

Report on an announced inspection of

HMP & YOI Parc

Young People's Unit

2 - 6 July 2012

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

Crown copyright 2012

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

Contents

	Introduction	5
	Fact page	7
	Healthy prison summary	9
1	Safety	19
<hr/>		
2	Respect	33
<hr/>		
3	Purposeful activity	47
<hr/>		
4	Resettlement	53
<hr/>		
5	Recommendations, housekeeping points and good practice	61
<hr/>		
	Appendices	
<hr/>		
	I Inspection team	67
	II Establishment population profile	68
	III Summary of children and young people questionnaires and interviews	71

Introduction

The Young People's Unit in HMP and YOI Parc is unusual in a number of respects. It is the only young offender institution (YOI) for children and young people - mostly 16 and 17 year olds - in Wales. It is part of the only privately run prison in Wales. In addition to children and young people, the establishment also holds adult males and young offenders. It is relatively small and one of the better YOIs for children and young people.

Just over 50 young people were held on the unit at the time of our inspection. Few of them told us they felt unsafe, and that appeared to be directly related to the size of the establishment. The small size was conducive to the good relationships between young people and staff that the young people told us about and we observed. These good relationships were reflected in the high proportion of young people who told us they had a member of staff they could turn to if they had a problem and who believed it would be taken seriously if they reported bullying. That was a well-founded view. Although the high use of separation was a concern, safety was underpinned by generally sound processes for dealing with bullying, poor behaviour and young people who were at risk of self harm.

In view of this generally good picture, it was frustrating that our positive assessment of safety was undermined by processes outside the unit's direct control. Young people were transported to HMP and YOI Parc in the same vehicle as adult prisoners. Worse, automatic strip-searching of all new arrivals had been reintroduced whether or not there was any individual intelligence to justify it.

Day-to-day life on the unit was generally harmonious. Young people from different parts of the country and from different backgrounds got on well together. Staff had appropriately high expectations of the young people but relationships were friendly and engaged. Most concerns were appropriately sorted out informally without resort to formal complaints or discipline processes. Health care was good. Young people complained about the food with some justification – it was too often monotonous, served lukewarm an hour after it had left the kitchens and portions appeared pretty small.

Most young people were out of their cells for more than 10 hours a day. Many of the young people had been very alienated from formal education and a significant number – two out of five - had learning difficulties. There was no speech and language therapy available, which was a significant omission. Nevertheless, the overall quality of education and training was good and the young people made good progress. However, lessons were too long for some of them. Some complained about being bored during association, and the unit could have done more to encourage young people to use their energy constructively once formal classes had ended. There were no opportunities to work in the unit, for instance. This was compounded by the reduced and now very limited opportunities for release on temporary licence (ROTL), which denied the young people the opportunity to gain real work experience, put something back into the community through projects and placements or progress resettlement plans.

Other arrangements to help young people prepare for release also needed attention. Almost two out five of the young people held had been looked-after by a local authority at some stage in their childhood, and unit caseworkers had to work hard to ensure that the relevant local authorities met their responsibilities. This might have been reflected in the relatively high number of young people who were released to bed and breakfast accommodation or who did not know where they would be staying until just before their release. Releasing a young person from a YOI into bed and breakfast accommodation is to give them a pretty certain return ticket. In other respects, resettlement provision was better. Young people were involved in making

plans for their future, and arrangements for visits and involving a young person's family were very good.

The young people's unit at HMP and YOI Parc compares well with similar establishments. It provides a safe and decent environment and generally prepares young people well for release. It is important that this facility is available in Wales for young people from Wales. However, the unit's potential would be increased by the removal of some disproportionate security measures imposed on it and a greater opportunity for young people to gain work experience through ROTL.

Nick Hardwick
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

September 2012

Fact page

Task of the establishment

HMP & YOI Parc is a category B prison which holds convicted adults serving over two years, including indeterminate sentences for public protection, convicted young offenders and convicted and remanded young people. Parc has an operational capacity of 1,474 prisoners, as follows:

Adult	775
Young offenders	280
Young people	64
Rule 45 Prisoners (adult)	335
Rule 45 Prisoners (YO)	20

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

Private - G4S Care and Justice Services

Region/Department

Parc is the only private prison and the only juvenile custodial establishment in Wales.

Number held in young people's unit

The average population for the second quarter of 2012 was 52. Fifty young people were held at the start of the inspection.

Certified normal accommodation

64

Operational capacity

64

Date of last full inspection

15 June 2009

Brief history

The young people's unit first opened as a remand unit in 2002 with a capacity of 28 beds and expanded to 36 beds with a mixture of remand and sentenced young people. In February 2007, the unit expanded to 64, again a mixture of remand and sentenced young people.

Short description of residential units

The young people's unit is separated into two wings, Echo (E) and Golf (G). G wing has 24 cells, 12 single and 12 double, and holds 36 young people. E wing has 22 cells, 16 single and six double, and holds 28 young people

Director

Janet Wallsgrove

Escort contractor

GeoAmey

Health service commissioner and providers

G4S Integrated Services

Learning and skills providers
G4S

Independent Monitoring Board chair
Jean Davies

Healthy prison summary

Introduction

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

HP2 All inspections carried out by HM Inspectorate of Prisons contribute to the UK's response to its international obligations under the Optional Protocol to the UN Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (OPCAT). OPCAT requires that all places of detention are visited regularly by independent bodies – known as the National Preventive Mechanism (NPM) – which monitor the treatment of and conditions for detainees. HM Inspectorate of Prisons is one of several bodies making up the NPM in the UK.

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

Safety	children and young people, particularly the most vulnerable, are held safely
Respect	children and young people are treated with respect for their human dignity
Purposeful activity	children and young people are able, and expected, to engage in activity that is likely to benefit them
Resettlement	children and young people are effectively helped to prepare for their release back into the community and 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 by the National Offender Management Service.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Safety

HP5 Young people were looked after well on admission. Early days procedures were thorough and young people found the induction process helpful. The reintroduction of routine strip-searching was a retrograde step. Safeguarding arrangements were efficient and child protection procedures were extremely well organised. Vulnerable young people were well cared for and staff took incidents of bullying seriously and dealt with them efficiently. The use of separation was high but this usually took place in the children and young people's unit and relatively few young people were held in the intensive support unit in the main part of the prison. Fights occurred regularly but young people told us they felt safe and the unit remained a reasonably safe place. Outcomes for young people against this healthy prison test were reasonably good.

HP6 Most young people did not experience long journeys to the prison and reported being content with their treatment on escort. Some young people spent lengthy periods in court following completion of their case, but this problem had not been quantified. Most young people did not receive any information about the unit prior to their arrival, although young people transferring out were notified in advance. More than half the young people travelled in vehicles with adult prisoners, which was significantly higher than the comparator and a concerning trend.¹

HP7 Staff treated young people with respect on arrival and tried to reassure them about what to expect in the unit. Initial interviews were thorough, but the written assessments did not always make reference to all the available background information. Young people's initial physical needs were adequately met.

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

- HP8 Routine strip-searching had been reinstated since the previous inspection in order to comply with a Prison Service Instruction. This was unnecessarily intrusive and a backward step.
- HP9 Significantly more young people than the comparator said they saw someone from health care on arrival and most young people said they felt safe on their first night.
- HP10 We received unusually positive feedback from young people about their experience of induction, which they described as relevant and interesting. The programme provided all the information young people needed in an accessible format.
- HP11 The concept of safeguarding was clearly understood by unit staff. All aspects of safeguarding were considered at operational and strategic meetings which were generally well attended. A wide range of safeguarding data was produced and the monitoring and trend analysis was effective.
- HP12 Daily briefings ensured that key staff were kept up to date with the circumstances of the most vulnerable and challenging young people.
- HP13 A number of different plans had been developed to address the needs of young people. This had created confusion and duplication, and streamlining was necessary. The standard of the ACCT (assessment, care in custody and teamwork) documents and supported living plans was consistently good, while the quality of other plans was variable.
- HP14 Most young people felt safe on the unit, which was reflected in our discussion groups and in our survey. Young people were given the opportunity to express their views about safety in the community forum.
- HP15 There was a comprehensive child protection policy, which had been written jointly with the local safeguarding children board. It contained clear guidance on how the establishment would respond to staff who reported inappropriate behaviour by colleagues.
- HP16 Staff had received training in child protection and understood their responsibilities in this area. Engagement between the establishment and the local authority was excellent. Child protection referrals were dealt with promptly and appropriately and, where necessary, the local authority convened strategy meetings. Child protection records were exemplary with rigorous oversight by the director, who ensured that actions were followed through.
- HP17 Our survey results indicated that there were low levels of victimisation across a range of indicators and high levels of confidence among young people that staff would take complaints of victimisation seriously. Staff were alert to signs of bullying and, when it was identified, community support plans were used for victims and alleged perpetrators. Young people were aware of these anti-bullying measures and appeared to have confidence in the way they were used.
- HP18 Young people at risk of suicide and self-harm continued to be well cared for. An analysis of work in this area had been undertaken the previous year which had identified areas for improvement. These were being addressed.

- HP19 Incidents of self-harm were minor and consisted mostly of scratching. The number of self-harm incidents was comparable to the previous year, at approximately five a month. Some prolific self-harmers had been held on the unit since the previous inspection and they had been well supported.
- HP20 A proportionate approach was adopted towards vulnerable young people and the threshold for opening ACCT documents was appropriate. Young people subject to ACCT procedures whom we spoke to said they felt supported and cared for.
- HP21 Young people had a good understanding of the rewards and sanctions scheme. Our survey indicated that young people felt the different levels made them change their behaviour. A relatively high proportion of young people were on the lowest level and attempts were being made to introduce greater differentiation.
- HP22 Apart from routine strip-searching, physical security measures were proportionate. Elements of dynamic security worked well and security information reports were used effectively. Intelligence-led strip-searching was appropriately authorised.
- HP23 A few young people were kept on the unit for education on the basis of risk of violence, but there were otherwise no restrictions on access to regime activities.
- HP24 Efforts were taken to make the adjudication process age appropriate. It was encouraging to see that increasing use had recently been made of minor reports. Restorative justice was used wherever possible to resolve disputes.
- HP25 There were four or five control and restraint incidents a month, most of which followed fights between young people. Governance of use of force was effective. Young people were debriefed following use of force, although records of debriefs lacked detail. The annual review of restraint carried out by the local authority helped to increase transparency.
- HP26 Planned removals were rare and, when they were carried out, they were filmed. Staff from the adult site occasionally carried out these removals which made the process less child focussed.
- HP27 A high number of young people experienced unit separation because of disruptive behaviour, and a few were unable to attend activities with their peer group. These sanctions had a significant impact but we recognised that staff were trying to find more effective ways of managing disruptive behaviour.
- HP28 Limited use had been made of the intensive support unit (ISU) over the previous year. The ISU provided a restricted regime and, apart from a short period of exercise, young people were locked up for most of the day.
- HP29 Drugs were not a serious issue in the unit. The illicit use of tobacco was acknowledged by staff and young people to be a much greater problem than the use of illegal drugs or diverted medication.

Respect

- HP30 Staff and young people interacted extremely well and treated each other with respect. The living conditions were reasonable. Young people enjoyed eating together but did not like the food. There were various constructive avenues open to young people who had complaints and they were well supported in pursuing their legal rights. Young people's religious needs were well catered for and progress was beginning to be made in developing work on diversity. The standard of health care had improved but there were still gaps in specialist provision. Outcomes for young people against this healthy prison test were good.
- HP31 The two young people's wings were clean and reasonably well maintained, although the shower areas needed refurbishment.
- HP32 The cells had no chairs or lockable cupboards and the toilets were inadequately screened. Shared cells were cramped and ventilation remained poor.
- HP33 Young people were able to have a shower every day and had good access to telephones, but there was little privacy for them to make calls.
- HP34 Managers expected staff to maintain high standards of behaviour towards young people and staff adopted a professional, helpful approach while maintaining appropriate boundaries. Inappropriate behaviour was challenged, although we overheard some homophobic comments which were not challenged by staff.
- HP35 Young people were encouraged to raise issues at consultation meetings which were subsequently followed through.
- HP36 Key workers introduced themselves to young people promptly following admission and maintained regular contact with them throughout their sentence.
- HP37 Staff and young people told us that life on the unit was harmonious and that young people from different ethnic backgrounds, regions and abilities coexisted reasonably well. Monitoring data did not provide evidence of any groups being disadvantaged on the unit. The whole-prison approach to diversity made it difficult to identify distinctive issues on the unit. Unit-specific policies had recently been introduced which was likely to help.
- HP38 Staff diversity representatives were enthusiastic about their role but the young people who were diversity representatives needed more help to allow them to carry out their responsibilities effectively.
- HP39 Young people with disabilities had care plans to address their needs, but not all staff were aware of this.
- HP40 Major cultural events were celebrated and there were adequate arrangements in place for young people who wanted to speak Welsh.
- HP41 All young people were seen shortly after their arrival by a member of the chaplaincy team, and chaplains continued to visit vulnerable young people regularly. Attendance at formal religious ceremonies was low, but young people were free to participate in

services and our survey indicated that most young people had access to a chaplain of their own faith.

- HP42 Pastoral care and bereavement support were excellent.
- HP43 It was easy for young people to make complaints but few chose to do so formally. Many contentious issues between staff and young people were resolved informally. Support from advocates was available for young people who wanted to make a complaint and young people were routinely consulted about their views at the community forum.
- HP44 Young people were given clear information on admission about their legal rights and caseworkers ensured that they had access to independent legal advice where necessary. Specialist help was provided to young people who needed to make bail applications.
- HP45 Young people spoke positively about their experience of health care services. The standard of primary and secondary care was good and young people's access to nurses and doctors was very good. The provision of dedicated unit nurses was appreciated by young people. Young people were given health care appointments when no adult prisoners were present. Health care beds for young people were located on the adult site, which was not an ideal environment, but they were rarely used.
- HP46 Individual support was available for young people with common mental health problems and specialist support was provided by the child and adolescent mental health service for young people with more complex needs. There was no clinical psychology or speech and language therapy provision.
- HP47 Our survey showed that young people did not like the food and this was reinforced consistently in our discussion groups. Hot food was served over an hour after it had left the kitchen and we found evidence of food being served below the minimum temperature, which required immediate attention. Some of the food that we tasted was lukewarm and, while the quality was adequate, some portions were quite small.

Purposeful activity

HP48 Most young people received ample time out of their cells, but they often became bored. Their educational needs were assessed thoroughly and classroom work was well planned. Attendance and attainment in class were good and the standard of teaching was high. There were still problems in young people arriving at class on time. Lessons were too long, but teachers organised breaks to mitigate this. Some young people had the chance to participate in simulated work experience, the library was now better resourced and young people received sufficient access to PE. Outcomes for young people against this healthy prison test were good.

HP49 Most young people had more than 10 hours out of their cell every day, which was an improvement from our previous inspection. However, the few young people placed on separation who were also not receiving group education could receive as little as 75 minutes unlocked each day.

- HP50 We found few young people on the wings during our roll checks. There were no cancellations to the regime. Clothing was now provided to allow young people to exercise during inclement weather.
- HP51 Association was well supervised and staff engaged well with young people. There were few activities for young people in the evenings and at weekends and they complained of boredom during these periods.
- HP52 Initial assessments of young people's interests, abilities and learning needs were good and were used for planning purposes. The quality of teaching was good and the curriculum was balanced and relevant. Young people participated well in class and few were excluded. Nearly all young people attended classes, and sessions were provided by education staff on the wing if they were unable to do so, so that they did not fall behind.
- HP53 Attainment was good and most young people made progress in class. Staff used individual learning plans effectively to help young people participate in planning their education. Good use was made of learning support assistants and peer mentors.
- HP54 Young people complained to us about the length of lessons, although teachers were now introducing breaks. Effective provision was made for young people who had difficulty concentrating.
- HP55 Punctuality was variable. In a few cases young people regularly arrived late which caused unnecessary disruption.
- HP56 Young people had better access to the library and helpful activities had been introduced to encourage reading. Not enough use was made of the library in the evening.
- HP57 Young people involved in activities such as cleaning took part in simulated work experience in the prison and a small number worked as peer mentors. There was no release on temporary licence and no young people had the opportunity to participate in a work placement outside the establishment.
- HP58 All young people had access to professional careers advice and most took advantage of this service.
- HP59 The PE facilities were good and most young people had adequate opportunity to participate in PE.

Resettlement

- HP60 The resettlement committee had not been convened for some time and as a result there was an absence of strategic management in this area. Internal planning arrangements remained efficient: young people felt involved and received support from caseworkers. There was no release on temporary licence (ROTL) and some young people faced serious difficulty in obtaining decent accommodation on release. Public protection arrangements were sound and the needs of looked-after children were recognised. Young people were given adequate support in relation to finance. All young people were interviewed prior to discharge to make sure anyone with

health, drug or alcohol problems continued to receive the help they needed. A range of life skills and offending behaviour programmes had recently been introduced which were designed to meet the needs of young people on the unit. Staff helped young people to maintain contact with their families and visiting arrangements were supportive. Outcomes for young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

- HP61 A comprehensive resettlement strategy and needs analysis had been produced, but the quarterly resettlement committee had not met during 2012 and there had been no recent strategic oversight of this area of work.
- HP62 Unit staff had tried to monitor the outcomes for young people who had been released, but community youth offending services often failed to respond to requests for data.
- HP63 No young people had been released on ROTL during 2012, which was a retrograde step.
- HP64 Good quality training and remand management plans had been produced, based on young people's needs. Our survey showed that all young people believed they had been involved in developing their plans. Training planning and remand management meetings were timely, well managed and child focussed. Young people were aware of the targets that had been set and caseworkers worked closely with youth offending team (YOT) workers and family members to try to ensure that targets were achieved.
- HP65 There were good transitional arrangements in place for young people serving long sentences, when they moved to the adult site.
- HP66 Young people subject to public protection procedures were identified on admission and monitored closely throughout their time in custody. Appropriate restrictions on contact were imposed and, where necessary, unit staff attended multi-agency public protection meetings in the community.
- HP67 There were arrangements in place to identify young people admitted to the unit who had looked-after status. Caseworkers were robust in their engagement with local authority social services departments to ensure they fulfilled their obligations. Young people spoke positively about their caseworkers and, in our survey, most young people said that their caseworker had helped them to prepare for release and that they had had a say in what would happen to them.
- HP68 If a young person had problems with accommodation, this was identified early and caseworkers made significant efforts to ensure that suitable accommodation was found. Despite this, a few young people were released to unsuitable bed and breakfast accommodation, and others were not aware of their accommodation arrangements until just before their release.
- HP69 All young people were seen by the unit nurse shortly before their release to ensure that any outstanding health care issues were addressed. If young people had drug or alcohol problems, contact was made with the community YOT to facilitate continuity of care.
- HP70 Caseworkers gave practical advice to young people on managing their money and helped them to open bank accounts. Classroom based courses were provided to help

young people manage their personal finances, and money management was included in a number of vocational courses.

- HP71 Young people were encouraged to maintain or re-establish family relationships. Information on how to contact family and friends was provided on arrival and reiterated during induction and by key workers. Visitors spoke very highly of the support provided to them by all staff. The family support worker met young people individually to offer support. Wing files showed that young people were given free telephone calls to maintain contact with their family.
- HP72 Young people had good access to visits, which started on time. They could request additional visits when necessary and young people from outside the area could receive visits during the day and extended visits at weekends. There was no play area in the visits room, although books and toys were provided. Quarterly family days were organised, but were not available to all young people.
- HP73 The cost of travelling to Parc was prohibitive for many families who lived outside the area.
- HP74 A range of programmes covering life skills, problem solving and offending behaviour, had been introduced over the previous year and were well publicised. They had been designed to meet the needs of most young people and were delivered by a dedicated team. There were systems in place to evaluate the effectiveness of these interventions and young people told us that they found them helpful.

Main concerns and recommendations

- HP75 Concern: The routine strip-searching of all young people on arrival had been reintroduced in order to comply with a Prison Service Instruction since the last inspection. The practice of routinely strip-searching young people in custody is unnecessary, intrusive and demeaning. The adverse impact on a vulnerable child is potentially extremely serious.

Recommendation: Strip-searching of young people in custody should only be carried out after a properly conducted risk assessment has indicated this is necessary.

- HP76 Concern: The ROTL scheme was no longer operating which meant young people did not have the opportunity to gain work experience outside the prison and reduced other opportunities to help them resettle successfully.

Recommendation: All eligible young people should be given opportunities for release on temporary licence.

Section 1: Safety

Courts, escorts and transfers

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.1 Most young people did not experience long journeys to Parc and felt safe during escort. Some spent lengthy periods in court after completion of their case and young people frequently travelled with adult prisoners.
- 1.2 Procedures describing what happened on admission and for the first 24 hours were described in a policy and staff followed these. Most young people did not experience long journeys to the prison and, in our survey, young people reported feeling safe under escort.
- 1.3 Some young people spent lengthy periods in court after completion of their case but this was not monitored by the prison. We learned about one young man who finished his court appearance at Swansea Crown Court at 10.25 am, started his journey to the prison at 3.20pm, arriving at 5.50pm. His journey had included over an hour in the van at HMP Swansea, while an adult prisoner who had travelled with him was admitted to the establishment.
- 1.4 Although information booklets had been provided to the local courts, most young people did not receive any advance information to help them prepare for arrival. Those transferring to other establishments were notified in advance.
- 1.5 Fifty-two per cent of young people reported travelling in vehicles shared with adults, against the national comparator of 27%, and 16% at the inspection in 2010. This was a concerning trend. It showed a marked but unsurprising increase, reflecting the work practice specified in the current contract.
- 1.6 There had been 94 court appearances from January to June 2012, of which 34 had taken place via the video link. This was a promising development as the video link facility had been seldom used previously.

Recommendations

- 1.7 Young people should not spend lengthy periods waiting in court after their case has been completed, and this should be monitored by the prison.
- 1.8 Young people should be transported separately from adult prisoners.

Housekeeping point

- 1.9 Young people should have access to information before their admission to help them prepare for their arrival.

Early days in custody

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.10 Young people were received courteously at the prison but they were inappropriately strip-searched. Initial assessments did not always accurately identify vulnerabilities noted in the ASSET document. Officers were supportive and sensitive to the needs of young people and young people were very positive about induction.
- 1.11 Staff at the establishment knew in advance when a young person was arriving and there was no delay in disembarking from the van. Reception officers were friendly towards young people, explained what would happen and offered food and drink. Young people were dealt with separately from adult prisoners and, although they did not remain in reception long, they had to wait in a stark holding room with nothing to occupy them. Routine strip-searching had been reinstated in order to comply with a Prison Service Instruction and this was not necessary or proportionate.
- 1.12 Officers from the young people's unit escorted young people to the admissions room on the unit where they were interviewed by an officer who completed an initial induction assessment to identify risk, need and concerns, and carried out a cell-sharing risk assessment. Not all assessments contained the relevant information available in the ASSET document.
- 1.13 Officers were supportive and sensitive in their approach towards young people. They explained patiently the prison regime and sources of help available and described what to expect on the first evening and the following day.
- 1.14 Young people were able to shower and make a free telephone call, although this was made in the presence of an officer. We also observed an interview with a nurse which was not undertaken in private. Most young men reported feeling safe on their first night and all were placed on precautionary 72-hour, 30-minute observations.
- 1.15 Cells were properly prepared in advance and young people were introduced to other staff on the unit in a respectful way.
- 1.16 There was no peer support scheme and the information booklet and induction pack containing sweets, toiletries, writing materials and phone credit, were not provided until the following day.
- 1.17 Young people were very positive about the five-day induction programme which began the day after arrival. They were well engaged by a knowledgeable induction officer who used a variety of interesting methods of communication. Staff from other departments also delivered presentations. Each young person received an induction pack and a well designed, age-appropriate information booklet, although this was only available in English and Welsh and Braille. There was limited need for telephone interpreting, but it was used when necessary.

Recommendation

- 1.18 All aspects of the initial induction assessments should be completed properly and in private and they should accurately identify and record personal characteristics and vulnerabilities available in the ASSET document.

Housekeeping points

- 1.19 The initial holding room should be more welcoming and activities should be provided.
- 1.20 Young people should always be able to make an initial telephone call in private.
- 1.21 Initial information should be available in a range of languages.
- 1.22 Young people should receive the induction pack when they arrive.

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.

- 1.23 Safeguarding arrangements were well organised and efficient. Appropriate information was shared within the unit and with relevant colleagues in the community. This helped staff to deal effectively with vulnerable and challenging young people. Attempts were made to obtain the views of young people on safeguarding.
- 1.24 A comprehensive safeguarding policy and operational safeguarding document had been produced, which focussed on young people's transition to the community. Both had been agreed and signed off by Bridgend local safeguarding children board (LSCB).
- 1.25 Procedures for consultation, monitoring and the development of safeguarding activities on the unit were clear. There was good consultation with young people about safeguarding issues: the safeguarding manager met a group of young people monthly at the community forum, where safeguarding was a standing agenda item.
- 1.26 Concerns about the most vulnerable and challenging young people on the unit were dealt with at operational staff unit meetings and multidisciplinary meetings. At the meeting we attended, we were impressed by the prompt decision making and the helpful emphasis on consulting with family members .
- 1.27 There were two safeguarding committees: the monthly internal safeguarding young people committee, and the quarterly child protection and safeguarding committee. The internal meeting concentrated on feedback from young people, monitoring unit safeguarding policies

and discussion of trends. The quarterly meeting focussed more on strategic matters and was attended by two members of the LSCB.

- 1.28 The concept of safeguarding was defined broadly at the meetings and included complaints, separation, standards of child protection, unexplained injuries and safer custody. The designated membership of both committees was appropriate, but attendance was sporadic and reports from some departments were not available for discussion.
- 1.29 The unit used a range of care plans to support the most vulnerable and challenging young people and during the inspection we identified seven such plans. Some young people could have had as many as four plans, all requiring staff input, and some streamlining was necessary to avoid confusion and duplication. ACCT documents (assessment, care in custody and teamwork) and supported living plans were of consistently high quality, but the quality of other care plans was variable.
- 1.30 Young people we spoke to and feedback from the community forum suggested that young people felt safe and knew how to report concerns or anxieties.

Recommendation

- 1.31 **The care planning arrangements should be streamlined in order to avoid confusion and duplication. Plans should be integrated and of a consistently good quality.**

Housekeeping point

- 1.32 Designated members of the safeguarding committee should always attend or send a representative. Departmental reports for the committees should be provided as required.

Child protection

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.33 A joint child protection policy had been produced, which provided clear staff guidance. A high-quality analysis of child protection referrals had been completed. Staff had been trained in child protection and understood their responsibilities. The engagement between the establishment and the local authority was extremely good and child protection referrals were dealt with promptly and appropriately. Internal investigations were rigorous and child protection records exemplary, with appropriate oversight from the director. Young people, their families and external agencies were all kept closely involved while investigations were taking place.

- 1.34 A comprehensive child protection policy had been approved by the LSCB and was regularly reviewed. It contained clear instructions to staff on actions to take if a young person disclosed abuse. There was an unambiguous requirement to report wrongdoing by colleagues, and staff we spoke to understood and supported this. Appropriate support was available for staff who were subject to allegations themselves.

- 1.35 There had been an excellent analysis of all child protection logs since January 2011, which covered the nature and extent of all referrals. The subsequent action plan had not yet been implemented.
- 1.36 A child protection training package, devised with the local authority, had been delivered to all staff. It was evident that staff understood their responsibilities to children and young people.
- 1.37 There had been seven child protection referrals since January 2011, five of which related to incidents involving restraint and two to allegations against the police, prior to the young person arriving at Parc. All but one case was referred immediately to the local authority which responded promptly.
- 1.38 There was very good communication with the local authority intake and assessment team. Relevant information was sent by the establishment, enabling prompt assessments to be made. Strategy meetings were held when required and minutes were comprehensive. While none of the allegations involving restraint had led to full external investigations, a full internal investigation had been recommended for one incident. The investigation was robust and the outcome shared with the local authority. There was good representation from the LSCB at the quarterly child protection meetings.
- 1.39 The establishment's child protection records were exemplary. The child protection coordinator ensured that all issues were properly recorded and pursued matters vigorously, so that investigations were completed as quickly as possible. The director had appropriate oversight of all investigations and signed them when she was satisfied that they had been properly completed.
- 1.40 There was close contact with young people, their families and appropriate external agencies during investigations. Records indicated that young people and their families appreciated knowing how investigations were proceeding and the reasons for decisions.

Good practice

- 1.41 *Excellent engagement with young people, their families and appropriate external agencies during investigations helped young people to cope through potentially difficult situations.*

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.

- 1.42 In our survey, more young people than at any similar establishment thought that, if they reported being a victim of bullying or harassment, it would be taken seriously. There were sensible precautions to try to limit bullying for canteen goods, and ongoing interaction with young people helped staff to pick up and act on signs of bullying or intimidation. Families were given useful information on how to raise concerns about young people.

- 1.43 In our survey, 43% of young people said they thought it would be taken seriously if they reported being a victim of bullying or harassment against the national comparator of 28%.

Young people who were identified as victims of bullying were placed on a community support plan which was reviewed regularly to keep the young person safe. Young people were advised not to discuss their offence, and cell-sharing risk assessments were carried out and reviewed appropriately.

- 1.44 Various measures were taken to reduce opportunities for bullying, including issuing canteen items directly to young people in their cells, marking goods and tracking stock levels. Staff regularly sat with young people at meals and during association to talk informally and to pick up on undercurrents that might indicate a potential problem between young people. They were quick to notice young people who were reluctant to leave their cells for association or other group activities and find out why.
- 1.45 The information pack sent to families encouraged them to talk to staff if they were worried about the way a young person was being treated. It included contact details for the family support worker, case workers, youth offending team (YOT) worker and the safeguarding team leader.

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.

- 1.46 Young people at risk of suicide and self-harm were well looked after. Levels of self-harm were steady and consistent with the previous year. Data collection was comprehensive. In general, a proportionate approach was adopted towards vulnerable young people. Night staff were properly briefed at handovers to ensure they were aware of newly admitted young people and those subject to ACCT procedures.
- 1.47 There was good management and care of young people at risk of suicide and self-harm. A comprehensive needs analysis had been undertaken in November 2011 using a range of sources such as interviews with young people, ACCT documents and completed vulnerability assessment forms (T1Vs). The analysis had identified some areas for improvement and development and progress had been made in relation to the quality of ACCT documents and levels of staff training.
- 1.48 The level of self-harm taking place was comparable to 2011, with approximately five incidents each month (28 in the previous six months). Most of these acts involved scratching and punching walls. The senior safeguarding manager undertook the role of suicide and self-harm coordinator and child protection coordinator which helped to ensure that procedures were followed consistently. There had been some prolific self-harmers on the unit since the previous inspection and they had been well supported. One young person who had difficulty communicating when he was upset was helpfully given flash cards to show staff how he was feeling so they could respond accordingly.
- 1.49 Data collection was comprehensive and covered type of self-harm incident, location, time of day, ethnicity of the young person and the number of ACCT documents opened. An analysis of these data was presented at the two safeguarding meetings and all young people on ACCT documents were discussed at the operational and multidisciplinary meeting. The data showed

that young people were more likely to harm themselves in the first few weeks at the establishment and just prior to release. Because of this, the senior safeguarding manager had developed a safeguarding questionnaire for young people to complete about their experiences when they first arrived on the unit.

- 1.50 The quality assurance process was good: operational managers checked documents after each review to ensure that it had been appropriately conducted, trigger points addressed and that the care plan met the identified risk factors. A post-closure quality check was conducted by the senior safeguarding manager and any concerns were discussed with the member of staff and training offered where necessary.
- 1.51 In general, a balanced and proportionate approach was adopted towards vulnerable young people. The ACCT review that we observed was conducted well and staff sought to reassure the young person throughout, enabling him to participate. The family support worker, or in some cases unit staff, contacted the young person's next of kin to contribute to the assessment using a vulnerability screen form which covered any suicide or self-harm concerns about the young person and his family. Staff were fully conversant with the young people on open ACCTs on their unit and what their needs were.
- 1.52 Sixty-eight ACCT documents had been opened in the previous six months, the majority as a result of identified vulnerability of new arrivals which were closed after the first review. The four ACCT documents open at the time of the inspection which we examined were of good quality, particularly the interviews with young people and the care maps. Reviews always included the caseworker and a member of health care but in some cases the case manager was not present because of shift patterns, and this had been raised by the senior safeguarding manager. Young people we spoke to on ACCTs said they felt well cared for by staff and one young person told us that staff had worked hard to reconcile him with his family.
- 1.53 Young people placed in the intensive support unit for behaviour management reasons had an ACCT document opened even if there were no identified vulnerabilities, which was not appropriate.
- 1.54 The telephone numbers of Child line and the Samaritans were prominently displayed on the wings. There were two camera cells on E wing, which had clear operating procedures. At the time of the inspection, there was one young person in a camera cell who required enhanced surveillance. Handover arrangements with night staff had an appropriate focus on young people new to the unit and those currently subject to ACCT, and the documentation showed that thorough handovers regularly took place.
- 1.55 Caseworkers ensured that any safeguarding issues were communicated to the YOTs for young people being released so that support arrangements could be put in place.

Recommendations

- 1.56 The allocated case manager should be present at all ACCT reviews.
- 1.57 Young people placed in the intensive support unit should only be placed on an ACCT document where there are identified risks of suicide or self-harm.

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.

- 1.58 There was an overarching behaviour management policy which was effectively overseen by the safeguarding committee. Young people were clear about the rules of the unit.
- 1.59 The behaviour management policy combined all the procedures used to manage young people's behaviour. These included rewards and sanctions, adjudications, minor reports and restorative justice. Oversight of the policy was carried out carefully by the monthly safeguarding committee meeting.
- 1.60 Young people were told about the rules during induction and those we spoke to were aware of the rules, the consequences of breaking them and the benefits of good behaviour. The rules were set out in an age-appropriate way in the Welcome to Parc booklet and were not over-restrictive.

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.

- 1.61 The rewards and sanctions scheme was motivational. Young people understood the scheme and in our survey indicated that it had made them change their behaviour. Entitlements for those on the lowest level of the scheme were fair. Young people could make quick progress through the scheme but some needed more help to modify their behaviour and progress.
- 1.62 The rewards and sanctions scheme was well understood by young people. They knew their review day and the decision process for promotions and demotions. Young people were not always present at their reviews, but they were involved if demotion was likely. There were no automatic reductions to bronze level and all demotions had to be preceded by a review. In our survey, 69% of young people said the different levels of the rewards and sanctions scheme had made them change their behaviour against the national comparator of 51%. At the beginning of the inspection, 30% of young people were on the lowest level, 36% on the middle level and 34% on the top level.
- 1.63 Young people could, and some did, progress quickly through the scheme but some young people found it difficult to maintain a steady level of behaviour. They moved between bronze and silver and needed more support to modify their behaviour for a sustained period. We did not find much evidence in the files of key workers setting meaningful targets to help young people achieve promotion.

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.

- 1.64 There were effective security arrangements in place and relevant information was shared properly. Routine strip-searching had been re-introduced and greater use was being made of minor reports. Young people were given the opportunity to participate in disciplinary hearings, and punishments were awarded in line with the tariff.
- 1.65 Dynamic security was effective and underpinned by positive relationships between staff and young people. On average 40 security information reports (SIRS) were submitted each month. Observation books were checked daily by a senior manager to ensure that all issues of concern to staff had been notified to the security department. Clear lines of communication existed between the security department and staff based in the young people's unit and any follow-up action requested by the security department in response to an SIR was normally carried out.
- 1.66 There were no unreasonable barriers to young people having access to regime activities, although a small number had been kept on the unit for education on the basis of risk of violence to others. This often occurred after a fight and before any mediation had taken place. These situations were monitored with a view to returning young people to group education as soon as it was safe to do so.
- 1.67 Since the last inspection, routine strip-searching for new admissions (other than transfers in from another prison), transfers and discharges had been reinstated. This was disappointing given the unit's previous successful use of risk-assessed strip-searching. Non-routine strip-searches were risk assessed and authorised by a senior manager. Twenty-four had been authorised between January and May 2012, with seven 'finds'. Young people confirmed to us that searches were carried out appropriately.
- 1.68 When young people broke unit rules, this could be addressed by a warning, a negative entry in wing files (this was used to inform the next rewards and sanctions review), minor report or adjudication. There had been little use of minor reports at the beginning of the year, but this had increased since March. Between March and May 2012, there had been 69 minor reports and 160 adjudications compared with no minor reports and 104 adjudications in the first two months of the year.
- 1.69 Adjudications were held in a comfortable environment which young people were familiar with. They were conducted by managers experienced in working with young people and the punishment tariff had been modified to take account of the needs of young people. After a fight or assault, loss of group education was sometimes imposed and in-cell education was provided to allow time for mediation to be carried out. Evidence showed that young people were being returned to group education at the earliest possible time. Punishments given were within the agreed tariff, with many towards the lower end.

- 1.70 Young people were offered the help of an advocate for their adjudication but records showed that only five young people had used an advocate in the preceding five months. After their adjudication, young people met an operational manager who reviewed their punishment and agreed a behaviour management plan with them. This included short-term targets to rescind part of their punishment.

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.

- 1.71 There was no evidence that levels of bullying were high. The unit had a clear policy on violence reduction which included bullying. Young people were consulted about bullying and staff were aware of what to look for. Community support plans for bullies were used where necessary. Fights and assaults were dealt with promptly by staff and where possible mediation was used to resolve disputes.
- 1.72 There was a clear policy setting out the unit's approach towards bullying. A safeguarding survey had been conducted recently in an attempt to establish young people's perceptions of bullying, but the responses lacked detail and were of limited value.
- 1.73 Staff were alert to indicators of bullying and the daily multidisciplinary meetings provided a forum to share information about bullying and other challenging behaviour.
- 1.74 A young person who was identified as or suspected of being a bully was given a community support plan (CSP), which included a care map with targets and regular reviews of progress. Although young people on a CSP were subject to 30-minute observations, some of the records lacked evidence of purposeful engagement between staff and the young person. Since the beginning of 2012, three young people had been placed on a CSP for bullying behaviour and one for inciting others to riot.
- 1.75 When fights and assaults took place between young people, staff were quick to step in. Between January and May 2012, 16 fights and 36 assaults had taken place. Staff used CCTV to review these cases carefully. Injuries arising from fights and assaults were not usually serious, but an incident had occurred on the unit shortly before the inspection when a young person had required hospital treatment after an assault by another young person.
- 1.76 Mediation was used when there was conflict between young people and they agreed to participate. It had been used 32 times so far in 2012. Young people could also be referred to the interventions team for one-to-one work. Violence and bullying were monitored at the monthly and quarterly safeguarding meetings.

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.

- 1.77 The use of force was monitored carefully. It had increased since the previous inspection but was used only when necessary. The records of debriefs were not sufficiently detailed.
- 1.78 The overall level of recorded use of force had increased, although the use of full control and restraint (C&R) remained constant. Between 2010 and 2011 there were 127 incidents of use of force with 72 cases where C&R was used. Between 2011 and 2012 there were 241 incidents of use of force with 68 cases where C&R was used. Planned use of force happened infrequently, with five incidents recorded between January and May 2012. Staff from the adult site were sometimes involved in planned use of force. The use of outside staff in conflict situations, whom young people were not familiar with, could create additional tensions. Data and analysis relating to use of force were examined by the monthly and quarterly safeguarding committees. The LSCB carried out an annual review of the use of force, which included talking to young people. Allegations made against staff following use of force were referred to the local authority for investigation.
- 1.79 Fights, assaults and confrontations between young people were the most common reasons for force being used. There was no evidence that C&R was used simply to gain compliance. Young people were given the opportunity to see health care after all uses of force, although records showed that some declined to see the nurse. Injuries that occurred were minor and reported to the Youth Justice Board each month.
- 1.80 The restraint minimisation policy included the management of young people's behaviour, and risk assessment and planning for young people from the point of reception. Although comprehensive data were provided to the two safeguarding meetings, the minutes did not record more detailed discussion of the issues. Quality assurance was appropriate and included examination of use of force records and videotapes with a feedback loop to staff involved in the incidents. Young people were debriefed immediately after the incident by an operational manager and then a day later by a unit senior manager who had reviewed the paperwork and CCTV. Some of the records of debriefs we reviewed lacked detail, and it was not clear that the young person had been given the opportunity to reflect on what triggered the incident and how a different outcome could have been achieved.

Recommendation

- 1.81 Only staff from the young people's unit should be used for planned use of force.

Housekeeping points

- 1.82 Minutes of meetings should record how data were used to identify issues for further discussion.
- 1.83 Records of use of force debriefs should demonstrate young people's learning and links to their care plans.

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.

- 1.84 Many young people experienced separation on the unit as part of a disciplinary procedure. With a few exceptions, they attended education and training activities with other young people. The intensive support unit was used for short periods of time to locate a small number of very disruptive young people. Young people were not kept there for unnecessarily long periods, but the regime was limited and did not allow interaction with other young people.
- 1.85 Young people who received an award of loss of association during an adjudication or minor report served their separation on the unit and were subject to 30-minute checks while in their cells. The unit had reviewed the use of unit separation and had identified that, between January and May 2012, 158 young people had experienced separation on the unit. The longest a young person had spent on unit separation in any month was 27 days. Young people on unit separation had daily access to telephones, showers and outside exercise and the majority attended education with their peer group. A small number were unable to attend group education for a few days, usually because of a fight. This was kept under regular review so that they could have a less restricted regime as soon as it was safe for them to do so. In January 2012, young people spent an average of nine days separated, and in May this had reduced to an average of six days.
- 1.86 The most disruptive young people could be moved to the intensive support unit (ISU) which was only used to accommodate young people, and not as a punishment. The cells were adequately furnished, had natural light and ventilation, in-cell sanitation and a television. Three of the cells had cameras. The ISU had been used 11 times so far in 2012, all but one for less than 24 hours. One young person had stayed there for three days. Young people in the ISU were supervised at all times by a member of staff from the young people's unit and were subject to 30-minute checks. The regime for young people was limited, with one-to-one education and interventions work in a room in the ISU and access to telephones, showers and exercise daily.

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.

- 1.87 All young people were appropriately screened for substance use and given substance use awareness training. Clinical care, while rarely required, was comprehensive. Illicit drugs were not widely available to young people, although tobacco was a concern. The layout of the mandatory drug testing suite needed adjustment. Psychosocial care was comprehensive, well integrated and easy to access.

- 1.88 Substance use screening and assessment procedures were appropriate, with all young people receiving the substance misuse awareness programme as part of their induction.
- 1.89 A full range of clinical treatment options was available, though there was minimal demand for the service. Only two young people were receiving clinical treatment at the time of the inspection, both for detoxification from benzodiazepine dependence.
- 1.90 Young people told us in focus groups that there was little use of illicit drugs in the unit. This was confirmed by the fact that in the six months from January to June 2012, there had been only one mandatory drug testing (MDT) random or suspicion positive among the young people.
- 1.91 The illicit use of tobacco was acknowledged by staff and young people to be a far greater concern than the use of illegal drugs or diverted medication. Nicotine replacement therapy was offered in the form of lozenges, though the young people complained that the taste was a disincentive to their use.
- 1.92 The MDT suite was clean and tidy. The toilet area used for sample collection had an observation window at toilet bowl level. Officers told us that the window was for the observation of adult prisoners, and when young people provided samples, they were told to stand back from the window.
- 1.93 Psychosocial care was provided by two young people's substance misuse service (YPSMS) workers, who were very highly thought of by the young people. Interventions included a wide range of needs-led group work and one-to-one modules. It was clear that this service took note of the young people's most up-to-date choice of substances, with appropriate responses in awareness and harm reduction information given.
- 1.94 Access to the YPSMS workers was easy for young people, with a minimum of twice-daily opportunities for ad hoc or scheduled support sessions. Integration between the YPSMS and other departments and services was very good, with a daily multidisciplinary team meeting facilitating communication and the discussion of individual cases.

Housekeeping point

- 1.95 The observation window in the MDT suite should be covered before testing young people.

Section 2: Respect

Residential units

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.1 The accommodation was generally clean and well maintained, although cells were poorly equipped and the ventilation was bad. The overall design allowed staff to supervise effectively and young people felt safe. There were adequate arrangements to ensure that young people were regularly able to shower, use the telephone and the laundry.
- 2.2 The young people's unit consisted of two wings, G and E. G wing accommodated up to 36 young people with 12 single and 12 double cells and E wing held 28 young people in 16 single and six double cells. Wing size and design provided good sight lines and staff were able to carry out supervision effectively with the aid of CCTV. Young people said they felt safe on the units.
- 2.3 Cells and communal areas were light, generally clean and well maintained. Unchanged from previous inspections, the installation of sealed windows resulted in poor ventilation. In some cells litter had been pushed between the perspex window screens, where it remained. Shared cells were cramped.
- 2.4 Toilets were not fully screened and some required deep cleaning. Cells had no chairs and young people had no choice but to sit on beds. Young people did not have access to lockable cupboards.
- 2.5 Picture displays in some cells extended well beyond the display boards and in some instances contained offensive material.
- 2.6 In our survey, 65% of young people said their cell bell was quickly responded to against the comparator of 37%.
- 2.7 Dining areas doubled as association areas. On G wing, tables and seating were fixed, while on E wing, these were set up at meal times and then stored away. Young people had access to a variety of suitable recreational activities and the 'gold room' for those with enhanced status contained additional activities unavailable on the wings. Despite this, many young people still complained of boredom.
- 2.8 The walls of both exercise yards contained bright murals and outside exercise equipment was provided, although we never saw this used. In our survey, 94% of young men said they had daily association and exercise against respective national comparators of 72% and 44%.
- 2.9 Each wing had two telephones to which young people had good daily access, but privacy was limited. Information about free numbers and monitoring displayed in the phone hoods was obscured by litter pushed underneath the perspex covering. There was no opportunity to exchange unused visit entitlements for phone credit.

- 2.10 Young men were able to shower daily. However, showers were showing some water damage and needed refurbishment.
- 2.11 Young people were encouraged and able to keep their cells clean, but many mattresses contained graffiti.
- 2.12 Application forms were freely available and given to staff who logged their receipt and destination, but their return was not recorded. In our survey, young people were generally positive about applications.
- 2.13 Young people could send two, free second-class letters each week and they valued this. Outgoing mail was posted within 24 hours and incoming post was received in the same timescale.
- 2.14 Young people wore their own clothes and had daily access to laundry facilities. Bedding was exchanged weekly. Prison-issue clothing was provided to those with insufficient of their own. New underwear and socks were available.
- 2.15 Young people could have clothing sent in up to the maximum allowed within 28 days of arrival. After this (apart from looked-after young people for whom there was no timescale), there was no other opportunity to exchange clothing, even to mark the changing of seasons, and young people were obliged to buy what they needed from catalogues.

Recommendations

- 2.16 **Cells should have effective ventilation.**
- 2.17 **Cells should be equipped with chairs, toilets should be fully screened, and young people should have access to a lockable cupboard.**
- 2.18 **Showers should always be of a serviceable standard.**

Housekeeping points

- 2.19 Displays in cells should be monitored to ensure that standards of security and decency are maintained.
- 2.20 Telephones should be used in private and young people should have the opportunity to exchange unused visits entitlement for phone credit.
- 2.21 Damaged mattresses should be replaced.
- 2.22 Young people should be able to exchange clothing regularly.

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 Young people spoke positively about their relationships with staff and we observed consistently good interactions between staff and young people. Young people were able to raise any concerns they had at monthly forums. Key workers introduced themselves to young people quickly and all staff working with young people on the unit made informative comments in wing files.

2.24 In our discussion groups, young people described having good relationships with staff, and we saw friendly, appropriate and helpful interactions between staff and young people. Staff were professional in their conduct and engaged in a caring way with young people.

2.25 Young people attended monthly consultation forums with staff, including unit managers. The subject matter discussed was often themed, but young people could raise additional issues. Minutes did not always record action points to address issues raised by young people.

2.26 In our survey, 72% of young people reported that staff treated them with respect and 84% felt that they had someone to turn to with a problem; 59% said their key worker had checked on them personally in the last week, against the comparator of 35%; and 82% felt that their key worker tried to help them.

2.27 Key workers introduced themselves promptly to young people and there were regular comments written in wing files by a variety of different staff. Comments were of good quality, demonstrating interaction with young people and knowledge of their personal circumstances. Poor and inappropriate behaviour was generally challenged, although we overheard some homophobic comments go unchecked by staff.

2.28 Officers maintained contact with parents and carers and attended training planning meetings, remand meetings and other relevant reviews.

Housekeeping points

2.29 Minutes of forum meetings should include action points to address issues raised by young people.

2.30 Staff should always be alert to and challenge inappropriate comment.

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.

- 2.31 Staff and young people described to us a relatively harmonious unit where individuals from different backgrounds integrated well. Apart from a small number of homophobic comments, there was no evidence that any minority group was being disadvantaged. Work was being carried out to develop the role of young people diversity representatives.

Strategic management

- 2.32 There was an equality and diversity policy specifically for young people, which covered all their needs, and a separate policy for foreign national and transgender young people. These policies had been issued in June 2012 and were not yet signed off by the director or familiar to unit staff.
- 2.33 A monthly equality and diversity meeting was chaired by the director and attended by department heads with appropriate representation from unit staff. An equality and diversity report for the whole establishment was presented at each meeting which contained only the age and ethnicity profile of young people. The equality and diversity manager told us that, with the recent introduction of P-NOMIS, it was anticipated that further information should soon be captured about young people, such as disability and sexual orientation.
- 2.34 Monitoring data identifying any disadvantage to minority groups were discussed and the young people's unit was monitored separately, but only in relation to race. There was no evidence of any unfair disadvantage to young people. The number of discrimination incident report forms (DIRFs) submitted each month was discussed at the monthly meeting and it had been identified that further work was needed with the young people on homophobic name calling and attitudes. Twenty DIRFs had been submitted in the last six months, nearly half of which were from a young person who was gay and had been subjected to name calling.
- 2.35 Consultation with young people about equality and diversity issues was developing. Three young people acted as diversity representatives and their pictures were displayed on the units and their role described on their cell doors. They had received support and training from the equality and diversity manager and operational manager and were still gaining an understanding of their role. The forum was limited to the diversity representatives which did not allow minority groups to express their views directly.
- 2.36 The young people were supported by the staff equality and diversity representatives who attended the equality forums with the young people representatives. Some of the staff had received training in gender identity and sexual orientation. All staff on the unit had received diversity training and further training was being delivered in disability and sexual orientation.
- 2.37 All young people were told how to report discrimination during induction and the presentation enabled young people to understand the diversity in the unit and the need to respect differences. There was access to free-phone helpline numbers for Muslim young people and the lesbian gay bisexual transgender (LGBT) excellence centre in Wales.
- 2.38 Regular events were held to promote each area of diversity. Films, discussions and education classes were used to promote events like LGBT and Black History Month. There were good displays in the corridors for different cultures which could have been replicated on the wings. There were adequate arrangements for young people who wanted to speak Welsh and some staff were learning the Welsh language. Those that did speak it were identified on wings and wore a badge.

Recommendation

- 2.39 Work being carried out to address discrimination should be sustained and additional effort made to promote positive images of minority groups.

Diverse needs

- 2.40 Young people and staff told us that it was a harmonious unit and that young people from different ethnic backgrounds, regions and abilities co-existed reasonably well. This was consistent with what we observed. Interventions were available for young people convicted of racially aggravated offences or who had been involved in racist bullying. These were delivered by the interventions team and staff trained in mediation also conducted sessions for young people involved in racist name calling. The religion of young people was monitored but there was no representation from the chaplaincy team at the equality and diversity meeting.
- 2.41 There was a foreign national coordinator for the whole prison and comprehensive systems to support and advise young people with immigration issues. There was good liaison between the foreign national coordinator and the UK Border Agency (UKBA). Appropriate adults supported young people who had meetings with UKBA. Young people had access to airmail letters and additional phone credit if family members lived abroad. Information about the young people's unit was not readily accessible in other languages. ESOL (English for speakers of other languages) classes had been arranged for young people who did not speak English.
- 2.42 The establishment had good links with the LGBT Excellence centre Wales which had provided one-to-one support for a young person who was gay. The transgender policy provided valuable practical information to staff, including how to carry out searches.
- 2.43 The unit had identified 21 young people with learning disabilities. There were no young people with physical disabilities and no adapted cells on the unit. We were told by the equality and diversity manager that any young person with a significant physical disability would not be sent to the unit. Supported living plans (SLPs) had been introduced to address need and increase staff awareness of how learning disabilities might be manifested in young people's behaviour. The plans contained helpful information to give staff a better understanding of particular learning disabilities. Not all staff were aware of what SLPs were, or which young people had them.

Recommendations

- 2.44 There should be a separate focus in the monthly prison report on equality and diversity issues for young people.
- 2.45 More young people should be invited to the equality forum, particularly representatives from the range of minority groups on the unit.

Housekeeping point

- 2.46 All unit-based staff should be aware of young people with learning disabilities who need additional support.

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.

- 2.47 Members of the chaplaincy team had a high profile on the unit. They were easily accessible and young people found it easier to attend services than in the past. There was adequate provision for those of minority faiths and the pastoral care provided by chaplains was excellent.
- 2.48 The chaplaincy team consisted of seven chaplains from Christian denominations. There were no Sikh, pagan or Buddhist chaplains and during the inspection there were no young people of these faiths. We were informed that if a young person requested it, they would be given the opportunity to see a chaplain of their own faith. This was confirmed in our survey, in which 65% of young people said it was easy/very easy for them to attend religious services against 34% at the previous inspection.
- 2.49 Young people and adult prisoners attended separate services because tobacco had been traded at some services. Twenty per cent (10) of young people were recorded as Muslim and about eight young people attended an Islamic instruction class and Friday prayers conducted on the unit by the part-time Muslim chaplain. Young people told us that they enjoyed participating in these classes.
- 2.50 Approximately eight young people attended the multid denominational Christian service each Thursday afternoon. Young people in our discussion groups told us that they watched inspirational films, read books and sang at these sessions. Records showed that over half of the young people were registered as 'no religion' or 'other'.
- 2.51 Posters on the unit advised young people of faith activities and encouraged them to speak to a member of the chaplaincy if they wanted to see a chaplain of a specific faith. In our survey, 82% of young people said they were able to see a chaplain of their faith in private against the comparator of 66%.
- 2.52 The chaplaincy team were visible around the unit and as part of their statutory duties they saw all young people who were placed on ACCT (assessment, care in custody and teamwork) documents, any who were separated (see behaviour management section) and those who had asked to see a member of the team. Chaplains played a central role in safeguarding and attended all relevant meetings and care planning meetings when asked to do so.
- 2.53 The chaplaincy provided excellent pastoral care. They arranged memorial services in the chapel or world faith room and provided a tranquil environment for young people to spend time, particularly if they had suffered bereavement. They were also able to facilitate visits from one of the national association of prison visitors. At the time of the inspection, no young people were using this service and we were told it was very rare for them to do so.

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.

2.54 Although not widely used, the complaints system was easy for young people to access and they were provided with helpful, prompt replies.

2.55 Young people we spoke to knew how to make a complaint. They were told about this during induction and information on how to make a complaint was also included in the comprehensive induction booklet. In the last six months, 14 complaints had been made. Young people had good relationships with staff and it was easy for them to talk to officers, enabling many complaints to be dealt with quickly and informally (see section on relationships between staff and young people). Young people also had the opportunity to attend community forum meetings with staff to discuss and resolve any complaints.

2.56 Complaint forms and confidential access envelopes were accessible on the two wings and the complaints box was emptied each night by the night duty manager. The unit had recently changed the timescale for response to complaints to five working days for initial complaints and appeals. The complaints we examined concerned a range of issues, including food and young people's money. If the complaints clerk felt that the matter should be resolved by a member of staff rather than formally, it was referred back to unit staff to discuss with the young person.

2.57 Ninety-six per cent of complaints had been responded to within the timescales and the quality of the responses was good. The respondent referred to the young person by his title and surname and, if the unit was at fault (three of the complaints), apologies were given and a resolution offered with a timescale for it to be completed.

2.58 There had been two complaints against staff which had been dealt with by operational managers. In one case a meeting had been held between the young person and the member of staff involved and it had been resolved amicably. Young people we spoke to told us that they had never been discouraged from making a complaint and they were aware of the appeals procedure and how to get help with it. There had been no appeals against the decision in the complaints that we looked at.

2.59 The quality assurance process involved a senior manager sampling a selection of complaints to check the quality and timeliness of responses. Analysis of complaints was undertaken to identify trends, but, given the small number of complaints submitted, there were no emerging trends.

Legal rights

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.60 Young people were aware of their legal rights. Caseworkers and the remand worker ensured that young people had sufficient access to their legal advisers. There was a good service for young people on remand and legal assistance was given to young people who made bail applications. The process for making early and late release decisions for young people serving detention and training orders was well managed.
- 2.61 Legal rights were explained to young people on induction and this information was reinforced by posters on the units. Young people were clear that they had a right to legal advice and, although there were no trained legal rights officers, they had good access to their legal advisers, usually facilitated by their caseworker or remand worker.
- 2.62 The visiting facilities for legal advisers were suitably private and legal mail was not opened by staff. Young people said that staff were prepared to read legal documents to them, if asked. Free telephone contact with legal advisers was facilitated during the day.
- 2.63 Remanded young people were seen quickly by the remand worker, and bail applications were considered as soon as possible. Meetings with workers from external youth offending services to develop bail packages were organised effectively and young people confirmed that they were given every opportunity to apply for bail. All young people on remand had a comprehensive remand management plan and were given the same access to all regime activities as sentenced young people. Caseworkers ensured that sentenced young people had the opportunity to appeal against their sentence and young people on recall were given access to appropriate legal advice.
- 2.64 Young people had access to legal advisers, who represented their needs to local authorities when accommodation arrangements were not being resolved satisfactorily.
- 2.65 Early and late release arrangements for those serving detention and training orders were explained clearly and the decision-making process, which included the right to appeal against decisions, was understood by young people. There was a multidisciplinary approach, including involvement of the community youth offending service and the young person, to making recommendations for release. Caseworkers were familiar with the procedure for recommending release on licence conditions for young people serving long sentences.

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.

- 2.66 Young people spoke positively of health care services. Governance arrangements were robust. The delivery of primary and secondary care was good and young people could see nurses and doctors without undue delay. Young people had access to an appropriate pharmacy service and were given the opportunity to see a dentist. The in-patient location for young people was not ideal. Mental health care was good but there was an absence of clinical psychology and speech and language therapy.

Governance arrangements

- 2.67 Young people we spoke to were generally happy with health care, although in our survey 47% said that overall quality had fallen in the last year against the comparator of 70%.
- 2.68 The service commissioner was G4S and the provider was G4S medical services. A comprehensive health needs analysis (HNA) had been prepared by Public Health Wales in 2009-2010 and a review of the HNA had started. Implementation of the health development plan, based on the HNA, was being supervised by the partnership board which functioned well. Health care staff attended the daily young people's unit multidisciplinary team meetings and the regular wing meetings at which health care issues could be raised by young people.
- 2.69 Clinical governance arrangements were robust. There was a rich mix of skills among the staffing complement – administrative, primary care, mental health and learning disability. There were two registered nurses at Parc at all times. Efficient systems for credential checking, training alerts and clinical supervision were in place. Mandatory training included safeguarding and child protection.
- 2.70 Clinical records were subject to regular clinical audit. Prevention of communicable diseases was driven by a comprehensive policy and there was an information-sharing agreement with other agencies.
- 2.71 The health centre was on two floors, reasonably well laid out and to a good standard. The treatment rooms on E and G wings were of variable quality and neither met infection control standards. Building work had started to create a clinical room on E wing which would be infection-control compliant. There was routine audit of infection control and actions designed to rectify non-compliance were taken. Resuscitation equipment included automated external defibrillators, oxygen and airway support items. Kit was strategically sited and regularly checked. Clinicians were trained in its use.
- 2.72 Staff members were in uniform and clearly identifiable. We observed positive relationships between clinicians and patients. Young people were given information about health services during initial health screening. The material was in written form and not accessible to those with reading difficulties.
- 2.73 There had been only one formal complaint about health care in the three months prior to our inspection; the written response was focused and easy to read. Young people we spoke to knew how to make written comments or complaints about care, although they preferred to take them to the wing-based nurses for attention.
- 2.74 There was an active health promotion group chaired by the deputy director. Health representatives attended the group and health care participated in a monthly timetable of activities and events. There were assertive, age-appropriate disease prevention and screening programmes. Immunisation and vaccination programmes mirrored Welsh national and local campaigns including MMR (measles, mumps and rubella) and meningitis C. The focus at the time of our inspection was on blood-borne viruses (BBV) related to substance misuse, including hepatitis B and C. A BBV specialist held clinics for young patients each week. Barrier protection was advertised on the wings and was available along with advice.

Housekeeping point

- 2.75 A pictorial guide to health care should be introduced as soon as possible.

Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.76 Young people underwent a comprehensive initial health screen and a secondary health assessment which included seeing a GP. If there appeared to be serious health problems, learning difficulties/disabilities, sensory or physical impairments, a supported living plan (SLP) was created. The plan was passed to wing-based officers and was subject to multidisciplinary review after seven days.
- 2.77 Young people had almost immediate access to dedicated nurses on the wings. Nurses were being trained in the use of triage algorithms at the time of our inspection. From 9am for up to an hour the health centre was reserved for young patients to attend clinics; no adult prisoners were present during that time and staff members accompanied the young patients at all times. In practice, they went immediately to their appointments. Failures to attend were rare. There was an extensive array of nurse and GP-led primary care clinics, plus specialist clinics such as physiotherapy and optometry. Practice nurses specialised in the care of long-term conditions such as diabetes and epilepsy. St James practice provided out-of-hours GP cover and nurses indicated that GPs would attend at the weekends, for example to suture wounds.

Good practice

- 2.78 *The use of supported living plans provided a focus to ensure that potential health problems and disabilities were not missed during the young person's induction to Parc.*

Inpatient care

- 2.79 There were two health care beds on U wing - an adult area - contained within a de-stimulation suite behind a locked door off the main association area. The beds did not form part of the certified normal accommodation and had only been used on three occasions in the last three years. When the beds were in use, a uniformed officer and nurse would be located in the suite with the patient. The beds had been used to offer enhanced observation of patients for up to 48 hours. Therapeutic options were limited due to the location of the beds and constraints of the environment. While the inpatient arrangements for young people were not ideal, on balance they provided a useful resource on the limited occasions that they were required.

Secondary care

- 2.80 Young patients 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.

Pharmacy

- 2.81 Patients did not have any direct contact with the pharmacist and pharmacy technicians, though they could apply to make an appointment to see the pharmacist. There were no pharmacy-led clinics or medicines use reviews. There was access to up-to-date reference sources, including the British National Formulary for Children. Prescribing was appropriate for the age group. Patients received written information about their medications.
- 2.82 Young people were able to access medication out of hours. A night nurse was available to administer night-time medications. There was a good range of patient group directions (PGDs)

in place but medicines supplied from PGDs were not always recorded on the patient's prescription chart. In addition, if a patient without a prescription chart was supplied with these medicines, there was a policy that pharmacy should be notified. In practice, this did not happen. A PGD for aspirin did not state that it should not be administered to under-16s without the recommendation of a doctor. Patients sharing cells did not have lockable boxes in which to store in-possession items.

Recommendations

- 2.83 **The pharmacist and pharmacy technicians should be supported to develop pharmacy services such as pharmacy-led clinics and medicines use reviews.**
- 2.84 **Lockable boxes should be provided in shared cells for storage of in-possession medicines.**

Housekeeping points

- 2.85 Clear, retrievable records should be kept of the date checks that take place in the pharmacy.
- 2.86 Medicines supplied via PGDs should be recorded on the patient's prescription chart.
- 2.87 The PGD for aspirin should clearly state that aspirin should not be administered to under-16s without the recommendation of a doctor.

Dentistry

- 2.88 All young people were listed for a dental screening on arrival at Parc and the appointment occurred within seven days. A full range of treatments was available as was oral hygiene advice from a nurse and therapists. Young people were given priority for subsequent appointments so that waiting times were short. As the wing-based nurses ensured that the majority of young people kept their appointments, attendance was high. Emergency dental cover was in place but rarely used. The dental surgery was of a high standard, though the design of the taps on the sink in the de-contamination room required attention.

Recommendation

- 2.89 **Fixtures in the dental suite decontamination room should be infection control compliant.**

Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.90 About a third of uniformed staff at Parc had been trained in mental health awareness. A new programme of training, more specifically related to the needs of young people, was in an advanced stage of development.
- 2.91 In our survey, 9% of young people believed themselves to have emotional or mental health problems against the comparator of 27%. Screening for mental health and learning disabilities occurred at reception and during induction. Wing-based mental health and learning disability nurses were available to young people by self-referral or at the request of officers. Those

requiring support were offered one-to-one attention; therapies were solution based; cognitive approaches were available; loss counselling was available via the chaplaincy. There was a variety of self-help and guided-help materials for use with young patients, including colourful comic book explanations of conditions such as ADHD (attention deficit hyperactivity disorder).

- 2.92 Patients with more complex problems were referred to the child and adolescent mental health services (CAMHS). A CAMHS consultant and a nurse provided assessment and advice on treatment. Liaison with the wing-based nurses was via a weekly meeting, SystemOne and telephone. There was an absence of clinical psychology or speech and language therapy.
- 2.93 Young people with early onset severe mental illness were referred by CAMHS to the forensic adolescent consultation and treatment service (FACTs). FACTs was very responsive and acted as gatekeeper to external secure health service beds. There were no secure health service beds locally and access was subject to additional commissioning requirements. Despite this, in the last year, most young people requiring a bed had been transferred within seven days, and all within two weeks.

Recommendation

- 2.94 Young people should have access to clinical psychology and speech and language therapy as clinically indicated.

Good practice

- 2.95 *The transfer time between FACTs assessment and the patient being admitted to a secure health service bed was exceptionally low.*

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.

- 2.96 Young people did not like the food. The menu provided choices to meet all diets, but had not been overseen by a dietician or nutritionist. The kitchen was clean and food properly stored and prepared, but it was cooked at least an hour before meals started and was sometimes served below the minimum temperature.
- 2.97 The menu was based on a four-week cycle with a budget of £2.30 per head per day. It provided daily choices of five lunch and five evening meals to meet all diets, including selections of fruit and vegetables.
- 2.98 Young people complained about all aspects of catering and in our survey only 6% described the food as good against the comparator of 19%.
- 2.99 The quality of food we sampled was generally good, but some items were lukewarm, some portions small, and the repetitive choice of potatoes, rice or pasta to accompany most evening

meals was monotonous. The menu had not been overseen by a dietician/nutritionist. Young people did not have a kettle or flask to make a hot drink when locked up.

- 2.100 Most meals were provided by external suppliers and reheated; little was cooked from source. Food was properly stored and prepared and the kitchen well managed and clean. Meals were taken in a van in hot trolleys to the young people's unit up to an hour before serving. Food was served from mobile serveries, inferior to those on the adult site which were equipped with griddles and deep fat fryers, allowing some freshly cooked items unavailable to young people.
- 2.101 Young people receiving medication to treat ADHD, which suppressed appetite, received a sandwich pack with fruit and a biscuit each evening to eat when locked up.
- 2.102 There were no food comments books but catering staff often attended young people's forum meetings. However, minutes recorded complaints about cold food as far back as May 2011 with no apparent improvement. Food surveys were undertaken across the whole prison but never specifically for young people.
- 2.103 Each unit was expected to maintain a weekly catering log recording daily fridge and food temperatures. Completed logs recorded temperatures of many items 'on arrival' and before serving, at well below the required serving temperature of 63 degrees, including temperatures of 36.8 and 42.4 degrees. There was no management oversight of temperatures and no food items had been returned to the kitchen.

Recommendations

- 2.104 Menus should be designed in consultation with a dietician/nutritionist.
- 2.105 Catering equipment on units should match the facilities on the adult wings.
- 2.106 Food should be served at the correct temperature, and temperatures should be recorded at the point of service and effectively monitored by managers.

Housekeeping point

- 2.107 Young people should be able to make a hot drink after evening lock up.

Good practice

- 2.108 *The provision of a food pack for young men receiving medication for ADHD ensured that they had something to eat when hungry after evening lock up.*

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 were generally satisfied with the prison shop. Those arriving without money could wait several days for their first order and young people were not consulted about the purchasing list. The administration charge of 50p on catalogue orders was unacceptable.
- 2.110** The shop was managed in house by G4S and weekly purchases were delivered in clear sealed bags. In our survey, 62% of young people said that the shop sold a wide enough variety of products against the comparator of 43%. Young people arriving with money could submit emergency orders, but, depending on their day of arrival, those without money could wait over a week to receive their first order.
- 2.111** The canteen list was not well advertised and young people were not always aware of what items they could purchase.
- 2.112** There had been no survey to identify young people's views of the purchase list and purchasing staff did not attend forum meetings.
- 2.113** Young people were able to order newspapers and magazines and could shop from several catalogues, although an administration charge of 50p was levied on each order.

Recommendations

- 2.114** Young people arriving without private money should be offered an advance of up to one week's pay to use for purchases, with repayment staged over a period of time.
- 2.115** Young people should not be charged an administration fee for catalogue orders.

Housekeeping points

- 2.116** Purchasing staff should be represented at consultation forums.
- 2.117** The purchase list should be publicised prominently on both wings.

Section 3: Purposeful activity

Time out of cell

Expected outcomes:

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

- 3.1 Most young people had ample time unlocked each weekday. During our roll checks few young people remained on the wings. There were no cancellations to the regime. Young people we spoke to during association complained of boredom, particularly on E wing.
- 3.2 Most young people had more than 10 hours unlocked each weekday. Young people on the lowest level of the rewards and sanctions scheme were unlocked for 11 hours and those on the platinum level, the highest, were unlocked for 12.5 hours. During the weekend they were unlocked on average for just under 11 hours. The small number of young people placed on separation, loss of association and classroom education had as little as 75 minutes unlocked and during the inspection there were four such young people in this category (see also behaviour management section).
- 3.3 During the roll checks that we carried out during the inspection, few young people remained on the wings. There were no cancellations to the regime. In our survey, 94% of young people said they usually had association and went outside for exercise every day against respective national comparators of 72% and 44%.
- 3.4 The atmosphere during association was relaxed and staff engaged with young people in activities and general conversation, helping to create a safe environment. Staff were aware of vulnerable young people and checked on them without being intrusive. Young people who were entitled to evening association were encouraged to leave their cells and mix with their peers. Any issues concerning young people unwilling to engage were investigated to ensure that bullying was not the cause.
- 3.5 There were table tennis and table football facilities on both wings and G wing also had a game console. Board games were available but we did not observe them being used. Young people we spoke to during association, particularly on E wing, complained of boredom and sat around in groups on the stairs or went to their cells before the end of association.
- 3.6 Young people on gold level and above were able to go to the 'gold room' which had a large television, sofas and recreational equipment. Young people we spoke to about the room appreciated these benefits.
- 3.7 The exercise yards attached to each of the units were a reasonable size and contained gym equipment and a few benches. The murals on the walls enhanced the appearance of the environment. Appropriate clothes were provided for young people to exercise during poor weather.

Recommendation

- 3.8 Young people should be given the opportunity to participate in activities which allow them to make constructive use of their leisure time.

Housekeeping point

- 3.9 Young people should be unlocked on time for association.

Education, learning and skills

Inspection of the provision of education and educational standards, as well as vocational training in YOIs for young people, is undertaken by Estyn, working under the general direction of HM Inspectorate of Prisons. For information on how Estyn inspects education and training see the Estyn inspection guidance.

Expected outcomes:

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

3.10 The strategic management of education, learning and skills was good. Relevant data were collected to identify needs, plan provision and track progress. The curriculum was balanced and more broadly based than we had found previously. Behaviour in class was mostly good and young people participated well when given opportunities to learn. Teaching staff treated young people with respect and the standard of teaching overall was good. Class attendance was good but poor punctuality created problems. Lessons lasted too long. Levels of attainment were good and most young people made progress learning. There were limited opportunities for work experience. The library had been promoted and young people were making good use of it.

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

Achievements of young people engaged in learning and skills and work:	Good
Quality of learning and skills and work provision:	Good
Leadership and management of learning and skills and work:	Good

Management of education and learning and skills

- 3.12 Since the last inspection, the management structure of the unit education department had been strengthened by the introduction of two additional posts: development coordinator and inclusion coordinator.
- 3.13 All teachers were clear about the individual circumstances and learning needs of each young person. There was good communication within the unit, with teachers meeting each day to share information about young people and their progress. A useful database had been developed which enabled teachers to monitor young people's progress towards their learning targets. This helped teachers to plan support effectively.
- 3.14 The unit benchmarked itself regularly against the local authority and the local further education institution and had a clear understanding of how well it was performing within the local and national education community.
- 3.15 There were effective education partnerships with Rathbone, a voluntary youth sector organisation which delivered employability skills, and with the local 14-19 Learning Network. Managers from the prison attended partnership meetings and participated in joint training.
- 3.16 Managers undertook regular observations of staff performance, which enabled them to identify and meet staff training and development needs. Overall, teachers demonstrated good teaching skills.

Provision of activities

- 3.17 The general induction procedures worked well and all young people had their basic skills assessed systematically as part of this process. Education staff followed this up with a supplementary diagnosis of basic skills, which enabled them to ensure that young people received appropriate levels of support to extend their existing skills.
- 3.18 Young people were consulted about which learning pathways they wanted to follow and were allocated to educational activities promptly. Young people made good progress in developing their basic skills in literacy and numeracy sessions. However, a small number of lessons were not sufficiently challenging to engage and motivate learners appropriately.
- 3.19 There were good opportunities for young people to engage with tutors through the medium of Welsh.
- 3.20 The curriculum was well balanced and sufficiently broad. It had improved since the last inspection, providing young people with better access to academic and vocational skills. All young people in education took part in citizenship classes where they learned about sustainable development and global citizenship. There was good provision for young people to take part in subjects that enabled them to express themselves through spoken or written language, music or art. Where required, there were also opportunities for learners to take GCSEs, such as English, maths and sociology. This enabled young people to complete courses that they had been following prior to being sentenced.
- 3.21 Teachers used individual learning plans well to review young people's progress in each subject. Most encouraged young people to comment on their achievements and to set new targets and objectives for future sessions.

- 3.22 Most young people behaved well in class and participated well in activities. Staff monitored behaviour well, recorded individual young people's standards of behaviour consistently and used these records to review progress regularly with young people

Recommendation

- 3.23 All lessons should be sufficiently challenging to engage and motivate young people.

Quality of provision

- 3.24 Staff had very good working relationships with young people and this helped them to engage in education. During the inspection, no young person was excluded from education.
- 3.25 Nearly all young people participated in education. If a young person was unable to attend sessions, for example because staff judged his circumstances to present a risk to himself or other young people, education staff visited his cell to provide coaching and assignments to ensure he did not fall behind. Most lessons started on time and overall attendance was good. However, in several lessons, young people arrived up to 15 minutes late, which disrupted the progress made by the rest of the class.
- 3.26 Lessons were too long, lasting for up to 1¼ hours each. Nearly all teachers took account of this by introducing new topics at appropriate intervals or by changing activities so that young people remained interested.
- 3.27 Overall the standard of teaching was good. In nearly all lessons, teachers planned well and catered for the full range of young people's learning needs. They were sensitive to changing circumstances and behaviour within the groups and implemented helpful contingency plans if they needed to change the pace or topic of the lesson.
- 3.28 In sessions that we observed, young people treated each other with respect and in many sessions supported each other well. Teachers maintained a focus on diversity issues in sessions and there were many examples of art work and learning display materials which promoted equality. There were adequate opportunities for learners to learn about the culture, language and economy of Wales. For example, there were several displays that promoted this awareness, and in cooking classes the tutor used local products, explaining to young people where they had been grown. There were a few bilingual displays in classes and learners' access to Welsh speaking tutors had improved.

Recommendations

- 3.29 Young people should arrive on time for all lessons.
- 3.30 The duration of classroom sessions should be designed to suit the learning needs of young people.

Education and vocational achievements

- 3.31 Overall attainment rates were good. The unit's learner outcome report of August 2011 identified attainment rates as 98%. The unit had benchmarked performance favourably against

a local college and a community education organisation. Most learners made good or very good progress during classes.

- 3.32 A majority of young people (61%) improved their basic skills, progressing to work that was at least one achievement level higher (such as from entry level 2 to entry level 3) between the time of their arrival and that of their release. A few (11%) increased the level of their basic skills by three levels of achievement (such as from entry level 2 to level 2).
- 3.33 All young people had access to subject and vocational courses which prepared them for the world of work. In nearly all subjects, teachers gave learners helpful information and guidance which enhanced their understanding of what employers need. There were limited opportunities for young people to gain direct work experience and there were no young people undertaking work placements through the ROTL scheme at the time of the inspection. The education unit continued to work with Rathbone to give young people employability training and this helped some young people to improve their knowledge and understanding of the world of work (see section on management of education and learning and skills).
- 3.34 Young people made good progress towards the targets they had agreed in their individual learning plans. They were clear about how well they were performing and understood what they needed to do to improve further. Targets were updated regularly and contributed effectively to helping young people work towards sentence plan objectives.
- 3.35 Daily meetings of education staff ensured that staff discussed young people's individual performance regularly. This helped them to identify early changes in young people's performance and to put appropriate support in place to ensure they made the best progress. There were several good examples of young people who were due to be released before they completed their learning objectives receiving additional support from staff to ensure they finished their qualifications in time.

Recommendation

- 3.36 **Young people should have more opportunity for work experience including, where appropriate, the use of release on temporary licence.**

Library

- 3.37 All young people were aware of the library facilities and knew when they could access the library during the day. However, only a few were aware that they could use it during the evening, when the facility was underused.
- 3.38 A reasonably wide range of books catered for most abilities. There was a good selection of material in a format accessible to young people who did not read well. There was an adequate selection of Welsh medium books, reference books and publications that enabled young people to carry out research into their career planning.
- 3.39 A professional librarian visited twice a week and an orderly worked in the library one day a week. Young people using the library were offered sufficient support and they were able to engage through the medium of Welsh with the visiting librarian.
- 3.40 The rate of borrowing books had increased. This was in part due to the librarian promoting book challenges which encouraged young people to read more. Staff had also started to read to groups of young people, which had improved their interest in books and reading. The

librarian had arranged for visiting authors to talk to young people, which had further enhanced their interest in reading.

Housekeeping point

- 3.41 Young people should be made aware that they can use the library in the evening.

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.

3.42 All young people had sufficient access to PE. This department was well managed and the facilities were good. Activities had been designed to meet the needs of all abilities. There was an integrated approach towards healthy living which helped young people make links between physical fitness and diet.

3.43 All young people could participate in at least two hours of physical fitness activity a day, supervised and led by well qualified staff. PE was provided as a discrete learning pathway and the unit had increased the range of accredited awards available to learners in PE. There were awards available to meet a wide range of ability levels and young people progressed well between award levels.

3.44 A selection of activities was available to suit young people of most levels of fitness. The rate of refusals in gym activities was low. Young people had access to a range of sport and PE facilities, including an all-weather five-a-side football pitch, a climbing wall and a well-equipped gym. Equipment was of a good standard and fit for purpose.

3.45 There was gym equipment in the exercise yard, which a few young people used in addition to formal gym sessions. Those young people who had reached gold level or above in the incentives scheme had the opportunity to participate in additional gym sessions at weekends.

3.46 Young people had good access to shower facilities and felt safe when showering. They were given adequate time to shower after PE or sport sessions, before returning to classes or breaks.

3.47 Staff used individual learning plans with young people to agree fitness improvement targets. All young people participating in PE pathways were clear that their fitness and stamina had improved as a result of their activities.

3.48 Young people learned about the relevance of healthy eating in classroom and gym sessions and were able to explain the types of food that provided energy in sport activities and the importance of a balanced diet to health. Several young people identified that their eating habits had improved since they had learned about the impact food had on their fitness and health.

Section 4: Resettlement

Pre-release and resettlement

Expected outcomes:

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

- 4.1 The strategic management of resettlement was weak. Most internal departments engaged well with young people's resettlement plans, but key workers needed to be more involved. The use of release on temporary licence was poor. Despite efforts by unit staff, resettlement outcomes were not being monitored effectively.
- 4.2 There was a comprehensive resettlement strategy, but it contained no reference to the management of looked-after children. The strategy was reviewed and updated annually, but there was no evidence of the involvement of external agencies in its development. Young people were consulted on issues that affected them. Implementation of the strategy was the responsibility of the quarterly resettlement committee meeting, but no meeting had taken place in 2012 and this lack of strategic oversight of resettlement for a significant period was unacceptable. There had been little involvement at earlier meetings from external agencies, particularly youth offending services, which was a weakness.
- 4.3 A resettlement needs analysis had been completed for 2011, which covered the age of young people, where they came from, the nature of their offence and length of sentence. Comprehensive information was collected on the use of the substance misuse service, but only basic data were gathered on the use of release on temporary licence (ROTL), the accommodation young people were released to and early release decisions for young people serving detention and training orders. The action plan arising from the needs analysis had not been implemented.
- 4.4 The use of ROTL was unacceptably poor and young people were disadvantaged by the lack of opportunities. No young people had been released on ROTL so far in 2012, compared with 10 in 2011. The 2011 needs analysis had identified the need to improve the involvement with regional youth offending services and widen the range of opportunities, but this had not been accomplished.
- 4.5 The establishment had made efforts to monitor the resettlement outcomes for young people released from Parc, but regional youth offending services had not responded to these requests and there remained a lack of data on resettlement outcomes.

Recommendations

- 4.6 The resettlement committee should be reinstated with more involvement from external organisations. The committee should oversee the implementation of the resettlement strategy and action plans.

- 4.7 The establishment should work with their regional resettlement consortium, youth offending services and the Youth Justice Board to ensure that information on resettlement outcomes is collected after young people leave the unit.

Training planning and remand management

Expected outcomes:

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

- 4.8 The planning arrangements for all young people were well organised and efficient. Each young person had an individualised plan and particular attention was paid to the distinctive needs of looked-after children. Public protection arrangements were sound and young people transferring to the adult estate were properly supported.

- 4.9 All young people were allocated a caseworker, who was responsible for the management of individual training plans. Remand management was the responsibility of a worker seconded from the local youth offending service. Sentenced and remanded young people were contacted promptly and initial training and remand management plans were drawn up within the appropriate timescale and in a collaborative way. There was good initial involvement with the young person's community youth offending worker, and young people's families were contacted where possible. In our survey, 100% of young people said that they had been involved in the development of their plan. A community youth offending team (YOT) worker confirmed that caseworkers engaged effectively with them concerning the progress of young people.

- 4.10 The training and remand management plans that we scrutinised covered a range of welfare and resettlement issues. Each plan attempted to address the individual needs of the young person. Clear targets were set and explained to young people, and the member of staff designated to help the young person meet his targets was clearly identified. In our survey, 100% of young people said they understood the targets in their plan, which was exceptional. However, the unit-based key workers were generally not involved in helping young people to meet their targets and their attendance at training planning reviews was poor.

- 4.11 Remanded young people received an excellent service; they were supported on arrival and given every opportunity to make an early bail application. A remand plan was quickly drawn up, enabling them to access the same services as a sentenced young person (see section on legal rights).

- 4.12 Training planning and remand management meetings were well organised and timely. There was good attendance by external youth offending services and adequate involvement by internal departments, which was monitored. A representative from the education department attended regularly and staff from other departments were invited to attend to address specific aspects of the young person's care. Planning meetings that we observed were well managed and focused on the young person's safety, welfare and resettlement. Consideration was given to referring a young person to life skills programmes. In one review that we observed, the young person's parents were helped to make a contribution and their concerns were

appropriately addressed. They told us of their satisfaction with their son's care, how easy it was to communicate with his caseworker and how helpful their son's experience on the unit had been. This endorsement of the way that caseworkers engaged with young people's families was reinforced in the records that we examined.

- 4.13 Young people serving detention and training orders were able to stay in the young people's unit when they reached the age of 18, if they wished to remain and were not assessed as a risk to others. There were good transition arrangements for young people who transferred to the adult site at the age of 18. Young people were given information about the regime and were able to visit their new unit. There was effective sharing of information between relevant departments.
- 4.14 The unit was not equipped to manage the needs of young people serving indeterminate sentences, but did manage those serving long determinate sentences, including the preparation of reports assessing their suitability for early release on home detention curfew.

Public protection

- 4.15 Caseworkers ensured that young people assessed as a risk to the public were identified quickly after their arrival and this was confirmed by the community YOT. There was adequate oversight of public protection cases by senior managers from the young people's unit. Staff from the unit attended the establishment-wide public protection meetings.
- 4.16 Caseworkers said that they were usually informed of external multi-agency public protection meetings which they attended. They had a good understanding of the arrangements which needed to be followed to reduce the risk to the public.
- 4.17 Restrictions on the contact some young people had with people outside the establishment were considered carefully. Where necessary, restrictions were imposed on mail, telephone contact and visits. These were proportionate and reviewed in the light of changing circumstances.

Looked-after children

- 4.18 In our survey, 38% said that they had been in the care of the local authority. Caseworkers were the lead workers for looked-after young people, but there was no reference in the resettlement strategy to their particular needs or how they would be managed, nor did the establishment collect data relating to numbers or the quality of involvement by local authorities, which was an omission.
- 4.19 Caseworkers identified new arrivals who were known to local authorities and made contact promptly with allocated social workers, to advise them that young people were in the unit and to help facilitate reviews. Although the establishment had provided no formal training on the needs of looked-after children, caseworkers were familiar with young people's entitlements and how local authorities should support those in their care. When local authorities did not support young people, caseworkers were rigorous in addressing these failings.
- 4.20 Young people's allocated social workers were invited to attend training planning and remand management meetings, but attendance was not monitored. The unit tried to facilitate looked-after children reviews on the same day as internal reviews which was sometimes successful. They reported that very few looked-after children reviews, which were convened by the local authority, took place within the required timescales.

Housekeeping points

- 4.21 Key workers should be more involved in young people's resettlement.
- 4.22 Further data should be collected on the numbers of looked-after children and the quality of the service they receive from their local authorities.

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.

- 4.23 Caseworkers provided the main source of help to prepare young people for release. Support across each of the resettlement pathways was adequate, although outcomes in terms of accommodation were still sometimes poor. Young people were encouraged and helped to maintain contact with their families. A range of relevant programmes had recently been introduced which were specifically designed to meet the needs of young people on the unit.
- 4.24 The majority of young people we spoke to who were about to be released, said that they had been well prepared, and this was confirmed in our survey where 89% of young people said that their caseworker had helped them to prepare for release. Fifty-six per cent of young people said they had had a say in what would happen to them when they were released against the comparator of 38%.
- 4.25 Practical arrangements for release were thorough, including ensuring that financial matters were in order and the provision of a proper bag for young people's belongings. Travel arrangements were made at final review meetings, though in some instances young people were unsure of where they were going to live at the time of the meeting.
- 4.26 The young person's community YOT was responsible for completing the pre-release plan, but these were often not available in time for the final pre-release meeting. Arrangements were made for the first review meeting after a young person was released and the establishment caseworkers often attended these meetings.

Accommodation

- 4.27 The establishment's own data, provided for the resettlement committee, showed that in 2011 only 65% of young people returned to their family home on release, with the remainder captured under the broad heading of 'supportive lodgings'. Critically the text explaining the data commented: 'at times accommodation was found last minute and emergency accommodation provided'. However, apart from commenting on the involvement of legal advisers in advocating for young people, the data contained no recommendation to address this need, nor was there an action on accommodation in the action plan, which was an omission. Limited information was collected on the type of accommodation young people returned to but there was no assessment of its safety, suitability and sustainability.

- 4.28 Young people's accommodation needs were assessed early and there was good engagement with youth offending services and local authorities when it was apparent that young people would not be returning home. However, caseworkers said it was not uncommon for young people not to know where they were going until a few days before release and that some returned to bed and breakfast accommodation, which was unacceptable. Despite this, in our survey, only 11% of young people thought that finding accommodation would be a problem against the comparator of 26%.
- 4.29 Caseworkers tried hard to ensure that suitable accommodation was found. Contact had been made with specialist providers in some areas and they were able to help local youth offending services to place young people.
- 4.30 If young people did not have suitable accommodation arranged, the casework team were clear how matters should be escalated. There was good use of advocates and, in some cases, more formal legal representation, to try and ensure that local authorities assessed young people as children in need and provided appropriate accommodation for them.

Housekeeping point

- 4.31 More detailed information should be collected on the type of accommodation young people return to on release and whether the accommodation is safe, suitable and sustainable.

Education, training and employment

- 4.32 A visiting careers officer from Careers Wales provided independent advice and guidance about education, training and employment. Young people said they found this service helpful.
- 4.33 In the past, a few young people eligible for ROTL had secured employer placements in a limited range of industries. Their progress was reviewed by employment supervisors, youth offending service workers, careers advisers and unit staff. Progress was recorded in diaries, which helped young people to review their achievements during work experience. Since the beginning of the year, young people had had no opportunity to access these placements under ROTL (see main recommendation HP76).
- 4.34 The visiting careers adviser liaised with other career service providers to help young people access opportunities on their release. The impact of this was difficult to evaluate as many services liaised directly with providers at local level. The careers adviser communicated well with case workers to ensure that sentence planning reviews took account of the young person's development and progress. Staff regularly discussed the young person's moving forward plans, produced by the careers adviser, at these meetings.

Health care

- 4.35 Prior to release or transfer, young people were seen by the wing-based nurses who also attended the pre-release board meetings. Arrangements were made for young people to take home medications and harm minimisation materials as necessary. Young people without a GP were offered advice on how to obtain one. The child and adolescent mental health service worked with the adult mental health in-reach team to ensure smooth transfer of patients with mental illnesses between the young people's unit and adult wings.

Drugs and alcohol

- 4.36 Links with local YOTs were good in terms of ongoing support for young people using drugs. However, clinical staff told us that referrals to community prescribers, though rarely needed, were problematic as few worked with under 18 year olds.

Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.37 In our survey, 26% of young people said they thought that money/finances were going to be a problem when they were released against the comparator of 43%. Young people with financial problems were identified early and picked up quickly by caseworkers. Practical advice and help was given to young people about how to manage their money while they were in custody, and there were systems to ensure that the correct amount was available to young people on their release. Some young people had been able to save and the unit was proactive in helping young people to open bank accounts.
- 4.38 Specific courses were available to help young people manage their personal finances. Money management was included in the pre-release course 'UR2Feet', and a new programme called 'Making a fresh start', run by Barclays bank, was aimed at helping young people improve their personal money management skills. Financial management at work was also included in a number of vocational courses.

Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.39 Managers knew how many young people were from outside the immediate area; at the time of the inspection, 10 young people were from Birmingham and London. Some of their families found the cost and time taken to travel to the prison prohibitive.
- 4.40 Information on how to maintain contact with family and friends was given to young people on arrival and reiterated during induction. Key workers and caseworkers reinforced this and families were invited to attend training planning and remand management meetings. Young people were helped to maintain contact through free telephone calls home. Caseworkers maintained contact with the social workers of looked-after children, and one-to-one meetings with young people could quickly be arranged in the unit for community professionals.
- 4.41 The family support worker introduced herself to newly arrived young people and contacted their parent/carer within 24 hours of arrival to tell them about the unit and offer support, including her direct telephone line. A well produced information booklet was sent to them.
- 4.42 There were four annual family days when activities were organised for young people and their visitors, but they were only open to young men on enhanced level. The most recent event had enabled young people on lower levels to invite family to see them receive achievement certificates. There was no use of ROTL to support family contact.
- 4.43 Young people were entitled to up to 32 hours of visits each month which they booked themselves by application. In our survey, 65% of young people said they usually had one or more visits each week. Visits took place on weekday evenings and during the mornings and afternoons at weekends. However, they were flexibly organised on weekdays, or visits extended, to meet the needs of visitors. Inter-wing visits between close relatives were facilitated. A shuttle bus took visitors to and from the local station apart from Sunday.

- 4.44 The unit maintained a photographic record of all visitors but, despite this, staff in the search area said visitors would be turned away if they did not have identification at each visit. Managers said this was unnecessary.
- 4.45 There was no outside visitors' centre but visitors waited in a comfortable waiting area with appropriate facilities. Visitors were extremely positive about the help and support they received from all prison staff.
- 4.46 Closed and non-contact visits were only authorised when security intelligence had identified significant risk. Visitors could transfer money electronically into young people's accounts or via the email-a-prisoner website.
- 4.47 Visits were held on the mezzanine in the main visits room. The environment was relaxed and visits effectively supervised. Some books and a limited number of small toys were provided but there was no play area. Children could use the large play area in the main visits room but this could not be easily seen from the mezzanine, and children had to be accompanied by a carer.

Recommendations

- 4.48 Family days should be open to all young people.
- 4.49 ROTL should be used to help maintain family relationships.
- 4.50 Visitors should not be turned away if they do not have identification on every visit.

Housekeeping point

- 4.51 The range of toys in the visits area should be improved.

Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.52 Although not based on a needs analysis, in the previous year the unit had introduced a range of life skills, problem-solving and offending behaviour programmes to meet the needs of most young people. The programmes were delivered individually to young people by a dedicated interventions team.
- 4.53 The interventions were very well publicised and young people were also alerted to the opportunities at their training planning meetings. Young people had easy and straightforward access to these programmes, although only a small number had so far completed them.
- 4.54 It was too early to assess the effectiveness of the programmes, but evaluation procedures had been put into place. All programmes were submitted to the establishment internal accreditation panel, which contributed to the assessment of their effectiveness. Some young people we spoke to said that the programme they had been on had been helpful, and there was also positive feedback from an external youth offending service worker, who described how one young person still used techniques learned on a programme to think about how he should respond more positively to difficult situations.

Section 5: Recommendations, housekeeping points and good practice

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

Main recommendation

To NOMS

- 5.1 Strip-searching of young people in custody should only be carried out after a properly conducted risk assessment has indicated this is necessary. (HP75)

Main recommendation

To the director

- 5.2 All eligible young people should be given opportunities for release on temporary licence. (HP76)

Recommendation

To the escort contractor and director

Courts, escorts and transfers

- 5.3 Young people should not spend lengthy periods waiting in court after their case has been completed, and this should be monitored by the prison. (1.7)

Recommendation

To the escort contractor

Courts, escorts and transfers

- 5.4 Young people should be transported separately from adult prisoners. (1.8)

Recommendations

To the director

Early days in custody

- 5.5 All aspects of the initial induction assessments should be completed properly and in private and they should accurately identify and record personal characteristics and vulnerabilities available in the ASSET document. (1.18)

Care and protection of children and young people

- 5.6 The care planning arrangements should be streamlined in order to avoid confusion and duplication. Plans should be integrated and of a consistently good quality. (1.31)

Suicide and self-harm prevention

- 5.7 The allocated case manager should be present at all ACCT reviews. (1.56)
- 5.8 Young people placed in the intensive support unit should only be placed on an ACCT document where there are identified risks of suicide or self-harm. (1.57)

The use of force

- 5.9 Only staff from the young people's unit should be used for planned use of force. (1.81)

Residential units

- 5.10 Cells should have effective ventilation. (2.16)
- 5.11 Cells should be equipped with chairs, toilets should be fully screened, and young people should have access to a lockable cupboard. (2.17)
- 5.12 Showers should always be of a serviceable standard. (2.18)

Equality and diversity

- 5.13 Work being carried out to address discrimination should be sustained and additional effort made to promote positive images of minority groups. (2.39)
- 5.14 There should be a separate focus in the monthly prison report on equality and diversity issues for young people. (2.44)
- 5.15 More young people should be invited to the equality forum, particularly representatives from the range of minority groups on the unit. (2.45)

Health services

- 5.16 The pharmacist and pharmacy technicians should be supported to develop pharmacy services such as pharmacy-led clinics and medicines use reviews. (2.83)
- 5.17 Lockable boxes should be provided in shared cells for storage of in-possession medicines. (2.84)
- 5.18 Fixtures in the dental suite decontamination room should be infection control compliant. (2.89)
- 5.19 Young people should have access to clinical psychology and speech and language therapy as clinically indicated. (2.94)

Catering

- 5.20 Menus should be designed in consultation with a dietician/nutritionist. (2.104)
- 5.21 Catering equipment on units should match the facilities on the adult wings. (2.105)

- 5.22 Food should be served at the correct temperature, and temperatures should be recorded at the point of service and effectively monitored by managers. (2.106)

Purchases

- 5.23 Young people arriving without private money should be offered an advance of up to one week's pay to use for purchases, with repayment staged over a period of time. (2.114)
- 5.24 Young people should not be charged an administration fee for catalogue orders. (2.115)

Time out of cell

- 5.25 Young people should be given the opportunity to participate in activities which allow them to make constructive use of their leisure time. (3.8)

Education, learning and skills

- 5.26 All lessons should be sufficiently challenging to engage and motivate young people. (3.23)
- 5.27 Young people should arrive on time for all lessons. (3.29)
- 5.28 The duration of classroom sessions should be designed to suit the learning needs of young people. (3.30)
- 5.29 Young people should have more opportunity for work experience including, where appropriate, the use of release on temporary licence. (3.36)

Pre-release and resettlement

- 5.30 The resettlement committee should be reinstated with more involvement from external organisations. The committee should oversee the implementation of the resettlement strategy and action plans. (4.6)
- 5.31 The establishment should work with their regional resettlement consortium, youth offending services and the Youth Justice Board to ensure that information on resettlement outcomes is collected after young people leave the unit. (4.7)

Reintegration planning

- 5.32 Family days should be open to all young people. (4.48)
- 5.33 ROTL should be used to help maintain family relationships. (4.49)
- 5.34 Visitors should not be turned away if they do not have identification on every visit. (4.50)

Housekeeping points

Courts, escorts and transfers

- 5.35 Young people should have access to information before their admission to help them prepare for their arrival. (1.9)

Early days in custody

- 5.36 The initial holding room should be more welcoming and activities should be provided. (1.19)
- 5.37 Young people should always be able to make an initial telephone call in private. (1.20)
- 5.38 Initial information should be available in a range of languages. (1.21)
- 5.39 Young people should receive the induction pack when they arrive. (1.22)

Care and protection of children and young people

- 5.40 Designated members of the safeguarding committee should always attend or send a representative. Departmental reports for the committees should be provided as required. (1.32)

The use of force

- 5.41 Minutes of meetings should record how data were used to identify issues for further discussion. (1.82)
- 5.42 Records of use of force debriefs should demonstrate young people's learning and links to their care plans. (1.83)

Substance misuse

- 5.43 The observation window in the MDT suite should be covered before testing young people. (1.95)

Residential units

- 5.44 Displays in cells should be monitored to ensure that standards of security and decency are maintained. (2.19)
- 5.45 Telephones should be used in private and young people should have the opportunity to exchange unused visits entitlement for phone credit. (2.20)
- 5.46 Damaged mattresses should be replaced. (2.21)
- 5.47 Young people should be able to exchange clothing regularly. (2.22)

Relationships between staff and children and young people

- 5.48 Minutes of forum meetings should include action points to address issues raised by young people. (2.29)
- 5.49 Staff should always be alert to and challenge inappropriate comment. (2.30)

Equality and diversity

- 5.50 All unit-based staff should be aware of young people with learning difficulties who need additional support. (2.46)

Health services

- 5.51 A pictorial guide to health care should be introduced as soon as possible. (2.75)
- 5.52 Clear, retrievable records should be kept of the date checks that take place in the pharmacy. (2.85)
- 5.53 Medicines supplied via PGDs should be recorded on the patient's prescription chart. (2.86)
- 5.54 The PGD for aspirin should clearly state that aspirin should not be administered to under-16s without the recommendation of a doctor. (2.87)

Catering

- 5.55 Young people should be able to make a hot drink after evening lock up. (2.107)

Purchases

- 5.56 Purchasing staff should be represented at consultation forums. (2.116)
- 5.57 The purchase list should be publicised prominently on both wings. (2.117)

Time out of cell

- 5.58 Young people should be unlocked on time for association. (3.9)

Education, learning and skills

- 5.59 Young people should be made aware that they can use the library in the evening. (3.41)

Training planning and remand management

- 5.60 Key workers should be more involved in young people's resettlement. (4.21)
- 5.61 Further data should be collected on the numbers of looked-after children and the quality of the service they receive from their local authorities. (4.22)

Reintegration planning

- 5.62 More detailed information should be collected on the type of accommodation young people return to on release and whether the accommodation is safe, suitable and sustainable. (4.31)
- 5.63 The range of toys in the visits area should be improved. (4.51)

Good practice

Child protection

- 5.64 Excellent engagement with young people, their families and appropriate external agencies during investigations helped young people to cope through potentially difficult situations. (1.41)

Health services

- 5.65 The transfer time between FACTs assessment and the patient being admitted to a secure health service bed was exceptionally low. (2.95)

Catering

- 5.66 The provision of a food pack for young men receiving medication for ADHD ensured that they had something to eat when hungry after evening lock up. (2.108)

Appendix I: Inspection team

Nick Hardwick	Chief Inspector
Ian Macfadyen	Team leader
Joss Crosbie	Inspector
Angela Johnson	Inspector
Vinnett Percy	Inspector
Ian Thomson	Inspector

Specialist inspectors

Paul Tarbuck	Health care inspector
Paul Roberts	Substance use inspector
Helen Boniface	Pharmacy inspector
Alun Connick	Estyn inspector
Penny Lewis	Estyn inspector

Olayinka Macauley	Researcher
Nalini Sharma	Researcher

Appendix II: Establishment population profile

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

Status	Number of young people	%
Sentenced	39	78
Recalls	4	8
Convicted unsentenced	1	2
Remand	6	12
Detainee	0	0
Total	50	100

Age	Number of young people	%
15 years	1	2
16 years	10	20
17 years	38	76
18 years	1	2
Total	50	100

Nationality	Number of young people	%
British	48	96
Foreign nationals	2	4
Total	50	100

Ethnicity	Number of young people	%
White		
British	38	76
Irish		
Other white		
Mixed		
White and black Caribbean	2	4
White and black African		
White and Asian		
Other Mixed	1	2
Asian or Asian British		
Indian		
Pakistani	1	2
Bangladeshi		
Other Asian	1	2
Black or black British		
Caribbean	1	2
African	2	4
Other black	4	8
Chinese or other ethnic group		
Chinese		
Other ethnic group		
Not stated		
Total	50	100

Religion	Number of young people	%
Baptist		
Church of England	3	6
Roman Catholic	4	8
Other Christian denominations	4	8
Muslim	10	20
Sikh		
Hindu		
Buddhist		
Jewish		
Other	11	22
No religion	18	36
Total	50	100

Sentenced only – length of stay by age

Length of stay	<1 mth	1–3 mths	3–6 mths	6–12 mths	1–2 yrs	2 yrs +	Total
Age							
15 years	1						1
16 years	2	6	2				10
17 years	2	13	11	5			31
18 years				1			1
Total	5	19	13	6			43

Unsentenced only – length of stay by age

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

Main offence	Number of young people	%
Violence against the person	14	28
Sexual offences	2	4
Burglary	11	22
Robbery	9	18
Theft and handling	2	4
Fraud and forgery		
Drugs offences	5	10
Other offences	7	14
Offence not recorded/holding warrant		
Total	50	100

Number of Section 53 (2)/91s (determinate sentences only) by age and sentence

Sentence	Under 2 yrs	2–3 yrs	3–4 yrs	4–5 yrs	5 yrs +	Total
Age						
15 years						
16 years						
17 years			3			3

18 years							
Total			3				3

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

Sentence	4 mths	6 mths	8 mths	10 mths	12 mths	18 mths	24 mths	Total
Age								
15 years					1			1
16 years		1	2	1	3			7
17 years		3	4	3	6	9	2	27
18 years								
Total		4	6	4	10	9	2	35

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

Sentence	Under 2 yrs	2-3 yrs	3-4 yrs	4-5 yrs	5 yrs +	Total
Age						
15 years						
16 years			1			1
17 years						
18 years				1		1
Total			1	1		2

Number of indeterminate sentences by age

Sentence	Section 90	Section 53 (1)	ISPPCJ03	Recall	HMP	Total
Age						
15 years						
16 years			1	1		2
17 years				1		1
18 years						
Total			1	2		3

Distance from Home

Under 60 miles	Over 60 miles
42	8

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

Introduction

HM Inspectorate of Prisons has conducted surveys of children and young people (aged 15–18) held in prison custody, in collaboration with the Youth Justice Board (YJB), since 2001. As part of a service level agreement (SLA) between HM Inspectorate of Prisons and the YJB, each establishment holding children and young people is now surveyed on an annual basis. The objective of the survey is to give young people the chance to comment on their treatment and conditions in custody, as part of the evidence base for HM Inspectorate of Prisons and the YJB.

This summary provides young people's self-reported experiences and perceptions within HMYOI Parc. It includes a description of the survey methodology, a description of how the data has been analysed and the survey results.

In addition to these stand-alone summaries, an annual report collates the results of all surveys conducted each year. This is a detailed report that includes a year-on-year comparison of survey data, a breakdown across establishments and diversity analyses.

As well as being published within this stand-alone summary and in the annual report, the survey data collected were used for an inspection. During inspections, findings from the survey are triangulated with inspectors' observations, discussions with young people and staff and documentation held in the establishment. The inspection report (which can be found at www.justice.gov.uk/about/hmi-prisons) provides a triangulated assessment of how the establishment is performing against the Inspectorate of Prisons' inspection criteria 'Expectations'. These survey results are also included within the inspection report appendices.

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 30 May 2012, the population of young people at HMYOI Parc was 52. The sample size was 50, as two young people were at court on the day of the visit so were unavailable to complete the questionnaire. Overall, this represented 96% of the population of children and young people.

Completion of the questionnaire was voluntary. Refusals were noted. Interviews were carried out with any respondents with literacy difficulties. In total, one respondent was 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, 38 respondents completed and returned their questionnaires. This represented 73% of children and young people in the establishment at the time. The response rate from the sample was 76%.

Five respondents refused to complete a questionnaire and seven 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. All missing responses were excluded from the analysis. 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 Parc in 2010. 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 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 is 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

Q1	How old are you?	
	15.....	2 (5%)
	16.....	4 (11%)
	17.....	31 (82%)
	18.....	1 (3%)
Q2	Are you a British citizen?	
	Yes	35 (95%)
	No	2 (5%)
Q3	Do you understand spoken English?	
	Yes	36 (97%)
	No.....	1 (3%)
Q4	Do you understand written English?	
	Yes	35 (97%)
	No.....	1 (3%)
Q5	What is your ethnic origin?	
	<i>White - British</i>	28 (74%)
	<i>White - Irish</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>White - Other</i>	1 (3%)
	<i>Black or black British - Caribbean</i>	2 (5%)
	<i>Black or black British - African</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Black or black British - Other</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Indian</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Pakistani</i>	1 (3%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Chinese</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Other</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Mixed race - White and black Caribbean</i>	4 (11%)
	<i>Mixed race - White and black African</i>	1 (3%)
	<i>Mixed race - White and Asian</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Mixed race - Other</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Arab</i>	1 (3%)
	<i>Other ethnic group</i>	0 (0%)
Q6	What is your religion?	
	None	20 (57%)
	Church of England.....	5 (14%)
	Catholic.....	3 (9%)
	Protestant.....	1 (3%)
	Other Christian denomination.....	1 (3%)
	Buddhist	0 (0%)
	Hindu.....	0 (0%)
	Jewish.....	0 (0%)
	Muslim	5 (14%)
	Sikh.....	0 (0%)

Q7	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	
	Yes.....	1 (3%)
	No.....	35 (95%)
	Don't know.....	1 (3%)
Q8	Do you have any children?	
	Yes.....	3 (8%)
	No.....	33 (92%)
Q9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability (i.e. do you need help with any long-term physical, mental or learning needs)?	
	Yes.....	5 (14%)
	No.....	32 (86%)
Q10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	
	Yes.....	14 (39%)
	No.....	22 (61%)

SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE

Q1	Are you sentenced?	
	Yes.....	32 (86%)
	No - unsentenced/on remand.....	5 (14%)
Q2	How long is your sentence (the full DTO sentence)?	
	Not sentenced	5 (15%)
	<i>Less than 6 months</i>	6 (18%)
	<i>6 to 12 months</i>	9 (26%)
	<i>More than 12 months, up to 2 years</i>	8 (24%)
	<i>More than 2 years</i>	6 (18%)
	<i>Indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP)</i>	0 (0%)
Q3	How long have you been in this establishment?	
	<i>Less than 1 month</i>	9 (24%)
	<i>1 to 6 months</i>	21 (55%)
	<i>More than 6 months, but less than 12 months</i>	6 (16%)
	<i>12 months to 2 years</i>	2 (5%)
	<i>More than 2 years</i>	0 (0%)
Q4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	
	Yes.....	27 (71%)
	No.....	11 (29%)

SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS

Q1	On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?	
	Yes.....	33 (89%)
	No.....	1 (3%)
	Don't remember.....	3 (8%)
Q2	On your most recent journey here, were there any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females travelling with you?	
	Yes.....	20 (53%)

No..... 16 (42%)
 Don't remember 2 (5%)

Q3 On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?
 Less than 2 hours 27 (71%)
 2 to 4 hours..... 9 (24%)
 More than 4 hours..... 1 (3%)
 Don't remember 1 (3%)

Q4 On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?
 My journey was less than 2 hours 27 (71%)
 Yes 0 (0%)
 No..... 10 (26%)
 Don't remember 1 (3%)

Q5 On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?
 My journey was less than 2 hours 27 (71%)
 Yes 2 (5%)
 No..... 9 (24%)
 Don't remember 0 (0%)

Q6 On your most recent journey here, how did you feel you were treated by the escort staff?
 Very well..... 6 (16%)
 Well 13 (34%)
 Neither 10 (26%)
 Badly..... 2 (5%)
 Very badly 0 (0%)
 Don't remember 7 (18%)

Q7 Before you arrived here, did you receive any information to help you prepare for coming here?
 Yes - and it was helpful..... 9 (24%)
 Yes - but it was not helpful 1 (3%)
 No - I received no information..... 22 (58%)
 Don't remember 6 (16%)

SECTION 4: FIRST DAYS

Q1 How long were you in reception?
 Less than 2 hours 22 (59%)
 2 hours or longer..... 11 (30%)
 Don't remember 4 (11%)

Q2 When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?
 Yes 32 (86%)
 No..... 0 (0%)
 Don't remember/not applicable..... 5 (14%)

Q3 How well did you feel you were treated in reception?
 Very well..... 2 (5%)
 Well 19 (51%)
 Neither 13 (35%)
 Badly..... 0 (0%)
 Very badly 0 (0%)

Don't remember 3 (8%)

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

Not being able to smoke.....	20 (54%)	Money worries.....	7 (19%)
Loss of property.....	7 (19%)	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to.....	12 (32%)
Feeling scared.....	6 (16%)	Health problems.....	20 (54%)
Gang problems.....	7 (19%)	Getting phone numbers.....	16 (43%)
Contacting family.....	22 (59%)	Staff did not ask me about any of these.....	4 (11%)

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

Not being able to smoke.....	20 (59%)	Money worries.....	5 (15%)
Loss of property.....	6 (18%)	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to.....	1 (3%)
Feeling scared.....	2 (6%)	Health problems.....	3 (9%)
Gang problems.....	2 (6%)	Getting phone numbers.....	8 (24%)
Contacting family.....	8 (24%)	I did not have any problems.....	5 (15%)

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

Toiletries/basic items.....	31 (86%)
The opportunity to have a shower.....	22 (61%)
Something to eat.....	28 (78%)
A free phone call to friends/family.....	32 (89%)
PIN phone credit.....	17 (47%)
Information about feeling worried/upset.....	12 (33%)
Don't remember.....	1 (3%)
I was not given any of these.....	0 (0%)

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.....	27 (77%)
Peer mentor.....	3 (9%)
Childline/Samaritans.....	10 (29%)
The prison shop/canteen.....	4 (11%)
Don't remember.....	5 (14%)
I did not have access to any of these.....	2 (6%)

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

Yes.....	32 (86%)
No.....	5 (14%)
Don't remember.....	0 (0%)

Q9 Did you feel safe on your first night here?

Yes.....	32 (86%)
No.....	2 (5%)
Don't remember.....	3 (8%)

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

I have not been on an induction course.....	0 (0%)
Yes.....	28 (78%)
No.....	3 (8%)

Don't remember 5 (14%)

SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT

Q1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	
	Yes	37 (100%)
	No	0 (0%)
	Don't know	0 (0%)
Q2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	
	Yes	24 (65%)
	No	12 (32%)
	Don't know	1 (3%)
Q3	What is the food like here?	
	Very good	0 (0%)
	Good	2 (6%)
	Neither	13 (36%)
	Bad	12 (33%)
	Very bad	9 (25%)
Q4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	
	<i>I have not bought anything yet/don't know</i>	0 (0%)
	Yes	22 (61%)
	No	14 (39%)
Q5	How easy is it for you to attend religious services?	
	<i>I don't want to attend religious services</i>	8 (22%)
	Very easy	12 (32%)
	Easy	12 (32%)
	Neither	3 (8%)
	Difficult	0 (0%)
	Very difficult	0 (0%)
	Don't know	2 (5%)
Q6	Can you speak to a chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?	
	Yes	30 (81%)
	No	1 (3%)
	Don't know/not applicable	6 (16%)
Q7	Can you speak to a peer mentor when you need to?	
	Yes	16 (43%)
	No	1 (3%)
	Don't know	20 (54%)
Q8	Can you speak to a member of the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB) when you need to?	
	Yes	6 (17%)
	No	3 (8%)
	Don't know	27 (75%)
Q9	Can you speak to an advocate (an outside person to help you) when you need to?	
	Yes	18 (49%)
	No	3 (8%)

Don't know 16 (43%)

SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF

Q1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	
	Yes	26 (72%)
	No	10 (28%)
Q2	If you had a problem, who would you turn to? (Please tick all that apply)	
	No one	6 (16%)
	Personal officer	14 (38%)
	Wing officer	12 (32%)
	Teacher/education staff	5 (14%)
	Gym staff	3 (8%)
	Chaplain	9 (24%)
	IMB	2 (5%)
	YOT worker	9 (24%)
	Social worker	8 (22%)
	Health services staff	7 (19%)
	Peer mentor	6 (16%)
	Another young person here	7 (19%)
	Case worker	16 (43%)
	Advocate	5 (14%)
	Family/friends	24 (65%)
	Childline/Samaritans	2 (5%)
Q3	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	
	Yes	22 (59%)
	No	15 (41%)
Q4	When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?	
	<i>I still have not met him/her</i>	3 (8%)
	In your first week	18 (49%)
	After your first week	8 (22%)
	Don't remember	8 (22%)
Q5	How often do you see your personal (named) officer?	
	<i>I still have not met him/her</i>	3 (8%)
	At least once a week	25 (69%)
	Less than once a week	8 (22%)
Q6	Do you feel your personal (named) officer tries to help you?	
	<i>I still have not met him/her</i>	3 (8%)
	Yes	27 (75%)
	No	6 (17%)

SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS

Q1	Is it easy to make an application?	
	Yes	32 (86%)
	No	1 (3%)
	Don't know	4 (11%)
Q2	Are applications sorted out fairly?	
	<i>I have not made an application</i>	14 (39%)
	Yes	15 (42%)
	No	7 (19%)
Q3	Are applications sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	
	<i>I have not made an application</i>	14 (39%)
	Yes	16 (44%)
	No	6 (17%)

Q4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	
	Yes.....	26 (70%)
	No.....	1 (3%)
	Don't know	10 (27%)
Q5	Are complaints sorted out fairly?	
	<i>I have not made a complaint</i>	18 (51%)
	Yes.....	3 (9%)
	No.....	14 (40%)
Q6	Are complaints sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	
	<i>I have not made a complaint</i>	18 (53%)
	Yes.....	3 (9%)
	No.....	13 (38%)
Q7	Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint?	
	Yes.....	4 (11%)
	No.....	19 (54%)
	Never needed to make a complaint.....	12 (34%)

SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE

Q1	What level of the rewards and sanctions scheme are you on?	
	<i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i>	0 (0%)
	Enhanced (top).....	16 (43%)
	Standard (middle).....	12 (32%)
	Basic (bottom).....	9 (24%)
	Don't know	0 (0%)
Q2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the rewards and sanctions scheme?	
	<i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i>	0 (0%)
	Yes.....	21 (57%)
	No.....	12 (32%)
	Don't know	4 (11%)
Q3	Do the different levels of the rewards and sanctions scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	
	<i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i>	0 (0%)
	Yes.....	26 (70%)
	No.....	9 (24%)
	Don't know	2 (5%)
Q4	Have you had a minor report since you have been in this establishment?	
	Yes.....	19 (51%)
	No.....	17 (46%)
	Don't know	1 (3%)
Q5	If you have had a minor report, was the process explained clearly to you?	
	<i>I have not had a minor report</i>	18 (49%)
	Yes.....	14 (38%)
	No.....	5 (14%)
Q6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been in this establishment?	
	Yes.....	21 (60%)

No..... 14 (40%)
 Don't know 0 (0%)

Q7 If you have had an adjudication ('nicking'), was the process explained clearly to you?
I have not had an adjudication..... 14 (41%)
 Yes..... 17 (50%)
 No..... 3 (9%)

Q8 Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?
 Yes..... 8 (23%)
 No..... 27 (77%)
 Don't know 0 (0%)

Q9 If you have spent a night in the care and separation unit (CSU), how were you treated by staff?
I have not been to the care and separation unit..... 32(97%)
 Very well..... 0 (0%)
 Well..... 1 (3%)
 Neither..... 0 (0%)
 Badly..... 0 (0%)
 Very badly..... 0 (0%)

SECTION 9: SAFETY

Q1 Have you ever felt unsafe here?
 Yes..... 7 (19%)
 No..... 30 (81%)

Q2 Do you feel unsafe now?
 Yes..... 2 (6%)
 No..... 33 (94%)

Q3 In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

<i>Never felt unsafe</i>	30 (86%)
<i>Everywhere</i>	4 (11%)
<i>Care and separation unit</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Association areas</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Reception area</i>	0 (0%)
<i>At the gym</i>	0 (0%)
<i>In an exercise yard</i>	0 (0%)
<i>At work</i>	0 (0%)
<i>At education</i>	0 (0%)
<i>At religious services</i>	0 (0%)
<i>At meal times</i>	0 (0%)
<i>At healthcare</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Visits area</i>	0 (0%)
<i>In wing showers</i>	0 (0%)
<i>In gym showers</i>	0 (0%)
<i>In corridors/stairwells</i>	0 (0%)
<i>On your landing/wing</i>	1 (3%)
<i>During movement</i>	0 (0%)
<i>In your cell</i>	0 (0%)

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

Yes 6 (16%)
 No..... 31 (84%)

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

Insulting remarks (about you, your family or friends) 0 (0%)
Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted) 5 (14%)
Sexual abuse..... 0 (0%)
Feeling threatened or intimidated..... 1 (3%)
Having your canteen/property taken..... 1 (3%)
Medication..... 0 (0%)
Debt..... 0 (0%)
Drugs 0 (0%)
Your race or ethnic origin 0 (0%)
Your religion/religious beliefs..... 0 (0%)
Your nationality 0 (0%)
You are from a different part of the country to others 0 (0%)
You are from a Traveller community..... 0 (0%)
Your sexuality..... 0 (0%)
Your age..... 0 (0%)
You having a disability 0 (0%)
You were new here..... 0 (0%)
Your offence/crime 0 (0%)
Gang related issues 0 (0%)

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

Yes 11 (31%)
 No..... 25 (69%)

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

Insulting remarks (about you, your family or friends) 6 (17%)
Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted) 2 (6%)
Sexual abuse..... 0 (0%)
Feeling threatened or intimidated..... 4 (11%)
Having your canteen/property taken..... 3 (8%)
Medication..... 0 (0%)
Debt..... 0 (0%)
Drugs 0 (0%)
Your race or ethnic origin 0 (0%)
Your religion/religious beliefs..... 0 (0%)
Your nationality 0 (0%)
You are from a different part of the country to others 1 (3%)
You are from a Traveller community..... 0 (0%)
Your sexuality..... 0 (0%)
Your age..... 0 (0%)
You having a disability 0 (0%)
You were new here..... 0 (0%)
Your offence/crime 3 (8%)
Gang related issues 0 (0%)
Because you made a complaint 4 (11%)

Q10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?		
	Yes	16 (50%)	
	No.....	11 (34%)	
	Don't know	5 (16%)	
Q11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you told them you had been victimised?		
	Yes.....	16 (43%)	
	No.....	11 (30%)	
	Don't know	10 (27%)	
Q12	Is shouting through the windows a problem here?		
	Yes.....	18 (49%)	
	No.....	17 (46%)	
	Don't know	2 (5%)	

SECTION 10: HEALTH SERVICES

Q1	Is it easy to see the following people if you need to?			
		Yes	No	Don't know
	The doctor	23 (62%)	10 (27%)	4 (11%)
	The nurse	31 (84%)	3 (8%)	3 (8%)
	The dentist	17 (46%)	15 (41%)	5 (14%)
Q2	What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?			
	<i>I have not been</i>			3 (8%)
	<i>Very good</i>			0 (0%)
	<i>Good</i>			16 (43%)
	<i>Neither</i>			8 (22%)
	<i>Bad</i>			7 (19%)
	<i>Very bad</i>			3 (8%)
Q3	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/all of it in your room?			
	<i>I am not taking any medication</i>			20 (54%)
	<i>Yes, all of my meds</i>			1 (3%)
	<i>Yes, some of my meds</i>			1 (3%)
	<i>No</i>			15 (41%)
Q4	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?			
	Yes.....			3 (9%)
	No.....			32 (91%)
Q5	Are you being helped by anyone here with your emotional or mental health problems (e.g. a psychologist, doctor, counsellor, personal officer or another member of staff)?			
	<i>I do not have any emotional or mental health problems</i>			32 (91%)
	Yes.....			2 (6%)
	No.....			1 (3%)
Q6	Did you have problems with alcohol when you first arrived here?			
	Yes.....			4 (11%)
	No.....			31 (89%)
Q7	Have you received any help with alcohol problems here?			
	Yes.....			3 (9%)

	No.....	32 (91%)
Q8	Did you have problems with drugs when you first arrived here?	
	Yes.....	15 (44%)
	No.....	19 (56%)
Q9	Do you have problems with drugs now?	
	Yes.....	2 (6%)
	No.....	31 (94%)
Q10	Have you received any help with drugs problems here?	
	Yes.....	11 (32%)
	No.....	23 (68%)
Q11	How easy or difficult is it to get illegal drugs here?	
	Very easy.....	4 (11%)
	Easy.....	4 (11%)
	Neither.....	6 (17%)
	Difficult.....	4 (11%)
	Very difficult.....	2 (6%)
	Don't know.....	15 (43%)

SECTION 11: ACTIVITIES

Q1	How old were you when you were last at school?				
	14 or under.....	13 (36%)			
	15 or over.....	23 (64%)			
Q2	Have you ever been excluded from school?				
	Yes.....	32 (89%)			
	No.....	4 (11%)			
	Not applicable.....	0 (0%)			
Q3	Did you ever skip school before you came into custody?				
	Yes.....	29 (83%)			
	No.....	5 (14%)			
	Not applicable.....	1 (3%)			
Q4	Do you currently take part in any of the following activities? (Please tick all that apply to you.)				
	Education.....	32 (89%)			
	A job in this establishment.....	0 (0%)			
	Vocational or skills training.....	6 (17%)			
	Offending behaviour programmes.....	9 (25%)			
	I am not currently involved in any of these	2 (6%)			
Q5	If you have been involved in any of the following activities here, do you think they will help you when you leave prison?				
		Not been involved	Yes	No	Don't know
	Education	0 (0%)	26 (79%)	4 (12%)	3 (9%)
	A job in this establishment	4 (24%)	9 (53%)	2 (12%)	2 (12%)
	Vocational or skills training	4 (20%)	12 (60%)	2 (10%)	2 (10%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	2 (10%)	14 (67%)	2 (10%)	3 (14%)

Q6	Do you usually have association every day?	
	Yes	33(94%)
	No.....	2 (6%)
Q7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	
	Don't want to go	2 (6%)
	Yes	33 (94%)
	No.....	0 (0%)
Q8	How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?	
	Don't want to go	1 (3%)
	None	1 (3%)
	One to two times	20 (54%)
	Three to five times	14 (38%)
	More than five times.....	1 (3%)

SECTION 12: FAMILY AND FRIENDS

Q1	Are you able to use the telephone every day if you want to?	
	Yes	35 (97%)
	No.....	0 (0%)
	Don't know	1 (3%)
Q2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?	
	Yes	8 (22%)
	No.....	24 (67%)
	Don't know	4 (11%)
Q3	How many visits do you usually have each week, from family or friends?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	4 (11%)
	<i>Less than one a week</i>	6 (16%)
	<i>About one a week</i>	13 (35%)
	<i>More than one a week</i>	11 (30%)
	Don't know	3 (8%)
Q4	How easy is it for your family and friends to visit you here?	
	I don't get visits	4 (11%)
	Very easy	5 (14%)
	Easy.....	12 (33%)
	Neither.....	7 (19%)
	Difficult.....	6 (17%)
	Very difficult	2 (6%)
	Don't know	0 (0%)
Q5	Do your visits usually start on time?	
	I don't get visits	4 (11%)
	Yes	27 (75%)
	No.....	2 (6%)
	Don't know	3 (8%)

SECTION 13: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE

Q1	Do you think you will have a problem with any of the following things, when you are released? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Finding accommodation</i>	4 (11%)
	<i>Getting into school or college</i>	6 (17%)
	<i>Getting a job</i>	21 (60%)
	<i>Money/finances</i>	9 (26%)
	<i>Claiming benefits</i>	5 (14%)
	<i>Continuing health services</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Opening a bank account</i>	3 (9%)
	<i>Avoiding bad relationships</i>	3 (9%)
	<i>I won't have any problems</i>	13 (37%)
Q2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan (i.e. a plan that is discussed in your DTO/planning meetings, which sets out your targets)?	
	Yes.....	22 (65%)
	No.....	7 (21%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	5 (15%)
Q3	Were you involved in the development of your plan?	
	<i>I don't have a plan/don't know if I have a plan</i>	12 (39%)
	Yes.....	19 (61%)
	No.....	0 (0%)
Q4	Do you understand the targets that have been set in your plan?	
	<i>I don't have a plan/don't know if I have a plan</i>	12 (39%)
	Yes.....	19 (61%)
	No.....	0 (0%)
Q5	Do you have a caseworker here?	
	Yes.....	28 (82%)
	No.....	3 (9%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	3 (9%)
Q6	Has your caseworker helped to prepare you for release?	
	<i>I don't have a caseworker</i>	6 (18%)
	Yes.....	24 (73%)
	No.....	2 (6%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	1 (3%)
Q7	Has your social worker been to visit you since you have been here?	
	<i>I don't have a social worker</i>	19 (56%)
	Yes.....	10 (29%)
	No.....	5 (15%)
Q8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	
	Yes.....	19 (56%)
	No.....	7 (21%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	8 (24%)
Q9	Do you know who to contact for help with any of the following problems, before your release? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Finding accommodation</i>	12 (39%)

<i>Getting into school or college</i>	13 (42%)
<i>Getting a job</i>	15 (48%)
<i>Help with money/finances</i>	11 (35%)
<i>Help with claiming benefits</i>	8 (26%)
<i>Continuing health services</i>	7 (23%)
<i>Opening a bank account</i>	11 (35%)
<i>Avoiding bad relationships</i>	8 (26%)
<i>I don't know who to contact</i>	11 (35%)

Q10 What is most likely to stop you offending in the future? (Please tick all that apply to you)

<i>Not sentenced</i>	5 (15%)	<i>Having a mentor (someone you can ask for advice)</i>	1 (3%)
<i>Nothing, it is up to me</i>	5 (15%)	<i>Having a YOT worker or social worker that I get on with</i>	1 (3%)
<i>Making new friends outside</i>	3 (9%)	<i>Having children</i>	11 (32%)
<i>Going back to live with my family</i>	6 (18%)	<i>Having something to do that isn't crime</i>	13 (38%)
<i>Getting a place of my own</i>	6 (18%)	<i>This sentence</i>	11 (32%)
<i>Getting a job</i>	16 (47%)	<i>Getting into school/college</i>	6 (18%)
<i>Having a partner (girlfriend or boyfriend)</i>	14 (41%)	<i>Talking about my offending behaviour with staff</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Staying off alcohol/drugs</i>	11 (32%)	<i>Anything else</i>	0 (0%)

Q11 Do you want to stop offending?

<i>Not sentenced</i>	5 (15%)
<i>Yes</i>	25 (74%)
<i>No</i>	2 (6%)
<i>Don't know</i>	2 (6%)

Q12 Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here, that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?

<i>Not sentenced</i>	5 (15%)
<i>Yes</i>	15 (45%)
<i>No</i>	13 (39%)

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



Survey responses from children and young people: HMYOI Parc 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 Parc	Young people's comparator	2012 Parc	2010 Parc
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		38	882	38	57
SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU					
1.1	Are you 18 years of age?	2%	13%	2%	10%
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	6%	5%	6%	0%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	98%		98%	
1.4	Do you understand written English?	98%		98%	
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other category)?	24%	43%	24%	12%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	15%	21%	15%	15%
1.7	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	2%	4%	2%	3%
1.8	Do you have any children?	8%	12%	8%	7%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	14%	11%	14%	7%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	38%	29%	38%	25%
SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE					
2.1	Are you sentenced?	86%	75%	86%	80%
2.2	Is your sentence 12 months or less?	44%	36%	44%	33%
2.3	Have you been in this establishment for one month or less?	24%	17%	24%	31%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	71%	53%	71%	57%
SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS					
On your most recent journey here:					
3.1	Did you feel safe?	90%	81%	90%	84%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	52%	27%	52%	16%
3.3	Did you spend more than 4 hours in the van?	2%	9%	2%	3%
For those who spent 2 or more hours in the escort van:					
3.4	Were you offered a toilet break if you needed it?	0%	14%	0%	15%
3.5	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	20%	33%	20%	21%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	50%	49%	50%	56%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	24%		24%	

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

Key to tables

		2012 Paic	Young people's comparator	2012 Paic	2010 Paic
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		38	882	38	57
SECTION 4: YOUR FIRST FEW DAYS HERE					
4.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	59%	82%	59%	84%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	86%		86%	
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	57%	64%	57%	61%
When you first arrived, did staff ask if you needed help or support with any of the following:					
4.4a	Not being able to smoke?	54%	56%	54%	58%
4.4b	Loss of property?	18%	21%	18%	19%
4.4c	Feeling scared?	16%		16%	
4.4d	Gang problems?	18%		18%	
4.4e	Contacting family?	59%	58%	59%	66%
4.4f	Money worries?	18%	17%	18%	19%
4.4g	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	33%		33%	
4.4h	Health problems?	54%	56%	54%	56%
4.4i	Getting phone numbers?	43%	44%	43%	44%
4.5	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	84%	74%	84%	83%
When you first arrived, did you have problems with any of the following:					
4.5a	Not being able to smoke?	59%	48%	59%	74%
4.5b	Loss of property?	18%	16%	18%	21%
4.5c	Feeling scared?	7%		7%	
4.5d	Gang problems?	7%		7%	
4.5e	Contacting family?	24%	23%	24%	21%
4.5f	Money worries?	16%	19%	16%	11%
4.5g	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	2%		2%	
4.5h	Health problems?	9%	12%	9%	11%
4.5i	Getting phone numbers?	24%	33%	24%	21%
When you first arrived, were you given any of the following:					
4.6a	Toiletries/basic items?	85%		85%	
4.6b	The opportunity to have a shower?	62%	35%	62%	49%
4.6c	Something to eat?	77%	79%	77%	75%
4.6d	A free phone call to friends/family?	89%	73%	89%	80%
4.6e	PIN phone credit?	47%		47%	
4.6f	Information about feeling worried/upset?	33%		33%	

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

Key to tables

		2012 Parc	Young people's comparator	2012 Parc	2010 Parc
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		38	882	38	57
Within your first 24 hours, did you have access to the following people or services:					
4.7a	A chaplain?	77%	43%	77%	43%
4.7b	A peer mentor?	9%		9%	
4.7c	Childline/Samaritans	28%		28%	
4.7d	The prison shop/canteen?	11%	15%	11%	11%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	86%	69%	86%	31%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	86%	78%	86%	80%
4.10	For those who have been on an induction course: did it cover everything you needed to know about the establishment	77%	63%	77%	70%
SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT					
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	100%	70%	100%	98%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	65%	37%	65%	66%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	6%	19%	6%	5%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	62%	43%	62%	57%
5.5	Is it easy/very easy for you to attend religious services?	65%	57%	65%	34%
Can you speak to:					
5.7	A Chaplain of your faith in private?	82%	66%	82%	69%
5.8	A peer mentor?	43%		43%	
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	17%	26%	17%	12%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	49%	34%	49%	41%
SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF					
6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	72%	64%	72%	67%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	16%		16%	
6.3	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	59%	35%	59%	54%
For those who have met their personal officer:					
6.4	Did you meet your personal (named) officer within the first week?	53%	47%	53%	53%
6.5	Do you see your personal (named) officer at least once a week?	75%	59%	75%	73%
6.6	Do you feel your personal (named) officer tries to help you?	82%		82%	

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

Key to tables

		2012 Parc	Young people's comparator	2012 Parc	2010 Parc
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		38	882	38	57
SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS					
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	86%	77%	86%	75%
For those who have made an application:					
7.2	Do you feel applications are sorted out fairly?	69%	69%	69%	55%
7.3	Do you feel applications are sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	72%	61%	72%	42%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	69%	63%	69%	78%
For those who have made a complaint:					
7.5	Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	18%	37%	18%	35%
7.6	Do you feel complaints are sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	19%	42%	19%	21%
7.7	Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint?	11%		11%	
SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE					
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	43%	28%	43%	37%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	57%	46%	57%	56%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	69%	51%	69%	53%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	51%		51%	
For those who have had a minor report:					
8.5	Was the process explained clearly to you?	72%		72%	
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	61%	59%	61%	56%
For those who have had an adjudication ('nicking'):					
8.7	Was the process explained clearly to you?	85%	84%	85%	91%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	23%	37%	23%	28%
8.9	For those who had spent a night in the care and separation unit: did the staff treat you well/very well?	100%	39%	100%	50%
SECTION 9: SAFETY					
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	18%	32%	18%	10%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	6%		6%	

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

Key to tables

		2012 Paic	Young people's comparator	2012 Paic	2010 Paic
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		38	882	38	57
9.4	Have you ever been victimised by other young people here?	16%	24%	16%	19%
Since you have been here, have other young people:					
9.5a	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	0%	16%	0%	16%
9.5b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	14%	10%	14%	3%
9.5c	Sexually abused you?	0%	1%	0%	2%
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	2%		2%	
9.5e	Taken your canteen/property?	2%	6%	2%	2%
9.5f	Victimised you because of medication?	0%		0%	
9.5g	Victimised you because of debt?	0%		0%	
9.5h	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	2%	0%	0%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	4%	0%	0%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	3%	0%	0%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%		0%	
9.5l	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	0%	4%	0%	3%
9.5m	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%		0%	
9.5n	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%		0%	
9.5o	Victimised you because of your age?	0%		0%	
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	1%	0%	2%
9.5q	Victimised you because you were new here?	0%	9%	0%	5%
9.5r	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	0%	3%	0%	2%
9.5s	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	5%	0%	0%

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

Key to tables

		2012 Parc	Young people's comparator	2012 Parc	2010 Parc
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		38	882	38	57
9.7	Have you ever been victimised by a member of staff here?	31%	22%	31%	16%
Since you have been here, have staff:					
9.8a	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	17%	13%	17%	5%
9.8b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	6%	4%	6%	3%
9.8c	Sexually abused you?	0%	1%	0%	0%
9.8d	Threatened or intimidated you?	11%		11%	
9.8e	Taken your canteen/property?	8%	3%	8%	2%
9.8f	Victimised you because of medication?	0%		0%	
9.8g	Victimised you because of debt?	0%		0%	
9.8h	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	2%	0%	0%
9.8i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	5%	0%	0%
9.8j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	2%	0%	0%
9.8k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%		0%	
9.8k	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	2%	3%	2%	3%
9.8m	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%		0%	
9.8n	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%		0%	
9.8o	Victimised you because of your age?	0%		0%	
9.8p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	1%	0%	2%
9.8q	Victimised you because you were new here?	0%	4%	0%	2%
9.8r	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	8%	3%	8%	2%
9.8s	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	2%	0%	0%
9.8t	Victimised you because you made a complaint?	11%		11%	
9.10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	50%		50%	
9.11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	43%	28%	43%	49%
9.12	Is shouting through the windows a problem here?	49%	41%	49%	37%

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

Key to tables

		2012 Parc	Young people's comparator	2012 Parc	2010 Parc
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		38	882	38	57
SECTION 10: HEALTH SERVICES					
10.1a	Is it easy for you to see the doctor?	63%	54%	63%	42%
10.1b	Is it easy for you to see the nurse?	84%	74%	84%	58%
10.1c	Is it easy for you to see the dentist?	46%	33%	46%	32%
10.2	For those who have been to health services: Do you think the overall quality is good/very good?	47%	62%	47%	43%
10.3	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/all of it in your cell?	13%		13%	
10.4	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?	9%	27%	9%	18%
10.5	If you have emotional or mental health problems, are you being helped by anyone here?	75%	50%	75%	40%
10.6	Did you have any problems with alcohol when you first arrived?	11%	13%	11%	25%
10.7	Have you received any help with any alcohol problems here?	9%	5%	9%	15%
10.8	Did you have any problems with drugs when you first arrived?	44%	35%	44%	60%
10.9	Do you have a problem with drugs now?	7%	8%	7%	17%
10.10	Have you received any help with any drug problems here?	33%	21%	33%	43%
10.11	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs here?	23%	17%	23%	20%
SECTION 11: ACTIVITIES					
11.1	Were you 14 or younger when you were last at school?	36%	36%	36%	38%
11.2	Have you ever been excluded from school?	89%	87%	89%	88%
11.3	Did you ever skip school before you came into custody?	83%		83%	
Do you currently take part in any of the following:					
11.4a	Education?	89%	79%	89%	88%
11.4b	A job in this establishment?	0%	32%	0%	9%
11.4c	Vocational or skills training?	17%	20%	17%	3%
11.4d	Offending behaviour programmes?	25%	24%	25%	9%
11.4e	Nothing	6%	11%	6%	12%

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

Key to tables

		2012 Parc	Young people's comparator	2012 Parc	2010 Parc
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		38	882	38	57
For those who have taken part in the following activities while in this establishment: do you think that they will help you when you leave prison?					
11.5a	Education?	79%	63%	79%	67%
11.5b	A job in this establishment?	71%	50%	71%	39%
11.5c	Vocational or skills training?	76%	51%	76%	28%
11.5d	Offending behaviour programmes?	72%	47%	72%	41%
11.6	Do you usually have association every day?	94%	72%	94%	96%
11.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	94%	44%	94%	91%
11.8	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	2%	10%	2%	4%
SECTION 12: KEEPING IN TOUCH WITH FAMILY AND FRIENDS					
12.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	98%	66%	98%	95%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	23%	43%	23%	21%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	65%	35%	65%	54%
12.4	Is it easy/very easy for your family and friends to visit you here?	47%		47%	
12.5	Do your visits start on time?	75%	41%	75%	52%
SECTION 13: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE					
Do you think you will have a problem with the following, when you are released:					
13.1a	Finding accommodation?	11%	26%	11%	23%
13.1b	Getting into school or college?	17%	31%	17%	19%
13.1c	Getting a job?	61%	50%	61%	43%
13.1d	Money/finances?	26%	43%	26%	35%
13.1e	Claiming benefits?	15%	28%	15%	35%
13.1f	Continuing health services?	0%	12%	0%	17%
13.1g	Opening a bank account?	9%	19%	9%	17%
13.1h	Avoiding bad relationships?	9%	19%	9%	28%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	64%		64%	
For those with a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan:					
13.3	Were you involved in the development of your plan?	100%		100%	
13.4	Do you understand the targets set in your plan?	100%		100%	
13.5	Do you have a caseworker here?	82%		82%	
13.6	Has your caseworker helped to prepare you for release?	89%		89%	
For those with a social worker:					
13.7	Has your social worker been to visit you since you have been here?	65%		65%	
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	56%	38%	56%	55%

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	2012 Parc	Young people's comparator	2012 Parc	2010 Parc
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		38	882	38	57
Do you know who to contact for help with the following in preparation for your release:					
13.9a	Finding accommodation	39%	38%	39%	41%
13.9b	Getting into school or college	42%	44%	42%	35%
13.9c	Getting a job	49%	41%	49%	41%
13.9d	Help with money/finances	37%	32%	37%	29%
13.9e	Help with claiming benefits	27%	27%	27%	25%
13.9f	Continuing health services	22%	21%	22%	25%
13.9g	Opening a bank account	37%	29%	37%	27%
13.9h	Avoiding bad relationships	27%	23%	27%	25%
For those who were sentenced:					
13.11	Do you want to stop offending?	87%	89%	87%	95%
13.12	Have you done anything or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future	54%	45%	54%	73%