

Report on an unannounced full follow-up  
inspection of

# **HMYOI Werrington**

27 - 31 August 2012

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

Crown copyright 2013

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

# Contents

|          |   |           |
|----------|---|-----------|
| <b>1</b> | <b>Introduction</b>   | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>2</b> | <b>Fact page</b>  | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>3</b> | <b>Healthy prison summary and main recommendation</b>                 | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>4</b> | <b>Safety</b>   | <b>17</b> |
| <hr/>    |   |           |
| <b>5</b> | <b>Respect</b>  | <b>31</b> |
| <hr/>    |   |           |
| <b>6</b> | <b>Purposeful activity</b>  | <b>47</b> |
| <hr/>    |   |           |
| <b>7</b> | <b>Resettlement</b>   | <b>53</b> |
| <hr/>    |   |           |
| <b>8</b> | <b>Summary of recommendations and housekeeping points</b>             | <b>61</b> |
| <hr/>    |   |           |
| <b>9</b> | <b>Appendices</b>   |           |
| <hr/>    |   |           |
|          | I Inspection team   | 70        |
|          | II Progress on recommendations from the last report                   | 71        |
|          | III Establishment population profile                                  | 77        |
|          | IV Summary of children and young people questionnaires and interviews | 80        |



# Introduction

HMYOI Werrington is a young offender institution (YOI) near Stoke-on-Trent for 160 boys, most of whom were 16 or 17 years old. At the time of the inspection, it held 132 boys.

The establishment had a number of strengths. Relationships between staff and boys were generally friendly. Care for the most vulnerable boys was good, and force was used much more proportionately than at the previous inspection. The reintroduction of two social work posts ensured very good support for looked-after children and rigorous child protection. Health care provided a good service, and the chaplaincy was an effective and valued resource. Boys who needed help with basic literacy and numeracy skills received good support. Resettlement was a real strength, despite the difficulty in obtaining suitable accommodation and sustainable work, education or training places for all the boys who needed them. The YOI operated an impressive restorative justice scheme.

However, in a number of important areas the establishment had slipped back since the previous inspection. There was a high level of fights between the boys – most of these were not very serious but there had been a few very serious assaults. We saw evident opportunities for bullying, and threats were still shouted unchecked from windows at night. At times during the inspection the atmosphere was tense. This seemed to reflect mutually low expectations.

A concerning development was that staff had low expectations of the boys and poor behaviour was often not challenged. The boys had low expectations of the staff. Only 17% of the boys we surveyed said they would tell staff if they were being bullied, compared with 50% in surveys of similar establishments. Boys had little confidence in the complaints system as a means of resolving problems and too many complaints went unanswered.

The environment had deteriorated and much of it was shabby, boys could not shower or change their underwear daily, and they did not have the opportunity to clean their cells each day.

Too often there was too little for the boys to do – and this did not help create a purposeful and constructive ethos. Education and training classes were not of sufficient quality or quantity. Punctuality was often still poor. Staff shortages meant sessions were frequently cancelled, with ad hoc arrangements to ‘fill in time’ through sessions in the gym or youth club. There were very few opportunities for the boys to burn off excess energy in outside exercise. Only one in 20 told us they had an opportunity to exercise in the fresh air every day compared with the one in two we normally see. Boys frequently raised this as a concern in our group discussions with them.

Overall, Werrington had become unbalanced. In many ways it provided an appropriate caring environment that recognised the vulnerabilities of the children it held. But that was not enough. Staff were the adults in charge and their expectations about the behaviour of young people needed to be demonstrably clear and consistent. They needed to be more determined that young people, who had often been failed so badly by the education system in the past, were not also failed by the education and training provision at Werrington. For that to be so, and Werrington to be back on track, the weaknesses identified in this report need to be quickly addressed.

**Nick Hardwick**  
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

**December 2012**



# Fact page

## **Task of the establishment**

Werrington is a young offender institution holding sentenced and remanded young men up to the age of 18, primarily serving a detention and training order of four, six, eight 12, 18 or 24 months, and also those subject to Section 91 sentences.

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

Public

## **Region/Department**

West Midlands

## **Number held**

132: 107 sentenced and 25 remands

## **Certified normal accommodation**

160

## **Operational capacity**

168

## **Date of last full inspection**

June 2011

## **Brief history**

The institution started life in 1895 as an industrial school and was subsequently purchased by the Prison Commissioners in 1955. Two years later it opened as a senior detention centre.

Following implementation of the Criminal Justice Act 1982, it converted to a youth custody centre in 1985 and in 1988 it became a juvenile centre.

## **Short description of residential units**

Werrington has two accommodation blocks, the Doulton unit and the Denby unit.

The Doulton unit consists of two wings, A and B, with each wing split over two landings. A wing houses sentenced young people, while B wing houses remanded and sentenced young people.

The Denby unit accommodation is also split over two landings, C1 and C2. C1 contains the reintegration and support unit, while C2 holds young people who are on release on temporary licence or enhanced status. C2 provides more relaxed and independent living arrangements.

## **Name of governor**

Babafemi Dada

## **Escort contractor**

GeoAmey

## **Health service commissioner and providers**

NHS North Staffordshire

North Staffordshire Community Healthcare

**Learning and skills providers**

The Manchester College

**Independent Monitoring Board chair**

Antony Graves



# 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, courts and customs 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 reports include a summary of an establishment's performance against the model of a healthy prison. The four criteria of a healthy prison are:

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

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 prisoners are not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.**

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

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

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

HP5 The Inspectorate conducts follow-up inspections to assess progress against recommendations made in the previous full inspection. Follow-up inspections may be announced or unannounced and are proportionate to risk. In full follow-up inspections inspectors conduct a new inspection of the establishment and also assess whether recommendations made at the previous inspection have been achieved. They also investigate areas of serious concern identified in the previous inspection, or matters of concern subsequently drawn to the attention of the Chief Inspector. Inspectors use the findings of prisoner surveys (where available), prisoner focus groups, research analysis of prison data and observation. This enables a reassessment of previous healthy prison assessments held by the Inspectorate on all establishments, and published in reports from 2004 onwards. Full follow-up reports are presented as full inspection reports with a new set of recommendations. Repeated recommendations are, however, indicated within the main report, and a list of recommendations from the previous inspection, and our assessment of whether they have been achieved, is contained in the appendices.

## Safety

---

HP6 Young people were well treated on arrival but the reception area remained poor. Safeguarding arrangements were good and young people subject to ACCT (assessment, care in custody and teamwork) procedures were well cared for. Levels of violence were high but use of force and separation were used proportionately. There were a high number of violent incidents, some of which were very serious. Bullying was not tackled effectively. Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

HP7 At the last inspection in March 2011 we found that outcomes for young people at Werrington were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 34 recommendations in the area of safety. At this follow-up inspection we found that 17 of the recommendations had been achieved or partially achieved and 17 had not been achieved.

HP8 Some young people remained in court for long periods before being escorted to Werrington and almost half were admitted to the establishment after 7pm.

- HP9 A quarter of young people admitted to the prison for the first time arrived without all the necessary background information. Young people were dealt with in a respectful way when they arrived. The reception area remained completely unsuitable and we welcomed the fact that additional funds had been obtained to make the required improvements. The initial vulnerability assessments were poor and did not make sufficient use of all the available background information. Cells were not always properly prepared in advance for new arrivals.
- HP10 There were effective working relationships with the local safeguarding children board and an external representative regularly attended the safeguarding committee. The multi-agency safer health meeting was a promising initiative but the quality of care planning remained inconsistent.
- HP11 Child protection referrals were handled efficiently, with good external oversight. The local authority designated officer was appropriately involved in all cases raised that concerned staff. The recent addition of two social workers to the safeguarding team had provided an extra level of rigour to the internal child protection procedures.
- HP12 A casework approach to manage antisocial behaviour was being developed and the early signs were positive. Residential staff were not fully engaged in the process and there was an over-reliance on the safeguarding officer to carry out the work. The number of violent incidents in the prison was high and some of these had been serious. Bullying was evident and shouting out of windows was widespread. During the course of the inspection the atmosphere around the establishment was sometimes tense. Despite this, the number of young people on formal risk reduction measures was low.
- HP13 Links between violence reduction and security were good but the quality of investigation into alleged incidents was inconsistent. We were not confident that all information about suspected incidents was always properly investigated or acted upon. Victim support plans were underdeveloped.
- HP14 The number of young people being managed on suicide and self-harm procedures was slightly higher than previously reported but incidents of self-harm remained low, with only one serious incident so far this year. The content of ACCT documents reflected that young people were well cared for and quality checks were used to help improve performance. Good individual support for young people on ACCTs was provided by the safeguarding officer and safer cells had been installed across the establishment.
- HP15 The behaviour management strategy was wide ranging and was monitored effectively. Local rules and routines were published throughout residential and communal areas. Some staff were over-tolerant of poor behaviour.
- HP16 There was good use of intelligence information to inform risk and, on the whole, security procedures were proportionate and did not restrict young people unnecessarily from participating in a full regime.
- HP17 The number of adjudications remained high but had reduced slightly since the last inspection. Hearings were conducted fairly and good use was made of advocates at adjudications. The minor report system was now embedded and was used appropriately to deal with less serious infringements of prison rules, although the outcomes were not monitored properly.

- HP18 The number of incidents where force had been used was high at over 200 so far this year, but this was similar to what we found on the previous inspection. There had, however, been a significant decrease in reported incidents involving the full use of control and restraint techniques and greater use of de-escalation. The quality of debriefing that young people received after an incident was excellent.
- HP19 The environment where young people were located following separation was poor. The landing and cells were grubby, some of the toilets were filthy and graffiti was widespread. The regime provided was adequate and purposeful activity was offered to young people every day, including contact with education staff. Following separation, good efforts were made to return young people to the mainstream units and young people did not remain separated for long.
- HP20 The provision of drug and alcohol services had improved and the low mandatory drug testing rate was reassuring.<sup>1</sup>

## Respect

---

HP21 Much of the living environment was cramped, untidy and run down. The quality of relationships between staff and young people varied but staff did not always have high enough expectations of how young people should behave. The complaints system was not efficient. Health care was sound and the chaplaincy team provided a good service. Young people did not like the food. Outcomes for children and young people were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.

HP22 At the last inspection in March 2011 we found that outcomes for young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 31 recommendations in the area of respect.<sup>2</sup> At this follow-up inspection we found that 20 of the recommendations had been achieved or partially achieved and 11 had not been achieved.

HP23 The double cells were too small and did not contain enough furniture. Graffiti was fairly widespread and many of the cells were unkempt. Young people were not given the opportunity to keep their cells clean and cell toilets needed de-scaling. The showers were in reasonable condition but often untidy and not all young people were able to shower daily. The prison clothing issued to young people was in poor condition.

---

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

<sup>2</sup> This included recommendations about rewards and sanctions which, in our updated Expectations (Version 3, 2012), now appear under the healthy prison area of safety.

- HP24 In most cases officers and young people co-existed reasonably well. Expectations by staff of the young people were not high enough and there was too much tolerance of bad behaviour. The personal officer scheme did not work well and young people consistently reported that they rarely saw their designated member of staff.
- HP25 Most of the work carried out in relation to diversity concentrated on race and ethnicity. The other aspects of diversity were much less well developed. The monitoring system showed there was no evidence of obvious discrimination towards any black and minority ethnic group. The diversity officer was pro-active and frequently dealt with issues informally. Complaints relating to diversity were investigated well and appropriate remedial action was taken.
- HP26 Members of the chaplaincy team were popular and young people told us that their spiritual and pastoral needs were well catered for.
- HP27 Significantly fewer young people said it was easy to make a complaint or thought complaints were handled fairly compared to the previous inspection. Responses to most complaints were generally polite and focussed, with a small number of extremely helpful responses. However, a large number of complaints still awaited a response.
- HP28 Young people told us they did not receive any information about their legal rights and some said that they did not know how to contact their legal adviser. There were no formal arrangements for young people to have free telephone access to their legal advisers and young people complained about a lack of privacy during legal visits.
- HP29 Young people said they were satisfied with health care services. Governance arrangements were sound with good practice in service user consultation. The complaints system did not preserve medical confidentiality. Primary care services were appropriate to meet the need and there was good access to mental health support. Despite management action, a high number of young people still failed to keep appointments to attend clinics. The quality of pharmacy services had improved and they were now good. Dental services were very good and complied with best practice.
- HP30 We received very negative comments about the food in our discussion groups. This was reinforced by poor findings in our survey. Despite this, the food we tasted was adequate. There was a reasonable choice on the menu, including a cooked breakfast. Young people continued to have opportunities to eat communally.

## Purposeful activity

---

- HP31 The amount of time out of cell had reduced since the previous inspection and there was still no scheduled exercise. Educational provision was reasonable but vocational input was poor. Too many planned sessions were cancelled and young people were not able to spend enough time constructively engaged. Outcomes for children and young people were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.
- HP32 At the last inspection in March 2011 we found that outcomes for young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 11 recommendations in the area of purposeful activity. At this follow-up inspection we found that three had

been achieved or partially achieved, seven had not been achieved and one was no longer relevant.

- HP33 The amount of time young people had out of their cell had decreased since the previous inspection. Young people still did not have timetabled access to the open air, which was unacceptable.
- HP34 The checks we carried out showed that during the week most young people were engaged in activity off the wings. The regular cancellation of workshop sessions meant that some young people had to attend the youth club or gym, instead of programmed educational activity.
- HP35 There were good working relationships between OLASS managers and prison staff at an operational level. There was no formal prison strategy to develop learning and skills. There were not enough staff to deliver the vocational training programme properly and too many lessons were cancelled. Punctuality by young people attending classes was still poorly managed.
- HP36 Although there were sufficient activities for the population as a whole, the number of vocational training opportunities was inadequate and there was a lack of accreditation in some areas of work. Provision for life and social skills was insufficient and the youth club was not used to its full potential.
- HP37 The quality of teaching and learning was variable, with some inadequate sessions and too few good or outstanding learning sessions. Individual learning support was good. The achievement in some areas, particularly vocationally related programmes, was poor but there was good retention and achievement in literacy and numeracy.
- HP38 The library was well stocked and used by almost three-quarters of the population. The building itself was very cold and not open often enough.
- HP39 Young people had good access to core and recreational PE. Provision was good and there was a balanced programme. Young people behaved well in the gym and very few were returned to the wings early.

## Resettlement

---

- HP40 The management of resettlement remained good. Planning arrangements were sound and good use was made of ROTL (release on temporary licence). Constructive work was carried out in most of the resettlement pathways but obtaining decent accommodation for young people on release remained difficult. Reasonable steps were taken to help young people maintain family links. Outcomes for young people against this healthy prison test were good.
- HP41 At the last inspection in March 2011 we found that outcomes for young people were good against this healthy prison test. We made 10 recommendations in the area of resettlement. At this follow-up inspection we found that seven of the recommendations had been achieved or partially achieved and three had not been achieved.

- HP42 There was a comprehensive reducing re-offending strategy and action points from the resettlement needs analysis were monitored. Representatives from external youth offending services attended the resettlement committee, which was a positive feature. There continued to be good vocational and work opportunities for young people on ROTL.
- HP43 All young people had good quality training and remand management plans which they were involved in developing.
- HP44 Public protection was well managed. There were comprehensive assessments of young people who posed a risk to children and decisions taken in relation to these cases were defensible and proportionate.
- HP45 There were excellent systems in place to identify young people who had looked-after status. The establishment's internal social workers, who understood the legal requirements, worked effectively with local authorities to ensure that looked-after young people received their entitlements.
- HP46 Young people's accommodation needs were identified early in their sentence. Caseworkers made every effort to ensure that the relevant external agencies provided the necessary help to make sure each young person had a decent place to live on release. Despite this, a small number of young people were released to unsuitable bed and breakfast addresses or other unsuitable accommodation. A very small number were only found accommodation on the day of their release and this was unacceptable.
- HP47 Some useful contact took place between the prison and external education and training providers, but the number of young people who were able to sustain training places following release was small. Young people were not offered enough employment training in the establishment to support their resettlement needs. There was not enough careers advice available for young people.
- HP48 Pre-discharge support in relation to health care and substance misuse was good. Young people were not given help to manage their money.
- HP49 Young people had good access to interventions run by a dedicated programmes team, but their learning was not properly reinforced. The plans to evaluate these interventions had not yet been implemented.
- HP50 Over half the young people in the establishment lived less than 50 miles away. About a third said it was easy for friends or family to visit them, which was similar to our findings elsewhere. The visiting facilities were adequate but it was difficult to book visits using the externally managed booking line. Although 14% of young people in our survey said they had children, the parenting programme was not being delivered and no family days were being organised.

## Main concerns and recommendations

---

- HP51 Concern: Young people had much less opportunity to exercise in the fresh air than in any other young offender institution holding children and young people. This impeded their healthy development and reduced positive opportunities to expend their energy.

**Recommendation: All young people should have at least one hour each day in the open air in a suitably equipped area with seating and good recreational facilities. (Repeated recommendation 6.8)**

HP52 Concern: There were high levels of fights and bullying and young people lacked confidence that staff would deal with it effectively. Far fewer young people than in the comparator said they would tell staff if they had a problem. Poor behaviour too often went unchallenged and investigations into incidents were poor.

**Recommendation: Residential officers and managers should ensure poor behaviour and alleged assaults are seen to be challenged and investigated. Victims should be supported and procedures to deal with bullying and intimidation should be consistently implemented.**

HP53 Concern: Young people lacked confidence in the complaints system. Responses, when they were made, were generally good but too many complaints did not receive a response.

**Recommendation: Reasons for young people's lack of confidence in the complaints system should be investigated and addressed. All complaints should receive a prompt and appropriate response.**

HP54 Concern: There was insufficient education and vocational training provided. Education was too often cancelled because of staff shortages. Young people's time was 'filled in' with sessions in the gym or youth club.

**Recommendation: The management of learning and skills should be urgently improved so that the required quantity and quality of education and training is available on a consistent basis to meet the needs of the young people held.**



# Section 1: Safety

The reference numbers at the end of some recommendations indicate that they are repeated, and provide the paragraph location of the previous recommendation in the last report.

## Courts, escorts and transfers

---

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.1 Young people were not transported to Werrington promptly following the conclusion of their court hearings and late arrivals were frequent. Many young people were transported in vans with adult prisoners. Despite evident demand, there was no use of video link.
- 1.2 Young people often remained in court for long periods, in some cases for up to seven hours, before being escorted to Werrington, and many young people came from Birmingham courts about 50 miles away. Almost half the young people arrived after 7pm. Young people were not given information at court about the establishment, although a useful leaflet had been designed for this purpose. Young people were escorted in vans which were also used for adult prisoners. Escort vans that we examined were clean but young people said this was not always the case.
- 1.3 On average, there were about 80 discharges to court each month. Although there had been an increase in the number of young people held on remand, there was still no opportunity to appear at court through video link because the facilities were not available.
- 1.4 Young people were not given sufficient notice when being transferred to other establishments and in most cases were only told on the day they were moved.

## Recommendations

---

- 1.5 There should be no undue delays in transferring young people to Werrington following completion of their court cases.
- 1.6 Young people should not be transported on vehicles carrying adult prisoners.
- 1.7 Young people should be given information at court about the establishment so that they know what to expect when they arrive. (Repeated recommendation 1.11)
- 1.8 Video link should be used to avoid unnecessary court appearances.

# Early days in custody

---

## Expected outcomes:

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

1.9 Not all young people arrived with the relevant background information. The reception area remained poorly equipped but funding had now been obtained to make improvements. All new arrivals were routinely strip-searched. Staff were respectful and relaxed but there was no peer support available during the early days. There were no formal first night procedures on B wing and some new receptions found the environment intimidating. Many young people found induction too long.

## Reception

---

- 1.10 The reception area had not changed since the previous inspection and remained completely unsuitable. The holding rooms were untidy, the monitor displaying reception information was not working and there were no suitable facilities for private interviews. Funds had been secured to build a new reception area.
- 1.11 Reception staff were friendly and relaxed and there was an emphasis on reassuring young people that they would be safe. Food and drink were offered on admission and young people could make a telephone call to family or partners. Young people told us they were dealt with in a respectful way on arrival. All young people arriving at the prison for the first time were routinely strip-searched. When we observed this procedure being carried out, it was done sensitively. Nevertheless, this automatic procedure was intrusive and unnecessary.
- 1.12 A comprehensive guide containing useful information about the establishment was sent to parents or carers of young people.
- 1.13 The management plans which were produced following completion of the initial vulnerability assessments were poor and did not always make sufficient use of key information held in the ASSET document (the structured assessment tool used by youth offending teams in the community). In many cases the plans simply contained a list of departments rather than identifying concerns and outlining how these could be addressed.
- 1.14 Young people were supplied with a bedding pack and prison clothing, a reception pack which included confectionery, stamps, toiletries and telephone credit, together with an activity pack and radio. They were also given stationery to write a letter, information about visits and rules, and an induction booklet outlining the services and support available.
- 1.15 No formal peer support was available in reception or during the first night period. Managers explained that this was because they did not feel they could identify suitable young people to fulfil this role.

## **First night**

---

- 1.16 Young people spent their first night on B wing which held those who had completed induction, were on remand or had moved from other areas of the prison to avoid conflict. The wing was noisy and some new receptions, particularly those in custody for the first time, found shouting between cell windows intimidating.
- 1.17 There were no designated cells for new receptions and cells were not always adequately prepared in advance. We observed cells which had graffiti on the walls, were untidy and contained rubbish. If young people arrived after the wing had been locked up, they were shown immediately to their cell. Officers explained the cell call system but there were no formal first night procedures which would allow an introduction to the wing or an explanation of the morning routine. All new receptions were placed on 30-minute observations throughout the night.

## **Induction**

---

- 1.18 Induction began on the morning following reception and lasted for two weeks, which many young people said was too long. On the first day young people were required to stay in their cells to allow staff from education, the advocacy service and the substance misuse team to interview them individually.
- 1.19 Young people also had a private interview with an induction officer, which was relaxed and explored young people's feelings and anxieties about reception. This also provided an opportunity to contact family or friends if this had not been possible on the first night. Young people signed a range of agreements about behaviour and facilities. Induction included sessions on substance misuse, safeguarding, and health and safety, and included a tour of the site and an introduction to most departments. Sessions did not always take place as programmed or last the time that had been allocated, which meant that young people were locked in their cells for longer than necessary in their early days. Managers agreed that the programme could be more focused. In our survey, only 48% of young people against the comparator of 65% said that induction covered everything they needed to know about the establishment.
- 1.20 Most young people started their allocated activity on completion of induction. There was no system in place to ensure that new receptions had completed all parts of induction.

## **Recommendations**

---

- 1.21 **All relevant information about a young person should be available to the establishment prior to or at the point of their arrival.** (Repeated recommendation 1.25)
- 1.22 **Routine strip-searching should not take place.**
- 1.23 **Initial vulnerability assessments should contain clear management plans to address identified issues of concern.** (Repeated recommendation 1.27)
- 1.24 **New arrivals should have access to peer support as part of the reception and first night arrangements.** (Repeated recommendation 1.26)

- 1.25 Cells for new arrivals should be properly prepared and equipped to meet their needs. (Repeated recommendation 1.28)
- 1.26 New arrivals should have the opportunity to speak privately with a first night officer to address any anxieties they may have, ensure that their immediate needs are met and provide essential information. (Repeated recommendation 1.34)
- 1.27 Young people should be kept fully occupied through a comprehensive, well structured induction programme which informs them about the establishment.

### Housekeeping point

---

- 1.28 A central register should be kept to ensure that all elements of induction have been completed.

## Care and protection of children and young people

---

### Safeguarding

---

#### Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.29 A comprehensive safeguarding strategy was in place and there were strong working links with the local authority. There was good analysis of data at the safeguarding committee meetings and the safeguarding team had been further strengthened by the appointment of two social workers. The recently introduced weekly multi-agency safer health meeting was a promising initiative.
- 1.30 All the core components of safeguarding were set out in the safeguarding strategy. This and associated policies were referred to the local safeguarding children board (LSCB) for ratification following annual reviews. The governor or the head of the safeguarding team attended main meetings of the board.
- 1.31 The establishment held two regular safeguarding-type meetings. The quarterly strategic committee was chaired by the governor and membership included staff from key areas of the establishment as well as external partners including the local authority, LSCB, Stafford youth offending service and the NSPCC. The monthly safer health meeting was attended by a wider range of internal staff, and monthly data provided by the safeguarding team and reports from other parts of the establishment were discussed. Attendance at this meeting had been inconsistent and membership was under review to encourage relevant departments to attend. The minutes recorded full discussion of the data and those young people who were causing particular concern.
- 1.32 The safeguarding team reviewed all injury report forms and followed up any unexplained injuries. The health care department provided a report on injuries to the monthly safeguarding meeting and there was a good exchange of information on injuries.
- 1.33 The safeguarding team had been strengthened by the appointment of a social worker and a senior practitioner a few months before the inspection. The two social work specialists had

already made an impact on safeguarding young people, particularly in carrying out use of force debriefs with them. The safeguarding team continued to have a high profile and were active in supporting individual young people and providing specialist advice to staff across the establishment.

## Child protection

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.34 There was a comprehensive child protection policy and referrals were dealt with efficiently by the safeguarding team. Internal procedures had been strengthened with the appointment of social workers to the team. Regular monitoring of referrals was undertaken by the safeguarding committees and the local authority designated officer (LADO) was positive about the establishment's openness to scrutiny.
- 1.35 The establishment had a comprehensive child protection policy which had been ratified by the LSCB and was reviewed annually. Staff we spoke to were clear about how to deal with child protection issues.
- 1.36 There had been 16 child protection referrals since the beginning of 2012. These included complaints against staff, historical abuse and concern for family or friends in the community. Child protection referrals were discussed as a standing item at both the monthly and quarterly safeguarding meetings.
- 1.37 Child protection referrals continued to be managed efficiently. Improvements had been made to the way they were recorded and how progress was tracked. The LADO was positive about the establishment's openness and transparency and advised us that he was kept informed of internal referrals.
- 1.38 A subgroup of the LSCB visited the establishment regularly to sample use of force documentation and CCTV. Members of the group had attended control and restraint training at the establishment to help them to review documentation and CCTV.

## Victims of bullying and intimidation

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.39 Bullying was evident but not adequately dealt with. Few young people said they would tell staff if they had been victimised. A casework approach to the management of antisocial behaviour was being developed and early signs were promising. However, residential officers were not fully engaged in the process and there was an over-reliance on specialist staff. The quality of investigation into alleged incidents was inconsistent and we were not confident that all information about suspected incidents was properly investigated or acted on. Victim support plans needed development.

- 1.40 Formal procedures for the management of antisocial behaviour had recently been reviewed and a simple two-stage system had been introduced to identify, monitor and change antisocial behaviour. This was based principally on incentives and earned privileges sanctions supported by regular reviews to monitor behavioural changes. There was some evidence that these procedures were helping to reduce the number of bullying incidents but they were not always followed up consistently and there was no effective supervision. There was an over-reliance by residential officers and managers on the safeguarding team to ensure that the violence reduction policy was implemented properly. When safeguarding staff were absent, many of the procedures were not carried out (see main recommendation HP52).
- 1.41 The quality of investigations into alleged violence was poor in many cases and we were not certain that young people had the confidence to report incidents to staff. The number of young people on formal anti-bullying measures was disproportionately low in relation to the number of violent incidents (see section on bullying and violence reduction) and, in our survey, only 17% of respondents said that they would tell a member of staff that they had been victimised against the comparator of 50% (see main recommendation HP53).
- 1.42 The multi-agency safer health group met monthly to discuss the young people with serious behaviour problems (see sections on safeguarding and suicide prevention), but this forum did not deal adequately with the many young people who reported or feared bullying. There had been 128 bullying incidents reported in the previous six months. Shouting abuse from windows was widespread and we saw opportunities for bullying in many areas, particularly when young people walked to education. In our survey, young people commented: 'sometimes bullying occurs to vulnerable YPs through the windows' and 'when you're in your pad you get people shouting around and you feel unsafe'. We saw one young person who was afraid to leave his cell during association and said he would not attend education because he felt unsafe (see main recommendation HP52).

## Recommendation

---

- 1.43 **Better use should be made of the multi-agency safer health group to deal with problems associated with bullying.**

## Suicide and self-harm prevention

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.44 The suicide and self-harm policy and procedures were clear and understood by staff. Internal quality assurance had identified some weaknesses in ACCT (assessment, care in custody and teamwork) documentation which were being addressed. Care maps and reviews showed an appropriate focus on the young person and his needs. Vulnerable young people were looked after properly.
- 1.45 The suicide and self-harm prevention policy provided clear guidance to staff about their role in caring for a young person who had self-harmed or was at risk of doing so. There were eight open ACCTs at the time of the inspection, a slight increase on the previous inspection.

- 1.46 Suicide and self-harm prevention was managed by the safeguarding team. A safeguarding officer took the lead in providing valuable support to the most vulnerable young people and attending ACCT reviews. A member of the team undertook quality checks of ACCT documents, highlighting areas for improvement. Further weekly checks were carried out by the duty governor and daily by the residential manager. Safer cells had been installed on each wing since the previous inspection. One young person had recently required constant observation. He had remained on his residential wing and the establishment was considering the lessons learned from managing this rare occurrence.
- 1.47 The nature and extent of suicide and self-harm were monitored by the safeguarding committee, with data provided by the safeguarding team to inform discussion of patterns or trends. There had been 21 incidents of self-harm in the previous six months and 63 ACCTs had been opened in the same period. These mainly reflected staff concerns about young people on arrival, young people indicating that they might harm themselves or concerns identified by escort or court staff.
- 1.48 A daily register was used to ensure that staff were aware of young people on open ACCTs. This included information about dates and times of reviews. Reviews took place in the safeguarding offices which offered more privacy than the residential areas. Young people on an open ACCT who went to court had a review in reception before they left and another when they returned. Good arrangements were in place to keep youth offending teams informed when an ACCT was opened or closed on a young person or when a young person on an open ACCT was released from court.
- 1.49 Twenty-three trained ACCT assessors and 13 trained senior officers undertook the role of case manager for young people on ACCTs. ACCT reviews took place on time and were chaired by the case manager. Attendance at the reviews included most departments working with the young person but personal officers and education staff did not attend. The review we attended for a very vulnerable young person was well conducted and it was clear that a lot of thought and preparation had been put into how best to work with the young person. Reviews and care maps demonstrated an appropriate focus on the needs of the young person but entries in ACCTs did not demonstrate the quality of engagement required during observations. Night observations were too predictable. Both these weaknesses had been identified by internal quality assurance and disseminated to staff who were also told to make more use of information in ASSET documentation when conducting initial assessment interviews.
- 1.50 Overall, the robust management from the safeguarding team and the level of knowledge staff showed about young people on ACCTs meant that vulnerable young people were properly cared for.

### Housekeeping point

---

- 1.51 Night observations should not be predictable.

## Behaviour management

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

1.52 The standard of conduct expected of young people was specified in the behaviour management strategy but it was not clear that they always understood what was expected of them. Staff often tolerated poor behaviour without challenge.

1.53 The behaviour management strategy outlined a range of disciplinary procedures, including all methods of dealing with antisocial behaviour. It was linked with other relevant policies, such as violence reduction, adjudication and the incentive and earned privileges scheme. Its application was effectively monitored by the senior management team at safeguarding committee meetings.

1.54 Local rules and routines were publicised throughout residential and communal areas. Rules and routines appeared proportionate and were, on the whole, applied fairly. Staff usually dealt sensibly with normal adolescent behaviour but sometimes they were over tolerant or did not challenge behaviour that was unacceptable.

## Rewards and sanctions

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

1.55 The rewards and sanctions scheme was clear and administered efficiently, with sound monitoring. Despite the checks and balances, young people expressed mixed views about the fairness of the scheme. Young people on the lowest level of the scheme did not get enough help to progress.

1.56 In our survey, young people expressed mixed views on the scheme with just under half saying that they had been treated fairly or that the scheme had made them change their behaviour. In our groups, young people said they did not feel the scheme was fair and, in particular, that it was far harder to get a merit than a demerit.

1.57 At the time of the inspection, 33% of young people were on the enhanced level, 60% on standard and 7% on basic level. Young people who transferred in on enhanced level could retain that level once it had been verified by their originating establishment.

1.58 Young people on basic level only had access to association at weekends but had access to evening recreational PE twice during the week. Young people remained on basic for seven days until they were reviewed for promotion to standard. During this time they did not have any individualised targets to help them understand how to progress. Young people who remained on basic for three weeks were referred to the weekly multi-agency safer health meeting at which actions were agreed to help them progress to standard. Once the young person was judged ready to have a privilege returned, he advanced to standard level. Records indicated that young people usually received an initial warning prior to demotion to basic. Young people applied to be promoted to enhanced status and documentation was signed off by key areas of the establishment to confirm their good behaviour. Eleven applications for promotion had been submitted in July, of which 10 had been approved. Young people could appeal against decisions made about their rewards and sanctions level. Of 28 appeals submitted so far in 2012, four had been upheld.



- 1.59 C wing remained the designated enhanced wing but not all enhanced young people wanted to move there. One young person wrote in his survey: 'The enhanced wing is losing more and more privileges' and another wrote: 'they need more activities for enhanced YPs'. Overall, differentials between the levels remained adequate.
- 1.60 Good monitoring of the scheme was carried out with some safeguards in place, for example if a young person who appeared eligible for promotion to enhanced did not apply, the scheme administrator emailed his wing to ask that he be reminded of his eligibility. Young people could see a list of their merits and demerits, and the residential governor had oversight of 20% of rewards and sanctions reviews.

## Recommendation

---

- 1.61 **Clear targets should be set for young people whose behaviour is likely to result in a downgrade within the rewards and sanctions scheme. Targets for young people on basic level should specifically address the problematic behaviour.** (Repeated recommendation 7.18)

## Security and disciplinary procedures

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.62 The security arrangements were proportionate. The security department had good internal and external links and intelligence was shared effectively. The use of adjudications was still high and, although the minor report system was now embedded, this was poorly monitored.
- 1.63 The security committee was appropriately structured and meetings were well attended by managers and staff representatives from relevant areas of the establishment.
- 1.64 The security department received an average of 30 security intelligence reports each month. Intelligence was effectively and quickly communicated to other areas of the prison, particularly the safer custody coordinator and drug strategy committee, to allow them to make informed decisions about necessary action. Links with other departments, particularly the safeguarding team, were also well developed and responses were timely.
- 1.65 Good links had been established with the local police, particularly in dealing with gang related issues and addressing violent crime in the establishment. A police intelligence officer had been appointed to collate intelligence on gangs. He provided useful information on incoming young people to help inform and develop strategies. Systems had recently been put in place to track gang activity in the prison. A matrix to monitor known gang members was used to track their involvement in incidents of bullying, violence and other related issues.
- 1.66 We saw no evidence to show that the establishment was risk averse in terms of allocating activity spaces to young people or that security procedures were hindering their ability to experience a full regime.

- 1.67 The number of governor's adjudications remained high at about 126 a month, a reduction of about 10 a month since the previous inspection. However, the number of minor reports had increased from 29 a month in the six months prior to our last inspection to about 53 a month from January 2012 to date.
- 1.68 Young people were issued with written information on the adjudication process which emphasised what to expect from the experience. Staff also explained the process and checked that the young person understood. Good use was made of advocacy services and there was evidence that young people were encouraged to use them.
- 1.69 The adjudication room in the segregation unit was cramped, dirty and poorly decorated.
- 1.70 Most records of hearings that we examined showed that they were conducted fairly with appropriate, consistent punishment, but a few records indicated that young people were not always given the opportunity to put across their version of events fully.
- 1.71 Monthly statistics on the number and nature of adjudications were presented to the senior management team and safeguarding committee. Results of proven offences were noted, categorised and communicated to managers to identify trends and deal with problem areas as they arose.
- 1.72 Adjudication standardisation meetings took place quarterly and were usually chaired by the governor. Punishment tariffs had been published and were used consistently at formal hearings. There was evidence that minor report hearings were properly conducted by trained senior officers, but monitoring did not take place at the adjudication standardisation meetings.

## Recommendations

---

- 1.73 **All young people should be given the opportunity to explain fully their version of events relating to the charge.**
- 1.74 **Adjudications should be heard in a suitable environment.**
- 1.75 **The minor report system should be monitored at adjudication standardisation meetings.**

## Bullying and violence reduction

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.76 The violence reduction policy was based on an analysis of patterns of violence in the establishment but was not informed by consultation with young people. The collection of data relating to the number and nature of incidents was better than at other establishments and monitoring of the implementation of the policy at safeguarding committee meetings was very good. Nonetheless, the number of violent incidents was high.
- 1.77 A full review of arrangements to reduce violence in the establishment had taken place in late 2011 and a new violence reduction policy had been published. Its content was relevant, based on a detailed analysis of patterns of violence in the establishment. It was complemented by

other local policies and procedures, such as the incentives and earned privileges scheme and security reporting systems. However, young people had not been properly consulted about the policy.

- 1.78 There was evidence that young people understood that intimidating behaviour was unacceptable and were told during induction that any form of violence would not be tolerated.
- 1.79 The priority given to arrangements to deal with violence had increased since the last inspection and was good. A full-time violence reduction coordinator had been appointed, supported by two safeguarding officers. They reported directly to the head of safeguarding (a senior governor) who usually chaired the safer custody management committee.
- 1.80 The monthly safeguarding committee had oversight of safeguarding policies and reported to a quarterly strategic meeting which monitored progress. Meetings were well attended and minutes reflected focussed discussions on bullying, violence and suicide prevention issues. Links with the security department were particularly good (see section on security). Information provided each month by the safeguarding team on the number, type and location of violent incidents had also improved since our last inspection, and identification and analysis of trends, patterns and problem areas was better than at other establishments.
- 1.81 The number of violent incidents was high at over 100 in the six months prior to our inspection. Although most were minor fights that did not result in serious injuries, a significant number were reasonably serious and some involved the use of improvised weapons (see also section on victims of bullying and intimidation).

## Recommendation

---

- 1.82 **Consultation with young people should be better used to inform the violence reduction strategy.**

## The use of force

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.83 The number of incidents of use of force was high but there had been a significant decrease in reported incidents involving full use of control and restraint techniques and more use of de-escalation since the previous inspection. The de-briefing interview young people received after an incident was an excellent initiative.
- 1.84 The number of incidents of the use of force remained high. Force had been used on 229 occasions in the first six months of 2012, which represented an increase of about 10 a month over the same period in 2011.
- 1.85 About 70% of incidents did not involve the use of full control and restraint techniques. This reflected a significant improvement since the previous inspection and showed an increased use of de-escalation techniques. About 80% of young people were not segregated and returned to their own cells following an incident of the use of force.

- 1.86 Rigorous monitoring arrangements for use of force had been put in place with strong links to safeguarding, the security committee and the senior management team. Incidents were discussed at the monthly security committee and safeguarding meetings. Information on the nature of the incident, its location, the ethnicity and age of the young person was collated each month and presented for analysis to identify and manage emerging patterns and trends.
- 1.87 In the incidents we reviewed, spontaneous and planned intervention was well organised, properly carried out and documentation completed correctly. Authority was recorded, senior staff supervised incidents appropriately, and planned intervention was video recorded. Following an incident, young people received an excellent debrief from a qualified social worker.

## Separation/removal from normal location

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.88 Living conditions in the segregation unit were poor. The regime was adequate and purposeful activity was offered to young people every day. Planning to return longer-stay young people to normal location was well developed. The average length of stay was reasonably short and there had been a reduction in the number of young people segregated under prison rule 45 good order or discipline.
- 1.89 The segregation unit was located on a single landing in a separate area adjacent to the Denby unit (see section on residential units). There were eight segregation cells which included two safer cells with moulded plastic furniture.
- 1.90 The unit contained showers, a staff office and adjudication room. Living conditions were poor. Although recently decorated, corridors were engrained with dirt and cells were grubby. Toilets in cells were filthy and graffiti was present on furniture and etched into the plastic cell windows.
- 1.91 During the six months prior to the inspection, 79 young people had been segregated. About 55% of these had been segregated under prison rule 45 (good order or discipline - GOOD), and the others had been segregated for short periods, usually less than 24 hours, while they awaited a disciplinary hearing. Segregation was not used as a punishment following adjudication. These figures had reduced since the last inspection but were still high. The percentage of young people segregated under GOOD had reduced by about 50%. The average length of segregation was four days but a small number of young people had been segregated for longer periods.
- 1.92 Governance and management of segregation were good. The unit was administered by residential senior officers based on C wing supported by trained officers, and they all reported to the head of residence. A strategy had been published setting out the management arrangements and working practices on the unit and there was a specific staff selection policy with published criteria. Staff had received mental health awareness training delivered by the child and adolescent mental health service team (see also section on health services).

- 1.93 A basic daily programme included showers, exercise, access to telephones and education. We were told that young people could attend education or offending behaviour programmes following a risk assessment.
- 1.94 Reviews of longer-stay young people were timely and it was evident that planning to return them to normal location was well developed. Individual management plans had been raised for longer-stay young people, and there was evidence that staff supported them and addressed the issues that had contributed to their segregation.

## Recommendations

---

- 1.95 All areas of the segregation unit should be clean and free of graffiti.
- 1.96 Mental health training should be given to all segregation unit staff.

## Substance misuse

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.97 Our survey indicated that more young people had received help for drug and alcohol problems since the previous inspection. However, insufficient integration of the services involved remained. While the mandatory drug testing (MDT) rate was very low, the young people's substance misuse service (YPSMS) was understaffed and there was a lack of strategic focus on a 'whole-prison' approach to tackling substance misuse issues. The MDT suite was dirty and lacked adequate facilities.
- 1.98 In our survey, the number of young people arriving with drug or alcohol problems remained the same at around 32%, while the number saying they had received help had increased from 14% to 21%.
- 1.99 The drug strategy committee had not met for several months and there was a lack of strategic focus on a whole-prison approach to tackling substance misuse issues, particularly substance misuse related offending. The recent needs analysis suggested that at least 33% of the population had substance-related offences, but the YPSMS had insufficient staff resources to address this.
- 1.100 Communication between the YPSMS, health care and education staff was poor. The education department was responsible for the delivery of a basic drug and alcohol awareness course as part of the induction programme, but there was no communication between teaching staff and the YPSMS and no referrals were made. Teachers delivering the drug and alcohol awareness course were not trained to do so.
- 1.101 The health care team screened and treated young people for blood-borne viruses (BBV), but the YPSMS team delivered BBV awareness group sessions with no input from nurses. The health care team was planning to deliver nicotine substitution therapy, while the YPSMS delivered a separate smoking cessation programme on a one-to-one basis, again with no joint working.

- 1.102 The positive random mandatory drug testing (MDT) rate stood at 0% for the six months from February to July 2012. Young people said that the availability of drugs was not a concern, whereas the use of tobacco was.
- 1.103 All incidents of full searches carried out prior to MDT were properly logged in the statutory MDT register. There were still no hand-drying facilities for young people and the MDT suite was not sufficiently clean for a forensic testing environment, with litter and dirt on the floor.

## Recommendations

---

- 1.104 The YPSMS team should comprise sufficient administrative support and therapeutic workers to deliver an effective service that includes cover for leave and sickness. (Repeated recommendation 3.92.)
- 1.105 Responsibility for the delivery of the basic drug and alcohol awareness induction programme should be transferred from education to YPSMS to ensure an adequate skill base of facilitators and opportunity for identification of those in need of further interventions.
- 1.106 Smoking cessation advice and treatment should be made available to young people through an integrated health care and YPSMS programme. (Repeated recommendation 3.91.)

## Housekeeping points

---

- 1.107 The MDT suite should be kept clean and tidy to ensure a suitable forensic testing environment.
- 1.108 Hand-drying facilities should be made available for young people in the MDT suite.

## Section 2: Respect

The reference numbers at the end of some recommendations indicate that they are repeated, and provide the paragraph location of the previous recommendation in the last report.

### Residential units

---

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.1 Most of the living conditions were adequate but some young people occupied shared cells which were very cramped. Young people expressed concerns about limited access to showers and telephones and there were very few opportunities for them to take exercise. A new core day was planned to address these shortfalls. Communal areas were clean but many cells were untidy. Some improvements had been made to the consultation arrangements.
- 2.2 The grounds were clean and well kept. All cells had been designed for one person but 42 cells were used for two young people, similar to the previous inspection. The cells were cramped, young people had to share a table and there was room for only one chair. Toilets in shared cells were screened only by a curtain. Cells were reasonably furnished but many were untidy and graffiti was widespread. No cells were adapted for use by young people with disabilities (see section on diversity).
- 2.3 We found four cases where remand and sentenced young people shared cells because it was considered that sharing provided additional support. There were three additional cases of young people assessed as a high risk sharing cells: in one case, two foreign nationals provided mutual support; in the others initial high-risk assessments had been based on what young people had said at reception, but these assessments had subsequently been reviewed and downgraded. Such cases were noted in a monthly report on residential issues, although no explanation for sharing was recorded.
- 2.4 CCTV was installed on wings and supervision was satisfactory. Young people reported delays in answering cell call bells. In our survey, only 26% of young people said that their cell call bell was normally answered within five minutes against the comparator of 40%. There was still no auditable system on Doulton unit to help monitor responses and no quality assurance checks were carried out by managers. Speakers had been installed in the small office area on ground floor landings to alert staff to calls.
- 2.5 Evening association was rarely cancelled but association time was adversely affected by the time taken to unlock and control movements to activities, to reduce the potential for conflict. A reasonable range of activities was available to young people during association.
- 2.6 In our survey, 46% of young people said they could make a telephone call every day against the comparator of 67%. Most telephone calls were made during evening association. Funding had been secured for two additional telephones on each unit and time limited calls prevented telephones from being monopolised. Access to telephones had improved for young people in the segregation unit since the previous inspection.

- 2.7 Young people could make applications each day which were recorded, but progress to completion was not tracked. C2 landing did not keep a record of applications. There were no quality assurance checks of responses and, in our survey, only 57% of young people thought that they were sorted out fairly against the comparator of 69%.
- 2.8 A focus group of staff and young people was held each month. Young people had raised a wide range of issues, including a proposal for the introduction of a new core day. The meetings had been better organised in recent months, with action points identified, but only two young people from each wing attended.

### **Clothing and possessions**

---

- 2.9 Young people on the enhanced regime could wear their own clothes and there were laundry facilities on the units. Young people could change their bedding and prison clothing weekly but much of the clothing and towels was in a poor condition. Young people were not issued with sufficient underwear or socks to change daily, an issue which they raised in focus groups.
- 2.10 Some cells contained excessive amounts of kit and displays of toiletries and there was no check to ensure this had been obtained legitimately rather than through bullying.

### **Hygiene**

---

- 2.11 In our survey, only 36% of young people against the comparator of 72% said they could shower daily and young people had raised this at focus groups. Young people returning to their wing following evening activities did not have enough time to shower and those on the restricted regime relied on staff unlocking them to shower at the end of association. The establishment action plan indicated that young people on restricted regimes were given the opportunity to shower twice a week. The showers were in reasonable condition but untidy. Young people were supplied with basic toiletries.
- 2.12 Communal areas on wings were generally clean but cell toilets needed de-scaling. Young people were not given the opportunity to clean their cell each day. Stocks of cleaning materials were held on the wing but cleaning cupboards were untidy and did not contain sufficient brushes and mops.
- 2.13 It was anticipated that the proposed new core day would provide improvements in access to showers, kit change, telephone calls and exercise in the fresh air.

### **Recommendations**

---

- 2.14 **Cells designed for one should not contain two young people.** (Repeated recommendation 2.12)
- 2.15 **Young people should be given the opportunity to make a telephone call every day.** (Repeated recommendation 2.14)
- 2.16 **The auditable system in place to monitor response to cell call bells should cover all wings, and regular quality assurance checks should be carried out by managers.** (Repeated recommendation 2.13)



- 2.17 Limits on the number of toiletry items allowed in cell should be strictly enforced. (Repeated recommendation 2.20)
- 2.18 All young people should have daily access to showers. (Repeated recommendation 2.24)
- 2.19 Young people should be encouraged by residential staff to keep their cells and communal areas clean by offering appropriate incentives and practical help where necessary. (Repeated recommendation 2.25)

## Housekeeping points

---

- 2.20 All wings should maintain a log of applications and monitor the timeliness and quality of responses.
- 2.21 More young people should be represented at monthly focus groups.
- 2.22 Procedures for monitoring the issue and quality of prison clothing should be better managed.

## Relationships between staff and children and young people

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

2.23 The relationships between residential staff and young people were reasonable, but staff expectations of young people were low and there was too much tolerance of unacceptable behaviour. The personal officer scheme was not effective. Young people consistently reported that they rarely saw their personal officer and the case notes that we scrutinised reflected a lack of interaction. An effective consultation meeting with young people's representatives was held each month.

2.24 Since June 2012, a young people's consultation forum had been held each month, which was attended by a governor, senior officer and two representatives from each wing. Young people were able to raise concerns or provide feedback on issues raised by the establishment. The meetings were minuted and agreed actions were followed up by specific staff.

2.25 Responses to questions in our survey about relationships with staff were similar to those at our previous inspection and to the national comparator, and young people continued to have mixed views. The question on what young people would most like changed produced a variety of responses: 'respect from staff'; 'Not enough respect shown by staff. They try to take the 'mick' about our lives'; 'the staff are very friendly and polite'; 'they're ok, they have a laugh and a joke with you'. These polarised views of relationships with staff were reflected in our focus groups with young people.

2.26 The interactions between residential staff and young people that we observed were respectful and helpful, but some staff did not seem clear about when to intervene during particularly

boisterous behaviour. We observed a number of low-level incidents between young people which were not appropriately challenged and had the potential to escalate. Young people said that in many situations staff just looked on rather than intervened. Staff expectations of young people were too low and there was too much tolerance of unacceptable behaviour.

- 2.27 Electronic records of young people remained cursory and did not demonstrate a good level of engagement between staff and young people. Most entries gave factual information, such as whether the young person had a merit or de-merit, with no comment about the behaviour or possible reasons for it. Some records had been seen by managers, but there were no comments about the frequency or quality of staff entries. We examined 12 case records and only two included comments from the personal officer.
- 2.28 In our survey, 52% of young people said that they saw their personal officer at least once a week against 35% at the previous inspection. Details of personal officers were now posted outside young people's cells, although a number of young people told us that they did not know who their personal officer was, and others said that their personal officer had not introduced themselves or offered help. In our survey, 54% of young people said that their personal officer had tried to help them against the national comparator of 82%. Personal officers did not attend key meetings such as training planning or ACCT reviews.
- 2.29 It was evident that the personal officer scheme continued to be ineffective and this was acknowledged by senior managers. The policy was under review and there were plans to ensure that personal officers engaged more effectively with young people and other departments, particularly caseworkers.

## Recommendations

---

- 2.30 **Staff should expect high standards of conduct from young people and challenge poor behaviour.**
- 2.31 **All wing history sheets should be comprehensive, with balanced comments reflecting positive and negative behaviour.** (Repeated recommendation 2.32)
- 2.32 **Each young person should have a designated officer on the residential unit in which they reside who is their central point of contact and support and takes responsibility for their day-to-day care and well being through frequent contact and by attending relevant meetings relating to their care.** (Repeated recommendation HP47)

## Equality and diversity

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

2.33 Procedures to ensure equality and diversity were properly dealt with needed further development. More progress had been made in relation to race equality than the other protected characteristics. There was no obvious evidence of discrimination but monitoring equality of treatment did not cover all minority groups. Complaints were investigated well and the basic needs of foreign national young people continued to be met. Work on disability and gay, bisexual and transgender young people required more attention.

## Strategic management

---

- 2.34 The establishment equality policy had been reviewed in June 2012; it covered the protected characteristics but did not specify support available to young people. A member of the senior management team was designated champion for each protected characteristic. Work on race equality was more developed than the other protected characteristics.
- 2.35 A full-time diversity manager was responsible for work with young people on all the protected characteristics except foreign nationals. In our groups, he was identified by young people as a valued member of staff who assisted with problems relating to diversity.
- 2.36 The diversity and equality action team (DEAT) met every month and was chaired by the governor or deputy governor. Not all appropriate departments attended consistently. Young people representatives attended and two representatives from a local youth offending team had recently started to attend. The agenda included all the protected characteristics but the minutes did not record much discussion of areas other than race and ethnicity. The establishment monitored the impact of its regime through SMART (systematic monitoring and analysing of race equality treatment), but only by race and ethnicity.
- 2.37 Information about equality was displayed on notice boards around the establishment but there were few positive images representing diversity. There was some promotion of diversity, for example to mark Holocaust remembrance. Several departments, including education, catering and PE, had been involved in a two-week alternate Olympic games to raise awareness of different nationalities.
- 2.38 Twenty-one discrimination incident report forms (DIRFs) had been submitted so far in 2012, most of which related to race equality. These had been investigated to a reasonable standard and remedial or other follow-up action taken when required. When racist or discriminatory behaviour was proved, measures included use of the incentives and earned privileges scheme, referral to education for diversity awareness training, and monitoring under the anti-bullying system. Completed DIRFs were subject to scrutiny by a community based Muslim chaplain and discussed at the DEAT. Challenge It, Change It training had been completed by 83% of staff, and three senior officers and seven officers were among the 31 staff who had yet to attend. There were no protected characteristic support groups for young people. The Activ8 groups which we commended at the previous inspection for prompting discussion of diversity issues no longer took place.

## Recommendations

---

- 2.39 The impact of the regime on all minority groups should be monitored effectively. Appropriate action should be taken where necessary.
- 2.40 Support groups should be established for young people who belong to minority groups.

## Housekeeping point

---

- 2.41 All relevant departments should attend DEAT meetings consistently.

## Diverse needs

---

- 2.42 Black and minority ethnic young people had comprised about half the total population for several months. In our survey, black and minority ethnic respondents reported significantly better experiences than white young people of being treated well by escort staff, feeling that their religious beliefs were respected and taking part in education.
- 2.43 In our survey, 6% of young people said they were from a Gypsy, Roma, Traveller background. We were told that, although young people were asked if they belonged to this group, few volunteered the information and the equality officer was aware of just one young person in this category who was one of the diversity representatives.
- 2.44 Young people with a racist or hate crime component to their offence were identified on arrival and recorded on a central log which was shared with staff. Young people who subsequently displayed such attitudes were added to the list, including any who emerged as a result of DIRF investigations. Young people could be referred to education to attend a diversity course but there were no other interventions to address these kinds of extreme antisocial attitudes and behaviour.
- 2.45 There were 13 foreign national young people at the time of the inspection, two of whom were on remand. The foreign nationals coordinator was a member of the casework team and did not have any designated time for his work with foreign nationals. A local policy was in place and provision remained similar to that found at the last inspection.
- 2.46 An induction handbook in several languages gave basic information about food, health care, the regime, interpretation services, visits and telephone calls. It described young people's entitlement to a free five-minute telephone call each month, or two airmail letters if they preferred. At the time of the inspection, three Vietnamese young people were located on one residential unit to provide mutual support. Their command of English varied, but ESOL (English for speakers of other languages) provision was available through education. They were interviewed by our researchers using telephone interpretation to complete their surveys and were positive about their treatment.
- 2.47 The foreign nationals coordinator had established contact with a specialist legal firm who met all foreign national young people on arrival and offered ongoing support if required. Links with the UK Border Agency were effective. No young people had been held solely on immigration grounds for several years.
- 2.48 In our survey, 19 young people described themselves as having a disability and were more negative about their treatment across a range of indicators. New arrivals could disclose disabilities during their assessment by health care staff which was shared with the diversity officer. Nine young people had been entered on the database having disclosed attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, dyslexia or learning difficulties as their disability. Education assessments identified young people with learning disabilities and difficulties and an average of 30 young people were reported to the DEAT each month. It was not clear how information was shared with staff or used to inform the management of young people with disabilities as they did not have care plans to address their needs. At the time of the inspection, no young person had a personal emergency evacuation plan.

- 2.49 No accommodation had been adapted for use by young people with disabilities.
- 2.50 There was no specific support in place for young people who were gay or bisexual and we were told that very few young people had identified themselves as such. Some work to understand gender dysphoria had begun but there was no guidance for staff on how to manage a transgender young person.

## Recommendation

---

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

## Faith and religious activity

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.52 The chaplaincy team reflected all faiths in the population and they were well integrated into the establishment. Young people we spoke to were very positive about the chaplaincy, particularly Muslim young people. Access to services was good and young people were able to attend on time. Young people on the reintegration and support unit could attend corporate worship subject to a risk assessment. All major religious festivals were celebrated.
- 2.53 A full-time Muslim chaplain was the co-ordinating chaplain, supported by a range of sessional chaplains reflecting all faiths in the population. Young people we spoke to were very positive about the chaplaincy service. A duty chaplain was available seven days a week. In our survey, 91% of Muslim young people said their religious beliefs were respected. Young people had no difficulty attending services. All major religious festivals were celebrated and chaplains delivered a range of appropriate classes, including the Alpha course, Islamic lessons and a Sikh discussion group.
- 2.54 Religious complaints raised through DIRFs were taken seriously: one particular complaint about a cell search had prompted advice to staff about the handling of religious books.
- 2.55 Chaplains were well integrated within the prison. They visited all new arrivals individually to identify faith and religious needs and delivered a group induction session. When appropriate, they attended ACCT reviews and provided support to young people in crisis, for example bereavement. They spent time on the wings where young people were free to approach them, and also visited the reintegration and support unit (RSU). Young people on the RSU were not able to attend corporate worship subject to a risk assessment.
- 2.56 The timetable of religious services and classes was advertised on the wings. There was no longer a problem with young people getting to services punctually and staff time during the core day had now been allocated to ensure that Muslim young people could wash before prayers. All faiths used the large chapel as the multi-faith room was too small, but curtains had been installed to ensure that religious symbols could be concealed when appropriate.

## Complaints

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.57 Fewer young people found it easy to make a complaint than at the previous inspection and they were also less confident that complaints were handled fairly. Responses to complaints were generally good, and some were excellent. However, some complaints had not been responded to and there was no procedure for following them up.
- 2.58 One hundred and seventy-four complaints had been submitted from March 2012 to date. In our survey, only 47% of young people said it was easy to make a complaint and 26% that complaints were handled fairly, against 63% and 46% respectively at the last inspection.
- 2.59 Complaint forms were freely available on the wings and complaint boxes were emptied daily. We found one box which had been left unlocked. Complaints data were collated each month and the five most common topics identified: the category 'general/decency' appeared consistently but it was not clear what this covered. Data were submitted to the safeguarding meeting.
- 2.60 Responses to complaints were generally polite and focussed and we saw some excellent examples. In the previous three months, 45% of complaints had been upheld. All responses were seen by the safeguarding manager and the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB), and the deputy governor carried out a random quality assurance check on 10 complaints each month and fed back learning points to staff. Sixteen complaints from 2011 and 27 from 2012 still awaited a response and there was no procedure for following up outstanding responses (see main recommendation HP53).

### Housekeeping points

---

- 2.61 All complaints boxes should be kept locked.
- 2.62 The complaints category 'general/decency' should be clarified.

## Legal rights

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.63 The establishment had no legal rights policy. Young people said they did not receive any information about their legal rights and did not know how to contact their legal adviser. There were no formal arrangements for young people to make free telephone calls to their legal advisers and young people complained about a lack of privacy during legal visits.

- 2.64 The establishment had no legal rights policy or guidance to staff and the information young people were given about how to acquire legal advice was inconsistent. Legal rights were not included in the induction programme and young people only received ad hoc guidance from their caseworkers, who continued to allow them to make a free telephone call to their legal advisers. Many young people said they did not know they could make free telephone calls to their legal advisers, and some, who wanted to appeal their conviction, sentence or recall, said they did not know how to get legal advice.
- 2.65 There were facilities for confidential legal visits, although some young people complained that they had been unable to talk to their legal advisers in private.
- 2.66 There were effective arrangements in place to enable remanded young people who wanted to make bail applications to speak to solicitors. We observed clear advice being given to sentenced young people about their sentence and potential release date at their initial training planning meeting. There was a good system in place to ensure that applications for early release were properly considered. This was important because the proportion of young people on remand had increased significantly from 12.5% in 2011 at the time of the previous inspection, to 17% currently.

## Recommendation

---

- 2.67 All young people should be told of their legal rights and given access to free legal advice.

## Housekeeping point

---

- 2.68 Legal visits should always take place in private.

## Health services

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.69 Most young people told us they were satisfied with health services, although our survey findings reflected poorer results than we had found previously. Governance arrangements were sound, with good practice in service user consultation. The complaints system did not preserve medical confidentiality. Dispensary rooms on the wings were of variable quality. Primary care services were appropriate to meet need. Despite management action, 'did not attend' rates remained high for some clinics. The continuing absence of support for smoking cessation was unacceptable. Pharmacy services had improved. Dental services were very good and complied with best practice in avoidance of cross-contamination. Mental health services were proportionate to need with good access to the child and adolescent mental health service (CAMHS).

## Governance arrangements

---

- 2.70 Young people we spoke to expressed satisfaction with health care, although, in our survey, 67% said they were satisfied against 81% at the previous inspection.
- 2.71 The Staffordshire cluster of primary care trusts commissioned health services for the establishment which were provided by Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Partnership Trust (SSOTP). The health needs analysis had not been updated since 2010, although a draft mental health needs analysis had recently been drawn up. Implementation of the draft offender prison health delivery plan was supervised by the prison health partnership committee, which was well attended.
- 2.72 Clinical governance arrangements were sound. Learning points following an investigation were reported to the SSOTP and shared with other prisons they serviced. The manager was a senior nurse and the staffing complement included administrative, general and mental health clinicians. There were two members of staff on duty at all times, one of whom was a registered nurse. Systems for credential checking and training alerts were in place; nurses told us that training opportunities were good. Mandatory training included safeguarding and child protection. There was a policy for clinical supervision, although there was no systematic, documented supervision.
- 2.73 SystmOne was used to store and manage clinical information electronically. Clinical records were subject to clinical audit. Prevention of communicable diseases was driven by a comprehensive policy and there was an information-sharing agreement with other agencies.
- 2.74 Although compact, the health centre was of a very high standard. The waiting room was clean and tidy. The dispensary rooms on the wings were of variable quality. The fabric and fittings of Doulton rooms were of a high standard, but the room on Denby unit had limited suitability. Cleanliness also varied and Denby, in particular, was dirty and untidy. There was no running cold water in any of the rooms, which was inconvenient. Infection control was audited and actions designed to rectify non-compliance were in hand. Resuscitation equipment included two automated external defibrillators, oxygen and airway support items. Kit was strategically sited and regular checks were documented. Some items were out of date and were replaced as soon as we brought this to the nurses' attention.
- 2.75 Staff members were in uniform and clearly identifiable. We observed positive relationships between clinicians and patients. Young people were given written information about health services during initial health screening, and in a weekly health care induction session. The material was accessible to those with reading difficulties.
- 2.76 Young people we spoke to knew how to make written comments or complaints about care, although they preferred to take them to the nurses who were on the wings three times a day. There had been two complaints about health care in the year to August 2011: written responses were focussed and easy to read. There was a monthly health focus group at which young people were consulted about health care and invited to complete an age-appropriate questionnaire. Answers to questions posed at the focus groups were displayed outside the wing dispensaries.
- 2.77 There was no health promotion action group but one was to start in September 2012.
- 2.78 There was an annual health fair. The most recent in October 2011 had involved several prison departments and external participants. It was said to be very successful. Health promotion materials were on display in the health centre, and some on the wings. There were assertive



age-appropriate disease prevention and screening programmes, including chlamydia, meningitis C and blood-borne viruses (BBV). There were genitourinary specialist clinics. Barrier protection was advertised on the wings and was available together with advice.

## Recommendations

---

- 2.79 Clinical staff should have access to ongoing and documented clinical supervision.
- 2.80 There should be a confidential system for young people to make health care complaints. (Repeated recommendation 5.24)

## Housekeeping points

---

- 2.81 There should be an up-to-date health needs analysis.
- 2.82 Cold running water should be available in the wing dispensary rooms.
- 2.83 Denby dispensary room should be regularly cleaned and standards monitored.

## Good practice

---

- 2.84 *The ongoing health focus group meetings, age-appropriate health questionnaires and question-answer feedback approach provided meaningful opportunities for young people to influence the developing service.*

## Delivery of care (physical health)

---

- 2.85 Young people had a comprehensive initial health screen - although routine screening for learning disability did not occur – and a secondary health assessment, and they saw the GP. Patients were asked for consent to acquire and share health care information with GPs and others at several stages of assessment. They were given written guidance on what to consider when giving consent, in an easy-to-read format.
- 2.86 In our survey, 70% of young people thought it was easier to see a doctor and 88% a nurse than the respective national comparators of 53% and 73%. They had regular access to nurses on the wings where triage occurred; algorithms were used. There was an appropriate array of nurse and GP-led primary care clinics. Waiting lists were short and the failure-to-attend rate had improved dramatically for some clinics, for example immunisations (4% compared to 44% in January), but remained too high for some clinics such as GP 12%, CAMHS 15% and well man clinic 33%. There was a nurse-led clinic for the care of respiratory conditions such as asthma. Other long-term conditions were rare. Specialist clinicians, for example physiotherapists, attended on a case-by-case basis. The continuing absence of support for smoking cessation was unacceptable (see substance misuse section).
- 2.87 Young people had good access to secondary care appointments which were not unnecessarily restricted by security procedures. Waiting times were monitored and were in line with the local community.

## Recommendation

---

- 2.88 There should be a systematic approach to the identification and care of young people with learning disabilities.

## Pharmacy

---

- 2.89 Medication was supplied by a local pharmacy in a timely manner. The supply-only service model did not allow young people a complete pharmaceutical service as they had no access to pharmacy staff. Young people were given their medication by nursing staff and information about their medications was available to them. Reference books available to staff were out of date.
- 2.90 The majority of medicines were given in possession (63% against a comparator of 13%), although the policy was not being followed by staff and the decision appeared to be made by a doctor. Some in-possession risk assessments were found attached to patient notes and some on SystemOne, but there was no consistency of approach. Medicines supplied as homely remedies included 'pharmacy-only' medicines which should have been supplied on prescription or under patient group directions (PGDs). There was no provision for the supply of controlled drugs on discharge, other than the supply for that day.
- 2.91 Medicines were stored appropriately, including controlled drugs, and appropriate records were kept. Patients were encouraged to re-order their medications when necessary. The medicines and therapeutics committee was attended by relevant stakeholders and had provided a formulary. Prescribing appeared to be age appropriate, apart from the use of Circadin, which did not appear to be evidence based and was not licensed for this age group.

## Recommendations

---

- 2.92 The in-possession policy should be reviewed; the risk assessments of each drug and patient should be documented and reasons for the determination recorded.
- 2.93 The use of Circadin should be reviewed by the medicines and therapeutics committee to ensure that its use is evidence based and its unlicensed use risk assessed.

## Housekeeping points

---

- 2.94 Old reference books should be discarded to ensure that information used is up to date.
- 2.95 The range of PGDs should be extended to enable supply of more potent medication by the pharmacist and/or nurse and to avoid unnecessary consultations with the doctor. A copy of the original signed PGD should be present in the pharmacy and read and signed by all relevant staff.
- 2.96 The involvement of a pharmacist and/or pharmacy technicians in the provision of the pharmacy service should be encouraged.

## Dentistry

---

- 2.97 All young people were listed for a dental screening on arrival. A full range of treatments was available to them. The average waiting time following triage was two to three weeks with the longest wait at six weeks. The failure-to-attend rate had reduced from 40% to 6% in six months, which was commendable. Emergency dental cover was in place but rarely used. The dental surgery was of a high standard and complied with best practice in reduction of cross-contamination.
- 2.98 Dental waste was disposed of professionally.

## Delivery of care (mental health)

---

- 2.99 Most uniformed staff had received training in mental health awareness as part of the juvenile awareness staff programme (JASP); the number and type of referrals to primary mental health suggested that staff were alert to indicators of potential mental health problems. Screening for mental health problems occurred at reception and during induction. Mental health and other nurses were available to young people on the wings by self referral or at the request of officers or following an indicative threshold assessment grid. Young people requiring support were offered one-to-one attention on the wings or at the Monday clinic. Therapies were brief and solution based. Loss counselling was available through the chaplaincy. A variety of self-help and guided-help materials were available. Primary care nurses contributed to the weekly multi-agency safer health meetings.
- 2.100 Patients with more complex problems were referred to the CAMHS provided by South Staffordshire and Shropshire NHS Foundation Trust. A visiting CAMHS consultant and psychologists offered assessment and treatment. Primary care mental health nurses supported CAMHS staff in delivering services. Speech and language therapy was available via referral, although clinicians thought that a regular service might benefit the young people. Therapies included cognitive approaches and more specialised techniques for the treatment of post-traumatic stress. The care programme approach was used as necessary. Young people requiring in-patient care were transferred to Hindley. Only one such transfer had occurred in the last four years.

## Housekeeping point

---

- 2.101 The incidence of speech and language problems should be a component of the health needs analysis.

## Catering

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.102 Few young people said they liked the food and more direct consultation with them was needed. Monitoring of standards in wing serveries needed improvement.

- 2.103 In our survey, only 10% of young people said the food was good or very good against the comparator of 19%. Food was a source of frequent complaint to the IMB. The four-weekly menu cycle included a reasonable range of options for adolescents and those from minority groups. The menu was checked by a nutritionist.
- 2.104 There was little joint promotion of healthy eating or cultural diversity with other departments. Catering arrangements for Ramadan and Eid had been satisfactory. A range of meals from different countries had been served during the Olympics. The catering manager attended the DEAT meetings. Food comments books were not readily available to young people and comments in them were only from staff. Catering was regularly raised by young people at monthly focus groups but these were not attended by the catering manager. A survey was completed bi-annually. In the most recent survey, 56 (41%) young people responded and only 10% said they liked the range of food. There was no action plan in response to the survey. The food that we tasted was adequate.
- 2.105 On one wing neither staff nor young people serving food were wearing protective clothing, a concern that had been raised in the May 2012 area catering manager's report. Portion control was poor and catering staff said there was little consistency among servery workers and that it was difficult to maintain standards. Food left over was offered to servery workers but the rest was discarded. Young people continued to have opportunities to eat communally but these were to be reduced as part of the changes to the core day.
- 2.106 The main kitchen was clean and the most recent report from the area catering manager had been positive overall. The local environmental health department had awarded its highest food hygiene rating.

## Recommendations

---

- 2.107 **Consultation with young people about catering should be improved and acted upon where appropriate.**
- 2.108 **Monitoring and supervision of standards in the wing serveries should be improved.**

## Purchases

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.109 Young people could wait up to two weeks before receiving their first canteen order. Broader representation of young people was needed at meetings to discuss the canteen service.
- 2.110 Young people were offered pre-packed canteen goods at reception, but it could take up to two weeks for them to receive their first canteen order. Meetings were held with young people to discuss changes to the canteen list, but minutes of the three meetings that we looked at showed that only two young people had been present at two of the meetings.
- 2.111 Young people could place and receive orders each week and were told how much they had available to spend. Arrangements had been made to improve the provision of fresh produce and a pictogram of items available had been produced. There was little choice of craft

activities, although these were available through the youth clubs. There was a reasonable range of catalogues to order from and magazines could be ordered by application.

## **Recommendations**

---

- 2.112 Young people should be able to order items from the prison shop within 24 hours of their arrival at the establishment. (Repeated recommendation 8.13)**
- 2.113 All meetings to discuss changes to canteen items should include a broader representation of young people.**



## Section 3: Purposeful activity

The reference numbers at the end of some recommendations indicate that they are repeated, and provide the paragraph location of the previous recommendation in the last report.

### Time out of cell

---

Expected outcomes:

Children and young people spend most of their time out of their cell, engaged in activities such as education, leisure and cultural pursuits, seven days a week.<sup>3</sup>

- 3.1 Time out of cell remained reasonably good for most young people during the week, although not at weekends. Association took place each evening with young people allocated to a range of activities on different days. There was still no scheduled time outside for exercise during the week.
- 3.2 The published core day for a young person attending all his scheduled activities allowed in excess of 10 hours a day out of cell. Young people had less time than this because of slippage and some early lock up after meals. In addition, although the core day listed evening association and alternative activities between 6 and 8.15pm, we observed young people unlocked for just an hour in the evening for association. This still meant that few young people benefitted from more than 10 hours out of their cell each day, and overall there was slightly less time out of cell than at the last inspection.
- 3.3 Young people on basic level had much less time out of cell than other young people and did not have evening association or time to dine out. Some young people who did not attend group education also had education in their cells. This meant that, on occasion, some young people had less than three hours out of their cell each day. There was no evening association or dining out for the evening meal at weekends and young people were locked up from 5.15pm onwards. The maximum possible time out of cell at weekends was eight and a half hours.
- 3.4 At roll checks during the core day, we found few young people locked in their cells. Reasons for being in cell included education on the wing, refusing activity, waiting for an appointment or declining alternative activity when a class was cancelled. Workshop cancellations occurred during two roll checks and young people were given the opportunity to spend the session in the youth club, which most accepted.
- 3.5 There were fair systems of allocation during association to gym, youth club and wing association. Despite this, one young person wrote in his survey: 'We should have more activities because association is boring. I'd prefer more gym.' The controlled nature of evening unlock affected the time for association for young people who were unlocked last, but most young people had some time out of cell each weekday evening.
- 3.6 Only 5% of young people against the comparator of 50% said they could go outside for exercise every day, and the core day during the week did not include provision for time outside. Young people raised this as an issue in focus groups and, as reported at the previous inspection, it was not surprising that young people took their time walking to education and

---

<sup>3</sup> Time out of cell, in addition to formal 'purposeful activity', includes any time children and young people are out of their cells to associate or use communal facilities to take showers or make telephone calls.

other activities when they had the rare opportunity to be outside. The single exercise yard was not used routinely, due in part to a lack of agreement with staff on the supervision of exercise periods. Funding had been secured to develop additional exercise areas with an agreed staffing profile (see main recommendation HP51).

## Education, learning and skills

---

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

### Expected outcomes:

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

3.7 Young people continued to benefit from good initial assessments and support in learning and skills. Learning and skills was delivered five days a week with other 'creative activities' mainly in the evenings and at weekends. The contract hours provided by The Manchester College were inadequate, with insufficient vocational training staff and frequent class cancellations, which significantly hindered young people's preparation for release. The range of vocational training had significantly reduced. There was a reasonable range of education programmes. Achievements in education were generally good but required improvement on some short courses and vocational programmes. Teaching and learning remained variable and learning sessions were still too long. The overall management of learning and skills was inadequate and lacked formal strategies and structures to assess and improve the provision. The library provided a reasonable resource but opening hours were insufficient to meet fully the needs of the population.

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

|   |              |
|---|--------------|
| Achievements of young people in learning and skills and work: | satisfactory |
| Quality of learning and skills and work provision:            | inadequate   |
| Leadership and management of learning and skills and work:    | inadequate   |

## Management of education and learning and skills

---

3.9 The overall management of learning and skills was inadequate. There was no effective formal strategy to integrate creative activities with learning and skills activities. The OLASS contractor, The Manchester College (TMC), frequently failed to deliver the contracted hours in education and vocational training programmes. There was a very limited choice of accredited vocation related training and too many education classes were cancelled because there were not enough staff. Participation in education was low. In our survey, only 62% of young people said they participated in education against the comparator of 81%.



- 3.10 Communication between prison staff and TMC staff was good. Induction for young people was generally satisfactory. The management of the labour allocation process following induction was reasonably good and involved representatives from TMC. The careers information, advice and guidance provided to young people during induction was insufficient. The management of punctuality by the prison remained poor and, in some instances during the inspection, young people arrived at their programmed activity up to 45 minutes after the start of movement.
- 3.11 There was a detailed and constructive OLASS self-assessment process in place but no prison-wide self-assessment to drive improvement. A session observation scheme had been introduced by TMC for the OLASS provision but this was in early stages of development and required further work to drive the improvement needed in teaching and learning.

## Provision of activities

---

- 3.12 The establishment continued to have sufficient activity places for the population, including young people on remand. The majority of young people were engaged in some form of activity during the core day, although cancellation of education and vocational training sessions meant that young people were often redirected to the gym or youth club (see main recommendation HP54). Activities in the youth club provided social interaction but did not offer opportunities to develop independent living skills for resettlement and reintegration into the community. During the inspection, less than 10% of young people were locked in their cells and most of these were there for valid reasons. Unnecessary interruptions to learning and skills sessions remained an issue.
- 3.13 The range of education provision was reasonable and focused mainly on ICT, literacy and numeracy and some creative media work. Short courses in health and safety awareness and alcohol and drugs awareness were offered at induction. The establishment did not offer any life and social skills provision, for example, cookery, managing on a budget, or independent living. The virtual campus had been recently introduced and used for some on-line assessments, but was in an early stage of development.
- 3.14 Young people had a very limited choice of purposeful and constructive activities. Vocational training had reduced since the last inspection and was poor, with only brickwork or catering available under the OLASS contract. Accredited work in the kitchen and recycling/waste management continued to be underdeveloped.

## Quality of provision

---

- 3.15 Most learning sessions were held in a formal classroom environment: some classrooms were bright and spacious while others were dingy and required refurbishment. Since the last inspection, TMC had introduced breaks between learning sessions but classes were still too long for young people to concentrate. No vocational training in brickwork was observed during the inspection due to staff leave. However, the quality of practical work produced was evident. Young people on the brickwork programme were provided with classroom employability sessions as an alternative, which demotivated some learners, particularly young people who were repeating the sessions. Behaviour management was generally satisfactory. The reflection room was used effectively to address poor behaviour and most young people were reintegrated into learning sessions without being sent back to residential units.
- 3.16 In education, the quality of teaching and learning was variable, with a few inadequate sessions and not enough that were good or better. In the more effective sessions, there were very clear standards of behaviour and tutors had high expectations of what young people could achieve.

Tasks were interesting and challenging and young people produced work of a good standard and behaved well. In a marketing lesson, young people made excellent progress in developing their understanding of marketing principles, participating with great enthusiasm. The quality of the discussion was very high.

- 3.17 In the less effective sessions, there was too much use of printed worksheets, and tasks, such as word searches, were not challenging enough and too often young people did little work. The management of behaviour was sometimes ineffective.
- 3.18 In most sessions, learning support practitioners (LSPs) made good contributions to support young people with their work and their behaviour.
- 3.19 Support for literacy was good and young people with dyslexia were catered for well. LSPs had received a wide range of training in learning disability and had produced a useful booklet informing teachers of strategies they could adopt to help young people overcome barriers to learning.
- 3.20 A small number of accredited entry level alcohol and drugs awareness programmes were offered by TMC during induction, but tutors were not appropriately trained, qualified or experienced in the subjects (see recommendation 1.105).

## Education and vocational achievements

---

- 3.21 The number of young people staying on learning and skills programmes remained high at 98%, similar to the previous two years. However, the number of young people achieving qualifications had fallen during the same period to around 63%. Achievements remained very good for those on literacy and numeracy programmes. Achievements at entry level and level 1 were between 88% and 90%. Achievements on literacy programmes at level 2 were 67% and required improvement.
- 3.22 Achievements in brickwork in 2011-2012 were good at 81%. Tiling and plastering achievements were very poor with none during that year. Achievements in health and safety awareness and alcohol and drugs awareness delivered during induction were poor at 22% and 57% respectively and required improvement. Data showed that retention was 100% but neither TMC nor the establishment had analysed the data to determine the reasons for poor achievement.

## Recommendations

---

- 3.23 A formal strategy which includes an establishment-wide self-assessment of learning and skills and work should be developed and implemented to provide a clear action and quality improvement plan.
- 3.24 The establishment's creative activities programme should be integrated into the wider learning and skills and work strategy.
- 3.25 The lesson observation scheme should be applied rigorously to ensure that the quality of the less effective teaching and behaviour management is improved. (Repeated recommendation 6.26)
- 3.26 Punctuality should be improved. (Repeated recommendation 6.28)

- 3.27 Provision of careers information, advice and guidance should be increased to meet fully the needs of all young people.
- 3.28 Lessons should be shorter and not interrupted unnecessarily. (Repeated recommendation 6.25)
- 3.29 A life and social skills programme should be introduced to enable young people to learn independent living skills in preparation for release.
- 3.30 The range of activities in the youth club should be enhanced to improve the development of independent living skills for resettlement.
- 3.31 The virtual campus should be further developed to provide young people with appropriate access to learning and preparation for release.
- 3.32 Opportunities for accreditation in work in the kitchens and recycling/waste management should be further developed. (Repeated recommendation 6.23)
- 3.33 The facilities in the catering workshop should be improved. (Repeated recommendation 6.27)
- 3.34 Achievement of vocational programmes should be improved.

## Library

---

- 3.35 Most young people were scheduled to use the library and almost 75% were registered and regular users. However, the space was very cold and opening times were too restricted, with the library closed on Mondays and Fridays and in the evenings and only open on a Saturday morning at the weekends. A good range of books, DVDs and other materials were available, including legal texts and Prison Service Orders and Instructions. The library was not connected to the internet at the time of inspection which restricted access to online requests.
- 3.36 There were very effective links with neighbouring prisons for inter-prison loans and other resources, such as foreign national books, newspapers, magazines and easy read and Braille material. Good links were in place with education. There were too few books about working in different sectors of business or careers advice to help young people better understand the world of work and access to further education, training and employment. Library stock was regularly replenished and the book stock was good.

## Recommendations

---

- 3.37 The library should increase its opening hours to include evenings.
- 3.38 Heating should be provided in the library.
- 3.39 More careers information should be available for young people.

# Physical education and healthy living

---

## Expected outcomes:

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

- 3.40 Young people had good access to the gym and could participate in a suitably broad programme delivered by experienced and well-qualified staff. Facilities were good and well managed. Young people behaved well in the gym. Relationships between young people and PE staff and staff from other areas of the establishment were good. While attendance at PE sessions was generally good, PE staff did not always know the reasons for absences.
- 3.41 Young people had good access to core and recreational PE. There were six hours of core PE and a further 3.5 hours of recreational PE each week. Young people benefited from a broad and balanced PE programme that included team and individual sports and fitness training. The management of free weights was exceptionally good. Young people behaved well in the gym and worked hard in a very positive and purposeful atmosphere, and they enjoyed improving their fitness and team-working skills. Relationships between young people and PE staff and staff in other areas of the prison were good. Very few young people were returned to the wings for poor behaviour and gym bans were not used. While attendance at PE sessions was generally good, PE staff did not always know the reasons for absences.
- 3.42 Young people were successful in gaining a range of qualifications during their PE induction but accreditation other than this was limited, with only the community sports leaders' award available.
- 3.43 Resources and facilities for PE were good and managed well. The fitness suite and sports hall were clean and tidy and appropriate kit was worn by young people. The outside football pitch had enabled the establishment to take part, very successfully, in a local football league in which the team had won the 'Fair Play' award last season. This involvement helped young people maintain contact with the outside world. There were still too few showers.
- 3.44 While remedial PE was available, referrals were low. Accidents and injuries were reported appropriately and record keeping was good.

## Recommendations

---

- 3.45 The number of accredited programmes available to young people should be increased.
- 3.46 The number of showers available to young people for use after activities should be increased.

# Section 4: Resettlement

The reference numbers at the end of some recommendations indicate that they are repeated, and provide the paragraph location of the previous recommendation in the last report.

## Pre-release and resettlement

---

Expected outcomes:

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

- 4.1 There was a broad-based reducing re-offending strategy, but it had not yet been fully completed. The strategy and action points from the resettlement needs analysis were effectively monitored by a bimonthly resettlement committee. Young people reported that they were not aware how to get help in a number of resettlement areas. There continued to be good vocational and work opportunities for young people on release on temporary licence (ROTL).
- 4.2 The comprehensive reducing re-offending strategy had been revised in July 2012. It addressed all the resettlement pathways, and included case management and transitions, public protection and safeguarding children (see section on public protection), community engagement and ROTL. Each section had a list of aims, and it was the responsibility of named staff to lead on their implementation. The section on remanded and recalled young people had not been completed.
- 4.3 The strategy was monitored by a bi-monthly resettlement committee, which commendably included regular representation from youth offending services in the establishment's catchment area. The committee had a defined membership, terms of reference and a standing agenda. Attendance by a small core group directly involved in resettlement was good, but there was limited involvement from key departments such as education, residential and health care.
- 4.4 The establishment had undertaken a resettlement needs analysis, based on a young person's questionnaire and focus groups. Action points were agreed by the committee and these were monitored at committee meetings.
- 4.5 The establishment collected core resettlement data, but there was a lack of information to enable improvement of pre-release planning, for example resettlement outcomes of young people who had left the establishment.
- 4.6 The core resettlement work was driven by a casework team, who each took a lead role in each of the resettlement pathways. Despite regular contact between caseworkers and young people, our survey showed that significantly less young people than the national comparator said they knew where to get specialist help to find accommodation, get into school or college, get a job, help with money and access to continuing health services. These survey results demonstrated the poor contribution by some departments in the resettlement process. Resettlement was not covered during induction and residential staff, particularly personal officers, were not properly engaged with resettlement issues.

- 4.7 The establishment continued to regard the use of regular work and vocational training placements for young people on ROTL as an important part of their resettlement work. The number of young people participating in regular work outside the establishment had increased, with approximately seven young people engaged in constructive work programmes each week.

## Recommendations

---

- 4.8 The revised resettlement strategy should include a section on remanded young people and incorporate the findings of the needs analysis. (Repeated recommendation 9.6)
- 4.9 Young people should be told where they can receive specialist help in all the resettlement pathways and arrangements should be made to monitor this.
- 4.10 The establishment should collect data from external youth offending services on resettlement outcomes for young people when they have been in the community for at least three months. This data should inform the work of the establishment to reduce re-offending.

## Good practice

---

- 4.11 *The regular attendance of youth offending services at resettlement committee meetings helped to ensure that relevant information was shared effectively and that joint planning could be achieved more successfully.*
- 4.12 *The quality of work and vocational placements for young people on ROTL provided young people with relevant and extremely useful experience.*

## Training planning and remand management

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 4.13 Young people continued to have detailed training and remand management plans based on need. Training planning and remand management meetings were timely and young people had clear targets. Public protection was well managed and restrictions on contact with young people in custody were properly assessed. There were excellent systems in place to identify and support young people who had looked-after status.

- 4.14 Young people were allocated a caseworker, who was responsible for the management of individual training plans. Sentenced and remanded young people were contacted quickly by a caseworker and initial training and remand management plans were drawn up within the appropriate time scales. There was good initial involvement with the young person's community youth offending worker, and young people's families were contacted where possible. Plans were evidently drawn up collaboratively, and in our survey 84% of young people said that they were involved in their development. However, only 48% said that their

caseworker had helped them prepare for release against the comparator of 89%. Despite this, a community youth offending team worker said that caseworkers engaged effectively with them and responded positively to requests about young people's care.

- 4.15 The quality of training planning and remand management plans had improved since our last inspection. The majority of plans that we scrutinised were comprehensive and, while they included many of the same core areas, they were also individualised and attempted to address the specific needs of young people. Clear targets were set and explained to young people, but it was not always evident which member of staff was expected to help the young person meet his targets, particularly the need to improve behaviour. The engagement of personal officers was poor and there was no evidence that they supported young people to meet their targets, and little evidence that they attended training planning reviews.
- 4.16 Remanded young people received a good service from caseworkers. A remand plan was quickly drawn up, enabling them to use the same services as a sentenced young person. We were assured that young people were able to make a bail application if they wished, but not all the plans that we scrutinised referred to this.
- 4.17 Training planning and remand management meetings were well organised and timely. There was good attendance by external youth offending services, but the involvement of internal departments was erratic and attendance from education, residential and health care departments was rare. Attendance at reviews was not monitored and there was no systematic approach to improving attendance by different departments. Planning meetings that we observed were well managed and gave the young person every opportunity to participate. They focused on the young person's safety, welfare and resettlement issues and good information was provided on each of these areas.
- 4.18 Young people serving detention and training orders (DTOs), who reached the age of 18 years, were able to stay at Werrington if they wished as long as they were assessed as not being a risk to others. There were good transition arrangements in place for young people transferring to adult establishments, including those serving long sentences. In some cases, young people were given good information about the new establishment and received visits from their staff.
- 4.19 Young people serving life sentences were rarely located at Werrington, but, if required, the relevant assessments and documentation could be completed by one of the caseworkers who had been appropriately trained. Young people serving long determinate sentences received the same services as those on DTOs and the establishment prepared assessments of their suitability for early release on home detention curfew.

## Housekeeping points

---

- 4.20 Remand records should indicate whether or not young people wish to make a bail application.
- 4.21 Attendance at training planning and remand management meetings should be monitored and the gaps in attendance addressed.

## Public protection

---

- 4.22 There was a comprehensive up-to-date public protection policy. Implementation was led by the monthly risk management committee, chaired by the head of resettlement. Attendance was good from all key departments, in particular the local police intelligence officer and the

seconded social workers. Minutes of the meeting indicated detailed discussion took place of individual young people considered to be a risk.

- 4.23 The establishment had clear criteria to deal with young people who might present a risk to the public and there was a good system for them to be identified early by reception staff and the case administration team. They were each allocated a caseworker, placed on a database, and discussed at the earliest risk management committee meeting. There were good links with youth offending services, who received minutes of the risk management committee, in relation to a young person from their area. Caseworkers attended the reviews of young people at external multi-agency public protection panels.
- 4.24 There were appropriate procedures in place to ensure that young people were protected while in custody. Decisions about whom they had contact with were made by senior managers and, in the records that we scrutinised, restrictions were rare, proportionate and defensible. Comprehensive assessments of young people were carried out if they were considered a risk to children in the community because of the nature of their offence or other indicators. We saw one case where effective cross-departmental working and good engagement with external agencies had helped to protect a young person and other young people he might have had contact with in custody. A comprehensive risk management plan had been prepared for his release.

## Looked-after children

---

- 4.25 At the time of the inspection, seven young people were on full care orders of whom four had been subject to a looked-after children review while in custody. A further 11 young people had been looked-after children previously.
- 4.26 The establishment's two seconded social workers took the lead in identifying and supporting young people with looked-after status. There were excellent systems in place to identify young people, including telephone calls to the local authorities of all young people to see if they had been known to them. Looked-after young people were contacted by the social workers and also received letters from them explaining their role and what they should expect from their local authority children's services department. The social workers were active in ensuring that local authorities met their responsibilities to these young people.
- 4.27 Looked-after children had excellent access to specialist staff, who understood their experiences and needs, and were offered weekly appointments with the social workers. They were allowed free telephone calls to community agencies offering support. Social workers usually attended training planning meetings and other reviews for looked-after children.

## Reintegration planning

---

### Expected outcomes:

Children and young people's resettlement needs are addressed prior to release. An effective multi-agency response is used to meet the specific needs of each individual young person in order to maximise the likelihood of successful reintegration into the community.

- 4.28 All young people had pre-release plans and practical arrangements for release were thorough. Caseworkers worked hard to secure suitable accommodation, but some young people were still released to inappropriate bed and breakfast and hostel accommodation. The



establishment had useful contacts with education and training providers but the number of young people who were able to sustain training places following release was small. There was good pre-discharge health care and substance misuse support, but young people were not helped to manage their money. Young people had good access to interventions delivered by a dedicated programmes team, but their learning was not reinforced. The recent introduction of restorative justice meetings between young people and their victims was an important initiative. Visits facilities were adequate but it was difficult to make contact through the centralised externally managed booking line.

- 4.29 All young people had a pre-release plan, setting out their living arrangements and supervision requirements when they were released. At the final review meeting that we observed, the caseworker was resolute in making sure that proper arrangements were in place for a young person whose immediate plans were uncertain. Caseworkers ensured that young people were aware of what was required of them when they were released.
- 4.30 Practical arrangements for release were thorough, including ensuring that financial matters were in order and the provision of an appropriate bag for the young person's belongings. Young people had the opportunity to launder their clothes, which had been in storage, but not all chose to do so. Travel arrangements were made at the final review meetings.

## Accommodation

---

- 4.31 In our survey, 23% of young people said they thought that finding accommodation would be a problem. Establishment data showed that no young people left the establishment without an address to go to, although caseworkers said that a very small number of young people had left the establishment without an address, and were escorted to housing offices where a placement was found on the day.
- 4.32 Young people's accommodation needs were assessed early and there was good engagement with youth offending services and local authorities where it was apparent that young people would not be returning home. There was a lack of data on the type of accommodation young people were released to, and caseworkers said that it was not uncommon for young people not to know where they were going until a few days before release and that some had returned to bed and breakfast accommodation.
- 4.33 Caseworkers made significant efforts to ensure that suitable accommodation was found. If it was not, they were clear about how this should be progressed. There was good use of advocates, and occasionally more formal legal representation, to insist that local authorities assess young people as children in need and provide suitable accommodation for them.

## Recommendation

---

- 4.34 **The establishment should collect data about the sustainability of the accommodation that young people have been released to. This should be analysed and used to identify the most suitable accommodation for young people on release. (Repeated recommendation 9.25)**

## Education, training and employment

---

- 4.35 The establishment concentrated on addressing literacy and numeracy skills and focussed on employability programmes. However, the range of vocational training available was very poor: the establishment failed to provide sufficient employability skills training or to recognise and record any skills acquired informally. A work ethos was not promoted. No life and social skills training was provided to support independent living and no pre-release course was offered. Prison staff worked well with external agencies to procure placements and ROTL was well managed and used effectively to help young people identify and secure further education, training and employment opportunities. During the last six months, only 13 young people had obtained sustained places in further training.
- 4.36 Connexions and The Manchester College did not provide sufficient careers information, advice and guidance. The virtual campus facility had not been developed and young people did not enjoy the full range of learning and work preparation activities.

## Recommendations

---

- 4.37 Careers information, advice and guidance should be increased to ensure that all young people are fully supported throughout their time in custody.
- 4.38 A pre-release course should be introduced to help young people to find employment on release.

## Health care

---

- 4.39 Night nurses identified young people designated for release or transfer. They were offered a pre-discharge assessment by a nurse and there were plans to introduce a pre-discharge clinic later in 2012. Young people were given to-take-home medications as necessary and harm minimisation materials. Those without GPs were offered advice on how to obtain one. Nurses worked with resettlement staff to encourage young people who were not returning home to register with community health agencies. The primary mental health team liaised with the respective adult mental health in-reach team to ensure smooth transfer to adult prisons of patients with mental health problems. The Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Partnership Trust palliative care policy and end-of-life pathway were in place but had not been used.

## Drugs and alcohol

---

- 4.40 There were good links with relevant community based providers for the small number of young people who required follow-up support post release in relation to substance misuse.

## Finance, benefit and debt

---

- 4.41 In our survey, 40% of young people said they thought that money/finances was going to be a problem when they were released, and 21% thought that claiming benefits would be a problem. There was no evidence of young people being given practical advice about how to manage their money while they were in custody, but young people had access to their individual financial records and there were systems in place to ensure that the correct money was available to them on release. The establishment had instigated arrangements for young people to open bank accounts, but the bank was no longer offering this opportunity.

- 4.42 Courses designed to help young people manage their personal finances were available from the programmes team, education department and caseworkers, but there were very few referrals to these programmes and they rarely took place.

## Recommendation

---

- 4.43 **All young people should be offered financial advice, including the opportunity to attend a practical course in money management.**

## Children, families and contact with the outside world

---

- 4.44 Domestic visits sessions were two hours long and took place on Wednesday, Friday, Saturday and Sunday afternoons. Visitors were required to book into the visitors' centre which was an unheated portakabin with ill-fitting windows. After a rubdown search, they were escorted into the visits hall which was clean and bright, with new seating accommodating 17 young people and their visitors. Although the hall was small, young people did not report difficulty in securing a visit. There was no play area but toys were freely available and a good range of information was displayed. A snack bar was open and well used during the visit that we observed, which began promptly. Visitors told us it was difficult to get through to the new externally managed booking line; we tried twice but were unsuccessful in getting an answer. No young people were subject to closed visits.
- 4.45 Almost two-thirds of young people were less than 50 miles from home but, in our survey, only 32% of young people said it was easy for friends/family to visit. Accumulated visits and inter-prison visits were available but demand was extremely low. The security department kept records of visits and spoke to young people who did not receive visits to try to identify the reason.
- 4.46 In our survey, 14% of young people said they had children but there was no support provided to reflect this. The parenting programme developed in 2011 had not been delivered in 2012. Instead, a 'Building bridges' course looking at healthy relationships was delivered to young people and their parents/carers by a voluntary sector provider. This incorporated an additional evening visit with family after completion and extremely positive feedback had been received. No family days were organised.

## Recommendations

---

- 4.47 **Family days should be held each month.** (Repeated recommendation 9.50)
- 4.48 **Young people with children should be provided with additional visits and support to help them build and maintain family contact and improve their parenting skills.** (Repeated recommendation 9.51)

## Housekeeping points

---

- 4.49 The visitors' centre should be kept in a good state of repair.
- 4.50 Difficulties in using the visitors' booking line should be monitored and reported to the provider.

## Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

---

- 4.51 Two dedicated officers delivered a variety of programmes to which young people were referred through the training planning process in agreement with their community YOT worker.
- 4.52 Young people were able to attend programme sessions over a period, each addressing different issues. Individual assessments were produced at the end of these sessions, but the important link between what the young person had learned and the opportunity to put that into practice while in custody had not been made. Staff, particularly personal officers, were not aware of the behaviour and attitudes that young people were trying to address and did not reinforce their learning from the courses.
- 4.53 These programmes had been developed by the programmes team who had conducted their own evaluation of their potential effectiveness by asking young people their views. Feedback had been used to improve the programmes, but the team did not have the resources to carry out a thorough evaluation. Feedback forms that we saw suggested that young people found the programmes helpful and enjoyable and this was endorsed in our focus groups.
- 4.54 The report of our last inspection recommended to the Youth Justice Board (YJB) that there should be a systematic evaluation of the effectiveness of programmes. The YJB agreed and sent a detailed response explaining measures taken to address this issue, which had not yet been fully implemented.

## Recommendation

---

- 4.55 **Staff, particularly personal officers, should be familiar with the programmes that young people are studying and should help young people to adopt new attitudes and behaviour.**

## Good practice

---

- 4.56 *The introduction of well established restorative justice practice is an important initiative.*

# Section 5: Summary of recommendations and housekeeping points

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

## Main recommendations

To the governor

- 
- 5.1 All young people should have at least one hour each day in the open air in a suitably equipped area with seating and good recreational facilities. (HP51, repeated recommendation 6.8)
  - 5.2 Residential officers and managers should ensure poor behaviour and alleged assaults are seen to be challenged and investigated. Victims should be supported and procedures to deal with bullying and intimidation should be consistently implemented. (HP52)
  - 5.3 Reasons for young people's lack of confidence in the complaints system should be investigated and addressed. All complaints should receive a prompt and appropriate response. (HP53)
  - 5.4 The management of learning and skills should be urgently improved so that the required quantity and quality of education and training is available on a consistent basis to meet the needs of the young people held. (HP54)

## Recommendations

To the National Offender Management Service

---

### Courts, escorts and transfers

---

- 5.5 There should be no undue delays in transferring young people to Werrington following completion of their court cases. (1.5)
- 5.6 Young people should not be transported on vehicles carrying adult prisoners. (1.6)

## Recommendations

To the governor

---

### Courts, escorts and transfers

---

- 5.7 Young people should be given information at court about the establishment so that they know what to expect when they arrive. (1.7, repeated recommendation 1.11)
- 5.8 Video link should be used to avoid unnecessary court appearances. (1.8)

## **Early days in custody**

---

- 5.9 All relevant information about a young person should be available to the establishment prior to or at the point of their arrival. (1.21, repeated recommendation 1.25)
- 5.10 Routine strip-searching should not take place. (1.22)
- 5.11 Initial vulnerability assessments should contain clear management plans to address identified issues of concern. (1.23, repeated recommendation 1.27)
- 5.12 New arrivals should have access to peer support as part of the reception and first night arrangements. (1.24, repeated recommendation 1.26)
- 5.13 Cells for new arrivals should be properly prepared and equipped to meet their needs. (1.25, repeated recommendation 1.28)
- 5.14 New arrivals should have the opportunity to speak privately with a first night officer to address any anxieties they may have, ensure that their immediate needs are met and provide essential information. (1.26, repeated recommendation 1.34)
- 5.15 Young people should be kept fully occupied through a comprehensive, well structured induction programme which informs them about the establishment. (1.27)

## **Victims of bullying and intimidation**

---

- 5.16 Better use should be made of the multi-agency safer health group to deal with problems associated with bullying. (1.43)

## **Rewards and sanctions**

---

- 5.17 Clear targets should be set for young people whose behaviour is likely to result in a downgrade within the rewards and sanctions scheme. Targets for young people on basic level should specifically address the problematic behaviour. (1.61, repeated recommendation 7.18)

## **Security and disciplinary procedures**

---

- 5.18 All young people should be given the opportunity to explain fully their version of events relating to the charge. (1.73)
- 5.19 Applications should be heard in a suitable environment. (1.74)
- 5.20 The minor report system should be monitored at adjudication standardisation meetings. (1.75)

## **Bullying and violence reduction**

---

- 5.21 Consultation with young people should be better used to inform the violence reduction strategy. (1.82)

## **Separation/removal from normal location**

---

- 5.22 All areas of the segregation unit should be clean and free of graffiti. (1.95)
- 5.23 Mental health training should be given to all segregation unit staff. (1.96)

## **Substance misuse**

---

- 5.24 The YPSMS team should comprise sufficient administrative support and therapeutic workers to deliver an effective service that includes cover for leave and sickness. (1.104, repeated recommendation 3.92.)
- 5.25 Responsibility for the delivery of the basic drug and alcohol awareness induction programme should be transferred from education to YPSMS to ensure an adequate skill base of facilitators and opportunity for identification of those in need of further interventions. (1.105)
- 5.26 Smoking cessation advice and treatment should be made available to young people through an integrated health care and YPSMS programme. (1.106, repeated recommendation 3.91.)

## **Residential units**

---

- 5.27 Cells designed for one should not contain two young people. (2.14, repeated recommendation 2.12)
- 5.28 Young people should be given the opportunity to make a telephone call every day. (2.15, repeated recommendation 2.14)
- 5.29 The auditable system in place to monitor response to cell call bells should cover all wings, and regular quality assurance checks should be carried out by managers. (2.16, repeated recommendation 2.13)
- 5.30 Limits on the number of toiletry items allowed in cell should be strictly enforced. (2.17, repeated recommendation 2.20)
- 5.31 All young people should have daily access to showers. (2.18, repeated recommendation 2.24)
- 5.32 Young people should be encouraged by residential staff to keep their cells and communal areas clean by offering appropriate incentives and practical help where necessary. (2.19, repeated recommendation 2.25)

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

---

- 5.33 Staff should expect high standards of conduct from young people and challenge poor behaviour. (2.30)
- 5.34 All wing history sheets should be comprehensive, with balanced comments reflecting positive and negative behaviour. (2.31, repeated recommendation 2.32)

- 5.35 Each young person should have a designated officer on the residential unit in which they reside who is their central point of contact and support and takes responsibility for their day-to-day care and well being through frequent contact and by attending relevant meetings relating to their care. (2.32, repeated recommendation HP47)

### **Equality and diversity**

---

- 5.36 The impact of the regime on all minority groups should be monitored effectively. Appropriate action should be taken where necessary. (2.39)
- 5.37 Support groups should be established for young people who belong to minority groups. (2.40)

### **Diverse needs**

---

- 5.38 There should be effective links between education, health care and the diversity lead for disability to ensure that young people with disabilities are identified at an early stage, information about their needs is shared with relevant staff, and they have a suitable care plan. (2.51)

### **Legal rights**

---

- 5.39 All young people should be told of their legal rights and given access to free legal advice. (2.67)

### **Health services**

---

- 5.40 Clinical staff should have access to ongoing and documented clinical supervision. (2.79)
- 5.41 There should be a confidential system for young people to make health care complaints. (2.80, repeated recommendation 5.24)
- 5.42 There should be a systematic approach to the identification and care of young people with learning disabilities. (2.88)
- 5.43 The in-possession policy should be reviewed; the risk assessments of each drug and patient should be documented and reasons for the determination recorded. (2.92)
- 5.44 The use of Circadin should be reviewed by the medicines and therapeutics committee to ensure that its use is evidence based and its unlicensed use risk assessed. (2.93)

### **Catering**

---

- 5.45 Consultation with young people about catering should be improved and acted upon where appropriate. (2.107)
- 5.46 Monitoring and supervision of standards in the wing serveries should be improved. (2.108)



## **Purchases**

---

- 5.47 Young people should be able to order items from the prison shop within 24 hours of their arrival at the establishment. (2.112, repeated recommendation 8.13)
- 5.48 All meetings to discuss changes to canteen items should include a broader representation of young people. (2.113)

## **Education, learning and skills**

---

- 5.49 A formal strategy which includes an establishment-wide self-assessment of learning and skills and work should be developed and implemented to provide a clear action and quality improvement plan. (3.23)
- 5.50 The establishment's creative activities programme should be integrated into the wider learning and skills and work strategy. (3.24)
- 5.51 The lesson observation scheme should be applied rigorously to ensure that the quality of the less effective teaching and behaviour management is improved. (3.25, repeated recommendation 6.26)
- 5.52 Punctuality should be improved. (3.26, repeated recommendation 6.28)
- 5.53 Provision of careers information, advice and guidance should be increased to meet fully the needs of all young people. (3.27)
- 5.54 Lessons should be shorter and not interrupted unnecessarily. (3.28, repeated recommendation 6.25)
- 5.55 A life and social skills programme should be introduced to enable young people to learn independent living skills in preparation for release. (3.29)
- 5.56 The range of activities in the youth club should be enhanced to improve the development of independent living skills for resettlement. (3.30)
- 5.57 The virtual campus should be further developed to provide young people with appropriate access to learning and preparation for release. (3.31)
- 5.58 Opportunities for accreditation in work in the kitchens and recycling/waste management should be further developed. (3.32, repeated recommendation 6.23)
- 5.59 The facilities in the catering workshop should be improved. (3.33, repeated recommendation 6.27)
- 5.60 Achievement of vocational programmes should be improved. (3.34)

## **Library**

---

- 5.61 The library should increase its opening hours to include evenings. (3.37)
- 5.62 Heating should be provided in the library. (3.38)

- 5.63 More careers information should be available for young people. (3.39)

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

---

- 5.64 The number of accredited programmes available to young people should be increased. (3.45)
- 5.65 The number of showers available to young people for use after activities should be increased. (3.46)

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

---

- 5.66 The revised resettlement strategy should include a section on remanded young people and incorporate the findings of the needs analysis. (4.8, repeated recommendation 9.6)
- 5.67 Young people should be told where they can receive specialist help in all the resettlement pathways and arrangements should be made to monitor this. (4.9)
- 5.68 The establishment should collect data from external youth offending services on resettlement outcomes for young people when they have been in the community for at least three months. This data should inform the work of the establishment to reduce re-offending. (4.10)

### **Reintegration planning**

---

- 5.69 The establishment should collect data about the sustainability of the accommodation that young people have been released to. This should be analysed and used to identify the most suitable accommodation for young people on release. (4.34, repeated recommendation 9.25)
- 5.70 Careers information, advice and guidance should be increased to ensure that all young people are fully supported throughout their time in custody. (4.37)
- 5.71 A pre-release course should be introduced to help young people to find employment on release. (4.38)
- 5.72 All young people should be offered financial advice, including the opportunity to attend a practical course in money management. (4.43)
- 5.73 Family days should be held each month. (4.47, repeated recommendation 9.50)
- 5.74 Young people with children should be provided with additional visits and support to help them build and maintain family contact and improve their parenting skills. (4.48, repeated recommendation 9.51)
- 5.75 Staff, particularly personal officers, should be familiar with the programmes that young people are studying and should help young people to adopt new attitudes and behaviour. (4.55)

# Housekeeping points

---

## **Early days in custody**

---

- 5.76 A central register should be kept to ensure that all elements of induction have been completed. (1.28)

## **Suicide and self-harm prevention**

---

- 5.77 Night observations should not be predictable. (1.51)

## **Substance misuse**

---

- 5.78 The MDT suite should be kept clean and tidy to ensure a suitable forensic testing environment. (1.107)
- 5.79 Hand-drying facilities should be made available for young people in the MDT suite. (1.108)

## **Residential units**

---

- 5.80 All wings should maintain a log of applications and monitor the timeliness and quality of responses. (2.20)
- 5.81 More young people should be represented at monthly focus groups. (2.21)
- 5.82 Procedures for monitoring the issue and quality of prison clothing should be better managed. (2.22)

## **Equality and diversity**

---

- 5.83 All relevant departments should attend DEAT meetings consistently. (2.41)

## **Complaints**

---

- 5.84 All complaints boxes should be kept locked. (2.61)
- 5.85 The complaints category 'general/decency' should be clarified. (2.62)

## **Legal rights**

---

- 5.86 Legal visits should always take place in private. (2.68)

## **Health services**

---

- 5.87 There should be an up-to-date health needs analysis. (2.81)
- 5.88 Cold running water should be available in the wing dispensary rooms. (2.82)

- 5.89 Denby dispensary room should be regularly cleaned and standards monitored. (2.83)
- 5.90 Old reference books should be discarded to ensure that information used is up to date. (2.94)
- 5.91 The range of PGDs should be extended to enable supply of more potent medication by the pharmacist and/or nurse and to avoid unnecessary consultations with the doctor. A copy of the original signed PGD should be present in the pharmacy and read and signed by all relevant staff. (2.95)
- 5.92 The involvement of a pharmacist and/or pharmacy technicians in the provision of the pharmacy service should be encouraged. (2.96)
- 5.93 The incidence of speech and language problems should be a component of the health needs analysis. (2.101)

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

---

- 5.94 Remand records should indicate whether or not young people wish to make a bail application. (4.20)
- 5.95 Attendance at training planning and remand management meetings should be monitored and the gaps in attendance addressed. (4.21)

### **Reintegration planning**

---

- 5.96 The visitors' centre should be kept in a good state of repair. (4.49)
- 5.97 Difficulties in using the visitors' booking line should be monitored and reported to the provider. (4.50)

## **Examples of good practice**

---

### **Health services**

---

- 5.98 The ongoing health focus group meetings, age-appropriate health questionnaires and question-answer feedback approach provided meaningful opportunities for young people to influence the developing service. (2.84)

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

---

- 5.99 The regular attendance of youth offending services at resettlement committee meetings helped to ensure that relevant information was shared effectively and that joint planning could be achieved more successfully. (4.11)
- 5.100 The quality of work and vocational placements for young people on ROTL provided young people with relevant and extremely useful experience. (4.12)

## **Reintegration planning**

---

5.101 The introduction of well established restorative justice practice is an important initiative. (4.56)

## Appendix I: Inspection team

---

|                |                 |
|----------------|-----------------|
| Nick Hardwick  | Chief Inspector |
| Ian Macfadyen  | Team leader     |
| Bev Alden      | Inspector       |
| Paul Fenning   | Inspector       |
| Angela Johnson | Inspector       |
| Gordon Riach   | Inspector       |
| Ian Thomson    | Inspector       |
| Jess Broughton | Researcher      |
| Yinka Macauley | Researcher      |

### **Specialist inspectors**

|                   |                           |
|-------------------|---------------------------|
| Paul Roberts      | Substance use inspector   |
| Kathleen Byrne    | Health services inspector |
| Sue Melvin        | Pharmacist                |
| Bob Cowdrey       | Ofsted inspector          |
| Martyn Rhowbotham | Ofsted inspector          |

## Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report

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

| <b>Safety</b>   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Children and young people, particularly the most vulnerable, are held safely.</b>  |   |
| <p>At the last inspection, in 2011, there were good procedures to check young people's experience on escort but they generally described it in poor terms. New arrivals were treated well by reception staff, but the reception facility was too small. The majority of new arrivals were strip-searched but managers adopted a properly informed risk assessed approach. New arrivals spent their first night and early days in custody co-located with less settled and more disruptive remanded young people. Induction was not sufficiently informative. Safeguarding and child protection procedures were generally sound but individual care planning needed improvement. Young people at risk of self-harm were well cared for. The changed population had not resulted in an increased level of fights and assaults, but bullying and intimidation were significant problems. Governance arrangements for the use of force were robust. Rewards and sanctions were generally managed well. The use of adjudications was high and some punishments inappropriate. The reintegration and separation unit was not overused and staff treated young people well but the environment, regime and reintegration plans were inadequate. Young people were not accessing illegal substances but there were still no clinical interventions for smoking cessation. Outcomes for young people were reasonably good in relation to this healthy prison test.</p> |   |
| <b>Main recommendations</b>   |   |
| The reception area should be redesigned so that it is suitable to provide an appropriate environment for the increased throughput of young people. (HP46)   | <b>Not achieved</b>                         |
| Young people who have been identified as particularly vulnerable or who have been displaying difficult or challenging behaviour should have an individual care plan that addresses their assessed needs. The care plan should be assessed at least weekly by a multidisciplinary team. (HP48)   | <b>Partially achieved</b>                   |
| Systematic and frequent consultation should take place with young people about bullying and victimisation. Data collection and analysis relating to incidents of bullying and victimisation should be comprehensive and should be used alongside the results of consultation with young people to inform the management of bullying. (HP49)   | <b>Partially achieved</b>                   |
| <b>Recommendations</b>  |   |
| There should be at least one safer cell on each residential unit. (3.29)  | <b>Achieved</b>                             |
| New arrivals should have the opportunity to speak privately with a first night officer to address any anxieties they may have, ensure that their immediate needs are met and provide essential information. (1.34)  | <b>Not achieved</b><br>(Rec repeated, 1.26) |
| The monthly safeguarding strategy committee should monitor all injuries sustained by young people, particularly those relating to the use of force. (3.11)  | <b>Achieved</b>                             |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Minor reports should be embedded into the behaviour management strategy and staff trained to use them appropriately. (7.26)  | <b>Achieved</b>                          |
| Health care staff should carry out a full examination of all young people involved in an incident of the use of force. (7.36)  | <b>Achieved</b>                          |
| The establishment should produce an age-appropriate, local use of force policy. (7.37)   | <b>Achieved</b>                          |
| All staff should have up to date training in C and R. (7.38)   | <b>Achieved</b>                          |
| Young people in the RSU should be allowed a daily shower and telephone call irrespective of their behaviour. (7.49)  | <b>Achieved</b>                          |
| Young people located in the RSU should have an individual care plan that identifies their problem behaviour and the underlying causes. The plans should clearly outline how the behaviour is to be addressed, include a suitable regime that meets their needs and lead to an appropriately staged reintegration to normal location. Reviews should be multidisciplinary. (7.50) | <b>Achieved</b>                          |
| The quality of ACCT documentation should be improved. Care maps should set out all sources of help and support that have been agreed and clearly ascribe responsibility for delivering all aspects of the plan. (3.30)   | <b>Partially achieved</b>                |
| Staff should engage with young people subject to ACCT monitoring when carrying out their checks on them and records should clearly demonstrate the young person's response. (3.31)   | <b>Partially achieved</b>                |
| Young people who have been identified for intervention through the violence reduction strategy should have individual plans that include specific actions to address the problematic behaviour and underlying causes. (3.44)   | <b>Partially achieved</b>                |
| Young people who have been the victims of bullying should have a support plan that identifies specific action so that they feel and are safe and protected from further victimisation. (3.45)  | <b>Partially achieved</b>                |
| Young people should be kept up to date with their progress within the rewards and sanctions scheme. In particular staff should always inform them when they have been given a demerit and explain the reasons for it. (7.17)   | <b>Partially achieved</b>                |
| Young people should be escorted in vehicles that are safe, secure, clean and comfortable and separate from adult prisoners. (1.10)   | <b>Not achieved</b>                      |
| Young people should be given information at court about the establishment so that they know what to expect when they arrive. (1.11)  | <b>Not achieved</b> (Rec repeated, 1.7)  |
| All relevant information about a young person should be available to the establishment prior to or at the point of their arrival. (1.25)   | <b>Not achieved</b> (Rec repeated, 1.21) |
| New arrivals should have access to peer support as part of the reception and first night arrangements. (1.26)  | <b>Not achieved</b> (Rec repeated, 1.24) |
| Initial vulnerability assessments should contain clear management plans to address identified issues of concern. (1.27)  | <b>Not achieved</b> (Rec repeated, 1.23) |
| Cells for new arrivals should be properly prepared and equipped to meet their needs. (1.28)  | <b>Not achieved</b> (Rec repeated, 1.25) |
| Young people should be kept fully occupied through a comprehensive, well structured, induction programme that informs them about the establishment and enables them to take part in the regime without delay. (1.37)   | <b>Not achieved</b>                      |
| All allegations of ill treatment by staff should be referred to the local authority first response team. (3.18)  | <b>Not achieved</b>                      |
| Mediation should be developed as an integral part of the violence reduction strategy. (3.46)   | <b>Not achieved</b>                      |
| Staff should tackle robustly shouting out of windows. (3.47)   | <b>Not achieved</b> (Rec repeated, 1.47) |
| Strip-searching should only be carried out after a thorough and detailed risk assessment. (7.8)  | <b>Not achieved</b>                      |



|   |   |
|---|---|
| Clear targets should be set for young people whose behaviour is likely to result in a downgrade within the rewards and sanctions scheme. Targets for young people on basic level should specifically address the problematic behaviour. (7.18)  | <b>Not achieved</b><br>(Rec repeated, 1.61) |
| Adjudications should take place in a suitable setting. (7.27)   | <b>Not achieved</b>                         |
| The RSU should be maintained in a clean and tidy condition at all times. (7.47)   | <b>Not achieved</b>                         |
| Training for RSU staff should include managing difficult and challenging young people and mental health awareness. (7.48)   | <b>Not achieved</b>                         |
| Smoking cessation advice and treatment should be made available to young people through an integrated health care and YPSMS programme. (3.91)   | <b>Not achieved</b> (Rec repeated, 1.111)   |
| The YPSMS team should comprise sufficient administrative support and therapeutic workers to deliver an effective service that includes cover for leave and sickness. (3.92)   | <b>Not achieved.</b> (Rec repeated, 1.104)  |
| <h2>Respect</h2> <p><b>Children and young people are treated with respect for their human dignity.</b></p> <hr/> <p>At the last inspection in 2011, the condition of the residential units varied although most were reasonably well maintained and clean. Young people did not always have the opportunity for a daily shower or telephone call. Catering arrangements were good. Young people expressed differing views on the quality of their relationships with staff but overall were less positive than previously. Personal officer work had not improved and did not meet the needs of young people or operate as described in the policy. Applications and complaints worked well. Progress had been made in some areas of diversity but in general it remained underdeveloped. Race issues continued to be well managed and the basic needs of young foreign nationals were well catered for. There had been improvements in services offered by the chaplaincy. Health care was an improved service. Overall, outcomes for young people were reasonably good in relation to this healthy prison test.</p> |   |
| <b>Main recommendation</b>  |   |
| Each young person should have a designated officer on the residential unit in which they reside who is their central point of contact and support and takes responsibility for their day-to-day care and well being through frequent contact and by attending relevant meetings relating to their care. (HP47)  | <b>Not achieved</b><br>(Rec repeated, 2.32) |
| <b>Recommendations</b>  |   |
| Young people should be given the opportunity to make a telephone call every day. (2.14)   | <b>Not achieved</b><br>(Rec repeated, 2.15) |
| All foreign national young people should have the opportunity to receive independent advice and guidance. (4.23)  | <b>Achieved</b>                             |
| Young people should be able to attend religious services as well as other activities rather than have to choose one over the other, and should be able to attend services on time. (3.74)   | <b>Achieved</b>                             |
| Young people located in the RSU should be permitted to attend corporate worship subject to a risk assessment. (3.75)  | <b>Achieved</b>                             |
| Health care staff should attend relevant training planning meetings to ensure that young people's health care needs are properly catered for. (5.9)   | <b>Achieved</b>                             |
| All discipline staff should receive basic life support training. (5.23)   | <b>Achieved</b>                             |
| Health care staff should be notified and attend every use of control and restraint. (5.25)  | <b>Achieved</b>                             |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| All young people with a specific health care need such as asthma should have a care plan. (5.26)   | <b>Achieved</b>                              |
| All medication records should be fully completed, including a record of occasions when a patient has missed or refused a dose, with the reason for the omission. (5.38)  | <b>Achieved</b>                              |
| The medicines management forum should develop a formulary. (5.39)  | <b>Achieved</b>                              |
| The prison should liaise with the PCT to ensure that the surgery and equipment meet all required standards and regulations. (5.48)   | <b>Achieved</b>                              |
| Action should be taken to address the high level of cancelled dental appointments. (5.49)  | <b>Achieved</b>                              |
| Triage protocols should be introduced without delay. (5.64)  | <b>Achieved</b>                              |
| A review of all primary care appointments should be conducted and action taken to reduce lost appointment time. (5.65)   | <b>Achieved</b>                              |
| A chronic disease register should be developed on SystemOne which enables regular monitoring and review of young people with chronic conditions. (5.66)  | <b>Achieved</b>                              |
| All discipline staff should receive mental health awareness training. (5.75)   | <b>Achieved</b>                              |
| The mental health needs assessment should be updated to take account of the new and expanding remand population. (5.76)  | <b>Achieved</b>                              |
| The equality and diversity policy should outline how the needs of young people from the full range of diverse groups in the establishment will be met, and ensure that appropriate equal treatment is monitored and diversity celebrated. (4.8)  | <b>Partially achieved</b>                    |
| The in-possession risk assessment of each drug and patient should be properly documented and the reasons for the decision provided. (5.37)   | <b>Partially achieved</b>                    |
| Mental health nurses should have protected time to carry out their mental health work. (5.67)  | <b>Partially achieved</b>                    |
| Cells designed for one should not contain two young people. (2.12)   | <b>Not achieved</b><br>(Rec repeated, 2.14)  |
| The auditable system in place to monitor response to cell call bells should cover all wings and regular quality assurance checks should be carried out by managers. (2.13)   | <b>Not achieved</b><br>(Rec repeated, 2.16)  |
| Limits on the number of toiletry items allowed in cell should be strictly enforced. (2.20)   | <b>Not achieved</b><br>(Rec repeated, 2.17)  |
| All young people should have daily access to showers. (2.24)   | <b>Not achieved</b><br>(Rec repeated, 2.18)  |
| Young people should be encouraged by residential staff to keep their cells and communal areas clean by offering appropriate incentives and practical help where necessary. (2.25)  | <b>Not achieved</b><br>(Rec repeated, 2.19)  |
| All wing history sheets should be comprehensive, with balanced comments reflecting positive and negative behaviour. (2.32)   | <b>Not achieved</b><br>(Rec repeated, 2.31)  |
| There should be regular support and information groups available for young people who are foreign nationals. (4.24)  | <b>Not achieved</b>                          |
| All young people with a disability should have a multidisciplinary care plan that sets out how their day-to-day needs, including social care needs, will be met and ensures equality of access to all aspects of the regime and services. The care plans should be readily available to all staff involved in the care of young people. (4.29) | <b>Not achieved</b>                          |
| Young people should be able to order items from the prison shop within 24 hours of their arrival at the establishment. (8.13)  | <b>Not achieved</b><br>(Rec repeated, 2.112) |
| There should be a confidential system for young people to make health care complaints. (5.24)  | <b>Not achieved</b><br>(Rec repeated, 2.80)  |

## Purposeful activity

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

At the last inspection in 2011 the majority of young people spent a good amount of time out of their cells during the week but fared worse at weekends. Association was daily but there was still no scheduled time in the open air. Young people were properly assessed and allocated to courses that met their needs. They benefitted from good support in education and appropriate attention was given to those with low levels of literacy and numeracy. There was a wide range of courses that met their needs well. Young people's achievements and progress were generally good and they gained useful skills in the vocational workshops. There had been improvement in the qualifications young people achieved. The quality of teaching and learning was variable and lessons were too long. Poor behaviour was not always managed well. Attendance was good but punctuality remained problematic. The library was a good resource and used well and access to high quality PE was outstanding. Overall outcomes for young people were reasonably good in relation to this healthy prison test.

### Recommendations

|   |   |
|---|---|
| There should be specialist support for young people with dyslexia. (6.24)   | <b>Achieved</b>                                   |
| Lessons should be shorter and not interrupted unnecessarily. (6.25)   | <b>Partially achieved</b><br>(Rec repeated, 3.28) |
| The lesson observation scheme should be applied rigorously to ensure that the quality of the less effective teaching and behaviour management is improved. (6.26)   | <b>Partially achieved</b><br>(Rec repeated, 3.25) |
| Showers for young people to use after PE should be sufficient in number to allow young people to take a shower after their activity. Showers should be brought up to a good standard with a particular emphasis on making them safe for young people to use. (6.41) | <b>Partially achieved</b>                         |
| All young people should spend at least 10 hours a day out of their cells. (6.7)   | <b>Not achieved</b>                               |
| All young people should have at least one hour in the open air each day in a suitably equipped area with seating and good recreational facilities. (6.8)  | <b>Not achieved</b> (Rec repeated, HP51)          |
| Access to vocational training should be improved for young people under school-leaving age. (6.22)  | <b>Not achieved</b>                               |
| Opportunities for accreditation in work in the kitchens and recycling/waste management should be further developed. (6.23)  | <b>Not achieved</b> (Rec repeated, 3.32)          |
| The facilities in the catering workshop should be improved. (6.27)  | <b>Not achieved</b> (Rec repeated, 3.33)          |
| Punctuality should be improved. (6.28)  | <b>Not achieved</b> (Rec repeated, 3.26)          |
| Formal accreditation should be introduced to the core PE programme. (6.40)  | <b>No longer relevant</b>                         |

## Resettlement

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

At the last inspection in 2011, the strategic management of resettlement had improved. A recent needs analysis set a clear agenda for each resettlement pathway and appropriate services were in place in most areas. Training planning meetings were managed well and transition planning was thorough, although some targets in individual training plans and remand management plans were inadequate. Public protection arrangements were sound. Access to visits and facilities had improved. Although there

|  |   |
|--|---|
| had been no family days for some time, good initiatives were in place to help rebuild family relationships. Opportunities for release on temporary licence provision as part of reintegration planning were exceptional and included post-release support and follow-up work. Substance use services were good. Overall outcomes for young people were good in relation to this healthy prison test. |   |
| <b>Recommendations</b>   |   |
| Relevant voluntary, statutory and community agencies should be invited to attend the resettlement management committee meetings. (9.7)   | <b>Achieved</b>                             |
| Training plans and remand management plans should set specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and time-bound targets based on a comprehensive assessment of risk and need and consultation with the young person. This should be clearly recorded on the appropriate documentation. (9.19)   | <b>Achieved</b>                             |
| All young people being released or transferred should be seen in advance of their discharge and given information about local health services and health promotion advice. (9.35)  | <b>Achieved</b>                             |
| All young people should be entitled to one visit each week irrespective of rewards and sanctions levels. (9.48)  | <b>Achieved</b>                             |
| Visits should start in accordance with the published time. (9.49)  | <b>Achieved</b>                             |
| There should be a systematic evaluation of the effectiveness of programmes. (9.55)   | <b>Partially achieved</b>                   |
| The revised resettlement strategy should include a section on remanded young people and incorporate the findings of the needs analysis. (9.6)  | <b>Not achieved</b><br>(Rec repeated, 4.8)  |
| The establishment should collect data about the sustainability of the accommodation that young people have been released to. This should be analysed and used to identify the most suitable accommodation for young people on release. (9.25)  | <b>Not achieved</b><br>(Rec repeated, 4.34) |
| Family days should be held each month. (9.50)  | <b>Not achieved</b> (Rec repeated, 4.47)    |
| Young people with children should be provided with additional visits and support to help them build and maintain family contact and improve their parenting skills. (9.51)   | <b>Not achieved</b> (Rec repeated, 4.48)    |

## Appendix III: Establishment population profile

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

| Status                | Number of young people | %  |
|-----------------------|------------------------|----|
| Sentenced             | 97                     | 72 |
| Recalls               | 8                      | 5  |
| Convicted unsentenced | 6                      | 4  |
| Remand                | 23                     | 17 |
| Detainee              | 0                      | 0  |
| <b>Total</b>          | <b>134</b>             |    |

| Age          | Number of young people | %  |
|--------------|------------------------|----|
| 15 years     | 8                      | 5  |
| 16 years     | 24                     | 17 |
| 17 years     | 83                     | 61 |
| 18 years     | 19                     | 14 |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>134</b>             |    |

| Nationality       | Number of young people | %  |
|-------------------|------------------------|----|
| British           | 121                    | 97 |
| Foreign nationals | 13                     | 9  |
| <b>Total</b>      | <b>134</b>             |    |

| Ethnicity                            | Number of young people | %          |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------|------------|
| <i>White</i>                         |                        |            |
| British                              | 62                     | 45         |
| Irish                                | 2                      | 1          |
| Other white                          | 3                      | 2          |
| <i>Mixed</i>                         |                        |            |
| White and black Caribbean            | 18                     | 13         |
| White and black African              | 1                      | 0.7        |
| White and Asian                      | 3                      | 2          |
| Other mixed                          | 2                      | 1          |
| <i>Asian or Asian British</i>        |                        |            |
| Indian                               | 4                      | 3          |
| Pakistani                            | 7                      | 5          |
| Bangladeshi                          |                        |            |
| Other Asian                          |                        |            |
| <i>Black or black British</i>        |                        |            |
| Caribbean                            | 3                      | 1          |
| African                              | 17                     | 12         |
| Other black                          | 5                      | 3          |
| <i>Chinese or other ethnic group</i> |                        |            |
| Chinese                              |                        |            |
| Arab                                 |                        |            |
| Other ethnic group                   | 3                      | 2          |
| <i>Not stated</i>                    |                        |            |
| <b>Total</b>                         | <b>134</b>             | <b>100</b> |

| Religion                      | Number of young people | %          |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|------------|
| Baptist                       |                        |            |
| Church of England             | 6                      | 4          |
| Roman Catholic                | 16                     | 11         |
| Other Christian denominations | 25                     | 18         |
| Muslim                        | 26                     | 19         |
| Sikh                          | 2                      | 1          |
| Hindu                         |                        |            |
| Buddhist                      |                        |            |
| Jewish                        |                        |            |
| Other                         | 1                      | 0.7        |
| No religion                   | 47                     | 35         |
| Not stated                    | 11                     | 8          |
| <b>Total</b>                  | <b>134</b>             | <b>100</b> |

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

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

| Length of stay | <1 mth    | 1–3 mths  | 3–6 mths  | 6–12 mths | 1–2 yrs  | 2 yrs +  | 4 yrs +  | Total      |
|----------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|------------|
| <b>Age</b>     |           |           |           |           |          |          |          |            |
| 15 years       | 3         | 1         | 1         | 0         | 0        | 0        | 0        | 5          |
| 16 years       | 5         | 5         | 7         | 4         | 0        | 0        | 0        | 21         |
| 17 years       | 12        | 20        | 12        | 13        | 3        | 0        | 0        | 60         |
| 18 years       | 2         | 9         | 5         | 3         | 0        | 0        | 0        | 19         |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>22</b> | <b>35</b> | <b>25</b> | <b>20</b> | <b>3</b> | <b>0</b> | <b>0</b> | <b>105</b> |

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

| Length of stay | <1 mth    | 1–3 mths  | 3–6 mths | 6–12 mths | 1–2 yrs  | 2 yrs+   | 4 yrs +  | Total     |
|----------------|-----------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|
| <b>Age</b>     |           |           |          |           |          |          |          |           |
| 15 years       | 3         | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0        | 0        | 0        | 3         |
| 16 years       | 1         | 2         | 0        | 0         | 0        | 0        | 0        | 3         |
| 17 years       | 10        | 9         | 3        | 0         | 1        | 0        | 0        | 23        |
| 18 years       | 0         | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0         |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>14</b> | <b>11</b> | <b>3</b> | <b>0</b>  | <b>1</b> | <b>0</b> | <b>0</b> | <b>29</b> |

| Main offence                         | Number of young people | %          |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------|------------|
| Violence against the person          | 19                     | 14.2       |
| Sexual offences                      | 2                      | 1.5        |
| Burglary                             | 16                     | 12         |
| Robbery                              | 54                     | 40.3       |
| Theft and handling                   | 4                      | 3          |
| Fraud and forgery                    | 0                      | 0          |
| Drugs offences                       | 7                      | 5.3        |
| Other offences                       | 31                     | 23.1       |
| Offence not recorded/holding warrant | 1                      | 0.7        |
| <b>Total</b>                         | <b>134</b>             | <b>100</b> |

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

| Sentence     | 4 mths | 6 mths | 8 mths | 10 mths | 12 mths | 18 mths | 24 mths | Recall | Total |
|--------------|--------|--------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|--------|-------|
| <b>Age</b>   |        |        |        |         |         |         |         |        |       |
| 15 years     |        |        | 1      |         |         | 1       | 1       | 1      | 4     |
| 16 years     | 4      | 1      | 1      | 3       | 3       | 3       | 3       | 2      | 20    |
| 17 years     | 6      | 4      | 6      | 3       | 5       | 5       | 7       | 5      | 41    |
| 18 years     | 2      | 1      |        | 2       | 3       | 4       | 3       | 0      | 15    |
| <b>Total</b> |        |        |        |         |         |         |         |        | 80    |

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

| Sentence     | Under 2 yrs | 2-3 yrs | 3-4 yrs | 4-5 yrs | 5 yrs + | Recall | Total |
|--------------|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|--------|-------|
| <b>Age</b>   |             |         |         |         |         |        |       |
| 15 years     | 0           | 0       | 0       | 0       | 0       | 0      | 0     |
| 16 years     | 0           | 1       | 1       | 0       | 1       | 0      | 3     |
| 17 years     | 1           | 4       | 6       | 3       | 3       | 1      | 18    |
| 18 years     | 0           | 1       | 0       | 0       | 1       | 0      | 2     |
| <b>Total</b> | 1           | 6       | 7       | 3       | 5       | 1      | 23    |

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

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

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

| Sentence     | Under 2 yrs | 2-5 yrs | 5 - 10 yrs | 10 - 15 yrs | 15 - 20 yrs | Recall | Total |
|--------------|-------------|---------|------------|-------------|-------------|--------|-------|
| <b>Age</b>   |             |         |            |             |             |        |       |
| 15 years     | 0           | 0       | 0          | 0           | 0           | 0      | 0     |
| 16 years     | 0           | 0       | 0          | 0           | 0           | 0      | 0     |
| 17 years     | 0           | 0       | 0          | 0           | 0           | 0      | 0     |
| 18 years     | 0           | 0       | 0          | 0           | 0           | 0      | 0     |
| <b>Total</b> | 0           | 0       | 0          | 0           | 0           | 0      | 0     |

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

| Sentence     | Under 2 yrs | 2-5 yrs | 5 - 10 yrs | 10 - 15 yrs | 15 - 20 yrs | 20yrs + | Total |
|--------------|-------------|---------|------------|-------------|-------------|---------|-------|
| <b>Age</b>   |             |         |            |             |             |         |       |
| 15 years     | 0           | 0       | 0          | 0           | 0           | 0       | 0     |
| 16 years     | 0           | 0       | 0          | 0           | 0           | 0       | 0     |
| 17 years     | 0           | 0       | 0          | 1           | 0           | 0       | 1     |
| 18 years     | 0           | 0       | 0          | 0           | 0           | 0       | 0     |
| <b>Total</b> | 0           | 0       | 0          | 1           | 0           | 0       | 0     |

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

---

## Survey methodology

---

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

## Selecting the sample

---

At the time of the survey on 21 August 2012, the population of young people at HMYOI Werrington was 132. The sample size was 131, as one young person was at court on the day of the visit so was unavailable to complete a questionnaire. Overall, this represented 99% of the population of children and young people.

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

Interviews were carried out with any respondents with literacy difficulties. In total, five 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, 112 respondents completed and returned their questionnaires. This represented 85% of children and young people in the establishment at the time.

Three respondents refused to complete a questionnaire, four questionnaires were not returned and 12 were returned blank.



## Comparisons

---

Presented alongside the results from this survey are the comparator figures for all children and young people surveyed in young offender institutions. This comparator is based on all responses from surveys carried out in the other 10 male establishments surveyed since April 2011. Within the statistical analyses all data have been weighted in order to mimic a consistent percentage sampled in each establishment.

A further comparator compares the responses of young people in 2012 against the responses of young people surveyed at HMYOI Werrington in 2011. 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 the survey questions may have changed. However, both percentages are true of the populations they were taken from, and the statistical significance (see below) is correct.

On occasion, the analysis comparing the most recent survey findings to the previous survey findings at an establishment will be different in the stand-alone findings document and in the appendices of an inspection report. This occurs when the current survey is being used for an inspection but the previous survey carried out at the establishment was not; for inspection purposes it is more helpful to compare the current survey to the survey that was carried out for the last inspection and so this version will appear in the inspection report, while the comparison between the current survey and the last survey at the establishment will appear in the stand-alone document.

In addition, the following analyses were conducted:

- A comparison within the 2012 survey between the responses of white young people and those from a black and minority ethnic group.
- A comparison within the 2012 survey between the responses of Muslim young people and non-Muslim young people.
- A comparison within the 2012 survey between the responses of young people who consider themselves to have a disability and those who do not consider themselves to have a disability.

In all the above documents, statistically significant differences are highlighted. Statistical significance indicates whether there is a real difference between the figures, i.e. the difference is not due to chance alone. Results that are significantly better are indicated by green shading, results that are significantly worse are indicated by blue shading, and where there is no significant difference there is no shading. Orange shading has been used to show a significant difference in demographic background details.

Some questions have been filtered according to the response to a previous question. Filtered questions are clearly indented and preceded by an explanation as to which respondents are included in the filtered questions. Otherwise, percentages provided refer to the entire sample. All missing responses are excluded from the analysis.

## Summary

---

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

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

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

# Survey results

## SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU

|           |   |           |
|-----------|---|-----------|
| <b>Q1</b> | <b>How old are you?</b>                             |           |
|           | 15.....   | 6 (5%)    |
|           | 16.....   | 20 (18%)  |
|           | 17.....   | 69 (62%)  |
|           | 18.....   | 17 (15%)  |
| <b>Q2</b> | <b>Are you a British citizen?</b>                   |           |
|           | Yes.....  | 106 (95%) |
|           | No.....   | 6 (5%)    |
| <b>Q3</b> | <b>Do you understand spoken English?</b>            |           |
|           | Yes.....  | 107 (96%) |
|           | No.....   | 4 (4%)    |
| <b>Q4</b> | <b>Do you understand written English?</b>           |           |
|           | Yes.....  | 105 (95%) |
|           | No.....   | 5 (5%)    |
| <b>Q5</b> | <b>What is your ethnic origin?</b>                  |           |
|           | <i>White - British</i> .....                        | 54 (49%)  |
|           | <i>White - Irish</i> .....                          | 4 (4%)    |
|           | <i>White - Other</i> .....                          | 1 (1%)    |
|           | <i>Black or black British - Caribbean</i> .....     | 15 (14%)  |
|           | <i>Black or black British - African</i> .....       | 3 (3%)    |
|           | <i>Black or black British - Other</i> .....         | 1 (1%)    |
|           | <i>Asian or Asian British - Indian</i> .....        | 3 (3%)    |
|           | <i>Asian or Asian British - Pakistani</i> .....     | 9 (8%)    |
|           | <i>Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi</i> .....   | 3 (3%)    |
|           | <i>Asian or Asian British - Chinese</i> .....       | 0 (0%)    |
|           | <i>Asian or Asian British - Other</i> .....         | 0 (0%)    |
|           | <i>Mixed race - White and black Caribbean</i> ..... | 10 (9%)   |
|           | <i>Mixed race - White and black African</i> .....   | 2 (2%)    |
|           | <i>Mixed race - White and Asian</i> .....           | 0 (0%)    |
|           | <i>Mixed race - Other</i> .....                     | 2 (2%)    |
|           | <i>Arab</i> .....                                   | 0 (0%)    |
|           | <i>Other ethnic group</i> .....                     | 4 (4%)    |
| <b>Q6</b> | <b>What is your religion?</b>                       |           |
|           | None.....   | 35 (32%)  |
|           | Church of England.....                              | 19 (17%)  |
|           | Catholic.....                                       | 23 (21%)  |
|           | Protestant.....                                     | 1 (1%)    |
|           | Other Christian denomination.....                   | 9 (8%)    |
|           | Buddhist.....                                       | 1 (1%)    |
|           | Hindu.....  | 0 (0%)    |
|           | Jewish.....   | 0 (0%)    |
|           | Muslim.....   | 20 (18%)  |
|           | Sikh.....   | 1 (1%)    |

|            |   |          |
|------------|---|----------|
| <b>Q7</b>  | <b>Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?</b>   |          |
|            | Yes.....  | 6 (6%)   |
|            | No.....   | 96 (89%) |
|            | Don't know.....   | 6 (6%)   |
| <b>Q8</b>  | <b>Do you have any children?</b>  |          |
|            | Yes.....  | 15 (14%) |
|            | No.....   | 94 (86%) |
| <b>Q9</b>  | <b>Do you consider yourself to have a disability</b> (i.e. do you need help with any long-term physical, mental or learning needs)? |          |
|            | Yes.....  | 19 (17%) |
|            | No.....   | 90 (83%) |
| <b>Q10</b> | <b>Have you ever been in local authority care?</b>  |          |
|            | Yes.....  | 27 (25%) |
|            | No.....   | 79 (75%) |

## SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE

|           |   |          |
|-----------|---|----------|
| <b>Q1</b> | <b>Are you sentenced?</b>   |          |
|           | Yes.....  | 84 (76%) |
|           | No - unsentenced/on remand.....   | 26 (24%) |
| <b>Q2</b> | <b>How long is your sentence (the full DTO sentence)?</b>   |          |
|           | <b>Not sentenced</b> .....  | 26 (24%) |
|           | Less than 6 months.....   | 15 (14%) |
|           | 6 to 12 months.....   | 24 (22%) |
|           | More than 12 months, up to 2 years.....   | 20 (19%) |
|           | More than 2 years.....  | 18 (17%) |
|           | Indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP).....   | 4 (4%)   |
| <b>Q3</b> | <b>How long have you been in this establishment?</b>  |          |
|           | Less than 1 month.....  | 20 (18%) |
|           | 1 to 6 months.....  | 62 (56%) |
|           | More than 6 months, but less than 12 months.....  | 19 (17%) |
|           | 12 months to 2 years.....   | 9 (8%)   |
|           | More than 2 years.....  | 1 (1%)   |
| <b>Q4</b> | <b>Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?</b> |          |
|           | Yes.....  | 59 (53%) |
|           | No.....   | 52 (47%) |

## SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS

|           |   |          |
|-----------|---|----------|
| <b>Q1</b> | <b>On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?</b>   |          |
|           | Yes.....  | 85 (77%) |
|           | No.....   | 13 (12%) |
|           | Don't remember.....   | 13 (12%) |
| <b>Q2</b> | <b>On your most recent journey here, were there any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females travelling with you?</b> |          |
|           | Yes.....  | 44 (39%) |

|           |  |          |
|-----------|--|----------|
|           | No.....  | 57 (51%) |
|           | Don't remember .....   | 11 (10%) |
| <b>Q3</b> | <b>On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?</b>                          |          |
|           | Less than 2 hours .....  | 71 (63%) |
|           | 2 to 4 hours.....  | 25 (22%) |
|           | More than 4 hours.....   | 8 (7%)   |
|           | Don't remember .....   | 8 (7%)   |
| <b>Q4</b> | <b>On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?</b>                            |          |
|           | <b>My journey was less than 2 hours</b> .....  | 71 (64%) |
|           | Yes .....  | 4 (4%)   |
|           | No.....  | 32 (29%) |
|           | Don't remember .....   | 4 (4%)   |
| <b>Q5</b> | <b>On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?</b>                  |          |
|           | <b>My journey was less than 2 hours</b> .....  | 71 (64%) |
|           | Yes .....  | 12 (11%) |
|           | No.....  | 24 (22%) |
|           | Don't remember .....   | 4 (4%)   |
| <b>Q6</b> | <b>On your most recent journey here, how did you feel you were treated by the escort staff?</b>      |          |
|           | Very well.....   | 14 (13%) |
|           | Well.....  | 40 (36%) |
|           | Neither.....   | 35 (31%) |
|           | Badly.....   | 3 (3%)   |
|           | Very badly.....  | 5 (4%)   |
|           | Don't remember .....   | 15 (13%) |
| <b>Q7</b> | <b>Before you arrived here, did you receive any information to help you prepare for coming here?</b> |          |
|           | Yes - and it was helpful.....  | 25 (22%) |
|           | Yes - but it was not helpful.....  | 19 (17%) |
|           | No - I received no information.....  | 51 (46%) |
|           | Don't remember .....   | 17 (15%) |

## SECTION 4: FIRST DAYS

|           |  |          |
|-----------|--|----------|
| <b>Q1</b> | <b>How long were you in reception?</b>                                   |          |
|           | Less than 2 hours .....  | 90 (81%) |
|           | 2 hours or longer.....   | 7 (6%)   |
|           | Don't remember .....   | 14 (13%) |
| <b>Q2</b> | <b>When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?</b> |          |
|           | Yes .....  | 90 (81%) |
|           | No.....  | 14 (13%) |
|           | Don't remember/not applicable.....                                       | 7 (6%)   |
| <b>Q3</b> | <b>How well did you feel you were treated in reception?</b>              |          |
|           | Very well.....   | 27 (24%) |
|           | Well.....  | 53 (48%) |
|           | Neither.....   | 17 (15%) |
|           | Badly.....   | 1 (1%)   |
|           | Very badly.....  | 5 (5%)   |

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

**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..... | 40 (40%) | Money worries.....                                    | 21 (21%) |
| Loss of property.....        | 18 (18%) | Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to..... | 37 (37%) |
| Feeling scared.....          | 32 (32%) | Health problems.....                                  | 55 (54%) |
| Gang problems.....           | 51 (50%) | Getting phone numbers.....                            | 51 (50%) |
| Contacting family.....       | 62 (61%) | <b>Staff did not ask me about any of these.....</b>   | 15 (15%) |

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

|                              |          |   |          |
|------------------------------|----------|---|----------|
| Not being able to smoke..... | 49 (49%) | Money worries.....                                    | 20 (20%) |
| Loss of property.....        | 12 (12%) | Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to..... | 16 (16%) |
| Feeling scared.....          | 8 (8%)   | Health problems.....                                  | 6 (6%)   |
| Gang problems.....           | 13 (13%) | Getting phone numbers.....                            | 31 (31%) |
| Contacting family.....       | 28 (28%) | <b>I did not have any problems.....</b>               | 33 (33%) |

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

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| Toiletries/basic items.....                  | 90 (81%) |
| The opportunity to have a shower.....        | 48 (43%) |
| Something to eat.....                        | 87 (78%) |
| A free phone call to friends/family.....     | 84 (76%) |
| PIN phone credit.....                        | 64 (58%) |
| Information about feeling worried/upset..... | 39 (35%) |
| Don't remember.....                          | 7 (6%)   |
| <b>I was not given any of these.....</b>     | 3 (3%)   |

**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.....                                     | 43 (41%) |
| Peer mentor.....                                  | 11 (10%) |
| Childline/Samaritans.....                         | 11 (10%) |
| The prison shop/canteen.....                      | 8 (8%)   |
| Don't remember.....                               | 26 (25%) |
| <b>I did not have access to any of these.....</b> | 36 (34%) |

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

|                     |          |
|---------------------|----------|
| Yes.....            | 87 (80%) |
| No.....             | 12 (11%) |
| Don't remember..... | 10 (9%)  |

**Q9 Did you feel safe on your first night here?**

|                     |          |
|---------------------|----------|
| Yes.....            | 81 (76%) |
| No.....             | 19 (18%) |
| Don't remember..... | 7 (7%)   |

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

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| <b>I have not been on an induction course.....</b> | 6 (6%)   |
| Yes.....   | 50 (46%) |
| No.....  | 32 (29%) |

Don't remember ..... 21 (19%)

## SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT

|           |  |          |
|-----------|--|----------|
| <b>Q1</b> | <b>Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?</b>                              |          |
|           | Yes .....  | 39 (36%) |
|           | No .....   | 64 (59%) |
|           | Don't know .....   | 6 (6%)   |
| <b>Q2</b> | <b>Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?</b>                         |          |
|           | Yes .....  | 28 (26%) |
|           | No .....   | 67 (62%) |
|           | Don't know .....   | 13 (12%) |
| <b>Q3</b> | <b>What is the food like here?</b>   |          |
|           | Very good .....  | 0 (0%)   |
|           | Good .....   | 11 (10%) |
|           | Neither .....  | 32 (30%) |
|           | Bad .....  | 31 (29%) |
|           | Very bad .....   | 32 (30%) |
| <b>Q4</b> | <b>Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?</b>                         |          |
|           | <i>I have not bought anything yet/don't know</i> .....                                       | 9 (8%)   |
|           | Yes .....  | 49 (45%) |
|           | No .....   | 51 (47%) |
| <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> .....                                       | 17 (16%) |
|           | Very easy .....  | 29 (27%) |
|           | Easy .....   | 38 (35%) |
|           | Neither .....  | 9 (8%)   |
|           | Difficult .....  | 4 (4%)   |
|           | Very difficult .....   | 3 (3%)   |
|           | Don't know .....   | 9 (8%)   |
| <b>Q9</b> | <b>Are you religious beliefs respected?</b>  |          |
|           | Yes .....  | 59 (57%) |
|           | No .....   | 11 (11%) |
|           | Don't know/not applicable .....  | 34 (33%) |
| <b>Q6</b> | <b>Can you speak to a chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?</b>                  |          |
|           | Yes .....  | 66 (61%) |
|           | No .....   | 6 (6%)   |
|           | Don't know/not applicable .....  | 37 (34%) |
| <b>Q7</b> | <b>Can you speak to a peer mentor when you need to?</b>                                      |          |
|           | Yes .....  | 28 (26%) |
|           | No .....   | 17 (16%) |
|           | Don't know .....   | 61 (58%) |
| <b>Q8</b> | <b>Can you speak to a member of the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB) when you need to?</b> |          |
|           | Yes .....  | 18 (17%) |
|           | No .....   | 19 (18%) |

Don't know ..... 69 (65%)

**Q9 Can you speak to an advocate (an outside person to help you) when you need to?**  
Yes ..... 45 (41%)  
No ..... 18 (17%)  
Don't know ..... 46 (42%)

## SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF

**Q1 Do most staff treat you with respect?**  
Yes ..... 71 (68%)  
No ..... 34 (32%)

**Q2 If you had a problem, who would you turn to? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**

|                               |          |                                 |          |
|-------------------------------|----------|---------------------------------|----------|
| No one .....                  | 31 (29%) | Social worker .....             | 11 (10%) |
| Personal officer .....        | 28 (26%) | Health services staff .....     | 5 (5%)   |
| Wing officer .....            | 20 (19%) | Peer mentor .....               | 3 (3%)   |
| Teacher/education staff ..... | 7 (7%)   | Another young person here ..... | 12 (11%) |
| Gym staff .....               | 9 (8%)   | Case worker .....               | 20 (19%) |
| Chaplain .....                | 17 (16%) | Advocate .....                  | 8 (7%)   |
| IMB .....                     | 6 (6%)   | Family/friends .....            | 55 (51%) |
| YOT worker .....              | 26 (24%) | Childline/Samaritans .....      | 3 (3%)   |

**Q3 Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?**  
Yes ..... 32 (30%)  
No ..... 75 (70%)

**Q4 When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?**

|   |          |
|---|----------|
| <i>I still have not met him/her</i> ..... | 13 (12%) |
| In your first week .....                  | 41 (38%) |
| After your first week .....               | 30 (28%) |
| Don't remember .....                      | 23 (21%) |

**Q5 How often do you see your personal (named) officer?**

|   |          |
|---|----------|
| <i>I still have not met him/her</i> ..... | 13 (13%) |
| At least once a week .....                | 43 (44%) |
| Less than once a week .....               | 41 (42%) |

**Q6 Do you feel your personal (named) officer tries to help you?**

|   |          |
|---|----------|
| <i>I still have not met him/her</i> ..... | 13 (13%) |
| Yes .....                                 | 47 (47%) |
| No .....                                  | 40 (40%) |

## SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS

**Q1 Is it easy to make an application?**

|                  |          |
|------------------|----------|
| Yes .....        | 85 (80%) |
| No .....         | 11 (10%) |
| Don't know ..... | 10 (9%)  |

**Q2 Are applications sorted out fairly?**

|   |          |
|---|----------|
| <i>I have not made an application</i> ..... | 24 (23%) |
| Yes .....                                   | 46 (44%) |
| No .....                                    | 34 (33%) |



|           |  |          |
|-----------|--|----------|
| <b>Q3</b> | <b>Are applications sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?</b>              |          |
|           | <i>I have not made an application</i> .....                              | 24 (22%) |
|           | Yes.....   | 47 (44%) |
|           | No.....  | 36 (34%) |
| <b>Q4</b> | <b>Is it easy to make a complaint?</b>                                   |          |
|           | Yes.....   | 51 (47%) |
|           | No.....  | 17 (16%) |
|           | <i>Don't know</i> .....  | 40 (37%) |
| <b>Q5</b> | <b>Are complaints sorted out fairly?</b>                                 |          |
|           | <i>I have not made a complaint</i> .....                                 | 66 (61%) |
|           | Yes.....   | 11 (10%) |
|           | No.....  | 32 (29%) |
| <b>Q6</b> | <b>Are complaints sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?</b>                |          |
|           | <i>I have not made a complaint</i> .....                                 | 66 (61%) |
|           | Yes.....   | 12 (11%) |
|           | No.....  | 30 (28%) |
| <b>Q7</b> | <b>Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint?</b> |          |
|           | Yes.....   | 9 (9%)   |
|           | No.....  | 57 (56%) |
|           | <i>Never needed to make a complaint</i> .....                            | 36 (35%) |

## 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> .....   | 5 (5%)   |
|           | <i>Enhanced (top)</i> .....  | 31 (29%) |
|           | <i>Standard (middle)</i> .....   | 56 (52%) |
|           | <i>Basic (bottom)</i> .....  | 7 (7%)   |
|           | <i>Don't know</i> .....  | 8 (7%)   |
| <b>Q2</b> | <b>Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the rewards and sanctions scheme?</b>                |          |
|           | <i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i> .....   | 5 (5%)   |
|           | Yes.....   | 49 (46%) |
|           | No.....  | 42 (39%) |
|           | <i>Don't know</i> .....  | 11 (10%) |
| <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> .....   | 5 (5%)   |
|           | Yes.....   | 50 (48%) |
|           | No.....  | 35 (33%) |
|           | <i>Don't know</i> .....  | 15 (14%) |
| <b>Q4</b> | <b>Have you had a minor report since you have been here?</b>   |          |
|           | Yes.....   | 50 (48%) |
|           | No.....  | 49 (47%) |
|           | <i>Don't know</i> .....  | 6 (6%)   |

|           |  |          |
|-----------|--|----------|
| <b>Q5</b> | <b>If you have had a minor report, was the process explained clearly to you?</b>                       |          |
|           | <i>I have not had a minor report</i> .....   | 55 (54%) |
|           | Yes.....   | 32 (31%) |
|           | No.....  | 15 (15%) |
| <b>Q6</b> | <b>Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?</b>                              |          |
|           | Yes.....   | 59 (56%) |
|           | No.....  | 41 (39%) |
|           | Don't know.....  | 5 (5%)   |
| <b>Q7</b> | <b>If you have had an adjudication ('nicking'), was the process explained clearly to you?</b>          |          |
|           | <i>I have not had an adjudication</i> .....  | 46 (44%) |
|           | Yes.....   | 49 (47%) |
|           | No.....  | 10 (10%) |
| <b>Q8</b> | <b>Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?</b>                         |          |
|           | Yes.....   | 22 (21%) |
|           | No.....  | 79 (75%) |
|           | Don't know.....  | 5 (5%)   |
| <b>Q9</b> | <b>If you have spent a night in the care and separation unit (CSU), how were you treated by staff?</b> |          |
|           | <i>I have not been to the care and separation unit</i> .....   | 75 (77%) |
|           | Very well.....   | 3 (3%)   |
|           | Well.....  | 5 (5%)   |
|           | Neither.....   | 6 (6%)   |
|           | Badly.....   | 3 (3%)   |
|           | Very badly.....  | 5 (5%)   |

## SECTION 9: SAFETY

|           |  |          |
|-----------|--|----------|
| <b>Q1</b> | <b>Have you ever felt unsafe here?</b>   |          |
|           | Yes.....   | 29 (27%) |
|           | No.....  | 77 (73%) |
| <b>Q2</b> | <b>Do you feel unsafe now?</b>   |          |
|           | Yes.....   | 13 (13%) |
|           | No.....  | 91 (88%) |
| <b>Q3</b> | <b>In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b> |          |
|           | <i>Never felt unsafe</i> .....   | 77 (75%) |
|           | Everywhere.....  | 14 (14%) |
|           | Care and separation unit.....  | 3 (3%)   |
|           | Association areas.....   | 5 (5%)   |
|           | Reception area.....  | 3 (3%)   |
|           | At the gym.....  | 4 (4%)   |
|           | In an exercise yard.....   | 4 (4%)   |
|           | At work.....   | 4 (4%)   |
|           | At education.....  | 7 (7%)   |
|           | At religious services.....   | 4 (4%)   |
|           | At meal times.....   | 5 (5%)   |
|           | At healthcare.....   | 4 (4%)   |
|           | Visits area.....   | 3 (3%)   |
|           | In wing showers.....   | 6 (6%)   |

|                                      |        |
|--------------------------------------|--------|
| <i>In gym showers</i> .....          | 4 (4%) |
| <i>In corridors/stairwells</i> ..... | 5 (5%) |
| <i>On your landing/wing</i> .....    | 4 (4%) |
| <i>During movement</i> .....         | 9 (9%) |
| <i>In your cell</i> .....            | 6 (6%) |

**Q4 Have you ever been victimised by another young person/group of young people here (e.g. insulted or assaulted you)?**

|          |          |
|----------|----------|
| Yes..... | 26 (25%) |
| No.....  | 80 (75%) |

**Q5 If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**

|   |          |
|---|----------|
| <i>Insulting remarks (about you, your family or friends)</i> .....  | 13 (12%) |
| <i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i> .....        | 12 (11%) |
| <i>Sexual abuse</i> .....   | 1 (1%)   |
| <i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i> .....                      | 10 (9%)  |
| <i>Having your canteen/property taken</i> .....                     | 7 (7%)   |
| <i>Medication</i> .....   | 2 (2%)   |
| <i>Debt</i> .....   | 4 (4%)   |
| <i>Drugs</i> .....  | 2 (2%)   |
| <i>Your race or ethnic origin</i> .....                             | 3 (3%)   |
| <i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i> .....                        | 3 (3%)   |
| <i>Your nationality</i> .....                                       | 4 (4%)   |
| <i>You are from a different part of the country to others</i> ..... | 4 (4%)   |
| <i>You are from a Traveller community</i> .....                     | 3 (3%)   |
| <i>Your sexuality</i> .....   | 1 (1%)   |
| <i>Your age</i> .....   | 2 (2%)   |
| <i>You having a disability</i> .....                                | 3 (3%)   |
| <i>You were new here</i> .....                                      | 11 (10%) |
| <i>Your offence/crime</i> .....                                     | 1 (1%)   |
| <i>Gang related issues</i> .....                                    | 5 (5%)   |

**Q7 Have you ever been victimised by staff here? (e.g. insulted or assaulted you)**

|          |          |
|----------|----------|
| Yes..... | 24 (23%) |
| No.....  | 79 (77%) |

**Q8 If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**

|   |          |
|---|----------|
| <i>Insulting remarks (about you, your family or friends)</i> .....  | 11 (11%) |
| <i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i> .....        | 3 (3%)   |
| <i>Sexual abuse</i> .....   | 2 (2%)   |
| <i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i> .....                      | 4 (4%)   |
| <i>Having your canteen/property taken</i> .....                     | 4 (4%)   |
| <i>Medication</i> .....   | 2 (2%)   |
| <i>Debt</i> .....   | 1 (1%)   |
| <i>Drugs</i> .....  | 1 (1%)   |
| <i>Your race or ethnic origin</i> .....                             | 3 (3%)   |
| <i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i> .....                        | 2 (2%)   |
| <i>Your nationality</i> .....                                       | 2 (2%)   |
| <i>You are from a different part of the country to others</i> ..... | 2 (2%)   |
| <i>You are from a Traveller community</i> .....                     | 1 (1%)   |
| <i>Your sexuality</i> .....   | 0 (0%)   |
| <i>Your age</i> .....   | 1 (1%)   |
| <i>You having a disability</i> .....                                | 2 (2%)   |

|   |        |
|---|--------|
| <i>You were new here</i> .....            | 2 (2%) |
| <i>Your offence/crime</i> .....           | 3 (3%) |
| <i>Gang related issues</i> .....          | 0 (0%) |
| <i>Because you made a complaint</i> ..... | 8 (8%) |

**Q10 If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?**

|                         |          |
|-------------------------|----------|
| Yes .....               | 16 (17%) |
| No.....                 | 51 (55%) |
| <i>Don't know</i> ..... | 26 (28%) |

**Q11 Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you told them you had been victimised?**

|                         |          |
|-------------------------|----------|
| Yes .....               | 30 (30%) |
| No.....                 | 38 (38%) |
| <i>Don't know</i> ..... | 32 (32%) |

**Q12 Is shouting through the windows a problem here?**

|                         |          |
|-------------------------|----------|
| Yes .....               | 40 (40%) |
| No.....                 | 54 (53%) |
| <i>Don't know</i> ..... | 7 (7%)   |

## SECTION 10: HEALTH SERVICES

**Q1 Is it easy to see the following people if you need to?**

|                   | Yes      | No       | <i>Don't know</i> |
|-------------------|----------|----------|-------------------|
| The doctor .....  | 72 (70%) | 17 (17%) | 14 (14%)          |
| The nurse .....   | 91 (88%) | 6 (6%)   | 6 (6%)            |
| The dentist ..... | 37 (36%) | 45 (43%) | 22 (21%)          |

**Q2 What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?**

|                                     |          |
|-------------------------------------|----------|
| <b><i>I have not been</i></b> ..... | 8 (8%)   |
| <i>Very good</i> .....              | 21 (20%) |
| <i>Good</i> .....                   | 45 (42%) |
| <i>Neither</i> .....                | 23 (22%) |
| <i>Bad</i> .....                    | 8 (8%)   |
| <i>Very bad</i> .....               | 1 (1%)   |

**Q3 If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/all of it in your room?**

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| <b><i>I am not taking any medication</i></b> ..... | 57 (54%) |
| <i>Yes, all of my meds</i> .....                   | 15 (14%) |
| <i>Yes, some of my meds</i> .....                  | 15 (14%) |
| No.....  | 18 (17%) |

**Q4 Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?**

|           |          |
|-----------|----------|
| Yes ..... | 19 (19%) |
| No.....   | 83 (81%) |

**Q5 Are you being helped by anyone here with your emotional or mental health problems (e.g. a psychologist, doctor, counsellor, personal officer or another member of staff)?**

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

|            |  |          |
|------------|--|----------|
| <b>Q6</b>  | <b>Did you have problems with alcohol when you first arrived here?</b> |          |
|            | Yes .....  | 10 (10%) |
|            | No.....  | 93 (90%) |
| <b>Q7</b>  | <b>Have you received any help with alcohol problems here?</b>          |          |
|            | Yes .....  | 7 (7%)   |
|            | No.....  | 97 (93%) |
| <b>Q8</b>  | <b>Did you have problems with drugs when you first arrived here?</b>   |          |
|            | Yes .....  | 33 (32%) |
|            | No.....  | 70 (68%) |
| <b>Q9</b>  | <b>Do you have problems with drugs now?</b>                            |          |
|            | Yes .....  | 6 (6%)   |
|            | No.....  | 96 (94%) |
| <b>Q10</b> | <b>Have you received any help with drugs problems here?</b>            |          |
|            | Yes .....  | 21 (20%) |
|            | No.....  | 82 (80%) |
| <b>Q11</b> | <b>How easy or difficult is it to get illegal drugs here?</b>          |          |
|            | Very easy .....  | 9 (9%)   |
|            | Easy.....  | 6 (6%)   |
|            | Neither.....   | 6 (6%)   |
|            | Difficult.....   | 10 (10%) |
|            | Very difficult .....   | 15 (15%) |
|            | Don't know .....   | 55 (54%) |

## SECTION 11: ACTIVITIES

|           |  |          |
|-----------|--|----------|
| <b>Q1</b> | <b>How old were you when you were last at school?</b>  |          |
|           | 14 or under.....   | 36 (35%) |
|           | 15 or over.....  | 66 (65%) |
| <b>Q2</b> | <b>Have you ever been excluded from school?</b>  |          |
|           | Yes .....  | 88 (87%) |
|           | No.....  | 11 (11%) |
|           | Not applicable.....  | 2 (2%)   |
| <b>Q3</b> | <b>Did you ever skip school before you came into custody?</b>  |          |
|           | Yes .....  | 72 (71%) |
|           | No.....  | 25 (25%) |
|           | Not applicable.....  | 4 (4%)   |
| <b>Q4</b> | <b>Do you CURRENTLY take part in any of the following activities?<br/>(Please tick all that apply to you.)</b> |          |
|           | Education .....  | 65 (61%) |
|           | A job in this establishment.....   | 27 (25%) |
|           | Vocational or skills training.....   | 17 (16%) |
|           | Offending behaviour programmes.....  | 24 (23%) |
|           | <b>I am not currently involved in any of these</b> .....   | 13 (12%) |

|           |  |                          |            |           |                   |
|-----------|--|--------------------------|------------|-----------|-------------------|
| <b>Q5</b> | <b>If you have been involved in any of the following activities here, do you think they will help you when you leave prison?</b> |                          |            |           |                   |
|           |  | <b>Not been involved</b> | <b>Yes</b> | <b>No</b> | <b>Don't know</b> |
|           | Education  | 8 (9%)                   | 51 (56%)   | 23 (25%)  | 9 (10%)           |
|           | A job in this establishment  | 16 (21%)                 | 32 (41%)   | 17 (22%)  | 13 (17%)          |
|           | Vocational or skills training  | 17 (24%)                 | 23 (32%)   | 20 (28%)  | 12 (17%)          |
|           | Offending behaviour programmes   | 11 (15%)                 | 34 (47%)   | 19 (26%)  | 9 (12%)           |

|           |   |          |
|-----------|---|----------|
| <b>Q6</b> | <b>Do you usually have association every day?</b> |          |
|           | Yes .....   | 70 (69%) |
|           | No .....  | 31 (31%) |

|           |   |          |
|-----------|---|----------|
| <b>Q7</b> | <b>Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?</b> |          |
|           | <b>Don't want to go</b> .....                             | 4 (4%)   |
|           | Yes .....   | 5 (5%)   |
|           | No .....  | 93 (91%) |

|           |   |          |
|-----------|---|----------|
| <b>Q8</b> | <b>How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?</b> |          |
|           | <b>Don't want to go</b> .....                                 | 5 (5%)   |
|           | None .....  | 7 (7%)   |
|           | One to two times .....  | 38 (37%) |
|           | Three to five times .....                                     | 51 (50%) |
|           | More than five times .....                                    | 1 (1%)   |

## SECTION 12: FAMILY AND FRIENDS

|           |   |          |
|-----------|---|----------|
| <b>Q1</b> | <b>Are you able to use the telephone every day, if you want to?</b> |          |
|           | Yes .....   | 47 (46%) |
|           | No .....  | 54 (52%) |
|           | Don't know .....  | 2 (2%)   |

|           |   |          |
|-----------|---|----------|
| <b>Q2</b> | <b>Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?</b> |          |
|           | Yes .....   | 39 (38%) |
|           | No .....  | 60 (58%) |
|           | Don't know .....  | 5 (5%)   |

|           |   |          |
|-----------|---|----------|
| <b>Q3</b> | <b>How many visits do you usually have each week, from family or friends?</b> |          |
|           | <b>I don't get visits</b> .....   | 35 (31%) |
|           | Less than one a week .....  | 28 (25%) |
|           | About one a week .....  | 28 (25%) |
|           | More than one a week .....  | 4 (4%)   |
|           | Don't know .....  | 17 (15%) |

|           |  |          |
|-----------|--|----------|
| <b>Q4</b> | <b>How easy is it for your family and friends to visit you here?</b> |          |
|           | <b>I don't get visits</b> .....                                      | 35 (34%) |
|           | Very easy .....  | 13 (13%) |
|           | Easy .....   | 20 (19%) |
|           | Neither .....  | 13 (13%) |
|           | Difficult .....  | 12 (12%) |
|           | Very difficult .....   | 6 (6%)   |
|           | Don't know .....   | 4 (4%)   |

|           |  |          |
|-----------|--|----------|
| <b>Q5</b> | <b>Do your visits usually start on time?</b> |          |
|           | <i>I don't get visits</i> .....              | 35 (33%) |
|           | Yes .....                                    | 37 (35%) |
|           | No.....                                      | 26 (25%) |
|           | <i>Don't know</i> .....                      | 7 (7%)   |

## SECTION 13: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE

|           |  |          |
|-----------|--|----------|
| <b>Q1</b> | <b>Do you think you will have a problem with any of the following things, when you are released? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>                    |          |
|           | <i>Finding accommodation</i> .....   | 23 (23%) |
|           | <i>Getting into school or college</i> .....  | 29 (29%) |
|           | <i>Getting a job</i> .....   | 56 (57%) |
|           | <i>Money/finances</i> .....  | 40 (40%) |
|           | <i>Claiming benefits</i> .....   | 21 (21%) |
|           | <i>Continuing health services</i> .....  | 12 (12%) |
|           | <i>Opening a bank account</i> .....  | 13 (13%) |
|           | <i>Avoiding bad relationships</i> .....  | 19 (19%) |
|           | <i>I won't have any problems</i> .....   | 31 (31%) |
| <b>Q2</b> | <b>Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan (i.e. a plan that is discussed in your DTO/planning meetings, which sets out your targets)?</b> |          |
|           | Yes .....  | 48 (47%) |
|           | No.....  | 24 (23%) |
|           | <i>Don't know</i> .....  | 31 (30%) |
| <b>Q3</b> | <b>Were you involved in the development of your plan?</b>  |          |
|           | <i>I don't have a plan/don't know if I have a plan</i> .....   | 55 (56%) |
|           | Yes .....  | 36 (37%) |
|           | No.....  | 7 (7%)   |
| <b>Q4</b> | <b>Do you understand the targets that have been set in your plan?</b>  |          |
|           | <i>I don't have a plan/don't know if I have a plan</i> .....   | 55 (56%) |
|           | Yes .....  | 41 (42%) |
|           | No.....  | 2 (2%)   |
| <b>Q5</b> | <b>Do you have a caseworker here?</b>  |          |
|           | Yes .....  | 93 (90%) |
|           | No.....  | 3 (3%)   |
|           | <i>Don't know</i> .....  | 7 (7%)   |
| <b>Q6</b> | <b>Has your caseworker helped to prepare you for release?</b>  |          |
|           | <i>I don't have a caseworker</i> .....   | 10 (10%) |
|           | Yes .....  | 42 (43%) |
|           | No.....  | 35 (36%) |
|           | <i>Don't know</i> .....  | 11 (11%) |
| <b>Q7</b> | <b>Has your social worker been to visit you since you have been here?</b>  |          |
|           | <i>I don't have a social worker</i> .....  | 49 (49%) |
|           | Yes .....  | 30 (30%) |
|           | No.....  | 22 (22%) |

|            |  |  |
|------------|--|--|
| <b>Q8</b>  | <b>Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?</b>  |  |
|            | Yes .....  | 36 (36%)   |
|            | No.....  | 50 (50%)   |
|            | Don't know .....   | 15 (15%)   |
| <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>  | 17 (20%)   |
|            | <i>Getting into school or college.....</i>   | 18 (21%)   |
|            | <i>Getting a job .....</i>   | 23 (26%)   |
|            | <i>Help with money/finances .....</i>  | 14 (16%)   |
|            | <i>Help with claiming benefits.....</i>  | 8 (9%)   |
|            | <i>Continuing health services .....</i>  | 10 (11%)   |
|            | <i>Opening a bank account.....</i>   | 11 (13%)   |
|            | <i>Avoiding bad relationships .....</i>  | 11 (13%)   |
|            | <b><i>I don't know who to contact.....</i></b>   | <b>57 (66%)</b>  |
| <b>Q10</b> | <b>What is most likely to stop you offending in the future?</b>  | <b>(Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>                                  |
|            | <b><i>Not sentenced .....</i></b> 26 (25%)   | <i>Having a mentor (someone you can ask for advice) .....</i> 8 (8%)         |
|            | <i>Nothing, it is up to me .....</i> 16 (16%)  | <i>Having a YOT worker or social worker that I get on with.....</i> 17 (17%) |
|            | <i>Making new friends outside.....</i> 17 (17%)  | <i>Having children .....</i> 17 (17%)  |
|            | <i>Going back to live with my family</i> 13 (13%)  | <i>Having something to do that isn't crime .....</i> 27 (26%)                |
|            | <i>Getting a place of my own.....</i> 27 (26%)   | <i>This sentence.....</i> 27 (26%)   |
|            | <i>Getting a job .....</i> 43 (42%)  | <i>Getting into school/college .....</i> 22 (22%)                            |
|            | <i>Having a partner (girlfriend or boyfriend) .....</i> 35 (34%)   | <i>Talking about my offending behaviour with staff.....</i> 2 (2%)           |
|            | <i>Staying off alcohol/drugs .....</i> 16 (16%)  | <i>Anything else.....</i> 7 (7%)   |
| <b>Q11</b> | <b>Do you want to stop offending?</b>  |  |
|            | <b><i>Not sentenced .....</i></b>  | 26 (25%)   |
|            | Yes .....  | 69 (66%)   |
|            | No.....  | 3 (3%)   |
|            | Don't know .....   | 6 (6%)   |
| <b>Q12</b> | <b>Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here, that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?</b>   |  |
|            | <b><i>Not sentenced .....</i></b>  | 26 (26%)   |
|            | Yes .....  | 38 (38%)   |
|            | No.....  | 36 (36%)   |



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



**Survey responses from children and young people:  
HMYOI Werrington 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**

|  |   | 2012 Werrington | Young people's comparator | Werrington 2012 | Werrington 2011 |
|--|---|-----------------|---------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 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>112</b>      | <b>807</b>                | <b>112</b>      | <b>107</b>      |
| <b>SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU</b>  |   |                 |                           |                 |                 |
| 1.1  | Are you 18 years of age?  | 15%             | 12%                       | 15%             | 18%             |
| 1.2  | Are you a foreign national?   | 5%              | 5%                        | 5%              | 7%              |
| 1.3  | Do you understand spoken English?   | 96%             | 98%                       | 96%             |                 |
| 1.4  | Do you understand written English?  | 95%             | 98%                       | 95%             |                 |
| 1.5  | Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other category)? | 47%             | 42%                       | 47%             | 44%             |
| 1.6  | Are you Muslim?   | 19%             | 20%                       | 19%             | 12%             |
| 1.7  | Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?  | 6%              | 4%                        | 6%              | 7%              |
| 1.8  | Do you have any children?   | 14%             | 12%                       | 14%             | 13%             |
| 1.9  | Do you consider yourself to have a disability?  | 17%             | 11%                       | 17%             | 5%              |
| 1.10   | Have you ever been in local authority care?   | 26%             | 30%                       | 26%             | 23%             |
| <b>SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE</b>  |   |                 |                           |                 |                 |
| 2.1  | Are you sentenced?  | 76%             | 75%                       | 76%             | 84%             |
| 2.2  | Is your sentence 12 months or less?   | 37%             | 36%                       | 37%             | 41%             |
| 2.3  | Have you been in this establishment for one month or less?  | 18%             | 18%                       | 18%             | 37%             |
| 2.4  | Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?                                  | 53%             | 53%                       | 53%             | 53%             |
| <b>SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS</b>  |   |                 |                           |                 |                 |
| On your most recent journey here:  |   |                 |                           |                 |                 |
| 3.1  | Did you feel safe?  | 76%             | 82%                       | 76%             | 74%             |
| 3.2  | Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?   | 39%             | 27%                       | 39%             | 33%             |
| 3.3  | Did you spend more than 4 hours in the van?   | 7%              | 9%                        | 7%              | 6%              |
| For those who spent 2 or more hours in the escort van:   |   |                 |                           |                 |                 |
| 3.4  | Were you offered a toilet break if you needed it?   | 11%             | 14%                       | 11%             | 6%              |
| 3.5  | Were you offered anything to eat or drink?  | 30%             | 32%                       | 30%             | 24%             |
| 3.6  | Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?  | 49%             | 49%                       | 49%             | 59%             |
| 3.7  | Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?                                | 23%             | 24%                       | 23%             |                 |
| <b>SECTION 4: YOUR FIRST FEW DAYS HERE</b>   |   |                 |                           |                 |                 |
| 4.1  | Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?  | 81%             | 81%                       | 81%             | 77%             |
| 4.2  | When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?   | 81%             | 86%                       | 81%             |                 |
| 4.3  | Were you treated well/very well in reception?   | 72%             | 64%                       | 72%             | 89%             |

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

### Key to tables

|  |   | 2012 Werrington | Young people's comparator | Werrington 2012 | Werrington 2011 |
|--|---|-----------------|---------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|  | 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>112</b>      | <b>807</b>                | <b>112</b>      | <b>107</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?  | 40%             | 58%                       | 40%             | 49%             |
| <b>4.4b</b>  | Loss of property?   | 18%             | 22%                       | 18%             | 22%             |
| <b>4.4c</b>  | Feeling scared?   | 32%             | 16%                       | 32%             |                 |
| <b>4.4d</b>  | Gang problems?  | 50%             | 18%                       | 50%             |                 |
| <b>4.4e</b>  | Contacting family?  | 61%             | 58%                       | 61%             | 53%             |
| <b>4.4f</b>  | Money worries?  | 21%             | 17%                       | 21%             | 18%             |
| <b>4.4g</b>  | Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?   | 37%             | 33%                       | 37%             |                 |
| <b>4.4h</b>  | Health problems?  | 55%             | 56%                       | 55%             | 52%             |
| <b>4.4i</b>  | Getting phone numbers?  | 50%             | 44%                       | 50%             | 46%             |
| <b>4.5</b>   | Did you have any problems when you first arrived?   | 67%             | 75%                       | 67%             | 69%             |
| When you first arrived, did you have problems with any of the following:                       |   |                 |                           |                 |                 |
| <b>4.5a</b>  | Not being able to smoke?  | 49%             | 48%                       | 49%             | 46%             |
| <b>4.5b</b>  | Loss of property?   | 12%             | 16%                       | 12%             | 12%             |
| <b>4.5c</b>  | Feeling Scared?   | 8%              | 7%                        | 8%              |                 |
| <b>4.5d</b>  | Gang Problems?  | 13%             | 7%                        | 13%             |                 |
| <b>4.5e</b>  | Contacting Family?  | 28%             | 24%                       | 28%             | 14%             |
| <b>4.5f</b>  | Money worries?  | 20%             | 20%                       | 20%             | 12%             |
| <b>4.5g</b>  | Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?   | 16%             | 2%                        | 16%             |                 |
| <b>4.5h</b>  | Health problems?  | 6%              | 12%                       | 6%              | 11%             |
| <b>4.5i</b>  | Getting phone numbers?  | 31%             | 33%                       | 31%             | 26%             |
| When you first arrived, were you given any of the following:                                   |   |                 |                           |                 |                 |
| <b>4.6a</b>  | Toiletries/basic items?   | 81%             | 85%                       | 81%             |                 |
| <b>4.6b</b>  | The opportunity to have a shower?   | 44%             | 36%                       | 44%             | 49%             |
| <b>4.6c</b>  | Something to eat?   | 79%             | 80%                       | 79%             | 80%             |
| <b>4.6d</b>  | A free phone call to friends/family?  | 76%             | 73%                       | 76%             | 84%             |
| <b>4.6e</b>  | PIN phone credit?   | 58%             | 47%                       | 58%             |                 |
| <b>4.6f</b>  | Information about feeling worried/upset?  | 35%             | 33%                       | 35%             |                 |
| Within your first 24 hours, did you have access to the following people or services:           |   |                 |                           |                 |                 |
| <b>4.7a</b>  | A chaplain?   | 41%             | 46%                       | 41%             | 23%             |
| <b>4.7b</b>  | A peer mentor?  | 10%             | 9%                        | 10%             |                 |
| <b>4.7c</b>  | Childline/Samaritans  | 10%             | 28%                       | 10%             |                 |
| <b>4.7d</b>  | The prison shop/canteen?  | 7%              | 16%                       | 7%              | 12%             |
| <b>4.8</b>   | Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?                                  | 80%             | 69%                       | 80%             | 89%             |
| <b>4.9</b>   | Did you feel safe on your first night here?   | 76%             | 78%                       | 76%             | 82%             |
| <b>4.10</b>  | For those who have been on an induction course: did it cover everything you needed to know about the establishment? | 48%             | 65%                       | 48%             | 59%             |

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

Key to tables

|   |  | 2012 Werrington | Young people's comparator | Werrington 2012 | Werrington 2011 |
|---|--|-----------------|---------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|   | 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>112</b>      | <b>807</b>                | <b>112</b>      | <b>107</b>      |
| <b>SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT</b>                |  |                 |                           |                 |                 |
| 5.1   | Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?   | 36%             | 72%                       | 36%             | 53%             |
| 5.2   | Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?  | 26%             | 40%                       | 26%             | 20%             |
| 5.3   | Do you find the food here good/very good?  | 10%             | 19%                       | 10%             | 22%             |
| 5.4   | Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?  | 45%             | 45%                       | 45%             | 42%             |
| 5.5   | Is it easy/very easy for you to attend religious services?   | 61%             | 57%                       | 61%             | 47%             |
| 5.6   | Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?  | 57%             | 57%                       | 57%             | 46%             |
| Can you speak to:                                       |  |                 |                           |                 |                 |
| 5.7   | A Chaplain of your faith in private?   | 61%             | 68%                       | 61%             | 55%             |
| 5.8   | A peer mentor?   | 26%             | 43%                       | 26%             |                 |
| 5.9   | A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?  | 17%             | 26%                       | 17%             | 25%             |
| 5.10  | An advocate (an outside person to help you)?   | 41%             | 35%                       | 41%             | 36%             |
| <b>SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF</b>              |  |                 |                           |                 |                 |
| 6.1   | Do most staff treat you with respect?  | 68%             | 65%                       | 68%             | 60%             |
| 6.2   | If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?  | 29%             | 16%                       | 29%             |                 |
| 6.3   | Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?                     | 30%             | 36%                       | 30%             | 39%             |
| For those who have met their personal officer:          |  |                 |                           |                 |                 |
| 6.4   | Did you meet your personal (named) officer within the first week?  | 43%             | 47%                       | 43%             | 45%             |
| 6.5   | Do you see your personal (named) officer at least once a week?   | 52%             | 61%                       | 52%             | 35%             |
| 6.6   | Do you feel your personal (named) officer tries to help you?   | 54%             | 82%                       | 54%             |                 |
| <b>SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS</b>           |  |                 |                           |                 |                 |
| 7.1   | Is it easy to make an application?   | 80%             | 77%                       | 80%             | 71%             |
| For those who have made an application:                 |  |                 |                           |                 |                 |
| 7.2   | Do you feel applications are sorted out fairly?  | 57%             | 69%                       | 57%             | 72%             |
| 7.3   | Do you feel applications are sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?   | 57%             | 61%                       | 57%             | 68%             |
| 7.4   | Is it easy to make a complaint?  | 47%             | 62%                       | 47%             | 63%             |
| For those who have made a complaint:                    |  |                 |                           |                 |                 |
| 7.5   | Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?  | 26%             | 35%                       | 26%             | 46%             |
| 7.6   | Do you feel complaints are sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?   | 29%             | 42%                       | 29%             | 43%             |
| 7.7   | Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint?  | 9%              | 11%                       | 9%              |                 |
| <b>SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE</b> |  |                 |                           |                 |                 |
| 8.1   | Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?  | 29%             | 28%                       | 29%             | 29%             |
| 8.2   | Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?                                    | 46%             | 46%                       | 46%             | 47%             |
| 8.3   | Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?  | 48%             | 51%                       | 48%             | 53%             |
| 8.4   | Have you had a minor report since you have been here?  | 48%             | 51%                       | 48%             |                 |
| For those who have had a minor report:                  |  |                 |                           |                 |                 |
| 8.5   | Was the process explained clearly to you?  | 68%             | 72%                       | 68%             |                 |

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

### Key to tables

|   |  | 2012 Werrington | Young people's comparator | Werrington 2012 | Werrington 2011 |
|---|--|-----------------|---------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|   | 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>  |  | 112             | 807                       | 112             | 107             |
| <b>8.6</b>  | Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?                                       | 57%             | 60%                       | 57%             | 57%             |
| For those who have had an adjudication ('nicking'): |  |                 |                           |                 |                 |
| <b>8.7</b>  | Was the process explained clearly to you?  | 83%             | 84%                       | 83%             | 74%             |
| <b>8.8</b>  | Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?                                  | 21%             | 37%                       | 21%             | 29%             |
| <b>8.9</b>  | For those who had spent a night in the care and separation unit: did the staff treat you well/very well? | 35%             | 43%                       | 35%             | 54%             |
| <b>SECTION 9: SAFETY</b>                            |  |                 |                           |                 |                 |
| <b>9.1</b>  | Have you ever felt unsafe here?  | 27%             | 31%                       | 27%             | 30%             |
| <b>9.2</b>  | Do you feel unsafe now?  | 12%             | 6%                        | 12%             |                 |
| <b>9.4</b>  | Have you ever been victimised by other young people here?  | 25%             | 24%                       | 25%             | 31%             |
| Since you have been here, have other young people:  |  |                 |                           |                 |                 |
| <b>9.5a</b>   | Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?  | 12%             | 15%                       | 12%             | 17%             |
| <b>9.5b</b>   | Hit, kicked or assaulted you?  | 11%             | 11%                       | 11%             | 11%             |
| <b>9.5c</b>   | Sexually abused you?   | 1%              | 1%                        | 1%              | 2%              |
| <b>9.5d</b>   | Threatened or intimidated you?   | 10%             | 2%                        | 10%             |                 |
| <b>9.5e</b>   | Taken your canteen/property?   | 6%              | 6%                        | 6%              | 8%              |
| <b>9.5f</b>   | Victimised you because of medication?  | 2%              | 0%                        | 2%              |                 |
| <b>9.5g</b>   | Victimised you because of debt?  | 4%              | 0%                        | 4%              |                 |
| <b>9.5h</b>   | Victimised you because of drugs?   | 2%              | 2%                        | 2%              | 4%              |
| <b>9.5i</b>   | Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?  | 3%              | 4%                        | 3%              | 4%              |
| <b>9.5j</b>   | Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?   | 3%              | 2%                        | 3%              | 2%              |
| <b>9.5k</b>   | Victimised you because of your nationality?  | 4%              | 0%                        | 4%              |                 |
| <b>9.5l</b>   | Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?                                    | 4%              | 4%                        | 4%              | 8%              |
| <b>9.5m</b>   | Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?   | 3%              | 0%                        | 3%              |                 |
| <b>9.5n</b>   | Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?   | 1%              | 0%                        | 1%              |                 |
| <b>9.5o</b>   | Victimised you because of your age?  | 2%              | 0%                        | 2%              |                 |
| <b>9.5p</b>   | Victimised you because you have a disability?  | 3%              | 1%                        | 3%              | 3%              |
| <b>9.5q</b>   | Victimised you because you were new here?  | 10%             | 9%                        | 10%             | 12%             |
| <b>9.5r</b>   | Victimised you because of your offence/crime?  | 1%              | 3%                        | 1%              | 5%              |
| <b>9.5s</b>   | Victimised you because of gang related issues?   | 5%              | 4%                        | 5%              | 9%              |
| <b>9.7</b>  | Have you ever been victimised by a member of staff here?   | 23%             | 22%                       | 23%             | 28%             |
| Since you have been here, have staff:               |  |                 |                           |                 |                 |
| <b>9.8a</b>   | Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?  | 11%             | 13%                       | 11%             | 17%             |
| <b>9.8b</b>   | Hit, kicked or assaulted you?  | 3%              | 4%                        | 3%              | 1%              |
| <b>9.8c</b>   | Sexually abused you?   | 2%              | 1%                        | 2%              | 2%              |
| <b>9.8d</b>   | Threatened or intimidated you?   | 4%              | 11%                       | 4%              |                 |
| <b>9.8e</b>   | Taken your canteen/property?   | 4%              | 3%                        | 4%              | 2%              |
| <b>9.8f</b>   | Victimised you because of medication?  | 2%              | 0%                        | 2%              |                 |

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

### Key to tables

|  |  | 2012 Werrington | Young people's comparator | Werrington 2012 | Werrington 2011 |
|--|--|-----------------|---------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|  | 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>112</b>      | <b>807</b>                | <b>112</b>      | <b>107</b>      |
| <b>9.8g</b>  | Victimised you because of debt?  | 1%              | 0%                        | 1%              |                 |
| <b>9.8h</b>  | Victimised you because of drugs?   | 1%              | 2%                        | 1%              | 2%              |
| <b>9.8i</b>  | Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?  | 3%              | 4%                        | 3%              | 6%              |
| <b>9.8j</b>  | Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?   | 2%              | 2%                        | 2%              | 3%              |
| <b>9.8k</b>  | Victimised you because of your nationality?  | 2%              | 0%                        | 2%              |                 |
| <b>9.8k</b>  | Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?                                    | 2%              | 3%                        | 2%              | 2%              |
| <b>9.8m</b>  | Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?   | 1%              | 0%                        | 1%              |                 |
| <b>9.8n</b>  | Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?   | 0%              | 0%                        | 0%              |                 |
| <b>9.8o</b>  | Victimised you because of your age?  | 1%              | 0%                        | 1%              |                 |
| <b>9.8p</b>  | Victimised you because you have a disability?  | 2%              | 1%                        | 2%              | 1%              |
| <b>9.8q</b>  | Victimised you because you were new here?  | 2%              | 4%                        | 2%              | 5%              |
| <b>9.8r</b>  | Victimised you because of your offence/crime?  | 3%              | 3%                        | 3%              | 1%              |
| <b>9.8s</b>  | Victimised you because of gang related issues?   | 0%              | 1%                        | 0%              | 2%              |
| <b>9.8t</b>  | Victimised you because you made a complaint?   | 7%              | 11%                       | 7%              |                 |
| <b>9.10</b>  | If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?  | 17%             | 50%                       | 17%             |                 |
| <b>9.11</b>  | Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?                     | 30%             | 29%                       | 30%             | 27%             |
| <b>9.12</b>  | Is shouting through the windows a problem here?  | 40%             | 40%                       | 40%             | 41%             |
| <b>SECTION 10: HEALTH SERVICES</b>                 |  |                 |                           |                 |                 |
| <b>10.1a</b>                                       | Is it easy for you to see the doctor?  | 70%             | 53%                       | 70%             | 60%             |
| <b>10.1b</b>                                       | Is it easy for you to see the nurse?   | 88%             | 73%                       | 88%             | 87%             |
| <b>10.1c</b>                                       | Is it easy for you to see the dentist?   | 36%             | 33%                       | 36%             | 32%             |
| <b>10.2</b>  | For those who have been to health services: do you think the overall quality is good/very good?          | 67%             | 61%                       | 67%             | 81%             |
| <b>10.3</b>  | If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/all of it in your cell?                       | 63%             | 13%                       | 63%             |                 |
| <b>10.4</b>  | Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?   | 18%             | 27%                       | 18%             | 20%             |
| <b>10.5</b>  | If you have emotional or mental health problems, are you being helped by anyone here?                    | 35%             | 50%                       | 35%             | 24%             |
| <b>10.6</b>  | Did you have any problems with alcohol when you first arrived?   | 10%             | 13%                       | 10%             | 12%             |
| <b>10.7</b>  | Have you received any help with any alcohol problems here?   | 7%              | 5%                        | 7%              | 6%              |
| <b>10.8</b>  | Did you have any problems with drugs when you first arrived?   | 32%             | 35%                       | 32%             | 33%             |
| <b>10.9</b>  | Do you have a problem with drugs now?  | 6%              | 8%                        | 6%              | 12%             |
| <b>10.10</b>                                       | Have you received any help with any drug problems here?  | 21%             | 21%                       | 21%             | 14%             |
| <b>10.11</b>                                       | Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs here?  | 15%             | 17%                       | 15%             | 19%             |
| <b>SECTION 11: ACTIVITIES</b>                      |  |                 |                           |                 |                 |
| <b>11.1</b>  | Were you 14 or younger when you were last at school?   | 35%             | 35%                       | 35%             | 40%             |
| <b>11.2</b>  | Have you ever been excluded from school?   | 87%             | 88%                       | 87%             | 92%             |
| <b>11.3</b>  | Did you ever skip school before you came into custody?   | 71%             | 83%                       | 71%             |                 |

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

### Key to tables

|  |  | 2012 Werrington | Young people's comparator | Werrington 2012 | Werrington 2011 |
|--|--|-----------------|---------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|  | 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>112</b>      | <b>807</b>                | <b>112</b>      | <b>107</b>      |
| Do you currently take part in any of the following:  |  |                 |                           |                 |                 |
| <b>11.4a</b>   | Education?   | 62%             | 81%                       | 62%             | 75%             |
| <b>11.4b</b>   | A job in this establishment?   | 26%             | 31%                       | 26%             | 25%             |
| <b>11.4c</b>   | Vocational or skills training?   | 16%             | 21%                       | 16%             | 24%             |
| <b>11.4d</b>   | Offending behaviour programmes?  | 22%             | 24%                       | 22%             | 18%             |
| <b>11.4e</b>   | Nothing  | 12%             | 10%                       | 12%             | 9%              |
| For those who have taken part in the following activities while in this establishment: do you think that they will help you when you leave prison? |  |                 |                           |                 |                 |
| <b>11.5a</b>   | Education?   | 61%             | 65%                       | 61%             | 69%             |
| <b>11.5b</b>   | A job in this establishment?   | 52%             | 52%                       | 52%             | 46%             |
| <b>11.5c</b>   | Vocational or skills training?   | 42%             | 53%                       | 42%             | 49%             |
| <b>11.5d</b>   | Offending behaviour programmes?  | 55%             | 49%                       | 55%             | 49%             |
| <b>11.6</b>  | Do you usually have association every day?   | 69%             | 72%                       | 69%             | 66%             |
| <b>11.7</b>  | Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?   | 5%              | 50%                       | 5%              | 0%              |
| <b>11.8</b>  | Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?   | 1%              | 10%                       | 1%              | 5%              |
| <b>SECTION 12: KEEPING IN TOUCH WITH FAMILY AND FRIENDS</b>  |  |                 |                           |                 |                 |
| <b>12.1</b>  | Are you able to use the telephone every day?   | 46%             | 67%                       | 46%             | 52%             |
| <b>12.2</b>  | Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?                                  | 37%             | 43%                       | 37%             | 36%             |
| <b>12.3</b>  | Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?                                 | 29%             | 36%                       | 29%             | 38%             |
| <b>12.4</b>  | Is it easy/very easy for your family and friends to visit you here?                                      | 32%             | 47%                       | 32%             |                 |
| <b>12.5</b>  | Do your visits start on time?  | 36%             | 43%                       | 36%             | 31%             |
| <b>SECTION 13: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE</b>   |  |                 |                           |                 |                 |
| Do you think you will have a problem with the following, when you are released:  |  |                 |                           |                 |                 |
| <b>13.1a</b>   | Finding accommodation?   | 23%             | 26%                       | 23%             | 23%             |
| <b>13.1b</b>   | Getting into school or college?  | 29%             | 31%                       | 29%             | 25%             |
| <b>13.1c</b>   | Getting a job?   | 56%             | 51%                       | 56%             | 46%             |
| <b>13.1d</b>   | Money/finances?  | 40%             | 43%                       | 40%             | 37%             |
| <b>13.1e</b>   | Claiming benefits?   | 21%             | 29%                       | 21%             | 20%             |
| <b>13.1f</b>   | Continuing health services?  | 12%             | 12%                       | 12%             | 13%             |
| <b>13.1g</b>   | Opening a bank account?  | 13%             | 19%                       | 13%             | 13%             |
| <b>13.1h</b>   | Avoiding bad relationships?  | 19%             | 19%                       | 19%             | 17%             |
| <b>13.2</b>  | Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?   | 47%             | 64%                       | 47%             |                 |
| For those with a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan:  |  |                 |                           |                 |                 |
| <b>13.3</b>  | Were you involved in the development of your plan?   | 84%             | 100%                      | 84%             |                 |
| <b>13.4</b>  | Do you understand the targets set in your plan?  | 96%             | 100%                      | 96%             |                 |
| <b>13.5</b>  | Do you have a caseworker here?   | 90%             | 82%                       | 90%             |                 |
| <b>13.6</b>  | Has your caseworker helped to prepare you for release?   | 48%             | 89%                       | 48%             |                 |

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

**Key to tables**

|   |   | 2012 Werrington | Young people's comparator | Werrington 2012 | Werrington 2011 |
|---|---|-----------------|---------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|   | 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>112</b>      | <b>807</b>                | <b>112</b>      | <b>107</b>      |
| For those with a social worker:   |   |                 |                           |                 |                 |
| <b>13.7</b>   | Has your social worker been to visit you since you have been here?  | <b>57%</b>      | <b>65%</b>                | <b>29%</b>      |                 |
| <b>13.8</b>   | Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?  | <b>35%</b>      | <b>39%</b>                | <b>35%</b>      | <b>43%</b>      |
| If you have a problem with any of the following, do you know who to ask for help? |   |                 |                           |                 |                 |
| <b>13.9a</b>  | Finding accommodation   | <b>19%</b>      | <b>38%</b>                | <b>19%</b>      | <b>24%</b>      |
| <b>13.9b</b>  | Getting into school or college  | <b>21%</b>      | <b>45%</b>                | <b>21%</b>      | <b>43%</b>      |
| <b>13.9c</b>  | Getting a job   | <b>26%</b>      | <b>41%</b>                | <b>26%</b>      | <b>41%</b>      |
| <b>13.9d</b>  | Help with money/finances  | <b>17%</b>      | <b>33%</b>                | <b>17%</b>      | <b>31%</b>      |
| <b>13.9e</b>  | Help with claiming benefits   | <b>9%</b>       | <b>28%</b>                | <b>9%</b>       | <b>17%</b>      |
| <b>13.9f</b>  | Continuing health services  | <b>12%</b>      | <b>21%</b>                | <b>12%</b>      | <b>16%</b>      |
| <b>13.9g</b>  | Opening a bank account  | <b>13%</b>      | <b>29%</b>                | <b>13%</b>      | <b>29%</b>      |
| <b>13.9h</b>  | Avoiding bad relationships  | <b>13%</b>      | <b>24%</b>                | <b>13%</b>      | <b>20%</b>      |
| For those who were sentenced:   |   |                 |                           |                 |                 |
| <b>13.11</b>  | Do you want to stop offending?  | <b>88%</b>      | <b>89%</b>                | <b>88%</b>      | <b>89%</b>      |
| <b>13.12</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>52%</b>      | <b>46%</b>                | <b>52%</b>      | <b>51%</b>      |

# Children and Young People: Diversity Analysis



## Key question responses (ethnicity/religion) HMYOI Werrington 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>52</b>                              | <b>59</b>          | <b>20</b>           | <b>89</b>               |
| 1.2  | Are you a foreign national?   | 12%                                    | 0%                 | 9%                  | 5%                      |
| 1.3  | Do you understand spoken English?   | 92%                                    | 100%               | 96%                 | 96%                     |
| 1.4  | Do you understand written English?  | 90%                                    | 100%               | 96%                 | 95%                     |
| 1.5  | Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)? |  |                    | 96%                 | 37%                     |
| 1.6  | Are you Muslim?   | 37%                                    | 2%                 |                     |                         |
| 1.5  | Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?  | 0%                                     | 10%                | 0%                  | 6%                      |
| 1.9  | Do you consider yourself to have a disability?  | 12%                                    | 22%                | 5%                  | 19%                     |
| 1.10   | Have you ever been in local authority care?   | 14%                                    | 33%                | 21%                 | 27%                     |
| 2.1  | Are you sentenced?  | 73%                                    | 79%                | 75%                 | 77%                     |
| 2.4  | Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?                                    | 68%                                    | 41%                | 65%                 | 51%                     |
| 3.2  | Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?   | 40%                                    | 39%                | 46%                 | 37%                     |
| 3.6  | Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?  | 60%                                    | 39%                | 46%                 | 50%                     |
| 3.7  | Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?                                  | 21%                                    | 24%                | 17%                 | 24%                     |
| 4.2  | When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?   | 77%                                    | 84%                | 91%                 | 80%                     |
| 4.3  | Were you treated well/very well in reception?   | 66%                                    | 78%                | 71%                 | 74%                     |
| 4.8  | Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?  | 80%                                    | 79%                | 71%                 | 81%                     |
| 4.9  | Did you feel safe on your first night here?   | 76%                                    | 75%                | 68%                 | 78%                     |
| 5.1  | Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?  | 33%                                    | 37%                | 22%                 | 39%                     |
| 5.2  | Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?   | 29%                                    | 22%                | 32%                 | 25%                     |
| 5.3  | Do you find the food here good/very good?   | 11%                                    | 10%                | 5%                  | 12%                     |
| 5.4  | Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?   | 36%                                    | 52%                | 32%                 | 49%                     |
| 5.6  | Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?   | 76%                                    | 41%                | 91%                 | 49%                     |



## Children and Young People: Diversity Analysis

### Key to tables

| Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better  |   | Black and minority ethnic young people | White young people | Muslim young people | Non-Muslim young people |
|--|---|--|--------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse  |   |  |                    |                     |                         |
| Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details |   |  |                    |                     |                         |
| Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference                            |   |  |                    |                     |                         |
| <b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>   |   | <b>52</b>                              | <b>59</b>          | <b>20</b>           | <b>89</b>               |
| Can you speak to:  |   |  |                    |                     |                         |
| 5.7  | A chaplain of your faith in private?                                    | 63%                                    | 60%                | 68%                 | 59%                     |
| 5.8  | A peer mentor?  | 20%                                    | 31%                | 25%                 | 28%                     |
| 5.9  | A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?                     | 20%                                    | 16%                | 29%                 | 15%                     |
| 5.10   | An advocate (an outside person to help you)?                            | 37%                                    | 45%                | 32%                 | 44%                     |
| 6.1  | Do most staff treat you with respect?                                   | 61%                                    | 72%                | 52%                 | 72%                     |
| 6.2  | If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?                 | 22%                                    | 36%                | 22%                 | 30%                     |
| 7.1  | Is it easy to make an application?                                      | 78%                                    | 82%                | 67%                 | 83%                     |
| 7.4  | Is it easy to make a complaint?   | 50%                                    | 46%                | 41%                 | 50%                     |
| 8.1  | Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?               | 24%                                    | 32%                | 26%                 | 30%                     |
| 8.2  | Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?   | 46%                                    | 45%                | 41%                 | 48%                     |
| 8.3  | Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?                 | 38%                                    | 55%                | 32%                 | 53%                     |
| 8.4  | Have you had a minor report since you have been here?                   | 46%                                    | 49%                | 38%                 | 50%                     |
| 8.6  | Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?      | 57%                                    | 56%                | 57%                 | 55%                     |
| 8.8  | Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here? | 25%                                    | 18%                | 10%                 | 21%                     |
| 9.1  | Have you ever felt unsafe here?   | 24%                                    | 30%                | 38%                 | 24%                     |
| 9.2  | Do you feel unsafe now?   | 13%                                    | 12%                | 10%                 | 12%                     |
| 9.4  | Have you been victimised by other young people here?                    | 21%                                    | 29%                | 23%                 | 24%                     |
| Since you have been here, have other young people:   |   |  |                    |                     |                         |
| 9.5d   | Threatened or intimidated you?  | 7%                                     | 12%                | 18%                 | 7%                      |
| 9.5i   | Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?                   | 2%                                     | 3%                 | 5%                  | 1%                      |
| 9.5j   | Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?              | 2%                                     | 3%                 | 10%                 | 1%                      |
| 9.5k   | Victimised you because of your nationality?                             | 2%                                     | 6%                 | 5%                  | 4%                      |
| 9.5p   | Victimised you because you have a disability?                           | 0%                                     | 6%                 | 0%                  | 2%                      |
| 9.7  | Have you been victimised by staff here?                                 | 27%                                    | 20%                | 43%                 | 17%                     |

## 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>52</b>                              | <b>59</b>          | <b>20</b>           | <b>89</b>               |
| Since you have been here, have staff:               |  |  |                    |                     |                         |
| <b>9.8d</b>   | Threatened or intimidated you?   | 4%                                     | 3%                 | 5%                  | 1%                      |
| <b>9.8i</b>   | Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?  | 2%                                     | 3%                 | 5%                  | 2%                      |
| <b>9.8j</b>   | Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?   | 0%                                     | 3%                 | 0%                  | 2%                      |
| <b>9.8k</b>   | Victimised you because of your nationality?  | 2%                                     | 2%                 | 5%                  | 1%                      |
| <b>9.8p</b>   | Victimised you because you have a disability?  | 0%                                     | 3%                 | 0%                  | 1%                      |
| <b>9.10</b>   | If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?  | 11%                                    | 24%                | 6%                  | 20%                     |
| <b>9.11</b>   | Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?                     | 21%                                    | 38%                | 26%                 | 32%                     |
| <b>10.1a</b>  | Is it easy/very easy for you to see the doctor?  | 61%                                    | 77%                | 62%                 | 74%                     |
| <b>10.1b</b>  | Is it easy/very easy for you to see the nurse?   | 85%                                    | 91%                | 81%                 | 89%                     |
| <b>10.4</b>   | Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?  | 16%                                    | 21%                | 23%                 | 18%                     |
| Do you currently take part in any of the following: |  |  |                    |                     |                         |
| <b>11.4a</b>  | Education?   | 76%                                    | 49%                | 67%                 | 59%                     |
| <b>11.4b</b>  | A job in this establishment?   | 19%                                    | 32%                | 23%                 | 27%                     |
| <b>11.4c</b>  | Vocational or skills training?   | 9%                                     | 23%                | 18%                 | 15%                     |
| <b>11.4d</b>  | Offending behaviour programmes?  | 16%                                    | 27%                | 23%                 | 24%                     |
| <b>11.4e</b>  | Nothing?   | 9%                                     | 17%                | 10%                 | 13%                     |
| <b>11.6</b>   | Do you usually have association everyday?  | 66%                                    | 72%                | 50%                 | 73%                     |
| <b>11.7</b>   | Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?   | 4%                                     | 6%                 | 0%                  | 6%                      |
| <b>11.8</b>   | Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?   | 0%                                     | 2%                 | 0%                  | 1%                      |
| <b>12.1</b>   | Are you able to use the telephone every day?   | 35%                                    | 53%                | 29%                 | 50%                     |
| <b>12.2</b>   | Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?                                  | 44%                                    | 32%                | 43%                 | 34%                     |
| <b>12.3</b>   | Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?                                 | 33%                                    | 24%                | 25%                 | 31%                     |
| <b>13.2</b>   | Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?   | 50%                                    | 42%                | 42%                 | 48%                     |
| <b>13.8</b>   | Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?                                     | 33%                                    | 38%                | 30%                 | 38%                     |

## Diversity Analysis - Disability



### Key question responses (disability analysis) HMYOI Werrington 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   | <b>Consider themselves to have a disability</b> | <b>Do not consider themselves to have a disability</b> |
|  | Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse   |   |  |
|  | Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details                          |   |  |
|  | Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference   |   |  |
| <b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b> |   | <b>19</b>                                       | <b>90</b>  |
| 1.2  | Are you a foreign national?   | 0%  | 7%   |
| 1.3  | Do you understand spoken English?   | 100%  | 95%  |
| 1.4  | Do you understand written English?  | 100%  | 94%  |
| 1.5  | Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)? | 32%   | 51%  |
| 1.6  | Are you Muslim?   | 5%  | 20%  |
| 1.5  | Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?  | 18%   | 2%   |
| 1.10   | Have you ever been in local authority care?   | 22%   | 25%  |
| 2.1  | Are you sentenced?  | 64%   | 79%  |
| 2.4  | Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?                                    | 26%   | 61%  |
| 3.2  | Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?   | 36%   | 40%  |
| 3.6  | Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?  | 41%   | 48%  |
| 3.7  | Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?                                  | 22%   | 20%  |
| 4.2  | When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?   | 83%   | 80%  |
| 4.3  | Were you treated well/very well in reception?   | 83%   | 69%  |
| 4.8  | Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?  | 78%   | 80%  |
| 4.9  | Did you feel safe on your first night here?   | 62%   | 79%  |
| 5.1  | Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?  | 32%   | 38%  |
| 5.2  | Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?   | 9%  | 30%  |
| 5.3  | Do you find the food here good/very good?   | 10%   | 11%  |
| 5.4  | Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?   | 41%   | 47%  |
| 5.6  | Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?   | 38%   | 60%  |

## Diversity Analysis - Disability

### Key to tables

|  |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
|  | Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better  | <b>Consider themselves to have a disability</b> | <b>Do not consider themselves to have a disability</b> |
|  | Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse  |   |  |
|  | Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details |   |  |
|  | Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference                            |   |  |
| Can you speak to:                                  |  |   |  |
| <b>5.7</b>   | A chaplain of your faith in private?   | 59%   | 61%  |
| <b>5.8</b>   | A peer mentor?   | 23%   | 27%  |
| <b>5.9</b>   | A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?  | 22%   | 15%  |
| <b>5.10</b>  | An advocate (an outside person to help you)?   | 52%   | 38%  |
| <b>6.1</b>   | Do most staff treat you with respect?  | 67%   | 67%  |
| <b>6.2</b>   | If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?  | 48%   | 26%  |
| <b>7.1</b>   | Is it easy to make an application?   | 77%   | 80%  |
| <b>7.4</b>   | Is it easy to make a complaint?  | 48%   | 46%  |
| <b>8.1</b>   | Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?  | 17%   | 31%  |
| <b>8.2</b>   | Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?                                    | 48%   | 47%  |
| <b>8.3</b>   | Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?  | 29%   | 51%  |
| <b>8.4</b>   | Have you had a minor report since you have been here?  | 68%   | 41%  |
| <b>8.6</b>   | Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?                                       | 64%   | 54%  |
| <b>8.8</b>   | Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?                                  | 36%   | 17%  |
| <b>9.1</b>   | Have you ever felt unsafe here?  | 43%   | 24%  |
| <b>9.2</b>   | Do you feel unsafe now?  | 18%   | 11%  |
| <b>9.4</b>   | Have you been victimised by other young people here?   | 43%   | 21%  |
| Since you have been here, have other young people: |  |   |  |
| <b>9.5d</b>  | Threatened or intimidated you?   | 29%   | 6%   |
| <b>9.5i</b>  | Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?  | 10%   | 1%   |
| <b>9.5j</b>  | Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?   | 5%  | 2%   |
| <b>9.5k</b>  | Victimised you because of your nationality?  | 18%   | 1%   |
| <b>9.5p</b>  | Victimised you because you have a disability?  | 18%   | 0%   |
| <b>9.7</b>   | Have you been victimised by staff here?  | 41%   | 19%  |

## Diversity Analysis - Disability

### Key to tables

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
|   | Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better  | <b>Consider themselves to have a disability</b> | <b>Do not consider themselves to have a disability</b> |
|   | Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse  |   |  |
|   | Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details |   |  |
|   | Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference                            |   |  |
| Since you have been here, have staff:               |  |   |  |
| <b>9.8d</b>   | Threatened or intimidated you?   | 9%  | 2%   |
| <b>9.8i</b>   | Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?  | 5%  | 2%   |
| <b>9.8j</b>   | Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?   | 9%  | 0%   |
| <b>9.8k</b>   | Victimised you because of your nationality?  | 5%  | 1%   |
| <b>9.8p</b>   | Victimised you because you have a disability?  | 9%  | 0%   |
| <b>9.10</b>   | If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?  | 30%   | 15%  |
| <b>9.11</b>   | Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?                     | 19%   | 33%  |
| <b>10.1a</b>  | Is it easy/very easy for you to see the doctor?  | 59%   | 72%  |
| <b>10.1b</b>  | Is it easy/very easy for you to see the nurse?   | 90%   | 88%  |
| <b>10.4</b>   | Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?  | 43%   | 11%  |
| Do you currently take part in any of the following: |  |   |  |
| <b>11.4a</b>  | Education?   | 48%   | 66%  |
| <b>11.4b</b>  | A job in this establishment?   | 22%   | 26%  |
| <b>11.4c</b>  | Vocational or skills training?   | 26%   | 14%  |
| <b>11.4d</b>  | Offending behaviour programmes?  | 26%   | 22%  |
| <b>11.4e</b>  | Nothing?   | 22%   | 9%   |
| <b>11.6</b>   | Do you usually have association everyday?  | 60%   | 72%  |
| <b>11.7</b>   | Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?   | 0%  | 6%   |
| <b>11.8</b>   | Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?   | 0%  | 1%   |
| <b>12.1</b>   | Are you able to use the telephone every day?   | 25%   | 52%  |
| <b>12.2</b>   | Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?                                  | 33%   | 38%  |
| <b>12.3</b>   | Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?                                 | 9%  | 33%  |
| <b>13.2</b>   | Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?   | 32%   | 50%  |
| <b>13.8</b>   | Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?                                     | 36%   | 35%  |