

Report on an unannounced inspection of

HMYOI Cookham Wood

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

9 – 20 June 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/hmiprison/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

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:
hmiprison.enquiries@hmiprison.gsi.gov.uk

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

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

Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Introduction | 5 |
| Fact page | 7 |
| About this inspection and report | 9 |
| Summary | 11 |
| Section 1. Safety | 19 |
| Section 2. Respect | 35 |
| Section 3. Purposeful activity | 49 |
| Section 4. Resettlement | 55 |
| Section 5. Recommendations and housekeeping points | 63 |
| Section 6. Appendices | 71 |
| Appendix I: Inspection team | 71 |
| Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report | 73 |
| Appendix III: Establishment population profile | 79 |
| Appendix IV: Summary of children and young people questionnaires and interviews | 83 |

Introduction

HMYOI Cookham Wood is a closed custodial facility for sentenced or remanded boys under the age of 18. Located in Kent, the institution has a wide catchment across southern England and now holds up to 196 young people. We last inspected Cookham Wood in July 2013 and this inspection is the latest in what are now annual visits to facilities which hold children, which are intrinsically high risk.

When we last inspected we found an institution that was ensuring reasonably good or better outcomes across all our healthy prison tests. The ensuing year has been a challenge to the institution, principally because it has transitioned following the opening of a brand new accommodation that has radically re-shaped and improved the facility. Combined with this, there has been organisational restructuring that has impacted all prisons, and has led to debilitating staff shortages followed by significant challenges in the ability to recruit and replace staff. In our view both factors explain, to an extent, why there has been some deterioration in outcomes, notably safety, and stalled progress in other areas.

This inspection revealed real concerns about safety at Cookham Wood. Too many young people continued to arrive too late in the day, often after long waits in court cells. The number of recorded violent incidents was high and rising, and some were serious with evidence of concerted attacks on individuals. The use of weapons was not uncommon: during a recent lockdown search 30 weapons were discovered. Useful initiatives to challenge the perpetrators of violence, as well as to support victims had lapsed, and monitoring and linkages to safeguarding structures were weaker. Use of force was similarly high, and we were not confident that all instances we observed were justified, or that arrangements to ensure accountability were sufficiently robust. De-escalation of incidents was evident but it was clear to us that the introduction of new techniques that, for example, replace the use of pain compliance on children were urgently needed. We were told that the introduction of these techniques had been delayed due to staff shortages.

The segregation unit, referred to as Phoenix Unit, was still contained in the older accommodation and was a poor environment. At the time of our visit 15 boys were held in the facility for a variety of reasons. The needs of these young people were often complex and challenging but the regime had improved; and the support provided by a multi-disciplinary team of staff, that normally ensured effective re-integration, was commendable.

Child safeguarding, a key responsibility in an institution of this kind, had deteriorated. Links with the local authority were still effective at a strategic level but there were significant weaknesses internally and the safeguarding meeting had not taken place regularly during 2014: this matter was being addressed. Child protection work was similarly concerning. Arrangements were not working effectively and we found a number of instances where issues or complaints had not been followed up. We were assured before we left that cases that may have been missed would be followed up systematically.

Behaviour management was another area of concern, security was generally applied in a proportionate way but the institution was effectively operating two rewards and sanctions schemes in parallel. In our view this approach was confusing, sometimes inconsistent and often arbitrary, all of which undermined legitimacy and therefore the effectiveness of the schemes.

The quality of the new accommodation at Cookham Wood was excellent. The design of the accommodation, comprising discrete landings which could hold approximately 30 young people, also provided the institution with real opportunities going forward, as there was the capacity to create smaller, more supportive communities within the wider prison that we have seen work well elsewhere.

Relationships between staff and young people were more mixed. Most young people felt respected and we observed many good interactions, but some poor behaviour among young people was not challenged with sufficient rigour and staff needed to be more consistent and attentive in modelling their own behaviour. Work to promote equality and diversity was poor and there was evidence that this was impacting outcomes for minorities. The provision of health care was in a state of transition following the recent appointment of new providers. Outcomes were adequate but undermined by crippling staff shortages.

At the time of our inspection the institution was operating a restricted regime, largely as a consequence of staff shortages that had led to some deterioration in access to time out of cell. Overall however, the quality of learning and skills provision remained good but required improved leadership and management. Learning was also impeded by poor punctuality and underuse of capacity. The gym was insufficient for the increased population for which it now catered. Resettlement work continued to be effective with training planning that was both thorough and inclusive. Opportunities for temporary release in support of resettlement were available, and work across the resettlement pathways was generally good.

We inspected Cookham Wood at a tough and challenging time. A new governor had recently been appointed and there had been significant loss of staff, not all of whom had been replaced. The move to new accommodation had been successful, but had clearly been a significant management distraction. Outcomes had suffered but the institution was sighted and there was evidence that issues were beginning to be gripped, so there remains every reason for optimism about the outlook at Cookham Wood. However, risks remain and the need to recruit suitable new staff is fundamental to the future success of the prison.

Nick Hardwick
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

October 2014

Fact page

Task of the establishment

HMYOI Cookham Wood holds male sentenced and remanded young people.

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

Public

Region/Department

Kent

Number held

135

Certified normal accommodation

196

Operational capacity

196

Date of last full inspection

May 2013

Brief history

Built in 1978, Cookham Wood was a female establishment until 2007 when it was closed and re-roled to a juvenile prison with bed spaces commissioned by the Youth Justice Board. In 2012 work was started on new accommodation and education facilities, which was completed in January 2014. This increased the capacity from 131 to 179 and created an environment which improved the safety, decency and security of the prison. All cells are built to safer cell standard and have showers and in-cell telephones.

Short description of residential units

Residential unit - 179 bed

Phoenix unit - 7 bed complex needs unit

Cedar unit – 17 bed unit

Name of governor/director

Jonathan French

Escort contractor

GEOAmey

Health service commissioner and providers

NHS England Kent, Surrey and Sussex

Oxleas NHS Foundation Trust - primary care

Central North-west London NHS Trust – child and adolescent mental health services

KCA – substance misuse

Learning and skills providers

CfBT

Independent Monitoring Board chair

Richard Baker

About this inspection and report

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

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

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

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Safety | children and young people, particularly the most vulnerable, are held safely |
| Respect | children and young people are treated with respect for their human dignity |
| Purposeful activity | children and young people are able, and expected, to engage in activity that is likely to benefit them |
| Resettlement | children and young people are prepared for their release into the community and helped to reduce the likelihood of 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.¹

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

Summary

Safety

- S1 *Some boys spent too long at court after their cases had been dealt with. Reception and first night procedures were thorough. Feedback from boys about the quality of induction was mixed. The safeguarding and child protection arrangements were weak. The level of self-harm was low; while we saw good support provided to vulnerable individuals, the associated documentation was poor. Use of force was high and the governance of it was weak. Levels of violence were high and incidents resulting in serious injury were not uncommon. Discipline procedures were administered fairly. The rewards and sanctions scheme was confusing and not well regulated. There was limited demand for substance misuse support but the quality of the service had improved and was appropriate. **Outcomes for children and young people were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.***
- S2 *At the last inspection in May 2013, we found that outcomes for young people at Cookham Wood were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 18 recommendations in the area of safety. At this follow-up inspection we found that four of the recommendations had been achieved, seven had been partially achieved, six had not been achieved and one was no longer relevant.*
- S3 Too many children spent long periods in court cells and arrived late in reception. We saw evidence of a boy arriving as late as 9.45pm despite the completion of his court appearance at 11.30am that morning.
- S4 In our discussion groups, boys complained about the cleanliness of escort vans but the condition of the vans that we inspected was reasonable.
- S5 Although the reception area was small, the facilities were adequate to deal with relatively small numbers of boys. The area was generally clean. During the inspection, longstanding racist graffiti in the holding room was quickly removed. The reception process was systematic and well organised and boys usually remained in reception for about an hour.
- S6 Risk assessment and management forms were completed efficiently on reception and were complemented the following day by in-depth assessments by case workers. The quality of these assessments was adequate.
- S7 Staff ensured that children were located safely in suitable accommodation on the first night centre. Initial observations over the first 24 hours were carried out systematically.
- S8 The induction programme was delivered to all new arrivals. It was comprehensive but elements of it were delivered in an uninspiring way and we did not see much active engagement by boys.
- S9 The weekly safer regimes meeting continued to provide a useful forum for multidisciplinary discussion of the most challenging and vulnerable boys. The monthly safeguarding forum was not currently meeting. As a result, data were not examined and problem areas were not identified. This weakness had been identified and remedial action was being taken. Links with the local safeguarding children board at a strategic level were good.

- S10 The quality of child protection work had deteriorated and procedures were not being followed correctly. Cases which should have been referred to the local authority for independent scrutiny had not been; some of these were quite serious. A boy had recently received a fracture following an incident where force had been used. This case had been appropriately referred to the local authority.
- S11 The number of violent incidents remained high. Despite this, most boys in our survey did not report feeling unsafe. Serious injuries following fights and assaults were not uncommon. We observed over a dozen videos of incidents which revealed the use of weapons, attacks on individuals by multiple assailants and reckless behaviour by boys, including kicking and head stamping. A recent lockdown search had uncovered 35 weapons. Twenty-eight per cent of the mainstream population were on some form of necessary restriction.
- S12 The number of self-harm incidents was low but the quality of ACCT documents (assessment, care in custody and teamwork case management for children at risk of suicide or self-harm) was often not good enough and quality checks were not carried out regularly.
- S13 Although we observed examples of very good individual care, support plans were often not well prepared, reviews were sometimes cursory and children were not always involved in the process.
- S14 Conditions in the constant watch cell were awful and this was not a suitable place to accommodate vulnerable children.
- S15 Telephones in cells helped vulnerable boys to keep in touch with family and support networks.
- S16 The use of an incentives and earned privileges scheme alongside a rewards and sanctions scheme was confusing and sometimes resulted in the same behaviour being dealt with by different sanctions. Staff preferred to use the yellow card system but lack of management oversight and monitoring meant that it was not always used fairly and consistently. Posting notices about sanctions on the doors of cells was unnecessary and stigmatising.
- S17 Physical security was proportionate. Movements of boys were carried out appropriately to maintain the safety of over a quarter of the population who were in conflict with each other. The focus on maintaining safety was supported by good information exchange between security and other key departments.
- S18 Strip-searching was now conducted by risk assessment only, although we found instances of searches under restraint, which was inappropriate.
- S19 The prison had a good, supportive relationship with the local police.
- S20 The number of adjudications had risen slightly since our last inspection but was lower than most comparable prisons. Most adjudications were for fighting and assaults, reflecting the levels of violence in the establishment. Quality assurance was undertaken and the procedures were administered fairly, although the rooms where adjudications were held were not suitable. Boys were still separated for punishment purposes, which was inappropriate. Mediation by trained staff was offered to boys and take up was good.
- S21 Use of force was high and had increased since our last inspection. We were not confident that all spontaneous incidents of use of force were justified, particularly when force, sometimes including the use of pain infliction, was used to gain compliance from children. We found evidence of de-escalation of many incidents and the recordings of planned interventions that we viewed showed that force was used proportionately. Oversight of the

use of force was poor and too many documents had not been completed. Debriefs were not always detailed enough. Many incidents were not considered quickly enough by the restraint minimisation meeting.

- S22 The Phoenix unit was a completely unsuitable environment for children. There was offensive graffiti in cells, no natural light and dirty cells. At times the unit was noisy and chaotic. Plans to move the unit to the Cedars building needed to be expedited.
- S23 The Phoenix unit fulfilled several functions which was confusing and not conducive to supporting the different needs of the boys located there. Relationships between staff and boys on the unit were good and staff knew the children in their care well. Management support for the unit was inconsistent. Despite the difficulties of running such a complicated unit, the regime had improved and most boys attended activities on the main site.
- S24 Formal care planning was good and each child had appropriate multidisciplinary support to address their needs.
- S25 There was little evidence of problems with illegal drugs or diverted medication. However, the strategic approach to drug strategy and supply reduction was underdeveloped and suspicion drug testing was not carried out. The substance misuse service had significantly improved, and joint working with health care and other departments was now good.

Respect

S26 *The living conditions in the new accommodation were very good and offered potential for effective supervision and relationships. Relationships between staff and boys were generally positive. Work on diversity was poor which had adverse consequences for minority groups. Children received adequate support from the chaplaincy. The complaints process was sound and boys had suitable access to their solicitors. Staff shortages in primary health care were having a negative impact but mental health support was good. The food was very unpopular with boys but the meals we sampled were adequate. **Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***

S27 *At the last inspection in May 2013, we found that outcomes for young people at Cookham Wood were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 14 recommendations in the area of respect. At this follow-up inspection we found that three of the recommendations had been achieved, four had been partially achieved and seven had not been achieved.*

- S28 The new accommodation provided an excellent living environment. The design of the building facilitated good supervision by staff and the potential for effective relationships to develop between staff and children.
- S29 Boys had telephones and showers in their cells and good access to prison kit, the laundry and cleaning materials
- S30 Applications were not routinely tracked and recording of this was poor.
- S31 We observed respectful behaviour between staff and children, although we saw inappropriate behaviour by boys go unchallenged during early induction sessions. We also heard staff swearing in conversations that could be overheard by children.
- S32 Staff shortages were putting staff under significant pressure.

- S33 In our survey, boys' views on their personal officers were mixed: less than half said they saw their personal officer each week and under two-thirds thought their personal officer tried to help them. Case notes did not contain regular entries for all boys and some provided little evidence of meaningful conversations.
- S34 The youth council continued to provide a very good forum for children to raise concerns.
- S35 There was no governance of diversity work and no member of staff had enough time to carry out adequate equality work across the establishment. Diversity and equality were not promoted at any level; this was exacerbated by the lack of equality representatives and no identified person for children to approach. This major gap in provision was having an adverse impact on boys from minority groups.
- S36 Some black and minority ethnic boys felt that staff treated them unequally and that some staff lacked cultural awareness. Black and minority ethnic boys were over-represented in adjudications, use of force and on the Phoenix unit. We were not confident that any monitoring or effective investigation had been undertaken to understand and address concerns expressed by black and minority ethnic children.
- S37 The discrimination incident report form system was poorly promoted and not understood by boys. Most referrals were submitted by staff.
- S38 Most boys with a disability were identified on admission but they were not provided with adequate support. We spoke to one boy with significant physical disabilities who said he felt unsafe and another boy with a disability who needed support. We did not think enough was being done to support them.
- S39 No work was being done to identify, monitor or support gay or transgender boys. Good pockets of individual work in education and casework were in evidence for boys from a foreign national and Traveller background.
- S40 The chaplaincy provided sufficient cover to meet the basic requirements and boys had reasonable access to worship. The new multi-faith room was very stark and did not provide a sufficiently discreet and contemplative environment. Muslim services continued to be held in the gym as there were no ablution facilities in the multi-faith room.
- S41 Complaints were dealt with in a respectful, appropriate and timely manner. There was some analysis of complaints but this was not followed up.
- S42 The advocates were an excellent source of independent support for children and provided an independent avenue for them to raise complaints.
- S43 Boys had their legal rights explained to them during induction and they were helped by their caseworker to contact legal representatives, social workers and youth offending teams. They were helped to understand their sentence requirements, particularly the early and late release arrangements for those serving a detention and training order. Boys on remand received adequate support in making bail applications.
- S44 The new primary health care provider was still developing a new model of care and local governance procedures. Generally children received good care, but crippling staff shortages were severely affecting provision and service development.
- S45 The CHAT comprehensive health assessment tool had recently been introduced to identify health care needs systematically on admission and this was a positive development.

- S46 Most services were provided on the units. The new health care rooms provided an improved environment, but there were not enough consulting rooms and too many appointments were wasted because boys arrived late. Dental services were good, but waiting times were too long. The quality of the pharmacy service was reasonable.
- S47 The new health and wellbeing service provided good support to children, including an innovative enhanced sexual behaviour service. Further planned developments included family liaison, art therapy and peer support work.
- S48 Despite recommendations made in the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman report, there were still too few staff trained in emergency first aid.
- S49 Many boys we spoke to were unhappy with the quality and quantity of the food, although we observed healthy meals and reasonable portion sizes. While there was some consultation through the bi-annual food surveys and the youth council, there was no evidence of changes in response to concerns about food. Communal dining took place for breakfast and dinner, but weekday lunches were served at the cell door.

Purposeful activity

S50 *The introduction of a restricted regime had led to deterioration in time out of cell. Access to exercise remained limited. Ofsted's overall judgement was that provision in learning and skills was good. Leadership and management in learning and skills required improvement. The overall quality of teaching and learning was good. Behaviour management was effective. There was an adequately stocked library and access to it had improved slightly but was still not sufficient. Children had adequate opportunity to participate in PE but the facilities needed renovation and extension.*
Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

S51 *At the last inspection in May 2013, we found that outcomes for young people at Cookham Wood were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made nine recommendations in the area of purposeful activity. At this follow-up inspection we found that two of the recommendations had been achieved, two had been partially achieved and five had not been achieved.*

- S52 As a direct result of staff shortages and with the introduction of a restricted regime, time out of cell had deteriorated since our last inspection. Children now only received association on alternate days. If fully occupied, some boys could still have over nine hours out of cell during a weekday, reducing to over seven at weekends. However, this could be as low as two hours for the minority who were not fully engaged with the regime. When we carried out roll checks during the day, few boys were locked in their cells.
- S53 Children were not given enough time in the open air and limited activities were available during exercise.
- S54 The development strategy for learning and skills was adequate. The range and variety of learning and skills provision was good and met the needs of the national curriculum. Quality improvement and assurance was not effective across the provision. Use of data and targets for performance monitoring was not fully effective and did not adequately support performance management.

- S55 There were enough activity places for the population. Allocation was fair, but appropriate places were not always available to meet the children's preferences as a result of security issues. Boys on the Phoenix unit had useful but limited learning opportunities.
- S56 Much of the teaching, learning and assessment sessions were good and included effective planning to meet individual need. Boys received good support to help them develop and make progress in their learning.
- S57 Classroom management promoted mutually respectful behaviour. Tutors did not consistently set and use individual learning targets to plan and develop learning. Equality and diversity were not well promoted during sessions. Tutors did not place enough emphasis on correcting spelling and grammar in written work.
- S58 Achievement of accredited units in education and vocational training programmes delivered by CfBT Education Trust (Centre for British Teachers) was good. Boys developed a good standard of skills and knowledge. Their personal, social and employability skill development was also good. They made good progress, enjoyed their learning and collaborated well.
- S59 Children's learning was impeded by poor punctuality, cancellation of sessions and underuse of maximum class capacity.
- S60 The library had improved. It was spacious and adequately stocked and equipped. Access to the library was allocated through timetabled sessions and had improved from 20 to 30 minutes per person each week. Opening hours had been extended, but children still did not have enough access and some had no timetabled access.
- S61 Access to the gym and sports facilities was good. The breadth of accredited courses was adequate and achievements were good. PE staff worked well with other prison staff to engage children and address their specific needs. Links with the community, to develop competitive sports activity, were very limited.
- S62 The PE facilities were deteriorating and there was not enough capacity for the planned expansion of the prison population.

Resettlement

- S63 *Resettlement was managed effectively and the training and remand planning arrangements continued to be thorough. Public protection arrangements were sound and children who were looked after were supported well by staff. A few boys continued to have opportunities on release on temporary licence (ROTL). Provision under the resettlement pathways was generally good. Staff succeeded in helping boys to maintain contact with their family and friends. **Outcomes for children and young people were good against this healthy prison test.***
- S64 *At the last inspection in May 2013, we found that outcomes for young people at Cookham Wood were good against this healthy prison test. We made nine recommendations in the area of resettlement. At this follow-up inspection we found that one of the recommendations had been achieved, three had been partially achieved and five had not been achieved.*
- S65 The resettlement strategy set out how pre-release and resettlement work should be delivered. The monthly resettlement meeting provided an appropriate forum to discuss resettlement work, including the pathways. The delivery of resettlement services was well

- coordinated, and the casework team had effective links with specialists involved in the care of boys at the establishment. They maintained good communication with boys' families.
- S66 The risk and resettlement needs of each boy were identified soon after arrival. Not enough children received ROTL because resources to carry out risk assessments and follow-up work were inadequate. There was no follow up of children's progress post release.
- S67 All boys had training and remand management plans based on their identified needs. Training planning and remand management meetings were timely. Meetings that we observed were well managed and collaborative. Boys were encouraged to participate and their contributions were taken seriously. Associated documentation was good, but attendance at meetings by internal departments remained poor.
- S68 Public protection cases were accurately identified, and the risk management committee met regularly to discuss any child identified to be a risk. Children subject to MAPPAs (multi-agency public protection arrangements) were properly identified. We saw a youth offending team (YOT) worker explaining clearly and sympathetically the implications of being subject to MAPPAs to one boy approaching release.
- S69 There were efficient systems to identify children with looked-after status and good efforts were made to help them receive the support they were entitled to from their local authority.
- S70 Reintegration planning continued to be well organised. Transition work started in good time and boys were given information about prisons they could move to and discussed their preferences.
- S71 Children's accommodation needs continued to be identified at an early stage. In the previous 12 months, no child had been released without an address, although boys sometimes had to wait until just days before their release date to know where they would be living. Where necessary, the establishment, with the support of Barnardo's advocates, made sustained and robust efforts to ensure that community agencies provided suitable accommodation.
- S72 The quality of information, advice and guidance was good and received high quality support from specialist staff.
- S73 Over the previous 12 months, 150 of 181 boys discharged had entered education or employment on release. Good partnership working was used to help boys move successfully into education, training or employment on release.
- S74 All children were seen before release to ensure continuity of health care in the community. Discharge planning for boys with significant mental health problems started early and was effective. There was good liaison between substance misuse workers and community services.
- S75 Children were able to take a range of courses on financial management and budgeting skills, but they were still not able to open bank accounts unless they were on ROTL.
- S76 The visits hall was operating at full capacity and would not be able to accommodate an increase in the population. Visits were sometimes curtailed because of staff shortages and we received numerous complaints about this.
- S77 Maintaining contact with families was well organised. There were bimonthly family days, correspondence with families and regular support to help children arrange visits. An

independent visiting scheme was run by a number of the YOTs. Caseworkers monitored children who did not have visits and provided support where appropriate.

- S78 Parent craft courses and a regular young dads group provided good support to new fathers, especially the Traveller population.
- S79 Boys had access to relevant one-to-one and group work with caseworkers and specialist workers. A range of courses were facilitated by external providers which children could attend, based on their assessed needs.

Main concerns and recommendations

- S80 **Concern:** Despite previous recommendations, late arrivals continued to occur. This affected the ability of staff to settle new arrivals properly and resulted in a poorer first night experience.

Recommendation: Key staff at the establishment, NOMS, the YJB and the escort providers should meet regularly to monitor and resolve problems relating to escort arrangements and ensure that children arrive at the establishment in good time to be assessed and settled on their first night. (Repeated recommendation 1.4)

- S81 **Concern:** Cases which should have been subject to scrutiny under the child protection arrangements were not being considered, which was a serious omission. Not all children were therefore receiving adequate support and protection.

Recommendation: If there has been an allegation of maltreatment of a child by a member of staff, or if abuse of a child is alleged or suspected, a prompt and appropriate investigation should be carried out and followed up to protect the child.

- S82 **Concern:** The use of two schemes to address the behaviour of children was confusing and the schemes were used arbitrarily. The use of instant sanctions without recourse to a hearing or appeal brings into question the legitimacy of managing children in this way.

Recommendation: A single rewards and sanctions scheme should be devised which sets out expected levels of behaviour, how children can progress to the highest level and how poor behaviour will be managed. Sanctions should only be awarded after a hearing and appeal procedures should be explained clearly.

- S83 **Concern:** Use of force was high and had increased since our last inspection. Oversight was poor and incidents were not considered fully by the restraint minimisation committee or in a timely fashion. Force and pain inducement were used to gain compliance. Not all incidents requiring referral for child protection issues had been identified and not all had been referred for further investigation where they had been raised by children or third parties on their behalf.

Recommendation: The number of incidents of use of force should be reduced. All incidents should be reviewed quickly and any issues identified addressed. Child protection issues identified should at all times be referred for further investigation by the local authority designated officer.

Section 1. Safety

Courts, escorts and transfers

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.1** *Most boys felt safe on escort vehicles but too many arrived after 8pm having spent many hours in police and court cells. Children continued to be handcuffed in court custody and when transferred from the court building to the escort van, despite being in secure areas. The court-video link was underused.*
- 1.2** Children told us that they felt safe on escort vehicles, and in our survey 83% said they had felt safe.
- 1.3** Too many children arrived at the establishment late in the evening. Some had travelled long distances and had spent lengthy periods in court cells after their case was finished. Records showed that up to 40% of boys arrived from court after 8pm. During the inspection one boy arrived at 9.45pm although his court appearance had finished at 11.30am. Boys often shared escort vans with adults for part of the journey.
- 1.4** Boys transferring to another establishment were told of their transfer on the day and caseworkers informed their families.
- 1.5** The escort vehicles that we examined were reasonably clean and well equipped. Children told us, and escort staff confirmed, that handcuffing routinely took place in court custody and on to escort vans irrespective of any security risk assessment.
- 1.6** The court video-link facility was underused, but plans were in place to upgrade the facility so that it could be used more widely.

Recommendation

- 1.7** **Handcuffs should only be used during escort when it is necessary, justified and appropriate.**

Early days in custody

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.8** *Staff treated new arrivals well and processed them promptly. The induction wing was well equipped and prepared. Boys who arrived late could not see a peer mentor but were able to make a free telephone call. The induction programme was comprehensive but information was delivered in an uninspiring manner and some elements were duplicated.*
- I.9** Reception was generally clean, but there was some offensive graffiti which had been there for some time. The searching of children on arrival was carried out appropriately. Strip-searching was conducted in a private area but only undertaken if supported by justifiable suspicion or intelligence.
- I.10** Survey results for early days at the establishment were generally positive and significantly more children than at comparator establishments said they were treated well. The reception process was systematic, thorough and prompt. All new arrivals were risk assessed at reception, and in-depth assessments were carried out later by caseworkers and shared with induction staff. A health care practitioner saw all new arrivals before they were taken to the induction wing. Meals were provided for late arrivals when necessary. Canteen packs containing soft drinks, biscuits and chocolate were routinely given to new arrivals, except for those transferring from another young offender institution. We did not understand the reasoning for this disparity.
- I.11** Personal possessions arrived sealed and were checked in the child's presence. Property was initially retained in the reception area but it was explained to the child that he could retrieve it later and most did so the following morning.
- I.12** First night procedures were sound and staff were aware in advance of newly arrived children and their circumstances. There were systems in place for additional observations and for children who arrived with no information on their record.
- I.13** The induction wing was part of the new accommodation and was in excellent condition, with in-cell shower, toilet, drinking water, telephone, television, radio/CD player, and kettle. All cells were properly prepared for new arrivals. There was no official trained peer supporter scheme, although a boy who lived on the wing acted in this capacity on an ad hoc basis. In our survey, only 70% of boys said they were able to make a telephone call on arrival, although all children we spoke to told us that this happened and records confirmed this. Every new arrival was given an additional £2.50 free telephone credit to facilitate contact with family and friends.
- I.14** Boys stayed on the induction wing for two weeks and received a comprehensive induction which delivered most of the information required. We observed two sessions which were delivered in an uninspiring manner with staff reading from a screen. This did not engage the boys. Some of the information was duplicated in induction sessions delivered by other agencies.

- I.15** The induction programme was disjointed and we observed many interruptions to sessions as caseworkers, Barnardo's advocacy staff and the chaplaincy tried to arrange interviews with the children on the first day.

Recommendations

- I.16** All children should have access to canteen packs on arrival.
- I.17** There should be a formal peer mentor scheme to provide support to all boys new to the establishment.
- I.18** Induction sessions should be coordinated and delivered in an engaging way.

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.19** *The oversight of safeguarding had deteriorated since the previous inspection. Links with the local safeguarding children board remained effective but there was not enough analysis of data relating to key areas of safety, and safeguarding meetings had not taken place regularly. A weekly multidisciplinary safer regimes meeting provided a good forum to plan the care of the most challenging and vulnerable boys.*

- I.20** Links with Medway safeguarding children board were effective and the establishment was represented at meetings of the main board and a subgroup of the board. A local authority representative attended the quarterly safeguarding meeting which formed part of the senior management team meeting. This helped to ensure that all key areas of the prison were represented.
- I.21** The monthly safeguarding meeting had not taken place regularly during 2014, in part due to changes in the staff managing safeguarding. Senior managers were aware of the deficiencies and told us that action was in hand to address them. One consequence of this intermittent discussion of safeguarding data was a lack of focus on key areas of safety at a time when the establishment was experiencing change in its population and associated challenges (see sections on suicide and self-harm prevention and bullying and violence reduction).
- I.22** Safeguarding team integrated information reports (STIIRs) continued to be the mechanism for any member of staff to pass safeguarding concerns or information to the safeguarding team. During the year from April 2013, 642 STIIRs had been submitted. These were followed up by a dedicated member of the safeguarding team, although this officer was often redeployed to other duties. STIIRs were subject to internal audit which had identified that some areas of the establishment were not submitting STIIRs. Appropriate remedial action had been taken.
- I.23** A weekly multidisciplinary safer regimes meeting provided a good forum to plan the care of the most challenging and vulnerable boys.

Recommendations

- I.24** The safeguarding meeting should take place monthly in line with the safeguarding strategy and should be attended by all relevant departments. Relevant data should be analysed and used to inform discussion on key areas of safety.
- I.25** The safeguarding team should be adequately resourced so that work is undertaken thoroughly and consistently.

Child protection

Expected outcomes:

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

I.26 *Links with the local safeguarding children board were good. The quality of child protection work had deteriorated recently. Cases which should have been referred to the local authority for independent scrutiny had not been. Some of these were quite serious. Remedial action was beginning to take place.*

- I.27** During the previous inspection we found that the child protection procedures had improved. Referrals were dealt with appropriately and the introduction of a seconded social worker had improved communication with the local authority. However, on this occasion we found that for at least two months before the inspection, the internal child protection procedures had not been functioning properly. The problem was compounded by the fact that the establishment was managing a particularly difficult group of boys at the same time.
- I.28** We identified at least four cases involving the use of force since the beginning of 2014 where complaints had been made by a child or concerns had been raised by staff, which had not been properly followed up. In addition to this, on three occasions children had been searched under restraint, which was unacceptable. These cases had not been referred to the local authority for independent scrutiny.
- I.29** Although the weaknesses that we found were serious, we were reassured that the governor and others were aware of these problems and had begun to address them. As the monthly safeguarding meetings, at which child protection was a key element, had fallen into abeyance, the recently appointed safeguarding manager had been given responsibility for reinstating them. The seconded social worker had also embarked on identifying cases which should have been referred to the local authority but had been missed. The local authority designated officer indicated that this work would be supported by the local authority.
- I.30** At a strategic level, links with the local authority remained good. The governor was a full member of the local safeguarding children board (LSCB) and the chair of the LSCB had visited the establishment recently to discuss the implications for boys of introducing a restricted regime.

Recommendation

- I.31 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.**

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.32** *Staff had a heightened awareness of bullying and few incidents were identified. We were not confident that formal support systems for the victims of bullying were fully developed.*

- I.33** The identification of bullying and victims was reasonably good, and information sharing in the residential unit was very good. Communication between residential managers, education staff and the security department helped to identify incidents of bullying that had not been reported through more formal channels. We observed good supervision on wings: officers regularly patrolled landings and association areas when boys were unlocked. We saw examples of officers taking appropriate action to deal with potential incidents before they developed.
- I.34** Residential staff who observed bullying taking place recorded this in wing observation books and electronic history files. Few incidents had been identified. There was no evidence from our discussion with children or from survey results that bullying was widespread.
- I.35** Formal support for victims of bullying was less well developed. We were not confident that the 'team around the child' (TAC) system was effective but the weekly multidisciplinary safer regimes meeting provided good support for a few particularly vulnerable boys (see section on suicide and self-harm prevention).

Recommendation

- I.36 Measures to support victims of bullying should be strengthened so that effective help is always provided.**

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.37 *The collection and analysis of data at monthly safeguarding meetings had deteriorated since the previous inspection. The number of self-harm incidents was low but the quality of ACCT (assessment, care in custody and teamwork case management of children at risk of suicide or self-harm) documents was sometimes inadequate. We observed examples of very good individual care, but support plans were often not well prepared, reviews were cursory and consultation with children was inadequate. Conditions in the constant watch cell were not entirely suitable to accommodate vulnerable children.*

I.38 The nature and extent of self-harm over time were discussed at quarterly safeguarding meetings. Monthly meetings to monitor the management of self-harm were not effective and were usually poorly attended (see section on violence reduction).

I.39 The weekly multidisciplinary safer regimes meeting was attended by the head of young people, representatives from the safeguarding team, residential managers and the mental health in-reach team. They identified all new ACCT cases and discussed the progress of the more complicated cases. This forum worked well and provided an excellent method of addressing the needs of particularly vulnerable boys.

I.40 During the six months to May 2014, 53 ACCT documents had been opened. This was similar to the previous inspection. Over the same period, the number of actual incidents of self-harm had reduced from 38 to 24. Most injuries were superficial and caused by scratching or punching walls. There had been no serious self-inflicted injuries or deaths in custody since the previous inspection. An action plan had been raised following the death in custody in 2012 and was managed by the head of safeguarding. Many of the recommendations from the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman's report and clinical reviews had been implemented.

I.41 The quality of too many ACCT documents remained poor. We observed examples of very good individual care, but written support plans were not always well prepared, reviews were cursory and there was not enough consultation with children. We still found examples of a punitive approach to addressing challenging behaviour, such as the removal of televisions and demotion to basic level without sufficient consideration of the individual care needs of the boys. We found little evidence of managers checking documents regularly and quality assurance was poor.

I.42 Conditions in the constant observation cell in the segregation unit remained awful. The cell was dark and dirty and there was graffiti on the walls.

Recommendations

I.43 **The collection and analysis of data should be improved.**

I.44 **The quality of ACCT documents should be improved.**

- I.45 The constant watch cell in the segregation unit should not be used to accommodate children at risk of suicide or self-harm.**

Behaviour management

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.46** *The behaviour management strategy encompassed all relevant policies and described how to challenge poor behaviour and acknowledge good behaviour. Mediation by trained staff was available to children and there was good uptake.*

- I.47** The behaviour management policies had been incorporated into one strategy which emphasised the expectation of positive behaviour by boys in an environment of staff support. The strategy was complex and was not provided in an age-appropriate format. Some elements of the strategy were presented to boys on induction.
- I.48** Staff were encouraged to challenge poor behaviour proportionately by using behaviour management tools such as the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme, rewards and sanctions and adjudications. However, IEP and rewards and sanctions were used inconsistently and we were concerned about the legitimacy of using instant sanctions (see section on incentives and earned privileges).
- I.49** Mediation by trained staff was used to encourage better relationships between boys in conflict with one another. Uptake of mediation services was good and we saw some positive results. There was not enough monitoring and scrutiny of some aspects of behaviour management and identification of trends (see sections on incentives and earned privileges and use of force).

Recommendation

- I.50 All aspects of the behaviour management strategy should be fully monitored to identify trends and action should be taken to address any issues.**

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.51** *The boundaries between the IEP and rewards and sanctions schemes were unclear and both schemes were used to address the same kind of behaviour. Some boys received an instant sanction and others did not. There was a lack of management oversight and monitoring of the use of both schemes to ensure fairness and consistency. Use of the rewards and sanctions scheme appeared arbitrary.*
- I.52** Staff used two schemes to address less serious poor behaviour, which we have not seen in any other young offender institution. The incentives and earned privileges scheme had three levels - basic, standard and enhanced. Staff could give behaviour warnings for minor infringements of rules, which could result in demotion, or boys could be promoted to a higher level if they behaved well. The rewards and sanctions (R&S) scheme offered the same sanctions as minor reports but without a hearing. Staff could give green cards, attracting financial or material awards for good behaviour beyond standard expectations. Yellow cards, which could be awarded for poor behaviour, attracted instant sanctions of up to three days' loss of privileges, often for the same acts of disobedience that attracted behaviour warnings under the IEP scheme. The boundaries between the two schemes were unclear.
- I.53** Although staff said they preferred the R&S scheme, the awarding of warnings or yellow cards appeared arbitrary and children said that they were often not given a chance to appeal against the sanctions until after they had been served. We examined the wing files of 30 boys and it was not clear if children's appeals against sanctions were heard before the sanction had been served. We questioned the legitimacy of the R&S scheme and the use of notices on cell doors describing the sanctions awarded was demoralising.
- I.54** IEP reviews were carried out quickly and tailored to meet individual need. We saw some examples of good support to boys to encourage them to improve their behaviour.
- I.55** There was little oversight and no monitoring of either scheme to ensure fairness and consistency.

Housekeeping point

- I.56** Notices on cell doors describing sanctions imposed should be removed.

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.57 *Physical security was proportionate and focused on the safety of children. Information was shared promptly but not always acted on swiftly. Strip-searching was only undertaken following a risk assessment. We were concerned to find incidents of searching under restraint. Adjudications were used to address more serious infringements of rules and the number of adjudications had risen since our last inspection. Children had good access to advocates.*

I.58 Physical security was proportionate to the risks posed by the population. The monthly security meeting was well attended and focused on the safety of children. Monthly objectives reflected the intelligence received. Information sharing was good, particularly with the safer custody team, and a daily bulletin provided up-to-date information to staff. Over 1,200 intelligence reports had been received in the previous six months and the intelligence received was analysed quickly. Individual target searches were not always carried out swiftly. An intelligence-led full lockdown search had taken place just before the inspection, during which over 30 home-made weapons had been found and many boys had subsequently been subject to disciplinary procedures. In relation to intelligence received, the number of rub-down searches had been increased to ensure children were kept safe.

I.59 The establishment had a good relationship with the local police who shared relevant information about the children and were prepared to follow up cases referred to them appropriately.

I.60 Free movement to activities was well organised and children were also escorted to activities outside mass movement times. Sometimes there were delays in young people commencing work or education placements because risk assessments were not always completed on time.

I.61 All cell and strip-searching was carried out on an intelligence and risk-led basis. We were concerned to find incidents of boys being searched under restraint, which was unacceptable. None of these incidents had been referred to the local authority designated officer for scrutiny. The documentation was incomplete and we were unable to ascertain the level of searches carried out (see section on use of force).

I.62 The number of adjudications had increased slightly since our last inspection from 476 to 499 per hundred. The main charges were for fighting and assaults and referrals were made to the police where necessary. Adjudications were carried out on the wings. The rooms were laid out formally, staff appeared overbearing at times and the environment was not child friendly.

I.63 Adjudication documentation was issued the day before the hearing. Boys were contacted by advocates before the hearing and advocates could accompany the boys. Advocacy services were well embedded and boys we spoke to appreciated the support they had been given by advocates.

I.64 Children were given the opportunity to express their views during the adjudications that we observed. The completed documentation that we reviewed indicated that full account was

taken of mitigating circumstances. Punishments were given in accordance with a published tariff and appeared consistent and appropriate for the population. Removal from unit was still used as a punishment, which was inappropriate.

- I.65** Minor reports were not used to address minor infringements of the rules.
- I.66** Adjudication review meetings took place every two months and minutes indicated a thorough discussion of the tariff. Adjudication documents were quality checked by the governor and issues were raised with adjudicating governors.

Recommendations

- I.67** **Children should not be searched under restraint.**
- I.68** **The adjudication rooms should provide a child-friendly environment and staff should play a supportive role.**

Housekeeping point

- I.69** Intelligence-led searches should be carried out quickly.

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.70 *The number of violent incidents was high and there was clear potential for serious injury. Many assaults involved groups of boys attacking single boys. There was also significant use of weapons. Attendance at monthly safeguarding meetings was poor and analysis of information to identify trends was also poor. Strategies to deal with violent behaviour were not fully developed.*

- I.71** Some of the procedures and protocols in the safeguarding policy to reduce levels of violence had stalled during the months before the inspection. Monitoring data provided for the monthly safeguarding meeting were underdeveloped and did not reflect local indicators. Attendance was poor and important links with the security department were not in place.
- I.72** The number of violent incidents remained too high and had increased slightly since the previous inspection. During the six months before the inspection, 169 acts of violence had been recorded compared to 130 at the previous inspection: 103 had been recorded as assaults and 66 as fights between boys. The number of assaults between children was high at about 15 a month compared with nine at the previous inspection. Some incidents were very serious and involved gangs of boys attacking a single boy. CCTV recordings showed groups of children kicking and punching each other. The use of weapons was not uncommon and we saw many incidents where they had been used against unarmed boys. During a lockdown search of the main wing shortly before our inspection, more than 30 weapons had been found in different cells. Despite this, most boys said they felt safe. In our survey, only 10% said that they felt unsafe at the time of the inspection.

- I.73** The 'team around the child' (TAC) initiative introduced before the previous inspection to manage the challenging of perpetrators and support for victims of violence was in abeyance and, at the time of the inspection, was only used to monitor a few boys involved in violent and antisocial behaviour. Despite these high levels of violence, there were only seven open documents at the time of the inspection.
- I.74** Restrictions were placed on the regime of boys displaying persistent or serious violent behaviour. Some were managed on the basic level of the IEP scheme or were accommodated in the segregation unit. Some were not permitted to have their meals out of cell and some were temporarily precluded from association in the evening. At the time of the inspection, 28% of the mainstream population were on some form of regime restriction.

Recommendations

- I.75** **The establishment should develop and implement an effective and comprehensive strategy to understand and reduce the high levels of violence among children.**
- I.76** **Monthly safeguarding meetings should be well attended and the analysis of data on levels of violence should be improved.**
- I.77** **The TAC initiative to manage and address violent behaviour should be fully implemented.**

The use of force

Expected outcomes:

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

I.78 *The use of force was high and had increased since the previous inspection. We were not confident that all spontaneous incidents where force had been used were justified. We found evidence of de-escalation in many incidents and recordings of the planned interventions that we viewed showed that force was proportionate. Oversight of the use of force was poor and too many documents had not been completed. Debriefs of children were not always sufficiently detailed. Many incidents were not considered fully or promptly enough at the restraint management meeting. Some incidents where boys had complained about the use of force had not been dealt with independently. Force and pain infliction continued to be used to gain compliance.*

- I.79** Use of force was high and had increased since the previous inspection. The use of full control and restraint techniques had also increased slightly. There had been 282 incidents of use of force in the previous six months (13 December to 13 June 2014) compared to 250 at our last inspection. Pain compliance had been used on at least four occasions, including the use of the mandibular angle technique (a form of restraint which involves pressure being applied at a point below the ear), and staff acknowledged that they used infliction of pain through wrist locks to gain compliance, which was inappropriate. Only one instance had been referred to the safeguarding team for further investigation. All planned incidents had been recorded and CCTV coverage was retrieved for many spontaneous incidents. There had been a delay in introducing MMPR (minimising and managing physical restraint) due to staff shortages.

- I.80** Most incidents of the use of force were spontaneous and occurred when staff intervened in fights or assaults. Documentation that we reviewed showed that force was not always justified. The infliction of pain to gain compliance from boys had also been used. In one incident, staff fully restrained a boy whom they knew well, who refused to give his name and prison number when he returned from court to reception. This had not been identified as inappropriate by the restraint minimisation committee. We found at least two other instances of staff using wrist locks to inflict pain to gain compliance which had not been identified by the committee or referred for investigation.
- I.81** There was some evidence in the documentation and CCTV recordings of staff de-escalating situations and trying to avoid restraining children. All children were seen by a member of health care staff following use of force.
- I.82** Debriefs following restraints were carried out by caseworkers. Some of the debriefs we examined did not give a full account of the incident. Children we spoke to were not confident to make complaints about restraint themselves but some had done so with the assistance of advocates. Child protection referrals had not always been made and followed up when appropriate. Where children made a complaint about the way restraint was used, this was not always referred as a child protection matter.
- I.83** Oversight of the use of force was poor. CCTV coverage of incidents was sometimes checked by orderly officers on the same day and incidents were not fully considered by the restraint minimisation committee until all documentation had been received from staff. The completion of reports was awaited for 49 incidents dating back to April 2014, resulting in significant delays in the investigation of incidents. The committee had not met for two weeks before our inspection, compounding the delays. We were not confident that all incidents requiring further investigation had been identified by the committee.

Recommendations

- I.84** **Pain inducement techniques should not be used during use of force.** (Repeated recommendation I.67)
- I.85** **Force should only be used as a last resort and not to gain compliance.** (Repeated recommendation I.68)
- I.86** **Debriefs of children following use of force should include a full account of the incident.**

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.87** *Phoenix unit remained a poor environment. There was offensive graffiti in cells, the unit lacked natural light and not all cells were clean. The unit was noisy and chaotic at times. The unit fulfilled several functions which was not conducive to supporting the different needs of the boys held there. Despite this, the support that staff provided on the unit was good and most boys were reintegrated to mainstream units. Relationships between staff and children were good and staff knew the boys well. Day-to-day management support for such a complex unit was inconsistent. The regime had improved and formal care and support planning was good, with appropriate multidisciplinary input.*
- I.88** Phoenix unit remained a poor environment for boys who were separated. There was graffiti in cells and not all cells were clean. The unit lacked natural light and was noisy and chaotic at times. The unit fulfilled several functions. It was used as punishment, and for boys requiring constant watch facilities, those with complex needs needing additional support and those who were socially isolated. This was not conducive to supporting the needs of all the boys held there and plans to move some aspects of the unit to a different wing (Cedars) to separate the most vulnerable and complex children needed to be expedited. Day-to-day management support for a unit of this type was vital but it lacked consistency and supervising officers were often used for other duties. A forensic psychologist who was based on the unit provided good support to staff and boys.
- I.89** At the time of the inspection, 15 boys were resident on the unit which had been extended into one of the neighbouring closed units to accommodate the unusually high number. This had added to the difficulty of managing all the children held there. Two boys were held in the unit for good order or discipline (GOOD), three for punishment (removal from unit), nine had complex needs and one was on a constant watch.
- I.90** In the previous six months, an equal number of the 97 boys in the unit had been held for GOOD and for complex needs. The average length of stay for those on GOOD was about seven days, while boys with complex needs stayed far longer. Those on the unit for the latter reason at the time of the inspection had been there for between 46 and 133 days, which was too long. However, the quality of multidisciplinary interventions and support that they received was commendable. Almost all children were reintegrated to mainstream residential units.
- I.91** All boys on the unit for GOOD had been appropriately authorised for separation. Documentation showed that all boys on the unit were reviewed regularly and frequently. All reviews were multidisciplinary and detailed care and support plans indicated that appropriate interventions and support were offered and children were able to contribute. Some identified actions were not time bound and documentation did not always show when they had been completed. Staff on the unit knew the boys well and relationships were good. Boys on the unit were complimentary about their treatment.
- I.92** The regime on the unit had improved and 10 of the 15 children had full timetables and were attending off-unit activities. Boys were given the opportunity to exercise, make telephone calls and have a shower every day. The exercise yard was bleak.

- I.93** Monitoring and review of segregation was conducted in sufficient detail at the safer regimes meeting.

Recommendations

- I.94** Children needing to be separated for discipline reasons or because they have complex needs should be held in a suitable environment.
- I.95** Children should be separated for the shortest time possible.
- I.96** All separated children should have time-bound targets.

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.97 *Substance misuse services had improved and were good. Joint working with other departments was now effective. There was little evidence of illicit drugs, but the strategic approach to drug strategy and supply reduction was inadequate. Suspicion drug testing remained ineffective.*

- I.98** Service delivery was not informed by a substance misuse strategy, needs assessment or action plan, although a draft strategy, including supply reduction, was being developed. A quarterly substance misuse strategy meeting was incorporated into the resettlement meeting, but minutes indicated that substance misuse lacked sufficient focus.
- I.99** Nurses screened children for substance misuse during the first night process. Any boy who required drug or alcohol detoxification was transferred to another establishment for treatment, although this rarely occurred. NHS England was progressing plans to introduce clinical provision.
- I.100** NHS England had more than doubled funding for substance misuse services since the previous inspection. KCA (providing drug, alcohol and mental health services) had taken over psychosocial services in June 2013. A full-time manager and three workers provided a good range of one-to-one and group support, including a drug and alcohol support group, and information on harm reduction and gangs and dealing issues.
- I.101** The KCA harm reduction worker assessed all new arrivals using the CHAT (comprehensive health assessment tool) and offered continuing support. Integration with primary health care and mental health services was very good and workers engaged effectively with other departments. Record keeping, care planning and case supervision were good.
- I.102** In our survey, 12% of boys said it was easy to get illegal drugs in the establishment. There were few drug finds and little evidence of problems with illegal drugs or diverted medication. The establishment continued to use only suspicion mandatory drug testing (MDT). This remained an ineffective measure of drug use as 29 of the 34 tests requested since June 2013 had not been completed because of a lack of trained staff and, more recently, an MDT suite.

Recommendations

- I.103 A substance misuse strategy should be produced which is informed by a comprehensive needs analysis. It should contain an action plan with performance measures which are reviewed at substance misuse strategy meetings.**
- I.104 The mandatory drug testing programme should be adequately resourced to undertake all requested suspicion tests. (Repeated recommendation I.51)**

Section 2. Respect

Residential units

Expected outcomes:

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

2.1 *The standard of residential accommodation was very high. In-cell facilities were good and cells were clean. Some outside areas were unkempt. Boys, including those on remand, could not wear their own clothes.*

- 2.2** Previously the accommodation had been poor but a new accommodation block had opened earlier in the year. It consisted of five residential wings of 30 single cells and one wing of 29 cells to enable one cell built to DDA (Disability Discrimination Act) standards.
- 2.3** The accommodation was bright, clean and well kept, and the furniture and fittings in the cells were good. All cells had a shower, a toilet, drinking water and washbasin. Telephones, television, radio/CD player and a kettle were standard in all cells. Graffiti was extremely rare.
- 2.4** Cell inspections were carried out each day and we were told that problems were rectified quickly. All wing notice boards contained relevant up-to-date information, but in English only. Staff told us that it was extremely rare to have a child who could not understand English. A professional telephone interpretation service was available, but staff could not recall using it.
- 2.5** Incoming mail was processed daily. Five per cent of all mail was checked by censors. Mail was usually delivered to the wings on the day it was received and outgoing mail was posted the day after it was received from the child. Most boys we spoke to were content with the procedure for post. There were good processes for handling legally privileged mail.
- 2.6** All boys were required to wear prison clothes, even when on remand. The clothes were of reasonable quality. Boys could not wash their own clothes. The laundry operated efficiently and the quality and quantity of clothing issued at the weekly kit exchange was acceptable.
- 2.7** Most property was stored in the reception area. Boys had access to their property by application and they could retrieve it reasonably quickly. In our survey, 69% of boys said that they felt applications were sorted out fairly and 58% said this was done within seven days against respective comparators of 44% and 25%. Most children we spoke to said that, with the exception of registering their PIN telephone numbers, the application system worked well. There was an applications tracking system, but this did not monitor the timeliness and quality of the application process effectively.

Recommendation

- 2.8** **Boys on remand should not have to wear prison clothes.** (Repeated recommendation 2.11)

Relationships between staff and children and young people

Expected outcomes:

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

2.9 *Relationships between staff and children were generally good. However, we saw some inappropriate behaviour by boys go unchallenged and heard some staff swearing in front of children. Personal officer work needed improvement. Consultation arrangements were well established, but not all actions were taken forward promptly.*

- 2.10** The relationships between children and staff appeared reasonably good. In our survey, 86% of boys against the comparator of 69% said that most staff treated them with respect. Boys from minority groups were less positive about the quality of relationships in the survey and in person during the inspection (see section on diversity).
- 2.11** We did not see any reluctance from boys to approach staff. Some uniformed staff made more effort than others to interact with the boys, for example during association some staff engaged in activities or talked to boys while others sat together apart from the boys. We observed staff dealing firmly but sensitively with boys who were reluctant to return to their cells at the end of evening association. The boys had been enjoying themselves and were full of energy and staff talked to them and walked them to their doors. We saw some poor behaviour by boys which was not challenged, for example during induction a boy who was ill mannered and swore was not told that this was unacceptable. We heard staff swearing in conversations with one another which could be overheard by children; this set a bad example and undermined the efforts of other staff to challenge such language from boys.
- 2.12** Staff demonstrated knowledge of the individual children in their care. Not all staff wore names on their uniforms, which was a safeguarding concern.
- 2.13** The personal officer scheme was under review at the time of the inspection and managers were aware of areas for improvement identified by inspectors. In our survey, 42% of boys against the comparator of 59% said they saw their personal officer at least once a week. Some told us they did not know who their personal officer was, although they were aware from their induction that they should have one. Cell cards did not include the names of personal officers and there were no notices setting out which cells officers were responsible for. Most entries in electronic case notes related only to behaviour. A minority of entries showed that a conversation had taken place between a boy and his personal officer and quality assurance checks were not taking place consistently. It was clear that caseworkers undertook some of the work normally undertaken by personal officers in other establishments, for example keeping in touch with families and helping boys sort out pin phone credit issues.
- 2.14** The youth council, supported by Kinetic, an independent youth work service, was the main forum for children to raise concerns. The council met regularly but some issues raised were not addressed promptly by the establishment (see sections on diversity and catering).

Recommendations

- 2.15 All staff should wear their names on their uniform.**

- 2.16** Staff should model the behaviour expected from children and poor behaviour by boys should be challenged consistently.
- 2.17** The personal officer scheme should be relaunched and effective quality assurance put in place.

Housekeeping point

- 2.18** Issues raised at youth council meetings should be acted on and feedback provided at the next meeting.

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.

- 2.19** *Work on the strategic management of equality and diversity, and on the protection afforded to minority groups, was poor. This had adverse consequences for all minority groups except for children from a foreign national background.*

Strategic management

- 2.20** There were no governance structures for equality and diversity work and there was no strategic management of equality. There was no up-to-date equality and diversity policy or action plan in place, and no recording, monitoring or analysis of equality data or SMART monitoring (systematic monitoring and analysing of race equality treatment). Diversity was not adequately addressed at senior management team (SMT) meetings. Equality and diversity work had been prioritised until summer 2013, but evidence showed, and staff acknowledged, that staff changes had occurred and equality had been neglected.
- 2.21** No member of staff had enough time to undertake adequate equality work across the establishment. The diversity officer operated in name only and did not have the time to coordinate equality work effectively or check to see that equality was systematically introduced or explained and promoted to the children. This sent the wrong signal to staff and children about the priority that should be given to equality.
- 2.22** Equality meetings, including diversity and equality action team (DEAT) meetings, had been merged under the safeguarding umbrella. Analysis of the minutes of the monthly safeguarding sub-group meetings, at which equality should have been discussed, showed that diversity had not been discussed over the previous six months apart from two items on foreign national children.
- 2.23** Diversity was not promoted at any level in the establishment. There were no equality representatives and no readily accessible point of contact for equality issues. The SMT

minutes over the previous six months did not show any discussion of equality issues. The youth council was the only forum for children to express views on diversity issues, but when the council asked for an equality focus group to be set up, this item was deferred to subsequent meetings and there was no evidence of any follow up.

- 2.24** Discrimination incident report forms (DIRFs) were available to boys while they were moving location, but they were not kept on the landings near the cells. Children we spoke to had little awareness of the DIRF system, and those who were aware of it lacked confidence in the confidentiality or effectiveness of the procedure. We found only one DIRF form behind numerous other forms, and no posters to promote or explain the DIRF system. The system did not provide an adequate safeguard for boys to raise discrimination concerns against staff or other boys. Seventeen DIRFs had been submitted in the previous six months, most of which concerned inappropriate racial language by boys. Some of the DIRFs had been investigated, while others had only been partially completed and not adequately investigated. We found no evidence of regular quality assurance. In 99% of cases a staff member rather than a child used the DIRF form to address alleged discriminatory action. There was no analysis of the DIRFs to identify patterns and trends, which was all the more alarming given evidence of discontent by some black and minority ethnic and Muslim children and children with disabilities (see section on diverse needs).
- 2.25** The lack of effective and coordinated equality work had created a major gap in provision and had an adverse impact on children from the vast majority of minority groups.

Recommendations

- 2.26** **Up-to-date equality and diversity policies and an action plan should be put in place, and effective recording, monitoring and analysis of equality data should be started immediately.**
- 2.27** **Specific, regular equality meetings, particularly diversity and equality action team (DEAT) meetings, should be re-established. The senior management team should address and monitor equality issues regularly.**
- 2.28** **A dedicated equality officer with adequate time and resources should be appointed to coordinate and promote equality work.**
- 2.29** **Equality representatives should be appointed and publicised and should attend DEAT meetings.**
- 2.30** **Equality and diversity should be promoted at all levels of the establishment and should be explained to boys on arrival and throughout their sentence.**
- 2.31** **Equality and diversity issues or requests raised in the youth council should be addressed immediately and followed up, and reasons should be given for decisions.**
- 2.32** **The DIRF system should be explained and promoted to children and forms should be readily available on landings by the cells.**

Diverse needs

- 2.33** At the time of the inspection, 54% of children were of black and minority ethnic origin. In our survey, 76% of black and minority ethnic boys felt that staff treated them with respect

against 95% of white children. Black and minority ethnic boys were also more negative in our discussion groups. They perceived an undercurrent of unequal treatment by staff and told us that not all staff were committed to equality and diversity. They described what they perceived as different responses to them by staff when boys were messing about during exercise. They felt that staff were more likely to intervene when black and minority ethnic boys were involved and were more likely to award punishments to this population. This was also raised as a concern in the youth council meetings.

- 2.34** Some racist graffiti was evident during the inspection. It had been left for too long in reception and in the Phoenix unit. The Independent Monitoring Board observed that there was consistent over-representation of black and minority ethnic boys in use of force cases (71%), adjudications and in the Phoenix unit. There was very little evidence of systematic monitoring of equality or adequate investigation of this over-representation.
- 2.35** Boys told us they felt that certain staff were not sufficiently culturally aware. There was a lack of suitable staff training and only 3.7% of staff were black and minority ethnic.
- 2.36** In our survey, 9% of children said they regarded themselves as Gypsy, Romany or Traveller. There was no official forum for this group but some good individual work was being undertaken. In education, Traveller children were helped with reading, writing and mathematics in a group learning environment. Caseworkers had initiated a youth parent club for new fathers from a Traveller background to develop parenting skills and promote the maintenance of family ties (see section on children, families and contact with outside world). This was a commendable initiative.
- 2.37** At the time of the inspection, there were 16 foreign national boys in the establishment. There was evidence of some good work with the foreign national population. The management of foreign national boys was discussed at a monthly meeting and practical help was offered to them. A foreign national youth club was organised and Migrant Help² visited the establishment. Interpretation services had been used very little over the previous year. We spoke to one boy with a traumatic history who found it difficult to express his concerns in English and did not have regular access to interpretation services. All foreign national boys and boys with parents or carers living overseas received credit for a five-minute telephone call each month.
- 2.38** In our survey, 24% of children considered themselves to have a disability. Their perceptions were more negative than those of other children in some important areas, including safety: 37% of children with disabilities against the comparator of 14% said they had been victimised by other boys. Two boys with physical disabilities who spoke to us referred to a lack of systematic care or care plans, no named member of staff to turn to and many practical problems arising from their disability. One boy with memory loss arising from an accident could not remember to complete applications or visits orders. Another felt unsafe during movement from education classrooms. There was no disability liaison officer or disability forum, and the boys we spoke to did not know who their personal officers were.
- 2.39** Health care staff carried out disability screening with children when they arrived. The disability database recorded 15 boys, three with physical disabilities. During the inspection we found four children with physical disabilities, and only one child who was not on the database had a personal emergency evacuation plan (PEEP). One partially-sighted boy who had been waiting four months for prescription glasses suffered severe headaches which had not been treated. There were no systems in place to ensure that children with physical disabilities had care plans or received regular support.

² A voluntary organisation offering support to migrants and victims of trafficking

- 2.40** In our survey, only 61% of Muslim boys said they were treated with respect by staff against the comparator of 93%, and 46% of Muslim boys said they had felt unsafe in the establishment compared with 21% of non-Muslim boys. There was no evidence that these concerns had been identified and addressed.
- 2.41** No work was being carried out to identify, monitor and support gay and transgender boys.

Recommendations

- 2.42** **The negative perceptions of black and minority ethnic children should be investigated further and acted on.** (Repeated recommendation 2.34)
- 2.43** **Cultural awareness should be promoted and staff should receive refresher training in equality.**
- 2.44** **Regular forums or events to promote equality should be held for children from all protected characteristic groups.**
- 2.45** **Boys from a foreign national background should have regular access to professional interpretation services.**
- 2.46** **A disability liaison officer should be appointed.**
- 2.47** **Children with physical disabilities should have care plans and should receive practical support.**
- 2.48** **The negative perceptions of safety and respect that many Muslim boys have should be investigated and addressed.**
- 2.49** **Monitoring by characteristics other than race should be undertaken to check that other minority groups are not at a disadvantage.** (Repeated recommendation 2.35)

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.

2.50 *The chaplaincy was well established and fulfilled its statutory duties but carried out little work beyond this. Boys had good access to chaplains but the facilities available for worship were stark.*

- 2.51** Members of the chaplaincy were available seven days a week and fulfilled their statutory duties. There was little evidence of any supporting faith classes or activities. Members of the chaplaincy were very visible throughout the inspection and each new arrival met a member of the chaplaincy on their first day.
- 2.52** The multi-faith room was situated in the new accommodation block. It catered mainly for Christian worship. It was a stark room which did not provide a contemplative environment.

A meeting room next to the gym served as a faith room for Muslim worship, ostensibly because there were ablution facilities in an adjacent room.

- 2.53** Children could attend faith services of their choice subject to security checks. If a boy was unable to attend worship, a chaplain visited him.

Recommendation

- 2.54** Children should be able to attend faith classes and groups in addition to corporate worship.

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.

- 2.55** *Governance of complaint procedures had improved since the previous inspection, although some boys still had little faith in the system. Responses to complaints were timely and adequate.*

- 2.56** In our survey, 53% of boys said that complaints were sorted out fairly and 49% that they were sorted out quickly against 30% and 19% respectively in 2013.

- 2.57** Complaint forms were available by the main office on the wings but boys could only take a form while out on movement. Locked complaint boxes were emptied each day.

- 2.58** Staff ensured that complaints were tracked and children received responses which were timely, polite and age appropriate.

- 2.59** Complaints data were analysed and submitted in a monthly report to the deputy governor. Trends emerging from the analysis, such as concerns about the food, were not followed up. Minutes of senior management team meetings did not indicate any discussion about complaints.

- 2.60** Quality assurance of 10% of the complaints had identified poor practice, but we did not see evidence of the identified weaknesses being addressed. An independent child advocacy service was available to help boys fill out complaint forms. The advocates provided an excellent service which was appreciated by the boys.

Recommendations

- 2.61** Complaint forms should be readily available to boys on their landing whenever they want one.

- 2.62** Trends emerging from analysis of complaints data should be investigated and followed up and should be discussed at senior management team meetings.

Legal rights

Expected outcomes:

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

2.63 *Arrangements to make sure that children understood the nature of their detention remained good. They had good telephone access to their legal advisers, but the visits room did not provide enough privacy for legal visits.*

2.64 Caseworkers explained their legal rights to children during their initial meeting and ensured that they understood their sentence or remand status. Boys on remand were given appropriate help to make bail applications.

2.65 Children continued to have free telephone access to their legal advisers, youth offending team workers and social workers, although caseworkers told us this was less easy to facilitate since the move to the new accommodation. The Barnardo's advocates arranged specialist legal support for boys who needed it, for example when trying to secure suitable accommodation from their local authority on release. Legal visits took place in the main visits room which did not provide suitable privacy for boys to discuss their case.

Recommendation

2.66 **Legal visits should take place in private.**

Health services

Expected outcomes:

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

2.67 *The new primary health care provider was planning to develop improved services, but crippling staff shortages, insufficient consulting rooms and an inefficient movements system were all adversely affecting current service provision. Dental services were good, but waiting times were too long. The standard of pharmacy services was good. The new health and wellbeing team provided a very good and improving service.*

Governance arrangements

2.68 NHS England Kent, Surrey and Sussex commissioned Oxleas NHS Foundation Trust to provide primary care services and Central and North West London NHS Trust (CNWL) to provide integrated mental health services. Both services had only been in place for 10 weeks and were still implementing their planned models of care.

- 2.69** Regular joint provider and clinical governance meetings were held and they were well attended. Working relationships among the providers, commissioners and the prison were excellent, although the new partnership board had not yet met. A new health needs assessment was just being started.
- 2.70** In our survey, 60% of children were satisfied with health services. The six complaints received in the previous 14 months had been responded to appropriately. Reported adverse incidents were managed appropriately. Health service user forums helped to inform service development.
- 2.71** A registered nurse was on site from 7am to 9pm Monday to Friday and 7.45am to 9.30pm at weekends. A senior nurse managed Cookham Wood and nearby HMP Rochester. Three-quarters of the core team was absent through sickness or as a result of vacant posts. Despite some excellent long-term agency staff, the team struggled to cover all activities and some areas, including immunisations, systematic support for boys with disabilities and health promotion, had deteriorated. Kent Medical Consortium provided four GP clinics a week and out-of-hours cover.
- 2.72** Most of the primary care policies in use were out of date. Systems were in place for communicable disease management and information sharing. Staff training and supervision had been adversely affected by staff shortages.
- 2.73** In our survey, fewer children said it was easy to see a nurse than the comparator (57% against 70%). Most services were delivered from three clinical rooms in the new unit, which offered an improved environment but there were still not enough rooms for the scale of the service. Not all areas complied with infection control requirements, but an action plan from a recent external audit was being implemented.
- 2.74** Emergency equipment, including oxygen and external defibrillators, was easily accessible to custody staff. However, despite a recent Prisons and Probation Ombudsman report, too few staff were trained in emergency first aid. Training was planned for July 2014. We were told that ambulance response times were good and that systems existed for emergency vehicles to have prompt access to the establishment.
- 2.75** Health staff were easily identifiable and we observed excellent interactions with boys. The electronic clinical records (SystemOne) that we sampled were very good. All new arrivals received accessible information about health services.
- 2.76** Systematic health promotion had previously been very good, but it had deteriorated due to staff shortages. Staff were being recruited to new health promotion posts. Boys had access to nicotine replacement therapy. Immunisation and vaccination clinics were not running regularly. Barrier protection was available on discharge, but there was no policy or agreed system to provide barrier protection in custody.

Recommendations

- 2.77** **There should be sufficient well trained and supported staff and facilities to provide all required services.**
- 2.78** **Children requiring emergency first aid out of hours should have prompt access to appropriately trained staff.**
- 2.79** **Barrier protection should be available supported by a policy which specifically considers the needs of children.**

Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.80** Primary care nurses saw all new arrivals promptly for a private initial assessment using the CHAT (comprehensive health assessment tool). Arrangements to see late arrivals were adequate. A further comprehensive assessment was completed the next day. Effective liaison with community services ensured continuity of care.
- 2.81** Boys asked nurses for services or submitted confidential applications. Waiting times were generally reasonable, but major delays in escorting boys wasted a lot of appointments and increased waiting times. There was no waiting area and one movement officer collected each boy separately for appointments, waited and then brought him back before collecting the next boy.
- 2.82** The nursing team lacked skills in lifelong conditions, although demand was low and external specialists or the GP managed any lifelong conditions. Any child who received an accidental injury or was involved in a violent incident was seen promptly and automatically reviewed the next day, which offered good support. Access to hospital appointments was good and was well managed.

Recommendation

- 2.83** **Children should be able to attend their health appointments on time.**

Pharmacy

- 2.84** HMP Rochester provided medicines promptly and provided telephone support if required. A pharmacist visited monthly to oversee medicines reconciliation and management, but there were no pharmacy-led clinics.
- 2.85** Prescribing levels were low and appropriate to the population. Most medicines were correctly stored, although we found some named patient medicines mixed with stock, one unlabelled item and some loose strips. Refrigerator temperatures were recorded daily. Date checking was overseen by the pharmacist, although the fridge contained some out-of-date vaccines. Controlled drug management was appropriate.
- 2.86** Most medicines were given as supervised doses, with a few low-risk medicines given in possession. There was an appropriate in-possession policy and risk assessment, although these were not consistently completed. Medicines were administered in the morning and early evening from two locations. Record keeping was good and non-attendance was shared with relevant staff and followed up.
- 2.87** Nurses could administer a range of over-the-counter medicines, but there was no overarching policy and most nurses had not been trained to administer them. If a boy requested pain relief out of hours, the orderly officer checked the 'do not administer paracetamol' list and, if the boy was not on the list, two paracetamol were administered and recorded. Some nurses we spoke to were unaware of this list, which prevented it from being consistently updated.

Recommendations

- 2.88** **Children should have regular access to pharmacy clinics, including medicines use reviews.**

- 2.89 In-possession risk assessments which consider the risks of the patient and the drug should be consistently completed and be accessible to health care staff.**

Housekeeping points

- 2.90** Stock management should be robust, all medicines should be in date and correctly packaged, and patient and stock medication should be stored separately.
- 2.91** All health staff should ensure the 'do not administer paracetamol' list is up to date.

Dentistry

- 2.92** A local practice provided a weekly clinic and an emergency service as required. During our inspection, 20 boys were waiting for assessment and 10 had waited over four weeks, which was too long. We were told that this was because boys had not been brought to their appointments (see recommendation 2.83). NHS-equivalent dental treatment was available and appropriate entries were made on SystemOne. We were unable to observe a consultation.
- 2.93** The dental surgery was large and well equipped, but did not achieve best practice because there was no separate decontamination room. All dental equipment was appropriately maintained and dental waste was disposed of professionally.

Recommendation

- 2.94 The dental surgery should have a separate decontamination room to be fully compliant with infection control standards.**

Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.95** In our survey, 28% of boys reported that they had emotional or mental health problems and 53% of these reported that someone in the establishment was helping them with this. There were effective working relationships between prison and mental health staff. Most discipline staff had received some recent mental health awareness training and CNWL was commissioned to provide ongoing training.
- 2.96** NHS England had commissioned enhanced mental health provision called the health and wellbeing team (HWBT). CNWL provided mental health nurses (RMNs), clinical psychology, psychiatry and speech and language therapy. There were about five new referrals a week through the open referral system. At the time of the inspection, the team was supporting 26 children with mild to moderate needs and 16 with severe needs. Records that we examined indicated that assessments were carried out quickly and children received impressive levels of input.
- 2.97** An innovative enhanced sexual behaviour service had recently been established which was working closely with case workers to identify and support victims and perpetrators of sexually harmful behaviour. There were advanced plans to provide art therapy, family support and peer support.
- 2.98** An RMN saw all new arrivals for a mental health assessment using the CHAT tool. Substance misuse, primary care and mental health workers discussed every new arrival at a weekly

allocation meeting, which facilitated effective partnership working and ensured that all boys received personalised case management. Overall, liaison with community services and other prison departments was very good.

2.99 No boy had been transferred to community mental health services during the previous year.

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.

2.100 *Most children did not like the food, although their perception of the quality of the food had improved since the last inspection. Consultation arrangements concerning catering were weak. Stocks and supplies of food were sometimes inadequate with adverse consequences for the boys. Lunch was still issued at the cell door, which was inappropriate.*

2.101 In our survey, 20% of children thought the food was good against 9% at the last inspection. However, in our discussion groups and individually most boys were negative about the quantity and quality of food, and food was one of the most common reasons for making a complaint. On one evening during the inspection, we found that the bread was mouldy and could not be eaten.

2.102 Portions were of a decent size and the temperature of the food was checked regularly. Breakfast packs were issued at the cell door but children had a choice of eating outside their cell if they wished. A cold lunch was put on the beds in the cells and the boys ate alone locked in their cells, which boys said was disrespectful. At the time of the inspection, 18 boys were on loss of dining in association. They were served first from the wing serveries during dinner, which was an improvement since the previous year. Children could dine in association for breakfast, the evening meal and for all meals at the weekend.

2.103 There was a varied menu which operated on a four-week cycle and generally met the needs of the population. It included medical diets, suitable food for vegetarians and vegans and individuals following religious diets. Fresh fruit and vegetables were available each day. Several formal complaints had been made that the boys regularly did not get the choices they had selected on the menus, and this was reflected in our discussions with boys. Catering staff agreed that there had been problems following a change in the menu order forms and this may have contributed to these concerns. There had still been no assessment of the nutritional content of the menu.

2.104 Wing serveries were clean and boys serving food were appropriately dressed. The dishwasher in the B wing servery was broken. The kitchen was small but clean. Children cleaned the kitchen and prepared breakfast packs but did no cooking. There were no accredited qualifications for boys who worked in the kitchen.

2.105 Consultation arrangements in relation to catering were inadequate. A food survey was carried out every six months but the most recent survey results that the catering staff had were dated July 2013. The results had been analysed but there was no evidence of changes to the quality or range of menu choices as a result and children had not been informed of any follow up from the survey. There were no food comment books for boys to share their views on the food. The youth council had raised concerns about food, but minutes indicated

that catering staff did not attend regularly, and no action had been taken to address these concerns.

Recommendations

- 2.106 All meals should be issued at the servery and eaten in association.**
- 2.107 The menu should be assessed for nutritional content.**
- 2.108 Boys should be employed to prepare food so that they can achieve related qualifications.** (Repeated recommendation 2.90)
- 2.109 Consultation arrangements should be improved. Food comments books should be introduced, a catering representative should attend the youth council and a bi-annual food survey should be carried out.**

Housekeeping points

- 2.110** Supplies of essential foodstuffs, such as bread, should be stocked in sufficient quantity to meet demand and kept in date.
- 2.111** Problems associated with the change in menu should be resolved.
- 2.112** The dishwasher in the B-wing servery should be repaired.

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.

2.113 *The purchases system operated smoothly, but there was no consultation on the range of products on the list which minority groups of children found inadequate. New arrivals, particularly boys transferring from another establishment, had to wait too long for their first canteen order.*

- 2.114** Most new arrivals were given a free pack of limited supplies in reception. They had to wait up to seven days to make their first shop order, depending on the day they arrived. An emergency pack could be bought with approval from the authorising governor, but this was not publicised and many boys were unaware of it. Boys transferring from other establishments did not receive a reception or emergency pack. They had to wait a week before they could place an order and 12 days before delivery. The potential for boys to go into debt with other boys over purchases was concerning.
- 2.115** In our survey, 65% of boys said that the shop/canteen sold a wide enough variety of products against 45% at the previous inspection and the comparator of 51%. Black and minority ethnic (47%) and Muslim (44%) children were more negative about the range of goods than white and non-Muslim boys (81% and 70% respectively). Consultation was inadequate. Children told us that they did not know how to make changes to the canteen list and staff told us that the process was complicated. Minutes of the youth council showed that boys had asked for

more variety on the canteen list, but there was no evidence that this was followed up and the request had simply rolled over to subsequent meetings.

2.116 Catalogues, newspapers and hobby items were available to purchase, but this was not well promoted and many children did not know how to order such items.

2.117 An analysis of complaints over the previous six months indicated that the delivery of purchased items was sometimes delayed or the wrong item was delivered.

Recommendations

2.118 **New arrivals should be able to place an order from the purchases list within 24 hours of their arrival and the reception pack should be sufficient to meet their needs until they receive their first order.** (Repeated recommendation 2.98)

2.119 **All boys, including those transferring from another establishment, should be offered a free reception pack and an emergency pack if needed.**

2.120 **Children should be regularly consulted about the content and variety on the purchases list and concerns raised should be followed up.**

Housekeeping points

2.121 Delays in the delivery of items purchased from the canteen should be investigated and rectified.

2.122 Boys should be given the opportunity to request changes to the canteen list and this should be promoted.

Section 3. Purposeful activity

Time out of cell

Expected outcomes:

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

- 3.1** *The impact of staff shortage meant that time out of cell had deteriorated since the last inspection with a reduction in association. When fully occupied, boys could have over nine hours out of cell on weekdays and over seven hours at weekends. Boys not fully engaged with the regime could have as little as two hours out of cell. Few boys were locked in their cells when we carried out roll checks. Not enough time was allowed outside and few activities were available during exercise.*
- 3.2** At the time the inspection took place, over a quarter of officer posts were not filled and time out of cell had reduced since the last inspection. Following the introduction of a restricted regime a significant number of children had lost association or dining out time under the rewards and sanctions scheme. Some boys only had evening association every other day and others missed evening association for up to three days. In our survey, only 37% of boys said that they had association every day against the comparator of 73% and 69% at our last inspection. Boys who were fully occupied could have just over nine hours out of cell during the week, decreasing to just over seven at weekends. Time out of cell could be as low as two hours a day for a few boys not fully engaged with the regime. Nine per cent of boys were locked in their cells when we carried out roll checks during the core day.
- 3.3** Most children only had half an hour outside each day. Table tennis tables had been provided on the new exercise yard, but the yards remained bleak with no other activities provided while boys were on exercise.

Recommendations

- 3.4 All children should spend a minimum of 10 hours every day out of their cell.** (Repeated recommendation 3.6)
- 3.5 Boys should be given the opportunity to spend at least one hour in the open air every day.** (Repeated recommendation 3.7)
- 3.6 More activities should be available during outside exercise.** (Repeated recommendation 3.8)

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

Education, learning and skills

Inspection of the provision of education and educational standards, as well as vocational training in YOIs for young people, is undertaken by the Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted⁴) working under the general direction of HM Inspectorate of Prisons. For information on how Ofsted inspects education and training see the Ofsted framework and handbook for inspection.

Expected outcomes:

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

3.7 *The leadership and management of education, learning and skills required improvement to bring it to a high standard. Data and targets were not used effectively enough to monitor performance. Attendance and punctuality were not consistently good. Children's behaviour in classrooms had improved since the previous inspection and was generally good. The quality of teaching was good, as were boys' achievements in education and vocational training. The range and variety of learning and skills provision were good. The requirements of boys with learning difficulties and complex needs were well met. Access to the library had improved since the previous inspection but needed further improvement.*

3.8 *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: Requires improvement

Management of education and learning and skills

3.9 *The development strategy for learning and skills was designed to meet the demands of an increasing population. Since the previous inspection, most of the learning and skills provision had been housed in new accommodation which was of a good standard. Good use was made of programmes leading to the achievement of partial qualifications, which motivated children and addressed the needs of those with a short sentence.*

⁴ Ofsted is the Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills. It reports directly to the UK Parliament and is independent and impartial. It (inter alia) inspects and regulates services that provide education and skills for all ages, including those in custody. For information on Ofsted's inspection framework, please visit: <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk>.

- 3.10** CfBT Education Trust provided a range of good education and vocational training services which reflected the requirements of the national curriculum. However, regime demands resulted in significant cancellation of sessions which often started later or finished earlier than planned.
- 3.11** Since the previous inspection, a quality improvement group had introduced more coherent monitoring and development of the provision. However, it did not focus enough on evaluating the quality of the provision to inform an effective improvement planning process. Data and targets were not used effectively enough to monitor performance. The self-assessment process still did not embrace a prison-wide assessment of quality to help drive improvements. CfBT had implemented robust procedures to monitor and raise the standard of teaching sessions but these were not yet fully developed or embedded.

Recommendations

- 3.12 Attendance and punctuality should be improved.**
- 3.13 Comprehensive quality improvement arrangements should be applied across all the provision to monitor and raise standards.**

Provision of activities

- 3.14** All children received an induction to education and training as part of a two-week induction programme. Their literacy, numeracy and computer skill levels were identified. Most boys obtained at least two accredited units at entry level or level 1 during induction, which included health and safety, equality and diversity and teamwork skills.
- 3.15** There were sufficient activity places for the population. There were 96 education places in the morning and 88 in the afternoon and the prison provided 80 additional places. Allocation to activities was fair and much care was taken to ensure that children's safety and preferences were addressed. However, appropriate activity places to meet preferences were not always available, for example if a child required safeguarding or security risk assessments had not been completed.
- 3.16** The curriculum had been extended since the previous inspection to include drama, creative arts, employability skills and media studies. CfBT offered boys the opportunity to gain qualifications, including functional English and mathematics, information and communications technology, business studies, project-based and distance learning, catering, brickwork, painting and decorating and personal and social development. English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) provision had significantly expanded. Activities included independent living, cleaning, a murals workshop, prison radio and an introduction to mechanics. The range and level of qualifications had continued to improve since the previous inspection, with more progression pathways from entry level to level 2 and some level 3 provision and higher-level distance learning.
- 3.17** Children were able to continue preparation for GCSE examinations which they had started in the community, although academic records were not always received from schools or colleges. At the time of the inspection, no boys were undertaking GCSEs or A levels. CfBT delivered individual learning sessions on the Phoenix unit, although this was often curtailed because of prison staff shortages. Ten of the 15 learners on the unit attended one or more learning sessions in the new education and training building each day. The national virtual campus (internet access for boys to community, education, training and employment opportunities) was still not in operation.

Recommendation

- 3.18 Boys should have access to the internet or the virtual campus to aid their research skills and employability activities.** (Repeated recommendation 4.34)

Quality of provision

- 3.19** The quality of teaching, learning and assessment was good in educational and vocational training programmes. Careful planning ensured that individual needs were met in most lessons and learners worked at an appropriate level. The good support which they received from their teachers enabled them to develop knowledge and skills and make adequate or better progress. Teachers managed their classes well and challenged inappropriate behaviour and language effectively. Suitably demanding targets were set to improve children's behaviour and social skills. Most boys behaved well in classrooms and workshops. They were respectful of others and worked productively in small groups and independently. Learning support assistants worked effectively with teachers when required. Support workers delivered additional sessions to help speakers of other languages with a poor command of English.
- 3.20** Teachers used a good range of teaching and learning activities which engaged children with diverse needs. The more able boys were stretched and challenged, for example, in a catering class where learners were making samosas, learners working at level 1 followed a basic recipe, while learners working at level 2 experimented with a wider variety of fillings and spices and reflected on the link between religious practices and food. In most other sessions, teachers did not effectively promote awareness of equality and diversity.
- 3.21** The new education and training building provided well equipped classrooms and adequate storage space. Most teachers made good use of wall space for engaging and relevant displays which promoted learning. However, not all teachers used information and learning technology effectively to support learning. Vocational training workshops were spacious and had good resources which enabled boys to develop a wide range of skills.
- 3.22** All children were issued with an individual learning plan folder during induction for planning, reviewing and recording learning. However, many boys did not routinely bring their plans to class for completion. When targets were set in learning plans, they were too often based on continuing or completing an activity rather than guiding the learner through a specific aspect of their learning. Targets were routinely set for the whole class instead of for individuals. Some written work contained useful, constructive comments to help a learner improve, but too much was left unmarked with little or no correction to spelling and grammar.

Recommendations

- 3.23 Planning of learning should include tailored targets to monitor and direct the progress of individual learners.**
- 3.24 Spelling and grammar in children's completed work should always be corrected and teachers should provide constructive feedback to guide improvement.**

Education and vocational achievements

- 3.25** Achievement in education and vocational training was good. Boys completed short accredited qualification units across their selected learning pathway, which included subject related qualifications, English, mathematics, and personal and social skills. Improvements in

achievement rates over the previous three years had been sustained. Most boys completed accredited qualification units in vocational training but the available data did not allow an assessment of achievement rates. Many boys had a history of school refusal or exclusion and few or no qualifications. Units of study offered the opportunity to complete a full or partial award and were particularly effective for boys staying for a short period. Boys enjoyed their learning and made good progress in developing practical skills and knowledge that would assist them with employability and independent living.

Recommendation

3.26 The monitoring of progress and achievement rates of children working towards qualifications should be improved.

Library

3.27 The library had been relocated to a more spacious room in the new education and training building and was organised well. A good range of fiction and non-fiction, easy readers and talking books were available. There was an appropriate stock of legal reference materials, foreign language and English dictionaries. Library staff were responsive to requests for books from the inter-library loans service. The main library was supplemented by a small facility for boys in the Phoenix unit, but the stock of books was not refreshed often enough.

3.28 Opening hours had been extended from two to three and a half days a week but the library was not open in the evening or at weekends. The weekly timetabled session had improved from 20 to 30 minutes, but this was still not enough for boys to make full use of the library. Some boys had no allocated library slot. The library had yet to provide a comprehensive programme to promote literacy across the establishment. Not all children received an induction to the library.

Recommendations

3.29 Access to the library should be improved for all children.

3.30 The library should improve the promotion of literacy across the establishment.

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.

3.31 *Access to the gym and sports facilities was good and the breadth of accredited courses met the needs of boys with short and long sentences. Achievement of unit and full qualifications was good. PE staff worked productively with other prison staff to engage learners and address their specific needs through remedial gym sessions. Links with the community to develop competitive sports activity were very limited.*

- 3.32** PE facilities comprised a sports hall which provided a good range of activities and a fitness room with resistance and weight training equipment. Staff monitored weight training use and actively encouraged participation in sport activities. The sports hall roof remained in need of repair and leaked during heavy rain. A large all-weather outdoor pitch offered good facilities, supplemented by a smaller pitch which needed maintenance. The gym only had one functioning toilet. Showers were adequate as most boys used the facilities on the wings.
- 3.33** Access to recreational PE was good and children had up to six hours a week in the gym. PE facilities did not offer sufficient capacity for the planned expansion of the population. The range and level of accredited courses was appropriate, although programmes at level 2 were not offered. The achievement of unit and full qualifications was good.
- 3.34** All boys received a detailed and timely induction to PE which included screening to ensure their fitness to participate. Boys completed health and safety qualifications, including Heart Start and manual handling, but these were not available to all children because of staff shortages.
- 3.35** Partnership working with health care and other prison staff was effective. Rehabilitation sessions were delivered to support health improvements, for example, weight loss, physical injury and mental health. Instructors were generally successful in motivating boys to participate in PE to promote healthy living. Boys could participate in the Duke of Edinburgh award. However, release on temporary licence was very limited and boys did not have the opportunity to play against visiting teams.

Recommendation

- 3.36 Opportunities should be provided for children to engage in community based competitive sports.**

Section 4. Resettlement

Pre-release and resettlement

Expected outcomes:

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

- 4.1** *The governance of resettlement remained effective and services continued to be very well coordinated by the casework team. Appropriate use was made of release on temporary licence (ROTL) but there was potential to extend its use to more boys.*
- 4.2** The resettlement service was organised well and informed by a recent needs analysis. The resettlement policy was due for review. The monthly resettlement meeting was not well attended and did not promote a whole establishment approach to resettlement. The resettlement meeting maintained a focus on the resettlement pathways and the use of ROTL. There was no follow up of children post release, although we were told of plans to undertake this.
- 4.3** The delivery of resettlement services continued to be organised well by the casework team. The team consisted of seconded social workers, youth offending team (YOT) workers and prison officers; boys were allocated to a caseworker who best met their needs. High-risk and more vulnerable boys were usually allocated to the social workers. Boys who returned to the establishment were often allocated to the caseworker they had had previously. Most boys we spoke to were positive about the support that their caseworkers offered.
- 4.4** Resettlement needs and risk were identified soon after arrival and there was an appropriate emphasis on preventing reoffending. Children had access to a range of relevant programmes to help them address their offending behaviour and provide support with finding accommodation, keeping in touch with their families/carers, developing personal finance skills and finding education or work post release. In our survey, 97% of sentenced boys said they wanted to stop offending, compared with 84% at the previous inspection.
- 4.5** The establishment continued to use ROTL as part of the pre-release process. Kinetic Youth (a youth work organisation specialising in custodial work) supported the programme by providing work at their allotment and community café for suitable boys. Other placements included community reparation work and a motor vehicle workshop. One boy had recently had an accompanied ROTL to the college he would be attending after his release. Another boy had visited a police station to talk about life in custody to the parents of children coming to the attention of the police. The ROTL officer was often deployed to other generic officer duties which had a detrimental impact on his work. Figures showed that when he had focused solely on ROTL up to nine boys had had ROTL at one time; at the time of the inspection, this had reduced to two while he undertook other duties as well as ROTL. Because of this, boys who had reached their eligibility date for ROTL were not risk assessed for suitability in good time and an important element of their training plan to prepare for release was not being achieved. The establishment also ran the risk of losing the placements if it did not fill them regularly.

Recommendations

- 4.6** The establishment should collect data on children released to the community.
- 4.7** All eligible children should be considered for ROTL suitability in good time.

Housekeeping point

- 4.8** All relevant internal departments should attend resettlement meetings.

Training planning and remand management

Expected outcomes:

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

4.9 *Boys had individual training or remand management plans. Boys moving to an adult prison were helped to prepare for this transition. Public protection arrangements remained sound and looked-after children were identified quickly and local authorities encouraged to provide the support they were entitled to.*

- 4.10** Children were allocated a caseworker on arrival who ensured that boys had individual training or remand management plans. Caseworkers made contact quickly with newly arrived boys they were responsible for and initial plans were completed within the required timescales. Caseworkers made and maintained contact with families and carers, and took responsibility for arranging the boy's initial visit from his parents or carers. A parent we spoke to was very complimentary about the support she and her son had received from his caseworker. In our survey, 37% of boys said they had a training or remand plan against the comparator of 51%, but we did not see any evidence of boys without plans during the inspection. Training plans we looked at were of good quality with clear targets which were followed up at subsequent meetings. Boys were involved in determining the targets at the meetings that we observed.
- 4.11** Children on remand were allocated to caseworkers and received the same services as sentenced children. They were supported to make bail applications and their planning reviews took place regularly.
- 4.12** Training planning and remand management meetings continued to be well organised and timely. Parents and carers were encouraged to attend, and many did. Attendance at the meetings by internal departments remained poor. Although they submitted information, their absence was a weakness as it prevented children from receiving and discussing up-to-date feedback, which was a weakness. At one meeting, the presence of an advocate provided a valuable opportunity for the boy to address his worries about his release accommodation and to play a part in resolving the issue (see section on accommodation).
- 4.13** Caseworkers chaired the meetings. Meetings that we attended were managed very well and boys were encouraged to contribute throughout. They were gently encouraged to disclose concerns about their release and about their life at Cookham Wood. Their achievements

were acknowledged, as too were areas for improvement. Preventing reoffending was a theme throughout the meetings, and plans for resettlement were discussed at an early stage.

- 4.14** The transition arrangements for boys who turned 18 and links with the prisons to which they moved were developing. Boys serving detention and training orders were able to remain past their 18th birthday but those serving longer sentences moved fairly quickly when they became 18. We were told that there was resistance from some adult prisons to take boys when they turned 18. However, recently some 18 year olds on remand had moved soon after their birthday rather than the previous practice of waiting until their next court appearance. Planning and discussion with the children started in good time before their birthday. We observed a helpful discussion with one boy during his training planning meeting when he expressed preferences for prisons to move to and explained why he wanted to avoid one prison. Decisions on where some boys moved to were predicated on addressing their offending behaviour or the type of offence they had committed. Their caseworkers and the advocates helped boys to understand what to expect when they moved.
- 4.15** The new health and wellbeing providers were working with a few boys with sexually harmful behaviour who had been prioritised because of their release dates and particular need (see section on delivery of care mental health). Other boys on a waiting list required similar input. An additional health and wellbeing team member was due to start after the inspection and there were well advanced plans to work with victims and perpetrators of sexually harmful behaviour and with boys who displayed this behaviour while in the establishment.

Recommendation

- 4.16 Training planning and remand management meetings should include staff from all areas who work with the children.**

Public protection

- 4.17** A clear public protection policy covered all relevant areas. The interdepartmental risk management team (IRMT) met regularly, but attendance was poor at some meetings. Notes of the meetings showed that detailed information was used to inform discussion about boys who were thought to be a risk. Children who might present a risk were identified soon after arrival and were recorded on a database before discussion at the IRMT meeting. Multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) documentation was completed and submitted to MAPPA meetings for appropriate children. Caseworkers attended a few initial MAPPA reviews in the community, but more often submitted written reports.
- 4.18** Proper attention was paid to the need for restrictions on the contact that some boys had with people outside the establishment. Restrictions were imposed on mail, telephone contact and visits when it was felt necessary to do so. These restrictions were kept under review as boys' circumstances changed.

Looked-after children

- 4.19** In our survey, 44% of children said they had been in local authority care. Establishment figures for April 2013 to March 2014 indicated an average of 48 children each month with looked-after status. Looked-after children were identified from their documentation and they were asked if they had been in care during their first night risk assessment management interview.

- 4.20** Letters were sent to their local authority when a looked-after child arrived. A useful information pack accompanied the letter, setting out the authority's obligations towards the boy and suggesting a weekly pocket money sum of £10. If a local authority was reluctant to discharge its responsibilities, caseworkers could refer to the senior practitioner and then to the Barnardo's advocates if a boy still did not get support from his local authority. We were told that statutory reviews were taking place, where possible in combination with a training planning or remand management meeting, but fewer medical reviews were being carried out. The establishment's database of looked-after children was not up to date and it was not possible to determine how many children were not receiving support.
- 4.21** Provision of suitable release accommodation for looked-after children remained a concern and caseworkers sometimes had to make concerted efforts to get local authorities to meet their obligations (see section on accommodation).

Housekeeping point

- 4.22** The looked-after children database should be kept up to date.

Reintegration planning

Expected outcomes:

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

4.23 *Caseworkers were the main source of support for boys before their release. Pathway services were generally good, although ensuring that boys had suitable accommodation to go to remained difficult. Visits arrangements were good but the visits room was too small to accommodate a larger population. There was an appropriate range of life skills and offending behaviour programmes, but evaluation and reinforcement of learning were still needed.*

- 4.24** In our survey, less than half the boys said they had had a say in what would happen to them after their release. This was at odds with the training planning meetings that we observed and the plans and records that we examined. Records indicated that children's plans set out the arrangements for their release, including where they would be living, supervision arrangements and activity. The establishment insisted that boys were picked up from the establishment on their day of release rather than use public transport to reach their destination. Despite occasional opposition, they made this clear to YOT workers in review meetings.
- 4.25** Practical arrangements for the day of release were effective. Boys had access to their money and property in reception and were given a holdall for their belongings. There was a stock of jeans, T-shirts and sweatshirts for boys who had outgrown their own clothes or did not have anything suitable. Caseworkers could also arrange for clothes to be sent in.

Accommodation

- 4.26** No children had been released to accommodation judged unsuitable by the establishment in the previous 12 months. Caseworkers resisted any suggestion of a boy being released to bed

and breakfast accommodation, and we were informed that not all local authorities the caseworkers dealt with were helpful in trying to find suitable accommodation for children not returning to their families. We were told that it was not uncommon for boys not to have an address until shortly before their release and that this could be a particular problem for looked-after children.

- 4.27** We observed a particularly complicated review involving a boy who said that returning to the parental home would probably lead him to reoffend. His family and YOT worker agreed, but the local authority children's services wanted him to return home and his housing application had been refused. His YOT worker was appealing the decision. A Barnardo's advocate attending the review offered to put the boy in touch with a solicitor who could approach the local authority on his behalf. The boy's concern that he would not be released in nine days' time because there was nowhere suitable for him to live was evident throughout the meeting, despite the efforts of all present to reassure him. It was wrong that this unnecessary level of pressure was placed on a child at a time when he needed to maintain his good behaviour and focus on completing education and training qualifications. He was finally given a foster care placement at 5.15pm on the day before his release after his solicitors had obtained a court order.

Education, training and employment

- 4.28** Boys benefited from the effective setting and review of targets to complete their sentence plan and be considered for ROTL. They received good quality information, advice and guidance from dedicated CfBT workers and the Medway Youth Trust while they were in custody. Links with community advice services were routinely established to facilitate appropriate support.
- 4.29** There was no pre-release course, but boys were able to develop job application skills by participating in CfBT programmes and attending the wing-based youth club organised by Kinetic.
- 4.30** The prison had a good range of community links, although ROTL was very limited. Partnership working was well used to support children's move into employment, education or training on release, for example, Working Links and NACRO supported boys from London. During the previous 12 months, 141 of the 181 convicted children who had been discharged entered education and nine found employment on release.

Health care

- 4.31** All children were seen on the day of discharge for health promotion advice and to receive medication to take home if appropriate. The health and wellbeing team started discharge planning early and arranged appropriate community follow up as required. There was good communication with GPs, YOTs and community services.

Drugs and alcohol

- 4.32** Substance misuse workers delivered a pre-release harm reduction session with boys who had engaged with the service. There was good liaison with community services.

Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.33** When they reached 18 years, boys continued to receive benefits advice from caseworkers and advocates. Financial support was also discussed in training planning meetings irrespective of age. CfBT provided a good range of learning opportunities for financial matters. Only boys who were released on temporary licence were able to open bank accounts.

Recommendation

- 4.34 All boys should be helped to open bank accounts.**

Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.35** The visitors' centre staff provided a good service to families. They explained visits procedures and supported visitors where necessary. The centre was open before and after each visit session and provided a vending machine with refreshments. Visitors said that they had no trouble booking visits.
- 4.36** Analysis of complaints and feedback from boys indicated a number of occasions when visits were shortened because boys were brought late to the visits hall.
- 4.37** Visitors said that staff treated them respectfully and that they were searched sensitively. Our observations confirmed this. However, the search area was cramped and searches were conducted outside, which visitors said happened even in bad weather.
- 4.38** The visits room was a good but small facility which was operating at full capacity. It had an unstaffed crèche area and refreshment machines, but no hot drinks or snacks. There were no toilet facilities for boys to use, which was inappropriate. Female visitors sometimes had to wait some time to use the toilet in the visits hall because a female staff member was not always available to search them. Boys whose visitors did not turn up for a booked visit sometimes had to wait until the end of the visit before returning to their cell.
- 4.39** Social visits took place three times a week on Saturday, Sunday and Wednesday evening. Newly arrived boys could have a reception visit within the first few days and boys on remand could have three visits a week. Boys had to wear a yellow sash during visits, which was unnecessary.
- 4.40** A range of family initiatives included bimonthly family days, parent craft courses and 'young dads' courses, including a Traveller new parent course. These initiatives were appreciated by children and their families. Family days were open to all children. Caseworkers were aware of boys who did not receive visits and focused during training planning meetings on establishing family contact.
- 4.41** Caseworkers were proactive in helping children to maintain family ties and kept in constant touch with families. They helped boys to complete visit orders where required. Families were invited to case reviews and encouraged to participate. External YOTs and social workers were encouraged to arrange volunteer visitors for boys who did not receive any other visits.

Recommendations

- 4.42 Boys should be brought to visits on time.**

- 4.43** The visits hall should be expanded when the population increases at Cookham Wood.
- 4.44** Toilets should be available near the visits hall for children to use.
- 4.45** Children should not be required to wear coloured bands in the visits hall.
(Repeated recommendation 4.47)

Housekeeping points

- 4.46** There should be appropriate facilities for searching visitors inside.
- 4.47** Female visitors should be able to use the toilet facilities without delay.

Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.48** Life skills and offending behaviour programmes remained well organised and linked to the identified needs of the child. Caseworkers referred boys to programmes to reflect targets in their training plans. In our survey, 30% of boys said that they were taking part in an offending behaviour programme against the comparator of 18%; 59% of boys who had taken part in an offending behaviour programme thought it would help them on release. A lack of formal evaluation prevented the establishment from assessing the effectiveness of the programmes.
- 4.49** Programmes included individual and group work with caseworkers, specialist departments and community partners. Children spoke positively of the 'most valuable player' and mindfulness programmes. The most valuable player programme, run by the London based PVE Project helped boys to question their lifestyles prior to custody and to plan for the future. The mindfulness programme was delivered under the aegis of the Mindfulness in Schools programme and aimed to help boys improve their focus and attention. Boys did not receive any encouragement and support from other staff in the establishment to reinforce their learning.

Recommendations

- 4.50** Programmes should be evaluated to assess their effectiveness. (Repeated recommendation 4.52)
- 4.51** Learning from programmes should be reinforced by staff across the establishment. (Repeated recommendation 4.54)

Section 5. Recommendations and housekeeping points

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

Main recommendation To the Youth Justice Board, NOMS, the escort contractor and the governor

- 5.1** Key staff at the establishment, NOMS, the YJB and the escort providers should meet regularly to monitor and resolve problems relating to escort arrangements and ensure that children arrive at the establishment in good time to be assessed and settled on their first night. (S80)

Main recommendations To the governor

- 5.2** If there has been an allegation of maltreatment of a child by a member of staff, or if abuse of a child is alleged or suspected, a prompt and appropriate investigation should be carried out and followed up to protect the child. (S81)
- 5.3** A single rewards and sanctions scheme should be devised which sets out expected levels of behaviour, how children can progress to the highest level and how poor behaviour will be managed. Sanctions should only be awarded after a hearing and appeal procedures should be explained clearly. (S82)
- 5.4** The number of incidents of use of force should be reduced. All incidents should be reviewed quickly and any issues identified addressed. Child protection issues identified should at all times be referred for further investigation by the local authority designated officer. (S83)

Recommendation To the escort contractor

- 5.5** Handcuffs should only be used during escort when it is necessary, justified and appropriate. (1.7)

Recommendations To the governor

Early days in custody

- 5.6** All children should have access to canteen packs on arrival. (1.16)
- 5.7** There should be a formal peer mentor scheme to provide support to all boys new to the establishment. (1.17)
- 5.8** Induction sessions should be coordinated and delivered in an engaging way. (1.18)

Care and protection of children and young people

- 5.9** The safeguarding meeting should take place monthly in line with the safeguarding strategy and should be attended by all relevant departments. Relevant data should be analysed and used to inform discussion on key areas of safety. (1.24)
- 5.10** The safeguarding team should be adequately resourced so that work is undertaken thoroughly and consistently. (1.25)
- 5.11** 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. (1.31)
- 5.12** Measures to support victims of bullying should be strengthened so that effective help is always provided. (1.36)
- 5.13** The collection and analysis of data should be improved. (1.43)
- 5.14** The quality of ACCT documents should be improved. (1.44)
- 5.15** The constant watch cell in the segregation unit should not be used to accommodate children at risk of suicide or self-harm. (1.45)

Behaviour management

- 5.16** All aspects of the behaviour management strategy should be fully monitored to identify trends and action should be taken to address any issues. (1.50)
- 5.17** Children should not be searched under restraint. (1.67)
- 5.18** The adjudication rooms should provide a child-friendly environment and staff should play a supportive role. (1.68)
- 5.19** The establishment should develop and implement an effective and comprehensive strategy to understand and reduce the high levels of violence among children. (1.75)
- 5.20** Monthly safeguarding meetings should be well attended and the analysis of data on levels of violence should be improved. (1.76)
- 5.21** The TAC initiative to manage and address violent behaviour should be fully implemented. (1.77)
- 5.22** Pain inducement techniques should not be used during use of force. (1.84)
- 5.23** Force should only be used as a last resort and not to gain compliance. (1.85)
- 5.24** Debriefs of children following use of force should include a full account of the incident. (1.86)
- 5.25** Children needing to be separated for discipline reasons or because they have complex needs should be held in a suitable environment. (1.94)
- 5.26** Children should be separated for the shortest time possible. (1.95)
- 5.27** All separated children should have time-bound targets. (1.96)

Substance misuse

- 5.28** A substance misuse strategy should be produced which is informed by a comprehensive needs analysis. It should contain an action plan with performance measures which are reviewed at substance misuse strategy meetings. (1.103)
- 5.29** The mandatory drug testing programme should be adequately resourced to undertake all requested suspicion tests. (1.104)

Residential units

- 5.30** Boys on remand should not have to wear prison clothes. (2.8)

Relationships between staff and children and young people

- 5.31** All staff should wear their names on their uniform. (2.15)
- 5.32** Staff should model the behaviour expected from children and poor behaviour by boys should be challenged consistently. (2.16)
- 5.33** The personal officer scheme should be relaunched and effective quality assurance put in place. (2.17)

Equality and diversity

- 5.34** Up-to-date equality and diversity policies and an action plan should be put in place, and effective recording, monitoring and analysis of equality data should be started immediately. (2.26)
- 5.35** Specific, regular equality meetings, particularly diversity and equality action team (DEAT) meetings, should be re-established. The senior management team should address and monitor equality issues regularly. (2.27)
- 5.36** A dedicated equality officer with adequate time and resources should be appointed to coordinate and promote equality work. (2.28)
- 5.37** Equality representatives should be appointed and publicised and should attend DEAT meetings. (2.29)
- 5.38** Equality and diversity should be promoted at all levels of the establishment and should be explained to boys on arrival and throughout their sentence. (2.30)
- 5.39** Equality and diversity issues or requests raised in the youth council should be addressed immediately and followed up, and reasons should be given for decisions. (2.31)
- 5.40** The DIRF system should be explained and promoted to children and forms should be readily available on landings by the cells. (2.32)
- 5.41** The negative perceptions of black and minority ethnic children should be investigated further and acted on. (2.42)
- 5.42** Cultural awareness should be promoted and staff should receive refresher training in equality. (2.43)

- 5.43** Regular forums or events to promote equality should be held for children from all protected characteristic groups. (2.44)
- 5.44** Boys from a foreign national background should have regular access to professional interpretation services. (2.45)
- 5.45** A disability liaison officer should be appointed. (2.46)
- 5.46** Children with physical disabilities should have care plans and should receive practical support. (2.47)
- 5.47** The negative perceptions of safety and respect that many Muslim boys have should be investigated and addressed. (2.48)
- 5.48** Monitoring by characteristics other than race should be undertaken to check that other minority groups are not at a disadvantage. (2.49)

Faith and religious activity

- 5.49** Children should be able to attend faith classes and groups in addition to corporate worship. (2.54)

Complaints

- 5.50** Complaint forms should be readily available to boys on their landing whenever they want one. (2.61)
- 5.51** Trends emerging from analysis of complaints data should be investigated and followed up and should be discussed at senior management team meetings. (2.62)

Legal rights

- 5.52** Legal visits should take place in private. (2.66)

Health services

- 5.53** There should be sufficient well trained and supported staff and facilities to provide all required services. (2.77)
- 5.54** Children requiring emergency first aid out of hours should have prompt access to appropriately trained staff. (2.78)
- 5.55** Barrier protection should be available supported by a policy which specifically considers the needs of children. (2.79)
- 5.56** Children should be able to attend their health appointments on time. (2.83)
- 5.57** Children should have regular access to pharmacy clinics, including medicines use reviews. (2.88)
- 5.58** In-possession risk assessments which consider the risks of the patient and the drug should be consistently completed and be accessible to health care staff. (2.89)

- 5.59** The dental surgery should have a separate decontamination room to be fully compliant with infection control standards. (2.94)

Catering

- 5.60** All meals should be issued at the servery and eaten in association. (2.106)
- 5.61** The menu should be assessed for nutritional content. (2.107)
- 5.62** Boys should be employed to prepare food so that they can achieve related qualifications. (2.108)
- 5.63** Consultation arrangements should be improved. Food comments books should be introduced, a catering representative should attend the youth council and a bi-annual food survey should be carried out. (2.109)

Purchases

- 5.64** New arrivals should be able to place an order from the purchases list within 24 hours of their arrival and the reception pack should be sufficient to meet their needs until they receive their first order. (2.118)
- 5.65** All boys, including those transferring from another establishment, should be offered a free reception pack and an emergency pack if needed. (2.119)
- 5.66** Children should be regularly consulted about the content and variety on the purchases list and concerns raised should be followed up. (2.120)

Time out of cell

- 5.67** All children should spend a minimum of 10 hours every day out of their cell. (3.4)
- 5.68** Boys should be given the opportunity to spend at least one hour in the open air every day. (3.5)
- 5.69** More activities should be available during outside exercise. (3.6)

Education, learning and skills

- 5.70** Attendance and punctuality should be improved. (3.12)
- 5.71** Comprehensive quality improvement arrangements should be applied across all the provision to monitor and raise standards. (3.13)
- 5.72** Boys should have access to the internet or the virtual campus to aid their research skills and employability activities. (3.18)
- 5.73** Planning of learning should include tailored targets to monitor and direct the progress of individual learners. (3.23)
- 5.74** Spelling and grammar in children's completed work should always be corrected and teachers should provide constructive feedback to guide improvement. (3.24)

5.75 The monitoring of progress and achievement rates of children working towards qualifications should be improved. (3.26)

5.76 Access to the library should be improved for all children. (3.29)

5.77 The library should improve the promotion of literacy across the establishment. (3.30)

Physical education and healthy living

5.78 Opportunities should be provided for children to engage in community based competitive sports. (3.36)

Pre-release and resettlement

5.79 The establishment should collect data on children released to the community. (4.6)

5.80 All eligible children should be considered for ROTL suitability in good time. (4.7)

Training planning and remand management

5.81 Training planning and remand management meetings should include staff from all areas who work with the children. (4.16)

Reintegration planning

5.82 All boys should be helped to open bank accounts. (4.34)

5.83 Boys should be brought to visits on time. (4.42)

5.84 The visits hall should be expanded when the population increases at Cookham Wood. (4.43)

5.85 Toilets should be available near the visits hall for children to use. (4.44)

5.86 Children should not be required to wear coloured bands in the visits hall. (4.45)

5.87 Programmes should be evaluated to assess their effectiveness. (4.50)

5.88 Learning from programmes should be reinforced by staff across the establishment. (4.51)

Housekeeping points

Behaviour management

5.89 Notices on cell doors describing sanctions imposed should be removed. (1.56)

5.90 Intelligence-led searches should be carried out quickly. (1.69)

Relationships between staff and children and young people

5.91 Issues raised at youth council meetings should be acted on and feedback provided at the next meeting. (2.18)

Health services

- 5.92** Stock management should be robust, all medicines should be in date and correctly packaged, and patient and stock medication should be stored separately. (2.90)
- 5.93** All health staff should ensure the 'do not administer paracetamol' list is up to date. (2.91)

Catering

- 5.94** Supplies of essential foodstuffs, such as bread, should be stocked in sufficient quantity to meet demand and kept in date. (2.110)
- 5.95** Problems associated with the change in menu should be resolved. (2.111)
- 5.96** The dishwasher in the B-wing servery should be repaired. (2.112)

Purchases

- 5.97** Delays in the delivery of items purchased from the canteen should be investigated and rectified. (2.121)
- 5.98** Boys should be given the opportunity to request changes to the canteen list and this should be promoted. (2.122)

Pre-release and resettlement

- 5.99** All relevant internal departments should attend resettlement meetings. (4.8)

Training planning and remand management

- 5.100** The looked-after children database should be kept up to date. (4.22)

Reintegration planning

- 5.101** There should be appropriate facilities for searching visitors inside. (4.46)
- 5.102** Female visitors should be able to use the toilet facilities without delay. (4.47)

Section 6. Appendices

Appendix I: Inspection team

| | |
|------------------|------------------------|
| Martin Lomas | Deputy chief inspector |
| Ian Macfadyen | Team leader |
| Gary Boughen | Inspector |
| Karen Dillon | Inspector |
| Francesca Gordon | Inspector |
| Angela Johnson | Inspector |
| Gordon Riach | Inspector |
| Paul Rowlands | Inspector |
| Helen Ranns | Researcher officer |
| Alissa Redmond | Research officer |
| Lucy Higgins | Research trainee |

Specialist inspectors

| | |
|----------------|---------------------------|
| Majella Pearce | Health services inspector |
| Steve Eley | Health services inspector |
| Huw Jenkins | Care Quality Commission |
| Sharon Monks | Pharmacist |
| Nigel Bragg | Ofsted inspector |
| Linda Truscott | Ofsted inspector |

Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report

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

Safety

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

At the last inspection in 2013, we found that early days procedures were good and the safeguarding and child protection arrangements had improved. Although the incidence of self-harm was low, improvements were required to the documentation and the level of training provided. Apart from some routine strip-searching, security measures were proportionate. The level of violence remained high, but there were few serious injuries and little bullying took place. A creative approach was being developed towards managing behaviour and tackling violence. Use of force was high but it was well governed. Aspects of the Phoenix unit remained good but some of the procedures needed to be improved. Substance misuse services were inadequate. Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendations

The support of young people at risk of suicide and self-harm should be strengthened, including ACCT training, quality of ACCT documents and consistency of case management. The environment for young people under constant supervision, and engagement with them by staff, should be improved. (S46)

Partially achieved

Recommendations

Key staff at the establishment, NOMS, the YJB and the escort providers should meet regularly, monitor and resolve problems relating to escort arrangements and ensure that young people arrive at the establishment in good time to be assessed and settled on their first night. (1.4)

Partially achieved (Recommendation repeated, S80)

Young people should only be strip-searched on the basis of intelligence or specific suspicion. (1.9)

Achieved

Young people should have the opportunity to make a telephone call before they are locked up on their first night. (1.10)

Achieved

Peer mentors should be available to assist late arrivals if required. (1.11)

Not achieved

The quality of investigations of safeguarding team integrated information reports and formal monitoring documents should be improved. (1.18)

Partially achieved

All young people for whom interventions or support are agreed should have a care plan. (I.19)

Partially achieved

All strands of behaviour management should be combined in an overarching strategy that is fully explained to staff and young people and monitored consistently. (I.36)

Partially achieved

Monitoring of the use of green and yellow cards should be strengthened and data reviewed regularly by senior managers. (I.43)

Not achieved

The mandatory drug testing (MDT) programme should be adequately resourced to undertake all requested suspicion tests. (I.51)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, I.105)

The 'team around the child' approach should be embedded and evaluated to measure its effectiveness. (I.60)

Partially achieved

The Surviving Our Streets and violence interrupters interventions should be evaluated to measure their effectiveness. (I.61)

No longer relevant

Pain inducement techniques should not be used during use of force. (I.67)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, I.84)

Force should only be used as a last resort and not to gain compliance. (I.68)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, I.85)

Young people should spend the minimum time possible on Phoenix unit where they should experience a broad regime and a good amount of time out of cell. (I.78)

Partially achieved

The establishment, in partnership with commissioners, should ensure that the substance misuse service is robustly managed, monitored and coordinated. Substance misuse workers should be provided with appropriate supervision and support. (I.89, repeated recommendation 3.66)

Achieved

Young people with problematic substance use should have a substance misuse care plan, which is coordinated with health and casework teams, and have access to a range of interventions which meet individual need. (I.90, repeated recommendation 3.67)

Achieved

The establishment should ensure that the MDT programme is adequately resourced to undertake all requested suspicion tests. (I.91)

Not achieved

Respect

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

At the last inspection in 2013, we found that despite the poor design of the buildings, the living environment was adequate. Young people had sufficient access to showers and telephones. The relationships young people had with staff were good and particularly good with some specialist staff, such as the caseworkers. The consultation arrangements were extremely good but young people had little faith in the applications and complaints procedures. Matters relating to diversity were managed effectively. Young people had access to very good health care services. The quality of the food was poor. Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

Recommendations

All communal areas should be clean and well maintained. (2.10)

Achieved

Young people on remand should not have to wear prison clothes. (2.11)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 2.8)

Applications should be responded to promptly and appropriately. (2.12)

Achieved

Interventions should be introduced to address discriminatory behaviour. (2.22)

Partially achieved

The negative perceptions of black and minority ethnic young people should be investigated further and acted on. (2.34)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 2.42)

Monitoring by characteristics other than race should be undertaken to check that other minority groups are not at a disadvantage. (2.35)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 2.49)

There should be an up-to-date health needs assessment. (2.63)

Partially achieved

The governor and NHS England – Kent, Surrey and Sussex should ensure that calls from clinicians to the ambulance service for emergency assistance receive unfettered responses. (2.64)

Achieved

Young people with clinical substance misuse needs should not be sent to Cookham Wood. (2.69)

Partially achieved

All procedures and policies should be formally reviewed and adopted by the medicines and therapeutics committee. All staff should read and sign these procedures. (2.75)

Not achieved

All meals should be issued at the servery and eaten in association. (2.89)

Not achieved

Young people should be employed to prepare food so that they can achieve related qualifications. (2.90)

Partially achieved (Recommendation repeated, 2.110)

Consultation arrangements should be improved. (2.91)

Not achieved

New arrivals should be able to place an order with the prison shop within 24 hours of their arrival and the reception pack should be sufficient to meet their needs until they receive their first order. (2.98)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 2.119)

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 2013, we found that allocation procedures were efficient and the curriculum was broad. Not all teaching was planned well enough. Behaviour in class was mostly managed well but, despite this, poor behaviour did limit the progress young people could make. The quality of learning in vocational training was good. Achievement rates were also good. Young people continued to have good access to PE but opportunities to spend time in the library had reduced. Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

Recommendations

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

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 3.4)

Young people should be given the opportunity to spend at least one hour in the open air every day. (3.7)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 3.5)

More activities should be available during outside exercise. (3.8)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 3.6)

Quality improvement procedures should be applied strategically across the prison to review and develop provision, identify and share good practice and produce an action plan to improve poor practice. (3.16)

Not achieved

The time allocated to ESOL should be extended to enable young people to improve their spoken and written English more quickly. (3.22)

Achieved

Further support should be given to help tutors plan learning activities to meet the diverse range of abilities in their classes. (3.29)

Achieved

Tutors should correct spelling and grammar errors in young people's written work and give detailed feedback on how they can improve their work. (3.30)

Partially achieved

Library visits should be extended to give young people enough time to use the facilities. (3.39)

Partially achieved

Maintenance should be carried out to repair the showers, toilets and leaking roof in the sports hall. (3.47)

Not achieved

Resettlement

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

At the last inspection in 2013, we found that resettlement had improved and was now impressive. The planning arrangements were well integrated and focused on the needs of young people. Good use was made of release on temporary licence. Young people were able to participate in a range of relevant offending behaviour programmes. Young people received effective support under each of the resettlement pathways, and their accommodation needs were particularly well addressed. Outcomes for children and young people were good against this healthy prison test.

Recommendations

Relevant internal departments should regularly attend the resettlement management meeting. (4.7)

Partially achieved

Links should be developed with prisons to which young people are most often transferred, so that transitions can be properly planned by the two participating establishments. (4.13)

Partially achieved

Young people should have access to the internet or the virtual campus to aid their research skills and employability activities. (4.34)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 3.18)

Harm reduction advice prior to release should be provided consistently, and post-release care should be properly planned and coordinated with caseworkers. (4.38, repeated recommendation 8.25)

Achieved

Young people should be given advice on how to claim benefits. (4.41)

Partially achieved

Young people should be helped to open bank accounts. (4.42)

Partially achieved

Young people should not be required to wear coloured bands in the visits hall (4.47)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 4.45)

Programmes should be evaluated to assess their effectiveness. (4.52)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 4.50)

Learning from programmes should be reinforced by staff across the establishment. (4.54)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 4.51)

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 | 95 | 70.9 |
| Recall | 1 | 0.7 |
| Convicted unsentenced | | |
| Remand | 38 | 28.4 |
| Detainees | | 0 |
| Total | 134 | 100 |

| Age | Number of young people | % |
|--------------|------------------------|------------|
| 15 years | 3 | 2.2 |
| 16 years | 42 | 31.3 |
| 17 years | 73 | 54.5 |
| 18 years | 16 | 11.9 |
| Total | 134 | 100 |

| Nationality | Number of young people | % |
|-------------------|------------------------|------------|
| British | 116 | 86.6 |
| Foreign nationals | 18 | 13.4 |
| Total | 134 | 100 |

| Ethnicity | Number of young people | % |
|---------------------------|------------------------|------------|
| White | | |
| British | 58 | 43.2 |
| Irish | 2 | 1.5 |
| Gypsy/Irish Traveller | | |
| Other white | 3 | 2.2 |
| Mixed | | |
| White and black Caribbean | 9 | 6.7 |
| White and black African | 1 | 0.7 |
| White and Asian | 1 | 0.7 |
| Other mixed | 5 | 4.3 |
| Asian or Asian British | | |
| Indian | 2 | 1.5 |
| Pakistani | | |
| Bangladeshi | 1 | 0.7 |
| Chinese | | |
| Other Asian | 5 | 3.7 |
| Black or black British | | |
| Caribbean | 14 | 10.4 |
| African | 17 | 12.6 |
| Other black | 11 | 8.2 |
| Other ethnic group | | |
| Arab | | |
| Other ethnic group | 4 | 2.9 |
| Not stated | 1 | 0.7 |
| Total | 134 | 100 |

| Religion | Number of young people | % |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|------------|
| Baptist | | |
| Church of England | 6 | 4.5 |
| Roman Catholic | 16 | 11.9 |
| Other Christian denominations | 25 | 18.7 |
| Muslim | 34 | 25.4 |
| Sikh | | |
| Hindu | | |
| Buddhist | | |
| Jewish | | |
| Other | | |
| No religion | 53 | 39.5 |
| Total | 134 | 100 |

| Other demographics | Number of young people | % |
|------------------------|------------------------|---|
| Gypsy/Romany/Traveller | | |
| | | |
| Total | | |

Sentenced only – length of stay by age

| Length of stay | <1 mth | 1–3 mths | 3–6 mths | 6–12 mths | 1–2 yrs | 2 yrs + | 4 yrs + | Total |
|----------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|---------|---------|-----------|
| Age | | | | | | | | |
| 15 years | 1 | 1 | 0 | | | | | 2 |
| 16 years | 3 | 13 | 5 | 6 | | | | 27 |
| 17 years | 10 | 18 | 14 | 9 | 3 | | | 54 |
| 18 years | 2 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 2 | | | 14 |
| Total | 16 | 37 | 22 | 17 | 5 | | | 97 |

Unsentenced only – length of stay by age

| Length of stay | <1 mth | 1–3 mths | 3–6 mths | 6–12 mths | 1–2 yrs | 2 yrs+ | 4 yrs + | Total |
|----------------|-----------|-----------|----------|-----------|---------|--------|---------|-----------|
| Age | | | | | | | | |
| 15 years | | 1 | | | | | | 1 |
| 16 years | 8 | 6 | 1 | | | | | 15 |
| 17 years | 8 | 8 | 2 | 1 | | | | 19 |
| 18 years | | 1 | 1 | | | | | 2 |
| Total | 16 | 16 | 4 | 1 | | | | 37 |

| Main offence | Number of young people | % |
|--|------------------------|------------|
| Violence against the person | 47 | 34.8 |
| Sexual offences | 9 | 6.7 |
| Burglary | 14 | 10.4 |
| Robbery | 29 | 21.5 |
| Theft and handling | 12 | 8.9 |
| Fraud and forgery | 1 | 0.7 |
| Drugs offences | 7 | 5.1 |
| Other offences | 16 | 11.9 |
| Offence not recorded / holding warrant | | |
| Total | 135 | 100 |

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

| Sentence | 4 mths | 6 mths | 8 mths | 10 mths | 12 mths | 18 mths | 24 mths | Recall | Total |
|--------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|--------|-----------|
| Age | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 years | 1 | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 16 years | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 7 | | 25 |
| 17 years | 5 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 9 | | 32 |
| 18 years | 1 | 1 | | | 3 | | | | 5 |
| Total | 9 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 12 | 9 | 16 | | 63 |

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

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

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

| Sentence | Under 2 yrs | 2–3 yrs | 3–4 yrs | 4–5 yrs | 5 yrs + | Recall | Total |
|--------------|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|--------|----------|
| Age | | | | | | | |
| 15 years | | | | | | | |
| 16 years | 1 | | | | | | 1 |
| 17 years | 6 | | | | | | 6 |
| 18 years | 1 | | | | | | 1 |
| Total | 8 | | | | | | 8 |

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

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

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

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

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 9 June 2014 the young person population at HMYOI Cookham Wood was 135. Questionnaires were distributed to 129 young people⁵.

We received a total of 104 completed questionnaires, a response rate of 81%. This included three questionnaires completed via interview. Twelve respondents refused to complete a questionnaire, 10 questionnaires were not returned and three were returned blank.

| Wing/Unit | Number of completed survey returns |
|--------------------------|------------------------------------|
| A2 | 18 |
| A3 | 26 |
| B1 | 20 |
| B2 | 21 |
| B3 | 10 |
| Care and separation unit | 9 |

⁵ Surveys were not distributed to four young people who had been released and two young people who were at court on the day of the survey.

Presentation of survey results and analyses

Over the following pages we present the survey results for HMYOI Cookham Wood.

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 significant⁶ 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 Cookham Wood 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 YOI's since April 2013.
- The current survey responses from HMYOI Cookham Wood in 2014 compared with the responses of young people surveyed at HMYOI Cookham Wood in 2013.
- 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 have been in local authority care and those who have not.

⁶ 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

| | | |
|-----------|--|-----------|
| Q1 | How old are you? | |
| | 15 | 2 (2%) |
| | 16 | 36 (35%) |
| | 17 | 55 (53%) |
| | 18 | 11 (11%) |
| Q2 | Are you a British citizen? | |
| | Yes | 96 (94%) |
| | No | 6 (6%) |
| Q3 | Do you understand spoken English? | |
| | Yes | 101 (99%) |
| | No | 1 (1%) |
| Q4 | Do you understand written English? | |
| | Yes | 100 (98%) |
| | No | 2 (2%) |
| Q5 | What is your ethnic origin? | |
| | White - British | 52 (50%) |
| | White - Irish | 2 (2%) |
| | White - Other | 1 (1%) |
| | Black or Black British - Caribbean | 12 (12%) |
| | Black or Black British - African | 10 (10%) |
| | Black or Black British - Other | 4 (4%) |
| | Asian or Asian British - Indian | 0 (0%) |
| | Asian or Asian British - Pakistani | 1 (1%) |
| | Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi | 2 (2%) |
| | Asian or Asian British - Chinese | 0 (0%) |
| | Asian or Asian British - Other | 2 (2%) |
| | Mixed race - White and Black Caribbean | 9 (9%) |
| | Mixed race - White and Black African | 0 (0%) |
| | Mixed race - White and Asian | 2 (2%) |
| | Mixed race - Other | 3 (3%) |
| | Arab | 1 (1%) |
| | Other ethnic group | 3 (3%) |
| Q6 | What is your religion? | |
| | None | 35 (35%) |
| | Church of England | 16 (16%) |
| | Catholic | 20 (20%) |
| | Protestant | 0 (0%) |
| | Other Christian denomination | 11 (11%) |
| | Buddhist | 0 (0%) |
| | Hindu | 0 (0%) |
| | Jewish | 0 (0%) |
| | Muslim | 19 (19%) |
| | Sikh | 0 (0%) |

| | | |
|------------|--|----------|
| Q7 | Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller? | |
| | Yes | 9 (9%) |
| | No..... | 87 (86%) |
| | Don't know | 5 (5%) |
| Q8 | Do you have any children? | |
| | Yes | 18 (18%) |
| | No..... | 84 (82%) |
| Q9 | Do you consider yourself to have a disability? (i.e. do you need help with any long-term physical, mental or learning needs.) | |
| | Yes | 24 (24%) |
| | No..... | 78 (76%) |
| Q10 | Have you ever been in local authority care? | |
| | Yes | 43 (44%) |
| | No..... | 55 (56%) |

SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE

| | | |
|-----------|---|----------|
| Q1 | Are you sentenced? | |
| | Yes | 76 (75%) |
| | No - unsentenced/on remand | 26 (25%) |
| Q2 | How long is your sentence (the full DTO sentence)? | |
| | Not sentenced | 26 (26%) |
| | Less than 6 months | 15 (15%) |
| | 6 to 12 months..... | 20 (20%) |
| | More than 12 months, up to 2 years..... | 12 (12%) |
| | More than 2 years..... | 26 (26%) |
| | Indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP)..... | 1 (1%) |
| Q3 | How long have you been in this establishment? | |
| | Less than 1 month..... | 18 (18%) |
| | 1 to 6 months | 59 (58%) |
| | More than 6 months, but less than 12 months..... | 15 (15%) |
| | 12 months to 2 years..... | 8 (8%) |
| | More than 2 years..... | 2 (2%) |
| Q4 | Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre? | |
| | Yes | 58 (56%) |
| | No..... | 46 (44%) |

SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS

| | | |
|-----------|---|----------|
| Q1 | On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe? | |
| | Yes | 86 (83%) |
| | No..... | 10 (10%) |
| | Don't remember | 8 (8%) |
| Q2 | On your most recent journey here, were there any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females travelling with you? | |
| | Yes | 26 (25%) |
| | No..... | 59 (57%) |
| | Don't remember | 19 (18%) |

| | | |
|-----------|--|----------|
| Q3 | On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van? | |
| | Less than 2 hours | 44 (43%) |
| | 2 to 4 hours..... | 47 (46%) |
| | More than 4 hours | 9 (9%) |
| | Don't remember | 3 (3%) |
| Q4 | On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break? | |
| | My journey was less than 2 hours | 44 (42%) |
| | Yes | 8 (8%) |
| | No..... | 48 (46%) |
| | Don't remember | 4 (4%) |
| Q5 | On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink? | |
| | My journey was less than 2 hours | 44 (43%) |
| | Yes | 32 (31%) |
| | No..... | 22 (21%) |
| | Don't remember | 5 (5%) |
| Q6 | On your most recent journey here, how did you feel you were treated by the escort staff? | |
| | Very well..... | 14 (14%) |
| | Well..... | 48 (47%) |
| | Neither | 27 (26%) |
| | Badly..... | 5 (5%) |
| | Very badly | 3 (3%) |
| | Don't remember | 6 (6%) |
| Q7 | Before you arrived here, did you receive any information to help you prepare for coming here? | |
| | Yes - and it was helpful..... | 19 (18%) |
| | Yes - but it was not helpful..... | 18 (17%) |
| | No - I received no information | 49 (48%) |
| | Don't remember | 17 (17%) |

SECTION 4: FIRST DAYS

| | | |
|-----------|--|-----------------------------|
| Q1 | How long were you in reception? | |
| | Less than 2 hours | 80 (78%) |
| | 2 hours or longer | 8 (8%) |
| | Don't remember | 15 (15%) |
| Q2 | When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way? | |
| | Yes | 86 (83%) |
| | No..... | 10 (10%) |
| | Don't remember/Not applicable | 7 (7%) |
| Q3 | How well did you feel you were treated in reception? | |
| | Very well..... | 19 (18%) |
| | Well..... | 60 (58%) |
| | Neither | 14 (14%) |
| | Badly..... | 2 (2%) |
| | Very badly | 3 (3%) |
| | Don't remember | 5 (5%) |
| Q4 | When you first arrived here, did staff ask if you needed help or support with any of the following things? (Please tick all that apply to you.) | |
| | Not being able to smoke 45 (46%) | Money worries..... 15 (15%) |

| | | | |
|-------------------------|----------|--|----------|
| Loss of property | 17 (17%) | Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to | 38 (39%) |
| Feeling scared..... | 35 (36%) | Health problems | 61 (62%) |
| Gang problems..... | 59 (60%) | Getting phone numbers | 39 (40%) |
| Contacting family | 56 (57%) | Staff did not ask me about any of these | 18 (18%) |

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 | 33 (34%) | Money worries..... | 15 (16%) |
| Loss of property | 10 (10%) | Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to | 8 (8%) |
| Feeling scared..... | 10 (10%) | Health problems | 14 (15%) |
| Gang problems..... | 14 (15%) | Getting phone numbers | 29 (30%) |
| Contacting family | 36 (38%) | I did not have any problems..... | 28 (29%) |

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

| | |
|--|----------|
| Toiletries/basic items | 73 (73%) |
| The opportunity to have a shower | 73 (73%) |
| Something to eat..... | 82 (82%) |
| A free phone call to friends/family..... | 70 (70%) |
| PIN phone credit..... | 60 (60%) |
| Information about feeling worried/upset..... | 35 (35%) |
| Don't remember | 4 (4%) |
| I was not given any of these | 6 (6%) |

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..... | 58 (59%) |
| Peer mentor | 20 (20%) |
| Childline/Samaritans..... | 34 (34%) |
| The prison shop/canteen..... | 13 (13%) |
| Don't remember | 17 (17%) |
| I did not have access to any of these | 17 (17%) |

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

| | |
|----------------------|----------|
| Yes | 81 (84%) |
| No..... | 13 (13%) |
| Don't remember | 3 (3%) |

Q9 Did you feel safe on your first night here?

| | |
|----------------------|----------|
| Yes | 81 (84%) |
| No..... | 12 (12%) |
| Don't remember | 4 (4%) |

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

| | |
|--|----------|
| I have not been on an induction course | 7 (7%) |
| Yes | 63 (66%) |
| No..... | 15 (16%) |
| Don't remember | 11 (11%) |

SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT

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

| | |
|------------------|----------|
| Yes | 94 (96%) |
| No | 4 (4%) |
| Don't know | 0 (0%) |

| | | |
|------------|--|----------|
| Q2 | Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes? | |
| | Yes | 37 (39%) |
| | No..... | 45 (47%) |
| | Don't know | 14 (15%) |
| Q3 | What is the food like here? | |
| | Very good..... | 3 (3%) |
| | Good..... | 16 (16%) |
| | Neither | 34 (35%) |
| | Bad | 21 (22%) |
| | Very bad..... | 23 (24%) |
| Q4 | Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products? | |
| | I have not bought anything yet/Don't know..... | 6 (6%) |
| | Yes | 65 (65%) |
| | No..... | 29 (29%) |
| Q5 | How easy is it for you to attend religious services? | |
| | I don't want to attend religious services | 20 (21%) |
| | Very easy..... | 27 (28%) |
| | Easy | 27 (28%) |
| | Neither | 6 (6%) |
| | Difficult..... | 3 (3%) |
| | Very difficult..... | 5 (5%) |
| | Don't know | 9 (9%) |
| Q6 | Are your religious beliefs respected? | |
| | Yes | 56 (56%) |
| | No..... | 15 (15%) |
| | Don't know/Not applicable..... | 29 (29%) |
| Q7 | Can you speak to a Chaplain of your faith in private if you want to? | |
| | Yes | 64 (64%) |
| | No..... | 3 (3%) |
| | Don't know/Not applicable..... | 33 (33%) |
| Q8 | Can you speak to a peer mentor when you need to? | |
| | Yes | 35 (35%) |
| | No..... | 12 (12%) |
| | Don't know | 52 (53%) |
| Q9 | Can you speak to a member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board) when you need to? | |
| | Yes | 29 (29%) |
| | No | 14 (14%) |
| | Don't know | 57 (57%) |
| Q10 | Can you speak to an advocate (an outside person to help you) when you need to? | |
| | Yes | 56 (57%) |
| | No..... | 11 (11%) |
| | Don't know | 32 (32%) |

SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF

| | | |
|-----------|--|----------|
| Q1 | Do most staff treat you with respect? | |
| | Yes | 82 (86%) |
| | No..... | 13 (14%) |

| | | |
|-----------|---|--|
| Q2 | If you had a problem, who would you turn to? (Please tick all that apply to you.) | |
| | No-one | 29 (32%) Social worker..... 9 (10%) |
| | Personal officer | 12 (13%) Health services staff..... 3 (3%) |
| | Wing Officer..... | 13 (14%) Peer mentor..... 2 (2%) |
| | Teacher/education staff | 2 (2%) Another young person here |
| | Gym staff..... | 7 (8%) Case worker |
| | Chaplain..... | 11 (12%) Advocate |
| | Independent Monitoring Board (IMB) .. | 3 (3%) Family/friends |
| | YOT worker | 11 (12%) Childline/Samaritans..... 2 (2%) |
| Q3 | Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on? | |
| | Yes | 35 (36%) |
| | No..... | 62 (64%) |
| Q4 | When did you first meet your personal (named) officer? | |
| | I still have not met him/her | 42 (43%) |
| | In your first week | 19 (19%) |
| | After your first week..... | 17 (17%) |
| | Don't remember | 20 (20%) |
| Q5 | How often do you see your personal (named) officer? | |
| | I still have not met him/her | 42 (47%) |
| | At least once a week | 20 (22%) |
| | Less than once a week..... | 28 (31%) |
| Q6 | Do you feel your personal (named) officer tries to help you? | |
| | I still have not met him/her | 42 (44%) |
| | Yes | 32 (34%) |
| | No..... | 21 (22%) |

SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS

| | | |
|-----------|---|----------|
| Q1 | Is it easy to make an application? | |
| | Yes | 87 (88%) |
| | No..... | 7 (7%) |
| | Don't know | 5 (5%) |
| Q2 | Are applications sorted out fairly? | |
| | I have not made an application | 16 (17%) |
| | Yes | 55 (57%) |
| | No..... | 25 (26%) |
| Q3 | Are applications sorted out quickly (within 7 days)? | |
| | I have not made an application | 16 (17%) |
| | Yes | 45 (48%) |
| | No..... | 32 (34%) |
| Q4 | Is it easy to make a complaint? | |
| | Yes | 54 (55%) |
| | No..... | 11 (11%) |
| | Don't know | 33 (34%) |
| Q5 | Are complaints sorted out fairly? | |
| | I have not made a complaint | 53 (55%) |
| | Yes | 23 (24%) |
| | No..... | 21 (22%) |

| | | |
|-----------|---|----------|
| Q6 | Are complaints sorted out quickly (within 7 days)? | |
| | <i>I have not made a complaint</i> | 53 (54%) |
| | Yes | 22 (22%) |
| | No..... | 23 (23%) |

| | | |
|-----------|--|----------|
| Q7 | Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint? | |
| | Yes | 9 (9%) |
| | No..... | 49 (52%) |
| | Never needed to make a complaint..... | 37 (39%) |

SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE

| | | |
|-----------|---|----------|
| Q1 | What level of the rewards and sanctions scheme are you on? | |
| | <i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i> | 4 (4%) |
| | <i>Enhanced (top)</i> | 24 (25%) |
| | <i>Standard (middle)</i> | 59 (61%) |
| | <i>Basic (bottom)</i> | 8 (8%) |
| | <i>Don't know</i> | 1 (1%) |

| | | |
|-----------|---|----------|
| Q2 | Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the rewards and sanctions scheme? | |
| | <i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i> | 4 (4%) |
| | Yes | 54 (59%) |
| | No..... | 28 (30%) |
| | <i>Don't know</i> | 6 (7%) |

| | | |
|-----------|--|----------|
| Q3 | Do the different levels of the rewards and sanctions scheme encourage you to change your behaviour? | |
| | <i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i> | 4 (4%) |
| | Yes | 42 (45%) |
| | No..... | 39 (41%) |
| | <i>Don't know</i> | 9 (10%) |

| | | |
|-----------|--|----------|
| Q4 | Have you had a minor report since you have been here? | |
| | Yes | 38 (40%) |
| | No..... | 29 (30%) |
| | <i>Don't know</i> | 29 (30%) |

| | | |
|-----------|--|----------|
| Q5 | If you have had a minor report, was the process explained clearly to you? | |
| | <i>I have not had a minor report</i> | 58 (61%) |
| | Yes | 29 (31%) |
| | No..... | 8 (8%) |

| | | |
|-----------|---|----------|
| Q6 | Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here? | |
| | Yes | 66 (69%) |
| | No..... | 28 (29%) |
| | <i>Don't know</i> | 1 (1%) |

| | | |
|-----------|---|----------|
| Q7 | If you have had an adjudication ('nicking'), was the process explained clearly to you? | |
| | <i>I have not had an adjudication</i> | 29 (31%) |
| | Yes | 56 (59%) |
| | No..... | 10 (11%) |

| | | |
|-----------|--|----------|
| Q8 | Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here? | |
| | Yes | 40 (43%) |
| | No..... | 49 (52%) |
| | <i>Don't know</i> | 5 (5%) |

| | | |
|-----------|--|----------|
| Q9 | If you have spent a night in the care and separation unit (CSU), how were you treated by staff? | |
| | <i>I have not been to the care and separation unit</i> | 79 (83%) |
| | <i>Very well</i> | 2 (2%) |
| | <i>Well</i> | 5 (5%) |
| | <i>Neither</i> | 3 (3%) |
| | <i>Badly</i> | 1 (1%) |
| | <i>Very badly</i> | 5 (5%) |

SECTION 9: SAFETY

| | | |
|-----------|--|----------|
| Q1 | Have you ever felt unsafe here? | |
| | Yes | 25 (26%) |
| | No..... | 70 (74%) |

| | | |
|-----------|--------------------------------|----------|
| Q2 | Do you feel unsafe now? | |
| | Yes | 9 (10%) |
| | No..... | 85 (90%) |

| | | |
|-----------|--|----------|
| Q3 | In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.) | |
| | <i>Never felt unsafe</i> | 70 (75%) |
| | <i>Everywhere</i> | 7 (8%) |
| | <i>Care and separation unit</i> | 1 (1%) |
| | <i>Association areas</i> | 4 (4%) |
| | <i>Reception area</i> | 1 (1%) |
| | <i>At the gym</i> | 11 (12%) |
| | <i>In an exercise yard</i> | 9 (10%) |
| | <i>At work</i> | 1 (1%) |
| | <i>At education</i> | 11 (12%) |
| | <i>At religious services</i> | 3 (3%) |
| | <i>At meal times</i> | 7 (8%) |
| | <i>At healthcare</i> | 0 (0%) |
| | <i>Visits area</i> | 9 (10%) |
| | <i>In wing showers</i> | 2 (2%) |
| | <i>In gym showers</i> | 3 (3%) |
| | <i>In corridors/stairwells</i> | 10 (11%) |
| | <i>On your landing/wing</i> | 5 (5%) |
| | <i>During movement</i> | 8 (9%) |
| | <i>In your cell</i> | 3 (3%) |

| | | |
|-----------|--|----------|
| Q4 | Have you ever been victimised by another young person/group of young people here? (e.g. insulted or assaulted you.) | |
| | Yes | 18 (19%) |
| | No..... | 78 (81%) |

| | | |
|-----------|---|--------|
| Q5 | If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.) | |
| | <i>Insulting remarks (about you, your family or friends)</i> | 8 (8%) |
| | <i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i> | 8 (8%) |
| | <i>Sexual abuse</i> | 0 (0%) |
| | <i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i> | 6 (6%) |
| | <i>Having your canteen/property taken</i> | 5 (5%) |
| | <i>Medication</i> | 1 (1%) |
| | <i>Debt</i> | 4 (4%) |
| | <i>Drugs</i> | 6 (6%) |
| | <i>Your race or ethnic origin</i> | 2 (2%) |
| | <i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i> | 1 (1%) |
| | <i>Your nationality</i> | 2 (2%) |

| | |
|--|--------|
| 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..... | 1 (1%) |
| You having a disability..... | 2 (2%) |
| You were new here..... | 4 (4%) |
| Your offence/crime..... | 2 (2%) |
| Gang related issues..... | 6 (6%) |

| | | | |
|------------|---|----------|--|
| Q7 | Have you ever been victimised by staff here? (e.g. insulted or assaulted you) | | |
| | Yes | 19 (20%) | |
| | No..... | 77 (80%) | |
| Q8 | If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.) | | |
| | Insulting remarks (about you, your family or friends)..... | 8 (8%) | |
| | Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted) | 2 (2%) | |
| | Sexual abuse | 0 (0%) | |
| | Feeling threatened or intimidated | 2 (2%) | |
| | Having your canteen/property taken..... | 2 (2%) | |
| | Medication..... | 2 (2%) | |
| | Debt | 0 (0%) | |
| | Drugs..... | 2 (2%) | |
| | Your race or ethnic origin..... | 5 (5%) | |
| | Your religion/religious beliefs | 4 (4%) | |
| | Your nationality | 3 (3%) | |
| | You are from a different part of the country to others | 1 (1%) | |
| | You are from a Traveller community..... | 1 (1%) | |
| | Your sexuality | 1 (1%) | |
| | Your age..... | 2 (2%) | |
| | You having a disability..... | 3 (3%) | |
| | You were new here..... | 2 (2%) | |
| | Your offence/crime..... | 3 (3%) | |
| | Gang related issues..... | 1 (1%) | |
| | Because you made a complaint | 7 (7%) | |
| Q10 | If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff? | | |
| | Yes | 18 (21%) | |
| | No..... | 42 (48%) | |
| | Don't know | 27 (31%) | |
| Q11 | Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised? | | |
| | Yes | 28 (29%) | |
| | No..... | 28 (29%) | |
| | Don't know | 39 (41%) | |
| Q12 | Is shouting through the windows a problem here? | | |
| | Yes | 35 (36%) | |
| | No..... | 55 (57%) | |
| | Don't know | 7 (7%) | |

SECTION 10: HEALTH SERVICES

| | | | | |
|-----------|---|----------|----------|------------|
| Q1 | Is it easy to see the following people if you need to? | | | |
| | | Yes | No | Don't know |
| | The doctor | 49 (51%) | 31 (32%) | 16 (17%) |
| | The nurse | 54 (57%) | 24 (25%) | 17 (18%) |
| | The dentist | 32 (34%) | 35 (38%) | 26 (28%) |

| | | |
|------------|---|----------|
| Q2 | What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here? | |
| | <i>I have not been</i> | 6 (6%) |
| | <i>Very good</i> | 17 (18%) |
| | <i>Good</i> | 37 (39%) |
| | <i>Neither</i> | 20 (21%) |
| | <i>Bad</i> | 9 (9%) |
| | <i>Very bad</i> | 7 (7%) |
| Q3 | If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/all of it in your room? | |
| | <i>I am not taking any medication</i> | 55 (58%) |
| | <i>Yes, all of my meds</i> | 8 (8%) |
| | <i>Yes, some of my meds</i> | 11 (12%) |
| | <i>No</i> | 21 (22%) |
| Q4 | Do you have any emotional or mental health problems? | |
| | <i>Yes</i> | 25 (27%) |
| | <i>No</i> | 66 (73%) |
| Q5 | Are you being helped by anyone here with your emotional or mental health problems? (e.g. a psychologist, doctor, counsellor, personal officer or another member of staff.) | |
| | <i>I do not have any emotional or mental health problems</i> | 66 (72%) |
| | <i>Yes</i> | 14 (15%) |
| | <i>No</i> | 12 (13%) |
| Q6 | Did you have problems with alcohol when you first arrived here? | |
| | <i>Yes</i> | 10 (10%) |
| | <i>No</i> | 87 (90%) |
| Q7 | Have you received any help with alcohol problems here? | |
| | <i>Yes</i> | 4 (4%) |
| | <i>No</i> | 93 (96%) |
| Q8 | Did you have problems with drugs when you first arrived here? | |
| | <i>Yes</i> | 29 (30%) |
| | <i>No</i> | 68 (70%) |
| Q9 | Do you have problems with drugs now? | |
| | <i>Yes</i> | 6 (6%) |
| | <i>No</i> | 87 (94%) |
| Q10 | Have you received any help with drugs problems here? | |
| | <i>Yes</i> | 23 (24%) |
| | <i>No</i> | 73 (76%) |
| Q11 | How easy or difficult is it to get illegal drugs here? | |
| | <i>Very easy</i> | 3 (3%) |
| | <i>Easy</i> | 8 (9%) |
| | <i>Neither</i> | 5 (6%) |
| | <i>Difficult</i> | 3 (3%) |
| | <i>Very difficult</i> | 13 (14%) |
| | <i>Don't know</i> | 58 (64%) |

SECTION II: ACTIVITIES

| | | |
|-----------|---|----------|
| Q1 | How old were you when you were last at school? | |
| | <i>14 or under</i> | 47 (49%) |
| | <i>15 or over</i> | 49 (51%) |

| | | | | | |
|-----------|--|--------------------------|------------|-----------|-------------------|
| Q2 | Have you ever been excluded from school? | | | | |
| | Yes | 84 | (90%) | | |
| | No..... | 9 | (10%) | | |
| | Not applicable..... | 0 | (0%) | | |
| Q3 | Did you ever skip school before you came into custody? | | | | |
| | Yes | 70 | (74%) | | |
| | No..... | 22 | (23%) | | |
| | Not applicable..... | 3 | (3%) | | |
| Q4 | Do you CURRENTLY take part in any of the following activities? (Please tick all that apply to you.) | | | | |
| | Education..... | 81 | (86%) | | |
| | A job in this establishment..... | 14 | (15%) | | |
| | Vocational or skills training..... | 27 | (29%) | | |
| | Offending behaviour programmes..... | 28 | (30%) | | |
| | I am not currently involved in any of these..... | 5 | (5%) | | |
| Q5 | If you have been involved in any of the following activities here, do you think they will help you when you leave prison? | | | | |
| | | <i>Not been involved</i> | <i>Yes</i> | <i>No</i> | <i>Don't know</i> |
| | Education | 6 (7%) | 63 (68%) | 16 (17%) | 7 (8%) |
| | A job in this establishment | 17 (28%) | 19 (32%) | 17 (28%) | 7 (12%) |
| | Vocational or skills training | 14 (22%) | 31 (48%) | 12 (18%) | 8 (12%) |
| | Offending behaviour programmes | 13 (20%) | 30 (47%) | 16 (25%) | 5 (8%) |
| Q6 | Do you usually have association every day? | | | | |
| | Yes | 35 | (37%) | | |
| | No..... | 59 | (63%) | | |
| Q7 | Can you usually go outside for exercise every day? | | | | |
| | Don't want to go..... | 11 | (12%) | | |
| | Yes | 52 | (55%) | | |
| | No..... | 32 | (34%) | | |
| Q8 | How many times do you usually go to the gym each week? | | | | |
| | Don't want to go..... | 8 | (9%) | | |
| | None..... | 13 | (15%) | | |
| | One to two times..... | 33 | (38%) | | |
| | Three to five times..... | 17 | (20%) | | |
| | More than five times..... | 16 | (18%) | | |

SECTION 12: FAMILY AND FRIENDS

| | | | | | |
|-----------|---|----|-------|--|--|
| Q1 | Are you able to use the telephone every day, if you want to? | | | | |
| | Yes | 80 | (85%) | | |
| | No..... | 12 | (13%) | | |
| | Don't know | 2 | (2%) | | |
| Q2 | Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)? | | | | |
| | Yes | 43 | (46%) | | |
| | No..... | 45 | (48%) | | |
| | Don't know | 6 | (6%) | | |
| Q3 | How many visits do you usually have each week, from family or friends? | | | | |
| | I don't get visits | 30 | (32%) | | |
| | Less than one a week..... | 26 | (28%) | | |

| | |
|---------------------------|----------|
| About one a week..... | 26 (28%) |
| More than one a week..... | 3 (3%) |
| Don't know | 8 (9%) |

Q4 How easy is it for your family and friends to visit you here?

| | |
|--------------------------|----------|
| I don't get visits | 30 (32%) |
| Very easy..... | 5 (5%) |
| Easy | 22 (23%) |
| Neither | 14 (15%) |
| Difficult..... | 12 (13%) |
| Very difficult..... | 7 (7%) |
| Don't know | 4 (4%) |

Q5 Do your visits usually start on time?

| | |
|--------------------------|----------|
| I don't get visits | 30 (32%) |
| Yes | 42 (45%) |
| No..... | 15 (16%) |
| Don't know | 6 (6%) |

SECTION 13: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE**Q1 Do you think you will have a problem with any of the following things, when you are released? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**

| | |
|-------------------------------------|----------|
| Finding accommodation | 29 (32%) |
| Getting into school or college..... | 30 (33%) |
| Getting a job..... | 55 (60%) |
| Money/finances | 36 (40%) |
| Claiming benefits..... | 13 (14%) |
| Continuing health services..... | 12 (13%) |
| Opening a bank account..... | 18 (20%) |
| Avoiding bad relationships | 20 (22%) |
| I won't have any problems..... | 26 (29%) |

Q2 Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan? (i.e. a plan that is discussed in your DTO/planning meetings, which sets out your targets)

| | |
|------------------|----------|
| Yes | 35 (37%) |
| No..... | 24 (26%) |
| Don't know | 35 (37%) |

Q3 Were you involved in the development of your plan?

| | |
|---|----------|
| I don't have a plan/don't know if I have a plan | 59 (65%) |
| Yes | 29 (32%) |
| No..... | 3 (3%) |

Q4 Do you understand the targets that have been set in your plan?

| | |
|---|----------|
| I don't have a plan/don't know if I have a plan | 59 (63%) |
| Yes | 34 (36%) |
| No..... | 1 (1%) |

Q5 Do you have a caseworker here?

| | |
|------------------|----------|
| Yes | 87 (92%) |
| No..... | 7 (7%) |
| Don't know | 1 (1%) |

Q6 Has your caseworker helped to prepare you for release?

| | |
|--------------------------------|----------|
| I don't have a caseworker..... | 8 (9%) |
| Yes | 47 (50%) |

| | | | | |
|------------|--|----------|---|----------|
| | No..... | 21 (22%) | | |
| | Don't know | 18 (19%) | | |
| Q7 | Has your social worker been to visit you since you have been here? | | | |
| | I don't have a social worker | 29 (31%) | | |
| | Yes | 45 (48%) | | |
| | No..... | 19 (20%) | | |
| Q8 | Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released? | | | |
| | Yes | 40 (42%) | | |
| | No..... | 38 (40%) | | |
| | Don't know | 17 (18%) | | |
| Q9 | Do you know who to contact for help with any of the following problems, before your release? (Please tick all that apply to you.) | | | |
| | Finding accommodation | 26 (30%) | | |
| | Getting into school or college..... | 22 (25%) | | |
| | Getting a job..... | 25 (29%) | | |
| | Help with money/finances | 17 (20%) | | |
| | Help with claiming benefits | 11 (13%) | | |
| | Continuing health services | 12 (14%) | | |
| | Opening a bank account..... | 21 (24%) | | |
| | Avoiding bad relationships | 16 (18%) | | |
| | I don't know who to contact..... | 49 (56%) | | |
| Q10 | What is most likely to stop you offending in the future? (Please tick all that apply to you.) | | | |
| | Not sentenced..... | 26 (27%) | Having a mentor (someone you can ask for advice)..... | 9 (9%) |
| | Nothing, it is up to me | 22 (23%) | Having a YOT worker or social worker that I get on with | 11 (11%) |
| | Making new friends outside..... | 16 (16%) | Having children | 12 (12%) |
| | Going back to live with my family | 15 (15%) | Having something to do that isn't crime | 21 (22%) |
| | Getting a place of my own..... | 21 (22%) | This sentence..... | 26 (27%) |
| | Getting a job..... | 38 (39%) | Getting into school/college | 25 (26%) |
| | Having a partner (girlfriend or boyfriend)..... | 26 (27%) | Talking about my offending behaviour with staff | 1 (1%) |
| | Staying off alcohol/drugs | 21 (22%) | Anything else..... | 2 (2%) |
| Q11 | Do you want to stop offending? | | | |
| | Not sentenced | 26 (27%) | | |
| | Yes | 67 (71%) | | |
| | No..... | 2 (2%) | | |
| | Don't know | 0 (0%) | | |
| 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? | | | |
| | Not sentenced | 26 (27%) | | |
| | Yes | 37 (39%) | | |
| | No..... | 32 (34%) | | |

Comparison with young people's comparator and previous survey results



Survey responses from children and young people: HMYOI Cookham Wood 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

| | | 2014 Cookham Wood | Young people's comparator | 2014 Cookham Wood | 2013 Cookham Wood |
|--|--|-------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| | Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better | | | | |
| | Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse | | | | |
| | Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details | | | | |
| | Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference | | | | |
| Number of completed questionnaires returned | | 104 | 649 | 104 | 81 |
| SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU | | | | | |
| 1.1 | Are you 18 years of age? | 10% | 12% | 10% | 10% |
| 1.2 | Are you a foreign national? | 6% | 5% | 6% | 5% |
| 1.3 | Do you understand spoken English? | 99% | 99% | 99% | 100% |
| 1.4 | Do you understand written English? | 98% | 98% | 98% | 100% |
| 1.5 | Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other category.) | 47% | 39% | 47% | 61% |
| 1.6 | Are you Muslim? | 19% | 22% | 19% | 27% |
| 1.7 | Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller? | 9% | 5% | 9% | 9% |
| 1.8 | Do you have any children? | 17% | 12% | 17% | 8% |
| 1.9 | Do you consider yourself to have a disability? | 24% | 18% | 24% | 27% |
| 1.10 | Have you ever been in local authority care? | 44% | 34% | 44% | 30% |
| SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE | | | | | |
| 2.1 | Are you sentenced? | 74% | 79% | 74% | 76% |
| 2.2 | Is your sentence 12 months or less? | 35% | 39% | 35% | 28% |
| 2.3 | Have you been in this establishment for one month or less? | 17% | 18% | 17% | 14% |
| 2.4 | Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre? | 56% | 54% | 56% | 44% |
| SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS | | | | | |
| On your most recent journey here: | | | | | |
| 3.1 | Did you feel safe? | 83% | 83% | 83% | 73% |
| 3.2 | Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females? | 25% | 39% | 25% | 32% |
| 3.3 | Did you spend more than 4 hours in the van? | 9% | 7% | 9% | 9% |
| For those who spent 2 or more hours in the escort van: | | | | | |
| 3.4 | Were you offered a toilet break if you needed it? | 13% | 16% | 13% | 8% |
| 3.5 | Were you offered anything to eat or drink? | 55% | 36% | 55% | 43% |
| 3.6 | Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff? | 60% | 52% | 60% | 48% |
| 3.7 | Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here? | 19% | 16% | 19% | 14% |
| SECTION 4: YOUR FIRST FEW DAYS HERE | | | | | |
| 4.1 | Were you in reception for less than 2 hours? | 78% | 82% | 78% | 82% |
| 4.2 | When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way? | 84% | 78% | 84% | 78% |
| 4.3 | Were you treated well/very well in reception? | 77% | 64% | 77% | 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? | 46% | 51% | 46% | 44% |

Comparison with young people's comparator and previous survey results

Key to tables

| | | 2014 Cookham Wood | Young people's comparator | 2014 Cookham Wood | 2013 Cookham Wood |
|--|---|-------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| | Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better | | | | |
| | Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse | | | | |
| | Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details | | | | |
| | Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference | | | | |
| Number of completed questionnaires returned | | 104 | 649 | 104 | 81 |
| 4.4b | Loss of property? | 17% | 19% | 17% | 19% |
| 4.4c | Feeling scared? | 36% | 24% | 36% | 29% |
| 4.4d | Gang problems? | 60% | 46% | 60% | 48% |
| 4.4e | Contacting family? | 57% | 54% | 57% | 46% |
| 4.4f | Money worries? | 16% | 16% | 16% | 24% |
| 4.4g | Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to? | 39% | 30% | 39% | 29% |
| 4.4h | Health problems? | 62% | 52% | 62% | 57% |
| 4.4i | Getting phone numbers? | 40% | 39% | 40% | 39% |
| 4.5 | Did you have any problems when you first arrived? | 71% | 74% | 71% | 73% |
| When you first arrived, did you have problems with any of the following: | | | | | |
| 4.5a | Not being able to smoke? | 34% | 48% | 34% | 35% |
| 4.5b | Loss of property? | 10% | 11% | 10% | 15% |
| 4.5c | Feeling scared? | 10% | 10% | 10% | 5% |
| 4.5d | Gang problems? | 14% | 15% | 14% | 16% |
| 4.5e | Contacting family? | 38% | 28% | 38% | 28% |
| 4.5f | Money worries? | 16% | 15% | 16% | 16% |
| 4.5g | Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to? | 8% | 12% | 8% | 4% |
| 4.5h | Health problems? | 14% | 12% | 14% | 12% |
| 4.5i | Getting phone numbers? | 30% | 27% | 30% | 28% |
| When you first arrived, were you given any of the following: | | | | | |
| 4.6a | Toiletries/basic items? | 73% | 79% | 73% | 72% |
| 4.6b | The opportunity to have a shower? | 74% | 45% | 73% | 78% |
| 4.6c | Something to eat? | 82% | 83% | 82% | 82% |
| 4.6d | A free phone call to friends/family? | 70% | 82% | 70% | 64% |
| 4.6e | PIN phone credit? | 60% | 60% | 60% | 58% |
| 4.6f | Information about feeling worried/upset? | 35% | 32% | 35% | 26% |
| Within your first 24 hours, did you have access to the following people or services: | | | | | |
| 4.7a | A chaplain? | 59% | 47% | 59% | 28% |
| 4.7b | A peer mentor? | 20% | 13% | 20% | 7% |
| 4.7c | Childline/Samaritans | 34% | 18% | 34% | 14% |
| 4.7d | The prison shop/canteen? | 13% | 11% | 13% | 5% |
| 4.8 | Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse? | 83% | 66% | 83% | 79% |
| 4.9 | Did you feel safe on your first night here? | 83% | 78% | 83% | 77% |
| 4.10 | For those who have been on an induction course: did it cover everything you needed to know about the establishment? | 71% | 62% | 71% | 58% |
| SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT | | | | | |
| 5.1 | Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to? | 96% | 80% | 96% | 68% |
| 5.2 | Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes? | 38% | 36% | 38% | 26% |
| 5.3 | Do you find the food here good/very good? | 20% | 16% | 20% | 9% |
| 5.4 | Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products? | 65% | 51% | 65% | 45% |

Comparison with young people's comparator and previous survey results

Key to tables

| | | 2014 Cookham Wood | Young people's comparator | 2014 Cookham Wood | 2013 Cookham Wood |
|---|--|-------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| | Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better | | | | |
| | Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse | | | | |
| | Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details | | | | |
| | Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference | | | | |
| Number of completed questionnaires returned | | 104 | 649 | 104 | 81 |
| 5.5 | Is it easy/very easy for you to attend religious services? | 56% | 56% | 56% | 48% |
| 5.6 | Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected? | 56% | 60% | 56% | 53% |
| Can you speak to: | | | | | |
| 5.7 | A chaplain of your faith in private? | 64% | 70% | 64% | 60% |
| 5.8 | A peer mentor? | 36% | 35% | 36% | 25% |
| 5.9 | A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)? | 29% | 22% | 29% | 18% |
| 5.10 | An advocate (an outside person to help you)? | 57% | 47% | 57% | 41% |
| SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF | | | | | |
| 6.1 | Do most staff treat you with respect? | 86% | 69% | 86% | 60% |
| 6.2 | If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to? | 32% | 21% | 32% | 27% |
| 6.3 | Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on? | 36% | 40% | 36% | 32% |
| For those who have met their personal officer: | | | | | |
| 6.4 | Did you meet your personal (named) officer within the first week? | 34% | 43% | 34% | 29% |
| 6.5 | Do you see your personal (named) officer at least once a week? | 42% | 59% | 42% | 46% |
| 6.6 | Do you feel your personal (named) officer tries to help you? | 61% | 70% | 61% | 62% |
| SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS | | | | | |
| 7.1 | Is it easy to make an application? | 88% | 73% | 88% | 76% |
| For those who have made an application: | | | | | |
| 7.2 | Do you feel applications are sorted out fairly? | 69% | 71% | 69% | 44% |
| 7.3 | Do you feel applications are sorted out quickly (within 7 days)? | 58% | 58% | 58% | 25% |
| 7.4 | Is it easy to make a complaint? | 55% | 55% | 55% | 55% |
| For those who have made a complaint: | | | | | |
| 7.5 | Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly? | 53% | 38% | 53% | 30% |
| 7.6 | Do you feel complaints are sorted out quickly (within 7 days)? | 49% | 38% | 49% | 19% |
| 7.7 | Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint? | 10% | 9% | 10% | 9% |
| SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE | | | | | |
| 8.1 | Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme? | 25% | 26% | 25% | 37% |
| 8.2 | Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme? | 59% | 50% | 59% | 31% |
| 8.3 | Do the different levels make you change your behaviour? | 45% | 49% | 45% | 48% |
| 8.4 | Have you had a minor report since you have been here? | 40% | 52% | 40% | 45% |
| For those who have had a minor report: | | | | | |
| 8.5 | Was the process explained clearly to you? | 79% | 80% | 79% | 67% |
| 8.6 | Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here? | 69% | 61% | 69% | 70% |
| For those who have had an adjudication ('nicking'): | | | | | |
| 8.7 | Was the process explained clearly to you? | 85% | 86% | 85% | 81% |
| 8.8 | Have you been physically restrained (Cand R) since you have been here? | 43% | 37% | 43% | 48% |
| 8.9 | For those who had spent a night in the care and separation unit: did the staff treat you well/very well? | 43% | 39% | 43% | 44% |
| SECTION 9: SAFETY | | | | | |
| 9.1 | Have you ever felt unsafe here? | 27% | 28% | 27% | 35% |
| 9.2 | Do you feel unsafe now? | 10% | 10% | 10% | 12% |

Comparison with young people's comparator and previous survey results

Key to tables

| | | 2014 Cookham Wood | Young people's comparator | 2014 Cookham Wood | 2013 Cookham Wood |
|--|--|-------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| | Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better | | | | |
| | Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse | | | | |
| | Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details | | | | |
| | Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference | | | | |
| Number of completed questionnaires returned | | 104 | 649 | 104 | 81 |
| 9.4 | Have you ever been victimised by other young people here? | 19% | 21% | 19% | 30% |
| Since you have been here, have other young people: | | | | | |
| 9.5a | Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends? | 8% | 10% | 8% | 14% |
| 9.5b | Hit, kicked or assaulted you? | 8% | 7% | 8% | 15% |
| 9.5c | Sexually abused you? | 0% | 0% | 0% | 3% |
| 9.5d | Threatened or intimidated you? | 6% | 8% | 6% | 9% |
| 9.5e | Taken your canteen/property? | 6% | 3% | 6% | 4% |
| 9.5f | Victimised you because of medication? | 1% | 0% | 1% | 1% |
| 9.5g | Victimised you because of debt? | 4% | 1% | 4% | 1% |
| 9.5h | Victimised you because of drugs? | 6% | 1% | 6% | 4% |
| 9.5i | Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin? | 2% | 1% | 2% | 4% |
| 9.5j | Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs? | 1% | 1% | 1% | 4% |
| 9.5k | Victimised you because of your nationality? | 2% | 2% | 2% | 4% |
| 9.5l | Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country? | 2% | 2% | 2% | 4% |
| 9.5m | Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community? | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% |
| 9.5n | Victimised you because of your sexual orientation? | 0% | 1% | 0% | 1% |
| 9.5o | Victimised you because of your age? | 1% | 0% | 1% | 4% |
| 9.5p | Victimised you because you have a disability? | 2% | 1% | 2% | 1% |
| 9.5q | Victimised you because you were new here? | 4% | 6% | 4% | 7% |
| 9.5r | Victimised you because of your offence/crime? | 2% | 2% | 2% | 4% |
| 9.5s | Victimised you because of gang related issues? | 6% | 4% | 6% | 8% |
| 9.7 | Have you ever been victimised by a member of staff here? | 20% | 24% | 20% | 31% |
| Since you have been here, have staff: | | | | | |
| 9.8a | Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends? | 8% | 13% | 8% | 12% |
| 9.8b | Hit, kicked or assaulted you? | 2% | 4% | 2% | 9% |
| 9.8c | Sexually abused you? | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| 9.8d | Threatened or intimidated you? | 2% | 4% | 2% | 4% |
| 9.8e | Taken your canteen/property? | 2% | 2% | 2% | 7% |
| 9.8f | Victimised you because of medication? | 2% | 1% | 2% | 3% |
| 9.8g | Victimised you because of debt? | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% |
| 9.8h | Victimised you because of drugs? | 2% | 1% | 2% | 3% |
| 9.8i | Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin? | 6% | 3% | 6% | 9% |
| 9.8j | Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs? | 4% | 2% | 4% | 0% |
| 9.8k | Victimised you because of your nationality? | 3% | 2% | 3% | 3% |
| 9.8k | Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country? | 1% | 2% | 1% | 4% |
| 9.8m | Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community? | 1% | 0% | 1% | 3% |
| 9.8n | Victimised you because of your sexual orientation? | 1% | 0% | 1% | 0% |
| 9.8o | Victimised you because of your age? | 2% | 1% | 2% | 1% |

Comparison with young people's comparator and previous survey results

Key to tables

| | | 2014 Cookham Wood | Young people's comparator | 2014 Cookham Wood | 2013 Cookham Wood |
|--|--|-------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| | Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better | | | | |
| | Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse | | | | |
| | Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details | | | | |
| | Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference | | | | |
| Number of completed questionnaires returned | | 104 | 649 | 104 | 81 |
| 9.8p | Victimised you because you have a disability? | 3% | 1% | 3% | 1% |
| 9.8q | Victimised you because you were new here? | 2% | 2% | 2% | 1% |
| 9.8r | Victimised you because of your offence/crime? | 3% | 1% | 3% | 3% |
| 9.8s | Victimised you because of gang related issues? | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| 9.8t | Victimised you because you made a complaint? | 7% | 5% | 7% | 7% |
| 9.10 | If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff? | 20% | 28% | 20% | 25% |
| 9.11 | Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised? | 29% | 32% | 29% | 27% |
| 9.12 | Is shouting through the windows a problem here? | 36% | 33% | 36% | 33% |
| SECTION 10: HEALTH SERVICES | | | | | |
| 10.1a | Is it easy for you to see the doctor? | 51% | 59% | 51% | 56% |
| 10.1b | Is it easy for you to see the nurse? | 57% | 70% | 57% | 69% |
| 10.1c | Is it easy for you to see the dentist? | 35% | 38% | 35% | 37% |
| 10.2 | For those who have been to health services: Do you think the overall quality is good/very good? | 60% | 54% | 60% | 58% |
| 10.3 | If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/all of it in your cell? | 48% | 53% | 48% | 40% |
| 10.4 | Do you have any emotional or mental health problems? | 28% | 21% | 28% | 32% |
| 10.5 | If you have emotional or mental health problems, are you being helped by anyone here? | 53% | 70% | 53% | 65% |
| 10.6 | Did you have any problems with alcohol when you first arrived? | 10% | 8% | 10% | 4% |
| 10.7 | Have you received any help with any alcohol problems here? | 4% | 5% | 4% | 1% |
| 10.8 | Did you have any problems with drugs when you first arrived? | 30% | 36% | 30% | 36% |
| 10.9 | Do you have a problem with drugs now? | 7% | 7% | 7% | 11% |
| 10.10 | Have you received any help with any drug problems here? | 24% | 22% | 24% | 16% |
| 10.11 | Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs here? | 12% | 15% | 12% | 14% |
| SECTION 11: ACTIVITIES | | | | | |
| 11.1 | Were you 14 or younger when you were last at school? | 49% | 37% | 49% | 40% |
| 11.2 | Have you ever been excluded from school? | 90% | 89% | 90% | 81% |
| 11.3 | Did you ever skip school before you came into custody? | 73% | 76% | 73% | 66% |
| Do you currently take part in any of the following: | | | | | |
| 11.4a | Education? | 86% | 74% | 86% | 76% |
| 11.4b | A job in this establishment? | 15% | 32% | 15% | 15% |
| 11.4c | Vocational or skills training? | 29% | 15% | 29% | 16% |
| 11.4d | Offending behaviour programmes? | 30% | 18% | 30% | 32% |
| 11.4e | Nothing | 6% | 15% | 6% | 14% |
| For those who have taken part in the following activities while in this establishment, do you think that they will help you when you leave prison: | | | | | |
| 11.5a | Education? | 73% | 65% | 73% | 66% |
| 11.5b | A job in this establishment? | 45% | 55% | 45% | 43% |
| 11.5c | Vocational or skills training? | 61% | 51% | 61% | 58% |
| 11.5d | Offending behaviour programmes? | 59% | 52% | 59% | 54% |
| 11.6 | Do you usually have association every day? | 37% | 73% | 37% | 69% |

Comparison with young people's comparator and previous survey results

Key to tables

| | | 2014 Cookham Wood | Young people's comparator | 2014 Cookham Wood | 2013 Cookham Wood |
|---|---|-------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| | Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better | | | | |
| | Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse | | | | |
| | Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details | | | | |
| | Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference | | | | |
| Number of completed questionnaires returned | | 104 | 649 | 104 | 81 |
| 11.7 | Can you usually go outside for exercise every day? | 55% | 59% | 55% | 48% |
| 11.8 | Do you go to the gym more than five times each week? | 19% | 12% | 19% | 23% |
| SECTION 12: KEEPING IN TOUCH WITH FAMILY AND FRIENDS | | | | | |
| 12.1 | Are you able to use the telephone every day? | 85% | 83% | 85% | 70% |
| 12.2 | Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels? | 46% | 38% | 46% | 53% |
| 12.3 | Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends? | 31% | 39% | 31% | 47% |
| 12.4 | Is it easy/very easy for your family and friends to visit you here? | 29% | 37% | 29% | 37% |
| 12.5 | Do your visits start on time? | 46% | 42% | 46% | 43% |
| SECTION 13: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE | | | | | |
| Do you think you will have a problem with the following, when you are released: | | | | | |
| 13.1a | Finding accommodation? | 32% | 24% | 32% | 29% |
| 13.1b | Getting into school or college? | 33% | 28% | 33% | 37% |
| 13.1c | Getting a job? | 61% | 51% | 61% | 60% |
| 13.1d | Money/finances? | 40% | 36% | 40% | 41% |
| 13.1e | Claiming benefits? | 14% | 20% | 14% | 20% |
| 13.1f | Continuing health services? | 13% | 7% | 13% | 10% |
| 13.1g | Opening a bank account? | 20% | 15% | 20% | 15% |
| 13.1h | Avoiding bad relationships? | 22% | 15% | 22% | 22% |
| 13.2 | Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan? | 37% | 51% | 37% | 49% |
| For those with a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan: | | | | | |
| 13.3 | Were you involved in the development of your plan? | 91% | 81% | 91% | 91% |
| 13.4 | Do you understand the targets set in your plan? | 98% | 94% | 98% | 88% |
| 13.5 | Do you have a caseworker here? | 92% | 82% | 92% | 89% |
| 13.6 | Has your caseworker helped to prepare you for release? | 55% | 46% | 55% | 48% |
| For those with a social worker: | | | | | |
| 13.7 | Has your social worker been to visit you since you have been here? | 70% | 67% | 70% | 68% |
| 13.8 | Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released? | 42% | 39% | 42% | 38% |
| Do you know who to contact for help with the following problems? | | | | | |
| 13.9a | Finding accommodation | 30% | 27% | 30% | 27% |
| 13.9b | Getting into school or college | 25% | 28% | 25% | 24% |
| 13.9c | Getting a job | 29% | 33% | 29% | 31% |
| 13.9d | Help with money/finances | 20% | 21% | 20% | 21% |
| 13.9e | Help with claiming benefits | 12% | 17% | 12% | 18% |
| 13.9f | Continuing health services | 14% | 14% | 14% | 14% |
| 13.9g | Opening a bank account | 24% | 17% | 24% | 17% |
| 13.9h | Avoiding bad relationships | 19% | 15% | 19% | 18% |
| For those who were sentenced: | | | | | |
| 13.11 | Do you want to stop offending? | 97% | 91% | 97% | 84% |
| 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? | 53% | 49% | 53% | 37% |

Diversity analysis



Key question responses (ethnicity/religion) HMYOI Cookham Wood 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

| | | Black and minority ethnic young people | White young people | Muslim young people | Non-Muslim young people |
|--|--|--|--------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| | Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better | | | | |
| | Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse | | | | |
| | Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details | | | | |
| | Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference | | | | |
| Number of completed questionnaires returned | | 49 | 55 | 19 | 82 |
| 1.2 | Are you a foreign national? | 11% | 1% | 4% | 5% |
| 1.3 | Do you understand spoken English? | 98% | 100% | 96% | 100% |
| 1.4 | Do you understand written English? | 100% | 96% | 100% | 97% |
| 1.5 | Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.) | | | 80% | 38% |
| 1.6 | Are you Muslim? | 33% | 7% | | |
| 1.5 | Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller? | 5% | 13% | 0% | 10% |
| 1.9 | Do you consider yourself to have a disability? | 16% | 29% | 28% | 22% |
| 1.10 | Have you ever been in local authority care? | 43% | 44% | 48% | 42% |
| 2.1 | Are you sentenced? | 77% | 72% | 80% | 73% |
| 2.4 | Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre? | 59% | 53% | 68% | 55% |
| 3.2 | Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females? | 14% | 35% | 16% | 28% |
| 3.6 | Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff? | 57% | 64% | 42% | 66% |
| 3.7 | Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare coming here? | 23% | 14% | 20% | 19% |
| 4.2 | When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way? | 77% | 89% | 64% | 88% |
| 4.3 | Were you treated well/very well in reception? | 67% | 86% | 58% | 81% |
| 4.8 | Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse? | 76% | 90% | 81% | 84% |
| 4.9 | Did you feel safe on your first night here? | 80% | 87% | 67% | 86% |
| 5.1 | Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to? | 93% | 99% | 87% | 99% |
| 5.2 | Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes? | 29% | 47% | 41% | 39% |
| 5.3 | Do you find the food here good/very good? | 27% | 13% | 24% | 18% |
| 5.4 | Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products? | 47% | 81% | 44% | 70% |
| 5.6 | Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected? | 59% | 52% | 67% | 54% |
| Can you speak to: | | | | | |

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

| Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better | | Black and minority ethnic young people | White young people | Muslim young people | Non-Muslim young people |
|--|---|--|--------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse | | | | | |
| Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details | | | | | |
| Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference | | | | | |
| Number of completed questionnaires returned | | 49 | 55 | 19 | 82 |
| 5.7 | A chaplain of your faith in private? | 64% | 64% | 83% | 58% |
| 5.8 | A peer mentor? | 27% | 44% | 17% | 40% |
| 5.9 | A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)? | 23% | 33% | 17% | 32% |
| 5.10 | An advocate (an outside person to help you)? | 45% | 67% | 44% | 61% |
| 6.1 | Do most staff treat you with respect? | 76% | 95% | 61% | 93% |
| 6.2 | If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to? | 31% | 32% | 43% | 28% |
| 7.1 | Is it easy to make an application? | 85% | 90% | 61% | 93% |
| 7.4 | Is it easy to make a complaint? | 53% | 57% | 36% | 59% |
| 8.1 | Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme? | 20% | 30% | 13% | 29% |
| 8.2 | Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme? | 53% | 64% | 41% | 64% |
| 8.3 | Do the different levels make you change your behaviour? | 40% | 48% | 30% | 48% |
| 8.4 | Have you had a minor report since you have been here? | 45% | 34% | 59% | 35% |
| 8.6 | Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here? | 70% | 69% | 77% | 69% |
| 8.8 | Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here? | 47% | 39% | 46% | 41% |
| 9.1 | Have you ever felt unsafe here? | 24% | 28% | 46% | 21% |
| 9.2 | Do you feel unsafe now? | 16% | 5% | 23% | 5% |
| 9.4 | Have you been victimised by other young people here? | 17% | 20% | 30% | 16% |
| Since you have been here, have other young people: | | | | | |
| 9.5d | Threatened or intimidated you? | 5% | 8% | 5% | 5% |
| 9.5i | Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin? | 5% | 0% | 0% | 1% |
| 9.5j | Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs? | 2% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| 9.5k | Victimised you because of your nationality? | 5% | 0% | 0% | 1% |
| 9.5p | Victimised you because you have a disability? | 2% | 2% | 0% | 1% |
| 9.7 | Have you been victimised by staff here? | 27% | 14% | 36% | 16% |

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

| | | Black and minority ethnic young people | White young people | Muslim young people | Non-Muslim young people |
|---|--|--|--------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| | Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better | | | | |
| | Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse | | | | |
| | Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details | | | | |
| | Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference | | | | |
| Number of completed questionnaires returned | | 49 | 55 | 19 | 82 |
| Since you have been here, have staff: | | | | | |
| 9.8d | Threatened or intimidated you? | 2% | 2% | 0% | 1% |
| 9.8i | Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin? | 12% | 0% | 18% | 1% |
| 9.8j | Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs? | 8% | 0% | 18% | 0% |
| 9.8k | Victimised you because of your nationality? | 7% | 0% | 13% | 1% |
| 9.8p | Victimised you because you have a disability? | 2% | 5% | 0% | 3% |
| 9.10 | If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff? | 15% | 27% | 19% | 22% |
| 9.11 | Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised? | 23% | 35% | 18% | 33% |
| 10.1a | Is it easy/very easy for you to see the doctor? | 44% | 57% | 46% | 53% |
| 10.1b | Is it easy/very easy for you to see the nurse? | 50% | 63% | 57% | 58% |
| 10.4 | Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems? | 23% | 32% | 35% | 26% |
| Do you currently take part in any of the following: | | | | | |
| 11.4a | Education? | 84% | 88% | 82% | 88% |
| 11.4b | A job in this establishment? | 21% | 10% | 18% | 14% |
| 11.4c | Vocational or skills training? | 25% | 31% | 36% | 28% |
| 11.4d | Offending behaviour programmes? | 29% | 31% | 23% | 32% |
| 11.4e | Nothing? | 9% | 2% | 13% | 3% |
| 11.6 | Do you usually have association every day? | 36% | 39% | 41% | 36% |
| 11.7 | Can you usually go outside for exercise every day? | 54% | 55% | 30% | 61% |
| 11.8 | Do you go to the gym more than five times each week? | 22% | 15% | 26% | 15% |
| 12.1 | Are you able to use the telephone every day? | 84% | 86% | 77% | 88% |
| 12.2 | Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels? | 43% | 48% | 46% | 45% |
| 12.3 | Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends? | 25% | 35% | 23% | 34% |
| 13.2 | Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan? | 40% | 34% | 55% | 35% |
| 13.8 | Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released? | 43% | 41% | 46% | 40% |

Diversity analysis - disability



Key question responses (disability analysis) HMYOI Cookham Wood 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 | Consider themselves to have a disability | Do not consider themselves to have a disability |
| | Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse | | |
| | Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details | | |
| | Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference | | |
| Number of completed questionnaires returned | | 24 | 78 |
| 1.2 | Are you a foreign national? | 9% | 5% |
| 1.3 | Do you understand spoken English? | 100% | 99% |
| 1.4 | Do you understand written English? | 97% | 99% |
| 1.5 | Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.) | 32% | 50% |
| 1.6 | Are you Muslim? | 23% | 18% |
| 1.5 | Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller? | 22% | 5% |
| 1.10 | Have you ever been in local authority care? | 70% | 36% |
| 2.1 | Are you sentenced? | 78% | 73% |
| 2.4 | Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre? | 32% | 64% |
| 3.2 | Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females? | 16% | 27% |
| 3.6 | Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff? | 58% | 61% |
| 3.7 | Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here? | 16% | 20% |
| 4.2 | When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way? | 74% | 86% |
| 4.3 | Were you treated well/very well in reception? | 78% | 76% |
| 4.8 | Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse? | 96% | 81% |
| 4.9 | Did you feel safe on your first night here? | 85% | 82% |
| 5.1 | Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to? | 96% | 96% |
| 5.2 | Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes? | 43% | 38% |
| 5.3 | Do you find the food here good/very good? | 25% | 18% |
| 5.4 | Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products? | 63% | 66% |
| 5.6 | Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected? | 57% | 56% |

Diversity analysis - disability

Key to tables

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better | Consider themselves to have a disability | Do not consider themselves to have a disability |
| | Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse | | |
| | Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details | | |
| | Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference | | |
| Can you speak to: | | | |
| 5.7 | A chaplain of your faith in private? | 57% | 66% |
| 5.8 | A peer mentor? | 25% | 38% |
| 5.9 | A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)? | 25% | 30% |
| 5.10 | An advocate (an outside person to help you)? | 63% | 56% |
| 6.1 | Do most staff treat you with respect? | 80% | 88% |
| 6.2 | If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to? | 28% | 33% |
| 7.1 | Is it easy to make an application? | 96% | 86% |
| 7.4 | Is it easy to make a complaint? | 57% | 55% |
| 8.1 | Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme? | 25% | 26% |
| 8.2 | Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme? | 50% | 61% |
| 8.3 | Do the different levels make you change your behaviour? | 33% | 49% |
| 8.4 | Have you had a minor report since you have been here? | 48% | 38% |
| 8.6 | Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here? | 85% | 64% |
| 8.8 | Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here? | 39% | 44% |
| 9.1 | Have you ever felt unsafe here? | 43% | 22% |
| 9.2 | Do you feel unsafe now? | 15% | 9% |
| 9.4 | Have you been victimised by other young people here? | 37% | 14% |
| Since you have been here, have other young people: | | | |
| 9.5d | Threatened or intimidated you? | 15% | 4% |
| 9.5i | Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin? | 4% | 1% |
| 9.5j | Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs? | 4% | 0% |
| 9.5k | Victimised you because of your nationality? | 4% | 1% |
| 9.5p | Victimised you because you have a disability? | 4% | 1% |
| 9.7 | Have you been victimised by staff here? | 25% | 19% |

Diversity analysis - disability

Key to tables

| | | | |
|---|--|---|--|
| | Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better | Consider themselves to have a disability | Do not consider themselves to have a disability |
| | Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse | | |
| | Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details | | |
| | Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference | | |
| Since you have been here, have staff: | | | |
| 9.8d | Threatened or intimidated you? | 4% | 1% |
| 9.8i | Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin? | 15% | 3% |
| 9.8j | Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs? | 15% | 1% |
| 9.8k | Victimised you because of your nationality? | 11% | 1% |
| 9.8p | Victimised you because you have a disability? | 11% | 1% |
| 9.10 | If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff? | 44% | 15% |
| 9.11 | Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised? | 39% | 27% |
| 10.1a | Is it easy/very easy for you to see the doctor? | 63% | 47% |
| 10.1b | Is it easy/very easy for you to see the nurse? | 67% | 54% |
| 10.4 | Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems? | 65% | 15% |
| Do you currently take part in any of the following: | | | |
| 11.4a | Education? | 85% | 87% |
| 11.4b | A job in this establishment? | 26% | 13% |
| 11.4c | Vocational or skills training? | 39% | 26% |
| 11.4d | Offending behaviour programmes? | 19% | 33% |
| 11.4e | Nothing? | 4% | 4% |
| 11.6 | Do you usually have association every day? | 39% | 37% |
| 11.7 | Can you usually go outside for exercise every day? | 43% | 58% |
| 11.8 | Do you go to the gym more than five times each week? | 15% | 20% |
| 12.1 | Are you able to use the telephone every day? | 81% | 86% |
| 12.2 | Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels? | 50% | 44% |
| 12.3 | Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends? | 19% | 35% |
| 13.2 | Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan? | 41% | 37% |
| 13.8 | Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released? | 41% | 43% |

Diversity analysis



Key question responses (local authority care analysis) HMYOI Cookham Wood 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 | Young people who have been in local authority care | Young people who have not been in local authority care |
| | Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse | | |
| | Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details | | |
| | Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference | | |
| Number of completed questionnaires returned | | 43 | 55 |
| 1.2 | Are you a foreign national? | 2% | 10% |
| 1.3 | Do you understand spoken English? | 100% | 99% |
| 1.4 | Do you understand written English? | 98% | 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.) | 46% | 47% |
| 1.6 | Are you Muslim? | 22% | 18% |
| 1.5 | Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller? | 13% | 7% |
| 1.9 | Do you consider yourself to have a disability? | 38% | 13% |
| 2.1 | Are you sentenced? | 74% | 75% |
| 2.4 | Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre? | 39% | 69% |
| 3.2 | Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females? | 29% | 24% |
| 3.6 | Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff? | 59% | 64% |
| 3.7 | Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here? | 13% | 25% |
| 4.2 | When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way? | 84% | 82% |
| 4.3 | Were you treated well/very well in reception? | 71% | 78% |
| 4.8 | Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse? | 86% | 81% |
| 4.9 | Did you feel safe on your first night here? | 90% | 82% |
| 5.1 | Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to? | 94% | 96% |
| 5.2 | Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes? | 32% | 44% |
| 5.3 | Do you find the food here good/very good? | 16% | 19% |
| 5.4 | Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products? | 63% | 64% |
| 5.6 | Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected? | 63% | 51% |

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

| | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| | Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better | Young people who have been in local authority care | Young people who have not been in local authority care |
| | 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? | 70% | 62% |
| 5.8 | A peer mentor? | 42% | 30% |
| 5.9 | A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)? | 37% | 23% |
| 5.10 | An advocate (an outside person to help you)? | 68% | 48% |
| 6.1 | Do most staff treat you with respect? | 86% | 86% |
| 6.2 | If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to? | 24% | 39% |
| 7.1 | Is it easy to make an application? | 87% | 87% |
| 7.4 | Is it easy to make a complaint? | 60% | 54% |
| 8.1 | Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme? | 18% | 29% |
| 8.2 | Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme? | 49% | 62% |
| 8.3 | Do the different levels make you change your behaviour? | 27% | 56% |
| 8.4 | Have you had a minor report since you have been here? | 57% | 31% |
| 8.6 | Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here? | 84% | 62% |
| 8.8 | Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here? | 52% | 37% |
| 9.1 | Have you ever felt unsafe here? | 25% | 26% |
| 9.2 | Do you feel unsafe now? | 10% | 8% |
| 9.4 | Have you been victimised by other young people here? | 24% | 15% |
| Since you have been here, have other young people: | | | |
| 9.5d | Threatened or intimidated you? | 10% | 4% |
| 9.5i | Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin? | 2% | 2% |
| 9.5j | Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs? | 2% | 0% |
| 9.5k | Victimised you because of your nationality? | 2% | 2% |
| 9.5p | Victimised you because you have a disability? | 2% | 2% |
| 9.7 | Have you been victimised by staff here? | 23% | 15% |

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| | Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better | Young people who have been in local authority care | Young people who have not been in local authority care |
| | Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse | | |
| | Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details | | |
| | Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference | | |
| Since you have been here, have staff: | | | |
| 9.8d | Threatened or intimidated you? | 2% | 0% |
| 9.8i | Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin? | 10% | 2% |
| 9.8j | Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs? | 8% | 2% |
| 9.8k | Victimised you because of your nationality? | 6% | 2% |
| 9.8p | Victimised you because you have a disability? | 6% | 2% |
| 9.10 | If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff? | 19% | 22% |
| 9.11 | Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised? | 27% | 32% |
| 10.1a | Is it easy/very easy for you to see the doctor? | 58% | 46% |
| 10.1b | Is it easy/very easy for you to see the nurse? | 62% | 52% |
| 10.4 | Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems? | 41% | 13% |
| Do you currently take part in any of the following: | | | |
| 11.4a | Education? | 80% | 92% |
| 11.4b | A job in this establishment? | 18% | 14% |
| 11.4c | Vocational or skills training? | 27% | 33% |
| 11.4d | Offending behaviour programmes? | 34% | 27% |
| 11.4e | Nothing? | 8% | 2% |
| 11.6 | Do you usually have association every day? | 43% | 32% |
| 11.7 | Can you usually go outside for exercise every day? | 54% | 55% |
| 11.8 | Do you go to the gym more than five times each week? | 21% | 17% |
| 12.1 | Are you able to use the telephone every day? | 85% | 86% |
| 12.2 | Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels? | 50% | 40% |
| 12.3 | Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends? | 23% | 37% |
| 13.2 | Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan? | 42% | 30% |
| 13.8 | Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released? | 57% | 31% |