14 (52%)
Letting family know where you are ..... 13 (48%)	<b>Staff did not ask me about any of these</b> ..... 4 (15%)

**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 ..... 12 (48%)	Money worries ..... 4 (16%)
Loss of property ..... 1 (4%)	Feeling low/upset/needing someone to talk to ..... 1 (4%)
Housing problems ..... 5 (20%)	Health problems ..... 0 (0%)
Needing protection from other young people ..... 2 (8%)	Getting phone numbers ..... 8 (32%)
Letting family know where you are ..... 3 (12%)	<b>I did not have any problems</b> ... 7 (28%)

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

A reception pack ..... 14 (52%)  
The opportunity to have a shower ..... 5 (19%)  
Something to eat ..... 21 (78%)  
A free phone call to friends/family ..... 22 (81%)  
Information about the PIN telephone system ..... 13 (48%)  
Information about feeling low/upset ..... 6 (22%)  
Don't remember ..... 2 (7%)  
**I was not given any of these** ..... 0 (0%)

<b>Q7</b>	<b>Within your first 24 hours here, did you have access to the following people or services? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Chaplain or religious leader</i> .....	12 (48%)
	<i>Peer support/peer mentor/Listener/Samaritans</i> .....	3 (12%)
	<i>The prison shop/canteen</i> .....	2 (8%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	3 (12%)
	<b><i>I did not have access to any of these</i></b> .....	9 (36%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a member of healthcare staff?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	16 (59%)
	<i>No</i> .....	9 (33%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	2 (7%)
<b>Q9</b>	<b>Did you feel safe on your first night at this establishment?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	24 (89%)
	<i>No</i> .....	2 (7%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	1 (4%)
<b>Q10</b>	<b>Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the establishment?</b>	
	<b><i>I have not been on an induction course</i></b> .....	2 (7%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	14 (52%)
	<i>No</i> .....	7 (26%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	4 (15%)

## SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	26 (93%)
	<i>No</i> .....	1 (4%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	1 (4%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	17 (61%)
	<i>No</i> .....	8 (29%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	3 (11%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>What is the food like here?</b>	
	<i>Very good</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Good</i> .....	6 (21%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....	5 (18%)
	<i>Bad</i> .....	12 (43%)
	<i>Very bad</i> .....	5 (18%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?</b>	
	<b><i>I have not bought anything yet</i></b> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	6 (22%)
	<i>No</i> .....	21 (78%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	0 (0%)

<b>Q5</b>	<b>How easy is it for you to attend religious services?</b>		
	<i>I don't want to attend religious services</i> .....		4 (14%)
	<i>Very easy</i> .....		7 (25%)
	<i>Easy</i> .....		11 (39%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....		2 (7%)
	<i>Difficult</i> .....		2 (7%)
	<i>Very difficult</i> .....		0 (0%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....		2 (7%)

<b>Q6</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions about religion:</b>			
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Don't know/ Not applicable</b>
	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	21 (78%)	1 (4%)	5 (19%)
	Can you speak to a religious leader in private if you want to?	18 (67%)	4 (15%)	5 (19%)

<b>Q7</b>	<b>Please answer the following about staff here:</b>		
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
	Is there a member of staff you feel you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	19 (73%)	7 (27%)
	Do <b>most</b> staff treat you with respect?	18 (64%)	10 (36%)

## SECTION 6: HEALTH SERVICES

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Did you have a full health assessment the day after your arrival?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	15 (54%)
	<i>No</i> .....	4 (14%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	9 (32%)

<b>Q2</b>	<b>What do you think of the overall quality of the health care?</b>	
	<i>I have not been to health care</i> .....	4 (14%)
	<i>Very good</i> .....	3 (11%)
	<i>Good</i> .....	8 (29%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....	6 (21%)
	<i>Bad</i> .....	6 (21%)
	<i>Very bad</i> .....	1 (4%)

<b>Q3</b>	<b>Is it easy to see the following people if you need to?</b>			
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Don't know</b>
	The doctor .....	9 (33%)	16 (59%)	2 (7%)
	The nurse .....	18 (67%)	8 (30%)	1 (4%)
	The dentist .....	4 (15%)	15 (58%)	7 (27%)
	The optician .....	3 (11%)	13 (46%)	12 (43%)
	The pharmacist.....	3 (11%)	13 (48%)	11 (41%)

<b>Q4</b>	<b>If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep it in your cell?</b>	
	<i>I am not taking any medication</i> .....	16 (57%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	1 (4%)

No ..... 5 (18%)  
 Don't know ..... 6 (21%)

**Q5 Please answer the following about alcohol:**

	Yes	No
Did you have problems with alcohol when you first arrived here?	1 (4%)	27 (96%)
Have you received any help with alcohol problems in this prison?	0 (0%)	28 (100%)

**Q6 Please answer the following about drugs:**

	Yes	No
Did you have problems with drugs when you first arrived here?	0 (0%)	28 (100%)
Do you have problems with drugs now?	1 (4%)	27 (96%)
Have you received any help with drug problems in this prison?	1 (4%)	27 (96%)

**Q7 How easy is it to get illegal drugs here?**

Very easy .....	4 (15%)
Easy .....	3 (11%)
Neither .....	2 (7%)
Difficult .....	0 (0%)
Very difficult .....	0 (0%)
Don't know .....	18 (67%)

**Q8 Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?**

Yes .....	5 (18%)
No .....	23 (82%)

**Q9 If you feel you have emotional or mental health problems, are you being helped by anyone here (for example; a psychologist, doctor, counsellor, personal officer or another member of prison staff)?**

<b><i>I do not have any emotional or mental health problems</i></b> .....	23 (82%)
Yes .....	3 (11%)
No .....	2 (7%)

**SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS**

**Q1 Do you know how to make an application?**

Yes .....	25 (89%)
No .....	3 (11%)

**Q2 Is it easy to make an application?**

Yes .....	17 (61%)
No .....	3 (11%)
Don't know .....	8 (29%)

<b>Q3</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions about applications:</b>			
		<b><i>I have not made one</i></b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
	Do you feel applications are sorted out fairly?	7 (26%)	15 (56%)	5 (19%)
	Do you feel applications are sorted out promptly? (Within seven days)	7 (26%)	7 (26%)	13 (48%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Do you know how to make a complaint?</b>			
	Yes .....			20 (71%)
	No .....			8 (29%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>Is it easy to make a complaint?</b>			
	Yes .....			15 (56%)
	No .....			4 (15%)
	Don't know .....			8 (30%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions about complaints:</b>			
		<b><i>I have not made one</i></b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
	Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	18 (67%)	4 (15%)	5 (19%)
	Do you feel complaints are sorted out promptly? (Within seven days)	18 (69%)	4 (15%)	4 (15%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?</b>			
	Yes .....			3 (12%)
	No .....			22 (88%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>Can you speak to the following people when you need to?</b>			
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Don't know</b>
	A peer mentor/peer support/Listener	7 (25%)	4 (14%)	17 (61%)
	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)	5 (18%)	5 (18%)	18 (64%)
	An advocate (an outside person to help you)	4 (14%)	4 (14%)	20 (71%)

## SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE

<b>Q1</b>	<b>What level of the rewards and sanctions scheme are you on?</b>	
	<b><i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i></b> .....	1 (4%)
	<b><i>Enhanced (top)</i></b> .....	13 (46%)
	<b><i>Standard (middle)</i></b> .....	13 (46%)
	<b><i>Basic (bottom)</i></b> .....	0 (0%)
	<b><i>Don't know</i></b> .....	1 (4%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the rewards and sanctions scheme?</b>	
	<b><i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i></b> .....	1 (4%)
	Yes .....	12 (43%)
	No .....	10 (36%)
	Don't know .....	5 (18%)

<b>Q3</b>	<b>Do the different levels of the rewards and sanctions scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?</b>	
	<i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i> .....	1 (4%)
	Yes .....	12 (43%)
	No .....	10 (36%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	5 (18%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Have you had a 'nicking' (adjudication) since you have been in this establishment?</b>	
	Yes .....	9 (32%)
	No .....	18 (64%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	1 (4%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>If you have had a 'nicking' (adjudication), was the process explained clearly to you?</b>	
	<i>I have not had an adjudication</i> .....	18 (67%)
	Yes .....	6 (22%)
	No .....	3 (11%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>If you have been physically restrained (C and R), how many times has this happened since you have been in this establishment?</b>	
	<i>I have not been restrained</i> .....	21 (78%)
	Once .....	4 (15%)
	Twice .....	2 (7%)
	Three times .....	0 (0%)
	More than three times .....	0 (0%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>If you have spent a night in the care and separation unit (CSU), how were you treated by staff?</b>	
	<i>I have not been to the care and separation unit</i> .....	25 (93%)
	Very well .....	1 (4%)
	Well .....	0 (0%)
	Neither .....	1 (4%)
	Badly .....	0 (0%)
	Very badly .....	0 (0%)

## SECTION 9: SAFETY

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Have you ever felt unsafe in this establishment?</b>	
	Yes .....	6 (21%)
	No .....	22 (79%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>If you have ever felt unsafe, in which areas of this establishment do you/have you ever felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<b>Never felt unsafe</b> .....	22 (81%)
	<i>Everywhere</i> .....	1 (4%)
	<i>Care and separation unit</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Association areas</i> .....	1 (4%)
	<i>Reception area</i> .....	1 (4%)
	<i>At the gym</i> .....	1 (4%)
	<i>At mealtimes</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>At health care</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Visits area</i> .....	1 (4%)
	<i>In wing showers</i> .....	1 (4%)
	<i>In gym showers</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>In corridors/stairwells</i> .....	0 (0%)



<i>In an exercise yard</i> .....	1 (4%)	<i>On your landing/wing</i> .....	1 (4%)
<i>At work</i> .....	0 (0%)	<i>In your cell</i> .....	0 (0%)
<i>At education</i> .....	2 (7%)		

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

Yes ..... 3 (12%)  
 No ..... 23 (88%)

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

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

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

Yes ..... 5 (19%)  
 No ..... 21 (81%)

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

<i>Insulting remarks (about you, your family or friends)</i> .....	4 (15%)	<i>Because of drugs</i> .....	0 (0%)
<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i> .....	1 (4%)	<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i> .....	1 (4%)
<i>Sexual abuse</i> .....	0 (0%)	<i>Because you were new here</i> .....	1 (4%)
<i>Because of your race or ethnic origin</i> .....	1 (4%)	<i>Because you are from a different part of the country</i> .....	0 (0%)
<i>Because of your religious beliefs</i> .....	0 (0%)	<i>Because of gang related issues</i> .....	1 (4%)
<i>Because you have a disability</i> ..	0 (0%)	<i>Because of my offence/crime</i> ....	2 (8%)

**Q9 If you were being victimised who would you tell?**

<i>No one</i> .....	14 (56%)	<i>Teacher/education staff</i> .....	2 (8%)
<i>Personal officer</i> .....	10 (40%)	<i>Gym staff</i> .....	2 (8%)
<i>Wing officer</i> .....	4 (16%)	<i>Listener/Samaritan/Buddy</i> .....	3 (12%)
<i>Chaplain</i> .....	1 (4%)	<i>Another young person here</i> ....	5 (20%)
<i>Health care staff</i> .....	3 (12%)	<i>Family/friends</i> .....	8 (32%)

**Q10 Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?**

Yes ..... 13 (46%)

No ..... 9 (32%)  
 Don't know ..... 6 (21%)

**Q11 Is shouting through the windows a problem here?**

Yes ..... 8 (29%)  
 No ..... 17 (61%)  
 Don't know ..... 3 (11%)

**Q12 Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?**

Yes ..... 8 (30%)  
 No ..... 19 (70%)

**SECTION 10: ACTIVITIES**

**Q1 How old were you when you were last at school?**

14 or under ..... 5 (19%)  
 15 or over ..... 22 (81%)

**Q2 Please answer the following questions about school:**

	Yes	No	Not applicable
Have you ever been excluded from school?	25 (89%)	3 (11%)	0 (0%)
Did you used to truant from school?	18 (67%)	8 (30%)	1 (4%)

**Q3 Do you CURRENTLY take part in any of the following activities? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**

Education ..... 23 (82%)  
 A job in this establishment ..... 9 (32%)  
 Vocational or skills training ..... 4 (14%)  
 Offending behaviour programmes ..... 5 (18%)  
 I am not currently involved in any of these ..... 0 (0%)

**Q4 If you have been involved in any of the following activities, in this establishment, do you think they will help you when you leave prison?**

	Not been involved	Yes	No	Don't know
Education	0 (0%)	14 (56%)	11 (44%)	0 (0%)
A job in this establishment	5 (22%)	9 (39%)	7 (30%)	2 (9%)
Vocational or skills training	5 (25%)	9 (45%)	4 (20%)	2 (10%)
Offending behaviour programmes	4 (19%)	8 (38%)	8 (38%)	1 (5%)

**Q5 Do you usually have association every day?**

Yes ..... 26 (93%)  
 No ..... 2 (7%)  
 Don't know ..... 0 (0%)

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

Don't want to go ..... 2 (7%)  
 None ..... 0 (0%)

<i>One to two times</i> .....	11 (39%)
<i>Three to five times</i> .....	11 (39%)
<i>More than five times</i> .....	2 (7%)
<i>Don't know</i> .....	2 (7%)

<b>Q7</b>	<b>Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?</b>	
	<i>Don't want to go</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	13 (46%)
	<i>No</i> .....	14 (50%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	1 (4%)

## SECTION 11: FAMILY AND FRIENDS

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Are you able to use the telephone every day if you want to?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	26 (93%)
	<i>No</i> .....	2 (7%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	0 (0%)

<b>Q2</b>	<b>Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	14 (50%)
	<i>No</i> .....	12 (43%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	2 (7%)

<b>Q3</b>	<b>How easy is it for your family and friends to visit you here?</b>	
	<i>Very easy</i> .....	1 (4%)
	<i>Easy</i> .....	10 (37%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....	5 (19%)
	<i>Difficult</i> .....	7 (26%)
	<i>Very difficult</i> .....	3 (11%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	1 (4%)

<b>Q4</b>	<b>How many visits do you usually have each week, from family or friends?</b>	
	<i>Not been here a week yet</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>I don't get visits</i> .....	5 (19%)
	<i>Less than one a week</i> .....	11 (41%)
	<i>About one a week</i> .....	9 (33%)
	<i>More than one a week</i> .....	1 (4%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	1 (4%)

<b>Q5</b>	<b>Do your visits usually start on time?</b>	
	<i>I don't get visits</i> .....	5 (19%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	10 (37%)
	<i>No</i> .....	10 (37%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	2 (7%)

<b>Q6</b>	<b>How are you and your family/friends usually treated by visits staff?</b>	
	<i>I don't get visits</i> .....	5 (19%)
	<i>Very well</i> .....	2 (7%)
	<i>Well</i> .....	10 (37%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....	9 (33%)

<i>Badly</i> .....	0 (0%)
<i>Very badly</i> .....	0 (0%)
<i>Don't know</i> .....	1 (4%)

## SECTION 12: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE

<b>Q1</b>	<b>When did you first meet your personal officer?</b>				
	<i>I still have not met him/her</i> .....				1 (4%)
	<i>In your first week</i> .....				19 (68%)
	<i>After your first week</i> .....				5 (18%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....				3 (11%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>How often do you see your personal officer?</b>				
	<i>I still have not met him/her</i> .....				1 (4%)
	<i>At least once a week</i> .....				19 (68%)
	<i>Less than once a week</i> .....				8 (29%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>Do you feel your personal officer has helped you?</b>				
	<i>I still have not met him/her</i> .....				1 (4%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....				16 (57%)
	<i>No</i> .....				11 (39%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?</b>				
	<i>Yes</i> .....				16 (57%)
	<i>No</i> .....				8 (29%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....				4 (14%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions about training plans, sentence plans or remand plans:</b>				
		<b><i>I don't have one</i></b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b><i>Don't know</i></b>
	Were you involved in the development of your plan?	8 (29%)	11 (39%)	0 (0%)	9 (32%)
	Do you understand the targets that have been set in your plan?	8 (29%)	13 (46%)	0 (0%)	7 (25%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>Has your YOT worker been in touch since you arrived at this establishment?</b>				
	<i>Yes</i> .....				27 (96%)
	<i>No</i> .....				1 (4%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>Do you know how to get in touch with your YOT worker?</b>				
	<i>Yes</i> .....				12 (44%)
	<i>No</i> .....				15 (56%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions about your release:</b>				
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b><i>Don't know</i></b>	
	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	15 (58%)	7 (27%)	4 (15%)	
	Are you planning on going to school or college after release?	20 (74%)	6 (22%)	1 (4%)	

Do you have a job to go to on release? 4 (15%) 21 (81%) 1 (4%)

**Q9 Do you know who to contact for help with any of the following problems, before your release? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**

<i>Finding accommodation</i> .....	14 (56%)
<i>Getting into school or college</i> .....	15 (60%)
<i>Getting a job</i> .....	13 (52%)
<i>Help with money/finances</i> .....	10 (40%)
<i>Help with claiming benefits</i> .....	9 (36%)
<i>Continuing health services</i> .....	4 (16%)
<i>Opening a bank account</i> .....	7 (28%)
<i>Avoiding bad relationships</i> .....	5 (20%)
<b><i>I don't know who to contact</i></b> .....	8 (32%)

**Q10 Do you think you will have a problem with any of the following things, when you are released? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**

<i>Finding accommodation</i> .....	5 (19%)
<i>Getting into school or college</i> .....	6 (22%)
<i>Getting a job</i> .....	13 (48%)
<i>Money/finances</i> .....	11 (41%)
<i>Claiming benefits</i> .....	10 (37%)
<i>Continuing health services</i> .....	0 (0%)
<i>Opening a bank account</i> .....	5 (19%)
<i>Avoiding bad relationships</i> .....	4 (15%)
<b><i>I won't have any problems</i></b> .....	6 (22%)

**Q11 What is most likely to stop you offending in the future? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**

<b><i>Not sentenced</i></b> .....	0 (0%)	<i>Having a mentor (someone you can ask for advice)</i> .....	4 (14%)
<i>Nothing, it is up to me</i> .....	11 (39%)	<i>Having a YOT worker or social worker that I get on with</i> .....	4 (14%)
<i>Making new friends outside</i> ....	2 (7%)	<i>Having children</i> .....	4 (14%)
<i>Going back to live with my family</i> .....	4 (14%)	<i>Having something to do that isn't crime</i> .....	11 (39%)
<i>Getting a place of my own</i> .....	7 (25%)	<i>This sentence</i> .....	5 (18%)
<i>Getting a job</i> .....	15 (54%)	<i>Getting into school/college</i> .....	11 (39%)
<i>Having a partner (girlfriend or boyfriend)</i> .....	5 (18%)	<i>Talking about my offending behaviour with staff</i> .....	0 (0%)
<i>Staying off alcohol/drugs</i> .....	6 (21%)	<i>Anything else</i> .....	2 (7%)

**Q12 Do you want to stop offending?**

<b><i>Not sentenced</i></b> .....	0 (0%)
<i>Yes</i> .....	25 (89%)
<i>No</i> .....	1 (4%)
<i>Don't know</i> .....	2 (7%)

**Q13**

**Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you in this establishment, that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?**

<i>Not sentenced</i> .....	0 (0%)
Yes .....	11 (42%)
No .....	15 (58%)

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



### Survey responses from children and young people: HMYOI Feltham 2011

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

#### Key to tables

		HMYOI Feltham 2011	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Feltham 2011	HMYOI Feltham 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		110	785	110	118
<b>SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU</b>					
1.1	Are you 18 years of age?	5%	17%	5%	7%
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	7%	5%	7%	8%
1.3	Is English your first language?	75%	93%	75%	80%
1.4	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other category)?	83%	30%	83%	82%
1.5	Are you Muslim?	39%	12%	39%	36%
1.6	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	3%	6%	3%	3%
1.7	Do you have any children?	12%	13%	12%	6%
1.8	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	10%	10%	10%	8%
1.9	Have you ever been in local authority care?	17%	28%	17%	21%
<b>SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE</b>					
2.1	Are you sentenced?	35%	78%	35%	42%
2.2	Is your sentence 12 months or less?	17%	34%	17%	23%
2.3	Have you been in this establishment for one month or less?	18%	19%	18%	21%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	61%	52%	61%	62%
<b>SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS</b>					
For your most recent journey, either to or from court or between prisons, we want to know:					
3.1	Was the van clean?	42%	43%	42%	40%
3.2	Did you feel safe?	77%	84%	77%	70%
3.3	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or anyone of a different gender?	26%	27%	26%	23%
3.4	Did you spend more than four hours in the van?	0%	6%	0%	4%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:					
3.5	Were you offered a toilet break if you needed it?	14%	14%	14%	3%
3.6	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	17%	35%	17%	25%
3.7	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	49%	53%	49%	55%
3.8	Before you arrived here (either from court or another establishment), were you told that you would be coming to this establishment?	80%	78%	80%	81%
3.9	Before you arrived here (either from court or another establishment), were you given written information about coming to this establishment?	7%	4%	7%	1%

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

### Key to tables

		HMYOI Feltham 2011	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Feltham 2011	HMYOI Feltham 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		110	785	110	118
<b>SECTION 4: YOUR FIRST FEW DAYS HERE</b>					
4.1	Were you in reception for less than two hours?	85%	79%	85%	86%
4.2	When you were searched was this carried out in an understanding way?	74%	79%	74%	75%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	58%	70%	58%	59%
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?	45%	56%	45%	39%
4.4b	Loss of property?	15%	21%	15%	16%
4.4c	Housing problems?	12%	20%	12%	15%
4.4d	Needing protection from other young people?	36%	24%	36%	26%
4.4e	Letting family know where you are?	59%	63%	59%	46%
4.4f	Money worries?	11%	19%	11%	13%
4.4g	Feeling low/upset/needing someone to talk to?	27%	42%	27%	24%
4.4h	Health problems?	50%	60%	50%	48%
4.4i	Getting phone numbers?	31%	45%	31%	32%
4.5	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	79%	76%	79%	76%
When you first arrived, did you have problems with any of the following:					
4.5a	Not being able to smoke?	45%	51%	45%	41%
4.5b	Loss of property?	18%	17%	18%	16%
4.5c	Housing problems?	19%	14%	19%	11%
4.5d	Needing protection from other young people?	18%	7%	18%	13%
4.5e	Letting family know where you are?	18%	23%	18%	17%
4.5f	Money worries?	28%	16%	28%	27%
4.5g	Feeling low/upset/needing someone to talk to?	14%	18%	14%	20%
4.5h	Health problems?	9%	12%	9%	11%
4.5i	Getting phone numbers?	42%	30%	42%	37%
When you first arrived, were you given any of the following:					
4.6a	A reception pack?	54%	75%	54%	62%
4.6b	The opportunity to have a shower?	11%	40%	11%	13%
4.6c	Something to eat?	83%	80%	83%	82%
4.6d	A free phone call to friends/family?	73%	76%	73%	74%
4.6e	Information about the PIN telephone system?	56%	60%	56%	51%
4.6f	Information about feeling low/upset?	20%	32%	20%	14%
Within your first 24 hours, did you have access to the following people or services:					
4.7a	The chaplain or religious leader?	37%	46%	37%	47%
4.7b	A peer mentor, Listener or the Samaritans?	16%	24%	16%	17%
4.7c	Did you have access to the prison shop/canteen?	16%	16%	16%	14%



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

### Key to tables

		HMYOI Feltham 2011	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Feltham 2011	HMYOI Feltham 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		110	785	110	118
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a member of health care staff?	51%	73%	51%	55%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	59%	81%	59%	64%
4.10	For those who have been on an induction course: did it cover everything you needed to know about the establishment	45%	68%	45%	53%
<b>SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT</b>					
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	82%	68%	82%	75%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	46%	33%	46%	46%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	15%	20%	15%	13%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	32%	47%	32%	28%
5.5	Is it easy/very easy for you to attend religious services?	58%	58%	58%	58%
5.6a	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	72%	54%	72%	65%
5.6b	Can you speak to a religious leader in private if you want to?	75%	65%	75%	68%
5.7	Is there a member of staff you can turn to with a problem?	71%	65%	71%	52%
5.8	Do you feel that most of the staff here treat you with respect?	71%	62%	71%	60%
<b>SECTION 6: HEALTH SERVICES</b>					
6.1	Did you have a full health assessment the day after your arrival?	49%	63%	49%	51%
6.2	For those who have been to health care: do you think the overall quality is good/very good?	37%	67%	37%	34%
6.3a	Is it easy for you to see the doctor?	29%	58%	29%	32%
6.3b	Is it easy for you to see the nurse?	65%	75%	65%	65%
6.3c	Is it easy for you to see the dentist?	13%	38%	13%	13%
6.3d	Is it easy for you to see the optician?	5%	29%	5%	11%
6.3e	Is it easy for you to see the pharmacist?	6%	31%	6%	12%
6.4	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep it in your cell?	26%	34%	26%	25%
6.5a	Did you have any problems with alcohol when you first arrived?	7%	15%	7%	10%
6.5b	Have you received any help with any alcohol problems here?	0%	10%	0%	4%
6.6a	Did you have any problems with drugs when you first arrived?	18%	38%	18%	14%
6.6b	Do you have any problems with drugs now?	6%	9%	6%	7%
6.6c	Have you received any help with any drug problems here?	6%	25%	6%	8%
6.7	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs here?	12%	21%	12%	8%
6.8	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	23%	22%	23%	17%
6.9	If you feel you have emotional or mental health problems, are you being helped by anyone here?	36%	53%	36%	36%

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

### Key to tables

		HMYOI Feltham 2011	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Feltham 2011	HMYOI Feltham 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>110</b>	<b>785</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>118</b>
<b>SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS</b>					
<b>7.1</b>	Do you know how to make an application?	69%	91%	69%	67%
<b>7.2</b>	Is it easy to make an application?	55%	81%	55%	50%
For those who have made an application:					
<b>7.3a</b>	Do you feel applications are sorted out fairly?	55%	71%	55%	45%
<b>7.3b</b>	Do you feel applications are sorted out promptly (within seven days)?	31%	68%	31%	32%
<b>7.4</b>	Do you know how to make a complaint?	77%	87%	77%	77%
<b>7.5</b>	Is it easy to make a complaint?	53%	67%	53%	59%
For those who have made a complaint:					
<b>7.6a</b>	Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	30%	36%	30%	24%
<b>7.6b</b>	Do you feel complaints are sorted out promptly (within seven days)?	33%	41%	33%	21%
<b>7.7</b>	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	13%	19%	13%	18%
Can you speak to the following people when you need to:					
<b>7.8a</b>	A peer mentor or Listener?	21%	36%	21%	20%
<b>7.8b</b>	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)	18%	32%	18%	20%
<b>7.8c</b>	An advocate (an outside person to help you)	15%	41%	15%	23%
<b>SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE</b>					
<b>8.1</b>	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	17%	30%	17%	23%
<b>8.2</b>	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	46%	50%	46%	35%
<b>8.3</b>	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	45%	56%	45%	37%
<b>8.4</b>	Have you had a 'nicking' (adjudication) since you have been here?	65%	55%	65%	51%
<b>8.5</b>	Was the 'nicking' (adjudication) process explained clearly to you?	91%	82%	91%	74%
<b>8.6</b>	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	43%	36%	43%	33%
<b>8.7</b>	For those who had spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit: did the staff treat you well/very well?	19%	58%	19%	33%

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

### Key to tables

		HMYOI Feltham 2011	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Feltham 2011	HMYOI Feltham 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		110	785	110	118
<b>SECTION 9: SAFETY</b>					
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	46%	25%	46%	30%
9.3	Has another young person or group of young people victimised (insulted or assaulted) you here?	22%	24%	22%	20%
If you have felt victimised by another young person/group of young people, did the incident involve:					
9.4a	Insulting remarks?	14%	15%	14%	12%
9.4b	Physical abuse?	8%	11%	8%	10%
9.4c	Sexual abuse?	0%	2%	0%	0%
9.4d	Racial or ethnic abuse?	5%	3%	5%	3%
9.4e	Your religious beliefs?	4%	2%	4%	3%
9.4f	Your disability?	1%	2%	1%	0%
9.4g	Drugs?	1%	3%	1%	1%
9.4h	Having your canteen/property taken?	8%	6%	8%	2%
9.4i	Because you were new here?	6%	8%	6%	6%
9.4j	Being from a different part of the country than others?	3%	6%	3%	3%
9.4k	Gang related issues?	11%	6%	11%	6%
9.4l	Your offence/crime?	2%	4%	2%	2%
9.6	Has a member of staff or group of staff victimised (insulted or assaulted) you here?	17%	26%	17%	27%
If you have felt victimised by a member of staff/group of staff members, did the incident involve:					
9.7a	Insulting remarks?	11%	16%	11%	13%
9.7b	Physical abuse?	2%	6%	2%	3%
9.7c	Sexual abuse?	0%	2%	0%	0%
9.7d	Racial or ethnic abuse?	6%	4%	6%	5%
9.7e	Your religious beliefs?	2%	2%	2%	2%
9.7f	Your disability?	2%	1%	2%	0%
9.7g	Drugs?	2%	3%	2%	0%
9.7h	Having your canteen/property taken?	1%	3%	1%	1%
9.7i	Because you were new here?	5%	4%	5%	8%
9.7j	Being from a different part of the country than others?	2%	4%	2%	0%
9.7k	Gang related issues?	0%	2%	0%	1%
9.7l	Your offence/crime?	1%	3%	1%	3%
9.9	If you were being victimised by another young person or a member of staff would you be able to tell anyone about it	52%	57%	52%	49%
9.10	If you did tell a member of staff that you were being victimised do you think it would be taken seriously?	21%	33%	21%	22%
9.11	Is shouting through the windows a problem here?	34%	42%	34%	30%
9.12	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	25%	39%	25%	26%

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

### Key to tables

		HMYOI Feltham 2011	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Feltham 2011	HMYOI Feltham 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		110	785	110	118
<b>SECTION 10: ACTIVITIES</b>					
<b>10.1</b>	Were you 14 or younger when you were last at school?	24%	44%	24%	19%
<b>10.2a</b>	Have you ever been excluded from school?	86%	88%	86%	79%
<b>10.2b</b>	Have you ever truanted from school?	60%	72%	60%	53%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:					
<b>10.3a</b>	Education?	65%	76%	65%	75%
<b>10.3b</b>	A job in this establishment?	24%	36%	24%	22%
<b>10.3c</b>	Vocational or skills training?	12%	21%	12%	7%
<b>10.3d</b>	Offending behaviour programmes?	16%	25%	16%	15%
For those who have taken part in the following activities while in this prison: do you think that they will help you when you leave prison?					
<b>10.4a</b>	Education?	44%	70%	44%	43%
<b>10.4b</b>	A job in this establishment?	46%	62%	46%	42%
<b>10.4c</b>	Vocational or skills training?	42%	59%	42%	41%
<b>10.4d</b>	Offending behaviour programmes?	32%	56%	32%	33%
<b>10.5</b>	Do you usually have association every day?	85%	65%	85%	91%
<b>10.6</b>	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	3%	14%	3%	2%
<b>10.7</b>	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	49%	42%	49%	53%
<b>SECTION 11: KEEPING IN TOUCH WITH FAMILY AND FRIENDS</b>					
<b>11.1</b>	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	73%	63%	73%	68%
<b>11.2</b>	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	42%	37%	42%	47%
<b>11.3</b>	Is it easy/very easy for your family and friends to visit you here?	45%	47%	45%	37%
<b>11.4</b>	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	42%	39%	42%	40%
<b>11.5</b>	Do your visits start on time?	29%	48%	29%	23%
<b>11.6</b>	Are you and your visitors treated well/very well by visits staff?	39%	48%	39%	34%
<b>SECTION 12: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE</b>					
For those who have met their personal officer:					
<b>12.1</b>	Did you meet your personal officer within the first week?	48%	50%	48%	55%
<b>12.2</b>	Do you see your personal officer at least once a week?	55%	62%	55%	65%
<b>12.3</b>	Do you feel your personal officer has helped you?	51%	55%	51%	55%
<b>12.4</b>	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	26%	52%	26%	21%
For those with a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan:					
<b>12.5a</b>	Were you involved in the development of your plan?	53%	55%	53%	60%
<b>12.5b</b>	Do you understand the targets set in your plan?	62%	70%	62%	73%
<b>12.6</b>	Has your YOT worker been in touch with you since your arrival here?	84%	85%	84%	80%
<b>12.7</b>	Do you know how to get in touch with your YOT worker?	37%	63%	37%	34%

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

### Key to tables

		HMYOI Feltham 2011	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Feltham 2011	HMYOI Feltham 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>110</b>	<b>785</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>118</b>
Please answer the following about your preparation for release:					
<b>12.8</b>	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	21%	47%	21%	22%
<b>12.8</b>	Are you going to school or college on release?	69%	60%	69%	71%
<b>12.8</b>	Do you have a job to go to on release?	23%	21%	23%	19%
Do you know who to contact for help with the following in preparation for your release:					
<b>12.9</b>	Finding accommodation	34%	38%	34%	24%
<b>12.9</b>	Getting into school or college	43%	48%	43%	38%
<b>12.9</b>	Getting a job	34%	47%	34%	28%
<b>12.9</b>	Help with money/finances	32%	37%	32%	16%
<b>12.9</b>	Help with claiming benefits	21%	30%	21%	13%
<b>12.9</b>	Continuing health services	16%	25%	16%	12%
<b>12.9</b>	Opening a bank account	21%	34%	21%	17%
<b>12.9</b>	Avoiding bad relationships	13%	28%	13%	9%
Do you think you will have a problem with the following, when you are released:					
<b>12.10</b>	Finding accommodation?	38%	25%	38%	37%
<b>12.10</b>	Getting into school or college?	43%	23%	43%	36%
<b>12.10</b>	Getting a job?	53%	47%	53%	53%
<b>12.10</b>	Help with money/finances?	39%	39%	39%	37%
<b>12.10</b>	Help with claiming benefits?	30%	26%	30%	22%
<b>12.10</b>	Continuing health services?	12%	14%	12%	13%
<b>12.10</b>	Opening a bank account?	18%	16%	18%	16%
<b>12.10</b>	Avoiding bad relationships?	20%	20%	20%	18%
For those who were sentenced:					
<b>12.12</b>	Do you want to stop offending?	74%	93%	74%	91%
<b>12.13</b>	Have you done anything or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future	20%	49%	20%	41%

## Children and Young People: Diversity Analysis



### Diversity comparator (ethnicity and religion) HMYOI Feltham + Heron Unit 2011

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

#### Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic young people	White young people	Muslim young people	Non-Muslim young people
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>108</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>82</b>
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	12%	2%	13%	4%
1.3	Is English your first language?	79%	97%	71%	81%
1.4	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?			96%	72%
1.5	Are you Muslim?	40%	2%		
1.6	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	2%	8%	0%	4%
1.9	Have you ever been in local authority care?	20%	30%	22%	13%
2.1	Are you sentenced?	63%	78%	45%	44%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	58%	50%	51%	64%
3.3	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or anyone of a different gender?	29%	25%	15%	32%
3.7	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	52%	52%	41%	54%
3.8	Before you arrived here, were you told that you would be coming to this establishment?	74%	81%	71%	82%
4.2	When you were searched was this carried out in an understanding way?	76%	80%	74%	72%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	67%	69%	51%	60%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a member of health care staff?	68%	72%	46%	57%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	72%	83%	60%	65%
4.10	Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the establishment?	58%	69%	42%	49%
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	69%	70%	77%	87%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	36%	35%	35%	55%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	18%	20%	12%	17%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	35%	51%	17%	41%
5.6a	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	67%	50%	75%	71%
5.7	Is there a member of staff you can turn to with a problem?	64%	67%	66%	75%
5.8	Do you feel that most of the staff here treat you with respect?	61%	65%	71%	72%
6.3a	Is it easy for you to see the doctor?	46%	59%	26%	31%
6.3b	Is it easy for you to see the nurse?	72%	75%	63%	67%
6.7	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs here?	14%	23%	23%	8%
6.8	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	20%	23%	22%	22%
7.2	Is it easy to make an application?	69%	82%	53%	56%
7.5	Is it easy to make a complaint?	63%	66%	46%	59%

## Children and Young People: Diversity Analysis

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic young people	White young people	Muslim young people	Non-Muslim young people
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>108</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>82</b>
<b>8.1</b>	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	27%	29%	19%	25%
<b>8.2</b>	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	45%	52%	41%	48%
<b>8.3</b>	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	49%	58%	32%	53%
<b>8.4</b>	Have you had a 'nicking' (adjudication) since you have been here?	65%	51%	63%	58%
<b>8.6</b>	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	41%	34%	49%	36%
<b>9.1</b>	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	32%	25%	47%	40%
<b>9.3</b>	Has another young person or group of young people victimised (insulted or assaulted) you here?	19%	25%	18%	23%
If you have felt victimised by another young person/group of young people, did the incident involve:					
<b>9.4d</b>	Racial or ethnic abuse?	4%	3%	6%	3%
<b>9.4e</b>	Your religious beliefs?	3%	2%	3%	4%
<b>9.6</b>	Has a member of staff or group of staff victimised (insulted or assaulted) you here?	27%	22%	17%	18%
If you have felt victimised by a member of staff/group of staff, did the incident involve:					
<b>9.5d</b>	Racial or ethnic abuse?	10%	1%	8%	5%
<b>9.5e</b>	Your religious beliefs?	4%	1%	4%	0%
<b>9.9</b>	If you were being victimised by another young person or a member of staff would you be able to tell anyone about it?	52%	58%	43%	55%
<b>9.10</b>	If you did tell a member of staff that you were being victimised do you think it would be taken seriously?	26%	36%	19%	29%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:					
<b>10.3a</b>	Education?	74%	75%	55%	75%
<b>10.3b</b>	A job in this establishment?	29%	37%	22%	25%
<b>10.3c</b>	Vocational or skills training?	16%	22%	11%	14%
<b>10.3d</b>	Offending behaviour programmes?	21%	26%	18%	15%
<b>10.5</b>	Do you usually have association everyday?	70%	68%	82%	88%
<b>10.6</b>	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	11%	13%	3%	4%
<b>10.7</b>	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	46%	40%	35%	57%
<b>11.1</b>	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	66%	64%	61%	85%
<b>11.2</b>	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	42%	36%	48%	39%
<b>11.3</b>	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	34%	43%	36%	46%
<b>12.3</b>	Do you feel your personal officer has helped you?	51%	58%	52%	54%
<b>12.4</b>	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	42%	53%	36%	26%
<b>12.5b</b>	Do you understand the targets set in your plan?	70%	69%	64%	63%
<b>12.6a</b>	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	39%	46%	23%	28%
<b>12.6b</b>	Are you going to school or college on release?	71%	56%	71%	70%
<b>12.14</b>	Have you done anything or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?	47%	47%	33%	20%

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



### Survey responses from children and young people: Heron Unit 2011

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

#### Key to tables

		Heron Unit 2011	Feltham 2011	Heron Unit 2011	Heron Unit 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		28	110	28	27
<b>SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU</b>					
1.1	Are you 18 years of age?	0%	5%	0%	3%
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	7%	7%	7%	7%
1.3	Is English your first language?	93%	75%	93%	86%
1.4	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other category)?	67%	83%	67%	52%
1.5	Are you Muslim?	41%	39%	41%	26%
1.6	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	0%	3%	0%	8%
1.7	Do you have any children?	10%	12%	10%	23%
1.8	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	7%	10%	7%	7%
1.9	Have you ever been in local authority care?	14%	17%	14%	33%
<b>SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE</b>					
2.1	Are you sentenced?	100%	35%	100%	100%
2.2	Is your sentence 12 months or less?	76%	17%	76%	90%
2.3	Have you been in this establishment for one month or less?	10%	18%	10%	31%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	43%	61%	43%	41%
<b>SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS</b>					
For your most recent journey, either to or from court or between prisons, we want to know:					
3.1	Was the van clean?	33%	42%	33%	48%
3.2	Did you feel safe?	87%	77%	87%	79%
3.3	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or anyone of a different gender?	20%	26%	20%	38%
3.4	Did you spend more than four hours in the van?	0%	0%	0%	3%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:					
3.5	Were you offered a toilet break if you needed it?	0%	14%	0%	10%
3.6	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	33%	17%	33%	33%
3.7	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	47%	49%	47%	69%
3.8	Before you arrived here (either from court or another establishment), were you told that you would be coming to this establishment?	66%	80%	66%	75%
3.9	Before you arrived here (either from court or another establishment), were you given written information about coming to this establishment?	14%	7%	14%	0%



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

### Key to tables

		Heron Unit 2011	Feltham 2011	Heron Unit 2011	Heron Unit 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		28	110	28	27
<b>SECTION 4: YOUR FIRST FEW DAYS HERE</b>					
<b>4.1</b>	Were you in reception for less than two hours?	87%	85%	87%	79%
<b>4.2</b>	When you were searched was this carried out in an understanding way?	76%	74%	76%	86%
<b>4.3</b>	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	43%	58%	43%	69%
When you first arrived, did staff ask if you needed help or support with any of the following:					
<b>4.4a</b>	Not being able to smoke?	55%	45%	55%	56%
<b>4.4b</b>	Loss of property?	17%	15%	17%	15%
<b>4.4c</b>	Housing problems?	31%	12%	31%	37%
<b>4.4d</b>	Needing protection from other young people?	21%	36%	21%	37%
<b>4.4e</b>	Letting family know where you are?	48%	59%	48%	52%
<b>4.4f</b>	Money worries?	10%	11%	10%	7%
<b>4.4g</b>	Feeling low/upset/needing someone to talk to?	21%	27%	21%	33%
<b>4.4h</b>	Health problems?	48%	50%	48%	63%
<b>4.4i</b>	Getting phone numbers?	52%	31%	52%	48%
<b>4.5</b>	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	73%	79%	73%	78%
When you first arrived, did you have problems with any of the following:					
<b>4.5a</b>	Not being able to smoke?	48%	45%	48%	54%
<b>4.5b</b>	Loss of property?	4%	18%	4%	17%
<b>4.5c</b>	Housing problems?	19%	19%	19%	30%
<b>4.5d</b>	Needing protection from other young people?	7%	18%	7%	0%
<b>4.5e</b>	Letting family know where you are?	11%	18%	11%	9%
<b>4.5f</b>	Money worries?	15%	28%	15%	26%
<b>4.5g</b>	Feeling low/upset/needing someone to talk to?	4%	14%	4%	0%
<b>4.5h</b>	Health problems?	0%	9%	0%	9%
<b>4.5i</b>	Getting phone numbers?	33%	42%	33%	46%
When you first arrived, were you given any of the following:					
<b>4.6a</b>	A reception pack?	52%	54%	52%	69%
<b>4.6b</b>	The opportunity to have a shower?	17%	11%	17%	7%
<b>4.6c</b>	Something to eat?	79%	83%	79%	83%
<b>4.6d</b>	A free phone call to friends/family?	83%	73%	83%	75%
<b>4.6e</b>	Information about the PIN telephone system?	48%	56%	48%	62%
<b>4.6f</b>	Information about feeling low/upset?	21%	20%	21%	17%
Within your first 24 hours, did you have access to the following people or services:					
<b>4.7a</b>	The chaplain or religious leader?	48%	37%	48%	43%
<b>4.7b</b>	A peer mentor, Listener or the Samaritans?	11%	16%	11%	14%
<b>4.7c</b>	Did you have access to the prison shop/canteen?	7%	16%	7%	14%

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

### Key to tables

		Heron Unit 2011	Feltham 2011	Heron Unit 2011	Heron Unit 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		28	110	28	27
<b>4.8</b>	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a member of health care staff?	59%	51%	59%	57%
<b>4.9</b>	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	90%	59%	90%	82%
<b>4.10</b>	For those who have been on an induction course: did it cover everything you needed to know about the establishment	56%	45%	56%	58%
<b>SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT</b>					
<b>5.1</b>	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	93%	82%	93%	79%
<b>5.2</b>	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	60%	46%	60%	52%
<b>5.3</b>	Do you find the food here good/very good?	20%	15%	20%	7%
<b>5.4</b>	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	21%	32%	21%	41%
<b>5.5</b>	Is it easy/very easy for you to attend religious services?	63%	58%	63%	79%
<b>5.6a</b>	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	79%	72%	79%	74%
<b>5.6b</b>	Can you speak to a religious leader in private if you want to?	66%	75%	66%	78%
<b>5.7</b>	Is there a member of staff you can turn to with a problem?	74%	71%	74%	59%
<b>5.8</b>	Do you feel that most of the staff here treat you with respect?	63%	71%	63%	76%
<b>SECTION 6: HEALTH SERVICES</b>					
<b>6.1</b>	Did you have a full health assessment the day after your arrival?	53%	49%	53%	59%
<b>6.2</b>	For those who have been to health care: do you think the overall quality is good/very good?	46%	37%	46%	46%
<b>6.3a</b>	Is it easy for you to see the doctor?	35%	29%	35%	31%
<b>6.3b</b>	Is it easy for you to see the nurse?	66%	65%	66%	79%
<b>6.3c</b>	Is it easy for you to see the dentist?	14%	13%	14%	7%
<b>6.3d</b>	Is it easy for you to see the optician?	10%	5%	10%	4%
<b>6.3e</b>	Is it easy for you to see the pharmacist?	10%	6%	10%	7%
<b>6.4</b>	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep it in your cell?	8%	26%	8%	29%
<b>6.5a</b>	Did you have any problems with alcohol when you first arrived?	3%	7%	3%	0%
<b>6.5b</b>	Have you received any help with any alcohol problems here?	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>6.6a</b>	Did you have any problems with drugs when you first arrived?	0%	18%	0%	25%
<b>6.6b</b>	Do you have any problems with drugs now?	3%	6%	3%	7%
<b>6.6c</b>	Have you received any help with any drug problems here?	3%	6%	3%	21%
<b>6.7</b>	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs here?	25%	12%	25%	10%
<b>6.8</b>	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	17%	23%	17%	14%
<b>6.9</b>	If you feel you have emotional or mental health problems, are you being helped by anyone here?	60%	36%	60%	25%

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

### Key to tables

		Heron Unit 2011	Feltham 2011	Heron Unit 2011	Heron Unit 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		28	110	28	27
<b>SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS</b>					
7.1	Do you know how to make an application?	90%	69%	90%	45%
7.2	Is it easy to make an application?	60%	55%	60%	43%
For those who have made an application:					
7.3a	Do you feel applications are sorted out fairly?	76%	55%	76%	50%
7.3b	Do you feel applications are sorted out promptly (within seven days)?	33%	31%	33%	39%
7.4	Do you know how to make a complaint?	70%	77%	70%	89%
7.5	Is it easy to make a complaint?	55%	53%	55%	61%
For those who have made a complaint:					
7.6a	Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	44%	30%	44%	30%
7.6b	Do you feel complaints are sorted out promptly (within seven days)?	50%	33%	50%	18%
7.7	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	11%	13%	11%	7%
Can you speak to the following people when you need to:					
7.8a	A peer mentor or Listener?	24%	21%	24%	35%
7.8b	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)	17%	18%	17%	25%
7.8c	An advocate (an outside person to help you)	13%	15%	13%	25%
<b>SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE</b>					
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	47%	17%	47%	26%
8.2	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	43%	46%	43%	48%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	43%	45%	43%	52%
8.4	Have you had a 'nicking' (adjudication) since you have been here?	33%	65%	33%	45%
8.5	Was the 'nicking' (adjudication) process explained clearly to you?	67%	91%	67%	82%
8.6	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	21%	43%	22%	31%
8.7	For those who had spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit: did the staff treat you well/very well	50%	19%	50%	14%

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

### Key to tables

		Heron Unit 2011	Feltham 2011	Heron Unit 2011	Heron Unit 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		28	110	28	27
<b>SECTION 9: SAFETY</b>					
<b>9.1</b>	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	20%	46%	20%	31%
<b>9.3</b>	Has another young person or group of young people victimised (insulted or assaulted) you here?	11%	22%	11%	7%
If you have felt victimised by another young person/group of young people, did the incident involve:					
<b>9.4a</b>	Insulting remarks?	7%	14%	7%	7%
<b>9.4b</b>	Physical abuse?	7%	8%	7%	0%
<b>9.4c</b>	Sexual abuse?	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>9.4d</b>	Racial or ethnic abuse?	0%	5%	0%	0%
<b>9.4e</b>	Your religious beliefs?	0%	4%	0%	0%
<b>9.4f</b>	Your disability?	0%	1%	0%	0%
<b>9.4g</b>	Drugs?	0%	1%	0%	0%
<b>9.4h</b>	Having your canteen/property taken?	0%	8%	0%	3%
<b>9.4i</b>	Because you were new here?	7%	6%	7%	3%
<b>9.4j</b>	Being from a different part of the country than others?	4%	3%	4%	0%
<b>9.4k</b>	Gang related issues?	0%	11%	0%	3%
<b>9.4l</b>	Your offence/crime?	4%	2%	4%	0%
<b>9.6</b>	Has a member of staff or group of staff victimised (insulted or assaulted) you here?	19%	17%	19%	17%
If you have felt victimised by a member of staff/group of staff members, did the incident involve:					
<b>9.7a</b>	Insulting remarks?	14%	11%	14%	10%
<b>9.7b</b>	Physical abuse?	4%	2%	4%	0%
<b>9.7c</b>	Sexual abuse?	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>9.7d</b>	Racial or ethnic abuse?	4%	6%	4%	7%
<b>9.7e</b>	Your religious beliefs?	0%	2%	0%	3%
<b>9.7f</b>	Your disability?	0%	2%	0%	3%
<b>9.7g</b>	Drugs?	0%	2%	0%	0%
<b>9.7h</b>	Having your canteen/property taken?	4%	1%	4%	0%
<b>9.7i</b>	Because you were new here?	4%	5%	4%	3%
<b>9.7j</b>	Being from a different part of the country than others?	0%	2%	0%	0%
<b>9.7k</b>	Gang related issues?	4%	0%	4%	0%
<b>9.7l</b>	Your offence/crime?	7%	1%	7%	3%
<b>9.9</b>	If you were being victimised by another young person or a member of staff would you be able to tell anyone about it	44%	52%	44%	64%
<b>9.10</b>	If you did tell a member of staff that you were being victimised do you think it would be taken seriously?	47%	21%	47%	50%
<b>9.11</b>	Is shouting through the windows a problem here?	30%	34%	30%	33%
<b>9.12</b>	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	31%	25%	31%	36%

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

### Key to tables

		Heron Unit 2011	Feltham 2011	Heron Unit 2011	Heron Unit 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		28	110	28	27
<b>SECTION 10: ACTIVITIES</b>					
<b>10.1</b>	Were you 14 or younger when you were last at school?	17%	24%	17%	26%
<b>10.2a</b>	Have you ever been excluded from school?	90%	86%	90%	3%
<b>10.2b</b>	Have you ever truanted from school?	66%	60%	66%	59%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:					
<b>10.3a</b>	Education?	83%	65%	83%	64%
<b>10.3b</b>	A job in this establishment?	33%	24%	33%	26%
<b>10.3c</b>	Vocational or skills training?	13%	12%	13%	19%
<b>10.3d</b>	Offending behaviour programmes?	17%	16%	17%	19%
For those who have taken part in the following activities while in this prison: do you think that they will help you when you leave prison?					
<b>10.4a</b>	Education?	56%	44%	56%	48%
<b>10.4b</b>	A job in this establishment?	50%	46%	50%	65%
<b>10.4c</b>	Vocational or skills training?	63%	42%	63%	60%
<b>10.4d</b>	Offending behaviour programmes?	47%	32%	47%	36%
<b>10.5</b>	Do you usually have association every day?	93%	85%	93%	89%
<b>10.6</b>	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	7%	3%	7%	14%
<b>10.7</b>	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	47%	49%	47%	61%
<b>SECTION 11: KEEPING IN TOUCH WITH FAMILY AND FRIENDS</b>					
<b>11.1</b>	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	93%	73%	93%	78%
<b>11.2</b>	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	50%	42%	50%	43%
<b>11.3</b>	Is it easy/very easy for your family and friends to visit you here?	41%	45%	41%	50%
<b>11.4</b>	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	38%	42%	38%	14%
<b>11.5</b>	Do your visits start on time?	38%	29%	38%	43%
<b>11.6</b>	Are you and your visitors treated well/very well by visits staff?	45%	39%	45%	46%
<b>SECTION 12: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE</b>					
For those who have met their personal officer:					
<b>12.1</b>	Did you meet your personal officer within the first week?	69%	48%	69%	81%
<b>12.2</b>	Do you see your personal officer at least once a week?	69%	55%	69%	83%
<b>12.3</b>	Do you feel your personal officer has helped you?	59%	51%	59%	75%
<b>12.4</b>	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	57%	26%	57%	43%
For those with a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan:					
<b>12.5a</b>	Were you involved in the development of your plan?	55%	53%	55%	33%
<b>12.5b</b>	Do you understand the targets set in your plan?	67%	62%	67%	41%
<b>12.6</b>	Has your YOT worker been in touch with you since your arrival here?	97%	84%	97%	82%
<b>12.7</b>	Do you know how to get in touch with your YOT worker?	45%	37%	45%	41%

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

### Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		Heron Unit 2011	Feltham 2011	Heron Unit 2011	Heron Unit 2010
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse					
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details					
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference					
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		28	110	28	27
Please answer the following about your preparation for release:					
12.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	57%	21%	57%	39%
12.8	Are you going to school or college on release?	75%	69%	75%	78%
12.8	Do you have a job to go to on release?	14%	23%	14%	11%
Do you know who to contact for help with the following in preparation for your release:					
12.9	Finding accommodation	56%	34%	56%	50%
12.9	Getting into school or college	59%	43%	59%	46%
12.9	Getting a job	52%	34%	52%	54%
12.9	Help with money/finances	41%	32%	41%	22%
12.9	Help with claiming benefits	37%	21%	37%	13%
12.9	Continuing health services	15%	16%	15%	17%
12.9	Opening a bank account	27%	21%	27%	17%
12.9	Avoiding bad relationships	19%	13%	19%	13%
Do you think you will have a problem with the following, when you are released:					
12.10	Finding accommodation?	17%	38%	17%	28%
12.10	Getting into school or college?	21%	43%	21%	24%
12.10	Getting a job?	48%	53%	48%	58%
12.10	Help with money/finances?	41%	39%	41%	42%
12.10	Help with claiming benefits?	38%	30%	38%	16%
12.10	Continuing health services?	0%	12%	0%	8%
12.10	Opening a bank account?	17%	18%	17%	16%
12.10	Avoiding bad relationships?	14%	20%	14%	20%
For those who were sentenced:					
12.12	Do you want to stop offending?	90%	74%	90%	96%
12.13	Have you done anything or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future	43%	20%	43%	59%