

Report on an unannounced inspection of

# **HMYOI Werrington**

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

**23 September – 4 October 2013**

## **Glossary of terms**

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

Crown copyright 2014

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

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

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

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

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

# Contents

Introduction	5
Fact page	7
About this inspection and report	9
Summary	11
Section 1. Safety	19
Section 2. Respect	33
Section 3. Purposeful activity	47
Section 4. Resettlement	53
Section 5. Recommendations and housekeeping points	61
Section 6. Appendices	67
Appendix I: Inspection team	67
Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report	69
Appendix III: Establishment population profile	77
Appendix IV: Summary of children and young people questionnaires and interviews	81



# Introduction

HMYOI Werrington, located near Stoke-on-Trent, in the West Midlands, is a facility for up to 160 boys under the age of 18. During our inspection about two-thirds of the boys were sentenced and a third were on remand. The significant risks and accountability of institutions holding children and young people means we now inspect them more frequently and this inspection followed one we undertook approximately 13 months ago. In 2012 we found a reasonably caring institution but one that had slipped back, where expectations were too low, poor behaviour was not sufficiently challenged and where young people had too little to do. At this inspection we found some improvements, but with significant shortcomings remaining. The institution could no longer be described as deteriorating but our overall assessments against our tests of a healthy prison remain unchanged.

An impressive feature of Werrington was the new purpose-built reception. Young people reported very positively about their treatment on arrival, although this good start was undermined by partially completed initial risk assessments and very poor first night accommodation. Behaviour management had improved since our last visit and there was now less toleration of poor behaviour. Anti-bullying measures were more robust, but levels of violence remained high. Use of force, however, had fallen, was better managed, and incidents were now more likely to be de-escalated by staff. Werrington's whole approach to the safety of young people was underpinned by some very effective and efficient child protection and safeguarding arrangements. Connections and relationships with the local authority in support of this work were very good.

Relationships between staff and young people were respectful and positive, but this was often not reflected in formal structures such as case notes or an effective personal officer or mentoring scheme. Despite this there were higher expectations of young people. Outcomes for young people from minorities were also reasonably good, although again, these could have been better had structures to promote equality and diversity, such as meaningful consultation, been more extensive. The quality of respect in Werrington was, however, critically undermined by some very poor environmental conditions. Some cells we inspected were filthy and a few were not in a fit state to house young people. Too many cells were also holding two young people despite being designed and equipped for one.

Young people generally had a reasonable amount of time out of cell, although there were some groups who had significantly more restricted access. The provision of education was satisfactory but the range of vocational training was more limited. The institution was developing its strategy to improve learning and skills and attendance and behaviour were better. Across a number of quality indicators, however, such as the quality of teaching and achievements, particularly in functional skills, outcomes remained too variable and required improvement.

Werrington's work in support of resettlement remained good. Initial assessments and sentence management arrangements were sound and targets were appropriate, although ongoing engagement from case workers was more limited. More could be done to consolidate offending behaviour work but in general pre-release work was comprehensive and resettlement support was continuing to improve.

Werrington has taken steps to address some of the key issues we identified at our last visit. There is now a more positive approach to working with young people and some significant risk continues to be reasonably well managed. This will be more sustainable and useful if it is supported by effective systems and structures to embed the improvement. Improvements to the provision of purposeful activity need speeding up and the cleanliness of accommodation requires immediate attention.

**Nick Hardwick**  
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

March 2014



# Fact page

**Task of the establishment**

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

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

Public

**Region/Department**

West Midlands

**Number held**

119: 89 sentenced and 30 remand

**Certified normal accommodation**

160

**Operational capacity**

168

**Date of last full inspection**

August 2012

**Brief history**

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

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

**Short description of residential units**

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

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

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

**Name of governor/director**

Babafemi Dada

**Escort contractor**

GeoAmey

**Health service commissioner and providers**

NHS North Staffordshire

North Staffordshire Community Healthcare

**Learning and skills providers**

The Manchester College

**Independent Monitoring Board chair**

Antony Graves

# About this inspection and report

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

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

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

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

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

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

Our assessments might result in one of the following:

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

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

Since April 2013, the majority of our inspections have been full follow-ups of previous inspections, with most unannounced. Previously, inspections were either full (a new inspection of the establishment), full follow-ups (a new inspection of the establishment with an assessment of whether recommendations at the previous inspection had been achieved and investigation of any areas of serious concern previously identified) or short follow-ups (where there were comparatively fewer concerns and establishments were assessed as making either sufficient or insufficient progress against the previous recommendations).

## This report

This explanation of our approach is followed by a summary of our inspection findings against the four healthy prison tests. There then follow four sections each containing a detailed account of our findings against our *Expectations. Criteria for assessing the treatment of children and young people and conditions in prisons*. The reference numbers at the end of some recommendations indicate that they are repeated, and provide the paragraph location of the previous recommendation in the last report. Section 5 collates all recommendations, housekeeping points and examples of good practice arising from the inspection. Appendix II lists the recommendations from the previous inspection, and our assessment of whether they have been achieved.

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

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

---

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

# Summary

## Safety

- S1 *Young people were treated well on arrival and the new reception building was an excellent resource. The first night accommodation was very poor. Safeguarding arrangements were comprehensive and thorough. Vulnerable young people told us they were well looked after. Although levels of violence were high, the atmosphere in the establishment was discernibly less tense than we had found previously. Bullying was evident and more needed to be done to understand its scale and nature. The number of adjudications was extremely high. Use of force and separation were used proportionately. Treatment and conditions in the separation unit had improved. Support for young people with substance misuse problems was good. **Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***
- S2 *At the last inspection in August 2012, we found that outcomes for young people at Werrington were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 23 recommendations in the area of safety. At this follow-up inspection we found that seven of the recommendations had been achieved, nine had been partially achieved and seven had not been achieved.*
- S3 The new purpose-built reception building provided a much improved environment and enabled staff to admit young people in a comfortable setting with privacy. Young people reported being treated significantly better in reception than at other juvenile establishments. These positive findings were confirmed by our own observations of the reception process.
- S4 Routine strip-searching on admission no longer took place; this was a very welcome development.
- S5 Many of the initial risk assessments that we examined did not have risk management plans completed.
- S6 The condition of the first night cells was completely unacceptable.
- S7 Young people told us that induction lasted too long and there were lengthy periods when they were not occupied; however, there were plans to address this.
- S8 Working relationships with the local safeguarding children board and the local authority continued to be very effective. Following a recent restructuring, the safeguarding team had been re-formed; while still relatively new, team members had a depth of knowledge of the young people. The collection of data and monitoring of safeguarding areas were mostly comprehensive, and this information was discussed appropriately at safeguarding meetings.
- S9 The weekly multi-agency safeguarding and health meeting was an effective forum for discussing and coordinating the care of the most vulnerable or challenging young people. Child protection referrals continued to be handled efficiently, with excellent oversight by the local authority, which discharged its responsibilities towards the prison diligently.
- S10 The proportion of young people in our survey who said they would tell a member of staff if they were being victimised had increased significantly since the last inspection. We saw more evidence on this inspection of staff challenging antisocial behaviour by young people and more use was being made of mediation to resolve conflict between young people.

- S11 The number of self-harm incidents over the previous six months was considerably higher than at our last inspection, although almost half these incidents involved a few individuals. Information on the extent and pattern of self-harm was monitored by the safeguarding committee and analysed appropriately. Management oversight was generally good, with regular reviews and checks.
- S12 Most young people subject to assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management for young people at risk of suicide or self-harm were offered reasonable support, although there remained a need to identify more clearly who would take responsibility for specific actions identified at review meetings.
- S13 The behaviour management strategy linked all the relevant component policies and provided staff with an effective framework to challenge poor behaviour and encourage good behaviour. In contrast to previously, staff were no longer over- tolerant of poor behaviour.
- S14 The rewards and sanctions scheme was not popular with young people who felt it was too easy to receive a demerit and too hard to gain a merit. Reviews for those on the lowest level did not always take place when they should, leading to confusion and inconsistency. Young people were automatically demoted to basic for some offences without a review.
- S15 The approach to security was proportionate and did not unnecessarily restrict access to the regime. We were concerned about the use of strip-searching under restraint. Closed visits were not always imposed fairly, although young people were removed from this restriction at the earliest opportunity.
- S16 The number of adjudications was very high and there had been a significant rise since our last inspection. We recognised that some of this was inevitable as it was linked to the high level of fights and assaults, and we commended the use of mediation and the introduction of reparation as alternative ways of managing poor behaviour. Punishments were age appropriate and fair and removal from unit was not used.
- S17 Sensible practical arrangements had been put in place to counteract bullying for canteen. 'Rent' was mentioned to us several times as an issue and we were made aware that if young people were being pressurised by other young people to pay rent this was dealt with robustly. The full nature and extent of this problem was unclear and required closer investigation.
- S18 In the six months prior to the inspection, the number of violent incidents was broadly similar to what we found in the six months prior to the previous inspection. Most of these involved low- level fights; however, a small number of serious injuries had been sustained.
- S19 In comparison to the previous inspection, the incidence of full use of force had reduced significantly and de-escalation was now used widely. Force, particularly full use of control and restraint, was only used as a last resort. Some pain compliance was reported, which was inappropriate with this age group. The governance of use of force was excellent and full regard was given to young people's safety and their understanding of incidents.
- S20 The environment in the separation unit had improved since our last inspection, with less graffiti and cleaner cells. Staff relationships with young people in the unit were excellent and staff knew the young people well. We observed good supportive work taking place with young people awaiting adjudication.
- S21 Few young people remained in the unit for long periods and the majority were reintegrated through considered planning to normal location in the prison. The regime on the unit was

adequate and young people had access to education and activities off the unit as part of their reintegration plans.

- S22 The young people's substance misuse service (YPSMS) provided an appropriate range of interventions despite being in a state of flux during the handover to a new provider. Education staff still delivered the universal drugs education input with some oversight by the YPSMS manager, which represented an improvement from the last inspection. Illicit drugs were not widely available and few young people said it was easy to get drugs.

## Respect

**S23** *The living conditions were poor. Much of the residential accommodation was cramped, untidy, run down and gloomy. Many of the cells were in very poor condition. The quality of relationships had improved and staff had raised their expectations about how young people should behave. The personal officer scheme was ineffective. Young people from minority groups did not appear to be disadvantaged but consultation with them was weak and a more strategic approach was needed to the promotion of diversity. The complaints system had been improved and was now efficient. Health care provision was good and the chaplaincy provided good spiritual support but needed to extend their involvement. Although food was unpopular with young people, we found it to be good.*  
**Outcomes for children and young people were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.**

S24 *At the last inspection in August 2012, we found that outcomes for young people at Werrington were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test. We made 23 recommendations in the area of respect. At this follow-up inspection we found that 16 of the recommendations had been achieved and seven had not been achieved.*

- S25 The internal communal areas were very grubby and required maintenance. Some of the cells were very dirty, contained graffiti and required decoration. Cells designed for one continued to accommodate two, they were cramped and the toilet screening was inadequate. Many cells contained damaged furniture and there had been no progress in this area since the previous inspection.
- S26 Access to prison-issue clothing, sheets, mail, telephones and showers had improved and was now good.
- S27 Most young people said that staff treated them with respect and the interactions that we observed between staff and young people were predominantly constructive. Expectations about how young people should behave had risen and staff were now more confident about challenging poor conduct. The personal officer scheme was still not embedded and entries in case history notes reflected irregular and perfunctory contact.
- S28 Consultation arrangements remained effective and issues raised by young people were followed through.
- S29 We found no direct evidence of discrimination against young people from minority groups. There were still no consultation arrangements for young people from minority groups and diversity was not promoted strategically throughout the prison. Provision for foreign national young people was reasonable. The holistic approach to managing young people with learning disabilities was very good.

- S30 Young people spoke positively about the spiritual support available from the chaplaincy. All major faiths were provided for but the range of services and classes provided by the team was limited.
- S31 Formal complaints were investigated fully and answered in a timely and polite way. There was good analysis of trends and patterns and follow-up investigations were conducted when required. The advocates provided an extremely useful source of independent support to young people who wanted to make a complaint.
- S32 The quality of and access to primary care was good. Young people in our survey and those we spoke to were positive about their experience of health care. Reception screening covered risk-related issues with appropriate follow through. GP care was focused on the needs of young people.
- S33 Care planning in health care was very good. The multi-agency safeguarding and health framework was used effectively for vulnerable young people with multiple and complex needs, and information about young people with disabilities was shared by health care staff across the establishment.
- S34 Dentistry and pharmacy services were good.
- S35 Primary mental health nurses provided young people with responsive and compassionate care and child and adolescent mental health service psychologists provided young people with timely assessments and access to appropriate therapies.
- S36 The food was unpopular with young people but we found it to be nutritionally balanced with reasonable portion sizes. Young people continued to have opportunities to eat communally but it was not appropriate for the significant number of young people on some form of punishment to have their meals served at their cell doors.

## Purposeful activity

S37 *Most young people had reasonable time out of their cell, although at the weekend those on punishment were locked up most of the day. Scheduled exercise had very recently been put in place. Classroom attendance had improved significantly and the number of cancelled classes had reduced. Behaviour in class was good. There were sufficient activity places. Achievements were variable. Overall the Ofsted judgement was that the provision required improvement. Young people had sufficient access to the library and there were some good facilities in the PE department. **Outcomes for children and young people were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.***

S38 *At the last inspection in August 2012, we found that outcomes for young people at Werrington were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test. We made 19 recommendations in the area of purposeful activity. At this follow-up inspection we found that eight of the recommendations had been achieved, four had been partially achieved and seven had not been achieved.*

- S39 Young people who were not on losses or subject to discipline received about eight hours unlocked each day. For young people on basic level, the weekend regime was particularly restricted and this could result in them having as little as one hour out of their cell a day.
- S40 During daytime checks that we carried out, we found over a quarter of young people in their cells. Many were there for good reasons, but we did find some young people on induction

who had no activity and some young people on 'educational support', for whom time out of cell on one half of the day was minimal.

- S41 Although small and without equipment, the new exercise areas gave young people access to time outside as part of their core day, which was an improvement. Most young people had association daily and the youth club provided some variety and an alternative to staying on their units each evening.
- S42 There was a clear strategy for the development of education, learning and skills. The self-assessment process required improvement to ensure that progress could be identified and monitored. There were good internal and external partnerships and these had been used well to create improvements.
- S43 Attendance had improved to 87% and the number of classes cancelled due to staff shortages had significantly reduced. The initial assessment of young people's wider learning needs was good, and support was well planned and very effective. There were sufficient activity places for the population.
- S44 The range of OLASS (offenders' learning and skills services) provision in education generally met the needs of young people but the variety of vocational training needed further improvement and more courses were needed to develop independent living skills.
- S45 Teaching, learning and assessment required improvement to increase the amount of good teaching. The use of learning support assistants was good. Planning of learning was generally appropriate but in some cases presented insufficient challenge for young people.
- S46 Behaviour was managed well and in most cases was good. Retention was generally good and most young people completed their programmes.
- S47 Achievement of accredited qualifications was variable with some high achievement on vocational courses but some low achievement in Mathematics and English. Skills development in vocational training was good.
- S48 The library was well organised and provided a welcoming environment. The stock reflected the needs of the population and young people had enough access.
- S49 The PE facilities and the standard of equipment were good. Outside facilities were used well for team sports and links with the community were good. Access to outside facilities was restricted during winter months when the football field became waterlogged. The PE programmes were appropriate for the population, with a focus on healthy living, but there were not enough accredited courses.

## Resettlement

- S50 *The management of resettlement remained good and the planning arrangements were sound. The role of case workers needed to be more integrated. Work relating to public protection and looked-after children was good. Finding suitable accommodation on release remained difficult but follow-up tracking had been introduced. There had been some improvements in the work carried out under the resettlement pathways but more needed to be done to reinforce the work carried out by the programmes team. Reasonable steps were taken to help young people maintain family links.*  
**Outcomes for children and young people were good against this healthy prison test.**

*S51 At the last inspection in August 2012, we found that outcomes for young people at Werrington were good against this healthy prison test. We made 10 recommendations in the area of resettlement. At this follow-up inspection we found that six of the recommendations had been achieved, two had been partially achieved and two had not been achieved.*

- S52 The resettlement strategy was comprehensive and clear. It was usefully informed by a needs analysis and monitored effectively through quarterly strategy meetings.
- S53 Good links had been established with local youth offending teams (YOTs), especially in Staffordshire and Stoke, which had facilitated collaborative work with community providers.
- S54 The recent reduction in the number of case workers and the increase in case loads had diluted the support young people received but steps were being taken to remedy this.
- S55 The process for assessing young people for release on temporary licence was good.
- S56 Young people were contacted promptly by case workers on arrival and initial assessment and target setting were managed efficiently. Subsequent meetings, including reviews and pre-release meetings, were also managed well. Attendance at review meetings by YOT workers was high and the links between case workers and YOT workers were generally positive. The level of multidisciplinary involvement in review meetings was variable and contributions from wing staff too often focused exclusively on the young person's behaviour.
- S57 Although overall planning review targets were appropriate, not enough attention was given to addressing offending behaviour, and reinforcing and consolidating new skills for young people.
- S58 There was considerable variation in the level and quality of engagement between case workers and young people. Case workers rarely had formal interaction with young people outside the planning process and contact, while regular, was usually brief and unfocused.
- S59 The recent development of links with the Staffordshire integrated offender management project, which enabled most local juvenile offenders to be located at Werrington, was a positive initiative.
- S60 Public protection arrangements were good. Young people subject to monitoring measures were managed appropriately and multi-agency public protection arrangement (MAPPA) cases were reviewed in a timely manner. The necessary links with community agencies had been established to ensure appropriate pre-release arrangements were in place.
- S61 There were good systems in place to identify and manage looked-after children. Appropriate review meetings were undertaken with social services and YOTs and the prison-based social workers actively promoted the interests of looked-after children.
- S62 Pre-release final reviews were comprehensive and generally covered all necessary areas to help prepare young people for release. Prior to release, case workers always ensured that young people were prepared and aware of what was required of them after they were discharged.
- S63 Case workers, in consultation with YOT workers, identified the young person's accommodation needs early in the sentence and considerable efforts were made to ensure appropriate provision would be available on release. Most young people were released to permanent accommodation, primarily with their families. However, in the previous six

months 26 young people had been released to supported accommodation, which varied in quality. The establishment had begun to undertake post-release follow-up checks of accommodation but it was too early to assess outcomes.

- S64 Information, advice and guidance (IAG) provided before release was good and included productive links with community agencies to support young people into training and employment on release. There was no pre-release course, but CV production and coaching in job applications were well planned and supported by the IAG worker.
- S65 Young people had no opportunity to carry out independent job searches and the virtual campus was underdeveloped and not used enough to support progression into employment.
- S66 All young people were now offered an assessment of their finance, benefit and debt needs during induction. Good links had been established with a number of community agencies to offer continuing support with debt management and financial advice.
- S67 The visiting arrangements were reasonable. There were few delays for family members and friends to get to the visits area, but the level of support for those visiting the prison for the first time was very limited. A range of additional support was available to help young people maintain contact with their families, including the Time for Families course, and monthly family visits.
- S68 Young people had access to a range of relevant programmes which covered the main areas of concern identified in the establishment needs analysis. In the last seven months, over 170 places on programmes had been offered to young people. The work delivered by the programmes team was not supported or reinforced by staff elsewhere in the prison.

## Main concerns and recommendations

- S69 Concern: The programmes team provided considerable input to a high number of young people. The interventions were specifically designed to address the unmet need which had been identified in the needs analysis but this was not reinforced by mainstream staff.

**Recommendation: All staff who have direct contact with young people should be familiar with the programmes that young people participate in and ensure that, wherever possible, their own work reinforces the learning that takes place on these courses.**

- S70 Concern: The condition of the first night accommodation was extremely poor. It was not suitable for any young person to reside in and completely unacceptable for a potentially vulnerable, newly admitted individual.

**Recommendation: The first night accommodation should be clean, adequately equipped and properly furnished.**

- S71 Concern: The standard of living conditions was unacceptably poor and unsuitable for children.

**Recommendation: The residential accommodation should be clean, tidy and well maintained.**



# Section 1. Safety

## Courts, escorts and transfers

### Expected outcomes:

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

**I.1** *Young people were reasonably positive about their escort experience. While some young people still had long waits at court after their case had been heard, managers said that late arrivals were not as common as they had been. A few young people continued to be received without full documentation.*

**I.2** Young people in our groups were relatively positive about their experience of escorts and journeys to and from the establishment. In our survey, 63% said they had been offered something to eat and drink during their journey against the comparator of 35%. The van that we looked at was clean with little graffiti in the cubicles. Gel bags were carried for young people who needed to go to the toilet en route. The sample of person escort records (PERs) that we checked showed that a few young people had been offered a comfort stop, and many of the journeys took less than two hours. The PERs also showed that some young people experienced waits at court after their case had been heard, but managers reported that late arrivals were not as common as they had been. A leaflet about Werrington had been distributed to escorts and courts, but only a few young people said they had received information before they arrived at reception.

**I.3** A few young people continued to arrive without full documentation. We saw one young person who had been taken to court from another prison establishment arriving with no property or records, including medical information.

### Recommendation

**I.4** **All relevant information about a young person should be available to the establishment prior to or at the point of their arrival.** (Repeated recommendation I.21)

## 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.**

**I.5** *The reception area was much improved and young people were positive about their experience of reception. The condition of first night accommodation was poor and needed immediate attention. Induction was too long, but the establishment had plans to address this.*

- I.6** The new purpose-built reception facility had natural light, private interview rooms, holding rooms in clear sight of the booking-in desk, showers and a video conference facility for court appearances. It had been in use for a matter of days at the start of the inspection and provided young people with a much improved facility. In our survey, which had been carried out while the previous reception area was in operation, 80% of young people said they had been treated well in reception against the comparator of 67%.
- I.7** We observed welcoming staff engaging well with young people. Routine strip- searching was not carried out and young people were seen by a nurse in a private room. Interviews with reception staff were conducted in private and young people were able to make a telephone call to a family member or carer. Staff used telephone interpreting services with young people who did not speak English well. Showers and food were offered and young people were able to buy a reception pack of snacks, biscuits, squash and phone credit, repayable at 50p a week.
- I.8** Risk assessment monitoring was completed by reception staff. The sample of completed assessments that we looked at showed that attention had been paid to the information that arrived with young people and to what young people had to say, but plans to address risk during their first days in custody were rarely completed. All young people were checked regularly during their first night and night staff were briefed about the location of these young people. Night staff included an additional officer to deal with late arrivals, although they had not been trained in reception and first night responsibilities.
- I.9** New arrivals were allocated to cells on B wing, or A wing if there were no cells available on B wing. Several young people told us that the cells they had been given on arrival were dirty. We observed one cell allocated to a newly arrived young person which was in an unacceptable condition and the young person was located elsewhere. Our checks on other empty cells revealed similar deficiencies, and one young person told us that in five months he had not seen a cell cleaned for a new arrival.
- I.10** Induction started the day after young people arrived and lasted 2 weeks. The programme was comprehensive but young people told us they thought it lasted too long and this was confirmed in the findings of an internal review. Plans were in place to reduce the length of the programme by half. We observed delays in the programme being delivered and as a result young people remained locked up for too long

## Recommendation

- I.11 Initial risk assessments should include clear actions to address identified issues of concern.**

## Care and protection of children and young people

### Safeguarding

#### Expected outcomes:

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

**I.12** *The establishment had good links with the local authority. Collection and use of safeguarding data were effective. The weekly multi-agency safeguarding and health meeting played a valuable part in keeping young people safe.*

**I.13** The comprehensive safeguarding strategy and associated policies were ratified by the local safeguarding children board. The governor or head of safeguarding attended meetings of the main board and the minutes showed that issues relevant to Werrington had been discussed. The support the establishment received from the local authority was among the best we have seen.

**I.14** Since the previous inspection, the dedicated safeguarding team had been disbanded and its work allocated to all staff, but the team had been re-formed a few months before the inspection. The team was not at its full complement at the time of the inspection but the team members had detailed knowledge of the young people. The two on-site social workers continued to play a significant part in the team and provided an important link with the local authority.

**I.15** Strategic and operational safeguarding meetings took place quarterly and monthly and were chaired by the head of safeguarding or the safeguarding custodial manager. The quarterly meeting had oversight of the strategic management of safeguarding and was well attended by the local authority and other external stakeholders. The monthly operational meeting had wider representation from internal departments. A range of data was presented to the meetings, but this did not include the number of incidents of bullying that had taken place (see section on bullying and violence reduction).

**I.16** The most vulnerable and complex young people were discussed at a weekly multi-agency safeguarding and health meeting. Any member of staff could refer a young person for discussion. They included young people who could not progress off the lowest level of the rewards and sanctions scheme, bullies, vulnerable young people and young people who had been subject to repeated use of restraint. Young people remained on the agenda until the meeting was satisfied that their situation had been properly addressed. Care planning was developing and actions relating to the young person were assigned to specific staff. Minutes were widely shared and actions followed up. The meeting provided a good forum for ensuring consistency of care for young people.

## Child protection

### Expected outcomes:

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

**I.17** *Child protection referrals continued to be handled efficiently, with excellent oversight by the local authority which discharged its responsibilities to the prison diligently. Improvements had been made in the recording of child protection cases.*

**I.18** The arrangements for dealing with child protection referrals were very good. Staff whom we spoke to were clear about their role and child protection referrals were considered systematically at the monthly and quarterly safeguarding meetings.

- 1.19** Working relationships between the establishment and the local authority had traditionally been good and since the previous inspection they had improved further. The local authority designated officer and another senior manager from the local authority initiated contact with us during the inspection to explain this. Local authority staff regularly checked the quality of child protection work at the establishment and a quarterly interface meeting had recently been introduced to examine joint working practices. The recording of child protection referrals had improved and the more detailed information now held by the establishment and the local authority followed the same format as cases managed in the community. Local authority staff whom we met had an unusually good understanding of the distinctive characteristics of a juvenile custodial setting and acknowledged their responsibility to provide independent scrutiny.
- 1.20** Four child protection referrals had been made to the local authority since the beginning of the year, most relating to incidents of restraint. There had been 24 contacts between establishment and local authority concerning child protection. A strategy meeting chaired by an independent social work manager examined the referrals thoroughly and CCTV footage was routinely scrutinised. None of the four cases had progressed to a further investigation by the local authority and they had all been dealt with internally by the safeguarding department.

## 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.**

**1.21** *More young people than at the previous inspection said they would tell staff if they were being victimised. Staff were vigilant in submitting intelligence about bullying and there was good sharing of information.*

- 1.22** In our survey, 31% of young people said they would tell a member of staff if they were being victimised compared with 17% at the previous inspection. It was clear that staff were aware of the need for vigilance to tackle such behaviour and 297 security information reports (SIRs) about bullying had been submitted to the security department in the six months before the inspection. There was good sharing of information between security and the safeguarding team. The safeguarding team had started to talk individually or in small groups to young people to discuss bullying and safety issues. Victims were referred to the multi-agency safeguarding and health meeting to identify additional support.
- 1.23** A number of measures were used to help young people feel safe: mediation, a change of activity or wing and placing young people who took part in bullying or intimidation on the reducing risk programme (see section on bullying and violence reduction). Some unobtrusive measures were used to help victims, for example marking property with UV pens and checking the cells of suspected bullies on the basis of staff observation rather than involvement of the victim. An establishment survey carried out during 2013 had provided information on young people's perception of the extent of bullying.

### Housekeeping point

- 1.24** A bullying survey should be carried out regularly by the establishment.

## Suicide and self-harm prevention

### Expected outcomes:

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

- I.25** *Young people at risk of self-harm were well cared for and there was appropriate management oversight. Although the number of self-harm incidents and ACCT case management documents (assessment, care in custody and teamwork) had increased since the last inspection, almost half the incidents had involved a small number of prolific self-harmers. Records did not consistently reflect the level of care, and responsibility for some targets and objectives set for young people needed clarification.*
- I.26** The suicide and self-harm prevention policy was comprehensive. At the time of our inspection, six young people were on an open ACCT which we were told was about average.
- I.27** Suicide and self-harm prevention was managed by the safeguarding team. Information on the pattern and extent of self-harm was monitored through the monthly safeguarding meeting and there was good analysis of patterns and trends.
- I.28** During the six months before the inspection, there had been 73 incidents of self-harm, a considerable increase on the 21 at the last inspection. Thirty-six of the incidents involved five prolific self-harmers. Eighty-nine ACCTs had been opened compared with 63 at the previous inspection. Our review of files showed that the level of care given to some of the most troubled young people was very good. They were reviewed regularly at the multi-agency safeguarding and health meetings and information and actions were appropriately linked back to ACCT case managers and review meetings.
- I.29** Quality assurance checks were undertaken by the safeguarding team, weekly checks were carried out by the duty governor and daily checks by residential managers. Most staff on residential units knew about the young people on ACCTs and case notes indicated regular contact. Despite this, we came across one case where a case worker had been to see the young person but had not noted this in the ACCT document. We were not confident that all contacts were recorded or that records accurately reflected the level of support and care provided. Young people said that the levels of support they received were good, and appreciated.
- I.30** Staff whom we spoke to all had a list of young people subject to ACCT procedures which was updated each day and they knew when reviews were due. Reviews usually took place in the safeguarding office which provided privacy and a more relaxed environment than wing offices. Attendance from across the establishment was variable and case workers did not consistently attend reviews. Care maps were generally appropriate, but the responsibility for objectives in care maps and at ACCT reviews was not clear. When asked, young people were uncertain about which staff were responsible.

## Recommendation

- I.31 Care maps and ACCT reviews should clearly indicate who is responsible for targets set and follow-up actions, including conducting regular discussions to ensure consistency.**

## Behaviour management

### Expected outcomes:

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

- I.32** *The behaviour management strategy linked all relevant policies. It encouraged staff to challenge poor behaviour and acknowledge good behaviour.*

- I.33** The behaviour management strategy included all relevant policies. Staff were encouraged to challenge poor behaviour and to consider the proportionate use of behaviour management tools such as warnings, the rewards and sanctions scheme, minor reports and adjudications. They were also encouraged to acknowledge positive behaviour. We observed that staff were less tolerant of poor behaviour than at our last inspection.

- I.34** Mediation was overseen by trained staff from the YMCA. It was used to encourage better relationships between young people in conflict with each other. No young people who had undertaken mediation had been involved in further incidents.

## Rewards and sanctions

### Expected outcomes:

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

- I.35** *The rewards and sanctions scheme was not well received by young people. The scheme was applied inconsistently and not all reviews were well recorded or took account of the young person's circumstances. Targets were not set for all young people on the basic level of the scheme and young people were automatically demoted to basic with no review for some offences.*

- I.36** Young people in our groups spoke negatively about the rewards and sanctions scheme. They said demerits were issued too freely and it was difficult to gain a merit, particularly from wing staff. This was reflected in the sample of case notes that we reviewed which showed that wing staff were less likely to award merits than other staff. The differentials between the levels were adequate.

- I.37** Young people transferring from other establishments on the highest level of the scheme retained that status and young people on standard level could apply for enhanced level at any time. Staff did not nominate young people for advancement.

- I.38** Demerits were given for poor behaviour and these were recorded on individual P-Nomis files (Prison Service IT system). Reviews should have been carried out when a young person received three demerits, but we found many instances of between six and 11 demerits before a review was carried out, which led to inconsistency and confusion. Demerits that we saw were given appropriately. Young people could attend reviews and make written submissions. The records that we examined for demotion to basic level were poorly completed and did not reflect consideration of the circumstances of the young person, but rather the number of demerits gained. Many did not record targets to address the behaviour. Young people could be automatically demoted to basic level for a number of offences, with no review. There were 17 young people on the basic level of the scheme at the time of our inspection. Monitoring was poor: the records of many young people had few entries about their behaviour to contribute to their reviews while on basic level.
- I.39** Reviews of young people applying for enhanced level were more effective and showed full consideration of the young person's behaviour.

## Recommendations

- I.40** **The reasons for young people's poor perceptions of the rewards and sanctions scheme should be investigated and action taken to ensure consistent and fair application of the scheme.**
- I.41** **All rewards and sanctions scheme reviews should be fully documented and should take account of all the young person's circumstances. Clear individual targets should be set to help young people improve their behaviour.**
- I.42** **Demotion to basic level should be subject to a full review and should not be automatic.**

## Security and disciplinary procedures

### Expected outcomes:

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

- I.43** *Security was appropriately focused on the main issues. Attendance at the monthly security committee meeting was poor. Security was proportionate to the risks posed to young people and did not restrict their access to the regime. Outcomes from security reports were acted on quickly and searching was largely intelligence led. Information sharing with safeguarding staff was good. Strip-searching under restraint took place, not always as a last resort. Closed visits were not always used because of incidents relating to visits. Young people were removed from restrictions at the earliest opportunity.*

- I.44** The approach to security was proportionate to the risks posed and did not restrict young people's access to activities.

- I.45** The security department received a significant flow of information from all departments and staff were focused on the main issues of bullying, inappropriate behaviour, threats, drugs and violence.
- I.46** The security committee met monthly but was poorly attended by staff from other departments and strategic objectives were not wide ranging enough. Information was thoroughly analysed and relevant targets set to address areas requiring attention. Appropriate information reports were passed quickly to the safeguarding and safer custody teams.
- I.47** Most searches were intelligence led, although there was a requirement for every cell to be searched at least once a year. Target searches were carried out swiftly. Strip- searches were carried out following risk assessment and authorisation by a duty manager. All strip-searches were logged. There had been at least four incidents of young people being strip-searched under restraint and not as a last resort.
- I.48** Twelve young people were subject to closed visits at the time of our inspection. Records showed that closed visits did not always arise from inappropriate behaviour or incidents relating to visits. Reviews were carried out monthly by the security committee and young people were removed from the restrictions at the earliest opportunity. Reviews of banned visitors only occurred if the visitor made representation to the governor.

## Recommendations

- I.49** **Staff from all departments should attend the security committee meeting to enable the development of appropriate strategic objectives.**
- I.50** **Young people should not be strip-searched under restraint.**
- I.51** **Closed visits should only be used following illicit behaviour related to visits.**

## Housekeeping point

- I.52** Banned visitors should be reviewed monthly and restrictions lifted at the earliest opportunity.

## Adjudications

**I.53** *The number of adjudications had increased since the last inspection and was very high. Adjudications were used to manage more serious infringements of rules, and punishments were age appropriate and fair. Removal from unit was not used. Minor reports had recently been reinstated for less serious offences. The adjudication room had been improved but the environment was still not age appropriate.*

- I.54** The number of adjudications had increased since our last inspection and was four times the number per hundred prisoners in similar establishments. There had been 1,102 adjudications during 2012 and 916 in the six months before our inspection. The main charges were fighting, assaults and disobedience. More serious charges were referred to the independent adjudicator, with police involvement where necessary or when requested by young people.

- I.55** Adjudication documentation was issued the day before the hearing and young people were given adequate time to prepare their case. Young people awaiting adjudication were seen by the Barnardo's advocacy service before their hearing and could ask for help once the hearing had started. Records that we examined showed that hearings were adjourned for advice to be sought.
- I.56** The room used for adjudications had been improved since our last inspection but was still not suitable for young people.
- I.57** The adjudications that we observed were conducted in an age-appropriate manner and the young person was given every chance to express his perception of events. The documentation that we reviewed confirmed this and showed that full account was taken of mitigating circumstances.
- I.58** Punishments were awarded according to a published tariff. Punishments were consistent and appropriate and removal from unit was not used. Mediation was offered to young people involved in fights and assaults and other conflict between young people, and mediation was taken into account in the award given. A reparation scheme had been implemented two months before our inspection which enabled young people who had damaged property to undertake voluntary work in their own time to repair the damage. This was well received by young people.
- I.59** Adjudication review meetings took place quarterly to identify trends, undertake long-term monitoring, and review the punishment tariff and minor reports. The governor conducted a 10% quality check of disciplinary hearings.

## Recommendation

- I.60** **The very high number of adjudications should be investigated and action taken to reduce them.**

## Housekeeping point

- I.61** Adjudications should be heard in a more suitable environment. (Repeated recommendation I.74)

## Bullying and violence reduction

### Expected outcomes:

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

- I.62** Steps had been taken to reduce the potential for bullying but young people still talked to us about 'rent'<sup>2</sup> and the incidence of bullying was not monitored. Violent incidents had increased since the previous inspection.

<sup>2</sup> Young people asked other young people to pay in canteen items for being on the unit.

- I.63** The violence reduction strategy was linked to other appropriate local policies. The safeguarding team explained violence reduction and other safeguarding measures during the induction programme, sometimes with the help of another young person.
- I.64** Sensible steps had been taken since the previous inspection to reduce the potential for intimidation and violence. Young people moved to and from activities in escorted groups rather than on free flow. Interactions and behaviour between young people were noted by staff and shared with the security department where appropriate, and the young person involved was supported. Play fighting was challenged.
- I.65** Bullying had been fully discussed at a recent safeguarding meeting, including the need to challenge shouting out of windows, although bullying was not a standing agenda item. The safeguarding team were very knowledgeable about young people but they did not monitor the incidence of bullying to measure the effectiveness of their procedures. We were told that 'rent' had been a problem a few months earlier. Robust action had been taken, including the transfer of the suspected ringleader, but it had started to feature again in security reports and needed to be addressed.
- I.66** The reducing risk programme (RRP) was used to manage the behaviour of young people who posed a risk to others through bullying, violence or other intimidating behaviour. Members of the safeguarding team took the lead in working through the programme with young people, who were given clear targets. Documentation that we looked at showed that young people were given appropriate targets, including attending courses with the programmes department. Records showed the pleasure that one young person took in being able to say 'I've been good' at his weekly review and in receiving positive feedback from wing staff on his behaviour. Notes of weekly reviews were thorough and were recorded on electronic case notes.
- I.67** Young people on RRP lost their privileges which they had the opportunity to earn back gradually at the weekly reviews. The safeguarding officers decided on the removal of privileges. There was no governance of this practice and new procedures for the oversight and endorsement of decisions by safeguarding managers were being introduced.
- I.68** There had been 123 violent incidents during the six months before the inspection, compared with over 100 over the same period at the previous inspection. Many incidents were low-level fights or assaults and staff quickly intervened. Three incidents since the previous inspection had resulted in serious injuries to young people and the police liaison officer had provided support to manage these incidents.

## Recommendation

- I.69** **The incidence of bullying should be robustly monitored and the results should be used to measure the effectiveness of interventions.**

## The use of force

### Expected outcomes:

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

**I.70** *The number of incidents of use of force was the same as comparable establishments and significant levels of de-escalation were recorded. Full control and restraint was used as a last resort, although some pain compliance was reported, which was inappropriate with this age group. Governance by all appropriate agencies was excellent.*

**I.71** The number of incidents of full use of control and restraint was similar to other comparable establishments and had reduced since our last inspection. There had been 246 incidents in the previous six months, 102 of which had involved full use of restraint techniques.

**I.72** Documentation that we reviewed showed that force, particularly the full use of control and restraint, was used as a last resort. Incident reports were completed thoroughly, but too many lacked accompanying documents. De-escalation was evident in all the cases we looked at and few young people were relocated to the reintegration and support unit (RSU). Pain compliance in the form of the mandibular angle technique had been used (a form of restraint which involves pressure being applied at a point below the ear), which was inappropriate with young people.

**I.73** Governance of use of force was excellent. All planned incidents were video recorded and CCTV coverage was retrieved for many spontaneous incidents. We reviewed a sample of recordings and found the use of force to be proportionate to the circumstances. All recordings and incidents of use of force were reviewed at the weekly force minimisation meeting attended by external agencies, such as social workers, advocacy staff and mediators, as well as prison staff. Lessons to be learned were disseminated to all staff with suggestions as to how the management of incidents could have been improved. Health care staff attended all planned incidents and visited young people quickly after a spontaneous incident. Handcuffs were used only when necessary.

**I.74** Special accommodation had been used once when furniture had been removed from a young person's cell. The use had been appropriately managed.

**I.75** Young people were debriefed by a duty governor or a member of the safeguarding team after any incident of use of force. Follow-up debriefings were carried out by the safeguarding team. The young person's parent or carer and their youth offending team worker were informed of the circumstances of any incident where force had been used. Child protection issues arising from the use of force were dealt with quickly and thoroughly by the safeguarding team.

### Recommendation

**I.76 Pain infliction should not be applied to young people.**

## Good practice

- I.77** *Governance of use of force was excellent and the dissemination of learning points to staff offered alternative ways of managing very challenging young people and ensured that staff understood that force was to be used as a last resort.*

## Separation/removal from normal location

### Expected outcomes:

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

- I.78** *The environment in the reintegration and support unit (RSU) had improved since our last inspection: there was less graffiti and cells were cleaner. Relationships between staff and young people were excellent. Staff knew the young people well and we observed some commendable supportive work. Few young people remained in the unit for long periods and effective planning enabled most young people to be reintegrated to normal location. The regime on the unit was adequate and young people had access to education and activities off the unit.*

- I.79** The environment in the RSU had improved significantly since our last inspection. Cells and communal areas were cleaner and there was much less graffiti. The policy clearly explained the regime in the unit and was fully implemented.
- I.80** One young person had been resident on the unit for six days at the time of our inspection for reasons of good order. Only two of the 143 young people held in the unit in the last six months had remained for over 30 days and nine had stayed for over 10 days. Fifty-nine of the young people had been held awaiting adjudication. Most young people returned to residential units following separation.
- I.81** All young people on the unit had been appropriately authorised for separation. Documentation showed that young people were reviewed frequently according to their circumstances, and at least weekly. Reintegration planning was started promptly and no later than the first separation review. Records showed that young people were reintegrated well to residential units and were offered support by appropriate departments. We saw excellent support offered to two young people awaiting independent adjudications who had expressed a fear of the procedure. Staff brought them to the unit before the hearings, explained the process fully and ensured they were offered the support of advocates. Both were in good spirits when we spoke to them after their adjudications and one had been offered a support plan.
- I.82** The regime on the unit was adequate and young people were able to attend activities off the unit and participate in education and cleaning on the unit as part of the reintegration plan. Young people said that they were well treated by staff and had daily access to telephones, showers, a governor and health care staff. Relationships between staff and young people were excellent and staff knew the young people very well. Not all staff had received mental health training.
- I.83** The segregation and monitoring review group met quarterly to consider a wide range of information and analysis of statistics which supported the policy of reintegration to residential units.

## Recommendation

- I.84 All segregation unit staff should receive mental health training.** (Repeated recommendation I.96)

## 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.**

- I.85** *The young people's substance misuse service provided an appropriate range of interventions despite being in a state of flux during the handover to a new provider.*

- I.86** The education department continued to deliver drugs education with oversight by the young people's substance misuse service (YPSMS) manager. Drugs were not widely available and the security department had demonstrated effective intelligence gathering. The drug strategy committee had been absorbed into the security committee which was not well attended by non-security staff.
- I.87** No clinical treatment had been required since the previous inspection. Delphi healthcare (based at HMP Drake Hall) provided this service if the need arose.
- I.88** The drug and alcohol charity 'Lifeline Project' was in the process of taking over the YPSMS. The new team operational on 1 November 2013 consisted of a full-time team leader, three drug and alcohol co-ordinators, one drug and alcohol support worker and one administrator. Outcomes for young people were not being adversely affected during the changeover. Most young people whom we spoke to, who had used the service recently, spoke highly of the workers and the level of support they had received. The team's caseload at the time of the inspection was 51.
- I.89** The education department delivered a drugs and alcohol awareness programme to all young people during induction, with some oversight, training and advice from the YPSMS manager.
- I.90** The YPSMS provided targeted one-to-one and group interventions which covered a good range of drug- and alcohol-related issues. Care plans were not sufficiently detailed.
- I.91** The smoking cessation service was delivered by health care workers but links with the YPSMS had much improved since the last inspection, and referrals were made to the YPSMS when young people smoked substances other than tobacco.

## Housekeeping point

- I.92** Care plans for targeted substance misuse interventions should be comprehensive and include SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and timebound) targets.

## Drug testing

- I.93** In our survey, 11% of young people said it was easy to get drugs. The random positive mandatory drug testing (MDT) rate had stood at 0% for the six months before the inspection. Six suspicion tests in the same period had yielded six positive results for cannabis which demonstrated effective intelligence gathering. We were concerned that poor attendance at the security committee by non-security staff ran the risk of a lack of strategic focus on drugs and alcohol in the establishment. The drug strategy document and action plans needed revision.
- I.94** The MDT suite was clean, tidy and appropriately equipped. Regular suite cleaning was recorded in the MDT log book.

## Recommendation

- I.95** **The security committee, attended by all appropriate departments, should establish and monitor the drug and alcohol strategy and action plans.**

## 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 environment on the wings was stark and poorly maintained. Some cells were in an unacceptable condition, particularly on the first night wing. Cells designed for one continued to accommodate two, with inadequate furniture and toilet screening. Response time to cell call bells was poor. Access to prison kit, showers and telephones had improved.*
- 2.2** External areas were clean and presented well but the environment on the wings was stark, with no pictures or murals. Many areas were grubby and required maintenance. CCTV was installed on all wings and supervision was satisfactory. Association areas were reasonably well equipped and facilities in the two youth clubs were good.
- 2.3** The condition of some cells was the worst we had seen for some time. Some cells were filthy, gloomy and covered in graffiti, and contained offensive material, heavily scaled toilets, damaged furniture and smashed observation panels. Young people had access to cleaning materials and were given the opportunity to clean their cell each day but this was not monitored effectively. Weekly cell inspections had been unsuccessful in encouraging some young people to keep their cells clean. The establishment had recently introduced a cell decoration programme but many cells continued to be in a poor decorative condition. We were particularly concerned at the condition of the cells on B wing, which provided accommodation for young people on their first night in custody, many of which were in an uninhabitable state (see section on early days in custody).
- 2.4** All cells had been designed for one young person, but 44 cells were used to accommodate two young people, similar to the previous inspection. Cells were cramped with not enough furniture and inadequate toilet screening.
- 2.5** In our survey, only 26% of young people said that their cell call bell was normally answered within five minutes against the comparator of 38%. An electronic cell call register was in place on all wings. Timings from the register showed that there were considerable delays in cell call bells being answered throughout the establishment. Quality assurance checks were ineffective.
- 2.6** In our survey, 72% of young people said they could normally get a shower every day compared to 36% at the last inspection. Access to showers had improved with the implementation of a domestic hour during the core day, including daily access for young people on restricted regimes. The condition of showers varied: some were clean and others required maintenance. Young people were locked in the shower and had to bang on the door to gain the attention of staff. The practice of locking the door was unnecessary.
- 2.7** A new prison clothing exchange procedure had recently been implemented which had improved access to clothing. Young people could wear their own clothes on the wings. The laundry facilities on A and B wings were out of order and young people had resorted to washing their clothes in cell basins, which was inappropriate.

- 2.8** Access to telephones had improved since the last inspection. In our survey, 74% of young people said they could use the telephone every day compared with 46% previously. A time limit on calls ensured that telephones were not monopolised. Access to mail was good.
- 2.9** Young people could make applications each day. Most young people said that applications were responded to fairly.

## Recommendations

- 2.10** The wings should be decorated and maintained to reflect the population and cells should be maintained in good decorative condition.
- 2.11** Residential staff should ensure that young people keep their cells and communal areas clean by offering appropriate incentives and practical help where necessary. (Repeated recommendation 2.19)
- 2.12** Cells designed for one should not accommodate two young people. (Repeated recommendation 2.14)
- 2.13** Cell call bells should be answered promptly.

## Housekeeping points

- 2.14** Young people should not be locked in the shower area.
- 2.15** Wing laundry facilities should be maintained.

## 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.**

**2.16** *Most young people said they were treated with respect and we observed some positive engagement. Staff expectations of young people were higher than previously. The personal officer scheme was still not embedded and case notes reflected this. Consultation arrangements continued to be effective.*

- 2.17** In our survey, three-quarters of young people said staff treated them with respect and this was reiterated by young people in our focus groups. We found the quality of relationships predominantly constructive and particularly positive between education staff and young people. All staff routinely referred to young people by their preferred name and had a good level of knowledge of the young people in their care. Low-level incidents of boisterous behaviour, where uniformed staff had not intervened at the previous inspection, were now challenged. Incidents we saw demonstrated that staff appeared more confident and less tolerant of unacceptable behaviour. Expectations of young people were higher than previously.

- 2.18** In our survey, 78% of young people felt their personal officer tried to help them compared to 54% previously. However, we found that the personal officer scheme remained ineffective. Personal officer engagement with other departments and in case reviews, particularly ACCT (assessment, care in custody and teamwork) case management reviews, was still not embedded.
- 2.19** Officer entries in electronic case history notes were irregular and largely mechanistic, focusing predominantly on negative behaviour, with little mention of personal circumstances. Entries did not reflect the good level of engagement between staff and young people. Quality assurance was ineffective.
- 2.20** A structured young people's consultation forum was held each month. Young people were encouraged to present suggestions and subsequent actions were delegated to specific staff to follow up.

## Recommendations

- 2.21** **Each young person should have a designated officer on their residential unit who is their central point of contact and support and takes responsibility for their day-to-day care and wellbeing through frequent contact and by attending relevant meetings relating to their care.** (Repeated recommendation 2.32)
- 2.22** **All electronic case notes should be comprehensive, with balanced comments reflecting positive and negative behaviour.** (Repeated recommendation 2.31)

## 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.**

- 2.23** *The equality policy did not include each protected characteristic. There was no obvious discrimination against young people from minority groups. The establishment's approach to promoting diversity was underdeveloped. There continued to be a lack of support groups for young people. Complaints were investigated well. With the exception of Gypsy, Romany, Travellers and gay young people, the needs of minority groups were met well.*

## Strategic management

- 2.24** The establishment equality and diversity policy did not cover each protected characteristic or specify the support available to young people from minority groups. A perfunctory review had been undertaken in June 2013 but the policy was not due for a full review until June 2014.

- 2.25** The diversity and equality action team (DEAT) met bimonthly and was chaired by the governor or deputy governor. Attendance had improved since the previous inspection and was now good. Members of the senior management team took the lead for each protected characteristic and reported developments to the DEAT. However, with the exception of race and disability, there was minimal involvement from those responsible for other protected characteristics in promoting equality and diversity. The DEAT considered SMART (systematic monitoring and analysis of race equality treatment) monitoring data which suggested that black and minority ethnic young people were not discriminated against across a range of indicators. A local monitoring tool had also been used to determine if young people in each age range were discriminated against. A range of criteria had been monitored and these had shown no evidence of discrimination.
- 2.26** At the time of the inspection three young people acted as equality representatives. They were unclear about their role and had been given no formal training. They met the equality manager intermittently and attended the DEAT, but had no input to the development of equality or diversity. There were still no support groups for young people from a minority group.
- 2.27** The promotion of equality and diversity was limited. There were some posters celebrating Black History Month and a timetable of events. However, there were few positive images representing diversity and limited promotion of other cultural events. Most young people and staff were unaware of how diversity was being promoted.
- 2.28** Seventy discrimination incident report forms (DIRFs) had been submitted so far in 2013 which was much higher than at the previous inspection. However, most were unrelated to incidents of discrimination and were more suited to the formal complaints procedure. Most discrimination complaints related to race equality. Incidents were investigated reasonably well and responses were polite and timely. Completed DIRFs were not subject to external scrutiny. The establishment maintained a list of young people who had been identified as racist and, although there was no programme to challenge racists, the equality officer undertook some one-to-one work.

## Recommendations

- 2.29** **All aspects of equality and diversity should be promoted throughout the establishment.**
- 2.30** **Support groups should be established for young people who belong to minority groups** (Repeated recommendation 2.40)

## Housekeeping point

- 2.31** The equality policy should be reviewed and should include specific support available to young people from minority groups.

## Diverse needs

- 2.32** About half the population consisted of black and minority ethnic young people. In focus groups and in our survey, black and minority ethnic young people reported experiences similar to white young people across a range of indicators.

- 2.33** In our survey, 6% of young people considered themselves to be from a Gypsy, Romany, Traveller background. The equality manager was unaware of any young person from this minority group.
- 2.34** There were 12 foreign national young people at the time of the inspection, six of whom had remand status. The equality manager had regular contact with the minors team at the Home Office and with embassies. No independent immigration advice was available. Limited information was available in other languages but there was good use of interpretation services. An interpreting device held in reception to communicate with new arrivals who did not speak English was used when required. Teaching English as a foreign language was taught on a one-to-one basis to a number of young people. Young people were given a free five-minute telephone call to their country of origin.
- 2.35** In our survey, 16% of young people described themselves as having a disability and had similar views about their treatment as young people with no disability. Identification during the reception process was good and those young people with complex needs were referred to a multi-agency safeguarding and health meeting where care plans were agreed. About 40 young people had been identified as having a learning need. Special educational needs coordinators (SENCOs) distributed a list of young people with identified education related behaviour to all departments, ensuring a holistic approach to the management of young people with special educational needs. During adjudications, information from the SENCOs was taken into account when determining punishments. At the time of the inspection, no young people had a personal emergency evacuation plan.
- 2.36** At the time of the inspection, no young people had identified themselves to the establishment as gay or bisexual. There were no displays promoting positive images of gay people.

## Recommendation

- 2.37** **The establishment should ensure that the needs of young people from minority groups are addressed by actively promoting all aspects of diversity**

## Housekeeping point

- 2.38** Positive images of gay people should be displayed throughout the establishment.

## 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.**

- 2.39** *The chaplaincy represented all major faiths and was well integrated into the establishment. Young people were positive about the chaplaincy.*

- 2.40** The chaplaincy provided for all major faiths in the population. A full-time Muslim chaplain was supported by a range of sessional chaplains from other faiths. In our survey, 73% of young people said they believed their religious beliefs were respected against the comparator

of 58%. Young people in our focus groups were positive about the chaplaincy service. All young people were visited by the chaplain each week and were asked if they wished to attend one of the corporate religious services. All major festivals were celebrated. A limited range of classes were delivered, including the Alpha course and Islamic lessons, but there was no community involvement with the chaplaincy, which was an omission.

## 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.**

**2.41** *Fewer young people thought complaints were dealt with quickly than the comparator, although we found that complaints were managed well. Responses to complaints and quality assurance procedures were good.*

**2.42** In our survey, only 21% of young people said they felt complaints were sorted out quickly against the comparator of 40%. There had been no late complaint forms in the previous six months. Complaint forms were freely available on wings and the confidential locked boxes were emptied daily by the complaints clerk.

**2.43** In the previous six months, 208 complaints had been submitted, which was similar to the last inspection. About 35% of these complaints had been upheld. Complaints data were collated and analysed at a monthly performance meeting. Identified concerns were addressed by the senior management team. The three most common causes for complaint were wing issues, staff issues and property.

**2.44** Responses to complaints were fully investigated, answered in a courteous manner and at the appropriate level. A quality check sheet was used by managers to ensure the quality of responses was appropriate. All complaints were seen by the safeguarding manager, senior social worker and a member of the Independent Monitoring Board. The deputy governor carried out a check on a random sample which provided good quality assurance. Complaints with a child protection element were forwarded to the local authority designated officer for further investigation. Advocates from an independent child advocacy service provided an extremely useful source of support for young people who required it.

## Legal rights

### Expected outcomes:

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

**2.45** *A recently written policy outlined the support that should be provided to young people to obtain legal advice and guidance. Induction staff and case workers had clear roles and case workers appropriately liaised with community services through youth offending teams (YOTs). There was, however, no quality assurance in place to ensure that young people received a consistent service.*

**2.46** Since the last inspection, the establishment had drawn up an appropriate legal services policy and procedures document which covered key issues and described how young people could acquire information and advice, including bail support.

**2.47** Induction staff obtained key initial information on a young person's status and whether they needed legal advice to make a bail application or to appeal against their sentence or conviction. Information was forwarded to case workers who took primary responsibility for obtaining necessary support and information, usually in discussion with community YOT workers. Initial contact with young people by their case workers also included legal advice and guidance. Young people were given leaflets outlining support services and these were also available in all the review meeting rooms.

**2.48** Case workers liaised well with community YOT workers and there were particularly good links with the bail and remand team at Birmingham YOT.

**2.49** There were limited quality assurance arrangements in the case work team and we were not confident that the service available to young people was of consistent quality.

### Recommendation

**2.50** **Quality assurance of case work should be enhanced to ensure that young people receive consistent support with legal rights.**

## 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.**

**2.51** *Health services remained good, with further progress since our last inspection. Young people were treated courteously, with timely access to primary care services. Care planning was commendable. Wider access to speech and language therapy was needed. Young people had prompt access to dental checks. The pharmacy service was satisfactory. Mental health services were very good.*

## Governance arrangements

- 2.52** Health services were commissioned by NHS England and provided by Staffordshire and Stoke on Trent Partnership Trust and CAMHS (child and adolescent mental health services) by ENGAGE (South Staffordshire and Shropshire NHS Foundation Trust). Mature partnership working was demonstrated by regular partnership board meetings with appropriate representation and an agenda focused on the needs of young people. There was an effective structure of local operational and governance meetings. The draft health needs assessment (HNA) was due to be published.
- 2.53** In our survey, 65% of young people who had been to health care were positive about the quality of services against the comparator of 54%. A regular health focus group provided young people with the opportunity to raise concerns and suggestions for improvements.
- 2.54** Health care appointments and treatments were carried out in the main health care department, two wing treatment rooms and a reception room; all provided a clean and clinically suitable environment. A satisfactory infection control audit had been completed earlier in the year with 98% compliance, and a satisfactory patient-led assessment of the care environment had been completed recently.
- 2.55** Twenty-four hour nursing cover provided minor illness and injury care at night or weekends. Young people requiring medical care could be referred to the out-of-hours GP service which provided telephone advice and visits. Emergency response by the local ambulance service was good and there had been a prompt response recently for a young person with serious burns.
- 2.56** Automated defibrillators were located in health care and the main information centre and nurses were trained to use them. No prison staff had been trained in their use and very few prison staff had received up-to-date basic life support training. A full resuscitation kit was located in health care and smaller grab bags in the wing treatment rooms. Daily checks were up to date.
- 2.57** Care planning was systematic and focused on young people's needs, including significant input by health care to the prison multi-agency safeguarding and health meeting in respect of young people with complex needs.
- 2.58** Young people could acquire age-appropriate health promotion advice and literature appropriate to their needs, including immunisations and sexual health. Health care was part of a wider prison health promotion group which had recently organised a successful health fair.
- 2.59** There was effective reporting and learning from clinical incidents and we noted commendable investigations and action following the small number of serious incidents. There had been effective escalation of a concern about a young person with specific vulnerabilities who had received poor emergency care at a local hospital.
- 2.60** The complaint system was confidential and well advertised and young people knew how to make a complaint. There had been two written complaints in the last year.
- 2.61** Consent for information sharing and treatment was sought in line with mental capacity guidance for young people. There was good recognition of safeguarding needs supported by effective links with other prison departments and external agencies.

- 2.62** Policies were comprehensive, including information sharing and consent and infection control; a few policies were out of date and there were gaps in policy adaptation for the prison environment.
- 2.63** Staff mandatory training was up to date and most staff had received further clinical training; there was scope to enhance the child-focused skills and knowledge of all the nursing staff. Clinical supervision was well established and used by staff.

## Recommendations

- 2.64** **An up-to-date health needs assessment should address the health and well being needs of young people, including the need for wider access to speech and language therapy to support young people with communication and behavioural challenges.**
- 2.65** **All prison staff should have up-to-date basic life support skills, including use of automated defibrillators.**
- 2.66** **Specific child-focused skills and knowledge training, including mental health, should be available to nursing staff.**

## Housekeeping point

- 2.67** Policies should be up to date and should address the specific circumstances of the prison environment.

## Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.68** Primary care services were good and young people we spoke to appreciated health care staff and said they felt comfortable talking to them. We observed sensitive and courteous care of young people.
- 2.69** Young people were screened on arrival, including identification of disability and learning disability, which was shared with the establishment disability liaison officer. Appropriate referrals were made to the GP, substance use services and mental health. A new comprehensive health screening tool was due to be implemented.
- 2.70** A secondary assessment was completed in reception for young people transferring from other establishments. Young people arriving from court or secure training centres were assessed the following day. Clinical records showed good attention to risk and appropriate referrals.
- 2.71** Young people could ask nursing staff or submit an application to see a GP. Most young people were seen by the GP within a day of their request. GP consultations that we observed identified and treated pertinent issues. Nurses visited the residential wings three times a day and young people said they found nurses accessible. Young people were escorted to health care by a designated officer and there were very few 'did not attend' appointments.
- 2.72** There were a few young people with long-term conditions; reception and secondary screening triggered identification and clinical records showed appropriate follow up. External appointments were rarely cancelled.

- 2.73** SystmOne electronic clinical records provided a timely and accurate reflection of care given.

## Pharmacy

- 2.74** Medication was supplied by a local pharmacy and administered by nursing staff. Age-appropriate information about their medication was available to young people.
- 2.75** The pharmacist attended the health promotion forum but was not routinely available to young people for advice and information.
- 2.76** Paper prescription/administration charts that we reviewed showed some dose omissions with no reason recorded. Missed doses were routinely followed up but we noted some omissions in recording the reasons for missed doses on one chart, although this had been recorded on SystmOne. There was an isolated example of a young man who had not requested a new asthma preventative inhaler which had not been picked up by nursing or pharmacy staff, and he was then given an asthma review.
- 2.77** In-possession risk assessments were carried out correctly and recorded on SystmOne. Young people were only able to have creams and inhalers in possession even when the risk assessment indicated they could have all their medicines in possession. The revised in-possession policy had not yet been ratified. A reasonable range of medicines was included under patient group directions<sup>3</sup> (PGDs) and the homely remedies policy, but non-prescription medicines were often administered rather than given to young people to self manage. Young people were encouraged to ask for new supplies of their medicines.
- 2.78** Medicines were stored and recorded in accordance with legal and professional requirements.
- 2.79** The medicines and therapeutics committee was attended by relevant stakeholders and had developed a formulary. Prescribing was age appropriate.

## Recommendation

- 2.80** **Young people who miss one or more doses of prescribed medicines and/or do not renew regular essential prescriptions should always be followed up to ensure their wellbeing. The medicines administration record should clearly show the reason for missed doses.**

## Housekeeping points

- 2.81** The draft in-possession policy should be ratified and implemented appropriately and young people should be able to self manage non-prescription medicines where risk assessments indicate.
- 2.82** Pharmacy-led clinics should be explored to give young people community equivalent services.

---

<sup>3</sup> Enable the supply and administration of prescription-only medicine by persons other than a doctor or pharmacist, usually a nurse

## Dentistry

- 2.83 A weekly dental clinic was provided by an NHS Trust dentist. Out-of-hours access to emergency treatment was also provided by the Trust.
- 2.84 Young people had prompt access to dental checks and the full range of NHS treatment. There were seven young people on the waiting list at the time of the inspection and the longest wait for a routine appointment was two weeks.
- 2.85 An easy-to-read oral hygiene leaflet was available in the waiting room.
- 2.86 The dental suite was modern, clean and met national standards, including requisite checks of specialist equipment.

## Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.87 Mental health services were provided through an integrated arrangement between the primary mental health nurses and a CAMHS team of psychologists and a visiting psychiatrist. Primary mental health nurses had not received child-focused training.
- 2.88 CAMHS staff undertook assessments of young people identified as potentially having a learning disability. There were well developed links between the Mental Health staff and other agencies including YOTs. Access to speech and language therapy to support young people with communication and behavioural difficulties was limited.
- 2.89 Young people were seen by primary mental health nurses within 24 hours and within a maximum of 5 days by CAMHS staff. The visiting psychiatrist saw young people who required a medical assessment or specialist prescribing. Members of the mental health team were responsive to the needs of young people and accepted referrals from mainstream staff as well as from young people themselves.
- 2.90 We observed excellent and thoughtful consultations with some troubled young people supported by mature links with other departments, including safeguarding and social work. Young people we spoke to said they felt supported and cared for.
- 2.91 We noted some delayed and cancelled appointments caused by lack of escorts.
- 2.92 There were effective links with community CAMHS and community mental health teams to facilitate transition from prison to community. There had been no mental health act assessments or transfers to secure mental health units in the last year.
- 2.93 Very few prison staff had received up-to-date mental health awareness training despite the commissioning of CAMHS to provide it; we were told that there were no available sessions in the prison staff mandatory training cycle.

## Recommendation

- 2.94 **Mental health awareness training, including learning disability, for prison staff should be prioritised to ensure they can support and manage young people effectively.**

## Housekeeping point

- 2.95** Efforts should be made to ensure young people do not suffer delayed or cancelled appointments.

## 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 were negative about the quality and quantity of food but we found the quality good. The menu was balanced and approved by a nutritionist. The kitchen and serveries were well maintained. Most young people could dine in association but it was inappropriate for food to be served at cell doors for some young people. Consultation arrangements were good.*

- 2.97** Young people in our survey and during the inspection were negative about the quality and quantity of food. We found portion sizes reasonable and food quality good. The budget for meals was £2.40 per young person per day. The four-week menu cycle included a nutritionally balanced range of options, including vegetarian, vegan, religious and medical diets. Breakfast provided the option of cereal or porridge and toast and was adequate. Fresh fruit and vegetables were available each day. The menu was regularly checked by a nutritionist.
- 2.98** The kitchen and serveries were clean and well maintained. Young people cleaned the kitchen but did no cooking, which was a missed opportunity. Young people who worked on the serveries were appropriately dressed in whites and the servery was supervised by staff to ensure consistency of portion control.
- 2.99** Young people were able to dine in association except for lunch. However, a considerable number of young people who were on loss of privileges or on the basic level of the rewards and sanctions scheme had meals served at cell doors, which was unnecessary and disrespectful.
- 2.100** Consultation arrangements had improved since the last inspection. Food comments books were readily available and all comments were responded to in writing by the catering manager. The catering manager attended the monthly young persons' focus group meeting and there had been changes to the menu in response to comments. A survey was completed bi-annually and actions taken where appropriate. A healthy eating campaign had been launched at a health promotion day, which was a positive initiative.

## Recommendations

- 2.101** **Young people should be employed to prepare food so that they can achieve related qualifications.**
- 2.102** **All meals should be issued at the servery and eaten in association.**

## 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.**

**2.103** *Purchases were organised well and attempts were being made to ensure that all young people could buy some goods regardless of when they arrived at the establishment.*

**2.104** Purchases were managed efficiently. Young people could place an order each week. Young people who arrived too late in the week to place an order were able to buy a small bag of goods delivered at the same time as other orders. This alleviated the problem of a young person having to wait over a week to place his first order. Consultation meetings on items available to buy were open to any young person and there was evidence that goods were added to the list to meet local requests.

**2.105** Some additional items could be purchased from a catalogue, and newspapers and magazines could be ordered. There were no administration charges and where possible staff collected catalogue goods and delivery charges did not apply.



## Section 3. Purposeful activity

### Time out of cell

#### Expected outcomes:

**Children and young people spend most of their time out of their cell, engaged in activities such as education, leisure and cultural pursuits, seven days a week.<sup>4</sup>**

- 3.1** *Most young people had over eight hours out of cell during the week, and less at weekends. Young people on the basic level of the rewards and sanctions scheme fared particularly badly at weekends. New exercise areas had been built and young people had recently started daily timetabled access to time outside.*
- 3.2** The establishment reported an average of less than seven hours unlocked each weekday. We estimated that most young people received over eight hours unlocked each day, but those on disciplinary losses of dining out or association or who had more wing-based activities fared worse. We saw some slippage during the inspection, for example young people locked up 10 minutes before the end of association scheduled in the core day. During checks that we carried out over the week, we found more than a quarter of young people in their cells. Reasons included issues with other young people that needed resolution, refusal of activity, activity on the unit, pre- or post-domestic hour when showers, telephone calls and time outside took place. We found some young people on induction in their cells, and young people who had on-unit education received about 30 minutes during the morning or afternoon and spent the rest of that half day in their cells.
- 3.3** Time out of cell at weekends was more limited for all young people, with lock-up at 5.25pm. Young people on the basic rewards and sanctions level could have as little as one hour out of cell each day at weekends; a few young people in this position expressed the view that they would rather be in the reintegration and support unit where the regime was better.
- 3.4** New exercise areas had been built and had just started to be used. Although equipment for the yards had not yet arrived, the opportunity for young people to have some time outside each day was an improvement since the last inspection. The domestic hour included 30 minutes outside. Association took place daily and young people were able to attend youth clubs as well as wing association. In our survey, three-quarters of young people said they had association each day.

### Recommendations

- 3.5 All young people should receive 10 hours out of cell each day.**
- 3.6 Young people should have at least one hour outside each day.**

<sup>4</sup> Time out of cell, in addition to formal 'purposeful activity', includes any time children and young people are out of their cells to associate or use communal facilities to take showers or make telephone calls.

## Education, learning and skills

Inspection of the provision of education and educational standards, as well as vocational training in YOIs for young people, is undertaken by the Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted<sup>5</sup>) working under the general direction of HM Inspectorate of Prisons. For information on how Ofsted inspects education and training see the Ofsted framework and handbook for inspection.

### Expected outcomes:

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

**3.7** *A clear strategic direction had been implemented with a strong focus on the improvement of the education, learning and skills provision. The self-assessment process needed to be more formalised. Good internal and external partnerships were used well to drive improvement. The number of classes cancelled had reduced significantly since the last inspection and punctuality and attendance had improved. Quality improvement processes had improved. The range of education courses met the needs of young people but the variety of vocational training needed improvement. Learning support practitioners were used well. Behaviour management was generally good. Achievement of accredited qualifications was variable. Young people were gaining in confidence and improving their personal development skills. The library provided a welcoming environment and organised a variety of projects to interest young people.*

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

*Outcomes for children and young people engaged in learning and skills and work activities:*  
Requires improvement

*Quality of learning and skills and work activities, including the quality of teaching, training, learning and assessment:*  
Requires improvement

*Effectiveness of leadership and management of learning and skills and work activities:*  
Requires improvement

## Management of education and learning and skills

**3.9** *A clear strategic direction had been developed and implemented since the last inspection, focusing on improving the overall provision. The operational development plan for learning and skills was driving improvement but needed to be fully formalised to facilitate monitoring of progress.*

<sup>5</sup> Ofsted is the Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills. It reports directly to the UK Parliament and is independent and impartial. It (inter alia) inspects and regulates services that provide education and skills for all ages, including those in custody. For information on Ofsted's inspection framework, please visit: <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk>.

**3.10** Internal partnership working between the OLASS (offenders' learning and skills services) provider, The Manchester College, and the establishment was very effective at driving improvement, but the overall OLASS provision still needed improvement. The College had recruited additional staff to reduce the number of cancelled classes, although improvement was still needed, and had developed an effective contingency plan to cover absenteeism. Punctuality had improved and most young people arrived on time for their class; attendance had also improved to around 87%. Opportunities for staff development were good and support for new teachers was very effective. The College had implemented a more robust process for observations of teaching, learning and assessment and there were early indications of a positive impact on the quality of teaching. The self-assessment procedure for the OLASS provision was well understood and reflected the findings of inspectors. A wider self-assessment procedure encompassing all learning and skills in the establishment was being developed. Staff were motivated to improve and morale was high. The range of available data to review and monitor performance was satisfactory.

## Recommendations

- 3.11** The number of cancelled classes should continue to be reduced.
- 3.12** The establishment-wide self-assessment process should be formalised and linked with the operational development plan to improve the monitoring of progress.

## Provision of activities

- 3.13** There were sufficient activity places; allocation to activities was managed well and was fair and equitable. Education staff were skilled at directing young people to the most appropriate courses. Initial assessment of young people's wider learning needs was good and good efforts were made to use information on prior attainment to inform the initial assessment. The special educational needs co-ordinator supported young people's learning very effectively, developing strategies to overcome complex barriers to learning. These were shared effectively across the establishment, with an excellent guide for teachers and establishment staff. The provision of information, advice and guidance by The Manchester College was good.
- 3.14** The range of OLASS provision in education generally met the needs of young people and included English, mathematics, information technology, art, personal and social development courses and business enterprise. The variety of vocational training required improvement and more courses were needed to develop independent living skills. Plans were at an advanced stage to introduce additional vocational courses to meet this need. Employment skills development was available through an accredited programme (Ready, steady, work) which included personal attributes, workplace values and practices, and financial capability.
- 3.15** Additional activities such as the youth club were not sufficiently integrated with learning and skills to enhance learning and personal development. There was not enough opportunity for young people to participate in work experience in the establishment.

## Recommendations

- 3.16** A wider range of vocational training courses should be provided, with a focus on the development of independent living skills.

- 3.17 Youth club activities should be improved to enhance the opportunities for young people's learning and personal development.**
- 3.18 The opportunity for young people to gain work experience in the establishment should be reviewed and enhanced.**

### Quality of provision

- 3.19** The quality of teaching, learning and assessment required improvement. There were not enough good classes. In the best sessions, the planning of learning was good with extension activities for the more able learners. Teachers used a variety of activities to motivate young people and engage them in learning. Learning support practitioners were used effectively and supported learning well. In weaker sessions, young people were not sufficiently challenged, the pace was slow and young people became bored and disengaged. In most cases, behaviour was managed well and did not affect learning except in a few weaker sessions. Staff were skilled at de-escalating potentially confrontational situations. Few young people were excluded from education and when this happened they were managed back into education swiftly. Young people on residential units who were unable to attend education received good support to maintain their learning.
- 3.20** Very effective coaching in vocational training helped young people to develop practical employability skills. Facilities for vocational training were good, with well planned workshops. Learners had good access to English and mathematics support in vocational training, but not enough attention was paid to correcting spelling and grammar in written work to reinforce learning. Individual learning plans were consistently used but tended to overemphasise the activity undertaken rather than the learning that had taken place. Teachers encouraged young people to progress and provided good levels of individual support. There was mutual respect between teachers and young people.

### Recommendations

- 3.21 The quality of teaching and learning should be improved so that all young people are sufficiently challenged in their learning.**
- 3.22 Spelling and grammatical errors in young people's written work should be corrected to reinforce their learning.**
- 3.23 The recording of young people's progress in individual learning plans should be improved.**

### Education and vocational achievements

- 3.24** Most young people completed their programme, making good progress, and retention was good. Achievement of accredited qualifications was variable with high achievement on vocational training courses, but some low achievement in information technology, English and mathematics. Data from the current year indicated improvement in achievements on lower performing courses. Some variations in achievement were found between different groups of young people and the College was working towards closing the gap. Young people identified as having a learning disability achieved as well as their peers.

- 3.25** Skills development of young people in vocational training was good and high standards of work were achieved. Young people were improving in confidence and self-esteem, developing personal skills and taking pride in their work.
- 3.26** Young people's communication skills were improving and they were eager to talk about what they had achieved. Alongside their main qualification, they were developing skills such as team work, taking instructions and problem solving.

## Recommendation

- 3.27** **Courses with low success rates should be improved by providing young people with additional support so that retention rates are increased and more young people complete courses.**

## Library

- 3.28** The library was well planned and provided a welcoming environment with good displays to engage young people. The library stock reflected the needs of young people. The library had good access through an interlibrary exchange service to books in different languages. The library organised projects to promote reading and wider understanding by young people of subjects such as health and equality and diversity. Young people who wanted to use the library to research career paths used a small section dedicated to careers information which linked well to information provided by The Manchester College. Links to education were good. The library was open during the week and on Saturday mornings, which was appropriate. Establishment staff were not available for the library to open in the evening. Computers were available in the library, but at the time of the inspection they were damaged and needed to be replaced.

## Housekeeping point

- 3.29** The damaged computers in the library should be replaced.

## 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.**

- 3.30** *PE facilities and equipment were good. Outside facilities were used well for team sports and good links had been made with a community league to provide competitive sport. Programmes were appropriate for young people and focused on developing an understanding of healthy living. There were not enough accredited courses and not enough showers for the number of young people using the gym.*

- 3.31** The PE facilities and equipment were good. A good-sized room was used for cardiovascular, resistance and free weights, and a large sports hall for a variety of activities. Outside facilities were used well for team sports and good links had been made with a community football

league to provide competitive sport. Access to outside facilities was restricted during winter months when the football field became waterlogged.

- 3.32** The programmes provided by the gym were appropriate for the population and PE staff were vigilant about appropriate use of free weights by young people. Links with health care were good and PE staff helped young people to develop an understanding of healthy living. Not enough accredited courses were available to young people and establishment staff were undergoing training so that further accredited courses could be introduced. There were not enough showers for the number of young people using the gym. Access to PE for young people was appropriate.

### Recommendation

- 3.33 Further accredited courses should be introduced and their effectiveness monitored.**

## 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 reducing reoffending policy was up to date. It covered each resettlement pathway and was based on a needs analysis. The reducing reoffending meeting took place quarterly to review pathway progress against identified key objectives. Good links had been established with community providers and community youth offending teams (YOTs). Attempts to obtain post-release outcome data had started but relatively little had so far been obtained. The establishment was recruiting two new case workers to restore the team complement to its former level. Release on temporary licence opportunities were appropriately managed.*
- 4.2** The resettlement function had been reorganised since the last inspection and was now managed by the head of reducing reoffending. In line with national guidance, the administrative functions of the offender management department were distributed across the administration team. These changes worked well and established good links between case workers and other departments. The offender management department was well managed by the head of case work who reported to the head of reducing reoffending.
- 4.3** The reducing reoffending policy had been reviewed and updated in June 2013 and covered each pathway appropriately. Key priorities had been identified and progress against each was reviewed at the quarterly reducing reoffending meeting.
- 4.4** The strategy was informed by a needs analysis of the population undertaken in March 2013. Data primarily derived from questionnaires completed by 88 young people, a 67% return rate. Core demographic information and Asset (young offender assessment profile) scores for the population had been included. Findings from questionnaires had been used to identify key priorities for each pathway but little use had been made of the Asset data.
- 4.5** The number of case workers had been reduced from six to four since the last inspection. This increased caseload had had a detrimental effect on the time available to case workers to engage with young people to work on reducing their risk of reoffending. At the time of the inspection, the establishment was interviewing candidates with a view to restoring the number of case workers to six.
- 4.6** The establishment had developed good links with community agencies and services, including YOTs in Staffordshire and Stoke. Since March 2013, the establishment had contacted YOTs three months after young people had been released to obtain post-release outcome data. So far only 20 responses had been received.
- 4.7** The number of young people on ROTL (release on temporary licence) was slightly lower than at the last inspection, with an average of less than five young people a month and 15 individuals in the previous six months. It was apparent from our review of case files that case workers were attempting to identify young people who would benefit from such

opportunities and to manage risk to facilitate ROTL. We were concerned that there was no link between ROTL placements and the work and training completed by young people at the establishment (see section on reintegration planning: education, training and employment).

## 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** *Young people were allocated to case managers promptly and training plan meetings were managed efficiently. Too many targets in training plans were not sufficiently focused on offending behaviour or the factors underpinning it. Contributions to review meetings by departments across the establishment were variable. Public protection arrangements were appropriate and well managed. There were good arrangements in place to manage and support looked-after children.*

**4.9** Sentenced and remanded young people were allocated to a case worker promptly and initial training plans were drawn up in collaboration with the young person. Subsequent reviews were managed within appropriate timescales and the establishment arranged meetings where possible to enable YOT workers to attend. We were told that it was rare for YOT workers not to attend meetings. Parents of young people attended meetings where possible.

**4.10** Review meetings were managed well and young people appeared fully engaged at the reviews that we observed. There was no indication of a significant backlog of training plans, but in our survey only 40% of young people said that they had one against the comparator of 52%.

**4.11** There were a number of review meeting rooms and they were well used. Attempts were made to ensure that other internal departments attended review meetings, but this remained relatively rare and was not monitored. Written contributions were usually made by wing staff, not always the young person's personal officer, but too often contributions did not focus on offending behaviour or the identified risk factors underpinning it.

**4.12** A review of case files and training plans showed considerable variation in quality and focus. Many targets were appropriate but some initial plans referred exclusively to conduct with no indication of whether the young person had the skills to achieve the target. For example, a number of young people who were subject to impulsivity had targets relating to adherence to the regime with no reference to the development of skills to achieve this. Some plans indicated the need for input from the offending behaviour programme team, while others simply indicated the need for an assessment and a target to engage in work identified through the assessment.

**4.13** Case workers we spoke to indicated that, outside the review process, their contact with young people varied considerably. Structured meetings or contact were rarely undertaken; most contact was informal when they visited the wing or applications were submitted by the young person. Case workers did not routinely attend ACCT (assessment, care in custody and teamwork) case management review meetings or reviews of rewards and sanctions status.

- 4.14** There was little scrutiny by managers of case files, training plans or engagement by case workers with young people beyond case reviews. Although Asset files were reviewed and quality assured, this did not extend any further. Case workers did not receive regular professional supervision focusing on their case work practice.
- 4.15** It was rare for young people serving indeterminate sentences to be held at the establishment. No young person had been held on a section 226 detention for public protection order or a section 90 mandatory life sentence in the previous 12 months. Young people serving long determinate sentences received the same services as those on detention and training orders and the establishment carried out assessments of their suitability for early release on home detention curfew. Eight young people had been considered in the previous 12 months: two had been granted and one decision was pending at the time of the inspection.
- 4.16** Young people were not automatically transferred to a young adult establishment on reaching their 18th birthday. Arrangements for those aged 18 to transfer from the juvenile estate were sound. Eight 18-year olds were held at the time of our inspection who had been assessed as presenting no significant risk to other young people. A good initiative had recently been developed with the Staffordshire integrated offender management project to improve the management of young people across the estate from the Staffordshire area. At the time of the inspection, 11 of the 17 young people from Staffordshire in the estate were held at Werrington compared with only three of 15 young people when the project started.

### Good practice

- 4.17** *The establishment had worked with Staffordshire integrated offender management project to improve the management of young people from Staffordshire across the juvenile estate. More young people were now located at Werrington, closer to home area services.*

### Public protection

- 4.18** The public protection policy was comprehensive and public protection arrangements were appropriate and well managed. The case files of all young people were scrutinised on reception and missing information was sought from case workers or YOTs to ensure that appropriate plans for the management of young people in custody and on release were put in place.
- 4.19** At the time of the inspection, 17 young people had been identified as DYOs (deter young offenders - young offenders assessed as posing the highest risk of causing serious harm to others and/or likelihood of reoffending), two young people were managed under MAPPAs (multi-agency public protection arrangements) at level two and eight at level one. Three young people had been identified as a risk to children and three were subject to harassment monitoring.
- 4.20** The risk management meeting reviewed all young people identified as presenting a risk on release each month during the last three months of their sentence. Other cases were reviewed appropriately and there were good links with other establishment meetings, including multi-agency safeguarding and health.

## Looked-after children

- 4.21** At the time of the inspection six young people were held on a full care order. With the change in legislation at the end of 2012, an average of 18 newly remanded young people each month were now also categorised as looked-after children. The scale of the work required had clearly increased in the previous nine months and it was being managed well.
- 4.22** Good screening systems were in place, which were undertaken by the two establishment social workers to ensure that all necessary information was obtained on newly arrived young people. There were good links with local authorities to ensure that they met their responsibilities to these young people. Appropriate meetings and reviews were conducted and young people were encouraged and supported in obtaining their entitlements from local authorities.

## Recommendations

- 4.23 Attendance at, and contributions to, training planning and remand management meetings should be monitored and the gaps addressed.**
- 4.24 Case workers should be offered regular professional supervision focused on developing their practice in work with young people.**
- 4.25 Quality assurance should be introduced to ensure consistent and effective practice in case work with young people.**
- 4.26 Case workers should be involved, wherever possible, in all reviews of young people during their time in custody, including ACCT and rewards and sanctions reviews.**

## 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.**

**4.27** *Final reviews were well managed and parents or carers were encouraged to attend. Most young people returned to live with their families but young people who were unable to do so often had to wait until close to release to find out where they would be living. Some were allocated to hostels or bed and breakfast accommodation. There was no pre-release course but careers advice was good. Pre-release health care arrangements were good and work was developing to link young people with community substance misuse services. Finance, benefit and debt provision had progressed and support to maintain family links was good, including help to repair damaged family relationships.*

- 4.28** About 15 sentenced young people and eight remanded young people were released each month.
- 4.29** Final case work reviews were undertaken with young people in the last two weeks of their sentence. They were well managed by case workers and attended by YOT workers and, where appropriate, representatives from other agencies likely to be involved with the young

person on release, for example substance misuse workers. Parents and carers were encouraged to attend, and many did. Other internal departments involved with the young person did not routinely attend, which was an omission.

- 4.30** Final reviews examined progress against targets, plans for post-release supervision and licence conditions. Young people were made aware of what was expected of them once released.

## Accommodation

- 4.31** YOT workers were responsible for ensuring that appropriate accommodation was available for young people on release, while case workers ensured that accommodation was considered at the earliest opportunity, usually at the initial review.
- 4.32** In most cases young people returned home to live with their family but in the last six months 26 sentenced young people had been released to 'supported' accommodation. The type and quality of this accommodation was not monitored, even at the point of release. We were told that in most cases it constituted hostels or bed and breakfast accommodation. Attempts to secure outcome data on accommodation post release were at an early stage (see section on pre-release and resettlement).
- 4.33** Case workers were assertive with local authorities and YOT workers to ensure that accommodation was secured, but staff told us that young people often did not know where they were going until very close to release.

## Recommendation

- 4.34** **The accommodation that sentenced and remanded young people are released to and its sustainability should be monitored and recorded. Data should be used to evaluate the needs of the population and ensure that appropriate accommodation is available for all young people.**

## Education, training and employment

- 4.35** Careers guidance before release was good and there were productive links with community agencies to support young people into training and employment on release. There was no pre-release course, but CV production and coaching in job applications were well planned and supported effectively by The Manchester College advice worker. ROTL was not used sufficiently to coordinate vocational training in the establishment with work experience in the community. Links had been made with employers which needed to be used more effectively to inform vocational courses and provide employment opportunities. Young people had no opportunities for independent job search and the virtual campus<sup>6</sup> was underdeveloped and not used enough to facilitate progression into further education, training or employment.

---

<sup>6</sup> Enables young people to have internet access to community education, training and employment opportunities.

## Recommendations

- 4.36** Release on temporary licence should be used to coordinate vocational training in the establishment with work experience in the community.
- 4.37** Contacts with employers should be developed to ensure that vocational training in the establishment is focused on employment.
- 4.38** Job search facilities should be provided for young people.

## Health care

- 4.39** Pre-release health care arrangements were good. Each young person was seen by a nurse the day before discharge and summary information was sent to their GP. Young people not registered with a GP were given advice on how to register and contact was made with the YOT to help young people to register. On the day of release, young people were given a supply of prescribed medication and health promotion literature and were offered condoms.
- 4.40** Young people subject to the care programme approach<sup>7</sup> were linked with their local child and adolescent mental health service or community mental health team in good time before their release.
- 4.41** There was a palliative care policy and access to the hospital-at-home service and local hospice service. No young people had needed palliative care.

## Drugs and alcohol

- 4.42** The establishment was developing contacts with community drug and alcohol agencies. The wide catchment area of the establishment made it difficult for staff to make resettlement arrangements for young people released to distant locations.

## Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.43** There had been considerable progress with this pathway since our last inspection. All young people were seen during induction by the programmes team outreach worker to identify finance, benefit or debt concerns. In our survey, 49% of young people against the comparator of 38% said they thought they would have problems with money and finance problems on release, although the number of young people indicating a problem during induction was low. In the previous six months, only three young people had been referred to and completed the money management course delivered by the programmes team.
- 4.44** Other initiatives to help with finance issues included access to Citizens' Advice, which attended on a needs basis (twice in the previous three months), and an organisation called 'West Midlands loan sharks' working with the police to help people with illegal loans and debts. Young people were able to open bank accounts before release with the Staffordshire credit union.

---

<sup>7</sup> The delivery of community mental health services to individuals diagnosed with a mental illness.

## Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.45** Support for young people to maintain family contact was generally good. The Time for Families charity delivered the Building Bridges course which was run eight times a year and worked closely with the young person and their families to build closer relationships. Additional family visits were available each month to all young people on the enhanced level of the rewards and sanctions scheme. Parenting courses had been completed by three young people in the last six months.
- 4.46** Visits arrangements were efficient and there were rarely delays in the start of visits. A small visitors' centre opened about half an hour before visits were due to start. Visitors booked in at the centre but very little information or support was provided for those visiting for the first time.
- 4.47** The visits hall was large and could accommodate up to 17 young people and their visitors at any one time. Demand was not high and there were few problems in booking visits.
- 4.48** The establishment monitored young people who did not receive visits and helped them to make or re-establish contact with their family and friends. A family day was scheduled for November 2013 for young people who had few or no regular visits.

## Recommendation

- 4.49** **The prison should identify visitors attending the establishment for the first time to offer support and advice before their visit.**

## Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.50** The programme team delivered a range of programmes approved by the Youth Justice Board (YJB) which focused on the identified needs of young people. During the previous seven months, 46 programmes with 170 places had been delivered. A new course for young people convicted of burglary reflected a recent rise in the number of young people with such convictions.
- 4.51** The programmes were evaluated by facilitators and feedback was received from young people, but the YJB had not independently evaluated the programmes to assess their long-term effectiveness.
- 4.52** There was little reinforcement by other staff in the establishment of the learning that young people derived from programmes. Awareness training had been delivered to most staff, but staff in some departments, including case workers, were not consistently encouraged to reinforce the messages and skills taught on the programmes. This lack of integration undermined the principles and impact of the programmes.

## Recommendation

- 4.53** **Programmes delivered by the establishment to address young people's offending should be independently evaluated to ensure that they meet need and are effective in changing behaviour.**



# Section 5. Recommendations and housekeeping points

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

## Main recommendations

To the governor

- 5.1 All staff who have direct contact with young people should be familiar with the programmes that young people participate in and ensure that, wherever possible, their own work reinforces the learning that takes place on these courses. (S69)
- 5.2 The first night accommodation should be clean, adequately equipped and properly furnished. (S70)
- 5.3 The residential accommodation should be clean, tidy and well maintained. (S71)

## Recommendation

To the Youth Justice Board and the Governor

### Reintegration planning

- 5.4 Programmes delivered by the establishment to address young people's offending should be independently evaluated to ensure that they meet need and are effective in changing behaviour. (4.53)

## Recommendation

To the National Offender Management Service

### Courts, escorts and transfers

- 5.5 All relevant information about a young person should be available to the establishment prior to or at the point of their arrival. (1.4)

## Recommendations

To the governor

### Early days in custody

- 5.6 Initial risk assessments should include clear actions to address identified issues of concern. (1.11)

### Care and protection of children and young people

- 5.7 Care maps and ACCT reviews should clearly indicate who is responsible for targets set and follow-up actions, including conducting regular discussions to ensure consistency. (1.31)

### **Behaviour management**

- 5.8** The reasons for young people's poor perceptions of the rewards and sanctions scheme should be investigated and action taken to ensure consistent and fair application of the scheme. (1.40)
- 5.9** All rewards and sanctions scheme reviews should be fully documented and should take account of all the young person's circumstances. Clear individual targets should be set to help young people improve their behaviour. (1.41)
- 5.10** Demotion to basic level should be subject to a full review and should not be automatic. (1.42)
- 5.11** Staff from all departments should attend the security committee meeting to enable the development of appropriate strategic objectives. (1.49)
- 5.12** Young people should not be strip-searched under restraint. (1.50)
- 5.13** Closed visits should only be used following illicit behaviour related to visits. (1.51)
- 5.14** The very high number of adjudications should be investigated and action taken to reduce them. (1.60)
- 5.15** The incidence of bullying should be robustly monitored and the results should be used to measure the effectiveness of interventions. (1.69)
- 5.16** Pain infliction should not be applied to young people. (1.76)
- 5.17** All segregation unit staff should receive mental health training. (1.84) (Repeated recommendation 1.96)

### **Substance misuse**

- 5.18** The security committee, attended by all appropriate departments, should establish and monitor the drug and alcohol strategy and action plans. (1.95)

### **Residential units**

- 5.19** The wings should be decorated and maintained to reflect the population and cells should be maintained in good decorative condition. (2.10)
- 5.20** Residential staff should ensure that young people keep their cells and communal areas clean by offering appropriate incentives and practical help where necessary. (2.11) (Repeated recommendation 2.19)
- 5.21** Cells designed for one should not accommodate two young people. (2.12) (Repeated recommendation 2.14).
- 5.22** Cell call bells should be answered promptly. (2.13)

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

- 5.23** Each young person should have a designated officer on their residential unit who is their central point of contact and support and takes responsibility for their day-to-day care and

wellbeing through frequent contact and by attending relevant meetings relating to their care. (2.21) (Repeated recommendation 2.9)

- 5.24** All electronic case notes should be comprehensive, with balanced comments reflecting positive and negative behaviour. (2.22) (Repeated recommendation 2.8)

### Equality and diversity

- 5.25** All aspects of equality and diversity should be promoted throughout the establishment. (2.29)
- 5.26** Support groups should be established for young people who belong to minority groups (2.30) (repeated recommendation 2.40)
- 5.27** The establishment should ensure that the needs of young people from minority groups are addressed by actively promoting all aspects of diversity (2.37)

### Legal rights

- 5.28** Quality assurance of case work should be enhanced to ensure that young people receive consistent support with legal rights. (2.50)

### Health services

- 5.29** An up-to-date health needs assessment should address the health and well being needs of young people, including the need for wider access to speech and language therapy to support young people with communication and behavioural challenges. (2.64)
- 5.30** All prison staff should have up-to-date basic life support skills, including use of automated defibrillators. (2.65)
- 5.31** Specific child-focused skills and knowledge training, including mental health, should be available to nursing staff. (2.66)
- 5.32** Young people who miss one or more doses of prescribed medicines and/or do not renew regular essential prescriptions should always be followed up to ensure their wellbeing. The medicines administration record should clearly show the reason for missed doses. (2.80)
- 5.33** Mental health awareness training, including learning disability, for prison staff should be prioritised to ensure they can support and manage young people effectively. (2.94)

### Catering

- 5.34** Young people should be employed to prepare food so that they can achieve related qualifications. (2.101)
- 5.35** All meals should be issued at the servery and eaten in association. (2.102)

### Time out of cell

- 5.36** All young people should receive 10 hours out of cell each day. (3.5)
- 5.37** Young people should have at least one hour outside each day. (3.6)

### Education, learning and skills

- 5.38** The number of cancelled classes should continue to be reduced. (3.11)
- 5.39** The establishment-wide self-assessment process should be formalised and linked with the operational development plan to improve the monitoring of progress. (3.12)
- 5.40** A wider range of vocational training courses should be provided, with a focus on the development of independent living skills. (3.16)
- 5.41** Youth club activities should be improved to enhance the opportunities for young people's learning and personal development. (3.17)
- 5.42** The opportunity for young people to gain work experience in the establishment should be reviewed and enhanced. (3.18)
- 5.43** The quality of teaching and learning should be improved so that all young people are sufficiently challenged in their learning. (3.21)
- 5.44** Spelling and grammatical errors in young people's written work should be corrected to reinforce their learning. (3.22)
- 5.45** The recording of young people's progress in individual learning plans should be improved. (3.23)
- 5.46** Courses with low success rates should be improved by providing young people with additional support so that retention rates are increased and more young people complete courses. (3.27)

### Physical education and healthy living

- 5.47** Further accredited courses should be introduced and their effectiveness monitored. (3.33)

### Training planning and remand management

- 5.48** Attendance at, and contributions to, training planning and remand management meetings should be monitored and the gaps addressed. (4.23)
- 5.49** Case workers should be offered regular professional supervision focused on developing their practice in work with young people. (4.24)
- 5.50** Quality assurance should be introduced to ensure consistent and effective practice in case work with young people. (4.25)
- 5.51** Case workers should be involved, wherever possible, in all reviews of young people during their time in custody, including ACCT and rewards and sanctions reviews. (4.26)

### Reintegration planning

- 5.52** The accommodation that sentenced and remanded young people are released to and its sustainability should be monitored and recorded. Data should be used to evaluate the needs of the population and ensure that appropriate accommodation is available for all young people. (4.34)

- 5.53** Release on temporary licence should be used to coordinate vocational training in the establishment with work experience in the community. (4.36)
- 5.54** Contacts with employers should be developed to ensure that vocational training in the establishment is focused on employment. (4.37)
- 5.55** Job search facilities should be provided for young people. (4.38)
- 5.56** The prison should identify visitors attending the establishment for the first time to offer support and advice before their visit. (4.49)

## Housekeeping points

### Care and protection of children and young people

- 5.57** A bullying survey should be carried out regularly by the establishment. (1.24)

### Behaviour management

- 5.58** Banned visitors should be reviewed monthly and restrictions lifted at the earliest opportunity. (1.52)
- 5.59** Adjudications should be heard in a more suitable environment. (1.61)

### Substance misuse

- 5.60** Care plans for targeted substance misuse interventions should be comprehensive and include SMART targets. (1.92)

### Residential units

- 5.61** Young people should not be locked in the shower area. (2.14)
- 5.62** Wing laundry facilities should be maintained. (2.15)

### Equality and diversity

- 5.63** The equality policy should be reviewed and should include specific support available to young people from minority groups. (2.31)
- 5.64** Positive images of gay people should be displayed throughout the establishment. (2.38)

### Health services

- 5.65** Policies should be up to date and should address the specific circumstances of the prison environment. (2.67)
- 5.66** The draft in-possession policy should be ratified and implemented appropriately and young people should be able to self manage non-prescription medicines where risk assessments indicate. (2.81) (previous recommendation 2.92)

- 5.67** Pharmacy-led clinics should be explored to give young people community equivalent services. (2.82)
- 5.68** Efforts should be made to ensure young people do not suffer delayed or cancelled appointments. (2.95)

### Education, learning and skills

- 5.69** The damaged computers in the library should be replaced. (3.29)

## Examples of good practice

### Behaviour management

- 5.70** Governance of use of force was excellent and the dissemination of learning points to staff offered alternative ways of managing very challenging young people and ensured that staff understood that force was to be used as a last resort. (1.77)

### Training planning and remand management

- 5.71** The establishment had worked with Staffordshire integrated offender management project to improve the management of young people from Staffordshire across the juvenile estate. More young people were now located at Werrington, closer to home area services. (4.17)

# Section 6. Appendices

## Appendix I: Inspection team

Martin Lomas	Deputy chief inspector
Ian MacFadyen	Team leader
Karen Dillon	Inspector
Angela Johnson	Inspector
Andy Lund	Inspector
Keith McInnis	Inspector
Hayley Cripps	Research officer
Joe Simmonds	Research officer
Gemma Quayle	Research trainee

### **Specialist inspectors**

Paul Roberts	Substance misuse inspector
Nicola Rabjohns	Health services inspector
Matthew Tedstone	Care Quality Commission inspector
Richard Chapman	Pharmacist
Stephen Miller	Ofsted inspector
Tony Gallagher	Ofsted inspector



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

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

### Safety

**Children and young people, particularly the most vulnerable, are held safely.**

*At the last inspection in 2012 young people were well treated on arrival but the reception area remained poor. Safeguarding arrangements were good and young people subject to ACCT (assessment, care in custody and teamwork) procedures were well cared for. Levels of violence were high but use of force and separation were used proportionately. There was a high number of violent incidents, some of which were very serious. Bullying was not tackled effectively. Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.*

#### Main recommendation

Residential officers and managers should ensure poor behaviour and alleged assaults are seen to be challenged and investigated. Victims should be supported and procedures to deal with bullying and intimidation should be consistently implemented. (HP52)

**Partially achieved**

#### Recommendations

There should be no undue delays in transferring young people to Werrington following completion of their court cases. (1.5)

**Partially achieved**

Young people should not be transported on vehicles carrying adult prisoners. (1.6)

**Partially achieved**

Young people should be given information at court about the establishment so that they know what to expect when they arrive. (1.7)

**Partially achieved**

Video link should be used to avoid unnecessary court appearances. (1.8)

**Not achieved**

All relevant information about a young person should be available to the establishment prior to or at the point of their arrival. (1.21)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 1.4)

Routine strip-searching should not take place. (1.22)

**Achieved**

Initial vulnerability assessments should contain clear management plans to address identified issues of concern. (1.23)

**Not achieved**

New arrivals should have access to peer support as part of the reception and first night arrangements. (1.24)

**Not achieved**

Cells for new arrivals should be properly prepared and equipped to meet their needs. (1.25)

**Not achieved**

New arrivals should have the opportunity to speak privately with a first night officer to address any anxieties they may have, ensure that their immediate needs are met and provide essential information. (1.26)

**Partially achieved**

Young people should be kept fully occupied through a comprehensive, well structured induction programme which informs them about the establishment. (1.27)

**Partially achieved**

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

**Partially achieved**

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

**Not achieved**

All young people should be given the opportunity to explain fully their version of events relating to the charge. (1.73)

**Achieved**

Adjudications should be heard in a suitable environment. (1.74)

**Partially achieved** (recommendation repeated as housekeeping point 1.61)

The minor report system should be monitored at adjudication standardisation meetings. (1.75)

**Achieved**

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

**Partially achieved**

All areas of the segregation unit should be clean and free of graffiti. (1.95)

**Achieved**

Mental health training should be given to all segregation unit staff. (1.96)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 1.84)

The YPSMS team should comprise sufficient administrative support and therapeutic workers to deliver an effective service that includes cover for leave and sickness. (1.104)

**Achieved**

Responsibility for the delivery of the basic drug and alcohol awareness induction programme should be transferred from education to YPSMS to ensure an adequate skill base of facilitators and opportunity for identification of those in need of further interventions. (I.105)

**Achieved**

Smoking cessation advice and treatment should be made available to young people through an integrated health care and YPSMS programme. (I.106)

**Achieved**

## Respect

**Children and young people are treated with respect for their human dignity.**

*At the last inspection in 2012 much of the living environment was cramped, untidy and run down. The quality of relationships between staff and young people varied but staff did not always have high enough expectations of how young people should behave. The complaints system was not efficient. Health care was sound and the chaplaincy provided a good service. Young people did not like the food. Outcomes for children and young people were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.*

### Main recommendation

Reasons for young people's lack of confidence in the complaints system should be investigated and addressed. All complaints should receive a prompt and appropriate response. (HP53)

**Achieved**

### Recommendations

Cells designed for one should not contain two young people. (2.14)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.12)

Young people should be given the opportunity to make a telephone call every day. (2.15)

**Achieved**

The auditable system in place to monitor response to cell call bells should cover all wings, and regular quality assurance checks should be carried out by managers. (2.16)

**Not achieved**

Limits on the number of toiletry items allowed in cell should be strictly enforced. (2.17)

**Achieved**

All young people should have daily access to showers. (2.18)

**Achieved**

Young people should be encouraged by residential staff to keep their cells and communal areas clean by offering appropriate incentives and practical help where necessary. (2.19)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.11)

Staff should expect high standards of conduct from young people and challenge poor behaviour. (2.30)

**Achieved**

All wing history sheets should be comprehensive, with balanced comments reflecting positive and negative behaviour. (2.31)

**Not achieved** (Recommendation repeated, 2.22)

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

**Not achieved** (Recommendation repeated, 2.21)

The impact of the regime on all minority groups should be monitored effectively. Appropriate action should be taken where necessary. (2.39)

**Not achieved**

Support groups should be established for young people who belong to minority groups. (2.40)

**Not achieved** (Recommendation repeated, 2.30)

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

**Achieved**

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

**Achieved**

Clinical staff should have access to ongoing and documented clinical supervision. (2.79)

**Achieved**

There should be a confidential system for young people to make health care complaints. (2.80)

**Achieved**

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

**Achieved**

The in-possession policy should be reviewed; the risk assessments of each drug and patient should be documented and reasons for the determination recorded. (2.92)

**Achieved**

The use of Circadin should be reviewed by the medicines and therapeutics committee to ensure that its use is evidence based and its unlicensed use risk assessed. (2.93)

**Achieved**

Consultation with young people about catering should be improved and acted upon where appropriate. (2.107)

**Achieved**

Monitoring and supervision of standards in the wing serveries should be improved. (2.108)

**Achieved**

Young people should be able to order items from the prison shop within 24 hours of their arrival at the establishment. (2.112)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.107)

All meetings to discuss changes to canteen items should include a broader representation of young people. (2.113)

**Achieved**

## Purposeful activity

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

*At the last inspection in 2012 the amount of time out of cell had reduced since the previous inspection and there was still no scheduled exercise. Educational provision was reasonable but vocational input was poor. Too many planned sessions were cancelled and young people were not able to spend enough time constructively engaged. Outcomes for children and young people were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.*

### Main recommendations

All young people should have at least one hour each day in the open air in a suitably equipped area with seating and good recreational facilities. (HP51)

**Partially achieved**

The management of learning and skills should be urgently improved so that the required quantity and quality of education and training is available on a consistent basis to meet the needs of the young people held. (HP54)

**Achieved**

### Recommendations

A formal strategy which includes an establishment-wide self-assessment of learning and skills and work should be developed and implemented to provide a clear action and quality improvement plan. (3.23)

**Partially achieved**

The establishment's creative activities programme should be integrated into the wider learning and skills and work strategy. (3.24)

**Not achieved**

The lesson observation scheme should be applied rigorously to ensure that the quality of the less effective teaching and behaviour management is improved. (3.25)

**Achieved**

Punctuality should be improved. (3.26)

**Achieved**

Provision of careers information, advice and guidance should be increased to meet fully the needs of all young people. (3.27)

**Achieved**

Lessons should be shorter and not interrupted unnecessarily. (3.28)

**Partially achieved**

A life and social skills programme should be introduced to enable young people to learn independent living skills in preparation for release. (3.29)

**Not achieved**

The range of activities in the youth club should be enhanced to improve the development of independent living skills for resettlement. (3.30)

**Not achieved**

The virtual campus should be further developed to provide young people with appropriate access to learning and preparation for release. (3.31)

**Not achieved**

Opportunities for accreditation in work in the kitchens and recycling/waste management should be further developed. (3.32)

**Not achieved**

The facilities in the catering workshop should be improved. (3.33)

**Achieved**

Achievement of vocational programmes should be improved. (3.34)

**Achieved**

The library should increase its opening hours to include evenings. (3.37)

**Not achieved.**

Heating should be provided in the library. (3.38)

**Achieved**

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

**Achieved**

The number of accredited programmes available to young people should be increased. (3.45)

**Partially achieved**

The number of showers available to young people for use after activities should be increased. (3.46)

**Not achieved.**

## Resettlement

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

*At the last inspection in 2012 the management of resettlement remained good. Planning arrangements were sound and good use was made of ROTL (release on temporary licence). Constructive work was carried out in most of the resettlement pathways but obtaining decent accommodation for young people on release remained difficult. Reasonable steps were taken to help young people maintain family links. Outcomes for children and young people were good against this healthy prison test.*

### Recommendations

The revised resettlement strategy should include a section on remanded young people and incorporate the findings of the needs analysis. (4.8)

**Achieved**

Young people should be told where they can receive specialist help in all the resettlement pathways and arrangements should be made to monitor this. (4.9)

**Achieved**

The establishment should collect data from external youth offending services on resettlement outcomes for young people when they have been in the community for at least three months. This data should inform the work of the establishment to reduce re-offending. (4.10)

**Partially achieved**

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

**Partially achieved.**

Careers information, advice and guidance should be increased to ensure that all young people are fully supported throughout their time in custody. (4.37)

**Achieved**

A pre-release course should be introduced to help young people to find employment on release. (4.38)

**Not achieved**

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

**Achieved**

Family days should be held each month. (4.47)

**Achieved**

Young people with children should be provided with additional visits and support to help them build and maintain family contact and improve their parenting skills. (4.48)

**Achieved**

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

**Not achieved**



## Appendix III: Establishment population profile

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

### Population breakdown by:

Status	Number of young people	%
Sentenced	81	68
Recalls	8	7
Convicted unsentenced	0	0
Remand	30	25
Detainee	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>100</b>

Age	Number of young people	%
15 years	4	3
16 years	18	15
17 years	89	75
18 years	8	7
<b>Total</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>100</b>

Nationality	Number of young people	%
British	107	90
Foreign nationals	12	10
<b>Total</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>100</b>

Ethnicity	Number of young people	%
White	52	44
British	3	3
Irish	8	7
Other White		
Mixed		
White and Black Caribbean	15	13
White and Black African	1	1
White and Asian	2	2
Other Mixed	2	2
Asian or Asian British		
Indian	3	3
Pakistani	9	8
Bangladeshi	4	
Other Asian		
Black or Black British		
Caribbean	7	6
African	5	4
Other Black	8	7
Chinese or other ethnic group		
Chinese		
Arab		

Other ethnic group		
Not stated		
<b>Total</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>100</b>

Religion	Number of young people	%
Baptist		
Church of England	4	3
Roman Catholic	17	14
Other Christian denominations	13	11
Muslim	32	27
Sikh		
Hindu		
Buddhist		
Jewish		
Other	13	11
No religion	40	34
<b>Total</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>100</b>

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

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

Length of stay	<1 mth	1–3 mths	3–6 mths	6–12 mths	1–2 yrs	2 yrs +	4 yrs +	Total
<b>Age</b>								
15 years	1		2					3
16 years	5	3	1	5				14
17 years	16	17	13	16	2			64
18 years		2	1	5				8
<b>Total</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>2</b>			<b>89</b>

#### Unsentenced only – length of stay by age – Remands - don't know how long they will be remanded for.

Length of stay	<1 mth	1–3 mths	3–6 mths	6–12 mths	1–2 yrs	2 yrs+	4 yrs +	Total
<b>Age</b>								
15 years			1					1
16 years	3			1				4
17 years	8	5	6	3	3			25
18 years								
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>			<b>30</b>

Main offence	Number of young people	%
Violence against the person	30	25
Sexual offences	2	2
Burglary	10	8
Robbery	46	39
Theft and handling	4	3
Fraud and forgery	1	1
Drugs offences	0	0

Other offences	26	22
Offence not recorded / holding warrant	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>100</b>

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

Sentence	4 mths	6 mths	8 mths	10 mths	12 mths	18 mths	24 mths	Recall	Total
<b>Age</b>									
15 years								1	1
16 years	1	1	2	1		1	4	1	11
17 years	6	4	9	2	5	6	9	5	46
18 years	2					3	3		8
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>66</b>

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

Sentence	Under 2 yrs	2–3 yrs	3–4 yrs	4–5 yrs	5 yrs +	Recall	Total
<b>Age</b>							
15 years				2			2
16 years			2	1		1	4
17 years		2	2	8	2		14
18 years					1		1
<b>Total</b>		<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>21</b>



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

### Children and young people survey methodology

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

### Sampling

Questionnaires were distributed to all young people.

### Distributing and collecting questionnaires

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

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

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

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

### Survey response

At the time of the survey on 23 September 2013 the young person population at HMYOI Werrington was 117. Using the method described above, questionnaires were distributed to all 117 young people.

We received a total of 97 completed questionnaires, a response rate of 83%. This included one questionnaire completed via interview. Three respondents refused to complete a questionnaire, 14 questionnaires were not returned and three were returned blank.

Wing/Unit	Number of completed survey returns
A	38
B	37
C2	19
C1	3

## Presentation of survey results and analyses

Over the following pages we present the survey results for HMYOI Werrington.

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

We also present a number of comparative analyses. In all the comparative analyses that follow, statistically significant<sup>8</sup> differences are indicated by shading. Results that are significantly better are indicated by green shading, results that are significantly worse are indicated by blue shading. If the difference is not statistically significant there is no shading. Orange shading has been used to show a statistically significant difference in young peoples' background details.

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

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

The following comparative analyses are presented:

- The current survey responses from HMYOI Werrington in 2013 compared with responses from young people surveyed in all other young offender institutions. This comparator is based on all responses from young people surveys carried out in seven YOIs since April 2012.
- The current survey responses from HMYOI Werrington in 2013 compared with the responses of young people surveyed at HMYOI Werrington in 2012.
- A comparison within the 2013 survey between the responses of white young people and those from a black and minority ethnic group.
- A comparison within the 2013 survey between the responses of Muslim young people and non-Muslim young people.
- A comparison within the 2013 survey between the responses of young people who consider themselves to have a disability and those who do not consider themselves to have a disability.

---

<sup>8</sup> A statistically significant difference between the two samples is one that is unlikely to have arisen by chance alone, and can therefore be assumed to represent a real difference between the two populations. Our significance level is set at 0.05 which means that there is only a 5% likelihood that the difference is due to chance.

## Survey summary

### SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU

<b>Q1</b>	<b>How old are you?</b>	
	15.....	5 (5%)
	16.....	17 (18%)
	17.....	67 (69%)
	18.....	8 (8%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Are you a British citizen?</b>	
	Yes.....	93 (97%)
	No.....	3 (3%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>Do you understand spoken English?</b>	
	Yes.....	93 (98%)
	No.....	2 (2%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Do you understand written English?</b>	
	Yes.....	93 (98%)
	No.....	2 (2%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>What is your ethnic origin?</b>	
	<i>White - British</i> .....	46 (48%)
	<i>White - Irish</i> .....	1 (1%)
	<i>White - Other</i> .....	2 (2%)
	<i>Black or Black British - Caribbean</i> .....	7 (7%)
	<i>Black or Black British - African</i> .....	6 (6%)
	<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> .....	9 (9%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi</i> .....	3 (3%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Chinese</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Other</i> .....	1 (1%)
	<i>Mixed race - White and Black Caribbean</i> .....	15 (16%)
	<i>Mixed race - White and Black African</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Mixed race - White and Asian</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Mixed race - Other</i> .....	3 (3%)
	<i>Arab</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Other ethnic group</i> .....	3 (3%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>What is your religion?</b>	
	<i>None</i> .....	27 (28%)
	<i>Church of England</i> .....	15 (16%)
	<i>Catholic</i> .....	19 (20%)
	<i>Protestant</i> .....	1 (1%)
	<i>Other Christian denomination</i> .....	8 (8%)
	<i>Buddhist</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Hindu</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Jewish</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Muslim</i> .....	26 (27%)
	<i>Sikh</i> .....	0 (0%)

<b>Q7</b>	<b>Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?</b>	
	Yes.....	6 (6%)
	No.....	82 (87%)
	Don't know.....	6 (6%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>Do you have any children?</b>	
	Yes.....	13 (14%)
	No.....	82 (86%)
<b>Q9</b>	<b>Do you consider yourself to have a disability?</b> (i.e. do you need help with any long-term physical, mental or learning needs)	
	Yes.....	15 (16%)
	No.....	79 (84%)
<b>Q10</b>	<b>Have you ever been in local authority care?</b>	
	Yes.....	29 (32%)
	No.....	63 (68%)

## SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Are you sentenced?</b>	
	Yes.....	74 (77%)
	No - unsentenced/on remand.....	22 (23%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>How long is your sentence (the full DTO sentence)?</b>	
	Not sentenced.....	22 (23%)
	Less than 6 months.....	14 (15%)
	6 to 12 months.....	18 (19%)
	More than 12 months, up to 2 years.....	21 (22%)
	More than 2 years.....	20 (21%)
	Indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP).....	1 (1%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>How long have you been in this establishment?</b>	
	Less than 1 month.....	20 (21%)
	1 to 6 months.....	45 (47%)
	More than 6 months, but less than 12 months.....	26 (27%)
	12 months to 2 years.....	4 (4%)
	More than 2 years.....	0 (0%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?</b>	
	Yes.....	57 (59%)
	No.....	39 (41%)

## SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS

<b>Q1</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?</b>	
	Yes.....	72 (77%)
	No.....	13 (14%)
	Don't remember.....	9 (10%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, were there any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females travelling with you?</b>	
	Yes.....	34 (35%)
	No.....	47 (48%)
	Don't remember.....	16 (16%)

<b>Q3</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?</b>	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i> .....	49 (51%)
	<i>2 to 4 hours</i> .....	35 (36%)
	<i>More than 4 hours</i> .....	7 (7%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	5 (5%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?</b>	
	<i>My journey was less than 2 hours</i> .....	49 (53%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	6 (6%)
	<i>No</i> .....	33 (35%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	5 (5%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?</b>	
	<i>My journey was less than 2 hours</i> .....	49 (52%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	29 (31%)
	<i>No</i> .....	14 (15%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	3 (3%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, how did you feel you were treated by the escort staff?</b>	
	<i>Very well</i> .....	17 (18%)
	<i>Well</i> .....	31 (33%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....	30 (32%)
	<i>Badly</i> .....	6 (6%)
	<i>Very badly</i> .....	4 (4%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	5 (5%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>Before you arrived here, did you receive any information to help you prepare for coming here?</b>	
	<i>Yes - and it was helpful</i> .....	13 (14%)
	<i>Yes - but it was not helpful</i> .....	8 (9%)
	<i>No - I received no information</i> .....	56 (60%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	17 (18%)

## SECTION 4: FIRST DAYS

<b>Q1</b>	<b>How long were you in reception?</b>	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i> .....	62 (65%)
	<i>2 hours or longer</i> .....	23 (24%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	10 (11%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	70 (74%)
	<i>No</i> .....	13 (14%)
	<i>Don't remember/Not applicable</i> .....	12 (13%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>How well did you feel you were treated in reception?</b>	
	<i>Very well</i> .....	26 (27%)
	<i>Well</i> .....	50 (53%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....	12 (13%)
	<i>Badly</i> .....	2 (2%)
	<i>Very badly</i> .....	1 (1%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	4 (4%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>When you first arrived here, did staff ask if you needed help or support with any of the following things? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Not being able to smoke</i> ..... 44 (52%) <i>Money worries</i> .....	24 (29%)

<i>Loss of property</i> .....	17 (20%)	<i>Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to</i> .....	29 (35%)
<i>Feeling scared</i> .....	25 (30%)	<i>Health problems</i> .....	57 (68%)
<i>Gang problems</i> .....	44 (52%)	<i>Getting phone numbers</i> .....	49 (58%)
<i>Contacting family</i> .....	57 (68%)	<i>Staff did not ask me about any of these</i> .....	10 (12%)

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

<i>Not being able to smoke</i> .....	43 (49%)	<i>Money worries</i> .....	13 (15%)
<i>Loss of property</i> .....	10 (11%)	<i>Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to</i> .....	12 (14%)
<i>Feeling scared</i> .....	12 (14%)	<i>Health problems</i> .....	8 (9%)
<i>Gang problems</i> .....	14 (16%)	<i>Getting phone numbers</i> .....	20 (23%)
<i>Contacting family</i> .....	28 (32%)	<i>I did not have any problems</i> .....	26 (30%)

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

<i>Toiletries/basic items</i> .....	75 (81%)
<i>The opportunity to have a shower</i> .....	42 (45%)
<i>Something to eat</i> .....	75 (81%)
<i>A free phone call to friends/family</i> .....	74 (80%)
<i>PIN phone credit</i> .....	48 (52%)
<i>Information about feeling worried/upset</i> .....	23 (25%)
<i>Don't remember</i> .....	5 (5%)
<i>I was not given any of these</i> .....	3 (3%)

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

<i>Chaplain</i> .....	31 (37%)
<i>Peer mentor</i> .....	12 (14%)
<i>Childline/Samaritans</i> .....	9 (11%)
<i>The prison shop/canteen</i> .....	11 (13%)
<i>Don't remember</i> .....	21 (25%)
<i>I did not have access to any of these</i> .....	26 (31%)

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

<i>Yes</i> .....	71 (78%)
<i>No</i> .....	16 (18%)
<i>Don't remember</i> .....	4 (4%)

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

<i>Yes</i> .....	71 (76%)
<i>No</i> .....	17 (18%)
<i>Don't remember</i> .....	5 (5%)

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

<i>I have not been on an induction course</i> .....	6 (7%)
<i>Yes</i> .....	47 (52%)
<i>No</i> .....	25 (27%)
<i>Don't remember</i> .....	13 (14%)

## SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT

**Q1 Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?**

<i>Yes</i> .....	67 (72%)
------------------	----------

	No .....	25 (27%)
	Don't know .....	1 (1%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?</b>	
	Yes.....	24 (26%)
	No.....	63 (68%)
	Don't know .....	5 (5%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>What is the food like here?</b>	
	Very good.....	0 (0%)
	Good.....	13 (14%)
	Neither.....	30 (32%)
	Bad.....	22 (24%)
	Very bad.....	28 (30%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?</b>	
	I have not bought anything yet/Don't know.....	7 (8%)
	Yes.....	41 (45%)
	No.....	44 (48%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>How easy is it for you to attend religious services?</b>	
	I don't want to attend religious services.....	7 (8%)
	Very easy.....	33 (35%)
	Easy.....	35 (38%)
	Neither.....	6 (6%)
	Difficult.....	1 (1%)
	Very difficult.....	3 (3%)
	Don't know .....	8 (9%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>Are your religious beliefs respected?</b>	
	Yes.....	66 (73%)
	No.....	7 (8%)
	Don't know/Not applicable.....	17 (19%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>Can you speak to a Chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?</b>	
	Yes.....	65 (71%)
	No.....	3 (3%)
	Don't know/Not applicable .....	24 (26%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>Can you speak to a peer mentor when you need to?</b>	
	Yes.....	32 (36%)
	No.....	13 (14%)
	Don't know .....	45 (50%)
<b>Q9</b>	<b>Can you speak to a member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board) when you need to?</b>	
	Yes.....	14 (16%)
	No .....	14 (16%)
	Don't know .....	62 (69%)
<b>Q10</b>	<b>Can you speak to an advocate (an outside person to help you) when you need to?</b>	
	Yes.....	43 (47%)
	No.....	12 (13%)
	Don't know .....	36 (40%)

## SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Do most staff treat you with respect?</b>		
	Yes.....	68 (74%)	
	No.....	24 (26%)	
<b>Q2</b>	<b>If you had a problem, who would you turn to? (Please tick all that apply)</b>		
	No-one.....	21 (24%)	Social worker..... 6 (7%)
	Personal officer.....	25 (28%)	Health services staff..... 5 (6%)
	Wing Officer.....	25 (28%)	Peer mentor..... 2 (2%)
	Teacher/education staff.....	7 (8%)	Another young person here..... 14 (16%)
	Gym staff.....	9 (10%)	Case worker..... 24 (27%)
	Chaplain.....	14 (16%)	Advocate..... 7 (8%)
	Independent Monitoring Board (IMB).....	4 (4%)	Family/friends..... 37 (42%)
	YOT worker.....	17 (19%)	Childline/Samaritans..... 3 (3%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?</b>		
	Yes.....	35 (38%)	
	No.....	56 (62%)	
<b>Q4</b>	<b>When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?</b>		
	I still have not met him/her.....	18 (20%)	
	In your first week.....	34 (37%)	
	After your first week.....	25 (27%)	
	Don't remember.....	14 (15%)	
<b>Q5</b>	<b>How often do you see your personal (named) officer?</b>		
	I still have not met him/her.....	18 (22%)	
	At least once a week.....	32 (39%)	
	Less than once a week.....	33 (40%)	
<b>Q6</b>	<b>Do you feel your personal (named) officer tries to help you?</b>		
	I still have not met him/her.....	18 (21%)	
	Yes.....	53 (62%)	
	No.....	15 (17%)	

## SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Is it easy to make an application?</b>		
	Yes.....	68 (74%)	
	No.....	8 (9%)	
	Don't know.....	16 (17%)	
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Are applications sorted out fairly?</b>		
	I have not made an application.....	26 (30%)	
	Yes.....	43 (50%)	
	No.....	17 (20%)	
<b>Q3</b>	<b>Are applications sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?</b>		
	I have not made an application.....	26 (28%)	
	Yes.....	39 (42%)	
	No.....	27 (29%)	
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Is it easy to make a complaint?</b>		
	Yes.....	49 (52%)	

No..... 11 (12%)  
 Don't know ..... 34 (36%)

**Q5 Are complaints sorted out fairly?**  
*I have not made a complaint*..... 58 (64%)  
 Yes..... 11 (12%)  
 No..... 22 (24%)

**Q6 Are complaints sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?**  
*I have not made a complaint*..... 58 (64%)  
 Yes..... 7 (8%)  
 No..... 25 (28%)

**Q7 Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint?**  
 Yes..... 7 (8%)  
 No..... 45 (49%)  
 Never needed to make a complaint..... 40 (43%)

## SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE

**Q1 What level of the rewards and sanctions scheme are you on?**  
*Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is*..... 4 (4%)  
 Enhanced (top)..... 26 (28%)  
 Standard (middle) ..... 49 (53%)  
 Basic (bottom) ..... 11 (12%)  
 Don't know ..... 2 (2%)

**Q2 Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the rewards and sanctions scheme?**  
*Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is*..... 4 (5%)  
 Yes..... 40 (45%)  
 No..... 29 (33%)  
 Don't know ..... 15 (17%)

**Q3 Do the different levels of the rewards and sanctions scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?**  
*Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is*..... 4 (4%)  
 Yes..... 46 (52%)  
 No..... 33 (37%)  
 Don't know ..... 6 (7%)

**Q4 Have you had a minor report since you have been here?**  
 Yes..... 52 (55%)  
 No..... 34 (36%)  
 Don't know ..... 8 (9%)

**Q5 If you have had a minor report, was the process explained clearly to you?**  
*I have not had a minor report*..... 42 (45%)  
 Yes..... 40 (43%)  
 No..... 12 (13%)

**Q6 Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?**  
 Yes..... 63 (68%)  
 No..... 27 (29%)  
 Don't know ..... 2 (2%)

<b>Q7</b>	<b>If you have had an adjudication ('nicking'), was the process explained clearly to you?</b>	
	<i>I have not had an adjudication</i> .....	29 (32%)
	Yes.....	53 (59%)
	No.....	8 (9%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?</b>	
	Yes.....	34 (37%)
	No.....	51 (56%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	6 (7%)
<b>Q9</b>	<b>If you have spent a night in the care and separation unit (CSU), how were you treated by staff?</b>	
	<i>I have not been to the care and separation unit</i> .....	56 (62%)
	<i>Very well</i> .....	3 (3%)
	<i>Well</i> .....	9 (10%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....	16 (18%)
	<i>Badly</i> .....	4 (4%)
	<i>Very badly</i> .....	2 (2%)

## SECTION 9: SAFETY

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Have you ever felt unsafe here?</b>	
	Yes.....	29 (31%)
	No.....	64 (69%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Do you feel unsafe now?</b>	
	Yes.....	12 (13%)
	No.....	79 (87%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Never felt unsafe</i> .....	64 (72%)
	<i>Everywhere</i> .....	4 (4%)
	<i>Care and separation unit</i> .....	2 (2%)
	<i>Association areas</i> .....	7 (8%)
	<i>Reception area</i> .....	1 (1%)
	<i>At the gym</i> .....	6 (7%)
	<i>In an exercise yard</i> .....	3 (3%)
	<i>At work</i> .....	8 (9%)
	<i>At education</i> .....	13 (15%)
	<i>At religious services</i> .....	2 (2%)
	<i>At meal times</i> .....	6 (7%)
	<i>At healthcare</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Visits area</i> .....	4 (4%)
	<i>In wing showers</i> .....	1 (1%)
	<i>In gym showers</i> .....	5 (6%)
	<i>In corridors/stairwells</i> .....	6 (7%)
	<i>On your landing/wing</i> .....	9 (10%)
	<i>During movement</i> .....	11 (12%)
	<i>In your cell</i> .....	2 (2%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Have you ever been victimised by another young person/group of young people here? (e.g. insulted or assaulted you)</b>	
	Yes.....	20 (22%)
	No.....	73 (78%)

<b>Q5</b>	<b>If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you, your family or friends)</i> .....	6 (6%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i> .....	9 (10%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i> .....	7 (8%)
	<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i> .....	4 (4%)
	<i>Medication</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Debt</i> .....	2 (2%)
	<i>Drugs</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i> .....	2 (2%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Your nationality</i> .....	3 (3%)
	<i>You are from a different part of the country to others</i> .....	1 (1%)
	<i>You are from a Traveller community</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Your sexuality</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Your age</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>You having a disability</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>You were new here</i> .....	4 (4%)
	<i>Your offence/crime</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Gang related issues</i> .....	6 (6%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>Have you ever been victimised by staff here? (e.g. insulted or assaulted you)</b>	
	Yes.....	16 (17%)
	No.....	76 (83%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you, your family or friends)</i> .....	5 (5%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i> .....	1 (1%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i> .....	2 (2%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i> .....	3 (3%)
	<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i> .....	2 (2%)
	<i>Medication</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Debt</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Drugs</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i> .....	3 (3%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Your nationality</i> .....	1 (1%)
	<i>You are from a different part of the country to others</i> .....	1 (1%)
	<i>You are from a Traveller community</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Your sexuality</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Your age</i> .....	1 (1%)
	<i>You having a disability</i> .....	1 (1%)
	<i>You were new here</i> .....	3 (3%)
	<i>Your offence/crime</i> .....	1 (1%)
	<i>Gang related issues</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Because you made a complaint</i> .....	5 (5%)
<b>Q10</b>	<b>If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?</b>	
	Yes.....	25 (31%)
	No.....	35 (44%)
	Don't know .....	20 (25%)
<b>Q11</b>	<b>Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?</b>	
	Yes.....	27 (30%)
	No.....	25 (28%)

*Don't know* ..... 37 (42%)

<b>Q12</b>	<b>Is shouting through the windows a problem here?</b>		
	Yes.....	30 (33%)	
	No.....	51 (57%)	
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	9 (10%)	

## SECTION 10: HEALTH SERVICES

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Is it easy to see the following people if you need to?</b>			
		Yes	No	<i>Don't know</i>
	The doctor .....	60 (66%)	20 (22%)	11 (12%)
	The nurse .....	67 (75%)	15 (17%)	7 (8%)
	The dentist .....	28 (31%)	37 (41%)	25 (28%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?</b>			
	<i>I have not been</i> .....			5 (6%)
	<i>Very good</i> .....			11 (13%)
	<i>Good</i> .....			42 (49%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....			18 (21%)
	<i>Bad</i> .....			6 (7%)
	<i>Very bad</i> .....			4 (5%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/all of it in your room?</b>			
	<i>I am not taking any medication</i> .....			53 (59%)
	<i>Yes, all of my meds</i> .....			8 (9%)
	<i>Yes, some of my meds</i> .....			14 (16%)
	<i>No</i> .....			15 (17%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?</b>			
	Yes.....			21 (25%)
	No.....			64 (75%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>Are you being helped by anyone here with your emotional or mental health problems?</b> (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> .....			64 (74%)
	Yes.....			15 (17%)
	No.....			8 (9%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>Did you have problems with alcohol when you first arrived here?</b>			
	Yes.....			10 (11%)
	No.....			81 (89%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>Have you received any help with alcohol problems here?</b>			
	Yes.....			6 (6%)
	No.....			87 (94%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>Did you have problems with drugs when you first arrived here?</b>			
	Yes.....			29 (31%)
	No.....			66 (69%)
<b>Q9</b>	<b>Do you have problems with drugs now?</b>			
	Yes.....			4 (4%)
	No.....			85 (96%)

<b>Q10</b>	<b>Have you received any help with drugs problems here?</b>	
	Yes.....	14 (16%)
	No.....	75 (84%)
<b>Q11</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it to get illegal drugs here?</b>	
	Very easy.....	5 (6%)
	Easy.....	5 (6%)
	Neither.....	6 (7%)
	Difficult.....	3 (3%)
	Very difficult.....	18 (21%)
	Don't know.....	50 (57%)

## SECTION 11: ACTIVITIES

<b>Q1</b>	<b>How old were you when you were last at school?</b>	
	14 or under.....	27 (29%)
	15 or over.....	65 (71%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Have you ever been excluded from school?</b>	
	Yes.....	84 (92%)
	No.....	7 (8%)
	Not applicable.....	0 (0%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>Did you ever skip school before you came into custody?</b>	
	Yes.....	68 (75%)
	No.....	22 (24%)
	Not applicable.....	1 (1%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Do you CURRENTLY take part in any of the following activities? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	Education.....	65 (73%)
	A job in this establishment.....	27 (30%)
	Vocational or skills training.....	16 (18%)
	Offending behaviour programmes.....	22 (25%)
	I am not currently involved in any of these.....	16 (18%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>If you have been involved in any of the following activities here, do you think they will help you when you leave prison?</b>	
		<i>Not been involved</i> Yes      No      Don't know
	Education	8 (10%)      49 (59%)      20 (24%)      6 (7%)
	A job in this establishment	12 (20%)      26 (43%)      16 (27%)      6 (10%)
	Vocational or skills training	8 (15%)      24 (45%)      13 (25%)      8 (15%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	11 (19%)      25 (43%)      14 (24%)      8 (14%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>Do you usually have association every day?</b>	
	Yes.....	69 (77%)
	No.....	21 (23%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?</b>	
	Don't want to go.....	9 (10%)
	Yes.....	5 (6%)
	No.....	75 (84%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?</b>	
	Don't want to go.....	5 (5%)

None.....	10 (11%)
One to two times.....	29 (32%)
Three to five times.....	46 (51%)
More than five times.....	1 (1%)

## SECTION 12: FAMILY AND FRIENDS

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Are you able to use the telephone every day, if you want to?</b>	
	Yes.....	68 (74%)
	No.....	22 (24%)
	Don't know.....	2 (2%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?</b>	
	Yes.....	33 (36%)
	No.....	48 (53%)
	Don't know.....	10 (11%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>How many visits do you usually have each week, from family or friends?</b>	
	I don't get visits.....	25 (26%)
	Less than one a week.....	23 (24%)
	About one a week.....	29 (30%)
	More than one a week.....	3 (3%)
	Don't know.....	16 (17%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>How easy is it for your family and friends to visit you here?</b>	
	I don't get visits.....	25 (28%)
	Very easy.....	7 (8%)
	Easy.....	18 (20%)
	Neither.....	15 (17%)
	Difficult.....	12 (13%)
	Very difficult.....	5 (6%)
	Don't know.....	7 (8%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>Do your visits usually start on time?</b>	
	I don't get visits.....	25 (28%)
	Yes.....	31 (35%)
	No.....	20 (22%)
	Don't know.....	13 (15%)

## SECTION 13: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Do you think you will have a problem with any of the following things, when you are released? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	Finding accommodation.....	23 (26%)
	Getting into school or college.....	22 (25%)
	Getting a job.....	46 (53%)
	Money/finances.....	42 (48%)
	Claiming benefits.....	23 (26%)
	Continuing health services.....	8 (9%)
	Opening a bank account.....	18 (21%)
	Avoiding bad relationships.....	13 (15%)
	I won't have any problems.....	24 (28%)

<b>Q2</b>	<b>Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan? (i.e. a plan that is discussed in your DTO/planning meetings, which sets out your targets)</b>	
	Yes.....	35 (41%)
	No.....	18 (21%)
	Don't know.....	33 (38%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>Were you involved in the development of your plan?</b>	
	<i>I don't have a plan/don't know if I have a plan</i> .....	51 (63%)
	Yes.....	25 (31%)
	No.....	5 (6%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Do you understand the targets that have been set in your plan?</b>	
	<i>I don't have a plan/don't know if I have a plan</i> .....	51 (63%)
	Yes.....	29 (36%)
	No.....	1 (1%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>Do you have a case worker here?</b>	
	Yes.....	74 (85%)
	No.....	6 (7%)
	Don't know.....	7 (8%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>Has your case worker helped to prepare you for release?</b>	
	<i>I don't have a case worker</i> .....	13 (15%)
	Yes.....	27 (32%)
	No.....	23 (27%)
	Don't know.....	22 (26%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>Has your social worker been to visit you since you have been here?</b>	
	<i>I don't have a social worker</i> .....	39 (44%)
	Yes.....	31 (35%)
	No.....	18 (20%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?</b>	
	Yes.....	29 (35%)
	No.....	40 (48%)
	Don't know.....	15 (18%)
<b>Q9</b>	<b>Do you know who to contact for help with any of the following problems, before your release? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Finding accommodation</i> .....	14 (18%)
	<i>Getting into school or college</i> .....	17 (22%)
	<i>Getting a job</i> .....	21 (28%)
	<i>Help with money/finances</i> .....	16 (21%)
	<i>Help with claiming benefits</i> .....	11 (14%)
	<i>Continuing health services</i> .....	8 (11%)
	<i>Opening a bank account</i> .....	9 (12%)
	<i>Avoiding bad relationships</i> .....	9 (12%)
	<i>I don't know who to contact</i> .....	46 (61%)
<b>Q10</b>	<b>What is most likely to stop you offending in the future? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Not sentenced</i> .....	22 (26%)
	<i>Nothing, it is up to me</i> .....	19 (22%)
	<i>Making new friends outside</i> .....	11 (13%)
	<i>Going back to live with my family</i> .....	13 (15%)
	<i>Having a mentor (someone you can ask for advice)</i> .....	9 (11%)
	<i>Having a YOT worker or social worker that I get on with</i> .....	12 (14%)
	<i>Having children</i> .....	15 (18%)
	<i>Having something to do that isn't crime</i> .....	24 (28%)

<i>Getting a place of my own</i> .....	25 (29%)	<i>This sentence</i> .....	16 (19%)
<i>Getting a job</i> .....	38 (45%)	<i>Getting into school/college</i> .....	20 (24%)
<i>Having a partner (girlfriend or boyfriend)</i> .....	26 (31%)	<i>Talking about my offending behaviour with staff</i> .....	2 (2%)
<i>Staying off alcohol/drugs</i> .....	23 (27%)	<i>Anything else</i> .....	1 (1%)

**Q11 Do you want to stop offending?**

<i>Not sentenced</i> .....	22 (25%)
<i>Yes</i> .....	54 (62%)
<i>No</i> .....	3 (3%)
<i>Don't know</i> .....	8 (9%)

**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> .....	22 (26%)
<i>Yes</i> .....	30 (35%)
<i>No</i> .....	34 (40%)

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



### Survey responses from children and young people: HMYOI Werrington 2013

**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

		2013 Werrington	Young people's comparator	2013 Werrington	2012 Werrington
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>97</b>	<b>725</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>112</b>
<b>SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU</b>					
1.1	Are you 18 years of age?	9%	14%	9%	15%
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	3%	3%	3%	5%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	98%	99%	98%	96%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	98%	99%	98%	95%
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other category.	49%	41%	49%	47%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	27%	20%	27%	19%
1.7	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	6%	7%	6%	6%
1.8	Do you have any children?	14%	12%	14%	14%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	16%	18%	16%	17%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	32%	32%	32%	26%
<b>SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE</b>					
2.1	Are you sentenced?	77%	80%	77%	76%
2.2	Is your sentence 12 months or less?	34%	37%	34%	37%
2.3	Have you been in this establishment for one month or less?	21%	15%	21%	18%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	60%	54%	60%	53%
<b>SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS</b>					
On your most recent journey here:					
3.1	Did you feel safe?	76%	84%	76%	76%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	35%	38%	35%	39%
3.3	Did you spend more than 4 hours in the van?	7%	9%	7%	7%
For those who spent 2 or more hours in the escort van:					
3.4	Were you offered a toilet break if you needed it?	13%	15%	13%	11%
3.5	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	63%	35%	63%	30%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	52%	53%	52%	49%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	14%	15%	14%	23%
<b>SECTION 4: YOUR FIRST FEW DAYS HERE</b>					
4.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	65%	83%	65%	81%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	74%	82%	74%	81%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	80%	67%	80%	72%
When you first arrived, did staff ask if you needed help or support with any of the following:					

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

### Key to tables

		2013 Werrington	Young people's comparator	2013 Werrington	2012 Werrington
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>97</b>	<b>725</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>112</b>
<b>4.4a</b>	Not being able to smoke?	53%	51%	53%	40%
<b>4.4b</b>	Loss of property?	21%	21%	21%	18%
<b>4.4c</b>	Feeling scared?	30%	27%	30%	32%
<b>4.4d</b>	Gang problems?	53%	45%	53%	50%
<b>4.4e</b>	Contacting family?	68%	52%	68%	61%
<b>4.4f</b>	Money worries?	28%	19%	28%	21%
<b>4.4g</b>	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	34%	33%	34%	37%
<b>4.4h</b>	Health problems?	68%	53%	68%	55%
<b>4.4i</b>	Getting phone numbers?	58%	41%	58%	50%
<b>4.5</b>	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	71%	72%	71%	67%
When you first arrived, did you have problems with any of the following:					
<b>4.5a</b>	Not being able to smoke?	49%	47%	49%	49%
<b>4.5b</b>	Loss of property?	11%	10%	11%	12%
<b>4.5c</b>	Feeling scared?	14%	6%	14%	8%
<b>4.5d</b>	Gang problems?	16%	12%	16%	13%
<b>4.5e</b>	Contacting family?	32%	25%	32%	28%
<b>4.5f</b>	Money worries?	15%	15%	15%	20%
<b>4.5g</b>	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	14%	8%	14%	16%
<b>4.5h</b>	Health problems?	9%	11%	9%	6%
<b>4.5i</b>	Getting phone numbers?	23%	26%	23%	31%
When you first arrived, were you given any of the following:					
<b>4.6a</b>	Toiletries/basic items?	81%	79%	81%	81%
<b>4.6b</b>	The opportunity to have a shower?	45%	55%	45%	44%
<b>4.6c</b>	Something to eat?	81%	85%	81%	79%
<b>4.6d</b>	A free phone call to friends/family?	80%	80%	80%	76%
<b>4.6e</b>	PIN phone credit?	52%	64%	52%	58%
<b>4.6f</b>	Information about feeling worried/upset?	25%	32%	25%	35%
Within your first 24 hours, did you have access to the following people or services:					
<b>4.7a</b>	A chaplain?	37%	48%	37%	41%
<b>4.7b</b>	A peer mentor?	15%	15%	15%	10%
<b>4.7c</b>	Childline/Samaritans	11%	18%	11%	10%
<b>4.7d</b>	The prison shop/canteen?	13%	12%	13%	7%
<b>4.8</b>	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	78%	66%	78%	80%
<b>4.9</b>	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	76%	81%	76%	76%
<b>4.10</b>	For those who have been on an induction course: did it cover everything you needed to know about the establishment?	55%	60%	55%	48%
<b>SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT</b>					
<b>5.1</b>	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	72%	81%	72%	36%
<b>5.2</b>	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	26%	38%	26%	26%
<b>5.3</b>	Do you find the food here good/very good?	14%	17%	14%	10%

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

### Key to tables

		2013 Werrington	Young people's comparator	2013 Werrington	2012 Werrington
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>97</b>	<b>725</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>112</b>
<b>5.4</b>	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	45%	48%	45%	45%
<b>5.5</b>	Is it easy/very easy for you to attend religious services?	73%	60%	73%	61%
<b>5.6</b>	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	73%	58%	73%	57%
Can you speak to:					
<b>5.7</b>	A chaplain of your faith in private?	71%	73%	71%	61%
<b>5.8</b>	A peer mentor?	36%	38%	36%	26%
<b>5.9</b>	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	16%	31%	16%	17%
<b>5.10</b>	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	47%	42%	47%	41%
<b>SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF</b>					
<b>6.1</b>	Do most staff treat you with respect?	74%	68%	74%	68%
<b>6.2</b>	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	23%	25%	23%	29%
<b>6.3</b>	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	38%	41%	38%	30%
For those who have met their personal officer:					
<b>6.4</b>	Did you meet your personal (named) officer within the first week?	47%	42%	47%	43%
<b>6.5</b>	Do you see your personal (named) officer at least once a week?	49%	61%	49%	52%
<b>6.6</b>	Do you feel your personal (named) officer tries to help you?	78%	73%	78%	54%
<b>SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS</b>					
<b>7.1</b>	Is it easy to make an application?	74%	79%	74%	80%
For those who have made an application:					
<b>7.2</b>	Do you feel applications are sorted out fairly?	71%	71%	71%	57%
<b>7.3</b>	Do you feel applications are sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	59%	60%	59%	57%
<b>7.4</b>	Is it easy to make a complaint?	52%	53%	52%	47%
For those who have made a complaint:					
<b>7.5</b>	Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	33%	40%	33%	26%
<b>7.6</b>	Do you feel complaints are sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	21%	40%	21%	29%
<b>7.7</b>	Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint?	7%	9%	7%	9%
<b>SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE</b>					
<b>8.1</b>	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	28%	31%	28%	29%
<b>8.2</b>	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	45%	49%	45%	46%
<b>8.3</b>	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	52%	50%	52%	48%
<b>8.4</b>	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	55%	56%	55%	48%
For those who have had a minor report:					
<b>8.5</b>	Was the process explained clearly to you?	76%	79%	76%	68%
<b>8.6</b>	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	69%	62%	69%	57%
For those who have had an adjudication ('nicking'):					
<b>8.7</b>	Was the process explained clearly to you?	87%	86%	87%	83%
<b>8.8</b>	Have you been physically restrained (Cand R) since you have been here?	37%	34%	37%	21%
<b>8.9</b>	For those who had spent a night in the care and separation unit: did the staff treat you well/very well?	36%	51%	36%	35%

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

### Key to tables

		2013 Werrington	Young people's comparator	2013 Werrington	2012 Werrington
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>97</b>	<b>725</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>112</b>
<b>SECTION 9: SAFETY</b>					
<b>9.1</b>	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	31%	30%	31%	27%
<b>9.2</b>	Do you feel unsafe now?	14%	11%	14%	12%
<b>9.4</b>	Have you ever been victimised by other young people here?	21%	22%	21%	25%
Since you have been here, have other young people:					
<b>9.5a</b>	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	6%	9%	6%	12%
<b>9.5b</b>	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	10%	8%	10%	11%
<b>9.5c</b>	Sexually abused you?	0%	1%	0%	1%
<b>9.5d</b>	Threatened or intimidated you?	7%	7%	7%	10%
<b>9.5e</b>	Taken your canteen/property?	4%	3%	4%	6%
<b>9.5f</b>	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	1%	0%	2%
<b>9.5g</b>	Victimised you because of debt?	2%	1%	2%	4%
<b>9.5h</b>	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	1%	0%	2%
<b>9.5i</b>	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	2%	2%	2%	3%
<b>9.5j</b>	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	2%	0%	3%
<b>9.5k</b>	Victimised you because of your nationality?	4%	2%	4%	4%
<b>9.5l</b>	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	1%	3%	1%	4%
<b>9.5m</b>	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%	1%	0%	3%
<b>9.5n</b>	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	1%	0%	1%
<b>9.5o</b>	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	1%	0%	2%
<b>9.5p</b>	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	1%	0%	3%
<b>9.5q</b>	Victimised you because you were new here?	4%	5%	4%	10%
<b>9.5r</b>	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	0%	3%	0%	1%
<b>9.5s</b>	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	6%	4%	6%	5%
<b>9.7</b>	Have you ever been victimised by a member of staff here?	17%	27%	17%	23%
Since you have been here, have staff:					
<b>9.8a</b>	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	5%	16%	5%	11%
<b>9.8b</b>	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	1%	5%	1%	3%
<b>9.8c</b>	Sexually abused you?	2%	1%	2%	2%
<b>9.8d</b>	Threatened or intimidated you?	4%	6%	4%	4%
<b>9.8e</b>	Taken your canteen/property?	2%	3%	2%	4%
<b>9.8f</b>	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	1%	0%	2%
<b>9.8g</b>	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	1%	0%	1%
<b>9.8h</b>	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	1%	0%	1%
<b>9.8i</b>	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	4%	4%	4%	3%
<b>9.8j</b>	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	3%	0%	2%
<b>9.8k</b>	Victimised you because of your nationality?	1%	2%	1%	2%
<b>9.8k</b>	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	1%	3%	1%	2%
<b>9.8m</b>	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%	1%	0%	1%
<b>9.8n</b>	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	1%	0%	0%
<b>9.8o</b>	Victimised you because of your age?	1%	1%	1%	1%

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

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	2013 Werrington	Young people's comparator	2013 Werrington	2012 Werrington
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>97</b>	<b>725</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>112</b>
<b>9.8p</b>	Victimised you because you have a disability?	1%	1%	1%	2%
<b>9.8q</b>	Victimised you because you were new here?	4%	2%	4%	2%
<b>9.8r</b>	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	1%	2%	1%	3%
<b>9.8s</b>	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	2%	0%	0%
<b>9.8t</b>	Victimised you because you made a complaint?	5%	5%	5%	7%
<b>9.10</b>	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	31%	28%	31%	17%
<b>9.11</b>	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	31%	31%	31%	30%
<b>9.12</b>	Is shouting through the windows a problem here?	33%	30%	33%	40%
<b>SECTION 10: HEALTH SERVICES</b>					
<b>10.1a</b>	Is it easy for you to see the doctor?	66%	60%	66%	70%
<b>10.1b</b>	Is it easy for you to see the nurse?	75%	73%	75%	88%
<b>10.1c</b>	Is it easy for you to see the dentist?	31%	43%	31%	36%
<b>10.2</b>	For those who have been to health services: Do you think the overall quality is good/very good?	65%	54%	65%	67%
<b>10.3</b>	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/all of it in your cell?	60%	51%	60%	63%
<b>10.4</b>	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?	25%	23%	25%	18%
<b>10.5</b>	If you have emotional or mental health problems, are you being helped by anyone here?	64%	72%	64%	35%
<b>10.6</b>	Did you have any problems with alcohol when you first arrived?	11%	10%	11%	10%
<b>10.7</b>	Have you received any help with any alcohol problems here?	6%	6%	6%	7%
<b>10.8</b>	Did you have any problems with drugs when you first arrived?	30%	38%	30%	32%
<b>10.9</b>	Do you have a problem with drugs now?	5%	10%	5%	6%
<b>10.10</b>	Have you received any help with any drug problems here?	16%	23%	16%	21%
<b>10.11</b>	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs here?	11%	17%	11%	15%
<b>SECTION 11: ACTIVITIES</b>					
<b>11.1</b>	Were you 14 or younger when you were last at school?	30%	39%	30%	35%
<b>11.2</b>	Have you ever been excluded from school?	93%	87%	93%	87%
<b>11.3</b>	Did you ever skip school before you came into custody?	75%	76%	75%	71%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:					
<b>11.4a</b>	Education?	73%	79%	73%	62%
<b>11.4b</b>	A job in this establishment?	31%	31%	31%	26%
<b>11.4c</b>	Vocational or skills training?	18%	14%	18%	16%
<b>11.4d</b>	Offending behaviour programmes?	25%	20%	25%	22%
<b>11.4e</b>	Nothing	18%	11%	18%	12%
For those who have taken part in the following activities while in this establishment, do you think that they will help you when you leave prison:					
<b>11.5a</b>	Education?	66%	64%	66%	61%
<b>11.5b</b>	A job in this establishment?	53%	54%	53%	52%
<b>11.5c</b>	Vocational or skills training?	54%	51%	54%	42%
<b>11.5d</b>	Offending behaviour programmes?	53%	50%	53%	55%

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

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	2013 Werrington	Young people's comparator	2013 Werrington	2012 Werrington
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>97</b>	<b>725</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>112</b>
<b>11.6</b>	Do you usually have association every day?	<b>77%</b>	<b>76%</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>69%</b>
<b>11.7</b>	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	<b>6%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>5%</b>
<b>11.8</b>	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	<b>1%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>1%</b>
<b>SECTION 12: KEEPING IN TOUCH WITH FAMILY AND FRIENDS</b>					
<b>12.1</b>	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	<b>74%</b>	<b>82%</b>	<b>74%</b>	<b>46%</b>
<b>12.2</b>	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	<b>36%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>37%</b>
<b>12.3</b>	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	<b>34%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>29%</b>
<b>12.4</b>	Is it easy/very easy for your family and friends to visit you here?	<b>28%</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>32%</b>
<b>12.5</b>	Do your visits start on time?	<b>35%</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>36%</b>
<b>SECTION 13: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE</b>					
Do you think you will have a problem with the following, when you are released:					
<b>13.1a</b>	Finding accommodation?	<b>27%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>23%</b>
<b>13.1b</b>	Getting into school or college?	<b>26%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>29%</b>
<b>13.1c</b>	Getting a job?	<b>53%</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>56%</b>
<b>13.1d</b>	Money/finances?	<b>49%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>40%</b>
<b>13.1e</b>	Claiming benefits?	<b>27%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>21%</b>
<b>13.1f</b>	Continuing health services?	<b>9%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>12%</b>
<b>13.1g</b>	Opening a bank account?	<b>21%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>13%</b>
<b>13.1h</b>	Avoiding bad relationships?	<b>15%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>19%</b>
<b>13.2</b>	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	<b>40%</b>	<b>52%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>47%</b>
For those with a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan:					
<b>13.3</b>	Were you involved in the development of your plan?	<b>83%</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>84%</b>
<b>13.4</b>	Do you understand the targets set in your plan?	<b>97%</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>96%</b>
<b>13.5</b>	Do you have a caseworker here?	<b>85%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>90%</b>
<b>13.6</b>	Has your caseworker helped to prepare you for release?	<b>38%</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>48%</b>
For those with a social worker:					
<b>13.7</b>	Has your social worker been to visit you since you have been here?	<b>63%</b>	<b>64%</b>	<b>63%</b>	<b>57%</b>
<b>13.8</b>	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	<b>34%</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>35%</b>
Do you know who to contact for help with the following problems?					
<b>13.9a</b>	Finding accommodation	<b>19%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>19%</b>
<b>13.9b</b>	Getting into school or college	<b>23%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>21%</b>
<b>13.9c</b>	Getting a job	<b>27%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>26%</b>
<b>13.9d</b>	Help with money/finances	<b>21%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>17%</b>
<b>13.9e</b>	Help with claiming benefits	<b>14%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>9%</b>
<b>13.9f</b>	Continuing health services	<b>11%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>12%</b>
<b>13.9g</b>	Opening a bank account	<b>12%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>13%</b>
<b>13.9h</b>	Avoiding bad relationships	<b>12%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>13%</b>
For those who were sentenced:					
<b>13.11</b>	Do you want to stop offending?	<b>83%</b>	<b>89%</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>88%</b>
<b>13.12</b>	Have you done anything or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?	<b>47%</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>52%</b>

## Diversity analysis



### Key question responses (ethnicity/religion) HMYOI Werrington 2013

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

#### Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic young people	White young people	Muslim young people	Non-Muslim young people
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>47</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>70</b>
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	2%	2%	7%	1%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	98%	100%	97%	99%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	98%	100%	97%	99%
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)			93%	34%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	49%	3%		
1.5	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	0%	12%	0%	8%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	9%	23%	3%	20%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	24%	39%	23%	35%
2.1	Are you sentenced?	74%	81%	74%	78%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	70%	49%	73%	55%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	37%	35%	31%	37%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	44%	59%	43%	54%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	20%	9%	21%	12%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	68%	81%	52%	81%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	82%	79%	68%	84%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	75%	81%	61%	84%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	72%	81%	66%	79%
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	70%	72%	79%	71%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	30%	23%	38%	22%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	13%	14%	21%	12%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	32%	57%	15%	55%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	75%	71%	85%	69%

## Diversity analysis

### Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic young people	White young people	Muslim young people	Non-Muslim young people
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>47</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>70</b>
Can you speak to:					
5.7	A chaplain of your faith in private?	76%	67%	86%	65%
5.8	A peer mentor?	22%	49%	25%	38%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	13%	18%	8%	18%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	45%	49%	41%	49%
6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	72%	74%	66%	79%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	25%	22%	18%	27%
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	70%	78%	63%	77%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	49%	55%	43%	54%
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	29%	28%	36%	27%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	39%	51%	39%	49%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	52%	52%	50%	53%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	56%	55%	57%	55%
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	69%	68%	79%	66%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	39%	37%	19%	44%
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	24%	37%	28%	31%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	9%	15%	18%	12%
9.4	Have you been victimised by other young people here?	20%	23%	24%	19%
Since you have been here, have other young people:					
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	11%	4%	3%	9%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	2%	2%	3%	1%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	0%	0%	0%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	7%	0%	7%	1%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	0%	0%	0%
9.7	Have you been victimised by staff here?	19%	18%	17%	18%

## Diversity analysis

### Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic young people	White young people	Muslim young people	Non-Muslim young people
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>47</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>70</b>
Since you have been here, have staff:					
<b>9.8d</b>	Threatened or intimidated you?	4%	2%	0%	5%
<b>9.8i</b>	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	7%	0%	3%	3%
<b>9.8j</b>	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>9.8k</b>	Victimised you because of your nationality?	2%	0%	0%	1%
<b>9.8p</b>	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	2%	0%	1%
<b>9.10</b>	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	30%	32%	28%	31%
<b>9.11</b>	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	21%	38%	36%	29%
<b>10.1a</b>	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the doctor?	59%	72%	59%	68%
<b>10.1b</b>	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the nurse?	70%	80%	78%	74%
<b>10.4</b>	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	12%	35%	19%	28%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:					
<b>11.4a</b>	Education?	77%	69%	85%	69%
<b>11.4b</b>	A job in this establishment?	35%	27%	28%	31%
<b>11.4c</b>	Vocational or skills training?	14%	22%	8%	21%
<b>11.4d</b>	Offending behaviour programmes?	25%	24%	15%	28%
<b>11.4e</b>	Nothing?	15%	20%	15%	20%
<b>11.6</b>	Do you usually have association every day?	75%	79%	76%	77%
<b>11.7</b>	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	2%	9%	0%	7%
<b>11.8</b>	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	0%	2%	0%	1%
<b>12.1</b>	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	64%	83%	70%	75%
<b>12.2</b>	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	43%	30%	44%	34%
<b>12.3</b>	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	29%	39%	32%	34%
<b>13.2</b>	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	42%	40%	57%	35%
<b>13.8</b>	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	36%	33%	40%	33%

## Diversity analysis - disability



### Key question responses (disability analysis) HMYOI Werrington 2013

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

#### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	<b>Consider themselves to have a disability</b>	<b>Do not consider themselves to have a disability</b>
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>15</b>	<b>79</b>
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	6%	1%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	100%	99%
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	28%	54%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	6%	30%
1.5	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	12%	5%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	44%	29%
2.1	Are you sentenced?	67%	80%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	39%	64%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	56%	33%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	67%	49%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	12%	14%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	79%	74%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	71%	83%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	77%	79%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	65%	80%
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	75%	70%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	12%	30%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	13%	13%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	71%	39%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	69%	74%
Can you speak to:			

## Diversity analysis - disability

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	<b>Consider themselves to have a disability</b>	<b>Do not consider themselves to have a disability</b>
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
5.7	A chaplain of your faith in private?	67%	72%
5.8	A peer mentor?	39%	33%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	11%	15%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	50%	47%
6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	77%	74%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	6%	26%
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	77%	74%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	61%	52%
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	39%	26%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	41%	46%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	71%	48%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	67%	53%
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	56%	70%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	56%	34%
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	44%	26%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	35%	7%
9.4	Have you been victimised by other young people here?	33%	19%
Since you have been here, have other young people:			
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	11%	7%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	2%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	0%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	4%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	0%
9.7	Have you been victimised by staff here?	29%	17%
Since you have been here, have staff:			

## Diversity analysis - disability

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	<b>Consider themselves to have a disability</b>	<b>Do not consider themselves to have a disability</b>
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>9.8d</b>	Threatened or intimidated you?	6%	2%
<b>9.8i</b>	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	4%
<b>9.8j</b>	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	0%
<b>9.8k</b>	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	1%
<b>9.8p</b>	Victimised you because you have a disability?	6%	0%
<b>9.10</b>	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	35%	31%
<b>9.11</b>	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	28%	29%
<b>10.1a</b>	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the doctor?	79%	63%
<b>10.1b</b>	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the nurse?	100%	72%
<b>10.4</b>	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	65%	16%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:			
<b>11.4a</b>	Education?	72%	72%
<b>11.4b</b>	A job in this establishment?	28%	32%
<b>11.4c</b>	Vocational or skills training?	28%	17%
<b>11.4d</b>	Offending behaviour programmes?	21%	26%
<b>11.4e</b>	Nothing?	21%	18%
<b>11.6</b>	Do you usually have association every day?	71%	78%
<b>11.7</b>	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	6%	6%
<b>11.8</b>	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	0%	1%
<b>12.1</b>	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	67%	74%
<b>12.2</b>	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	39%	35%
<b>12.3</b>	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	39%	33%
<b>13.2</b>	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	35%	43%
<b>13.8</b>	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	35%	34%