

Report on an unannounced inspection of

# **HMYOI Hindley**

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

**3 – 14 March 2014**

## **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 in our 'Guide for writing inspection reports' on our website at:  
<http://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/about-our-inspections/>

Crown copyright 2014

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

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

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

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

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

# Contents

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Introduction  | 5  |
| Fact page   | 9  |
| About this inspection and report  | 11 |
| Summary   | 13 |
| Section 1. Safety   | 21 |
| Section 2. Respect  | 37 |
| Section 3. Purposeful activity  | 51 |
| Section 4. Resettlement   | 57 |
| Section 5. Recommendations and housekeeping points                              | 67 |
| Section 6. Appendices   | 75 |
| Appendix I: Inspection team   | 75 |
| Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report                   | 77 |
| Appendix III: Establishment population profile                                  | 83 |
| Appendix IV: Summary of children and young people questionnaires and interviews | 87 |



# Introduction

HMYOI Hindley is a cluster site establishment with two adjacent sites under one governor. We inspected the lower site which held 161 boys mostly aged 16 and 17, although some of the boys were either a year older or younger. The upper site held young adults aged between 18 and 21. The age range of those held at Hindley has changed over the years; between April 2009 and December 2013 the establishment held just boys, but since then the establishment has begun to admit 18 to 21-year-old young men again. During the inspection it was announced that the number of young adults held was to increase significantly and in my view there was a real risk that this would detract attention from the safe management of the very vulnerable and challenging younger boys that the establishment held.

The vulnerability of the boys held at Hindley was at the forefront of everyone's mind during the inspection because it took place while the inquest of Jake Hardy was in progress. Jake Hardy was a 17-year-old boy who had heart-breakingly killed himself while at Hindley in January 2012. The jury's verdict, which came after our inspection had ended, concluded that, 'Jake Hardy died as a result of his own deliberate act but the evidence does not establish, beyond reasonable doubt, whether he intended that act to cause his death'. It identified a number of serious failings by HMYOI Hindley that contributed to his death.

The vulnerability of many of the boys held at Hindley was plain to see and appeared greater than we see elsewhere. About half the boys were in touch with mental health services. There were good quality services for boys whose behaviour was affected by brain injury, who had a learning disability or who needed speech and language therapy, although in some cases the availability of these services was insufficient to meet demand. These boys were much more likely to be the subject of disciplinary processes or to feel unsafe. Three out of five of the boys held were assessed as having at least a medium need for substance abuse interventions. Two out of five told us they had been in local authority care – and not surprisingly this group were much less likely to receive regular visits than other boys.

In light of this, some of the outcomes Hindley achieved were very impressive. The quality of education, learning and skills provided was the best we have seen in any young offender institution (YOI) holding this age group. 41% of the boys told us they had been 14 or under when they last attended school and 90% told us they had been excluded from school at some point. Despite this, Ofsted, our partner inspectorate, judged provision to be as good, if not better, than that found in the community. The provision was interesting and the quality of teaching good and sometimes outstanding; it motivated boys who had been failed by the ordinary school system. Behaviour in education was well managed and staff had high expectations of the boys, which was reflected in achievements. It was therefore disappointing that national policies had reduced the amount of time boys could spend out of their cells since the last inspection and that boys sometimes had less than 15 minutes a day to exercise in the open air – which cannot have been good for their behaviour, safety or health.

Resettlement work was also good. There was effective internal communication within Hindley, and between Hindley and the boys' home areas, thanks to the secondment of youth offending service staff from those areas to Hindley. The identification and support of boys who had been looked after by a local authority was excellent. For those boys who had the support of their families, there was evidence that they had been appropriately involved in planning training, and the establishment worked to sustain family links.

Arrangement for boys with longer sentences, who would transfer to adult establishments, and management of public protection issues were also sound. Practical resettlement services were well organised. No young person had left recently without accommodation to go to and most had a job or training place they could start soon after release. More could have been done to develop

independent living skills on the wings. There was good access to programmes that would help boys change their offending behaviour, although there was doubt about the future provision of sex offender treatment programmes and this needed to be resolved quickly. Hindley needed to do more to understand how sustainable these arrangements were and how successful they were in preventing boys from reoffending.

Relationships between staff and boys had improved since the last inspection and we saw some impressive interactions. Boys told us that the support they received from personal officers was much more effective than had been the case before. Too little was done to identify and meet the needs of those with protected characteristics. Those who were Muslim or from black or minority ethnic backgrounds reported similar experiences to the population as a whole, but boys with disabilities reported much more negatively. There were a small number of foreign nationals who were no longer able to obtain legal aid for advice and representation. We were told they were 'confused, anxious, in panic or in denial' about their immigration status. Barnardos' advocates were doing some good work to support them.

Health services were very good; in addition to impressive but stretched mental health provision, other services such as dentistry – critical for a group with very poor dental and oral health – were also very good. Generally good relationships were in contrast to the overall environment which was austere and prison-like. There was a good deal of litter in the exercise yards that had accumulated over some time. Many cells were cramped with smelly, inadequately screened toilets, and boys had to eat some of their meals in their cells next to the toilet. Food was adequate but meals were served much too early.

By the time of this inspection there had been improvements in processes to keep boys safe. Boys were treated well on arrival and there were careful efforts to establish the support needs of those who were new to custody. Safeguarding arrangements had much improved. Support for those at risk of suicide and self-harm was also better, but recording needed further improvement and care planning remained weak. Processes to identify and tackle bullies and support victims were good but credible intelligence about bullying of individual boys needed to be more rigorously followed up. Staff challenged poor behaviour when they saw it. There was good dynamic security and the use of force had declined.

Yet despite these efforts, Hindley struggled to keep the vulnerable boys it held safe. There had been 251 bullying incidents reported in the previous six months. Intimidating shouting out of windows at night remained a problem, despite efforts by staff. On average there was one fight or assault every day – slightly more than at the last inspection when we already thought the level was high. We watched CCTV coverage of previous incidents. In one case a boy who appeared to have fallen out with others, meekly 'reported' to a side room off the main association area to meet his assailants. While one boy kept watch, others crowded round to punch and kick him. The incident only came to light when the CCTV was viewed later. There had been 167 self-harm incidents in the previous six months, this continued the rise we had noted at the previous inspection.

Although most processes had improved there were some serious weaknesses. We identified a number of incidents where boys had been strip-searched under restraint. The environment and regime in the segregation unit remained poor, despite good relationships. We were very concerned that at the time of the inspection, consideration was being given to withdrawing funding from the Willow Unit, an essential, effective psychologically-informed resource for boys with the most complex problems. It was a vital service that kept some of the most vulnerable boys safe and in my view, closure of the Willow Unit would be a reckless and dangerous development.

Overall, this inspection found some significant but necessary improvement at Hindley. Some aspects, such as learning and skills and resettlement work are now very good, comparing favourably not just with other YOIs but with similar provision in the community. However, these improvements are fragile. The boys Hindley holds are now more vulnerable and more challenging than ever, and, as in other YOIs we have inspected, the evidence of this inspection suggests a much more fundamental

review is required about how best to hold these boys safely and securely. In the short term, it is essential that the pressures involved in expanding and developing the young adults side, at the same time as managing budget reviews and new policy initiatives on the boys side, do not provide a dangerous distraction to managing the already high risks involved in keeping the boys at Hindley safe, secure and prepared for a positive new start when they leave.

**Nick Hardwick**  
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

August 2014





# Fact page

## Task of the establishment

HMYOI Hindley is a cluster site comprising a closed under 18 YOI holding boys between the age of 15 and 18, and a closed separate young adult YOI holding young adult males between the age of 18 and 21.

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

Public sector

## Region/Department

Northwest

## Number held (under 18 YOI)

161

## Certified normal accommodation

248

## Operational capacity

252

## Date of last full inspection

19 – 21 November 2012

## Brief history

HMYOI Hindley opened as a Borstal in 1961 and, following the establishment of the young people's estate in July 2001, became a combined site establishment, with up to 192 young people and 324 young adults. On 1 April 2009 Hindley re-roled to become a fully juvenile site. Due to a reduction in the number of young people offenders across England and Wales it was announced on 1 July 2013 that the number of juvenile places at Hindley would be reduced. Hindley became a cluster site of two separate YOIs and began receiving young adult offenders (between the age of 18 and 21) on 6 December 2013.

## Short description of residential units (Juvenile side)

**A Wing:** Built in 1961 and refurbished in 2005 and 2012. The wing holds up to 66 sentenced young people on all incentives and earned privileges (IEP) levels.

**B Wing:** Built in 1961 and refurbished in 2008 and 2012. The wing holds up to 58 sentenced young people on all IEP levels.

**C Wing:** Built in 1961 and refurbished in 2008/09. The wing holds up to 66 sentenced young people on all IEP levels.

**D Wing:** Built in 1961 and refurbished in 2010. The wing holds up to 66 sentenced young people and is currently closed for accommodation purposes.

**J Wing:** A temporary custodial module built in 2008, this wing is the first night centre which holds a few young people on enhanced regime who act as mentors to new arrivals. It can hold up to 40 young people, including two designated health care beds. One cell has been converted to a reduced ligature point cell.

Willow: The complex needs unit holds up to 13 young people; it has one designated health care bed and one mental health bed.

Sycamore: Re-opened in April 2011 after refurbishment, it holds up to nine young people as the segregation unit.

**Name of governor/director**

Peter Francis

**Escort contractor**

GEOAmey

**Health service commissioner and providers**

Bridgewater Community Healthcare Trust (primary care provider)

Greater Manchester West Mental Health Trust (provider)

NHS England (commissioner)

**Learning and skills providers**

The Manchester College

**Independent Monitoring Board chair**

Judith Lukey

# About this inspection and report

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

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

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

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

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

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

Our assessments might result in one of the following:

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

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

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

## This report

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

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

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

---

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

# Summary

## Safety

- S1** *Late arrivals were a problem and young people shared transport with adults. Young people were treated well on arrival and their basic needs were met. Routine strip-searching no longer took place, but we found cases where young people had been strip-searched under restraint. The early days provision was sound. Child protection procedures continued to work well and the safeguarding arrangements had been improved. Levels of self-harm remained high; the response to and procedures for dealing with this had improved but needed to do so further. Fights and assaults continued to occur on a daily basis and injuries sustained were mostly superficial. New measures had been introduced to reduce the risk of violence and support for victims had improved. Shouting out of windows remained a problem. Use of force was reducing and was relatively low. The rewards and sanctions scheme was motivational. The regime and conditions in Sycamore unit were poor. Young people with complex needs were given vital individual support on Willow unit. Young people with substance misuse problems received a good service. Few young people reported feeling unsafe. **Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***
- S2** *At the last inspection in November 2012, we found that outcomes for children and young people at Hindley were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test. We made 23 recommendations about safety. At this follow-up inspection we found that six of the recommendations had been achieved, 13 had been partially achieved and four had not been achieved.*
- S3** During the six months before the inspection, one third of young people had arrived at the establishment after 7pm. Young people continued to share transport with adults and were not adequately separated.
- S4** The new reception area for young people was not child friendly and there were plans to improve it. Reception staff were welcoming and sensitive to young people's needs. Routine strip-searching no longer took place on admission.
- S5** First night accommodation contained graffiti and the toilets needed deep cleaning. Cells on the first night centre were adequately equipped and ready for young people to move into. Young people's immediate needs were well met on the first night centre. The quality of risk assessment and management documentation was reasonable, but some of the action points were generic.
- S6** The induction programme was comprehensive and more young people than the comparator said induction covered everything they needed to know about the establishment. There was not enough to keep young people occupied during their first two days at the establishment.
- S7** There were effective working relationships with the local safeguarding children board. Oversight of safer custody had been strengthened by the amalgamation of suicide and self-harm and violence reduction meetings. This new forum was well attended and a wide range of relevant information was discussed, although injuries sustained by young people were not routinely covered.
- S8** Child protection referrals continued to be dealt with effectively and the local authority designated officer was informed of all allegations against staff. The joint establishment and local authority bimonthly child protection meeting had reduced the time taken to deal with

cases and had improved the scrutiny of child protection referrals. We were concerned to find that there had been three incidents of strip-searching under restraint since the previous inspection, not all of which had been referred to the local authority for scrutiny.

- S9 A number of improvements had been made since the previous inspection in the way young people who might face difficulties in custody were supported. This included spending more time on admission interviewing young people whose first time it was in custody. More attention was also given to monitoring young people who did not come out of their cell.
- S10 The use of intervention plans to manage victims and perpetrators of bullying had improved, although records of this work were often brief and functional and lacking in analysis. During the previous six months, 251 bullying incidents had been reported. Although staff had attempted to address shouting out of windows, our survey indicated that young people believed it to be more of a problem than previously.
- S11 Fights and assaults had averaged one a day since the beginning of 2013, slightly higher than at the previous inspection when we found the level to be very high. The number of serious injuries sustained as a result of these incidents was low and most cases involved cuts and black eyes. Weekly multidisciplinary meetings combining security and safeguarding staff helped with the management of potential and actual perpetrators of violence.
- S12 There had been 164 self-harm incidents in the previous six months, involving 37 young people, a continuing rise from the increasing rate noted at the previous inspection. Over the same period, 88 ACCTs (assessment, care in custody and teamwork case management for prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm) had been opened; in all cases there had been evidence of risk of self-harm. Efforts had been made to improve the quality of ACCTs, but the standard of care maps in particular still fell short of our expectations.
- S13 Our survey indicated that more young people than the comparator regarded the incentives scheme as fair and motivational. Review boards made sound decisions, and young people knew that they could appeal. Targets and plans for improvement were often cursory and formulaic for young people on the lowest level and their entitlements remained very limited. An appropriately flexible approach was taken on Willow unit to providing incentives for young people but arrangements on Sycamore unit were punitive.
- S14 We recognised that a particularly high proportion of young people had mental health, substance abuse and other difficulties and this was reflected in the behaviour we saw. This created real difficulties for staff who had to look after young people who were very vulnerable but could be very challenging at the same time.
- S15 The good relationships between staff and young people contributed to effective dynamic security. Investigations into credible threats needed to be more rigorous. The number of adjudications had risen since our last inspection, while the number of minor reports had decreased. Use of force involving full restraint had reduced significantly and we found good examples of de-escalation. The young offender institution (YOI) did not receive adequate support from the local police when trying to follow through discipline procedures.
- S16 Oversight of the use of force was excellent, but the records of debriefs of some young people were not sufficiently detailed and they were not carried out by an independent person.
- S17 The segregation unit Sycamore remained a poor environment. Relationships between staff and young people were good, but the regime was poor and young people spent much of their time locked in their cells. Most young people returned to mainstream wings after a short period but formal reintegration planning lacked foresight. Multidisciplinary support was

offered to challenging young people who remained segregated for longer periods, but their needs were not always clearly identified.

- S18 The Willow unit for young people with the most complex needs provided an essential resource and the regime was based on a psychologically informed approach. We observed staff managing extremely challenging behaviour in a calm way. Case management was thorough and there was a strong focus on preparing young people for reintegration to a main wing. Subject to risk assessment, young people were encouraged to be active and out of their cell. However, association was sometimes cancelled in the evening when there was a staff shortage elsewhere in the establishment.
- S19 Specialist clinical drug treatment and integrated case management and interventions were all of a high quality and delivered to a population with much higher levels of need than in most YOIs. The generic substance misuse awareness programme, delivered during induction to all young people, was much less effective.

## Respect

**S20** *The living conditions remained austere and institutional. The relationships between staff and young people that we observed were consistently good and officers challenged poor behaviour confidently. Young people's religious needs were well met. The management of diversity was weak. The applications and complaints procedures were sound. Legal rights were managed effectively. Health care services were very good. Young people expressed mixed views about the food but the quality was adequate. **Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***

S21 *At the last inspection in November 2012, we found that outcomes for children and young people at Hindley were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 15 recommendations about respect.<sup>2</sup> At this follow-up inspection we found that two of the recommendations had been achieved, three had been partially achieved, nine had not been achieved and one was no longer relevant.*

S22 Efforts had been made to soften the environment, but the accommodation in most wings was poor. Many cells were cramped, some toilets were unhygienic and young people had to sleep and eat in close proximity to them. Some cells had broken observation panels and a number of young people said they had been allocated to dirty cells. Some of the showers were damp and mouldy. Sycamore and Willow units were particularly shabby with offensive graffiti, while accommodation on the first night centre was good. There was a lot of litter in the external areas.

S23 Young people did not tell us about disrespectful behaviour by staff as they had at the previous inspection and the interactions that we saw were positive. Inappropriate behaviour by young people was challenged properly by staff. Young people responded positively in our survey about their personal officers. The monthly report which personal officers sent to parents/carers was a commendable way of keeping families informed.

S24 The consultation arrangements with young people remained effective and had been enhanced by the introduction of regular wing meetings.

<sup>2</sup> This included recommendations about the incentives and earned privileges scheme which, in our updated Expectations (Version 4, 2012), now appear under the healthy prison area of safety.

- S25 There was a comprehensive equality policy, but it was out of date. Equality meetings were poorly attended by staff and although boys were invited, they rarely attended or were consulted in other ways. SMART (systematic monitoring and analysis of race equality treatment) procedures only covered race and ethnicity and were being replaced by a more comprehensive system. Data indicated that young people from a black and minority ethnic background had not been treated equally in relation to release on temporary licence applications throughout 2013. The investigation of this had still not been completed. Responses to discrimination incident report forms were not quality checked. Focus groups for young people from protected groups no longer took place.
- S26 Young people with disabilities reported a significantly worse experience across a range of issues, including safety, adjudications and use of force. A disability researcher had recently been appointed to develop support for young people who had suffered from head injuries.
- S27 Some foreign national young people with uncertain immigration status did not have an immigration lawyer. The work done by Barnardo's to secure specialist advice for a young person liable to deportation was impressive.
- S28 Faith provision was good. The chaplaincy was visible and accessible and delivered effective pastoral support.
- S29 Most of the responses to complaints that we read were satisfactory. Legal rights were explained to young people on induction and their key worker helped them to contact their legal representatives. Bail applications were made within the appropriate timescales.
- S30 Governance of health care was very good and working relationships between YOI - based staff and health care providers were effective. Young people had good access to GP services and a range of primary care services, including speech and language therapy and physiotherapy. Medicines management was good with evidence-based and age-appropriate prescribing. All young people were referred to the dentist and were seen within three weeks. Dental hygiene education was excellent. Health promotion and development using health trainers was imaginative.
- S31 An integrated pathway for mental health services encompassed learning disabilities, speech and language therapy and the new brain injury service. There was excellent access to therapeutic interventions, including services to address previous trauma and abuse. The level of need for these specialist services was high and about half the population used one of the services. Links with local secure mental health units were very good. All transfers in the previous year had been completed within two weeks.
- S32 Young people's views on the quality and quantity of food varied widely. We found both to be adequate with the exception of breakfast. Evening meals were served too early.

## Purposeful activity

- S33** *Time out of cell had reduced since the previous inspection and the opportunity for young people to exercise outside was far too limited. Young people continued to enjoy very high quality education and training and many made excellent progress. They were motivated to learn and behaved well in class. The standard of work in vocational training was good and some was outstanding. Access to the library and gym had improved. **Outcomes for children and young people were good against this healthy prison test.***



**S34** *At the last inspection in November 2012, we found that outcomes for children and young people at Hindley were good against this healthy prison test. We made eight recommendations about purposeful activity. At this follow-up inspection we found that five of the recommendations had been achieved, one had been partially achieved and two had not been achieved.*

**S35** Young people spent less time out of their cell than at the previous inspection. Establishment records indicated an average of between seven and eight hours a day unlocked for most. Young people on the lowest level of the rewards scheme spent only a maximum of 2 hours 15 minutes out of their cell at weekends, which was unacceptable. During our roll checks, 16% of young people were in their cell during activity periods. Some exercise periods lasted only 15 minutes.

**S36** There was a clear strategy for the management of learning and skills and performance management was robust. There were excellent partnerships between the education provider and the establishment. The management of education, learning and skills was good. Teaching, learning and coaching were good and sometimes outstanding. Challenging behaviour was managed well.

**S37** Initial assessments of young people's learning needs were good, and learning support was effective. The range of provision met young people's needs and gave them opportunities to progress.

**S38** Access to and the quality of careers information, advice and guidance were good.

**S39** In vocational training, tutors helped young people to develop their employability skills and the achievement of qualifications was good. Progress in English and mathematics was very good. In education and training, young people were given the opportunity to develop good personal and social skills such as team working and taking instructions.

**S40** All young people had timetabled access to the library. The library stock had been improved and was appropriate for the population.

**S41** PE facilities and equipment were of a good standard. Outside facilities were used effectively for team games but there were no links with the community to promote competitive sport. PE programmes were appropriate for the age group, with a strong focus on healthy living. Achievement on accredited courses was high. Attendance at PE was programmed for all young people but it was not well monitored.

## Resettlement

**S42** *The strategic management of resettlement was effective and sentence planning arrangements were thorough. Staff continued to promote the interests of looked-after children. The management of risk within public protection had improved and was now good. Opportunities for release on temporary licence were limited. The resettlement pathways continued to be well organised and progress had been made in most areas. More needed to be done to reinforce the pathway work on the wings.*  
**Outcomes for children and young people were good against this healthy prison test.**

*S43 At the last inspection in November 2012, we found that outcomes for children and young people at Hindley were good against this healthy prison test. We made three recommendations about resettlement. At this follow-up inspection we found that one of the recommendations had been achieved and two had not been achieved.*

S44 There was an up-to-date, comprehensive reducing reoffending delivery plan, based on an excellent needs analysis. Coordination between departments delivering resettlement services remained effective and good links with community agencies had been improved further by the secondment of youth offending service workers from local areas. Young people's risk and resettlement needs were quickly identified on arrival and there was an appropriate focus on preventing re-offending.

S45 The numbers of young people receiving release on temporary licence remained low.

S46 All young people had detailed training or remand management plans based on need and most young people in our survey said that they had been involved in the development of their plans and understood their targets. Training planning and remand management meetings were timely and the meeting that we observed was well managed and child focused. Training planning documentation had improved. Detailed pre-release plans were prepared for young people about to leave the establishment. Survey findings indicated that two-thirds of young people felt well supported by their key workers before release.

S47 Public protection cases were identified accurately on arrival and young people assessed as presenting a risk were subject to careful review. Restrictions on contact and the monitoring of young people's letters and telephone calls were managed proportionately. Assessments of young people who represented a risk to other children were comprehensive. The public protection arrangements had been improved by the development of links with community agencies, allowing young people vulnerable to exploitation and extreme radicalisation to be identified.

S48 There were excellent systems in place to identify young people with looked-after status. The work carried out by the establishment social workers to ensure that looked-after young people were properly reviewed and received their entitlements had improved. The new specialist nursing service for looked-after children provided continuity of care.

S49 Young people's accommodation needs continued to be identified early in their sentence. Sustained 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 previous 12 months without an address. More needed to be done to reinforce independent living skills on the wings.

S50 There were excellent links with community agencies which helped young people to move into education, training or employment on release.

S51 All young people were invited to attend a pre-release session delivered by a health trainer which encouraged links with health services in the community. Links with community mental health teams were effective and representatives were routinely invited to pre-release reviews.

S52 Resettlement work for young people with substance misuse problems was integrated effectively into all casework interventions. Contact with community agencies for young people from further afield was more difficult to arrange.

- S53 Young people received advice on managing their money and avoiding debt and support was available to young people with existing debts.
- S54 Less than half the young people said that they received one or more visits each week. The family forum was an excellent initiative.
- S55 Young people continued to have good access to a range of interventions and the evaluation of this work was developing well. The future of work with young people who had been convicted of a sexual offence was uncertain and needed to be resolved. The restorative justice work led by the chaplain was a positive initiative.

## Main concerns and recommendations

- S56 Concern: The regime and environment of the Sycamore Unit was poor. Behaviour management and re-integration planning required improvement. Some young people were held on the unit for long periods.

**Recommendation: The physical environment of Sycamore unit should be improved so that it provides a suitable place 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.**

- S57 Concern: Young people did not have the opportunity to take enough exercise in the fresh air every day and this impeded their healthy development.

**Recommendation: All young people should have an hour's exercise in the open air every day.** (Repeated main recommendation HP55)

- S58 Concern: The inquest into the self-inflicted death of Jake Hardy at Hindley in 2012, which concluded after this inspection, criticised the establishment for failing to support and protect him against the bullying that had been a significant factor in his death. Hindley now holds a large number of boys and young people whose behaviour is very challenging but who are also very vulnerable. Although some weaknesses remained, there had been real improvements in the support for victims and anti-bullying processes. Nevertheless, the number of reported bullying incidents, fights and assaults was higher than it had been at the last inspection and the intimidating shouting out of windows at night remained a problem. The establishment showed us a number of very concerning incidents that had been captured on CCTV. The development of the young adult side of the establishments created a danger that the management of the risks that were evident on the boys and young people's side would be de-prioritised.

**Recommendation:**

**a) The YJB should instigate an independent expert review of its policies and resources to prevent bullying and support victims across all YOIs that hold children and young people**

**b) NOMS should ensure that safety indicators at Hindley are very closely monitored, any adverse impact of developments on the site quickly identified and remedial action taken.**



# 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.**

- |            |  |
|------------|--|
| <b>1.1</b> | <i>Some young people remained in court too long before being transported to the young offender institution (YOI), and late arrivals were a problem. Young people shared vans with adult prisoners.</i> |
|------------|--|
- 1.2** Young people were still waiting in court for lengthy periods after their cases had been dealt with. During the inspection, a young person sentenced at 11.50am arrived at Hindley at 7.10pm after a two-hour journey. Another young person on crutches who had finished at court at 1pm left at 6.45pm with two prisoners who had to be dropped off at a police station. He arrived at Hindley at 9.20pm. Records indicated that in the previous six months one third of young people had arrived in reception after 7pm.
- 1.3** Young people often shared transport with adult prisoners and were usually dropped off last. During the inspection a van arrived with a young person and three adults on board and the escort staff said it was unusual to have been told to deliver a young person first. The vans were equipped with sliding doors to separate young people from adults but this did not prevent them from talking to each other. The van we looked at was reasonably clean, with less graffiti than we sometimes see. Food and water was available, although few young people said they were offered food during their journey. In our survey, 89% of young people said they felt safe on the vans, but in our discussion groups they said they had little interaction with escort staff.
- 1.4** Video link was sometimes used instead of a young person going to court, but there was scope to extend this. The establishment had recently joined a regional working group on increasing the use of videolink.

### Recommendations

- 1.5 Young people should not be held in court cells for unnecessarily long periods.** (Repeated recommendation 1.6)
- 1.6 Young people should not be transported with adult prisoners.** (Repeated recommendation 1.5)

## Early days in custody

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.7** *The new reception area was not child friendly enough. Staff were welcoming and sensitive to young people's needs and young people were no longer routinely strip-searched. First night arrangements were comprehensive. Although young people could spend a lot of time locked up during their first 48 hours, they were generally positive about their first days at Hindley and the induction process.*
- 1.8** A new reception facility was in use which was not particularly child friendly, but ensured that young people were kept separate from young adults on arrival. Work was under way to improve the environment. Holding rooms had televisions but no information about Hindley or reading material. The reception area was clean with enough private rooms for interviews. Staff were welcoming and approachable to young people and alert to their needs. In our survey, 73% of young people said they were treated well in reception against the comparator of 62%.
- 1.9** Young people had a private interview with a member of staff and health care screening was conducted in a properly equipped private room. Routine strip- searching no longer took place on admission or anywhere else in the establishment.
- 1.10** We saw young people moved fairly quickly to the first night unit (Juniper wing), although some young people in our discussion groups said they had spent lengthy periods in reception. First night procedures remained good and a detailed risk assessment management interview was carried out. Assessments were quality checked by managers. In the sample that we examined some immediate actions identified as necessary did not provide enough detail on what was required. Records indicated, and young people confirmed, that they could make a telephone call home the day they arrived and were offered another call the following day. £3 free pin-phone credit was added to their accounts and they were given a pack of grocery items to last until their first shop order. Microwave meals were available.
- 1.11** Cells on the first night unit Juniper were reasonably clean, but toilets were badly stained and required deep cleaning. Cells were prepared ready for a young person to move into with clean bedding and hygiene products. All first night cells had integral showers but not all had curtains and in some we saw small amounts of graffiti. A trained peer mentor who lived on Juniper unit was available to young people. Levels of initial observation were good and were enhanced for new arrivals whose background documentation had not yet arrived. Night staff on Juniper included dedicated first night officers.
- 1.12** Young people undergoing lengthy trials were accommodated on Juniper so that they had access to showers before and after their regular journeys to and from court. At the time of the inspection, arrangements had been made with the kitchen for one young person to have hot food available when he returned from court.

- I.13** Most young people spent 48 hours on Juniper before moving to one of the residential units. They received some induction while on Juniper but this depended on staff from relevant areas coming to them and young people could spend too much time locked up during these 48 hours. They then completed a comprehensive five-day induction programme in education. In our survey, 71% of young people said that induction told them all they needed to know against the comparator of 58% and 58% at the previous inspection.

## Recommendation

- I.14** **Young people should spend less time locked up during their first 48 hours at the establishment.**

## Housekeeping points

- I.15** Holding rooms in reception should contain more information and reading material for young people.
- I.16** Toilets in first night cells should be deep cleaned.

## 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.17** *There was a comprehensive safeguarding strategy and good links between the establishment and the local authority. Oversight of safeguarding had been strengthened, but there were some omissions in data collected and analysed. The procedure available for staff to raise safeguarding concerns worked effectively. Support plans were used for the most vulnerable young people, although some were too generic.*

- I.18** The establishment had an effective working relationship with the local safeguarding children board (LSCB). The safeguarding strategy was ratified by the LSCB following annual reviews. The head of safeguarding attended main meetings of the board and members of the safeguarding team attended subgroups of the LSCB. Staff could access online training provided by the local authority, although this was mainly used by managers and the safeguarding team. All staff working with young people were required to attend the National Offender Management Service Working with Young People training and were on target to complete the training by mid-2016.
- I.19** The multidisciplinary safeguarding team incorporated YOI staff and social workers. A procedure for staff to report safeguarding concerns had been implemented since the previous inspection and was working well. All reports were followed up by a member of the safeguarding team and signed off by safeguarding managers. The safeguarding team was alert to the risk of staff using this procedure instead of dealing with issues as they arose and they dealt with this appropriately. Another helpful change in work practice was the introduction

of one-to-one interviews of all young people who had not been in custody before. This session took place once induction was completed and helped to identify and resolve any particular difficulties this potentially vulnerable group of young people had (see section on victims of bullying and intimidation).

- I.20** Safeguarding meetings had been reorganised since the previous inspection. Violence reduction and suicide prevention had been merged into a well attended monthly safer custody meeting which had strengthened oversight of these areas and established a more holistic view of violence and vulnerability. However, data were not being used to identify longitudinal patterns and trends. A bimonthly safeguarding committee meeting attended by representatives of the local authority discussed safeguarding at a strategic level. Standing agenda items included suicide and self-harm and violence reduction, together with child protection, looked-after children, reception and first night in custody, restraint minimisation, public protection and staff training. Injuries sustained by young people recorded on F213 forms were not regularly discussed at either of these two meetings which was an omission, and reports of injuries to young people were not routinely copied to the safeguarding team.
- I.21** The weekly safer regimes meeting was a multidisciplinary forum attended by a range of YOI staff at which young people of particular concern were discussed and information was shared. Young people were discussed each week until the meeting was satisfied that their vulnerability had been properly addressed. Support intervention plans were produced for these young people and at the time of the inspection seven individuals were being helped in this way. The plans focused appropriately on the young person's needs but some of the follow-up actions identified were not specific enough.

## Recommendation

- I.22 All injuries to young people, including those that are unexplained, should be closely monitored by the safeguarding committee.** (Repeated recommendation I.22)

## Housekeeping points

- I.23** Data for safeguarding and safer custody meetings should be used to provide trend analysis.
- I.24** All F213 forms detailing injuries to young people should be examined by the safeguarding team.
- I.25** Support intervention plans should contain actions specific to the young person.

## Good practice

- I.26** *The one-to-one interview carried out with young people new to custody was a useful additional means of checking that individuals from a potentially vulnerable group were settling in and felt safe.*



## Child protection

### Expected outcomes:

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

- I.27** *Child protection referrals continued to be dealt with effectively and the local authority designated officer (LADO) was informed of all allegations against staff. The bimonthly child protection meeting effectively scrutinised all child protection referrals. Incidents of strip-searching under restraint had not been subject to external scrutiny by the local authority. Not all staff had their names clearly displayed.*
- I.28** The comprehensive child protection policy had been prepared in conjunction with the Wigan Safeguarding Children Board and updated in October 2013. The policy described the management of child protection allegations and the identification of potential areas of concern for young people in the establishment and their vulnerability to external exploitation, such as child trafficking. The establishment whistle-blowing policy produced in January 2014 appropriately covered the reporting of child protection concerns and the option of contacting the LADO. Family and friends visiting the establishment were given contact details to report concerns to the local authority; this option had not so far been used.
- I.29** The number of child protection referrals had decreased; there had been 22 referrals in the six months before the inspection, compared to 71 in a 10-month period in 2012. Sixteen of the recent referrals concerned allegations against a staff member, two of which related to restraint. The LADO had convened four strategy meetings, which had concluded that no further formal action would be taken against the members of staff. In three cases it had been agreed to determine if staff required further training to improve their performance. The LADO was satisfied that all appropriate cases were referred and that the establishment presented all available information for external scrutiny. The progress and outcomes of internal investigations of staff were shared with the LADO, who was satisfied that they were dealt with fairly and robustly.
- I.30** The child protection log was detailed and demonstrated effective communication with key people in and outside the establishment. A bimonthly child protection meeting had been established in May 2013 to examine child protection referrals and strategic and operational child protection issues. The meeting was well attended by establishment and local authority representatives. A child protection action plan ensured that actions were addressed. The LADO said that cases were now completed more quickly and there was greater transparency in the scrutiny of cases. At the meeting that we attended, there was detailed scrutiny of all child protection referrals and related matters.
- I.31** We found three incidents of strip-searching under restraint, a practice which should never be carried out on a child. One of these incidents had resulted in a child protection allegation which was referred to the LADO and a decision was made not to proceed with a detailed investigation. Despite the very serious nature of strip-searching under restraint and the potential for abuse, neither of the two other cases was referred for external investigation.
- I.32** Not all staff had their names clearly displayed so that they could be seen by young people. This situation needed to be rectified so that young people can identify all the staff who have contact with them.

## Recommendations

- I.33** Children in custody should never be subject to a strip-search under restraint. If this does take place, the case should always be referred to the local authority for external scrutiny.
- I.34** All members of staff who have contact with young people should have their names clearly displayed.

## 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.35** *Support for young people who had experienced or were at risk of victimisation had improved after sustained management attention. However, certain groups reported feeling relatively unsafe.*

**I.36** As indicated later in the report, there had been an increase in reported bullying since the previous inspection. Bullies were more often challenged directly. All young people were given a presentation on safer custody during induction and, as we have referred to earlier in the report, a private meeting was held with every young person in custody for the first time, where a questionnaire to assess their resilience was used. There was a 24-hour hotline for families to report concerns about bullying (see section on safeguarding and bullying, and violence reduction).

**I.37** Closer attention was now given to young people who missed meals or stayed in their cell at mealtimes. Staff spoke to the young person, and each instance was recorded. Support intervention plans were used for young people at risk of victimisation, although some daily entries were superficial (see section on suicide and self-harm prevention).

**I.38** In our survey, more young people who said they had a disability and young people who had been in local authority care said they had felt unsafe in the establishment than their peers.

## 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.39** *The level of self-harm had increased since the previous inspection. The assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) procedure had been improved, but flaws remained, particularly in care planning and in the level of observation and interaction recorded in the daily entries of members of staff.*

- I.40** There had been 164 self-harm incidents in the previous six months involving 37 young people. This was a rise from the previous inspection, when the population had been higher, from an average of 20 to 27 cases a month. Most incidents took the form of superficial cuts.
- I.41** The ACCT process was used appropriately: 88 ACCTs had been opened in the previous six months, following direct evidence of a risk of self-harm. Lessons had been learned from the Prisons & Probation Ombudsman's enquiry into a self-inflicted death in 2012 and progress had been made but this was an area that needed sustained attention. Continuity had been improved by the same case manager working with a young person, and good practice was disseminated at a monthly case managers' meeting. Risks and triggers for self-harm were recorded in all cases, but the quality of entries still fell short, particularly the objectives set in care maps, which were often generic. Support intervention plans (see section on victims of bullying) were used sparingly (five times in six months) but appropriately to support young people for whom residual risks remained after an ACCT had been closed. We observed a good handover to night staff of information about young people at risk.
- I.42** A local policy on supporting young people at risk of self-harm had been published and communicated to staff, but it was too long and difficult to absorb.

## Recommendation

- I.43** **Staff should be given training and support to fulfil all aspects of the ACCT procedure well.**

## 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.44** *The behaviour management strategy incorporated all relevant policies and encouraged staff to challenge poor behaviour and acknowledge good behaviour. Mediation was available to young people but staff were not trained in its use.*

- I.45** The behaviour management strategy incorporated all relevant policies. It emphasised an expectation of positive behaviour within a young person-centred culture and an environment of mutual respect. Managers encouraged positive relationships between staff and young people, complemented by effective staff supervision.
- I.46** Staff were encouraged to challenge poor behaviour using behaviour management tools such as the incentives and earned privileges scheme, minor reports and adjudications for a proportionate response to the behaviour displayed. Mediation was used to improve relationships between young people in conflict with each other, but staff were not trained in its use. There was no monitoring of mediation or of other aspects of behaviour management.

## Recommendations

- I.47 Staff undertaking mediation should be trained in its use.**
- I.48 All aspects of the behaviour management strategy, including 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.49** *The incentives and earned privileges rewards and sanctions scheme worked well in most respects, although the bronze (lowest) level was too punitive and was applied particularly rigidly in the separation unit.*

- I.50** There was a fair balance of young people on the three regime levels, with about a quarter on gold, a fifth on bronze and the remainder on silver. Young people were consulted regularly about the incentives scheme and, in our survey, 57% said they had been treated fairly in their experience of the rewards scheme and 62% that the levels made them change their behaviour against respective comparators of 44% and 46%. There were real incentives to reach the gold level, including better in-cell facilities, the prospect of a move to Juniper wing, a job in the staff canteen, and possibly release on temporary licence. Motivation was reinforced by good use of positive incentives, with good behaviour points contributing to tangible rewards. Weekly review boards were structured, with information from a range of departments, and the appeal procedure was clear to young people.
- I.51** The entitlements on bronze level were very limited and progression and targets for return to the silver (standard) level were often hampered by cursory and unimaginatively routine entries.
- I.52** The incentives scheme was applied differently in the two specialist units. In Willow, to meet the very variable needs of the young people located there, a flexible and responsive approach was adopted to incentivising positive behaviour and changes could be made on a daily basis. In the Sycamore unit rules were applied rigidly and staff tended to be slower at responding to changing circumstances.

## Recommendation

- I.53 The rewards and sanctions scheme should be applied flexibly and sensitively to boys in both Sycamore and Willow units.**

## 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.54** *Physical security was proportionate and good relationships between staff and young people supported dynamic security. There was an overall focus on safety and information exchange was good resulting in prompt action but investigations into credible threats needed to be more rigorous. The police did not support the YOI in following up assaults. We were concerned to find incidents of strip-searching under restraint. The number of adjudications had risen and records were not always complete, while the number of minor reports had reduced significantly.*
- I.55** There was a very high level of young people with mental health, substance abuse and other problems. Many of the young people subject to disciplinary procedures were vulnerable as well as challenging.
- I.56** Physical security was proportionate to the risks posed by the young people. The monthly security meeting was well attended: it focussed on the safety of young people in the context of threats and bullying and objectives reflected the intelligence received. Investigations needed to be more rigorous where credible intelligence suggested that bullying was a threat to the safety of an individual boy. Relationships between staff and young people were good and supported dynamic security. The safer custody and security departments met weekly to monitor incidents as they were reported. Over 1,500 intelligence reports had been received in the previous six months. Intelligence was analysed quickly and target searches were carried out swiftly.
- I.57** Free movement to activities was well supervised and young people were escorted to activities outside mass movement times. Young people were not unnecessarily restricted in their access to work or education activities.
- I.58** All cell and strip-searching was carried out on an intelligence and risk-led basis and monitored by the safeguarding team. We were concerned to find that not all incidents of strip-searching young people under restraint had been referred to the LADO for consideration (see section on child protection).
- I.59** The number of adjudications had increased since our last inspection from 562 to 602 per hundred young people over six months. The main charges were for damage, fighting, assaults and indiscipline. More serious charges were referred to the independent adjudicator. Referrals were also made to the police but the YOI did not receive enough support from the police, who rarely took forward prosecutions of young people involved in assaults on one another. Adjudications were carried out on the wings and in the segregation unit for young people resident there. The rooms used were suitable.
- I.60** Adjudication documentation was issued at least the day before the hearing. Young people were offered the assistance of an advocate during the hearing or could ask for one before the adjudication. Advocacy services were well embedded and young people we spoke to appreciated the support they were given.

- I.61** During the adjudications that we observed, young people were given the opportunity to put their point of view. The completed documentation that we reviewed showed that full account was taken of any mitigating circumstances. However, some records did not describe fully events leading up to the disciplinary charge, particularly when young people had pleaded guilty and may not have had the chance to explain their side of the story. Punishments were given in accordance with a published tariff; they appeared consistent and appropriate for this age group. Removal from unit was not used as a punishment.
- I.62** The number of minor reports used to deal with minor infringements of the rules had reduced significantly since our last inspection from 888 per 100 young people over six months, to 284 per 100 young people at the time of the inspection. Managers had focussed on encouraging staff to use the most appropriate disciplinary measures to deal with poor behaviour. The rewards and sanctions scheme functioned well and was being used by staff to deal with less serious infringements of the rules, where in the past they had resorted to using minor reports. Charges were laid and punishments awarded within current guidelines. Monitoring and quality assurance was not routinely carried out.
- I.63** Adjudication review meetings had been reintroduced after a gap of six months but it was too early for identification of trends or to establish why there had been a recent increase in the use of adjudications. Adjudication documents were quality checked by the deputy governor who raised any issues with adjudicating governors.

## Recommendations

- I.64** **Investigations should be determined and rigorous where credible intelligence suggests that bullying is a threat to the safety of an individual boy.**
- I.65** **The increase in adjudications should be reviewed to make sure they are used more proportionately and a strategy to reduce the level of use is put in place.**
- I.66** **All young people should be given the opportunity to explain fully their perspective of events relating to the charge, and investigations into allegations should be conducted thoroughly.**
- I.67** **NOMS should work with the establishment to ensure effective arrangements are in place with the local police for the investigation of allegations of serious offences committed by boys and young people in the establishment.**
- I.68** **Disciplinary procedures should be monitored to identify and act on any trends, and quality assurance of minor reports should be undertaken consistently.**

## 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.69** *Levels of violence and intimidation remained high, although much was being done to try and address these problems. Abuse shouted out of windows remained a particular problem. There were weaknesses in the analysis of data relating to bullying and violence reduction. Despite all this, most young people reported feeling safe.*

- I.70** The volume of reported bullying incidents had increased – at the last inspection there had been 199 in the previous six months compared with 251 at this inspection. Bullying intervention plans were used assiduously, and staff had been trained in their use, but entries in the plans were often brief and functional, with no information on the young person's state of mind or behaviour towards others (see section on victims of bullying and intimidation).
- I.71** The high level of fights and assaults at the previous inspection had increased from 28 to an average of 32 a month. (There was a significant spike in August 2013 when all the young people from the upper half of the site had been moved to the lower half.) Mediation was often used by officers after fights and altercations, which was positive.
- I.72** Supervision had been improved following an increase in violent incidents during movements. The locking off of association pods, so that young people were separated from those on other landings, also contributed to safety. Nevertheless, there was evidence that verbal aggression was at a particularly high level. In our survey, 17% said that other young people had made insulting remarks about them, their family or friends, against 9% in similar establishments and 8% at the previous inspection. Forty per cent against the comparator of 31% said that shouting through windows was a problem. During our night visits there was much shouting, which to a newcomer would feel aggressive. The safer custody meeting, which was well attended by a range of departments, had given considerable attention to this issue, but the problem remained and more needed to be done.
- I.73** A weekly multidisciplinary meeting was attended by education, security and other staff who discussed good quality information about individual young people, contributing to their safety. However, although the dynamics of safety were discussed thoroughly at different meetings, there was still no systematic, quantitative analysis of patterns and trends over time and management understanding of safety issues remained largely anecdotal.
- I.74** In 2013 there had been 73 reportable incidents, 46 of which were categorised as incidents at height. In an attempt to reduce the occurrence and limit the risks involved in these situations, an inflatable bag had been designed locally for use in these scenarios. Staff told us they thought this new procedure had been successful in reducing the number of incidents at height but the comparative data were not yet available to demonstrate this.

## Recommendations

- I.75** **Managers should take additional measures to ensure boys are not intimidated by the abuse shouted out of windows at night, if necessary, additional measures should include deploying extra staff after lock up to identify perpetrators and to stop this behaviour.**
- I.76** **Systematic, quantitative analysis of safety issues, including incidents, should be carried out from month to month and year to year, and planning to reduce the level of violence should be based on the learning from such analysis.**

## The use of force

### Expected outcomes:

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

**1.77** *Use of force involving full restraint had reduced significantly since our last inspection and we found good examples of de-escalation and the avoidance of full restraint by staff. Staff saw the introduction of minimising and managing physical restraint (MMPR) as positive, but it was too early to measure the impact on the use of restraint generally. Debriefs of young people were not always sufficiently detailed and they were not carried out by an independent person. Oversight of the use of force was excellent.*

**1.78** Although more young people in our survey than at the last inspection said they had been restrained, use of control and restraint had reduced and was significantly lower than in similar establishments. There had been 273 incidents of use of force between September 2013 and January 2014, when MMPR<sup>3</sup> had been introduced. Only 59 of these incidents had involved the use of full restraint. MMPR measures had been used 134 times since January 2014. It was too early to measure the impact of the introduction of MMPR, although staff told us they saw it as a positive move. Most incidents of the use of force were spontaneous when staff intervened in fights or assaults. Special accommodation was not used. The restraint minimisation strategy was clear and reflected Youth Justice Board and National Offender Management Service guidance on use of force.

**1.79** Documentation and recordings that we reviewed showed that force, particularly full use of control and restraint and MMPR, was generally used as a last resort. There was some good evidence of staff de-escalating situations and making every effort to avoid restraining young people. All young people were seen by a member of health care staff following use of force.

**1.80** Debriefs of young people that we examined often did not give a full account of the incident. Debriefs were carried out by the MMPR team, who were discipline staff, rather than by an independent person. Young people appeared confident in making complaints about use of force, either directly or with the assistance of advocates or other third parties. Complaints were investigated thoroughly and young people were kept safe following their complaint. All planned incidents had been recorded and CCTV coverage had been retrieved for many spontaneous incidents.

**1.81** All incidents of use of force were reviewed the following day by the MMPR team who viewed CCTV coverage. A weekly use of force meeting was attended by staff from departments concerned with safety and safeguarding. They discussed all incidents in detail and again viewed CCTV coverage and planned incident recordings. Use of force was further discussed at safer custody meetings and actions identified and followed up.

<sup>3</sup> In response to a recommendation made by the Independent Review of Restraint in Juvenile Secure Settings in 2008, the government commissioned the National Offender Management Service to develop a new restraint system for secure training centres and under-18 young offender institutions. The new restraint system, MMPR, aims to provide secure estate staff with the ability to recognise young people's behaviour, and use de-escalation and diversion strategies to minimise the use of restraint through application of behaviour management techniques. It sets out a number of physical restraint techniques. The use of physical restraint on a young person must always be viewed as the last available option. *Minimising and Managing Physical Restraint, Safeguarding Processes, Governance Arrangements, and Roles and Responsibilities. MOJ, NOMS, YJB*



## Recommendation

- I.82 Debriefs of young people following use of force should be carried out by an independent person.**

## 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.83** *Sycamore unit remained a poor environment. There was graffiti in cells and not all cells were clean. Most young people did not remain there for long and almost all returned to normal location. Relationships between staff and young people on the unit were good. The regime was poor and young people spent much of their time in their cells. Formal reintegration planning lacked foresight. Some multidisciplinary support was offered to very challenging young people but it lacked focus on how best to address their needs.*

- I.84** Sycamore unit remained a poor environment for young people who were separated. Most cells and communal areas were not clean and there was graffiti in cells and on the outside of cell doors. There was broken glass in the observation panels of two cell doors; one of the cells was occupied by a young person who was on an ACCT and who had attempted self-harm. The panels were not replaced until towards the end of the inspection.
- I.85** Six young people were resident on the unit at the time of our inspection, all of whom were separated for reasons of good order or discipline. Most of the 96 young people held in the unit during the previous six months had been held for good order. The average length of stay was just under 10 days, although 10 young people had been held for more than 20 days with the longest stay of 77 days. Almost all young people were reintegrated to mainstream residential units.
- I.86** All young people on the unit had been appropriately authorised for separation. Documentation showed that reviews took place according to individual need, sometimes within two or three days of a previous review. Reintegration planning lacked foresight and for many young people started too late. Most of the reintegration plans that we examined were akin to behaviour management plans. There was little formal reintegration such as the opportunity for young people to attend activities off Sycamore unit.
- I.87** Multidisciplinary meetings were held to discuss some of the most challenging young people, but adequate forward planning was lacking. In most cases, a transfer out of the establishment was recommended without identifying how to address the young person's complex needs.
- I.88** Targets set for young people on the unit were generally perfunctory and the regime was pre-printed on the initial segregation authorisation documents. One young person had been set a target to continue his current behaviour even though he had been arguing with other young people on the unit and shouting out of windows.
- I.89** The regime on the unit was poor and limited education opportunities were offered. The young people we spoke to said they spent a lot of time in their cells reading or sleeping. Young people were offered the opportunity to exercise, make telephone calls and have a shower every day.

- I.90** Young people said 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.91** Monitoring and review of segregation did not take place in sufficient detail at any meeting.

## Recommendation

- I.92 Use of separation should be analysed and monitored so that any identified issues or trends can be investigated and acted on.**

## Willow unit

**I.93** The Willow unit was a resource within the establishment to care for young people with complex needs. It achieved this successfully by providing care in a constructive, thoughtful and consistent way.

- I.94** There was strong, well-coordinated multidisciplinary support for the young people on Willow unit. Case reviews which we observed involved officers, a custodial manager, a dedicated teacher on the unit, a key worker, the mental health team leader, and a brain injury specialist nurse.
- I.95** Young people on the unit lost their association period on two evenings in the first week of the inspection, and staff acknowledged that this happened from time to time. This caused real difficulties to a vulnerable group of young people for whom predictable routines were important, but otherwise their regime was not unduly restricted.
- I.96** Despite the high levels of conflict and numerous incidents on the unit, it was clear that the young people located there were well looked after. Staff showed an interest in the welfare of the young people and they had a good understanding of their needs. We observed staff demonstrating appropriately tolerant and patient behaviour in the face of very challenging conduct by some young people.
- I.97** Work practices on the unit were psychologically informed and designed to help young people manage their emotions and behave appropriately. Among the strategies in active use were reintroducing young people to the main population by re-entering the induction process, spending short periods on association or in education classes to re-acustom them to mixing with larger numbers of their peers, and taking part in gym sessions with young people from other units. Whenever individual risk factors permitted, the young people in Willow joined in the mainstream education sessions as a matter of routine.

## 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.98** *Clinical drug treatment, integrated case management and interventions were all of a high quality, delivered to a population of young people with significantly higher levels of need than in most YOIs. The substance misuse awareness programme, delivered to all young people during induction, was less effective. Evidence pointed to low levels of drugs availability in the establishment despite young people's perception in our survey that it was significantly higher than the comparator.*
- I.99** Young people were appropriately assessed by primary health nurses on arrival using the comprehensive health assessment tool (CHAT). Those with clinical and/or specialist psychosocial needs were referred to the specialist substance use nurse, whose caseload stood at 18. No young people were receiving opiate substitution treatment at the time of the inspection. The establishment was, however, equipped to handle complex detoxification needs.
- I.100** Sixty-one per cent of the population were assessed as having medium levels of need, requiring targeted substance misuse interventions. This was a higher percentage than we find in most YOIs. These young people were cared for by case managers with specific drugs training. An appropriately holistic approach was taken to this group of young people, combining offending behaviour work with basic drugs education, targeted drugs interventions and resettlement work.
- I.101** Electronic record keeping was divided between SystmOne for clinical records and eAsset for case management records. This caused some problems for information sharing as staff did not always have ready access to one or the other system. Verbal communication, on the other hand, was good. This occurred both informally and formally when care was coordinated through weekly multidisciplinary meetings.
- I.102** A universal substance misuse awareness programme was delivered to all young people during induction. Some young people we spoke to said they found it too much to take in during induction.
- I.103** Key workers could refer young people to a range of more in-depth awareness groups delivered by a competent team of facilitators from Manchester College. Waiting lists were long for the two most popular groups on cannabis and harm reduction. Allocation was determined by risk and discharge date, but some young people waited up to two months for a course.
- I.104** The substance misuse clinical lead attended the weekly mental health meeting where care for young people with dual diagnoses was discussed.
- I.105** In our survey, 24% of young people said it was easy or very easy to get drugs against the comparator of 14%. In our discussions with young people, opinions were divided on the extent of drugs availability. However, there had been only one mandatory drug testing (MDT) random positive in the previous six months and the numbers of drug-related information reports and drug finds were very low.

**I.106** The MDT suite had been improved following the previous inspection and was clean, tidy and appropriately equipped. There was a little slippage of suspicion testing and weekend random testing due to staff redeployment.

### **Recommendations**

**I.107** A review should be conducted to determine the effectiveness of delivering the substance misuse awareness programme during induction to ensure the optimum uptake of information.

**I.108** MDT should be adequately resourced to cover suspicion and weekend testing.

## 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** *Although efforts had been made to soften the environment with murals and posters, most accommodation was austere and institutional and some was particularly shabby. Some toilets had no lids and smelt unclean and young people had to eat and sleep in close proximity to them. There was some offensive graffiti in cells in Willow and Sycamore units, but relatively little on other wings. Applications were dealt with fairly.*
- 2.2** Although some effort had been made to soften the environment with murals and posters, most accommodation was austere and institutional. Most cells were cramped. Some toilets smelt unclean with an excessive build up of lime scale and had no lids. There was inadequate screening of toilets in some cells and young people had to eat and sleep in close proximity to them. Communal showers were cleaned every day and given a monthly industrial clean. However, some were poorly ventilated, damp and mouldy.
- 2.3** The worst accommodation in Willow and Sycamore units was particularly shabby. The best accommodation was on Juniper wing with cells about twice the size which had integral shower/sanitary units. This wing had a brighter feel. One young person described it as being more homely.
- 2.4** We saw some cells with no curtain and many did not have a lockable cupboard. We saw a number with broken observation panels containing shards of glass, including one in Sycamore unit which was accommodating a young person on an ACCT (see section on separation/removal from normal accommodation). During the inspection empty cells were being given a deep clean. Many young people told us that initially they were placed in dirty cells. One young person told us he was placed in a cell which had been smashed up by the previous occupant. As a result, the window would not close and he had had to stuff the gaps with damp toilet paper to reduce the draught.
- 2.5** There was offensive graffiti in cells in Willow and Sycamore units, but relatively little on other wings, where young people reported strong management of the issue. We did not see any offensive material on display.
- 2.6** There was a great deal of litter in the exercise yards and much of it appeared to have been there for some time.
- 2.7** Young people told us that cleaning materials were readily available. Some complained they were not given enough time to keep themselves and their cells clean, because of delays in the regime (see section on time out of cell). All bedding was changed regularly. There was good access to laundry facilities but a drier was not working on A wing and laundered clothing awaiting collection there was damp and smelt unaired.

- 2.8** The quality of YOI-issue clothing was reasonably good and there were weekly kit changes. Only young people on the enhanced level of the rewards and sanctions scheme could wear their own clothes and only during association. These restrictions were also applied to young people on remand.
- 2.9** Although we were told that managers regularly monitored response rates to cell bells, only 33% of young people in our survey said they were answered within five minutes.
- 2.10** Most young people were very positive about their access to applications and the responses they received. In our survey, 82% said applications were dealt with fairly against the comparator of 65%.
- 2.11** Consultation arrangements were reasonable and the monthly Voices in Prison showed purposeful engagement with young people. We were informed by Barnardo's staff that meetings were constructive and they commented favourably on the work of Voices in Prison representatives between meetings.

## Recommendations

- 2.12 Showers should be kept free of mould.**
- 2.13 Empty cells should be kept clean and equipped ready for occupation.**
- 2.14 All living accommodation should be free of graffiti.**
- 2.15 Young people should not be accommodated in cells with smashed observation panels; smashed panels should be repaired promptly.**
- 2.16 All young people should have the opportunity to wear their own clothes.**  
(Repeated recommendation 2.12)

## Housekeeping points

- 2.17** All cells should have curtains.
- 2.18** Exercise yards should be kept clean and free of litter.

## 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.**

- 2.19** *Most young people were positive about their relationships with staff and we observed appropriate interactions taking place consistently during the inspection. Personal officer work was not fully recorded in electronic case notes, but in our survey young people were more positive about the help they received from personal officers than at comparator establishments.*

- 2.20** In our survey, 76% of young people said that most staff treated them with respect against the comparator of 67%. This positive finding was reflected in what young people told us during the inspection and in our observations. During the previous inspection, we had received persistent comments from young people that a few staff made abusive comments to them. On this occasion we received no such reports.
- 2.21** The interactions between staff and young people that we observed were appropriate. Staff used first names to address young people and appeared to know their backgrounds and histories. Staff generally identified and challenged poor behaviour.
- 2.22** All young people were allocated a personal officer. In our survey, 81% of young people said they felt their personal officer tried to help them against the comparator of 66%. Despite management checks, the quality of personal officer entries in electronic case notes varied, and some did not reflect the good quality personal officer work that was taking place. Some recorded targets were common to several young people, for example '*to keep himself and his room clean and tidy at all times*' and '*to remain negative comment, minor and governor report free*'. It was not clear to young people how their targets would help them progress through the rewards and sanctions scheme or what help they would need to achieve them.
- 2.23** The monthly progress report sent by personal officers to parents/carers was an effective way of keeping them informed of their child's progress and behaviour. In our groups most young people said they had someone they could go to with a problem and key workers were mentioned most often as a source of support. Entries in case notes from staff across a range of disciplines painted a picture of young people's progress.

### Housekeeping point

- 2.24** All personal officers should make at least one entry a week in electronic case notes describing their interaction with the young person.

### Good practice

- 2.25** *The routine monthly contact personal officers made with families was an effective way of helping to motivate young people to spend their time constructively as well as keeping relatives up to date with how the young person was.*

## 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.**

**2.26** *The management of equality and diversity was weak. Equality meetings were poorly attended and not sufficiently purposeful. There were no longer any forums for protected groups. Young people from a black and minority ethnic background reported a broadly comparable experience to young people in other groups. Young people with disabilities reported a significantly worse experience across a range of issues. Some foreign national young people whose immigration status was uncertain did not have an immigration solicitor, but there had been some good work to provide one foreign national with free advice.*

### Strategic management

- 2.27** There was a comprehensive equality policy which covered all protected characteristics. However, some sections on the management of diversity were out of date. An equality action team met monthly. An external equality partner no longer attended the meeting. There was some evidence of actions being repeatedly carried over to ensuing meetings. Meetings were poorly attended by staff and although boys were invited, they rarely attended or were consulted in other ways.
- 2.28** The establishment had been monitoring the treatment of young people through SMART (systematic monitoring and analysis of race equality treatment), but only by race and ethnicity. A new comprehensive monitoring system was being implemented at the time of the inspection. When SMART data suggested unequal treatment, further investigations were carried out but not always in a timely or effective way. For example, monitoring showed that black and minority ethnic young offenders had consistently received fewer approved ROTL (release on temporary licence) days throughout 2013. An investigation had been requested in April 2013, but the initial response was inadequate and further investigations had still not been completed by the time of the inspection.
- 2.29** There was a full-time equality adviser and equality officer, although the latter was often redeployed to other duties. The equality officer went through an equality questionnaire with all young people during induction and carried out day-to-day liaison with young people from minority groups. Information about equality was displayed on notice boards around the establishment, including photographs of young people appointed as diversity representatives.
- 2.30** Since our last inspection, focus groups for young people from different minority groups had fallen into abeyance. The equality officer had attended two general consultation meetings but there had been no discussion on equality in one and very little in the other.
- 2.31** Most discrimination incident report forms (DIRFs) submitted in 2013 related to race equality. It was not always clear from documentation how thoroughly complaints had been investigated, but most appeared to have been handled adequately with appropriate follow-up action. Completed DIRFs were no longer subject to external scrutiny and quality checking of



responses by a senior manager was no longer operating. At the time of the inspection, six of the last 15 DIRF responses were overdue.

- 2.32** Staff were required to undertake a basic Civil Service e-learning equality training session which was inadequate for the complex problems they faced.

## Diverse needs

- 2.33** Black and minority ethnic young people comprised 20% of the population and Muslims 15%. In our survey, both groups reported a similar experience to others in the establishment across a wide range of issues, including discipline. Although both groups reported significantly worse access to telephones and showers, young people we spoke to did not feel discriminated against in this respect. There was an efficient system for identifying young people who had exhibited racist behaviour, or had committed racially aggravated offences.
- 2.34** Seven young people in our survey sample said they were from a Gypsy/Roma/Traveller background, while establishment data recorded just two. One Romany young person described to us the need for a discrete understanding of and approach to this group which he felt was undermined by the lack of a dedicated equality representative, forum and support from external specialist organisations.
- 2.35** Young people with a disability reported worse treatment in our survey across a wide range of issues. For example, only 8% said they were on the enhanced level of the rewards and sanctions scheme compared with 32% of young people without a disability. Our survey also suggested that young people with a disability were significantly more likely to have been subject to formal disciplinary procedures and to have been physically restrained (81% and 54% against respective comparators of 57% and 30% for young people who did not have a disability).
- 2.36** We spoke to two young people who believed they were more likely to be subject to disciplinary procedures because of their disabilities. One described emotional and anger management problems arising from a head injury. He felt that wing staff misunderstood him and failed to take account of the cause of his behaviour. He was on a waiting list to see a researcher from The Disabilities Trust Foundation who had recently begun working with young people who had suffered a brain injury. In the first three months of the project, she had received 36 referrals. We saw an impressive guidance note the researcher had prepared explaining how wing staff should support a young person with behavioural problems arising from a head injury.
- 2.37** There was evidence that many young people had mental health and emotional problems which affected their behaviour. Young people were well cared for by mental health care professionals. However, other than guidance from the new brain injury service, there was no systematic sharing of information or shared care plans with wing staff. They were ill equipped to support young people with behavioural difficulties and to avoid discriminating against young people with disabilities.
- 2.38** Personal emergency evacuation plans were kept on notice boards in wing offices. Day and night staff we spoke to knew who these young people were and what assistance they would need in an emergency.
- 2.39** No young people had identified themselves as gay or bisexual in the previous year. Posters were displayed around the establishment to combat homophobia and raise awareness of support available. Staff had attended Manchester Pride 2013 on a float decorated by young people and art staff.

- 2.40** Eight foreign national young people were held under sentence at the time of the inspection, a number of whom were liable for deportation. Staff could not recall any young people held under immigration powers but told us it had happened in the past. The entitlement of children to legal aid for most immigration advice had been abolished since the previous inspection. We spoke to two young people who did not have legal representation and Barnardo's advocates described young people in this situation being confused, anxious, in panic, or in denial about their immigration status. We were impressed by Barnardo's work in a recent case when a young person had secured representation funded by the local authority. This work could be built on for all unrepresented young people.

## Recommendations

- 2.41** The impact of the regime on all minority groups should be monitored, and prompt, effective action should be taken to investigate and address potential inequality.
- 2.42** Regular support and consultation meetings should be held with different minority groups, in partnership with external support organisations as appropriate.
- 2.43** DIRF responses should be quality checked internally and by an external equality partner.
- 2.44** The establishment should keep staff equality training needs under review and deliver training to meet those needs.
- 2.45** Wider use should be made of guidance notes, to assist wing staff when dealing with young people whose disabilities affected their behaviour.
- 2.46** The establishment should work with Barnardo's to ensure that all young people with uncertain immigration status have access to independent specialist legal advice.

## Housekeeping point

- 2.47** Representatives of all relevant departments should consistently attend equality action team meetings.

## 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.**

- 2.48** *Faith provision was good. The chaplaincy was well integrated into the establishment and delivered good pastoral support. The facilities for worship were also good.*

- 2.49** In our survey, 58% of young people said that their religious beliefs were respected. Black and minority ethnic and Muslim young offenders reported particularly favourably, with 93% and 95% respectively saying that their religious beliefs were respected.
- 2.50** The chaplaincy was well integrated into the establishment and chaplains attended key meetings, such as equality, security and safer custody. The managing chaplain took the lead on restorative justice initiatives and had developed the bespoke restorative justice intervention, Time 4 Change, with community youth offending team partners and volunteers (see section on attitudes, thinking and behaviour).
- 2.51** The Christian chapel was ideal for services and contained a number of easy chairs for chaplains to talk informally to young people. The multi-faith room was used primarily by Muslim young people and displayed paintings celebrating the Muslim faith. There were washing facilities for use in preparation for prayers. Corporate worship was accessible to all young people, including those on Willow and Sycamore units, and a member of the chaplaincy visited these units each day. A wide range of religious courses and classes were offered.
- 2.52** Pastoral support was good. All young people were visited by a chaplain within 24 hours of their arrival and advised of the services offered by the chaplaincy. The team often attended ACCT (assessment, care in custody and teamwork) reviews and chaplaincy staff were regularly engaged in work with young people and their families.

## 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.**

**2.53** *Responses to complaints were generally satisfactory, although quality checking needed improvement.*

- 2.54** In our survey, 56% of young people who had made a complaint said complaints were sorted out fairly and 51% that they were sorted out quickly, against respective comparators of 34% and 31%.
- 2.55** Barnardo's advocates helped young people with complaints when they needed assistance and were generally satisfied with the fairness of the process. In the sample of complaints that we examined, most responses were satisfactory, polite and easy to understand and suitable remedies were offered where appropriate. However, not all responses addressed the issues and not all were sufficiently courteous.
- 2.56** The complaints clerk completed a quality checklist form for each response identifying concerns, but these were not sent to the responding officer. A sample of responses was quality checked by senior managers, but the sample was not taken specifically from cases where the clerk had identified concerns.

## Recommendation

- 2.57** Any concern about the quality of a complaint response should be communicated to the author of the response. The sample checked by senior managers should include responses for which concerns have been identified.

## Legal rights

### Expected outcomes:

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

**2.58** *Their legal rights were explained to young people on induction and licence conditions were clarified before release. Young people were helped by their key worker or personal officer to contact their legal representatives, and were allowed to make free telephone calls. There were proper systems to ensure that young people understood their sentence. Bail applications were made within the appropriate timescales.*

- 2.59** Key workers explained young people's rights to them on induction and young people told us that they understood the nature of their sentence and how they could contact a legal adviser. Licence conditions were recorded on final reports and we observed the conditions being explained clearly to a young person just before his release.
- 2.60** Young people continued to have good access to their legal advisers. They were given credit to telephone their solicitor or access to make a confidential call to a legal adviser by arrangement with their key worker or personal officer. The facilities for confidential legal meetings were adequate.
- 2.61** Remanded young people were allocated a key worker promptly and bail applications were arranged within the appropriate timescales.
- 2.62** The nature of their sentences and critical dates were explained to young people, including a possible release date. Young people serving detention and training orders were given comprehensive information about early and late release arrangements and signed a document to confirm their understanding of the possibility of late release. Applications for early or late release were detailed and appropriately considered by senior managers. There had been no late releases in the previous six months.

## 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.**

**2.63** *Health care provision was excellent with effective governance and mature relationships between YOI and health care staff. Young people could see nurses and the GP easily and dental care was excellent. Speech and language therapy, learning disability and looked-after children services supported young people with complex needs. Medicines management was age appropriate. Health promotion included imaginative preparation for release and parenting skills. The mental health pathway provided a helpful range of therapeutic interventions, including psychology and counselling.*

### Governance arrangements

- 2.64** Health care was commissioned by NHS England. Primary health care was provided by Bridgewater Community Healthcare Trust and mental health care by Greater Manchester West Mental Health Trust. There was mature and effective partnership working between YOI, health providers and commissioners, who held regular informal meetings. The reframed partnership board did not include the provider. The newly appointed head of health care was a registered learning disabilities nurse. The draft health needs assessment described current services but did not include a population needs analysis.
- 2.65** The main health care suite was modern and comparable with a community GP practice. The Kings Fund had provided funding for the waiting area to be refurbished with bright colours and a low reception desk. The new design of the waiting room had led to a dramatic reduction in the number of violent incidents taking place there.
- 2.66** An appropriate range of health care meetings took place, including clinical needs, governance and medicines management. Health care professionals were well embedded in wider establishment meetings resulting in excellent joint working between health and discipline staff which was let down only by a lack of systematic information sharing (see section on diverse needs).
- 2.67** The use of young people's focus groups to understand their concerns about health provided useful pointers for quality assurance. A discharge questionnaire provided a further opportunity for young people to give feedback on their experience of services.
- 2.68** Staff training was appropriate, up to date and encompassed young people's needs. Staff were supervised properly.
- 2.69** An appropriate range of health policies included safeguarding, blood-borne viruses, infection control and emergency response. The detailed sexual health guidance focused appropriately on the specific needs of young people.
- 2.70** Young people were asked if they consented to the sharing of information and verbal or written consent was recorded.
- 2.71** Health care staff always introduced themselves to young people but not all staff wore name badges (see section on child protection).

- 2.72** Safeguarding arrangements were excellent and health care staff were trained to identify safeguarding issues and escalate concerns.
- 2.73** Health promotion and education was creative and supportive; health trainers were used to help young people develop parenting skills and to access health services on release.
- 2.74** An effective childhood and blood-borne virus immunisation schedule encouraged young people to protect themselves. Young people were able to request condoms from the visiting sexual health service.
- 2.75** There was an emergency response and ambulance access protocol and staff confirmed that there had been no significant delays in ambulances entering the establishment.
- 2.76** Resuscitation kits were kept in the main health care suite and the treatment room on C/D wing. Automated defibrillators were kept in wing offices and the main suite. Kits were untidy, with some items missing, and recorded checks were inadequate. Eleven per cent of staff in contact with young people had received up-to-date training in first aid.

## Recommendations

- 2.77** **A health needs assessment should be carried out to identify the current and future needs of the population and to inform the provision of services.**
- 2.78** **Resuscitation kits should be in good order and should contain items appropriate to young people. Regular recorded checks should be carried out. All YOI staff should have up-to-date resuscitation skills, including use of the defibrillator.**

## Good practice

- 2.79** *The development of young people's parenting skills supported their rehabilitation and life skills.*

## Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.80** In our survey, significantly more young people than at comparator YOIs said that access to health professionals and the quality of health care services were good. Most young people we spoke to said they felt cared for by health care staff and that staff were approachable.
- 2.81** All young people were seen on arrival by a nurse for completion of an initial risk assessment followed by a comprehensive health assessment (CHAT tool) the following day on the induction wing. Assessments that we observed were respectful. An information leaflet was provided and young people with learning difficulties were given a simple version with picture icons.
- 2.82** Young people were able to see a nurse every day on the wing. The clinic timetable allowed routine appointments with the GP four days a week but in practice young people were able to see the GP six days a week on request or if their need was deemed urgent. We observed the GP seeing one young person outside the scheduled sessions to check his progress with medication changes.
- 2.83** An age-appropriate range of primary care services included physiotherapy. Overall waiting times were reasonable.

- 2.84** An integrated pathway for young people with a learning disability facilitated early identification and assessment using the specialised CHAT 5 as the key assessment tool. Specialist learning disability nurses and a speech and language therapist provided a responsive service, although the wait for new routine speech and language therapy referrals was 20 weeks at the time of our inspection. There were excellent working relationships with the mental health team.
- 2.85** A new brain injury service delivered by the Brain Injury Research Trust identified young people with brain injuries and provided care and advice to young people and staff.
- 2.86** A designated looked-after children's nurse identified a named nurse for each looked-after child and ensured continuity of care by identifying previous history and health care needs.
- 2.87** Out-of-hours emergencies were covered by the 24-hour nurse service and the local community out-of-hours' GP service which gave telephone advice to nurses or visited as appropriate. Young people who needed to go to hospital were referred appropriately.
- 2.88** SystmOne clinical records were complete and contained care plans for young people with complex needs. Health care professionals used the electronic task system effectively to ensure timely communication; blood tests were received electronically and reviewed regularly by the GP.
- 2.89** External hospital appointments were rarely cancelled and the decision to change an appointment was always made by a clinician.

## Recommendation

- 2.90** **Young people should have timely access to speech and language therapy.**

## Good practice

- 2.91** *The new brain injury service provided young people and staff with essential support to manage problems arising from brain injuries.*
- 2.92** *A designated looked-after children's nurse with effective links to local authorities and youth offending teams ensured excellent continuity of health care for this vulnerable group of young people.*

## Pharmacy

- 2.93** Pharmacy services were supplied from HMP Garth complemented by a full-time pharmacy technician.
- 2.94** The main pharmacy room was small and was used temporarily for the administration of medicines; medicines were stored in the treatment room on C/D wing which was the only location used for the administration of controlled drugs. Medicines were administered three times a day from both rooms. Administration from the pharmacy room was disrupted by movements along the corridor, which were noisy and poorly supervised by officers.
- 2.95** A comprehensive in-possession risk assessment was completed and reviewed when a new prescription was raised. An agreed formulary included over-the-counter medicines. Prescribing was age appropriate. A few young people with attention hyperactivity deficit

disorder were prescribed melatonin to help them sleep; this was monitored and supervised by the psychiatrist.

- 2.96** Controlled drugs were stored in appropriate cabinets with restricted circulation of keys which were kept in a fixed key safe in the pharmacy. All medicines were regularly date checked and were stored in lockable metal cupboards and trolleys. There were no locked cupboards for medicine storage in young people's cells.
- 2.97** There were no pharmacy led clinics and limited medicine use reviews.

## Recommendations

- 2.98** **Locked cupboards for prescribed medicines should be provided in all cells.**
- 2.99** **There should be pharmacy led clinics and regular medicine use reviews.**

## Dentistry

- 2.100** A range of NHS dental treatment equivalent to community services was available to young people.
- 2.101** All young people were referred to the dentist on arrival. If they failed to attend the appointment for a legitimate reason, they were given a further appointment. The facility for YOI officers to make a direct referral to the dentist for young people with an acute dental problem was commendable.
- 2.102** Young people were advised by the dental hygienist before seeing the dentist. Creative visual aids helped to promote oral health.
- 2.103** There were short waits for routine appointments. The dental suite was spacious and compliant with national infection control requirements.

## Good practice

- 2.104** *All young people were referred to the dentist. Dental and oral hygiene education supported a population with very poor dental and oral health.*

## Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.105** An integrated mental health pathway provided a wide range of interventions, including counselling, psychology, nursing psychiatry and art therapy.
- 2.106** All young people were assessed using the CHAT 4 (mental health) tool which triggered further assessment and intervention. The transfer of the CHAT assessment to an electronic template had resulted in some masking of risks, including self-harm.
- 2.107** Referrals could be made by young people and any member of staff. Referrals were allocated at a clinical team meeting and young people were seen within 72 hours. A high proportion of the population used these services. About half the young people in the establishment were in contact with a mental health professional, including some with complex and challenging problems. Young people told us they felt well cared for by mental health professionals.



- 2.108** Specialist prescribing was initiated and monitored by the psychiatrist, and young people on specialist psychiatric medicines were monitored appropriately.
- 2.109** There were good links with local secure hospitals and the five transfers that had taken place during the previous year had been completed within two weeks.

## Recommendation

- 2.110** **Urgent attention should be given to ensuring that the electronic CHAT tool accurately reflects any risks identified in the printed version.**

## 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.**

**2.111** *Young people's views on the quality and quantity of food varied widely. We felt that the quality and quantity were adequate with the exception of breakfast. Lunch was not eaten communally and evening meals were served too early.*

- 2.112** In our survey, only 16% of young people said the food was good or very good. In our discussion groups and at the monthly Voices in Prison meetings, young people's opinions varied widely. The establishment carried out a food survey twice a year using an age-appropriate survey form.
- 2.113** The four-week menu cycle provided five choices at lunch and dinner which met dietary needs ranging from Halal to vegetarian and vegan. A 'sporting' option (healthy choice) was offered. Monthly themed evenings included appropriate menus.
- 2.114** Cooked breakfasts were no longer provided and breakfast packs were distributed each morning. Young people ate their lunch in their cells. The evening meal was served too early at 4.30pm on weekdays and 4.45pm at weekends.
- 2.115** Food was divided into portions in the kitchen which was an innovative way of reducing bullying. The food that we sampled was tasty with adequate portion sizes.
- 2.116** Wing serveries were kept clean. The kitchen was clean and in good order. Up to five young people working in the kitchen could achieve an OCN level 2 certificate.

## Recommendations

- 2.117** **Young people should be able to eat their lunch communally.**
- 2.118** **The evening meal should be served between 5 and 6.30pm.** (Repeated recommendation 2.87)

## 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.**

**2.119** *Young people received a reception pack or could buy items from wing shops on arrival. First canteen orders could take up to 12 days to be delivered.*

**2.120** Young people were offered a pack of canteen goods at reception, or they could buy a few items from wing-based shops. They could wait up to seven days before placing an initial order and fulfilment could take up to 12 days. Young people could select goods from the wing shop in exchange for credit points earned during the week, although access and stock levels varied between wings. Canteen was discussed at the monthly Voices in Prison meetings, which were attended by two young people representatives from each wing.

### Recommendation

**2.121** **Young people should be able to order items from the YOI shop within 24 hours of their arrival at the establishment.** (Repeated recommendation 2.93)

## Section 3. Purposeful activity

### Time out of cell

#### Expected outcomes:

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

**3.1** *Since the introduction of the new core day in April 2013, young people had spent less time out of their cell. During the checks that we carried out, approximately 16% of young people were in their cell during activity periods. All were properly accounted for. The limited outdoor exercise available to young people was unacceptable.*

**3.2** Since the introduction of the core day in April 2013, the scheduled time that young people had to spend out of their cells had reduced from over 10 hours to 9 hours 45 minutes on weekdays for young people on the gold and silver levels of the rewards and sanctions scheme. Young people on the bronze level had 8 hours 15 minutes. This reduced further at weekends to 8 hours 15 minutes (gold and silver) and 2 hours 15 minutes (bronze), which was unacceptable. Young people on the Sycamore unit continued to be locked up for longer periods than other units.

**3.3** Establishment records showed that during the six months before the inspection, the average time young people spent out of their cells was between seven and eight hours a day. The data that we examined did not reflect accurately the time young people spent out of their cells, for example the delays in getting young people to activities and appointments which we observed during the inspection were not recorded.

**3.4** The roll checks that we carried out showed that approximately 16% of young people were still in their cells because they had refused to attend the activity, were unwell, or waiting for an appointment, an adjudication or mediation.

**3.5** In our survey, 84% of young people said they could have association every day against the comparator of 70%. However, only 62% of young people who had a disability said that they had association every day against 88% who did not have a disability. Many young people said that the association areas were too cramped and did not provide enough activities and we agreed with this.

**3.6** In our survey, only 45% of young people said that they could go outside for exercise each day against the comparator of 59%. Young people told us that they did not get the full 30 minutes allotted for exercise and we observed some sessions of less than 15 minutes so that some young people could be kept apart.

### Recommendation

**3.7 All young people should spend a minimum of 10 hours every day out of their cell.**  
(Repeated recommendation 3.6)

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

## Housekeeping point

- 3.8** The establishment should investigate why fewer young people with a disability say that they have association every day.

## Education, learning and skills

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

### Expected outcomes:

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

**3.9** *There was a clear strategic direction for the development of education, learning and skills. Quality improvement arrangements were now good. Excellent partnerships were in place and the operational management of education and training was good. The self-assessment process was used effectively for improvement. The analysis and management of data informed improvement activities. Support for young people with complex learning needs was excellent. The range and variety of provision met the needs of young people well. The quality of teaching, learning and coaching was good and some was outstanding. There was effective management of poor behaviour which helped to maintain a productive learning environment. Target setting in individual learning plans needed improvement and the sequencing of activities needed better co-ordination. The standard of young people's work was good. The library was well run and well attended. Achievement of accredited qualifications in physical education was good.*

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

*Overall effectiveness of learning and skills and work : **Good***

*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***

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

## Management of education and learning and skills

- 3.11** There was clear strategic direction for the development of education, learning and skills. Arrangements for quality improvement were now good. Good use was made of observations of teaching and learning to manage staff performance robustly. There was a strong focus on improving teaching, learning and assessment and good systems to support and develop staff. The education provider and establishment had an excellent partnership which benefited learners and drove improvement. Joint initiatives enabled the establishment to secure additional funding to develop the provision. Young people were punctual to classes and attendance was good. Movement between classes was calm and efficiently organised. On a few occasions activities needed better co-ordination to minimise disruption to learning.
- 3.12** The operational management of education and learning and skills by the Manchester College was good. Changes to the curriculum and staffing structure during the recent re-role of the establishment had caused little disruption to learning. Staff morale was high; they had high expectations of young people and encouraged them to progress. The self-assessment process was well developed, understood by staff and used as an effective tool to drive improvement. The effective use of data to support judgements and identify areas of under-performance facilitated good improvement planning.

## Recommendation

- 3.13** **The sequence and timing of courses should not interrupt other learning activities.**

## Provision of activities

- 3.14** Induction to education, learning and skills was thorough and well managed. Initial assessment of young people effectively identified their learning support needs. Specialist learning support for young people was excellent. The special educational needs coordinator provided guidance on how to support young people with complex needs, which was shared as appropriate with other departments. Links with the local authority helped to obtain information on the previous attainment and wider support needs of young people. Career guidance was good and focused on the young person's longer-term resettlement objectives. Allocation to activities was fair, appropriate and timely.
- 3.15** There were sufficient activity places for the population. The variety of provision met the needs of young people and provided opportunities to progress. Qualifications in education and vocational training ranged from entry level to level 2. The tutorial programme was well planned with an appropriate range of topics for study. Vocational training provided equal opportunities for all young people to gain qualifications in bricklaying, plastering, recycling, fitting interiors, painting and decorating, and warehousing and storage. A few young people achieved valuable fork-lift truck driving licences and there were opportunities for young people to prepare for their construction site safety certificate on release.
- 3.16** Work experience in the establishment consisted of kitchen work, wing cleaning, garden maintenance, laundry and a painting party; qualifications were available in each of these areas. Young people worked towards accredited qualifications in customer service awards while at work.

## Quality of provision

- 3.17** The quality of teaching, learning and assessment was good and some was outstanding. Teachers had high aspirations for young people and challenged them to progress. The planning of learning accommodated individual learning needs well. Teachers used question and answer techniques in lessons to assess learning. The assessment of written work had improved and identifying spelling and grammar errors helped young people to improve their written English skills.
- 3.18** Learning support assistants were very effectively used to promote learning and support young people. They were skilled at intervening at the appropriate time and maintained a balance between support and challenge, helping to promote independent learning. The management of classroom behaviour benefited from a well-developed behaviour strategy which was consistently applied and understood by young people and staff. In isolated cases of poor behaviour, tutors managed disruptive young people firmly and fairly. If young people were removed from class for a short time, they were swiftly managed back into learning. Teachers had a good understanding of equality and diversity, which were promoted well. Teachers and young people had a high level of mutual respect.
- 3.19** Coaching in vocational training placed strong emphasis on improving the employability of young people. Tutors helped young people to meet exacting professional standards, such as in the staff mess and forklift truck training. English and mathematics were integrated into vocational areas and young people understood why they needed to develop these skills. In the interior fittings workshop, young people demonstrated improved mathematics skills in accurately measuring and calculating angles.
- 3.20** English and mathematics sessions were well planned. Good use was made of interactive technology to involve young people, for example, in a mathematics session young people could check if their answers were correct. In other sessions, interactive quizzes were used as starter activities and in an ICT session a video was used to support understanding of a practical activity. Learning sessions provided good opportunities for young people to develop their listening, communication and reading skills, to increase their confidence and to work with their peers.
- 3.21** In individual learning plans, tutors and learners agreed detailed improvement targets for vocational, personal and social skills development. However, some plans were not specific enough.
- 3.22** Classroom accommodation and facilities were good and effective use was made of wall displays which included young people's work. A range of learning resources and materials were used very effectively. All classrooms in the education department had interactive boards. Vocational training workshops provided a good standard of accommodation.

## Recommendation

- 3.23** **Specific targets should be set for young people in individual learning plans to help them understand what they have to achieve and the timescale.**

## Education and vocational training achievements

- 3.24** Young people made good progress in English and most young people progressed by at least one level before leaving. Achievement of accredited qualifications was good although achievement rates for functional skills, English and mathematics were slightly lower than the

previous year, but still above the national average. The 13 young people who had followed GCSE courses during the previous year had achieved 26 qualifications. Standards of learners' work were good overall and outstanding in art, bricklaying, plastering and the staff mess. In vocational training, young people quickly developed a good work ethic which improved their employability and personal and social skills, such as team working, taking instructions and problem solving. They became more confident as their communication skills improved and welcomed the opportunity to talk about their work. A few young people did not perform as well and the YOI was working hard to address this.

## Recommendation

- 3.25 The establishment should ensure that young people who underachieve are given the opportunity to improve their achievement of accredited qualifications.**

## Library

- 3.26** The library service was delivered by the Wigan Leisure and Culture Trust. Small satellite libraries were located on Willow and Sycamore units. The library was managed well by a librarian supported by a library assistant. Access to the library was reasonable, with each class group and vocational workshop timetabled to attend for 30 minutes a week. The library stock reflected the needs of the population with a variety of easy reads, graphic novels and books in a variety of different languages. A good range of national newspapers was provided and a few games. Books not held in stock could be requested and were generally available within a few weeks. The library promoted the development of literacy very well through a variety of activities. Storybook Dads (prisoners recording stories for their children) was well established. Additional activities included the 'six book reading challenge' and an annual Easter short story/ poetry competition. The library was well used, with data on the number of young people using it collected and analysed to identify any groups who did not attend.

## 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.**

- 3.27** *PE facilities were good and access had improved. Links with health care were very effective. The monitoring of gym use was inadequate. Good links had been established with sport in the community to provide a range of activities, but more opportunities for competitive sport were needed.*

- 3.28** Good facilities included a sports hall, a fitness suite, weights room and a sports field for football and rugby. The outdoor artificial pitch had been refurbished and was used regularly for team games.
- 3.29** Access to PE had improved since the previous inspection and was good. The proportion of young people taking PE had increased to 72% and attendance rates at individual sessions were good. However, the proportion of young people under school-leaving age who undertook PE as part of the national curriculum was not monitored adequately.

- 3.30** Some young people took part in PE five times a week and there were opportunities during the evenings and weekends for young people engaged in full-time education, training or work. Sessions were clearly structured and attendance was good. Behaviour in the gym was very good and accident rates were very low.
- 3.31** There were good links with health care and provision of remedial PE was good. Individual fitness and weight-loss programmes were very effective. PE was offered in discrete sessions to the most vulnerable young people on the Willow and Sycamore units, although participation was not well monitored.
- 3.32** Good links were being developed in the community and outline agreements for young people to work in sports settings under release on temporary licence had been made. PE instructors had significantly increased the range of activities and games offered including short tennis, badminton, indoor hockey and an outdoor pursuit course with the Army. A number of young people had achieved their Football Association referee qualifications and a well-received 'Running with the Wolves' event had been held with a local Rugby League team to encourage healthy living. There were not enough opportunities for more competitive sport with community teams.
- 3.33** An improved range of accredited training was available; young people could achieve level one qualifications in customer service and personal physical fitness. A number of useful work-related courses such as first aid at work and manual handling were also offered. Advanced plans were in place for a range of additional training courses, such as football skills, steroid awareness and rugby union coaching awards. Consultation with young people through regular surveys had improved.

## Recommendations

- 3.34** The analysis and use of data should be improved to monitor the participation of all young people, including the most vulnerable such as those under school-leaving age and young people in Willow and Sycamore units.
- 3.35** More opportunities for competitive sport with community teams should be developed.



## 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** *There was an up-to-date, comprehensive reducing reoffending delivery plan, based on an excellent needs analysis. It was not clear if the reducing re-offending meeting identified whether targets in the plan were being met. The coordination between departments delivering resettlement services remained effective, and the links with community agencies had been improved further by the secondment of youth offending service workers. Young people's risk and resettlement needs were identified on arrival and there was an appropriate focus on preventing re-offending. The numbers of young people receiving release on temporary licence (ROTL) remained low.*

**4.2** The establishment had produced an excellent reducing re-offending needs analysis in September 2013, which had been incorporated into the revised reducing re-offending delivery plan published in January 2014. The plan continued to focus on the practical arrangements for young people to return the community. All pathways had a nominated manager with other staff contributing to developing practice in that area. There had been particular recent emphasis on the development of the restorative justice pathway.

**4.3** A new transitions pathway for young people transferring to the young adult estate was in the development stage. The establishment was conducting a national pilot for transition arrangements on behalf of the children's and young people's secure estate. Contact had been made with young offender institutions (YOIs) which received young people when they reached 18 years, in particular Swinfen Hall to enable young people to complete sex offender treatment programmes.

**4.4** The targets in the reducing reoffending delivery plan were discussed at reducing reoffending meetings, but attendance was erratic and pathway managers did not always attend. Not all pathways were fully discussed and it was unclear from the minutes how targets were being monitored. Coordination between departments in their delivery of services to individual young people remained effective. The establishment had good links with community agencies but they did not attend meetings regularly. Significant resettlement data were collected which helped to identify core interventions and services to enhance pre-release planning and improve resettlement outcomes for young people. Information on the resettlement outcomes for young people who had left the establishment continued to be unavailable in many cases.

**4.5** The core resettlement work continued to be undertaken by a group of experienced key workers, managed by senior practitioners and a manager from the local youth offending service (YOS). All the key workers were seconded from a range of YOS across the north-west and it was evident that these close links with the community enabled key workers to understand the issues young people faced at home and the services available to support them. Key worker case loads were manageable at approximately 20 young people per worker.

- 4.6** The establishment had introduced a new assessment and needs analysis tool for young people to complete on arrival and when they left the establishment. The tool had the potential to identify the services and interventions required and to assess changes in attitude or behaviour while in custody.
- 4.7** Young people's risk and resettlement needs were identified on arrival and there was an appropriate focus on preventing re-offending. Records indicated that young people were seen at least weekly by their key worker, who also chaired their training planning meetings. Key workers ensured that the services available to a young person, in and outside the establishment, were properly coordinated. Most young people in our focus groups told us that their key worker was the person they would most likely go to if they had a problem. In our survey, 67% of young people said that their key worker had helped them to prepare for release against the comparator of 42%.
- 4.8** The number of young people on ROTL remained low. During the six months before the inspection, 29 young people had applied, but only 14 had been approved which meant that some work placements had been lost and placements were extremely limited at the time of the inspection. The management and promotion of ROTL had changed recently, with one person working full time across the education and resettlement departments, but it was too early to assess the effect of this.

## Recommendations

- 4.9** **The establishment should investigate why young people reoffend when released from custody, particularly young people who return to Hindley, to ensure that their preparation for release is appropriately focused.**
- 4.10** **The targets in the reducing reoffending delivery plan should be properly monitored.**

## Good practice

- 4.11** *The appointment of a team of community YOS workers from across the establishment catchment area promotes a greater understanding of the communities young people come from and facilitates links with local services on their release.*

## 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.**

**4.12** *All young people had detailed training and remand management plans based on need and most young people in our survey said that they were involved in the development of their plans and understood their targets. Training planning and remand management meetings were timely and the meeting that we observed was well managed and child focused. The training planning documentation had improved since our last inspection and continued to demonstrate good engagement with young people. There were detailed pre-release plans for young people about to leave the establishment.*

**4.13** The arrangements for training planning and remand management remained effective. All young people were allocated a key worker on arrival who was responsible for the management of individual training plans. Risk assessments were completed quickly and appropriate resources allocated. Young people who were assessed as a high risk to the public were allocated to senior practitioners. Sentenced and remanded young people were contacted quickly by a relevant worker and initial training and remand management plans were developed within appropriate time scales. There was good initial involvement with the young person's community youth offending worker, and young people's families were contacted where possible. The drawing up of plans was a collaborative exercise and, in our survey, 82% of young people said they were involved in the development of their plans.

**4.14** The training and remand management plans that we scrutinised covered a range of welfare and resettlement issues. The plans were very detailed and we recognised an overall improvement in the content and an attempt to address the specific needs of young people. Educational targets remained clear and helpful. Targets addressing behavioural issues were not as formulaic as at the previous inspection and were more focused on identifying the behaviour that needed to improve and the interventions required to achieve change. Targets were explained to young people, who knew which member of staff would help them to meet their targets. In our survey, 94% of young people said that they understood the targets in their plan.

**4.15** There were 11 remanded young people at the time of the inspection and the number of remands had remained consistently low. Remanded young people continued to receive a good service from key workers. A remand plan was drawn up which enabled them to use the same services as a sentenced young person. Young people continued to be given clear information about making a bail application, and records showed that key workers helped to facilitate young people's contact with their legal advisers and community YOT worker.

**4.16** Training planning and remand management meetings were well organised and timely. There was good attendance by community YOTs, but the involvement of internal departments was erratic and attendance by residential and health care departments continued to need improvement. Attendance by the education department had improved. The planning meeting that we observed was the final meeting before the young person's release. It was attended by community YOT workers and the young person's mother, with a written report from the education department. The key worker who chaired the meeting was well prepared and gave a good account of the young person's progress and behaviour. The young person was given

every opportunity to participate and was given a clear message on what was expected of him on release. The documentation that we scrutinised for other meetings focused on the young person's safety, welfare and resettlement and helpful information was submitted by internal departments, apart from health care and residential. YOT workers we spoke to, who came regularly to the establishment, said that training planning meetings were well organised and run to a high standard.

- 4.17** Young people serving detention and training orders (DTOs), who still had part of their sentence to serve, were now transferred out of the establishment by the time they were 18 years one month. If they were assessed as being a risk to others, they were transferred as soon as they were 18. We were told that in some cases young people were unable to start a specific offending behaviour or life skills programme as they would be unable to complete it. Resettlement managers expressed concern that young people on DTOs would not have proper assessment and review meetings in the young adult estate. There were good transition arrangements for young people serving long sentences transferring to adult establishments, and we scrutinised a number of case files which demonstrated effective planning for young people serving long sentences for serious offences.
- 4.18** The number of young people serving sentences for sexual abuse remained high, with the majority undertaking an assessment and therapeutic work with a specialist therapist, working with the Lucy Faithfull Foundation. We were advised that the establishment's contract with the Lucy Faithfull Foundation had ceased and the arrangements to continue this vital work had not been finalised.
- 4.19** Young people serving life sentences were rarely accommodated, but some key workers had received appropriate training to complete the relevant assessments and documentation if required. Young people serving long determinate sentences continued to receive the same services as those on DTOs, with the establishment preparing parole reports and assessing suitability for early release on home detention curfew.

## Public protection

- 4.20** Public protection cases were identified by the senior key workers and reviewed throughout the young person's sentence. Restrictions on contact and the monitoring of young people's letters and telephone calls were properly scrutinised and there were comprehensive assessments of young people who were a risk to children. Developing links with community agencies and the identification of young people vulnerable to exploitation and extreme radicalisation had improved public protection arrangements.
- 4.21** There was a comprehensive up-to-date public protection policy and a monthly risk management committee meeting. Attendance had improved but the local police intelligence officer still did not always attend as required by the policy. The seconded social workers with responsibility for looked-after children were now invited. Minutes of the meeting showed detailed discussion of individual young people considered to be a risk.
- 4.22** The establishment had clear criteria for young people who could present a risk to the public and all new arrivals who were assessed as a risk were identified promptly. Senior key workers scrutinised the documentation of all new arrivals who were immediately allocated a key worker, entered on a database and discussed at the earliest risk management committee meeting. Key workers attended most reviews of young people at external multi-agency public protection panels.

- 4.23** Procedures to protect young people while in custody remained appropriate. The risk management committee decided whom they should have contact with and these decisions were approved by the head of reducing reoffending. A number of young people had their mail and telephone calls monitored. These were regularly reviewed and restrictions lifted when it was believed that risks had reduced. Young people who were considered a risk to children in the community because of their offence or other indicators were given comprehensive assessments so that their level of risk could be determined and actions taken to manage the risk effectively.

## Looked-after children

- 4.24** There were excellent systems in place to identify young people with looked-after status. The support these young people received had been improved by the work of the social workers, who ensured that looked-after young people were properly reviewed, visited by their social workers and received appropriate amounts of money.
- 4.25** The establishment had extremely efficient systems in place to identify any young person who was known, or had previously been known, to their local authority. All relevant documentation was read on the young person's arrival and his local authority was contacted to clarify their involvement. During 2013, 47 young people had been on full care orders, a further 102 had been known to their local authority, and 128 were looked after because they had been remanded in custody. In all, 308 young people had been involved with their local authority and were entitled to continued support. In our survey, 40% of young people said that they had been in local authority care.
- 4.26** A well established, experienced seconded social work team was responsible for identifying and supporting young people with looked-after status. A social worker allocated to each young person with looked-after status provided information about their role in supporting them through custody, and what to expect from their external children's services department. The social work unit managed a comprehensive database, which identified the young person's local authority, the date of their reviews, the money they received and when they were visited by their community social worker. Local authorities who did not meet their obligations were robustly challenged. There was an overall improvement in all levels of contact by responsible local authorities since our last inspection.

## Reintegration planning

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 4.27** *Reintegration planning remained very good. Pre-release plans were detailed and there was good support for young people who needed help with accommodation, although there was no follow up post release. The proportion of young people who had an education, training and employment place on release had increased since the previous inspection and young people benefited from access to relevant programme work. A sizeable proportion of young people, many of whom were looked after, still did not receive regular visits. The family forum was a good example of involving families in the care of young people in custody. Some very good restorative justice work was being undertaken.*

- 4.28** Young people had a pre-release plan, produced in collaboration with their community YOT, which set out their living arrangements and supervision requirements when they were released. The establishment made sure the young person understood what was required of him when he was released.
- 4.29** Practical arrangements for release remained thorough. Young people were provided with a suitable bag for their belongings and a stock of clothing was available for those who had nothing suitable to wear. Young people could have their own clothes washed ready for their release if they wished. Any money they had in their YOI account was waiting for them in reception on the day of their release. Travel arrangements were agreed at the final review meeting and usually included in the pre-release plan.

## Accommodation

- 4.30** Establishment data showed that in the previous year three young people had been released to accommodation which the establishment had assessed as unsuitable. More needed to be done to follow up the sustainability of accommodation post release.
- 4.31** Accommodation needs continued to be assessed early and young people who did not have a suitable address to return to were supported by the safeguarding team and if necessary referred to their home local authority. Key workers had good links with community YOTs and the establishment NACRO housing officer worked with community YOTs and local authorities to assist young people who needed accommodation. The needs of hard-to-place young people were escalated, and the internal advocates played an important role in persuading local authorities to meet their obligations. If necessary, legal representatives were involved. The establishment told us that accommodation issues typically had to be escalated in areas where they did not have established links.

## Recommendation

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

## Education, training and employment

- 4.33** Established links with community agencies had been further developed to support young people's transition into education, training and employment after release. Careers advice was very good and the same advice worker acted for a young person in custody and after release, which provided continuity. Entry to education or training on leaving the establishment had increased to 73%. The use of ROTL facilitated positive education and training outcomes on release, but more ROTL opportunities were needed. A well-developed pre-release course supported by an external employer gave young people opportunities to produce CVs and develop interview skills. The virtual campus<sup>6</sup> was not operational in the establishment.

---

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

## Recommendations

- 4.34** Opportunities for release on temporary licence should be extended to support entry into education, training and employment.
- 4.35** The virtual campus should be introduced to support education, training and employment opportunities on release.

## Health care

- 4.36** All young people attended a pre-release health promotion session which gave them the opportunity to talk about their concerns and receive advice on contacting community health services. All young people were seen by a nurse before release and given a supply of any prescribed medications.
- 4.37** Young people with complex mental health problems were linked with their local community child and adolescent mental health service. There was effective pre-release planning with community teams.

## Good practice

- 4.38** *Imaginative sessions with young people to prepare them for release provided young people with an opportunity to discuss their concerns and get advice about community help services.*

## Drugs and alcohol

- 4.39** Resettlement work was integrated into all case management interventions for young people with substance use problems, which was appropriate.

## Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.40** Young people had the opportunity to open a bank account with a high street bank while at the establishment and none who had applied to do so had been turned down by the bank. Young people who had committed finance related offences or who had debts were identified during induction and given help to negotiate with creditors, particularly over rent arrears.
- 4.41** The comprehensive pre-release course included practical advice on finance, benefits and debt. Applications were made for young people with no national insurance number and a pre-release worker made appointments at local offices for young people who needed to claim benefits after their release. Young people received guidance on how to manage their money and understand utility bills and pay slips, how to manage debt and avoid pay day loans.

## Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.42** In our survey, 91% of young people said they had good access to telephones against the comparator of 80%. We were not told of problems with receiving or sending mail and the procedure for dealing with incoming and outgoing mail was well organised. 'Email a prisoner' was in use and videolink was used to facilitate contact between young people and their family members in other prisons. Nine such contacts had been made during the six months prior to

the inspection, compared with 35 over 11 months at the previous inspection. Staff told us it was becoming more difficult to arrange videolink contacts with other prisons.

- 4.43** About a third of young people were more than 50 miles from home and, in our survey, 48% said they usually had at least one visit a week against the comparator of 38%. Survey results were particularly poor for young people with looked-after status, only 30% of whom said they had a weekly visit. There was no organised young offender visitor scheme. Young people who did not receive visits could exchange them for additional phone credit. Visits entitlements were generally reasonable, although young people on the lowest level of the rewards and sanctions scheme only had one- hour instead of two-hour visits, which seemed unnecessarily harsh in the context of other work to promote family contact.
- 4.44** All young people could apply to attend family days and feedback from them was positive. The well established family forum provided good support for families who attended and valuable feedback for the establishment. Problems such as booking visits by telephone had been identified early and resolved. Families were able to see more of the establishment and visit, for example, the education and gym facilities.
- 4.45** The visits hall was large and well maintained. Social visits took place on alternate afternoons and two half days at weekends. Visits could be booked by telephone, email or while attending a visit. The visitors' centre run by Partners of Prisoners (POPs) provided good information and support for visitors. Arrangements to enter the visits hall were efficient. A tea bar run by POPs served hot or cold drinks and snacks and a play area was available for visiting children to use.
- 4.46** Facilities for legal visits and police interviews were reasonable. A notice displayed near the facility reminded staff that an appropriate adult should be present during police interviews with young people under the age of 18. The closed visits facilities were inadequate and afforded no privacy to visitors or young people if more than two booths were in use at the same time. During the inspection, six young people were on closed visits.

## Recommendations

- 4.47** **The establishment should consider introducing a visitors' scheme for young people who do not receive visits.**
- 4.48** **All young people should receive the same length of visit irrespective of their rewards and sanctions level.**
- 4.49** **The closed visits facility should be reviewed.**

## Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.50** The interventions team comprised a YOI service manager and three education staff whose work was appropriately integrated into the reducing re-offending strategy. The team delivered a number of interventions based on needs identified in the establishment needs analysis and relevant to young people's offending. Young people were usually referred to a programme following discussion at a training planning meeting, and with the agreement of their community YOT worker.
- 4.51** Young people could, and did, attend several interventions. Individual assessments were produced at the end of the sessions, but the important bridge between what the young person had learned and encouragement to put that learning into practice while in custody



had still not been made. Residential staff were still not aware of the behaviours and attitudes that young people were trying to address by attending these interventions, and their learning was not being reinforced on the units or in other areas of the establishment.

- 4.52** The team manager was evaluating the effectiveness of the interventions, by assessing a young person's behaviour before and after completion. Findings suggested an improvement in many young people's behaviour but it was not possible to measure the impact of the lack of reinforcement of learning on the overall outcomes.
- 4.53** Young people who had a sexual component to their offending had had good access to specialist interventions provided by the Lucy Faithfull Foundation. Funding for this work was due to transfer to a new provider and it was not clear how young people who were midway through addressing their behaviour would be supported to continue their work. This needed to be resolved quickly.
- 4.54** A restorative justice programme was led by the chaplain. Young people were helped to consider the consequences of their offending for all parties and to offer an apology or reparation. Victim conferences were held, three of which had taken place in March 2014 when young people had met the victims of their offences and had apologised.

## Recommendation

- 4.55** **Wing-based staff should be familiar with what young people are learning from interventions and young people should be supported to practise new attitudes and behaviours, particularly through engagement with their personal officer.**  
(Repeated recommendation 4.52)



## Section 5. Recommendations and housekeeping points

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

### Main recommendations To the Youth Justice Board and NOMS

- 5.1** The physical environment of Sycamore unit should be improved so that it provides a suitable place 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. (S56)
- 5.2** All young people should have an hour's exercise in the open air every day. (S57)
- 5.3** a) The YJB should instigate an independent expert review of its policies and resources to prevent bullying and support victims across all YOIs that hold children and young people
- b) NOMS should ensure that safety indicators at Hindley are very closely monitored, any adverse impact of developments on the site quickly identified and remedial action taken. (S58)

### Recommendation To the Youth Justice Board

#### Courts, escorts and transfers

- 5.4** Young people should not be held in court cells for unnecessarily long periods. (1.5)

### Recommendations To NOMS

#### Courts, escorts and transfers

- 5.5** Young people should not be transported with adult prisoners. (1.6)
- 5.6** NOMS should work with the establishment to ensure effective arrangements are in place with the local police for the investigation of allegations of serious offences committed by boys and young people in the establishment. (1.67)

### Recommendations To the governor

#### Early days in custody

- 5.7** Young people should spend less time locked up during their first 48 hours at the establishment. (1.14)

## Safeguarding

- 5.8** All injuries to young people, including those that are unexplained, should be closely monitored by the safeguarding committee. (1.22)

## Child protection

- 5.9** Children in custody should never be subject to a strip-search under restraint. If this does take place, the case should always be referred to the local authority for external scrutiny. (1.33)
- 5.10** All members of staff who have contact with young people should have their names clearly displayed. (1.34)

## Suicide and self-harm prevention

- 5.11** Staff should be given training and support to fulfil all aspects of the ACCT procedure well. (1.43)

## Behaviour management

- 5.12** Staff undertaking mediation should be trained in its use. (1.47)
- 5.13** All aspects of the behaviour management strategy, including the use of mediation, should be monitored. (1.48)
- 5.14** The rewards and sanctions scheme should be applied flexibly and sensitively to boys in both Sycamore and Willow units. (1.53)
- 5.15** Investigations should be determined and rigorous where credible intelligence suggests that bullying is a threat to the safety of an individual boy. (1.64)
- 5.16** The increase in adjudications should be reviewed to make sure they are used more proportionately and a strategy to reduce the level of use is put in place. (1.65)
- 5.17** All young people should be given the opportunity to explain fully their perspective of events relating to the charge, and investigations into allegations should be conducted thoroughly. (1.66)
- 5.18** Disciplinary procedures should be monitored to identify and act on any trends, and quality assurance of minor reports should be undertaken consistently. (1.68)
- 5.19** Managers should take additional measures to ensure boys are not intimidated by the abuse shouted out of windows at night, if necessary, additional measures should include deploying extra staff after lock up to identify perpetrators and to stop this behaviour. (1.75)
- 5.20** Systematic, quantitative analysis of safety issues, including incidents, should be carried out from month to month and year to year, and planning to reduce the level of violence should be based on the learning from such analysis. (1.76)
- 5.21** Debriefs of young people following use of force should be carried out by an independent person. (1.82)

- 5.22** Use of separation should be analysed and monitored so that any identified issues or trends can be investigated and acted on. (1.92)

#### Substance misuse

- 5.23** A review should be conducted to determine the effectiveness of delivering the substance misuse awareness programme during induction to ensure the optimum uptake of information. (1.107)
- 5.24** MDT should be adequately resourced to cover suspicion and weekend testing. (1.108)

#### Residential units

- 5.25** Showers should be kept free of mould. (2.12)
- 5.26** Empty cells should be kept clean and equipped ready for occupation. (2.13)
- 5.27** All living accommodation should be free of graffiti. (2.14)
- 5.28** Young people should not be accommodated in cells with smashed observation panels; smashed panels should be repaired promptly. (2.15)
- 5.29** All young people should have the opportunity to wear their own clothes. (2.16)

#### Equality and diversity

- 5.30** The impact of the regime on all minority groups should be monitored, and prompt, effective action should be taken to investigate and address potential inequality. (2.41)
- 5.31** Regular support and consultation meetings should be held with different minority groups, in partnership with external support organisations as appropriate. (2.42)
- 5.32** DIRF responses should be quality checked internally and by an external equality partner. (2.43)
- 5.33** The establishment should keep staff equality training needs under review and deliver training to meet those needs. (2.44)
- 5.34** Wider use should be made of guidance notes, to assist wing staff when dealing with young people whose disabilities affected their behaviour. (2.45)
- 5.35** The establishment should work with Barnardo's to ensure that all young people with uncertain immigration status have access to independent specialist legal advice. (2.46)

#### Complaints

- 5.36** Any concern about the quality of a complaint response should be communicated to the author of the response. The sample checked by senior managers should include responses for which concerns have been identified. (2.57)

### Health services

- 5.37** A health needs assessment should be carried out to identify the current and future needs of the population and to inform the provision of services. (2.77)
- 5.38** Resuscitation kits should be in good order and should contain items appropriate to young people. Regular recorded checks should be carried out. All YOI staff should have up-to-date resuscitation skills, including use of the defibrillator. (2.78)
- 5.39** Young people should have timely access to speech and language therapy. (2.90)
- 5.40** Locked cupboards for prescribed medicines should be provided in all cells. (2.98)
- 5.41** There should be pharmacy led clinics and regular medicine use reviews. (2.99)
- 5.42** Urgent attention should be given to ensuring that the electronic CHAT tool accurately reflects any risks identified in the printed version. (2.110)

### Catering

- 5.43** Young people should be able to eat their lunch communally. (2.117)
- 5.44** The evening meal should be served between 5 and 6.30pm. (2.118)

### Purchases

- 5.45** Young people should be able to order items from the YOI shop within 24 hours of their arrival at the establishment. (2.121)

### Time out of cell

- 5.46** All young people should spend a minimum of 10 hours every day out of their cell. (3.7)

### Education, learning and skills

- 5.47** The sequence and timing of courses should not interrupt other learning activities. (3.13)
- 5.48** Specific targets should be set for young people in individual learning plans to help them understand what they have to achieve and the timescale. (3.23)
- 5.49** The establishment should ensure that young people who underachieve are given the opportunity to improve their achievement of accredited qualifications. (3.25)

### Physical education and healthy living

- 5.50** The analysis and use of data should be improved to monitor the participation of all young people, including the most vulnerable such as those under school-leaving age and young people in Willow and Sycamore units. (3.34)
- 5.51** More opportunities for competitive sport with community teams should be developed. (3.35)

### Pre-release and resettlement

- 5.52** The establishment should investigate why young people reoffend when released from custody, particularly young people who return to Hindley, to ensure that their preparation for release is appropriately focused. (4.9)
- 5.53** The targets in the reducing reoffending delivery plan should be properly monitored. (4.10)

### Reintegration planning

- 5.54** The accommodation to which sentenced and remanded young people are released and its sustainability should be monitored and recorded. Data should be used to evaluate the needs of the population and ensure that appropriate accommodation is available for all young people. (4.32)
- 5.55** Opportunities for release on temporary licence should be extended to support entry into education, training and employment. (4.34)
- 5.56** The virtual campus should be introduced to support education, training and employment opportunities on release. (4.35)
- 5.57** The establishment should consider introducing a visitors' scheme for young people who do not receive visits. (4.47)
- 5.58** All young people should receive the same length of visit irrespective of their rewards and sanctions level. (4.48)
- 5.59** The closed visits facility should be reviewed. (4.49)
- 5.60** Staff should be familiar with what young people are learning from interventions and young people should be supported to practise new attitudes and behaviours, particularly through engagement with their personal officer. (4.55)

## Housekeeping points

### Early days in custody

- 5.61** Holding rooms in reception should contain more information and reading material for young people. (1.15)
- 5.62** Toilets in first night cells should be deep cleaned. (1.16)

### Care and protection of children and young people

- 5.63** Data for safeguarding and safer custody meetings should be used to provide trend analysis. (1.23)
- 5.64** All F213 forms detailing injuries to young people should be examined by the safeguarding team. (1.24)
- 5.65** Support intervention plans should contain actions specific to the young person. (1.25)

## Residential units

- 5.66** All cells should have curtains. (2.17)
- 5.67** Exercise yards should be kept clean and free of litter. (2.18)

## Relationships between staff and children and young people

- 5.68** All personal officers should make at least one entry a week in electronic case notes describing their interaction with the young person. (2.24)

## Equality and diversity

- 5.69** Representatives of all relevant departments should consistently attend equality action team meetings. (2.47)

## Time out of cell

- 5.70** The establishment should investigate why fewer young people with a disability say that they have association every day. (3.8)

# Good practice

## Care and protection of children and young people

- 5.71** The one-to-one interview carried out with young people new to custody was a useful additional means of checking that individuals from a potentially vulnerable group were settling in and felt safe. (1.26)

## Relationships between staff and young people

- 5.72** The routine monthly contact personal officers made with families was an effective way of helping to motivate young people to spend their time constructively as well as keeping relatives up to date with how the young person was. (2.25)

## Health services

- 5.73** The development of young people's parenting skills supported their rehabilitation and life skills. (2.79)
- 5.74** The new brain injury service provided young people and staff with essential support to manage problems arising from brain injuries. (2.91)
- 5.75** A designated looked-after children's nurse with effective links to local authorities and youth offending teams ensured excellent continuity of health care for this vulnerable group of young people. (2.92)
- 5.76** All young people were referred to the dentist. Dental and oral hygiene education supported a population with very poor dental and oral health. (2.104)



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

- 5.77** The appointment of a team of community YOS workers from across the establishment catchment area promotes a greater understanding of the communities young people come from and facilitates links with local services on their release. (4.11)

### **Reintegration planning**

- 5.78** Imaginative sessions with young people to prepare them for release provided young people with an opportunity to discuss their concerns and get advice about community help services. (4.38)



## Section 6. Appendices

### Appendix I: Inspection team

|                     |                  |
|---------------------|------------------|
| Nick Hardwick       | Chief inspector  |
| Ian MacFadyen       | Team leader      |
| Karen Dillon        | Inspector        |
| Deri Hughes-Roberts | Inspector        |
| Angela Johnson      | Inspector        |
| Martin Kettle       | Inspector        |
| Ian Thomson         | Inspector        |
| Ewan Kennedy        | Researcher       |
| Helen Ranns         | Researcher       |
| Gemma Quayle        | Research trainee |

#### **Specialist inspectors**

|                 |                            |
|-----------------|----------------------------|
| Paul Roberts    | Substance misuse inspector |
| Nicola Rabjohns | Health services inspector  |
| Stan Brandwood  | Pharmacist                 |
| Kathleen Byrne  | CQC inspector              |
| Stephen Miller  | Ofsted inspector           |
| Gerard McGrath  | Ofsted inspector           |
| Margaret Hobson | Ofsted inspector           |

#### **Observers**

|                 |                          |
|-----------------|--------------------------|
| Jo Morgan       | Ofsted regional director |
| Saad Al Shamlan | Bahraini observer        |
| Ahmed Al Malki  | Bahraini observer        |



## 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, early days' provision was very good and child protection arrangements were sound. Levels of self-harm were high and, although young people subject to ACCT (assessment, care in custody and teamwork) procedures were well cared for, the strategy for suicide prevention needed to be given greater priority. The number of violent incidents between young people was high. There was insufficient analysis of these incidents. Use of force was well managed but too much use was made of formal disciplinary measures. The regime and conditions in Sycamore unit were poor but this was mitigated by the good relationships between staff and young people. Outcomes for young people were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.*

#### Main recommendations

The safeguarding committee should ensure it has strategic oversight of violence and self-harm in the establishment and that lessons and actions arising from a previous death in custody are sustained. (HP53)

**Partially achieved**

The collection and analysis of information about violent incidents should be improved. All allegations of bullying should be investigated thoroughly and relevant information shared appropriately between departments. All data relating to violence reduction should be used to inform the violence reduction strategy. (HP54)

**Partially achieved**

#### Recommendations

Young people should not be held in court cells for unnecessarily long periods. (1.6)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated I. 5)

Young people should not be transported with adult prisoners. (1.5)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated I. 6)

Strip-searching of young people in custody should only be carried out after a properly conducted risk assessment has indicated this is necessary. (1.14)

**Achieved**

All staff should receive training in working with children and young people. (1.21)

**Partially achieved**

All injuries to young people, including those that are unexplained, should be closely monitored by the safeguarding committee. (1.22)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 1.22)

Young people who have been identified as particularly vulnerable or with specific needs, or who have been displaying challenging behaviour, should have a care plan to meet their assessed needs. (1.23)

**Partially achieved**

Staff should be familiar with national instructions about how to support young people at risk of self-harm and a local protocol should be produced setting out how this is to be implemented at HMYOI Hindley. (1.37)

**Partially achieved**

The behaviour management strategy should be properly monitored. (1.42)

**Partially achieved**

Links between security and the violence reduction team should be improved. (1.61)

**Achieved**

Mandatory drug testing suites should be fit for purpose. The MDT programme should meet the requirements of the relevant Prison Service Orders and be adequately resourced to undertake an unpredictable pattern of testing across the week. (1.62)

**Partially achieved**

The high number of adjudications should be reviewed and a strategy to reduce them put into place. (1.63)

**Partially achieved**

All young people should be given the opportunity to explain fully their perspective of events relating to the charge. (1.64)

**Partially achieved**

Investigations into allegations should be conducted thoroughly and punishments should be fair and proportionate. (1.65)

**Partially achieved**

Minor infringements of prison rules should, wherever possible, be resolved through informal means. (1.66)

**Achieved**

The monitoring of disciplinary procedures by senior staff should be robust. (1.67)

**Partially achieved**

The collection and analysis of information about violent incidents should be improved and the data used to inform the violence reduction strategy. (1.75)

**Partially achieved**

Staff should receive training in the implementation of behaviour improvement plans. (1.76)

**Achieved**

The incidence of use of force should be reviewed and a plan for its reduction should be implemented. (1.84)

**Achieved**

The regime for young people in segregation should be improved to provide a balanced regime and sufficient time unlocked. (1.93)

**Not achieved**

All young people with substance misuse problems should receive adequate help. (1.103)

**Achieved**

All information relating to substance misuse should be shared effectively. (1.104)

**Partially achieved**

## Respect

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

*At the last inspection in 2012, most of the living areas were in good condition but some of the accommodation was institutionalised and not suitable for young people. The relationships which we observed between staff and young people were sound and in some cases good. Despite this, we were concerned about repeated and consistent reports from young people that a small number of staff treated them very disrespectfully. Diversity was managed well. The applications and complaints procedures worked efficiently. The chaplaincy team provided a comprehensive service and health services were exemplary. Food was unpopular with young people. The Willow unit provided care for young people with complex needs. Outcomes for young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.*

### Recommendations

The environment on E and F wing should be improved so that it is more appropriate for the age group held. (2.9)

**No longer relevant**

Showers should be cleaned daily and mould removed. (2.10)

**Partially achieved**

Empty cells should be cleaned and equipped ready for occupation. (2.11)

**Partially achieved**

All young people should have the opportunity to wear their own clothing. (2.12)

**Not achieved** (repeated recommendation 2.16)

All wings should have adequate laundry facilities which should be well maintained. (2.13)

**Partially achieved**

Managers should identify staff who are the subject of repeated complaints, ensure they understand the behaviour expected of them and take action if these standards are not met. (2.19)

**Achieved**

All staff should wear name badges. (2.20)

**Not achieved**

The impact of the regime on all minority groups should be monitored effectively and appropriate action taken to address inequality. (2.25)

**Not achieved**

Whenever it is possible, all young people who belong to a minority group should have the opportunity to attend a support group. (2.26)

**Not achieved**

Young people from all minority backgrounds should be identified and attempts made to meet their particular needs. (2.35)

**Not achieved**

The views of black and minority ethnic young people on their treatment by staff should be kept under regular review. (2.36)

**Not achieved**

Information about all young people with disabilities should be shared with those involved in their care and the young people should have a suitable care plan. (2.37)

**Not achieved**

The evening meal should be served between 5 and 6.30pm. (2.87)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.120)

Young people should be able to order items from the prison shop within 24 hours of their arrival at the establishment. (2.93)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.123)

The length of time young people on Willow unit spend unlocked should not be restricted, unless this has been identified as necessary and in their best interests. (2.95)

**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, most young people received enough time unlocked, although those on the bronze level of the rewards and sanctions scheme were locked up for too long at weekends. Access to outdoor exercise was poor. Young people benefitted from good quality education and training. The standard of teaching was good and young people behaved well in class. Young people were given the opportunity to develop a range of relevant skills and they made good achievements. Not enough young people participated in PE. The library was a good resource but young people did not have sufficient time there. Outcomes for young people were good against this healthy prison test.*

### Main recommendation

All young people should have an hour's exercise in the open air every day. (HP55)

**Not achieved** (main recommendation repeated, S56)

### Recommendations

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

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, main recommendation S57)



All young people, irrespective of their location, should have equal access to the range of vocational training provided. (3.14)

**Achieved**

The quality of assessment and marking should be improved and should include advice for young people on how to progress. (3.24)

**Achieved**

The proportion of young people leaving the establishment with a confirmed education, training or employment place should be improved. (3.31)

**Achieved**

The use of release on temporary licence should be extended to enable young people to secure training and work experience in the community. (3.32)

**Achieved**

All young people, including those under school-leaving age, should take part in timetabled core PE. (3.42)

**Partially achieved**

Opportunities for PE-based release on temporary licence should be developed. (3.43)

**Achieved**

## Resettlement

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

*At the last inspection in 2012, the management of resettlement had improved. There was a clear vision and a strong team approach. Planning was sound and pathway work was well organised. Staff made good attempts to help young people obtain decent accommodation on release, but too few young people left the establishment with work, training or education placements. Young people had opportunities to participate in programmes. Young people were supported to maintain contact with their families but visits were too short for some. Young people with complex needs living on Willow unit received intensive support but the restrictive regime seemed at odds with a therapeutic approach. Outcomes for young people were good against this healthy prison test.*

### Recommendations

Information should be collected on the resettlement outcomes of all young people who have left the establishment. (4.7)

**Not achieved**

All young people should receive the same minimum visit entitlement. (4.45)

**Achieved**

Staff should be familiar with what young people are learning from interventions and young people should be supported to practise new attitudes and behaviours, particularly through engagement with their personal officer. (4.52)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 4.55)



## 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             | 134                    | 84.8       |
| Recall                | 0                      |            |
| Convicted unsentenced | 8                      | 5.1        |
| Remand                | 16                     | 10.1       |
| Detainees             | 0                      |            |
| <b>Total</b>          | <b>158</b>             | <b>100</b> |

| Age          | Number of young people | %          |
|--------------|------------------------|------------|
| 15 years     | 6                      | 3.8        |
| 16 years     | 36                     | 22.8       |
| 17 years     | 93                     | 58.9       |
| 18 years     | 23                     | 14.6       |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>158</b>             | <b>100</b> |

| Nationality       | Number of young people | %          |
|-------------------|------------------------|------------|
| British           | 150                    | 94.9       |
| Foreign nationals | 8                      | 4.4        |
| Not stated        | 1                      | 0.6        |
| <b>Total</b>      | <b>159</b>             | <b>100</b> |

| Ethnicity                 | Number of young people | %          |
|---------------------------|------------------------|------------|
| White                     |                        |            |
| British                   | 115                    | 72.8       |
| Irish                     | 1                      | 0.6        |
| Gypsy/Irish Traveller     | 2                      | 1.3        |
| Other white               | 4                      | 2.5        |
| Mixed                     |                        |            |
| White and black Caribbean | 4                      | 2.5        |
| White and black African   |                        |            |
| White and Asian           | 2                      | 1.3        |
| Other mixed               | 5                      | 3.2        |
| Asian or Asian British    |                        |            |
| Indian                    | 2                      | 1.3        |
| Pakistani                 | 3                      | 1.9        |
| Bangladeshi               | 2                      | 1.3        |
| Chinese                   |                        |            |
| Other Asian               | 6                      | 3.8        |
| Black or black British    |                        |            |
| Caribbean                 | 3                      | 1.9        |
| African                   | 3                      | 1.9        |
| Other black               | 5                      | 3.2        |
| Other ethnic group        |                        |            |
| Arab                      | 1                      | 0.6        |
| Other ethnic group        |                        |            |
| Not stated                |                        |            |
| <b>Total</b>              | <b>158</b>             | <b>100</b> |

| Religion                      | Number of young people | %          |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|------------|
| Baptist                       | 0                      |            |
| Church of England             | 14                     | 8.9        |
| Roman Catholic                | 35                     | 22.2       |
| Other Christian denominations | 15                     | 9.5        |
| Muslim                        | 19                     | 12         |
| Sikh                          | 1                      | 0.6        |
| Hindu                         |                        |            |
| Buddhist                      |                        |            |
| Jewish                        |                        |            |
| Other                         |                        |            |
| No religion                   | 73                     | 46.2       |
| Not stated                    | 1                      | 0.6        |
| <b>Total</b>                  | <b>158</b>             | <b>100</b> |

| Other demographics     | Number of young people | %          |
|------------------------|------------------------|------------|
| Gypsy/Romany/Traveller | 2                      | 1.3        |
|                        |                        |            |
| <b>Total</b>           | <b>2</b>               | <b>1.3</b> |

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

| Length of stay | <1 mth    | 1–3 mths  | 3–6 mths  | 6–12 mths | 1–2 yrs  | 2 yrs + | 4 yrs + | Total      |
|----------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|---------|---------|------------|
| <b>Age</b>     |           |           |           |           |          |         |         |            |
| 15 years       |           | 2         | 1         |           |          |         |         | 3          |
| 16 years       | 8         | 10        | 8         | 4         |          |         |         | 30         |
| 17 years       | 12        | 27        | 18        | 14        | 7        |         |         | 78         |
| 18 years       | 4         | 3         | 9         | 6         | 1        |         |         | 23         |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>24</b> | <b>42</b> | <b>36</b> | <b>24</b> | <b>8</b> |         |         | <b>134</b> |

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

| Length of stay | <1 mth   | 1–3 mths  | 3–6 mths | 6–12 mths | 1–2 yrs | 2 yrs+ | 4 yrs + | Total     |
|----------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|---------|--------|---------|-----------|
| <b>Age</b>     |          |           |          |           |         |        |         |           |
| 15 years       | 1        | 2         |          |           |         |        |         | 3         |
| 16 years       | 2        | 3         | 1        |           |         |        |         | 6         |
| 17 years       | 6        | 8         |          | 1         |         |        |         | 15        |
| 18 years       |          |           |          |           |         |        |         |           |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>9</b> | <b>13</b> | <b>1</b> | <b>1</b>  |         |        |         | <b>24</b> |

| Main offence                           | Number of young people | %          |
|--|------------------------|------------|
| Violence against the person            | 34                     | 21.9       |
| Sexual offences                        | 5                      | 3.2        |
| Burglary                               | 32                     | 20.6       |
| Robbery                                | 41                     | 26.5       |
| Theft and handling                     | 10                     | 6.5        |
| Fraud and forgery                      |                        |            |
| Drugs offences                         | 8                      | 5.2        |
| Other offences                         | 25                     | 16.1       |
| Offence not recorded / holding warrant | 0                      |            |
| <b>Total</b>                           | <b>155</b>             | <b>100</b> |

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

| Sentence     | 4 mths    | 6 mths    | 8 mths    | 10 mths  | 12 mths   | 18 mths   | 24 mths   | 24 mth +  | Recall | Total      |
|--------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--------|------------|
| <b>Age</b>   |           |           |           |          |           |           |           |           |        |            |
| 15 years     | 1         | 1         | 0         | 0        | 1         | 0         | 0         | 0         |        | 3          |
| 16 years     | 3         | 2         | 2         | 0        | 5         | 5         | 2         | 2         |        | 21         |
| 17 years     | 10        | 7         | 6         | 1        | 13        | 8         | 7         | 7         |        | 59         |
| 18 years     | 1         | 6         | 2         | 0        | 2         | 4         | 4         | 6         |        | 25         |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>15</b> | <b>16</b> | <b>10</b> | <b>1</b> | <b>21</b> | <b>17</b> | <b>13</b> | <b>15</b> |        | <b>108</b> |

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

### Children and young people survey methodology

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

### Sampling

Questionnaires were offered to all young people.

### Distributing and collecting questionnaires

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

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

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

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

### Survey response

At the time of the survey on 3 March 2014 the young person population at HMYOI Hindley was 156. Surveys were distributed to all young people.

We received a total of 138 completed questionnaires, a response rate of 88%. This included five questionnaires completed via interview. Nine respondents refused to complete a questionnaire, three questionnaires were not returned and six were returned blank.

| Wing/Unit                | Number of completed survey returns |
|--------------------------|------------------------------------|
| A                        | 30                                 |
| B                        | 42                                 |
| C                        | 35                                 |
| J                        | 21                                 |
| Care and separation unit | 3                                  |
| Willow                   | 7                                  |

## Presentation of survey results and analyses

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

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

We also present a number of comparative analyses. In all the comparative analyses that follow, statistically significant<sup>7</sup> differences are indicated by shading. Results that are significantly better are indicated by green shading, results that are significantly worse are indicated by blue shading. If the difference is not statistically significant there is no shading. Orange shading has been used to show a statistically significant difference in young people's background details.

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

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

The following comparative analyses are presented:

- The current survey responses from HMYOI Hindley in 2014 compared with responses from young people surveyed in all other young offender institutions. This comparator is based on all responses from young people surveys carried out in seven YOIs since April 2013.
- The current survey responses from HMYOI Hindley in 2014 compared with the responses of young people surveyed at HMYOI Hindley in 2012.
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between the responses of white young people and those from a black and minority ethnic group.
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between the responses of Muslim young people and non-Muslim young people.
- A comparison within the 2014 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.
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between the responses of young people who had been in local authority care and those who had not.

---

<sup>7</sup> A statistically significant difference between the two samples is one that is unlikely to have arisen by chance alone, and can therefore be assumed to represent a real difference between the two populations. Our significance level is set at 0.05 which means that there is only a 5% likelihood that the difference is due to chance.



## Survey summary

### SECTION I: ABOUT YOU

|           |  |           |
|-----------|--|-----------|
| <b>Q1</b> | <b>How old are you?</b>                      |           |
|           | 15 .....                                     | 7 (5%)    |
|           | 16 .....                                     | 33 (24%)  |
|           | 17 .....                                     | 81 (59%)  |
|           | 18 .....                                     | 16 (12%)  |
| <b>Q2</b> | <b>Are you a British citizen?</b>            |           |
|           | Yes .....                                    | 131 (98%) |
|           | No .....                                     | 2 (2%)    |
| <b>Q3</b> | <b>Do you understand spoken English?</b>     |           |
|           | Yes .....                                    | 134 (99%) |
|           | No .....                                     | 2 (1%)    |
| <b>Q4</b> | <b>Do you understand written English?</b>    |           |
|           | Yes .....                                    | 130 (97%) |
|           | No .....                                     | 4 (3%)    |
| <b>Q5</b> | <b>What is your ethnic origin?</b>           |           |
|           | White - British .....                        | 102 (76%) |
|           | White - Irish .....                          | 5 (4%)    |
|           | White - Other .....                          | 1 (1%)    |
|           | Black or Black British - Caribbean .....     | 6 (4%)    |
|           | Black or Black British - African .....       | 4 (3%)    |
|           | Black or Black British - Other .....         | 0 (0%)    |
|           | Asian or Asian British - Indian .....        | 0 (0%)    |
|           | Asian or Asian British - Pakistani .....     | 2 (1%)    |
|           | Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi .....   | 1 (1%)    |
|           | Asian or Asian British - Chinese .....       | 0 (0%)    |
|           | Asian or Asian British - Other .....         | 2 (1%)    |
|           | Mixed race - White and Black Caribbean ..... | 2 (1%)    |
|           | Mixed race - White and Black African .....   | 0 (0%)    |
|           | Mixed race - White and Asian .....           | 2 (1%)    |
|           | Mixed race - Other .....                     | 4 (3%)    |
|           | Arab .....                                   | 4 (3%)    |
|           | Other ethnic group .....                     | 0 (0%)    |
| <b>Q6</b> | <b>What is your religion?</b>                |           |
|           | None .....                                   | 51 (38%)  |
|           | Church of England .....                      | 20 (15%)  |
|           | Catholic .....                               | 41 (30%)  |
|           | Protestant .....                             | 1 (1%)    |
|           | Other Christian denomination .....           | 2 (1%)    |
|           | Buddhist .....                               | 0 (0%)    |
|           | Hindu .....                                  | 0 (0%)    |
|           | Jewish .....                                 | 0 (0%)    |
|           | Muslim .....                                 | 20 (15%)  |
|           | Sikh .....                                   | 1 (1%)    |

|            |  |           |
|------------|--|-----------|
| <b>Q7</b>  | <b>Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?</b>  |           |
|            | Yes .....  | 7 (5%)    |
|            | No.....  | 123 (93%) |
|            | Don't know .....   | 2 (2%)    |
| <b>Q8</b>  | <b>Do you have any children?</b>   |           |
|            | Yes .....  | 15 (12%)  |
|            | No.....  | 115 (88%) |
| <b>Q9</b>  | <b>Do you consider yourself to have a disability? (i.e. do you need help with any long-term physical, mental or learning needs.)</b> |           |
|            | Yes .....  | 23 (17%)  |
|            | No.....  | 112 (83%) |
| <b>Q10</b> | <b>Have you ever been in local authority care?</b>   |           |
|            | Yes .....  | 55 (40%)  |
|            | No.....  | 81 (60%)  |

### SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE

|           |   |           |
|-----------|---|-----------|
| <b>Q1</b> | <b>Are you sentenced?</b>   |           |
|           | Yes .....   | 119 (87%) |
|           | No - unsentenced/on remand .....  | 18 (13%)  |
| <b>Q2</b> | <b>How long is your sentence (the full DTO sentence)?</b>   |           |
|           | Not sentenced.....  | 18 (13%)  |
|           | Less than 6 months.....   | 20 (15%)  |
|           | 6 to 12 months.....   | 35 (26%)  |
|           | More than 12 months, up to 2 years.....   | 38 (28%)  |
|           | More than 2 years.....  | 21 (15%)  |
|           | Indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP).....   | 4 (3%)    |
| <b>Q3</b> | <b>How long have you been in this establishment?</b>  |           |
|           | Less than 1 month.....  | 29 (21%)  |
|           | 1 to 6 months.....  | 65 (47%)  |
|           | More than 6 months, but less than 12 months.....  | 24 (17%)  |
|           | 12 months to 2 years.....   | 20 (14%)  |
|           | More than 2 years.....  | 0 (0%)    |
| <b>Q4</b> | <b>Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?</b> |           |
|           | Yes .....   | 69 (51%)  |
|           | No.....   | 67 (49%)  |

### SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS

|           |   |           |
|-----------|---|-----------|
| <b>Q1</b> | <b>On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?</b>   |           |
|           | Yes .....   | 122 (88%) |
|           | No.....   | 8 (6%)    |
|           | Don't remember .....  | 8 (6%)    |
| <b>Q2</b> | <b>On your most recent journey here, were there any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females travelling with you?</b> |           |
|           | Yes .....   | 45 (33%)  |
|           | No.....   | 67 (49%)  |
|           | Don't remember .....  | 26 (19%)  |

|           |  |          |
|-----------|--|----------|
| <b>Q3</b> | <b>On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?</b>                          |          |
|           | <i>Less than 2 hours</i> .....   | 72 (52%) |
|           | <i>2 to 4 hours</i> .....  | 51 (37%) |
|           | <i>More than 4 hours</i> .....   | 8 (6%)   |
|           | <i>Don't remember</i> .....  | 7 (5%)   |
| <b>Q4</b> | <b>On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?</b>                            |          |
|           | <i>My journey was less than 2 hours</i> .....  | 72 (53%) |
|           | <i>Yes</i> .....   | 15 (11%) |
|           | <i>No</i> .....  | 46 (34%) |
|           | <i>Don't remember</i> .....  | 3 (2%)   |
| <b>Q5</b> | <b>On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?</b>                  |          |
|           | <i>My journey was less than 2 hours</i> .....  | 72 (53%) |
|           | <i>Yes</i> .....   | 23 (17%) |
|           | <i>No</i> .....  | 38 (28%) |
|           | <i>Don't remember</i> .....  | 2 (1%)   |
| <b>Q6</b> | <b>On your most recent journey here, how did you feel you were treated by the escort staff?</b>      |          |
|           | <i>Very well</i> .....   | 22 (16%) |
|           | <i>Well</i> .....  | 47 (34%) |
|           | <i>Neither</i> .....   | 44 (32%) |
|           | <i>Badly</i> .....   | 7 (5%)   |
|           | <i>Very badly</i> .....  | 3 (2%)   |
|           | <i>Don't remember</i> .....  | 15 (11%) |
| <b>Q7</b> | <b>Before you arrived here, did you receive any information to help you prepare for coming here?</b> |          |
|           | <i>Yes - and it was helpful</i> .....  | 20 (15%) |
|           | <i>Yes - but it was not helpful</i> .....  | 22 (16%) |
|           | <i>No - I received no information</i> .....  | 68 (50%) |
|           | <i>Don't remember</i> .....  | 27 (20%) |

#### SECTION 4: FIRST DAYS

|           |  |           |
|-----------|--|-----------|
| <b>Q1</b> | <b>How long were you in reception?</b>   |           |
|           | <i>Less than 2 hours</i> .....   | 112 (82%) |
|           | <i>2 hours or longer</i> .....   | 9 (7%)    |
|           | <i>Don't remember</i> .....  | 16 (12%)  |
| <b>Q2</b> | <b>When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?</b>   |           |
|           | <i>Yes</i> .....   | 119 (87%) |
|           | <i>No</i> .....  | 10 (7%)   |
|           | <i>Don't remember/Not applicable</i> .....   | 8 (6%)    |
| <b>Q3</b> | <b>How well did you feel you were treated in reception?</b>  |           |
|           | <i>Very well</i> .....   | 32 (24%)  |
|           | <i>Well</i> .....  | 68 (50%)  |
|           | <i>Neither</i> .....   | 25 (18%)  |
|           | <i>Badly</i> .....   | 2 (1%)    |
|           | <i>Very badly</i> .....  | 4 (3%)    |
|           | <i>Don't remember</i> .....  | 5 (4%)    |
| <b>Q4</b> | <b>When you first arrived here, did staff ask if you needed help or support with any of the following things? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b> |           |
|           | <i>Not being able to smoke</i> ..... 73 (56%) <i>Money worries</i> .....   | 22 (17%)  |

|                         |          |   |          |
|-------------------------|----------|---|----------|
| Loss of property .....  | 28 (21%) | Feeling worried/upset/need-<br>ing someone to talk to ..... | 37 (28%) |
| Feeling scared.....     | 32 (24%) | Health problems.....  | 73 (56%) |
| Gang problems.....      | 67 (51%) | Getting phone numbers.....                                  | 52 (40%) |
| Contacting family ..... | 73 (56%) | Staff did not ask me about any of<br>these .....            | 16 (12%) |

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

|                               |          |   |          |
|-------------------------------|----------|---|----------|
| Not being able to smoke ..... | 65 (52%) | Money worries .....   | 14 (11%) |
| Loss of property .....        | 17 (14%) | Feeling worried/upset/need-<br>ing someone to talk to ..... | 18 (15%) |
| Feeling scared.....           | 15 (12%) | Health problems.....  | 13 (10%) |
| Gang problems.....            | 15 (12%) | Getting phone numbers.....                                  | 35 (28%) |
| Contacting family .....       | 33 (27%) | I did not have any problems .....                           | 28 (23%) |

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

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| Toiletries/basic items .....                  | 115 (84%) |
| The opportunity to have a shower .....        | 101 (74%) |
| Something to eat.....                         | 120 (88%) |
| A free phone call to friends/family .....     | 117 (85%) |
| PIN phone credit.....                         | 97 (71%)  |
| Information about feeling worried/upset ..... | 61 (45%)  |
| Don't remember .....                          | 8 (6%)    |
| I was not given any of these.....             | 2 (1%)    |

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

|   |          |
|---|----------|
| Chaplain.....                               | 78 (57%) |
| Peer mentor .....                           | 31 (23%) |
| Childline/Samaritans.....                   | 35 (26%) |
| The prison shop/canteen.....                | 17 (13%) |
| Don't remember .....                        | 17 (13%) |
| I did not have access to any of these ..... | 33 (24%) |

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

|                      |           |
|----------------------|-----------|
| Yes .....            | 103 (75%) |
| No.....              | 24 (18%)  |
| Don't remember ..... | 10 (7%)   |

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

|                      |           |
|----------------------|-----------|
| Yes .....            | 111 (83%) |
| No.....              | 14 (10%)  |
| Don't remember ..... | 9 (7%)    |

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

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| I have not been on an induction course ..... | 10 (7%)  |
| Yes .....                                    | 89 (65%) |
| No.....                                      | 22 (16%) |
| Don't remember .....                         | 15 (11%) |

## SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT

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

|           |           |
|-----------|-----------|
| Yes ..... | 109 (80%) |
| No .....  | 23 (17%)  |

|            |  |          |
|------------|--|----------|
|            | <i>Don't know</i> .....  | 4 (3%)   |
| <b>Q2</b>  | <b>Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?</b>                         |          |
|            | Yes .....  | 44 (33%) |
|            | No.....  | 82 (62%) |
|            | <i>Don't know</i> .....  | 7 (5%)   |
| <b>Q3</b>  | <b>What is the food like here?</b>   |          |
|            | <i>Very good</i> .....   | 1 (1%)   |
|            | <i>Good</i> .....  | 20 (15%) |
|            | <i>Neither</i> .....   | 38 (28%) |
|            | <i>Bad</i> .....   | 39 (29%) |
|            | <i>Very bad</i> .....  | 36 (27%) |
| <b>Q4</b>  | <b>Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?</b>                         |          |
|            | <i>I have not bought anything yet/Don't know</i> .....                                       | 7 (5%)   |
|            | Yes .....  | 69 (51%) |
|            | No.....  | 60 (44%) |
| <b>Q5</b>  | <b>How easy is it for you to attend religious services?</b>                                  |          |
|            | <i>I don't want to attend religious services</i> .....                                       | 21 (16%) |
|            | <i>Very easy</i> .....   | 39 (29%) |
|            | <i>Easy</i> .....  | 42 (31%) |
|            | <i>Neither</i> .....   | 10 (7%)  |
|            | <i>Difficult</i> .....   | 3 (2%)   |
|            | <i>Very difficult</i> .....  | 2 (1%)   |
|            | <i>Don't know</i> .....  | 17 (13%) |
| <b>Q6</b>  | <b>Are your religious beliefs respected?</b>   |          |
|            | Yes .....  | 77 (58%) |
|            | No.....  | 13 (10%) |
|            | <i>Don't know/Not applicable</i> .....   | 43 (32%) |
| <b>Q7</b>  | <b>Can you speak to a Chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?</b>                  |          |
|            | Yes .....  | 98 (73%) |
|            | No.....  | 3 (2%)   |
|            | <i>Don't know/Not applicable</i> .....   | 34 (25%) |
| <b>Q8</b>  | <b>Can you speak to a peer mentor when you need to?</b>                                      |          |
|            | Yes .....  | 57 (42%) |
|            | No.....  | 17 (13%) |
|            | <i>Don't know</i> .....  | 61 (45%) |
| <b>Q9</b>  | <b>Can you speak to a member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board) when you need to?</b> |          |
|            | Yes.....   | 35 (26%) |
|            | No .....   | 15 (11%) |
|            | <i>Don't know</i> .....  | 85 (63%) |
| <b>Q10</b> | <b>Can you speak to an advocate (an outside person to help you) when you need to?</b>        |          |
|            | Yes .....  | 64 (47%) |
|            | No.....  | 15 (11%) |
|            | <i>Don't know</i> .....  | 57 (42%) |

**SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF**

|           |   |          |   |
|-----------|---|----------|---|
| <b>Q1</b> | <b>Do most staff treat you with respect?</b>  |          |   |
|           | Yes .....   | 99 (76%) |   |
|           | No.....   | 32 (24%) |   |
| <b>Q2</b> | <b>If you had a problem, who would you turn to? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>    |          |   |
|           | No-one .....  | 29 (22%) | Social worker..... 20 (15%)             |
|           | Personal officer .....  | 46 (35%) | Health services staff..... 15 (11%)     |
|           | Wing Officer.....   | 33 (25%) | Peer mentor .....                       |
|           | Teacher/education staff .....   | 8 (6%)   | Another young person here..... 20 (15%) |
|           | Gym staff.....  | 4 (3%)   | Case worker..... 20 (15%)               |
|           | Chaplain.....   | 23 (17%) | Advocate..... 8 (6%)                    |
|           | Independent Monitoring Board (IMB) ..   | 4 (3%)   | Family/friends..... 67 (51%)            |
|           | YOT worker .....  | 38 (29%) | Childline/Samaritans .....              |
|           |   |          | 1 (1%)                                  |
| <b>Q3</b> | <b>Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?</b> |          |   |
|           | Yes .....   | 52 (40%) |   |
|           | No.....   | 77 (60%) |   |
| <b>Q4</b> | <b>When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?</b>                               |          |   |
|           | I still have not met him/her .....  | 19 (15%) |   |
|           | In your first week .....  | 55 (42%) |   |
|           | After your first week.....  | 42 (32%) |   |
|           | Don't remember .....  | 15 (11%) |   |
| <b>Q5</b> | <b>How often do you see your personal (named) officer?</b>                                  |          |   |
|           | I still have not met him/her .....  | 19 (15%) |   |
|           | At least once a week .....  | 77 (60%) |   |
|           | Less than once a week.....  | 33 (26%) |   |
| <b>Q6</b> | <b>Do you feel your personal (named) officer tries to help you?</b>                         |          |   |
|           | I still have not met him/her .....  | 19 (15%) |   |
|           | Yes .....   | 85 (69%) |   |
|           | No.....   | 20 (16%) |   |

**SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS**

|           |   |           |  |
|-----------|---|-----------|--|
| <b>Q1</b> | <b>Is it easy to make an application?</b>                   |           |  |
|           | Yes .....   | 114 (86%) |  |
|           | No.....   | 8 (6%)    |  |
|           | Don't know .....  | 11 (8%)   |  |
| <b>Q2</b> | <b>Are applications sorted out fairly?</b>                  |           |  |
|           | I have not made an application .....                        | 21 (17%)  |  |
|           | Yes .....   | 85 (68%)  |  |
|           | No.....   | 19 (15%)  |  |
| <b>Q3</b> | <b>Are applications sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?</b> |           |  |
|           | I have not made an application .....                        | 21 (16%)  |  |
|           | Yes .....   | 79 (62%)  |  |
|           | No.....   | 28 (22%)  |  |
| <b>Q4</b> | <b>Is it easy to make a complaint?</b>                      |           |  |
|           | Yes .....   | 84 (63%)  |  |
|           | No.....   | 12 (9%)   |  |
|           | Don't know .....  | 37 (28%)  |  |

|           |  |          |
|-----------|--|----------|
| <b>Q5</b> | <b>Are complaints sorted out fairly?</b>                                 |          |
|           | <i>I have not made a complaint</i> .....                                 | 70 (53%) |
|           | Yes .....  | 35 (27%) |
|           | No.....  | 27 (20%) |
| <b>Q6</b> | <b>Are complaints sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?</b>                |          |
|           | <i>I have not made a complaint</i> .....                                 | 70 (53%) |
|           | Yes .....  | 32 (24%) |
|           | No.....  | 30 (23%) |
| <b>Q7</b> | <b>Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint?</b> |          |
|           | Yes .....  | 8 (6%)   |
|           | No.....  | 79 (62%) |
|           | <i>Never needed to make a complaint</i> .....                            | 41 (32%) |

## SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE

|           |  |          |
|-----------|--|----------|
| <b>Q1</b> | <b>What level of the rewards and sanctions scheme are you on?</b>  |          |
|           | <i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i> .....   | 2 (2%)   |
|           | <i>Enhanced (top)</i> .....  | 37 (28%) |
|           | <i>Standard (middle)</i> .....   | 67 (51%) |
|           | <i>Basic (bottom)</i> .....  | 22 (17%) |
|           | <i>Don't know</i> .....  | 3 (2%)   |
| <b>Q2</b> | <b>Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the rewards and sanctions scheme?</b>                |          |
|           | <i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i> .....   | 2 (2%)   |
|           | Yes .....  | 73 (57%) |
|           | No.....  | 36 (28%) |
|           | <i>Don't know</i> .....  | 16 (13%) |
| <b>Q3</b> | <b>Do the different levels of the rewards and sanctions scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?</b> |          |
|           | <i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i> .....   | 2 (2%)   |
|           | Yes .....  | 79 (62%) |
|           | No.....  | 37 (29%) |
|           | <i>Don't know</i> .....  | 9 (7%)   |
| <b>Q4</b> | <b>Have you had a minor report since you have been here?</b>   |          |
|           | Yes .....  | 81 (61%) |
|           | No.....  | 41 (31%) |
|           | <i>Don't know</i> .....  | 10 (8%)  |
| <b>Q5</b> | <b>If you have had a minor report, was the process explained clearly to you?</b>                           |          |
|           | <i>I have not had a minor report</i> .....   | 51 (39%) |
|           | Yes .....  | 69 (53%) |
|           | No.....  | 11 (8%)  |
| <b>Q6</b> | <b>Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?</b>                                  |          |
|           | Yes .....  | 82 (62%) |
|           | No.....  | 46 (35%) |
|           | <i>Don't know</i> .....  | 4 (3%)   |
| <b>Q7</b> | <b>If you have had an adjudication ('nicking'), was the process explained clearly to you?</b>              |          |
|           | <i>I have not had an adjudication</i> .....  | 50 (39%) |
|           | Yes .....  | 69 (53%) |
|           | No.....  | 10 (8%)  |

|           |  |          |
|-----------|--|----------|
| <b>Q8</b> | <b>Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?</b>                         |          |
|           | Yes .....  | 46 (35%) |
|           | No.....  | 78 (59%) |
|           | Don't know .....   | 8 (6%)   |
| <b>Q9</b> | <b>If you have spent a night in the care and separation unit (CSU), how were you treated by staff?</b> |          |
|           | <i>I have not been to the care and separation unit</i> .....   | 96 (74%) |
|           | Very well.....   | 5 (4%)   |
|           | Well.....  | 9 (7%)   |
|           | Neither .....  | 8 (6%)   |
|           | Badly.....   | 8 (6%)   |
|           | Very badly.....  | 3 (2%)   |

## SECTION 9: SAFETY

|           |   |           |
|-----------|---|-----------|
| <b>Q1</b> | <b>Have you ever felt unsafe here?</b>  |           |
|           | Yes .....   | 34 (26%)  |
|           | No.....   | 98 (74%)  |
| <b>Q2</b> | <b>Do you feel unsafe now?</b>  |           |
|           | Yes .....   | 8 (6%)    |
|           | No.....   | 120 (94%) |
| <b>Q3</b> | <b>In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>  |           |
|           | Never felt unsafe .....   | 98 (77%)  |
|           | Everywhere .....  | 7 (5%)    |
|           | Care and separation unit.....   | 4 (3%)    |
|           | Association areas .....   | 10 (8%)   |
|           | Reception area .....  | 0 (0%)    |
|           | At the gym .....  | 2 (2%)    |
|           | In an exercise yard .....   | 6 (5%)    |
|           | At work.....  | 1 (1%)    |
|           | At education .....  | 5 (4%)    |
|           | At religious services.....  | 0 (0%)    |
|           | At meal times .....   | 6 (5%)    |
|           | At healthcare .....   | 1 (1%)    |
|           | Visits area .....   | 5 (4%)    |
|           | In wing showers.....  | 2 (2%)    |
|           | In gym showers .....  | 1 (1%)    |
|           | In corridors/stairwells.....  | 8 (6%)    |
|           | On your landing/wing .....  | 10 (8%)   |
|           | During movement.....  | 12 (9%)   |
|           | In your cell .....  | 3 (2%)    |
| <b>Q4</b> | <b>Have you ever been victimised by another young person/group of young people here? (e.g. insulted or assaulted you)</b> |           |
|           | Yes .....   | 30 (23%)  |
|           | No.....   | 101 (77%) |
| <b>Q5</b> | <b>If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>                   |           |
|           | Insulting remarks (about you, your family or friends).....  | 22 (17%)  |
|           | Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted) .....   | 9 (7%)    |
|           | Sexual abuse .....  | 0 (0%)    |
|           | Feeling threatened or intimidated .....   | 12 (9%)   |
|           | Having your canteen/property taken.....   | 5 (4%)    |



|  |         |
|--|---------|
| Medication.....  | 0 (0%)  |
| Debt .....   | 4 (3%)  |
| Drugs.....   | 2 (2%)  |
| Your race or ethnic origin.....                              | 1 (1%)  |
| Your religion/religious beliefs .....                        | 0 (0%)  |
| Your nationality .....                                       | 0 (0%)  |
| You are from a different part of the country to others ..... | 2 (2%)  |
| You are from a Traveller community.....                      | 1 (1%)  |
| Your sexuality .....   | 1 (1%)  |
| Your age.....  | 1 (1%)  |
| You having a disability .....                                | 1 (1%)  |
| You were new here.....                                       | 11 (8%) |
| Your offence/crime.....                                      | 2 (2%)  |
| Gang related issues.....                                     | 4 (3%)  |

|            |   |           |
|------------|---|-----------|
| <b>Q7</b>  | <b>Have you ever been victimised by staff here? (e.g. insulted or assaulted you)</b>                    |           |
|            | Yes .....   | 29 (22%)  |
|            | No.....   | 103 (78%) |
| <b>Q8</b>  | <b>If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b> |           |
|            | Insulting remarks (about you, your family or friends).....  | 16 (12%)  |
|            | Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted) .....   | 6 (5%)    |
|            | Sexual abuse .....  | 0 (0%)    |
|            | Feeling threatened or intimidated .....   | 6 (5%)    |
|            | Having your canteen/property taken.....   | 3 (2%)    |
|            | Medication.....   | 1 (1%)    |
|            | Debt .....  | 0 (0%)    |
|            | Drugs.....  | 0 (0%)    |
|            | Your race or ethnic origin.....   | 1 (1%)    |
|            | Your religion/religious beliefs .....   | 1 (1%)    |
|            | Your nationality .....  | 0 (0%)    |
|            | You are from a different part of the country to others .....  | 2 (2%)    |
|            | You are from a Traveller community.....   | 0 (0%)    |
|            | Your sexuality .....  | 0 (0%)    |
|            | Your age.....   | 0 (0%)    |
|            | You having a disability .....   | 0 (0%)    |
|            | You were new here.....  | 0 (0%)    |
|            | Your offence/crime.....   | 0 (0%)    |
|            | Gang related issues.....  | 1 (1%)    |
|            | Because you made a complaint .....  | 8 (6%)    |
| <b>Q10</b> | <b>If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?</b>                                  |           |
|            | Yes .....   | 32 (26%)  |
|            | No.....   | 72 (59%)  |
|            | Don't know .....  | 18 (15%)  |
| <b>Q11</b> | <b>Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?</b>             |           |
|            | Yes .....   | 43 (33%)  |
|            | No.....   | 47 (36%)  |
|            | Don't know .....  | 39 (30%)  |
| <b>Q12</b> | <b>Is shouting through the windows a problem here?</b>  |           |
|            | Yes .....   | 52 (40%)  |
|            | No.....   | 59 (45%)  |
|            | Don't know .....  | 20 (15%)  |

## SECTION 10: HEALTH SERVICES

|            |   |           |          |            |
|------------|---|-----------|----------|------------|
| <b>Q1</b>  | <b>Is it easy to see the following people if you need to?</b>   |           |          |            |
|            |   | Yes       | No       | Don't know |
|            | The doctor .....  | 94 (72%)  | 25 (19%) | 11 (8%)    |
|            | The nurse .....   | 106 (83%) | 17 (13%) | 5 (4%)     |
|            | The dentist .....   | 72 (57%)  | 37 (29%) | 18 (14%)   |
| <b>Q2</b>  | <b>What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?</b>  |           |          |            |
|            | <i>I have not been</i> .....  |           |          | 10 (8%)    |
|            | <i>Very good</i> .....  |           |          | 20 (15%)   |
|            | <i>Good</i> .....   |           |          | 67 (51%)   |
|            | <i>Neither</i> .....  |           |          | 16 (12%)   |
|            | <i>Bad</i> .....  |           |          | 13 (10%)   |
|            | <i>Very bad</i> .....   |           |          | 5 (4%)     |
| <b>Q3</b>  | <b>If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/all of it in your room?</b>   |           |          |            |
|            | <i>I am not taking any medication</i> .....   |           |          | 70 (54%)   |
|            | <i>Yes, all of my meds</i> .....  |           |          | 9 (7%)     |
|            | <i>Yes, some of my meds</i> .....   |           |          | 26 (20%)   |
|            | <i>No</i> .....   |           |          | 25 (19%)   |
| <b>Q4</b>  | <b>Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?</b>   |           |          |            |
|            | <i>Yes</i> .....  |           |          | 29 (23%)   |
|            | <i>No</i> .....   |           |          | 97 (77%)   |
| <b>Q5</b>  | <b>Are you being helped by anyone here with your emotional or mental health problems? (e.g. a psychologist, doctor, counsellor, personal officer or another member of staff.)</b> |           |          |            |
|            | <i>I do not have any emotional or mental health problems</i> .....  |           |          | 97 (76%)   |
|            | <i>Yes</i> .....  |           |          | 25 (20%)   |
|            | <i>No</i> .....   |           |          | 6 (5%)     |
| <b>Q6</b>  | <b>Did you have problems with alcohol when you first arrived here?</b>  |           |          |            |
|            | <i>Yes</i> .....  |           |          | 7 (5%)     |
|            | <i>No</i> .....   |           |          | 125 (95%)  |
| <b>Q7</b>  | <b>Have you received any help with alcohol problems here?</b>   |           |          |            |
|            | <i>Yes</i> .....  |           |          | 4 (3%)     |
|            | <i>No</i> .....   |           |          | 128 (97%)  |
| <b>Q8</b>  | <b>Did you have problems with drugs when you first arrived here?</b>  |           |          |            |
|            | <i>Yes</i> .....  |           |          | 56 (43%)   |
|            | <i>No</i> .....   |           |          | 75 (57%)   |
| <b>Q9</b>  | <b>Do you have problems with drugs now?</b>   |           |          |            |
|            | <i>Yes</i> .....  |           |          | 8 (6%)     |
|            | <i>No</i> .....   |           |          | 122 (94%)  |
| <b>Q10</b> | <b>Have you received any help with drugs problems here?</b>   |           |          |            |
|            | <i>Yes</i> .....  |           |          | 33 (25%)   |
|            | <i>No</i> .....   |           |          | 98 (75%)   |
| <b>Q11</b> | <b>How easy or difficult is it to get illegal drugs here?</b>   |           |          |            |
|            | <i>Very easy</i> .....  |           |          | 15 (12%)   |
|            | <i>Easy</i> .....   |           |          | 16 (12%)   |
|            | <i>Neither</i> .....  |           |          | 14 (11%)   |
|            | <i>Difficult</i> .....  |           |          | 12 (9%)    |

|                     |          |
|---------------------|----------|
| Very difficult..... | 11 (9%)  |
| Don't know .....    | 61 (47%) |

### SECTION 11: ACTIVITIES

|           |  |                          |            |           |                   |
|-----------|--|--------------------------|------------|-----------|-------------------|
| <b>Q1</b> | <b>How old were you when you were last at school?</b>  |                          |            |           |                   |
|           | 14 or under .....  |                          |            |           | 53 (41%)          |
|           | 15 or over.....  |                          |            |           | 77 (59%)          |
| <b>Q2</b> | <b>Have you ever been excluded from school?</b>  |                          |            |           |                   |
|           | Yes.....   |                          |            |           | 118 (90%)         |
|           | No.....  |                          |            |           | 11 (8%)           |
|           | Not applicable.....  |                          |            |           | 2 (2%)            |
| <b>Q3</b> | <b>Did you ever skip school before you came into custody?</b>  |                          |            |           |                   |
|           | Yes .....  |                          |            |           | 105 (81%)         |
|           | No.....  |                          |            |           | 13 (10%)          |
|           | Not applicable.....  |                          |            |           | 11 (9%)           |
| <b>Q4</b> | <b>Do you CURRENTLY take part in any of the following activities?<br/>(Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>                   |                          |            |           |                   |
|           | Education.....   |                          |            |           | 94 (73%)          |
|           | A job in this establishment.....   |                          |            |           | 36 (28%)          |
|           | Vocational or skills training.....   |                          |            |           | 22 (17%)          |
|           | Offending behaviour programmes .....   |                          |            |           | 27 (21%)          |
|           | I am not currently involved in any of these.....   |                          |            |           | 16 (12%)          |
| <b>Q5</b> | <b>If you have been involved in any of the following activities here, do you think they will help you when you leave prison?</b> |                          |            |           |                   |
|           |  | <i>Not been involved</i> | <i>Yes</i> | <i>No</i> | <i>Don't know</i> |
|           | Education  | 8<br>(7%)                | 78 (63%)   | 15 (12%)  | 22 (18%)          |
|           | A job in this establishment  | 18 (20%)                 | 43 (48%)   | 10 (11%)  | 18 (20%)          |
|           | Vocational or skills training  | 23 (26%)                 | 35 (40%)   | 11 (13%)  | 19 (22%)          |
|           | Offending behaviour programmes   | 20 (23%)                 | 40 (45%)   | 14 (16%)  | 14 (16%)          |
| <b>Q6</b> | <b>Do you usually have association every day?</b>  |                          |            |           |                   |
|           | Yes.....   |                          |            |           | 110 (84%)         |
|           | No.....  |                          |            |           | 21 (16%)          |
| <b>Q7</b> | <b>Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?</b>  |                          |            |           |                   |
|           | Don't want to go.....  |                          |            |           | 17 (13%)          |
|           | Yes.....   |                          |            |           | 65 (49%)          |
|           | No.....  |                          |            |           | 50 (38%)          |
| <b>Q8</b> | <b>How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?</b>  |                          |            |           |                   |
|           | Don't want to go.....  |                          |            |           | 23 (18%)          |
|           | None.....  |                          |            |           | 18 (14%)          |
|           | One to two times .....   |                          |            |           | 24 (18%)          |
|           | Three to five times.....   |                          |            |           | 31 (24%)          |
|           | More than five times .....   |                          |            |           | 35 (27%)          |

### SECTION 12: FAMILY AND FRIENDS

|           |   |           |
|-----------|---|-----------|
| <b>Q1</b> | <b>Are you able to use the telephone every day, if you want to?</b> |           |
|           | Yes .....   | 119 (91%) |
|           | No.....   | 11 (8%)   |

|           |   |          |
|-----------|---|----------|
|           | <i>Don't know</i> .....   | 1 (1%)   |
| <b>Q2</b> | <b>Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?</b> |          |
|           | Yes .....   | 40 (30%) |
|           | No.....   | 81 (61%) |
|           | <i>Don't know</i> .....   | 11 (8%)  |
| <b>Q3</b> | <b>How many visits do you usually have each week, from family or friends?</b>         |          |
|           | <i>I don't get visits</i> .....   | 28 (22%) |
|           | <i>Less than one a week</i> .....   | 28 (22%) |
|           | <i>About one a week</i> .....   | 61 (47%) |
|           | <i>More than one a week</i> .....   | 2 (2%)   |
|           | <i>Don't know</i> .....   | 11 (8%)  |
| <b>Q4</b> | <b>How easy is it for your family and friends to visit you here?</b>                  |          |
|           | <i>I don't get visits</i> .....   | 28 (21%) |
|           | <i>Very easy</i> .....  | 22 (17%) |
|           | <i>Easy</i> .....   | 32 (24%) |
|           | <i>Neither</i> .....  | 19 (14%) |
|           | <i>Difficult</i> .....  | 17 (13%) |
|           | <i>Very difficult</i> .....   | 7 (5%)   |
|           | <i>Don't know</i> .....   | 7 (5%)   |
| <b>Q5</b> | <b>Do your visits usually start on time?</b>  |          |
|           | <i>I don't get visits</i> .....   | 28 (22%) |
|           | Yes .....   | 73 (57%) |
|           | No.....   | 18 (14%) |
|           | <i>Don't know</i> .....   | 10 (8%)  |

### SECTION 13: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE

|           |  |          |
|-----------|--|----------|
| <b>Q1</b> | <b>Do you think you will have a problem with any of the following things, when you are released? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>                    |          |
|           | <i>Finding accommodation</i> .....   | 23 (19%) |
|           | <i>Getting into school or college</i> .....  | 40 (33%) |
|           | <i>Getting a job</i> .....   | 64 (53%) |
|           | <i>Money/finances</i> .....  | 44 (36%) |
|           | <i>Claiming benefits</i> .....   | 18 (15%) |
|           | <i>Continuing health services</i> .....  | 7 (6%)   |
|           | <i>Opening a bank account</i> .....  | 16 (13%) |
|           | <i>Avoiding bad relationships</i> .....  | 12 (10%) |
|           | <i>I won't have any problems</i> .....   | 37 (31%) |
| <b>Q2</b> | <b>Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan? (i.e. a plan that is discussed in your DTO/planning meetings, which sets out your targets)</b> |          |
|           | Yes .....  | 82 (64%) |
|           | No.....  | 18 (14%) |
|           | <i>Don't know</i> .....  | 29 (22%) |
| <b>Q3</b> | <b>Were you involved in the development of your plan?</b>  |          |
|           | <i>I don't have a plan/don't know if I have a plan</i> .....   | 47 (39%) |
|           | Yes .....  | 61 (50%) |
|           | No.....  | 13 (11%) |
| <b>Q4</b> | <b>Do you understand the targets that have been set in your plan?</b>  |          |
|           | <i>I don't have a plan/don't know if I have a plan</i> .....   | 47 (38%) |
|           | Yes .....  | 72 (59%) |

|            |  |           |  |          |
|------------|--|-----------|--|----------|
|            | No.....  | 4 (3%)    |  |          |
| <b>Q5</b>  | <b>Do you have a caseworker here?</b>  |           |  |          |
|            | Yes .....  | 83 (64%)  |  |          |
|            | No.....  | 13 (10%)  |  |          |
|            | Don't know .....   | 33 (26%)  |  |          |
| <b>Q6</b>  | <b>Has your caseworker helped to prepare you for release?</b>  |           |  |          |
|            | <i>I don't have a caseworker.....</i>  | 46 (37%)  |  |          |
|            | Yes .....  | 53 (42%)  |  |          |
|            | No.....  | 22 (18%)  |  |          |
|            | Don't know .....   | 4 (3%)    |  |          |
| <b>Q7</b>  | <b>Has your social worker been to visit you since you have been here?</b>  |           |  |          |
|            | <i>I don't have a social worker.....</i>   | 46 (36%)  |  |          |
|            | Yes .....  | 57 (44%)  |  |          |
|            | No.....  | 26 (20%)  |  |          |
| <b>Q8</b>  | <b>Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?</b>  |           |  |          |
|            | Yes .....  | 49 (39%)  |  |          |
|            | No.....  | 51 (41%)  |  |          |
|            | Don't know .....   | 25 (20%)  |  |          |
| <b>Q9</b>  | <b>Do you know who to contact for help with any of the following problems, before your release? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b> |           |  |          |
|            | <i>Finding accommodation .....</i>   | 34 (32%)  |  |          |
|            | <i>Getting into school or college.....</i>   | 39 (36%)  |  |          |
|            | <i>Getting a job.....</i>  | 35 (33%)  |  |          |
|            | <i>Help with money/finances .....</i>  | 25 (23%)  |  |          |
|            | <i>Help with claiming benefits .....</i>   | 18 (17%)  |  |          |
|            | <i>Continuing health services .....</i>  | 18 (17%)  |  |          |
|            | <i>Opening a bank account.....</i>   | 20 (19%)  |  |          |
|            | <i>Avoiding bad relationships .....</i>  | 16 (15%)  |  |          |
|            | <i>I don't know who to contact.....</i>  | 54 (50%)  |  |          |
| <b>Q10</b> | <b>What is most likely to stop you offending in the future? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>                                     |           |  |          |
|            | <i>Not sentenced.....</i>  | 18 (15%)  | <i>Having a mentor (someone you can ask for advice).....</i>         | 6 (5%)   |
|            | <i>Nothing, it is up to me .....</i>   | 30 (24%)  | <i>Having a YOT worker or social worker that I get on with .....</i> | 26 (21%) |
|            | <i>Making new friends outside.....</i>   | 22 (18%)  | <i>Having children .....</i>   | 21 (17%) |
|            | <i>Going back to live with my family .....</i>   | 30 (24%)  | <i>Having something to do that isn't crime .....</i>                 | 46 (37%) |
|            | <i>Getting a place of my own.....</i>  | 35 (28%)  | <i>This sentence .....</i>   | 41 (33%) |
|            | <i>Getting a job.....</i>  | 63 (51%)  | <i>Getting into school/college .....</i>                             | 36 (29%) |
|            | <i>Having a partner (girlfriend or boyfriend).....</i>   | 41 (33%)  | <i>Talking about my offending behaviour with staff.....</i>          | 9 (7%)   |
|            | <i>Staying off alcohol/drugs .....</i>   | 44 (35%)  | <i>Anything else .....</i>   | 5 (4%)   |
| <b>Q11</b> | <b>Do you want to stop offending?</b>  |           |  |          |
|            | <i>Not sentenced.....</i>  | 18 (14%)  |  |          |
|            | Yes .....  | 101 (80%) |  |          |
|            | No.....  | 2 (2%)    |  |          |
|            | Don't know .....   | 6 (5%)    |  |          |

**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> ..... | 18 (15%) |
| Yes .....                  | 53 (43%) |
| No.....                    | 53 (43%) |

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



### Survey responses from children and young people: HMYOI Hindley 2014

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

#### Key to tables

|  |   | HMYOI Hindley 2014 | Young people's comparator | HMYOI Hindley 2014 | HMYOI Hindley 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   |                    |                           |                    |                    |
| <b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>   |   | <b>138</b>         | <b>591</b>                | <b>138</b>         | <b>169</b>         |
| <b>SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU</b>  |   |                    |                           |                    |                    |
| 1.1  | Are you 18 years of age?  | 12%                | 11%                       | 12%                | 19%                |
| 1.2  | Are you a foreign national?   | 1%                 | 5%                        | 1%                 | 2%                 |
| 1.3  | Do you understand spoken English?   | 99%                | 99%                       | 99%                | 100%               |
| 1.4  | Do you understand written English?  | 97%                | 99%                       | 97%                | 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. | 20%                | 46%                       | 20%                | 18%                |
| 1.6  | Are you Muslim?   | 15%                | 23%                       | 15%                | 8%                 |
| 1.7  | Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?  | 5%                 | 6%                        | 5%                 | 4%                 |
| 1.8  | Do you have any children?   | 12%                | 11%                       | 12%                | 9%                 |
| 1.9  | Do you consider yourself to have a disability?  | 17%                | 20%                       | 17%                | 13%                |
| 1.10   | Have you ever been in local authority care?   | 40%                | 32%                       | 40%                | 33%                |
| <b>SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE</b>  |   |                    |                           |                    |                    |
| 2.1  | Are you sentenced?  | 87%                | 77%                       | 87%                | 83%                |
| 2.2  | Is your sentence 12 months or less?   | 40%                | 37%                       | 40%                | 41%                |
| 2.3  | Have you been in this establishment for one month or less?  | 21%                | 17%                       | 21%                | 18%                |
| 2.4  | Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?                                  | 51%                | 54%                       | 51%                | 58%                |
| <b>SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS</b>  |   |                    |                           |                    |                    |
| On your most recent journey here:  |   |                    |                           |                    |                    |
| 3.1  | Did you feel safe?  | 89%                | 80%                       | 89%                | 92%                |
| 3.2  | Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?   | 33%                | 39%                       | 33%                | 35%                |
| 3.3  | Did you spend more than 4 hours in the van?   | 6%                 | 8%                        | 6%                 | 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?   | 24%                | 14%                       | 24%                | 17%                |
| 3.5  | Were you offered anything to eat or drink?  | 37%                | 37%                       | 37%                | 36%                |
| 3.6  | Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?  | 50%                | 52%                       | 50%                | 55%                |
| 3.7  | Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?                                | 15%                | 15%                       | 15%                | 14%                |
| <b>SECTION 4: YOUR FIRST FEW DAYS HERE</b>   |   |                    |                           |                    |                    |
| 4.1  | Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?  | 82%                | 82%                       | 82%                | 80%                |
| 4.2  | When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?   | 87%                | 76%                       | 87%                | 89%                |
| 4.3  | Were you treated well/very well in reception?   | 73%                | 62%                       | 73%                | 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?  | 55%                | 49%                       | 55%                | 56%                |

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

### Key to tables

|  |   | HMYOI Hindley 2014 | Young people's comparator | HMYOI Hindley 2014 | HMYOI Hindley 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                                       |                    |                           |                    |                    |
| <b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>                                   |   | <b>138</b>         | <b>591</b>                | <b>138</b>         | <b>169</b>         |
| <b>4.4b</b>  | Loss of property?   | 22%                | 19%                       | 22%                | 20%                |
| <b>4.4c</b>  | Feeling scared?   | 24%                | 25%                       | 24%                | 26%                |
| <b>4.4d</b>  | Gang problems?  | 51%                | 45%                       | 51%                | 49%                |
| <b>4.4e</b>  | Contacting family?  | 55%                | 51%                       | 55%                | 57%                |
| <b>4.4f</b>  | Money worries?  | 17%                | 17%                       | 17%                | 22%                |
| <b>4.4g</b>  | Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?   | 28%                | 30%                       | 28%                | 36%                |
| <b>4.4h</b>  | Health problems?  | 55%                | 53%                       | 55%                | 57%                |
| <b>4.4i</b>  | Getting phone numbers?  | 40%                | 38%                       | 40%                | 52%                |
| <b>4.5</b>   | Did you have any problems when you first arrived?   | 77%                | 73%                       | 77%                | 71%                |
| When you first arrived, did you have problems with any of the following:             |   |                    |                           |                    |                    |
| <b>4.5a</b>  | Not being able to smoke?  | 52%                | 45%                       | 52%                | 50%                |
| <b>4.5b</b>  | Loss of property?   | 14%                | 11%                       | 14%                | 5%                 |
| <b>4.5c</b>  | Feeling scared?   | 12%                | 9%                        | 12%                | 5%                 |
| <b>4.5d</b>  | Gang problems?  | 12%                | 16%                       | 12%                | 9%                 |
| <b>4.5e</b>  | Contacting family?  | 26%                | 28%                       | 26%                | 19%                |
| <b>4.5f</b>  | Money worries?  | 11%                | 16%                       | 11%                | 10%                |
| <b>4.5g</b>  | Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?   | 14%                | 10%                       | 14%                | 12%                |
| <b>4.5h</b>  | Health problems?  | 11%                | 13%                       | 11%                | 9%                 |
| <b>4.5i</b>  | Getting phone numbers?  | 28%                | 28%                       | 28%                | 22%                |
| When you first arrived, were you given any of the following:                         |   |                    |                           |                    |                    |
| <b>4.6a</b>  | Toiletries/basic items?   | 84%                | 77%                       | 84%                | 88%                |
| <b>4.6b</b>  | The opportunity to have a shower?   | 74%                | 41%                       | 74%                | 85%                |
| <b>4.6c</b>  | Something to eat?   | 88%                | 82%                       | 88%                | 88%                |
| <b>4.6d</b>  | A free phone call to friends/family?  | 85%                | 78%                       | 85%                | 88%                |
| <b>4.6e</b>  | PIN phone credit?   | 71%                | 57%                       | 71%                | 80%                |
| <b>4.6f</b>  | Information about feeling worried/upset?  | 45%                | 26%                       | 45%                | 45%                |
| Within your first 24 hours, did you have access to the following people or services: |   |                    |                           |                    |                    |
| <b>4.7a</b>  | A chaplain?   | 57%                | 42%                       | 57%                | 59%                |
| <b>4.7b</b>  | A peer mentor?  | 23%                | 10%                       | 23%                | 20%                |
| <b>4.7c</b>  | Childline/Samaritans  | 26%                | 16%                       | 26%                | 26%                |
| <b>4.7d</b>  | The prison shop/canteen?  | 12%                | 10%                       | 12%                | 11%                |
| <b>4.8</b>   | Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?                                  | 75%                | 66%                       | 75%                | 80%                |
| <b>4.9</b>   | Did you feel safe on your first night here?   | 83%                | 77%                       | 83%                | 86%                |
| <b>4.10</b>  | For those who have been on an induction course: did it cover everything you needed to know about the establishment? | 71%                | 58%                       | 71%                | 58%                |
| <b>SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT</b>   |   |                    |                           |                    |                    |
| <b>5.1</b>   | Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?  | 80%                | 79%                       | 80%                | 93%                |
| <b>5.2</b>   | Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?   | 33%                | 34%                       | 33%                | 43%                |
| <b>5.3</b>   | Do you find the food here good/very good?   | 16%                | 16%                       | 16%                | 15%                |
| <b>5.4</b>   | Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?   | 51%                | 50%                       | 51%                | 45%                |



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

### Key to tables

|   | Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better  | HMYOI Hindley 2014 | Young people's comparator | HMYOI Hindley 2014 | HMYOI Hindley 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                            |                    |                           |                    |                    |
| <b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>      |  | <b>138</b>         | <b>591</b>                | <b>138</b>         | <b>169</b>         |
| <b>5.5</b>  | Is it easy/very easy for you to attend religious services?   | <b>61%</b>         | <b>54%</b>                | <b>61%</b>         | <b>69%</b>         |
| <b>5.6</b>  | Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?  | <b>58%</b>         | <b>59%</b>                | <b>58%</b>         | <b>56%</b>         |
| Can you speak to:                                       |  |                    |                           |                    |                    |
| <b>5.7</b>  | A chaplain of your faith in private?   | <b>73%</b>         | <b>67%</b>                | <b>73%</b>         | <b>80%</b>         |
| <b>5.8</b>  | A peer mentor?   | <b>42%</b>         | <b>31%</b>                | <b>42%</b>         | <b>47%</b>         |
| <b>5.9</b>  | A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?  | <b>26%</b>         | <b>20%</b>                | <b>26%</b>         | <b>39%</b>         |
| <b>5.10</b>   | An advocate (an outside person to help you)?   | <b>47%</b>         | <b>45%</b>                | <b>47%</b>         | <b>43%</b>         |
| <b>SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF</b>              |  |                    |                           |                    |                    |
| <b>6.1</b>  | Do most staff treat you with respect?  | <b>76%</b>         | <b>67%</b>                | <b>76%</b>         | <b>72%</b>         |
| <b>6.2</b>  | If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?  | <b>22%</b>         | <b>22%</b>                | <b>22%</b>         | <b>24%</b>         |
| <b>6.3</b>  | Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?                     | <b>40%</b>         | <b>38%</b>                | <b>40%</b>         | <b>46%</b>         |
| For those who have met their personal officer:          |  |                    |                           |                    |                    |
| <b>6.4</b>  | Did you meet your personal (named) officer within the first week?  | <b>49%</b>         | <b>39%</b>                | <b>49%</b>         | <b>55%</b>         |
| <b>6.5</b>  | Do you see your personal (named) officer at least once a week?   | <b>70%</b>         | <b>54%</b>                | <b>70%</b>         | <b>70%</b>         |
| <b>6.6</b>  | Do you feel your personal (named) officer tries to help you?   | <b>81%</b>         | <b>66%</b>                | <b>81%</b>         | <b>81%</b>         |
| <b>SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS</b>           |  |                    |                           |                    |                    |
| <b>7.1</b>  | Is it easy to make an application?   | <b>86%</b>         | <b>71%</b>                | <b>86%</b>         | <b>91%</b>         |
| For those who have made an application:                 |  |                    |                           |                    |                    |
| <b>7.2</b>  | Do you feel applications are sorted out fairly?  | <b>82%</b>         | <b>65%</b>                | <b>82%</b>         | <b>78%</b>         |
| <b>7.3</b>  | Do you feel applications are sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?   | <b>74%</b>         | <b>48%</b>                | <b>74%</b>         | <b>90%</b>         |
| <b>7.4</b>  | Is it easy to make a complaint?  | <b>63%</b>         | <b>51%</b>                | <b>63%</b>         | <b>54%</b>         |
| For those who have made a complaint:                    |  |                    |                           |                    |                    |
| <b>7.5</b>  | Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?  | <b>56%</b>         | <b>34%</b>                | <b>56%</b>         | <b>60%</b>         |
| <b>7.6</b>  | Do you feel complaints are sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?   | <b>51%</b>         | <b>31%</b>                | <b>51%</b>         | <b>67%</b>         |
| <b>7.7</b>  | Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint?  | <b>6%</b>          | <b>10%</b>                | <b>6%</b>          | <b>5%</b>          |
| <b>SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE</b> |  |                    |                           |                    |                    |
| <b>8.1</b>  | Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?  | <b>28%</b>         | <b>26%</b>                | <b>28%</b>         | <b>36%</b>         |
| <b>8.2</b>  | Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?                                    | <b>57%</b>         | <b>44%</b>                | <b>57%</b>         | <b>57%</b>         |
| <b>8.3</b>  | Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?  | <b>62%</b>         | <b>46%</b>                | <b>62%</b>         | <b>53%</b>         |
| <b>8.4</b>  | Have you had a minor report since you have been here?  | <b>61%</b>         | <b>50%</b>                | <b>61%</b>         | <b>73%</b>         |
| For those who have had a minor report:                  |  |                    |                           |                    |                    |
| <b>8.5</b>  | Was the process explained clearly to you?  | <b>87%</b>         | <b>77%</b>                | <b>87%</b>         | <b>84%</b>         |
| <b>8.6</b>  | Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?                                       | <b>62%</b>         | <b>63%</b>                | <b>62%</b>         | <b>59%</b>         |
| For those who have had an adjudication ('nicking'):     |  |                    |                           |                    |                    |
| <b>8.7</b>  | Was the process explained clearly to you?  | <b>88%</b>         | <b>85%</b>                | <b>88%</b>         | <b>94%</b>         |
| <b>8.8</b>  | Have you been physically restrained (Cand R) since you have been here?                                   | <b>35%</b>         | <b>39%</b>                | <b>35%</b>         | <b>24%</b>         |
| <b>8.9</b>  | For those who had spent a night in the care and separation unit: did the staff treat you well/very well? | <b>43%</b>         | <b>39%</b>                | <b>43%</b>         | <b>63%</b>         |
| <b>SECTION 9: SAFETY</b>                                |  |                    |                           |                    |                    |
| <b>9.1</b>  | Have you ever felt unsafe here?  | <b>26%</b>         | <b>30%</b>                | <b>26%</b>         | <b>25%</b>         |

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

### Key to tables

|  |  | HMYOI Hindley 2014 | Young people's comparator | HMYOI Hindley 2014 | HMYOI Hindley 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                            |                    |                           |                    |                    |
| <b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b> |  | <b>138</b>         | <b>591</b>                | <b>138</b>         | <b>169</b>         |
| <b>9.2</b>   | Do you feel unsafe now?  | <b>6%</b>          | <b>12%</b>                | <b>6%</b>          | <b>7%</b>          |
| <b>9.4</b>   | Have you ever been victimised by other young people here?  | <b>23%</b>         | <b>21%</b>                | <b>23%</b>         | <b>20%</b>         |
| Since you have been here, have other young people: |  |                    |                           |                    |                    |
| <b>9.5a</b>  | Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?  | <b>17%</b>         | <b>9%</b>                 | <b>17%</b>         | <b>8%</b>          |
| <b>9.5b</b>  | Hit, kicked or assaulted you?  | <b>7%</b>          | <b>8%</b>                 | <b>7%</b>          | <b>6%</b>          |
| <b>9.5c</b>  | Sexually abused you?   | <b>0%</b>          | <b>1%</b>                 | <b>0%</b>          | <b>3%</b>          |
| <b>9.5d</b>  | Threatened or intimidated you?   | <b>10%</b>         | <b>8%</b>                 | <b>10%</b>         | <b>7%</b>          |
| <b>9.5e</b>  | Taken your canteen/property?   | <b>4%</b>          | <b>3%</b>                 | <b>4%</b>          | <b>3%</b>          |
| <b>9.5f</b>  | Victimised you because of medication?  | <b>0%</b>          | <b>0%</b>                 | <b>0%</b>          | <b>1%</b>          |
| <b>9.5g</b>  | Victimised you because of debt?  | <b>3%</b>          | <b>1%</b>                 | <b>3%</b>          | <b>1%</b>          |
| <b>9.5h</b>  | Victimised you because of drugs?   | <b>1%</b>          | <b>1%</b>                 | <b>1%</b>          | <b>1%</b>          |
| <b>9.5i</b>  | Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?  | <b>1%</b>          | <b>2%</b>                 | <b>1%</b>          | <b>2%</b>          |
| <b>9.5j</b>  | Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?   | <b>0%</b>          | <b>2%</b>                 | <b>0%</b>          | <b>3%</b>          |
| <b>9.5k</b>  | Victimised you because of your nationality?  | <b>0%</b>          | <b>2%</b>                 | <b>0%</b>          | <b>3%</b>          |
| <b>9.5l</b>  | Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?                                    | <b>1%</b>          | <b>3%</b>                 | <b>1%</b>          | <b>3%</b>          |
| <b>9.5m</b>  | Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?   | <b>1%</b>          | <b>0%</b>                 | <b>1%</b>          | <b>1%</b>          |
| <b>9.5n</b>  | Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?   | <b>1%</b>          | <b>1%</b>                 | <b>1%</b>          | <b>1%</b>          |
| <b>9.5o</b>  | Victimised you because of your age?  | <b>1%</b>          | <b>1%</b>                 | <b>1%</b>          | <b>1%</b>          |
| <b>9.5p</b>  | Victimised you because you have a disability?  | <b>1%</b>          | <b>1%</b>                 | <b>1%</b>          | <b>1%</b>          |
| <b>9.5q</b>  | Victimised you because you were new here?  | <b>8%</b>          | <b>5%</b>                 | <b>8%</b>          | <b>3%</b>          |
| <b>9.5r</b>  | Victimised you because of your offence/crime?  | <b>1%</b>          | <b>3%</b>                 | <b>1%</b>          | <b>3%</b>          |
| <b>9.5s</b>  | Victimised you because of gang related issues?   | <b>3%</b>          | <b>5%</b>                 | <b>3%</b>          | <b>3%</b>          |
| <b>9.7</b>   | Have you ever been victimised by a member of staff here?   | <b>22%</b>         | <b>26%</b>                | <b>22%</b>         | <b>25%</b>         |
| Since you have been here, have staff:              |  |                    |                           |                    |                    |
| <b>9.8a</b>  | Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?  | <b>12%</b>         | <b>15%</b>                | <b>12%</b>         | <b>15%</b>         |
| <b>9.8b</b>  | Hit, kicked or assaulted you?  | <b>5%</b>          | <b>5%</b>                 | <b>5%</b>          | <b>3%</b>          |
| <b>9.8c</b>  | Sexually abused you?   | <b>0%</b>          | <b>0%</b>                 | <b>0%</b>          | <b>2%</b>          |
| <b>9.8d</b>  | Threatened or intimidated you?   | <b>5%</b>          | <b>4%</b>                 | <b>5%</b>          | <b>5%</b>          |
| <b>9.8e</b>  | Taken your canteen/property?   | <b>2%</b>          | <b>3%</b>                 | <b>2%</b>          | <b>5%</b>          |
| <b>9.8f</b>  | Victimised you because of medication?  | <b>1%</b>          | <b>1%</b>                 | <b>1%</b>          | <b>2%</b>          |
| <b>9.8g</b>  | Victimised you because of debt?  | <b>0%</b>          | <b>0%</b>                 | <b>0%</b>          | <b>1%</b>          |
| <b>9.8h</b>  | Victimised you because of drugs?   | <b>0%</b>          | <b>1%</b>                 | <b>0%</b>          | <b>1%</b>          |
| <b>9.8i</b>  | Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?  | <b>1%</b>          | <b>4%</b>                 | <b>1%</b>          | <b>3%</b>          |
| <b>9.8j</b>  | Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?   | <b>1%</b>          | <b>3%</b>                 | <b>1%</b>          | <b>3%</b>          |
| <b>9.8k</b>  | Victimised you because of your nationality?  | <b>0%</b>          | <b>2%</b>                 | <b>0%</b>          | <b>1%</b>          |
| <b>9.8k</b>  | Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?                                    | <b>1%</b>          | <b>2%</b>                 | <b>1%</b>          | <b>5%</b>          |
| <b>9.8m</b>  | Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?   | <b>0%</b>          | <b>1%</b>                 | <b>0%</b>          | <b>1%</b>          |
| <b>9.8n</b>  | Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?   | <b>0%</b>          | <b>0%</b>                 | <b>0%</b>          | <b>1%</b>          |

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

### Key to tables

|  |  | HMYOI Hindley 2014 | Young people's comparator | HMYOI Hindley 2014 | HMYOI Hindley 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                            |                    |                           |                    |                    |
| <b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>   |  | <b>138</b>         | <b>591</b>                | <b>138</b>         | <b>169</b>         |
| <b>9.8o</b>  | Victimised you because of your age?  | <b>0%</b>          | <b>1%</b>                 | <b>0%</b>          | <b>2%</b>          |
| <b>9.8p</b>  | Victimised you because you have a disability?  | <b>0%</b>          | <b>2%</b>                 | <b>0%</b>          | <b>1%</b>          |
| <b>9.8q</b>  | Victimised you because you were new here?  | <b>0%</b>          | <b>2%</b>                 | <b>0%</b>          | <b>3%</b>          |
| <b>9.8r</b>  | Victimised you because of your offence/crime?  | <b>0%</b>          | <b>2%</b>                 | <b>0%</b>          | <b>1%</b>          |
| <b>9.8s</b>  | Victimised you because of gang related issues?   | <b>1%</b>          | <b>1%</b>                 | <b>1%</b>          | <b>1%</b>          |
| <b>9.8t</b>  | Victimised you because you made a complaint?   | <b>6%</b>          | <b>5%</b>                 | <b>6%</b>          | <b>5%</b>          |
| <b>9.10</b>  | If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?  | <b>26%</b>         | <b>27%</b>                | <b>26%</b>         | <b>32%</b>         |
| <b>9.11</b>  | Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?                     | <b>34%</b>         | <b>30%</b>                | <b>34%</b>         | <b>36%</b>         |
| <b>9.12</b>  | Is shouting through the windows a problem here?  | <b>40%</b>         | <b>31%</b>                | <b>40%</b>         | <b>33%</b>         |
| <b>SECTION 10: HEALTH SERVICES</b>   |  |                    |                           |                    |                    |
| <b>10.1a</b>   | Is it easy for you to see the doctor?  | <b>72%</b>         | <b>54%</b>                | <b>72%</b>         | <b>76%</b>         |
| <b>10.1b</b>   | Is it easy for you to see the nurse?   | <b>83%</b>         | <b>67%</b>                | <b>83%</b>         | <b>91%</b>         |
| <b>10.1c</b>   | Is it easy for you to see the dentist?   | <b>57%</b>         | <b>33%</b>                | <b>57%</b>         | <b>68%</b>         |
| <b>10.2</b>  | For those who have been to health services: Do you think the overall quality is good/very good?          | <b>72%</b>         | <b>48%</b>                | <b>72%</b>         | <b>70%</b>         |
| <b>10.3</b>  | If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/all of it in your cell?                       | <b>59%</b>         | <b>49%</b>                | <b>59%</b>         | <b>52%</b>         |
| <b>10.4</b>  | Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?   | <b>23%</b>         | <b>23%</b>                | <b>23%</b>         | <b>21%</b>         |
| <b>10.5</b>  | If you have emotional or mental health problems, are you being helped by anyone here?                    | <b>80%</b>         | <b>67%</b>                | <b>80%</b>         | <b>95%</b>         |
| <b>10.6</b>  | Did you have any problems with alcohol when you first arrived?   | <b>5%</b>          | <b>9%</b>                 | <b>5%</b>          | <b>9%</b>          |
| <b>10.7</b>  | Have you received any help with any alcohol problems here?   | <b>3%</b>          | <b>5%</b>                 | <b>3%</b>          | <b>7%</b>          |
| <b>10.8</b>  | Did you have any problems with drugs when you first arrived?   | <b>43%</b>         | <b>35%</b>                | <b>43%</b>         | <b>40%</b>         |
| <b>10.9</b>  | Do you have a problem with drugs now?  | <b>6%</b>          | <b>9%</b>                 | <b>6%</b>          | <b>5%</b>          |
| <b>10.10</b>   | Have you received any help with any drug problems here?  | <b>25%</b>         | <b>22%</b>                | <b>25%</b>         | <b>22%</b>         |
| <b>10.11</b>   | Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs here?  | <b>24%</b>         | <b>14%</b>                | <b>24%</b>         | <b>20%</b>         |
| <b>SECTION 11: ACTIVITIES</b>  |  |                    |                           |                    |                    |
| <b>11.1</b>  | Were you 14 or younger when you were last at school?   | <b>41%</b>         | <b>38%</b>                | <b>41%</b>         | <b>44%</b>         |
| <b>11.2</b>  | Have you ever been excluded from school?   | <b>90%</b>         | <b>87%</b>                | <b>90%</b>         | <b>87%</b>         |
| <b>11.3</b>  | Did you ever skip school before you came into custody?   | <b>82%</b>         | <b>74%</b>                | <b>82%</b>         | <b>80%</b>         |
| Do you currently take part in any of the following:  |  |                    |                           |                    |                    |
| <b>11.4a</b>   | Education?   | <b>73%</b>         | <b>76%</b>                | <b>73%</b>         | <b>79%</b>         |
| <b>11.4b</b>   | A job in this establishment?   | <b>28%</b>         | <b>30%</b>                | <b>28%</b>         | <b>35%</b>         |
| <b>11.4c</b>   | Vocational or skills training?   | <b>17%</b>         | <b>14%</b>                | <b>17%</b>         | <b>16%</b>         |
| <b>11.4d</b>   | Offending behaviour programmes?  | <b>21%</b>         | <b>20%</b>                | <b>21%</b>         | <b>24%</b>         |
| <b>11.4e</b>   | Nothing  | <b>12%</b>         | <b>14%</b>                | <b>12%</b>         | <b>10%</b>         |
| For those who have taken part in the following activities while in this establishment, do you think that they will help you when you leave prison: |  |                    |                           |                    |                    |
| <b>11.5a</b>   | Education?   | <b>68%</b>         | <b>65%</b>                | <b>68%</b>         | <b>68%</b>         |
| <b>11.5b</b>   | A job in this establishment?   | <b>61%</b>         | <b>52%</b>                | <b>61%</b>         | <b>61%</b>         |
| <b>11.5c</b>   | Vocational or skills training?   | <b>54%</b>         | <b>50%</b>                | <b>54%</b>         | <b>51%</b>         |
| <b>11.5d</b>   | Offending behaviour programmes?  | <b>58%</b>         | <b>50%</b>                | <b>58%</b>         | <b>52%</b>         |
| <b>11.6</b>  | Do you usually have association every day?   | <b>84%</b>         | <b>70%</b>                | <b>84%</b>         | <b>87%</b>         |

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

### Key to tables

|   |   | HMYOI Hindley 2014 | Young people's comparator | HMYOI Hindley 2014 | HMYOI Hindley 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   |                    |                           |                    |                    |
| <b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>                              |   | 138                | 591                       | 138                | 169                |
| 11.7  | Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?  | 49%                | 59%                       | 49%                | 35%                |
| 11.8  | Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?  | 27%                | 8%                        | 27%                | 20%                |
| <b>SECTION 12: KEEPING IN TOUCH WITH FAMILY AND FRIENDS</b>                     |   |                    |                           |                    |                    |
| 12.1  | Are you able to use the telephone every day?  | 91%                | 80%                       | 91%                | 90%                |
| 12.2  | Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?   | 30%                | 42%                       | 30%                | 36%                |
| 12.3  | Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?  | 48%                | 38%                       | 48%                | 50%                |
| 12.4  | Is it easy/very easy for your family and friends to visit you here?   | 41%                | 36%                       | 41%                | 47%                |
| 12.5  | Do your visits start on time?   | 57%                | 38%                       | 57%                | 68%                |
| <b>SECTION 13: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE</b>                                      |   |                    |                           |                    |                    |
| Do you think you will have a problem with the following, when you are released: |   |                    |                           |                    |                    |
| 13.1a   | Finding accommodation?  | 19%                | 27%                       | 19%                | 20%                |
| 13.1b   | Getting into school or college?   | 33%                | 29%                       | 33%                | 16%                |
| 13.1c   | Getting a job?  | 53%                | 52%                       | 53%                | 45%                |
| 13.1d   | Money/finances?   | 37%                | 38%                       | 37%                | 29%                |
| 13.1e   | Claiming benefits?  | 15%                | 22%                       | 15%                | 13%                |
| 13.1f   | Continuing health services?   | 6%                 | 7%                        | 6%                 | 8%                 |
| 13.1g   | Opening a bank account?   | 13%                | 15%                       | 13%                | 12%                |
| 13.1h   | Avoiding bad relationships?   | 10%                | 17%                       | 10%                | 11%                |
| 13.2  | Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?  | 64%                | 48%                       | 64%                | 59%                |
| For those with a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan:                   |   |                    |                           |                    |                    |
| 13.3  | Were you involved in the development of your plan?  | 82%                | 84%                       | 82%                | 84%                |
| 13.4  | Do you understand the targets set in your plan?   | 94%                | 93%                       | 94%                | 95%                |
| 13.5  | Do you have a caseworker here?  | 64%                | 87%                       | 64%                | 61%                |
| 13.6  | Has your caseworker helped to prepare you for release?  | 67%                | 42%                       | 67%                | 61%                |
| For those with a social worker:   |   |                    |                           |                    |                    |
| 13.7  | Has your social worker been to visit you since you have been here?  | 69%                | 66%                       | 69%                | 64%                |
| 13.8  | Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?  | 39%                | 39%                       | 39%                | 35%                |
| Do you know who to contact for help with the following problems?                |   |                    |                           |                    |                    |
| 13.9a   | Finding accommodation   | 32%                | 25%                       | 32%                | 35%                |
| 13.9b   | Getting into school or college  | 36%                | 26%                       | 36%                | 29%                |
| 13.9c   | Getting a job   | 33%                | 32%                       | 33%                | 41%                |
| 13.9d   | Help with money/finances  | 23%                | 21%                       | 23%                | 31%                |
| 13.9e   | Help with claiming benefits   | 17%                | 17%                       | 17%                | 28%                |
| 13.9f   | Continuing health services  | 17%                | 13%                       | 17%                | 26%                |
| 13.9g   | Opening a bank account  | 19%                | 16%                       | 19%                | 29%                |
| 13.9h   | Avoiding bad relationships  | 15%                | 15%                       | 15%                | 21%                |
| For those who were sentenced:   |   |                    |                           |                    |                    |
| 13.11   | Do you want to stop offending?  | 93%                | 90%                       | 93%                | 86%                |
| 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? | 50%                | 47%                       | 50%                | 43%                |

## Diversity analysis



### Key question responses (ethnicity and religion) HMYOI Hindley 2013

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

#### Key to tables

|  |  | Black and minority ethnic young people | White young people | Muslim young people | Non-Muslim young people |
|--|--|--|--------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
|  | Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better  |  |                    |                     |                         |
|  | Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse  |  |                    |                     |                         |
|  | Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details                           |  |                    |                     |                         |
|  | Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference  |  |                    |                     |                         |
| <b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b> |  | <b>27</b>                              | <b>108</b>         | <b>20</b>           | <b>116</b>              |
| 1.2  | Are you a foreign national?  | 0%                                     | 1%                 | 0%                  | 2%                      |
| 1.3  | Do you understand spoken English?  | 100%                                   | 99%                | 100%                | 99%                     |
| 1.4  | Do you understand written English?   | 93%                                    | 98%                | 96%                 | 98%                     |
| 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%                | 6%                      |
| 1.6  | Are you Muslim?  | 74%                                    | 0%                 |                     |                         |
| 1.5  | Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?   | 0%                                     | 6%                 | 0%                  | 6%                      |
| 1.9  | Do you consider yourself to have a disability?   | 7%                                     | 18%                | 5%                  | 19%                     |
| 1.10   | Have you ever been in local authority care?  | 35%                                    | 42%                | 32%                 | 42%                     |
| 2.1  | Are you sentenced?   | 90%                                    | 88%                | 100%                | 85%                     |
| 2.4  | Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?                                     | 45%                                    | 52%                | 46%                 | 52%                     |
| 3.2  | Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?  | 30%                                    | 34%                | 30%                 | 33%                     |
| 3.6  | Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?   | 60%                                    | 49%                | 55%                 | 50%                     |
| 3.7  | Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare coming here?                                       | 19%                                    | 14%                | 26%                 | 13%                     |
| 4.2  | When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?  | 84%                                    | 88%                | 86%                 | 88%                     |
| 4.3  | Were you treated well/very well in reception?  | 70%                                    | 77%                | 65%                 | 75%                     |
| 4.8  | Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?   | 81%                                    | 74%                | 74%                 | 76%                     |
| 4.9  | Did you feel safe on your first night here?  | 90%                                    | 84%                | 91%                 | 82%                     |
| 5.1  | Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?   | 63%                                    | 86%                | 55%                 | 85%                     |
| 5.2  | Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?  | 23%                                    | 36%                | 14%                 | 37%                     |
| 5.3  | Do you find the food here good/very good?  | 11%                                    | 17%                | 10%                 | 17%                     |
| 5.4  | Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?  | 35%                                    | 55%                | 32%                 | 53%                     |

## Diversity analysis

### Key to tables

|  |  | Black and minority ethnic young people | White young people | Muslim young people | Non-Muslim young people |
|--|--|--|--------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
|  | Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better  |  |                    |                     |                         |
|  | Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse  |  |                    |                     |                         |
|  | Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details |  |                    |                     |                         |
|  | Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference                            |  |                    |                     |                         |
| <b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b> |  | <b>27</b>                              | <b>108</b>         | <b>20</b>           | <b>116</b>              |
| <b>5.6</b>   | Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?  | <b>93%</b>                             | <b>50%</b>         | <b>95%</b>          | <b>53%</b>              |
| Can you speak to:                                  |  |  |                    |                     |                         |
| <b>5.7</b>   | A chaplain of your faith in private?   | <b>83%</b>                             | <b>71%</b>         | <b>86%</b>          | <b>72%</b>              |
| <b>5.8</b>   | A peer mentor?   | <b>47%</b>                             | <b>43%</b>         | <b>43%</b>          | <b>43%</b>              |
| <b>5.9</b>   | A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?  | <b>38%</b>                             | <b>23%</b>         | <b>27%</b>          | <b>26%</b>              |
| <b>5.10</b>  | An advocate (an outside person to help you)?   | <b>59%</b>                             | <b>46%</b>         | <b>48%</b>          | <b>47%</b>              |
| <b>6.1</b>   | Do most staff treat you with respect?  | <b>70%</b>                             | <b>78%</b>         | <b>58%</b>          | <b>78%</b>              |
| <b>6.2</b>   | If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?  | <b>32%</b>                             | <b>19%</b>         | <b>33%</b>          | <b>20%</b>              |
| <b>7.1</b>   | Is it easy to make an application?   | <b>74%</b>                             | <b>88%</b>         | <b>75%</b>          | <b>87%</b>              |
| <b>7.4</b>   | Is it easy to make a complaint?  | <b>70%</b>                             | <b>62%</b>         | <b>75%</b>          | <b>61%</b>              |
| <b>8.1</b>   | Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?  | <b>18%</b>                             | <b>32%</b>         | <b>11%</b>          | <b>30%</b>              |
| <b>8.2</b>   | Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?                                    | <b>50%</b>                             | <b>60%</b>         | <b>47%</b>          | <b>59%</b>              |
| <b>8.3</b>   | Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?  | <b>56%</b>                             | <b>65%</b>         | <b>53%</b>          | <b>64%</b>              |
| <b>8.4</b>   | Have you had a minor report since you have been here?  | <b>69%</b>                             | <b>59%</b>         | <b>67%</b>          | <b>61%</b>              |
| <b>8.6</b>   | Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?                                       | <b>62%</b>                             | <b>63%</b>         | <b>58%</b>          | <b>64%</b>              |
| <b>8.8</b>   | Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?                                  | <b>37%</b>                             | <b>35%</b>         | <b>37%</b>          | <b>35%</b>              |
| <b>9.1</b>   | Have you ever felt unsafe here?  | <b>22%</b>                             | <b>26%</b>         | <b>16%</b>          | <b>27%</b>              |
| <b>9.2</b>   | Do you feel unsafe now?  | <b>7%</b>                              | <b>6%</b>          | <b>5%</b>           | <b>7%</b>               |
| <b>9.4</b>   | Have you been victimised by other young people here?   | <b>11%</b>                             | <b>26%</b>         | <b>5%</b>           | <b>26%</b>              |
| Since you have been here, have other young people: |  |  |                    |                     |                         |
| <b>9.5d</b>  | Threatened or intimidated you?   | <b>0%</b>                              | <b>12%</b>         | <b>0%</b>           | <b>11%</b>              |
| <b>9.5i</b>  | Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?  | <b>4%</b>                              | <b>0%</b>          | <b>0%</b>           | <b>1%</b>               |
| <b>9.5j</b>  | Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?   | <b>0%</b>                              | <b>0%</b>          | <b>0%</b>           | <b>0%</b>               |
| <b>9.5k</b>  | Victimised you because of your nationality?  | <b>0%</b>                              | <b>0%</b>          | <b>0%</b>           | <b>0%</b>               |
| <b>9.5p</b>  | Victimised you because you have a disability?  | <b>0%</b>                              | <b>1%</b>          | <b>0%</b>           | <b>1%</b>               |

## Diversity analysis

### Key to tables

|   |  | Black and minority ethnic young people | White young people | Muslim young people | Non-Muslim young people |
|---|--|--|--------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
|   | Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better  |  |                    |                     |                         |
|   | Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse  |  |                    |                     |                         |
|   | Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details |  |                    |                     |                         |
|   | Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference                            |  |                    |                     |                         |
| <b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>  |  | <b>27</b>                              | <b>108</b>         | <b>20</b>           | <b>116</b>              |
| <b>9.7</b>  | Have you been victimised by staff here?  | <b>26%</b>                             | <b>20%</b>         | <b>30%</b>          | <b>20%</b>              |
| Since you have been here, have staff:               |  |  |                    |                     |                         |
| <b>9.8d</b>   | Threatened or intimidated you?   | <b>7%</b>                              | <b>2%</b>          | <b>11%</b>          | <b>2%</b>               |
| <b>9.8i</b>   | Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?  | <b>0%</b>                              | <b>0%</b>          | <b>0%</b>           | <b>0%</b>               |
| <b>9.8j</b>   | Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?   | <b>0%</b>                              | <b>1%</b>          | <b>0%</b>           | <b>1%</b>               |
| <b>9.8k</b>   | Victimised you because of your nationality?  | <b>0%</b>                              | <b>0%</b>          | <b>0%</b>           | <b>0%</b>               |
| <b>9.8p</b>   | Victimised you because you have a disability?  | <b>0%</b>                              | <b>0%</b>          | <b>0%</b>           | <b>0%</b>               |
| <b>9.10</b>   | If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?  | <b>29%</b>                             | <b>26%</b>         | <b>17%</b>          | <b>28%</b>              |
| <b>9.11</b>   | Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?                     | <b>41%</b>                             | <b>32%</b>         | <b>37%</b>          | <b>33%</b>              |
| <b>10.1a</b>  | Is it easy/very easy for you to see the doctor?  | <b>63%</b>                             | <b>77%</b>         | <b>58%</b>          | <b>75%</b>              |
| <b>10.1b</b>  | Is it easy/very easy for you to see the nurse?   | <b>74%</b>                             | <b>85%</b>         | <b>75%</b>          | <b>85%</b>              |
| <b>10.4</b>   | Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?  | <b>19%</b>                             | <b>24%</b>         | <b>11%</b>          | <b>24%</b>              |
| Do you currently take part in any of the following: |  |  |                    |                     |                         |
| <b>11.4a</b>  | Education?   | <b>89%</b>                             | <b>69%</b>         | <b>89%</b>          | <b>70%</b>              |
| <b>11.4b</b>  | A job in this establishment?   | <b>12%</b>                             | <b>32%</b>         | <b>6%</b>           | <b>32%</b>              |
| <b>11.4c</b>  | Vocational or skills training?   | <b>23%</b>                             | <b>16%</b>         | <b>17%</b>          | <b>17%</b>              |
| <b>11.4d</b>  | Offending behaviour programmes?  | <b>12%</b>                             | <b>23%</b>         | <b>6%</b>           | <b>23%</b>              |
| <b>11.4e</b>  | Nothing?   | <b>4%</b>                              | <b>15%</b>         | <b>6%</b>           | <b>14%</b>              |
| <b>11.6</b>   | Do you usually have association every day?   | <b>96%</b>                             | <b>82%</b>         | <b>95%</b>          | <b>83%</b>              |
| <b>11.7</b>   | Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?   | <b>41%</b>                             | <b>51%</b>         | <b>30%</b>          | <b>52%</b>              |
| <b>11.8</b>   | Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?   | <b>44%</b>                             | <b>22%</b>         | <b>53%</b>          | <b>22%</b>              |
| <b>12.1</b>   | Are you able to use the telephone every day?   | <b>74%</b>                             | <b>94%</b>         | <b>75%</b>          | <b>93%</b>              |
| <b>12.2</b>   | Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?                                  | <b>41%</b>                             | <b>28%</b>         | <b>37%</b>          | <b>30%</b>              |
| <b>12.3</b>   | Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?                                 | <b>37%</b>                             | <b>50%</b>         | <b>30%</b>          | <b>51%</b>              |
| <b>13.2</b>   | Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?   | <b>67%</b>                             | <b>64%</b>         | <b>63%</b>          | <b>64%</b>              |
| <b>13.8</b>   | Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?                                     | <b>37%</b>                             | <b>41%</b>         | <b>37%</b>          | <b>41%</b>              |

## Diversity analysis - disability



### Key question responses (disability analysis) HMYOI Hindley 2014

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

#### Key to tables

|  |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
|  | Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better  | <b>Consider themselves to have a disability</b> | <b>Do not consider themselves to have a disability</b> |
|  | Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse  |   |  |
|  | Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details                           |   |  |
|  | Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference  |   |  |
| <b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b> |  | <b>23</b>                                       | <b>112</b>   |
| 1.2  | Are you a foreign national?  | 4%  | 1%   |
| 1.3  | Do you understand spoken English?  | 96%   | 99%  |
| 1.4  | Do you understand written English?   | 100%  | 96%  |
| 1.5  | Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.) | 9%  | 22%  |
| 1.6  | Are you Muslim?  | 4%  | 17%  |
| 1.5  | Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?   | 8%  | 5%   |
| 1.10   | Have you ever been in local authority care?  | 54%   | 39%  |
| 2.1  | Are you sentenced?   | 81%   | 87%  |
| 2.4  | Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?                                     | 44%   | 52%  |
| 3.2  | Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?  | 39%   | 32%  |
| 3.6  | Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?   | 46%   | 50%  |
| 3.7  | Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?                                   | 12%   | 15%  |
| 4.2  | When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?  | 77%   | 88%  |
| 4.3  | Were you treated well/very well in reception?  | 58%   | 78%  |
| 4.8  | Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?   | 69%   | 77%  |
| 4.9  | Did you feel safe on your first night here?  | 64%   | 86%  |
| 5.1  | Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?   | 73%   | 82%  |
| 5.2  | Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?  | 24%   | 36%  |
| 5.3  | Do you find the food here good/very good?  | 8%  | 17%  |
| 5.4  | Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?  | 46%   | 52%  |
| 5.6  | Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?  | 44%   | 60%  |



## Diversity analysis - disability

### Key to tables

|  |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
|  | Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better  | <b>Consider themselves to have a disability</b> | <b>Do not consider themselves to have a disability</b> |
|  | Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse  |   |  |
|  | Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details |   |  |
|  | Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference                            |   |  |
| Can you speak to:                                  |  |   |  |
| 5.7  | A chaplain of your faith in private?   | 69%   | 74%  |
| 5.8  | A peer mentor?   | 31%   | 45%  |
| 5.9  | A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?  | 19%   | 28%  |
| 5.10   | An advocate (an outside person to help you)?   | 54%   | 46%  |
| 6.1  | Do most staff treat you with respect?  | 71%   | 77%  |
| 6.2  | If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?  | 28%   | 21%  |
| 7.1  | Is it easy to make an application?   | 88%   | 86%  |
| 7.4  | Is it easy to make a complaint?  | 72%   | 62%  |
| 8.1  | Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?  | 8%  | 32%  |
| 8.2  | Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?                                    | 40%   | 62%  |
| 8.3  | Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?  | 48%   | 66%  |
| 8.4  | Have you had a minor report since you have been here?  | 62%   | 61%  |
| 8.6  | Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?                                       | 81%   | 57%  |
| 8.8  | Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?                                  | 54%   | 30%  |
| 9.1  | Have you ever felt unsafe here?  | 54%   | 19%  |
| 9.2  | Do you feel unsafe now?  | 8%  | 6%   |
| 9.4  | Have you been victimised by other young people here?   | 52%   | 16%  |
| Since you have been here, have other young people: |  |   |  |
| 9.5d   | Threatened or intimidated you?   | 25%   | 6%   |
| 9.5i   | Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?  | 0%  | 1%   |
| 9.5j   | Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?   | 0%  | 0%   |
| 9.5k   | Victimised you because of your nationality?  | 0%  | 0%   |
| 9.5p   | Victimised you because you have a disability?  | 4%  | 0%   |

## Diversity analysis - disability

### Key to tables

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
|   | Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better  | <b>Consider themselves to have a disability</b> | <b>Do not consider themselves to have a disability</b> |
|   | Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse  |   |  |
|   | Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details |   |  |
|   | Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference                            |   |  |
| <b>9.7</b>  | Have you been victimised by staff here?  | <b>35%</b>                                      | <b>19%</b>   |
| Since you have been here, have staff:               |  |   |  |
| <b>9.8d</b>   | Threatened or intimidated you?   | <b>12%</b>                                      | <b>3%</b>  |
| <b>9.8i</b>   | Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?  | <b>4%</b>                                       | <b>0%</b>  |
| <b>9.8j</b>   | Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?   | <b>0%</b>                                       | <b>1%</b>  |
| <b>9.8k</b>   | Victimised you because of your nationality?  | <b>0%</b>                                       | <b>0%</b>  |
| <b>9.8p</b>   | Victimised you because you have a disability?  | <b>0%</b>                                       | <b>0%</b>  |
| <b>9.10</b>   | If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?  | <b>20%</b>                                      | <b>29%</b>   |
| <b>9.11</b>   | Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?                     | <b>24%</b>                                      | <b>36%</b>   |
| <b>10.1a</b>  | Is it easy/very easy for you to see the doctor?  | <b>65%</b>                                      | <b>73%</b>   |
| <b>10.1b</b>  | Is it easy/very easy for you to see the nurse?   | <b>76%</b>                                      | <b>84%</b>   |
| <b>10.4</b>   | Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?  | <b>52%</b>                                      | <b>17%</b>   |
| Do you currently take part in any of the following: |  |   |  |
| <b>11.4a</b>  | Education?   | <b>64%</b>                                      | <b>75%</b>   |
| <b>11.4b</b>  | A job in this establishment?   | <b>36%</b>                                      | <b>26%</b>   |
| <b>11.4c</b>  | Vocational or skills training?   | <b>24%</b>                                      | <b>16%</b>   |
| <b>11.4d</b>  | Offending behaviour programmes?  | <b>28%</b>                                      | <b>20%</b>   |
| <b>11.4e</b>  | Nothing?   | <b>24%</b>                                      | <b>10%</b>   |
| <b>11.6</b>   | Do you usually have association every day?   | <b>62%</b>                                      | <b>88%</b>   |
| <b>11.7</b>   | Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?   | <b>54%</b>                                      | <b>50%</b>   |
| <b>11.8</b>   | Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?   | <b>20%</b>                                      | <b>29%</b>   |
| <b>12.1</b>   | Are you able to use the telephone every day?   | <b>92%</b>                                      | <b>91%</b>   |
| <b>12.2</b>   | Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?                                  | <b>35%</b>                                      | <b>29%</b>   |
| <b>12.3</b>   | Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?                                 | <b>54%</b>                                      | <b>49%</b>   |
| <b>13.2</b>   | Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?   | <b>58%</b>                                      | <b>64%</b>   |
| <b>13.8</b>   | Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?                                     | <b>32%</b>                                      | <b>41%</b>   |

## Diversity analysis



### Key question responses (local authority care analysis) HMYOI Hindley 2014

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

#### Key to tables

|  |  |   |   |
|--|--|---|---|
|  | Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better  | <b>Young people who have been in local authority care</b> | <b>Young people who have not been in local authority care</b> |
|  | Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse  |   |   |
|  | Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details                           |   |   |
|  | Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference  |   |   |
| <b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b> |  | <b>55</b>   | <b>81</b>   |
| 1.2  | Are you a foreign national?  | 0%  | 2%  |
| 1.3  | Do you understand spoken English?  | 97%   | 100%  |
| 1.4  | Do you understand written English?   | 95%   | 99%   |
| 1.5  | Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.) | 16%   | 21%   |
| 1.6  | Are you Muslim?  | 12%   | 17%   |
| 1.5  | Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?   | 3%  | 7%  |
| 1.9  | Do you consider yourself to have a disability?   | 22%   | 14%   |
| 2.1  | Are you sentenced?   | 82%   | 90%   |
| 2.4  | Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?                                     | 31%   | 64%   |
| 3.2  | Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?  | 26%   | 37%   |
| 3.6  | Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?   | 61%   | 44%   |
| 3.7  | Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?                                   | 11%   | 17%   |
| 4.2  | When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?  | 87%   | 88%   |
| 4.3  | Were you treated well/very well in reception?  | 76%   | 72%   |
| 4.8  | Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?   | 74%   | 75%   |
| 4.9  | Did you feel safe on your first night here?  | 84%   | 82%   |
| 5.1  | Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?   | 84%   | 79%   |
| 5.2  | Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?  | 36%   | 32%   |
| 5.3  | Do you find the food here good/very good?  | 17%   | 14%   |
| 5.4  | Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?  | 58%   | 46%   |

## Diversity analysis

### Key to tables

|  |  |   |   |
|--|--|---|---|
|  | Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better  | <b>Young people who have been in local authority care</b> | <b>Young people who have not been in local authority care</b> |
|  | Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse  |   |   |
|  | Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details |   |   |
|  | Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference                            |   |   |
| <b>5.6</b>   | Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?  | <b>54%</b>  | <b>60%</b>  |
| Can you speak to:                                  |  |   |   |
| <b>5.7</b>   | A chaplain of your faith in private?   | <b>69%</b>  | <b>74%</b>  |
| <b>5.8</b>   | A peer mentor?   | <b>41%</b>  | <b>43%</b>  |
| <b>5.9</b>   | A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?  | <b>30%</b>  | <b>24%</b>  |
| <b>5.10</b>  | An advocate (an outside person to help you)?   | <b>53%</b>  | <b>42%</b>  |
| <b>6.1</b>   | Do most staff treat you with respect?  | <b>75%</b>  | <b>77%</b>  |
| <b>6.2</b>   | If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?  | <b>18%</b>  | <b>24%</b>  |
| <b>7.1</b>   | Is it easy to make an application?   | <b>89%</b>  | <b>83%</b>  |
| <b>7.4</b>   | Is it easy to make a complaint?  | <b>66%</b>  | <b>61%</b>  |
| <b>8.1</b>   | Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?  | <b>26%</b>  | <b>30%</b>  |
| <b>8.2</b>   | Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?                                    | <b>59%</b>  | <b>57%</b>  |
| <b>8.3</b>   | Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?  | <b>58%</b>  | <b>66%</b>  |
| <b>8.4</b>   | Have you had a minor report since you have been here?  | <b>68%</b>  | <b>56%</b>  |
| <b>8.6</b>   | Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?                                       | <b>69%</b>  | <b>57%</b>  |
| <b>8.8</b>   | Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?                                  | <b>41%</b>  | <b>29%</b>  |
| <b>9.1</b>   | Have you ever felt unsafe here?  | <b>37%</b>  | <b>19%</b>  |
| <b>9.2</b>   | Do you feel unsafe now?  | <b>8%</b>   | <b>6%</b>   |
| <b>9.4</b>   | Have you been victimised by other young people here?   | <b>28%</b>  | <b>20%</b>  |
| Since you have been here, have other young people: |  |   |   |
| <b>9.5d</b>  | Threatened or intimidated you?   | <b>12%</b>  | <b>8%</b>   |
| <b>9.5i</b>  | Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?  | <b>2%</b>   | <b>0%</b>   |
| <b>9.5j</b>  | Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?   | <b>0%</b>   | <b>0%</b>   |
| <b>9.5k</b>  | Victimised you because of your nationality?  | <b>0%</b>   | <b>0%</b>   |
| <b>9.5p</b>  | Victimised you because you have a disability?  | <b>0%</b>   | <b>1%</b>   |

## Diversity analysis

### Key to tables

|   |  |   |   |
|---|--|---|---|
|   | Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better  | <b>Young people who have been in local authority care</b> | <b>Young people who have not been in local authority care</b> |
|   | Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse  |   |   |
|   | Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details |   |   |
|   | Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference                            |   |   |
| <b>9.7</b>  | Have you been victimised by staff here?  | <b>18%</b>  | <b>25%</b>  |
| Since you have been here, have staff:               |  |   |   |
| <b>9.8d</b>   | Threatened or intimidated you?   | <b>5%</b>   | <b>4%</b>   |
| <b>9.8i</b>   | Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?  | <b>2%</b>   | <b>0%</b>   |
| <b>9.8j</b>   | Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?   | <b>0%</b>   | <b>1%</b>   |
| <b>9.8k</b>   | Victimised you because of your nationality?  | <b>0%</b>   | <b>0%</b>   |
| <b>9.8p</b>   | Victimised you because you have a disability?  | <b>0%</b>   | <b>0%</b>   |
| <b>9.10</b>   | If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?  | <b>28%</b>  | <b>25%</b>  |
| <b>9.11</b>   | Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?                     | <b>28%</b>  | <b>37%</b>  |
| <b>10.1a</b>  | Is it easy/very easy for you to see the doctor?  | <b>82%</b>  | <b>65%</b>  |
| <b>10.1b</b>  | Is it easy/very easy for you to see the nurse?   | <b>84%</b>  | <b>82%</b>  |
| <b>10.4</b>   | Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?  | <b>35%</b>  | <b>14%</b>  |
| Do you currently take part in any of the following: |  |   |   |
| <b>11.4a</b>  | Education?   | <b>61%</b>  | <b>81%</b>  |
| <b>11.4b</b>  | A job in this establishment?   | <b>26%</b>  | <b>29%</b>  |
| <b>11.4c</b>  | Vocational or skills training?   | <b>23%</b>  | <b>13%</b>  |
| <b>11.4d</b>  | Offending behaviour programmes?  | <b>18%</b>  | <b>22%</b>  |
| <b>11.4e</b>  | Nothing?   | <b>16%</b>  | <b>10%</b>  |
| <b>11.6</b>   | Do you usually have association every day?   | <b>82%</b>  | <b>86%</b>  |
| <b>11.7</b>   | Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?   | <b>49%</b>  | <b>51%</b>  |
| <b>11.8</b>   | Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?   | <b>24%</b>  | <b>27%</b>  |
| <b>12.1</b>   | Are you able to use the telephone every day?   | <b>89%</b>  | <b>92%</b>  |
| <b>12.2</b>   | Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?                                  | <b>29%</b>  | <b>32%</b>  |
| <b>12.3</b>   | Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?                                 | <b>30%</b>  | <b>62%</b>  |
| <b>13.2</b>   | Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?   | <b>64%</b>  | <b>63%</b>  |
| <b>13.8</b>   | Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?                                     | <b>44%</b>  | <b>34%</b>  |