

Report on an unannounced inspection of

HMP & YOI Wetherby

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

7 – 18 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

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

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

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

Printed and published by:
Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons
Victory House
6th floor
30-34 Kingsway
London WC2B 6EX
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	75
Appendix IV: Summary of children and young people questionnaires and interviews	79

Introduction

HMP & YOI Wetherby in Yorkshire is a dedicated facility holding young men under the age of 18. We last inspected the institution in early 2012. Since then two units have been mothballed owing to the fall in the national juvenile population. Wetherby now holds just under 230 young people, excluding the specialist Keppel Unit which we did not inspect on this occasion. Our inspection did include the Anson facility, now the only dedicated juvenile unit in England and Wales for young people with life or long-term determinate sentences.

Overall this a good report that describes an institution that manages a challenging population well. Against all our healthy prison tests we found outcomes that were reasonably good, or better.

The vast majority of young people reported feeling safe. Arrival in to custody was managed satisfactorily despite inconsistencies in the quality of some initial assessments and weaknesses in the induction programme. Young people continued to be admitted to the establishment late and this made it more difficult for staff to settle them in safely. Safeguarding arrangements were effective and multi-disciplinary structures were in place to ensure the needs of vulnerable young people were addressed. The presence of prison-based social workers had brought tangible improvements to the quality of child protection work.

There had been no recent bullying surveys at Wetherby, which was an omission, but available evidence suggested there was comparatively little victimisation and that bullying incidents were relatively low level. There was, however, some emerging evidence to suggest incidents involving group assaults on individuals were becoming more common. In contrast the use of force had reduced significantly with clear indications that staff had the confidence to de-escalate incidents. The use of adjudication had also reduced and the prison had a coordinated approach to behaviour management, although young people had, with some justification, limited confidence in the rewards and sanctions scheme which was meant to promote good behaviour. Conditions in the separation and care unit (SCU) remained bleak and the regime for most young people held there was inadequate.

Incidences of self-harm among young people were higher than in comparable establishments, which was of concern. The evidence suggested most cases were comparatively minor and no young person had required hospital treatment recently as a consequence of self-harm. Arrangements to monitor risks and support young people were reasonable.

Accommodation was clean and well equipped and recently refurbished windows helped prevent rubbish from being thrown into the grounds and young people shouting out, sometimes to intimidate others. The quality of relationships between staff and young people were respectful and work to promote equality and diversity ensured comparable outcomes for most groups. Complaints were mostly dealt with satisfactorily and health services were good. Food was not popular with young people, although our own assessment was that it was reasonable and that portions were adequate.

Access to time out of cell was similar to our last visit, with most young people unlocked for over eight hours a day. We did, however, find a quarter of young people locked in cell during the working day and there were some limitations on evening association. Overall learning and skills provision was meeting the needs of young people with a good focus on functional skills and a good range of education and vocational training. Learning facilities were good, teaching was good and there was real evidence of improving achievements among young people. Our colleagues in Ofsted assessed the provision as 'good' against their main assessments.

Services to promote resettlement were similarly good. Interventions and case management were well coordinated, multidisciplinary and based on an up-to-date assessment of need among the population. All young people were allocated a case worker and the evidence indicated that both young people and, to an extent, their families were involved in training plans. Temporary release was used well to support reintegration and there was good support for those young people serving long sentences.

Our overall assessment was that Wetherby was a well led and effective institution. It was safe and respectful, and although the challenges and risks of such a volatile and vulnerable group of young people were ever present, there was confidence and focus among managers and staff that ensured the needs of young people were being met.

Nick Hardwick
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

March 2014

Fact page

Task of the establishment

To hold male young people

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

Public

Region/Department

Yorkshire and Humberside

Number held

185

Certified normal accommodation

228

Operational capacity

228

Date of last full inspection

30 January – 3 February 2012

Brief history

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

Short description of residential units

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

Benbow – first night facility and standard accommodation

Collingwood – standard accommodation

Drake – standard accommodation

Name of governor/director

Sara Snell

Escort contractor

GEOAmey

Health service commissioner and providers

Leeds Community Healthcare NHS Trust

Learning and skills providers

The Manchester College

Independent Monitoring Board chair

Michael Crosby

About this inspection and report

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

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

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

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

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.¹

¹ 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 *Late arrivals continued to be a problem and some new admissions shared transport with adults. Young people were treated well on arrival, apart from the routine strip-searching, which was due to cease shortly. Reception and first night procedures were sound, but the induction process needed to be improved. The safeguarding and child protection arrangements were generally effective. Levels of self-harm were relatively high, but this was managed effectively. The environment within the separation and care unit was poor and although most young people only stayed for short periods of time, the regime was not good enough. Use of force was reducing but the procedures for accountability were poor. Incidents involving serious violence were not common, but recently there had been a number of troubling incidents of concerted indiscipline. Most elements of discipline were managed well, although the rewards and sanctions scheme was not effective. Most young people generally reported feeling safe. **Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***

S2 *At the last inspection in February 2012, we found that outcomes for young people at Wetherby were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 16 recommendations in the area of safety. At this follow-up inspection we found that three of the recommendations had been achieved, seven had been partially achieved, five had not been achieved and one was no longer relevant*

S3 Too many young people still arrived at the establishment late in the evening and a high proportion of them shared transport with adults. Escort vans were clean but very poorly ventilated. In our survey, 90% of young people said they felt safe on their journey to the establishment which was significantly higher than the comparator.

S4 Reception staff were efficient and polite and showed a sensitivity and awareness of young people's needs. The practice of routine strip-searching continued but was due to stop soon, with the introduction of a pilot alternative. Young people's immediate practical needs were generally met on reception but late arrivals did not always receive a shower on their first night. All young people were issued with a useful booklet about the establishment on arrival.

S5 First night accommodation was clean but cramped and austere; most young people we spoke to said they felt safe on their first night. The quality of risk assessment and management documentation was variable. Action points were too generic and Asset information (YJB document providing important background information about the young person completed by youth offending teams) was missing or out of date in approximately 10% of cases.

S6 Young people complained that the induction programme was not informative enough and that they were locked up for long periods during induction.

S7 There were strong links between the establishment and the local authority social services department. Data collection and monitoring of safeguarding areas were effective and there was appropriate oversight at the monthly and quarterly safeguarding meetings. The areas monitored needed to be kept under active review to ensure that emerging areas of concern could be identified quickly and examined closely.

S8 The weekly multidisciplinary safeguarding meetings provided an effective forum to discuss the most vulnerable or challenging young people. The care plans produced as a result of these meetings were specific to the young person's needs.

- S9 Links with the local authority had improved over the past year; with effective input from prison-based social workers and close scrutiny of all referrals to the local authority. We identified three cases where incidents “dealt with internally” should have been treated as child protection referrals but had not been dealt with properly.
- S10 In our survey, fewer young people than at comparator establishments said they had been victimised by another young person and fewer also said they had felt unsafe while at Wetherby.
- S11 Information sharing between staff about tensions between young people was good and fights were sometimes anticipated and prevented or broken up quickly.
- S12 Levels of self-harm were higher than at comparator establishments. Most incidents involved superficial injuries and there were a few young people who had harmed themselves more than once. ACCTs (assessment, care in custody and teamwork case management for young people at risk of suicide or self-harm) were opened appropriately in response to acts of self-harm and staff concerns about young people. Young people on ACCTs benefited from multidisciplinary support and staff had good knowledge of the young people in their care who were on ACCTs. Entries in ACCTs were usually observational and did not reflect interaction with the young person. In some cases night observations were too predictable.
- S13 Bullying was mostly low level, but there had not been a bullying survey for some time. More use was being made of the Address and Begin to Change process than at the previous inspection and this helped to manage the behaviour of young people who were involved in bullying or violence. Many of the plans to help young people change their behaviour were not specific enough.
- S14 The proportion of assaults and fights was relatively low in comparison to similar establishments. Records showed that young people had attended hospital on three occasions this year following fights or assaults and one serious injury had been sustained. A rising incidence of group attacks on individuals had been identified by the safeguarding committee; this needed to be monitored closely.
- S15 Young people we spoke to did not find the rewards and sanctions scheme motivational and it was not promoted positively by staff. Reviews were poorly documented and targets were often formulaic. The opportunity for young people to gain incremental increases in their privileges when on the red (lowest) level was a successful feature.
- S16 Physical security was proportionate. Good relationships between staff and young people contributed to effective dynamic security. There was a clear focus on the safety of young people throughout the establishment. Staff reported intelligence quickly and this information was acted on without undue delay.
- S17 The level of adjudications was relatively high, but was reducing significantly. Adjudications were generally used appropriately to deal with the more serious infringements of rules.
- S18 Use of force involving full restraint had reduced significantly since our last inspection and we found some good examples of de-escalation and staff seeking to avoid full restraint. Too many documents associated with use of force were missing and we were not confident that all young people were seen by health care or debriefed after incidents of restraint. Debriefs were generally poorly recorded and were not completed by an independent person.
- S19 The separation and care unit (SCU) remained a poor environment for young people and, although the communal areas were cleaner than previously, there were still significant amounts of graffiti behind cell doors. Most young people who were segregated did not

remain there for long and almost all returned to normal location within the establishment. Relationships between staff and young people in the SCU were excellent, as was the support offered to young people who remained segregated for longer periods. Care planning for those staying for shorter periods was rudimentary. The regime in the SCU was poor for those not going through reintegration and young people we spoke to spent much of their time sleeping. Showers were not available every day.

- S20 The young people's substance misuse service (YPSMS) provided a comprehensive range of high quality one-to-one and group interventions. The YPSMS and child and adolescent mental health service were improving their joint working for young people with a dual diagnosis (substance use and mental health problems).

Respect

S21 *The living conditions were generally reasonable. Relationships between staff and young people were positive and staff were confident about challenging poor behaviour. There was little conflict between young people from different backgrounds and minority groups were well supported. Young people's religious needs were well catered for. There were delays in responding to some complaints and young people were not always able to contact their solicitors. Health care provision was good, particularly in relation to mental health. Young people did not like the food. **Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***

S22 *At the last inspection in February 2012, we found that outcomes for young people at Wetherby were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 14 recommendations in the area of respect. At this follow-up inspection we found that four of the recommendations had been achieved, four had been partially achieved and six had not been achieved.*

- S23 Residential areas were reasonably clean and tidy and attempts to keep graffiti under control had largely worked. Most young people took an interest in keeping their cell in good order but we did see some pictures which contravened the offensive displays policy. It was inappropriate for young people to eat some meals in cells next to uncovered toilets.
- S24 Young people were far more positive than at the previous inspection about their access to showers and telephones and we saw staff working conscientiously to ensure that all young people were able to use them each day. Some young people wore clothes that were in poor condition.
- S25 Relationships between staff and young people were good and young people were comfortable about approaching staff for help. All the interactions that we observed were appropriate, with staff challenging inappropriate behaviour by young people without being heavy handed. Records showed little evidence of good quality work by personal officers.
- S26 The strategic management of equality and diversity was reasonably good. Despite a lack of consultation, outcomes for minority groups were good. This was reflected in our survey and in our discussions with young people. Staff dealt appropriately with overt discrimination by young people and the quality of investigations into incidents of discrimination was good. Services for young people from a foreign national background were reasonably good but telephone interpretation was underused.
- S27 Chaplaincy staff were visible around the establishment and provided young people with pastoral and spiritual support. The range of faith services met the needs of the population and young people we spoke to were positive about the work carried out by the chaplaincy.

- S28 Most young people said they found it easy to make a complaint and forms were readily available. We came across some complaints which had not been replied to. The quality of responses varied.
- S29 Young people had their sentences or remand status clearly explained to them by caseworkers and there was a good system to ensure that properly informed early or late release decisions were made for those serving a detention and training order.
- S30 Not all young people were able to receive free confidential advice from their legal representatives.
- S31 Health care was delivered effectively and an appropriate range of services was available for young people. Young people received routine appointments very quickly for all clinics but attended in groups which could result in extended waiting times. Young people with chronic diseases were well managed. The dental and pharmacy services were good.
- S32 With the integration of primary and secondary services, mental health services had improved since our last inspection and were now very good. A range of specialist staff had been retained including learning disability, speech and language therapy and forensic psychology. All young people were now screened in reception by a mental health nurse.
- S33 In our survey, only 18% of young people said the food was good. Despite this, the food that we tasted was reasonably good. We welcomed the communal dining arrangements which allowed young people to eat together in a civilised way for some meals. Training opportunities in the kitchen were underused.

Purposeful activity

S34 *Time out of cell for young people was broadly the same as the previous inspection. Young people on basic level were locked up for most of the weekend. Time available for exercise had greatly increased and was now offered daily. Leadership and management of learning and skills and quality assurance were good. The quality of teaching and learning and behaviour management were also good. Some of the accommodation for teaching and learning was poor. There was a strong emphasis on functional skills and the level of achievement had improved. Access to the library and gym were good. Internet access for young people to access community education, training and employment opportunities was not operating. The virtual campus was not operating. **Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***

S35 *At the last inspection in February 2012, we found that outcomes for young people at Wetherby were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 13 recommendations in the area of purposeful activity. At this follow-up inspection we found that 11 of the recommendations had been achieved, one had been partially achieved and one had not been achieved.*

S36 Young people had about eight hours a day unlocked during the week. Some received far less time out of cell because of their behaviour, and during random roll checks, we found a quarter of young people in their cells. Young people had less time out of cell at weekends, particularly those on basic level of the rewards and sanctions scheme, who could have only one hour out of their cell each day.

S37 Not all young people had scheduled association every day. However, we were assured that young people were able to receive some out of cell activity each weekday evening, unless

- their regime level or punishment precluded this. The association sessions that we observed were relaxed.
- S38 Young people were positive about their access to time outside, and survey results were now better than at similar establishments. We were pleased to see that young people who had recently been dealt with for serious disciplinary matters were still given the opportunity to take part in exercise. The exercise areas provided little opportunity for young people to burn off energy.
- S39 Management of learning and skills was good with some very effective innovations and developments, particularly in education. The range of provision was appropriate and the levels of accreditation had increased. Appropriate vocational work areas enabled young people to benefit from good work skill development and there were developed plans for further partnerships to promote apprenticeship training.
- S40 The art and education cookery rooms were too small, poorly designed and badly furnished. The national virtual campus to provide young people with internet access to community education, training and employment opportunities was not operating.
- S41 Teaching, learning and assessment were good with very good individual learning support. Links between the education cookery room and the main kitchen were weak and did not enable vocational qualifications to be carried out.
- S42 Initial and diagnostic assessment and advice and guidance were very effective.
- S43 Functional skills were threaded through all education subjects and helped young people to progress. Their research and thinking skills were developed by very good enrichment activities. Young people attending education and training said they felt safe there.
- S44 Achievements in education, training and in the gym were good. In education there was a 9% increase in overall success rates in 2012 to 2013. The transfer of portfolios to other establishments was not monitored well. Good behaviour management and speech and language therapy helped young people to progress to higher levels of literacy.
- S45 Access to the library had improved to include evening and weekend opening. A good range of events supported reading and job search skills.
- S46 Access to the gym and sports facilities was good and there was an improved range of accredited courses. Links with the community needed to be strengthened to develop competitive sport activities.

Resettlement

- S47** *The strategic management of resettlement remained effective. The planning arrangements were generally effective and support for looked-after children had improved significantly. We were not confident that young people on remand who may be eligible for bail were always dealt with quickly enough. Provision under the resettlement pathways had improved. Opportunities for release on temporary licence had been extended and plans were well advanced to re-establish employer links. Young people moving on from the long-term unit received good support, but needed more detailed information about the receiving establishment. Young people were helped to maintain contact with their families, but more family days were needed. **Outcomes for children and young people were good against this healthy prison test.***

S48 At the last inspection in February 2012, we found that outcomes for young people at Wetherby were good against this healthy prison test. We made six recommendations in the area of resettlement. At this follow-up inspection we found that four recommendations had been partially achieved and two had not been achieved.

- S49 The reducing re-offending strategy had been developed from an up-to-date needs analysis and was monitored by a well attended strategy meeting, which included representatives from community agencies.
- S50 There was an excellent multidisciplinary approach to meeting the needs of young people, which was coordinated effectively by the casework team.
- S51 The use of release on temporary licence continued to provide an important additional method of assisting young people to integrate back into the community.
- S52 In our survey, the vast majority of young people said that they had a sentence or remand plan and that they understood the objectives and targets. Training and remand management plans were usually based on young people's needs. Review meetings were timely and there was good attendance by community youth offending teams, but attendance and contributions from internal departments remained erratic.
- S53 We were not confident that bail applications were made promptly enough, with the potential for young people to remain in custody longer than necessary.
- S54 The training planning arrangements for young people serving indeterminate and long sentences on the Anson unit were comprehensive and the additional care planning meetings ensured that the needs of this high-risk group of young people were reviewed regularly.
- S55 Young people spoke highly of the support they received from the caseworkers. They felt involved in arrangements to transfer to young adult establishments, although more detailed information on the receiving establishments was needed. We were not confident that young people who had undertaken education or personal development programmes would be able to progress in these areas when they moved to a young adult establishment.
- S56 There were effective systems to identify young people who had looked-after status. The social workers worked hard to get local authorities to meet their obligations to looked-after young people. The frequency of looked-after children reviews had increased, but there was still room for improvement and many young people did not receive their entitlement to appropriate additional financial support.
- S57 Accommodation needs were identified early in the young person's sentence and significant efforts were made to ensure that community agencies provided suitable accommodation for young people who were not returning home. No young people had been released in the last 12 months without an address, though, despite the establishment's best efforts, some young people did not know their address until just before release.
- S58 There was an excellent pre-release course and a new multi-skills workshop was due to be introduced shortly with further vocational training workshops planned. Links with employers had reduced which had had a detrimental impact on employment opportunities.
- S59 Health care discharge planning for young people was well organised and good links were maintained with the local community.

- S60 Advice on finance, benefit and debt was limited, but progress was being made to address this.
- S61 Young people's families said that it was easy to book visits and that staff treated them with respect. The seating in the visits area was too close and conversations could be easily overheard.
- S62 Celebration days and family days on Anson unit were well received by young people, but they needed to be extended to all young people on the main site. Some young people who had had difficulty maintaining relationships with their families were able to participate in programmes designed to improve these relationships.
- S63 The 'In2out' mentoring project was an extremely useful initiative which should be developed further to benefit more young people. There was a wide range of personal development programmes to meet the needs of all young people.

Main concerns and recommendations

- S64 Concern: Despite a previous recommendation, late arrivals continued to occur and this affected the ability of staff to settle new arrivals in properly and resulted in a poorer first night experience.

Recommendation: Problems relating to late arrivals should be resolved. (Repeated recommendation HP49)

- S65 Concern: The separation and care unit was a completely unsuitable environment to look after difficult and challenging young people. The needs of young people held there were not always properly assessed and monitored and the regime was inadequate.

Recommendation: The separation and care unit should be improved so that it is a suitable environment in which to work with difficult and challenging young people. All young people in the separation and care unit should have detailed care and reintegration plans, based on an initial and ongoing assessment of their risks and needs, with access to as full a regime as possible and with specific and time- bound targets.

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 *Too many young people arrived at the establishment late in the evening. A few young people had long journeys. Vans were clean but poorly ventilated. Young people felt safe while being transferred. Some young people were given a helpful leaflet about the establishment before arrival.*

I.2 Too many young people continued to arrive late (see main recommendation paragraph S64). In the three months before our inspection, 44 young people had arrived after 7.30pm, with the latest at 9.45pm. Some young people had long journeys from as far as Norfolk. Unlike neighbouring prisons, the establishment did not lock young people out if they arrived late and escorts going to a number of prisons went to Wetherby last. Escort vans were clean and had no graffiti but they were poorly ventilated and some had a bad odour. Young people were sometimes escorted with adults but, in our survey, 90% of young people said they felt safe on their most recent journey against the comparator of 81%. Person escort records were completed to a reasonably high standard. Some young people were given a helpful leaflet at court entitled, 'Everything you need to know on your first night in Wetherby'.

Recommendations

I.3 **Young people should not be transported with adult prisoners.**

I.4 **All young people should receive information about the prison before they are admitted.**

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 *Reception staff were efficient and caring but young people spent too long in reception. They could have showers, hot meals and a telephone call on arrival but could not see a peer mentor. All young people arriving from court or secure training centres were strip-searched. First night cells were clean but austere. Risk information from the Youth Justice Board was sometimes missing or out of date and the quality of risk assessment and management (RAM) documentation was variable. Some induction sessions did not use age-appropriate language and were not focused enough. Young people received an excellent booklet about life at Wetherby on arrival.*

- I.6** Staff received helpful placement information from the Youth Justice Board (YJB) before young people arrived and reception staff read young people's person escort records. Reception staff were efficient and thorough and focused on young people's immediate needs in a polite manner. Officers reassured young people that they were there to help and care for them while in custody. Young people could spend up to two hours in reception, often because of the quantity of documentation which was completed in the reception area.
- I.7** Young people were offered showers on arrival. We observed a number of young people accepting this offer, but in our survey only 28% of young people said they had been offered a shower against the comparator of 60%. Showers were clean and private. Unappetising microwave meals were offered. More young people (82%) than at our last inspection (74%) said they were given something to eat on arrival. New arrivals were asked if they would like to telephone an adult and officers telephoned to check that the person was happy to receive a call. Young people did not have the opportunity to speak to a peer mentor on arrival.
- I.8** All young people arriving from court or secure training centres (STCs) were routinely strip-searched, which was intrusive and disproportionate. We were told that this practice was shortly due to cease.
- I.9** New arrivals were located on B wing on a dedicated first night spur. First night cells were clean and free of graffiti but they were cramped and austere. In-cell toilets had no screening, seats or covers.
- I.10** First night staff drew information from placement orders and e-Asset (YJB assessment document completed by youth offending teams) to complete risk assessment and management (RAM) forms. The quality of the RAMs was variable. If staff had access to up-to-date Asset reports, the RAMs clearly outlined the risks that young people presented, but if the Asset was missing, the RAM was of limited value. Staff told us that in about 10% of cases the Asset was missing or out of date. Triggers and actions in RAMs were often too generic and did not focus on individual need.
- I.11** The five-day induction programme started on the first working day after arrival. The induction session that we observed was delivered using PowerPoint and lasted about 45 minutes. Several images were used but the presentation was not delivered in age-appropriate language and too many topics were covered in a single session. Staff told us that a lot of the information 'went in one ear and out the other'. In our survey, 55% of young people said that induction covered everything they needed to know about the establishment against 74% at the previous inspection. Young people were provided with an excellent information book on reception, which was comprehensive and easy to read.

Recommendations

- I.12 All new arrivals should be given the opportunity to speak to a peer mentor before they are locked up for the night.**
- I.13 Toilets in first night accommodation should have seats and lids and should be screened.**
- I.14 First night risk management plans should be relevant to the young person's needs and identified risks, and managers should monitor quality through robust quality assurance. (Repeated recommendation I.18)**

Housekeeping point

- I.15** Induction sessions should be age appropriate.

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.16 *Links between the establishment and the local authority had improved. The collection and use of safeguarding data were effective. The weekly multi-agency safeguarding meeting provided a useful forum for agreeing the support and management of very vulnerable or challenging young people.*

I.17 Links with the local safeguarding children board (LSCB) had strengthened since the previous inspection, aided by the appointment of on-site social workers as part of the safeguarding team who were involved in the care of young people. The safeguarding protocol was agreed with the LSCB following annual reviews.

I.18 A number of regular safeguarding meetings took place. A quarterly meeting chaired by the head of safeguarding oversaw the strategic management of safeguarding, including self-harm, violence, bullying, child protection and use of force, but not injuries sustained during use of force. There was appropriate attendance by functional areas and by a representative of the local authority. The head of safeguarding also chaired a monthly safeguarding meeting which had an operational focus and looked at a range of statistical data covering relevant areas. There were no data on the reasons for young people self-harming and, while there was comparison with previous months and years, few patterns or trends had been identified.

I.19 The weekly safeguarding meeting was a useful multidisciplinary forum to discuss young people of the most concern and agree their management. The meeting we attended demonstrated a good level of discussion and understanding of the young people. The care plans developed at the meeting focused on the young person's needs but needed to identify the required outcomes rather than just the actions to be taken. The care plans produced at the meetings focused on the young person's needs and were updated to reflect changing circumstances. They were also cross referenced to ACCT (assessment, care in custody and teamwork) care maps to help maintain consistency.

Recommendation

- I.20** **Injuries sustained during use of force should be monitored by the safeguarding children strategy meeting.**

Housekeeping point

- I.21** The reasons for young people self-harming should be monitored by the safeguarding meeting.

Child protection

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.22** *Child protection procedures had improved over the past year following the reinstatement of the establishment social workers and closer scrutiny of all referrals. We identified three incidents which were not appropriately dealt with as child protection referrals but, otherwise, child protection procedures were thorough.*
- I.23** The relationship between the establishment and the local authority had improved significantly since the previous inspection and were described as constructive by both parties. The local authority designated officer (LADO) attended the quarterly safeguarding committee consistently and played an active part in child protection work at the establishment. The LADO was consulted about and gave advice on all child protection referrals.
- I.24** Since the previous inspection, three social workers had been reinstated at the establishment who covered the whole site. Between May and October 2013 the team had received 21 child protection referrals, two-thirds of which related to historic abuse or concerns raised about family members outside the establishment. The remainder concerned allegations against staff and consideration was being given to whether these should be dealt with at strategy meetings.
- I.25** We found three cases earlier in the year where force had been used and where information should have been passed to the social work team but was not. We were told that a procedure had recently been introduced to notify the social work team of all safeguarding matters.
- I.26** The social work staff were well integrated in the establishment and attended safeguarding meetings. Most of their work focused on looked-after children, but they also played a key role in child protection. The social workers and safeguarding staff examined all child protection referrals which were raised at a weekly meeting chaired by the governor. The level of scrutiny at this meeting was impressive: the staff present were well briefed about each case, documentation was carefully checked and CCTV footage was viewed. The governor did not sign off cases until she was satisfied that investigations had been completed properly and additional information was frequently requested.

Good practice

- I.27** *The weekly meeting of a small team of specialist staff chaired by the governor to examine child protection referrals was an effective and efficient way of ensuring that all referrals were dealt with properly.*

Victims of bullying and intimidation

Expected outcomes:

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

I.28 *Fewer young people at Wetherby than at comparator establishments said they had been victimised by other young people. Most bullying consisted of name calling and insults, young people known to be victims of bullying were supported through the weekly safeguarding meeting.*

I.29 In our survey, 15% of young people said they had been victimised by other young people against the comparator of 24%. Staff were aware of the potential for bullying and challenged such behaviour, for example play fighting or name calling. Many security incident reports related to low-level bullying. Observations books were used to record bullying behaviour and information was shared effectively with security staff. Shouting out of windows was not as evident as at the previous inspection (see also section on residential units) and staff were regularly reminded of the need to challenge young people who shouted out and to record this in appropriate logs, although it was difficult to identify at night which young people were involved. In our survey, just under a third of young people said shouting out was a problem. Young people who were victims of bullying were discussed at the weekly safeguarding meeting and offered support by the multidisciplinary team. This included a change of daytime activities, change of unit, separate movements from young people named as perpetrators, and monitoring of relationships between young people.

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.30 *The incidence of self-harm was higher than at some juvenile establishments. Most incidents resulted in minor injuries. The quality of ACCT (assessment, care in custody and teamwork case management for young people at risk of suicide or self-harm) documents was reasonable but night observations were sometimes too predictable.*

I.31 During the six months before the inspection, there had been 95 acts of self-harm and 106 ACCT documents had been opened, most in response to staff concerns about a young person rather than an attempt at self-harm. A few young people self-harmed repeatedly. Scratching and cutting resulting in minor injuries were the most common forms of self-harm. No young person had required hospital treatment following a self-harm incident during the six months before the inspection. Self-harm data were reviewed at the monthly safeguarding meeting and there were few discernible patterns. Young people had access to Samaritans telephones which they could have in their cells, and Samaritan volunteers visited the establishment each week.

- I.32** The quality of ACCT documents was generally reasonable. Initial assessments were conducted promptly, and the young person's thoughts and feelings were recorded. There were 22 ACCT assessors from a range of disciplines across the site. Case management was conducted by custodial managers and reviews included members of specialist teams involved in the young person's care. Care maps were updated following reviews, with actions relevant to the young person's needs. Families/carers were informed when a young person self-harmed. Observations took place at the required frequency, but many entries on ACCTs were observational and did not record interaction with the young person. Some night observations were too predictable. Regular management checks were not recorded on all ACCTs.
- I.33** A young person needing to be on constant watch remained on the unit and was observed through the hatch in his cell door or moved to health care which had cameras in cells. Neither option included interaction with the young person. Anti ligature clothing had been used once in recent months. Its use with this group of vulnerable young people was inappropriate.
- I.34** Night staff we spoke to were aware of the location of young people on open ACCTs and the frequency of their observations. They had all had ACCT training and carried anti-ligature knives. They said they would unlock the door to a young person's room to preserve life without waiting for additional back up and some gave examples of this.

Recommendations

- I.35** **Managers should ensure that night observations are not predictable.**
- I.36** **Anti-ligature clothing should not be used.**

Housekeeping point

- I.37** ACCT observations should include interaction with the young person and this should be recorded.

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.38** *The behaviour management strategy coordinated all relevant policies and gave clear guidance on the management of poor behaviour. Mediation was not included in the policy and staff were not trained to use mediation.*

- I.39** Behaviour was managed through the Address and Begin to Change (ABC) policy. This was an intervention and target based approach which incorporated all relevant policies to manage antisocial behaviour. It gave clear guidelines for the management of poor behaviour and how perpetrators and victims should be managed and supported (see also section on bullying and violence reduction). Safeguarding was a key element of the policy. Incidents were monitored at the weekly safeguarding and stability meetings.

- I.40** Staff used mediation constructively to resolve conflict between young people but mediation was not included in the policy. Staff were not trained in mediation and there was no managerial oversight of its use.

Recommendation

- I.41** **Staff undertaking mediation should be trained in its use and the use of mediation should be monitored.**

Rewards and sanctions

Expected outcomes:

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

I.42 *The rewards and sanctions policy was out of date. Young people did not value the differentials between the levels and said that there was no incentive to reach the highest gold level. C-Nomis records showed that staff did not promote the scheme to young people. Reviews were poorly documented and targets were not tailored to the individual young person. The opportunity for young people on the lowest level to gain incremental increases in privileges represented a realistic approach to behaviour management.*

- I.43** The rewards and sanctions policy had not been updated since August 2011 despite a requirement for an annual review. The scheme described the different levels of the scheme and how young people could move between them. Staff and young people had reasonable knowledge of how the scheme was applied but, in practice, the scheme was not well used. Young people in our groups said there was no real value in being on the highest gold level and there was no incentive for them to reach it. C-Nomis (Prison Service IT system) records showed that staff did not promote the scheme to young people.
- I.44** Young people transferring from other establishments on the highest level of the scheme retained that status. Young people could apply for gold level four to six weeks after arrival and applications were dealt with swiftly.
- I.45** Warnings were given for poor behaviour but few were recorded on individual C-Nomis files and staff told us they did not all use the written warning forms. Reviews were carried out when a young person received three or more warnings. Young people could attend these reviews and make written submissions. Record keeping was poor and some reviews did not show that all information had been considered before a decision was made. Reviews were carried out by a senior officer and at least one other member of staff. Young people could request the assistance of an advocate.
- I.46** At the time of the inspection, 35 young people were on the red (lowest) level of the rewards and sanctions scheme and were managed under the ABC programme. The regime for young people on the red level was less harsh than at our previous inspection and young people could have radios when their television was removed. Target setting was perfunctory and did not always challenge the poor behaviour that had triggered the young person's demotion to red level. For example, one young person had been set a target not to fight or assault anyone despite the fact that he had not been involved in any such behaviour. Frequent reviews were

carried out for young people on the red level who could gain incremental returns of lost privileges. This was a realistic, age-appropriate way of encouraging better behaviour.

Recommendation

- I.47 The rewards and sanctions scheme should be reviewed annually. In consultation with young people, the scheme should be re-launched and applied consistently across the establishment.**

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.48 *Physical security was proportionate and good staff-prisoner relationships supported dynamic security. There was a strong focus on the safety of young people supported by good information exchange. The weekly stability meeting played a useful monitoring role. Staff reported information quickly and this was acted on without delay. Most strip-searching was carried out following risk assessment.*

- I.49** Physical security was proportionate to the risks posed, with supervised movement to activities. Young people were escorted to activities and appointments outside the mass movement times. The monthly security meeting was well attended and was focused on the safety of young people, an ethos which was evident throughout the establishment. Monthly objectives reflected intelligence received and there was good evidence of follow-up action.
- I.50** The relationships between staff and young people were good and helped to support good dynamic security. Staff from all departments reported intelligence to security and 2,608 security incident reports had been received in the previous six months. Information sharing between the security department and other departments, particularly safeguarding and safer custody, was good. Attention was focused on the main concerns of threats, tobacco, violence and bad behaviour. The information received was analysed quickly and follow-up actions, such as target searching, were carried out swiftly.
- I.51** Young people were not restricted unnecessarily in their access to activities. The weekly stability meeting examined issues as they arose and identified immediate risks to young people and the security of the establishment. Actions were identified and carried out, usually the same day.
- I.52** All cell searching was carried out on an intelligence-led basis. Routine strip-searching continued in reception for some new arrivals, although we understood this practice was shortly due to cease. Neither these searches nor strip-searches following a risk assessment were monitored.

Recommendations

- I.53** Young people should not be routinely strip-searched. Strip-searching should only be carried out after a thorough risk assessment has identified serious risk of harm to the young person or others, and on the authorisation of a duty governor. (Repeated recommendation 7.9)
- I.54** All strip-searching should be monitored by the safeguarding children strategy committee.

Adjudications

- I.55** The number of adjudications had reduced since our last inspection and was proportionately less than at similar establishments. Charges related mainly to assaults, indiscipline, fights and threatening and abusive behaviour. More serious charges were referred to the independent adjudicator and to the police when necessary or when requested by young people.
- I.56** Adjudication documentation was issued the day before the hearing. Young people were offered the assistance of an advocate before or during the hearing. Advocacy services were well embedded and young people we spoke to appreciated the support they were given. Advocates supported young people in a number of other ways, for example, contact with social workers, help with day-to-day problems and with use of force debriefs.
- I.57** Adjudications were carried out on the wings and in the separation and care unit for young people located there. The rooms used were suitable and age appropriate.
- I.58** We were unable to observe an adjudication. Young people in our groups said that adjudications were fair and they were able to have their say. The completed documentation that we reviewed confirmed that young people were given the opportunity to present their case and that full account was taken of mitigating circumstances. Records did not always give a full account of events leading up to the disciplinary charge, nor was enough evidence always recorded to support a finding of guilt. This had been identified during quality assurance by the deputy governor and was being addressed.
- I.59** Punishments were given in accordance with a published tariff. Punishments appeared consistent and appropriate for young people. The use of removal from unit for punishment had ceased in August 2013.
- I.60** Adjudication review meetings took place quarterly to examine statistics, identify trends, review the punishment tariff and carry out long-term monitoring.
- I.61** Minor reports were used to deal with less serious infringements of the rules. In our survey, 69% of young people said that they had had a minor report against the comparator of 51%. Charges were laid and punishments awarded within guidelines. Monitoring and quality assurance were carried out each month by residential custodial managers.

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 Bullying was mostly low level but a bullying survey had not been conducted recently. In our own survey, fewer young people than the comparator said they had felt unsafe while at the establishment. Name calling and insults were the most common reported forms of bullying. A rising number of group attacks was beginning to cause concern.

I.63 The establishment used the ABC programme to address bullying and antisocial behaviour, with appropriate links to the rewards and sanctions scheme (see also section on behaviour management). Tier one of the programme consisted of monitoring the poor behaviour, and tier two the removal of privileges and use of interventions to address the behaviour, while supporting the victims. Young people involved in antisocial behaviour could be referred to psychology or the child and adolescent mental health service for individual work.

I.64 Incidents of violence, bullying and antisocial behaviour were recorded in observation books and reported to the safeguarding team and to security (see section on security). Security and safeguarding worked effectively to share information and ensure a consistent response to bullying and violence. In our survey, less than a third of young people said they would tell staff if they were being victimised. Bullying was discussed at consultation meetings, but there had not been a survey of bullying recently to gauge the views of the whole population. Young people could report victimisation directly to staff, through a complaint dealt with by a member of the safeguarding team, or to an advocate or chaplain. A safeguarding telephone number was publicised to family members/carers so that they could report any concerns. Twenty-nine bullying incidents had been reported during the six months before the inspection.

I.65 Young people placed on tier two of the ABC programme had all their privileges removed, which included association, dining out and their television. They were given plans to address their behaviour and could start to regain privileges after three days if they were meeting their targets. The plans we looked at were not specific enough to help young people change their behaviour.

I.66 In our survey, 23% of young people said they had felt unsafe at Wetherby against the comparator of 31%. The occurrence of violent incidents was lower per 100 of the population than at most similar establishments. There had been 100 fights and 92 assaults in the six months before the inspection. Since the beginning of the year three young people had required outside hospital investigation or treatment as the result of a violent incident. One young person had sustained a serious injury, after being assaulted by eight young people. This was being investigated by the police. Staff told us that two-on-one assaults were becoming more common; group assaults had been properly identified by the safeguards committee as an area for close monitoring. Staff intervened quickly when fights or assaults occurred and mediation was used when appropriate to resolve issues between young people.

Recommendations

I.67 **Plans for young people on the behaviour change programme should be individual to the young person and should describe the support available to help him achieve his targets.**

I.68 **There should be regular surveys of all young people on bullying and other antisocial behaviour.**

The use of force

Expected outcomes:

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

1.69 *Use of force had reduced significantly since our last inspection and we found some good examples of de-escalation. Too many documents detailing the need for, and use of, force were missing and we were not confident that all young people were offered appropriate support following restraint. We found some cases where child protection referrals had not been made. Debriefs were often not carried out by an independent person and were poorly recorded. Young people could safely make a complaint about use of force and investigation was thorough.*

1.70 Full use of control and restraint had reduced since our last inspection and was significantly lower than in similar establishments. There had been 316 incidents in the previous six months, 155 of which had involved full use of restraint techniques. Most incidents of use of force were spontaneous when staff intervened in fights or assaults.

1.71 Documentation setting out the need for use of force and the type of force used that we reviewed showed that force, particularly the full use of control and restraint, was generally used as a last resort. There was considerable evidence of staff de-escalating situations and making every effort to avoid restraining young people. However, almost 20% of use of force paperwork was incomplete or missing despite the efforts made by the safeguarding team to ensure that it was completed. This made it difficult to be confident that force was always used as a last resort.

1.72 We were not confident that all young people were seen by a member of health care staff following use of force or that all young people were debriefed. Debriefs that we examined often did not give a full account of what had happened and were not carried out by an independent person. We found three cases where child protection referrals had not been made. Videos of two planned removals showed that fully compliant young people were handcuffed with wrist locks applied and were required to walk bent over to the separation and care unit, which was excessive. If young people made complaints, these were investigated thoroughly and young people were kept safe following their complaint. We found evidence of the use of pain compliance in the form of the Mandibular angle technique² during 11 incidents in the previous six months, which was inappropriate. Not all planned incidents had been recorded.

1.73 Special accommodation had not been used since the last inspection.

1.74 The safeguarding and restraint minimisation committee discussed all aspects of use of force and carried out long term monitoring of statistics. Use of force was also discussed in detail at safeguarding strategy meetings. Use of force paperwork was reviewed but as almost one fifth was incomplete, the potential impact of quality assurance was very limited.

² A form of restraint which involves pressure being applied at a point below the ear.

Recommendations

- I.75** Use of force documentation should be completed as soon as possible after an incident.
- I.76** All young people should be seen by health care staff immediately after an incident and they should be fully debriefed by an independent person.
- I.77** Child protection referrals should be made in every case where a young person complains about use of force or when quality assurance procedures show that undue force was used.
- I.78** Only the minimum amount of force should be used when necessary and pain compliance should not be used with young people.

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.79 *The separation and care unit (SCU) remained a poor environment for young people, with a considerable amount of graffiti in cells. Most young people did not remain in the SCU for long. Young people did not have showers each day. Relationships between staff and young people were excellent. We found evidence of excellent support offered to young people who remained separated for longer periods but care planning was still rudimentary.*

- I.80** Conditions in the SCU were poor, although communal areas were cleaner than at our last inspection, there were still significant amounts of graffiti behind cell doors and the living environment was bleak and not suitable for holding children.
- I.81** At the time of the inspection, eight young people were resident on the unit for reasons of good order or discipline, four of whom were returned to residential units during the inspection. In the previous six months, 182 young people had been held in the SCU, 34% for good order, 40% awaiting an adjudication, and 26% for removal from unit, which had ceased to be used as a punishment in August 2013.
- I.82** The average length of stay was two days for young people awaiting adjudication and eight for those removed from their residential unit. Only four young people had been held in the unit for more than 20 days. Almost all young people were reintegrated to residential units.
- I.83** All young people on the unit had been appropriately authorised for separation. Documentation indicated frequent reviews according to individual need. Reintegration planning was good for young people who were on the unit for longer periods, with evidence of excellent support for very challenging young people, including access to off-unit activities such as association and gym. Care planning was less good for young people in the SCU for shorter periods. Targets set were generally perfunctory and the regime was pre-printed on the documents. Care plans were not time bound and it was difficult to see how young people would progress. One young person had been set a target to engage with different organisations with no suggestions of which organisations or how he would set about it.

- I.84** The regime on the SCU was inadequate for young people who were not undergoing formal reintegration and the young people we spoke to reported that they spent a lot of time sleeping. All young people were risk assessed for access to off-unit activities but this was generally restricted to young people who were there for longer periods. Limited education opportunities were offered on the unit. Young people were encouraged to have time in the open air in association, but they were only offered the opportunity to shower every other day (see main recommendation paragraph S65).
- I.85** Young people said that they were well treated by staff and had daily access to telephones, a governor and health care staff. Relationships between staff and young people were excellent and staff knew the young people well.
- I.86** Monitoring and review of separation had recently been introduced at the quarterly adjudications meeting.

Recommendation

- I.87** Young people in the SCU should be able to have a shower each day.

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.88 *The young people's substance misuse service (YPSMS) provided a full clinical treatment service with a comprehensive range of high quality one-to-one and group interventions, although demand was low. The introduction of the new core day had imposed time constraints which made it difficult to schedule substance misuse interventions. Joint working with CAMHS was improving. The mandatory drug testing rate stood at 0%.*

- I.89** Assessment arrangements were very good. Young people were assessed on arrival by mental health nurses using the new comprehensive health assessment tool. Young people assessed as needing more than universal substance misuse awareness were given a more detailed assessment by a YPSMS worker to be completed within five days. Most young people were seen more quickly.
- I.90** Only one young person had required opiate substitution treatment in the past year, and he had been transferred to the Keppel unit. Several other young people had been admitted to the inpatient unit for withdrawal observation or alcohol detoxification. Others had elected to stay on the wings and an observation log was put in place to monitor their progress. If clinical treatment was needed, YPSMS and health care teams worked closely on a joint care plan which could involve the young person remaining in the in-patient facility for stabilisation.
- I.91** Universal drug and alcohol awareness sessions were delivered by the education department, while more intense psychosocial substance misuse work for young people assessed as needing targeted or specialist treatment was delivered by the well-qualified and enthusiastic YPSMS. Interventions included age-appropriate, targeted group and one-to-one work on the most commonly used drugs (cannabis and alcohol) and up-to-date work on the new psychoactive substances. Cravings, stress and anxiety were effectively addressed for many young people by auricular acupuncture.

- I.92** In our survey, 41% of young people arrived at the establishment with drug problems against the comparator of 33%, and 36% said they had received help with their drug problems against 21%.
- I.93** The effectiveness of this comprehensive package of interventions seemed to be in jeopardy because of the time constraints imposed by the new core day. Priority was given to education and it was proving difficult to schedule enough time for substance misuse group work and one-to-one sessions. Groups often ran with fewer participants than the optimum for effective interaction and some young people on remand had been released before their care plans had been addressed.
- I.94** YPSMS and CAMHS were improving joint working for young people with a dual diagnosis (substance use and mental health problems) by working to a new protocol which required regular three-way meetings attended by specialists and the young person and effective information sharing between CAMHS and YPSMS.
- I.95** YPSMS workers provided a good range of substance misuse awareness training to officers and health care workers, particularly addressing the needs of young people undergoing detoxification.
- I.96** The drug-testing regime was proactive and responsive and was conducted from a clean, tidy and well equipped testing suite. Mandatory drug testing rates were zero for the six months to August 2013.

Recommendation

- I.97** **Time allocated to the delivery of interventions for substance misuse problems should be given a higher priority in the cases of greatest need.**

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** *Cells and communal areas were kept clean and reasonably well maintained and less litter was evident than at the previous inspection. Some prison-issue clothing was in poor condition. Access to showers and telephones was much improved.*
- 2.2** Since the previous inspection, two of the main accommodation units had been mothballed and young people were now accommodated on four residential units. Communal areas were clean and reasonably well equipped, with table tennis, sofas and folding tables for communal eating. New windows had been installed which prevented young people from throwing rubbish outside and external areas were far cleaner. Staff told us that it was more difficult for young people to shout out of the new windows and some young people said that shouting out was less of an issue than it had been.
- 2.3** All cells were single occupancy, adequately equipped and maintained appropriately. Efforts to combat graffiti had met with some success. Cells on Benbow unit were the smallest and young people had to sleep in close proximity to the toilet. Most of the cell toilets had no seats or lids and it was inappropriate for young people to eat in these cells (see section on catering). Many of the cells that we looked at were well kept by their occupants. Weekly cell inspections were carried out and the occupant of the best kept cell on each unit was awarded additional telephone credit. The offensive displays policy was largely adhered to, although we saw some pictures which contravened the policy.
- 2.4** In our survey, only 23% of young people said their cell call bell was usually answered within five minutes, against the comparator of 40%. Although managers undertook spot checks of response times, there was no central monitoring. During the inspection we saw staff from the separation and care unit (SCU) respond to an alarm call leaving the SCU unstaffed. Although cell bells from the SCU rang in the office on the nearby Benbow unit, we were not confident that staff on the unit would know that the SCU was unstaffed and they needed to respond. Generally, we saw staff responding promptly to cell bells.
- 2.5** Age-appropriate posters and notices were displayed in the communal areas.
- 2.6** Access to telephones had improved since the previous inspection. In our survey, 77% against 18% previously said they could use the telephone every day and young people told us that they had better access. We saw staff working conscientiously to determine which young people had had access to telephones and which still needed the opportunity. The cost of making telephone calls was high, particularly to mobile phones which for many young people was the only means of contacting family and friends. Young people could send two free letters a week and were able to buy stamps from the prison shop. Incoming mail was handed out each day. There was a clear procedure for handling applications, but unit logs did not record when an application had been dealt with.

- 2.7** Advocates were visible around the units and young people told us they knew who they were and the support they could offer (see section on adjudications). Between April and June 2013, the advocates had received 860 requests from young people to see them.
- 2.8** Young people wore prison-issue clothes, but could wear their own trainers, underwear and socks and some gym kit. Young people on all units wore t-shirts and sweatshirts of a different colour, some of which we noted were in poor condition. Some young people said that if they had a good item of clothing they kept it rather than hand it in on the weekly kit exchange. Kit issued included an outdoor jacket. There was reasonable access to unit laundry facilities for personal items.
- 2.9** Showers on the units were in individual cubicles. They were clean and had less graffiti than at the previous inspection, but they were poorly ventilated. The new standard core day included a domestic hour for each young person to shower, make a telephone call and have time in the fresh air. In our survey, 74% of young people said they could shower every day against 31% at the previous inspection. Staff kept lists of who had had a shower to ensure that all young people had the opportunity. New arrivals were issued with toiletries and could obtain further supplies from the unit office or buy them through the prison shop.

Recommendation

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

Relationships between staff and children and young people

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.11** *Most young people said they were treated with respect and we observed some positive engagement by staff. The personal officer scheme was not working well and case notes reflected this.*

- 2.12** In our survey, a majority of young people said staff treated them with respect. The relationships that we observed during the inspection were mostly constructive. Staff used preferred names for young people and most staff had good knowledge of the young people in their care. Not all staff wore their name badges on their uniforms. Staff challenged unacceptable behaviour confidently and proportionately.
- 2.13** In our survey, 47% of young people said they saw their personal officer at least once a week and 61% that they thought their personal officer tried to help them against respective comparators of 63% and 72%. The personal officer scheme was not working well. Entries by officers on electronic case notes were irregular and showed little evidence of interaction with the young person, focusing instead on the young person's behaviour since the previous entry. Personal officers had no involvement with other departments and did not attend case reviews, ACCT (assessment, care in custody and teamwork), safeguarding, and detention and training order reviews. The establishment had changed the personal officer policy just before the inspection; officers were now responsible for named young people rather than designated areas, but it was too early to assess the impact.

- 2.14** There were regular unit consultation meetings with young people. Minutes of the meetings showed that full discussion took place, but actions were not clearly identified or followed up at subsequent meetings. The inaugural meeting of a young people's council attended by representatives from all the units (including Keppel) took place during the inspection. The meeting identified inconsistencies among units in the way that procedures were applied. Young people were asked to seek their peers' views on a proposal to manage offensive displays and how the exercise areas could be improved.

Recommendations

- 2.15 All staff should wear their names on their uniform.** (Repeated recommendation 2.23)
- 2.16 Each young person should have a designated officer on their residential unit as their central point of contact and support. The officer should take responsibility for the young person's care and wellbeing by frequent contact and by attending relevant meetings relating to their care.**

Housekeeping point

- 2.17** Notes of consultation meetings should include actions to be taken and reports on those actions at subsequent meetings.

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.

- 2.18** *The strategic management of equality was reasonably good and equality action group meetings were productive. Investigations into discrimination incidents were good and perpetrators were challenged. We were not confident that all protected characteristics had been identified. Treatment and conditions were monitored only by race. Diversity events were celebrated throughout the year. Outcomes for minority groups were comparable to majority groups. There were no regular meetings with community organisations nor did they provide any support.*

Strategic management

- 2.19** Equality and diversity were managed to a reasonably good standard by a part-time equality officer supported by an administrator. The equality and diversity policy dated 2013 required minor updating.
- 2.20** The equality action group met bimonthly and was chaired by the governor. Meetings were well attended and productive and were attended by young people. Three young people acted as diversity representatives; a fourth was being recruited. Representatives we spoke to were

positive about their role and the support from the equality officer. Representatives met the equality team regularly but minutes showed that discussion focused on general prison issues rather than equality.

- 2.21** Discrimination incident report forms were freely available around the establishment for young people to report unfair treatment. In the six months before our inspection, 46 incidents had been reported, mostly concerning race. Many incidents involved young people using offensive and discriminatory language to other young people. Investigations were thorough and well documented and perpetrators were robustly challenged. The governor quality assured all investigations. The equality officer attended a quarterly scrutiny meeting with staff from other local prisons to share learning from investigations that had been carried out.
- 2.22** Young people completed an equality questionnaire during induction but we were not confident that all young people from minority groups were identified (see section on protected characteristics). Good links with health care enabled disability information to be passed to the equality team. Young people's protected characteristics were recorded on Prison Service computer records.
- 2.23** Young people's treatment and conditions were monitored by race but not by other protected characteristics. A programme of equality impact assessments was in operation, some of which were not completed on time. A range of diversity events were celebrated throughout the year.
- 2.24** There were no regular meetings with minority groups and no community organisations attended the establishment to offer support to minority groups.

Recommendation

- 2.25** **Equality of treatment for all minority groups should be effectively monitored and appropriate action taken to address inequality.**

Housekeeping point

- 2.26** Equality impact assessments should be completed on time.

Diverse needs

- 2.27** Outcomes for minority groups were generally comparable to majority groups. Twenty-four per cent of the population were from a black or minority ethnic group. In our survey, 56% of ethnic minority young people said that most staff treated them with respect and 10% said that they currently felt unsafe. Both these figures were similar for white young people. We met a group of black and minority ethnic young people who spoke positively of their treatment and conditions.
- 2.28** The establishment used SMART (systematic monitoring and analysing of race equality treatment) to monitor outcomes for black and minority ethnic young people and the data were scrutinised at equality action group meetings. Data for the previous 12 months showed that outcomes were within the expected range except for segregation under good order or discipline where black and minority ethnic young people had been overrepresented in five of the last 12 months. The establishment explained this anomaly by the poor behaviour of a few individuals who had had to be repeatedly segregated.

- 2.29** The establishment had only identified two Travellers or Gypsies, while our survey showed that there were 18 in the establishment. There were plans for the Leeds Gipsy and Traveller Exchange to attend the establishment.
- 2.30** There were nine foreign nationals at the time of the inspection and support for them was reasonably good. A caseworker with knowledge of immigration procedures acted as the foreign national coordinator. All foreign national cases were allocated to her (see section on resettlement) and she made referrals to Immigration Enforcement and helped young people to instruct immigration solicitors. She had referred young people, via the NSPCC child trafficking advice centre, to the national referral mechanism. In at least one case, a young person had been recognised as a suspected victim of trafficking and granted the 45-day reflection and recover period prior to being formally interviewed about the suspected trafficking.
- 2.31** Telephone interpretation was underused for young people who could not speak English. Reception staff and the foreign national coordinator regularly and confidently used telephone interpreters but we did not identify any wing staff who had used them, despite cases of obvious need. A young person on remand who did not speak any English told us he felt safe and his immediate needs were met but he wanted more information about his case. Most foreign nationals were located on C wing where a touch screen kiosk provided a range of information in English and three other languages. Audio information was provided via a telephone handset.
- 2.32** Twelve per cent of the population were Muslim. In our survey, Muslim young people's perceptions of prison life were largely comparable to non-Muslims: 73% of Muslims said their religious beliefs were respected and only 5% said that they currently felt unsafe.
- 2.33** The prison had identified 54 young people with a disability, similar to our survey response. Most disabilities related to learning difficulties. Personal emergency evacuation plans were created where necessary and were of a high quality. There were no multidisciplinary care plans.
- 2.34** The establishment had identified four young people who were either gay or bisexual, who were located on the Keppel unit (see HMIP report on Keppel unit). We were not confident that gay or bisexual young people felt safe enough to disclose their sexuality. Staff and equality representatives told us that gay young people would be bullied if their identity was known.

Recommendations

- 2.35** **Young people with disabilities should have a care plan.**
- 2.36** **There should be more support for gay and bisexual young people.**

Housekeeping point

- 2.37** Wing staff should use telephone interpretation for young people who do not speak English.

Good practice

- 2.38** *A touch screen kiosk on C wing provided information in foreign languages and in audio formats.*

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 *Young people's spiritual needs were met well, chaplaincy staff were visible and well known around the establishment. Young people were positive about the support they received from the chaplaincy.*

2.40 The chaplaincy consisted of eight chaplains from a range of faiths who provided spiritual and pastoral support to young people. Chaplains of faiths not represented in the team were available when required. Major religious festivals were celebrated. During the inspection a well organised meal to celebrate Eid was appreciated by all the young people and staff who attended.

2.41 The chaplains were well integrated and visible around the establishment throughout the inspection. A member of the team contributed to the induction programme and the induction leaflet described the support available to young people of all beliefs.

2.42 Photographs of the chaplains and the times of services were displayed around the establishment. Muslim prayers took place on Friday, Catholic mass on Saturday and Church of England/Free Church service on Sunday. All services were held in the chapel and multi-faith centre which were used flexibly by the chaplaincy to deliver classes and services.

2.43 Chaplains participated in meetings at which individual young people were discussed, including ACCT reviews and the weekly safeguarding meeting. It was evident that they knew the young people well and provided valuable one-to-one support to some of the most vulnerable young people. Members of the team visited young people in the separation and care unit (SCU) and those on open ACCTs each day and contributed to strategic meetings.

2.44 The chaplaincy organised visitors for young people who did not receive visits, and young people were helped to find religious groups with whom they could worship after their release. Important mentoring work to support young people's resettlement was being developed by the chaplaincy in partnership with a community organisation (see section on reintegration planning).

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.

2.45 *Complaint forms were freely available on residential units. Replies to complaints were acceptable but some complaints submitted in August and September 2013 had not been replied to.*

- 2.46** Complaint forms were freely available. The locked boxes were emptied each night and the complaints distributed to appropriate function heads at the morning meeting. Records showed that 276 complaints had been submitted by young people in the six months before the inspection. Information on the number, origin and subject of complaints was provided to the monthly safeguarding meeting. There were no discernible trends.
- 2.47** The majority of complaints were replied to within the timescales, but we found complaints in each of August and September 2013 with no record of a reply. There was not an effective procedure for following up missing replies. The complaints clerk included useful information with replies on how to appeal.
- 2.48** A member of the safeguarding team undertook quality assurance of replies. Replies that we sampled were polite and addressed the issue. Some were very good, others were adequate but a few addressed the young person who made the complaint in the third person, which was inappropriate.

Housekeeping points

- 2.49** There should be a clear procedure for identifying overdue complaints and providing prompt replies.
- 2.50** All replies to complaints should be addressed personally.

Legal rights

Expected outcomes:

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

2.51 *Young people understood their sentence or remand status and decisions on early or late release were properly managed. We were not confident that all young people had access to specialist legal advice.*

- 2.52** The absence of a consistently prompt and reliable method of assessing the circumstances of young people held on remand meant there was a risk that some young people could remain in custody for longer than necessary. There was still no specialist legal rights officer and young people had to contact their own legal adviser if they needed detailed or specialist advice. Young people's rights were explained to them at their initial meeting with their caseworker and young people said that they were given good information about their sentence or remand status. Advice was also available from the internal advocacy service and a number of young people said that this was their preferred option when they wanted help and information. Early or late decisions for young people serving a detention and training order were properly informed.
- 2.53** The procedure for young people to contact their legal advisers was unclear and caseworkers told us that they were no longer able to facilitate young people's telephone calls to their legal advisers. Residential staff did not give consistent explanations of how young people could make a free confidential call to their legal advisers. We were not confident that all young people were able to access the specialist legal advice they were entitled to.

- 2.54** Legal visits continued to be available every weekday in closed booths or in the open area of the visits hall.

Recommendations

- 2.55** **Bail applications should be progressed immediately after a young person's arrival, and case workers should have sufficient time to facilitate contact between young people, their legal advisers and community youth offending team workers.**
- 2.56** **There should be a clear procedure for young people to make free and confidential telephone calls to their legal advisers and this should be explained to all staff and young people.**

Health services

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.57** *Young people were provided with a very good level of health care by a large team of staff with appropriate skills. Young people were positive about the level of care received and they did not have to wait for long periods to receive appointments. Pharmacy and dental services were good and sufficient to meet the demands of the population. Mental health care had developed further to provide a very good integrated service to meet the primary and secondary needs of most young people.*

Governance arrangements

- 2.58** Commissioning arrangements were developing and the governor and head of health care were active members of the partnership board. The head of health care ensured that health care issues and actions were discussed at the senior management team meetings. Young people in our survey were positive about the level of health care services delivered but less so about the quality of care, although this was not reflected by young people we spoke to. Access to the service was good. Initial care was provided on the wings by nursing staff, and GP and specialist clinics were provided in the health care centre.
- 2.59** A comprehensive, informative health needs assessment had been completed in 2012. The head of health care effectively managed a large team of nurses and health care assistants with the support of two senior nurses responsible for the general and mental health teams. The teams included a range of staff with additional qualifications in the care of children. There were seven vacancies in the team and an active programme of recruitment. Patients with chronic diseases were well cared for by 'Citywide', a team of nurses who also managed patients in Leeds and Wealstun prisons.

- 2.60** Care was provided 24 hours each day with nurses available on the wings or in the health care centre at night. There was continued investment in the training and development of staff and all were in date for the mandatory training elements. Clinical supervision was underpinned by the provider policy and was available in groups or individually.
- 2.61** Six GPs were contracted from a local practice to deliver a daily clinic apart from Sunday. Out-of-hours cover was provided to the same level as the local community and this was considered by staff to be good when required. Pharmacy services were provided by a full-time technician based in the health care unit. Dental services were provided by an independent dentist and nurse, with two sessions each week meeting the demands of the young people.
- 2.62** The quality and management of clinical records was good. All were maintained electronically using SystemOne. Emergency resuscitation equipment, including automated external defibrillators (AEDs), was located in six areas across the site, including the health care centre. Records of checks for the equipment were made daily. Discipline staff were trained in emergency first aid and 32 had received training in the use of AEDs.
- 2.63** Health care issues were discussed at regular unit health care focus groups and the incidence of complaints was very low. Occasional complaints were dealt with by senior nursing staff in a sensitive and efficient manner. Information about the health care services was widely available in a range of languages. This included health promotion advice and programmes available on the unit and in the health care centre.

Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.64** All young people were seen in reception by one of the mental health nurses and a comprehensive initial assessment for children and adolescents was carried out. They were seen the following day for secondary screening, including an appointment with a GP. A range of information was provided about the health care services. Young people had access to daily clinics on the wings and one of the qualified children's nurses cared for all looked-after children. There were no significant waiting times for clinics and all young people were treated on the wing or at specialist clinics in the health care centre. Some young people experienced delays waiting in healthcare as they attended for appointments in groups rather than individually.
- 2.65** There were four in-patient cells in the main thoroughfare of the health care centre which led to a restricted regime for young people who were always overseen by the health care discipline officer. There was a well equipped association room and young people could be supervised in the gardens surrounding the health care centre.
- 2.66** A suitable range of age-appropriate health promotion screening and information services were available. Good relations were maintained with the SCU where young people were seen daily by health care staff and additionally when required. Young people attending outside hospital appointments were well managed with good escorting arrangements.

Recommendation

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

Pharmacy

- 2.68** The pharmacy was run by a pharmacy technician but no cover was provided for leave or sickness. Young people could not routinely see a pharmacist on-site but could ask to speak to the pharmacist from Wealstun.
- 2.69** Most medicines were supplied as patient specific and labelled correctly with the initial of the person dispensing and checking the medication. A patient information leaflet was supplied. An audit trail for the supply of controlled drug stock from the health care centre was in place.
- 2.70** Young people could be supplied with a range of medication for treating minor ailments without a prescription. These supplies were recorded on SystemOne.
- 2.71** Administration took place four times a day from a good-sized, clean and tidy treatment room. Systems were in place to ensure patient confidentiality during administration. Fridge temperatures were recorded daily, including action taken if the temperature went outside the accepted range.
- 2.72** Administration was recorded on prescription charts. We looked at a sample of charts and found a number of gaps. Staff had access to the internet for information on medication.

Recommendation

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

Housekeeping point

- 2.74** Full records of administration of medicines should be made, including records of all occasions when the young person refuses medication or fails to attend.

Dentistry

- 2.75** Young people attended the dental surgery in the health care centre. The surgery comprised one large room which was adequately furnished but the floor needed re-covering to comply with the control of infection. A separate decontamination room was being installed at the time of our inspection. The position of the x-ray equipment inhibited its use. Emergency resuscitation equipment and medicines were located in the surgery and appropriately maintained. Patients were very satisfied with the level of dental care provided and there was no significant waiting time for appointments. We observed young people being treated very well while their privacy was maintained. Dental records were well managed electronically using SystemOne.

Recommendation

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

Housekeeping point

2.77 The dental x-ray machine should be fully functional.

Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.78** Since the previous inspection, the mental health services had been integrated and now provided primary, secondary and specialist child and adolescent mental health services. The team proactively supported young people and the resources enabled a wide variety of treatment programmes and sessions to be completed. The staff ran regular group work sessions such as anxiety management, identifying and dealing with triggers, or self-help groups.
- 2.79** The mental health team also provided learning disability services, occupational therapy, speech and language therapy and drama therapy services. A consultant psychiatrist who specialised in child and adolescent mental health attended twice weekly. A psychology department was available to young people and the mental health team linked closely with the forensic psychologist from this team.
- 2.80** Young people with serious and enduring mental health problems were transferred under the Mental Health Act to specialist secondary and tertiary care if clinically indicated. The need for transfer was rapidly identified and action taken to ensure that moves took place in a timely fashion.
- 2.81** The mental health team had created a training package for custody staff which covered the management of mental health crisis, working with young people who presented with risky behaviour or experienced hallucinations, and working with young people with a learning disability.

Catering

Expected outcomes:

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

2.82 *Young people had one hot meal a day during the week and two at weekends. Staff ate with young people on the Anson unit. Food portions were satisfactory and the quality was reasonable. There was good consultation with young people about food and their views were acted on. The kitchen was reasonably clean. Opportunities for young people to work in the kitchen and in the local hospitality industry were underused.*

2.83 Breakfast consisted of toast and cereals during the week and a hot brunch at weekends. A baguette was served at lunch but, following consultation with young people, there were plans to add hot soup. Hot meals were served in the evenings. An evening snack, such as a muffin or chocolate biscuit, was served with the evening meal. Young people ate their breakfast and evening meals communally but lunch in their cells. This was given to young people at their cell doors which was inappropriate. Staff on Anson unit ate with the young people. The menu included one cultural meal a month.

- 2.84** The food we tasted was of reasonable quality but in our survey only 18% of young people said the food was good. Portion sizes were large enough for young people. The quality and calorific content of the menu were checked by a dietician from Leeds City Council. Special diets were catered for.
- 2.85** Consultation arrangements were good. There were food comments books on each wing and young people were surveyed twice a year. A member of the catering team attended consultation meetings with young people and listened to their views. Young people's views were acted on when feasible.
- 2.86** The kitchen was reasonably clean but during our night visit an uncovered tray of chips had been left out. Only three young people worked in the kitchen towards their NVQs at levels one and two. There was capacity for 10 young people to work in the kitchen and this was an underused resource. There were excellent opportunities for young people to be released on temporary licence to work in the local hospitality industry, but no young people were working out at the time of the inspection.

Recommendations

- 2.87** **Young people should not eat their meals in their cells.** (Repeated recommendation 8.7)
- 2.88** **More young people should have the opportunity to work in the kitchen and local hospitality industry, and gain qualifications in catering.**

Housekeeping point

- 2.89** The kitchen should be clean and all food should be stored hygienically overnight.

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.

- 2.90** The canteen list contained a wide range of items, although fewer Muslim young people than non-Muslim young people said that there was enough variety on the list. Some young people had to wait over a week after arrival to receive any items. Young people did not receive help to manage their money.
- 2.91** There was a good range of items on the canteen list, although it still did not contain any fresh fruit.
- 2.92** Young people could still only order their purchases once a week on Tuesday evening and received their goods on Saturday morning. Young people arriving in the establishment later in the week had to wait over seven days to receive canteen items. We were told that external purchasing arrangements prevented the establishment from changing this. Young people received reception packs on arrival, but these were intended to cater for their immediate needs and there had been no initiative to put more into the reception pack, or distribute additional packs to young people who had to wait for a long period before

receiving their purchases. Black and minority ethnic young people said that there was nothing specific for them in the reception pack. Young people who did not have the opportunity to buy telephone credit during this initial period were able to make free welfare calls to their families.

- 2.93** In our survey, the percentage of black and minority ethnic young people saying that there was not enough variety of products for them had improved since the previous inspection, though at 39% it was still lower than the 56% of white young people who were content with the variety. Black and minority ethnic young people we spoke to said the items on the list were adequate. However, only 27% of Muslim young people said that they were content with the canteen list against 54% of non-Muslim young people. Issues relating to the canteen list were raised at consultation meetings.

Recommendations

- 2.94** **New arrivals should be able to place an order with the prison shop within 24 hours of their arrival, and the reception pack should be sufficient to meet their needs until they receive their first order.** (Repeated recommendation 8.13)
- 2.95** **The establishment should consult Muslim young people to ensure that the canteen list includes enough items to meet their needs.**

Housekeeping point

- 2.96** Staff should use the purchasing arrangements to help young people manage their money and to prioritise and plan their spending.

Section 3. Purposeful activity

Time out of cell

Expected outcomes:

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

- 3.1** *Time out of cell for most young people was comparable to the previous inspection. Young people now had daily access to time outside and take up was good. All young people had less time out of cell at weekends than during the week.*
- 3.2** The establishment had introduced the standardised core day for young people, which included a domestic hour for each young person. The establishment reported an average of eight hours unlocked each weekday. We estimated that most young people received around 8.5 hours unlocked each day, but those on disciplinary losses of dining out or association or who had unit-based education fared worse. We did not see any slippage in adhering to the published core day. During a check that we carried out over the week, we found a quarter of young people in their cells. Reasons included refusal of an optional activity, on-unit education, issues with other young people that needed resolution, waiting for a disciplinary hearing or no scheduled activity because of poor behaviour. Young people who had on-unit education received about 30 minutes out of cell during the morning or afternoon and often spent most of 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 by 5.30pm. Young people on the basic rewards and sanctions level could have as little as one hour out of cell each day at weekends.
- 3.4** Young people did not have association every weekday evening. In our survey, 44% of young people said they had association daily against a comparator of 83%, although this was a significant improvement on the 23% at the previous inspection. The two landings on each unit shared the available association time between them so only half the unit had association at any one time. On evenings with no association young people could spend time on outside exercise. Recreational gym was available to each unit one evening a week. The association sessions that we observed were relaxed and young people had a variety of things to do on their spurs.
- 3.5** In our survey, 67% of young people said they usually went outside for exercise each day compared with 36% at comparator establishments and 28% at the last inspection. During the inspection, we observed young people spending between 30 and 45 minutes outside. The exercise areas had poor facilities and young people could walk and talk but could not expend any energy.

Recommendations

- 3.6 All young people should spend a minimum of 10 hours every day out of their cell.**

³ 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.

- 3.7 Young people should be given the opportunity to spend at least one hour in the open air every day.**
- 3.8 Outside recreational areas should be equipped with suitable activities and/or games equipment.**

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 (Ofsted⁴) 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.

3.9 *Strategic planning focused on helping young people to address their learning needs. Quality improvement procedures and careers, advice and guidance were good. The quality of teaching and learning was high and attendance and retention rates were good and had increased since the previous inspection. The art and cookery teaching accommodation was unsuitable. Use of the speech and learning specialist was effective. There was an appropriate range of provision and achievements were good overall. The library was well organised, with appropriate access. PE facilities were good and the range of accredited courses had improved. There was a good focus on developing young people's understanding of healthy living.*

3.10 *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: good

Quality of learning and skills and work activities, including the quality of teaching, training, learning and assessment: good

Effectiveness of leadership and management of learning and skills and work activities: good

Management of education and learning and skills

3.11 The leadership and management of learning and skills were good. The establishment business plan and the learning and skills strategic plan reflected a range of very effective innovations and developments which benefited young people and helped to address their individual

⁴ 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>.

learning needs. Examples included rigorous analysis of the provision to realign programmes to reflect external influences while retaining programmes that were most appropriate to the young people; a well monitored mentoring programme involving young people as mentors; and a pilot mediation programme to support relationships between young people and between staff and young people. The effective use of a speech and language therapist supported the progress of individual learners. A thorough analysis of staff qualifications and teaching expertise supported the new GCSE and AS/A level courses.

- 3.12** Quality improvement procedures were good. The education self-assessment report was broadly accurate, with an appropriate action plan. Plans were well advanced to complete the full range of learning and skills in a new establishment self-assessment report. The management of the Offender Learning and Skills Service (OLASS) contract was good and so was the careers advice and guidance provision managed by the OLASS contractor.
- 3.13** The quality of teaching and learning was high and education met the needs of the diverse population. Allocation of young people to education and training had improved and was now good, with some excellent examples of departments sharing information to speed up the process.
- 3.14** Managers used data effectively to inform decisions on planning the provision. Data on retention and achievement were analysed to provide an accurate picture of the successful qualification outcomes. Behaviour management practices had been applied more rigorously and attendance and retention rates had improved significantly since the last inspection.

Housekeeping point

- 3.15** The full range of learning and skills should be included in the establishment self-assessment report.

Provision of activities

- 3.16** The Manchester College delivered an appropriate range of activities to meet the needs of young people and further developments were imminent. The provision included courses up to level 2 in functional skills in English and mathematics, information and communication technology, personal development, hospitality, art and design, performing arts and a pre-release course. A business enterprise activities award was available up to level 3. An appropriate range of GCSEs and A level courses was delivered to reflect the length of stay of some young people and for those who could manage this level of study. Suitable progression opportunities were provided for young people.
- 3.17** Appropriate subcontracted vocational work was delivered by East Riding College in carpentry, painting and brickwork. The opening of a multi-skills academy and an industrial cleaning unit were imminent. A range of work activities included reconditioning bicycles, farms and gardens, composting, and accredited courses by the YMCA and the Army Cadets Academy to support young people on their release or transfer to another establishment.
- 3.18** Learners had limited access to IT in education and in the main library to complete research and job search. The national virtual campus (internet access for young people to community education, training and employment opportunities) was not in operation which had a detrimental effect on learning for young people, particularly in access to employment opportunities and support with job applications.

Recommendation

3.19 Access to information technology should be significantly improved to enhance learning, education research and job search opportunities for young people.

Quality of provision

- 3.20** Learning sessions were well planned and included a variety of activities to engage and motivate young people. Topics were appropriate to young people, who were encouraged to talk about previous experiences. Tutors were skilled at adapting their lesson plans to reflect the mixed abilities of the group and at managing poor behaviour. The number of young people removed from education had significantly reduced. Extension activities were used to challenge the more able learners. Tutors used a good range of teaching techniques to evaluate learning, and course materials were of a good quality. Initial assessment and diagnostic assessment identified effectively the support young people required to develop English and mathematics and their learning plans identified the appropriate interventions and support needs. Opportunities were taken to reinforce learning throughout all sessions.
- 3.21** The special educational needs coordinator identified more complex needs and produced support plans to help tutors to plan learning sessions. Information on support strategies was readily available in tutors' files. Student support officers were proactive in obtaining prior special educational needs statements which were used well to inform support plans. Information on young people's support needs was provided to staff across the establishment. There were good links with the local authority and access to an external educational psychologist.
- 3.22** Regular, focused staff training took place to ensure that tutors were equipped to support young people with complex needs. Learning support practitioners were encouraged to develop a specialist area of support and were appropriately matched with specific young people.
- 3.23** The pace of learning was good and tutors encouraged learners to progress. Learning support practitioners supported individual learners with complex needs and helped them to progress. The use of information learning technology was an effective tool to support learning. Individual learning plans included effective targets for learners to progress in their main qualification, but targets for personal development and the recording of these were weak. Young people continuing with GCSE subjects were supported well and tutors were skilled in a variety of subject areas. Learners enjoyed their learning and said that they felt safe in education and training.
- 3.24** The mentoring training programme for young people to support their peers was good. Tutors had started to observe the mentors to assure the quality of the programme and to help young people understand the importance of standards and consistency in their work with their peers.
- 3.25** Individual support for learners in English and mathematics was excellent. Functional skills were threaded through all education and training subjects and helped learners to make good progress. Learners received one-to-one support across their lessons. Learners who spoke English as a second language received appropriate initial assessment and one-to-one coaching to support their language development. Very good enrichment activities helped the young people to develop research and thinking skills.
- 3.26** The careers advice and guidance was very good, with excellent communications and sharing of information across the establishment. Young people had very good access to the staff

team, with a minimum of three formal meetings during their sentence and many more informal meetings. Staff ensured that young people were generally allocated to their first choice of programme as soon as possible. The induction programme was appropriate.

- 3.27** Classroom accommodation was generally good, with very effective use of wall displays by tutors to support a positive learning environment. Vocational workshops were spacious and enabled young people to develop their construction crafts. The hospitality NVQs at level 2 in the main kitchen were good but the transfer of learners from the Level 1 programme in education to the main kitchen was underdeveloped. The teaching accommodation in the art and cookery rooms was inappropriate: the rooms were too small and poorly designed and furnished.

Recommendations

- 3.28** **Specific targets which are focused on the individual learner's needs should be set on personal development courses.**
- 3.29** **The recruitment of young people from the kitchen in education to the main kitchen for the study of NVQs in hospitality and catering should be improved.**

Housekeeping point

- 3.30** The accommodation for art and cookery should be improved to enable better access to resources and learning activities.

Education and vocational achievements

- 3.31** Achievements in education, training and the gym were good overall. Success rates in education had increased by 9% in 2012 to 2013 and success rates in GCSE and AS/A level were good for young people who completed the courses. Learners who stayed on their course completed their learning programme but the transfer of learner portfolios to other establishments or on release was not monitored sufficiently. The analysis of data was good and different groups of learners were monitored when slow progress or low achievement rates had been identified, an improvement since the last inspection. Young people developed good personal skills and improved their self-esteem and confidence. Most young people developed good communication skills and were confident to talk about their work in class. Most made good progress in their learning.
- 3.32** Standards of behaviour were generally good and young people were in most cases very respectful to their tutors. The overall standard of young people's work was good, and in a few cases very good, and they took pride in their work. Young people following GCSE courses developed good independent learning and research skills and recognised the progress they were making. The standard of work in vocational workshops was generally good.

Library

- 3.33** The library was well organised and provided a spacious environment with good access to computers and private study areas for young people and an appropriate stock of books. The library was no longer located in the education block, which restricted non-timetabled visits by young people. Links between the library and education were good. Young people in the

separation and care unit and health care could request books from the library and books in other languages were easily accessible through the inter-library loan service. The library was now open in the evenings and at weekends. Projects and events had increased since the last inspection and promoted literacy and wider learning well. Young people had no supervised access to the internet to carry out a job search.

Recommendation

- 3.34 Use of the library should be monitored to ensure the new location for education does not deter young people from using the library.**

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.

3.35 *Access to the gym and sports facilities was good and there was an improved range of accredited courses. Links with the community needed to be strengthened to develop competitive sport activities. There was a clear focus on developing young people's understanding of healthy living.*

3.36 PE facilities were good and outside facilities provided good opportunities for a variety of team sports. Classroom accommodation was good and used effectively for PE courses. Young people's induction to the gym was appropriate. Some contacts had been made with the community but there were no links with community leagues to provide opportunities for competitive team sports.

3.37 The number of accredited PE courses had improved since the last inspection and provided an appropriate range for young people. Most young people completed their courses successfully. Non-accredited programmes also reflected the needs of the population. PE staff had appropriate teaching qualifications. Programmes were delivered by 10 staff assisted by four young people who acted as orderlies and had previously achieved the 'principles of health and fitness' qualification. Exercise programmes were tailored to the needs of young people and appropriate restrictions were placed on the use of free weights.

3.38 There was a clear focus on developing young people's understanding of healthy living through links with other areas of the establishment, including health care. There were specific mental health and substance misuse programmes. Young people had good access to timetabled PE each week with optional recreational PE. Data on use of PE were collected and PE staff looked in to those young people who did not take part. Young people were rarely excluded from PE for poor behaviour.

Recommendation

- 3.39 Links with the community should be developed to provide opportunities for young people to engage in competitive sport.**

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 re-offending strategy had been developed from an up-to-date needs analysis and was monitored by a well attended reducing re-offending strategy meeting. The establishment did not collect the full range of resettlement and re-offending outcomes for young people. There was an excellent multidisciplinary approach to meeting the needs of young people, coordinated effectively by the casework team. The well planned use of release on temporary licence (ROTL) continued to help young people to reintegrate into the community.*

4.2 The resettlement needs analysis carried out in 2012 had formed the basis of the establishment's comprehensive 2013 reducing re-offending strategy, which contained actions for improvement under each resettlement pathway. Coverage of young people serving long sentences was cursory, but included a commitment to focus on this group in the next needs analysis. Young people who sexually abuse were not covered, which was an omission. The reducing re-offending strategy was monitored by a well attended quarterly meeting, which included regular attendance by statutory and voluntary agencies.

4.3 The establishment did not collect the full range of resettlement and re-offending outcomes for young people and could not measure the effectiveness of their interventions. The education department did collect data on the education, training and employment plans for each young person at their point of release.

4.4 The delivery of reducing re-offending services was well coordinated by a multidisciplinary casework team, managed by a governor. This blend of professional experience provided a balance of community and custodial knowledge. Caseworkers managed a caseload of remanded and sentenced young people. The Anson unit for young people serving long and indeterminate sentences had three dedicated caseworkers, and young people told us that they felt properly supported by the Anson casework team.

4.5 Young people were allocated to a caseworker on arrival and risk and resettlement needs were identified quickly. There was an appropriate focus on preventing re-offending, and referrals were made promptly to personal development programmes and mental health and drugs and alcohol misuse services. Preparation was made for young people's return to the community by maintaining links with their family or finding alternative accommodation. Arrangements for young people serving long sentences to transfer to young adult establishments were considered at the earliest opportunity. In our survey, the percentage of young people who knew who to ask for help with a problem was significantly less than at the previous inspection across all resettlement pathways.

4.6 The procedure for assessing young people eligible for ROTL was excellent. All young people who had applied were interviewed and young people who were initially unsuccessful were encouraged to behave positively so that they could eventually use the full range of ROTL

opportunities. Young people who were refused ROTL could appeal against the decision and we saw an excellent letter from the governor, explaining the reasons for refusal and encouraging the young person to improve his behaviour so that he could reapply. From January 2012 to August 2013, the establishment reported 1,006 placements, involving 136 young people. The imaginative range of placements included community reparation, work experience, and visits to promote family contact. Two young people attended meetings of the Wetherby Youth Council, which provided an excellent opportunity to contribute to and gain experience of local community matters.

Recommendation

4.7 **There should be a systematic collection of resettlement and re-offending outcomes for young people who leave Wetherby.**

Housekeeping point

4.8 Young people should be told where they can seek information and advice on key issues that will assist in their successful resettlement.

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.

4.9 *Training and remand management plans were based on young people's needs; most young people said that they were involved in their plans and understood their targets. There was good provision for remanded young people, but we were not confident that all bail applications were processed quickly enough. Review meetings were child focused and timely, although attendance by staff was erratic. Public protection was managed well. The training planning arrangements for young people serving indeterminate and long sentences were comprehensive and parole applications and lifer work were effective. The seconded social workers worked hard to get local authorities to meet their obligations to looked-after young people, but many young people did not receive the additional financial support that they were entitled to.*

4.10 A case worker who was responsible for the management of individual training plans was allocated to all young people on arrival. Initial training and remand management plans for young people who were not granted bail were developed within appropriate time scales. A cycle of assessment, planning and review was evident in the planning documentation. Training plans that we scrutinised were of good quality and demonstrated that caseworkers were central to sentence and resettlement planning and a whole-establishment approach to reducing re-offending. There were examples of case workers and other staff devoting much time to young people and keeping their families informed. In our survey, 83% of young people said they were involved in the development of their plan and 94% said they understood the targets that had been set.

- 4.11** Remanded young people were able to make a bail application, and records indicated that case workers facilitated young people's contact with their legal advisers and community youth offending team (YOT) worker. However, case workers told us that the allocation of work sometimes prevented them from facilitating this contact with external bodies swiftly after the young person arrived in custody. Young people on remand had training plans and access to the same services as sentenced young people.
- 4.12** Training planning and remand management meetings were timely, with good attendance by community YOTs. Family members attended about half the meetings. Two families of young people new to the establishment, whom we spoke to in the visitors' centre, said that they had been contacted quickly by caseworkers after their son's arrival and that the initial review meetings were well organised. Despite the commitment to a whole-establishment approach to reducing reoffending, attendance at reviews by internal departments remained erratic, particularly by representatives of the residential units whose attendance was poor. Case workers said there was no procedure to ensure that the appropriate people attended. Case workers chaired the meetings and gathered information from relevant departments, but they said that information often had to be chased. The planning meeting that we observed was child focused and allowed the young person and his mother to participate fully. It was evident that the case worker knew the young person well, up-to-date information on his progress was provided and appropriate focus was placed on his achievement.

Recommendation

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

Housekeeping point

- 4.14** A procedure should be put in place to ensure that the appropriate staff attend training planning reviews.

Public protection

- 4.15** There was a comprehensive public protection policy, and individual young people were discussed at the monthly interdepartmental risk management board, which was well attended. Minutes of the meetings indicated that young people considered to be a risk were fully discussed and an appropriate emphasis was placed on monitoring release arrangements and the suitability of accommodation. External statutory agencies were contacted if concerns were raised.
- 4.16** There were clear criteria for early identification of young people who might present a risk to the public. They were placed on a database and discussed at the earliest interdepartmental meeting. Young people who needed to be considered by external multi-agency public protection panels (MAPPA) were identified, and reports submitted to MAPPA meetings.
- 4.17** There were appropriate procedures for identifying young people who were assessed as being a risk to children in the community, and reasonable restrictions were put in place to ensure that contact was risk assessed. Decisions on whom young people had contact with were made by the interdepartmental risk management board and regularly reviewed, and we found that restrictions were proportionate. Few young people had their mail and telephone

calls monitored and they were regularly reviewed and restrictions lifted when it was felt that the risks had reduced.

Indeterminate sentence young people

- 4.18** At the time of the inspection, 47 young people were serving long sentences, nine of which were mandatory life sentences and four indeterminate sentences for public protection. Most of these young people were serving their sentence on the Anson unit, a 48-bed unit which was the only specialist long-term secure unit for children and young people in England and Wales. Young people on the unit had been sentenced for particularly violent offences. The unit had recently received a group of young people from the long-term unit at Warren Hill, which had closed. The Youth Justice Board (YJB) and Anson unit managers were satisfied that the transfer had been managed well.
- 4.19** Training planning arrangements for young people serving indeterminate and long sentences were comprehensive. Young people were also subject to an additional care planning process and there were more multidisciplinary reviews than prescribed by the YJB national standards, which was appropriate for this group of high-risk young people. The training planning and care planning documentation that we scrutinised was detailed and there was good evidence of multidisciplinary work and a wide range of specialist interventions and personal development programmes for young people. There was an effective procedure to ensure that parole applications and lifer documentation were completed on time and the documentation was comprehensive.
- 4.20** Many young people on the unit moved to a young adult establishment at the age of 18 and it was evident that plans for the transition were discussed in detail with case workers. Staff from Swinfen Hall YOI attended the unit every three months to talk about Swinfen Hall and the young adult estate and to help young people prepare for the move. There were good links with some other young adult establishments which regularly received young people from the unit, but this did not include all receiving establishments. Some young people had basic questions about where they were going which staff could not answer.
- 4.21** Young people on the unit had access to a good range of educational and personal development courses, but it was uncertain if they would be able to continue these courses once they moved to a young adult establishment.

Recommendations

- 4.22 Up-to-date information on all young adult establishments should be available to young people who are being transferred.**
- 4.23 Young adult establishments should be identified where young people transferring from the juvenile estate are able to continue their educational and personal development work.**

Looked-after children

- 4.24** In our survey, 27% of young people said that they had been in the care of the local authority. At the time of the inspection, 82 young people had looked-after status, of whom 22 had been on full care orders and 38 were on remand.

- 4.25** Three establishment social workers identified young people with looked-after status from the documentation accompanying them into custody and focused on their needs. There was no establishment policy on looked-after children, although their resettlement needs were referred to in the reducing re-offending strategy. A useful briefing paper had been produced by Leeds youth offending service and the social work team had delivered awareness training to unit staff.
- 4.26** The social work team wrote to all local authorities to advise them that a young person whom they were responsible for was on the unit and challenged them when they did not meet their obligations. Appropriate financial support had been secured in some cases, but many young people were not receiving enough financial support from their home local authority.
- 4.27** The work done by internal case workers and social workers to secure accommodation for looked-after children was impressive and we saw evidence of concerted efforts to ensure that local authorities fulfilled their responsibilities to accommodate young people. Confirmation of placements sometimes arrived very late.
- 4.28** Good efforts were made to ensure that looked-after children were reviewed by their local authority while in custody and we were told that there had been a steady improvement over the past year; however, some local authorities continued to fail to meet their obligation to review the young person's care, particularly those who had been in voluntary care but were still in need of support.

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.

4.29 *Reintegration planning was effective and included a new mentoring scheme. Accommodation was found for all young people, but some did not know where they were going until just before they were released. There was an excellent pre-release course. Health care and drugs and alcohol discharge planning for young people was organised well. Advice on finance, benefit and debt was limited, but progress was being made to address this. Families said that it was easy to book visits and that staff treated them with respect, but more work needed to be done to improve the visits facilities. Family days were held on Anson unit but not on the other units. There was a wide range of personal development programmes.*

- 4.30** All young people had a release plan which was prepared by their community YOT worker. The plans that we scrutinised were comprehensive. Young people who were assessed as being a high risk of re-offending had plans to be intensively supervised in the community and there were some imaginative schemes to encourage young people to engage with education and training on release.
- 4.31** A mentoring programme delivered by a voluntary organisation, 'In2out', had started in May 2013, since when 16 young people had been offered mentors from their home communities, to support them while in custody and on release.

- 4.32** Practical release arrangements were good; young people had access to their money and were given a holdall for their belongings. Young people had their clothes laundered before release, and new clothes were available if needed.

Accommodation

- 4.33** In our survey, 23% of young people said they would have a problem with accommodation when they were released. Accommodation needs were assessed early and updated throughout the young person's sentence. Specific attention was given to young people who were considered a risk to the public. Case workers said that they assessed and recorded the suitability of accommodation but this information was not analysed. We were advised that no young people left the establishment without an address to go to but, despite the best efforts of staff, some young people did not know their address until just before release.
- 4.34** Case managers pursued responsible local authorities and YOTs rigorously, when they considered that a young person was not going to suitable accommodation. They escalated the needs of hard-to-place young people, using the internal advocates and legal representation when required.

Education, training and employment

- 4.35** The excellent pre-release course prepared young people for release into the community and seeking further education and/or training. Very good partnerships had been established with a range of voluntary and business organisations. A new multi-skills workshop and an industrial cleaning workshop were to be opened imminently. The use of ROTL was limited; the resettlement team was collaborating with education staff to develop this work.

Health care

- 4.36** Pre-release arrangements for young people were very good. They were provided with information on how to contact a GP in the community and the CAMHS team ensured that young people had access to mental health services in the community when required.

Drugs and alcohol

- 4.37** Resettlement work was well organised including pre-release one-to-one sessions between YPSMS workers and young people to reinforce harm reduction and overdose messages where necessary. YPSMS workers also made contact with community agencies and families to facilitate continuing support following a young person's release.

Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.38** Advice on finance and benefits was very limited. Some young people received formal advice through a modular course delivered by the education department. Informal advice was given by unit staff and case workers and the social work team helped looked-after children to manage their financial resources while in custody. There was no facility to help young people open bank accounts, but contact had been made with Leeds City Credit Union to enable young people to open a bank account and save some of their earnings while in custody.

Recommendations

4.39 All young people should be given advice on how to claim benefits.

4.40 Young people should be helped to open bank accounts.

Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.41** In our survey, only 35% of young people said that it was easy or very easy to visit, and 37% said that they usually received a visit once a week. Seventy-seven percent of young people said that they could use the telephone every day compared with 18% in our 2012 survey.
- 4.42** The Anson unit had a much wider catchment area than the rest of the main site, and some young people lived a long way from their home areas. At the time of the inspection, 12 of the 35 young people on the unit came from London, following the closure of the long-term unit at Warren Hill.
- 4.43** Young people who did not receive visits were identified and some received visits from the local visitors' scheme. Case workers kept families informed of young people's progress throughout their sentence. ROTL was used for young people to spend time with families on local town visits.
- 4.44** The Anson unit held a family day every three months, but there were no family days for young people on the other units. Families were invited to events to celebrate young people's achievements. Two personal development courses, 'Family Talk' and 'Building Bridges', encouraged young people to engage positively with their families. The 'Life Minus Violence' course delivered on the Anson unit offered regular family days for participants.
- 4.45** Domestic visits were only available on Wednesday afternoon and evening, Saturday morning and afternoon and Sunday afternoon. The Wednesday evening session lasted one hour, and all other sessions two hours. Sentenced young people could have two weekend and one midweek visit, and remanded young people only one visit a week, which was inadequate.
- 4.46** Visitors continued to be sent an information booklet about the establishment and visiting arrangements, usually within 24 hours of a young person's reception. Visits were booked by telephone and families we spoke to said that they had no problems booking their visit. Visitors said that staff treated them respectfully on visits. Some said that the closeness of the seating made it difficult to have a private conversation, and young people confirmed this.
- 4.47** The visitors' centre still had no play facilities. The centre was small and, while there was enough room on the midweek visit that we observed, we were told that it was often extremely cramped at weekends. The range of information for visitors was very limited and there was no guidance on how to seek support in the community. Visitors told us that they did not often experience delays in getting to visits, but we saw visitors queuing outside the main gate in the rain. The visit that we observed started on time.
- 4.48** The visits hall had been brightened up since our last inspection, but it needed cleaning. There was a small children's play area but there were no staff to supervise it; on the visit that we observed, it had not been tidied since the previous visit and toys were scattered across the floor. The small tea bar was now only open at the weekend; visitors used vending machines during the week which provided fizzy drinks, crisps and chocolate.

- 4.49** The visits session that we observed was relaxed. Staff observed from a good distance and engaged positively with visitors who needed assistance. In our groups, young people confirmed that staff treated their visitors well.

Recommendations

- 4.50** **The visitors' centre and visits hall should offer a better environment, including supervised children's play areas and a wider and healthier range of refreshments.** (Repeated recommendation 9.37)
- 4.51** **The prison should develop links to community services to facilitate support and guidance for visitors to Wetherby.** (Repeated recommendation 9.38)
- 4.52** **Family days should be available to all young people.** (Repeated recommendation 9.39)

Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.53** Young people had the opportunity for individual sessions with specialist staff including psychology, social work and CAMHS. They also had good access to personal development group programmes, which had been selected following a needs analysis to meet the needs of young people on the main site and on the Anson unit. In our survey, 51% of young people said they thought that attending the offending behaviour programmes would help them on their release from custody.
- 4.54** The personal development programmes on the main site consisted of the accredited juvenile estate thinking skills, and two locally approved programmes: ACCESS and TEAM. The ACCESS programme was a short course designed to help young people with coping and problem solving and the TEAM programme was based on a cognitive behavioural approach and was intended to improve emotional control. Referrals to programmes were made by the young person's case worker. Records that we examined indicated that all young people were considered for a personal development programme, but not all were considered suitable. Young people who had been referred were assessed for their suitability by a member of the psychology department, and most were recommended to undertake the programme. The reasons were recorded if young people were unsuitable or failed to complete, and alternative interventions were considered. On completion of the programme, a written report was sent to the young person's case worker and local YOT.
- 4.55** Young people on the Anson unit could undertake a nine-month programme, designed for violent offenders, called Life Minus Violence.
- 4.56** The Lucy Faithfull Foundation offered assessment and treatment to all young people who had sexually abused others; effective support to reinforce these therapeutic interventions and help young people address the causes of their offending was not provided by residential staff. All the programmes delivered were evaluated for their effectiveness.

Recommendation

- 4.57** **Young people receiving treatment from the Lucy Faithfull Foundation should be supported by residential staff who are informed about the work being undertaken with them.**

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 Recommendation **To the Youth Justice Board and NOMS**

5.1 Problems relating to late arrivals should be resolved. (S64)

Main Recommendation **To the governor**

5.2 The separation and care unit should be improved so that it is a suitable environment in which to work with difficult and challenging young people. All young people in the separation and care unit should have detailed care and reintegration plans, based on an initial and ongoing assessment of their risks and needs, with access to as full a regime as possible and with specific and time- bound targets. (S65)

Recommendations **To the Youth Justice Board and NOMS**

Courts, escorts and transfers

- 5.3** Young people should not be transported with adult prisoners. (1.3)
- 5.4** All young people should receive information about the prison before they are admitted. (1.4)
- 5.5** Young adult establishments should be identified where young people transferring from the juvenile estate are able to continue their educational and personal development work. (4.23)

Recommendations **To the governor**

Early days in custody

- 5.6** All new arrivals should be given the opportunity to speak to a peer mentor before they are locked up for the night. (1.12)
- 5.7** Toilets in first night accommodation should have seats and lids and should be screened. (1.13)
- 5.8** First night risk management plans should be relevant to the young person's needs and identified risks, and managers should monitor quality through robust quality assurance. (1.14)

Care and protection of children and young people

- 5.9** Injuries sustained during use of force should be monitored by the safeguarding children strategy meeting. (I.20)

Suicide and self-harm prevention

- 5.10** Managers should ensure that night observations are not predictable. (I.35)
- 5.11** Anti-ligature clothing should not be used. (I.36)

Behaviour management

- 5.12** Staff undertaking mediation should be trained in its use and the use of mediation should be monitored. (I.41)
- 5.13** The rewards and sanctions scheme should be reviewed annually. In consultation with young people, the scheme should be re-launched and applied consistently across the establishment. (I.47)
- 5.14** Young people should not be routinely strip-searched. Strip-searching should only be carried out after a thorough risk assessment has identified serious risk of harm to the young person or others, and on the authorisation of a duty governor. (I.53)
- 5.15** All strip-searching should be monitored by the safeguarding children strategy committee. (I.54)
- 5.16** Plans for young people on the behaviour change programme should be individual to the young person and should describe the support available to help him achieve his targets. (I.67)
- 5.17** There should be regular surveys of all young people on bullying and other antisocial behaviour. (I.68)
- 5.18** Use of force documentation should be completed as soon as possible after an incident. (I.75)
- 5.19** All young people should be seen by health care staff immediately after an incident and they should be fully debriefed by an independent person. (I.76)
- 5.20** Child protection referrals should be made in every case where a young person complains about use of force or when quality assurance procedures show that undue force was used. (I.77)
- 5.21** Only the minimum amount of force should be used when necessary and pain compliance should not be used with young people. (I.78)
- 5.22** Young people in the SCU should be able to have a shower each day. (I.87)

Substance misuse

- 5.23** Time allocated to the delivery of interventions for substance misuse problems should be given a higher priority in the cases of greatest need. (I.97)

Residential units

- 5.24** Response times to in-cell emergency call bells should be monitored to ensure they are responded to within five minutes. (2.10)

Relationships between staff and children and young people

- 5.25** All staff should wear their names on their uniform. (2.15)
- 5.26** Each young person should have a designated officer on their residential unit as their central point of contact and support. The officer should take responsibility for the young person's care and wellbeing by frequent contact and by attending relevant meetings relating to their care. (2.16)

Equality and diversity

- 5.27** Equality of treatment for all minority groups should be effectively monitored and appropriate action taken to address inequality (2.25)
- 5.28** Young people with disabilities should have a care plan. (2.35)
- 5.29** There should be more support for gay and bisexual young people. (2.36)

Legal rights

- 5.30** Bail applications should be progressed immediately after a young person's arrival, and case workers should have sufficient time to facilitate contact between young people, their legal advisers and community youth offending team workers. (2.55)
- 5.31** There should be a clear procedure for young people to make free and confidential telephone calls to their legal advisers and this should be explained to all staff and young people. (2.56)

Health services

- 5.32** Young people located on the in-patient unit should have access to a normal regime. (2.67)
- 5.33** Adequate pharmacy cover should be provided for leave and sickness.(2.73)
- 5.34** The dental surgery floor should be re-covered to comply with the control of infection. (2.76)

Catering

- 5.35** Young people should not eat their meals in their cells. (2.87)
- 5.36** More young people should have the opportunity to work in the kitchen and local hospitality industry, and gain qualifications in catering.(2.88)

Purchases

- 5.37** New arrivals should be able to place an order with the prison shop within 24 hours of their arrival, and the reception pack should be sufficient to meet their needs until they receive their first order. (2.94)

- 5.38** The establishment should consult Muslim young people to ensure that the canteen list includes enough items to meet their needs. (2.95)

Time out of cell

- 5.39** All young people should spend a minimum of 10 hours every day out of their cell. (3.6)
- 5.40** Young people should be given the opportunity to spend at least one hour in the open air every day. (3.7)
- 5.41** Outside recreational areas should be equipped with suitable activities and/or games equipment. (3.8)

Education, learning and skills

- 5.42** Access to information technology should be significantly improved to enhance learning, education research and job search opportunities for young people. (3.19)
- 5.43** Specific targets which are focused on the individual learner's needs should be set on personal development courses. (3.28)
- 5.44** The recruitment of young people from the kitchen in education to the main kitchen for the study of NVQs in hospitality and catering should be improved. (3.29)
- 5.45** Use of the library should be monitored to ensure the new location for education does not deter young people from using the library. (3.34)

Physical education and healthy living

- 5.46** Links with the community should be developed to provide opportunities for young people to engage in competitive sport. (3.39)

Pre-release and resettlement

- 5.47** There should be a systematic collection of resettlement and re-offending outcomes for young people who leave Wetherby.(4.7)

Training planning and remand management

- 5.48** Staff from all relevant departments should be represented at training planning or remand management reviews or submit a detailed report if they cannot attend. (4.13)
- 5.49** Up-to-date information on all young adult establishments should be available to young people who are being transferred. (4.22)

Reintegration planning

- 5.50** All young people should be given advice on how to claim benefits. (4.39)
- 5.51** Young people should be helped to open bank accounts. (4.40)
- 5.52** The visitors' centre and visits hall should offer a better environment, including supervised children's play areas and a wider and healthier range of refreshments. (4.50)

- 5.53** The prison should develop links to community services to facilitate support and guidance for visitors to Wetherby. (4.51)
- 5.54** Family days should be available to all young people. (4.52)
- 5.55** Young people receiving treatment from the Lucy Faithfull Foundation should be supported by residential staff who are informed about the work being undertaken with them. (4.57)

Housekeeping points

Early days in custody

- 5.56** Induction sessions should be age appropriate. (1.15)

Care and protection of children and young people

- 5.57** The reasons for young people self-harming should be monitored by the safeguarding meeting. (1.21)
- 5.58** ACCT observations should include interaction with the young person and this should be recorded. (1.37)

Relationships between staff and children and young people

- 5.59** Notes of consultation meetings should include actions to be taken and reports on those actions at subsequent meetings. (2.17)

Equality and diversity

- 5.60** Equality impact assessments should be completed on time. (2.26)
- 5.61** Wing staff should use telephone interpretation for young people who do not speak English. (2.37)

Complaints

- 5.62** There should be a clear procedure for identifying overdue complaints and providing prompt replies. (2.49)
- 5.63** All replies to complaints should be addressed personally. (2.50)

Health services

- 5.64** Full records of administration of medicines should be made, including records of all occasions when the young person refuses medication or fails to attend. (2.74)
- 5.65** The dental x-ray machine should be fully functional. (2.77)

Catering

- 5.66** The kitchen should be clean and all food should be stored hygienically overnight. (2.89)

Purchases

- 5.67** Staff should use the purchasing arrangements to help young people manage their money and to prioritise and plan their spending. (2.96)

Education, learning and skills

- 5.68** The full range of learning and skills should be included in the establishment self-assessment report. (3.15)
- 5.69** The accommodation for art and cookery should be improved to enable better access to resources and learning activities. (3.30)

Pre-release and resettlement

- 5.70** Young people should be told where they can seek information and advice on key issues that will assist in their successful resettlement. (4.8)

Training planning and remand management

- 5.71** A procedure should be put in place to ensure that the appropriate staff attend training planning reviews. (4.14)

Examples of good practice

Care and protection of children and young people

- 5.72** The weekly meeting of a small team of specialist staff chaired by the governor to examine child protection referrals was an effective and efficient way of ensuring that all referrals were dealt with properly. (1.27)

Equality and diversity

- 5.73** A touch screen kiosk on C wing provided information in foreign languages and in audio formats. (2.38)

Section 6. Appendices

Appendix I: Inspection team

Martin Lomas	Deputy chief inspector
Ian MacFadyen	Team leader
Colin Carroll	Inspector
Karen Dillon	Inspector
Angela Johnson	Inspector
Ian Thomson	Inspector
Hayley Cripps	Research officer
Annie Crowley	Research officer
Joe Simmonds	Research officer

Specialist inspectors

Paul Roberts	Substance misuse inspector
Mick Bowen	Health services inspector
Katie Tucker	Care Quality Commission inspector
Helen Jackson	Pharmacist
Jen Walters	Ofsted inspector
Stephen Miller	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, late arrivals remained a problem. Reception and first night staff dealt with new arrivals well, but few young people got a shower on their first night. The induction programme was informative. The active involvement of the local authority in safeguarding arrangements was a welcome development but the lack of in-house social work support was significant. Multidisciplinary support and engagement in the self-harm monitoring process were generally good. Bullying was managed effectively and staff were enthusiastic about the new behaviour management policy, many elements of which worked well. The separation and care unit was a poor environment for difficult young people although its use was declining significantly, as was the use of force. Detoxification and mandatory drug testing were managed safely. Outcomes for young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendation

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

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, S64)

The separation and care unit should be improved so that it is a suitable environment in which to work with difficult and challenging young people. Location in the separation and care unit should not be used to punish young people. All young people in the separation and care unit should have detailed care and reintegration plans, based on an initial and ongoing assessment of their risks and need, which are regularly reviewed and updated. Where appropriate, young people should be encouraged and enabled to engage in the normal regime as part of their care and reintegration plan. (HP50)

Partially achieved (recommendation repeated, S65)

Recommendations

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

Partially achieved

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

Partially achieved

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

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 1.14)

Oversight of the use of force, injuries sustained by young people and the use of the care and separation unit should be added to the remit of the quarterly safeguarding committee to ensure independent oversight of these areas. (3.8)

Partially achieved

The quality of care plans for the most vulnerable young people should be improved, properly coordinated with other relevant plans and quality assured. (3.9)

Partially achieved

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

No longer relevant

More should be done to encourage young people to give information about bullying, for example, through regular surveys and focus groups. Findings should be acted upon to encourage young people to have greater confidence to report bullying. (3.35)

Not achieved

The quality of behavioural (ABC) plans for young people who bully should be improved. (3.36)

Not achieved

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

Partially achieved (recommendation repeated, 1.53)

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

Achieved

Full control and restraint should not be used simply to obtain compliance with staff instructions. All planned removals should be videoed. (7.26)

Partially achieved

Debriefs of young people following use of force should be used to discuss the incident fully. This should be recorded and linked to any other care and management plans for the young person. (7.27)

Not achieved

A substance misuse/dual diagnosis nurse should be appointed to provide comprehensive and coordinated care to young people with complex needs. (3.65)

Achieved

There should be information and training for residential officers on the care of young people undergoing detoxification. (3.66)

Achieved

Respect

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

At the last inspection in 2012, the living environment had improved overall but access to showers and telephones was inadequate. Applications and complaints were dealt with well. Catering arrangements were good but young people did not like the food. The role of the personal officer was underdeveloped. Young people received good support from the chaplains. In the main, relationships between staff and young people were good. The equality action group worked effectively but monitoring for equality of services needed to be improved, and perceptions of discriminatory treatment needed to be addressed. There had been some good initiatives to work with different minority groups. Foreign nationals were well supported. Health services were very good. Outcomes for young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendation

All young people should have daily access to telephones and showers, including after work for those employed in dirty areas. (HP51)

Achieved

Recommendations

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

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 2.10)

All staff should display their name on their uniform. (2.23)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 2.15)

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

Not achieved

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

Partially achieved

Negative perceptions of young people from black and minority ethnic groups and from young Muslim people should be examined further and areas of concern monitored and addressed by the equality action group. (4.13)

Achieved

Out-of-range patterns and trends identified by SMART monitoring data should be fully investigated and the underlying issues addressed. (4.14)

Achieved

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

Partially achieved

Full-time pharmacy support should be provided. (5.23)

Partially achieved

Standard operating procedures should be thoroughly reviewed. (5.24)

Achieved

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

Not achieved

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

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 2.86)

New arrivals should be able to place an order with the prison shop within 24 hours of their arrival, and the reception pack should be sufficient to meet their needs until they receive their first order. (8.13)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 2.95)

The establishment should investigate the reasons for black and minority ethnic young people's dissatisfaction with the prison shop, and take action to address these. (8.14)

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

Recommendations

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

Partially achieved

The information provided by the special educational needs coordinator (SENCO) should be used to provide better support in sessions for young people with specific learning or behavioural needs, and the success of this monitored through internal lesson observations. This information should also be shared across the establishment. (6.24)

Achieved

The allocation process should be improved to enable more consideration of young people's first choice of activity, and waiting lists should be better managed and monitored. (6.25)

Achieved

The quality of teaching and learning should be improved. (6.26)

Achieved

There should be qualifications above level 1 to provide progression routes for more able young people and those with longer sentences. (6.27)

Achieved

Young people should have supervised access to the internet to support their education and training programmes. (6.28)

Not achieved

The progress young people make in developing important work skills should be recognised and recorded. (6.29)

Achieved

Behaviour management should be improved and a strategy developed to reduce the number of young people returned to the wings or excluded from education. (6.30)

Achieved

All young people who work in vocational training workshops should have access to appropriate personal protective equipment. (6.31)

Achieved

Young people should have adequate access to the library during the week in the evenings and at weekends. (6.36)

Achieved

The library should introduce events to promote literacy and encourage more young people to access the facilities. (6.37)

Achieved

The range of PE courses and accreditation should be increased. (6.46)

Achieved

Young people who do not arrive for their scheduled core PE should be followed up more rigorously. (6.47)

Achieved

Resettlement

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

At the last inspection, in 2012, the strategic management of resettlement was very efficient, and underpinned by an extremely thorough needs analysis. Training planning, remand management and public protection were well managed. Young people benefited from good finance, benefit and debt advice and accommodation support to prepare them well for their release. Release on temporary licence opportunities were very good. Substance misuse services were good. More work was needed to promote better contact between young people and their families. There was a range of programmes based on the needs analysis, and many young people completed a relevant one. Outcomes for young people were good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendation

The visitors' centre and visits hall should be improved. The contact that young people maintain with their families should be monitored to identify individuals, who might need help, as well as to identify and address any overarching problems in maintaining family ties. (HP52)

Partially achieved

Recommendations

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

Partially achieved (recommendation repeated, 4.13)

Sentenced young people should be offered one domestic visit per week and those on remand daily visits if requested. (9.36)

Partially achieved

The visitors' centre and visits hall should offer a better environment, including supervised children's play areas and a wider and healthier range of refreshments. (9.37)

Partially achieved (recommendation repeated, 4.50)

The prison should develop links to community services to facilitate support and guidance for visitors to Wetherby. (9.38)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 4.51)

Family days should be available to all young people. (9.39)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 4.52)

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	158	85
Recalls	4	2
Convicted unsentenced	7	4
Remand	16	9
Detainee		
Total	185	100

Age	Number of young people	%
15 years	4	2
16 years	46	25
17 years	117	63
18 years	18	10
Total	185	100

Nationality	Number of young people	%
British	176	95
Foreign nationals	9	5
Total	185	100

Ethnicity	Number of young people	%
White		
British	133	72
Irish	1	1
Other White	6	3
Mixed		
White and Black Caribbean	5	3
White and Black African		
White and Asian	4	2
Other Mixed	2	1
Asian or Asian British		
Indian	2	1
Pakistani	8	4
Bangladeshi	1	1
Other Asian	2	1
Black or Black British		
Caribbean	11	6
African	6	3
Other Black	2	1
Chinese or other ethnic group		
Chinese		
Arab		
Other ethnic group		
Not stated	3	2
Total	185	100

Religion	Number of young people	%
Baptist		
Church of England	11	6
Roman Catholic	17	9
Other Christian denominations	16	9
Muslim	22	12
Sikh	3	2
Hindu		
Buddhist		
Jewish		
Other	3	2
No religion	113	61
Total	185	100

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

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
Age								
15 years	3	1						4
16 years	12	14	11	6	1			44
17 years	17	40	34	23	5			119
18 years	2	11	7	5	1			26
Total	34	66	52	34	7			193

Unsentenced only – length of stay by age

Length of stay	<1 mth	1–3 mths	3–6 mths	6–12 mths	1–2 yrs	2 yrs+	4 yrs +	Total
Age								
15 years			1					1
16 years	8	2	3					13
17 years	12	6	2	2				22
18 years								
Total	20	8	6	2				36

Main offence	Number of young people	%
Violence against the person	52	28
Sexual offences	5	3
Burglary	37	20
Robbery	40	22
Theft and handling	12	6
Fraud and forgery		
Drugs offences	6	3
Other offences	29	16
Offence not recorded / holding warrant	4	2
Total	185	100

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
Age									
15 years					2			1	3
16 years	4	5	3	1	6	3	2	2	26
17 years	7	7	6	0	17	10	9	3	59
18 years	1	1	3	0	3	5	2		15
Total	12	13	12	1	28	18	13	6	103

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
Age							
15 years							
16 years		2	1	2	1		6
17 years	3	7	3	3	6		22
18 years		1					1
Total	3	10	4	5	7		29

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

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

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

Sentence	Under 2 yrs	2–5 yrs	5 - 10 yrs	10 – 15 yrs	15 – 20 yrs	Recall	Total
Age							
15 years							
16 years							
17 years		1	1				2
18 years		2					2
Total		3	1				4

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

Sentence	Under 2 yrs	2–5 yrs	5 - 10 yrs	10 – 15 yrs	15 – 20 yrs	20yrs +	Total
Age							
15 years							
16 years			1		1		2
17 years				7			7
18 years							
Total			1	7	1		9

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

Survey summary

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

Selecting the sample

At the time of the survey on 28 January 2013, the population of young people at HMP & YOI Wetherby was 194. The sample size was 128. Overall, this represented 66% of the population of children and young people.

Respondents were randomly selected from a P-NOMIS population printout using a stratified systematic sampling method. This means, for example, that every second person is selected from a P-NOMIS list, which is printed in location order, if 50% of the population is to be sampled. Completion of the questionnaire was voluntary. Refusals were noted and no attempts were made to replace them.

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

Methodology

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

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

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

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

Response rates

In total, 83 respondents completed and returned their questionnaires. This represented 43% of children and young people in the establishment at the time. The response rate from the sample was 65%.

Nine respondents refused to complete a questionnaire, 27 questionnaires were not returned and nine were returned blank.

Comparisons

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

A further comparator compares the responses of young people in 2013 against the responses of young people surveyed at HMP & YOI Wetherby in 2012. It should be noted that, in order for statistical comparisons to be made between the most recent survey data and that of the previous survey, both sets of data have been coded in the same way. This may result in percentages from previous surveys looking higher or lower as some of the survey questions may have changed. However, both percentages are true of the populations they were taken from, and the statistical significance (see below) is correct.

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

In addition, the following analyses were conducted:

- A comparison within the 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.

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

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

Summary

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

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

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

Children and young people survey methodology

SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU

Q1	How old are you?	
	15.....	4 (5%)
	16.....	21 (25%)
	17.....	46 (55%)
	18.....	12 (14%)
Q2	Are you a British citizen?	
	Yes.....	82 (99%)
	No.....	1 (1%)
Q3	Do you understand spoken English?	
	Yes.....	82 (99%)
	No.....	1 (1%)
Q4	Do you understand written English?	
	Yes.....	80 (99%)
	No.....	1 (1%)
Q5	What is your ethnic origin?	
	<i>White - British</i>	54 (66%)
	<i>White - Irish</i>	2 (2%)
	<i>White - Other</i>	3 (4%)
	<i>Black or black British - Caribbean</i>	4 (5%)
	<i>Black or black British - African</i>	2 (2%)
	<i>Black or black British - Other</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Indian</i>	2 (2%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Pakistani</i>	8 (10%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Chinese</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Other</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Mixed race - White and black Caribbean</i>	3 (4%)
	<i>Mixed race - White and black African</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Mixed race - White and Asian</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Mixed race - Other</i>	2 (2%)
	<i>Arab</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Other ethnic group</i>	0 (0%)
Q6	What is your religion?	
	<i>None</i>	33 (42%)
	<i>Church of England</i>	14 (18%)
	<i>Catholic</i>	12 (15%)
	<i>Protestant</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Other Christian denomination</i>	5 (6%)
	<i>Buddhist</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Hindu</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Jewish</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Muslim</i>	13 (16%)
	<i>Sikh</i>	1 (1%)

Q7	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	
	Yes.....	4 (5%)
	No.....	75 (93%)
	Don't know.....	2 (2%)
Q8	Do you have any children?	
	Yes.....	6 (8%)
	No.....	74 (93%)
Q9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability (i.e. do you need help with any long-term physical, mental or learning needs)?	
	Yes.....	14 (17%)
	No.....	67 (83%)
Q10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	
	Yes.....	32 (39%)
	No.....	50 (61%)

SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE

Q1	Are you sentenced?	
	Yes.....	76 (93%)
	No - unsentenced/on remand.....	6 (7%)
Q2	How long is your sentence (the full DTO sentence)?	
	Not sentenced.....	6 (7%)
	Less than 6 months.....	14 (17%)
	6 to 12 months.....	11 (14%)
	More than 12 months, up to 2 years.....	24 (30%)
	More than 2 years.....	22 (27%)
	Indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP).....	4 (5%)
Q3	How long have you been in this establishment?	
	Less than 1 month.....	13 (16%)
	1 to 6 months.....	42 (52%)
	More than 6 months, but less than 12 months.....	15 (19%)
	12 months to 2 years.....	8 (10%)
	More than 2 years.....	3 (4%)
Q4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	
	Yes.....	40 (50%)
	No.....	40 (50%)

SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS

Q1	On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?	
	Yes.....	72 (88%)
	No.....	7 (9%)
	Don't remember.....	3 (4%)
Q2	On your most recent journey here, were there any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females travelling with you?	
	Yes.....	27 (33%)
	No.....	37 (45%)
	Don't remember.....	18 (22%)

Q3	On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	39 (48%)
	<i>2 to 4 hours</i>	25 (30%)
	<i>More than 4 hours</i>	14 (17%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	4 (5%)
Q4	On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?	
	<i>My journey was less than 2 hours</i>	39 (48%)
	<i>Yes</i>	10 (12%)
	<i>No</i>	29 (35%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	4 (5%)
Q5	On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?	
	<i>My journey was less than 2 hours</i>	39 (48%)
	<i>Yes</i>	15 (18%)
	<i>No</i>	27 (33%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	1 (1%)
Q6	On your most recent journey here, how did you feel you were treated by the escort staff?	
	<i>Very well</i>	16 (20%)
	<i>Well</i>	34 (43%)
	<i>Neither</i>	25 (32%)
	<i>Badly</i>	2 (3%)
	<i>Very badly</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	1 (1%)
Q7	Before you arrived here, did you receive any information to help you prepare for coming here?	
	<i>Yes - and it was helpful</i>	14 (18%)
	<i>Yes - but it was not helpful</i>	13 (16%)
	<i>No - I received no information</i>	39 (49%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	13 (16%)

SECTION 4: FIRST DAYS

Q1	How long were you in reception?	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	71 (90%)
	<i>2 hours or longer</i>	2 (3%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	6 (8%)
Q2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	
	<i>Yes</i>	70 (88%)
	<i>No</i>	6 (8%)
	<i>Don't remember/not applicable</i>	4 (5%)
Q3	How well did you feel you were treated in reception?	
	<i>Very well</i>	18 (23%)
	<i>Well</i>	41 (51%)
	<i>Neither</i>	17 (21%)
	<i>Badly</i>	2 (3%)
	<i>Very badly</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	1 (1%)

- Q4 When you first arrived here, did staff ask if you needed help or support with any of the following things? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**
- | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|----------|---|----------|
| <i>Not being able to smoke</i> | 57 (77%) | <i>Money worries</i> | 18 (24%) |
| <i>Loss of property</i> | 21 (28%) | <i>Feeling worried/upset/need-
ing someone to talk to</i> | 33 (45%) |
| <i>Feeling scared</i> | 26 (35%) | <i>Health problems</i> | 42 (57%) |
| <i>Gang problems</i> | 24 (32%) | <i>Getting phone numbers</i> | 38 (51%) |
| <i>Contacting family</i> | 50 (68%) | <i>Staff did not ask me about any
of these</i> | 8 (11%) |
- 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> | 39 (53%) | <i>Money worries</i> | 8 (11%) |
| <i>Loss of property</i> | 9 (12%) | <i>Feeling worried/upset/need-
ing someone to talk to</i> | 7 (10%) |
| <i>Feeling scared</i> | 5 (7%) | <i>Health problems</i> | 5 (7%) |
| <i>Gang problems</i> | 3 (4%) | <i>Getting phone numbers</i> | 15 (21%) |
| <i>Contacting family</i> | 18 (25%) | <i>I did not have any problems</i> | 22 (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> | 67 (86%) |
| <i>The opportunity to have a shower</i> | 25 (32%) |
| <i>Something to eat</i> | 66 (85%) |
| <i>A free phone call to friends/family</i> | 65 (83%) |
| <i>PIN phone credit</i> | 54 (69%) |
| <i>Information about feeling worried/upset</i> | 28 (36%) |
| <i>Don't remember</i> | 5 (6%) |
| <i>I was not given any of these</i> | 3 (4%) |
- Q7 Within your first 24 hours here, did you have access to the following people or services? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**
- | | |
|--|----------|
| <i>Chaplain</i> | 45 (59%) |
| <i>Peer mentor</i> | 9 (12%) |
| <i>Childline/Samaritans</i> | 10 (13%) |
| <i>The prison shop/canteen</i> | 11 (14%) |
| <i>Don't remember</i> | 24 (32%) |
| <i>I did not have access to any of these</i> | 15 (20%) |
- Q8 Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?**
- | | |
|-----------------------------|----------|
| <i>Yes</i> | 64 (81%) |
| <i>No</i> | 12 (15%) |
| <i>Don't remember</i> | 3 (4%) |
- Q9 Did you feel safe on your first night here?**
- | | |
|-----------------------------|----------|
| <i>Yes</i> | 69 (87%) |
| <i>No</i> | 6 (8%) |
| <i>Don't remember</i> | 4 (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 (8%) |
| <i>Yes</i> | 48 (62%) |
| <i>No</i> | 16 (21%) |
| <i>Don't remember</i> | 8 (10%) |

SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT

Q1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	
	Yes.....	22 (28%)
	No	56 (70%)
	Don't know	2 (3%)
Q2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	
	Yes.....	23 (29%)
	No.....	45 (57%)
	Don't know	11 (14%)
Q3	What is the food like here?	
	Very good.....	2 (3%)
	Good.....	9 (11%)
	Neither.....	22 (28%)
	Bad.....	27 (34%)
	Very bad.....	19 (24%)
Q4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	
	<i>I have not bought anything yet/don't know</i>	3 (4%)
	Yes.....	39 (49%)
	No.....	38 (48%)
Q5	How easy is it for you to attend religious services?	
	<i>I don't want to attend religious services</i>	17 (22%)
	Very easy.....	20 (26%)
	Easy.....	26 (34%)
	Neither.....	3 (4%)
	Difficult.....	1 (1%)
	Very difficult.....	1 (1%)
	Don't know	9 (12%)
Q6	Are you religious beliefs respected?	
	Yes.....	45 (58%)
	No.....	7 (9%)
	Don't know/not applicable.....	26 (33%)
Q7	Can you speak to a chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?	
	Yes.....	61 (78%)
	No.....	2 (3%)
	Don't know/not applicable.....	15 (19%)
Q8	Can you speak to a peer mentor when you need to?	
	Yes.....	28 (36%)
	No.....	8 (10%)
	Don't know	41 (53%)
Q9	Can you speak to a member of the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB) when you need to?	
	Yes.....	16 (21%)
	No	8 (10%)
	Don't know	53 (69%)

Q10	Can you speak to an advocate (an outside person to help you) when you need to?	
	Yes.....	40 (52%)
	No.....	6 (8%)
	Don't know.....	31 (40%)

SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF

Q1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	
	Yes.....	67 (84%)
	No.....	13 (16%)

Q2	If you had a problem, who would you turn to? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	No one.....	21 (27%)
	Personal officer.....	23 (30%)
	Wing officer.....	21 (27%)
	Teacher/education staff.....	8 (10%)
	Gym staff.....	5 (6%)
	Chaplain.....	14 (18%)
	IMB.....	2 (3%)
	YOT worker.....	14 (18%)
	Social worker.....	10 (13%)
	Health services staff.....	5 (6%)
	Peer mentor.....	3 (4%)
	Another young person here.....	15 (19%)
	Case worker.....	26 (34%)
	Advocate.....	7 (9%)
	Family/friends.....	36 (47%)
	Childline/Samaritans.....	2 (3%)

Q3	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	
	Yes.....	30 (38%)
	No.....	49 (62%)

Q4	When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?	
	I still have not met him/her.....	16 (20%)
	In your first week.....	26 (33%)
	After your first week.....	16 (20%)
	Don't remember.....	22 (28%)

Q5	How often do you see your personal (named) officer?	
	I still have not met him/her.....	16 (22%)
	At least once a week.....	30 (41%)
	Less than once a week.....	27 (37%)

Q6	Do you feel your personal (named) officer tries to help you?	
	I still have not met him/her.....	16 (21%)
	Yes.....	43 (55%)
	No.....	19 (24%)

SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS

Q1	Is it easy to make an application?	
	Yes.....	66 (81%)
	No.....	4 (5%)
	Don't know.....	11 (14%)

Q2	Are applications sorted out fairly?	
	I have not made an application.....	26 (33%)
	Yes.....	45 (57%)
	No.....	8 (10%)

Q3	Are applications sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	
	I have not made an application.....	26 (33%)
	Yes.....	37 (46%)
	No.....	17 (21%)

Q4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	
	Yes.....	51 (63%)
	No.....	9 (11%)
	Don't know.....	21 (26%)
Q5	Are complaints sorted out fairly?	
	<i>I have not made a complaint</i>	40 (51%)
	Yes.....	14 (18%)
	No.....	25 (32%)
Q6	Are complaints sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	
	<i>I have not made a complaint</i>	40 (49%)
	Yes.....	18 (22%)
	No.....	23 (28%)
Q7	Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint?	
	Yes.....	7 (9%)
	No.....	48 (62%)
	Never needed to make a complaint.....	23 (29%)

SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE

Q1	What level of the rewards and sanctions scheme are you on?	
	<i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i>	4 (5%)
	<i>Enhanced (top)</i>	22 (28%)
	<i>Standard (middle)</i>	40 (51%)
	<i>Basic (bottom)</i>	11 (14%)
	Don't know.....	2 (3%)
Q2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the rewards and sanctions scheme?	
	<i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i>	4 (5%)
	Yes.....	44 (58%)
	No.....	18 (24%)
	Don't know.....	10 (13%)
Q3	Do the different levels of the rewards and sanctions scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	
	<i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i>	4 (5%)
	Yes.....	43 (55%)
	No.....	27 (35%)
	Don't know.....	4 (5%)
Q4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	
	Yes.....	50 (64%)
	No.....	26 (33%)
	Don't know.....	2 (3%)
Q5	If you have had a minor report, was the process explained clearly to you?	
	<i>I have not had a minor report</i>	28 (36%)
	Yes.....	40 (52%)
	No.....	9 (12%)
Q6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	
	Yes.....	57 (71%)
	No.....	22 (28%)
	Don't know.....	1 (1%)

Q7	If you have had an adjudication ('nicking'), was the process explained clearly to you?	
	<i>I have not had an adjudication</i>	23 (29%)
	Yes.....	49 (62%)
	No.....	7 (9%)
Q8	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	
	Yes.....	27 (34%)
	No.....	49 (62%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	3 (4%)
Q9	If you have spent a night in the care and separation unit (CSU), how were you treated by staff?	
	<i>I have not been to the care and separation unit</i>	67 (86%)
	<i>Very well</i>	4 (5%)
	<i>Well</i>	3 (4%)
	<i>Neither</i>	3 (4%)
	<i>Badly</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Very badly</i>	1 (1%)

SECTION 9: SAFETY

Q1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	
	Yes.....	19 (23%)
	No.....	62 (77%)
Q2	Do you feel unsafe now?	
	Yes.....	9 (11%)
	No.....	72 (89%)
Q3	In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Never felt unsafe</i>	62 (81%)
	<i>Everywhere</i>	6 (8%)
	<i>Care and separation unit</i>	2 (3%)
	<i>Association areas</i>	6 (8%)
	<i>Reception area</i>	3 (4%)
	<i>At the gym</i>	8 (10%)
	<i>In an exercise yard</i>	7 (9%)
	<i>At work</i>	5 (6%)
	<i>At education</i>	6 (8%)
	<i>At religious services</i>	3 (4%)
	<i>At mealtimes</i>	6 (8%)
	<i>At health care</i>	3 (4%)
	<i>Visits area</i>	3 (4%)
	<i>In wing showers</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>In gym showers</i>	7 (9%)
	<i>In corridors/stairwells</i>	6 (8%)
	<i>On your landing/wing</i>	4 (5%)
	<i>During movement</i>	9 (12%)
	<i>In your cell</i>	2 (3%)
Q4	Have you ever been victimised by another young person/group of young people here (e.g. insulted or assaulted you)?	
	Yes.....	12 (15%)
	No.....	68 (85%)

Q5	If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you, your family or friends)</i>	8 (10%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted).....</i>	8 (10%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i>	2 (3%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated.....</i>	5 (6%)
	<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i>	4 (5%)
	<i>Medication.....</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Debt.....</i>	2 (3%)
	<i>Drugs.....</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin.....</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Your nationality</i>	0 (0%)
	<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>	1 (1%)
	<i>You were new here</i>	2 (3%)
	<i>Your offence/crime</i>	3 (4%)
	<i>Gang related issues</i>	1 (1%)
Q7	Have you ever been victimised by staff here (e.g. insulted or assaulted you)?	
	Yes.....	11 (14%)
	No.....	66 (86%)
Q8	If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you, your family or friends)</i>	8 (10%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted).....</i>	3 (4%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated.....</i>	4 (5%)
	<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Medication.....</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Debt.....</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Drugs.....</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin.....</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your nationality</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>You are from a different part of the country to others</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>You are from a Traveller community</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your sexuality.....</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your age</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>You having a disability</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>You were new here</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Your offence/crime</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Gang related issues</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Because you made a complaint.....</i>	1 (1%)
Q10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	
	Yes.....	20 (26%)
	No.....	40 (52%)
	Don't know	17 (22%)

Q11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	
	Yes.....	24 (30%)
	No.....	31 (39%)
	Don't know.....	24 (30%)

Q12	Is shouting through the windows a problem here?	
	Yes.....	26 (33%)
	No.....	45 (57%)
	Don't know.....	8 (10%)

SECTION 10: HEALTH SERVICES

Q1	Is it easy to see the following people if you need to?			
		Yes	No	Don't know
	The doctor	49 (61%)	17 (21%)	14 (18%)
	The nurse	60 (75%)	9 (11%)	11 (14%)
	The dentist	29 (37%)	27 (34%)	23 (29%)

Q2	What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?	
	<i>I have not been</i>	6 (8%)
	<i>Very good</i>	12 (15%)
	<i>Good</i>	29 (36%)
	<i>Neither</i>	20 (25%)
	<i>Bad</i>	7 (9%)
	<i>Very bad</i>	6 (8%)

Q3	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/all of it in your room?	
	<i>I am not taking any medication</i>	37 (47%)
	<i>Yes, all of my meds</i>	12 (15%)
	<i>Yes, some of my meds</i>	11 (14%)
	<i>No</i>	19 (24%)

Q4	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?	
	Yes.....	16 (20%)
	No.....	63 (80%)

Q5	Are you being helped by anyone here with your emotional or mental health problems (e.g. a psychologist, doctor, counsellor, personal officer or another member of staff)?	
	<i>I do not have any emotional or mental health problems</i>	63 (80%)
	Yes.....	12 (15%)
	No.....	4 (5%)

Q6	Did you have problems with alcohol when you first arrived here?	
	Yes.....	8 (10%)
	No.....	72 (90%)

Q7	Have you received any help with alcohol problems here?	
	Yes.....	5 (6%)
	No.....	75 (94%)

Q8	Did you have problems with drugs when you first arrived here?	
	Yes.....	33 (41%)
	No.....	47 (59%)

Q9	Do you have problems with drugs now?	
	Yes.....	6 (8%)
	No.....	73 (92%)

Q10	Have you received any help with drugs problems here?	
	Yes.....	28 (35%)
	No.....	51 (65%)
Q11	How easy or difficult is it to get illegal drugs here?	
	Very easy.....	9 (12%)
	Easy.....	8 (10%)
	Neither.....	5 (6%)
	Difficult.....	1 (1%)
	Very difficult.....	14 (18%)
	Don't know.....	41 (53%)

SECTION 11: ACTIVITIES

Q1	How old were you when you were last at school?				
	14 or under.....	38 (47%)			
	15 or over.....	43 (53%)			
Q2	Have you ever been excluded from school?				
	Yes.....	73 (91%)			
	No.....	6 (8%)			
	Not applicable.....	1 (1%)			
Q3	Did you ever skip school before you came into custody?				
	Yes.....	71 (88%)			
	No.....	10 (12%)			
	Not applicable.....	0 (0%)			
Q4	Do you currently take part in any of the following activities? (Please tick all that apply to you.)				
	Education.....	66 (84%)			
	A job in this establishment.....	48 (61%)			
	Vocational or skills training.....	15 (19%)			
	Offending behaviour programmes.....	24 (30%)			
	I am not currently involved in any of these.....	4 (5%)			
Q5	If you have been involved in any of the following activities here, do you think they will help you when you leave prison?				
		<i>Not been involved</i>	Yes	No	<i>Don't know</i>
	Education	1 (1%)	51 (71%)	12 (17%)	8 (11%)
	A job in this establishment	0 (0%)	38 (58%)	17 (26%)	10 (15%)
	Vocational or skills training	3 (6%)	22 (45%)	11 (22%)	13 (27%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	2 (4%)	26 (49%)	13 (25%)	12 (23%)
Q6	Do you usually have association every day?				
	Yes.....	27 (34%)			
	No.....	52 (66%)			
Q7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?				
	Don't want to go.....	9 (11%)			
	Yes.....	23 (28%)			
	No.....	49 (60%)			

Q8	How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?	
	<i>Don't want to go</i>	12 (15%)
	<i>None</i>	5 (6%)
	<i>One to two times</i>	33 (41%)
	<i>Three to five times</i>	24 (30%)
	<i>More than five times</i>	6 (8%)

SECTION 12: FAMILY AND FRIENDS

Q1	Are you able to use the telephone every day, if you want to?	
	<i>Yes</i>	27 (33%)
	<i>No</i>	52 (64%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	2 (2%)

Q2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?	
	<i>Yes</i>	20 (25%)
	<i>No</i>	57 (70%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	4 (5%)

Q3	How many visits do you usually have each week, from family or friends?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	17 (21%)
	<i>Less than one a week</i>	22 (27%)
	<i>About one a week</i>	26 (32%)
	<i>More than one a week</i>	3 (4%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	14 (17%)

Q4	How easy is it for your family and friends to visit you here?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	17 (21%)
	<i>Very easy</i>	10 (13%)
	<i>Easy</i>	17 (21%)
	<i>Neither</i>	9 (11%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	14 (18%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	12 (15%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	1 (1%)

Q5	Do your visits usually start on time?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	17 (22%)
	<i>Yes</i>	33 (43%)
	<i>No</i>	13 (17%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	14 (18%)

SECTION 13: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE

Q1	Do you think you will have a problem with any of the following things, when you are released? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Finding accommodation</i>	18 (24%)
	<i>Getting into school or college</i>	19 (25%)
	<i>Getting a job</i>	38 (50%)
	<i>Money/finances</i>	22 (29%)
	<i>Claiming benefits</i>	22 (29%)
	<i>Continuing health services</i>	7 (9%)
	<i>Opening a bank account</i>	16 (21%)
	<i>Avoiding bad relationships</i>	12 (16%)
	<i>I won't have any problems</i>	28 (37%)

Q2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan (i.e. a plan that is discussed in your DTO/planning meetings, which sets out your targets)?	
	Yes.....	51 (65%)
	No.....	15 (19%)
	Don't know.....	13 (16%)
Q3	Were you involved in the development of your plan?	
	<i>I don't have a plan/don't know if I have a plan</i>	28 (37%)
	Yes.....	41 (55%)
	No.....	6 (8%)
Q4	Do you understand the targets that have been set in your plan?	
	<i>I don't have a plan/don't know if I have a plan</i>	28 (38%)
	Yes.....	45 (62%)
	No.....	0 (0%)
Q5	Do you have a caseworker here?	
	Yes.....	74 (93%)
	No.....	2 (3%)
	Don't know.....	4 (5%)
Q6	Has your caseworker helped to prepare you for release?	
	<i>I don't have a caseworker</i>	6 (8%)
	Yes.....	37 (47%)
	No.....	23 (29%)
	Don't know.....	13 (16%)
Q7	Has your social worker been to visit you since you have been here?	
	<i>I don't have a social worker</i>	38 (49%)
	Yes.....	26 (33%)
	No.....	14 (18%)
Q8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	
	Yes.....	39 (50%)
	No.....	25 (32%)
	Don't know.....	14 (18%)
Q9	Do you know who to contact for help with any of the following problems, before your release? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Finding accommodation</i>	11 (24%)
	<i>Getting into school or college</i>	7 (16%)
	<i>Getting a job</i>	14 (31%)
	<i>Help with money/finances</i>	6 (13%)
	<i>Help with claiming benefits</i>	9 (20%)
	<i>Continuing health services</i>	2 (4%)
	<i>Opening a bank account</i>	8 (18%)
	<i>Avoiding bad relationships</i>	3 (7%)
	<i>I don't know who to contact</i>	22 (49%)
Q10	What is most likely to stop you offending in the future? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	6 (8%)
	<i>Nothing, it is up to me</i>	25 (32%)
	<i>Making new friends outside</i>	16 (20%)
	<i>Going back to live with my family</i>	21 (27%)
	<i>Having a mentor (someone you can ask for advice)</i>	8 (10%)
	<i>Having a YOT worker or social worker that I get on with</i>	16 (20%)
	<i>Having children</i>	16 (20%)
	<i>Having something to do that isn't crime</i>	27 (34%)

<i>Getting a place of my own</i>	32 (41%)	<i>This sentence</i>	28 (35%)
<i>Getting a job</i>	38 (48%)	<i>Getting into school/college</i>	22 (28%)
<i>Having a partner (girlfriend or boyfriend)</i>	32 (41%)	<i>Talking about my offending behaviour with staff</i>	8 (10%)
<i>Staying off alcohol/drugs</i>	29 (37%)	<i>Anything else</i>	6 (8%)

Q11 Do you want to stop offending?

<i>Not sentenced</i>	6 (8%)
<i>Yes</i>	68 (86%)
<i>No</i>	2 (3%)
<i>Don't know</i>	3 (4%)

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>	6 (8%)
<i>Yes</i>	36 (46%)
<i>No</i>	37 (47%)

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



Survey responses from children and young people: HMP & YOI Wetherby 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

		HMP & YOI Wetherby (Aug) 2013	Young people's comparator	HMP & YOI Wetherby (Aug) 2013	HMP & YOI Wetherby (Jan) 2012
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		153	679	153	115
SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU					
1.1	Are you 18 years of age?	13%	16%	13%	10%
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	2%	4%	2%	3%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%	100%	
1.4	Do you understand written English?	100%	98%	100%	
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other category.	24%	46%	24%	26%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	12%	22%	12%	13%
1.7	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	8%	7%	8%	5%
1.8	Do you have any children?	14%	12%	14%	8%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	18%	17%	18%	11%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	27%	32%	27%	30%
SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE					
2.1	Are you sentenced?	85%	78%	85%	86%
2.2	Is your sentence 12 months or less?	40%	35%	40%	39%
2.3	Have you been in this establishment for one month or less?	15%	14%	15%	17%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	51%	55%	51%	51%
SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS					
On your most recent journey here:					
3.1	Did you feel safe?	90%	81%	90%	83%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	40%	37%	40%	34%
3.3	Did you spend more than 4 hours in the van?	9%	9%	9%	5%
For those who spent 2 or more hours in the escort van:					
3.4	Were you offered a toilet break if you needed it?	18%	14%	18%	14%
3.5	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	33%	35%	33%	38%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	54%	52%	54%	54%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	17%	16%	17%	

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

Key to tables

		HMP & YOJ Wetherby (Aug) 2013	Young people's comparator	HMP & YOJ Wetherby (Aug) 2013	HMP & YOJ Wetherby (Jan) 2012
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		153	679	153	115
SECTION 4: YOUR FIRST FEW DAYS HERE					
4.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	87%	81%	87%	82%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	84%	81%	84%	
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	61%	68%	61%	68%
When you first arrived, did staff ask if you needed help or support with any of the following:					
4.4a	Not being able to smoke?	56%	48%	56%	70%
4.4b	Loss of property?	21%	20%	21%	33%
4.4c	Feeling scared?	24%	29%	24%	
4.4d	Gang problems?	28%	50%	28%	
4.4e	Contacting family?	51%	54%	51%	65%
4.4f	Money worries?	15%	20%	15%	23%
4.4g	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	28%	35%	28%	
4.4h	Health problems?	50%	54%	50%	56%
4.4i	Getting phone numbers?	32%	45%	32%	44%
4.5	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	73%	70%	73%	72%
When you first arrived, did you have problems with any of the following:					
4.5a	Not being able to smoke?	54%	45%	54%	54%
4.5b	Loss of property?	12%	10%	12%	16%
4.5c	Feeling scared?	4%	7%	4%	
4.5d	Gang problems?	9%	12%	9%	
4.5e	Contacting family?	28%	25%	28%	26%
4.5f	Money worries?	11%	16%	11%	12%
4.5g	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	5%	11%	5%	
4.5h	Health problems?	12%	10%	12%	13%
4.5i	Getting phone numbers?	25%	28%	25%	33%
When you first arrived, were you given any of the following:					
4.6a	Toiletries/basic items?	76%	81%	76%	
4.6b	The opportunity to have a shower?	28%	60%	28%	16%
4.6c	Something to eat?	82%	84%	82%	74%
4.6d	A free phone call to friends/family?	83%	79%	83%	76%

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

Key to tables

		HMP & YOJ Wetherby (Aug) 2013	Young people's comparator	HMP & YOJ Wetherby (Aug) 2013	HMP & YOJ Wetherby (Jan) 2012
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		153	679	153	115
4.6e	PIN phone credit?	64%	63%	64%	
4.6f	Information about feeling worried/upset?	27%	35%	27%	
Within your first 24 hours, did you have access to the following people or services:					
4.7a	A chaplain?	53%	46%	53%	53%
4.7b	A peer mentor?	8%	15%	8%	
4.7c	Childline/Samaritans	12%	19%	12%	
4.7d	The prison shop/canteen?	12%	12%	12%	12%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	54%	72%	54%	74%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	78%	80%	78%	83%
4.10	For those who have been on an induction course: did it cover everything you needed to know about the establishment	55%	60%	55%	74%
SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT					
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	74%	76%	74%	31%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	23%	40%	23%	25%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	18%	15%	18%	13%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	51%	46%	51%	43%
5.5	Is it easy/very easy for you to attend religious services?	61%	60%	61%	59%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	55%	58%	55%	55%
Can you speak to:					
5.7	A chaplain of your faith in private?	76%	70%	76%	70%
5.8	A peer mentor?	29%	38%	29%	
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	18%	31%	18%	27%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	45%	41%	45%	39%
SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF					
6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	63%	69%	63%	63%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	20%	27%	20%	
6.3	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	37%	40%	37%	33%
For those who have met their personal officer:					
6.4	Did you meet your personal (named) officer within the first week?	35%	44%	35%	47%
6.5	Do you see your personal (named) officer at least once a week?	47%	63%	47%	56%

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP & YOI Wetherby (Aug) 2013	Young people's comparator	HMP & YOI Wetherby (Aug) 2013	HMP & YOI Wetherby (Jan) 2012
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		153	679	153	115
6.6	Do you feel your personal (named) officer tries to help you?	61%	72%	61%	
SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS					
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	83%	79%	83%	81%
For those who have made an application:					
7.2	Do you feel applications are sorted out fairly?	76%	67%	76%	81%
7.3	Do you feel applications are sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	65%	58%	65%	69%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	60%	53%	60%	66%
For those who have made a complaint:					
7.5	Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	30%	40%	30%	33%
7.6	Do you feel complaints are sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	42%	39%	42%	48%
7.7	Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint?	8%	9%	8%	
SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE					
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	27%	32%	27%	24%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	48%	50%	48%	48%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	43%	51%	43%	49%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	69%	51%	69%	
For those who have had a minor report:					
8.5	Was the process explained clearly to you?	84%	77%	84%	
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	64%	60%	64%	59%
For those who have had an adjudication ('nicking'):					
8.7	Was the process explained clearly to you?	87%	86%	87%	83%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (Cand R) since you have been here?	34%	30%	34%	35%
8.9	For those who had spent a night in the care and separation unit: did the staff treat you well/very well?	64%	46%	64%	41%
SECTION 9: SAFETY					
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	23%	31%	23%	27%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	8%	12%	8%	
9.4	Have you ever been victimised by other young people here?	15%	24%	15%	17%
Since you have been here, have other young people:					
9.5a	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	5%	10%	5%	15%

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP & YOI Wetherby (Aug) 2013	Young people's comparator	HMP & YOI Wetherby (Aug) 2013	HMP & YOI Wetherby (Jan) 2012
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		153	679	153	115
9.5b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	1%	11%	1%	8%
9.5c	Sexually abused you?	0%	1%	0%	0%
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	4%	8%	4%	
9.5e	Taken your canteen/property?	1%	4%	1%	2%
9.5f	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	1%	0%	
9.5g	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	2%	0%	
9.5h	Victimised you because of drugs?	1%	1%	1%	1%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	1%	2%	1%	4%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	1%	2%	1%	3%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	2%	2%	2%	
9.5l	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	3%	2%	3%	7%
9.5m	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%	1%	0%	
9.5n	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	1%	1%	1%	
9.5o	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	1%	0%	
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	2%	0%	1%
9.5q	Victimised you because you were new here?	4%	6%	4%	11%
9.5r	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	4%	3%	4%	3%
9.5s	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	3%	5%	3%	3%
9.7	Have you ever been victimised by a member of staff here?	29%	26%	29%	20%
Since you have been here, have staff:					
9.8a	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	17%	15%	17%	9%
9.8b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	4%	5%	4%	7%
9.8c	Sexually abused you?	0%	1%	0%	1%
9.8d	Threatened or intimidated you?	4%	6%	4%	
9.8e	Taken your canteen/property?	2%	4%	2%	4%
9.8f	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	2%	0%	
9.8g	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	1%	0%	
9.8h	Victimised you because of drugs?	1%	1%	1%	0%
9.8i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	1%	4%	1%	5%

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP & YOI Wetherby (Aug) 2013	Young people's comparator	HMP & YOI Wetherby (Aug) 2013	HMP & YOI Wetherby (Jan) 2012
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		153	679	153	115
9.8j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	4%	3%	4%	2%
9.8k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	1%	2%	1%	
9.8k	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	3%	3%	3%	0%
9.8m	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	1%	1%	1%	
9.8n	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	1%	0%	
9.8o	Victimised you because of your age?	1%	2%	1%	
9.8p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	1%	1%	1%	0%
9.8q	Victimised you because you were new here?	1%	2%	1%	3%
9.8r	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	2%	3%	2%	3%
9.8s	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	1%	1%	1%	4%
9.8t	Victimised you because you made a complaint?	4%	6%	4%	
9.10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	30%	27%	30%	
9.11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	30%	31%	30%	26%
9.12	Is shouting through the windows a problem here?	30%	32%	30%	40%
SECTION 10: HEALTH SERVICES					
10.1a	Is it easy for you to see the doctor?	63%	61%	63%	57%
10.1b	Is it easy for you to see the nurse?	69%	77%	69%	68%
10.1c	Is it easy for you to see the dentist?	39%	42%	39%	30%
10.2	For those who have been to health services: Do you think the overall quality is good/very good?	45%	59%	45%	62%
10.3	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/all of it in your cell?	69%	50%	69%	
10.4	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?	21%	22%	21%	25%
10.5	If you have emotional or mental health problems, are you being helped by anyone here?	69%	67%	69%	46%
10.6	Did you have any problems with alcohol when you first arrived?	11%	9%	11%	19%
10.7	Have you received any help with any alcohol problems here?	6%	6%	6%	8%
10.8	Did you have any problems with drugs when you first arrived?	45%	34%	45%	45%
10.9	Do you have a problem with drugs now?	10%	8%	10%	10%
10.10	Have you received any help with any drug problems here?	30%	21%	30%	30%

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP & YOI Wetherby (Aug) 2013	Young people's comparator	HMP & YOI Wetherby (Aug) 2013	HMP & YOI Wetherby (Jan) 2012
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		153	679	153	115
10.11	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs here?	19%	16%	19%	25%
SECTION 11: ACTIVITIES					
11.1	Were you 14 or younger when you were last at school?	43%	37%	43%	40%
11.2	Have you ever been excluded from school?	93%	84%	93%	89%
11.3	Did you ever skip school before you came into custody?	85%	73%	85%	
Do you currently take part in any of the following:					
11.4a	Education?	81%	76%	81%	80%
11.4b	A job in this establishment?	64%	22%	64%	53%
11.4c	Vocational or skills training?	13%	14%	13%	21%
11.4d	Offending behaviour programmes?	17%	22%	17%	18%
11.4e	Nothing	9%	12%	9%	11%
For those who have taken part in the following activities while in this establishment, do you think that they will help you when you leave prison:					
11.5a	Education?	70%	62%	70%	61%
11.5b	A job in this establishment?	58%	52%	58%	55%
11.5c	Vocational or skills training?	45%	51%	45%	49%
11.5d	Offending behaviour programmes?	51%	49%	51%	46%
11.6	Do you usually have association every day?	44%	83%	44%	23%
11.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	67%	36%	67%	28%
11.8	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	13%	11%	13%	3%
SECTION 12: KEEPING IN TOUCH WITH FAMILY AND FRIENDS					
12.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	77%	77%	77%	18%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	41%	40%	41%	42%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	37%	39%	37%	32%
12.4	Is it easy/very easy for your family and friends to visit you here?	35%	37%	35%	
12.5	Do your visits start on time?	40%	43%	40%	45%
SECTION 13: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE					
Do you think you will have a problem with the following, when you are released:					

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

Key to tables

		HMP & YOI Wetherby (Aug) 2013	Young people's comparator	HMP & YOI Wetherby (Aug) 2013	HMP & YOI Wetherby (Jan) 2012
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		153	679	153	115
13.1a	Finding accommodation?	23%	26%	23%	25%
13.1b	Getting into school or college?	25%	32%	25%	27%
13.1c	Getting a job?	50%	55%	50%	47%
13.1d	Money/finances?	34%	40%	34%	40%
13.1e	Claiming benefits?	26%	20%	26%	29%
13.1f	Continuing health services?	7%	10%	7%	10%
13.1g	Opening a bank account?	9%	15%	9%	16%
13.1h	Avoiding bad relationships?	15%	18%	15%	16%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	58%	50%	58%	
For those with a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan:					
13.3	Were you involved in the development of your plan?	83%	88%	83%	
13.4	Do you understand the targets set in your plan?	94%	93%	94%	
13.5	Do you have a caseworker here?	92%	79%	92%	
13.6	Has your caseworker helped to prepare you for release?	47%	50%	47%	
For those with a social worker:					
13.7	Has your social worker been to visit you since you have been here?	67%	62%	67%	
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	45%	39%	45%	42%
If you have a problem with any of the following, do you know who to ask for help?					
13.9a	Finding accommodation	32%	24%	32%	41%
13.9b	Getting into school or college	29%	26%	29%	45%
13.9c	Getting a job	38%	32%	38%	45%
13.9d	Help with money/finances	26%	22%	26%	41%
13.9e	Help with claiming benefits	22%	17%	22%	38%
13.9f	Continuing health services	13%	15%	13%	27%
13.9g	Opening a bank account	20%	16%	20%	36%
13.9h	Avoiding bad relationships	20%	15%	20%	28%
For those who were sentenced:					
13.11	Do you want to stop offending?	94%	88%	94%	89%
13.12	Have you done anything or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future	47%	46%	47%	50%

Diversity analysis



Key question responses (ethnicity and religion) HMP & YOI Wetherby 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				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		36	115	18	127
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	5%	1%	0%	3%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	98%	100%	100%	99%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)			100%	11%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	56%	0%		
1.5	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	2%	9%	0%	9%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	0%	23%	0%	21%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	12%	31%	5%	29%
2.1	Are you sentenced?	88%	84%	96%	84%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	64%	47%	55%	49%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	44%	40%	17%	43%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	56%	54%	39%	56%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare coming here?	16%	18%	9%	17%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	86%	85%	91%	83%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	67%	60%	61%	62%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	51%	56%	46%	56%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	84%	77%	77%	79%
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	74%	74%	61%	77%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	29%	22%	23%	21%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	15%	18%	5%	19%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	39%	56%	27%	54%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	67%	51%	73%	51%

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				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		36	115	18	127
Can you speak to:					
5.7	A chaplain of your faith in private?	86%	73%	100%	72%
5.8	A peer mentor?	27%	28%	23%	29%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	20%	17%	17%	16%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	55%	42%	46%	43%
6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	56%	64%	46%	64%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	23%	19%	23%	18%
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	84%	85%	83%	83%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	64%	59%	61%	60%
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	31%	25%	32%	27%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	40%	52%	39%	50%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	27%	50%	32%	46%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	67%	69%	73%	70%
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	75%	61%	77%	62%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	42%	31%	46%	31%
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	22%	23%	23%	23%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	10%	8%	5%	8%
9.4	Have you been victimised by other young people here?	10%	16%	5%	16%
Since you have been here, have other young people:					
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	2%	5%	0%	5%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	2%	1%	5%	1%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	2%	1%	5%	0%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	5%	1%	5%	1%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	0%	0%	0%
9.7	Have you been victimised by staff here?	29%	28%	29%	29%

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				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		36	115	18	127
Since you have been here, have staff:					
9.8d	Threatened or intimidated you?	0%	5%	0%	4%
9.8i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	5%	0%	10%	0%
9.8j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	5%	3%	10%	1%
9.8k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	3%	0%	0%	1%
9.8p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	1%	0%	1%
9.10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	21%	33%	23%	31%
9.11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	37%	29%	20%	32%
10.1a	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the doctor?	62%	63%	57%	65%
10.1b	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the nurse?	71%	68%	57%	71%
10.4	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	10%	24%	0%	23%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:					
11.4a	Education?	95%	77%	91%	79%
11.4b	A job in this establishment?	54%	67%	48%	67%
11.4c	Vocational or skills training?	15%	12%	5%	13%
11.4d	Offending behaviour programmes?	24%	16%	29%	16%
11.4e	Nothing?	2%	11%	5%	10%
11.6	Do you usually have association every day?	42%	46%	43%	44%
11.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	51%	73%	24%	74%
11.8	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	12%	13%	10%	12%
12.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	78%	77%	71%	78%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	39%	41%	48%	41%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	26%	40%	33%	37%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	61%	57%	57%	58%
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	40%	47%	45%	45%

Diversity analysis - disability



Key question responses (disability analysis) HMP & YOI Wetherby 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	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		26	122
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	0%	3%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	100%	100%
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	0%	29%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	0%	15%
1.5	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	7%	7%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	53%	21%
2.1	Are you sentenced?	78%	87%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	41%	53%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	32%	41%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	66%	52%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	16%	18%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	69%	87%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	66%	61%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	66%	53%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	81%	78%
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	81%	72%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	33%	21%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	27%	15%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	48%	51%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	50%	56%

Diversity analysis - disability

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Can you speak to:			
5.7	A chaplain of your faith in private?	80%	76%
5.8	A peer mentor?	17%	31%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	19%	17%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	48%	43%
6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	70%	61%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	19%	20%
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	81%	85%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	52%	62%
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	19%	29%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	48%	49%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	50%	41%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	66%	71%
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	61%	64%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	29%	33%
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	29%	22%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	3%	9%
9.4	Have you been victimised by other young people here?	20%	12%
Since you have been here, have other young people:			
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	3%	4%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	2%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	2%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	3%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	0%
9.7	Have you been victimised by staff here?	31%	27%

Diversity analysis - disability

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Since you have been here, have staff:			
9.8d	Threatened or intimidated you?	0%	4%
9.8i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	2%
9.8j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	4%
9.8k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	1%
9.8p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	0%
9.10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	16%	34%
9.11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	31%	31%
10.1a	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the doctor?	66%	64%
10.1b	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the nurse?	79%	69%
10.4	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	43%	15%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:			
11.4a	Education?	79%	81%
11.4b	A job in this establishment?	66%	64%
11.4c	Vocational or skills training?	4%	14%
11.4d	Offending behaviour programmes?	14%	19%
11.4e	Nothing?	7%	9%
11.6	Do you usually have association every day?	52%	42%
11.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	82%	64%
11.8	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	8%	14%
12.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	75%	79%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	48%	38%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	35%	36%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	59%	59%
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	50%	45%