

Report on an announced inspection of

# **HMYOI Wetherby**

30 January – 3 February 2012

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

Crown copyright 2012

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

# Contents

<b>Introduction</b>	5
<b>Fact page</b>	9
<b>Healthy prison summary</b>	11
<b>1 Arrival in custody</b>	
<hr/>	
Courts, escorts and transfers	21
First days in custody	21
<b>2 Environment and relationships</b>	
<hr/>	
Residential units	25
Relationships between staff and children and young people	27
Personal officers	28
<b>3 Duty of care</b>	
<hr/>	
Safeguarding children	31
Child protection	32
Self-harm and suicide prevention	33
Bullying	35
Applications and complaints	36
Legal rights	37
Faith and religious activity	38
Substance use	38
<b>4 Diversity</b>	41
<hr/>	
<b>5 Health services</b>	45
<hr/>	
<b>6 Activities</b>	
<hr/>	
Time out of cell	51
Learning and skills	52
Physical education and health promotion	56
<b>7 Good order</b>	
<hr/>	
Behaviour management	59

<b>8</b>	<b>Services</b>	
	Catering	65
	Prison shop	66
<b>9</b>	<b>Resettlement</b>	
	Strategic management of resettlement	67
	Training planning and remand management	68
	Resettlement pathways	69
<b>10</b>	<b>Recommendations, housekeeping points and good practice</b>	75
	<b>Appendices</b>	
	I Inspection team	81
	II Establishment population profile	82
	III Summary of young people's questionnaires and interviews	85

# Introduction

At the time of this inspection, HMYOI Wetherby held 340 boys, most of whom were aged 16 and 17, although a few were a year younger or older. Forty-eight young people were held on the self-contained Keppel Unit which we have inspected and reported on separately. The most striking feature of Wetherby was the wide range of the young people held, the challenge some of them posed and the extreme vulnerability of others. Some of the most challenging were also the most vulnerable. It is in this context that the report should be read.

Most young people were reasonably safe at Wetherby but there were areas that needed attention. It was not acceptable that the new escort contract was still causing problems. Some young people arrived very late which risked the most vulnerable young people at the most vulnerable time not getting the attention they needed. This has plagued a number of establishments, has gone on too long and needs to be sorted out.

Reception processes were also marred by the automatic strip searching of all new arrivals who had not come from another Prison Service establishment – so a young person arriving from a privately run secure training centre would be strip searched; a young person arriving from another young offender institution would not. Not all staff had their names visible on their uniform which was a particular problem for new arrivals. It was hard to understand why staff were reluctant to do this as notice boards with staff names and photos were on display in the units.

Staff were positive about the new 'ABC' anti-bullying strategy which appeared to be having a positive impact. The ABC policy addressed both the behaviour of the bully and provided support for the victim. Fewer young people said they had been bullied than in comparable establishments or than at the time of the previous inspection. Staff were vigilant about intimidatory shouting out of windows at night and good monitoring had reduced bullying around the use of the shop. The use of force was subject to detailed scrutiny and had reduced considerably over the previous six months.

Suicide and self-harm prevention was generally sound, although the quality of documentation was variable. An initial action plan had been developed in response to a self-inflicted death the previous year and was regularly reviewed. Child protection procedures were efficient but some elements currently lacked sufficient independence; however, we were pleased that local authority involvement had increased and the imminent addition of three social workers would strengthen the arrangements further. A member of the safeguarding team checked all complaints which was good practice.

The care and separation unit was, in reality, an old-fashioned segregation unit, whatever the title. Its use had been reduced but nevertheless young people were still sent there as a punishment. The environment was bleak, young people spent most of the day locked in their cell and there was little effort to address their behaviour or prepare them for reintegration back onto the main units. Governance of the unit was not part of the remit of the safeguarding committee and this needed to be corrected.

The environment was generally satisfactory and young people's perception of their relationships with staff had improved since the last inspection. There was some good work on diversity. Most young people from black and ethnic minority backgrounds reported similar experiences to their white counterparts, with the exception that a much greater proportion said they had been victimised by staff. We did not find evidence to support this perception but the reasons for it and some monitoring data needed to be investigated further. There was very

good support for foreign national prisoners who were accommodated together on one unit, which also housed an impressive cultural centre. The chaplaincy was a visible and valued presence throughout the establishment.

Mental health services were well resourced and we noted much good practice. Mental health nurses worked in reception to identify young people who might need support and saw every boy who needed it quickly. They worked closely with unit staff and caseworkers. Speech and language and occupational therapists also provided valuable support. Health care was generally good.

Education and learning assessments were good and included screening for dyslexia and other hidden disabilities. The special educational needs coordinator provided excellent support. There was a broad range of courses to meet most needs but provision for more able boys or those serving long sentences was less satisfactory. Attendance and punctuality at education had improved but poor behaviour was still a problem in some lessons.

Resettlement provision was generally very good and the needs assessment was excellent. Making sure that young people had somewhere to live on release was a problem and the establishment's partnership with 'Transitional Plus Care' to provide accommodation for looked-after children appeared to be a very good initiative that should be properly evaluated and, if successful, replicated elsewhere.

There was very good use of release on temporary licence (ROTL) to enable young people to take up work experience placements. Most young people had an education, training or work placement to go to on release and work had begun to track their progress after release. I met one young person leaving the establishment to go to a placement with a local charity. Like all of those on ROTL, staff made a point of providing encouragement when he left in the morning and welcoming him back after work. He was well-motivated and positive about the support he had received.

There was a good range of programmes to address young people's offending behaviour and significantly more young people than before thought the help they had received would reduce the likelihood of them reoffending after release.

About half of the young people were more than 50 miles from home and 14% were more than 100 miles away. Either because of distance or because relationships with their families had broken down, some young people received no or very few visits. The visits hall was not a welcoming environment and the visitors centre was a limited facility. Arrangements for booking visits were poor. There were no efforts to identify and address issues with young people who had very few visits.

A few days before the inspection two boys had died elsewhere in youth custody. There had been a self-inflicted death at Wetherby itself the previous April. Walking round the establishment, the vulnerability of some of the young people held was obvious. One boy in the segregation unit with a lifelong medical condition that would have been hard for any teenager to manage, and who had exhibited very disruptive behaviour, asked me tearfully if I could take him home to his mum. I was later told he had been moved to a more appropriate secure medical facility. Another boy, who looked about 12 and was sporting a dramatic black eye, had been convicted of a serious offence, had been in further trouble and was confined to his cell. A boy in health care, described to me as 'low', lay on his bed not speaking. All these boys were receiving good attention and care, but you feared for them all.

Of course, that was not the whole story. All the young people in Wetherby had been convicted of or were on remand for serious offences that had caused harm and distress to their victims. A group of boys working in one of the serveries were boisterous and cheerful – probably a bit of a handful – but even they were more subdued and troubled when I came across them individually later. A group of cleaners on one of the units, comfortably ensconced in a store room, appeared very pleased with themselves and needed better supervision.

Overall, Wetherby provided reasonably good outcomes for most of the young people it held and some of the work it did – the care for young people with mental health problems for instance – was excellent. It had some weaknesses that need to be addressed; the poor segregation unit was notable among these. However, the greatest concern was the vulnerability of some of the young people held and the difficulty of holding them safely in a large establishment with a wide spread of population a long way from home – and that raises issues about how young offenders should be dealt with that cannot be resolved in one establishment alone.

**Nick Hardwick**  
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

**May 2012**





# Fact page

**Task of the establishment**

Male children and young people

**Prison status**

Public sector

**Region**

Yorkshire and Humberside

**Number held**

30.1.12: 340 (including Keppel Unit)

**Certified normal accommodation**

348 (plus 48 on Keppel Unit)

**Operational capacity**

348 (plus 48 on Keppel Unit)

**Date of last full inspection**

30 June–4 July 2008

**Brief history**

A former naval base, Wetherby became a borstal in 1958, and has since changed its role from an open youth custody centre to a closed youth custody centre and is now a dedicated centre for males under 18.

**Short description of residential units**

Anson – long-term determinate and life-sentenced young people.

Benbow – first night facility (temporary reduced spaces due to refurbishment work)

Collingwood – standard accommodation

Drake – standard accommodation

Exmouth – standard accommodation

Frobisher – standard accommodation

**Name of governor**

Sara Snell

**Escort contractor**

GeoAmey

**Health service commissioner and providers**

Leeds Community Health Care

**Learning and skills providers**

The Manchester College

**Independent Monitoring Board chair**

Michael Crosbie



# Healthy prison summary

## Introduction

---

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

HP2 All inspections carried out by HM Inspectorate of Prisons contribute to the UK's response to its international obligations under the 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.

HP3 All Inspectorate of Prisons young offender institution reports carry a summary of the conditions and treatment of children and young people, based on the four tests of a healthy prison that were first introduced in this inspectorate's thematic review *Suicide is everyone's concern*, published in 1999. The criteria are:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Safety

---

HP5 Late arrivals remained a problem. Reception and first night staff dealt with new arrivals well, but few young people got a shower on their first night. The induction programme was informative. The active involvement of the local authority in safeguarding arrangements was a welcome development but the lack of in-house social work support was significant. Multidisciplinary support and engagement in the self-harm monitoring process were generally good. Bullying was managed effectively and staff were enthusiastic about the new behaviour management policy, many elements of which worked well. The separation and care unit was a poor environment for difficult young people although its use was declining significantly, as was the use of force. Detoxification and mandatory drug testing were managed safely. Outcomes for young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

HP6 Young people complained about unnecessarily long waits at court and late arrivals continued to be a problem, typically twice a week. Where this occurred, the establishment kept meticulous records and notified the escort contractor promptly. Reception staff used prisoner escort records for detailed handovers with escort staff. A young people's information booklet had been sent to local courts but few new arrivals had been given this useful information. The video link was used appropriately for court appearances.

HP7 Reception procedures were efficient and staff gave helpful advice to new arrivals and ensured that their immediate needs were met. The otherwise supportive treatment was marred by routine strip searching. Designated first night staff carried out a thorough interview with all new arrivals. They completed initial vulnerability assessments, which contained a good deal of information, but related risk management plans did not always address the risks identified. Young people who arrived on time could have some interaction and a meal with their peers but

responses in our survey<sup>1</sup> indicated that not everyone was given a meal and very few young people had the opportunity for a shower before they were locked up on their first night in custody.

- HP8 The induction programme was delivered by a dedicated staff group together with input from all relevant departments. Young people reported positively on the induction programme, and appreciated the tour of the prison it included.
- HP9 The various safeguarding committees provided useful multidisciplinary forums for sharing information about vulnerable young people and monitored a wide range of safeguarding practice and procedures. Meetings were well attended and included appropriate external involvement. Good quality data were produced but there was insufficient detail in some areas to ensure the required level of scrutiny. The use of the separation and care unit was not monitored by the strategic safeguarding committee, which was a gap. The most vulnerable young people were highlighted for additional attention through a weekly safeguarding meeting attended by a range of disciplines, but resulting care plans were poor and not well coordinated with other relevant plans.
- HP10 Child protection procedures were efficient and all relevant referrals were sent to the local authority. The majority of child protection referrals related to complaints made by young people following the use of force. Initial investigations by the child protection coordinator were thorough but could not be considered independent. Various establishment procedures, including the work by the restraint minimisation committee, were effective in highlighting concerns about individual staff, and the governor had taken robust action when this had occurred. The recent involvement of the local authority designated officer through strategy meetings was a considerable improvement.
- HP11 Most young people subject to self-harm monitoring were monitored due to staff concerns rather than following actual incidents. The quality of assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) monitoring documentation was too variable but reviews had good multidisciplinary input and young people were well cared for. There was good strategic oversight of self-harm concerns. Areas of concern initially identified following the tragic self-inflicted death in April 2011 had been incorporated into an action plan and monitored appropriately. Near-misses were investigated thoroughly.

---

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

- HP12 There was good information on all aspects of security, which was shared with residential staff, but security meetings were poorly attended. Data collection, monitoring and analysis of security information and other aspects of behaviour management were robust. Recommendations from the investigation into a recent escape were given high priority and security procedures had improved. However, risk assessments before conducting a strip search were poor, as was governance of the procedures, and too many strip searches took place.
- HP13 Staff expressed confidence in the effectiveness of the recently introduced 'address and begin to change' (ABC) policy in managing poor behaviour, including violence, and the high number of fights and assaults was decreasing. There were good systems to ensure that young people who were a threat to each other were managed safely. Mediation was used to good effect between young people involved in fights.
- HP14 The ABC policy was also used to address bullying and our survey findings indicated some improvements in levels of victimisation. Shouting out of windows continued to be a problem, although staff tackled it well. Bullies and their victims were monitored through weekly meetings, and staff from a variety of disciplines contributed to the implementation of the ABC policy. However, behavioural plans for individuals subject to ABC were inadequate. Better information was needed about bullying for the further development of the policy. Young people needed to be encouraged to open up about bullying, for example, through regular surveys and focus groups.
- HP15 The rewards and sanctions scheme was an integral part of the behaviour management policy and was administered well. Although some young people expressed doubts about the value of reaching the top level of the scheme, those who had achieved it appreciated its benefits. The lowest level of the scheme imposed a harsh regime, although this was somewhat mitigated by the ability to earn back some privileges at the frequent reviews.
- HP16 The use of minor reports had increased and they were used well. Correspondingly, the number of adjudications had decreased significantly over the previous three months. In the sample we examined, punishments were proportionate and included deferred sentences and successful appeals. There were good monitoring arrangements for consistency and fairness of application. Advocates were available to young people facing adjudication and were used appropriately.
- HP17 The majority of restraint was used to break up fights between young people, although there were some examples of force used for non-compliance. There were peaks and troughs but overall the use of force had reduced considerably over the previous six months. The restraint minimisation committee worked effectively. Data collection on restraint was detailed and monthly reports contained a comprehensive analysis of the issues. Quality assurance procedures were robust and addressed shortcomings in the completion of documentation, as well as inappropriate staff conduct in a few cases. Arrangements to debrief young people following restraint were not as rigorous as they had been, and did not effect a change in behaviour.
- HP18 The separation and care unit was used inappropriately for punishment, and it remained to all intents and purposes a segregation unit. Although the environment had been renovated and had improved from a previously poor state, it remained unacceptably bleak and the regime was poor. Unit staff showed sensitivity and understanding of the young people in their care, but our survey indicated poor perceptions of their treatment by young people. The most problematic young people

separated for reasons of good order or discipline had regular multidisciplinary reviews but the resulting care plans were inadequate and did not ensure their reintegration to mainstream activities at the earliest opportunity. However, greater efforts were being made to reduce the use of the separation and care unit, and the throughput was reducing – significantly so over the last three months.

HP19 The number of young people requiring alcohol and/or benzodiazepine detoxification was increasing. A specialist GP session was available and young people received good care and support, but nurses did not have substance misuse or dual diagnosis expertise. There was a low positive mandatory drug testing rate, and procedures were appropriate.

## Respect

---

HP20 The living environment had improved overall but access to showers and telephones was inadequate. Applications and complaints were dealt with well. Catering arrangements were good but young people did not like the food. The role of the personal officer was underdeveloped. Young people received good support from the chaplains. In the main, relationships between staff and young people were good. The equality action group worked effectively but monitoring for equality of services needed to be improved, and perceptions of discriminatory treatment needed to be addressed. There had been some good initiatives to work with different minority groups. Foreign nationals were well supported. Health services were very good. Outcomes for young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

HP21 The residential units held up to 60 young people. They reported poor responses to in-cell emergency bells, despite a system of management checks. Communal areas were suitably equipped and generally clean but some outside areas had much litter. The laundry facilities had improved and the refurbished showers were a considerable improvement. Young people were encouraged through competitions to keep their cells clean and tidy, and most were. Access to showers for many young people was on alternate days, which was inadequate, particularly for those who worked in dirty areas. Access to telephones was also inadequate for most young people. Monthly consultation meetings with young people seemed to work well, and they received a good deal of support from the advocates.

HP22 The kitchen and serveries were clean and tidy, and young people working in the kitchen had opportunities to gain qualifications. Most young people ate communally for lunch and tea every day but breakfast was eaten in cells. A dietitian was consulted about menus, which included salad and fruit each day. A hot choice for lunch had been reintroduced. Young people complained about the food and in our survey only 13% said the food was good, against the comparator of 20%.

HP23 In our survey, young people indicated improved relationships with staff in being treated with respect and having someone to turn to with a problem. Residential staff were mostly knowledgeable about the young people in their care. Most staff we observed engaged with young people actively but others were not so inclined. Young people confidently approached staff and they were generally responsive to their requests, but opportunities for private discussions during association were limited. Not all staff wore names on their uniforms, which was an important safeguarding issue.

- HP24 The role of the residential support officer was underdeveloped. They did not attend meetings relating to the care of young people they were responsible for or record or share information appropriately. Young people gave mixed reports about the helpfulness of their residential support officer, although there had been some improvement since the previous survey.
- HP25 The multi-faith chaplaincy team provided good spiritual support for a variety of faiths and contributed well to the care of individual young people. Access to religious services, chaplains and the multi-faith room was good, apart from for young people in the separation and care unit. The chaplains attended most establishment-wide meetings. The involvement of community groups in mentoring and supporting young people in custody post-release was commendable.
- HP26 The applications system was well managed by unit staff and young people were positive about promptness and fairness in dealing with applications. Young people made good use of the complaints system. Most complaints we examined were dealt with well, and all complaints were checked by a member of the safeguarding team, which was an effective additional safeguard. There was good monitoring and analysis of complaints.
- HP27 Young people received prompt attention from caseworkers who arranged timely remand management meetings where bail was discussed with external youth offending team (YOT) workers. Free telephone calls to solicitors were facilitated and provision for legal visits was good.
- HP28 The equality action group was appropriately constituted, and meetings were usually well attended and included young people's representation. Many aspects of our survey indicated little difference in custodial experience between white and black and minority ethnic young people except for some aspects of adverse treatment from staff, an issue also reflected in our focus groups. Complaints about discrimination (discrimination incident report forms) were dealt with efficiently but there was no external validation. Monitoring for equal treatment did not cover all protective characteristics and there was insufficient consideration of anomalies highlighted by ethnic monitoring. Racist behaviour was tackled well. A small number of Travellers had been identified and appropriate support was provided from community groups. There was a wide range of support for young people who were foreign nationals including good use of translation services and a support group. Links with UK Border Agency and the Refugee Council were sound. Although young people with disabilities were supported well by health care and learning and skills, links with the diversity team, as well as the residential units, were underdeveloped. There had been positive work to support gay, bisexual and transgender young people.
- HP29 Health care offered a wide range of specialist provision suitable for the population, including a looked-after children nurse and a good number of registered mental health nurses, who often carried out reception screening. All young people were seen by the GP the day after their arrival. The quality of primary care was good and included very good access to the GP, a wide range of clinics and excellent provision for speech and language therapy. Health promotion was age-appropriate, linked with other relevant departments, and developing well. Dental and pharmacy services met the needs of the population. Mental health provision was excellent. There was good access to the child and adolescent mental health service (CAHMS), and the integration of primary mental health into CAHMS was progressing well. In our survey, young people's views of the overall quality of health care had improved.



## Purposeful activity

---

HP30 The majority of young people had a reasonable amount of time out of their cell but a few spent too much time locked up. Assessments by the learning and skills department were thorough, and the speech and language department and the special educational needs coordinator (SENCO) provided some excellent information about individuals, although it was not always used to good effect across the establishment. Punctuality in education had improved significantly and attendance was satisfactory. Teaching and learning were variable. The revised curriculum met the needs of most young people, apart from those serving long sentences or who were more able. Accreditation provision was low but worthwhile. Young people developed good skills in vocational training. The library was a poor resource with limited access. PE provision was very good. Outcomes for young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

HP31 The core day allowed for 10 hours out of cell a day for some young people but in reality most had between 7.5 and 8.5 hours on weekdays, with far less at weekends. Movement to activities generally took place as scheduled and there were few cancellations. A few young people on the basic level of the rewards and sanctions scheme or those temporarily excluded from learning and skills activities spent much longer locked up, but not usually for extended periods. Access to association was split across the residential landings, which meant that most young people had association every other evening. Young people could spend time in the open air most days and take up was good, despite poor facilities.

HP32 All young people received a thorough initial assessment, as well as screening for dyslexia and other hidden disabilities. Assessments were enhanced by input from the SENCO and the speech and language team but there was little evidence that it was effectively used by teachers or shared appropriately with other relevant staff. Young people were allocated to activity following an education induction. The management of waiting lists needed to be improved and further work was needed to enable more young people to access their first choice of programme when appropriate.

HP33 Attendance in education was satisfactory and punctuality had improved significantly and was now good. There was sometimes confusion about which young people should be attending which lessons.

HP34 Teaching and learning were variable but satisfactory overall. Behaviour management was inconsistent and a few young people were returned to their units each day for poor behaviour in classrooms, and too many young people were excluded for short periods and instead received a daily hour of literacy and numeracy on their unit.

HP35 Following a very thorough review, there was a broad range of both academic and vocational courses and the curriculum met the needs of most young people satisfactorily. However, there were insufficient courses to meet the needs of those serving long sentences or more able young people fully.

HP36 Achievements and standards were satisfactory. Young people developed good skills in vocational training and the army cadet course, and some produced an excellent standard of work in art. Wing cleaning was not sufficiently supervised and there were no accredited cleaning qualifications. Some young people contravened basic health and safety through lack of adequate training and supervision. There had been an

appropriate focus on developing skills in literacy and numeracy, and virtually all young people gained a qualification in these key subjects. Although the overall amount of accreditation was low, qualifications were meaningful.

- HP37 Access to the library remained extremely poor, and activities to promote literacy and reading to young people were inadequate.
- HP38 Young people had good access to at least three hours high quality, balanced core PE each week, as well as recreational PE in the evenings and at weekends. Although the core programme was not accredited, there were opportunities for accreditation in sports leaders, diet and nutrition and gym instructor courses. There were good links with external partners, and excellent work through a project where young people produced high quality booklets on Australian rules football for children in India learning the game. Release of temporary licence (ROTL) was used well for the Duke of Edinburgh's Award.

## Resettlement

---

- HP39 The strategic management of resettlement was very efficient, and underpinned by an extremely thorough needs analysis. Training planning, remand management and public protection were well managed. Young people benefited from good finance, benefit and debt advice and accommodation support to prepare them well for their release. Release on temporary licence opportunities were very good. Substance misuse services were good. More work was needed to promote better contact between young people and their families. There was a range of programmes based on the needs analysis, and many young people completed a relevant one. Outcomes for young people were good against this healthy prison test.
- HP40 The resettlement strategy was comprehensive and linked to an extremely thorough needs analysis. Discussions at the resettlement committee meetings focused appropriately on the pathways and were well informed. The head of reoffending attended regional strategic forums, which had resulted in collaborative work to develop work and accommodation opportunities for young people. The use of ROTL for a range of purposes had doubled since the previous inspection, and benefited at least 10 young people a month.
- HP41 The casework team took the principal role in training planning and remand management. Arrangements were efficient and young people were given good support. Attendance at reviews by residential support officers was poor and by specialists, such as education and health care, was erratic, although attendance at meetings was far better for young people from the Anson Unit.
- HP42 Relevant public protection cases were identified accurately on admission, restrictions were applied appropriately and individual young people were monitored well. All multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPAs) level three conferences were attended. There were good links with adult establishments to ensure that young people who transferred to adult prisons were properly prepared.
- HP43 Ensuring that all young people were released to suitable accommodation was an ongoing problem. The partnership arrangement with Transitional Plus Care, which

assisted young people with looked-after status leaving custody, was innovative. The chaplaincy had good links with local housing associations.

- HP44 Young people gained worthwhile qualifications that were recognised by colleges, and training providers, and benefited from good quality guidance and careers advice. Most young people had an education, training or employment placement to go to on their discharge, and work had begun to track their progress in their placement. A good range of companies and other agencies offered work placement opportunities in which young people gained valuable employment skills.
- HP45 Young people were assessed on induction to determine if they had any money problems and caseworkers provided the necessary help and advice. Information sessions about finance, benefit and debt had been introduced for a few young people. Young people were positive about the help they received in this area.
- HP46 The young people's substance misuse service (YPSMS) offered a good range of interventions and support and had some involvement with the vast majority of young people in the establishment. Young people were positive about the support they received. There was good coordinated care planning for young people with complex needs. Young people with a need had detailed release plans, and there was good engagement and information sharing with community services.
- HP47 Visits entitlements and opportunities to book a visit were too limited and there was no monitoring to identify and assist young people who did not get visits. Although staff were helpful, support and provision at the visitors' centre was limited. The visits hall was uninviting and visits did not always start on time. Family days were only available to young people on Keppel and Anson units. However, there had been some positive work to develop regular support sessions for young fathers, and the time for families programme was a valuable initiative.
- HP48 The range of offending behaviour programmes had been extended and included the accredited JETS (juvenile enhanced thinking skills) programme and a newly developed course for young people who had committed violent offences, being piloted with young people serving long sentences on the Anson Unit. All young people who had been convicted of a sexual offence received specialist input from the Lucy Faithful Foundation or the establishment's psychology team.

## Main concerns and recommendations

---

- HP49 Concern: Late arrivals continued to occur and this affected the ability of staff to settle new arrivals in properly and resulted in a poorer first night experience for them.

**Recommendation: Problems relating to late arrivals should be resolved.**

- HP50 Concern: The separation and care unit was a bleak environment and the regime and individual care plans for the most problematic young people held there were poor. In particular, care plans did not focus on reintegration to mainstream activities at the earliest opportunity.

**Recommendation: The separation and care unit should be improved so that it is a suitable environment in which to work with difficult and challenging young people. Location in the separation and care unit should not be used to punish**

young people. All young people in the separation and care unit should have detailed care and reintegration plans, based on an initial and ongoing assessment of their risks and need, which are regularly reviewed and updated. Where appropriate, young people should be encouraged and enabled to engage in the normal regime as part of their care and reintegration plan.

HP51 Concern: Access to association from Monday to Thursday was split across the residential landings which meant that the majority of young people had association every other evening. Consequently, access to telephones and showers for many young people was on alternate days, which was inadequate, and the lack of daily showers particularly affected those who worked in dirty areas.

**Recommendation: All young people should have daily access to telephones and showers, including after work for those employed in dirty areas.**

HP52 Concern: Many young people were held a long distance from their homes. The facilities for visitors were poor. Few young people got frequent family visits and there was no monitoring of family contact to identify whether maintaining contact with family and friends was a problem to be addressed.

**Recommendation: The visitors' centre and visits hall should be improved. The contact that young people maintain with their families should be monitored to identify individuals who might need help, as well as to identify and address any overarching problems in maintaining family ties.**

# Section 1: Arrival in custody

## Courts, escorts and transfers

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.1 Delays at court and late arrivals were still problems, but staff worked effectively to manage this. Prison staff made constructive efforts to communicate with escort and court staff to address the problems. A useful information booklet had been produced and distributed to local courts but few young people had been given it.
- 1.2 Young people in our discussion groups complained about waiting for long periods at court before their journey to Wetherby. Late arrivals also continued to be a problem and we were told that young people were admitted to the prison after 7.30pm at least twice a week. The establishment recorded such occurrences meticulously and maintained detailed records of timings for individual young people, allowing identification of the problem areas. It notified the escort contractor and the Youth Justice Board (YJB) monitor promptly, and escort contractors attended safeguarding meetings. Over the previous three months, young people had spent an average of between two-and-a-half and three hours on a vehicle, and there was some evidence that late arrivals were due to circuitous routes to the prison. In our survey, 34% of respondents said that they had travelled with adults, against the comparator of 24%.
- 1.3 There was a complaints book for young people to comment about their treatment before arriving at the prison, although this had no entries.
- 1.4 We observed prison staff using the contents of the individual's prisoner escort record (PER) for thorough verbal handovers with escort staff. Prison staff had sent a booklet with useful basic information about the prison to local courts, although few young people in our survey (only 5%) said they had seen it.
- 1.5 Young people going to court were properly prepared, and there was good use of video links when appropriate.

### Recommendation

---

- 1.6 Young people should be provided with the useful information booklet at court.

## First days in custody

---

### Expected outcomes:

Children and young people feel and are safe on their reception and introduction to the establishment. Their individual needs, both during and on release from custody, are identified and effective plans developed to meet those needs. During induction into the establishment young people are helped to understand establishment routines, are told how to access available

services, are given a clear idea of what is expected of them and are helped to cope with imprisonment.

1.7 Reception procedures were efficient and staff ensured that young people's basic needs were met. The introduction of Insiders and a more personalised approach had improved the treatment of new arrivals but this was marred by routine strip searching. Helpful information was offered to new arrivals, both verbally and in a written guide, but few young people reported the opportunity to have a shower and some said they had not been given a meal. The first night arrangements were sound and staff were alert to the vulnerability and needs of newly admitted young people. The induction process had been improved and was more relevant, and young people found it useful.

## Reception

---

- 1.8 The reception area was clean and tidy in the morning but became less so during the day. A wide range of posters gave young people helpful information about the prison. The holding rooms were relatively comfortable and young people had televisions to occupy them while they waited.
- 1.9 Our survey indicated that staff were diligent in asking new arrivals if they needed specific help or support: several responses were better than the comparators. Young people being discharged to court were offered breakfast in reception and staff spoke to all young people leaving the establishment, whether they were going to court, out on release on temporary licence or being discharged, to support them and check that they were all right.
- 1.10 We observed that young people travelling to and from court were routinely strip searched on their departure and arrival. Reception staff told us that young people were also strip searched on returning from release on temporary licence (ROTL), as well as on admission from a non-NOMS establishment, such as secure training centre (STC) or a secure children's home. Managers told us that a recently introduced policy intended to reduce the level of strip searching, but the staff we spoke to had not amended this practice and there seemed to be some confusion about the status of the new policy (see also paragraph 7.7).
- 1.11 An Insider was usually available to meet and greet new arrivals, other than those who arrived late. All new arrivals were given a 'quick guide' leaflet, available in a range of languages, which told them all they needed to know about what happened in the prison within their first 24 hours.
- 1.12 Young people did not generally remain in the reception area for more than an hour and new arrivals were offered a telephone call before they left. Young people told us that they were not offered a shower in reception, and our survey results on this were poor, although we observed young people given this opportunity. Those arriving after 8.15pm could not take a shower. In our survey, only 16% of respondents said they had the opportunity to shower when they first arrived.
- 1.13 New arrivals were offered a reception pack with stamps, stationery, refreshments and toiletries. This cost £2.50 and could be paid for at 50p a week.

## Recommendation

---

- 1.14 All new arrivals should be given the opportunity to speak to an Insider, take a shower and have a meal before they are locked up for the night.

## First night

---

- 1.15 The living conditions on the first night unit, Benbow, were adequate. Cells for new arrivals were clean, had fresh bedding and contained televisions and kettles. Staff had taken steps to ensure that current work to upgrade cells on the unit did not affect first night procedures.
- 1.16 Young people arriving on the unit were given a detailed information booklet about prison rules and routines and how to access sources of help. They had an interview in private with a specialist first night member of staff as soon as they arrived. First night staff were detailed to work until 10pm and were always available to deal with late arrivals. Interviews were conducted sensitively and thoroughly. Following completion of the interviews, young people could have a meal or go on association with others. Microwave meals were available in reception for late arrivals but in our survey under three-quarters of young people said that they had been offered a meal (see recommendation 1.14). Late arrivals also missed out on association with their peers and a meeting with an Insider.
- 1.17 First night staff completed young people's initial vulnerability assessments to a reasonably good standard. It was clear that they referred to the ASSET (YJB assessment document) and other background information to help complete them. The content of the assessments we examined were comprehensive, but the risk management plans were formulaic and did not always address the concerns highlighted in the assessment.

## Recommendation

---

- 1.18 First night risk management plans should be relevant to the young person's needs and identified risks, and managers should monitor quality through robust quality assurance.

## Induction

---

- 1.19 The induction programme had recently been reviewed and modified, and was now delivered by a small group of specialist induction staff. The course was shorter and enabled young people to be assessed and allocated to activities more quickly.
- 1.20 Young people started the induction programme the first working day after they arrived. The standard programme lasted five days, although recent returners were fast tracked. The programme involved interactive group discussions and presentations, supplemented by input from all key departments and also advocates. Participants were surveyed at the end for their views on its relevance. Feedback was usually positive, particularly about the tour of the prison, and few young people complained about spending too much time locked up during their induction. Young people were also given a detailed induction booklet, supplemented with short easy-read guides. In our survey, 74% of respondents said that their induction covered everything they needed to know, against the comparator of 63%.





# Section 2: Environment and relationships

## Residential units

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

2.1 The residential units were large accommodating up to 60 young people. Shouting out of windows remained a problem and young people reported poor responses to cell bells, despite management checks. Cells and communal areas were generally clean and reasonably maintained but there was some graffiti and litter thrown out of windows. There were monthly consultative meetings on the units, which seemed to work well. Advocates offered wide-ranging support. Laundry facilities and showers had been improved but access to them was still inadequate with many young people not having a daily shower, and nor did they have daily access to a telephone call.

### Accommodation and facilities

---

- 2.2 Apart from Anson, which could hold a maximum of 48, the residential units could each accommodate up to 60 young people. Communal areas were clean and suitably equipped, and young people were often engaged in cleaning them, including the exercise areas. However, the outside areas had rubbish thrown from cell windows.
- 2.3 There was no cell sharing, although some cells still had bunk beds. Cells were generally maintained appropriately, although there was graffiti throughout many cells, including on some mattresses and pillows, and in many shower cubicles. Many young people kept their cells very clean and tidy but there were some exceptions. Cells had a weekly inspection, and the resident in the best one on each unit was awarded additional telephone credit.
- 2.4 There was some shouting out of windows when young people were locked up, and in our survey 40% of respondents said this was a problem. Although this was concerning, this compared with 55% at the previous inspection (see also bullying section).
- 2.5 In our survey, only 25% of respondents said their cell call bell was usually answered within five minutes, against the comparator of 40%, and some young people we spoke to highlighted this as a problem. There was no central monitoring of cell bell response times but managers undertook checks, including testing how long it took for staff to respond to a bell. They had not highlighted any particular problems. We observed staff responding very quickly to cell bells.
- 2.6 The policy on offensive displays was adhered to and young people were able to personalise their cells with photographs and suitable posters. Some also had collections of toiletries in their cells, but these were not excessive and staff monitored the amounts displayed to minimise bullying. Young people did not have any lockable storage in their cells.
- 2.7 The communal areas displayed clear helpful notices and posters, and notices to young people were equally clear.

- 2.8 Each unit had three hooded telephones and staff supervised access to these and to showers and unit activities during association periods. Apart from Friday, young people had association by landing every other weekday, which affected their access to telephones and showers (see main recommendation HP51). In our survey, only 18% of respondents said they could use the telephone every day, against the comparator of 77%, and young people told us that it was difficult to use the telephone on Fridays, when credit was added to their accounts. Young people received two free letters a week and could buy additional stamps from the prison shop. Incoming mail was distributed daily.
- 2.9 There were monthly consultation meetings with young people, attended by two or three representatives from each unit, one or two unit staff, advocates and staff from other departments, for example catering, as required. A standing agenda covered safety, including bullying, the use of force, and complaints. Meetings were minuted, there was evidence that young people's representatives had consulted their peers about what to take forward to the meetings, and action points were followed up. However, the minutes of the meetings and related decisions were not systematically communicated to all young people.
- 2.10 Advocates offered support across a wide range of topics. These included support with legal issues, supporting young people at meetings and adjudications, and resolving accommodation concerns. The advocacy service was advertised on the residential units and advocates were regular visitors to the units. An average of just over 150 referrals were dealt with by the advocates each month between July and December 2011. The majority of these were direct referrals from young people themselves requesting assistance.

## Recommendation

---

- 2.11 **Response times to in-cell emergency call bells should be monitored to ensure they are responded to within five minutes.**

## Housekeeping point

---

- 2.12 Minutes of consultation meetings and resulting decisions should be effectively communicated to all young people.

## Clothing and possessions

---

- 2.13 All young people wore prison-issue clothing, except for trainers, underwear and socks and some gym kit. They received sufficient acceptable clothing to last the week. However, the tracksuit trousers had no pockets, and we were told that most young people kept their ID cards in their socks. The issued clothing included an outdoor jacket but no pyjamas.
- 2.14 Each unit had its own laundry, which young people could access on a rota. However, some still preferred to wash and dry their underwear in their cells.

## Hygiene

---

- 2.15 Unit showers were in individual cubicles, which was a considerable improvement on the previous facilities. The showers were kept clean, but some floors were broken and needed repair. Graffiti was a problem in many cubicles.

- 2.16 With split association arrangements every weekday apart from Friday, young people could only access a shower on their unit every other day. In our survey, only 31% of respondents said they could normally shower every day, against the comparator of 79%. Young people could use showers in the gym on the days when they had PE. A few young people who worked in particularly dirty areas complained to us that they were not always able to get a shower after work. Staff confirmed that while they always tried to accommodate such young people, they sometimes returned to the unit too close to food service to have a shower (see main recommendation HP51).
- 2.17 New arrivals were issued with toiletries and could obtain further supplies from the unit office or buy them through the prison shop. Kit exchange, including bedding and towels, took place weekly.

## Relationships between staff and children and young people

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.18 There had been some improvement in young people's relationships with staff. Most staff we spoke to had a good knowledge of the young people on their residential unit. Some staff were more formal than others in their relationships with young people, but young people appeared comfortable in approaching staff and they were generally responsive to the young people's requests. Not all staff wore their names on their uniforms, which was an important safeguarding measure.
- 2.19 In our survey, 63% of respondents said that most staff treated them with respect, compared with 53% at the last inspection, and 64%, against 55% in 2010, said there was a member of staff they could turn to with a problem. Staff were mostly knowledgeable about the young people in their care.
- 2.20 Not all staff wore their names on their uniforms. This could potentially inhibit communication, particularly for new arrivals on a unit, and could make it more difficult for a young person to raise concerns about individual staff. Photo boards with pictures and names of staff were displayed on the units.
- 2.21 Several young people told us about good staff, but in the focus groups and individually we were also told about staff viewed less positively. We observed that young people were confident in approaching staff, who were generally responsive to their requests. During association periods some staff spent time talking to young people or engaging in a game with them, but it was clear that the main priority was ensuring that young people were not getting into disputes with each other and that access to showers and telephones was properly managed. Importantly, young people were not ignored by staff but opportunities for private conversations were limited.

- 2.22 Regular staff wing entries on files reflected a reactive approach and were often a comment on the young person's behaviour rather than a report of active engagement with them. There were some noteworthy exceptions to this, where entries following a significant event in the individual's life were more informative and gave evidence of support provided. Observation books were used to good effect to share important information about young people, and some entries indicated that there had been private conversations with the young person to gain the information.

## Recommendation

---

- 2.23 All staff should display their name on their uniform.

## Personal officers

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.24 Young people had mixed experiences of their residential support officers (RSOs). RSO entries in records did not provide much evidence of meaningful engagement with young people, and they were not involved in relevant meetings to share information affecting their charges.
- 2.25 In our focus groups, young people were mostly negative about their experience of personal officers, known as residential support officers (RSOs). However, our survey results showed improvements in relationships with their RSO since the previous inspection: 56%, against 44%, said they saw their personal officer once a week, and 61%, against 47%, felt they had been of help.
- 2.26 RSOs were assigned by cell and photo boards showed who was assigned to which cell. However, young people only changed their personal officer if they moved to a different unit. Not all cell cards carried the name of the RSO. It was not clear from the records that RSOs met their young people within 24 hours of their arrival, and they did not attend relevant meetings affecting them, such as self-harm monitoring reviews or detention and training order (DTO) meetings. Other than electronic case note entries, there was little evidence of information sharing between RSOs and caseworkers or other specialist staff, such as the special educational needs coordinator, although the RSO had a key role in supporting young people on the residential unit.
- 2.27 RSOs made weekly electronic case note entries. These tended to be a review of the young person's behaviour and gave little evidence of meaningful interaction with him or advice or support given on how to improve his behaviour. Although good effort and behaviour were acknowledged in several RSO entries, they did not indicate the degree of help given to young people as reported in our survey.

## Recommendation

---

- 2.28 Residential support officers should attend relevant meetings and reviews relating to the care and management of the young people for whom they are responsible, and record and share information appropriately.



# Section 3: Duty of care

## Safeguarding children

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 3.1 The safeguarding committee structure worked well and meetings were well attended and involved appropriate external representation, including more recently the local authority designated officer. Good quality data was produced but some lacked sufficient detail for the required level of external scrutiny, and the use of the separation and care unit was not included in the remit of any of the safeguarding committees, which was a gap. The most vulnerable young people received additional attention through weekly multidisciplinary meetings, but resulting care plans were poor and not well coordinated with other related plans.
- 3.2 A safeguarding policy usefully explained the constituent elements of safeguarding and covered child protection, self-harm and suicide prevention, violence reduction and bullying, information sharing and staff recruitment.
- 3.3 The safeguarding committee structure was coherent and coordinated, and all meetings were well attended. A weekly multidisciplinary meeting of operational staff shared useful information about vulnerable young people. A monthly safeguarding meeting of heads of departments considered a range of good quality statistical data covering most relevant areas. A quarterly strategic committee meeting, which had a similar focus to the monthly meetings, was also attended by staff from external agencies, such as the escort provider and, more recently, the local authority designated officer.
- 3.4 The use of the care and separation unit was not monitored by the safeguarding committees, and useful information derived from the good quality governance by the restraint minimisation committee, including injuries sustained by young people, was not provided in sufficient detail to the safeguarding committee meetings attended by the local authority designated officer to provide the required level of independent oversight in this area (see paragraph 7.2). The range of safeguarding meetings was effective in sharing relevant information about vulnerable young people, but records indicated that discussion at the meetings focused on comparisons with the previous month, rather than full consideration of the detailed data to determine relevant patterns or trends and the action taken.
- 3.5 There were a number of systems for making assessments and formulating plans for young people at risk, including training or remand management plans, assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) self-harm monitoring and related care maps and the 'address and begin to change' (ABC) policy and related behaviour plans. In addition, young people who were highlighted for discussion at the weekly safeguarding meetings had a separate care plan, but the quality of those we examined was generally poor. Some young people, usually those with the most problematic behaviour, had several separate plans, which were not well coordinated.

- 3.6 At the time of the inspection, 38 young people had been identified as looked-after children. Caseworkers tried to promote their interests but the absence of a prison-based social worker restricted the progress that could be made (see also paragraph 3.14).
- 3.7 All staff working directly with young people had received Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) clearance and JASP (juvenile awareness staff training).

## Recommendations

---

- 3.8 Oversight of the use of force, injuries sustained by young people and the use of the care and separation unit should be added to the remit of the quarterly safeguarding committee to ensure independent oversight of these areas.
- 3.9 The quality of care plans for the most vulnerable young people should be improved, properly coordinated with other relevant plans and quality assured.

## Housekeeping point

---

- 3.10 Data produced for strategic safeguarding committee meetings should be analysed to determine relevant patterns and trends, and there should be a clear record of the committee's action to address concerns.

## Child protection

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 3.11 Child protection procedures were managed efficiently by the establishment's child protection coordinator. Initial investigations into referrals were thorough but lacked independence. The governor had taken robust action when more serious concerns about the behaviour of staff had been highlighted. Working arrangements with the local authority designated officer had improved significantly and his involvement in strategy meetings had been helpful. Overall, there was a lack of ongoing independent monitoring of child protection referrals but that was set to change with the imminent appointment of three social workers.
- 3.12 On average, there were approximately 11 referrals a month. The majority of child protection referrals arose from complaints made by young people following incidents where force had been used. The child protection policy included a whistle-blowing component, which made it clear that staff were obliged to report concerns about the behaviour of colleagues to the child protection coordinator, and there were examples of staff following the procedures and such referrals being made.
- 3.13 The establishment's child protection coordinator followed internal procedures diligently and passed all referrals to the local authority designated officer (LADO) in the first instance, other than those related to historic abuse. This was an improvement on previous procedures whereby the establishment had carried out its own initial investigations, including allegations of abuse by staff, and then filtered referrals depending on the available evidence. Although the revised procedures ensured that the LADO was able to direct the action to be taken by the



establishment, in reality the instructions were invariably for the establishment to investigate the allegation.

- 3.14 The establishment's child protection coordinator carried out these initial investigations. The investigations we examined were thorough and well documented. Although the child protection coordinator had received basic JASP training, she had not received any additional child protection training, in particular that relating to interviewing children and collecting evidence appropriately. Since the departure of the in-house social worker, there were no staff in the establishment with specialist child protection training, and the lack of independence in investigations at this important early stage was a weakness.
- 3.15 The child protection coordinator emailed the outcome of the investigations to the LADO, and invariably there was no further action in individual cases. There had been a number of more detailed internal investigations by managers into the conduct of individual staff, directed by the governor, when there had been a more serious incident or when a pattern of behaviour was emerging. The investigations we examined were robust, and appropriate action had been taken in agreement with the LADO as part of a series of strategy meetings. This was a considerable improvement on the previous arrangements, which had rarely involved strategy meetings with the LADO.
- 3.16 The child protection coordinator was persistent in pursuing appropriate responses from local authorities in relation to allegations of historical abuse.
- 3.17 There were no regular meetings with the LADO to monitor the progress of child protection referrals or maintain appropriate independent oversight of the initial investigations. In a useful meeting we had with the LADO during the inspection, it was clear that this was the inevitable consequence of limited local authority resources rather than lack of commitment. The LADO had recently been involved in the recruitment of three social workers for the establishment (a threefold increase in the previous social work staffing), and appointments were due to be made.

## Recommendation

---

- 3.18 The child protection coordinator should receive additional training relevant to the role.

## Self-harm and suicide prevention

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 3.19 The management of vulnerable young people at risk of self-harm and suicide was generally good. There were strong links within the safeguarding team and good analysis of information and data. Formal monitoring (ACCT) documentation varied in quality and some did not demonstrate well-coordinated care. Near-misses were properly investigated and used to learn lessons. There had been appropriate monitoring of identified actions following a tragic self-inflicted death.

- 3.20 An up-to-date and comprehensive suicide and self-harm prevention policy outlined the focus of suicide and self-harm prevention work as well as useful guidance for staff on every aspect of work involving assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) self-harm monitoring documents, and managing vulnerable young people more generally. A full-time suicide prevention coordinator was part of the wider safeguarding team. A daily record of all young people subject to ACCT management was maintained and available to all staff. All open ACCTs were subject to daily monitoring checks by the suicide prevention manager, who demonstrated a detailed knowledge of all open cases.
- 3.21 There was a well-established three-tier meeting structure for safeguarding generally and suicide and self-harm prevention specifically (see also paragraph 3.3). Analysis of self-harm and ACCT data was comprehensive. The weekly safeguarding meeting focused on specific casework relating to the most vulnerable individuals and complex cases. This model worked well and ensured an appropriate level of information sharing and dissemination of good practice.
- 3.22 The number of ACCTs opened in 2011 had risen from 276 in the previous year to 365. Despite this, the number of actual self-harm incidents was quite low at 34 in the last six months, although there had been 12 near-miss incidents in the previous year. All near-misses had been appropriately investigated, reports disseminated and lessons to be learned identified. This system was managed well. Parents or carers were notified when their child self-harmed and, when appropriate, they were invited to attend a review, although they seldom did so. There were usually around 15 ACCT documents open across the establishment as a whole (with about half to a third on the separately inspected, Keppel unit).
- 3.23 At the time of the inspection, two young people on ACCTs were accommodated in the inpatient unit. Although this was not unusual, we were assured that individuals were not allocated there only because they had self-harmed. A draft protocol already in use emphasised the necessity for medical factors to locate a young person on the unit, and this seemed to be the practice.
- 3.24 Overall the quality of ACCT documentation was variable. Initial assessments were generally good but care maps too often included generic objectives, and many specific targets did not identify who would take responsibility for their implementation – even though the suicide and self-harm prevention policy gave good guidance to staff, along with specific examples of how this work fitted together. These frailties were not picked up in the daily monitoring check.
- 3.25 Integration of work and the clear identification of objectives and roles and daily observations were better where the child and adolescent mental health service (CAHMS) was involved with the young person. Care plans developed by CAHMS staff tended to be more specific, with identified leads and clear links between the issues identified in assessments and the work and support to be undertaken.
- 3.26 ACCT reviews were generally well attended, with representatives from the young person's wing, health care staff and the chaplaincy, and other departments where necessary. The role of residential support officers in work with young people at risk of self-harm, however, was unclear. A role was rarely identified specifically for an individual officer, even when they were the young person's RSO (see recommendation 2.28). Despite the procedural frailties, young people at risk of self-harm received a good level of care, and those we spoke to confirmed this.
- 3.27 The tragic self-inflicted death of one young person at Wetherby in April 2011 had led to considerable work by the prison to develop an initial action plan pending the full report from the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman. The action plan identified significant work to be undertaken, which the safeguarding team reviewed regularly.

## Housekeeping point

---

- 3.28 Quality assurance should ensure better links between assessment, care maps and ongoing support for young people subject to ACCT processes.

## Bullying

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 3.29 Anti-bullying policies and procedures were comprehensive, and staff expressed confidence in the 'address and begin to change' (ABC) policy, which included clear systems to identify bullying and support for victims. Governance of the implementation of the policy was good but young people needed more encouragement to report bullying. The majority of reported bullying was name-calling. Staff were vigilant about shouting out of windows, and good monitoring had reduced the opportunities for bullying around use of the shop. Victims were well supported and persistent bullies had behaviour plans but the quality of the written plans was inadequate. More analysis of the available data was needed to better identify the nature and extent of bullying and any patterns or trends.
- 3.30 Policies and procedures to address bullying and reduce violence were comprehensive and linked the twin issues of security and safeguarding. The 'address and begin to change' (ABC) policy implemented in January 2011 set out a clear process for staff to monitor poor behaviour, including bullying, support victims and introduce interventions for the perpetrator if the behaviour continued. The procedures were linked to the rewards and sanctions scheme, and also encouraged and supported improved behaviour for those on the lowest level of the scheme. Unit senior officers were responsible for the implementation of the ABC policy, and the head of safeguarding had both strategic oversight of implementation of the policy and responsibility for ensuring individual young people were properly looked after. The work undertaken with all perpetrators and victims was discussed at the weekly safeguarding meeting, and concerns were fed back to senior officers to promote better practice.
- 3.31 Staff were trained in anti-bullying procedures and understood what was required of them. They expressed confidence in the ABC policy and believed that it allowed them to manage poor behaviour more effectively. Senior officers said that they were already seeing changes in young people's behaviour, and our survey indicated some improvements: only 17% of respondents said that they had been victimised by other young people, against the comparator of 26% and the previous survey finding of 25%. A monthly violence reduction report was produced for the safeguarding committee but the analysis of patterns and trends in relation to bullying was limited. For example, it did not include the type of bullying incidents or the locations where incidents had taken place (see also paragraph 3.4).
- 3.32 Staff said that the majority of reported bullying was name-calling, and this was supported by our survey. Shouting out of windows continued to be an issue, despite good efforts to tackle this, although our survey findings indicated that this had improved. There was also effective monitoring of young people's purchases from the shop to stop bullying. In our survey, only 2%

of young people who said that they had been bullied said it involved having their canteen or property taken, against the comparator of 7%.

- 3.33 There had been no bullying survey for over a year and no action had been taken following the last survey. There was emerging evidence that the new ABC system was identifying more bullies and their victims. Victims were monitored through the weekly safeguarding meetings and supported by staff from a variety of departments, including the chaplaincy, psychology and CAMHS. Behavioural plans were initiated for persistent bullies, but plans we examined were inadequate to help young people address their poor behaviour.
- 3.34 Young people could inform staff that they were being bullied confidentially through the formal complaints system, where all complaints were checked by the safeguarding team, or by telling a member of staff. Young people said that some staff were helpful but others avoided tackling the issue, and in our survey only 58% of young people said they would tell a member of staff if they were being victimised.

## Recommendations

---

- 3.35 More should be done to encourage young people to give information about bullying, for example, through regular surveys and focus groups. Findings should be acted upon to encourage young people to have greater confidence to report bullying.
- 3.36 The quality of behavioural (ABC) plans for young people who bully should be improved.

## Applications and complaints

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 3.37 Applications were well managed and young people were positive about the system. The management of complaints was reasonable, the quality of responses generally good and there was a quality assurance system, but outcomes were not consistently shared to sustain improvements
- 3.38 The application system was well managed. Although there was a general application form and several others, staff were able to advise young people about the form to use and how to complete it. In our survey, 81% of respondents said that their applications were dealt with fairly, against the comparator of 66%, and 69%, against 59%, said that were dealt with promptly. The general application form was in triplicate, which ensured that applicants had a copy and that follow up was efficient.
- 3.39 The prison received an average of around 90 complaints a month (discrimination incident reports were handled separately, see paragraph 4.6). Complaint forms were readily available on all residential units, and in our survey 89% of respondents, against the comparator of 82%, said they knew how to make a complaint. There was a monthly log of complaints and their category, and copies were sent to the senior management team (SMT).

- 3.40 The prison had adopted a new streamlined complaints model that allowed staff slightly longer to respond. Most complaints were responded to within the timescale. The prison had attempted to improve the quality of responses, and our own review found that this had been largely achieved. Most responses we saw were polite, clear and addressed the issue, with just a few exceptions. Some staff handwrote replies that were very difficult to read. Approximately 5% of complaints were appeals against adjudications or release on temporary licence, and we saw examples of considered and appropriate responses. A few appeals had been upheld.
- 3.41 There was quality assurance of a random 10% of complaints a month by a member of the SMT. However, these reviews were not consistently fed back to unit managers or the authors to ensure improvements.
- 3.42 A member of the safeguarding team checked all complaints, which offered an effective safeguard for child protection issues raised through this route. Complaints that indicated a racial or diversity aspect were forwarded to the diversity manager.

### Housekeeping points

---

- 3.43 Feedback from the quality assurance of complaints should be consistently shared with managers to help improve effectiveness.
- 3.44 Responses to complaints should be legible.

### Good practice

---

- 3.45 *A member of the safeguarding team checked all complaints, which offered an effective safeguard for child protection issues raised through this route.*

## Legal rights

---

Expected outcomes:

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

- 3.46 Caseworkers facilitated contact between young people and their legal advisers and arranged prompt remand planning meetings to discuss bail. Facilities for legal visits were good.
- 3.47 There were no staff with recent training in legal services and young people had to use their own legal advisers for legal information. Caseworkers interviewed all new arrivals, and arranged prompt remand planning meetings where bail could be discussed with external youth offending team (YOT) workers. Young people had remand management plans, and caseworkers told those who were sentenced about their early and late release dates. Caseworkers also facilitated telephone calls to solicitors for young people to discuss appeals or any other concerns about their case.
- 3.48 Legal visits were available every weekday and could take place in closed booths or the open area of the visits hall.

## Faith and religious activity

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 3.49 The multi-faith team offered good pastoral and spiritual support, including a range of services and classes. The team and its activities were well publicised, and chaplains were visible around the establishment, known to young people and attended key meetings. Post-release pastoral support was organised for young people as required.
- 3.50 The multi-faith chaplaincy team provided good spiritual and pastoral support to young people. The team was led by a full-time Muslim chaplain and included two full-time and five part-time chaplains and a part-time church link coordinator. Chaplains of faiths not represented in the team visited when required. Major religious festivals were celebrated, as well as regular services.
- 3.51 In our survey, 53% of respondents said they saw a chaplain within 24 hours of their arrival, against the comparator of 42%. The chaplaincy participated in the induction programme, and gave out a useful leaflet that clearly explained the support available.
- 3.52 Service times and photos of all the chaplains were well publicised around the establishment. Muslim prayers took place on Friday, Catholic mass on Saturday and Church of England/Free Church service on Sunday. Young people in the separation and care unit were permitted to attend corporate worship, subject to risk assessment, but in reality this did not happen (see also paragraph 7.31 and main recommendation HP50).
- 3.53 The chapel and multi-faith room were used flexibly to accommodate all faith services comfortably. The chaplaincy's records showed that in December 2011 an average of just under a quarter of young people had attended corporate worship each week.
- 3.54 The chaplains were a visible and known presence around the establishment, and contributed to the care of individual young people and to strategic meetings. The team made frequent visits to young people in the separation and care and inpatient units and to those on open ACCTs, as well as seeing new arrivals and attending ACCT reviews. It ran a range of faith classes, including Youth Alpha, Islamic studies, Bible study, 'first steps', and baptism preparation. The chaplaincy could also call on volunteers from local churches and mosques to provide mentoring support to young people while in custody and after release, and the church link coordinator identified religious groups that young people could worship with after release.

## Substance use

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 3.55 The number of young people requiring alcohol and/or benzodiazepine detoxification was increasing. While they received a good level of care and support, there was no designated substance misuse/dual diagnosis nurse. The young people's substance misuse service (YPSMS) offered a wide range of interventions, including health promotion initiatives, and was actively engaged with the majority of the population. Drug availability was low and there was good information sharing between YPSMS and the security department. Mandatory drug testing procedures were appropriate.
- 3.56 The substance misuse strategy had recently been updated and there was a young people's substance misuse service (YPSMS) annual delivery plan. There had been a needs analysis in 2010, and the results of the 2011 assessment would inform interim service provision. As elsewhere in the country, all substance misuse services were due to be re-commissioned during 2012/13. Quarterly substance misuse strategy meetings were attended by relevant senior managers from relevant departments.
- 3.57 Screening, assessment and care planning for young people dependent on alcohol and/or drugs were appropriate, and comprehensive clinical management protocols had been developed. A specialist GP was available to treat young people, with additional support available from the local substance misuse consultant, but the nurse skill mix did not include substance misuse or dual diagnosis expertise.
- 3.58 In the past 12 months, 37 young people had required detoxification – 21 from alcohol, 15 from benzodiazepines and one from heroin. This was a noticeable increase over the previous 12 months, when 21 young people had undergone detoxification.
- 3.59 Young people did not always want to be admitted as inpatients and the establishment had devised a detailed multidisciplinary treatment care plan approach for those who chose to be on a residential unit during detoxification. However, the protocol had not yet been distributed to residential staff, and we found staff on B unit unaware that a young person was undertaking an alcohol detoxification regime.
- 3.60 Joint working between primary, mental health services and the YPSMS team had improved. Treatment reviews were conducted jointly and the care of young people with complex needs was coordinated at the weekly safeguarding meeting. Young people received a high level of monitoring and support, and they had daily contact with nurses and YPSMS workers during detoxification.
- 3.61 In our survey, 54% of respondents said that not being allowed to smoke was a problem for them when they arrived, against the comparator of 46%. New arrivals were offered nicotine replacement therapy – 25 young people had taken up the offer in December 2011. Nurses and YPSMS staff offered support, and the teams were developing a wide range of health promotion initiatives using age-appropriate materials, which were delivered on the units during association.
- 3.62 All new arrivals received the substance misuse awareness programme during induction, which included smoking awareness. The YPSMS saw all new arrivals within their first three days, and the team was currently engaged with 262 young people. The service met or exceeded its targets. A wide range of interventions included one-to-one work supplemented by work books, half-day cannabis, alcohol and stimulant modules, a five-day 'alcohol and lifestyle' course co-delivered with PE staff, acupuncture sessions, and a one-day drug awareness module for army recruits (see paragraph 6.13). Interventions were interactive and took account of young

people's learning needs. In our survey, 30% of respondents said they received help with their drug problem, against the comparator of 19%.

- 3.63 Care plans were of good quality, and nominated link workers facilitated joint working with other departments. The team contributed to training and remand planning meetings and attended safeguarding meetings to coordinate the care of young people with complex needs.
- 3.64 Although a quarter of survey respondents, against the comparator of 16%, said that it was easy to get illegal drugs in the prison, there was little evidence of illicit use. The year-to-date random mandatory drug testing (MDT) rate was 1.75% against a target of 3%, and only four out of 30 suspicion tests in the previous six months were positive. MDT procedures were appropriate and did not involve routine strip searching. Finds were predominantly for tobacco. There were appropriate security measures to reduce supply, and good information sharing between the security department and the YPSMS.

## Recommendations

---

- 3.65 A substance misuse/dual diagnosis nurse should be appointed to provide comprehensive and coordinated care to young people with complex needs.
- 3.66 There should be information and training for residential officers on the care of young people undergoing detoxification.



# Section 4: Diversity

## Diversity

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 4.1 There was an appropriate emphasis on diversity and some provision for each protected characteristic, although development was inconsistent. Race equality continued to have the highest profile. Ethnic monitoring was mostly within the expected range but some differences remained unexplained with little analysis of apparent anomalies. Work with Travellers was developing. There had been much recent work on foreign national young people, with significant provision of translation and interpreting services and good links with the UK Border Agency and Refugee Council. Information about the number of young people with disabilities was not shared sufficiently across the prison. Support for gay, bisexual and transgender young people was good.
- 4.2 Diversity had been given a reasonably high profile across the establishment and was taken seriously. The diversity policy and action plans were up to date and sufficiently comprehensive. A full-time diversity manager was responsible for all strands of diversity except for work with young people who were foreign nationals (see paragraphs 4.16-18). There had been some work on all protective characteristics, although some areas were more extensively developed than others. A good range of notices and posters displayed positive images of minority groups across the prison.
- 4.3 The equality action group (EAG) met bimonthly and had representation from all key departments, with usually good attendance. Each residential unit had identified wing representatives but, because of the fast turnover of young people and the relative infrequency of meetings, two representatives were identified for each wing. Unit representatives also had their own forum where concerns were raised and discussed before they were taken to the EAG.
- 4.4 The diversity manager maintained a respected profile across the prison. There had been some links with local community groups, usually to support specific needs in the establishment (see paragraphs 4.11, 4.12 and 4.24).
- 4.5 Across the prison, 77% of staff had received diversity training, but training had been reduced pending revision of the course following changes to the Equality Act in 2011.
- 4.6 The prison monitored the impact of its regime by race and ethnicity through SMART (systematic monitoring and analysing of race equality treatment, see paragraph 4.10), but not by any other protective characteristic. Discrimination incident report forms (DIRFs, formerly racist incident reports) were widely available on all units, although most submitted in the previous six months had related to race. The number of DIRFs had remained fairly consistent, with 105 submitted in 2011 compared with 84 in 2010 and 106 in 2009. Submitted DIRFs were well managed and responded to on time and politely. Investigations were generally well

conducted and issues taken seriously, but there was no quality assurance or external scrutiny of complaints, and no analysis of patterns or trends.

## Recommendation

---

- 4.7 Equality of treatment for all minority groups should be effectively monitored and appropriate action taken to address any inequalities. There should be external validation of investigations into reported incidents of discrimination.

## Housekeeping point

---

- 4.8 The prison should analyse patterns and trends that emerge in discrimination incident report form (DIRF) data.

## Race equality

---

- 4.9 The black and minority ethnic population at Wetherby averaged around 18%. In our survey, black and minority ethnic respondents expressed few differences in their experiences compared with white young people, with the exception that 43%, compared with 13% of white respondents, said they had been victimised (insulted or assaulted) by staff. Although we found no evidence to support this contention, this view was also expressed in our black and minority ethnic focus group.
- 4.10 SMART ethnic monitoring was mostly within the expected range but some patterns remained unexplained with little analysis of this. In eight of the previous 12 months, black and minority ethnic young people had been above the range in the use of cellular confinement, and in five of the last seven months they had been above range for segregation for good order or discipline. Conversely, for six of the previous seven months they had been below range in the use of minor reports. No investigations had been commissioned to understand these anomalies.
- 4.11 The prison had contacted a community group to deliver work on challenging racially motivated behaviour and offending. A log was kept of young people who had a current or previous offence with a racist aspect, and 19 were currently on the list. There was no similar screening for young people with offences against other minority groups, such as those who were gay or had a disability.
- 4.12 Although the prison did not formally monitor or record Travellers, a few young people from this background had been identified and a support group had been held to explore issues and concern, with a community representative as a facilitator. The diversity manager maintained informal contact with a broad network of support for Travellers.

## Recommendations

---

- 4.13 Negative perceptions of young people from black and minority ethnic groups and from young Muslim people should be examined further and areas of concern monitored and addressed by the equality action group.
- 4.14 Out-of-range patterns and trends identified by SMART monitoring data should be fully investigated and the underlying issues addressed.

## Foreign nationals

---

- 4.15 Although the number of young people who were foreign nationals was low, at only 16 at the time of the inspection, the prison had given resources and time to manage this group of young people.
- 4.16 All foreign national young people were accommodated on a designated unit, Collingwood, where the foreign national coordinator was based along with three officers specifically trained to work with this group. All foreign nationals were identified within 48 hours of arrival and interviewed to establish their individual needs. Induction information was available in 25 languages, and there was a list of both staff and young people who spoke foreign languages and were willing to interpret informally. External interpreting services were used appropriately. The cultural centre on Collingwood was a positive initiative with resources for young people, including written information and advice from embassies.
- 4.17 There was a comprehensive foreign national strategy document, which also included a range of advice for staff working with foreign nationals. The foreign national strategy group met monthly and had appropriate representation from across the prison. Issues raised also fed into the wider EAG meeting.
- 4.18 All foreign national young people were invited to a support group that was scheduled to meet monthly, although attendance at the recent inaugural meeting had been low. Foreign national young people not receiving visits were entitled to free international telephone calls.
- 4.19 The prison had good links with the UK Border Agency (UKBA), which held monthly surgeries, and there was also monthly access to the Refugee Council. We were told that, to date, no young people had been detained at Wetherby for immigration purposes beyond the end of their sentence.

## Disability

---

- 4.20 There was a reasonably comprehensive disability policy. The diversity manager maintained a log of all young people identified as having a disability, but this depended on receiving accurate information from the health care and education departments, along with electronic case note records. At the time of the inspection, 14 young people with disabilities were identified, but this appeared to be a significant under-representation. In our own survey, 12% of respondents said they had a disability, and education staff had identified over 100 as having an educational special need, including 50 with a statement of special educational needs (see paragraph 6.8).
- 4.21 Personal emergency and evacuation plans (PEEPs) were in place for the few young people with a physical disability (three at the time of the inspection). However, there were no care plans for young people with learning disabilities to help unit staff manage their specific needs.

## Recommendation

---

- 4.22 **There should be effective links between education, health care and the diversity manager to ensure that young people with disabilities are identified at an early stage, information relating to their needs is shared with relevant staff, and that they have a suitable care plan.**

## Religion

---

- 4.23 In our survey, Muslim respondents (identified as 10% of young people in the prison's SMART data) expressed broadly similar views to black and minority ethnic respondents on victimisation by staff, but in most aspects had similar responses to non-Muslims. However, they did indicate that they were significantly less likely to undertake vocational training or offending behaviour programmes than non-Muslims. The prison did not monitor or evaluate such factors. (See recommendation 4.7.)

## Sexual orientation

---

- 4.24 Good links had been made with a community support group (MESMAC) that offered both group and individual support to a small group of young people on the Keppel unit who were gay or bisexual. Such support was available on other units but had not yet been taken up.

## Section 5: Health services

### Expected outcomes:

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

5.1 Health services were based on an up-to-date needs analysis that was regularly reviewed. Initial assessments by health care staff were thorough. Primary care services were delivered professionally by well-trained and motivated staff. Access to GP services was good, and other visiting health professionals provided a high level of care. Health promotion was age-appropriate and developing well. Pharmacy provision was improving steadily. Dental services were good with no significant waiting lists. Mental health provision was excellent.

### General

---

- 5.2 Health services were delivered by Leeds Community Healthcare NHS Primary Care Trust (PCT). A health care needs assessment had been completed and was regularly reviewed.
- 5.3 There was a main health care department and treatment rooms on residential units. All areas were child focused and reasonably clean and tidy. A registered nurse (RN) had oversight for infection control; there had been a recent infection control audit. A young person cleaned the department daily, and an appropriately trained PCT cleaner was due to be introduced.
- 5.4 Health care staff were integrated well into the prison and represented on a variety of multidisciplinary meetings.
- 5.5 Health care information was available in several languages, and professional interpreters were used where necessary.

### Clinical governance

---

- 5.6 The head of health care was a member of the prison partnership board and the prison senior management team. She also attended many other PCT and Prison Service meetings. Clinical staff included RNs and health care assistants. All were well trained and included specialists trained in mental health, lifelong conditions, looked-after children and health visiting. Professional development, including clinical supervision, was strongly supported and workforce development was ongoing. Four administrators supported health services. There were regular staff meetings and, despite a significant turnover in all grades, staff appeared highly motivated and keen to improve health services for the young people.
- 5.7 The PCT employed a prison officer to support the department. The GP service held six surgeries a week and included GPs experienced in the management of young people with substance use needs. Out-of-hours medical cover was through the PCT. The GP waiting list was well managed.
- 5.8 Emergency equipment was located in all clinical treatment areas and was subject to daily documented testing. Access to specialist clinical equipment was through PCT sources.

- 5.9 Clinical records and care plans were held on SystmOne (the clinical IT system). The clinical lead was working with staff to improve record keeping.
- 5.10 The management of communicable diseases was well established with excellent contacts with community partners.
- 5.11 Health staff ensured that young people understood informed consent for treatment and were advised that they could liaise with their parents/guardians if they were unsure of their rights.
- 5.12 A PCT 'health reps' forum was under development, and four young people had volunteered to represent young people on their units.
- 5.13 Complaints forms were available on all units but very few health care complaints were received. The head of health care or the manager answered all complaints and, where appropriate, spoke with the complainant. Young people were able to raise their complaint directly with the PCT.

## Primary care

---

- 5.14 All new arrivals had a full health screen, and secondary screening within 72 hours was being introduced. The GP saw all young people for an initial health review and to identify any existing health needs. Young people's own GPs were contacted for copies of their clinical records. If appropriate, young people were referred to other clinicians, such as substance use and mental health specialists.
- 5.15 Young people could access health services through a pictorial age-appropriate application form, available on all units. They could post the form in a dedicated secure health care box on the unit, or ask nurses during medication rounds if they could see a particular health specialist. Nursing staff collected and reviewed the application forms and directed them to the appropriate health specialist. Where appropriate, nurses dealt with the application and documented any action on to SystmOne. All treatment rooms had a list of basic remedies. All young people requesting to see the GP were seen by a nurse to ensure the referral was appropriate. Access to the GP was within 48 hours or sooner.
- 5.16 A comprehensive range of visiting PCT health specialists, including asthma and diabetes, visited the prison regularly to manage young people with these conditions. Where specific health services were not available in the prison, young people were taken out to community providers. Sexual health services were provided through community sources. All new arrivals were offered chlamydia screening and relevant treatment.
- 5.17 A registered sick children's nurse (RSCN) had been appointed with specific responsibility for looked-after children. New arrivals who disclosed during the reception health screening that they had been in care were referred to the RSCN, who contacted the appropriate local authority. All such young people had annual health and dental checks.
- 5.18 In our survey, 62% of young people who had been to health care said that the overall quality was good, compared with 52% in the previous survey.

## Pharmacy

---

- 5.19 Pharmacy services were provided by the Trust from HMP Wealstun, and an efficient pharmacy technician from Wealstun spent two days a week at Wetherby. There were no pharmacy-led

clinics for young people. Although pharmacy support to health care was very good, young people did not have direct access to a pharmacist. We had concerns about overall management of prescription charts. In one case, a patient not receiving his medication was prescribed a controlled drug that should have been administered daily. The chart indicated that the patient did not receive medication for four days, but it was unclear whether he refused to take the medicine or did not attend for it, and this had not been picked up by staff.

- 5.20 Prescriptions were faxed to the main pharmacy but were not checked beforehand. Other evidence suggested that some prescriptions were not completed correctly, leading to a delay.
- 5.21 There were limited patient group directions. Standard operating procedures were being reviewed – there was none for the disposal of controlled drugs.
- 5.22 We found expired disposable thermometers and face masks in treatment rooms.

## Recommendations

---

- 5.23 Full-time pharmacy support should be provided.
- 5.24 Standard operating procedures should be thoroughly reviewed.

## Housekeeping points

---

- 5.25 There should be patient group directions to enable the supply of more potent medications.
- 5.26 All pharmacy items with an expiry date should be checked regularly.

## Dentistry

---

- 5.27 Dental services were contracted in by the PCT, and were good. Two dentists, supported by a dental nurse, provided two sessions a week. The surgery needed some refurbishment. There was insufficient storage space and the fan heater was broken. Dental staff cleaned all surfaces and the floor. The head of health care was aware of the need to comply with infection control measures and was working toward meeting them. Cross-infection measures appeared satisfactory. Dental instruments were satisfactory but had to be cleaned after each patient, which restricted the number of patients that could be seen.
- 5.28 Eight patients were seen in each session. Initial examination waiting lists varied but were within targets. The treatment available was equal to that in the community.

## Recommendation

---

- 5.29 The dental surgery should be refurbished to ensure sufficient storage for all dental equipment.

## Inpatient care

---

- 5.30 The small inpatient unit was within the primary care facility, which was very busy and noisy at times. All the cells had cameras so that patients could be closely monitored. Four cells were

used for young people needing closer supervision, with only one occupied at the time of the inspection. We were told that the use of inpatient beds was under review and under-occupancy was the norm. There was no evidence that young people were inappropriately placed there. Time out of cell for inpatients was reasonable but sometimes limited because of outpatient activity. Nurses looked after inpatients but routine personal activity, such as showers and canteen, were managed by the officer. Where appropriate, inpatients could leave the unit, escorted, and attend the main gym or education. Inpatients received a high level of care from all health care staff.

## Secondary care

---

- 5.31 The administrator managed referrals to NHS hospitals. Approximately 25 young people a month were escorted to external NHS appointments. Three appointments had been rearranged in October and November 2011 due to lack of escorts.

## Mental health

---

- 5.32 Primary and secondary mental health services were separate but due to be amalgamated, which would benefit young people. Four primary care registered mental health nurses (RMNs) were dedicated to mental health duties, and were being assimilated into the child and adolescent mental health service (CAMHS).
- 5.33 The primary team worked in reception wherever possible, and followed up new arrivals they identified with any mental health issues the next day. If appropriate, the young person was admitted to health care for close observation and support.
- 5.34 Referrals were accepted from across the prison. An RMN saw every young person as soon as possible and completed a mental health assessment. If necessary, the young person was referred to the GP or the CAMHS team. Patients remained on the primary care caseload until both parties felt it appropriate to close it. The RMNs worked closely with unit staff and gave them support and guidance on how to manage the young people. Many young people had a diagnosis of ADHD (attention deficit hyperactivity disorder) or attachment disorder and needed considerable support. The RMNs worked closely with the patient's caseworker and shared relevant information. Where appropriate, the RMNs attended meetings, such as training planning, to provide information about individual young people. A young person discharged from the primary team continued to have access to them. Any deterioration in his condition would lead to intervention by the GP and, if necessary, CAMHS.
- 5.35 CAMHS was led by a clinical psychologist who was a member of the senior management team. The team, which was still recruiting staff, included psychologists, occupational therapists, drama and arts therapists, and was supported by two visiting psychiatrists, including a forensic specialist. Young people benefited from excellent access to the speech and language therapist who was based in education but worked closely with health services.
- 5.36 All referrals to the team were through the RMNs or GPs. CAMHS automatically saw all new arrivals already under the care of community mental health teams. A specific health screening was completed and discussed at a weekly management group. Young people were then allocated a CAMHS team member to work with one to one or participated in group work. The current caseload was approximately 85 young people, and they remained on the team's caseload for as long as necessary.



- 5.37 Mental health awareness training was available to all staff but staffing difficulties sometimes prevented programme delivery. The team had worked hard with unit officers, particularly on the Anson unit, which held young people serving long sentences for serious offences, where an occupational therapist spent time to interact with young people. The therapist had also worked with the prison garden team to establish a garden project for young people.

## Good practice

---

- 5.38 *The primary mental health team worked in reception wherever possible, and followed up new arrivals they identified with any mental health issues the next day.*
- 5.39 *A registered mental health nurse saw every referred young person as soon as possible and completed a mental health assessment.*
- 5.40 *The occupational therapist had worked with the prison garden team to establish a garden project for young people.*



# Section 6: Activities

## Time out of cell

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 6.1 Most young people had between 7.5 and 8.5 hours a day out of their cell on weekdays, and far less at weekends. Movement to activities generally took place as scheduled and there were few cancellations. Young people on the basic level of the rewards and sanctions scheme or those temporarily excluded from activities spent much longer locked up, but not usually for extended periods. Access to association was split across the residential landings, which meant that from Monday to Thursday most young people had association every other evening. Young people could spend time in the open air most days, and take up was good despite poor facilities.
- 6.2 From Monday to Thursday, the core day potentially allowed for 10 hours out of cell a day. The reality for most young people was less than this as daily association was split so that, over this period, they could only access the maximum time out of cell every other day. Association was organised so that on a Friday all young people received some time out of their cell. Cancellation of activities was not common and movements to and from activities took place on time. In the previous weeks, the establishment had reported an average time out of cell of between 7.5 and 8.5 hours each weekday and between four and five hours at the weekends, which appeared to be an accurate reflection of the experience of most young people. Young people who had three hours out of cell less than their peers included those on the lowest level of the rewards and sanctions scheme, and those who had lost dining out and association as part of a punishment. A few young people who had behaved badly in classes had one hour of education on their unit, but periods of exclusion did not usually last long. Residential staff told us that they made efforts to unlock these young people to clean and undertake wing work, but in reality young people not in mainstream education spent much of their day locked up (see also learning and skills section). We carried out two spot checks across all wings during the inspection but did not find high numbers of young people locked up for lengthy periods.
- 6.3 Association was available to most young people on alternative nights during the week, although those on the top level of the rewards and sanctions scheme could have additional association on the night when their landing was not scheduled for association. In our survey, only 22% of respondents, against the comparator of 79%, said they usually had association every day. The range of activities on association was adequate and staff supervision was unobtrusive. Staff were aware of and engaged with young people who chose not to come out of their cells for association and/or meals.
- 6.4 Time in the open air was scheduled each day with two sessions available, one in the morning and one in the evening. Take up was good during the inspection, despite cold weather and exercise areas that offered no opportunities for activity other than walking. However, each landing had one day when they were not able to go outside, and in our survey only 26% of respondents, against the 48% comparator, said they could go outside for exercise every day.

## Recommendation

---

- 6.5 Outside recreational areas should be equipped with suitable activity and/or games equipment, and young people should have daily access to time in the open air.

## 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) working under the general direction of HM Inspectorate of Prisons. For information on how Ofsted inspects education and training see the Ofsted framework and handbook for inspection.*

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 6.6 Assessment of young people's learning needs was thorough and enhanced by input from the special educational needs coordinator and the speech and language team. The curriculum met the needs of most young people, although opportunities for the more able or those on long sentences were too limited. Teaching and learning were satisfactory overall but there were inconsistencies in the standard of teaching and behaviour management, and a few young people were returned to their units each day for poor behaviour. Too many young people were excluded from education for short periods and instead received a daily hour of literacy and numeracy on their unit. Achievements and standards were satisfactory. Young people developed good skills in vocational training and the army cadet course. There was little accreditation but qualifications were meaningful. The library was under-resourced and access was inadequate.
- 6.7 All young people received an initial assessment of their literacy and numeracy. Those at entry level 2 or below were screened for dyslexia and other hidden disabilities. This information was provided to teachers but there was little evidence of its use in lessons. Neither was there any monitoring by managers to check that the information was used effectively.
- 6.8 Over 50 young people had a formal statement of special education need (SEN) and the prison maintained a detailed SEN register. For young people with a formal statement, the special educational needs coordinator (SENCO) prepared a very useful synopsis of the implications for teachers and learning support practitioners (LSPs). The speech and language team, including a dedicated LSP, worked well with the SENCO to provide helpful suggestions on how these often significant difficulties might be overcome.
- 6.9 Following an integrated induction, young people were allocated to an activity from a range of education and/or vocational courses. However, further work was needed to ensure that more young people were allocated to their first choice of programme when possible, and to improve the management and monitoring of waiting lists.
- 6.10 Teaching and learning were satisfactory. In the better lessons, teachers had prepared challenging, interesting and enjoyable tasks. Young people remained focused, behaved well and made progress. In these lessons, behaviour management was highly effective. There

were high expectations of what young people could achieve and their behaviour, which they met. Young people benefited from good individual coaching in the vocational workshops, and quickly developed their skills.

- 6.11 In the less successful lessons, young people failed to engage with the activities and spent too long not working and chatting to their friends. Some lessons relied too much on printed worksheets or workbooks, and young people found it difficult to concentrate to complete the work to the best of their ability. Some tasks were too simplistic. In some of these lessons we heard a significant amount of bad language, which was not always challenged effectively.
- 6.12 In the vocational workshops, daily diaries, when used well, enabled young people to reflect on what they had learned and tutors to praise good skills development. However, both at work and in vocational training, there was insufficient account of young people's progress in developing important work skills, such as taking instructions, receiving constructive criticism and acting on it, working as a team and showing initiative through working independently.
- 6.13 Young people made very rapid progress on the highly structured army cadet course, which was very successful in developing their independent living, health and social skills, and how these contributed to team performance.
- 6.14 The curriculum met the needs of most young people satisfactorily. A very thorough and highly appropriate review had resulted in a broad range of academic and vocational courses, which were planned well into a coherent timetable based on pathways. Young people who followed largely vocational or work pathways could still access literacy and numeracy lessons. However, there were insufficient courses to meet the needs of young people on long sentences, who gained a large number of lower level qualifications rather than fewer but more substantial ones. There were also insufficient courses at level 2 or higher to meet the needs of more able young people or those with a particular talent for a subject.
- 6.15 The needs of young people under school-leaving age were not fully met. Although the more able young people could follow GCSE and AS level courses in a reasonable range of subjects through the recently introduced 'step up' course, this innovative provision was under-resourced and required access to online learning materials to be fully effective. Some young people produced excellent work in art, had exhibited their work locally and visitors' comments on their artwork gave them good feedback.
- 6.16 The vocational training programmes were satisfactory in introducing construction crafts at national vocational qualification (NVO) level 1. Young people in the chef's academy developed skills at level 1 in hospitality and catering and could progress to the prison kitchen where they could develop their skills to NVO level 2. Health and safety courses gave young people a good basic understanding to enable them to work safely and effectively.
- 6.17 Achievements and standards were satisfactory. Although the overall number of accreditations was low, qualifications were meaningful and of value to young people as most were recognised by colleges, training providers and employers. There had been an appropriate focus on enabling young people to develop their literacy and numeracy, and virtually all left with a qualification in these key subjects. In 2010/11, over 600 qualifications were gained in literacy and/or numeracy, with nearly 100 at level 2. Most other accreditation was at level 1. A few young people also gained a total of 19 GCSEs in English, mathematics and art and design, and 114 gained the Prince's Trust award. Those on the army cadet course were successful in gaining awards in lifestyle and citizenship.

- 6.18 Young people developed good skills in vocational training. The difficulties in the coordination and quality of vocational training identified at the last inspection had been resolved. Three construction skills workshops enabled the progressive development of skills in brickwork, carpentry and joinery and painting. Most young people produced a satisfactory standard of work at level 1, but some showed good skill development above this level. Most young people enjoyed the practical work, saw the value of extending their skills to give them opportunity to gain employment on release, and developed good skills through work. In horticulture, the extensive facilities allowed young people to develop skills in grounds maintenance, propagating, growing vegetables, planting out seedlings and flowerbeds in the grounds. Young people's work in waste management and composting contributed to cost savings for the establishment. In the raptor centre, young people developed very good skills in handling rescued birds. Trainees in the bicycle repair shop quickly developed mechanical skills to repair bicycles for a charity, and some gained qualifications through this work. However, wing cleaning was not sufficiently supervised and some young people contravened basic health and safety through lack of adequate training and supervision. There were no accredited cleaning qualifications to improve and accredit young people's skills.
- 6.19 The supply and care of personal protective equipment was unsatisfactory. In some workshops, there were insufficient safety boots and some young people wore trainers instead, which contravened health and safety practice; this was not challenged by staff.
- 6.20 Relationships between learning and skills staff and young people were generally respectful. The standard of behaviour was good when young people were engaged in interesting and challenging activities. In some sessions, the SENCO included reports on individuals with behavioural issues. While the tutor was alerted to this, other support, such as an additional LSP, were not always deployed. Despite the best efforts of tutors, they were sometimes unable to control the poor behaviour of some individuals, which affected the group. On average, around four young people a day were returned to their unit for poor behaviour. At the time of the inspection, 18 young people (5%) were excluded from education due to security and/or safeguarding concerns and received literacy and numeracy tuition for one hour a day instead.
- 6.21 Attendance at education was satisfactory, although there was sometimes confusion about which young people should be attending which lessons. Punctuality had improved significantly and now enabled prompt starts to most lessons.
- 6.22 The head of learning and skills provided strong strategic leadership to improve provision, and there were productive partnerships between learning and skills, education and other functions in the prison. A full review had resulted in an improved curriculum, although it was recognised that there were still insufficient progression routes for young people serving longer sentences and those who were more able.
- 6.23 The self-assessment process was appropriately self-critical and provided a realistic and accurate account. Because the strengths and areas for improvement were understood well, the capacity to improve was good. However, the report did not encompass wider prison training or other functions that had a direct effect on learning and skills. Attention to safeguarding by the learning and skills department was good. The evaluation of teaching and learning in education recognised there was still too much 'satisfactory' teaching and not enough 'good' or better. In some of the annual lesson observations in vocational training, the evidence did not support the grades awarded.

## Recommendations

---

- 6.24 The information provided by the special educational needs coordinator (SENCO) should be used to provide better support in sessions for young people with specific learning or behavioural needs, and the success of this monitored through internal lesson observations. This information should also be shared across the establishment.
- 6.25 The allocation process should be improved to enable more consideration of young people's first choice of activity, and waiting lists should be better managed and monitored.
- 6.26 The quality of teaching and learning should be improved.
- 6.27 There should be qualifications above level 1 to provide progression routes for more able young people and those with longer sentences.
- 6.28 Young people should have supervised access to the internet to support their education and training programmes.
- 6.29 The progress young people make in developing important work skills should be recognised and recorded.
- 6.30 Behaviour management should be improved and a strategy developed to reduce the number of young people returned to the wings or excluded from education.
- 6.31 All young people who work in vocational training workshops should have access to appropriate personal protective equipment.

## Housekeeping point

---

- 6.32 Tutors should comment on how well young people meet their personal targets when reviewing performance in the daily diary sheets.

## Library

---

- 6.33 The library had not been fully staffed for a prolonged period and was staffed by cover staff from Leeds Libraries. Access to the library had not improved since the previous inspection, as a result of the staffing situation, and young people still did not have access in the evening or weekend. Attendance by some residential units was inhibited as library time clashed with other activities. The lack of an electronic booking system limited the ability to monitor library use.
- 6.34 There was an adequate range of appropriate easy reading books, fiction and non-fiction, graphical and foreign language books. Although stock was replaced sufficiently frequently, the book stock was insufficient for the population. The library estimated that approximately 100 books had gone missing over the previous three months. There were few newspapers, and the visual content of some was inappropriate for the age group.
- 6.35 Activities to promote literacy and reading were inadequate. Prison Service Orders were available by request.

## Recommendations

---

- 6.36 Young people should have adequate access to the library during the week in the evenings and at weekends.
- 6.37 The library should introduce events to promote literacy and encourage more young people to access the facilities.

## Housekeeping point

---

- 6.38 Library use and stock loss should be monitored more rigorously.

## Physical education and health promotion

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 6.39 Young people had good access to a high quality PE and made best use of the outdoor facilities. The programme was well balanced, facilities were good and young people behaved well when using them. The core programme was not accredited but a range of accredited courses was available. The department had well established links with appropriate internal departments and with external sports partners.
- 6.40 Young people had good access to at least three hours high quality core physical education (PE) each week and could also have a minimum of two sessions of recreational PE in the evenings and at weekends. Attendance at recreational PE was good. The core programme was well balanced and comprised team sports, including minor games, and personal fitness training. Facilities included a good size sports hall, fitness suite, good quality outside artificial pitch and dedicated PE classroom. The department took every opportunity to use the outside facilities.
- 6.41 The core programme was not currently accredited, although accredited courses included sports leaders, diet and nutrition, and gym instructor courses. ROTL was used well for the Duke of Edinburgh's Award course. Work was under way to develop accreditation further. The department had an appropriate policy to restrict the use of free weights.
- 6.42 Young people behaved well in the gymnasium, very few were returned to the residential units for poor behaviour, and gym bans were rare. The department had a very successful policy of encouraging young people who were initially reluctant to take part in PE. Not all young people expected at the gym were brought there from the residential units. Relationships between PE staff and young people were very good, and the department had a purposeful and productive ethos.



- 6.43 The department had good links with health care and CAMHS. Individualised programmes for weight loss or gain, for example, were devised and delivered on the wings. A lifestyle course was delivered in partnership with the young people's substance misuse service (YPSMS), and there were strong links with the psychology department.
- 6.44 There were also good links with external partners, such as rugby league clubs, cricket clubs, the armed forces and a wheelchair basketball team. There was excellent work through the 'Aussie rules' project, where young people produced high quality booklets of rules and tactics that were sent to India for children learning the game. There were currently no fixtures with external teams.
- 6.45 Clean kit was issued weekly and accidents were recorded appropriately. The showers had been improved since the last inspection and were now suitable.

## Recommendations

---

- 6.46 The range of PE courses and accreditation should be increased.
- 6.47 Young people who do not arrive for their scheduled core PE should be followed up more rigorously.



# Section 7: Good order

## Behaviour management

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 7.1 Behaviour management policies and procedures were clear and had the confidence of staff. The number of fights and assaults were high but decreasing, and mediation was used to good effect. Security had been tightened up and was proportionate, with the exception of strip searching procedures. There was extensive use of security information reports, and data collection, monitoring and analysis of security information and behaviour management were robust. Young people were clear about how the rewards and sanctions scheme worked. Those on the lowest level had the opportunity to regain lost privileges quickly, but their regime was too harsh. The number of adjudications had decreased, punishments were proportionate, and minor reports were used effectively. The use of force had reduced considerably, and staff made efforts to avoid using full control and restraint. Most planned removals were not videoed, and debriefs of young people following restraint lacked rigour. The separation and care unit was austere and the regime was poor, and it was used inappropriately for punishment.

## Behaviour management

---

- 7.2 The approach to behaviour management was broadly outlined in the violence reduction policy and supported by comprehensive policies and procedures relating to safeguarding, security and disciplinary issues, but it did not cover the use of the separation and care unit. Implementation of the policy was monitored at the monthly and quarterly safeguarding meetings, and individuals were monitored and discussed at the weekly multidisciplinary safeguarding meeting (see paragraph 3.3). The ABC policy (see paragraph 3.30), the primary process for managing poor behaviour, had been introduced in December 2011 and was supported by staff. The policy brought together monitoring, care planning and regular reviews, with interventions for the most troublesome young people. However, it was too early to judge its effectiveness in changing behaviour.
- 7.3 Unit senior officers were responsible for the operational implementation of behaviour management procedures. The senior and residential officers we spoke to had a clear understanding of the policy and their role in delivering it. Young people understood the different elements and how poor and worsening behaviour would escalate the punishments and interventions.

- 7.4 The number of fights and assaults had been high, but had fallen in the previous three months. Mediation was often used for young people involved in fights and was viewed by residential staff as an effective intervention. Repeat perpetrators were identified and discussed at safeguarding meetings and, since the introduction of the ABC policy, interventions from CAMHS, psychology and cognitive behavioural group work were now systematically offered to the most troublesome young people. Staff reported that young people had not been treated consistently previously – for example, repeat fighters had remained on the top level of the rewards and sanctions scheme without a review of their behaviour – and that the ABC policy was anticipated to bring a coherent approach to such inconsistencies in behaviour management. Some emerging evidence indicated a downward trend in the number of young people who repeatedly fought since the ABC policy and mediation had been implemented.

## Security

---

- 7.5 There was good information on all aspects of security, which was considered at the monthly security meetings. However, apart from the January 2012 meeting, attendance was poor and only included representation from the safeguarding team. The minutes of the meetings were comprehensive.
- 7.6 The report into a recent escape had been thoroughly considered and the resulting action plan was being implemented and given high priority in security meetings. The report had identified a number of failings and, as a consequence, security procedures had been tightened up and were mostly proportionate. Young people were properly risk assessed for activities, including ROTL, and there was a good system to keep apart those who were a risk to each other. The use of security information reports (SIRs) was comprehensive, and security meeting minutes indicated good analysis of their content. Residential staff reported that they received helpful information from the security department.
- 7.7 There was a comprehensive and up-to-date searching policy. While this highlighted the sensitivities around strip searching young people, it still instructed staff to strip search all new arrivals without a risk assessment, apart from those coming from a NOMS establishment, which was inappropriate (see paragraph 1.10). There was a requirement to risk assess strip searching in other areas and obtain the authorisation of a governor but the practice remained high, with 204 instances in the previous five months (not including routine strip searches on reception). Risk assessments we examined were poor and governance of the procedures was weak. There were very few finds of illegal substances and most finds were tobacco.
- 7.8 Dynamic security was reasonably good and we observed some effective engagement between staff and young people (see also paragraph 2.21). The night staff we observed were attentive to young people and had a good understanding of their potential vulnerabilities.

## Recommendation

---

- 7.9 **Young people should not be routinely strip searched. Strip searching should only be carried out after a thorough risk assessment has identified serious risk of harm to the young person or others, and on the authorisation of a duty governor.**

## Housekeeping point

---

- 7.10 The use of the separation and care unit should be part of the overarching behaviour management strategy.

## Rules and routines

---

- 7.11 The establishment's rules were clearly published on the units and in the induction pack. Young people said that they understood the rules, although it took a while to know them all. We were told that staff helped those who could not read well to understand them.

## Rewards and sanctions

---

- 7.12 The rewards and sanctions scheme was an integral part of the behaviour management strategy and was administered well. During the inspection, 5% of young people were on the lowest level (red), 64% on the middle level (silver) and 31% on the top level (gold). All new arrivals were placed on silver, but those transferring in from another establishment could retain their status, or were placed on silver if they had been on a lower level previously to give them a fresh start.
- 7.13 Although some young people expressed doubts about the value of top level, those who had achieved it appreciated its benefits, which included extra association and more access to family visits (for those on Anson unit) and community visits (depending on a risk assessment), as well as extra in-cell property and canteen spend limits (see also recommendation 9.39).
- 7.14 The regime for young people on the lowest level of the scheme was too harsh. They had no evening association, dining out or a television, and we came across some young people who did not even have a radio. Managers began to address provision of radios during the inspection when we brought it to their attention. However, young people on basic level could earn back elements of the regime at frequent reviews, the first one three days after their demotion, at which point most regained their television. Reviews were twice weekly thereafter and few young people stayed on the basic level for longer than a week. Young people had targets to work towards, which gave them the opportunity to demonstrate progress at their reviews. Young people were also subject to a warning period before demotion, which allowed them to improve their behaviour while under careful scrutiny and retain their privileges. Young people and staff we spoke to were clear about how the scheme worked, and young people could appeal against decisions to demote them, although appeals were rare.

## Recommendation

---

- 7.15 **Young people on the lowest level of the rewards and sanctions scheme should have access to an in-cell radio if they do not have a television.**

## Adjudications

---

- 7.16 The number of adjudications had risen in mid-2011, but had reduced significantly in the previous three months. Adjudications were used appropriately. Most were for fights and assaults, with a significant number for threatening and abusive language. Punishment guidelines outlined the agreed tariff for a variety of offences and there was scope for discretion, taking into account the impact of the incident on the victim and the vulnerabilities of the perpetrator. Wetherby's own analysis showed that adjudicators consistently used the lower end of the tariff, and this was confirmed in our scrutiny of a random selection of files.
- 7.17 In the sample we examined, punishments were generally proportionate, included deferred sentences, and were occasionally quashed on appeal. Although some records indicated only a

very brief discussion with young people, there was evidence that adjudicators generally took their mitigating circumstances into account.

- 7.18 There were good monitoring arrangements. The deputy governor looked at all adjudications each month, and there was a usually well-attended quarterly adjudications review meeting, which also considered the use of minor reports. The agenda and minutes of the meeting were comprehensive and showed detailed analysis of the issues, including adjudication trends, the consistency of punishments, the identification and delivery of staff who required training and diversity. Adjudications and minor reports were covered by ethnic monitoring.
- 7.19 In our focus groups, young people said that they were not allowed sufficient opportunity to speak, but that was not the case in the adjudications we observed. The process was clearly explained to young people facing adjudications, and advocates offered their services to young people and supported them in a few hearings.
- 7.20 The use of minor reports had increased over the last six months. Staff understood the process and had confidence in it. In the sample that we examined we found that they were used appropriately and that punishments were appropriate and consistent.

## Use of force

---

- 7.21 A comprehensive restraint minimisation policy drew together critical areas, such as ongoing individual risk assessment and planning, and broader procedures to manage young people's behaviour. However, the policy needed updating to include the ABC policy. Data collection on use of restraint was detailed and gave a good analysis of the nature of incidents and the locations where there was a particular concern. Monthly restraint minimisation meetings focused on the promotion of good practice in de-escalation, the use of appropriate techniques and the proper recording of incidents. Quality assurance arrangements were robust and included examination of use of force documentation and videotapes and any injuries sustained during restraint. This good quality governance was not linked to the safeguarding committee meetings so there was no regular thorough external scrutiny of the use of force (see paragraph 3.4).
- 7.22 The incidence of use of force had peaked in the four months to September 2011. There had been 271 incidents of control and restraint over the previous three months, but this had reduced significantly since then. Reports to the restraint minimisation committee provided a useful analysis of the possible reasons for the peaks and troughs and the general downward trend. Separating young people in fights was by far the most common reason for restraint. We were informed by staff working at the prison that they believed the most likely explanation for the increase was the influx of young people following the national disturbances in English cities in August 2011. Data provided by NOMS after the inspection contradicted this explanation. Consultations with young people suggested that tougher adjudication punishments for fighting introduced after that had been a deterrent, thereby simultaneously reducing the use of force. Data showed that force was still used for non-compliance, although the establishment's own quality assurance found that this has been wrongly recorded on many occasions. There was emerging evidence that staff made better efforts to avoid using full control and restraint, wherever possible, with more incidents involving limited restraint.
- 7.23 The quality of the use of force documentation we sampled was variable. Not all was completed properly. Some had not been correctly authorised, and some officer accounts did not give a full picture of the incident. The majority of documents suggested that de-escalation techniques were used. Some use of force documentation was produced late, with delays of three months

or more in a few cases. The robust quality assurance by the restraint minimisation committee had also highlighted these concerns, and concerted efforts were being made to address the shortcomings, including further staff training or investigations when concerns were raised.

- 7.24 There had been 19 planned removals between July and December 2011, of which only seven were videoed. However, the videos we viewed showed that removals were conducted well with good use of de-escalation techniques. CCTV footage of spontaneous uses of force, which the establishment had already identified as a concern, showed that in some instances staff behaved inappropriately. In the incidents that we viewed, matters had been referred as child protection cases to the local authority and had led to robust internal investigations. Young people told us that staff were sometimes over-excessive when using force. They had several avenues for complaint, and the complaints we reviewed were properly investigated.
- 7.25 There were good checks on the health and welfare of young people immediately after incidents, with a fuller debrief by a senior manager within 24 hours. However, the documentation we examined that recorded the debrief was cursory, and there was no evidence that the meeting was used to identify what had led to the restraint or consider any lessons to be learned from the incident.

## Recommendations

---

- 7.26 Full control and restraint should not be used simply to obtain compliance with staff instructions. All planned removals should be videoed.
- 7.27 Debriefs of young people following use of force should be used to discuss the incident fully. This should be recorded and linked to any other care and management plans for the young person.

## Care and separation

---

- 7.28 Although the care and separation unit had been renovated from its previously poor state, it remained bleak. Despite its name, the unit remained a segregation unit for all intents and purposes. However, there had been efforts to reduce the use as a punishment, even for those who persistently used violence, and the throughput overall had reduced significantly over the previous three months. Governance of the care and separation unit was not part of the remit of the safeguarding committee (see also paragraph 3.4).
- 7.29 All young people entering the unit received an induction pack and compact, which they were expected to sign. The document outlined their expected behaviour and the regime. The published regime allowed very little time for purposeful activity, and young people spent most of their time locked in their cells. They received daily exercise, a shower every other day and a telephone call twice a week, which was inadequate. Although we observed unit staff sensitivity and understanding of the young people in their care, in our survey, only 41% of those who had spent time in the unit said that staff had treated them well, a marked reduction from 72% in our 2010 survey.
- 7.30 All young people in the unit had a care plan, but those we examined were poor. Importantly, the plans failed to describe the reasons for the young person's separation, gave little detail about the behaviour to be addressed on the unit and did not outline plans for their successful reintegration to normal location. They were given targets and objectives to achieve, but they were not tailored to individual risks and needs. Only young people in the unit for good order and discipline had regular well-attended multidisciplinary reviews. Those removed from their

units for punishment were reviewed individually, but this was not done consistently (see main recommendation HP50).

- 7.31 Young people in the unit received daily visits from the duty governor and members of the chaplaincy and health care teams. Senior officers from their units also visited them occasionally, but not as part of a coherent care plan. Despite a requirement in the unit policy, there was no indication that young people were risk assessed to ascertain their suitability to engage in mainstream activities as part of their reintegration, and we were given no examples of segregated young people leaving the unit for activities.



# Section 8: Services

## Catering

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 8.1 Most young people ate communally for their main meals, which all offered hot food. Views of the food were poor, although young people were consulted regularly about it and a dietitian had also been consulted. The kitchen and serveries were clean and tidy, and young people working in the kitchen had opportunities to gain qualifications.
- 8.2 Most young people ate communally for their midday and evening meals. They took breakfast in their cells following consultation about whether they would prefer this to outside exercise in the morning, despite the inappropriateness of eating close to their toilet. Young people on the lowest rewards and sanctions level did not eat with their peers, and neither did those who lost dining out as part of an adjudication or minor report punishment. On the Anson unit, staff ate alongside young people.
- 8.3 The menus were on a four-week cycle and included the input of a dietitian from the local PCT. In our survey, only 13% of respondents said that the food was good, against the comparator of 20%, although the food during the inspection was of reasonable quality. Young people complained to us about the quality of some meat and the portion sizes. Portions had been worked out to provide a balanced diet, and most main courses came ready portioned to prevent bullying of servery workers for bigger portions. However, some individual meat portions looked small. The menus changed twice each year. Menu sheets featured helpful symbols beside each dish to indicate food types, and written descriptions of dishes were available on the units. Special diets were catered for, often in liaison with health care. Religious diets not catered for on the regular menu could be accommodated. Young people said that if they wanted to lose weight they knew where to go to get advice on healthy eating.
- 8.4 Breakfast was served on the morning it was eaten and included cereal and toast, as well as tea and coffee for the day, and both lunch and dinner offered hot options. Salad and fruit were available daily, and young people were given a supper supplement of biscuits to last the week.
- 8.5 Young people were surveyed about the food twice a year. The most recent survey had canvassed their views on having a cold meal on weekend evenings, monthly themed dinners, vegetables with every meal, and how often they identified and selected healthy options. Young people could also discuss food at the unit consultation meetings, and the units had comments books that were checked regularly by catering staff. There was evidence that young people's views were listened to and acted on appropriately.
- 8.6 The kitchen was clean and tidy, with appropriate storage arrangements and utensils for religious needs. During our night visit, we found the kitchen clean and all food and equipment properly stored away. Ten young people were employed in the kitchen and worked towards NVQs at levels 1 and 2. There were ROTL opportunities to work in two local hotels. The kitchen

had its own classroom and teacher, and young people and staff who worked on wing serveries also took food safety courses there. Young people wore the correct clothing when serving food and were supervised by staff. Kitchen staff regularly checked the cleanliness of serveries and flagged up any deficiencies to unit managers for attention.

## Recommendation

---

- 8.7 Young people should not eat their meals in their cells.

## Prison shop

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 8.8 Young people had weekly access to the shop but new arrivals could wait for a week before they could place their first order. Black and minority ethnic young people were less satisfied with the choice of goods available. Young people could also order magazines and newspapers, and from catalogues.
- 8.9 Young people could order weekly from the prison shop list, putting their orders in on Wednesday and receiving their goods on Friday. Young people who arrived between Wednesday and Tuesday had to wait a week for their first order. Although young people were given a reception pack it was limited, and this had implications for bullying.
- 8.10 The shop list included toiletries, snacks, drinks and stationery but no fresh fruit or healthy snacks other than dried fruit. Young people could discuss shop arrangements at unit consultation meetings, and feedback about the move of order deliveries from Sunday to Friday had been positive. In our survey, only 26% of black and minority ethnic respondents said the shop sold a wide enough range of products, compared with 49% of white young people.
- 8.11 To minimise the potential for bullying, shop orders were sealed in bags and handed to young people in their cells, or they were unlocked one at a time to collect their orders from the unit office. Staff told us they also checked large accumulations of in-cell property against canteen sheets to see if the young person had bought them himself and then take appropriate action.
- 8.12 Young people could order magazines and newspapers, as well as approved items, including CDs, from catalogues; these orders did not incur administration charges.

## Recommendations

---

- 8.13 New arrivals should be able to place an order with the prison shop within 24 hours of their arrival, and the reception pack should be sufficient to meet their needs until they receive their first order.
- 8.14 The establishment should investigate the reasons for black and minority ethnic young people's dissatisfaction with the prison shop, and take action to address these.

# Section 9: Resettlement

## Strategic management of resettlement

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 9.1 Resettlement work was well managed. Young people's needs were identified effectively, the strategy was based on an up-to-date needs analysis, and relevant services were being developed to meet them. Links with outside agencies were strong and prison staff took a leading role in initiating new work. Release on temporary licence was used very well.
- 9.2 The resettlement strategy was comprehensive and addressed the needs of all young people, including looked-after children and young people serving long sentences. The strategy was linked to a current and thorough needs analysis, which contained a large number of relevant and challenging recommendations. As well as surveying young people, staff were also consulted as part of the needs analysis process.
- 9.3 The resettlement committee met quarterly with an agenda based on the resettlement pathways. There was good attendance by internal staff, and attendance by external representatives, such as community-based youth offending team (YOT) staff and specialist accommodation providers, had improved. Minutes of the meetings indicated well-informed, focused and purposeful discussions.
- 9.4 The head of reoffending attended regional strategic forums involving local authority YOTs, and the prison had a high profile in these meetings. Resulting collaborative work had helped to improve work and accommodation opportunities for young people, as shown in employers' presentations to the establishment and the opportunity for young people to have direct access to a housing project (see paragraph 9.18).
- 9.5 There had been some changes in the management of resettlement since the previous inspection. Strategic lead managers had been allocated to each of the pathways, apart from that covering finance, benefit and debt, as well as a designated caseworker. Management of the casework team had also been decentralised to improve accountability and for more effective line management.
- 9.6 Use of release on temporary licence (ROTL) had doubled since the previous inspection, with at least 10 young people a month given this opportunity. ROTL was used for a range of purposes, including work placements, community visits and college interviews. We observed young people going out on ROTL being escorted to the gate by an officer who checked that they were properly prepared, including having a packed lunch, and encouraged them to do well.

## Housekeeping point

---

- 9.7 There should be designated lead officers for all resettlement pathways.

## Training planning and remand management

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 9.8 Training planning and remand management arrangements were sound overall. There was still not enough involvement by all departments, but the casework team ensured that the process continued to work effectively. Young people on the Anson unit benefited from its more intensive staff input, which enabled high quality plans. Young people transferring to an adult prison received good support. Public protection was well managed.
- 9.9 Members of the casework team organised and chaired all the training planning and remand management reviews. The caseworkers we spoke to had impressive knowledge about the young people they were responsible for. They helped young people to prepare for their reviews, and in our discussion groups young people were positive about the support from their allocated caseworkers.
- 9.10 The targets set in the training plans we examined were reasonably individualised and covered all the resettlement pathways. Young people were always given a copy of their plan. In our survey, 56% of respondents said that they had a plan, against the comparator of 47%. Attendance by internal staff at most planning meetings was still poor, and residential support officers (RSOs) and health care staff were seldom present. Although written reports were sometimes submitted, in most cases it was the caseworkers who obtained the necessary background information to prepare properly for the review. Community-based YOT workers usually attended reviews, and family members were present in well over half of the meetings.
- 9.11 The standard of training planning was better for young people on the Anson unit - a specialist unit for young people serving long sentences, including indeterminate sentences - than for young people on mainstream units. Higher levels of staffing on Anson permitted RSOs to carry out intensive personal officer type work. More specialists attended planning meetings on this unit and the RSOs were usually present and made active contributions. The quality of the resulting plans was also higher, with more specific targets set. Because of the relatively high risk that many young people on Anson presented, they tended to be prioritised for programmes. Unit staff routinely contributed towards home detention curfew (HDC) and parole assessments. Young people on Anson were allocated a psychologist according to their need.
- 9.12 Caseworkers were appointed to carry out work specifically with young people on remand and were available to meet with new arrivals every day, apart from Sunday. In addition to the areas normally covered within a planning meeting, the remand planning caseworkers made sure that

young people on remand were also given appropriate bail information, as well as ready access to their solicitors.

- 9.13 There were good informal links with adult establishments, which helped young people moving on to them, and the establishment had produced its own transition policy.
- 9.14 Public protection was managed well. Relevant individuals were identified accurately on admission and were monitored and reviewed at the monthly inter-departmental risk management meeting. The requirements of the public protection policy were followed diligently and, where necessary, restrictions were applied. A representative from the prison always attended when invited to attend a multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) level three conferences in the community.

## Recommendation

---

- 9.15 Staff from all relevant departments should be represented at training planning or remand management reviews or submit a detailed report if they cannot attend.

## Resettlement pathways

---

Expected outcomes:

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

## Reintegration planning

---

- 9.16 Young people who needed help with accommodation were well supported, and the prison had successfully negotiated direct access to 'move-on' accommodation for those who might otherwise have been homeless. There were very good opportunities for work placements through excellent use of release on temporary licence, and most young people went on to education, training or employment placements. New arrivals were assessed for any financial difficulties, and the prison offered finance information sessions. The young people's substance misuse service ensured that all young people received harm reduction and overdose prevention advice. Young people with a need had detailed release plans, and there was good engagement and information sharing with community services.

## Accommodation

---

- 9.17 The accommodation needs of all young people were discussed at their initial planning meetings. Where difficulties were identified, the caseworker worked with the home-based YOT worker to resolve these. We were told that no young person had been discharged with no fixed accommodation since the previous inspection, but some individuals had been placed in unsatisfactory settings, such as bed and breakfast accommodation. Where caseworkers were not satisfied that the local authority was discharging its responsibilities for young people who would be homeless without help, they took expert legal advice, and we were informed that they had had some successes as a result.

- 9.18 The prison had established a partnership arrangement with Transition Plus Care, a not-for-profit community interest company, which provided young people from a looked-after care background and leaving custody potentially homeless with access to a six-bedded unit in Leeds. Two young people who had been discharged from the prison were living at the unit at the time of the inspection and received ongoing support from social care staff. This was a positive initiative, and the resettlement department had discussed extending the range of such provision.
- 9.19 The chaplaincy had established links with several local housing associations, and caseworkers sometimes used these contacts to help place young people.

## Good practice

---

- 9.20 *The prison had developed collaborative throughcare work to provide specially designed supported accommodation for previously looked-after young people being discharged from prison.*

## Education, training and employment

---

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

- 9.21 Young people gained worthwhile qualifications, especially in literacy and numeracy, which were recognised by colleges and training providers, and gained good skills in the vocational workshops. There was good quality guidance and careers advice through the Connexions service.
- 9.22 Release on temporary licence (ROTL) opportunities were very good, and a good range of companies and other agencies offered work placements in which young people gained valuable employment skills. Highly effective pre-site visits enabled them to see their potential placement, meet staff and assess the job role. References given on completion of the placement had the potential to be used when applying for work or education courses on release. Connexions and business enterprise staff had worked very well together to develop this provision, and provided highly effective practical support to ensure young people's success on their placement. Most young people had an education, training or employment placement to go to on their discharge, and work had begun to track progress in their placement.

## Mental and physical health

---

- 9.23 There were no dedicated health discharge clinics. Health care staff saw young people in reception on their day of release and gave them a letter for their GP and a small supply of medication, if appropriate. In our survey 27% said that they knew how to contact continuing health services against the comparator of 21%. There was no prison policy for the management of young people requiring palliative care, but we were told that if needed, there would be efforts to release the young person on temporary licence to an appropriate community palliative care unit. Leeds Community Healthcare Trust had its own policies and protocol for the palliative care of young people.

## Finance, benefit and debt

---

- 9.24 As part of the induction programme, all young people were assessed for debt problems and given a useful leaflet about how to manage their money while in custody, as well as details

about how to open a bank account. Where money problems were identified, the young person's caseworker was notified to follow this up. Negotiations were under way between the establishment and a local bank to reach an agreement to allow young people to open bank accounts.

- 9.25 There was no allocated strategic lead for this pathway, but the caseworker designated with responsibility for this pathway had taken on the role and had been instrumental in setting up a pilot programme to provide young people from South Yorkshire with information sessions on finance, benefit and debt, delivered by Connexions staff. She had undergone specialist training in this area and had plans to extend the sessions to cover all young people. Young people were positive about the help they received with finance, benefit and debt problems. In our survey, 41% said they knew who to contact for help with money and finances, 38% knew who to contact about how to claim benefits, and 36% knew who to go to get help to open a bank account, which were all higher than the comparators.

## **Drugs and alcohol**

---

- 9.26 Young people's substance misuse service (YPSMS) workers prioritised attendance at final training planning meetings. Transfer and release plans were of good quality and there were appropriate links with community YOTs. As the establishment now had a wider catchment area, a regional protocol to improve information sharing between YOTs and the YPSMS was due to be implemented.
- 9.27 All young people received harm reduction and overdose prevention advice. This was during their initial assessment for those on remand, and one week before their release for those who were sentenced.

## **Children and families of offenders**

---

- 9.28 Although staff treated visitors respectfully, there were limited facilities in the visitors' centre and visits hall. Visits entitlements were too limited and there was no monitoring of the contact that young people had with their families through visits. Opportunities to book a visit were insufficient to meet the needs of visitors. Family days were only available for some young people, although visits for young fathers and the 'time for families' course were positive initiatives.
- 9.29 Domestic visits were available for up to two hours on Tuesday, Thursday, Saturday and Sunday afternoons and for one and a half hours on Wednesday evening. Young people on remand were entitled to one visit a week and those who were sentenced to two weekend and one midweek visit a month. This was insufficient. Although anecdotally staff told us that the majority of young people did not use their full entitlement to visits, there was no monitoring of family contact to identify whether maintaining contact with family and friends was a problem to be addressed. In our survey, less than a third of young people said that they had a visit at least once a week.
- 9.30 Visitors were sent an information booklet about the prison and visiting arrangements, usually within 24 hours of a young person's reception. Visits were booked by telephone but the booking clerk was only available for two hours on weekday mornings, which was a problem for visitors who worked. It was not possible to book visits by email or while at the establishment following a visit.

- 9.31 The visitors' centre was staffed by directly employed staff. The building was small and had no facilities for children to play and we were told that it was often extremely cramped, especially at weekends. Although there was a reasonable range of information for visitors, there were no community links or support to help visitors access external support. Visitors often experienced delays in getting to their visits. We observed a session where visitors did not get into the visits hall until 15 minutes after the session had started, even though there were only 12 visitors compared with a maximum of 31. We were told that delays at weekends were common.
- 9.32 The visits hall was bare and uninviting with few pictures on the walls. There was a small children's play area but no staff to supervise it. There was a small tea bar where volunteers served hot drinks and vending machines provided fizzy drinks, crisps and chocolate, but it was not possible to get a more substantial snack, even though some visitors had made very long journeys.
- 9.33 Despite the limitations of the facilities, we observed staff engaging positively with visitors, and young people confirmed that staff were generally respectful to their visitors. Visitors were searched respectfully, and searching of young people was appropriately risk assessed.
- 9.34 There had been a survey of visitors during 2011. Although the findings were positive overall, some arising recommendations had still to be implemented. Both Keppel and Anson units facilitated quarterly family days, but family days were not available to young people on other units. Family 'fun days' had begun for young fathers and those with siblings under five, but few participated and there was no professional input from specialist community projects; the staff involved did so voluntarily.
- 9.35 The 'time for families' programme was delivered eight times a year with each course running for one day a week over four consecutive weeks. This initiative was positive and young people spoke highly of it.

## Recommendations

---

- 9.36 Sentenced young people should be offered one domestic visit per week and those on remand daily visits if requested.
- 9.37 The visitors' centre and visits hall should offer a better environment, including supervised children's play areas and a wider and healthier range of refreshments.
- 9.38 The prison should develop links to community services to facilitate support and guidance for visitors to Wetherby.
- 9.39 Family days should be available to all young people.

## Housekeeping point

---

- 9.40 Opportunities for visitors to book their visits should be increased, and visits should start on time.



## Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

---

- 9.41 There was a wide range of relevant programmes and many young people completed one. Young people convicted of a sexual offence received specialist input to address their offending behaviour.
- 9.42 There was a wide range of programmes based on the findings of the resettlement needs analysis. The programmes were delivered by a multidisciplinary team led by the psychology department. Referrals for a place on a programme came mostly through training planning meetings, and allocation was based on risk and need, and that the sentence was sufficiently long enough to complete the programme.
- 9.43 Programmes on offer included JETS (juvenile estate thinking skills), the only accredited cognitive skills programme for this age group. The annual target of 36 completions for this course had been exceeded by 10. The most recent audit assessment rated the quality of delivery of this programme as high. The 'life minus violence – enhanced' programme was being piloted on Anson unit. It was a nine-month intensive course designed to meet the needs of young people with a history of violent offending.
- 9.44 In addition, there were three non-accredited courses. The STOP course aimed at increasing young people's awareness of the impact of offending, the TEAM course was designed to help individuals manage their emotions, and ACCESS was a problem-solving, communication and assertiveness course. The annual target for these courses was 136, and there had been a creditable 142 completions.
- 9.45 There were 10 young people on the main site who had been convicted of a sexual offence (there were others on the Keppel Unit). All received input to address their offending behaviour, either by a specialist from the Lucy Faithfull Foundation or from the establishment's psychology department.



# Section 10: Recommendations, housekeeping points and good practice

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

## Main recommendation

To the Youth Justice Board and NOMS

---

- 10.1 Problems relating to late arrivals should be resolved. (HP49)

## Main recommendations

To the governor

---

- 10.2 The separation and care unit should be improved so that it is a suitable environment in which to work with difficult and challenging young people. Location in the separation and care unit should not be used to punish young people. All young people in the separation and care unit should have detailed care and reintegration plans, based on an initial and ongoing assessment of their risks and need, which are regularly reviewed and updated. Where appropriate, young people should be encouraged and enabled to engage in the normal regime as part of their care and reintegration plan. (HP50)
- 10.3 All young people should have daily access to telephones and showers, including after work for those employed in dirty areas. (HP51)
- 10.4 The visitors' centre and visits hall should be improved. The contact that young people maintain with their families should be monitored to identify individuals who might need help, as well as to identify and address any overarching problems in maintaining family ties. (HP52)

## Recommendations

To the Youth Justice Board and NOMS

---

- 10.5 Young people should be provided with the useful information booklet at court. (1.6)
- 10.6 All staff should display their name on their uniform. (2.23)

## Recommendations

To the governor

---

### First days in custody

---

- 10.7 All new arrivals should be given the opportunity to speak to an Insider, take a shower and have a meal before they are locked up for the night. (1.14)
- 10.8 First night risk management plans should be relevant to the young person's needs and identified risks, and managers should monitor quality through robust quality assurance. (1.18)

### **Residential units**

---

- 10.9 Response times to in-cell emergency call bells should be monitored to ensure they are responded to within five minutes. (2.11)

### **Personal officers**

---

- 10.10 Residential support officers should attend relevant meetings and reviews relating to the care and management of the young people for whom they are responsible, and record and share information appropriately. (2.28)

### **Safeguarding children**

---

- 10.11 Oversight of the use of force, injuries sustained by young people and the use of the care and separation unit should be added to the remit of the quarterly safeguarding committee to ensure independent oversight of these areas. (3.8)
- 10.12 The quality of care plans for the most vulnerable young people should be improved, properly coordinated with other relevant plans and quality assured. (3.9)

### **Child protection**

---

- 10.13 The child protection coordinator should receive additional training relevant to the role. (3.18)

### **Bullying**

---

- 10.14 More should be done to encourage young people to give information about bullying, for example, through regular surveys and focus groups. Findings should be acted upon to encourage young people to have greater confidence to report bullying. (3.35)
- 10.15 The quality of behavioural (ABC) plans for young people who bully should be improved. (3.36)

### **Substance use**

---

- 10.16 A substance misuse/dual diagnosis nurse should be appointed to provide comprehensive and coordinated care to young people with complex needs. (3.65)
- 10.17 There should be information and training for residential officers on the care of young people undergoing detoxification. (3.66)

### **Diversity**

---

- 10.18 Equality of treatment for all minority groups should be effectively monitored and appropriate action taken to address any inequalities. There should be external validation of investigations into reported incidents of discrimination. (4.7)

- 10.19 Negative perceptions of young people from black and minority ethnic groups and from young Muslim people should be examined further and areas of concern monitored and addressed by the equality action group. (4.13)
- 10.20 Out-of-range patterns and trends identified by SMART monitoring data should be fully investigated and the underlying issues addressed. (4.14)
- 10.21 There should be effective links between education, health care and the diversity manager to ensure that young people with disabilities are identified at an early stage, information relating to their needs is shared with relevant staff, and that they have a suitable care plan. (4.22)

### **Health services**

---

- 10.22 Full-time pharmacy support should be provided. (5.23)
- 10.23 Standard operating procedures should be thoroughly reviewed. (5.24)
- 10.24 The dental surgery should be refurbished to ensure sufficient storage for all dental equipment. (5.29)

### **Time out of cell**

---

- 10.25 Outside recreational areas should be equipped with suitable activity and/or games equipment, and young people should have daily access to time in the open air. (6.5)

### **Learning and skills**

---

- 10.26 The information provided by the special educational needs coordinator (SENCO) should be used to provide better support in sessions for young people with specific learning or behavioural needs, and the success of this monitored through internal lesson observations. This information should also be shared across the establishment. (6.24)
- 10.27 The allocation process should be improved to enable more consideration of young people's first choice of activity, and waiting lists should be better managed and monitored. (6.25)
- 10.28 The quality of teaching and learning should be improved. (6.26)
- 10.29 There should be qualifications above level 1 to provide progression routes for more able young people and those with longer sentences. (6.27)
- 10.30 Young people should have supervised access to the internet to support their education and training programmes. (6.28)
- 10.31 The progress young people make in developing important work skills should be recognised and recorded. (6.29)
- 10.32 Behaviour management should be improved and a strategy developed to reduce the number of young people returned to the wings or excluded from education. (6.30)
- 10.33 All young people who work in vocational training workshops should have access to appropriate personal protective equipment. (6.31)

## **Library**

---

- 10.34 Young people should have adequate access to the library during the week in the evenings and at weekends. (6.36)
- 10.35 The library should introduce events to promote literacy and encourage more young people to access the facilities. (6.37)

## **Physical education and health promotion**

---

- 10.36 The range of PE courses and accreditation should be increased. (6.46)
- 10.37 Young people who do not arrive for their scheduled core PE should be followed up more rigorously. (6.47)

## **Behaviour management**

---

- 10.38 Young people should not be routinely strip searched. Strip searching should only be carried out after a thorough risk assessment has identified serious risk of harm to the young person or others, and on the authorisation of a duty governor. (7.9)
- 10.39 Young people on the lowest level of the rewards and sanctions scheme should have access to an in-cell radio if they do not have a television. (7.15)
- 10.40 Full control and restraint should not be used simply to obtain compliance with staff instructions. All planned removals should be videoed. (7.26)
- 10.41 Debriefs of young people following use of force should be used to discuss the incident fully. This should be recorded and linked to any other care and management plans for the young person. (7.27)

## **Catering**

---

- 10.42 Young people should not eat their meals in their cells. (8.7)

## **Prison shop**

---

- 10.43 New arrivals should be able to place an order with the prison shop within 24 hours of their arrival, and the reception pack should be sufficient to meet their needs until they receive their first order. (8.13)
- 10.44 The establishment should investigate the reasons for black and minority ethnic young people's dissatisfaction with the prison shop, and take action to address these. (8.14)

## **Training planning and remand management**

---

- 10.45 Staff from all relevant departments should be represented at training planning or remand management reviews or submit a detailed report if they cannot attend. (9.15)

## **Resettlement pathways**

---

- 10.46 Sentenced young people should be offered one domestic visit per week and those on remand daily visits if requested. (9.36)
- 10.47 The visitors' centre and visits hall should offer a better environment, including supervised children's play areas and a wider and healthier range of refreshments. (9.37)
- 10.48 The prison should develop links to community services to facilitate support and guidance for visitors to Wetherby. (9.38)
- 10.49 Family days should be available to all young people. (9.39)

## **Housekeeping points**

---

### **Residential units**

---

- 10.50 Minutes of consultation meetings and resulting decisions should be effectively communicated to all young people. (2.12)

### **Safeguarding children**

---

- 10.51 Data produced for strategic safeguarding committee meetings should be analysed to determine relevant patterns and trends, and there should be a clear record of the committee's action to address concerns. (3.10)

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

---

- 10.52 Quality assurance should ensure better links between assessment, care maps and ongoing support for young people subject to ACCT processes. (3.28)

### **Applications and complaints**

---

- 10.53 Feedback from the quality assurance of complaints should be consistently shared with managers to help improve effectiveness. (3.43)
- 10.54 Responses to complaints should be legible. (3.44)

### **Diversity**

---

- 10.55 The prison should analyse patterns and trends that emerge in discrimination incident report form (DIRF) data. (4.8)

### **Health services**

---

- 10.56 There should be patient group directions to enable the supply of more potent medications. (5.25)

10.57 All pharmacy items with an expiry date should be checked regularly. (5.26)

### **Learning and skills and work activities**

---

10.58 Tutors should comment on how well young people meet their personal targets when reviewing performance in the daily diary sheets. (6.32)

### **Library**

---

10.59 Library use and stock loss should be monitored more rigorously. (6.38)

### **Behaviour management**

---

10.60 The use of the separation and care unit should be part of the overarching behaviour management strategy. (7.10)

### **Strategic management of resettlement**

---

10.61 There should be designated lead officers for all resettlement pathways. (9.7)

### **Resettlement pathways**

---

10.62 Opportunities for visitors to book their visits should be increased, and visits should start on time. (9.40)

## **Examples of good practice**

---

10.63 A member of the safeguarding team checked all complaints, which offered an effective safeguard for child protection issues raised through this route. (3.45)

10.64 The primary mental health team worked in reception wherever possible, and followed up new arrivals they identified with any mental health issues the next day. (5.38)

10.65 A registered mental health nurse saw every referred young person as soon as possible and completed a mental health assessment. (5.39)

10.66 The occupational therapist had worked with the prison garden team to establish a garden project for young people. (5.40)

10.67 The prison had developed collaborative throughcare work to provide specially designed supported accommodation for previously looked-after young people being discharged from prison. (9.20)



## Appendix I: Inspection team

---

Nick Hardwick	Chief Inspector
Fay Deadman	Team leader
Ian Macfadyen	Inspector
Keith McInnis	Inspector
Angela Johnson	Inspector
Ian Thomson	Inspector
Alice Reid	Research officer
Nalini Sharma	Research trainee

### **Specialist inspectors**

Sigrid Engelen	Substance use inspector
Bridget McEvilly	Health services inspector
Helen Jackson	Pharmacy inspector
Martyn Rhowbotham	Ofsted inspector
Sheila Willis	Ofsted inspector
Ian Mather	Care Quality Commission inspector

## Appendix II: Establishment population profile

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

Status	Number	%
Sentenced	260	76.5
Recalls	16	4.7
Convicted unsentenced	10	2.9
Remand	54	15.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>340</b>	<b>100</b>

Age	Number	%
15 years	17	5
16 years	87	25.6
17 years	207	60.9
18 years	29	8.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>340</b>	<b>100</b>

Nationality	Number	%
British	323	95
Foreign nationals	17	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>340</b>	<b>100</b>

Ethnicity	Number	%
<i>White</i>		
British	267	78.5
Other white	7	2
<i>Mixed</i>		
White and black Caribbean	10	3
White and black African	5	1.5
White and Asian	4	1.2
Other mixed	3	0.9
<i>Asian or Asian British</i>		
Indian	1	0.3
Pakistani	14	4.1
Bangladeshi	2	0.6
Other Asian	4	1.2
<i>Black or black British</i>		
Caribbean	7	2
African	12	3.5
Other black	3	0.9
<i>Other ethnic group</i>	1	0.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>340</b>	<b>100</b>

Religion	Number	%
Church of England	25	7.4
Roman Catholic	41	12
Other Christian denominations	30	8.8
Muslim	32	9.4
Sikh	2	0.6
Other	3	0.9

No religion	207	60.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>340</b>	<b>100</b>

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

Length of stay	<1 mth	1–3 mths	3–6 mths	6–12 mths	1–2 yrs	Total
<b>Age</b>						
15 years	2	5	4	3	0	14
16 years	19	24	18	12	3	76
17 years	27	48	32	35	16	158
18 years	0	7	8	10	3	28
<b>Total</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>276</b>

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

Length of stay	<1 mth	1–3 mths	3–6 mths	Total
<b>Age</b>				
15 years	2	1	0	3
16 years	6	4	1	11
17 years	24	18	7	49
18 years	0	0	1	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>64</b>

Main offence	Number	%
Violence against the person	74	21.8
Sexual offences	24	7.1
Burglary	72	21.2
Robbery	79	23.2
Theft and handling	14	4.1
Drugs offences	11	3.2
Other offences	63	18.5
Offence not recorded/holding warrant	3	0.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>340</b>	<b>100</b>

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

Sentence	4 mths	6 mths	8 mths	10 mths	12 mths	18 mths	24 mths	Total
<b>Age</b>								
15 years	0	2	2	0	4	2	1	11
16 years	3	8	4	3	7	11	6	42
17 years	6	10	8	6	26	20	16	92
18 years	1	2	2	1	9	4	4	23
<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>168</b>

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

Sentence	3–4 yrs	4–5 yrs	5 yrs +	Total
<b>Age</b>				
16 years	1	1	1	3
17 years	0	1	2	3
18 years	0	0	1	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7</b>

Number of indeterminate sentences by age

Sentence	ISPPCJ03	HMP	Total
Age			
16 years	2	0	2
17 years	7	4	11
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>13</b>

Distance from home	Number	%
Under 50 miles	177	52.1
50-100 miles	115	33.8
100-150 miles	33	9.7
Over 150 miles	15	4.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>340</b>	<b>100</b>

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

---

### **Survey methodology**

---

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

### **Choosing the sample size**

---

At the time of the survey on 10 January 2012, the population of young people at HMYOI Wetherby (excluding the Keppel Unit) was 277. In total 148 young men from the main population at Wetherby were offered a survey.

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

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

### **Methodology**

---

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

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

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

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

### **Response rates**

---

In total, 115 respondents completed and returned their questionnaires. This represented 42% of children and young people in the establishment at the time. The response rate from the sample was 78%.

Four respondents refused to complete a questionnaire, 12 questionnaires were not returned and 17 were returned blank.

## Comparisons

---

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

Presented alongside the results from this survey are the comparator figures for all children and young people surveyed in young offender institutions. This comparator is based on all responses from surveys carried out in all eight male establishments surveyed since 2011.

Also included are statistically significant differences between the responses of young people surveyed at HMYOI Wetherby in 2010 and the responses of this 2012 survey, and significant differences between the responses of young people surveyed on Anson Unit and on Benbow Unit against all other units. It should be noted that, in order for statistical comparisons to be made between the most recent survey data and that of the previous survey, both sets of data have been coded in the same way. This may result in percentages from previous surveys looking higher or lower as some of our survey questions have changed. However, both percentages are true of the populations they were taken from, and the statistical significance is correct.

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

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

## Summary

---

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

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

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

# Survey results

## SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU

<b>Q1</b>	<b>How old are you?</b>	
	15.....	7 (6%)
	16.....	25 (22%)
	17.....	72 (63%)
	18.....	11 (10%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Are you a British citizen?</b>	
	Yes.....	109 (97%)
	No.....	3 (3%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>Is English your first language?</b>	
	Yes.....	102 (92%)
	No.....	9 (8%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>What is your ethnic origin?</b>	
	<i>White - British</i> .....	80 (70%)
	<i>White - Irish</i> .....	2 (2%)
	<i>White - other</i> .....	2 (2%)
	<i>Black or black British - Caribbean</i> .....	3 (3%)
	<i>Black or black British - African</i> .....	8 (7%)
	<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> .....	6 (5%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi</i> .....	3 (3%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - other</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Mixed heritage - white and black Caribbean</i> .....	6 (5%)
	<i>Mixed heritage - white and black African</i> .....	1 (1%)
	<i>Mixed heritage - white and Asian</i> .....	1 (1%)
	<i>Mixed heritage - other</i> .....	1 (1%)
	<i>Chinese</i> .....	0 (0%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>What is your religion?</b>	
	<i>None</i> .....	47 (42%)
	<i>Church of England</i> .....	25 (22%)
	<i>Catholic</i> .....	20 (18%)
	<i>Protestant</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Other Christian denomination</i> .....	7 (6%)
	<i>Buddhist</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Hindu</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Jewish</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Muslim</i> .....	14 (12%)
	<i>Sikh</i> .....	0 (0%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?</b>	
	Yes.....	6 (5%)
	No.....	98 (88%)
	Don't know.....	7 (6%)

<b>Q7</b>	<b>Do you have any children?</b>	
	Yes.....	9 (8%)
	No.....	105 (92%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>Do you consider yourself to have a disability?</b>	
	Yes.....	13 (11%)
	No.....	101 (89%)
<b>Q10</b>	<b>Have you ever been in local authority care?</b>	
	Yes.....	34 (30%)
	No.....	79 (70%)

## SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Are you sentenced?</b>	
	Yes.....	99 (86%)
	No - unsentenced/on remand.....	16 (14%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>How long is your sentence (the full DTO sentence)?</b>	
	<b>Not sentenced</b> .....	16 (14%)
	Less than six months.....	17 (15%)
	Six to twelve months.....	27 (24%)
	More than twelve months, up to two years.....	24 (21%)
	More than two years.....	26 (23%)
	Indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP).....	3 (3%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>How long have you been in this establishment?</b>	
	Less than one month.....	19 (17%)
	One to six months.....	62 (54%)
	More than six months, but less than twelve months.....	21 (18%)
	Twelve months to two years.....	10 (9%)
	More than two years.....	2 (2%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?</b>	
	Yes.....	58 (51%)
	No.....	56 (49%)

## SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS

<b>Q1</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?</b>	
	Yes.....	57 (50%)
	No.....	36 (31%)
	Don't remember.....	22 (19%)
	Not applicable.....	0 (0%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?</b>	
	Yes.....	95 (83%)
	No.....	12 (11%)
	Don't remember.....	7 (6%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, were there any adults (over 18) or people of a different gender, travelling with you?</b>	
	Yes.....	39 (34%)



	No.....	61 (53%)
	Don't remember .....	15 (13%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?</b>	
	Less than two hours .....	60 (53%)
	Two to four hours.....	40 (35%)
	More than four hours.....	6 (5%)
	Don't remember .....	7 (6%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?</b>	
	<b>My journey was less than two hours</b> .....	60 (54%)
	Yes.....	7 (6%)
	No.....	37 (33%)
	Don't remember .....	8 (7%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?</b>	
	<b>My journey was less than two hours</b> .....	60 (53%)
	Yes.....	20 (18%)
	No.....	29 (26%)
	Don't remember .....	4 (4%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, how did you feel you were treated by the escort staff?</b>	
	Very well.....	14 (12%)
	Well.....	47 (42%)
	Neither.....	34 (30%)
	Badly.....	7 (6%)
	Very badly.....	3 (3%)
	Don't remember .....	8 (7%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>Before you arrived, from court or another establishment, were you told that you would be coming here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	Yes, someone told me .....	82 (73%)
	Yes, I received written information.....	6 (5%)
	No, I was not told anything.....	21 (19%)
	Don't remember .....	6 (5%)

## SECTION 4: FIRST DAYS

<b>Q1</b>	<b>How long were you in reception?</b>	
	Less than two hours .....	94 (82%)
	Two hours or longer .....	15 (13%)
	Don't remember .....	6 (5%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>When you were searched, was this carried out in an understanding way?</b>	
	Yes.....	88 (77%)
	No.....	12 (10%)
	Don't remember .....	15 (13%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>Overall, how well did you feel you were treated in reception?</b>	
	Very well.....	12 (11%)
	Well.....	66 (58%)
	Neither.....	26 (23%)
	Badly.....	6 (5%)
	Very badly.....	0 (0%)

Don't remember ..... 4 (4%)

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

Not being able to smoke.....	76 (70%)	Money worries.....	25 (23%)
Loss of property.....	36 (33%)	Feeling low/upset/needing someone to talk to.....	46 (43%)
Housing problems.....	17 (16%)	Health problems.....	60 (56%)
Needing protection from other young people.....	26 (24%)	Getting phone numbers.....	48 (44%)
Letting family know where you are.....	70 (65%)	<b>Staff did not ask me about any of these.....</b>	12 (11%)

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

Not being able to smoke.....	54 (54%)	Money worries.....	12 (12%)
Loss of property.....	16 (16%)	Feeling low/upset/needing someone to talk to.....	17 (17%)
Housing problems.....	7 (7%)	Health problems.....	13 (13%)
Needing protection from other young people.....	4 (4%)	Getting phone numbers.....	33 (33%)
Letting family know where you are.....	26 (26%)	<b>I did not have any problems....</b>	28 (28%)

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

A reception pack.....	93 (84%)
The opportunity to have a shower.....	18 (16%)
Something to eat.....	82 (74%)
A free phone call to friends/family.....	84 (76%)
Information about the PIN telephone system.....	54 (49%)
Information about feeling low/upset.....	39 (35%)
Don't remember.....	7 (6%)
<b>I was not given any of these.....</b>	4 (4%)

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

Chaplain or religious leader.....	57 (53%)
Peer support/peer mentor/Listener/Samaritans.....	28 (26%)
The prison shop/canteen.....	13 (12%)
Don't remember.....	21 (20%)
<b>I did not have access to any of these.....</b>	28 (26%)

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

Yes.....	82 (74%)
No.....	18 (16%)
Don't remember.....	11 (10%)

**Q9 Did you feel safe on your first night at this establishment?**

Yes.....	92 (83%)
No.....	12 (11%)
Don't remember.....	7 (6%)

<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> .....	8 (7%)
	Yes.....	75 (68%)
	No.....	14 (13%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	13 (12%)

## 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 (31%)
	No.....	75 (67%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	2 (2%)

<b>Q2</b>	<b>Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?</b>	
	Yes.....	28 (25%)
	No.....	68 (61%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	15 (14%)

<b>Q3</b>	<b>What is the food like here?</b>	
	<i>Very good</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Good</i> .....	15 (13%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....	38 (34%)
	<i>Bad</i> .....	35 (31%)
	<i>Very bad</i> .....	24 (21%)

<b>Q4</b>	<b>Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?</b>	
	<i>I have not bought anything yet</i> .....	4 (4%)
	Yes.....	48 (43%)
	No.....	56 (50%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	3 (3%)

<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> .....	15 (14%)
	<i>Very easy</i> .....	29 (26%)
	<i>Easy</i> .....	36 (32%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....	16 (14%)
	<i>Difficult</i> .....	7 (6%)
	<i>Very difficult</i> .....	1 (1%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	7 (6%)

<b>Q6</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions about religion:</b>			
		Yes	No	<i>Don't know/ Not applicable</i>
	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	58 (55%)	16 (15%)	32 (30%)
	Can you speak to a religious leader in private if you want to?	73 (70%)	4 (4%)	28 (27%)

<b>Q7</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions about staff here:</b>		
		Yes	No
	Is there a member of staff you feel you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	69 (64%)	39 (36%)
	Do <b>most</b> staff treat you with respect?	67 (63%)	40 (37%)

## SECTION 6: HEALTH SERVICES

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Did you have a full health assessment the day after your arrival?</b>			
	Yes.....			76 (68%)
	No.....			17 (15%)
	Don't know.....			18 (16%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>What do you think of the overall quality of the health care?</b>			
	<i>I have not been to health care</i> .....			5 (5%)
	Very good.....			20 (18%)
	Good.....			46 (41%)
	Neither.....			21 (19%)
	Bad.....			10 (9%)
	Very bad.....			9 (8%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>Is it easy to see the following people if you need to?</b>			
		Yes	No	Don't know
	The doctor.....	61 (56%)	27 (25%)	20 (19%)
	The nurse.....	73 (68%)	19 (18%)	16 (15%)
	The dentist.....	33 (30%)	49 (45%)	28 (25%)
	The optician.....	28 (26%)	36 (34%)	42 (40%)
	The pharmacist.....	38 (36%)	28 (26%)	40 (38%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep it in your cell?</b>			
	<i>I am not taking any medication</i> .....			46 (42%)
	Yes.....			25 (23%)
	No.....			25 (23%)
	Don't know.....			13 (12%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions about alcohol:</b>			
		Yes	No	
	Did you have problems with alcohol when you first arrived here?	21 (19%)	90 (81%)	
	Have you received any help with alcohol problems in this establishment?	9 (8%)	100 (92%)	
<b>Q6</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions about drugs:</b>			
		Yes	No	
	Did you have problems with drugs when you first arrived here?	49 (45%)	61 (55%)	
	Do you have problems with drugs now?	11 (10%)	98 (90%)	
	Have you received any help with drug problems in this establishment?	33 (30%)	77 (70%)	
<b>Q7</b>	<b>How easy is it to get illegal drugs here?</b>			
	Very easy.....			15 (14%)
	Easy.....			12 (11%)
	Neither.....			10 (9%)
	Difficult.....			8 (7%)
	Very difficult.....			14 (13%)
	Don't know.....			50 (46%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?</b>			
	Yes.....			27 (25%)

No..... 82 (75%)

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

***I do not have any emotional or mental health problems***..... 82 (76%)  
 Yes..... 12 (11%)  
 No..... 14 (13%)

## SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS

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

Yes..... 98 (91%)  
 No..... 10 (9%)

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

Yes..... 87 (81%)  
 No..... 8 (7%)  
 Don't know ..... 13 (12%)

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

	<b><i>I have not made one</i></b>	Yes	No
Do you feel applications are sorted out fairly?	25 (23%)	68 (62%)	16 (15%)
Do you feel applications are sorted out promptly? (Within seven days)	25 (24%)	55 (52%)	25 (24%)

**Q4 Do you know how to make a complaint?**

Yes..... 98 (89%)  
 No..... 12 (11%)

**Q5 Is it easy to make a complaint?**

Yes..... 73 (66%)  
 No..... 9 (8%)  
 Don't know ..... 28 (25%)

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

	<b><i>I have not made one</i></b>	Yes	No
Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	52 (48%)	19 (17%)	38 (35%)
Do you feel complaints are sorted out promptly? (Within seven days)	52 (48%)	27 (25%)	29 (27%)

**Q7 Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?**

Yes..... 24 (22%)  
 No..... 84 (78%)

**Q8 Can you speak to the following people when you need to?**

	Yes	No	Don't know
A peer mentor/peer support/listener	37 (34%)	15 (14%)	57 (52%)
A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)	29 (27%)	15 (14%)	63 (59%)
An advocate (an outside person to help you)	41 (39%)	16 (15%)	49 (46%)

## 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> .....	8 (7%)
	<i>Enhanced (top)</i> .....	26 (23%)
	<i>Standard (middle)</i> .....	61 (55%)
	<i>Basic (bottom)</i> .....	7 (6%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	9 (8%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the rewards and sanctions scheme?</b>	
	<i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i> .....	8 (8%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	51 (48%)
	<i>No</i> .....	29 (27%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	18 (17%)
<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> .....	8 (8%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	51 (49%)
	<i>No</i> .....	33 (32%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	12 (12%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Have you had a 'nicking' (adjudication) since you have been in this establishment?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	65 (59%)
	<i>No</i> .....	35 (32%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	10 (9%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>If you have had a 'nicking' (adjudication), was the process explained clearly to you?</b>	
	<i>I have not had an adjudication</i> .....	35 (32%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	61 (56%)
	<i>No</i> .....	13 (12%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>If you have been physically restrained (C and R), how many times has this happened since you have been in this establishment?</b>	
	<i>I have not been restrained</i> .....	70 (65%)
	<i>Once</i> .....	16 (15%)
	<i>Twice</i> .....	8 (7%)
	<i>Three times</i> .....	5 (5%)
	<i>More than three times</i> .....	9 (8%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>If you have spent a night in the care and separation unit (CSU), how were you treated by staff?</b>	
	<i>I have not been to the care and separation unit</i> .....	82 (75%)
	<i>Very well</i> .....	3 (3%)
	<i>Well</i> .....	8 (7%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....	9 (8%)
	<i>Badly</i> .....	5 (5%)
	<i>Very badly</i> .....	2 (2%)

## SECTION 9: SAFETY

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Have you ever felt unsafe in this establishment?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	30 (27%)

No..... 80 (73%)

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

<i>Never felt unsafe</i> .....	80 (73%)	<i>At mealtimes</i> .....	5 (5%)
<i>Everywhere</i> .....	8 (7%)	<i>At health care</i> .....	0 (0%)
<i>Care and separation unit</i> .....	1 (1%)	<i>Visits area</i> .....	2 (2%)
<i>Association areas</i> .....	6 (6%)	<i>In wing showers</i> .....	1 (1%)
<i>Reception area</i> .....	0 (0%)	<i>In gym showers</i> .....	14 (13%)
<i>At the gym</i> .....	12 (11%)	<i>In corridors/stairwells</i> .....	3 (3%)
<i>In an exercise yard</i> .....	5 (5%)	<i>On your landing/wing</i> .....	1 (1%)
<i>At work</i> .....	2 (2%)	<i>In your cell</i> .....	3 (3%)
<i>At education</i> .....	6 (6%)		

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

Yes..... 18 (17%)  
No..... 90 (83%)

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

<i>Insulting remarks (about you, your family or friends)</i> .....	16 (15%)	<i>Because of drugs</i> .....	1 (1%)
<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i> .....	9 (8%)	<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i> .....	2 (2%)
<i>Sexual abuse</i> .....	0 (0%)	<i>Because you were new here</i> .....	12 (11%)
<i>Because of your race or ethnic origin</i> .....	4 (4%)	<i>Because you are from a different part of the country</i> .....	7 (7%)
<i>Because of your religious beliefs</i> .....	3 (3%)	<i>Because of gang related issues</i> .....	3 (3%)
<i>Because you have a disability</i> ....	1 (1%)	<i>Because of my offence/crime</i> .....	3 (3%)

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

Yes..... 22 (20%)  
No..... 86 (80%)

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

<i>Insulting remarks (about you, your family or friends)</i> .....	10 (9%)	<i>Because of drugs</i> .....	0 (0%)
<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i> .....	8 (7%)	<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i> .....	4 (4%)
<i>Sexual abuse</i> .....	1 (1%)	<i>Because you were new here</i> .....	3 (3%)
<i>Because of your race or ethnic origin</i> .....	6 (6%)	<i>Because you are from a different part of the country</i> .....	0 (0%)
<i>Because of your religious beliefs</i> .....	2 (2%)	<i>Because of gang related issues</i> ....	4 (4%)
<i>Because you have a disability</i> .....	0 (0%)	<i>Because of my offence/crime</i> .....	3 (3%)

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

<i>No one</i> .....	40 (43%)	<i>Teacher/education staff</i> .....	2 (2%)
<i>Personal officer</i> .....	26 (28%)	<i>Gym staff</i> .....	1 (1%)
<i>Wing officer</i> .....	18 (19%)	<i>Listener/Samaritan/Buddy</i> .....	9 (10%)
<i>Chaplain</i> .....	9 (10%)	<i>Another young person here</i> .....	17 (18%)
<i>Health care staff</i> .....	3 (3%)	<i>Family/friends</i> .....	28 (30%)

<b>Q10</b>	<b>Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?</b>	
	Yes.....	28 (26%)
	No.....	40 (37%)
	Don't know.....	39 (36%)
<b>Q11</b>	<b>Is shouting through the windows a problem here?</b>	
	Yes.....	43 (40%)
	No.....	52 (48%)
	Don't know.....	13 (12%)
<b>Q12</b>	<b>Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?</b>	
	Yes.....	35 (33%)
	No.....	71 (67%)

## SECTION 10: ACTIVITIES

<b>Q1</b>	<b>How old were you when you were last at school?</b>	
	14 or under.....	43 (40%)
	15 or over.....	64 (60%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions about school:</b>	
		Yes                      No                      Not applicable
	Have you ever been excluded from school?	94 (89%)              10 (9%)              2 (2%)
	Did you used to truant from school?	80 (79%)              16 (16%)              5 (5%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>Do you CURRENTLY take part in any of the following activities? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	Education.....	85 (79%)
	A job in this establishment.....	57 (53%)
	Vocational or skills training.....	22 (21%)
	Offending behaviour programmes.....	19 (18%)
	<b>I am not currently involved in any of these</b> .....	12 (11%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>If you have been involved in any of the following activities, in this establishment, do you think they will help you when you leave prison?</b>	
		<b>Not been involved</b> Yes              No              Don't know
	Education	5 (5%)              59 (58%)              29 (28%)              9 (9%)
	A job in this establishment	10 (10%)              48 (49%)              29 (30%)              11 (11%)
	Vocational or skills training	15 (19%)              31 (40%)              18 (23%)              14 (18%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	14 (17%)              31 (38%)              23 (28%)              13 (16%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>Do you usually have association every day?</b>	
	Yes.....	24 (22%)
	No.....	79 (73%)
	Don't know.....	5 (5%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?</b>	
	<b>Don't want to go</b> .....	11 (10%)
	None.....	4 (4%)
	One to two times.....	63 (58%)
	Three to five times.....	19 (18%)
	More than five times.....	3 (3%)



Don't know ..... 8 (7%)

<b>Q7</b>	<b>Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?</b>	
	<i>Don't want to go</i> .....	6 (6%)
	Yes .....	28 (26%)
	No .....	65 (60%)
	Don't know .....	10 (9%)

## SECTION 11: FAMILY AND FRIENDS

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Are you able to use the telephone every day if you want to?</b>	
	Yes .....	19 (18%)
	No .....	81 (75%)
	Don't know .....	8 (7%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?</b>	
	Yes .....	45 (42%)
	No .....	54 (50%)
	Don't know .....	9 (8%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>How easy is it for your family and friends to visit you here?</b>	
	Very easy .....	7 (6%)
	Easy .....	36 (33%)
	Neither .....	20 (19%)
	Difficult .....	22 (20%)
	Very difficult .....	12 (11%)
	Don't know .....	11 (10%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>How many visits do you usually have each week, from family or friends?</b>	
	<i>Not been here a week yet</i> .....	5 (5%)
	<i>I don't get visits</i> .....	19 (18%)
	<i>Less than one a week</i> .....	37 (35%)
	<i>About one a week</i> .....	30 (28%)
	<i>More than one a week</i> .....	4 (4%)
	Don't know .....	12 (11%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>Do your visits usually start on time?</b>	
	<i>I don't get visits</i> .....	19 (18%)
	Yes .....	47 (45%)
	No .....	23 (22%)
	Don't know .....	15 (14%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>How are you and your family/friends usually treated by visits staff?</b>	
	<i>I don't get visits</i> .....	19 (18%)
	Very well .....	9 (9%)
	Well .....	35 (33%)
	Neither .....	19 (18%)
	Badly .....	3 (3%)
	Very badly .....	0 (0%)
	Don't know .....	20 (19%)

## SECTION 12: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE

<b>Q1</b>	<b>When did you first meet your personal officer?</b>				
	<i>I still have not met him/her</i> .....				14 (13%)
	<i>In your first week</i> .....				44 (41%)
	<i>After your first week</i> .....				19 (18%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....				31 (29%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>How often do you see your personal officer?</b>				
	<i>I still have not met him/her</i> .....				14 (14%)
	<i>At least once a week</i> .....				48 (48%)
	<i>Less than once a week</i> .....				38 (38%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>Do you feel your personal officer has helped you?</b>				
	<i>I still have not met him/her</i> .....				14 (13%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....				55 (53%)
	<i>No</i> .....				35 (34%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?</b>				
	<i>Yes</i> .....				60 (56%)
	<i>No</i> .....				27 (25%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....				20 (19%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions about training plans, sentence plans or remand plans:</b>				
		<b><i>I don't have one</i></b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b><i>Don't know</i></b>
	Were you involved in the development of your plan?	27 (25%)	43 (41%)	7 (7%)	29 (27%)
	Do you understand the targets that have been set in your plan?	27 (25%)	51 (48%)	4 (4%)	24 (23%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>Has your YOT worker been in touch since you arrived at this establishment?</b>				
	<i>Yes</i> .....				96 (89%)
	<i>No</i> .....				12 (11%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>Do you know how to get in touch with your YOT worker?</b>				
	<i>Yes</i> .....				63 (58%)
	<i>No</i> .....				46 (42%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions about your release:</b>				
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b><i>Don't know</i></b>	
	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	45 (42%)	48 (44%)	15 (14%)	
	Are you planning on going to school or college after release?	47 (45%)	38 (36%)	20 (19%)	
	Do you have a job to go to on release?	21 (20%)	61 (59%)	21 (20%)	
<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> .....				40 (41%)
	<i>Getting into school or college</i> .....				44 (45%)
	<i>Getting a job</i> .....				44 (45%)
	<i>Help with money/finances</i> .....				40 (41%)

<i>Help with claiming benefits</i> .....	37 (38%)
<i>Continuing health services</i> .....	26 (27%)
<i>Opening a bank account</i> .....	35 (36%)
<i>Avoiding bad relationships</i> .....	28 (29%)
<b><i>I don't know who to contact</i></b> .....	35 (36%)

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

<i>Finding accommodation</i> .....	24 (25%)
<i>Getting into school or college</i> .....	26 (27%)
<i>Getting a job</i> .....	45 (47%)
<i>Money/finances</i> .....	38 (40%)
<i>Claiming benefits</i> .....	28 (29%)
<i>Continuing health services</i> .....	10 (10%)
<i>Opening a bank account</i> .....	15 (16%)
<i>Avoiding bad relationships</i> .....	15 (16%)
<b><i>I won't have any problems</i></b> .....	30 (31%)

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

<b><i>Not sentenced</i></b> .....	16 (15%)	<i>Having a mentor (someone you can ask for advice)</i> .....	9 (8%)
<i>Nothing, it is up to me</i> .....	33 (31%)	<i>Having a YOT worker or social worker that I get on with</i> .....	27 (25%)
<i>Making new friends outside</i> .....	21 (20%)	<i>Having children</i> .....	21 (20%)
<i>Going back to live with my family</i>	33 (31%)	<i>Having something to do that isn't crime</i> .....	32 (30%)
<i>Getting a place of my own</i> .....	20 (19%)	<i>This sentence</i> .....	28 (26%)
<i>Getting a job</i> .....	48 (45%)	<i>Getting into school/college</i> .....	28 (26%)
<i>Having a partner (girlfriend or boyfriend)</i> .....	36 (34%)	<i>Talking about my offending behaviour with staff</i> .....	5 (5%)
<i>Staying off alcohol/drugs</i> .....	36 (34%)	<i>Anything else</i> .....	7 (7%)

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

<b><i>Not sentenced</i></b> .....	16 (15%)
<i>Yes</i> .....	80 (75%)
<i>No</i> .....	4 (4%)
<i>Don't know</i> .....	6 (6%)

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

<b><i>Not sentenced</i></b> .....	16 (15%)
<i>Yes</i> .....	45 (42%)
<i>No</i> .....	45 (42%)

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



### Survey responses from children and young people: HMYOI Wetherby 2012

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

#### Key to tables

		HMYOI Wetherby 2012	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Wetherby 2012	HMYOI Wetherby 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>115</b>	<b>796</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>143</b>
<b>SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU</b>					
1.1	Are you 18 years of age?	10%	13%	10%	14%
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	3%	6%	3%	6%
1.3	Is English your first language?	92%	87%	92%	95%
1.4	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other category)?	26%	45%	26%	20%
1.5	Are you Muslim?	13%	22%	13%	10%
1.6	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	5%	5%	5%	6%
1.7	Do you have any children?	8%	13%	8%	16%
1.8	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	11%	10%	11%	8%
1.9	Have you ever been in local authority care?	30%	29%	30%	22%
<b>SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE</b>					
2.1	Are you sentenced?	86%	74%	86%	77%
2.2	Is your sentence 12 months or less?	39%	36%	39%	37%
2.3	Have you been in this establishment for one month or less?	17%	19%	17%	22%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	51%	53%	51%	50%
<b>SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS</b>					
For your most recent journey, either to or from court or between prisons, we want to know:					
3.1	Was the van clean?	50%	42%	50%	44%
3.2	Did you feel safe?	83%	80%	83%	88%
3.3	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or anyone of a different gender?	34%	24%	34%	26%
3.4	Did you spend more than four hours in the van?	5%	9%	5%	2%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:					
3.5	Were you offered a toilet break if you needed it?	14%	14%	14%	13%
3.6	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	38%	31%	38%	42%
3.7	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	54%	50%	54%	53%
3.8	Before you arrived here (either from court or another establishment), were you told that you would be coming to this establishment?	73%	75%	73%	76%
3.9	Before you arrived here (either from court or another establishment), were you given written information about coming to this establishment?	5%	12%	5%	4%

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

### Key to tables

		HMYOI Wetherby 2012	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Wetherby 2012	HMYOI Wetherby 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>115</b>	<b>796</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>143</b>
<b>SECTION 4: YOUR FIRST FEW DAYS HERE</b>					
<b>4.1</b>	Were you in reception for less than two hours?	<b>82%</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>82%</b>	<b>72%</b>
<b>4.2</b>	When you were searched was this carried out in an understanding way?	<b>77%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>74%</b>
<b>4.3</b>	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	<b>68%</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>67%</b>
When you first arrived, did staff ask if you needed help or support with any of the following:					
<b>4.4a</b>	Not being able to smoke?	<b>70%</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>68%</b>
<b>4.4b</b>	Loss of property?	<b>33%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>17%</b>
<b>4.4c</b>	Housing problems?	<b>16%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>13%</b>
<b>4.4d</b>	Needing protection from other young people?	<b>24%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>16%</b>
<b>4.4e</b>	Letting family know where you are?	<b>65%</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>65%</b>
<b>4.4f</b>	Money worries?	<b>23%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>17%</b>
<b>4.4g</b>	Feeling low/upset/needing someone to talk to?	<b>43%</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>46%</b>
<b>4.4h</b>	Health problems?	<b>56%</b>	<b>57%</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>60%</b>
<b>4.4i</b>	Getting phone numbers?	<b>44%</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>44%</b>
<b>4.5</b>	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	<b>72%</b>	<b>74%</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>78%</b>
When you first arrived, did you have problems with any of the following:					
<b>4.5a</b>	Not being able to smoke?	<b>54%</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>58%</b>
<b>4.5b</b>	Loss of property?	<b>16%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>14%</b>
<b>4.5c</b>	Housing problems?	<b>7%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>11%</b>
<b>4.5d</b>	Needing protection from other young people?	<b>4%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>5%</b>
<b>4.5e</b>	Letting family know where you are?	<b>26%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>19%</b>
<b>4.5f</b>	Money worries?	<b>12%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>16%</b>
<b>4.5g</b>	Feeling low/upset/needing someone to talk to?	<b>17%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>17%</b>
<b>4.5h</b>	Health problems?	<b>13%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>9%</b>
<b>4.5i</b>	Getting phone numbers?	<b>33%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>31%</b>
When you first arrived, were you given any of the following:					
<b>4.6a</b>	A reception pack?	<b>84%</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>86%</b>
<b>4.6b</b>	The opportunity to have a shower?	<b>16%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>19%</b>
<b>4.6c</b>	Something to eat?	<b>74%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>74%</b>	<b>73%</b>
<b>4.6d</b>	A free phone call to friends/family?	<b>76%</b>	<b>73%</b>	<b>76%</b>	<b>76%</b>
<b>4.6e</b>	Information about the PIN telephone system?	<b>49%</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>46%</b>
<b>4.6f</b>	Information about feeling low/upset?	<b>35%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>26%</b>
Within your first 24 hours, did you have access to the following people or services:					
<b>4.7a</b>	The chaplain or religious leader?	<b>53%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>57%</b>
<b>4.7b</b>	A peer mentor, Listener or the Samaritans?	<b>26%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>19%</b>
<b>4.7c</b>	Did you have access to the prison shop/canteen?	<b>12%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>14%</b>

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

### Key to tables

		HMYOI Wetherby 2012	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Wetherby 2012	HMYOI Wetherby 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>115</b>	<b>796</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>143</b>
<b>4.8</b>	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a member of health care staff?	<b>74%</b>	<b>69%</b>	<b>74%</b>	<b>71%</b>
<b>4.9</b>	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	<b>83%</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>82%</b>
<b>4.10</b>	For those who have been on an induction course: did it cover everything you needed to know about the establishment	<b>74%</b>	<b>63%</b>	<b>74%</b>	<b>66%</b>
<b>SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT</b>					
<b>5.1</b>	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	<b>31%</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>33%</b>
<b>5.2</b>	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	<b>25%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>29%</b>
<b>5.3</b>	Do you find the food here good/very good?	<b>13%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>16%</b>
<b>5.4</b>	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	<b>43%</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>37%</b>
<b>5.5</b>	Is it easy/very easy for you to attend religious services?	<b>59%</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>59%</b>	<b>61%</b>
<b>5.6a</b>	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	<b>55%</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>49%</b>
<b>5.6b</b>	Can you speak to a religious leader in private if you want to?	<b>70%</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>62%</b>
<b>5.7</b>	Is there a member of staff you can turn to with a problem?	<b>64%</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>64%</b>	<b>55%</b>
<b>5.8</b>	Do you feel that most of the staff here treat you with respect?	<b>63%</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>63%</b>	<b>53%</b>
<b>SECTION 6: HEALTH SERVICES</b>					
<b>6.1</b>	Did you have a full health assessment the day after your arrival?	<b>69%</b>	<b>63%</b>	<b>69%</b>	<b>62%</b>
<b>6.2</b>	For those who have been to health care: do you think the overall quality is good/very good?	<b>62%</b>	<b>63%</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>52%</b>
<b>6.3a</b>	Is it easy for you to see the doctor?	<b>57%</b>	<b>52%</b>	<b>57%</b>	<b>54%</b>
<b>6.3b</b>	Is it easy for you to see the nurse?	<b>68%</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>65%</b>
<b>6.3c</b>	Is it easy for you to see the dentist?	<b>30%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>24%</b>
<b>6.3d</b>	Is it easy for you to see the optician?	<b>26%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>21%</b>
<b>6.3e</b>	Is it easy for you to see the pharmacist?	<b>36%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>29%</b>
<b>6.4</b>	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep it in your cell?	<b>40%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>38%</b>
<b>6.5a</b>	Did you have any problems with alcohol when you first arrived?	<b>19%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>19%</b>
<b>6.5b</b>	Have you received any help with any alcohol problems here?	<b>8%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>13%</b>
<b>6.6a</b>	Did you have any problems with drugs when you first arrived?	<b>45%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>41%</b>
<b>6.6b</b>	Do you have any problems with drugs now?	<b>10%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>12%</b>
<b>6.6c</b>	Have you received any help with any drug problems here?	<b>30%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>31%</b>
<b>6.7</b>	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs here?	<b>25%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>26%</b>
<b>6.8</b>	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	<b>25%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>21%</b>
<b>6.9</b>	If you feel you have emotional or mental health problems, are you being helped by anyone here?	<b>46%</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>41%</b>

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

### Key to tables

		HMYOI Wetherby 2012	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Wetherby 2012	HMYOI Wetherby 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>115</b>	<b>796</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>143</b>
<b>SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS</b>					
<b>7.1</b>	Do you know how to make an application?	<b>91%</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>91%</b>	<b>85%</b>
<b>7.2</b>	Is it easy to make an application?	<b>81%</b>	<b>76%</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>73%</b>
For those who have made an application:					
<b>7.3a</b>	Do you feel applications are sorted out fairly?	<b>81%</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>76%</b>
<b>7.3b</b>	Do you feel applications are sorted out promptly (within seven days)?	<b>69%</b>	<b>59%</b>	<b>69%</b>	<b>70%</b>
<b>7.4</b>	Do you know how to make a complaint?	<b>89%</b>	<b>82%</b>	<b>89%</b>	<b>83%</b>
<b>7.5</b>	Is it easy to make a complaint?	<b>66%</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>65%</b>
For those who have made a complaint:					
<b>7.6a</b>	Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	<b>33%</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>28%</b>
<b>7.6b</b>	Do you feel complaints are sorted out promptly (within seven days)?	<b>48%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>45%</b>
<b>7.7</b>	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	<b>22%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>17%</b>
Can you speak to the following people when you need to:					
<b>7.8a</b>	A peer mentor or Listener?	<b>34%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>29%</b>
<b>7.8b</b>	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)	<b>27%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>25%</b>
<b>7.8c</b>	An advocate (an outside person to help you)	<b>39%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>35%</b>
<b>SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE</b>					
<b>8.1</b>	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	<b>24%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>30%</b>
<b>8.2</b>	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	<b>48%</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>52%</b>
<b>8.3</b>	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	<b>49%</b>	<b>51%</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>56%</b>
<b>8.4</b>	Have you had a 'nicking' (adjudication) since you have been here?	<b>59%</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>59%</b>	<b>50%</b>
<b>8.5</b>	Was the 'nicking' (adjudication) process explained clearly to you?	<b>83%</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>75%</b>
<b>8.6</b>	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	<b>35%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>35%</b>
<b>8.7</b>	For those who had spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit: did the staff treat you well/very well?	<b>41%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>72%</b>

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

### Key to tables

		HMYOI Wetherby 2012	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Wetherby 2012	HMYOI Wetherby 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>115</b>	<b>796</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>143</b>
<b>SECTION 9: SAFETY</b>					
<b>9.1</b>	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	27%	33%	27%	26%
<b>9.3</b>	Has another young person or group of young people victimised (insulted or assaulted) you here?	17%	26%	17%	25%
If you have felt victimised by another young person/group of young people, did the incident involve:					
<b>9.4a</b>	Insulting remarks?	15%	15%	15%	14%
<b>9.4b</b>	Physical abuse?	8%	10%	8%	10%
<b>9.4c</b>	Sexual abuse?	0%	1%	0%	2%
<b>9.4d</b>	Racial or ethnic abuse?	4%	4%	4%	4%
<b>9.4e</b>	Your religious beliefs?	3%	3%	3%	1%
<b>9.4f</b>	Your disability?	1%	1%	1%	2%
<b>9.4g</b>	Drugs?	1%	3%	1%	4%
<b>9.4h</b>	Having your canteen/property taken?	2%	7%	2%	5%
<b>9.4i</b>	Because you were new here?	11%	10%	11%	6%
<b>9.4j</b>	Being from a different part of the country than others?	7%	5%	7%	6%
<b>9.4k</b>	Gang related issues?	3%	5%	3%	8%
<b>9.4l</b>	Your offence/crime?	3%	3%	3%	5%
<b>9.6</b>	Has a member of staff or group of staff victimised (insulted or assaulted) you here?	20%	23%	20%	29%
If you have felt victimised by a member of staff/group of staff members, did the incident involve:					
<b>9.7a</b>	Insulting remarks?	9%	14%	9%	20%
<b>9.7b</b>	Physical abuse?	7%	3%	7%	11%
<b>9.7c</b>	Sexual abuse?	1%	1%	1%	0%
<b>9.7d</b>	Racial or ethnic abuse?	5%	4%	5%	4%
<b>9.7e</b>	Your religious beliefs?	2%	2%	2%	3%
<b>9.7f</b>	Your disability?	0%	1%	0%	2%
<b>9.7g</b>	Drugs?	0%	3%	0%	3%
<b>9.7h</b>	Having your canteen/property taken?	4%	3%	4%	2%
<b>9.7i</b>	Because you were new here?	3%	4%	3%	4%
<b>9.7j</b>	Being from a different part of the country than others?	0%	4%	0%	5%
<b>9.7k</b>	Gang related issues?	4%	1%	4%	2%
<b>9.7l</b>	Your offence/crime?	3%	3%	3%	2%
<b>9.9</b>	If you were being victimised by another young person or a member of staff would you be able to tell anyone about it	58%	56%	58%	62%
<b>9.10</b>	If you did tell a member of staff that you were being victimised do you think it would be taken seriously?	26%	29%	26%	29%
<b>9.11</b>	Is shouting through the windows a problem here?	40%	39%	40%	55%
<b>9.12</b>	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	33%	36%	33%	28%



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

### Key to tables

		HMYOI Wetherby 2012	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Wetherby 2012	HMYOI Wetherby 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>115</b>	<b>796</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>143</b>
<b>SECTION 10: ACTIVITIES</b>					
<b>10.1</b>	Were you 14 or younger when you were last at school?	<b>40%</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>46%</b>
<b>10.2a</b>	Have you ever been excluded from school?	<b>89%</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>89%</b>	<b>86%</b>
<b>10.2b</b>	Have you ever truanted from school?	<b>79%</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>71%</b>
Do you currently take part in any of the following:					
<b>10.3a</b>	Education?	<b>80%</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>58%</b>
<b>10.3b</b>	A job in this establishment?	<b>53%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>55%</b>
<b>10.3c</b>	Vocational or skills training?	<b>21%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>20%</b>
<b>10.3d</b>	Offending behaviour programmes?	<b>18%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>22%</b>
For those who have taken part in the following activities while in this prison: do you think that they will help you when you leave prison?					
<b>10.4a</b>	Education?	<b>61%</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>61%</b>	<b>62%</b>
<b>10.4b</b>	A job in this establishment?	<b>55%</b>	<b>51%</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>65%</b>
<b>10.4c</b>	Vocational or skills training?	<b>49%</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>57%</b>
<b>10.4d</b>	Offending behaviour programmes?	<b>46%</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>55%</b>
<b>10.5</b>	Do you usually have association every day?	<b>22%</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>21%</b>
<b>10.6</b>	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	<b>3%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>11%</b>
<b>10.7</b>	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	<b>26%</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>36%</b>
<b>SECTION 11: KEEPING IN TOUCH WITH FAMILY AND FRIENDS</b>					
<b>11.1</b>	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	<b>18%</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>27%</b>
<b>11.2</b>	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	<b>42%</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>35%</b>
<b>11.3</b>	Is it easy/very easy for your family and friends to visit you here?	<b>40%</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>45%</b>
<b>11.4</b>	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	<b>32%</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>38%</b>
<b>11.5</b>	Do your visits start on time?	<b>45%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>49%</b>
<b>11.6</b>	Are you and your visitors treated well/very well by visits staff?	<b>42%</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>47%</b>
<b>SECTION 12: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE</b>					
For those who have met their personal officer:					
<b>12.1</b>	Did you meet your personal officer within the first week?	<b>47%</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>52%</b>
<b>12.2</b>	Do you see your personal officer at least once a week?	<b>56%</b>	<b>61%</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>44%</b>
<b>12.3</b>	Do you feel your personal officer has helped you?	<b>61%</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>61%</b>	<b>47%</b>
<b>12.4</b>	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	<b>56%</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>54%</b>
For those with a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan:					
<b>12.5a</b>	Were you involved in the development of your plan?	<b>55%</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>52%</b>
<b>12.5b</b>	Do you understand the targets set in your plan?	<b>65%</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>63%</b>
<b>12.6</b>	Has your YOT worker been in touch with you since your arrival here?	<b>89%</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>89%</b>	<b>80%</b>
<b>12.7</b>	Do you know how to get in touch with your YOT worker?	<b>58%</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>57%</b>

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

### Key to tables

		HMYOI Wetherby 2012	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Wetherby 2012	HMYOI Wetherby 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>115</b>	<b>796</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>143</b>
Please answer the following about your preparation for release:					
<b>12.8</b>	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	<b>42%</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>42%</b>
<b>12.8</b>	Are you going to school or college on release?	<b>45%</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>58%</b>
<b>12.8</b>	Do you have a job to go to on release?	<b>21%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>21%</b>
Do you know who to contact for help with the following in preparation for your release:					
<b>12.9</b>	Finding accommodation	<b>41%</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>35%</b>
<b>12.9</b>	Getting into school or college	<b>45%</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>43%</b>
<b>12.9</b>	Getting a job	<b>45%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>41%</b>
<b>12.9</b>	Help with money/finances	<b>41%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>33%</b>
<b>12.9</b>	Help with claiming benefits	<b>38%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>31%</b>
<b>12.9</b>	Continuing health services	<b>27%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>22%</b>
<b>12.9</b>	Opening a bank account	<b>36%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>29%</b>
<b>12.9</b>	Avoiding bad relationships	<b>28%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>29%</b>
Do you think you will have a problem with the following, when you are released:					
<b>12.10</b>	Finding accommodation?	<b>25%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>21%</b>
<b>12.10</b>	Getting into school or college?	<b>27%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>19%</b>
<b>12.10</b>	Getting a job?	<b>47%</b>	<b>51%</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>43%</b>
<b>12.10</b>	Help with money/finances?	<b>40%</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>30%</b>
<b>12.10</b>	Help with claiming benefits?	<b>29%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>21%</b>
<b>12.10</b>	Continuing health services?	<b>10%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>12%</b>
<b>12.10</b>	Opening a bank account?	<b>16%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>13%</b>
<b>12.10</b>	Avoiding bad relationships?	<b>16%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>16%</b>
For those who were sentenced:					
<b>12.12</b>	Do you want to stop offending?	<b>89%</b>	<b>89%</b>	<b>89%</b>	<b>90%</b>
<b>12.13</b>	Have you done anything or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future	<b>50%</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>38%</b>

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



### Survey responses from children and young people: HMYOI Wetherby - Anson Unit 2012 vs all other units and Benbow Unit 2012 vs all other units.

**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

		Anson Unit	All other units (excl health care and segregation)	Benbow Unit	All other units (excl health care and segregation)
	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>13</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU</b>					
1.1	Are you 18 years of age?	0%	10%	8%	9%
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	7%	2%	0%	3%
1.3	Is English your first language?	84%	93%	100%	91%
1.4	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other category)?	39%	24%	0%	28%
1.5	Are you Muslim?	17%	12%	0%	14%
1.6	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	7%	5%	0%	6%
1.7	Do you have any children?	0%	8%	0%	8%
1.8	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	16%	12%	8%	12%
1.9	Have you ever been in local authority care?	16%	30%	37%	28%
<b>SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE</b>					
2.1	Are you sentenced?	100%	86%	82%	88%
2.2	Is your sentence 12 months or less?	0%	45%	54%	38%
2.3	Have you been in this establishment for one month or less?	0%	19%	27%	15%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	77%	48%	37%	54%
<b>SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS</b>					
For your most recent journey, either to or from court or between prisons, we want to know:					
3.1	Was the van clean?	45%	50%	73%	47%
3.2	Did you feel safe?	94%	82%	92%	82%
3.3	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or anyone of a different gender?	31%	35%	54%	32%
3.4	Did you spend more than four hours in the van?	16%	4%	0%	6%
3.7	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	45%	55%	27%	57%
3.8	Before you arrived here (either from court or another establishment), were you told that you would be coming to this establishment?	61%	74%	73%	73%
3.9	Before you arrived here (either from court or another establishment), were you given written information about coming to this establishment?	7%	5%	0%	6%

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

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Anson Unit	All other units (excl health care and segregation)	Benbow Unit	All other units (excl health care and segregation)
	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>13</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>SECTION 4: YOUR FIRST FEW DAYS HERE</b>					
<b>4.1</b>	Were you in reception for less than two hours?	69%	83%	73%	82%
<b>4.2</b>	When you were searched was this carried out in an understanding way?	77%	75%	82%	75%
<b>4.3</b>	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	69%	69%	50%	71%
When you first arrived, did staff ask if you needed help or support with any of the following:					
<b>4.4a</b>	Not being able to smoke?	45%	74%	58%	71%
<b>4.4b</b>	Loss of property?	23%	34%	21%	34%
<b>4.4c</b>	Housing problems?	16%	16%	8%	16%
<b>4.4d</b>	Needing protection from other young people?	39%	22%	8%	26%
<b>4.4e</b>	Letting family know where you are?	69%	64%	42%	67%
<b>4.4f</b>	Money worries?	39%	21%	8%	24%
<b>4.4g</b>	Feeling low/upset/needling someone to talk to?	55%	41%	21%	48%
<b>4.4h</b>	Health problems?	69%	54%	50%	56%
<b>4.4i</b>	Getting phone numbers?	61%	43%	21%	48%
<b>4.5</b>	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	83%	69%	79%	70%
When you first arrived, did you have problems with any of the following:					
<b>4.5a</b>	Not being able to smoke?	35%	57%	58%	54%
<b>4.5b</b>	Loss of property?	17%	14%	21%	14%
<b>4.5c</b>	Housing problems?	0%	7%	8%	6%
<b>4.5d</b>	Needing protection from other young people?	0%	5%	21%	2%
<b>4.5e</b>	Letting family know where you are?	41%	25%	42%	26%
<b>4.5f</b>	Money worries?	24%	11%	8%	13%
<b>4.5g</b>	Feeling low/upset/needling someone to talk to?	24%	17%	29%	16%
<b>4.5h</b>	Health problems?	24%	12%	8%	14%
<b>4.5i</b>	Getting phone numbers?	41%	31%	29%	32%
When you first arrived, were you given any of the following:					
<b>4.6a</b>	A reception pack?	77%	84%	92%	82%
<b>4.6b</b>	The opportunity to have a shower?	31%	13%	0%	17%
<b>4.6c</b>	Something to eat?	61%	76%	63%	75%
<b>4.6d</b>	A free phone call to friends/family?	84%	76%	46%	80%
<b>4.6e</b>	Information about the PIN telephone system?	69%	47%	27%	52%
<b>4.6f</b>	Information about feeling low/upset?	39%	35%	8%	39%
Within your first 24 hours, did you have access to the following people or services:					
<b>4.7a</b>	The chaplain or religious leader?	61%	52%	73%	51%
<b>4.7b</b>	A peer mentor, Listener or the Samaritans?	23%	27%	19%	27%
<b>4.7c</b>	Did you have access to the prison shop/canteen?	16%	11%	19%	11%

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

### Key to tables

		Anson Unit	All other units (excl health care and segregation)	Benbow Unit	All other units (excl health care and segregation)
	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>13</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>4.8</b>	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a member of health care staff?	<b>84%</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>73%</b>	<b>73%</b>
<b>4.9</b>	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	<b>84%</b>	<b>82%</b>	<b>82%</b>	<b>82%</b>
<b>SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT</b>					
<b>5.1</b>	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	<b>77%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>32%</b>
<b>5.2</b>	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	<b>23%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>27%</b>
<b>5.3</b>	Do you find the food here good/very good?	<b>23%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>15%</b>
<b>5.4</b>	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	<b>23%</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>44%</b>
<b>5.5</b>	Is it easy/very easy for you to attend religious services?	<b>77%</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>62%</b>
<b>5.6a</b>	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	<b>45%</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>56%</b>
<b>5.6b</b>	Can you speak to a religious leader in private if you want to?	<b>69%</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>74%</b>	<b>68%</b>
<b>5.7</b>	Is there a member of staff you can turn to with a problem?	<b>61%</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>65%</b>
<b>5.8</b>	Do you feel that most of the staff here treat you with respect?	<b>55%</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>67%</b>
<b>SECTION 6: HEALTH SERVICES</b>					
<b>6.1</b>	Did you have a full health assessment the day after your arrival?	<b>77%</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>71%</b>
<b>6.3a</b>	Is it easy for you to see the doctor?	<b>31%</b>	<b>59%</b>	<b>63%</b>	<b>55%</b>
<b>6.3b</b>	Is it easy for you to see the nurse?	<b>61%</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>73%</b>	<b>67%</b>
<b>6.3c</b>	Is it easy for you to see the dentist?	<b>7%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>31%</b>
<b>6.3d</b>	Is it easy for you to see the optician?	<b>7%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>27%</b>
<b>6.3e</b>	Is it easy for you to see the pharmacist?	<b>39%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>37%</b>
<b>6.5a</b>	Did you have any problems with alcohol when you first arrived?	<b>7%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>16%</b>
<b>6.5b</b>	Have you received any help with any alcohol problems here?	<b>7%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>5%</b>
<b>6.6a</b>	Did you have any problems with drugs when you first arrived?	<b>23%</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>63%</b>	<b>43%</b>
<b>6.6b</b>	Do you have any problems with drugs now?	<b>0%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>8%</b>
<b>6.6c</b>	Have you received any help with any drug problems here?	<b>23%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>31%</b>
<b>6.7</b>	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs here?	<b>19%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>23%</b>
<b>6.8</b>	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	<b>16%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>23%</b>

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

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Anson Unit	All other units (excl health care and segregation)	Benbow Unit	All other units (excl health care and segregation)
	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>13</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS</b>					
<b>7.1</b>	Do you know how to make an application?	<b>94%</b>	<b>91%</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>92%</b>
<b>7.2</b>	Is it easy to make an application?	<b>84%</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>82%</b>
<b>7.4</b>	Do you know how to make a complaint?	<b>100%</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>90%</b>
<b>7.5</b>	Is it easy to make a complaint?	<b>77%</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>63%</b>	<b>67%</b>
<b>7.7</b>	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	<b>23%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>23%</b>
Can you speak to the following people when you need to:					
<b>7.8a</b>	A peer mentor or Listener?	<b>31%</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>33%</b>
<b>7.8b</b>	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)	<b>16%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>26%</b>
<b>7.8c</b>	An advocate (an outside person to help you)	<b>39%</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>36%</b>
<b>SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE</b>					
<b>8.1</b>	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	<b>69%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>24%</b>
<b>8.2</b>	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	<b>50%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>48%</b>
<b>8.3</b>	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	<b>55%</b>	<b>51%</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>51%</b>
<b>8.4</b>	Have you had a 'nicking' (adjudication) since you have been here?	<b>61%</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>59%</b>
<b>8.6</b>	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	<b>23%</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>34%</b>

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

### Key to tables

		Anson Unit	All other units (excl health care and segregation)	Benbow Unit	All other units (excl health care and segregation)
	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>13</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>SECTION 9: SAFETY</b>					
<b>9.1</b>	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	<b>23%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>25%</b>
<b>9.3</b>	Has another young person or group of young people victimised (insulted or assaulted) you here?	<b>23%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>17%</b>
If you have felt victimised by another young person/group of young people, did the incident involve:					
<b>9.4a</b>	Insulting remarks?	<b>23%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>15%</b>
<b>9.4b</b>	Physical abuse?	<b>23%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>9%</b>
<b>9.4c</b>	Sexual abuse?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.4d</b>	Racial or ethnic abuse?	<b>16%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>5%</b>
<b>9.4e</b>	Your religious beliefs?	<b>7%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3%</b>
<b>9.4f</b>	Your disability?	<b>7%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>1%</b>
<b>9.4g</b>	Drugs?	<b>7%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>1%</b>
<b>9.4h</b>	Having your canteen/property taken?	<b>0%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>2%</b>
<b>9.4i</b>	Because you were new here?	<b>16%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>11%</b>
<b>9.4j</b>	Being from a different part of the country than others?	<b>16%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>8%</b>
<b>9.4k</b>	Gang related issues?	<b>7%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>2%</b>
<b>9.4l</b>	Your offence/crime?	<b>16%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3%</b>
<b>9.6</b>	Has a member of staff or group of staff victimised (insulted or assaulted) you here?	<b>31%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>19%</b>
If you have felt victimised by a member of staff/group of staff members, did the incident involve:					
<b>9.7a</b>	Insulting remarks?	<b>16%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>6%</b>
<b>9.7b</b>	Physical abuse?	<b>16%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>8%</b>
<b>9.7c</b>	Sexual abuse?	<b>0%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>1%</b>
<b>9.7d</b>	Racial or ethnic abuse?	<b>7%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>6%</b>
<b>9.7e</b>	Your religious beliefs?	<b>0%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>2%</b>
<b>9.7f</b>	Your disability?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.7g</b>	Drugs?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.7h</b>	Having your canteen/property taken?	<b>7%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>2%</b>
<b>9.7i</b>	Because you were new here?	<b>16%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>2%</b>
<b>9.7j</b>	Being from a different part of the country than others?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.7k</b>	Gang related issues?	<b>16%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3%</b>
<b>9.7l</b>	Your offence/crime?	<b>16%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>2%</b>
<b>9.9</b>	If you were being victimised by another young person or a member of staff would you be able to tell anyone about it	<b>50%</b>	<b>59%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>61%</b>
<b>9.10</b>	If you did tell a member of staff that you were being victimised do you think it would be taken seriously?	<b>16%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>29%</b>
<b>9.11</b>	Is shouting through the windows a problem here?	<b>7%</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>39%</b>
<b>9.12</b>	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	<b>55%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>32%</b>

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

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Anson Unit	All other units (excl health care and segregation)	Benbow Unit	All other units (excl health care and segregation)
	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>13</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>SECTION 10: ACTIVITIES</b>					
<b>10.1</b>	Were you 14 or younger when you were last at school?	31%	41%	21%	42%
<b>10.2a</b>	Have you ever been excluded from school?	69%	91%	79%	89%
<b>10.2b</b>	Have you ever truanted from school?	69%	82%	82%	80%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:					
<b>10.3a</b>	Education?	100%	80%	63%	85%
<b>10.3b</b>	A job in this establishment?	77%	51%	54%	55%
<b>10.3c</b>	Vocational or skills training?	16%	22%	0%	24%
<b>10.3d</b>	Offending behaviour programmes?	31%	17%	19%	19%
<b>10.5</b>	Do you usually have association every day?	61%	18%	63%	18%
<b>10.6</b>	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	7%	2%	0%	3%
<b>10.7</b>	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	55%	22%	8%	28%
<b>SECTION 11: KEEPING IN TOUCH WITH FAMILY AND FRIENDS</b>					
<b>11.1</b>	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	45%	14%	27%	17%
<b>11.2</b>	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	39%	42%	54%	40%
<b>11.3</b>	Is it easy/very easy for your family and friends to visit you here?	39%	41%	37%	41%
<b>11.4</b>	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	45%	31%	46%	32%
<b>11.5</b>	Do your visits start on time?	45%	45%	33%	46%
<b>11.6</b>	Are you and your visitors treated well/very well by visits staff?	45%	42%	21%	45%
<b>SECTION 12: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE</b>					
<b>12.6</b>	Has your YOT worker been in touch with you since your arrival here?	84%	90%	73%	92%
<b>12.7</b>	Do you know how to get in touch with your YOT worker?	61%	59%	54%	60%



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

**Key to tables**

		Anson Unit	All other units (excl health care and segregation)	Benbow Unit	All other units (excl health care and segregation)
	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>13</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100</b>
Please answer the following about your preparation for release:					
<b>12.8</b>	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	45%	43%	27%	45%
<b>12.8</b>	Are you going to school or college on release?	55%	44%	46%	46%
<b>12.8</b>	Do you have a job to go to on release?	24%	21%	19%	22%
Do you know who to contact for help with the following in preparation for your release:					
<b>12.9</b>	Finding accommodation	50%	39%	33%	41%
<b>12.9</b>	Getting into school or college	50%	44%	46%	45%
<b>12.9</b>	Getting a job	50%	44%	46%	45%
<b>12.9</b>	Help with money/finances	41%	40%	23%	42%
<b>12.9</b>	Help with claiming benefits	41%	37%	10%	40%
<b>12.9</b>	Continuing health services	41%	23%	10%	27%
<b>12.9</b>	Opening a bank account	35%	35%	23%	37%
<b>12.9</b>	Avoiding bad relationships	41%	26%	33%	27%
Do you think you will have a problem with the following, when you are released:					
<b>12.10</b>	Finding accommodation?	7%	26%	23%	24%
<b>12.10</b>	Getting into school or college?	24%	26%	33%	26%
<b>12.10</b>	Getting a job?	41%	46%	55%	45%
<b>12.10</b>	Help with money/finances?	35%	42%	46%	40%
<b>12.10</b>	Help with claiming benefits?	7%	31%	23%	29%
<b>12.10</b>	Continuing health services?	7%	9%	0%	10%
<b>12.10</b>	Opening a bank account?	0%	18%	10%	16%
<b>12.10</b>	Avoiding bad relationships?	41%	11%	10%	16%

# Children and Young People: Diversity Analysis



## Diversity comparator (ethnicity/religion) HMYOI Wetherby 2012

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

### Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic young people	White young people	Muslim young people	Non-Muslim young people
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>30</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>99</b>
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	3%	3%	0%	3%
1.3	Is English your first language?	76%	97%	79%	94%
1.4	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?			100%	16%
1.5	Are you Muslim?	44%	0%		
1.6	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	0%	7%	0%	6%
1.9	Have you ever been in local authority care?	17%	35%	15%	33%
2.1	Are you sentenced?	86%	86%	100%	84%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	60%	47%	79%	47%
3.3	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or anyone of a different gender?	19%	38%	21%	35%
3.7	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	66%	51%	71%	51%
3.8	Before you arrived here, were you told that you would be coming to this establishment?	56%	79%	50%	75%
4.2	When you were searched was this carried out in an understanding way?	74%	79%	71%	78%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	74%	68%	71%	68%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a member of health care staff?	76%	73%	65%	75%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	83%	84%	79%	83%
4.10	Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the establishment?	88%	68%	94%	70%
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	40%	28%	50%	28%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	37%	21%	42%	22%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	19%	11%	15%	12%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	26%	49%	29%	45%
5.6a	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	67%	49%	85%	49%
5.7	Is there a member of staff you can turn to with a problem?	57%	66%	71%	63%
5.8	Do you feel that most of the staff here treat you with respect?	60%	63%	79%	60%
6.3a	Is it easy for you to see the doctor?	41%	62%	61%	55%
6.3b	Is it easy for you to see the nurse?	59%	71%	79%	66%
6.7	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs here?	17%	28%	6%	27%
6.8	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	30%	23%	21%	26%
7.2	Is it easy to make an application?	80%	81%	79%	81%
7.5	Is it easy to make a complaint?	59%	69%	65%	67%

## Children and Young People: Diversity Analysis

### Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic young people	White young people	Muslim young people	Non-Muslim young people
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>30</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>99</b>
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	24%	22%	21%	23%
8.2	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	44%	49%	50%	47%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	44%	50%	58%	47%
8.4	Have you had a 'nicking' (adjudication) since you have been here?	66%	58%	65%	59%
8.6	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	39%	35%	50%	34%
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	21%	28%	21%	28%
9.3	Has another young person or group of young people victimised (insulted or assaulted) you here?	15%	18%	16%	16%
If you have felt victimised by another young person/group of young people, did the incident involve:					
9.4d	Racial or ethnic abuse?	3%	4%	7%	3%
9.4e	Your religious beliefs?	8%	1%	16%	1%
9.6	Has a member of staff or group of staff victimised (insulted or assaulted) you here?	43%	13%	42%	17%
If you have felt victimised by a member of staff/group of staff, did the incident involve:					
9.5d	Racial or ethnic abuse?	18%	1%	15%	5%
9.5e	Your religious beliefs?	7%	0%	15%	0%
9.9	If you were being victimised by another young person or a member of staff would you be able to tell anyone about it?	56%	57%	73%	55%
9.10	If you did tell a member of staff that you were being victimised do you think it would be taken seriously?	16%	29%	21%	26%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:					
10.3a	Education?	73%	81%	85%	78%
10.3b	A job in this establishment?	38%	58%	50%	55%
10.3c	Vocational or skills training?	16%	22%	0%	24%
10.3d	Offending behaviour programmes?	3%	22%	0%	21%
10.5	Do you usually have association everyday?	23%	22%	15%	23%
10.6	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	3%	3%	6%	2%
10.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	34%	24%	29%	24%
11.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	22%	16%	21%	16%
11.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	26%	48%	21%	44%
11.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	28%	34%	42%	30%
12.3	Do you feel your personal officer has helped you?	81%	55%	82%	57%
12.4	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	60%	55%	58%	55%
12.5b	Do you understand the targets set in your plan?	63%	65%	77%	62%
12.6a	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	54%	37%	71%	37%
12.6b	Are you going to school or college on release?	59%	40%	65%	42%
12.14	Have you done anything or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?	50%	49%	55%	49%

Diversity Analysis - Disability



Key questions (disability analysis) HMYOI Wetherby 2012

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>13</b>	<b>101</b>
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	0%	3%
1.3	Is English your first language?	94%	92%
1.4	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other category)?	23%	27%
1.5	Are you Muslim?	0%	14%
1.6	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	7%	5%
2.1	Are you sentenced?	84%	86%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	31%	54%
3.3	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or anyone of a different gender?	45%	33%
3.7	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	50%	55%
3.8	Before you arrived here, were you told that you would be coming to this establishment?	59%	74%
4.2	When you were searched was this carried out in an understanding way?	45%	81%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	76%	68%
4.4e	When you first arrived, did staff ask if you needed help or support with letting family know where you were?	50%	67%
4.4g	When you first arrived, did staff ask if you needed help or support with feeling low/upset/needing someone to talk to?	24%	45%
4.4h	When you first arrived, did staff ask if you needed help or support with health problems?	50%	56%
4.5	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	83%	70%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a member of health care staff?	83%	73%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	59%	86%
4.10	Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the establishment?	59%	76%
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	31%	31%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	16%	27%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	16%	13%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	31%	45%
5.6a	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	37%	57%
5.7	Is there a member of staff you can turn to with a problem?	50%	66%
5.8	Do you feel that most of the staff here treat you with respect?	41%	65%
6.3a	Is it easy for you to see the doctor?	41%	58%
6.3b	Is it easy for you to see the nurse?	76%	67%
6.4	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep it in your cell?	55%	37%
6.8	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	35%	24%
6.9	If you feel you have emotional or mental health problems, are you being helped by anyone here?	50%	45%

## Diversity Analysis - Disability

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
7.2	Is it easy to make an application?	82%	80%
7.5	Is it easy to make a complaint?	76%	65%
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	17%	24%
8.4	Have you had a 'nicking' (adjudication) since you have been here?	76%	57%
8.6	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	59%	32%
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	50%	25%
9.3	Has another young person or group of young people victimised (insulted or assaulted) you here?	24%	16%
9.4f	Has another young person or group of young people victimised (insulted or assaulted) you because you have a disability?	7%	0%
9.6	Has a member of staff or group of staff victimised (insulted or assaulted) you here?	24%	20%
9.7f	Has a member of staff or group of staff victimised (insulted or assaulted) you because you have a disability?	0%	0%
9.9	If you were being victimised by another young person or a member of staff would you be able to tell anyone about it?	58%	57%
9.10	If you did tell a member of staff that you were being victimised do you think it would be taken seriously?	37%	25%
9.12	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	19%	35%
10.3a	Do you currently take part in education?	92%	78%
10.3b	Do you currently have a job in this establishment?	29%	56%
10.3c	Do you currently take part in vocational or skills training?	42%	19%
10.3d	Do you currently take part in offending behaviour programmes?	29%	17%
10.5	Do you usually have association every day?	27%	22%
10.6	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	8%	2%
10.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	27%	25%
11.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	37%	15%
12.3	If you have a personal officer, do you feel your personal officer has helped you?	67%	61%
12.5a	For those with a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan: were you involved in the development of your plan?	71%	53%
12.5b	For those with a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan: do you understand the targets set in your plan?	71%	64%
12.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	35%	43%