

Report on an unannounced inspection of

# **HMYOI Wetherby**

## **Keppel Unit**

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

**12 – 23 August 2013**

## **Glossary of terms**

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

Crown copyright 2014

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

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

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

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

Printed and published by:  
Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons  
Victory House  
6th floor  
30-34 Kingsway  
London WC2B 6EX

# Contents

Introduction	5
Fact page	7
About this inspection and report	9
Summary	11
Section 1. Safety	17
Section 2. Respect	31
Section 3. Purposeful activity	41
Section 4. Resettlement	49
Section 5. Recommendations and housekeeping points	57
Section 6. Appendices	61
Appendix I: Inspection team	61
Appendix II: Establishment population profile	63
Appendix III: Summary of children and young people questionnaires and interviews	67



# Introduction

HMYOI Wetherby's Keppel unit, which opened in 2008, is designed to provide a safe and supportive environment for some of the most challenging and vulnerable young people in the country, whose needs cannot be met in the mainstream prison system. Initially it was intended that the unit would provide a regional service, to be replicated elsewhere when resources became available. As circumstances have changed, it now provides a nationwide remit and remains the only unit of its kind in the secure estate. This was our third inspection of the Keppel unit, and each time we have reported positively about the conditions and the way young people were being treated. On this occasion we found that the positive culture and work practices within the unit had developed to a higher level and it now provided a model of how a specialist unit should be run.

Boys arrived at the unit in an often fragile condition; some were emotionally damaged and all had complex histories. We were impressed by the high quality of care being delivered in an environment where boys had the chance to settle and the opportunity to thrive. All young people had an up-to-date care plan which ensured that their needs were under constant review. Levels of self-harm remained a concern but those who were at risk were well supported, family members were included and kept up to date and relevant information was effectively shared. Relationships between staff and young people were very good, and staff intervened quickly to prevent bullying and fights from escalating. The rewards and sanctions scheme provided incentives to improve behaviour but, of concern, removal from the unit was still used as a punishment, and routine strip-searching still took place with force sometimes used to gain compliance.

The unit was well designed with lots of natural light and plenty of space, which helped to create a calm atmosphere. Four separate living areas allowed the supervision of manageable numbers of young people. Strong and consistent leadership had fostered a multidisciplinary teamwork approach among staff. Young people ate their meals together, with staff, which encouraged good behaviour. Young people were complimentary about the pastoral and spiritual support available and those from minority groups benefitted from the inclusive atmosphere and good individual support from staff. The unit provided effective health care, including mental health provision.

Although the standard of teaching and learning was good, there was clear scope to broaden the range of subjects available and improve the curriculum for those staying on the unit for more than six months. The education department offered a supportive environment and poor behaviour was dealt with effectively. Lessons were well planned, with interesting and engaging activities, and most young people progressed well. Time out of cell was adequate and young people had regular time in the open air. Young people were also able to benefit from a range of therapeutic opportunities available within the unit grounds.

The main concerns we identified at our previous inspection related to strategic weaknesses and the relationship between the unit and external agencies. We were pleased to find that progress had been made in reaching a more coordinated approach towards resettlement and there was now greater involvement by external partners in the safeguarding and child protection arrangements. Release on temporary licence was being used well, and there was support and guidance available concerning most elements of the resettlement pathways. Many young people, however, struggled to maintain regular contact with their families – a key element of support working towards and on release – due to the distance they were held from home.

In the five years since its inception a positive ethos has been established and sustained within the Keppel unit and good work practices have become embedded. Despite their vulnerability, young people were provided with a high standard of care within a well run facility. Our findings reflect the positive reaction from most young people and overall, the outcomes available were having a constructive and positive influence on some otherwise difficult young people. The secure estate has much to learn from the positive way the Keppel unit has developed over recent years.

**Nick Hardwick**  
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

February 2014

# Fact page

**Task of the establishment**

To provide secure accommodation for young people 15-18 years of age who need additional care and support and who are unsuitable for placement on normal location for a variety of reasons

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

Public

**Region/Department**

Yorkshire and Humberside

**Number held**

43

**Certified normal accommodation**

48

**Operational capacity**

48

**Date of last full inspection**

May 2009

**Brief history**

Keppel unit was opened in October 2008. It is a national resource accommodating up to 48 young people.

**Short description of residential units**

Four spurs, each accommodating up to 12 young people, designated blue, red, green and yellow

**Name of governor**

Sara Snell

**Escort contractor**

GEOAmey

**Health service commissioner and providers**

Commissioner: NHS England

Provider: Leeds Community Health Trust

**Learning and skills providers**

Manchester College

**Independent Monitoring Board chair**

Michael Crosby



# About this inspection and report

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

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

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

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

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

- **outcomes for children and young people are good against this healthy prison test.**  
There is no evidence that outcomes for children and young people are being adversely affected in any significant areas.
- **outcomes for children and young people are reasonably good against this healthy prison test.**  
There is evidence of adverse outcomes for children and young people in only a small number of areas. For the majority, there are no significant concerns. Procedures to safeguard outcomes are in place.
- **outcomes for children and young people are not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.**  
There is evidence that outcomes for children and young people are being adversely affected in many areas or particularly in those areas of greatest importance to their well-being. Problems/concerns, if left unattended, are likely to become areas of serious concern.
- **outcomes for children and young people are poor against this healthy prison test.**  
There is evidence that the outcomes for children and young people are seriously affected by current practice. There is a failure to ensure even adequate treatment of and/or conditions for children and young people. Immediate remedial action is required.

Our assessments might result in one of the following:

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

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

Since April 2013, all of our inspections have been unannounced, other than in exceptional circumstances. This replaces the previous system of announced and unannounced full main inspections with full or short follow-ups to review progress. All of our inspections now follow up recommendations from the last full inspection, unless these have already been reviewed by a short follow-up inspection. This inspection follows a short follow-up inspection and does not report directly on progress made against the previous recommendations.

## This report

This explanation of our approach is followed by a summary of our inspection findings against the four healthy prison tests. There then follow four sections each containing a detailed account of our findings against our *Expectations. Criteria for assessing the treatment of children and young people and conditions in prisons*. Section 5 collates all recommendations, housekeeping points and examples of good practice arising from the inspection.

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

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

---

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

# Summary

## Safety

- S1 *Conditions in the SCU were poor. Apart from some routine strip-searching, young people were treated well on arrival. The first night and induction procedures were sound and the child protection and safeguarding arrangements had improved and were now good. Levels of self-harm were high, but this was managed effectively. Incidents involving violence were rare and discipline was generally well managed, with effective use of mediation. The rewards and sanctions scheme was motivational and inclusive. Despite their vulnerability, all the young people on the unit were well cared for. Support for young people with drug related problems was excellent. **Outcomes for children and young people were good against this healthy prison test.***
- S2 Most young people said that they felt safe on the journey to the unit. Some young people travelled in cars escorted by unit staff and they were particularly positive about their experience. The booking-in procedures on reception were prompt and efficient. Strip-searching of all young people arriving from court and non-Prison Service establishments was routine.
- S3 Initial risk assessments were comprehensive, but some of the action plans linked to them were limited in their scope.
- S4 Young people were given a full induction programme, and the majority said it covered everything they needed to know about the unit.
- S5 Links with the local authority in relation to child protection had improved significantly since the previous inspection. The local authority designated officer now attended the quarterly establishment safeguarding committee and was consulted and gave advice about all child protection referrals.
- S6 Internal procedures for child protection had also improved over the past year. All allegations were referred to the local authority and, in addition to independent scrutiny from the social workers based on site, each child protection referral was examined systematically every week by a small team, led by the governor.
- S7 The collection of data and monitoring in relation to safeguarding was effective. Seasonal peaks and troughs for incidents had been usefully identified, along with times of day when young people on the unit appeared to be most likely to harm themselves.
- S8 All young people on the unit had an up-to-date care plan. It was clear from the care planning meetings that we observed that the care plans provided an effective way of ensuring that young people's needs were constantly kept under review.
- S9 Bullying was mostly low level, and consisted of name calling and insults; staff were quick to challenge this to prevent it escalating. There were few fights and assaults between young people on the unit and when they did occur they were quickly broken up by staff; serious injuries were rare.
- S10 Levels of self-harm remained high. Most cases involved superficial injuries but there had been two near misses this year; both cases had been properly investigated and clear recommendations made.

- S11 Young people subject to assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management for prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm received good support from a multidisciplinary team and family members were kept up to date. Unit staff had detailed knowledge of the young people who were subject to ACCT procedures and this information was shared effectively.
- S12 Young people appreciated the benefits available to them on the gold level of the rewards and sanctions scheme. Young people were involved in making decisions within the scheme and the differentials were significant enough to encourage better behaviour.
- S13 The relationships between staff and young people were extremely good and this helped support good dynamic security. Staff reported intelligence quickly and acted on this information without delay, leading to a safer environment for young people.
- S14 Mediation was used constructively to help resolve conflict between young people. However, staff had not been trained in this approach and there was no managerial oversight or monitoring of its use.
- S15 Use of force involving full restraint had reduced significantly since our last inspection, although force was still sometimes used to gain compliance. Records of use of force varied in quality and some did not contain evidence of a debrief.
- S16 Conditions in the SCU were poor and the regime was limited. Removal from the unit was still used as a punishment for adjudications, which was unnecessary. However, few young people were separated or removed from the unit. The documentation associated with removal was not always fully completed and for some young people there was no record of a reintegration plan or weekly reviews. We found at least two instances of young people held on the unit under good order or discipline, with no appropriate governance in place. We also found evidence of some excellent support offered to young people removed from the unit who had been presenting very challenging behaviour.
- S17 The young people's substance misuse service delivered an effective, needs-led service with a comprehensive and up-to-date range of high quality interventions. Young people's needs were well met and the joint working arrangements were excellent.
- S18 Although mandatory drug testing rates had remained at zero for the previous six months, we still found a proactive and responsive drug-testing regime, conducted from a clean, tidy and well-equipped testing suite.

## Respect

S19 *The living conditions were of a high standard. Relationships between staff and young people remained excellent. Young people from minority groups were well supported. The consultation arrangements were good and young people were positive about the standard of the food. Young people were well supported by the chaplains. Health care provision was impressive, particularly in relation to mental health. **Outcomes for children and young people were good against this healthy prison test.***

- S20 The unit was well designed and comfortable. Cells were properly maintained and well equipped. The communal areas were clean and tidy.

- S21 The monthly consultation meetings run by the unit manager and the advocates provided an opportunity for young people to discuss their concerns openly. We saw evidence that matters raised here were followed up.
- S22 Relationships between staff and young people were extremely good, with a very high proportion of young people in our survey reporting that they were treated with respect. This was reinforced by the interactions we observed, where staff were friendly and tolerant but prepared to challenge inappropriate behaviour when necessary.
- S23 Staff mixed naturally with young people throughout the day. There was plenty of informal interaction, staff had a good understanding of the needs of the young people they were responsible for and seemed genuinely interested in them.
- S24 The diverse needs of all young people continued to be met through the well organised care planning process. Young people from minority groups responded well to the individual support provided by staff. Few formal complaints were made about discrimination and these were investigated properly with appropriate external scrutiny.
- S25 The chaplaincy visited the unit each day to provide pastoral and spiritual support. Faith provision was good and young people were complimentary about the help they received from chaplains. Mentoring for young people on release was overseen by the chaplaincy and this provided valuable long-term support.
- S26 Despite poor survey results, most young people told us that they understood how to make a complaint and forms were readily available on the unit for them to do this. Responses to complaints were mostly timely and clear, though some handwritten replies were difficult to read.
- S27 Young people had their sentences or remand status clearly explained to them by case workers and there was a good system in place to ensure that proper decisions were made regarding early or late release. The procedure for young people to obtain advice from their legal representatives was unclear.
- S28 Young people received effective health care treatment in the treatment room on the unit. They also had access to a wider range of services in the main health care centre, where they were seen separately from the main population at specialist clinics. The child and adolescent mental health team provided a comprehensive service. Young people received routine appointments very quickly for all clinics, but they attended in groups, which could lead to unnecessarily long waiting times.
- S29 Staffing levels in health care were very good and many staff were qualified in the specialist care of children.
- S30 Dental services were good and young people were seen for routine appointments within four weeks. The waiting list was short. The provision of pharmacy services was good.
- S31 All young people were screened initially by a mental health nurse. With the integration of primary and secondary services and the retention of a range of specialist staff, mental health provision had improved since our last inspection and young people received very good mental health care.
- S32 In our survey, over twice as many young people as at our last inspection said the food was good or very good and this was confirmed by young people we spoke to. Portion sizes and quality were adequate and young people were regularly consulted about the menu. Young

people ate their meals together, with members of staff, which helped to model positive behaviour.

- S33 The unit operated a standard canteen system. Young people who had difficulty managing their purchases were given help by staff. Some new arrivals had to wait too long to receive their first order.

## Purposeful activity

S34 *Young people received adequate time out of their cells and they could exercise in the open air regularly. The standard of teaching and learning was good, as was the management of behaviour. Punctuality and attendance were good. The curriculum provided variety and balance, but it did not meet the needs of those remaining on the unit for long stays. Young people had suitable access to the library. The PE facilities were good but retention rates on PE courses required improvement.*  
**Outcomes for children and young people were good against this healthy prison test.**

- S35 The amount of time young people had unlocked was slightly less than that reported at the last inspection and most young people now received between nine and 10 hours a day.
- S36 In our survey, almost all young people said they had association every day. The sessions we observed were relaxed and young people were offered a variety of activities to take part in. The new core day provided regular, scheduled time in the open air and the positive survey results reflected this improvement.
- S37 The management of education was good. Recent changes in the staffing structure and more focused staff training were helping to improve the quality of provision. Communication had improved and staff across the site now met together as curriculum teams to share knowledge, experience and best practice. Quality improvement processes were sound in education, but these checks and measures were not applied to assess the provision of prison-led activities.
- S38 The range of education provided was limited for those who stayed on the unit for more than six months. Few young people on the unit had access to the range of educational and vocational training on the main site, and for some this limited their opportunities.
- S39 The education department provided a welcoming and purposeful learning environment. Punctuality and attendance were good. The standard of teaching and learning was very good. Teachers made great efforts to provide interesting and effective learning activities and lessons were very well planned. Behaviour management was good and teachers dealt sensitively and effectively with poor behaviour.
- S40 Some of the officers present in classes were deployed very well to support young people and help them to complete their work.
- S41 Individual support was very good. Young people who were in receipt of an educational statement, about 50% of the population, received a high level of support to help them improve their skills. Most young people made at least satisfactory progress and many made good progress.
- S42 Too few teachers provided extension activities to meet the abilities of the more able young people, particularly when they had completed their work early. The quality of individual learning plans was weak.

- S43 The therapeutic value of the environmental programme was significant, but no learner had yet achieved a qualification as a result.
- S44 The library was well stocked and provided a welcoming environment. Young people had reasonable access to it and the resource was used well.
- S45 The range of PE facilities was good. Most young people who completed the programme in the PE academy achieved a qualification. Retention rates on the PE academy programme were low but no analysis or action had been undertaken to address this. All young people had access to recreational PE, but only young people who opted to participate in the PE academy had regular timetabled PE.

## Resettlement

S46 *An attempt was being made to achieve a more coordinated and strategic response to the complex resettlement needs of young people living on the unit. Day-to-day planning for young people was managed well by the case workers. Considerable effort was made to help prepare young people for their release and sufficient attention was paid to most of the pathway areas, although finance was a weakness. All young people had the opportunity to benefit from a wide range of useful interventions. **Outcomes for children and young people were good against this healthy prison test.***

- S47 The new reducing reoffending strategy and the analysis linked to it represented an important step forward in developing a strategic approach to the needs of a very complex population. More thought needed to be given to how the ambitious actions outlined in the strategy could be implemented and monitored. There was an excellent multidisciplinary approach to meeting the needs of young people, and this was coordinated effectively by the unit's dedicated case workers.
- S48 The increase in the use of release on temporary licence had been well planned and provided an important additional method of assisting young people to reintegrate into the community.
- S49 The care planning system provided young people with comprehensive sentence or remand plans, which were reviewed and updated regularly. Care planning and training planning documentation was comprehensive and reflected a high level of intervention from staff across the establishment.
- S50 The formal training planning reviews were timely, and well attended by youth offending teams, but they were often poorly attended by family members because of the long distance they lived from the unit. The care planning meetings that we attended demonstrated that staff knew the young people well and discussions covered the key areas, including resettlement planning.
- S51 There were effective systems in place to identify young people who had looked-after status. The seconded social workers worked hard to get local authorities to meet their obligations to looked-after young people. The frequency of looked-after children reviews had increased, but many young people still did not get the financial support they were entitled to.
- S52 Young people's accommodation needs were highlighted early in their sentence and significant efforts were made to ensure that external agencies provided suitable accommodation for young people who were not returning home. No young person had been released in the previous 12 months without an address, though, despite the unit's best efforts, some young people did not know their address until just before release.

- S53 Young people had good access to employment and training information and guidance, and some follow-up work was done to check on their progress after they were released. Discharge planning for health and substance misuse was well organised and in both these areas, good links were maintained with the local community. Advice on finance, benefit and debt was limited and some young people did not receive any.
- S54 The distance that some young people lived from the unit could be a significant factor in preventing regular family contact, with only 32% of young people saying that it was easy for their families to visit. Visits took place in a relaxed environment and young people said they felt comfortable and were able to have good conversations with their visitors. The monthly family days available to all young people were an important initiative to help improve the level of family contact.
- S55 The therapeutic work carried out by specialists with young people who had sexually abused others was reinforced by staff working on the unit.
- S56 There was a wide range of personal development programmes specifically designed to meet the needs of young people on the unit. In our survey, 76% of young people said that the offending behaviour programmes they attended would help them when they left the unit.

# Section 1. Safety

## Courts, escorts and transfers

### Expected outcomes:

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

- I.1** *Some young people arrived late after long journeys. Most young people felt safe and said that they were treated well by escort staff. Young people escorted by Keppel unit staff in a taxi were particularly positive about the experience.*
- I.2** Young people transferring from court were transported in cellular vehicles, usually in the company of adult prisoners. We were told by reception staff, and records confirmed, that many young people had experienced long journeys from court. Adult prisoners were given priority because of lock-out times and young people were often the last to be dropped off. The number of young people arriving late had increased since our previous inspections. During the six months before the inspection there had been 47 admissions, of which 21 young people had arrived after 7pm including seven after 8pm.
- I.3** Young people transferring from a secure establishment continued to travel in taxis escorted by unit staff. Young people preferred this form of transport, which could be timed to avoid late arrivals, and spoke very positively about the experience. However, young people travelling in a taxi continued to be handcuffed to their escorts. Risk assessments were completed by the sending establishments, but we were told that it was extremely rare for a young person to be assessed as not needing handcuffs. Young people travelling by taxi said they did not find the handcuffs uncomfortable.
- I.4** In our survey, 84% of young people said that they felt safe during their journey to the establishment and 71% said that they were treated well or very well by escort staff.
- I.5** There were no transfers out of the unit during the inspection, but the procedures described to us were thorough and reflected the individual needs of the young person.

## Early days in custody

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.6** *Young people were treated well on arrival, apart from some being routinely strip-searched. New arrivals were well prepared for and they were properly looked after when they arrived on the unit. Initial risk assessments were comprehensive, but complete risk management plans were not always in place for the first days in custody. The induction programme was comprehensive and gave young people the information they required.*
- 1.7** Young people continued to be admitted to the unit through the main reception area. Dedicated first days officers were assigned to greet young people who were usually fast tracked through reception and escorted to the unit, irrespective of the time they arrived on site. However, despite the best efforts of the escorts to avoid arriving during lunchtime lock down, we observed a young person waiting in a holding room in reception for approximately an hour during the lock down. Although he was under constant observation by unit staff, this was unacceptable.
- 1.8** In our survey, 79% of young people said that they were treated well or very well in reception.
- 1.9** Young people arriving from court or a non-Prison Service establishment continued to be routinely strip-searched on reception. In our previous inspection report we recommended that all young people should be risk assessed to identify vulnerabilities before a decision to strip-search was made. Young people's vulnerability was confirmed in our survey when 20% of young people said they were scared when they first arrived and 20% that they felt worried/upset/needed someone to talk to.
- 1.10** Young people were seen by a nurse on reception and we observed information from that interview being passed quickly to unit staff and the casework department, who were responsible for coordinating the care of young people.
- 1.11** The cells for newly admitted young people were clean and well prepared. Each had en suite facilities and young people arriving on the unit could take a shower whenever they wished. New arrivals were offered a free telephone call and food and drink and were provided with a pack containing toiletries, sweets and stationery. Five unit staff carried out first night duties. They had all received relevant training and were aware of their responsibilities. Those we spoke to were confident in their role. Young people we spoke to were positive about the way they were treated on arrival and most said they felt safe.
- 1.12** First night staff interviewed new arrivals in private to complete an initial risk assessment and cell-sharing risk assessments. Young people who arrived late were seen by a trained member of the first night team. Staff said that they always received complete background information on each young person. Risk assessments that we examined were comprehensive, although some action plans were incomplete and did not clarify how the young person would be kept safe over the first few days. All young people received hourly monitoring checks on their first night, which was proportionate, and young people considered to be a high risk to themselves were checked more frequently.

- I.13** Detailed information about all new young people was shared at the twice daily staff briefings.
- I.14** In our survey, 70% of young people said that the induction programme covered everything they needed to know about the unit. Young people we spoke to confirmed that they had been given a lot of information during their first few days on the unit.
- I.15** The induction programme started on the first working day after a young person's arrival and was delivered on a one-to-one basis, usually over three days, by an induction officer, with contributions from specialist departments. Each young person was issued with a book about all aspects of the unit. There was no delay in young people starting their education placement.

## Recommendation

- I.16** **Young people should only be strip-searched on the basis of intelligence or specific suspicion.**

## Housekeeping point

- I.17** All initial risk assessments should include a full action plan describing how a young person should be kept safe during his first days in custody.

## Care and protection of children and young people

### Safeguarding

#### Expected outcomes:

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

- I.18** *Links between the unit and the local authority had improved and were now good. Collection and use of safeguarding data were effective. The fortnightly care planning meetings and twice daily briefings were valuable elements which helped to keep young people safe.*

- I.19** Links with the local safeguarding children board (LSCB) had been strengthened since the previous inspection, aided by the appointment of social workers as part of the wider safeguarding team. Based on the main site, they met each new arrival to the unit and were appropriately involved in their care. A social work policy written by the establishment and Leeds City Council included the role and responsibilities of the social work team with regard to safeguarding on the unit. The safeguarding protocol was agreed with the LSCB following annual reviews. Staff on the unit had completed juvenile awareness staff programme training and were undertaking the new National Offender Management Service 'Working with young people' training.
- I.20** A number of coordinated safeguarding meetings took place in the establishment. A quarterly meeting chaired by the head of safeguarding had oversight of the strategic management of safeguarding. Discussion of unit data and analysis was a separate agenda item at this meeting. Generally there was appropriate attendance by staff from relevant functional areas and by a

representative of the local authority. The head of safeguarding also chaired a monthly safeguarding meeting with an operational focus and again unit data were separately discussed, including injuries and removal from the unit. Some useful trends had been identified, for example an increase in self-harm in February each year and a correlation between an increase in self-harm and reductions in fights and assaults. This information was fed back to staff and helped to raise their awareness about what to look for.

- I.21** Young people benefited from regular care planning meetings at which all aspects of their care were discussed with them. Meetings were chaired by a case worker and involved specialists working with the young person and a member of the residential team. At the meetings we attended, young people were at the centre of the discussion and were encouraged to raise concerns and reflect on their behaviour and progress. All young people had a care plan with specific targets which were reviewed at subsequent meetings.
- I.22** Twice daily unit briefings, attended by staff of all disciplines, provided an additional level of safeguarding. Relevant, up-to-date information about young people was shared so that tensions or concerns could be managed consistently and sympathetically before they became serious issues.

## Child protection

### Expected outcomes:

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

**I.23** *The child protection arrangements had improved and were now sound. There was greater external scrutiny and internal procedures now required all referrals to be examined appropriately.*

- I.24** Links between the prison and the local authority had improved significantly since the previous inspection and were described as constructive by both parties, including a senior local authority manager who visited during the inspection. The local authority designated officer (LADO) now attended the quarterly safeguarding committee consistently. The LADO played an active role in child protection work and was consulted about and gave advice on all child protection referrals. An average of two to four referrals were generated each month from the unit, about half of which concerned historical abuse and most of the remainder complaints from young people about the use of force. Strategy meetings convened since the beginning of the year had all related to cases on the main site.
- I.25** Internal child protection procedures had also improved since the previous inspection. A team of three prison-based social workers now covered the whole site and were well integrated in the unit. They attended the twice daily briefings and interviewed all newly admitted young people shortly after their arrival. Most of their work involved looked-after children, and they played a key role in child protection. The social workers and the safeguarding team examined all child protection referrals that were raised at a weekly meeting chaired by the governor. The level of scrutiny carried out at this meeting was impressive, staff were well briefed about each case, documentation was checked and, where available, CCTV footage was viewed. The governor did not sign off cases until she was satisfied that investigations had been completed properly, and additional information was frequently requested. These procedures ensured that child protection referrals were always dealt with in a systematic and methodical way.

## Good practice

- I.26** *The weekly meeting involving a small team of specialist staff chaired by the governor to examine child protection referrals was an effective and efficient way of ensuring that all referrals were dealt with properly.*

## Victims of bullying and intimidation

### Expected outcomes:

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

- I.27** *Most bullying took the form of name calling and insults which staff were quick to challenge before it escalated. Information sharing about victims of bullying was effective and staff monitoring was efficient.*

- I.28** Many of the security incident reports (SIRs) submitted for the unit related to low-level bullying. Staff were quick to challenge such behaviour and stopped play fighting promptly. We saw one member of staff check unobtrusively with a young person who declined spur association and exercise one evening to see if he had any problems. The observations book was used well to note bullying behaviour and it was clear that young people raised their concerns with a range of staff. Staff carefully monitored young people who had been bullied, and moves to different spurs were used to keep victims and perpetrators apart so that all young people could feel comfortable joining in activities. Regular care planning meetings provided a safe environment for young people to talk individually about bullying or concerns with other young people. Daily entries were made on each young person's electronic case notes and the monitoring and support of victims of bullying formed an integral part of the regime.

## Suicide and self-harm prevention

### Expected outcomes:

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

- I.29** *The incidence of self-harm was high and most incidents resulted in minor injuries. The quality of ACCT (assessment, care in custody and teamwork: case management for prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm) documents was mostly good and young people subject to these measures said they felt cared for.*

- I.30** In the first six months of 2013, there had been 165 acts of self-harm and 84 ACCT documents had been opened. A few young people self-harmed repeatedly. Scratching and cutting were the most common forms of self-harm. There had been two 'near misses' in February 2013, involving the same young person. These incidents had been properly

investigated by a member of the safeguarding team and recommendations made to keep the young person safe.

- I.31** Unit self-harm data were reviewed at the monthly safeguarding meeting and at the monthly unit managers meeting. The unit had identified that self-harm took place mostly on weekdays and between noon and 8pm. There was a continuing programme of ACCT refresher training, and all officers carried anti-ligature knives. Young people could have Samaritan telephones in their cells and staff said they had unlocked doors at night to give young people the phone. Samaritans visited the unit each week.
- I.32** The quality of ACCT documents was generally good. Initial assessments were conducted promptly, with good input recorded from the young person. There were 25 ACCT assessors from a range of disciplines across the site. Five unit staff were trained assessors and a further eight were on the waiting list for assessor training. The unit custodial managers chaired the reviews which helped to achieve consistency. Staff from specialist teams who were involved in the young person's care also participated. Care maps were updated after reviews with actions specific to the young person's needs. Families/carers were informed when a young person self-harmed, but they rarely participated in an ACCT review. Observations took place at the required frequency and staff made sure they got a response from the young person, unless he was asleep.
- I.33** If a young person was so vulnerable that they needed to be watched constantly, they would either be located in the health care centre or remain on the unit with their cell door open, supervised by two members of staff. The provision of extra staff to support young people in crisis was facilitated by managers, including an extra member of staff at night if the number of young people on frequent ACCT observations required it. The on-site nurse could also be based on the unit at night if a young person was of particular concern. Anti-ligature clothing had been used twice in the previous six months; its use was inappropriate. There was no log of the use of anti-ligature clothing.

## Recommendation

- I.34** **Anti-ligature clothing should not be used.**

## Behaviour management

### Expected outcomes:

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

- I.35** *There was a coherent approach to the management of behaviour. Not all the practice elements were formalised.*

- I.36** The ABC (address and begin to change) policy was an intervention and target based approach to behaviour management which incorporated appropriate policies, including the management of violence, assaults, fights and other antisocial behaviour. The policy gave clear guidance on the management of poor behaviour and the support of perpetrators and victims and included all required aspects of safeguarding. Monitoring of incidents was undertaken at the weekly safeguarding meeting (see section on safeguarding).

- I.37** Mediation was used widely to resolve conflict and to improve relationships between young people, but it was not included in any policy and staff were not trained in mediation. Mediation was recorded in electronic case notes and observation books but there was no managerial oversight.

### Recommendation

- I.38** **Staff undertaking mediation should be trained in its use and use of mediation should be monitored.**

## Rewards and sanctions

### Expected outcomes:

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

- I.39** *Young people we spoke to appreciated the enhanced facilities available to them on the gold level of the rewards and sanctions scheme, and the differentials were significant enough to encourage better behaviour. Reviews showed that young people were involved in setting realistic targets to help them achieve the gold level. Young people understood how the rewards and sanctions scheme worked and it was motivational. There was some evidence that it was not administered fairly.*

- I.40** The rewards and sanctions scheme was explained to young people during induction and young people and staff understood how it worked.
- I.41** Young people in our groups reported that the gold level was worthwhile because of the extra possessions they could have and the additional dining opportunities of a breakfast club and enhanced evening meal once a week.
- I.42** Young people transferring from other establishments on the highest level of the scheme could retain that status. Young people on silver level were reviewed after a month on the unit to ensure they were on the correct level but some staff said they waited up to six weeks before reviewing the young person. There was a facility for young people to apply for gold level but some staff thought this could only happen through recommendation.

### Recommendation

- I.43** **The rewards and sanctions scheme should be administered consistently. There was too much variation in the way staff implemented the scheme.**

## Security and disciplinary procedures

### Expected outcomes:

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

**I.44** *Excellent relationships between staff and young people underpinned good dynamic security on the unit. Staff reported intelligence quickly and acted on it without undue delay, leading to a safer environment for young people. There was still some routine strip-searching and neither this nor strip-searching by risk assessment was monitored.*

**I.45** The relationships between staff and young people on the unit were excellent and underpinned good dynamic security. Staff from all departments reported intelligence to the security department and 440 SIRs had been received in the previous six months. All staff were familiar with the main issues of bullying, threats, assaults and fights. They acted quickly on information received and dealt with incidents of fighting and bullying swiftly which created a safer environment for young people (see section on bullying and violence reduction).

**I.46** The approach to security was proportionate and young people were not unnecessarily restricted in their access to activities. Information sharing between the security department and unit staff was good and daily unit briefings were informative. Observation books were used effectively to pass on information. Staff showed good knowledge of the young people in their care and were tolerant of the behaviour associated with this age group.

## Adjudications

**I.47** Adjudications were administered fairly but records were not always complete. Removal from the unit was sometimes used as a punishment.

**I.48** There had been 135 adjudications during the six months before our inspection, mainly for fighting, assaults and threatening and abusive behaviour. More serious charges were referred to the independent adjudicator with police involvement when necessary or when requested by young people.

**I.49** Adjudication documentation was issued the day before the hearing. We found one case of a young person who could not read and write not having the documentation read or explained to him before his adjudication. Young people were offered the assistance of an advocate during the hearing or could ask for one before the adjudication.

**I.50** The adjudications that we observed were conducted in an age-appropriate way and every effort was made to ensure the young person understood what was happening. Child protection issues were taken seriously during hearings and young people were given adequate advice and support by adjudicators.

**I.51** The documentation that we reviewed showed that young people were given the chance to present their case and that mitigating circumstances were taken into account. Records did

not always give a full account of events leading up to the disciplinary charge, nor was sufficient evidence always recorded to support a finding of guilt. This had been identified during quality assurance by the deputy governor and appropriate action was being taken.

- I.52** Punishments were awarded according to a published tariff. They appeared consistent and appropriate for the age group with the exception of the use of removal from unit, which was unnecessary. There were no guidelines for managing young people who had been given this latter punishment.
- I.53** Minor reports were used appropriately to deal with small infringements of the rules. Charges were laid and punishments awarded within current guidelines. Monitoring and quality assurance were conducted on all hearings by the head of the unit.

## Recommendation

- I.54** **Removal from unit should not be used as a punishment.**

## Housekeeping point

- I.55** Staff should always ensure that young people understand adjudication documentation before attending a hearing.

## Bullying and violence reduction

### Expected outcomes:

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

- I.56** *Staff had a heightened awareness of bullying and were quick to address it. Nearly half the young people said they had been victimised by other young people, with name calling and insults being the most common methods. There was evidence to show that over half the young people regarded themselves as both victims and perpetrators of bullying, highlighting the complex nature of relationships in the unit.*

- I.57** The 'address and begin to change' policy used to address bullying and other antisocial behaviour was advertised around the unit with age-appropriate posters (see section on behaviour management). The policy was now consistent with the care planning system. Tier one of the policy consisted of monitoring and tier two the removal of privileges and use of intervention. Young people could be referred to psychology or the child and adolescent mental health service for individual work.
- I.58** Incidents of violence, bullying and antisocial behaviour were reported to the safeguarding team, who told us that unit staff had already taken necessary action by the time they received the notification. Incidents were also recorded in observation books and reported to security (see section on security and disciplinary procedures). In our survey, 45% of young people said they had been victimised by other young people, 15% said they had been hit, kicked or assaulted by another young person, and 36% said they had been the subject of insulting remarks. Managers, staff and young people confirmed that most bullying consisted of name calling or insults which were challenged promptly by staff. A recent bullying survey

undertaken by a psychology student showed that over half the young people identified themselves as perpetrators and victims, demonstrating the complex dynamics on the unit.

- I.59** Eight fights and 18 assaults had been recorded in the first six months of 2013, none of which had resulted in serious injuries. One assault had been on a member of staff. Play fighting was quickly stopped, and there was no evidence of group assaults. Staff said that other young people tended to step away from an incident and call for staff rather than get involved.
- I.60** Shouting out of windows was a particular problem at the time of the inspection, involving a few young people trading insults. In our survey, 50% of young people said shouting out of windows was a problem. Staff logged all instances of shouting and moved young people to spurs where they could not call to one another. Warnings were issued to young people who persisted and staff kept a close eye on them during the day to prevent escalation. Young people's differing views of shouting out of windows were illustrated in the survey: *'general talking through windows isn't a problem, it's just chatter, having a laugh and passing time'*; and *'when people are shouting out of windows it can cause arguments and fights'*. In our survey, 67% of young people thought that staff would take it seriously if they reported victimisation.

## Housekeeping point

- I.61** Actions taken in response to the 2013 bullying survey, and the outcomes, should be monitored by the safeguarding committee.

## The use of force

### Expected outcomes:

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

- I.62** *Use of force involving full restraint had reduced significantly since our last inspection. Force was still used on a few occasions to gain compliance. The quality of written records varied and some were incomplete. Young people could safely complain about use of force and the investigation of this was thorough.*

- I.63** Full use of control and restraint (C&R) had reduced significantly since our last inspection. There had been 33 incidents of use of force in the previous six months, 18 of which had involved full restraint techniques. Most incidents of use of force were spontaneous when staff intervened in fights or assaults.
- I.64** Documentation that we reviewed showed that force, particularly full use of C&R, was generally used as a last resort. However, we found three incidents when staff had intervened to gain compliance from a young person with no recorded attempts at de-escalation. Two of the incidents involved removal of a young person's training shoes when he had been downgraded on the rewards and sanctions scheme, which was excessively punitive.
- I.65** Documentation was not always completed thoroughly. De-escalation was evident in most of the cases we looked at and most young people were returned to their own cells. There were no formal cool-down areas and no policy to support cooling off or time out. We did not find any evidence of the use of pain compliance during incidents on the unit.

- I.66** Handcuffs were used only when necessary and when it was the safest option for the young person under restraint. Health care staff visited young people who had been restrained as soon as possible after the incident.
- I.67** The safeguarding and restraint minimisation committee discussed all aspects of use of force and the long-term monitoring of statistics. Use of force was also discussed at safeguarding meetings.
- I.68** The young person's parent or carer and their youth offending team worker were informed of any incident when force had been used. Child protection issues arising from use of force were dealt with quickly and thoroughly by the safeguarding team. In a few cases, there was no record of young people being debriefed by the duty manager after an incident of use of force.

## Recommendations

- I.69** Force should not be used to gain compliance.
- I.70** Cool-down areas should be provided with a policy for their use.

## Housekeeping points

- I.71** Use of force documentation should always give a full account of the incident.
- I.72** All young people subject to restraint or use of force should be debriefed as soon as possible after the incident and this should be recorded.

## Separation/removal from normal location

### Expected outcomes:

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

**I.73** *Conditions in the SCU were poor and the regime was limited. Few young people were separated or removed from normal location on the unit. Documentation was not always fully completed and there were instances of young people being held under good order or discipline without appropriate governance. We found evidence of excellent support to young people presenting with very challenging behaviour who had been removed from the unit.*

- I.74** Young people separated or removed from unit as a punishment on adjudication were located in the separation and care unit (SCU) or a wing in the main prison or in a cell on the unit. There was a poor regime on the SCU where the cells were dirty and covered in graffiti. Young people located in the SCU were strip-searched following a risk assessment.
- I.75** Seven young people had been separated with appropriate authorisation in the six months before our inspection, one for more than three days. Two young people had initially been located on the SCU on the good order or discipline rule and then moved to the unit under the same rule. While there, they were not subject to the governance, observations and visits by staff required for separated young people. Realistic and meaningful targets were set for

young people, but documentation was not fully completed and we could not find records of weekly reviews or a final review or discharge plan before relocation on the unit. Young people on the unit experienced an impoverished regime on the SCU and for the first few days back on the unit because they were not risk assessed to continue attending activities. In contrast, two separated young people received excellent support and care from different departments to address their problems.

## Recommendation

- 1.76 Young people under the good order or discipline rule in the SCU or on the unit should be managed in accordance with prison rules and the local policy, Documentation should be fully completed.**

## Substance misuse

### Expected outcomes:

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

**1.77** *The young people's substance misuse service (YPSMS) delivered a comprehensive, up-to-date range of high quality interventions to meet the needs of the young people. The joint working arrangements were excellent.*

- 1.78** Assessment arrangements were very good. Young people were assessed on arrival by mental health nurses using the initial screening section of the new comprehensive health assessment tool. Young people assessed as needing more than general substance misuse awareness were seen by a YPSMS worker for a more detailed assessment within a target period of five days, although most were seen within two days. No young people had required clinical interventions in the past year, but, if needed, the YPSMS and health care teams would work closely on a joint care plan with the option of the young person staying in the in-patient facility on the main site.
- 1.79** Psychosocial substance misuse work was delivered by two dedicated, well qualified and enthusiastic workers, each with an average caseload of just over 20 young people. Most young people were assessed as needing targeted interventions for moderate levels of drug and alcohol use. We found that the wide range of interventions on offer met the assessed needs of the population very well. Interventions included age-appropriate, targeted group and one-to-one work on the most commonly used substances (cannabis and alcohol). Interventions were delivered for other drugs, including the new psychoactive substances. Substance misuse workers delivered important sessions on healthy living in conjunction with the gym department. Auricular acupuncture was used effectively to address cravings, stress and anxiety and most young people who had received this treatment told us it was highly effective in modifying their moods and improving sleep patterns.
- 1.80** We were particularly impressed by the extent to which the YPSMS was integrated into the day-to-day care of the young people on the unit. Effective joint working with other departments took place through structured meetings, well defined protocols and informal information sharing. The YPSMS team was clearly well respected by other staff and highly valued by the young people.

- I.81** YPSMS family work was impressive. During family days on the unit, the team provided generic drugs information and more targeted help and support as requested by family members. Families were also offered the opportunity for involvement with a young person's treatment planning where appropriate.
- I.82** A well written strategy informed by a needs analysis contained an up-to-date, dynamic action plan.
- I.83** A proactive and responsive drug testing regime was conducted from a clean, tidy and well equipped testing suite. Mandatory drug testing rates had been zero for the previous six months.

### **Good practice**

- I.84** *The comprehensive, professional and well integrated work carried out by the YPSMS was a model of how a specialist service should be delivered within a secondary setting.*



## Section 2. Respect

### Residential units

#### Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.1** *Living conditions on the unit were of a high standard. The accommodation was comfortable, clean and well equipped. Young people helped to maintain the well kept grounds surrounding the unit and assisted in looking after the wildlife. Young people had access to all the facilities they needed.*
- 2.2** The unit accommodated up to 48 young people in four separate living areas, across two floors.
- 2.3** The building was well designed with plenty of open space, sufficient natural light and good sightlines. The cell doors were made of solid wood and the windows overlooking the grounds were reinforced but did not have bars. Cells were equipped with en suite showers and furnished with curtains and rugs.
- 2.4** The communal areas were tidy and well furnished with comfortable chairs and sofas. The carpets and wall coverings were in good order and there was a notable absence of graffiti and damage to the furniture. The living environment was clean and well maintained. Young people were encouraged to keep their cells clean and there were weekly competitions with prizes for the cleanest areas.
- 2.5** Each of the living areas had a recreational space for association, which was suitably equipped with table tennis and table football equipment. Young people ate their meals together in these areas.
- 2.6** There were telephones with privacy hoods in each living area and sufficient office space throughout the unit for staff to speak to young people in private.
- 2.7** Young people were issued with free hygiene products. They could wear their own socks and underwear, but were not allowed to wear their own clothes. Prison clothing provided was in good condition and available in suitable sizes. Clean bedding was issued weekly and all young people were given duvets. Mattresses were checked regularly and where necessary replacements provided.
- 2.8** Information about the regime was displayed in an age-appropriate format.
- 2.9** The unit building was self contained and surrounded by well kept grounds. The garden area at the front of the unit was attractively landscaped with a range of plants, bushes and trees. Ducks, chickens and rabbits were kept here, together with a number of different species of raptor. Young people helped to maintain the gardens and were given the opportunity to look after the animals. Many of those we spoke to showed an obvious pride in this. The centrepiece of the garden area was a fishing lake which was used extensively by young people for recreational and therapeutic purposes.

## Recommendation

### 2.10 Young people should be able to wear their own clothes.

## Relationships between staff and children and young people

### Expected outcomes:

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

**2.11** *Relationships between staff and young people were very good. Staff knew the young people well and we observed good interactions between officers and young people. Young people were positive about their personal officers, and electronic case notes were updated each day. Consultation arrangements worked well.*

**2.12** In our survey, 92% of young people said that staff treated them with respect. Unit managers and staff knew the circumstances of young people well and the relationships that we observed during the week were very good. Staff from all disciplines and young people spoke to each other in an informal manner, but inappropriate language or comments were properly challenged by staff. One young person asked in the survey to describe the best thing for him on the unit wrote: *'the support of staff. Whenever you need it there is always someone to talk to'*. Other young people echoed this with comments about *'help of staff'* and *'being listened to and having people around that understand you'*.

**2.13** Each spur had a young person representative who attended a monthly consultation meeting on behalf of their spur. The unit manager and one of the advocates attended the meetings which provided a useful opportunity for young people to communicate their opinions. There was evidence that changes suggested by young people had been accepted, for example the introduction of salt and pepper on dining tables and replacement furniture. Spur representatives took their role seriously and talked about the need to represent everyone's views.

**2.14** Each young person had a personal officer, a member of discipline staff on the unit. Despite fewer young people than at the previous inspection saying in our survey that they met their personal officer within a week of arrival (56% v 88%), 93% said they felt their personal officer tried to help them. Electronic case notes showed that officers made at least daily entries for all young people and more if circumstances warranted it. Notes generally showed good engagement between staff and young people, although some were observational and did not demonstrate interaction with the young person. The notes were used well at care planning meetings for discussions with young people.

## Equality and diversity

### Expected outcomes:

**The establishment demonstrates a clear and coordinated approach to eliminating discrimination, promoting equitable outcomes and fostering good relations, and ensures that no child or young person is unfairly disadvantaged. This is underpinned by effective processes to identify and resolve any inequality. The diverse needs of each young person**

**are recognised and addressed: these include, but are not restricted to, race equality, nationality, religion, disability (including mental, physical and learning disabilities and difficulties), gender, transgender issues and sexual orientation.**

**2.15** *The strategic management of diversity was undertaken for the whole site. There was little monitoring of the regime on the unit by protected characteristics. The culture on the unit was inclusive and use of inappropriate language was challenged. The quality of relationships on the unit combined with the individualised approach to care meant that young people who were 'different' were treated well. Young people with disabilities had their needs identified and well met.*

## Strategic management

- 2.16** Diversity work on the unit was incorporated into the Wetherby equality and diversity structure. The full-time equality manager post was vacant at the time of the inspection. A full-time equality officer was part of the safeguarding team. Bimonthly equality action group meetings were chaired by the governor. The unit was consistently represented but updates on the unit were not always available to the meeting. A young person representative had been appointed and had attended the most recent meeting. The diversity and equality policy was under review at the time of the inspection and there was a policy for the management of transsexual young people. There was good promotion of equality and diversity by the education department.
- 2.17** Discrimination incident report forms (DIRFs) were readily available to young people. Four DIRFs had been submitted in the previous six months. These related to the use of homophobic or racist language by other young people. They had been investigated by the equality officer and suitable action had been taken to address the behaviour. Young people were referred to psychology and CAMHS (child and adolescent mental health service) if investigations identified a need. All completed DIRFs were signed off by the governor. A consortium of local prisons, including Wetherby, met quarterly to validate a sample of completed DIRFs. A community representative and prisoner representatives from the establishment hosting the meeting attended.

## Diverse needs

- 2.18** At the time of the inspection, 9.5% of young people were of black and minority ethnic origin. This was a far smaller proportion than in other custodial settings. Ethnic monitoring data were discussed at equality action group meetings, but no specific monitoring for the unit was undertaken other than the composition of the population. We saw no evidence of racial tension and no young people reported in our survey being victimised because of their race or ethnicity. We were satisfied that the care planning arrangements and good relationships on the unit enabled young people to raise concerns about unfair treatment safely.
- 2.19** No young people in our survey identified themselves as Gypsy, Romany or Traveller which accorded with the unit records.
- 2.20** Only one foreign national young person had been located on the unit since the previous inspection. He had had access to the establishment foreign national coordinator and support from unit staff and his case worker. Telephone interpretation services were available, and there were effective links with the Home Office.

- 2.21** In our survey, 20 young people said they considered themselves to have a disability. This equated to 56% of the population and was more than double the percentage at the previous inspection. Arrangements to identify a young person with a disability were good. Straightforward questions about disability were put during their first night interview and health care carried out a detailed screening of new arrivals. Education assessments identified young people with learning disabilities and the establishment database showed that all but one young person had a learning disability. Personal emergency evacuation plans (PEEPs) were drawn up by the establishment disability liaison officer and the fire safety officer and displayed on the notice board in the main office. Staff we spoke to knew which young people had a PEEP and the nature of the assistance they required. An Epipen was kept in easy reach in the wing office for one young person who was at risk of a severe allergic reaction. Specialist staff working with young people with disabilities prepared good notes for unit staff on how to communicate effectively with and manage the behaviour of these young people.
- 2.22** In our survey, 13% of young people said they had experienced victimisation from other young people because of their sexual orientation. Members of the equality team told us that the only young people on the site to declare themselves gay or bisexual were on the unit. The culture on the unit was generally tolerant of all sexual orientations. Young people could display posters in their cells within the constraints of the offensive displays policy and could order an approved gay magazine.

## Recommendation

- 2.23** **In order to help prevent discrimination towards young people from all backgrounds diversity monitoring specific to the unit should be developed.**

## Faith and religious activity

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.24** *Faith services were good and the chaplaincy visited each day to provide pastoral and spiritual care. Young people were complimentary about the support they received from chaplains.*

- 2.25** Young people had the option of attending religious services in the main prison or a separate service on the unit. Facilities for all faiths were good. The chaplaincy attended the unit each day for morning and afternoon briefings and provided pastoral and spiritual support to young people on the unit. They contributed to ACCT (assessment, care in custody and teamwork) reviews, care planning and bereavement counselling. They also attended a range of meetings such as safer custody, safeguarding and security.
- 2.26** Young people we spoke to were complimentary about the support they received from chaplains and were content with their access to religious activities.
- 2.27** Resettlement support was organised and overseen by the chaplaincy for young people close to release through In 2 Out, an organisation that provided mentors for young people. A mentor assigned from a young person's local area met the young person while he was still in custody. The mentor attended final detention and training order reviews and contacted the youth offending team. Support was provided for at least 12 months post release, for example

to seek employment or prepare for interviews. Five young people were being supported at the time of the inspection and the chaplaincy was tracking their progress. A church link coordinator helped to find faith facilities in the community for young people. The targeted and sustained support provided by the In 2 Out mentoring organisation helped young people to cope moving out of a very structured environment into the community.

- 2.28** The chaplaincy had arranged for the boys brigade to set up a programme on lifestyle, health and fitness, community and personal issues. This had been well received at the first meeting of the project.

## Complaints

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.29** *Young people expressed some negative views in our survey about the complaints system. In practice, the arrangements worked quite efficiently, although there were problems with some of the replies.*

- 2.30** In our survey, 24% of young people said it was easy to make a complaint against 65% at the previous inspection. During the inspection, young people told us they knew how to complain but few had opted to do so as they preferred to talk to someone instead. In our survey, three-quarters of young people said they could speak to one of the independent advocates and over half said they could speak to a member of the Independent Monitoring Board. Eighty per cent of young people who had put in a complaint thought it had been dealt with fairly.
- 2.31** Complaint forms were freely available, but the forms and the box for completed complaints were clearly visible from the unit office. The locked boxes were emptied each night and the complaints distributed to relevant function heads at the morning meeting. Records showed that 47 complaints had been submitted by young people in the six months before the inspection, with far more in February and March than other months.
- 2.32** Most complaints were replied to within the timescales and the complaints clerk included a useful information sheet with replies about how to appeal. We found two complaints with no record of a reply.
- 2.33** A member of the safeguarding team undertook quality assurance of replies. Replies that we sampled were polite and addressed the issue, but most were handwritten and some were difficult to read.

### Housekeeping points

- 2.34** All replies to complaints should be legible.
- 2.35** A procedure should be put in place to escalate unanswered complaints to managers.

## Legal rights

### Expected outcomes:

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

**2.36** *Young people understood their sentence or remand status and decisions regarding early or late release were properly managed. The process for young people to access free and confidential legal advice was unclear.*

**2.37** There was no legal rights officer but case workers explained their rights to young people at their initial meeting and advice was also provided by the internal advocacy service. Young people we spoke to said that they were advised of their sentence or remand status and those on remand said that they had been helped to make a bail application. We saw records of their sentence or remand status being explained to young people during their initial training planning meeting. There was a good system in place to ensure that informed decisions were made about early or late release for young people serving a detention and training order.

**2.38** We were told that young people were able to make free, confidential telephone calls to their legal advisers, although the procedure was unclear.

**2.39** Legal visits took place in the visits hall and there was a facility for a confidential interview.

## Housekeeping point

**2.40** There should be a clear procedure for young people to make free, confidential telephone calls to their legal advisers which should be properly communicated to young people.

## Health services

### Expected outcomes:

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

**2.41** *Young people received a very good level of health care on the unit from a large team of staff with appropriate skills. Young people were positive about the level and quality of care and there were no significant waiting times for appointments. Pharmacy and dental services were good and met the requirements of the unit. Mental health care had developed into a very good integrated service which met the primary and secondary needs of most young people.*

## Governance arrangements

**2.42** Commissioning arrangements were developing and the governor and head of health care were active members of the local partnership board for NHS England. Health care issues and actions were discussed at senior management team meetings. Young people in our survey were positive about the level and quality of health care services and this was also reflected

by those we spoke to. Access to the service was good: initial care was provided on the unit by GPs and nurses, and specialist clinics were held in the health care centre on the main site.

- 2.43** A comprehensive health needs assessment had been completed in 2012. The head of health care managed effectively a large team of nurses and health care assistants with the support of two senior nurses who led the general and mental health teams. The teams included a range of staff with additional qualifications in the care of children.
- 2.44** Care was provided 24 hours a day and a nurse was available in the treatment room on the unit. If required, the night nurse could also be based on the unit. There was continuing investment in the training and development of staff who were all in date for the mandatory training elements. Clinical supervision was underpinned by the provider policy and was available in groups or individually.
- 2.45** Six GPs were contracted from a local practice to deliver a daily clinic apart from Sunday. Out-of-hours cover was provided to the same level as the local community. Pharmacy services were provided by a full-time technician based in the health care unit on the main site. Dental services were delivered in two sessions each week by an independent dentist and nurse, which met the needs of the young people.
- 2.46** The quality and management of clinical records was good. All were maintained electronically using SystemOne. Emergency resuscitation equipment was located on the unit and included an automated external defibrillator (AED). Records were made of daily checks on the equipment. Custody staff on the unit had received training in first aid but none had been trained in the use of AEDs.
- 2.47** Health care issues were discussed at regular unit health care focus groups and the incidence of complaints was very low. Complaints were dealt with by senior nursing staff in a sensitive and efficient manner. Information about health care services was widely available in a range of languages. This included health promotion advice and programmes delivered on the unit and in the health care centre.

## Recommendation

- 2.48** **Some custody staff should receive training in the use of AEDs.**

## Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.49** All young people were seen in reception by a mental health nurse who carried out a comprehensive initial assessment. A secondary screening, including an appointment with a GP, took place the following day. Young people had access to daily clinics on the unit and there was a named nurse for the unit. A qualified children's nurse cared for all looked-after children. There were no significant waiting times for clinics and all young people were seen on the unit or separately at specialist clinics in the health care centre.
- 2.50** There were four in-patient cells in the health care centre which were occasionally used by young people from the unit, although every effort was made to care for them in their own cells. The in-patient cells were located in the main thoroughfare of the health care centre which resulted in a restricted regime for patients. There was a well equipped association room and young people could be supervised in the gardens surrounding the health care centre.

- 2.51** A good range of age-appropriate health promotion screening and information was available. Good relationships were maintained with the separation and care unit where young people were seen each day by health care staff and more often when required. Young people attending outside hospital appointments were well managed with good escorting arrangements.

## Recommendation

- 2.52** **Young people located on the in-patient unit should have access to a normal regime.**

## Pharmacy

- 2.53** At the time of the inspection, the pharmacy technician had been on sick leave for two weeks with no technician cover provided. Young people could not routinely see a pharmacist but could ask to speak to the pharmacist from HMP Wealstun.
- 2.54** Most medicines were supplied as patient specific and labelled correctly, with the initial of the person dispensing and checking the medication. A patient information leaflet was supplied. An audit trail for the supply of controlled drug stock from the health care centre to the unit was in place and the transfer of controlled drugs was carried out in a secure manner.
- 2.55** Administration was recorded on prescription charts. We examined a sample of charts and found a number of gaps. There was no up-to-date reference material on the unit but staff had access to the internet for information on medication.

## Recommendation

- 2.56** **Adequate pharmacy cover should be provided for leave and sickness.**

## Housekeeping point

- 2.57** A full record should be made of the administration of medicines, including occasions when the young person refused medication or failed to attend.

## Dentistry

- 2.58** Young people attended the dental surgery in the health care centre. The surgery comprised a large room which was adequately furnished but the floor was in need of re-covering to comply with the control of infection. The position of the x-ray equipment inhibited its use. Emergency resuscitation equipment and medicines were located in the surgery and appropriately maintained. Young people told us they were very satisfied with the level of dental care. We observed young people being treated very well and in private. There was no significant waiting time for appointments. Dental records were well managed electronically using SystemOne.

## Recommendation

- 2.59** The dental surgery floor should be re-covered to comply with the control of infection.

## Housekeeping point

- 2.60** The dental x-ray machine should be fully functional.

## Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.61** Mental health services had been integrated since the previous inspection and provided primary, secondary and specialist child and adolescent mental health services. Most young people on the unit were receiving mental health services. They were well supported by the team and a wide variety of treatment programmes were delivered. The staff ran regular group work sessions such as anxiety management, identifying and dealing with triggers and self-help.
- 2.62** The team also delivered learning disability, occupational therapy, speech and language therapy and drama therapy services. A consultant psychiatrist who specialised in child and adolescent mental health attended twice weekly. The psychology department was available to young people and the mental health team liaised closely with the forensic psychologist.
- 2.63** Young people with serious and enduring mental health problems were transferred under the Mental Health Act to specialist secondary and tertiary care if clinically indicated. The need for transfer was rapidly identified and action taken to ensure that moves occurred in a timely fashion.
- 2.64** The mental health team had created a training package for custody staff on managing mental health crisis and working with young people who presented with challenging behaviour, experienced hallucinations or had a learning disability.

## Catering

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.65** *In our survey, 49% of young people said that the food was good or very good compared with 23% in 2012. Portion sizes and quality were adequate and consultation took place regularly. Young people were able to eat in association.*

- 2.66** A four-week pictorial menu cycle catered for all diets and was easy to read and understand. Once a month, a special themed meal was provided which was popular with young people. Kitchen facilities were good, the servery area was clean and food was stored and prepared appropriately. Young people on the unit could eat in association.
- 2.67** Breakfast was served on the day it was eaten and enhanced with toast and a snack such as a flapjack. Lunch was served too early at 11.45am. Lunch was a cold meal and hot food was

available at tea time. Young people we spoke to told us the food was good in quantity and quality. Portion sizes appeared adequate and the food that we tasted was of reasonable quality. Staff regularly sat and ate with the young people which encouraged social interaction and helped to create a pleasant atmosphere.

- 2.68** Young people from the unit were included in food surveys and consultation meetings.

## Purchases

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.69** *Some young people had to wait too long for their first canteen order. Most young people were satisfied with the variety of goods available.*

- 2.70** Some new arrivals had to wait for over 10 days to receive their first canteen order, depending on which day they arrived. In our survey, 78% of young people said the canteen sold a wide enough variety of products against 49% at the previous inspection. Suggestions for changes to the list could be made at the monthly consultation meetings.

- 2.71** Additional items could be purchased from a catalogue, and newspapers and magazines could be ordered. Appropriate arrangements were in place for young people to receive their purchases without other young people seeing what they had bought. Young people who found it difficult to manage money were given advice by unit staff and one young person described how he was trying to save as much as possible of his weekly earnings.

### Recommendation

- 2.72** **Young people should be able to place an order with the prison shop within 24 hours of their arrival.**

## Section 3. Purposeful activity

### Time out of cell

#### Expected outcomes:

**Children and young people spend most of their time out of their cell, engaged in activities such as education, leisure and cultural pursuits, seven days a week.<sup>2</sup>**

- 3.1** *Time spent out of cell had decreased slightly since the previous inspection but most young people had adequate time out of their cell during the week. They had less time unlocked at the weekend. Time scheduled outside had improved significantly since the previous inspection, and association took place daily.*
- 3.2** The establishment was using the standardised core day for young people which provided a maximum of 9.75 hours unlocked each day. We did not see any slippage in the advertised regime and most young people were receiving close to the maximum time available out of their cells. The exceptions were young people who had loss of association and/or eating out. Time out of cell at weekends was more limited for all young people, with lock-up at 5.30pm. Young people who were denied access to association and eating out for disciplinary reasons or because of the risk they posed to other young people could have less than two hours a day scheduled out of cell at weekends, although staff described one-to-one activities they had undertaken with young people in this situation to give them additional time out of their cell.
- 3.3** We found very few young people in their cells during our roll checks. Young people with no scheduled activity were usually out of their cells with spur staff.
- 3.4** Association was timetabled on weekday evenings and during the day at weekends. In our survey, 97% of young people said they had association each day. The association sessions that we saw were relaxed and young people had a variety of things to do on their spurs.
- 3.5** In our survey, 84% of young people said they usually went outside for exercise each day compared with 27% at the last inspection. This improvement was confirmed by our observations. Forty-five minutes' time outside for exercise was scheduled daily and young people were encouraged to use it to burn off energy. The core day allowed some young people more time outside to spend on their environmental activities; these seemed popular with young people who talked enthusiastically about their activities in the unit grounds.

<sup>2</sup> Time out of cell, in addition to formal 'purposeful activity', includes any time children and young people are out of their cells to associate or use communal facilities to take showers or make telephone calls.

## Education, learning and skills

Inspection of the provision of education and educational standards, as well as vocational training in YOIs for young people, is undertaken by the Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted<sup>3</sup>) working under the general direction of HM Inspectorate of Prisons. For information on how Ofsted inspects education and training see the Ofsted framework and handbook for inspection.

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 3.6** *The management of learning and skills and the provision of education were good. Good communication among all staff enabled them to meet the needs of young people well. Equality and diversity were well promoted throughout the year through themed curriculum events. Quality improvement processes were sound in education but under-developed in prison-led provision. Teaching and learning were good. Teachers planned learning well, lessons were interesting and effective, but they did not provide enough learning materials to meet the range of abilities in classes. Target setting in individual learning plans was weak which inhibited young people and teachers from measuring progress made in lessons. Learning support was good and helped learners to achieve. Outcomes were good overall. The library provided a reasonable service.*
- 3.7** *Ofsted made the following assessments about the learning and skills and work provision:*
- |  |             |
|--|-------------|
| <i>Outcomes for children and young people engaged in learning and skills and work activities:</i>                                | <i>Good</i> |
| <i>Quality of learning and skills and work activities, including the quality of teaching, training, learning and assessment:</i> | <i>Good</i> |
| <i>Effectiveness of leadership and management of learning and skills and work activities:</i>                                    | <i>Good</i> |

## Management of education and learning and skills

- 3.8** *The management of learning and skills was good. Education provision by The Manchester College was well managed, with good quality teaching and learning. Recent management staff changes and focused training events had had a significant effect on improving provision for young people. The range of training events on improving teaching, learning and assessment had provided staff with skills to enliven lessons and provide young people with interesting and effective activities which engaged them well.*

<sup>3</sup> Ofsted is the Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills. It reports directly to the UK Parliament and is independent and impartial. It (inter alia) inspects and regulates services that provide education and skills for all ages, including those in custody. For information on Ofsted's inspection framework, please visit: <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk>.

- 3.9** Communication was good. Staff across all areas worked well together to meet the needs of young people. Safeguarding young people was a high priority. Education newsletters and briefings disseminated good practice and informed all staff of changes and developments. Effective action had been taken to achieve consistency in the delivery of the curriculum between the main site and the unit to achieve a good or better learning experience for all young people.
- 3.10** Equality and diversity were promoted well in the curriculum. Most teachers responded well to opportunities in lessons, when equality and diversity topics arose naturally, to promote understanding and to challenge some learners' negative or inappropriate views. Themed events promoted different cultures and religions well.
- 3.11** Quality improvement processes in education were sound. Some good partnerships were developing with a wide range of prison departments to support improvement. At the time of the inspection, no checks or measures to assess the quality of provision were applied in prison-led activities to identify and address underperformance. No data were kept in the PE academy to measure retention and achievement rates and set improvement targets. The self-assessment report produced by the college gave a realistic assessment of provision. Prison funded education and training staff did not produce a self-assessment report to help them reflect on what was working well and what could be improved.

## Recommendation

- 3.12** **Quality improvement processes, including the collection and analysis of data, should be applied to prison provision to help identify good and poor performance and take action to improve where required.**

## Provision of activities

- 3.13** Young people participated in compulsory education for half a day and prison activities for the remainder. The range of programmes in education was good for young people who were on the unit for up to six months. A step-up programme on the main site enabled young people to complete GCSE or A level programmes started at school before they entered custody. The main site offered a wide range of vocational training but few young people took this option which limited their opportunities. Young people benefited from varied, well planned and frequent enrichment activities.
- 3.14** Education courses were offered in two pathways comprising compulsory English and mathematics, studied with vocational training in art and design and employability or ICT and media. However, once these pathways were completed, few other opportunities were available for young people with long sentences. The college aimed for young people to complete the pathway again and progress to the next level but young people were unclear about this and felt they were repeating the same work.
- 3.15** Activities provided by the prison included a PE academy, where young people participated in a 12-week programme and gained qualifications in active IQ, manual handling, health and safety, diet and nutrition and first aid. An environmental studies programme included horticulture, fishing and bird care, but no young people were working towards qualifications, although the prison was an accredited centre and able to offer them.

## Recommendations

- 3.16** Young people, especially those with longer sentences, should have more opportunities to participate in the range of vocational training offered on the main site.
- 3.17** Young people should be accredited for the skills they develop on the environmental programme.

## Housekeeping point

- 3.18** The college should explain clearly the progression routes in the education pathways so that young people fully understand the benefits of improving their skills.

## Quality of provision

- 3.19** The education department provided a welcoming and purposeful learning environment. Punctuality and attendance were good. Behaviour in classes was mostly good and teachers dealt sensitively and effectively with poor behaviour. Induction was thorough and met the needs of young people well.
- 3.20** Teaching and learning in education were good. Lessons were planned particularly well. Teachers provided stimulating and effective learning activities which focused and interested young people. The best sessions embedded other subjects well, providing interest and developing young people's breadth of knowledge. In a very effective mathematics lesson, scrabble tiles were used to spell the names of countries and identify the highest and lowest scrabble scores. Young people improved their understanding of geography and developed their speaking, spelling and mathematical skills. The lesson content stretched and challenged young people and made the session highly enjoyable. In an English lesson, a topical news event created lively and interesting debate and developed young people's speaking and listening skills well. Some officers present in classes were deployed very well to support young people and engage with them to complete activities, but others were not sufficiently directed by the teacher. Information learning technology was used well to enhance learning and provide good visual stimuli and participative learning activities.
- 3.21** Too few teachers provided extension activities to meet the abilities of the more able young people, particularly when they had completed their work early. Learning materials were not sufficiently differentiated for less able young people. Some struggled, which heightened their frustration and at times led to poor behaviour.
- 3.22** Young people's work was assessed well and teachers corrected grammatical and spelling errors and gave clear information on what the young person needed to do to improve.
- 3.23** Individual learning plans were weak. Target setting was incomplete and teachers did not measure sufficiently well the progress learners made in lessons.
- 3.24** Individual learning support was very good. The range of assessment and screening was good. Young people who were in receipt of an educational statement, about 50% of the young people on the unit, received very good support to help them improve their skills. Excellent records were kept of the progress they made. Details of specific needs were shared very well with all staff on the unit to enable effective multi-agency care.

## Housekeeping points

- 3.25** Teachers should direct officers present in their lessons so that they are clear about their support role and which young people require support.
- 3.26** Teachers should provide a variety of learning materials to meet the range of abilities of young people in their lessons.
- 3.27** Individual learning plans should be used more effectively to set precise learning goals and targets which measure the progress young people make.

## Education and vocational achievements

- 3.28** Overall achievement rates in 2012 to 2013 showed a potential significant increase over the previous year. However, the college had identified that improvement was needed in the outcomes for functional skills in mathematics and English and had taken effective action to address this.
- 3.29** Outcomes were very good for young people taking GCSE or A level courses, and young people gained passes at grades A to C in GCSE English and mathematics and in A level psychology.
- 3.30** Generally young people produced work of a good standard and some made excellent progress from their starting point.
- 3.31** The therapeutic value of the environmental programme for young people was significant but no learner had achieved a qualification.
- 3.32** In the PE academy, young people who completed the programme achieved well. Retention rates on programmes had been identified by PE staff as an issue, but no analysis or action had been undertaken to address this.

## Recommendation

- 3.33 PE staff should analyse why retention rates are low on some academy programmes and take action to improve them.**

## Library

- 3.34** The library, provided by Leeds Library and Information Services, offered young people a well-stocked facility and a welcoming environment. It was staffed by a library manager and a library assistant. Young people had weekly access to the library and attendance was good. Plans were well advanced to extend this to two evenings and a weekend visit. Young people also had access to a range of books on the unit that they could exchange between visits.
- 3.35** Library staff worked well with the education department to promote enrichment activities and provided visual displays and reading materials linked to them. The range of events to promote literacy, such as the six book challenge and author visits, was adequate. Useful career guidance materials were displayed in the library. The range of books, graphic novels, newspapers and easy reading materials were appropriate for the age group. Legal materials were available on request.

- 3.36** No internet facilities were available, but the librarian researched materials for young people on request.

## Physical education and healthy living

### Expected outcomes:

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

**3.37** *PE staff were well qualified. Young people had access to a range of good facilities and activities suitable for their age and ability. While access to recreational PE was good, not all young people had regular weekly timetabled PE. Fundraising and other events extended learners' skills well. Links with health care promoted young people's health and wellbeing. Quality improvement processes were underdeveloped.*

- 3.38** Physical education staff were well qualified and all were trained teachers. Staffing was adequate for the unit. All young people participated in an effective induction during their first few days in custody. The range of facilities was good, and included a sports hall, fitness and weights area, an outdoor all-weather pitch on the main site and two additional small fitness rooms and a grassed football pitch in the unit grounds. Most young people showered on their unit but the shower facilities in the main gym were adequate.
- 3.39** Young people had good access to recreational PE which provided activities for a range of abilities, including football, handball, racket sports and team games.
- 3.40** Young people had the opportunity to participate in fundraising events and projects that benefited the community. One project, run by Global Community Sports, taught young people handball and Aussie rules football. The young people then produced booklets for children abroad with instructions on how to play the games, which developed their literacy and art skills. Inter-unit activities on sports days allowed young people from different units to compete in team games. The Duke of Edinburgh Award scheme previously offered was not available as no staff were qualified to deliver it.
- 3.41** Only young people who opted to participate in the PE academy had good access to timetabled PE each week in addition to optional recreational PE.
- 3.42** Links with health care and substance misuse staff satisfactorily met the needs of young people and promoted health and wellbeing.
- 3.43** Quality improvement processes, such as observing the quality of teaching and learning and self-assessment, were not applied to measure the quality and standards of provision. Data on recreational sessions were not analysed to see if enough young people were using the facilities.

## Recommendations

- 3.44** All young people should have regular timetabled physical education in addition to recreational sessions. Non-attendance at recreational physical education should be monitored and action taken to improve participation.
- 3.45** Quality improvement processes should be applied to measure the quality of provision, identify areas for improvement and take effective action to rectify them.

## Housekeeping point

- 3.46** PE staff should explore the opportunity to accredit staff in the delivery of the Duke of Edinburgh Award to widen the range of provision available to young people.



## Section 4. Resettlement

### Pre-release and resettlement

#### Expected outcomes:

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

**4.1** *The recently published reducing reoffending strategy clarified the resettlement function of the unit but it did not cover all relevant areas and further work was needed to implement the action plan associated with it. The complex resettlement needs of young people held on the unit were identified early and plans were properly coordinated by the casework team who worked effectively to try and achieve good outcomes. Young people had good access to release on temporary licence (ROTL).*

**4.2** The first reducing reoffending strategy for the unit had been published in April 2013. The strategy covered the key resettlement pathways and specific actions to be completed under each pathway. The section on transitions to a young adult young offender institution (YOI) was weak and needed development in conjunction with receiving YOIs (see section on training planning and remand management). A recent needs analysis based on surveys and interviews with young people and staff had informed the strategy. Outcomes for young people who had left the unit were not collected in a systematic way and some valuable information was missing, which would have given the unit a better understanding of the needs of its population and the ability to plan more effectively for their release or transfer.

**4.3** The strategy did not cover the needs of young people who sexually abused others, which was an omission. On occasion, between 35% and 40% of young people had index offences relating to sexual abuse. All young people with relevant index offences were assessed and regularly interviewed by therapists from the Lucy Faithfull Foundation, who worked closely with other specialist workers and unit staff. Therapeutic interventions were supported by unit staff, and young people received high levels of support to help them address the causes of their offending. Young people returning to the community were properly prepared; some went to specialist facilities, which included accommodation.

**4.4** The implementation and effectiveness of the unit reducing reoffending strategy was monitored by the quarterly resettlement strategy meeting held on the main site. Minutes indicated that greater attention was given to the main site and very little time was spent considering the specific needs of the unit.

**4.5** The unit had four dedicated case workers, who coordinated the planning of services offered to young people, including their resettlement needs. The unit operated a dual planning arrangement, using their own care planning system alongside the national training planning arrangements in the Youth Justice Board National Standards. Young people's resettlement needs were discussed more frequently on the unit than elsewhere and these regular reviews of reintegration plans reflected young people's complex welfare needs and the resettlement and reducing reoffending issues that they presented. About half the young people needed to be accommodated by the local authority and many lived a long way from their home areas. The challenge of reintegrating this complex population into their home communities or to

another secure establishment was given proper attention by unit staff and the casework team.

- 4.6** Young people's risk and resettlement needs were identified soon after arrival and included in the initial care planning assessment and subsequently in the formal training planning documentation. The primary focus of initial care plans was the welfare of young people during their stay on the unit, but a range of services were identified early to help find accommodation and facilitate family contact.
- 4.7** The number of young people released on temporary licence as part of their resettlement planning had increased significantly recently. There were good arrangements to assess young people who met the criteria. Efforts to find suitable work placements had increased, but the number of young people benefiting from these opportunities was still small. An increasing number of young people went on town visits with their families which was an important initiative for young people who were some distance from their home.

## Recommendations

- 4.8 Resettlement and reoffending outcomes for young people who leave the unit should be systematically collected.**
- 4.9 The section on transition arrangements for young people in the reducing reoffending strategy should be strengthened and the strategy should include the management and resettlement needs of young people who have sexually abused others.**

## Housekeeping point

- 4.10** Arrangements should be made to monitor the reducing reoffending strategy.

## Training planning and remand management

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 4.11** *Young people had comprehensive sentence or remand management plans which were regularly reviewed and updated through care planning and training planning meetings. Formal training planning meetings were timely and well attended by community youth offending teams (YOTs). Some families found it difficult to attend because of the distance from their home. Staff knew the young people well. Transitions to the adult YOI estate were complex and needed further consideration. Public protection was managed well and looked-after children were receiving a much improved service, though many were still not receiving appropriate support from their home local authorities.*

- 4.12** All young people were allocated a case worker on arrival who was responsible for the coordination of individual care plans, training plans and remand management plans. Sentenced and remanded young people were contacted quickly by their case worker and we

saw evidence of multidisciplinary input to the initial planning arrangements. All plans that we scrutinised were written within appropriate time scales and there was evidence of a regular cycle of assessment, planning and review. Care and training plans were of good quality and demonstrated that case workers were central to the sentence and resettlement planning process, coordinating a multidisciplinary approach to the care and resettlement needs of young people. Families were kept informed of important issues. All plans were drawn up in a collaborative way and, in our survey, 75% of young people said they were involved in the development of their plan and 93% that they understood the targets they had been set.

- 4.13** Only a few young people on the unit were remanded and bail applications were not commonplace, but, when required, case workers facilitated young people's contact with their community YOT worker so that bail packages could be arranged. Initial remand meetings and remand review meetings were timely and there was good attendance by community YOTs. Young people on remand had care plans and training plans and could use the same services as sentenced young people.
- 4.14** Young people attended a fortnightly care planning meeting chaired by their case worker, and attended by a unit manager and other disciplines when necessary. Community YOT workers were invited and many attended on a monthly basis. These fortnightly reviews fed into the more formal training planning and remand management meetings which were well organised and timely, with good attendance from community YOTs and relevant unit staff. Attendance by family members was not so good and case workers believed that the distance from home was prohibitive for some. The care planning meetings that we observed were child focused and demonstrated that the case worker and other attendees had a good understanding of the young person's needs. Up-to-date information about the young person's progress was considered and there was appropriate focus on the young person's reintegration plans.
- 4.15** The transition of young people serving long sentences to the adult estate, when they reached the age of 18 years, was complex. Potential receiving establishments were concerned that the difference in environment and care on the Keppel unit compared with an adult YOI was so significant that young people would find the change extremely difficult to manage. They said that young people should first spend time on the Wetherby main site to soften the impact of an eventual move to a new establishment. Unit staff told us that young people responded differently to transition and staff were not convinced that planned moves to an adult YOI via the main site were always in the best interests of young people.

## Recommendation

- 4.16** **Young people should only be moved to the main site before transfer to a YOI when there is evidence that it is in their best interest to do so.**

## Public protection

- 4.17** There was a comprehensive public protection policy and individual young people were discussed regularly at the well attended monthly interdepartmental risk management board. Minutes of the meetings indicated thorough discussion of young people considered to be a risk and an appropriate emphasis on monitoring release arrangements and the suitability of accommodation on release. External statutory agencies were contacted if concerns were raised.
- 4.18** There were clear criteria for determining young people who might present a risk to the public and a good procedure for them to be identified early. Young people considered to be a risk were placed on a database and discussed at the earliest interdepartmental meeting.

Young people who needed to be considered by external multi-agency public protection panels (MAPPA) were identified, and reports submitted to MAPPA meetings. There were no young people subject to MAPPA arrangements on the unit at the time of the inspection.

- 4.19** There were appropriate procedures for identifying young people who were assessed as being a risk to children in the community, and reasonable restrictions ensured that contact was properly risk assessed. Decisions about whom young people had contact with were made by the interdepartmental risk management board and regularly reviewed, and we found that restrictions were proportionate. Very few young people had their mail and telephone calls monitored and these were regularly reviewed and restrictions lifted when it was felt that the risks had reduced and the monitoring was no longer required.

### Looked-after children

- 4.20** In our survey, 47% of young people said that they had been in the care of the local authority. At the time of the inspection, 22 young people had looked-after status, including seven who were looked after due to their remand status.
- 4.21** The establishment had three social workers who focused on the needs of young people with looked-after status. There was no establishment policy on looked-after children, though their resettlement needs were referred to in the reducing reoffending strategy. A useful briefing paper had been produced by Leeds Youth Offending Service and the social work team had delivered awareness training to unit staff. The social work team scrutinised all documentation accompanying young people into custody to identify young people who had been looked after.
- 4.22** Letters were sent to local authorities advising them that a young person they were responsible for was on the unit. The social work team advised local authorities of their responsibilities and challenged authorities who did not meet their obligations. Appropriate financial support had been secured in some cases, but a significant number of young people did not receive adequate financial support from their home local authority.
- 4.23** Internal case workers and social workers carried out impressive work to secure accommodation for looked-after children and we saw evidence of concerted efforts to ensure that local authorities fulfilled their responsibilities to accommodate young people. However, confirmation of placements was sometimes very late.
- 4.24** Good efforts were made to ensure that looked-after children were reviewed by their local authority while in custody and we were advised that there had been a steady improvement since October 2012, although some local authorities continued to fail to meet their obligations.

## Reintegration planning

### Expected outcomes:

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

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

**4.25** *Young people were properly prepared for release, though accommodation was sometimes only found at the very last moment. Young people had good access to guidance workers, but no pre-release course was available. Planning for health and substance misuse was well organised and included links with appropriate community services. The advice young people received on financial matters was poor. Although some young people were a long way from their home areas, efforts were made to mitigate the effect on families. The family days and 'family talk' were excellent initiatives. Young people had access to a good range of appropriate group and individual personal development programmes.*

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

**4.27** No young people were released during the inspection, but the practical release arrangements described to us by staff were efficient and young people had access to their money and clean clothes. Arrangements were in place to ensure that young people were properly supported in getting back to their home areas.

### Accommodation

**4.28** In our survey, 24% of young people said they would have a problem with accommodation when they were released. Accommodation needs were assessed early and updated throughout the young person's sentence, and specific attention was given to young people who were considered a risk to the public. No record was kept of whether staff thought that accommodation young people were returning to was suitable. Records showed that in the past year no young person had been released without an address, but, despite the best efforts of staff, some young people did not know their address until just before release.

**4.29** Case managers were rigorous in pursuing responsible local authorities and YOTs when they considered that a young person was not being found suitable accommodation. They escalated the needs of hard-to-place young people, using the internal advocates and legal representation when required.

### Education, training and employment

**4.30** Careers advice and guidance, provided by The Manchester College, was good. Guidance workers met all young people at induction and conducted a thorough interview to review their skills and encourage them to focus on long-term goals on release. Young people were supported to review the activities available and select an appropriate pathway that would enhance their skills and experience.

- 4.31** Guidance workers met young people six weeks before release to consolidate plans for education or training on release. They were also readily accessible to young people during their library visits and on the unit.
- 4.32** There was no pre-release programme to help learners develop and focus on plans for release. Only young people who selected the employability option in education developed interview skills as part of the programme.
- 4.33** Successful initiatives to forge links with YOT workers had improved communication, enabling the individual needs of the young person to be met effectively. The college had started to monitor if placements, employment or training plans developed in custody had been successful four weeks after release.

## Recommendation

- 4.34 All young people should have access to a pre-release programme to help them develop and focus on plans for release.**

## Health care

- 4.35** Pre-release arrangements for young people were very good and sufficient time was given to prepare for their release. Young people were provided with information on their health and future opportunities to access health care. The CAMHS team (child and adolescent mental health service) were fully involved with release arrangements and ensured appropriate access to community services when required.

## Drugs and alcohol

- 4.36** Resettlement work was well organised, including a range of family interventions and contact with community agencies to facilitate continuing support following a young person's release.

## Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.37** Financial advice was very limited and only some young people received any formal advice as part of a modular course provided by the education department. Some informal advice was given by unit staff and case workers, and the internal social work team helped looked-after children to manage their limited financial resources while they were in custody. There was no facility to help young people open bank accounts. The reducing reoffending strategy had identified a number of actions to deliver this pathway, but they had not yet been implemented.

## Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.38** As a national resource, the Keppel unit had a wide catchment area, and young people were often a long way from their home areas. At the time of the inspection, only 10 young people lived less than 50 miles from the unit, eight lived between 100 and 200 miles and four lived between 200 and 300 miles from the unit. Staff told us that distance from home did not appear to prevent professional workers visiting the unit, but some families did not have the resources to manage frequent visits even though the assisted prison visits scheme would reimburse them. In our survey, only 32% of young people said that it was easy or very easy

to visit and 38% said that they usually received a visit once a week. In our survey, 100% of young people said they could use the telephone every day.

- 4.39** Young people who did not receive visits were identified and some received visits from the local visitors' scheme. Case workers took on the responsibility of keeping families aware of the progress of young people throughout their stay. Family contact was encouraged by the use of ROTL for young people to spend time with families on local town visits.
- 4.40** The unit held monthly family days which all young people were eligible to attend. A lack of space limited numbers to six young people who could nominate two members of their family over the age of 18 years. The session lasted approximately three hours. Visitors were able to see where the young person lived, talk to staff, spend time together as a family and hear from a range of staff about the services available to young people on the unit.
- 4.41** Young people from the unit shared the visits hall with young people from the main site. The visits that we observed included four young people from the unit accompanied by a unit staff member, which was common practice. The visit was relaxed and the young people were not obviously identifiable. Staff observed visitors from a discreet distance and we were told by the young people that it was possible to have uninterrupted private conversations with their families. There had been concerns that some young people did not want to attend visits with young people from the main site, although young people we spoke to said that it was not a problem. Visits had been arranged specifically for young people on the unit, but these had not been well attended. They had ceased in May 2013 but were due to resume in September 2013.
- 4.42** Young people could attend 'family talk' family therapy sessions delivered by psychology, social work and CAMHS teams. The sessions offered young people the opportunity to talk about the difficulties related to their offending in the presence of their families. Families received written feedback from these sessions. Eleven young people and their families had attended these sessions since January 2012.

### Good practice

- 4.43** *All young people could attend regular family days with their families.*
- 4.44** *Young people were able to discuss issues relating to their offending in the presence of their families and in a safe environment.*

### Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.45** Young people had the opportunity to talk individually to a number of specialist staff, including the psychology, social work and CAMHS departments. They also had good access to a small range of personal development group programmes, which had been selected to meet the specific needs of the young people on the unit following a needs analysis (see also the Lucy Faithfull Foundation in the pre-release and resettlement section).
- 4.46** The establishment delivered JETS (juvenile estate thinking skills), the nationally accredited programme for young people, and two locally approved programmes, ACCESS and TEAM. Access to these programmes was good and referrals were made through the young people's case worker. Records that we scrutinised indicated that all young people were considered for a personal development programme, but not all were considered suitable referrals. Young people who were referred were assessed for their suitability by a member of the psychology department and most were recommended to start the programme. The number

of young people who completed a programme was good considering the nature of their difficulties. The reasons for young people not being considered suitable or their failure to complete a programme were recorded. Alternative interventions were considered for young people unable to participate in the programmes. Written reports on young people who completed a programme were passed to their case worker and community YOT.

**4.47** All the programmes delivered were properly evaluated for effectiveness.

### **Good practice**

**4.48** *Young people had access to an appropriate range of personal development programmes, informed by an up-to-date needs analysis.*

# Section 5. Recommendations and housekeeping points

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

## Recommendations

To the governor

### Early days in custody

- 5.1** Young people should only be strip-searched on the basis of intelligence or specific suspicion. (1.16)

### Care and protection of children and young people

- 5.2** Anti-ligature clothing should not be used. (1.34)

### Behaviour management

- 5.3** Staff undertaking mediation should be trained in its use and use of mediation should be monitored. (1.38)
- 5.4** The rewards and sanctions scheme should be administered consistently. (1.43)
- 5.5** Removal from unit should not be used as a punishment. (1.54)
- 5.6** Force should not be used to gain compliance. (1.69)
- 5.7** Cool-down areas should be provided with a policy for their use. (1.70)
- 5.8** Young people under the good order or discipline rule in the SCU or on the unit should be managed in accordance with prison rules and the local policy, Documentation should be fully completed. (1.76)

### Residential units

- 5.9** Young people should be able to wear their own clothes. (2.10)

### Equality and diversity

- 5.10** In order to help prevent discrimination towards young people from all backgrounds diversity monitoring specific to the unit should be developed. (2.23)

### Health services

- 5.11** Some custody staff should receive training in the use of AEDs. (2.48)
- 5.12** Young people located on the in-patient unit should have access to a normal regime. (2.52)

- 5.13** Adequate pharmacy cover should be provided for leave and sickness. (2.56)
- 5.14** The dental surgery floor should be re-covered to comply with the control of infection. (2.59)

#### **Purchases**

- 5.15** Young people should be able to place an order with the prison shop within 24 hours of their arrival. (2.72)

#### **Education, learning and skills**

- 5.16** Quality improvement processes, including the collection and analysis of data, should be applied to prison provision to help identify good and poor performance and take action to improve where required. (3.12)
- 5.17** Young people, especially those with longer sentences, should have more opportunities to participate in the range of vocational training offered on the main site. (3.16)
- 5.18** Young people should be accredited for the skills they develop on the environmental programme. (3.17)
- 5.19** PE staff should analyse why retention rates are low on some academy programmes and take action to improve them. (3.33)

#### **Physical education and healthy living**

- 5.20** All young people should have regular timetabled physical education in addition to recreational sessions. Non-attendance at recreational physical education should be monitored and action taken to improve participation. (3.44)
- 5.21** Quality improvement processes should be applied to measure the quality of provision, identify areas for improvement and take effective action to rectify them. (3.45)

#### **Pre-release and resettlement**

- 5.22** Resettlement and reoffending outcomes for young people who leave the unit should be systematically collected. (4.8)
- 5.23** The section on transition arrangements for young people in the reducing reoffending strategy should be strengthened and the strategy should include the management and resettlement needs of young people who have sexually abused others. (4.9)

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

- 5.24** Young people should only be moved to the main site before transfer to a YOI when there is evidence that it is in their best interest to do so. (4.16)

#### **Reintegration planning**

- 5.25** All young people should have access to a pre-release programme to help them develop and focus on plans for release. (4.34)

## Housekeeping points

### Early days in custody

- 5.26** All initial risk assessments should include a full action plan describing how a young person should be kept safe during his first days in custody. (1.17)

### Behaviour management

- 5.27** Staff should always ensure that young people understand adjudication documentation before attending a hearing. (1.55)
- 5.28** Actions taken in response to the 2013 bullying survey, and the outcomes, should be monitored by the safeguarding committee. (1.61)
- 5.29** Use of force documentation should always give a full account of the incident. (1.71)
- 5.30** All young people subject to restraint or use of force should be debriefed as soon as possible after the incident and this should be recorded. (1.72)

### Complaints

- 5.31** All replies to complaints should be legible. (2.34)
- 5.32** A procedure should be put in place to escalate unanswered complaints to managers. (2.35)

### Legal rights

- 5.33** There should be a clear procedure for young people to make free, confidential telephone calls to their legal advisers which should be properly communicated to young people. (2.40)

### Health services

- 5.34** A full record should be made of the administration of medicines, including occasions when the young person refused medication or failed to attend. (2.57)
- 5.35** The dental x-ray machine should be fully functional. (2.60)

### Education, learning and skills

- 5.36** The college should explain clearly the progression routes in the education pathways so that young people fully understand the benefits of improving their skills. (3.18)
- 5.37** Teachers should direct officers present in their lessons so that they are clear about their support role and which young people require support. (3.25)
- 5.38** Teachers should provide a variety of learning materials to meet the range of abilities of young people in their lessons. (3.26)
- 5.39** Individual learning plans should be used more effectively to set precise learning goals and targets which measure the progress young people make. (3.27)

### **Physical education and healthy living**

- 5.40** PE staff should explore the opportunity to accredit staff in the delivery of the Duke of Edinburgh Award to widen the range of provision available to young people. (3.46)

### **Pre-release and resettlement**

- 5.41** Arrangements should be made to monitor the reducing reoffending strategy. (4.10)

## **Examples of good practice**

- 5.42** The weekly meeting involving a small team of specialist staff chaired by the governor to examine child protection referrals was an effective and efficient way of ensuring that all referrals were dealt with properly. (1.26)
- 5.43** The comprehensive, professional and well integrated work carried out by the YPSMS was a model of how a specialist service should be delivered within a secondary setting. (1.84)
- 5.44** All young people could attend regular family days with their families. (4.43)
- 5.45** Young people were able to discuss issues relating to their offending in the presence of their families and in a safe environment. (4.44)
- 5.46** Young people had access to an appropriate range of personal development programmes, informed by an up-to-date needs analysis. (4.48)

## Section 6. Appendices

### Appendix I: Inspection team

Ian MacFadyen	Team leader
Karen Dillon	Inspector
Angela Johnson	Inspector
Ian Thomson	Inspector
Catherine Shaw	Head of research, development and thematic
Hayley Cripps	Researcher
Annie Crowley	Researcher
Joe Simmonds	Researcher

#### **Specialist inspectors**

Paul Roberts	Substance misuse inspector
Mick Bowen	Health services inspector
Katie Tucker	Care Quality Commission inspector
Helen Jackson	Pharmacist
Sheila Willis	Ofsted inspector



## Appendix II: Establishment population profile

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

Population breakdown by:

<b>Status</b>	<b>Number of young people</b>	<b>%</b>
Sentenced	34	77.2
Recalls	3	6.8
Convicted unsentenced	0	0
Remand	7	16
Detainee	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>100</b>

<b>Age</b>	<b>Number of young people</b>	<b>%</b>
15 years	1	2.3
16 years	5	11.4
17 years	31	70.4
18 years	7	15.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>100</b>

<b>Nationality</b>	<b>Number of young people</b>	<b>%</b>
British	44	100
Foreign nationals	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>100</b>

<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>Number of young people</b>	<b>%</b>
White		
British	38	86.4
Irish		
Other White		
Mixed		
White and Black Caribbean	4	9.1
White and Black African		
White and Asian		
Other Mixed		
Asian or Asian British		
Indian		
Pakistani	2	4.5
Bangladeshi		
Other Asian		
Black or Black British		
Caribbean		
African		
Other Black		
Chinese or other ethnic group		
Chinese		
Arab		
Other ethnic group		

Not stated		
<b>Total</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>100</b>

<b>Religion</b>	<b>Number of young people</b>	<b>%</b>
Baptist		
Church of England	7	15.9
Roman Catholic	5	11.4
Other Christian denominations		
Muslim	2	4.55
Sikh		
Hindu		
Buddhist		
Jewish		
Other	2	4.55
No religion	28	63.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>100</b>

<b>Other demographics</b>	<b>Number of young people</b>	<b>%</b>
Gypsy/Romany/ traveller	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

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

<b>Length of stay</b>	<1 mth	1–3 mths	3–6 mths	6–12 mths	1–2 yrs	2 yrs +	4 yrs +	<b>Total</b>
<b>Age</b>								
15 years								
16 years			1	1	2		1	5
17 years	1		2	9	6	4	3	25
18 years				2	2	3		7
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>		<b>3</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>37</b>

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

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

<b>Main offence</b>	<b>Number of young people</b>	<b>%</b>
Violence against the person	5	11.4
Sexual offences	8	18.2
Burglary	2	4.55
Robbery	13	29.5
Theft and handling	2	4.55
Fraud and forgery		
Drugs offences		
Other offences	14	31.8
Offence not recorded / holding warrant		
<b>Total</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>100</b>

**Number of DTO's by age and full sentence length, including the time in the community**

Sentence	4 mths	6 mths	8 mths	10 mths	12 mths	18 mths	24 mths	Recall	Total
<b>Age</b>									
15 years									
16 years				1		2		1	4
17 years	2	3	4	1	5	1	1	1	18
18 years	1	1			1	1	2		6
<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>28</b>

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

Sentence	Under 2 yrs	2-3 yrs	3-4 yrs	4-5 yrs	5 yrs +	Recall	Total
<b>Age</b>							
15 years							
16 years							
17 years		1	2		2		5
18 years			1				1
<b>Total</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>		<b>2</b>		<b>6</b>

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

Sentence	Under 2 yrs	2-3 yrs	3-4 yrs	4-5 yrs	5 yrs +	Recall	Total
<b>Age</b>							
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>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

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

Sentence	Under 2 yrs	2-5 yrs	5 - 10 yrs	10 – 15 yrs	15 – 20 yrs	Recall	Total
<b>Age</b>							
15 years							
16 years							
17 years						1	
18 years							1
<b>Total</b>						<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>

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

Sentence	Under 2 yrs	2-5 yrs	5 - 10 yrs	10 – 15 yrs	15 – 20 yrs	20yrs +	Total
<b>Age</b>							
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>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>



## Appendix III: Summary of children and young people questionnaires and interviews

### Children and young people survey methodology

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

### Sampling

Questionnaires were offered to all young people.

### Distributing and collecting questionnaires

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

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

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

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

### Survey response

At the time of the survey on 12 August 2013 the young person population at the Keppel Unit (HMYOI Wetherby) was 43. Using the method described above, questionnaires were distributed to all 43 young people.

We received a total of 38 completed questionnaires, a response rate of 88%. This included two questionnaires completed via interview. Three respondents refused to complete a questionnaire and two were returned blank.

<b>Wing/Unit</b>	<b>Number of completed survey returns</b>
Keppel Unit	37
Wetherby Healthcare Wing	1

## Presentation of survey results and analyses

Over the following pages we present the survey results for the Keppel Unit.

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

We also present a number of comparative analyses. In all the comparative analyses that follow, statistically significant<sup>4</sup> differences are indicated by shading. Results that are significantly better are indicated by green shading, results that are significantly worse are indicated by blue shading. If the difference is not statistically significant there is no shading. Orange shading has been used to show a statistically significant difference in young people's background details.

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

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

The following comparative analyses are presented:

The current survey responses from the Keppel Unit in August 2013 compared with the responses of young people surveyed at the Keppel Unit in January 2012.

---

<sup>4</sup> A statistically significant difference between the two samples is one that is unlikely to have arisen by chance alone, and can therefore be assumed to represent a real difference between the two populations. Our significance level is set at 0.05 which means that there is only a 5% likelihood that the difference is due to chance.

## Survey summary

### SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU

<b>Q1</b>	<b>How old are you?</b>	
	15	1 (3%)
	16	3 (8%)
	17	24 (63%)
	18	10 (26%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Are you a British citizen?</b>	
	Yes	37 (100%)
	No	0 (0%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>Do you understand spoken English?</b>	
	Yes	37 (97%)
	No	1 (3%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Do you understand written English?</b>	
	Yes	37 (100%)
	No	0 (0%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>What is your ethnic origin?</b>	
	<i>White - British</i>	34 (92%)
	<i>White - Irish</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>White - Other</i>	1 (3%)
	<i>Black or Black British - Caribbean</i>	1 (3%)
	<i>Black or Black British - African</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Black or Black British - Other</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Indian</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Pakistani</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Chinese</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Other</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Mixed race - White and Black Caribbean</i>	1 (3%)
	<i>Mixed race - White and Black African</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Mixed race - White and Asian</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Mixed race - Other</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Arab</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Other ethnic group</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>If other, please specify</i>	4 (100%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>What is your religion?</b>	
	<i>None</i>	17 (50%)
	<i>Church of England</i>	10 (29%)
	<i>Catholic</i>	5 (15%)
	<i>Protestant</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Other Christian denomination</i>	1 (3%)
	<i>Buddhist</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Hindu</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Jewish</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Muslim</i>	1 (3%)
	<i>Sikh</i>	0 (0%)

	<i>If other, please specify</i>	7 (100%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?</b>	
	Yes	0 (0%)
	No	32 (86%)
	Don't know	5 (14%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>Do you have any children?</b>	
	Yes	8 (21%)
	No	30 (79%)
<b>Q9</b>	<b>Do you consider yourself to have a disability? (i.e. do you need help with any long-term physical, mental or learning needs.)</b>	
	Yes	20 (56%)
	No	16 (44%)
<b>Q10</b>	<b>Have you ever been in local authority care?</b>	
	Yes	18 (47%)
	No	20 (53%)

## SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Are you sentenced?</b>	
	Yes	31 (82%)
	No - unsentenced/on remand	7 (18%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>How long is your sentence (the full DTO sentence)?</b>	
	Not sentenced	7 (18%)
	Less than 6 months	8 (21%)
	6 to 12 months	9 (24%)
	More than 12 months, up to 2 years	8 (21%)
	More than 2 years	4 (11%)
	Indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP)	2 (5%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>How long have you been in this establishment?</b>	
	Less than 1 month	7 (18%)
	1 to 6 months	21 (55%)
	More than 6 months, but less than 12 months	6 (16%)
	12 months to 2 years	4 (11%)
	More than 2 years	0 (0%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?</b>	
	Yes	24 (65%)
	No	13 (35%)

## SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS

<b>Q1</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?</b>	
	Yes	32 (84%)
	No	3 (8%)
	Don't remember	3 (8%)

<b>Q2</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, were there any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females travelling with you?</b>	
	Yes	17 (45%)
	No	17 (45%)
	Don't remember	4 (11%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?</b>	
	Less than 2 hours	10 (26%)
	2 to 4 hours	22 (58%)
	More than 4 hours	3 (8%)
	Don't remember	3 (8%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?</b>	
	My journey was less than 2 hours	10 (26%)
	Yes	6 (16%)
	No	18 (47%)
	Don't remember	4 (11%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?</b>	
	My journey was less than 2 hours	10 (26%)
	Yes	12 (32%)
	No	13 (34%)
	Don't remember	3 (8%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, how did you feel you were treated by the escort staff?</b>	
	Very well	6 (16%)
	Well	20 (54%)
	Neither	6 (16%)
	Badly	2 (5%)
	Very badly	1 (3%)
	Don't remember	2 (5%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>Before you arrived here, did you receive any information to help you prepare for coming here?</b>	
	Yes - and it was helpful	10 (28%)
	Yes - but it was not helpful	6 (17%)
	No - I received no information	16 (44%)
	Don't remember	4 (11%)

## SECTION 4: FIRST DAYS

<b>Q1</b>	<b>How long were you in reception?</b>	
	Less than 2 hours	29 (78%)
	2 hours or longer	4 (11%)
	Don't remember	4 (11%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?</b>	
	Yes	27 (77%)
	No	6 (17%)
	Don't remember/Not applicable	2 (6%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>How well did you feel you were treated in reception?</b>	
	Very well	7 (19%)
	Well	22 (59%)
	Neither	7 (19%)
	Badly	0 (0%)

	<i>Very badly</i>		0 (0%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>		1 (3%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>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.)</b>		
	<i>Not being able to smoke</i>	20 (57%)	<i>Money worries</i> 6 (17%)
	<i>Loss of property</i>	6 (17%)	<i>Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to</i> 16 (46%)
	<i>Feeling scared</i>	11 (31%)	<i>Health problems</i> 21 (60%)
	<i>Gang problems</i>	7 (20%)	<i>Getting phone numbers</i> 14 (40%)
	<i>Contacting family</i>	20 (57%)	<i>Staff did not ask me about any of these</i> 7 (20%)
	<i>Other (please specify)</i>	2 (100%)	
<b>Q5</b>	<b>When you first arrived here, did you have any of the following problems? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>		
	<i>Not being able to smoke</i>	20 (57%)	<i>Money worries</i> 7 (20%)
	<i>Loss of property</i>	1 (3%)	<i>Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to</i> 7 (20%)
	<i>Feeling scared</i>	7 (20%)	<i>Health problems</i> 10 (29%)
	<i>Gang problems</i>	3 (9%)	<i>Getting phone numbers</i> 10 (29%)
	<i>Contacting family</i>	12 (34%)	<i>I did not have any problems</i> 5 (14%)
	<i>Other (please specify)</i>	1 (100%)	
<b>Q6</b>	<b>When you first arrived here, were you given any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>		
	<i>Toiletries/basic items</i>		31 (86%)
	<i>The opportunity to have a shower</i>		13 (36%)
	<i>Something to eat</i>		34 (94%)
	<i>A free phone call to friends/family</i>		26 (72%)
	<i>PIN phone credit</i>		25 (69%)
	<i>Information about feeling worried/upset</i>		13 (36%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>		0 (0%)
	<i>I was not given any of these</i>		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</i>		17 (47%)
	<i>Peer mentor</i>		9 (25%)
	<i>Childline/Samaritans</i>		10 (28%)
	<i>The prison shop/canteen</i>		6 (17%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>		5 (14%)
	<b><i>I did not have access to any of these</i></b>		11 (31%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?</b>		
	<i>Yes</i>		21 (60%)
	<i>No</i>		9 (26%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>		5 (14%)
<b>Q9</b>	<b>Did you feel safe on your first night here?</b>		
	<i>Yes</i>		29 (83%)
	<i>No</i>		5 (14%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>		1 (3%)

<b>Q10</b>	<b>Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the establishment?</b>	
	<i>I have not been on an induction course</i>	6 (17%)
	Yes	20 (57%)
	No	3 (9%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	6 (17%)

## SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?</b>	
	Yes	35 (100%)
	No	0 (0%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	0 (0%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?</b>	
	Yes	17 (52%)
	No	9 (27%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	7 (21%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>What is the food like here?</b>	
	<i>Very good</i>	2 (6%)
	Good	15 (43%)
	<i>Neither</i>	11 (31%)
	Bad	5 (14%)
	<i>Very bad</i>	2 (6%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?</b>	
	<i>I have not bought anything yet/Don't know</i>	0 (0%)
	Yes	27 (77%)
	No	8 (23%)
<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>	12 (34%)
	<i>Very easy</i>	12 (34%)
	Easy	6 (17%)
	<i>Neither</i>	1 (3%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	2 (6%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	2 (6%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>Are your religious beliefs respected?</b>	
	Yes	20 (57%)
	No	2 (6%)
	<i>Don't know/Not applicable</i>	13 (37%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>Can you speak to a Chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?</b>	
	Yes	24 (69%)
	No	0 (0%)
	<i>Don't know/Not applicable</i>	11 (31%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>Can you speak to a peer mentor when you need to?</b>	
	Yes	22 (63%)
	No	2 (6%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	11 (31%)

<b>Q9</b>	<b>Can you speak to a member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board) when you need to?</b>	
	Yes	20 (57%)
	No	1 (3%)
	Don't know	14 (40%)
<b>Q10</b>	<b>Can you speak to an advocate (an outside person to help you) when you need to?</b>	
	Yes	26 (74%)
	No	3 (9%)
	Don't know	6 (17%)

## SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Do most staff treat you with respect?</b>	
	Yes	29 (91%)
	No	3 (9%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>If you had a problem, who would you turn to? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	No-one	5 (15%)
	Personal officer	15 (45%)
	Wing Officer	12 (36%)
	Teacher/education staff	3 (9%)
	Gym staff	4 (12%)
	Chaplain	8 (24%)
	Independent Monitoring Board (IMB)	4 (12%)
	YOT worker	14 (42%)
	Other (please specify)	4 (100%)
	Social worker	14 (42%)
	Health services staff	8 (24%)
	Peer mentor	3 (9%)
	Another young person here	9 (27%)
	Case worker	18 (55%)
	Advocate	11 (33%)
	Family/friends	21 (64%)
	Childline/Samaritans	3 (9%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?</b>	
	Yes	24 (77%)
	No	7 (23%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?</b>	
	I still have not met him/her	5 (15%)
	In your first week	16 (48%)
	After your first week	6 (18%)
	Don't remember	6 (18%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>How often do you see your personal (named) officer?</b>	
	I still have not met him/her	5 (16%)
	At least once a week	21 (68%)
	Less than once a week	5 (16%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>Do you feel your personal (named) officer tries to help you?</b>	
	I still have not met him/her	5 (17%)
	Yes	23 (77%)
	No	2 (7%)

## SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Is it easy to make an application?</b>	
	Yes	28 (82%)
	No	0 (0%)
	Don't know	6 (18%)

<b>Q2</b>	<b>Are applications sorted out fairly?</b>	
	<i>I have not made an application</i>	6 (19%)
	Yes	25 (78%)
	No	1 (3%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>Are applications sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?</b>	
	<i>I have not made an application</i>	6 (19%)
	Yes	17 (53%)
	No	9 (28%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Is it easy to make a complaint?</b>	
	Yes	8 (24%)
	No	1 (3%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	25 (74%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>Are complaints sorted out fairly?</b>	
	<i>I have not made a complaint</i>	25 (74%)
	Yes	7 (21%)
	No	2 (6%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>Are complaints sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?</b>	
	<i>I have not made a complaint</i>	25 (74%)
	Yes	6 (18%)
	No	3 (9%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint?</b>	
	Yes	4 (13%)
	No	14 (44%)
	<i>Never needed to make a complaint</i>	14 (44%)

## SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE

<b>Q1</b>	<b>What level of the rewards and sanctions scheme are you on?</b>	
	<i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i>	3 (9%)
	<i>Enhanced (top)</i>	10 (29%)
	<i>Standard (middle)</i>	20 (59%)
	<i>Basic (bottom)</i>	1 (3%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	0 (0%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the rewards and sanctions scheme?</b>	
	<i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i>	3 (9%)
	Yes	19 (59%)
	No	6 (19%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	4 (13%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>Do the different levels of the rewards and sanctions scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?</b>	
	<i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i>	3 (9%)
	Yes	18 (53%)
	No	10 (29%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	3 (9%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Have you had a minor report since you have been here?</b>	
	Yes	23 (68%)
	No	11 (32%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	0 (0%)

<b>Q5</b>	<b>If you have had a minor report, was the process explained clearly to you?</b>	
	<i>I have not had a minor report</i>	11 (33%)
	Yes	19 (58%)
	No	3 (9%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?</b>	
	Yes	21 (64%)
	No	11 (33%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	1 (3%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>If you have had an adjudication ('nicking'), was the process explained clearly to you?</b>	
	<i>I have not had an adjudication</i>	12 (36%)
	Yes	20 (61%)
	No	1 (3%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?</b>	
	Yes	12 (35%)
	No	20 (59%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	2 (6%)
<b>Q9</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>	31 (91%)
	<i>Very well</i>	2 (6%)
	<i>Well</i>	1 (3%)
	<i>Neither</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Badly</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Very badly</i>	0 (0%)

## SECTION 9: SAFETY

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Have you ever felt unsafe here?</b>	
	Yes	14 (41%)
	No	20 (59%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Do you feel unsafe now?</b>	
	Yes	5 (15%)
	No	28 (85%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Never felt unsafe</i>	20 (63%)
	<i>Everywhere</i>	1 (3%)
	<i>Care and separation unit</i>	1 (3%)
	<i>Association areas</i>	3 (9%)
	<i>Reception area</i>	2 (6%)
	<i>At the gym</i>	7 (22%)
	<i>In an exercise yard</i>	5 (16%)
	<i>At work</i>	2 (6%)
	<i>At education</i>	4 (13%)
	<i>At religious services</i>	1 (3%)
	<i>At meal times</i>	2 (6%)
	<i>At healthcare</i>	1 (3%)
	<i>Visits area</i>	5 (16%)
	<i>In wing showers</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>In gym showers</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>In corridors/stairwells</i>	3 (9%)

	<i>On your landing/wing</i>	1 (3%)
	<i>During movement</i>	5 (16%)
	<i>In your cell</i>	1 (3%)
	<i>Other (please specify)</i>	3 (100%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Have you ever been victimised by another young person/group of young people here? (e.g. insulted or assaulted you)</b>	
	Yes	15 (44%)
	No	19 (56%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you, your family or friends)</i>	12 (35%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	5 (15%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i>	1 (3%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	7 (21%)
	<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Medication</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Debt</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Drugs</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your nationality</i>	1 (3%)
	<i>You are from a different part of the country to others</i>	2 (6%)
	<i>You are from a Traveller community</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your sexuality</i>	4 (12%)
	<i>Your age</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>You having a disability</i>	1 (3%)
	<i>You were new here</i>	3 (9%)
	<i>Your offence/crime</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Gang related issues</i>	0 (0%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>Have you ever been victimised by staff here? (e.g. insulted or assaulted you)</b>	
	Yes	6 (18%)
	No	27 (82%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you, your family or friends)</i>	4 (12%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	2 (6%)
	<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Medication</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Debt</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Drugs</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your nationality</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>You are from a different part of the country to others</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>You are from a Traveller community</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your sexuality</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your age</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>You having a disability</i>	1 (3%)
	<i>You were new here</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your offence/crime</i>	0 (0%)

*Gang related issues* 0 (0%)  
*Because you made a complaint* 0 (0%)

<b>Q10</b>	<b>If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?</b>	
	Yes	14 (45%)
	No	10 (32%)
	Don't know	7 (23%)
<b>Q11</b>	<b>Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?</b>	
	Yes	21 (66%)
	No	5 (16%)
	Don't know	6 (19%)
<b>Q12</b>	<b>Is shouting through the windows a problem here?</b>	
	Yes	16 (50%)
	No	14 (44%)
	Don't know	2 (6%)

## SECTION 10: HEALTH SERVICES

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Is it easy to see the following people if you need to?</b>			
		Yes	No	Don't know
	The doctor .....	25 (76%)	7 (21%)	1 (3%)
	The nurse .....	29 (88%)	3 (9%)	1 (3%)
	The dentist .....	19 (58%)	10 (30%)	4 (12%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?</b>			
	<i>I have not been</i>			6 (18%)
	<i>Very good</i>			8 (24%)
	<i>Good</i>			12 (36%)
	<i>Neither</i>			7 (21%)
	<i>Bad</i>			0 (0%)
	<i>Very bad</i>			0 (0%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/all of it in your room?</b>			
	<i>I am not taking any medication</i>			12 (38%)
	<i>Yes, all of my meds</i>			4 (13%)
	<i>Yes, some of my meds</i>			3 (9%)
	<i>No</i>			13 (41%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?</b>			
	Yes			19 (58%)
	No			14 (42%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>Are you being helped by anyone here with your emotional or mental health problems? (e.g. a psychologist, doctor, counsellor, personal officer or another member of staff.)</b>			
	<i>I do not have any emotional or mental health problems</i>			14 (42%)
	Yes			16 (48%)
	No			3 (9%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>Did you have problems with alcohol when you first arrived here?</b>			
	Yes			8 (24%)
	No			25 (76%)

<b>Q7</b>	<b>Have you received any help with alcohol problems here?</b>	
	Yes	5 (15%)
	No	28 (85%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>Did you have problems with drugs when you first arrived here?</b>	
	Yes	21 (57%)
	No	16 (43%)
<b>Q9</b>	<b>Do you have problems with drugs now?</b>	
	Yes	8 (27%)
	No	22 (73%)
<b>Q10</b>	<b>Have you received any help with drugs problems here?</b>	
	Yes	15 (47%)
	No	17 (53%)
<b>Q11</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it to get illegal drugs here?</b>	
	Very easy	1 (3%)
	Easy	3 (9%)
	Neither	5 (15%)
	Difficult	1 (3%)
	Very difficult	5 (15%)
	Don't know	18 (55%)

## SECTION 11: ACTIVITIES

<b>Q1</b>	<b>How old were you when you were last at school?</b>				
	14 or under	10 (31%)			
	15 or over	22 (69%)			
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Have you ever been excluded from school?</b>				
	Yes	28 (88%)			
	No	4 (13%)			
	Not applicable	0 (0%)			
<b>Q3</b>	<b>Did you ever skip school before you came into custody?</b>				
	Yes	27 (82%)			
	No	6 (18%)			
	Not applicable	0 (0%)			
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Do you CURRENTLY take part in any of the following activities? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>				
	Education	33 (100%)			
	A job in this establishment	11 (33%)			
	Vocational or skills training	10 (30%)			
	Offending behaviour programmes	9 (27%)			
	I am not currently involved in any of these	0 (0%)			
<b>Q5</b>	<b>If you have been involved in any of the following activities here, do you think they will help you when you leave prison?</b>				
		<i>Not been involved</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
	Education	0 (0%)	27 (82%)	6 (18%)	0 (0%)
	A job in this establishment	3 (14%)	12 (55%)	6 (27%)	1 (5%)
	Vocational or skills training	3 (13%)	14 (61%)	6 (26%)	0 (0%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	2 (8%)	17 (71%)	5 (21%)	0 (0%)

<b>Q6</b>	<b>Do you usually have association every day?</b>	
	Yes	32 (97%)
	No	1 (3%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?</b>	
	<i>Don't want to go</i>	3 (9%)
	Yes	28 (85%)
	No	2 (6%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?</b>	
	<i>Don't want to go</i>	4 (12%)
	None	4 (12%)
	<i>One to two times</i>	8 (24%)
	<i>Three to five times</i>	15 (45%)
	<i>More than five times</i>	2 (6%)

## SECTION 12: FAMILY AND FRIENDS

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Are you able to use the telephone every day, if you want to?</b>	
	Yes	33 (100%)
	No	0 (0%)
	<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>	
	Yes	10 (31%)
	No	22 (69%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	0 (0%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>How many visits do you usually have each week, from family or friends?</b>	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	7 (20%)
	<i>Less than one a week</i>	11 (31%)
	<i>About one a week</i>	11 (31%)
	<i>More than one a week</i>	2 (6%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	4 (11%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>How easy is it for your family and friends to visit you here?</b>	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	7 (21%)
	Very easy	5 (15%)
	Easy	6 (18%)
	Neither	3 (9%)
	Difficult	11 (33%)
	Very difficult	1 (3%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	0 (0%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>Do your visits usually start on time?</b>	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	7 (21%)
	Yes	16 (48%)
	No	7 (21%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	3 (9%)

## SECTION 13: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE

<b>Q1</b>	<b>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.)</b>	
	<i>Finding accommodation</i>	8 (24%)
	<i>Getting into school or college</i>	11 (33%)

	<i>Getting a job</i>	19 (58%)
	<i>Money/finances</i>	11 (33%)
	<i>Claiming benefits</i>	8 (24%)
	<i>Continuing health services</i>	4 (12%)
	<i>Opening a bank account</i>	5 (15%)
	<i>Avoiding bad relationships</i>	10 (30%)
	<i>I won't have any problems</i>	10 (30%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan? (i.e. a plan that is discussed in your DTO/planning meetings, which sets out your targets)</b>	
	<i>Yes</i>	24 (73%)
	<i>No</i>	2 (6%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	7 (21%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>Were you involved in the development of your plan?</b>	
	<i>I don't have a plan/don't know if I have a plan</i>	9 (30%)
	<i>Yes</i>	16 (53%)
	<i>No</i>	5 (17%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Do you understand the targets that have been set in your plan?</b>	
	<i>I don't have a plan/don't know if I have a plan</i>	9 (27%)
	<i>Yes</i>	22 (67%)
	<i>No</i>	2 (6%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>Do you have a caseworker here?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i>	29 (88%)
	<i>No</i>	2 (6%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	2 (6%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>Has your caseworker helped to prepare you for release?</b>	
	<i>I don't have a caseworker</i>	4 (13%)
	<i>Yes</i>	15 (48%)
	<i>No</i>	7 (23%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	5 (16%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>Has your social worker been to visit you since you have been here?</b>	
	<i>I don't have a social worker</i>	7 (22%)
	<i>Yes</i>	18 (56%)
	<i>No</i>	7 (22%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i>	11 (33%)
	<i>No</i>	14 (42%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	8 (24%)
<b>Q9</b>	<b>Do you know who to contact for help with any of the following problems, before your release? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Finding accommodation</i>	11 (35%)
	<i>Getting into school or college</i>	14 (45%)
	<i>Getting a job</i>	14 (45%)
	<i>Help with money/finances</i>	9 (29%)
	<i>Help with claiming benefits</i>	9 (29%)
	<i>Continuing health services</i>	10 (32%)
	<i>Opening a bank account</i>	8 (26%)
	<i>Avoiding bad relationships</i>	8 (26%)
	<i>I don't know who to contact</i>	12 (39%)

<b>Q10</b>	<b>What is most likely to stop you offending in the future? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>		
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	7 (23%)	<i>Having a mentor (someone you can ask for advice)</i> 3 (10%)
	<i>Nothing, it is up to me</i>	7 (23%)	<i>Having a YOT worker or social worker that I get on with</i> 5 (17%)
	<i>Making new friends outside</i>	9 (30%)	<i>Having children</i> 4 (13%)
	<i>Going back to live with my family</i>	8 (27%)	<i>Having something to do that isn't crime</i> 10 (33%)
	<i>Getting a place of my own</i>	9 (30%)	<i>This sentence</i> 9 (30%)
	<i>Getting a job</i>	13 (43%)	<i>Getting into school/college</i> 9 (30%)
	<i>Having a partner (girlfriend or boyfriend)</i>	10 (33%)	<i>Talking about my offending behaviour with staff</i> 3 (10%)
	<i>Staying off alcohol/drugs</i>	7 (23%)	<i>Anything else</i> 1 (3%)
<b>Q11</b>	<b>Do you want to stop offending?</b>		
	<i>Not sentenced</i>		7 (23%)
	<i>Yes</i>		22 (71%)
	<i>No</i>		1 (3%)
	<i>Don't know</i>		1 (3%)
<b>Q12</b>	<b>Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here, that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?</b>		
	<i>Not sentenced</i>		7 (24%)
	<i>Yes</i>		14 (48%)
	<i>No</i>		8 (28%)

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



### Survey responses from children and young people: Keppel Unit 2013 (August)

**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

		Keppel Unit (Aug) 2013	HMYOI Wetherby (Aug) 2013	Keppel Unit (Aug) 2013	Keppel Unit (Jan) 2012
	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>38</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU</b>					
1.1	Are you 18 years of age?	26%	13%	26%	35%
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	0%	2%	0%	0%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	98%	100%	98%	
1.4	Do you understand written English?	100%	100%	100%	
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other category.)	5%	24%	5%	5%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	3%	12%	3%	3%
1.7	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	0%	8%	0%	5%
1.8	Do you have any children?	21%	14%	21%	5%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	56%	18%	56%	27%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	47%	27%	47%	47%
<b>SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE</b>					
2.1	Are you sentenced?	81%	85%	81%	78%
2.2	Is your sentence 12 months or less?	44%	40%	44%	18%
2.3	Have you been in this establishment for one month or less?	19%	15%	19%	9%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	64%	51%	64%	60%
<b>SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS</b>					
On your most recent journey here:					
3.1	Did you feel safe?	84%	90%	84%	89%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	44%	40%	44%	43%
3.3	Did you spend more than 4 hours in the van?	7%	9%	7%	5%
For those who spent 2 or more hours in the escort van:					
3.4	Were you offered a toilet break if you needed it?	22%	18%	22%	16%
3.5	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	44%	33%	44%	37%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	71%	54%	71%	56%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	28%	17%	28%	
<b>SECTION 4: YOUR FIRST FEW DAYS HERE</b>					
4.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	79%	87%	79%	79%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	78%	84%	78%	
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	79%	61%	79%	57%
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?	58%	56%	58%	61%
4.4b	Loss of property?	18%	21%	18%	27%
4.4c	Feeling scared?	31%	24%	31%	

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

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Keppel Unit (Aug) 2013	HMVOI Weatherby (Aug) 2013	Keppel Unit (Aug) 2013	Keppel Unit (Jan) 2012
	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>38</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>4.4d</b>	Gang problems?	20%	28%	20%	
<b>4.4e</b>	Contacting family?	58%	51%	58%	53%
<b>4.4f</b>	Money worries?	18%	15%	18%	6%
<b>4.4g</b>	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	46%	28%	46%	
<b>4.4h</b>	Health problems?	60%	50%	60%	44%
<b>4.4i</b>	Getting phone numbers?	40%	32%	40%	47%
<b>4.5</b>	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	85%	73%	85%	91%
When you first arrived, did you have problems with any of the following:					
<b>4.5a</b>	Not being able to smoke?	58%	54%	58%	63%
<b>4.5b</b>	Loss of property?	3%	12%	3%	19%
<b>4.5c</b>	Feeling scared?	20%	4%	20%	
<b>4.5d</b>	Gang problems?	8%	9%	8%	
<b>4.5e</b>	Contacting family?	35%	28%	35%	28%
<b>4.5f</b>	Money worries?	20%	11%	20%	25%
<b>4.5g</b>	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	20%	5%	20%	
<b>4.5h</b>	Health problems?	28%	12%	28%	22%
<b>4.5i</b>	Getting phone numbers?	28%	25%	28%	31%
When you first arrived, were you given any of the following:					
<b>4.6a</b>	Toiletries/basic items?	85%	76%	85%	
<b>4.6b</b>	The opportunity to have a shower?	37%	28%	37%	38%
<b>4.6c</b>	Something to eat?	95%	82%	95%	94%
<b>4.6d</b>	A free phone call to friends/family?	73%	83%	73%	80%
<b>4.6e</b>	PIN phone credit?	70%	64%	70%	
<b>4.6f</b>	Information about feeling worried/upset?	37%	27%	37%	
Within your first 24 hours, did you have access to the following people or services:					
<b>4.7a</b>	A chaplain?	48%	53%	48%	61%
<b>4.7b</b>	A peer mentor?	24%	8%	24%	
<b>4.7c</b>	Childline/Samaritans	28%	12%	28%	
<b>4.7d</b>	The prison shop/canteen?	17%	12%	17%	24%
<b>4.8</b>	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	60%	54%	60%	74%
<b>4.9</b>	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	83%	78%	83%	69%
<b>4.10</b>	For those who have been on an induction course: did it cover everything you needed to know about the establishment?	70%	55%	70%	65%
<b>SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT</b>					
<b>5.1</b>	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	100%	74%	100%	94%
<b>5.2</b>	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	51%	23%	51%	64%
<b>5.3</b>	Do you find the food here good/very good?	49%	18%	49%	23%
<b>5.4</b>	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	78%	51%	78%	49%
<b>5.5</b>	Is it easy/very easy for you to attend religious services?	51%	61%	51%	54%
<b>5.6</b>	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	58%	55%	58%	31%

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

### Key to tables

		Keppel Unit (Aug) 2013	HMYOI Wetherby (Aug) 2013	Keppel Unit (Aug) 2013	Keppel Unit (Jan) 2012
	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>38</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>33</b>
Can you speak to:					
5.7	A chaplain of your faith in private?	69%	76%	69%	71%
5.8	A peer mentor?	63%	29%	63%	
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	58%	18%	58%	44%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	74%	45%	74%	69%
<b>SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF</b>					
6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	92%	63%	92%	79%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	16%	20%	16%	
6.3	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	77%	37%	77%	72%
For those who have met their personal officer:					
6.4	Did you meet your personal (named) officer within the first week?	56%	35%	56%	88%
6.5	Do you see your personal (named) officer at least once a week?	80%	47%	80%	91%
6.6	Do you feel your personal (named) officer tries to help you?	93%	61%	93%	
<b>SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS</b>					
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	82%	83%	82%	81%
For those who have made an application:					
7.2	Do you feel applications are sorted out fairly?	97%	76%	97%	92%
7.3	Do you feel applications are sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	66%	65%	66%	82%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	24%	60%	24%	65%
For those who have made a complaint:					
7.5	Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	80%	30%	80%	65%
7.6	Do you feel complaints are sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	70%	42%	70%	63%
7.7	Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint?	14%	8%	14%	
<b>SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE</b>					
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	29%	27%	29%	35%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	58%	48%	58%	69%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	53%	43%	53%	54%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	68%	69%	68%	
For those who have had a minor report:					
8.5	Was the process explained clearly to you?	88%	84%	88%	
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	63%	64%	63%	57%
For those who have had an adjudication ('nicking'):					
8.7	Was the process explained clearly to you?	96%	87%	96%	91%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (Cand R) since you have been here?	36%	34%	36%	35%
8.9	For those who had spent a night in the care and separation unit: did the staff treat you well/very well?	100%	64%	100%	80%
<b>SECTION 9: SAFETY</b>					
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	41%	23%	41%	42%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	16%	8%	16%	
9.4	Have you ever been victimised by other young people here?	45%	15%	45%	54%

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

### Key to tables

		Keppel Unit (Aug) 2013	HM YOI Wetherby (Aug) 2013	Keppel Unit (Aug) 2013	Keppel Unit (Jan) 2012
	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>38</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>33</b>
Since you have been here, have other young people:					
<b>9.5a</b>	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	36%	5%	36%	35%
<b>9.5b</b>	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	15%	1%	15%	23%
<b>9.5c</b>	Sexually abused you?	3%	0%	3%	3%
<b>9.5d</b>	Threatened or intimidated you?	21%	4%	21%	
<b>9.5e</b>	Taken your canteen/property?	0%	1%	0%	3%
<b>9.5f</b>	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	0%	0%	
<b>9.5g</b>	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	0%	0%	
<b>9.5h</b>	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	1%	0%	3%
<b>9.5i</b>	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	1%	0%	6%
<b>9.5j</b>	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	1%	0%	3%
<b>9.5k</b>	Victimised you because of your nationality?	3%	2%	3%	
<b>9.5l</b>	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	5%	3%	5%	9%
<b>9.5m</b>	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%	0%	0%	
<b>9.5n</b>	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	13%	1%	13%	
<b>9.5o</b>	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	0%	0%	
<b>9.5p</b>	Victimised you because you have a disability?	3%	0%	3%	9%
<b>9.5q</b>	Victimised you because you were new here?	8%	4%	8%	12%
<b>9.5r</b>	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	0%	4%	0%	12%
<b>9.5s</b>	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	3%	0%	6%
<b>9.7</b>	Have you ever been victimised by a member of staff here?	18%	29%	18%	31%
Since you have been here, have staff:					
<b>9.8a</b>	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	13%	17%	13%	19%
<b>9.8b</b>	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	0%	4%	0%	3%
<b>9.8c</b>	Sexually abused you?	0%	0%	0%	6%
<b>9.8d</b>	Threatened or intimidated you?	5%	4%	5%	
<b>9.8e</b>	Taken your canteen/property?	0%	2%	0%	6%
<b>9.8f</b>	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	0%	0%	
<b>9.8g</b>	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	0%	0%	
<b>9.8h</b>	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	1%	0%	3%
<b>9.8i</b>	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	1%	0%	0%
<b>9.8j</b>	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	4%	0%	0%
<b>9.8k</b>	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	1%	0%	
<b>9.8k</b>	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	0%	3%	0%	3%
<b>9.8m</b>	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%	1%	0%	
<b>9.8n</b>	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	0%	0%	
<b>9.8o</b>	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	1%	0%	
<b>9.8p</b>	Victimised you because you have a disability?	3%	1%	3%	6%
<b>9.8q</b>	Victimised you because you were new here?	0%	1%	0%	0%

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

### Key to tables

		Keppel Unit (Aug) 2013	HMYOI Wetherby (Aug) 2013	Keppel Unit (Aug) 2013	Keppel Unit (Jan) 2012
	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>38</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>9.8r</b>	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	0%	2%	0%	3%
<b>9.8s</b>	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	1%	0%	3%
<b>9.8t</b>	Victimised you because you made a complaint?	0%	4%	0%	
<b>9.10</b>	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	46%	30%	46%	
<b>9.11</b>	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	67%	30%	67%	50%
<b>9.12</b>	Is shouting through the windows a problem here?	50%	30%	50%	71%
<b>SECTION 10: HEALTH SERVICES</b>					
<b>10.1a</b>	Is it easy for you to see the doctor?	76%	63%	76%	78%
<b>10.1b</b>	Is it easy for you to see the nurse?	87%	69%	87%	88%
<b>10.1c</b>	Is it easy for you to see the dentist?	57%	39%	57%	38%
<b>10.2</b>	For those who have been to health services: Do you think the overall quality is good/very good?	74%	45%	74%	90%
<b>10.3</b>	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/all of it in your cell?	35%	69%	35%	
<b>10.4</b>	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?	57%	21%	57%	47%
<b>10.5</b>	If you have emotional or mental health problems, are you being helped by anyone here?	86%	69%	86%	81%
<b>10.6</b>	Did you have any problems with alcohol when you first arrived?	24%	11%	24%	11%
<b>10.7</b>	Have you received any help with any alcohol problems here?	16%	6%	16%	9%
<b>10.8</b>	Did you have any problems with drugs when you first arrived?	57%	45%	57%	56%
<b>10.9</b>	Do you have a problem with drugs now?	27%	10%	27%	12%
<b>10.10</b>	Have you received any help with any drug problems here?	47%	30%	47%	43%
<b>10.11</b>	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs here?	13%	19%	13%	21%
<b>SECTION 11: ACTIVITIES</b>					
<b>11.1</b>	Were you 14 or younger when you were last at school?	31%	43%	31%	37%
<b>11.2</b>	Have you ever been excluded from school?	87%	93%	87%	79%
<b>11.3</b>	Did you ever skip school before you came into custody?	82%	85%	82%	
Do you currently take part in any of the following:					
<b>11.4a</b>	Education?	100%	81%	100%	97%
<b>11.4b</b>	A job in this establishment?	32%	64%	32%	20%
<b>11.4c</b>	Vocational or skills training?	30%	13%	30%	31%
<b>11.4d</b>	Offending behaviour programmes?	27%	17%	27%	46%
<b>11.4e</b>	Nothing	0%	9%	0%	0%
For those who have taken part in the following activities while in this establishment, do you think that they will help you when you leave prison:					
<b>11.5a</b>	Education?	82%	70%	82%	87%
<b>11.5b</b>	A job in this establishment?	64%	58%	64%	71%
<b>11.5c</b>	Vocational or skills training?	70%	45%	70%	62%
<b>11.5d</b>	Offending behaviour programmes?	76%	51%	76%	86%
<b>11.6</b>	Do you usually have association every day?	97%	44%	97%	97%
<b>11.7</b>	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	84%	67%	84%	27%
<b>11.8</b>	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	5%	13%	5%	3%

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

### Key to tables

		Keppel Unit (Aug) 2013	HMYOI Wetherby (Aug) 2013	Keppel Unit (Aug) 2013	Keppel Unit (Jan) 2012
	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>38</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>SECTION 12: KEEPING IN TOUCH WITH FAMILY AND FRIENDS</b>					
12.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	100%	77%	100%	94%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	31%	41%	31%	43%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	38%	37%	38%	17%
12.4	Is it easy/very easy for your family and friends to visit you here?	32%	35%	32%	
12.5	Do your visits start on time?	49%	40%	49%	33%
<b>SECTION 13: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE</b>					
Do you think you will have a problem with the following, when you are released:					
13.1a	Finding accommodation?	24%	23%	24%	25%
13.1b	Getting into school or college?	32%	25%	32%	39%
13.1c	Getting a job?	57%	50%	57%	42%
13.1d	Money/finances?	32%	34%	32%	53%
13.1e	Claiming benefits?	24%	26%	24%	25%
13.1f	Continuing health services?	13%	7%	13%	10%
13.1g	Opening a bank account?	16%	9%	16%	7%
13.1h	Avoiding bad relationships?	30%	15%	30%	25%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	73%	58%	73%	
For those with a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan:					
13.3	Were you involved in the development of your plan?	75%	83%	75%	
13.4	Do you understand the targets set in your plan?	93%	94%	93%	
13.5	Do you have a caseworker here?	87%	92%	87%	
13.6	Has your caseworker helped to prepare you for release?	55%	47%	55%	
For those with a social worker:					
13.7	Has your social worker been to visit you since you have been here?	71%	67%	71%	
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	32%	45%	32%	51%
If you have a problem with any of the following, do you know who to ask for help?					
13.9a	Finding accommodation	34%	32%	34%	52%
13.9b	Getting into school or college	46%	29%	46%	63%
13.9c	Getting a job	46%	38%	46%	66%
13.9d	Help with money/finances	29%	26%	29%	49%
13.9e	Help with claiming benefits	29%	22%	29%	38%
13.9f	Continuing health services	31%	13%	31%	46%
13.9g	Opening a bank account	26%	20%	26%	55%
13.9h	Avoiding bad relationships	26%	20%	26%	49%
For those who were sentenced:					
13.11	Do you want to stop offending?	93%	94%	93%	96%
13.12	Have you done anything or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?	64%	47%	64%	48%