

Report on an unannounced inspection of

# **HMYOI Wetherby**

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

**12 – 23 January 2015**

## **Glossary of terms**

We try to make our reports as clear as possible, but if you find terms that you do not know, please see the glossary in our 'Guide for writing inspection reports' on our website at: <http://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/about-our-inspections/>

Crown copyright 2015

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

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

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

This publication is available for download at: <http://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/>

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

# Contents

Introduction	5
Fact page	7
About this inspection and report	9
Summary	11
Section 1. Safety	19
Section 2. Respect	33
Section 3. Purposeful activity	47
Section 4. Resettlement	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 Wetherby is a closed facility for up to 276 boys under the age of 18. We last inspected the establishment in early 2014 but returned in January 2015 as part of our programme of annual inspection of all custodial institutions holding children. In 2014 we reported that outcomes at Wetherby were reasonably good or better against all of our healthy prison tests. This inspection found the prison going through a period of transition with the reopening of mothballed accommodation, the refurbishment of one of the wings and, not least, the appointment of a new governor. Outcomes for young people remained mainly good, although importantly this was not the case in respect of safety, where there had been a discernable deterioration.

Findings indicated that boys spent too long held in court cells at the conclusion of their cases before transfer to prison. Many arrived late at the prison which did not help with the important task of managing potential risk. Reception arrangements were, despite this, thorough, although new arrivals were then co-located on a first night facility that was also holding some boys who had been placed there because of their disruptive behaviour. This unhelpful distraction, some weak risk assessment, and inconsistent access to a full induction, undermined proper management of risk during the early days in custody.

The prison had a comprehensive and integrated safeguarding policy reflecting some good structures and effective oversight. However, the main weaknesses were in the analysis of bullying, violence reduction and separation. We were confident that staff had a good understanding of their child protection procedures and that there were high levels of independent scrutiny and local authority interest.

The identification of bullies and victims was reasonably good and we observed good supervision by staff on the wings, but nearly a third of boys reported victimisation from others which was a significant increase since our last inspection. There had also been an increase in the levels of violence recorded and in the severity of that violence. Some incidents were reckless, concerted and sometimes involved the use of weapons. Of equal concern was an increase in the severity of violence towards staff. During 2014 there had been 19 such recorded incidents where staff had received a significant injury. Arrangements to support behaviour management had been ineffective in addressing these concerning trends.

The management of security was broadly proportionate to the risks faced but the use of force had increased and was now higher than in similar institutions. Supervision of force also required improvement and better arrangements to support accountability. The environment and regime in the separation facility remained unsuitable for children but separation was not used excessively.

Most boys lived in decent conditions despite the grubbiness and lack of equipment in some cells. Relationships between staff and prisoners remained a strength, and it was commendable that there had been no loss of confidence or withdrawal by staff despite the violence they faced. Consultation between staff and young people was adequate but there was evidence to suggest that the personal officer scheme required renewal. Support for boys from minorities or with protected characteristics was reasonable, as were outcomes in respect of health provision.

Boys received slightly less time out of cell than previously and for a significant minority on various restrictions – usually for disciplinary or control purposes – unlock could be very limited. During the working day we found about 30% of boys locked up doing nothing, which was not good enough. The provision of education and learning opportunities was sufficiently broad and progression was possible. There was enough activity for all but too much was poorly allocated, take up was too low, and attendance was poor, which all contributed to needlessly negative outcomes. The quality of provision was generally good and most learners who completed their course could gain a qualification. Skills development in vocational training was good and a good work ethic was promoted.

Work to support resettlement was a strength and was predicated on a good understanding of the needs of the population. There had been progress in developing links with resettlement consortia and community partners who provided resettlement pathway services. Training and remand management planning was good and boys were encouraged to participate in the planning of their sentences. Support for boys with looked after status was well organised and there were some good public protection arrangements in place. However, less than a third of boys received a weekly visit, which was worse than elsewhere in the juvenile estate, and partly a feature of the fact that over 70% of boys originated from more than 50 miles from Wetherby.

Wetherby remained well-led and staff remained calm, measured and resilient. In most respects Wetherby provided the boys it held with positive opportunities to progress. However, this report also identified some significant challenges, not least in addressing and reducing the concerning levels of violence. Addressing this should be the priority of the establishment and much of its other work depends on progress in this area.

**Nick Hardwick**  
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

June 2015

# Fact page

## Task of the establishment

To hold male children and young people

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

Public

## Region/Department

Yorkshire and Humberside

## Number held

204

## Certified normal accommodation

276

## Operational capacity

276 (including Keppel unit 48)

## Date of last inspection

October 2013

## Type of inspection

Full unannounced

## Brief history

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

## Short description of residential units

Anson – long-term determinate and life-sentenced boys

Benbow – undergoing refurbishment and will accommodate long-term determinate and life-sentenced boys

Frobisher – first night facility and standard accommodation

Collingwood – standard accommodation

Drake – standard accommodation

Exmouth – standard accommodation

## Name of governor

Marcella Goligher

## Escort contractor

GeoAmey

## Health service commissioner and providers

Commissioner: NHS England Health and Justice

Providers: Leeds Community Healthcare NHS Trust  
South West Yorkshire Partnership Foundation Trust  
Lifeline

**Learning and skills providers**

The Manchester College

**Independent Monitoring Board chair**

Mary Augustine

# About this inspection and report

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

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

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

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

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

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

Our assessments might result in one of the following:

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

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

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

## This report

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

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

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

---

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

# Summary

## Safety

- S1** *Boys continued to spend too long at court and frequently arrived at Wetherby late. They were treated well on arrival. The reception and first night procedures were sound but the location of different groups of boys on the first night unit was not appropriate. Some boys did not receive a proper induction. Child protection procedures were effective but Safeguarding arrangements required some improvements. Levels of self-harm had reduced slightly and vulnerable boys were looked after well. Most elements of discipline were managed well, although the rewards and sanctions scheme was not motivational. Evidence showed that the use of force had increased and the governance associated with it was not sufficiently accountable. The care and separation unit continued to provide an unsuitable environment for boys. Levels of violence remained high and serious incidents were becoming more common. Some of these had resulted in staff sustaining very serious injuries. The current arrangements to deal with violence were having limited impact. **Outcomes for children and young people were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.***
- S2** *At the last inspection in October 2013, we found that outcomes for boys at Wetherby were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 22 recommendations in the area of safety. At this follow-up inspection we found that five of the recommendations had been achieved, five had been partially achieved and 12 had not been achieved.*
- S3** Boys still spent too long in court cells and often arrived at the prison late in the evening, which made it difficult to settle in new admissions. Boys sometimes still shared transport with adults.
- S4** The reception area was well managed and provided a welcoming environment, with staff who were skilled in dealing with boys. Background information from Asset<sup>2</sup> was used well but action points in the risk assessment and management documentation were too generic. It was not appropriate to locate disruptive boys with newly admitted boys on the first night centre. Not all boys completed the formal induction.
- S5** The safeguarding policy was comprehensive and safeguarding work was managed well.
- S6** Child protection arrangements were thorough and good work was carried out in pursuing allegations of historical abuse. There continued to be strong links between the establishment and the local authority social services department. We found one case of strip-searching under restraint which should have been referred to the local authority but was not.
- S7** Levels of violence remained high and there had been a significant increase in the severity of violence since the last inspection. Many of the violent incidents between boys were serious and some involved the use of weapons and groups of boys attacking individuals. The increased severity of attacks on staff was particularly concerning and had resulted in some bad injuries.

---

<sup>2</sup> Assessment process approved by the Youth Justice Board designed to determine the risk and protective factors which play a part in a young person's offending.

- S8 Restricted regimes for perpetrators of violence were difficult to manage on normal residential units and ABC (address and begin to change) interventions were not effective in dealing with violent behaviour.
- S9 Safeguarding and stability meetings were well attended but the analysis of information to identify trends and patterns of violence was underdeveloped.
- S10 The number of self-harm incidents had reduced since the previous inspection and a few boys accounted for a disproportionate number. Boys who had been identified as at risk of self-harm were well looked after. The analysis of data concerning self-harming behaviour was reasonably good. The quality of most ACCT<sup>3</sup> documents was good but some care maps lacked detail. Attendance at ACCT reviews was very good.
- S11 The rewards and sanctions scheme was explained to boys on arrival and boys said they understood how the scheme worked. In our survey, significantly fewer boys than the comparator said the scheme made them change their behaviour.
- S12 Physical security was proportionate and reflected the risks posed by boys at Wetherby. There was good information exchange between security and other departments. Intelligence was analysed well and key objectives were set accurately.
- S13 The number of adjudications was proportionally less than similar establishments. Minor reports were used appropriately for less serious infringements of the rules. Boys were offered access to advocates before adjudications, and reviews that we observed were carried out in a child friendly manner. The monitoring and oversight of disciplinary procedures were good.
- S14 The MMPR (managing and minimising physical restraint) model of restraint, which was designed to be less intrusive, had been introduced at Wetherby and was now fully implemented. Despite this, pain infliction was used more frequently to gain compliance.
- S15 The recorded use of force had increased since our last inspection and was slightly higher than in comparator establishments. Too many documents associated with use of force were missing and it was not possible to establish accurately the level of restraint used.
- S16 In the video recordings that we viewed and the full documentation of incidents that we examined, we found evidence of good de-escalation. Debriefs by advocates were completed quickly, although not all boys were seen by health care staff quickly enough following incidents of restraint.
- S17 Although the separation and care unit (SCU) cells were in better condition than previously, the environment was still austere and not suitable for holding boys. Significantly fewer boys than at the last inspection were held in the SCU and removal from unit was no longer used.
- S18 Few boys remained separated for long periods in the SCU. Reintegration and care planning for these boys was adequate but, for those staying a short time, it was poor. We were unable to determine how many boys had returned to normal location from the SCU. Documentation authorising separation was often incomplete.
- S19 The regime on the CSU was inadequate and all the boys we spoke to said they spent most of their time locked in their cells. Telephone calls and showers were not available every day. Relationships between staff and boys were good and staff knew the boys in their care well.

---

<sup>3</sup> Assessment, care in custody and teamwork case management of prisoners at risk of suicide and self-harm

- S20 Monitoring of the use of separation and use of force was inadequate.
- S21 The YPDASS (young people's drug and alcohol support service) was delivering a reduced service. Work was prioritised appropriately but many boys told us that they were having long waits for one-to-one support and that group work was not available. Boys on restricted regimes were kept locked in their cells during much of the day, and YPDASS workers had to talk to them through the door, which was disrespectful.

## Respect

**S22** *The living conditions were reasonable. Relationships between staff and boys were positive and staff remained confident about challenging poor behaviour. Boys from minority groups were mostly well supported. Boys' religious needs were well catered for. Responses to some complaints did not address the issues raised. Boys received better support in relation to legal rights. Health care provision was reasonably good. Boys were relatively positive about the food. **Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***

**S23** *At the last inspection in October 2013, we found that outcomes for boys at Wetherby were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 15 recommendations in the area of respect. At this follow-up inspection we found that six of the recommendations had been achieved, four had been partially achieved and five had not been achieved.*

- S24 Most boys lived in decent conditions and many showed pride in maintaining the standard of their own accommodation. Some cells, including those on the first night unit, were grubby and did not have cupboards or shelves for boys to store property. The integral toilets lacked seats and not all were adequately screened.
- S25 Communal areas were clean and well equipped, excluding Anson unit which was grubby with peeling paint. Not all showers were hot enough and, although the level of graffiti was generally low, shower doors on D wing were covered in graffiti.
- S26 Boys on remand could not wear their own clothes.
- S27 The relationships between staff and boys were consistently good and almost all interactions we observed were polite, respectful and supportive. Staff were firm but fair in their dealings with boys and challenged poor behaviour appropriately. Not all of the boys we spoke to said they were aware of the personal officer scheme and some said they did not have a specific member of staff they could turn to.
- S28 The strategic management of equality and diversity was effective. The distinct needs of boys with protected characteristics were recognised early, addressed and regularly reviewed by the equality manager. Treatment and conditions of boys across the protected characteristics were monitored reasonably well.
- S29 Although services for most foreign national boys and those with disabilities were reasonably good, there were no consultation or support groups. In our survey, over a third of boys with disabilities reported feeling unsafe and over half said they had been victimised by other boys. Support for Travellers and gay or bisexual boys was better than we often see and this reflected professional confidence.
- S30 Responses to discrimination incident report forms were good and quality assurance was very good.

- S31 The chaplaincy was well integrated in the prison and boys from all faiths received a good level of service. A wide range of useful groups and courses were provided by the chaplaincy. The multi-faith complex was comfortable and well equipped and provided a good environment.
- S32 Responses to complaints were polite, but not all dealt with the issue adequately or quickly enough. Some boys had been advised not to use the complaints system for a number of issues and this was not appropriate.
- S33 There was now a clear policy for boys to have contact with their legal representatives and we saw evidence that boys knew how to access free telephone calls and letters to their solicitors. Boys had their legal rights explained to them by their caseworkers and proper attention was paid to making sure that boys on remand were able to make a bail application if they wished to do so.
- S34 Overall the standard of health care services was reasonably good and most boys we spoke to were satisfied with the quality of provision. Partnership working and clinical governance were reasonably good, although there was a lack of formal managerial supervision and not all staff received clinical supervision. A separate confidential complaints system needed to be established and the use of incident reporting required further review.
- S35 There was an appropriate range of primary care services with good access to a GP and nurse-led clinics, although waiting times to see the optician were too long. Reception and subsequent health screening were comprehensive and included brain injury screening.
- S36 The previously integrated mental health team had divided into a primary team which was developing and a secondary care team, which provided a very good multidisciplinary service with a range of groups and individual sessions.
- S37 More boys than at comparator prisons liked the food at Wetherby, though several we spoke to were unhappy with portion sizes. The food we sampled was good. It was good that boys were able to dine in association for most meals but lunch was served at the cell door, which was disrespectful.

## Purposeful activity

- S38** *Boys had slightly less time out of their cell than previously. The significant minority of boys on restricted regimes received inadequate amounts of time out of their cell each day. Leadership and management of learning and skills were good. The quality of teaching and learning was also good, as was behaviour management. There was an appropriate range of provision for learning and skills. Outcomes were good but there was a need to ensure that boys did not drop out of courses, particularly functional skills. Access to the library was poor but access to the gym was good. Overall, Ofsted's judgement was that provision was good. **Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***
- S39 *At the last inspection in October 2013, we found that outcomes for boys at Wetherby were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made eight recommendations in the area of purposeful activity. At this follow-up inspection we found that two of the recommendations had been achieved and six had not been achieved.*

- S40 Most boys could have seven to eight hours unlocked during weekdays and about six at weekends, which was slightly less than we reported previously. However, it was much less for the significant minority on different restricted regimes, who could have as little as an hour a day unlocked. Roll checks during the middle of the core day showed about 30% of the population locked in their cells.
- S41 Strategic leadership of learning and skills was good. Managers had a very good grasp of where improvement was needed and were taking appropriate action. The Manchester College and the prison worked collaboratively to provide bespoke and responsive learning pathways, which met the needs of individual boys. They used their joint resources well. Data were collected but not analysed to inform management decisions, which inhibited planning and allocation.
- S42 Effective links with local authorities and other partners helped ensure that transition arrangements worked well.
- S43 Staff were well motivated. Responsive professional development opportunities were in place with good uptake. Not all teachers were taking the opportunity to refresh their subject knowledge and classroom skills.
- S44 The prison had undertaken detailed work to prepare for the new transforming youth custody initiative. This helped to create a context for a more comprehensive response to sentence planning, education and resettlement. The final plans needed to be firmly based on the best interests of the child.
- S45 The Manchester College self-assessment plan was clear and ambitious and set out well the progress against recommendations from previous inspections. More broadly, there was a good commitment to quality improvement.
- S46 The curriculum was broad and offered sufficient choice. Most courses provided opportunities for progression, except in a few vocational areas where courses were only offered at level 1. For the more able learners, a particularly effective 'step-up' course provided good opportunities to access level 3 courses.
- S47 There were enough activity places to meet need but attendance was poor. However, allocation processes were not sufficiently refined to ensure that boys were on the right course at the right level for their abilities, nor did they reflect the stage which boys had reached in their sentence.
- S48 The quality of teaching, learning and assessment was mostly good and in a few instances outstanding. The best teachers, in group and markedly in one-to-one settings, were skilled in enabling boys to consolidate their previous learning through well designed, relevant sessions and good questioning. In the weaker sessions teachers did not provide enough challenge to engage boys in learning.
- S49 Teaching and workshop environments were good. Teaching resources were up to date, although in information technology the standard of equipment and software was poor and outdated.
- S50 Boys with additional learning needs were identified well and supported effectively.

- S51 Most learners who completed their courses achieved a qualification. In personal and social development, achievement rates were high at 96% and in vocational training they were at 90%. In functional skills about half the learners withdrew from learning. Poor attendance was a continuing concern and not enough boys were engaged. This had a significant and negative impact on outcomes.
- S52 In vocational training, skills development was good and learners took pride in their work and achievements. At work, officer instructors worked hard to instil a work ethic in boys with some success.
- S53 The standard of learners' written work was satisfactory.
- S54 Behaviour was good and bad language was consistently challenged.
- S55 PE facilities were good, including a large sports hall with a climbing wall, weights and cardiovascular room and all-weather outdoor pitch. There was a good range of recreational PE, including team games, which promoted good relationships between the boys. Partnerships with two football clubs and an ambitious initiative with Sky Sports linking a top athlete with the prison expanded boys' outlooks.
- S56 Equipment was tired but in good working order and new replacement equipment was on order. Showers were in need of refurbishment.
- S57 The library had been relocated into education and potentially was more accessible. However, access at the time of the inspection was very poor because of staff shortages, and attendance by boys was very low.

## Resettlement

**S58** *The strategic management of resettlement remained effective and good links had been established with community partners. The planning arrangements were reliable and support for looked-after children had been extended to include children in need. Public protection arrangements were good. Improvements had been made to some of the resettlement pathways. Some very good work had been carried out to support boys transferring to the adult estate. Late release was being used effectively to encourage boys to make more constructive use of their time in custody. Distance from home was an ever greater problem, although some visits arrangements had improved. Programmes continued to be run efficiently but there was no provision for boys convicted of a sexual offence.*  
**Outcomes for children and young people were good against this healthy prison test.**

**S59** *At the last inspection in October 2013, we found that outcomes for boys at Wetherby were good against this healthy prison test. We made nine recommendations in the area of resettlement. At this follow-up inspection we found that three of the recommendations had been achieved, two had been partially achieved, three had not been achieved and one was no longer relevant.*

**S60** The reducing reoffending strategy was updated annually and based on a needs analysis of the population. It set out how pre-release and resettlement work would be delivered but did not cover adequately boys with a sexual element to their offending and those serving longer sentences. The reducing reoffending strategy meeting provided an effective forum to discuss work on resettlement, including the pathways. Attendance was good and included some community partners.

- S61 Good progress had been made in developing effective relationships with the resettlement consortia with an interest in boys at Wetherby, and with community partners who provided pathway services. Despite continued efforts by staff, community agencies did not consistently provide information which was needed to follow up boys' progress after release.
- S62 In contrast to similar establishments, efforts were made to use late release to support public protection, sentence planning and effective resettlement.
- S63 Training planning and remand management meetings were timely and properly recorded. Boys were encouraged to participate in their reviews, but specialist departments in the establishment did not attend often enough.
- S64 The standard of public protection work was very good with proper identification and management of such cases, including boys subject to MAPPA (multi-agency public protection arrangements).
- S65 Systems to identify boys who had looked-after status were efficient and boys who were assessed as children in need now received similar input from the on-site social workers, which was commendable. Good efforts were made to help boys receive appropriate support and regular reviews of their care from their local authority.
- S66 Reintegration planning was organised well. Transition work for boys moving to the adult estate had improved since the previous inspection and was now very good. The development of the In2Out mentoring scheme since the last inspection was a positive initiative to help boys make a successful return to the community.
- S67 Accommodation needs were identified and discussed early at planning meetings. No boys had been released without an address, but in some cases it had required sustained efforts by caseworkers, social workers and Barnardo's advocates to ensure that suitable accommodation was provided.
- S68 Teaching and support staff displayed a high level of awareness and this helped prepare boys for their next step towards resettlement. Effective work was undertaken to retrieve previous educational records and to negotiate college places. Information, advice and guidance was well established and staff were realistic and pragmatic in managing expectations.
- S69 Pre-release arrangements for boys with health care needs were very good. Support for boys with drug and alcohol problems was being developed.
- S70 Boys were now able to open a bank account while at Wetherby and efforts were made to encourage them to do so ready for release. Job Centre Plus attended the prison to advise boys about benefits and how to apply for them.
- S71 Only 28% of boys said they had a weekly visit from family or friends, which was worse than at other juvenile establishments. More than 70% of boys lived more than 50 miles from home, and it was worth exploring the potential for technology to increase the level of contact with families who found it difficult to visit.
- S72 Monthly engagement sessions in the visitors' centre were a positive means of identifying visitors' views on the visits arrangements. The first family day for boys on the main site had been held and we hoped this would become established.
- S73 The Building Bridges course, which now included through-the-gate support for some boys and their families, remained an important component in rebuilding fractured family relationships, as did the Family Talk work.

- S74 The cancellation at national level of the contract to undertake work with boys with a sexual element to their offending well before a replacement service was ready to deliver had left some boys without the specialist intervention they needed.
- S75 Other appropriate interventions work was undertaken in response to identified need. Programmes were relevant to boys' needs and, importantly, there were initiatives to familiarise other staff with the intervention work being undertaken and advise them on how to support it.

## Main concerns and recommendations

- S76 Concern: Some boys spent too long in court cells waiting for transport to Wetherby. These delays were compounded by the sharing of transport with adult prisoners who were dropped off first to meet lock-out times at the prisons they were going to. As a result, boys arrived at Wetherby late in the evening which presented clear safety and safeguarding issues.

**Recommendation: The issue of excessive time spent in court cells and associated late arrivals should be resolved as a priority.**

- S77 Concern: The separation and care unit remained a completely unsuitable environment to look after difficult and challenging boys. The needs of boys held there were not always properly assessed and monitored and the regime was inadequate.

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

- S78 Concern: Levels of violence between boys, and towards staff, had risen and some of the violence was reckless and unpredictable. Serious injuries had been sustained as a result of these incidents.

**Recommendation: An effective, comprehensive strategy should be developed in order to understand and reduce the high levels of violence among boys.**

# Section 1. Safety

## Courts, escorts and transfers

### Expected outcomes:

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

**I.1** *Boys spent too long in court cells and often arrived at the prison late in the evening, which made it difficult for staff to settle them in. Escorts still sometimes transported adults and children on the same vehicle.*

**I.2** Boys spent too long in court cells and often arrived late at the prison; we saw several examples of boys who had appeared in court in the morning, but did not arrive at the prison until 9pm because of the escort arrangements. They did not get to the wing until very late, which was tiring for them and made it difficult for staff to settle them in. The prison had received funding to double the capacity of the video link room which it was hoped would significantly reduce the number of boys who had to travel to court.

**I.3** In our survey, 80% of boys said they felt safe during escort compared with 90% at the previous inspection. Cellular vehicles were clean and carried refreshments and first aid equipment. Adults and boys were sometimes transported on the same vehicle, which was inappropriate. Person escort records were completed to a reasonably high standard.

### Recommendation

**I.4** **Boys should not be transported with adult prisoners.** (Repeated recommendation I.3)

## Early days in custody

### Expected outcomes:

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

**I.5** *The reception area was well managed and provided a welcoming environment with staff who were skilled at dealing with boys. Background information from Asset<sup>4</sup> was used well but actions in the risk assessment and management documentation were too generic. It was not appropriate to locate disruptive boys with newly admitted boys on the first night centre. Not all boys received an induction.*

<sup>4</sup> Youth Justice Board assessment documentation completed by youth offending teams

- I.6** The reception area was well managed; it was a welcoming environment staffed by officers who were skilled at dealing with boys and talked to them calmly and respectfully. There was no routine strip-searching of boys. New arrivals had a rub-down search and a BOSS chair (body orifice security scanner) was used.
- I.7** Reception staff received a range of information about new admissions in advance, including the Youth Justice Board (YJB) placement order, the Asset assessment and post-sentence reports. If some information was missing, staff said that the YJB speedily rectified this, and boys were subject to enhanced supervision on the first night unit until the information arrived.
- I.8** Microwave meals, sandwiches and pasties were provided in reception. Boys could shower if they arrived before core reception staff left at 7.45pm, but not if they arrived later. This was reflected in our survey with only 30% of boys saying they were offered the opportunity to shower against the comparator of 57%. Two orderlies working in reception were responsible for cleaning and helping staff, but there were no peer mentors to support new arrivals in reception or on the first night unit. New arrivals were asked if they would like to telephone an adult and officers telephoned to check that the person was happy to receive a call.
- I.9** Most new arrivals went to F wing, the dedicated first night and induction unit, where they usually remained for about a week. A private interview was conducted by first night staff but actions in the risk assessment and management (RAM) plan were not sufficiently specific to the individual. An information booklet was provided, but some of the information was out of date.
- I.10** Accommodation on the first night unit was reasonable, but integral toilets did not have seats or lids (see section on residential units). The unit was regularly used to accommodate disruptive and challenging boys, who mixed with the new arrivals. This was not appropriate. Boys with long sentences went straight to the Anson unit where the same first night and induction procedures were used.
- I.11** Induction lasted a week, although in our groups some boys said they had not had an induction and officers told us it was often cancelled because of staff shortages. Some newly arrived boys were locked in their cells all day as a result. Induction incorporated literacy and numeracy testing for education purposes and a power point presentation describing the regime. In our survey, 57% of those who had received an induction said it was useful.
- I.12** Numbers were not added to pin phones quickly enough; we spoke to boys who had been at the establishment for one to two weeks and had not been able to contact their families during that time. In our survey, 50% of respondents said they were given PIN phone credit on arrival against the comparator of 60% and 64% at the previous inspection.

## Recommendations

- I.13 All new arrivals should be given the opportunity to speak to a peer mentor before they are locked up for the night.** (Repeated recommendation I.12)
- I.14 First night risk management plans should be relevant to the young person's needs and identified risks, and managers should monitor quality through robust quality assurance.** (Repeated recommendation I.14)
- I.15 All new arrivals should receive a good quality induction to the prison.**

- I.16 Numbers should be added to pin phones quickly so that boys can maintain contact with their families on arrival.**

### Housekeeping point

- I.17** The information booklet should be kept up to date.

## 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.18** *The safeguarding meetings were well organised but a number of key areas did not receive enough attention. There was a comprehensive and well managed safeguarding policy with strong links to the local authority. Staff were familiar with the safeguarding procedures.*

- I.19** The safeguarding strategy was comprehensive and integrated with associated policies. It had been agreed by the local safeguarding children board (LSCB).
- I.20** A number of regular safeguarding meetings continued to take place. There were weaknesses in the analysis of bullying, violence reduction and separation (see relevant sections).
- I.21** A quarterly meeting chaired by the head of safeguarding oversaw the strategic management of safeguarding, including self-harm, violence reduction, child protection and use of force. Staff from key areas of the establishment and the local authority attended.
- I.22** The head of safeguarding also chaired the well established monthly safeguarding meeting which continued to have an operational focus and looked at a range of statistical data on relevant areas such as violence reduction and self-harm reduction (see sections on violence reduction and suicide and self-harm prevention).
- I.23** The weekly safeguarding meeting remained a useful multidisciplinary forum for discussing boys who were of the most concern and how to manage them. There were clear protocols for staff if information came to their attention that a young person may have been abused or injured while in custody. These cases were monitored at the local safeguarding board monthly meetings.
- I.24** Staff we spoke to were aware of the protocols and of their personal responsibility to protect children. All had received formal training.

## Child protection

### Expected outcomes:

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

- I.25** *Staff had a good understanding of child protection and the child protection procedures remained good. Referrals came from a variety of sources and were dealt with promptly and efficiently. The level of independent scrutiny was high and the local authority took a close interest. The governor took responsibility for ensuring that each case referred was properly dealt with and that actions were taken where necessary.*
- I.26** Links between the prison and the local authority remained good. The local authority designated officer (LADO) regularly attended the quarterly safeguarding committee meetings where he had made a presentation on his role. A sub-group of the LSCB had recently been set up to address issues relating to the secure estate in the area. The establishment had been represented at the first meeting. The LADO played an active role in child protection work at the establishment and was consulted about and gave advice on most child protection referrals.
- I.27** Staff we spoke to had a good understanding of child protection. Over 90% of staff who had direct contact with boys had completed child protection and safeguarding training.
- I.28** Details of all child protection referrals were kept up to date in a comprehensive log. During 2014, 112 child protection referrals had been made to the social workers by a variety of sources, including discipline staff. This reflected good staff awareness and confidence in the procedures. Most referrals concerned allegations by boys about staff behaviour, in particular when force had been used. A significant number of referrals concerned allegations of historical abuse.
- I.29** Five strategy meetings, chaired by a local authority representative, had been held during 2014. Staff had been given advice and guidance on eight occasions and one case had been referred to the police. Referrals made by inspectors from allegations made by boys in our survey were followed up promptly and thoroughly. Social work staff in the prison pursued allegations of historical abuse tenaciously and we were told of two cases where significant action had been taken in the community as a result.
- I.30** Working relationships between the prison and the local authority were described as transparent and open by both parties. Three prison-based social workers took the lead in child protection work. They were well integrated in the establishment and attended the weekly and monthly safeguarding meetings.
- I.31** Social workers and their colleagues in the safeguarding team continued to examine each child protection referral at a weekly meeting chaired by the governor. The level of scrutiny was thorough and referrals were addressed in a systematic and methodical way.

## 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** *Procedures to support victims of bullying and intimidation were reasonable but still required improvement. Survey results indicated that victimisation remained an issue and had increased since the last inspection.*
- I.33** The identification of bullying and of victims was reasonably good, and information sharing in the main residential units was very good. Allegations of bullying were treated consistently and were investigated promptly by wing managers.
- I.34** Less formal communication, particularly between residential managers, education staff and the security department, also helped to identify incidents of bullying which had not been reported through channels such as security information reports. We observed very good supervision on wings, with officers regularly patrolling landings and association areas when boys were unlocked. CCTV coverage was extensive and covered nearly all residential units and communal areas.
- I.35** Staff engaged positively with boys; they were approachable and clearly interested in the boys' welfare. We saw examples of officers taking appropriate action to manage potential incidents before they developed.
- I.36** Residential staff regularly identified bullying which they recorded in wing observation books and electronic history files. These were followed up by officers and managers. However, opportunities for bullying remained evident. In our survey, 29% of respondents said that they had been victimised by other boys against 15% at the previous inspection.
- I.37** Formal support for victims of bullying was not fully developed. We were not confident of the effectiveness of the address and begin to change (ABC) system introduced before the previous inspection to manage and address challenging and violent behaviour. The weekly safeguarding meetings provided good support for a few particularly vulnerable boys.

### Recommendation

- I.38** **Formal systems should be fully developed to support victims of bullying.**

## Suicide and self-harm prevention

### Expected outcomes:

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

**I.39** *The analysis of data to determine patterns and trends of self-harming behaviour was good and the number of incidents of self-harm had reduced. Generally the quality of ACCT<sup>5</sup> documents was good but many care maps lacked detail and some were not updated adequately. Attendance at reviews was very good.*

**I.40** Procedures and protocols in the safeguarding policy, including suicide prevention, were managed by the safeguarding team. They used a wide range of information to identify trends and patterns of self-harming behaviour, such as location, type, timing and peripheral circumstances of incidents, and were accountable for ensuring that procedures to manage boys at risk were properly implemented. A full-time suicide prevention coordinator acted as a central point for advice and guidance for staff.

**I.41** There had been 64 incidents of self-harm involving 39 boys during the six months before the inspection. This represented a reduction of over 30 incidents when compared to findings at the last inspection. The nature and extent of self-harm were monitored by the safeguarding committee and the monthly safer custody meeting, where data were used to help identify patterns and trends.

**I.42** During the six months before the inspection, 173 ACCT documents had been opened compared with 106 over the same period at the last inspection. There had been no serious self-inflicted injuries or deaths in custody since the last inspection. At the time of this inspection, there were 10 open ACCT documents, eight of which were for boys on the first night centre on F wing.

**I.43** The quality of ACCTs that we examined was generally very good. Many entries were detailed and indicated that residential staff knew and cared about the personal circumstances of individual boys. However, some care maps lacked detail and were not always updated adequately. Case reviews were timely and attendance was very good.

**I.44** Our observations confirmed that staff knew and cared about boys in crisis and helped them to address their concerns. They engaged positively with vulnerable boys and did not overreact to challenging behaviour. We saw many occasions when they dealt patiently and calmly with difficult boys.

**I.45** All the boys on ACCTs told us that officers treated them well and were responsive to their needs.

### Recommendation

**I.46 The quality of care maps should be improved.**

<sup>5</sup> Assessment, care in custody and teamwork case management of prisoners 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.47** *The behaviour management strategy, address and begin to change, had not worked effectively and did not include all aspects of behaviour management. Mediation was available to boys but staff were not trained and there was no monitoring of its use.*

**I.48** The behaviour management strategy, address and begin to change (ABC), focused on managing unacceptable behaviour, particularly violent behaviour. It did not incorporate security and discipline procedures or use of force and separation. It encouraged staff to manage poor behaviour through the rewards and sanctions scheme. Use of the ABC strategy had not resulted in a reduction in levels of violence (see sections on bullying and violence reduction and rewards and sanctions).

**I.49** Mediation was used to encourage better relationships between boys who were in conflict with each other but staff had not been trained in mediation. There was inadequate monitoring and scrutiny of some aspects of behaviour management and identification of trends (see sections on separation/removal from normal location and use of force).

### Recommendations

**I.50** **All aspects of behaviour management should be included in the strategy. Thorough monitoring should be carried out to identify trends and actions taken to address issues that arise.**

**I.51** **Staff undertaking mediation should be trained in its use and the use of mediation should be monitored.** (Repeated recommendation I.41)

## 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.52** *The rewards and sanctions scheme was explained to boys on arrival and they told us that they understood how it worked. It was not particularly motivational and in our survey, only 39% of boys said that the different levels made them change their behaviour.*

**I.53** The rewards and sanctions scheme was explained to boys on arrival and it was covered in the information booklet. Boys we spoke to said they understood how it worked. Boys transferring from other establishments on the highest level of the scheme retained that status. Most others were given 'a fresh start' and put on to the silver level regardless of whether they had been on a lower level at their previous establishment.

- I.54** At the time of the inspection, 45 boys were on the red (basic) level of the scheme, 107 were on silver (standard) and 43 were on the gold (enhanced) level. Boys on the gold level had additional privileges including an extra visit, access to jobs with a position of trust, and enhanced pay scales. However, in our survey 39% of boys against the comparator of 51% said the different levels made them change their behaviour.

## 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.55** *Physical security was proportionate and reflected the risks posed by the boys held at Wetherby. There was good information exchange between security and other departments and intelligence was well analysed. Key objectives reflected the intelligence received. Strip-searching was only carried out by risk assessment. The prison had a good, supportive relationship with the local police. The number of adjudications was proportionally less than similar establishments. Boys were offered access to advocates before adjudications. Monitoring and oversight of disciplinary procedures were good.*

- I.56** Physical security was proportionate to the risks posed by the boys at Wetherby. The monthly security meeting was well attended and there was a strong emphasis on the safety of boys. The security department was focused on violence and disorder and monthly objectives reflected the intelligence received and were followed up. Information sharing was good, particularly with the safeguarding team. Over 1,800 intelligence reports had been received in the previous six months and good relationships between staff and boys supported good dynamic security. The intelligence received was analysed well and most actions, such as target searching, were carried out quickly. The prison had a good relationship with the local police who shared relevant information about boys.
- I.57** Free movement to activities was well organised. Boys were moved unit by unit in response to an increased number of incidents in recent months during movement times. This had yet to be reviewed. Boys were escorted to activities outside mass movement times. A thorough risk assessment and review process was carried out for activities and boys were not delayed in their access to appropriate work or education activities. A record was kept of all boys who were unable to associate with other identified boys to keep them safe. However, no review was carried out to determine if the risks to their safety remained.
- I.58** All area, cell and strip-searching was now carried out on an intelligence- and risk-led basis and authorised by managers. However, we were concerned to find at least one incident where a young person had been strip-searched under restraint, which was inappropriate. The incident had not been recorded in the strip-search log or referred to the safeguarding team for consideration. The strip-search log also did not include strip-searches carried out in the segregation unit. Strip-searching was not monitored by the safeguarding committee.
- I.59** The number of adjudications was proportionally less than similar establishments. The main charges were for fighting and assaults, reflecting the high levels of violence. Referrals were made to the police where necessary. Adjudications were carried out on the wings; the rooms used were appropriate and the environment child friendly.

- I.60** Adjudication documentation was issued at least the day before the hearing. Boys were contacted by advocates before their hearing and could have an advocate present if they wished. Advocacy services were well embedded and boys we spoke to appreciated the support they were given.
- I.61** In adjudications that we observed, boys were given the chance to have their say. The completed documentation that we reviewed showed that full account was taken of mitigating circumstances. Punishments appeared appropriate for this age group and removal from unit was no longer used as a punishment. Minor reports were used to deal with minor infringements of the rules.
- I.62** Adjudication review meetings took place every quarter and minutes showed a good discussion on adjudications, minor reports and the tariff. Adjudication documents were quality checked by the deputy governor and issues were raised at the meeting and with adjudicating governors.

## Recommendation

- I.63** **All strip-searching should be monitored by the safeguarding children strategy committee.** (Repeated recommendation I.54)

## Housekeeping point

- I.64** The strip-search log should include all incidents of a young person being strip-searched.

## 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.65** *Safeguarding meetings were well attended but the analysis of information to identify trends and patterns of violence was underdeveloped. There had been an increase in the severity of violence since the previous inspection and systems to address this were not effective. Restricted regimes for perpetrators of violence were difficult to manage. Many violent incidents were serious and many involved groups of boys attacking a single victim. The severity of attacks on staff was particularly concerning.*

- I.66** Safeguarding meetings were usually well attended. Although minutes reflected focussed discussions, the analysis of data to identify emerging patterns and trends was underdeveloped.
- I.67** Some of the procedures and protocols in the safeguarding policy to reduce levels of violence were ineffective.
- I.68** There was little evidence that the ABC policy was having an impact on reducing violence. It was implemented inconsistently across the residential units, individual plans were cursory and behaviour targets were generic and not focused on individual need.

- I.69** Boys displaying persistent or serious violent behaviour had restrictions placed on their regime. Some were managed on the basic level of the incentives and earned privileges scheme or were accommodated in the segregation unit. Some were not permitted to have their meals out of cell and were precluded from association in the evening and some were not permitted to attend education or work activities. We estimated that at the time of the inspection, about a quarter of the mainstream population were on some form of regime restriction. Some, who had been excluded from work and education, received as little as an hour a day unlocked from their cells (see section on time out of cell).
- I.70** Different unlocking arrangements for individual boys were confusing and difficult for staff to manage.
- I.71** The number of violent incidents remained too high and had increased slightly since the previous inspection. During the six months before the inspection, 212 acts of violence had been recorded compared with 192 at the previous inspection. Of these, 88 were recorded as assaults on boys, 39 assaults on staff and 85 fights between boys.
- I.72** Some of these incidents were very serious and involved gangs of boys attacking a single young person. We watched CCTV recordings showing groups of boys kicking and punching each other. The use of weapons was not uncommon and we saw more incidents where weapons were used against unarmed boys than at the previous inspection. Much of the violence that we observed was reckless and unpredictable.
- I.73** The severity of assaults on staff was concerning. The prison had recorded at least 19 incidents in 2014 where staff had received serious injuries resulting in more than seven days' sick absence following assaults by boys. We saw recordings of incidents where officers had been punched and kicked repeatedly in the face and body. In one assault, an officer's nose had been broken and another had received serious facial injuries. During the three months October to December 2014, 22 cases of assaults on staff had been referred to the police. (See main recommendation S78.)

## Recommendation

- I.74** The analysis of data on levels of violence should be improved.

## 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.75** *Use of force had increased since our last inspection and was higher than in similar establishments. The full extent of use of force was unclear because some documents were missing. We found evidence of de-escalation in many incidents. Debriefs of boys were carried out by advocates but health care staff did not always see boys quickly enough. Reporting of child protection issues arising from use of force had improved since our last inspection. Oversight of the use of force was poor.*

- I.76** Use of force had increased since our last inspection and was higher than in comparator establishments. MMPR had been fully implemented. There had been 352 incidents of use of force in the previous six months compared to 316 at our last inspection. Pain compliance had been used on at least 19 occasions, almost double the level at the previous inspection, including the use of the mandibular angle technique<sup>6</sup>. Use of pain compliance was inappropriate with this age group and no incident had been referred to the safeguarding team for investigation. Not all video recordings of planned incidents had been retained, although the prison had retrieved CCTV coverage for many spontaneous incidents.
- I.77** Too many documents, such as officer and supervisor reports, were missing and the full extent and level of the use of force were unclear. MMPR specialist staff were too often redeployed to other duties preventing them from collating information. Although MMPR staff made every effort to review incidents quickly, we found some that had not been reviewed until more than 10 days after the incident.
- I.78** Most use of force was spontaneous when staff intervened in fights or assaults. Documentation that we reviewed showed that use of force was justified. There was evidence in documentation and video recordings of staff de-escalating situations and showing bravery in separating boys who were fighting or presenting threatening and abusive behaviour. We were not confident that all boys were seen quickly enough or at all by a member of health care staff following use of force.
- I.79** Debriefs of boys following use of force were carried out by advocates with follow-up debriefs by MMPR staff. Some of the follow-up debriefs did not give a full account of what had happened. Child protection referrals were made and followed up appropriately.
- I.80** Oversight of the use of force by managers was poor and the completion of documentation had not improved. YJB staff carried out separate quality assurance of some incidents of use of force.

## Recommendations

- I.81 Use of force documentation should be completed as soon as possible after an incident.** (Repeated recommendation I.75)
- I.82 Use of force should be monitored by the safeguarding committee and all incidents should be reviewed quickly after the incident has taken place.**
- I.83 MMPR specialist staff should not be redeployed to other duties.**
- I.84 All boys should be seen by health care staff immediately after an incident of use of force.**

## Housekeeping point

- I.85** All planned incidents should be video recorded and recordings kept securely.

---

<sup>6</sup> A form of restraint involving pressure being applied at a point below the ear

## 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.86** *The separation and care unit environment remained unsuitable for holding boys. Significantly fewer boys than at the previous inspection were held in the unit and few boys remained separated for long periods. Reintegration and care planning were poor. Documentation authorising separation was often incomplete. The regime on the care and separation unit was inadequate and boys spent most of their time locked in their cells. Telephone calls and showers were not available every day. Relationships between staff and boys were good. Monitoring of the use of separation was inadequate.*
- I.87** The separation and care unit (SCU) remained a poor environment for boys. Cells were cleaner than previously and there was little graffiti. The exercise yards were bare and austere. Three boys were resident on the unit at the time of the inspection, all for reasons of good order or discipline (GOoD). During the six months before the inspection, 78 boys had been held in the unit, almost half the number held before the previous inspection, which was commendable. Removal from unit as a punishment had ceased and managers no longer authorised boys to be held on the unit unnecessarily before adjudication. The average length of stay in the previous six months was seven days.
- I.88** All boys on the unit for GOoD had been appropriately authorised for separation but documentation often lacked information about the level of search required and the regime for the young person. Documentation showed that all boys on the unit were reviewed regularly and frequently. All reviews were multidisciplinary but reintegration and care planning was poor and identical generic targets had been set for all the boys on the unit when we inspected. There was evidence of more detailed care planning for the few boys who remained on the unit for longer periods. The absence of information prevented us from determining how many boys had returned to normal location.
- I.89** The regime on the unit was inadequate. All the boys we spoke to told us they spent most of their time locked in their cells. There was little evidence of any constructive activities, although staff sometimes allowed boys out of their cells to carry out cleaning work on the unit. Exercise was offered daily and some boys had been able to exercise together. Showers and telephone calls were only offered every other day.
- I.90** Relationships between staff and boys were respectful and boys said they were treated well. Staff knew the boys in their care well, although this was not reflected in the daily comments recorded in boys' files.
- I.91** Monitoring and review of segregation by the safeguarding committee was poor and consisted only of a list of the number of boys in the unit and the reasons for their separation.

## Recommendations

- I.92** Boys in the separation and care unit should be able to have a shower and make a telephone call every day.
- I.93** Use of the separation and care unit should be monitored by the safeguarding committee and kept under constant review.

## 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.94** *The new young people's drug and alcohol support service (YPDASS) was not yet fully operational. Boys were experiencing long waits for one-to-one sessions. No group work was in place. YPDASS workers had to conduct sessions with some boys through closed cell doors. Clinical opiate substitution treatment was rarely needed but suitable arrangements were in place. Drug supply reduction arrangements were appropriate even though the random mandatory drug testing (MDT) programme had all but ceased.*

- I.95** The YPDASS had been in place for three months. Lifeline (a charity providing drug and alcohol services) was delivering an interim service until the new staff team was in place in early February 2015.
- I.96** Psychosocial substance use work was prioritised appropriately for boys assessed as being in the greatest need. However, many boys told us that they were having long waits for one-to-one support. Group work was at an advanced stage of planning but not yet available.
- I.97** Boys who were termed 'unemployed disruptives' were kept behind their doors for much of the day and YPDASS workers had to talk to them through the door. This lacked confidentiality and respect and did little to build a therapeutic relationship.
- I.98** Clinical treatment was rarely needed but all appropriate protocols were in place. No specialist nursing staff worked on site, but there was appropriate access to specialist advice from GPs and substance use nurses at nearby HMP Leeds.
- I.99** In our survey, 19% of boys said it was easy to get drugs at Wetherby. The security department took a good strategic approach to drug supply reduction through effective dissemination of intelligence and targeted searching. However, the random MDT programme had only achieved its target number of tests in one of the six months to December 2014 and the stated random positive rate of 3.6% did not give an accurate picture of the presence of drugs in the establishment.
- I.100** The suspicion testing programme, on the other hand, was more comprehensively applied. During the six months to December 2014, 78 suspicion tests had been conducted and only four had returned positive. This had been interpreted as possible evidence of (currently non-detectable) new psychoactive substances.

**I.101** Boys we spoke to clearly believed that they ran a high risk of being caught if they used drugs, because of the rigorous suspicion-based testing and searching regimes. Subutex and cannabis had been detected in the few positive test results. Finds included some new psychoactive substances, buprenorphine (Subutex) and cannabis.

### **Recommendation**

**I.102** The prison and the YPDASS should work together to ensure that all one-to-one sessions with boys take place in suitably respectful and therapeutic environments and not through closed cell doors.

## 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** *Most boys lived in decent conditions but some cells were grubby and did not have cupboards or shelves. The integral toilets lacked seats and not all were adequately screened. Call bell response times were not analysed. Communal areas were generally clean and well equipped, apart from Anson unit. Some showers were not hot enough and some had graffiti. Boys on remand could not wear their own clothes.*
- 2.2** Two units which had previously been mothballed had been re-opened to make six units. One of these (Benbow) was closed during the inspection for refurbishment. All cells were single occupancy. Most accommodation was reasonable, although some cells, including those on the first night unit, were grubby and did not have cupboards or shelves for boys to store property. Cells had integral sanitation but the toilets had no seats or lids, and not all were adequately screened. Despite this, many boys took pride in keeping their cells clean and tidy.
- 2.3** Showers on units were in individual cubicles. In our survey, 90% of boys said they could have a daily shower against the comparator of 84% and 74% at the previous inspection. Some showers were not hot enough, particularly those on upper landings, and most were reasonably clean but poorly ventilated. Shower doors on Drake unit were covered in graffiti, but generally the level of graffiti in the establishment was low. New arrivals were issued with basic toiletries and further supplies could be purchased from the canteen list.
- 2.4** Cells had call bells; in our survey, 30% of boys said their call bell was answered within five minutes against the comparator of 40%. Call bell response times were not centrally monitored. Access to telephones was reasonable for most boys; 77% said they could make a call every day. Mail was delivered to units daily and boys were allowed to send two letters a week free of charge.
- 2.5** Most communal areas were clean and well equipped except for that on Anson unit which looked grubby with peeling paint.
- 2.6** In our survey, 65% of boys said it was easy to make an application against the comparator of 76% and 83% at the previous inspection. Some boys we spoke to said that responses to applications took too long and some were not answered at all. Some units made a log entry when an application was submitted, but not when a response was received.
- 2.7** Boys on remand were required to wear prison issue clothing and footwear, with t-shirts colour coded for different units. They were able to wear their own underwear and socks. Each unit had a laundry; not all the washing machines were working at the time of the inspection.

## Recommendations

- 2.8** Cells should have appropriate storage facilities and adequately screened toilets with seats and lids.
- 2.9** Showers should be sufficiently hot and kept free of graffiti.
- 2.10** Boys on remand should be able to wear their own clothes.

## Housekeeping points

- 2.11** Response times to in-cell emergency call bells should be monitored to ensure they are responded to within five minutes.
- 2.12** Laundry facilities should be kept in good working order.
- 2.13** Units should log when an application is submitted and when the response is received to monitor and improve timeliness.

## 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.**

**2.14** *The relationships between staff and boys were consistently good, and poor behaviour was challenged appropriately. Consultation meetings did not always take place regularly. Not all boys were aware of the personal officer scheme.*

- 2.15** The relationships between staff and boys were consistently good and almost all interactions that we observed were polite, respectful and supportive. Staff were firm but fair in their dealings with boys and challenged poor behaviour appropriately. Not all staff wore name badges, but there were posters on the units displaying staff photographs and names.
- 2.16** Monthly consultation meetings took place with boys, although some had been missed in the previous six months, we were told because of staff shortages. There was a personal officer scheme and each boy had the name of his personal officer on his cell door. However, not all the boys we spoke to were aware of the scheme. Some said they did not have a specific member of staff they could turn to, which was also reflected in the survey. Personal officer entries on NOMIS (Prison Service IT system) were sometimes infrequent and lacked detail.

## Recommendation

- 2.17** **Personal officers should introduce themselves to boys as soon as possible after arrival, and undertake and record regular and meaningful welfare checks.**

## Housekeeping point

- 2.18 Consultation meetings should be held regularly.

## 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 *Strategic management of equality and diversity was effective. The distinct needs of boys with protected characteristics were recognised early, addressed and regularly reviewed by the equality manager. Monitoring of the treatment and conditions of boys across protected characteristics was reasonably good. Services for most foreign national boys and those with disabilities were reasonable, but there were no consultation and support groups. Support for Travellers and gay or bisexual boys was developing and was better than we often see. Responses to discrimination incident report forms were good and quality assurance was very good.*

## Strategic management

- 2.20 The diversity and equality policy had not been reviewed since early 2013. Although it focused quite heavily on legal obligations, and less on meeting the individual needs of boys, its content remained relevant and its implementation in terms of monitoring outcomes and meeting the needs of boys was reasonably good.
- 2.21 There was a competent full-time equality manager and a well constructed equality action group (EAG). EAG meetings took place every three months and were chaired by a member of the senior management team, usually the governor. Most departments were represented and minutes showed that issues raised were followed up and some were carried over to the next meeting. Good use was made of monitoring data for the treatment of all protected characteristics; they were discussed in detail and some meaningful actions were taken. Statistical analysis of information was comprehensive and the implementation of an agreed race and equality action plan was monitored effectively.
- 2.22 Equality and diversity representatives had been appointed on three of the five wings but their role, to provide first-hand support to boys, was not well advertised. Many boys we spoke to said that they were not aware of equality representatives.
- 2.23 About 50 discrimination incident report forms (DIRFs) had been submitted in the six months before the inspection. They had all been investigated thoroughly and there was evidence of one-to-one discussions with those involved. Responses were quality assured by the head of safeguarding and often the governor. Some complaints relating to equality and diversity were made through the general complaints system. These were dealt with appropriately and referred to the equality manager for investigation. It was clear that complaints of discrimination against staff were taken seriously, and there was evidence of action being taken in appropriate cases.

- 2.24** The equality officer continued to attend a quarterly scrutiny meeting with senior staff from other Yorkshire prisons to share learning from investigations. Prisoners and external scrutineers also attended these meetings and quality assured a random sample of complaints. Boys from Wetherby attended the scrutiny meetings only when they were held at Wetherby. We considered this to be good practice.

## Recommendation

- 2.25** **The equality policy should be updated.**

## Good practice

- 2.26** *The involvement of the establishment in an area scrutiny panel, which included boys attending the meetings when they were held at Wetherby, strengthened the quality assurance of investigations into complaints of discrimination.*

## Diverse needs

- 2.27** About a quarter of the population were from a black or minority ethnic background and in our survey outcomes for them were generally comparable with white boys: 67% of boys from a black or minority ethnic background said that most staff treated them with respect; 7% said they had been threatened or intimidated; and 19% said that they currently felt unsafe. These results were similar for white boys.
- 2.28** However, 15% of boys from a black or minority ethnic background said they had been victimised by other boys and 10% by staff because of their race or ethnicity against 0% of white boys.
- 2.29** Boys from black and minority ethnic groups whom we spoke to were all quite positive about their treatment and said they felt supported and their needs were generally met. We observed good relationships between staff and boys and a reasonable personal officer scheme also helped to ensure that boys with protected characteristics received the help and support they needed.
- 2.30** Our survey indicated that approximately 8% of the population were from a Gypsy, Romany or Traveller background, while the prison had identified about 3% of the population. Although there was no formal help group for these young men, they received regular individual support. The equality manager and the chaplaincy were aware of their personal circumstances, met them frequently and dealt with specific needs as they arose. These boys all told us that they felt well supported.
- 2.31** Systems to identify boys with a disability were effective. Reception screening was thorough and boys were asked to declare any disabilities. A disability screening form was completed during induction and boys were asked again during health care interviews. In our survey, 15% of respondents identified themselves as having a disability, which reflected the prison records. Personal emergency and evacuation plans (PEEPs) were completed for all boys who required them and care plans had been raised for boys with more complex needs.
- 2.32** However, boys who considered themselves to have a disability reported more negatively than others in some important areas in our survey. For example, a third of respondents said that they felt unsafe at the moment, 52% said that they had been victimised by other boys and 33% by staff.

- 2.33** At the time of the inspection, there were 19 foreign national boys including an Albanian and two Vietnamese boys who spoke very little English. Use of a telephone interpretation service had improved since the last inspection, particularly on C wing where the two Vietnamese boys were located. The service was used appropriately and residential and reception staff used telephone interpreters confidently. There was a touch screen kiosk on C wing which provided a good range of prison information in five languages, including Vietnamese.
- 2.34** Day-to-day support for foreign national boys was reasonably good. All were assigned a case worker who met boys at regular formal case management meetings and informally on residential units every week. However, there were no forums for foreign national groups. Boys could make an international call to their families each month whether or not they had received visits and there was no limit to the number of letters they could send.
- 2.35** The establishment had identified only two boys who were gay or bisexual, who were located on the Keppel unit. This was outside the scope of this inspection. Their needs were met through good relationships with residential officers and regular contact with the equality manager. We saw examples on residential units of staff identifying and minimising homophobic language and behaviour.
- 2.36** The MESMAC group, a sexual health organisation based in York, regularly attended to offer support to the boys on Keppel unit and delivered awareness sessions to boys on the main site.

## Recommendations

- 2.37** **The poor perceptions of safety by boys who consider themselves to have a disability should be addressed.**
- 2.38** **Consultation and peer support groups should be held for all boys with protected characteristics.**

## Faith and religious activity

### Expected outcomes:

**All children and young people are able to practise their religion. The chaplaincy plays a full part in establishment life and contributes to young people's overall care, support and resettlement.**

**2.39** *The chaplaincy was well integrated and delivered good services for all faiths. A wide range of useful groups and courses was provided.*

- 2.40** The chaplaincy was active, visible and well integrated, delivering good services for all faiths. The team comprised a full-time managing chaplain supported by sessional and part-time chaplains covering all the main religions.
- 2.41** The multi-faith centre was located in a modern building near the residential units and provided a good environment for corporate worship for all faiths. Facilities were very good and included comfortable seating areas and a well equipped washing area for Muslim boys to prepare for prayers.

- 2.42** Most boys had good access to corporate worship/faith meetings each week and access to chaplains of their faith in private every week. Timings for corporate worship were well advertised and boys could usually attend without making prior applications.
- 2.43** Chaplains attended meetings at which individual boys were discussed, such as ACCT<sup>7</sup> reviews and safeguarding meetings. They knew the boys well and provided valuable one-to-one support to some of the most vulnerable boys.
- 2.44** The chaplaincy facilitated an excellent range of courses, groups and support sessions. The In2Out<sup>8</sup> programme was an excellent initiative, providing support before and after release from community mentors. Other courses such as the Alpha course, Islamic faith exploration groups, Bible and Qur'an studies and spiritual guidance groups were well attended.
- 2.45** In our survey, 53% of respondents said that their religious beliefs were respected and 59% that it was easy to attend services.

## 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.**

**2.46** *Responses to complaints were polite, but not all dealt with the issue adequately or were sufficiently timely. Boys had been advised not to use the complaints system for some issues, which was inappropriate.*

- 2.47** The night orderly officer emptied the complaints boxes daily. All complaints were logged and detailed analysis was undertaken; 230 complaints had been submitted in the previous six months but there were no consistent trends and complaints covered a wide range of issues. All responses were quality assured but, while most were polite, not all dealt with the issue sufficiently well. About 15% of complaints in the previous six months had not been responded to quickly enough.
- 2.48** We were concerned to see a badly worded staff notice on one of the units saying that boys should not use the complaints system for issues such as visits or property. Encouraging resolution through discussion with wing staff was appropriate, but prohibiting written complaints about these concerns was not.

## Recommendation

- 2.49** **All responses to complaints should be timely, should address the issue and should be underpinned by a robust quality assurance process.**

<sup>7</sup> Assessment, care in custody and teamwork case management reviews

<sup>8</sup> In2Out is a charity which seeks to reduce re-offending by young people who have been detained in custody

## Housekeeping point

**2.50** Boys should be free to use the complaints system without restrictions on the issue raised.

## Legal rights

### Expected outcomes:

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

**2.51** *Caseworkers explained to boys their legal rights and status. Arrangements for boys to contact legal advisers had improved since the previous inspection. Professional visitors expressed mixed views about the arrangements to see boys. Early and late release decisions were taken appropriately.*

**2.52** Boys' legal rights and custodial status were explained to them by their caseworker and they were given a useful booklet prepared by the casework department. Caseworkers checked with remanded boys at their initial meeting if they wanted to make a bail application, and liaised with community youth offending team (YOT) workers to ensure boys were able to do this. Fifty-three boys had been granted bail during the six months before the inspection. Three members of staff with legal advice training were available to support boys, and the internal advocacy service also provided advice.

**2.53** The procedure for boys to contact their legal advisers had been clarified in a policy which staff and boys were familiar with. Calls were free and confidential and boys could write free letters to their legal advisers. Legal visits were held on weekdays in closed booths or in the open area of the visits hall. Professional visitors we spoke to had mixed views on the ease of booking appointments and getting into the establishment. They also told us that at some formal meetings to discuss boys' needs there was a lack of information from key departments (see section on training planning and remand management).

**2.54** Early or late release arrangements for boys serving a detention and training order were used appropriately (see section on pre-release and resettlement).

## 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.**

**2.55** *Health services were reasonably good and most boys we spoke to were satisfied with the quality of health care. Partnership working and clinical governance were reasonably good, although some aspects required further review. There was an appropriate range of primary care services, with good access to a GP and nurse-led clinics. Waiting times to see the optician were too long. The health centre was well equipped, although the wing treatment rooms did not meet infection control standards. Dental services were reasonably good, although there was limited oral health promotion. The mental health team had divided into a primary team which was developing and a secondary team which provided a very good multidisciplinary service.*

### Governance arrangements

- 2.56** Health services were commissioned by NHS England and provided by Leeds Community Healthcare NHS Trust. The health needs assessment was out of date, although two individual services had been reviewed in 2014 including dental services. Partnership working was developing with a new governor and new interim service manager and commissioners planned to re-tender health services during 2015.
- 2.57** Twenty-four-hour health care services were provided with a minimum of a trained nurse and health care assistant on duty at night. During the day, services were provided by a primary care team, primary mental health team and a secondary care mental health team. The service had experienced staff sickness and was awaiting clearance for recruited staff; regular agency and bank staff had been used to meet the deficit. New substantive post holders and agency staff had a thorough induction and felt supported.
- 2.58** There was a proposed structure for managerial and clinical supervision, although this had not been fully implemented and too few staff had formal managerial supervision. Clinical supervision varied, although it was good in the secondary care mental health service. Mandatory training was well managed.
- 2.59** There was a good range of policies and procedures including access to multi-agency safeguarding procedures and links with the Children Looked After team in Leeds. Staff were aware of the systems for the prevention of communicable diseases and the action to take in the event of an outbreak.
- 2.60** The health care centre was clean and well equipped but the two treatment rooms on the wings did not meet infection control standards. The emergency equipment, including an automated external defibrillator (AED) in each treatment room and in the health care unit, was in good order and checked regularly.
- 2.61** There was no confidential health care complaints system and health care complaints were made through the general complaints system, which was inappropriate. Six concerns had been raised since April 2014 all of which had received timely and appropriate responses. Seven compliments had been received.

- 2.62** Health care staff attended incidents of self-harm and injury and reported on the establishment form F213 and in the individual's clinical record. Monitoring of the type and severity of these incidents was not undertaken and the use of the NHS clinical incident reporting system required further review to ensure that all appropriate incidents were being reported.
- 2.63** Health promotion and education was provided during individual consultations. Health promotion material was available in the health centre but limited information displayed on the wings was out of date.
- 2.64** Boys had access to age-appropriate disease prevention and screening programmes and immunisations and vaccinations. Barrier protection was not available.

## Recommendations

- 2.65** **There should be a full health needs assessment to ensure that the services commissioned meet the needs of the population.**
- 2.66** **All staff should have regular recorded clinical and managerial supervision.**
- 2.67** **All areas for the treatment of patients should meet infection control standards and be fit for purpose.**
- 2.68** **Boys should be able to complain about health services through a well publicised confidential system.**
- 2.69** **An effective incident reporting and monitoring system should be established and outcomes analysed to improve service delivery.**
- 2.70** **Barrier protection should be available supported by a policy appropriate to the needs of boys.**

## Housekeeping point

- 2.71** Health promotion boards should display up-to-date health information across the establishment.

## Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.72** All boys had an initial screening in reception by a mental health nurse to assess any immediate health risks, including mental health and substance misuse. Confidentiality, consent and information sharing were explained and any safeguarding concerns highlighted. A comprehensive secondary physical health screen was usually completed the following day, including an appointment with the GP, and involvement with other agencies was identified. The assessments we observed were undertaken in a professional and sensitive manner.
- 2.73** There was good access to a GP and other appointments, but boys waited too long to see the optician. The non-attendance rate for all health care appointments had increased during the last few months, but the reasons for this were not clear.

- 2.74** An appropriate range of nurse-led clinics was available and a weekly clinic for boys with long-term physical conditions was provided by a team of community based nurses with specialist training who offered clinics to all the prisons in Leeds. A children looked after specialist nurse completed more detailed assessments and liaised with community services. Staff levels had delayed this work; an additional specialist nurse had recently started.
- 2.75** GPs were contracted from a local practice to deliver a daily clinic apart from on Sunday. Out-of-hours cover was provided when required.
- 2.76** Four in-patient cells in the main health care centre were used if there was a clinical need and a therapeutic regime was provided. Only one of the cells was in use which we were told was common. Staff had positive interactions with the young person and good communication with custody staff who attended when required. No health care officer was allocated to the unit.
- 2.77** Boys were seen daily by health care staff in the care and separation unit and on other occasions when required.
- 2.78** External hospital appointments were well managed, although a few appointments had been cancelled because no custody staff were available.
- 2.79** Clinical records and appointments were maintained electronically using SystmOne and records that we observed were of a good standard. Staff used assessment templates which reflected national clinical guidance, although care planning was of a variable standard.

## Recommendations

- 2.80** **Boys should have timely access to an optician.**
- 2.81** **The failure-to-attend rate for all clinics should be investigated and appropriate measures taken to improve the use of clinics.**

## Housekeeping point

- 2.82** There should be a consistent approach to the standard of care planning which should be regularly reviewed and updated.

## Pharmacy

- 2.83** Medicines were supplied and dispensed by the pharmacy at HMP Wealstun. A pharmacy technician managed stock and completed some medicine administration. An additional pharmacy technician was being recruited, but there was minimal pharmacist input to support the pharmacy technician and to give advice to boys.
- 2.84** Most medicines were supplied as patient named items and were appropriately labelled. An adequate range of emergency stock was available. A good range of policies and procedures were used, including an in-possession policy. Most medicines were supplied as not in possession and completed risk assessments were kept with the patient's prescription and recorded on SystmOne. Pharmacy issues were discussed at the monthly Leeds prisons integrated governance meeting. There was an agreed prescribing formulary.

- 2.85** Recording of the refrigerator temperature in a treatment room was not robust enough. Most medicines were stored securely, although a medicine trolley was not secured when not in use.
- 2.86** Date checking was carried out but not documented. Medication returned for disposal and drug alerts was appropriately managed. Controlled drugs registers were compliant with the regulations and running balances were audited daily.
- 2.87** Medicine administration took place three times a day at appropriate times and was recorded accurately on prescription charts. Patients refusing on three consecutive occasions were referred to the prescriber for review. Due to staff shortages, there had been occasions when controlled drugs were administered by only one member of staff, which did not meet best practice standards.
- 2.88** There was good provision for medication on discharge and court appearances.

## Recommendations

- 2.89** **A pharmacist should visit the establishment regularly to check the systems in operation and support the pharmacy technician. Pharmacy led clinics, clinical audit and medication review should be provided.**
- 2.90** **There should be two staff present during the administration of a controlled drug in line with best practice.**

## Housekeeping points

- 2.91** Date checks for all medication should be documented.
- 2.92** The medicine trolley on E and F wing should be secured when not in use.
- 2.93** The maximum and minimum temperatures should be recorded daily for all medical refrigerators to ensure that heat sensitive items are stored within 2-8 degrees C range.

## Dentistry

- 2.94** Dental services were to be delivered by an independent dentist and dental nurse until the end of February 2015 when the dental contract was due to transfer to Leeds Community Health NHS Trust.
- 2.95** The large dental suite in the main health care building was adequately furnished. A separate decontamination room and new flooring had been installed since our last inspection and the environment was clean. Emergency resuscitation equipment and medicines were located in the surgery and appropriately maintained. Contracts for equipment were held by the establishment and NHS England, although we did not see these.
- 2.96** Two sessions a week met the need with an effective referral system and acceptable waiting times. However, there was no oral health promotion strategy.

## Recommendation

**2.97** There should be an oral health promotion strategy which embraces national guidance and provides an excellent standard of oral health promotion.

## Delivery of care (mental health)

**2.98** Custody staff received mental health awareness training during induction. The child and adolescent mental health service (CAMHS) was to deliver future sessions.

**2.99** The integrated mental health service had recently divided into a primary mental health team, which was a developing service with three out of seven staff in post, and a secondary care multi-professional CAMHS team. The teams met regularly to ensure continuity of care and both provided input to the assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) process.

**2.100** Primary team mental health nurses completed reception screening and provided support or referred to CAMHS when a greater level of input was required, or the young person was known to the community CAMHS team.

**2.101** The CAMHS team included a consultant psychiatrist, clinical psychologist, occupational therapist, creative therapist, mental health nurses, a learning disability nurse and a speech and language therapist. The team caseload was 95. Care was delivered from the CAMHS day unit and an assertive outreach model was offered on the units. Care and interventions included further mental health assessment, one-to-one psychological therapies, psychiatrist clinics, early interventions for first episode psychosis, drama therapy and an impressive range of group work including independent living skills. Since October 2014 an average of one session a week had been cancelled at very short notice because no custody staff were available, which had a negative impact on service delivery to a vulnerable client group.

**2.102** No young person with serious and enduring mental health problems had been transferred under the Mental Health Act to a specialist secondary or tertiary care unit from the main site during the previous six months. However, two boys had been transferred to the Keppel Unit and had later been transferred to specialist secure mental health facilities within an acceptable timeframe.

## Recommendations

**2.103** Continuing mental health awareness training should be established for custody staff.

**2.104** Boys should have regular planned interventions without disruption or cancellation.

## 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.**

**2.105** *More boys than at comparator prisons liked the food, and the meals we sampled were good. Boys dined in association for most meals but lunch was served at cell doors, which was disrespectful.*

**2.106** In our survey, 24% of boys said that the food was good or very good against the comparator of 16%. The food we sampled was good and, although some boys we spoke to were unhappy with them, the portion sizes that we saw were reasonable.

**2.107** Boys were given a pre-select menu two weeks in advance, which catered for specific diets such as halal and vegetarian. A breakfast pack was issued to boys during the week, with a hot breakfast provided at weekends, and the evening meal was a hot meal. We welcomed the fact that boys were able to dine in association for these meals but the cold lunch was served at cell doors while boys were locked up, which was not respectful. A themed meal was served once a month which had included Greek, Italian and Mexican food. There were food comments books on each wing but these were rarely used. A catering survey was carried out twice a year, but the return rate was very low.

**2.108** One boy was working towards his NVQ in hospitality and catering. Another had completed this qualification and was still working in the kitchen. There was capacity for more boys in the kitchen, although this had not been addressed.

### Recommendations

**2.109** **Boys should be able to dine in association for all meals.**

**2.110** **More boys should have the opportunity to work in the kitchen and local hospitality industry, and gain qualifications in catering.** (repeated recommendation 2.88)

### Housekeeping point

**2.111** Boys should be encouraged to complete the catering survey.

## 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.**

**2.112** *The content of the reception grocery pack<sup>9</sup> remained the same. Boys now received the pack and pin credit free of charge and could order additional packs. Purchases could still be ordered only once a week.*

**2.113** Canteen provision during reception had improved. Boys were given one reception pack, worth over £6, free of charge on arrival and £4 free pin phone credit. Boys with the necessary funds could request additional canteen packs. However, the content of the reception packs had not changed and was still only enough to meet immediate needs. A full canteen order could only be placed once a week and some boys waited up to 10 days to receive a full order. Orders were made on Tuesdays and goods delivered in sealed bags on Friday of the following week. We were told that purchasing arrangements with DHL still prevented the establishment from changing this.

**2.114** The range of items on the canteen list was good and different groups of boys, including Muslims, had been consulted to ensure there were enough items to meet their needs. Boys were able to make larger purchases from catalogues and to order newspapers and magazines. Families and friends were permitted to send in CDs. Consultation about the canteen took place at the boys' consultation meetings and DHL staff attended these meetings approximately every six months. Some changes had been made to the canteen list following consultation.

### Recommendations

**2.115** **Boys should be able to place an order with the prison shop within 24 hours of their arrival.**

**2.116** **The content of the reception packs should be reviewed in consultation with boys to ensure it meets their needs until they receive their first full order.**

---

<sup>9</sup> Usually contains basic food and drink items such as tea, milk, sugar and sweets

## Section 3. Purposeful activity

### Time out of cell

#### Expected outcomes:

**Children and young people spend most of their time out of their cell, engaged in activities such as education, leisure and cultural pursuits, seven days a week.<sup>10</sup>**

**3.1** *Most boys had about seven hours unlocked during weekdays and about six at weekends. However, a significant number on different restricted regimes had much less time out of cell. Some boys had as little as an hour a day unlocked.*

**3.2** We calculated that most boys had just over seven hours out of cell Monday to Friday and about six hours at the weekend. Unlocking usually started and ended on time, although we saw occasional slippage in the regime with some late unlocking.

**3.3** Time unlocked was unacceptably poor for a small but significant number of boys on restricted regimes on the residential units. We calculated that many received about three hours a day out of cell and we saw examples of boys receiving only an hour a day (see section on violence reduction).

**3.4** During roll checks in the middle of the core day, we found that 30% of the population were locked in their cells. On Collingwood unit, 44% of the population was locked up.

**3.5** Exercise was limited to half an hour a day on weekdays. Facilities in the exercise yards were poor.

#### Recommendations

**3.6 All boys should receive a full regime.**

**3.7 Boys should be given the opportunity to spend at least one hour in the open air every day.** (Repeated recommendation 3.7)

<sup>10</sup> Time out of cell, in addition to formal 'purposeful activity', includes any time children and young people are out of their cells to associate or use communal facilities to take showers or make telephone calls.

## Education, learning and skills

Inspection of the provision of education and educational standards, as well as vocational training in YOIs for young people, is undertaken by the Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted<sup>11</sup>) working under the general direction of HM Inspectorate of Prisons. For information on how Ofsted inspects education and training see the Ofsted framework and handbook for inspection.

### Expected outcomes:

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

**3.8** *Leadership and management in learning and skills were good. The quality of teaching and learning was also good, as was behaviour management, but attendance was poor. There was an appropriate range of provision for learning and skills. Outcomes were good but there was a need to ensure that boys did not drop out of courses, particularly functional skills. Access to the library was poor but access to the gym was good.*

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

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

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

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

*Effectiveness of leadership and management of learning and skills and work activities: Good*

## Management of education and learning and skills

**3.10** Strategic leadership was good. Managers had a good grasp of where improvement was needed and were taking appropriate action to improve the quality of teaching, learning and assessment. The education and vocational training provided by The Manchester College (TMC) was good. The college and the establishment collaborated to provide bespoke learning pathways suited to the needs of individual boys. Their joint resources were used well. The prison's and TMC's self-assessment reports were broadly accurate and improvement plans were clear, ambitious and set out well the progress made since the previous inspection.

<sup>11</sup> Ofsted is the Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills. It reports directly to the UK Parliament and is independent and impartial. It (inter alia) inspects and regulates services that provide education and skills for all ages, including those in custody. For information on Ofsted's inspection framework, please visit: <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk>.

- 3.11 Poor attendance had a significantly negative impact on outcomes; TMC reported an average weekly attendance of 74%. Data were collected but not always analysed to inform management decisions, which inhibited planning and allocation. Effective links with local authorities and other partners supported transition arrangements from custody to the community.
- 3.12 Staff were well motivated. A programme of continuing professional development was in place with good uptake. Not all teachers, however, were refreshing their subject knowledge and classroom skills through, for example, linking with local schools, colleges or professional networks.
- 3.13 The prison and TMC were undertaking detailed work in preparation for the new transforming youth custody initiative which would increase the amount of educational input being delivered.
- 3.14 A group of staff known as 'creative champions' worked well together to promote equality and diversity across the curriculum. Some teachers capitalised on such opportunities to reinforce equality and diversity in the classroom but this was not universal.

## Recommendations

- 3.15 **All prison departments should cooperate to ensure that more boys attend their planned activities.**
- 3.16 **The Manchester College should improve their analysis of data to better inform curriculum planning and allocation.**
- 3.17 **Teachers should be encouraged to extend their subject expertise by linking with good providers in the community.**

## Provision of activities

- 3.18 The curriculum encompassed broad academic, vocational and enrichment opportunities and offered sufficient choice. There were enough activity places to meet the needs of the population and additional places had been introduced as the population had increased. More activities were planned to reflect the new 30-hour week curriculum to be introduced from March 2015. However, take-up of places was low and allocation processes were not refined enough to ensure that boys were always on the right course and at the right level.
- 3.19 In education, courses in English and mathematics were offered from entry level 1 to level 2. A 'step-up' course was offered for the more able learners. Advanced-level courses were available for higher-level learners in a good range of subjects. Courses in bricklaying and carpentry were only offered at level 1 with no progression routes. In cleaning services, learners could progress from entry to level 1 and in business and information technology courses, from level 1 to level 3. A good range of personal development opportunities were available, including an award in mentoring.
- 3.20 In the education and vocational areas, there were about 114 full-time equivalent places of which 71% were allocated but with only 51% occupancy. Fifty-two places were available in work and 30 for induction. A further 50 boys were on a range of programmes, were unemployed or refusing to attend their activity place.

- 3.21** Boys had the opportunity to develop social and vocational skills in farms and gardens, composting and recycling work, the PE academy, Army cadet course and the 'bike project'. Most offered accredited qualifications. Citizenship was offered by the YMCA, and The Dogs Trust ran a four-week programme on the responsible care of dogs. Boys could also work as orderlies and cleaners.

## Recommendations

- 3.22** Allocation procedures should be improved to ensure that all places are used and that boys are placed on courses most appropriate to their needs.
- 3.23** When the curriculum is reviewed under transforming youth custody, greater attention should be placed to providing progression routes in vocational areas through qualifications that will enable learners to access work or further training on release.

## Quality of provision

- 3.24** The quality of teaching, learning and assessment was mostly good and in a few cases outstanding. The best teachers, in group and one-to-one settings, were skilled in enabling boys to consolidate their previous learning through well-designed relevant sessions and good questioning. They managed challenging behaviour calmly, sensitively and with determination. Most boys were receptive to this approach and participated well in lessons and workshops. In the few weaker cases, teachers did not provide enough challenge to engage boys in learning.
- 3.25** In vocational training and at work, boys benefited from good individual coaching. Most classes were small which enabled the trainers to give individual attention promptly. Boys in the bicycle workshop made very good progress. The Army cadet course was highly effective in developing learners' social and life skills. Boys spoke proudly of the new skills that they had acquired and all were very positive about the impact the course had had on their lives, skills and attitudes.
- 3.26** Boys with additional learning needs were identified well through initial assessment and supported effectively. All completed a basic skills assessment in English and mathematics and all were assessed for dyslexia. Where indicated, they had further diagnostic assessments to identify specific learning needs. The induction programme was planned and sequenced appropriately. It incorporated accredited manual handling, first aid and food hygiene courses which prepared boys well to participate safely in work and vocational training.
- 3.27** Teaching and workshop environments were good and well equipped and resources were up to date. However, in information technology equipment and software were poor and outdated.

## Recommendations

- 3.28** The Manchester College should share the best practice demonstrated by their most effective teachers to help less skilled and experienced staff improve the content and delivery of their lessons.
- 3.29** The planned replacement of IT equipment and software should be carried out as a priority.

## Education and vocational achievements

- 3.30** Most learners who completed their course achieved a qualification. On personal and social development courses, during 2013 to 2014, overall achievement rates were high at 96%. Similarly on vocational training, rates were high at 90%. Advanced-level success rates in English and mathematics were good. However, in functional skills, too many learners did not complete their qualification.
- 3.31** The prison's strategy to raise skills levels through compulsory English and mathematics was good. However, entry level learners had five half-day sessions each week, while those at entry 3 level and above had only one class of 90 minutes each week which reduced their pace of learning and the consolidation of their skills.
- 3.32** In vocational training, skills development was good and learners took pride in their work and achievements. In the bicycle workshop, learners developed very good problem-solving skills and worked with diligence to produce a high standard product. In brickwork, good displays of higher-level work encouraged learners to aspire to develop their skills above the level 1 qualification that they were working towards.
- 3.33** At work, officer instructors worked hard, with some success, to instil a work ethic in the boys.
- 3.34** The quality of most learners' written work met the standard of the award they were taking. However, teachers did not give enough advice to learners on how they could improve their work. For example, teachers' remarks included 'proof read your work' without directing learners to specific mistakes to help them focus on and reduce the common errors that they made.

## Recommendations

- 3.35** **TMC and prison staff should work together to reduce the number of boys who fail to complete their functional skills qualifications.**
- 3.36** **Teachers should provide boys with detailed advice on how they can improve their work.**

## Library

- 3.37** The library, provided by Leeds Library and Information Services, was staffed by two library assistants and overseen by an area manager. It had been relocated since the previous inspection to the education block, where it provided a welcoming environment. However, no teachers took the opportunity to use the facility as a learning resource to enhance their teaching and learning. The library was open on three days, two evenings and Saturday mornings, giving most learners the opportunity to attend at least once a week. However, staffing issues reduced significantly the opportunities to escort boys to the library. As a result, attendance was poor with few boys using the facilities. The highest users were staff who called in to borrow books for learners.
- 3.38** Boys did not receive information about the library on entry to the establishment to promote its services. Some activities, such as the six-book challenge, promoted literacy, but too few

boys were using the facilities to benefit. The Storybook Dads<sup>12</sup> initiative had just started and one boy had taken part. Themed events and displays promoted diversity.

- 3.39** The stock of books was adequate to meet the needs of the boys and provided a range of fiction, non-fiction, foreign language, easy and short reads, and graphic novels. Two computers allowed learners to take the driving theory test or play games during their library visit. A small range of books was available in the health care area and in the care and separation unit. A limited range of legal texts and Prison Service Instructions were available to loan.

## Recommendation

- 3.40** All learners should receive information about library services at induction and should be able to use the library at least once a week.

## 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.**

- 3.41** *PE facilities were good and of benefit to boys. The recreational programme was varied and access was good. PE instructors worked well with individual boys with specific needs to improve their health and wellbeing. Accidents and incidents were appropriately reported and managed. The PE academy offered a broad range of courses which supported boys' health and wellbeing and resettlement. There were some good initiatives with external clubs to help reintegrate boys into their community on release. The showers were in a poor state of repair.*

- 3.42** PE facilities were good and equipment was old but serviceable. New equipment was on order to upgrade facilities. Boys benefited from a good-sized sports hall with a climbing wall, a well-equipped cardiovascular and weights suite, an outdoor all-weather pitch and two classrooms. Good attention was paid to the health and safety of boys. There were sufficient screened shower facilities but the fabric of the room, with peeling plaster, needed repair.
- 3.43** The recreational programme offered boys a wide and varied range of team games and activities which promoted good team-building skills and relationships between boys. The views of boys were regularly surveyed to adapt the programme of activities to meet their needs where possible.
- 3.44** Access to PE was good with a minimum of two sessions every seven days. All learners participated in a PE induction. Referrals between health care and PE ensured that boys with specific health needs were screened before undertaking exercise. PE instructors worked well with individual boys with specific needs to improve their health and wellbeing. Accidents and incidents were appropriately reported and managed.

<sup>12</sup> In which prisoners record stories for their children

- 3.45** The PE academy offered a broad range of courses which supported boys' health and wellbeing, including active IQ at level 1, healthy living, gym instructor, diet and nutrition courses at levels 1 and 2, and first aid and emergency first aid. On occasions, PE staff had to be redeployed and sessions had to be cancelled. The good initiative between PE, psychology and programmes staff to address poor behaviour patterns in boys was no longer running.
- 3.46** There were good partnerships with Everton and Leeds football clubs, who worked with boys to help them reintegrate into the community on release. A Sky Sports initiative linked a world class athlete with the PE department who worked successfully with boys on vocational courses as a mentor and role model. However, there were still no opportunities for boys to play against visiting teams.

## Recommendations

- 3.47 The showers should be refurbished as a priority.**
- 3.48 The collective initiative between PE, psychology and programmes staff to address poor behaviour patterns in boys should be reinstated.**
- 3.49 The prison should provide opportunities for boys to play against visiting teams from the community.**



## Section 4. Resettlement

### Pre-release and resettlement

#### Expected outcomes:

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

**4.1** *The reducing re-offending strategy was reviewed each year and was based on an annual needs analysis. More emphasis was needed for boys serving long-term sentences and those with a sexual element to their offending. Implementation of the strategy was monitored by a reducing re-offending strategy meeting, but was hampered by a lack of information about boys after release. The casework team continued to provide good support to boys. Release on temporary licence was still used to help boys prepare for their return to the community, but less often than previously.*

**4.2** A resettlement needs analysis was carried out annually and used to inform the reducing re-offending strategy. Coverage of boys serving indeterminate sentences was appropriate but more emphasis was needed on the support and services available to boys serving longer, determinate sentences and boys with a sexual element to their offending. The quarterly reducing reoffending strategy meeting oversaw implementation of the strategy and attendance by internal departments and community partners was good.

**4.3** There were no data to facilitate the follow up of resettlement and reoffending outcomes for boys after they left Wetherby. Attempts to secure data from partner agencies had not been successful, and staffing constraints had limited the ability of the casework team to attend initial reviews in the community after release. Managers were establishing good links with relevant resettlement consortia<sup>13</sup> to aid the follow up of boys after release.

**4.4** The delivery of reducing re-offending services continued to be well coordinated by a multidisciplinary casework team. The team included operational and non-operational staff and an appropriate mix of custodial and community experience and knowledge. Caseworkers who were operational could be, and were, cross deployed to work on residential units when there were staff shortages. In recognition of this, they carried a slightly lower caseload. Nevertheless, this put an additional strain on the team and in some cases prevented as much spontaneous contact with boys as the caseworkers would have liked. Caseworkers each managed a caseload of remanded and sentenced boys, and worked in pods which included their administration support workers. Dedicated caseworkers spent a lot of their time on the Anson unit for boys serving longer and indeterminate sentences and were well known to the boys there.

**4.5** Boys were allocated to a caseworker on arrival. Risk and resettlement needs were identified quickly and there was an appropriate focus on preventing re-offending. In our survey, 36% of boys said that their caseworker helped them to prepare for release against the comparator of 50%. The reasons for this were unclear. Review meetings led by caseworkers were taking place regularly at which plans for release were discussed. Some very good work was being

<sup>13</sup> Strategic forums developed by the Youth Justice Board to improve links between the secure estate, youth offending teams and local authorities, in order to improve resettlement outcomes for young people released from custody

undertaken with boys serving long sentences who would be transferring to the adult estate. In our survey, the percentage of boys who knew who to ask for help with a problem was similar to comparator establishments over all resettlement pathways.

- 4.6** The procedure for assessing boys eligible for ROTL remained very good. All boys who applied were interviewed and, if unsuccessful, were given feedback and information on how to achieve ROTL opportunities. There was an appeals procedure for boys who wanted to appeal against their ROTL decision. During the six months before the inspection, 46 boys had been approved for ROTL from 101 who had applied. We were concerned that some boys who applied had unrealistic expectations about the likelihood of achieving ROTL, a concern that had also been expressed by a parent in a family forum meeting. ROTL was linked to sentence plan targets and placements included community reparation work, appointments to view possible accommodation in the community and family contact. Education and employment options after release could have been better promoted (see section on reintegration planning, education, training and employment).
- 4.7** In contrast to what we have found elsewhere effective use was made of the late release provisions of detention and training orders. This was initiated where young people had demonstrably and wittingly failed to achieve reasonably set training plan objectives and targets. Boys were made aware of early and late release arrangements at their first meetings with caseworkers, and late releases had been sought for some boys who had not engaged with their training plan requirements or worked to reduce the risk they posed. During the previous six months, two out of three applications to the court for a late release had been approved. In another case a boy had improved his behaviour and engagement when the real possibility of a late release was discussed with him in a training planning meeting. Early release provisions were also properly applied and 28 out of 42 applications had been approved in the preceding six months.

## Recommendation

- 4.8** **There should be a systematic collection of resettlement and re-offending outcomes for boys who leave Wetherby.** (Repeated recommendation 4.7)

## Training planning and remand management

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 4.9** *Training and remand management planning arrangements were good, but attendance at review meetings by staff other than caseworkers was not good enough. Public protection arrangements were good, as was the management of boys on indeterminate sentences. Transition arrangements for boys moving to the young adult estate continued to develop well. Identification of boys who had looked-after status was efficient and they received good support from the prison social workers. Good efforts were made to help boys receive the support they were entitled to by maintaining close links with their home local authority.*

- 4.10** Boys were allocated to a caseworker on arrival who took the lead on managing the boy's training or remand management plan. Initial plans were mostly developed within the appropriate timescales. Files checked during the inspection showed that boys had individual plans relevant to their needs. They were not given a copy of their own plan and targets, and in our survey only 46% of boys said they had a training plan. A pilot scheme had recently started to give boys on remand a copy of their targets. Eighty-nine per cent of the boys who knew they had a training plan said they had been involved in the development of the plan and 96% said they understood the targets in their plan. Targets were followed up at subsequent reviews. Boys on remand had training plans and access to the same services as sentenced boys.
- 4.11** Training planning and remand management meetings were timely, with good attendance by community YOTs. Attendance by other departments in the establishment was poor. Staff from residential units and education who had important roles to play in helping boys to work towards their training plan targets did not routinely attend the meetings. This work needed greater priority. The flow of information into the casework department was also erratic, and caseworkers were sometimes dependent on electronic case management notes which were not comprehensive. One professional visitor to a review meeting mentioned to us the lack of information available on the boy involved and said it was not uncommon. Family members were encouraged to attend the meetings, and caseworkers described community YOTs as supportive in getting families to the meetings. In a meeting that we observed the boy was encouraged to take part and was appropriately challenged when he showed a lack of insight into his offending.

## Recommendation

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

## Housekeeping point

- 4.13** Boys should be given a copy of the targets they are working towards.

## Public protection

- 4.14** The public protection policy was comprehensive and up to date. Boys who might present a risk to the public were identified in reception and records were checked by administrative staff in the casework team. Boys were placed on a database and discussed at the next interdepartmental risk management meeting (IDRM); this meeting took place monthly and was well attended. Minutes showed that boys considered to be a risk were discussed fully, including consideration of possible release arrangements. Statutory agencies were contacted if concerns were raised.
- 4.15** Boys who needed to be considered under multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPAs) were identified, and reports submitted to MAPPA meetings.
- 4.16** Proper attention was paid to the need for restrictions on contact that some boys had with people outside the establishment. Decisions on whom boys had contact with were made at the IDRM meeting, and restrictions were imposed on mail, telephone contact and visits when it was deemed necessary. These restrictions were kept under regular review and lifted when it was felt that the risk had reduced.

## Indeterminate sentence young people

- 4.17** At the time of the inspection, 11 boys were serving mandatory life sentences and one an indeterminate sentence for public protection. They, and other boys serving sentences of more than six years, were accommodated on the Anson unit. Anson was the only specialist long-term secure unit for boys in England and Wales and could hold up to 48 boys, many of whom were long distances from home. At the time of the inspection, preparations were being made for the imminent move of the unit to the refurbished Benbow unit.
- 4.18** Training planning arrangements for boys serving indeterminate and long sentences remained comprehensive and the boys benefited from a dedicated group of caseworkers. Boys remained subject to an additional care planning process which was appropriate given their level of risk. The processes to manage lifer documentation and parole applications were efficient and thorough.
- 4.19** Most of the boys on the unit, and at the establishment in general, moved to a young adult establishment at the age of 18. The management of this transition had progressed since the last inspection and was now very good and still improving. The good links with young adult establishments had been maintained and extended to other establishments. Staff from one young adult establishment were now attending the final training review meetings for boys at Wetherby and attention was being paid to identifying receiving prisons where educational and other work could be continued. Unusually, two boys from Wetherby had been assessed for category D adult status before their transfers and both had transferred to open prisons.

## Looked-after children

- 4.20** Since the previous inspection, the three prison based social workers had become well integrated and the range of boys they worked with had been extended to include children in need, as well as looked-after children. We were told that, in practice, they were now involved with about 80% of the population at any one time. Priority was given to boys who needed help and were not receiving it from external sources.
- 4.21** The social work team identified relevant cases on admission and contacted the appropriate local authorities to advise them that a young person whom they were responsible for had been admitted to custody and remind them of their obligations. The social workers maintained close links with their community colleagues and continued to try to ensure that looked-after children were reviewed by their local authority while in custody. In most cases these arrangements worked well, although not all boys received the financial support they were entitled to and the social workers tried to help them with this. Caseworkers were appreciative of the social workers' contribution and valued their attendance at local authority review meetings when this was possible.

## 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.**

**4.22** *Reintegration planning remained effective. The mentoring scheme was now embedded. Obtaining suitable accommodation for some boys remained an issue. Health care and drugs and alcohol planning for boys after release was good and some improvements had been made to work on finance, benefit and debt. Improvements to the visits facilities had started and family days for boys from all units had recently been introduced. There was an appropriate range of programmes, but the change in contractual arrangements for work with boys with a sexual element to their offending had left some of these boys without support.*

**4.23** Boys had appropriate release plans which were prepared by their community YOT worker. These were discussed during training planning meetings so that boys were prepared for the conditions on which they were released.

**4.24** The In2Out mentoring programme had developed very well and was providing mentors to boys in custody and after release. In2Out was delivered by a voluntary organisation, and was extending its network of volunteer mentors to reflect the wide range of geographic areas that boys returned to on release.

**4.25** Practical release arrangements remained good; boys had access to their money, were given a holdall for their belongings and could have new clothes handed in or have their existing clothes washed ready for release. All boys were expected to be met by a responsible person at the gate on the day of their release to take them to their accommodation; this was organised at training planning meetings.

### Accommodation

**4.26** In our survey, 18% of boys said they thought they would have a problem with finding accommodation when they were released. Accommodation needs were assessed early and updated throughout the young person's sentence. Proper attention was given to boys for whom there were public protection concerns or who were considered a risk to the public. We were told that no boys had left the establishment without an address to go to but, in common with similar establishments, despite the best efforts of all involved in their care, some boys did not have an address confirmed until very close to their release. The needs of hard-to-place boys were escalated as required with the support of the on-site social workers and advocates and legal input when needed.

### Education, training and employment

**4.27** Teaching and learning support staff were well aware of the need to prepare boys for resettlement. Education support services were tenacious and effective in sourcing boys' previous educational records and in negotiating further education and training places. Information, advice and guidance staff were well established and were realistic and pragmatic in managing the expectations of boys for their future career aims. All boys attended a pre-release course to sharpen the skills needed to live independently. The Manchester College

(TMC) managers contributed to a regional multi-agency forum working to strengthen transition arrangements for all boys leaving custody. Links with YOTs were improving but still required further development. There were too few instances of ROTL being used to support transition to further study or employment and the effectiveness of education, training and employment was undermined by weak operational links with the casework team. Efforts by TMC to develop tracking procedures to record boys remaining in positive activities in the community were a good first step.

## Recommendation

- 4.28 Operational links between the casework team and The Manchester College should be strengthened to improve ROTL opportunities and resettlement outcomes.**

## Health care

- 4.29** Pre-release arrangements for boys were good. There was effective liaison with community services to ensure that boys with serious and enduring mental health conditions continued to be managed appropriately on release. Boys were given medication appropriately and care was coordinated with community agencies as required.

## Drugs and alcohol

- 4.30** The young people's drug and alcohol support service (YPDASS) ensured that release plans were completed. Well targeted harm reduction and other substance use awareness information was given out during release planning sessions. Family intervention visits were not yet in place, although plans were well advanced for their introduction once the full YPDASS staff team was in place from the end of February 2015.

## Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.31** Some progress had been made since the previous inspection. Boys were now able to open a bank account with Leeds City Credit Union and boys who would benefit from having an account were encouraged to consider opening one. A representative from Job Centre Plus attended the establishment regularly to talk to boys as part of the pre-release course and to see boys individually. Boys were able to submit their applications for benefits before release. Some money management advice was available from the education department. Social workers helped looked-after children to manage their finances while in custody and other boys received informal advice from caseworkers and residential staff.

## Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.32** In our survey, only 28% of boys said they usually received a visit once a week, compared with 42% at similar establishments. Establishment figures indicated that 70% of boys were more than 50 miles from home. Just over three-quarters of boys said they could use the telephone every day. There was no other technology to supplement family contact for boys whose families found it difficult to visit.

- 4.33** A local visitors' scheme operated for boys who did not receive other visits. Caseworkers received regular lists of boys who had not had a visit for a month so they could follow up any family problems and talk to the boy. Caseworkers updated families and were the first point of contact for many families if they had any concerns.
- 4.34** The Anson unit held regular family days, and the first family day for boys on the other units had been held in December 2014. Two courses, 'Family Talk' and 'Building Bridges', enabled boys to work with their families to repair their relationships. Through-the-gate support from a local YOT was available for some boys who had completed 'Building Bridges' and their families.
- 4.35** Domestic visits were held on Wednesday afternoon and evening, Saturday morning and afternoon and Sunday afternoon. The Wednesday evening session had recently been reinstated and lasted 1.25 hours. Other visits sessions lasted two hours. Visits entitlements were included in the information pack sent to carers/parents, usually within a day of a boy arriving at Wetherby. The visits entitlement for sentenced boys was two weekend and one midweek visits a month, and for remanded boys one visit a week, which remained inadequate. Visits could be booked by telephone or email. Some parents had said in the visitors' forum that staff on the telephone booking line were sometimes unclear about the differing visits entitlements of remanded and sentenced boys.
- 4.36** Regular visitor forum sessions had started in the visitors' centre during weekend visits which was providing useful feedback on how visitors thought that family contact arrangements could be improved. There was no process to ensure that visitors who booked in first were taken into the visits hall first and some visitors waited outside the gate in all weathers after booking in. This had been identified as a weakness and was being addressed.
- 4.37** The visits hall was being refurbished and was clean and tidy, as were the visitors' toilets. There was a small unsupervised children's play area with some toys. The small tea bar did not open for weekday visits and visitors had to use vending machines instead. The absence of hot food represented a gap in services, given the distance many visitors had to travel and the lack of alternative facilities nearby.
- 4.38** The visits session that we observed was relaxed and started on time, although boys said this was not always the case. Staff observation during visits was not intrusive. Boys wore their prison issue clothing for visits. Boys whose visitors did not arrive within 10 to 15 minutes of the start of visits were asked to confirm contact numbers for their visitors so staff could check if they were on their way.

## Recommendations

- 4.39** **Alternative means of facilitating contact between boys and their families, making use of widely available technology, should be provided to supplement visits.**
- 4.40** **There should be no limit on the number of visits remanded boys can receive.**
- 4.41** **The visitors' centre and visits hall should offer a better environment, including supervised children's play areas and a wider and healthier range of refreshments.** (Repeated recommendation 4.50)

## Housekeeping point

- 4.42** Staff on the visits booking line should be clear about the visits entitlements of remanded and sentenced boys.

## Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.43** Boys had access to an appropriate range of personal development group programmes and the opportunity for individual work with psychologists, social workers and mental health specialists.
- 4.44** The personal development programmes delivered were the accredited juvenile estate thinking skills (JETS), and three locally approved programmes: ACCESS, TEAM and STOP. The ACCESS programme focused on problem solving, communication and assertiveness skills, TEAM was an emotional control programme and STOP was aimed at increasing awareness of the impact of offending. A review of STOP was in progress. Boys were referred to the psychology department where they were assessed for suitability for the programme. Boys on Anson had access to another programme, Life Minus Violence, which was designed for boys who had committed violent offences and took nine months to complete. Boys on the main site were not able to participate in this programme and were instead offered one-to-one work with a member of the psychology team. Other staff working with boys understood the objectives of their programme work and the behaviours that needed to be encouraged.
- 4.45** Since the previous inspection, the national contract with The Lucy Faithfull Foundation for assessment and treatment of boys who had sexually abused others had been terminated and there had been a lengthy gap in provision while a replacement service was introduced. This planning weakness meant boys who had been convicted of a sexual offence were not being given the opportunity to reduce the level of risk they presented.

## Recommendation

- 4.46** **Gaps in the provision of necessary services and interventions should not occur because of changes to contractual arrangements.**

# Section 5. Recommendations and housekeeping points

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

## Main recommendation To the Youth Justice Board and NOMS

- 5.1** The issue of excessive time spent in court cells and associated late arrivals should be resolved as a priority. (S76)

## Main recommendations To the governor

- 5.2** The separation and care unit should be improved so that it is a suitable environment in which to work with difficult and challenging boys. All boys in the separation and care unit should have detailed care and reintegration plans, based on an initial and ongoing assessment of their risks and needs, with access to as full a regime as possible and with specific and time-bound targets. (S77)
- 5.3** An effective, comprehensive strategy should be developed in order to understand and reduce the high levels of violence among boys. (S78)

## Recommendation To the Youth Justice Board and NOMS

### Courts, escort and transfers

- 5.4** Boys should not be transported with adult prisoners. (I.4)

## Recommendation To the Youth Justice Board

### Reintegration planning

- 5.5** Gaps in the provision of necessary services and interventions should not occur because of changes to contractual arrangements. (4.46)

## Recommendations To the governor

### Early days in custody

- 5.6** All new arrivals should be given the opportunity to speak to a peer mentor before they are locked up for the night. (I.13)

- 5.7** First night risk management plans should be relevant to the young person's needs and identified risks, and managers should monitor quality through robust quality assurance. (1.14)
- 5.8** All new arrivals should receive a good quality induction to the prison. (1.15)
- 5.9** Numbers should be added to pin phones quickly so that boys can maintain contact with their families on arrival. (1.16)

#### Care and protection of children and young people

- 5.10** Formal systems should be fully developed to support victims of bullying. (1.38)
- 5.11** The quality of care maps should be improved. (1.46)

#### Behaviour management

- 5.12** All aspects of behaviour management should be included in the strategy. Thorough monitoring should be carried out to identify trends and actions taken to address issues that arise. (1.50)
- 5.13** Staff undertaking mediation should be trained in its use and the use of mediation should be monitored. (1.51)
- 5.14** All strip-searching should be monitored by the safeguarding children strategy committee. (1.63)
- 5.15** The analysis of data on levels of violence should be improved. (1.74)
- 5.16** Use of force documentation should be completed as soon as possible after an incident. (1.81)
- 5.17** Use of force should be monitored by the safeguarding committee and all incidents should be reviewed quickly after the incident has taken place. (1.82)
- 5.18** MMPR specialist staff should not be redeployed to other duties. (1.83)
- 5.19** All boys should be seen by health care staff immediately after an incident of use of force. (1.84)
- 5.20** Boys in the separation and care unit should be able to have a shower and make a telephone call every day. (1.92)
- 5.21** Use of the separation and care unit should be monitored by the safeguarding committee and kept under constant review. (1.93)

#### Substance misuse

- 5.22** The prison and the YPDASS should work together to ensure that all one-to-one sessions with boys take place in suitably respectful and therapeutic environments and not through closed cell doors. (1.102)

#### Residential units

- 5.23** Cells should have appropriate storage facilities and adequately screened toilets with seats and lids. (2.8)

- 5.24** Showers should be sufficiently hot and kept free of graffiti. (2.9)
- 5.25** Boys on remand should be able to wear their own clothes. (2.10)

### Relationships between staff and children and young people

- 5.26** Personal officers should introduce themselves to boys as soon as possible after arrival, and undertake and record regular and meaningful welfare checks. (2.17)

### Equality and diversity

- 5.27** The equality policy should be updated. (2.25)
- 5.28** The poor perceptions of safety by boys who consider themselves to have a disability should be addressed. (2.37)
- 5.29** Consultation and peer support groups should be held for all boys with protected characteristics. (2.38)

### Complaints

- 5.30** All responses to complaints should be timely, should address the issue and should be underpinned by a robust quality assurance process. (2.49)

### Health services

- 5.31** There should be a full health needs assessment to ensure that the services commissioned meet the needs of the population. (2.65)
- 5.32** All staff should have regular recorded clinical and managerial supervision. (2.66)
- 5.33** All areas for the treatment of patients should meet infection control standards and be fit for purpose. (2.67)
- 5.34** Boys should be able to complain about health services through a well publicised confidential system. (2.68)
- 5.35** An effective incident reporting and monitoring system should be established and outcomes analysed to improve service delivery. (2.69)
- 5.36** Barrier protection should be available supported by a policy appropriate to the needs of boys. (2.70)
- 5.37** Boys should have timely access to an optician. (2.80)
- 5.38** The failure-to-attend rate for all clinics should be investigated and appropriate measures taken to improve the use of clinics. (2.81)
- 5.39** A pharmacist should visit the establishment regularly to check the systems in operation and support the pharmacy technician. Pharmacy led clinics, clinical audit and medication review should be provided. (2.89)

- 5.40** There should be two staff present during the administration of a controlled drug in line with best practice. (2.90)
- 5.41** There should be an oral health promotion strategy which embraces national guidance and provides an excellent standard of oral health promotion. (2.97)
- 5.42** Continuing mental health awareness training should be established for custody staff. (2.103)
- 5.43** Boys should have regular planned interventions without disruption or cancellation. (2.104)

#### Catering

- 5.44** Boys should be able to dine in association for all meals. (2.109)
- 5.45** More boys should have the opportunity to work in the kitchen and local hospitality industry, and gain qualifications in catering. (2.110)

#### Purchases

- 5.46** Boys should be able to place an order with the prison shop within 24 hours of their arrival. (2.115)
- 5.47** The content of the reception packs should be reviewed in consultation with boys to ensure it meets their needs until they receive their first full order. (2.116)

#### Time out of cell

- 5.48** All boys should receive a full regime. (3.6)
- 5.49** Boys should be given the opportunity to spend at least one hour in the open air every day. (Repeated recommendation 3.7). (3.7)

#### Education, learning and skills

- 5.50** All prison departments should cooperate to ensure that more boys attend their planned activities. (3.15)
- 5.51** The Manchester College should improve their analysis of data to better inform curriculum planning and allocation. (3.16)
- 5.52** Teachers should be encouraged to extend their subject expertise by linking with good providers in the community. (3.17)
- 5.53** Allocation procedures should be improved to ensure that all places are used and that boys are placed on courses most appropriate to their needs. (3.22)
- 5.54** When the curriculum is reviewed under transforming youth custody, greater attention should be placed to providing progression routes in vocational areas through qualifications that will enable learners to access work or further training on release. (3.23)
- 5.55** The Manchester College should share the best practice demonstrated by their most effective teachers to help less skilled and experienced staff improve the content and delivery of their lessons. (3.28)

- 5.56** The planned replacement of IT equipment and software should be carried out as a priority. (3.29)
- 5.57** TMC and prison staff should work together to reduce the number of boys who fail to complete their functional skills qualifications. (3.35)
- 5.58** Teachers should provide boys with detailed advice on how they can improve their work. (3.36)
- 5.59** All learners should receive information about library services at induction and should be able to use the library at least once a week. (3.40)

### Physical education and healthy living

- 5.60** The showers should be refurbished as a priority. (3.47)
- 5.61** The collective initiative between PE, psychology and programmes staff to address poor behaviour patterns in boys should be reinstated. (3.48)
- 5.62** The prison should provide opportunities for boys to play against visiting teams from the community. (3.49)

### Pre-release and resettlement

- 5.63** There should be a systematic collection of resettlement and re-offending outcomes for boys who leave Wetherby. (4.8)

### Training planning and remand management

- 5.64** Staff from all relevant departments should be represented at training planning or remand management reviews or submit a detailed report if they cannot attend. (4.12)

### Reintegration planning

- 5.65** Operational links between the casework team and The Manchester College should be strengthened to improve ROTL opportunities and resettlement outcomes. (4.28)
- 5.66** Alternative means of facilitating contact between boys and their families, making use of widely available technology, should be provided to supplement visits. (4.39)
- 5.67** There should be no limit on the number of visits remanded boys can receive. (4.40)
- 5.68** The visitors' centre and visits hall should offer a better environment, including supervised children's play areas and a wider and healthier range of refreshments. (4.41)

## Housekeeping points

### Early days in custody

- 5.69** The information booklet should be kept up to date. (1.17)

### **Behaviour management**

- 5.70** The strip-search log should include all incidents of a young person being strip-searched. (1.64)
- 5.71** All planned incidents should be video recorded and recordings kept securely. (1.85)

### **Residential units**

- 5.72** Response times to in-cell emergency call bells should be monitored to ensure they are responded to within five minutes. (2.11)
- 5.73** Laundry facilities should be kept in good working order. (2.12)
- 5.74** Units should log when an application is submitted and when the response is received to monitor and improve timeliness. (2.13)

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

- 5.75** Consultation meetings should be held regularly. (2.18)

### **Complaints**

- 5.76** Boys should be free to use the complaints system without restrictions on the issue raised. (2.50)

### **Health services**

- 5.77** Health promotion boards should display up-to-date health information across the establishment. (2.71)
- 5.78** There should be a consistent approach to the standard of care planning which should be regularly reviewed and updated. (2.82)
- 5.79** Date checks for all medication should be documented. (2.91)
- 5.80** The medicine trolley on E and F wing should be secured when not in use. (2.92)
- 5.81** The maximum and minimum temperatures should be recorded daily for all medical refrigerators to ensure that heat sensitive items are stored within 2-8°C range. (2.93)

### **Catering**

- 5.82** Boys should be encouraged to complete the catering survey. (2.111)

### **Training planning and remand management**

- 5.83** Boys should be given a copy of the targets they are working towards. (4.13)

### **Reintegration planning**

- 5.84** Staff on the visits booking line should be clear about the visits entitlements of remanded and sentenced boys. (4.42)

## Example of good practice

### Equality and diversity

- 5.85** The involvement of the establishment in an area scrutiny panel, which included boys attending the meetings when they were held at Wetherby, strengthened the quality assurance of investigations into complaints of discrimination. (2.26)



## Section 6. Appendices

### Appendix I: Inspection team

Martin Lomas	Deputy chief inspector
Ian MacFadyen	Team leader
Bev Alden	Inspector
Karen Dillon	Inspector
Angela Johnson	Inspector
Gordon Riach	Inspector
Njilan Morris-Jarra	Researcher
Rachel Murray	Researcher
Amy Radford	Researcher

#### **Specialist inspectors**

Paul Roberts	Substance misuse inspector
Maureen Jamieson	Health services inspector
Tony Gallagher	Ofsted inspector
Sheila Willis	Ofsted inspector
Liz Wands-Murray	Care Quality Commission inspector
Rachel O'Callaghan	Pharmacist



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

### Main recommendations

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

**Not achieved**

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

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated S79)

### Recommendations

Boys should not be transported with adult prisoners. (1.3)

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

All boys should receive information about the prison before they are admitted. (1.4)

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

All new arrivals should be given the opportunity to speak to a peer mentor before they are locked up for the night. (1.12)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 1.13)

Toilets in first night accommodation should have seats and lids and should be screened. (1.13)

**Partially achieved**

First night risk management plans should be relevant to the young person's needs and identified risks, and managers should monitor quality through robust quality assurance. (1.14)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 1.14)

Injuries sustained during use of force should be monitored by the safeguarding children strategy meeting. (1.20)

**Not achieved**

Managers should ensure that night observations are not predictable. (1.35)

**Achieved**

Anti-ligature clothing should not be used. (1.36)

**Partially achieved**

Staff undertaking mediation should be trained in its use and the use of mediation should be monitored. (1.41)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 1.51)

The rewards and sanctions scheme should be reviewed annually. In consultation with boys, the scheme should be re-launched and applied consistently across the establishment. (1.47)

**Achieved**

Boys should not be routinely strip-searched. Strip-searching should only be carried out after a thorough risk assessment has identified serious risk of harm to the young person or others, and on the authorisation of a duty governor. (1.53)

**Achieved**

All strip-searching should be monitored by the safeguarding children strategy committee. (1.54)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated 1.63)

Plans for boys on the behaviour change programme should be individual to the young person and should describe the support available to help him achieve his targets. (1.67)

**Not achieved**

There should be regular surveys of all boys on bullying and other antisocial behaviour. (1.68)

**Not achieved**

Use of force documentation should be completed as soon as possible after an incident. (1.75)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated 1.81)

All boys should be seen by health care staff immediately after an incident and they should be fully debriefed by an independent person. (1.76)

**Partially achieved**

Child protection referrals should be made in every case where a young person complains about use of force or when quality assurance procedures show that undue force was used. (1.77)

**Achieved**

Only the minimum amount of force should be used when necessary and pain compliance should not be used with boys. (1.78)

**Partially achieved**

Boys in the SCU should be able to have a shower each day. (1.87)

**Not achieved**

Time allocated to the delivery of interventions for substance misuse problems should be given a higher priority in the cases of greatest need. (1.97)

**Achieved**

## Respect

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

*At the last inspection in 2013, the living conditions were generally reasonable. Relationships between staff and boys were positive and staff were confident about challenging poor behaviour. There was little conflict between boys from different backgrounds and minority groups were well supported. Boy's religious needs were well catered for. There were delays in responding to some complaints and boys were not always able to contact their solicitors. Health care provision was good, particularly in relation to mental health. Boys did not like the food. Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.*

### Recommendations

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

**Not achieved**

All staff should wear their names on their uniform. (2.15)

**Not achieved**

Each young person should have a designated officer on their residential unit as their central point of contact and support. The officer should take responsibility for the young person's care and wellbeing by frequent contact and by attending relevant meetings relating to their care. (2.16)

**Partially achieved**

Equality of treatment for all minority groups should be effectively monitored and appropriate action taken to address inequality (2.25)

**Partially achieved**

Boys with disabilities should have a care plan. (2.35)

**Achieved**

There should be more support for gay and bisexual boys. (2.36)

**Achieved**

Bail applications should be progressed immediately after a young person's arrival, and case workers should have sufficient time to facilitate contact between boys, their legal advisers and community youth offending team workers. (2.55)

**Achieved**

There should be a clear procedure for boys to make free and confidential telephone calls to their legal advisers and this should be explained to all staff and boys. (2.56)

**Achieved**

Boys located on the in-patient unit should have access to a normal regime. (2.67)

**Achieved**

Adequate pharmacy cover should be provided for leave and sickness.(2.73)

**Partially achieved**

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

**Achieved**

More boys should have the opportunity to work in the kitchen and local hospitality industry, and gain qualifications in catering. (2.88)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated 2.110)

Boys should not have to eat their meals in their cells (2.87)

**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. (2.94)

**Partially achieved**

The establishment should consult Muslim boys to ensure that the canteen list includes enough items to meet their needs. (2.95)

**Not achieved**

## Purposeful activity

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

*At the last inspection in 2013, time out of cell for boys was broadly the same as the previous inspection. Boys on basic level were locked up for most of the weekend. Time available for exercise had greatly increased and was now offered daily. Leadership and management of learning and skills and quality assurance were good. The quality of teaching and learning and behaviour management were also good. Some of the accommodation for teaching and learning was poor. There was a strong emphasis on functional skills and the level of achievement had improved. Access to the library and gym were good. Internet access for boys to access community education, training and employment opportunities was not operating. The virtual campus was not operating. Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.*

## Recommendations

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

**Not achieved**

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

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated 3.7)

Outside recreational areas should be equipped with suitable activities and/or games equipment. (3.8)

**Not achieved**

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

**Not achieved**

Specific targets which are focused on the individual learner's needs should be set on personal development courses. (3.28)

**Achieved**

The recruitment of boys from the kitchen in education to the main kitchen for the study of NVQs in hospitality and catering should be improved. (3.29)

**Achieved**

Use of the library should be monitored to ensure the new location for education does not deter boys from using the library. (3.34)

**Not achieved**

Links with the community should be developed to provide opportunities for boys to engage in competitive sport. (3.39)

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

## Recommendations

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

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 4.8)

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

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 4.12)

Up-to-date information on all young adult establishments should be available to boys who are being transferred. (4.22)

**Achieved**

Young adult establishments should be identified where boys transferring from the juvenile estate are able to continue their educational and personal development work. (4.23)

**Partially achieved**

All boys should be given advice on how to claim benefits. (4.39)

**Achieved**

Boys should be helped to open bank accounts. (4.40)

**Achieved**

The visitors' centre and visits hall should offer a better environment, including supervised children's play areas and a wider and healthier range of refreshments. (4.50)

**Not achieved** (Recommendation repeated, 4.41)

The prison should develop links to community services to facilitate support and guidance for visitors to Wetherby. (4.51)

**Partially achieved**

Family days should be available to all boys. (4.52)

**Partially achieved**

Boys receiving treatment from the Lucy Faithfull Foundation should be supported by residential staff who are informed about the work being undertaken with them. (4.57)

**No longer relevant**

## 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 boys	%
Sentenced	163	79.90
Recall	4	1.96
Convicted unsentenced	0	0
Remand	36	17.69
Detainees	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>100</b>

Age	Number of boys	%
15 years	12	5.88
16 years	45	22.06
17 years	127	62.25
18 years	20	9.81
<b>Total</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>100</b>

Nationality	Number of boys	%
British	181	88.72
Foreign nationals	17	8.34
Not Stated	6	2.94
<b>Total</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>100%</b>

Ethnicity	Number of boys	%
White		
British	142	69.60
Irish	2	0.98
Gypsy/Irish Traveller	3	1.47
Other white	7	3.43
<b>Total</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>75.49</b>
Mixed		
White and black Caribbean	9	4.41
White and black African	1	0.5
White and Asian	0	0
Other mixed	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4.46</b>
Asian or Asian British		
Indian	1	0.5
Pakistani	14	7.35
Bangladeshi	1	0.5
Chinese	1	0.5
Other Asian	2	0.98
<b>Total</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>9.83</b>
Black or black British		
Caribbean	13	6.37
African	7	3.43

Other black	1	0.5
Total	21	10.29
Other ethnic group		
Arab		
Other ethnic group	1	0.5
Total	1	0.5
Not stated		
<b>Total</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>100%</b>

Religion	Number of boys	%
Baptist	1	0.5
Church of England	11	5.40
Roman Catholic	32	15.68
Other Christian denominations	25	12.25
Muslim	27	13.22
Sikh	0	0
Hindu	0	0
Buddhist	0	0
Jewish	0	0
Other	1	0.5
No religion	107	52.45
<b>Total</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>100%</b>

Other demographics	Number of boys	%
Gypsy/Romany/Traveller	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>

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

Length of stay	<1mth	1–3mths	3–6mths	6–12mths	1–2 yrs	2 yrs +	4 yrs+	Total
<b>Age</b>								
15 years	2	7	1	0	0	0	0	10
16 years	10	16	6	8	0	0	0	40
17 years	16	31	18	19	11	0	0	95
18 years	3	6	4	6	0	0	0	19
<b>Total</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>164</b>

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

Length of stay	<1mth	1–3 mths	3–6 mths	6–12mths	1–2yrs	2 yrs+	4 yrs+	Total
<b>Age</b>								
15 years	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
16 years	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	8
17 years	18	6	5	0	0	0	0	29
18 years	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>38</b>

Main offence	Number of boys	%
Violence against the person	34	16.66
Sexual offences	15	7.35
Burglary	22	10.78
Robbery	49	24.01
Theft and handling	4	1.99
Fraud and forgery	0	0
Drugs offences	9	4.41
Other offences	71	34.80
Offence not recorded / holding warrant	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

Sentence	4mths	6mths	8mths	10 mths	12 mths	18 mths	24 mths	Recall	Total
<b>Age</b>									
15 years	2	0	1	0	2	0	2	0	7
16 years	7	1	1	0	6	3	7	0	25
17 years	9	0	9	4	9	6	17	0	54
18 years	3	0	1	0	3	5	4	0	16
<b>Total</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>102</b>

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

Sentence	Under 2 yrs	2–3 yrs	3–4 yrs	4–5 yrs	5 yrs +	Recall	Total
<b>Age</b>							
15 years	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16 years	5	0	0	0	0	0	5
17 years	33	0	0	0	0	0	33
18 years	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
18 years	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>41</b>

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

Sentence	Under 2 yrs	2–3 yrs	3–4 yrs	4–5 yrs	5 yrs +	Recall	Total
<b>Age</b>							
15 years	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16 years	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
17 years	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
18 years	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>

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

Sentence	Under 2yrs	2–5 yrs	5–10 yrs	10–15 yrs	15–20 yrs	Recall	Total
<b>Age</b>							
15 years	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16 years	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
17 years	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
18 years	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

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

<b>Sentence</b>	<b>Under 2 yrs</b>	<b>2–5 yrs</b>	<b>5–10 yrs</b>	<b>10–15 yrs</b>	<b>15–20 yrs</b>	<b>20 yrs +</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Age</b>							
15 years	0	0	1	1	0	0	2
16 years	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
17 years	1	0	3	3	0	0	7
18 years	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>11</b>

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

### Children and young people survey methodology

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

### Sampling

Questionnaires were offered to all young people.

### Distributing and collecting questionnaires

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

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

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

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

### Survey response

At the time of the survey on 12 January 2015 the young person population at HMYOI Wetherby was 191. Using the method described above, questionnaires were distributed to 190 young people<sup>14</sup>.

We received a total of 152 completed questionnaires, a response rate of 80%. This included three questionnaires completed via interview. Thirteen respondents refused to complete a questionnaire, 21 questionnaires were not returned and four were returned blank.

---

<sup>14</sup> One young person was at court during the survey visit and therefore did not receive a questionnaire.

<b>Wing/Unit</b>	<b>Number of completed survey returns</b>
Anson	28
C	42
D	38
F	40
Health care	1
Care and separation unit	3

## Presentation of survey results and analyses

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

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

We also present a number of comparative analyses. In all the comparative analyses that follow, statistically significant<sup>15</sup> differences are indicated by shading. Results that are significantly better are indicated by green shading, results that are significantly worse are indicated by blue shading. If the difference is not statistically significant there is no shading. Orange shading has been used to show a statistically significant difference in young people's background details.

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

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

The following comparative analyses are presented:

- The current survey responses from HMYOI Wetherby in 2015 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 six YOIs since August 2013.
- The current survey responses from HMYOI Wetherby in 2015 compared with the responses of young people surveyed at HMYOI Wetherby in 2013.
- A comparison within the 2015 survey between the responses of white young people and those from a black and minority ethnic group.
- A comparison within the 2015 survey between the responses of Muslim young people and non-Muslim young people.
- A comparison within the 2015 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 2015 survey between responses of young people who have been in local authority care and those who have not been in local authority care.
- A best and worst wing analysis within the 2015 survey.

<sup>15</sup> A statistically significant difference between the two samples is one that is unlikely to have arisen by chance alone, and can therefore be assumed to represent a real difference between the two populations. Our significance level is set at 0.05 which means that there is only a 5% likelihood that the difference is due to chance.

## Survey summary

### SECTION I: ABOUT YOU

<b>Q1</b>	<b>How old are you?</b>	
	15 .....	7 (5%)
	16 .....	32 (22%)
	17 .....	93 (63%)
	18 .....	16 (11%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Are you a British citizen?</b>	
	Yes .....	142 (95%)
	No .....	7 (5%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>Do you understand spoken English?</b>	
	Yes .....	147 (98%)
	No .....	3 (2%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Do you understand written English?</b>	
	Yes .....	147 (98%)
	No .....	3 (2%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>What is your ethnic origin?</b>	
	White - British .....	107 (71%)
	White - Irish .....	2 (1%)
	White - Other .....	4 (3%)
	Black or Black British - Caribbean .....	12 (8%)
	Black or Black British - African .....	2 (1%)
	Black or Black British - Other .....	1 (1%)
	Asian or Asian British - Indian .....	0 (0%)
	Asian or Asian British - Pakistani .....	9 (6%)
	Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi .....	1 (1%)
	Asian or Asian British - Chinese .....	0 (0%)
	Asian or Asian British - Other .....	3 (2%)
	Mixed race - White and Black Caribbean .....	3 (2%)
	Mixed race - White and Black African .....	1 (1%)
	Mixed race - White and Asian .....	2 (1%)
	Mixed race - Other .....	1 (1%)
	Arab .....	0 (0%)
	Other ethnic group .....	2 (1%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>What is your religion?</b>	
	None .....	64 (44%)
	Church of England .....	22 (15%)
	Catholic .....	31 (21%)
	Protestant .....	3 (2%)
	Other Christian denomination .....	7 (5%)
	Buddhist .....	0 (0%)
	Hindu .....	0 (0%)
	Jewish .....	0 (0%)
	Muslim .....	20 (14%)
	Sikh .....	0 (0%)

<b>Q7</b>	<b>Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?</b>	
	Yes .....	11 (7%)
	No.....	132 (90%)
	Don't know .....	4 (3%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>Do you have any children?</b>	
	Yes .....	13 (9%)
	No.....	135 (91%)
<b>Q9</b>	<b>Do you consider yourself to have a disability? (i.e. do you need help with any long-term physical, mental or learning needs.)</b>	
	Yes.....	22 (15%)
	No.....	127 (85%)
<b>Q10</b>	<b>Have you ever been in local authority care?</b>	
	Yes .....	47 (32%)
	No.....	98 (68%)

### SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Are you sentenced?</b>	
	Yes .....	127 (85%)
	No - unsentenced/on remand .....	23 (15%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>How long is your sentence (the full DTO sentence)?</b>	
	Not sentenced.....	23 (16%)
	Less than 6 months.....	27 (18%)
	6 to 12 months.....	31 (21%)
	More than 12 months, up to 2 years.....	25 (17%)
	More than 2 years.....	37 (25%)
	Indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP).....	5 (3%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>How long have you been in this establishment?</b>	
	Less than 1 month.....	32 (22%)
	1 to 6 months.....	76 (51%)
	More than 6 months, but less than 12 months.....	21 (14%)
	12 months to 2 years.....	16 (11%)
	More than 2 years.....	3 (2%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?</b>	
	Yes .....	81 (54%)
	No.....	68 (46%)

### SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS

<b>Q1</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?</b>	
	Yes .....	119 (80%)
	No.....	10 (7%)
	Don't remember .....	19 (13%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, were there any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females travelling with you?</b>	
	Yes.....	60 (40%)
	No.....	69 (46%)
	Don't remember .....	20 (13%)

<b>Q3</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?</b>	
	Less than 2 hours .....	77 (52%)
	2 to 4 hours.....	54 (36%)
	More than 4 hours .....	11 (7%)
	Don't remember .....	7 (5%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?</b>	
	My journey was less than 2 hours .....	77 (52%)
	Yes .....	9 (6%)
	No.....	58 (39%)
	Don't remember .....	5 (3%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?</b>	
	My journey was less than 2 hours .....	77 (52%)
	Yes .....	29 (19%)
	No.....	42 (28%)
	Don't remember .....	1 (1%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, how did you feel you were treated by the escort staff?</b>	
	Very well.....	24 (16%)
	Well.....	58 (39%)
	Neither .....	45 (30%)
	Badly.....	4 (3%)
	Very badly .....	4 (3%)
	Don't remember .....	14 (9%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>Before you arrived here, did you receive any information to help you prepare for coming here?</b>	
	Yes - and it was helpful.....	25 (17%)
	Yes - but it was not helpful.....	15 (10%)
	No - I received no information .....	87 (59%)
	Don't remember .....	21 (14%)

#### SECTION 4: FIRST DAYS

<b>Q1</b>	<b>How long were you in reception?</b>	
	Less than 2 hours .....	120 (81%)
	2 hours or longer .....	12 (8%)
	Don't remember .....	17 (11%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?</b>	
	Yes .....	124 (84%)
	No.....	8 (5%)
	Don't remember/Not applicable .....	15 (10%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>How well did you feel you were treated in reception?</b>	
	Very well.....	36 (24%)
	Well.....	67 (45%)
	Neither .....	33 (22%)
	Badly.....	5 (3%)
	Very badly .....	2 (1%)
	Don't remember .....	6 (4%)

<b>Q4</b>	<b>When you first arrived here, did staff ask if you needed help or support with any of the following things? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	Not being able to smoke .....	82 (60%)
	Loss of property .....	31 (23%)
	Feeling scared.....	42 (31%)
	Gang problems.....	42 (31%)
	Contacting family .....	80 (58%)
	Money worries .....	23 (17%)
	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to.....	53 (39%)
	Health problems.....	82 (60%)
	Getting phone numbers.....	59 (43%)
	Staff did not ask me about any of these .....	18 (13%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>When you first arrived here, did you have any of the following problems? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	Not being able to smoke .....	68 (49%)
	Loss of property .....	17 (12%)
	Feeling scared.....	13 (9%)
	Gang problems.....	15 (11%)
	Contacting family .....	40 (29%)
	Money worries .....	14 (10%)
	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to.....	14 (10%)
	Health problems.....	14 (10%)
	Getting phone numbers.....	37 (26%)
	I did not have any problems .....	38 (27%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>When you first arrived here, were you given any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	Toiletries/basic items .....	114 (79%)
	The opportunity to have a shower .....	44 (30%)
	Something to eat.....	124 (86%)
	A free phone call to friends/family.....	109 (75%)
	PIN phone credit.....	72 (50%)
	Information about feeling worried/upset.....	39 (27%)
	Don't remember .....	3 (2%)
	I was not given any of these .....	5 (3%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>Within your first 24 hours here, did you have access to the following people or services? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	Chaplain.....	68 (49%)
	Peer mentor.....	9 (6%)
	Childline/Samaritans.....	18 (13%)
	The prison shop/canteen.....	14 (10%)
	Don't remember .....	31 (22%)
	<b>I did not have access to any of these .....</b>	<b>38 (27%)</b>
<b>Q8</b>	<b>Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?</b>	
	Yes .....	95 (64%)
	No.....	44 (30%)
	Don't remember .....	9 (6%)
<b>Q9</b>	<b>Did you feel safe on your first night here?</b>	
	Yes .....	110 (75%)
	No.....	21 (14%)
	Don't remember .....	16 (11%)
<b>Q10</b>	<b>Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the establishment?</b>	
	I have not been on an induction course .....	21 (14%)
	Yes .....	71 (49%)
	No.....	32 (22%)
	Don't remember .....	22 (15%)

## SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?</b>	
	Yes .....	135 (91%)
	No .....	12 (8%)
	Don't know .....	2 (1%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?</b>	
	Yes .....	44 (30%)
	No.....	89 (61%)
	Don't know .....	14 (10%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>What is the food like here?</b>	
	Very good.....	2 (1%)
	Good.....	32 (22%)
	Neither .....	56 (39%)
	Bad .....	28 (19%)
	Very bad.....	27 (19%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?</b>	
	I have not bought anything yet/Don't know.....	16 (11%)
	Yes .....	74 (52%)
	No.....	52 (37%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>How easy is it for you to attend religious services?</b>	
	I don't want to attend religious services .....	23 (17%)
	Very easy.....	42 (30%)
	Easy .....	40 (29%)
	Neither .....	8 (6%)
	Difficult.....	5 (4%)
	Very difficult.....	2 (1%)
	Don't know .....	19 (14%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>Are you religious beliefs respected?</b>	
	Yes .....	75 (53%)
	No.....	19 (13%)
	Don't know/Not applicable.....	47 (33%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>Can you speak to a Chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?</b>	
	Yes .....	90 (64%)
	No.....	6 (4%)
	Don't know/Not applicable.....	45 (32%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>Can you speak to a peer mentor when you need to?</b>	
	Yes .....	40 (29%)
	No.....	12 (9%)
	Don't know .....	88 (63%)
<b>Q9</b>	<b>Can you speak to a member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board) when you need to?</b>	
	Yes .....	23 (16%)
	No .....	10 (7%)
	Don't know .....	108 (77%)

<b>Q10</b>	<b>Can you speak to an advocate (an outside person to help you) when you need to?</b>	
	Yes .....	62 (44%)
	No.....	7 (5%)
	Don't know .....	72 (51%)

### SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Do most staff treat you with respect?</b>	
	Yes .....	99 (72%)
	No.....	39 (28%)

<b>Q2</b>	<b>If you had a problem, who would you turn to? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	No-one .....	42 (30%)
	Personal officer .....	32 (23%)
	Wing Officer.....	24 (17%)
	Teacher/education staff .....	6 (4%)
	Gym staff .....	0 (0%)
	Chaplain.....	29 (21%)
	Independent Monitoring Board (IMB) .....	4 (3%)
	YOT worker .....	42 (30%)
	Social worker .....	23 (16%)
	Health services staff .....	10 (7%)
	Peer mentor .....	3 (2%)
	Another young person here.....	25 (18%)
	Case worker.....	44 (31%)
	Advocate.....	9 (6%)
	Family/friends.....	74 (53%)
	Childline/Samaritans .....	4 (3%)

<b>Q3</b>	<b>Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?</b>	
	Yes .....	54 (38%)
	No.....	88 (62%)

<b>Q4</b>	<b>When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?</b>	
	I still have not met him/her .....	53 (37%)
	In your first week .....	36 (25%)
	After your first week.....	29 (20%)
	Don't remember .....	24 (17%)

<b>Q5</b>	<b>How often do you see your personal (named) officer?</b>	
	I still have not met him/her .....	53 (38%)
	At least once a week .....	42 (30%)
	Less than once a week.....	44 (32%)

<b>Q6</b>	<b>Do you feel your personal (named) officer tries to help you?</b>	
	I still have not met him/her .....	53 (39%)
	Yes .....	57 (42%)
	No.....	27 (20%)

### SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Is it easy to make an application?</b>	
	Yes .....	93 (65%)
	No.....	22 (15%)
	Don't know .....	27 (19%)

<b>Q2</b>	<b>Are applications sorted out fairly?</b>	
	I have not made an application .....	46 (33%)
	Yes .....	69 (49%)
	No.....	26 (18%)

<b>Q3</b>	<b>Are applications sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?</b>	
	<i>I have not made an application</i> .....	46 (33%)
	Yes .....	46 (33%)
	No.....	48 (34%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Is it easy to make a complaint?</b>	
	Yes .....	74 (52%)
	No.....	13 (9%)
	Don't know .....	55 (39%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>Are complaints sorted out fairly?</b>	
	<i>I have not made a complaint</i> .....	90 (64%)
	Yes .....	18 (13%)
	No.....	33 (23%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>Are complaints sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?</b>	
	<i>I have not made a complaint</i> .....	90 (64%)
	Yes .....	18 (13%)
	No.....	33 (23%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint?</b>	
	Yes .....	7 (5%)
	No.....	76 (55%)
	Never needed to make a complaint.....	55 (40%)

## SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE

<b>Q1</b>	<b>What level of the rewards and sanctions scheme are you on?</b>	
	<i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i> .....	16 (11%)
	<i>Enhanced (top)</i> .....	33 (24%)
	<i>Standard (middle)</i> .....	51 (36%)
	<i>Basic (bottom)</i> .....	32 (23%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	8 (6%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the rewards and sanctions scheme?</b>	
	<i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i> .....	16 (11%)
	Yes .....	66 (47%)
	No.....	37 (26%)
	Don't know .....	21 (15%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>Do the different levels of the rewards and sanctions scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?</b>	
	<i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i> .....	16 (12%)
	Yes .....	53 (39%)
	No.....	54 (39%)
	Don't know .....	14 (10%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Have you had a minor report since you have been here?</b>	
	Yes .....	84 (59%)
	No.....	44 (31%)
	Don't know .....	14 (10%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>If you have had a minor report, was the process explained clearly to you?</b>	
	<i>I have not had a minor report</i> .....	58 (41%)
	Yes .....	64 (46%)
	No.....	18 (13%)

<b>Q6</b>	<b>Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?</b>	
	Yes .....	85 (60%)
	No.....	44 (31%)
	Don't know .....	13 (9%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>If you have had an adjudication ('nicking'), was the process explained clearly to you?</b>	
	<i>I have not had an adjudication</i> .....	57 (41%)
	Yes .....	72 (52%)
	No.....	10 (7%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?</b>	
	Yes .....	47 (33%)
	No.....	85 (60%)
	Don't know .....	10 (7%)
<b>Q9</b>	<b>If you have spent a night in the care and separation unit (CSU), how were you treated by staff?</b>	
	<i>I have not been to the care and separation unit</i> .....	109 (79%)
	Very well.....	9 (7%)
	Well.....	9 (7%)
	Neither .....	7 (5%)
	Badly.....	0 (0%)
	Very badly .....	4 (3%)

### SECTION 9: SAFETY

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Have you ever felt unsafe here?</b>	
	Yes .....	41 (29%)
	No.....	99 (71%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Do you feel unsafe now?</b>	
	Yes .....	20 (14%)
	No.....	119 (86%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	Never felt unsafe .....	99 (74%)
	Everywhere .....	8 (6%)
	Care and separation unit.....	1 (1%)
	Association areas .....	9 (7%)
	Reception area .....	3 (2%)
	At the gym .....	10 (7%)
	In an exercise yard .....	17 (13%)
	At work.....	6 (4%)
	At education .....	16 (12%)
	At religious services.....	4 (3%)
	At meal times .....	11 (8%)
	At healthcare .....	5 (4%)
	Visits area .....	7 (5%)
	In wing showers.....	1 (1%)
	In gym showers .....	10 (7%)
	In corridors/stairwells.....	10 (7%)
	On your landing/wing .....	13 (10%)
	During movement .....	17 (13%)
	In your cell .....	6 (4%)

<b>Q4</b>	<b>Have you ever been victimised by another young person/group of young people here? (e.g. insulted or assaulted you)</b>	
	Yes .....	40 (29%)
	No.....	97 (71%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you, your family or friends)</i> .....	18 (13%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i> .....	14 (10%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i> .....	3 (2%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i> .....	17 (12%)
	<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i> .....	5 (4%)
	<i>Medication</i> .....	2 (1%)
	<i>Debt</i> .....	4 (3%)
	<i>Drugs</i> .....	1 (1%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i> .....	5 (4%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i> .....	3 (2%)
	<i>Your nationality</i> .....	3 (2%)
	<i>You are from a different part of the country to others</i> .....	6 (4%)
	<i>You are from a Traveller community</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Your sexuality</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Your age</i> .....	1 (1%)
	<i>You having a disability</i> .....	1 (1%)
	<i>You were new here</i> .....	7 (5%)
	<i>Your offence/crime</i> .....	5 (4%)
	<i>Gang related issues</i> .....	8 (6%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>Have you ever been victimised by staff here? (e.g. insulted or assaulted you)</b>	
	Yes .....	25 (18%)
	No.....	114 (82%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you, your family or friends)</i> .....	14 (10%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i> .....	7 (5%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i> .....	2 (1%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i> .....	4 (3%)
	<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i> .....	4 (3%)
	<i>Medication</i> .....	2 (1%)
	<i>Debt</i> .....	1 (1%)
	<i>Drugs</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i> .....	3 (2%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Your nationality</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>You are from a different part of the country to others</i> .....	2 (1%)
	<i>You are from a Traveller community</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Your sexuality</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Your age</i> .....	1 (1%)
	<i>You having a disability</i> .....	1 (1%)
	<i>You were new here</i> .....	1 (1%)
	<i>Your offence/crime</i> .....	1 (1%)
	<i>Gang related issues</i> .....	1 (1%)
	<i>Because you made a complaint</i> .....	1 (1%)
<b>Q10</b>	<b>If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?</b>	
	Yes .....	36 (27%)
	No.....	69 (51%)
	Don't know .....	29 (22%)

<b>Q11</b>	<b>Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?</b>		
	Yes .....	41 (30%)	
	No.....	55 (40%)	
	Don't know .....	42 (30%)	

<b>Q12</b>	<b>Is shouting through the windows a problem here?</b>		
	Yes .....	50 (36%)	
	No.....	74 (54%)	
	Don't know .....	14 (10%)	

### SECTION 10: HEALTH SERVICES

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Is it easy to see the following people if you need to?</b>			
		Yes	No	Don't know
	The doctor .....	78 (57%)	31 (23%)	27 (20%)
	The nurse .....	91 (68%)	21 (16%)	21 (16%)
	The dentist .....	45 (34%)	54 (41%)	33 (25%)

<b>Q2</b>	<b>What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?</b>		
	<i>I have not been</i> .....		20 (15%)
	<i>Very good</i> .....		10 (7%)
	<i>Good</i> .....		46 (34%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....		30 (22%)
	<i>Bad</i> .....		18 (13%)
	<i>Very bad</i> .....		12 (9%)

<b>Q3</b>	<b>If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/all of it in your room?</b>		
	<i>I am not taking any medication</i> .....		73 (53%)
	<i>Yes, all of my meds</i> .....		17 (12%)
	<i>Yes, some of my meds</i> .....		25 (18%)
	<i>No</i> .....		23 (17%)

<b>Q4</b>	<b>Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?</b>		
	Yes .....		34 (25%)
	No.....		100 (75%)

<b>Q5</b>	<b>Are you being helped by anyone here with your emotional or mental health problems? (e.g. a psychologist, doctor, counsellor, personal officer or another member of staff.)</b>		
	<i>I do not have any emotional or mental health problems</i> .....		100 (74%)
	Yes .....		22 (16%)
	No.....		14 (10%)

<b>Q6</b>	<b>Did you have problems with alcohol when you first arrived here?</b>		
	Yes .....		10 (7%)
	No.....		128 (93%)

<b>Q7</b>	<b>Have you received any help with alcohol problems here?</b>		
	Yes .....		4 (3%)
	No.....		133 (97%)

<b>Q8</b>	<b>Did you have problems with drugs when you first arrived here?</b>		
	Yes .....		57 (42%)
	No.....		80 (58%)

<b>Q9</b>	<b>Do you have problems with drugs now?</b>		
	Yes .....		9 (7%)
	No.....		128 (93%)

<b>Q10</b>	<b>Have you received any help with drugs problems here?</b>	
	Yes .....	28 (20%)
	No.....	109 (80%)
<b>Q11</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it to get illegal drugs here?</b>	
	Very easy.....	11 (8%)
	Easy.....	15 (11%)
	Neither.....	5 (4%)
	Difficult.....	5 (4%)
	Very difficult.....	14 (10%)
	Don't know.....	85 (63%)

### SECTION II: ACTIVITIES

<b>Q1</b>	<b>How old were you when you were last at school?</b>	
	14 or under .....	65 (49%)
	15 or over.....	69 (51%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Have you ever been excluded from school?</b>	
	Yes.....	122 (90%)
	No.....	11 (8%)
	Not applicable.....	3 (2%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>Did you ever skip school before you came into custody?</b>	
	Yes.....	109 (80%)
	No.....	22 (16%)
	Not applicable.....	5 (4%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Do you CURRENTLY take part in any of the following activities? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	Education.....	89 (65%)
	A job in this establishment.....	66 (49%)
	Vocational or skills training.....	10 (7%)
	Offending behaviour programmes.....	14 (10%)
	I am not currently involved in any of these.....	34 (25%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>If you have been involved in any of the following activities here, do you think they will help you when you leave prison?</b>	
		Not been involved      Yes      No      Don't know
	Education	15 (12%)      66 (52%)      28 (22%)      19 (15%)
	A job in this establishment	16 (14%)      42 (37%)      32 (28%)      24 (21%)
	Vocational or skills training	23 (23%)      29 (29%)      20 (20%)      27 (27%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	25 (25%)      29 (29%)      24 (24%)      22 (22%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>Do you usually have association every day?</b>	
	Yes.....	109 (81%)
	No.....	26 (19%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?</b>	
	Don't want to go.....	29 (21%)
	Yes.....	82 (60%)
	No.....	26 (19%)

<b>Q8</b>	<b>How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?</b>	
	<i>Don't want to go</i> .....	34 (25%)
	<i>None</i> .....	19 (14%)
	<i>One to two times</i> .....	51 (38%)
	<i>Three to five times</i> .....	28 (21%)
	<i>More than five times</i> .....	2 (1%)

### SECTION 12: FAMILY AND FRIENDS

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Are you able to use the telephone every day, if you want to?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	106 (77%)
	<i>No</i> .....	27 (20%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	5 (4%)

<b>Q2</b>	<b>Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	68 (50%)
	<i>No</i> .....	56 (41%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	13 (9%)

<b>Q3</b>	<b>How many visits do you usually have each week, from family or friends?</b>	
	<i>I don't get visits</i> .....	39 (26%)
	<i>Less than one a week</i> .....	38 (26%)
	<i>About one a week</i> .....	39 (26%)
	<i>More than one a week</i> .....	3 (2%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	30 (20%)

<b>Q4</b>	<b>How easy is it for your family and friends to visit you here?</b>	
	<i>I don't get visits</i> .....	39 (29%)
	<i>Very easy</i> .....	14 (10%)
	<i>Easy</i> .....	23 (17%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....	11 (8%)
	<i>Difficult</i> .....	25 (18%)
	<i>Very difficult</i> .....	16 (12%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	8 (6%)

<b>Q5</b>	<b>Do your visits usually start on time?</b>	
	<i>I don't get visits</i> .....	39 (29%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	35 (26%)
	<i>No</i> .....	42 (31%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	19 (14%)

### SECTION 13: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Do you think you will have a problem with any of the following things, when you are released? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Finding accommodation</i> .....	22 (17%)
	<i>Getting into school or college</i> .....	27 (21%)
	<i>Getting a job</i> .....	58 (46%)
	<i>Money/finances</i> .....	43 (34%)
	<i>Claiming benefits</i> .....	16 (13%)
	<i>Continuing health services</i> .....	10 (8%)
	<i>Opening a bank account</i> .....	21 (17%)
	<i>Avoiding bad relationships</i> .....	19 (15%)
	<i>I won't have any problems</i> .....	53 (42%)

<b>Q2</b>	<b>Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan? (i.e. a plan that is discussed in your DTO/planning meetings, which sets out your targets)</b>	
	Yes .....	60 (46%)
	No.....	22 (17%)
	Don't know .....	49 (37%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>Were you involved in the development of your plan?</b>	
	<i>I don't have a plan/don't know if I have a plan</i> .....	71 (55%)
	Yes .....	52 (40%)
	No.....	6 (5%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Do you understand the targets that have been set in your plan?</b>	
	<i>I don't have a plan/don't know if I have a plan</i> .....	71 (55%)
	Yes .....	56 (43%)
	No.....	2 (2%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>Do you have a caseworker here?</b>	
	Yes .....	109 (82%)
	No.....	9 (7%)
	Don't know .....	15 (11%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>Has your caseworker helped to prepare you for release?</b>	
	<i>I don't have a caseworker</i> .....	24 (18%)
	Yes .....	40 (30%)
	No.....	50 (37%)
	Don't know .....	21 (16%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>Has your social worker been to visit you since you have been here?</b>	
	<i>I don't have a social worker</i> .....	52 (39%)
	Yes .....	56 (42%)
	No.....	26 (19%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?</b>	
	Yes .....	51 (38%)
	No.....	62 (47%)
	Don't know .....	20 (15%)
<b>Q9</b>	<b>Do you know who to contact for help with any of the following problems, before your release? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Finding accommodation</i> .....	35 (32%)
	<i>Getting into school or college</i> .....	30 (28%)
	<i>Getting a job</i> .....	37 (34%)
	<i>Help with money/finances</i> .....	29 (27%)
	<i>Help with claiming benefits</i> .....	25 (23%)
	<i>Continuing health services</i> .....	21 (19%)
	<i>Opening a bank account</i> .....	27 (25%)
	<i>Avoiding bad relationships</i> .....	15 (14%)
	<i>I don't know who to contact</i> .....	57 (53%)

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

<i>Not sentenced</i> .....	23 (18%)	<i>Having a mentor (someone you can ask for advice)</i> .....	9 (7%)
<i>Nothing, it is up to me</i> .....	36 (28%)	<i>Having a YOT worker or social worker that I get on with</i> .....	20 (15%)
<i>Making new friends outside</i> .....	23 (18%)	<i>Having children</i> .....	24 (18%)
<i>Going back to live with my family</i> .....	45 (35%)	<i>Having something to do that isn't crime</i>	40 (31%)
<i>Getting a place of my own</i> .....	28 (22%)	<i>This sentence</i> .....	40 (31%)
<i>Getting a job</i> .....	65 (50%)	<i>Getting into school/college</i> .....	31 (24%)
<i>Having a partner (girlfriend or boyfriend)</i> .....	38 (29%)	<i>Talking about my offending behaviour with staff</i> .....	6 (5%)
<i>Staying off alcohol/drugs</i> .....	41 (32%)	<i>Anything else</i> .....	3 (2%)

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

<i>Not sentenced</i> .....	23 (17%)
<i>Yes</i> .....	98 (74%)
<i>No</i> .....	5 (4%)
<i>Don't know</i> .....	7 (5%)

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

<i>Not sentenced</i> .....	23 (17%)
<i>Yes</i> .....	53 (40%)
<i>No</i> .....	58 (43%)

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



### Survey responses from children and young people: HMYOI Wetherby 2015

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

#### Key to tables

		HMYOI Wetherby 2015	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Wetherby 2015	HMYOI Wetherby 2013
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>152</b>	<b>554</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>153</b>
<b>SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU</b>					
1.1	Are you 18 years of age?	11%	13%	11%	13%
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	5%	4%	5%	2%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	98%	99%	98%	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.)	25%	42%	25%	24%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	14%	22%	14%	12%
1.7	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	8%	6%	8%	8%
1.8	Do you have any children?	9%	11%	9%	14%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	15%	18%	15%	18%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	32%	39%	32%	27%
<b>SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE</b>					
2.1	Are you sentenced?	85%	75%	85%	85%
2.2	Is your sentence 12 months or less?	39%	38%	39%	40%
2.3	Have you been in this establishment for one month or less?	22%	16%	22%	15%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	54%	57%	54%	51%
<b>SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS</b>					
On your most recent journey here:					
3.1	Did you feel safe?	80%	85%	80%	90%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	40%	35%	40%	40%
3.3	Did you spend more than 4 hours in the van?	7%	6%	7%	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?	12%	16%	12%	18%
3.5	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	41%	44%	41%	33%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	55%	53%	55%	54%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	17%	16%	17%	17%
<b>SECTION 4: YOUR FIRST FEW DAYS HERE</b>					
4.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	80%	81%	80%	87%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	84%	82%	84%	84%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	69%	70%	69%	61%
When you first arrived, did staff ask if you needed help or support with any of the following:					
4.4a	Not being able to smoke?	60%	49%	60%	56%

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

### Key to tables

		HMYOI Wetherby 2015	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Wetherby 2015	HMYOI Wetherby 2013
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>152</b>	<b>554</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>153</b>
<b>4.4b</b>	Loss of property?	23%	18%	23%	21%
<b>4.4c</b>	Feeling scared?	31%	27%	31%	24%
<b>4.4d</b>	Gang problems?	31%	50%	31%	28%
<b>4.4e</b>	Contacting family?	58%	53%	58%	51%
<b>4.4f</b>	Money worries?	17%	15%	17%	15%
<b>4.4g</b>	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	39%	33%	39%	28%
<b>4.4h</b>	Health problems?	60%	53%	60%	50%
<b>4.4i</b>	Getting phone numbers?	43%	39%	43%	32%
<b>4.5</b>	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	73%	73%	73%	73%
When you first arrived, did you have problems with any of the following:					
<b>4.5a</b>	Not being able to smoke?	49%	42%	49%	54%
<b>4.5b</b>	Loss of property?	12%	11%	12%	12%
<b>4.5c</b>	Feeling scared?	9%	9%	9%	4%
<b>4.5d</b>	Gang problems?	11%	16%	11%	9%
<b>4.5e</b>	Contacting family?	28%	29%	28%	28%
<b>4.5f</b>	Money worries?	10%	14%	10%	11%
<b>4.5g</b>	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	10%	11%	10%	5%
<b>4.5h</b>	Health problems?	10%	12%	10%	12%
<b>4.5i</b>	Getting phone numbers?	27%	29%	27%	25%
When you first arrived, were you given any of the following:					
<b>4.6a</b>	Toiletries/basic items?	79%	80%	79%	76%
<b>4.6b</b>	The opportunity to have a shower?	30%	57%	30%	28%
<b>4.6c</b>	Something to eat?	86%	84%	86%	82%
<b>4.6d</b>	A free phone call to friends/family?	75%	80%	75%	83%
<b>4.6e</b>	PIN phone credit?	50%	60%	50%	64%
<b>4.6f</b>	Information about feeling worried/upset?	27%	35%	27%	27%
Within your first 24 hours, did you have access to the following people or services:					
<b>4.7a</b>	A chaplain?	49%	47%	49%	53%
<b>4.7b</b>	A peer mentor?	6%	15%	6%	8%
<b>4.7c</b>	Childline/Samaritans	13%	21%	13%	12%
<b>4.7d</b>	The prison shop/canteen?	10%	12%	10%	12%
<b>4.8</b>	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	64%	71%	64%	54%
<b>4.9</b>	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	75%	81%	75%	78%
<b>4.10</b>	For those who have been on an induction course: did it cover everything you needed to know about the establishment?	57%	63%	57%	55%
<b>SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT</b>					
<b>5.1</b>	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	90%	84%	90%	74%
<b>5.2</b>	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	30%	40%	30%	23%
<b>5.3</b>	Do you find the food here good/very good?	24%	16%	24%	18%
<b>5.4</b>	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	52%	51%	52%	51%

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

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMYOI Wetherby 2015	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Wetherby 2015	HMYOI Wetherby 2013
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>152</b>	<b>554</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>153</b>
<b>5.5</b>	Is it easy/very easy for you to attend religious services?	<b>59%</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>59%</b>	<b>61%</b>
<b>5.6</b>	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	<b>53%</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>55%</b>
Can you speak to:					
<b>5.7</b>	A chaplain of your faith in private?	<b>64%</b>	<b>69%</b>	<b>64%</b>	<b>76%</b>
<b>5.8</b>	A peer mentor?	<b>28%</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>29%</b>
<b>5.9</b>	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	<b>16%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>18%</b>
<b>5.10</b>	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	<b>44%</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>45%</b>
<b>SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF</b>					
<b>6.1</b>	Do most staff treat you with respect?	<b>72%</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>63%</b>
<b>6.2</b>	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	<b>30%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>20%</b>
<b>6.3</b>	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	<b>38%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>37%</b>
For those who have met their personal officer:					
<b>6.4</b>	Did you meet your personal (named) officer within the first week?	<b>40%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>35%</b>
<b>6.5</b>	Do you see your personal (named) officer at least once a week?	<b>49%</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>47%</b>
<b>6.6</b>	Do you feel your personal (named) officer tries to help you?	<b>68%</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>61%</b>
<b>SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS</b>					
<b>7.1</b>	Is it easy to make an application?	<b>65%</b>	<b>76%</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>83%</b>
For those who have made an application:					
<b>7.2</b>	Do you feel applications are sorted out fairly?	<b>73%</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>73%</b>	<b>76%</b>
<b>7.3</b>	Do you feel applications are sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	<b>49%</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>65%</b>
<b>7.4</b>	Is it easy to make a complaint?	<b>52%</b>	<b>59%</b>	<b>52%</b>	<b>60%</b>
For those who have made a complaint:					
<b>7.5</b>	Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	<b>35%</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>30%</b>
<b>7.6</b>	Do you feel complaints are sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	<b>35%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>42%</b>
<b>7.7</b>	Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint?	<b>5%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>8%</b>
<b>SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE</b>					
<b>8.1</b>	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	<b>24%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>27%</b>
<b>8.2</b>	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	<b>47%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>48%</b>
<b>8.3</b>	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	<b>39%</b>	<b>51%</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>43%</b>
<b>8.4</b>	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	<b>59%</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>59%</b>	<b>69%</b>
For those who have had a minor report:					
<b>8.5</b>	Was the process explained clearly to you?	<b>78%</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>84%</b>
<b>8.6</b>	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	<b>60%</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>64%</b>
For those who have had an adjudication ('nicking'):					
<b>8.7</b>	Was the process explained clearly to you?	<b>88%</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>87%</b>
<b>8.8</b>	Have you been physically restrained (Cand R) since you have been here?	<b>33%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>34%</b>
<b>8.9</b>	For those who had spent a night in the care and separation unit: did the staff treat you well/very well?	<b>62%</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>64%</b>
<b>SECTION 9: SAFETY</b>					
<b>9.1</b>	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	<b>29%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>23%</b>

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

### Key to tables

		HMYOI Wetherby 2015	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Wetherby 2015	HMYOI Wetherby 2013
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>152</b>	<b>554</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>153</b>
<b>9.2</b>	Do you feel unsafe now?	14%	11%	14%	8%
<b>9.4</b>	Have you ever been victimised by other young people here?	29%	24%	29%	15%
Since you have been here, have other young people:					
<b>9.5a</b>	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	13%	14%	13%	5%
<b>9.5b</b>	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	10%	9%	10%	1%
<b>9.5c</b>	Sexually abused you?	2%	0%	2%	0%
<b>9.5d</b>	Threatened or intimidated you?	12%	9%	12%	4%
<b>9.5e</b>	Taken your canteen/property?	4%	3%	4%	1%
<b>9.5f</b>	Victimised you because of medication?	2%	1%	2%	0%
<b>9.5g</b>	Victimised you because of debt?	3%	2%	3%	0%
<b>9.5h</b>	Victimised you because of drugs?	1%	2%	1%	1%
<b>9.5i</b>	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	4%	2%	4%	1%
<b>9.5j</b>	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	2%	1%	2%	1%
<b>9.5k</b>	Victimised you because of your nationality?	2%	2%	2%	2%
<b>9.5l</b>	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	5%	2%	5%	3%
<b>9.5m</b>	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%	1%	0%	
<b>9.5n</b>	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	1%	0%	1%
<b>9.5o</b>	Victimised you because of your age?	1%	1%	1%	0%
<b>9.5p</b>	Victimised you because you have a disability?	1%	1%	1%	0%
<b>9.5q</b>	Victimised you because you were new here?	5%	6%	5%	4%
<b>9.5r</b>	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	4%	1%	4%	4%
<b>9.5s</b>	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	6%	4%	6%	3%
<b>9.7</b>	Have you ever been victimised by a member of staff here?	18%	25%	18%	29%
Since you have been here, have staff:					
<b>9.8a</b>	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	10%	12%	10%	17%
<b>9.8b</b>	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	5%	5%	5%	4%
<b>9.8c</b>	Sexually abused you?	2%	0%	2%	0%
<b>9.8d</b>	Threatened or intimidated you?	3%	6%	3%	4%
<b>9.8e</b>	Taken your canteen/property?	3%	3%	3%	2%
<b>9.8f</b>	Victimised you because of medication?	2%	1%	2%	0%
<b>9.8g</b>	Victimised you because of debt?	1%	0%	1%	0%
<b>9.8h</b>	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	1%	0%	1%
<b>9.8i</b>	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	2%	4%	2%	1%
<b>9.8j</b>	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	3%	0%	4%
<b>9.8k</b>	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	2%	0%	1%
<b>9.8k</b>	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	2%	2%	2%	3%
<b>9.8m</b>	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%	1%	0%	1%
<b>9.8n</b>	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	0%	0%	
<b>9.8o</b>	Victimised you because of your age?	1%	1%	1%	1%

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

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMYOI Wetherby 2015	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Wetherby 2015	HMYOI Wetherby 2013
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>152</b>	<b>554</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>153</b>
<b>9.8p</b>	Victimised you because you have a disability?	1%	1%	1%	1%
<b>9.8q</b>	Victimised you because you were new here?	1%	3%	1%	1%
<b>9.8r</b>	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	1%	1%	1%	2%
<b>9.8s</b>	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	1%	1%	1%	1%
<b>9.8t</b>	Victimised you because you made a complaint?	1%	6%	1%	4%
<b>9.10</b>	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	27%	26%	27%	30%
<b>9.11</b>	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	30%	31%	30%	30%
<b>9.12</b>	Is shouting through the windows a problem here?	36%	36%	36%	30%
<b>SECTION 10: HEALTH SERVICES</b>					
<b>10.1a</b>	Is it easy for you to see the doctor?	57%	54%	57%	63%
<b>10.1b</b>	Is it easy for you to see the nurse?	69%	68%	69%	69%
<b>10.1c</b>	Is it easy for you to see the dentist?	34%	38%	34%	39%
<b>10.2</b>	For those who have been to health services: Do you think the overall quality is good/very good?	48%	56%	48%	45%
<b>10.3</b>	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/all of it in your cell?	65%	51%	65%	69%
<b>10.4</b>	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?	25%	22%	25%	21%
<b>10.5</b>	If you have emotional or mental health problems, are you being helped by anyone here?	61%	67%	61%	69%
<b>10.6</b>	Did you have any problems with alcohol when you first arrived?	8%	7%	8%	11%
<b>10.7</b>	Have you received any help with any alcohol problems here?	3%	4%	3%	6%
<b>10.8</b>	Did you have any problems with drugs when you first arrived?	42%	36%	42%	45%
<b>10.9</b>	Do you have a problem with drugs now?	6%	8%	6%	10%
<b>10.10</b>	Have you received any help with any drug problems here?	20%	24%	20%	30%
<b>10.11</b>	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs here?	19%	17%	19%	19%
<b>SECTION 11: ACTIVITIES</b>					
<b>11.1</b>	Were you 14 or younger when you were last at school?	49%	41%	49%	43%
<b>11.2</b>	Have you ever been excluded from school?	90%	85%	90%	93%
<b>11.3</b>	Did you ever skip school before you came into custody?	80%	74%	80%	85%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:					
<b>11.4a</b>	Education?	66%	75%	66%	81%
<b>11.4b</b>	A job in this establishment?	49%	22%	49%	64%
<b>11.4c</b>	Vocational or skills training?	8%	17%	8%	13%
<b>11.4d</b>	Offending behaviour programmes?	11%	20%	11%	17%
<b>11.4e</b>	Nothing	25%	14%	25%	9%
For those who have taken part in the following activities while in this establishment, do you think that they will help you when you leave prison:					
<b>11.5a</b>	Education?	59%	64%	59%	70%
<b>11.5b</b>	A job in this establishment?	43%	49%	43%	58%
<b>11.5c</b>	Vocational or skills training?	39%	52%	39%	45%
<b>11.5d</b>	Offending behaviour programmes?	39%	52%	39%	51%
<b>11.6</b>	Do you usually have association every day?	81%	67%	81%	44%

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

### Key to tables

		HMYOI Wetherby 2015	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Wetherby 2015	HMYOI Wetherby 2013
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		152	554	152	153
11.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	60%	59%	60%	67%
11.8	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	2%	15%	2%	13%
<b>SECTION 12: KEEPING IN TOUCH WITH FAMILY AND FRIENDS</b>					
12.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	77%	82%	77%	77%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	50%	39%	50%	41%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	28%	42%	28%	37%
12.4	Is it easy/very easy for your family and friends to visit you here?	27%	35%	27%	35%
12.5	Do your visits start on time?	26%	41%	26%	40%
<b>SECTION 13: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE</b>					
Do you think you will have a problem with the following, when you are released:					
13.1a	Finding accommodation?	18%	25%	18%	23%
13.1b	Getting into school or college?	21%	32%	21%	25%
13.1c	Getting a job?	46%	54%	46%	50%
13.1d	Money/finances?	34%	36%	34%	34%
13.1e	Claiming benefits?	13%	14%	13%	26%
13.1f	Continuing health services?	8%	8%	8%	7%
13.1g	Opening a bank account?	16%	15%	16%	9%
13.1h	Avoiding bad relationships?	15%	16%	15%	15%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	46%	45%	46%	58%
For those with a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan:					
13.3	Were you involved in the development of your plan?	89%	83%	89%	83%
13.4	Do you understand the targets set in your plan?	96%	95%	96%	94%
13.5	Do you have a caseworker here?	82%	85%	82%	92%
13.6	Has your caseworker helped to prepare you for release?	36%	50%	36%	47%
For those with a social worker:					
13.7	Has your social worker been to visit you since you have been here?	68%	72%	68%	67%
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	38%	40%	38%	45%
Do you know who to contact for help with the following problems?					
13.9a	Finding accommodation	32%	29%	32%	32%
13.9b	Getting into school or college	28%	29%	28%	29%
13.9c	Getting a job	35%	31%	35%	38%
13.9d	Help with money/finances	27%	21%	27%	26%
13.9e	Help with claiming benefits	23%	16%	23%	22%
13.9f	Continuing health services	19%	15%	19%	13%
13.9g	Opening a bank account	25%	17%	25%	20%
13.9h	Avoiding bad relationships	14%	15%	14%	20%
For those who were sentenced:					
13.11	Do you want to stop offending?	89%	92%	89%	94%
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?	48%	52%	48%	47%

## Diversity analysis



### Key question responses (ethnicity and religion) HMYOI Wetherby 2015

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

#### Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic young people	White young people	Muslim young people	Non-Muslim young people
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>37</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>127</b>
<b>1.2</b>	Are you a foreign national?	11%	3%	4%	5%
<b>1.3</b>	Do you understand spoken English?	94%	100%	100%	98%
<b>1.4</b>	Do you understand written English?	94%	100%	100%	98%
<b>1.5</b>	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)			100%	14%
<b>1.6</b>	Are you Muslim?	51%	0%		
<b>1.5</b>	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	2%	8%	4%	7%
<b>1.9</b>	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	9%	17%	12%	15%
<b>1.10</b>	Have you ever been in local authority care?	30%	33%	24%	34%
<b>2.1</b>	Are you sentenced?	81%	86%	84%	84%
<b>2.4</b>	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	54%	55%	56%	53%
<b>3.2</b>	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	38%	41%	31%	42%
<b>3.6</b>	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	56%	55%	60%	54%
<b>3.7</b>	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare coming here?	13%	17%	16%	16%
<b>4.2</b>	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	86%	84%	84%	84%
<b>4.3</b>	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	67%	70%	64%	70%
<b>4.8</b>	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	68%	62%	69%	62%
<b>4.9</b>	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	79%	73%	76%	75%
<b>5.1</b>	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	89%	91%	96%	90%
<b>5.2</b>	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	28%	31%	31%	29%
<b>5.3</b>	Do you find the food here good/very good?	20%	25%	20%	25%
<b>5.4</b>	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	48%	53%	42%	53%
<b>5.6</b>	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	77%	44%	83%	46%

## Diversity analysis

### Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic young people	White young people	Muslim young people	Non-Muslim young people
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>37</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>127</b>
Can you speak to:					
5.7	A chaplain of your faith in private?	65%	63%	73%	61%
5.8	A peer mentor?	26%	28%	35%	27%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	9%	17%	22%	14%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	47%	43%	39%	43%
6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	67%	73%	65%	72%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	43%	26%	50%	28%
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	62%	66%	65%	64%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	44%	54%	61%	51%
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	12%	28%	14%	25%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	33%	52%	36%	49%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	33%	41%	41%	38%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	57%	60%	59%	59%
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	67%	58%	71%	58%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	33%	33%	24%	35%
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	37%	27%	24%	30%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	19%	12%	5%	16%
9.4	Have you been victimised by other young people here?	24%	30%	29%	30%
Since you have been here, have other young people:					
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	7%	15%	0%	14%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	15%	0%	14%	3%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	10%	0%	14%	1%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	10%	0%	5%	2%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	1%	0%	1%
9.7	Have you been victimised by staff here?	22%	16%	29%	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				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>37</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>127</b>
Since you have been here, have staff:					
<b>9.8d</b>	Threatened or intimidated you?	3%	3%	5%	3%
<b>9.8i</b>	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	10%	0%	18%	0%
<b>9.8j</b>	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>9.8k</b>	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>9.8p</b>	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	1%	0%	1%
<b>9.10</b>	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	15%	30%	24%	27%
<b>9.11</b>	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	25%	31%	18%	30%
<b>10.1a</b>	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the doctor?	44%	61%	41%	58%
<b>10.1b</b>	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the nurse?	59%	71%	62%	68%
<b>10.4</b>	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	20%	28%	29%	26%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:					
<b>11.4a</b>	Education?	50%	71%	41%	68%
<b>11.4b</b>	A job in this establishment?	38%	52%	36%	50%
<b>11.4c</b>	Vocational or skills training?	0%	10%	0%	9%
<b>11.4d</b>	Offending behaviour programmes?	7%	12%	14%	10%
<b>11.4e</b>	Nothing?	44%	19%	48%	23%
<b>11.6</b>	Do you usually have association every day?	67%	84%	71%	82%
<b>11.7</b>	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	60%	60%	71%	57%
<b>11.8</b>	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	3%	1%	5%	1%
<b>12.1</b>	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	63%	81%	76%	77%
<b>12.2</b>	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	48%	51%	64%	46%
<b>12.3</b>	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	19%	32%	16%	29%
<b>13.2</b>	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	32%	51%	24%	48%
<b>13.8</b>	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	23%	43%	30%	38%

## Diversity analysis - disability



### Key question responses (disability analysis) HMYOI Wetherby 2015

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

#### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	<b>Consider themselves to have a disability</b>	<b>Do not consider themselves to have a disability</b>
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>22</b>	<b>127</b>
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	<b>0%</b>	<b>6%</b>
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	<b>96%</b>	<b>98%</b>
1.4	Do you understand written English?	<b>96%</b>	<b>98%</b>
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	<b>15%</b>	<b>27%</b>
1.6	Are you Muslim?	<b>11%</b>	<b>15%</b>
1.5	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	<b>14%</b>	<b>6%</b>
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	<b>36%</b>	<b>32%</b>
2.1	Are you sentenced?	<b>71%</b>	<b>87%</b>
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	<b>70%</b>	<b>50%</b>
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	<b>70%</b>	<b>36%</b>
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	<b>58%</b>	<b>54%</b>
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	<b>4%</b>	<b>19%</b>
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	<b>77%</b>	<b>85%</b>
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	<b>70%</b>	<b>70%</b>
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	<b>64%</b>	<b>63%</b>
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	<b>64%</b>	<b>76%</b>
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	<b>86%</b>	<b>92%</b>
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	<b>30%</b>	<b>31%</b>
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	<b>15%</b>	<b>26%</b>
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	<b>52%</b>	<b>52%</b>
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	<b>42%</b>	<b>55%</b>

## Diversity analysis - disability

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	<b>Consider themselves to have a disability</b>	<b>Do not consider themselves to have a disability</b>
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Can you speak to:			
5.7	A chaplain of your faith in private?	68%	63%
5.8	A peer mentor?	33%	29%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	29%	14%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	32%	46%
6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	70%	72%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	33%	30%
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	64%	66%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	64%	51%
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	31%	22%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	31%	49%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	38%	38%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	60%	59%
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	58%	60%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	39%	33%
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	52%	26%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	33%	11%
9.4	Have you been victimised by other young people here?	52%	26%
Since you have been here, have other young people:			
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	33%	9%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	4%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	3%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	3%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	4%	0%
9.7	Have you been victimised by staff here?	33%	14%

## Diversity analysis - disability

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	<b>Consider themselves to have a disability</b>	<b>Do not consider themselves to have a disability</b>
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Since you have been here, have staff:			
<b>9.8d</b>	Threatened or intimidated you?	<b>11%</b>	<b>2%</b>
<b>9.8i</b>	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	<b>0%</b>	<b>3%</b>
<b>9.8j</b>	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.8k</b>	Victimised you because of your nationality?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.8p</b>	Victimised you because you have a disability?	<b>4%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.10</b>	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	<b>33%</b>	<b>25%</b>
<b>9.11</b>	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	<b>33%</b>	<b>29%</b>
<b>10.1a</b>	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the doctor?	<b>64%</b>	<b>56%</b>
<b>10.1b</b>	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the nurse?	<b>75%</b>	<b>68%</b>
<b>10.4</b>	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	<b>75%</b>	<b>18%</b>
Do you currently take part in any of the following:			
<b>11.4a</b>	Education?	<b>64%</b>	<b>65%</b>
<b>11.4b</b>	A job in this establishment?	<b>44%</b>	<b>48%</b>
<b>11.4c</b>	Vocational or skills training?	<b>16%</b>	<b>6%</b>
<b>11.4d</b>	Offending behaviour programmes?	<b>16%</b>	<b>9%</b>
<b>11.4e</b>	Nothing?	<b>16%</b>	<b>28%</b>
<b>11.6</b>	Do you usually have association every day?	<b>67%</b>	<b>83%</b>
<b>11.7</b>	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	<b>58%</b>	<b>61%</b>
<b>11.8</b>	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	<b>0%</b>	<b>2%</b>
<b>12.1</b>	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	<b>81%</b>	<b>76%</b>
<b>12.2</b>	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	<b>81%</b>	<b>42%</b>
<b>12.3</b>	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	<b>29%</b>	<b>28%</b>
<b>13.2</b>	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	<b>25%</b>	<b>49%</b>
<b>13.8</b>	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	<b>33%</b>	<b>39%</b>

## Diversity analysis



### Key question responses (local authority care analysis) HMYOI Wetherby 2015

**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		
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>47</b>	<b>98</b>
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	7%	4%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	98%	98%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	98%	98%
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	24%	27%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	10%	16%
1.5	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	9%	7%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	17%	15%
2.1	Are you sentenced?	83%	86%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	32%	63%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	49%	36%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	52%	55%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	17%	15%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	86%	82%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	76%	65%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	66%	63%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	81%	72%
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	93%	89%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	36%	25%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	29%	21%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	55%	50%

## Diversity analysis

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	<b>Young people who have been in local authority care</b>	<b>Young people who have not been in local authority care</b>
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>5.6</b>	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	47%	55%
Can you speak to:			
<b>5.7</b>	A chaplain of your faith in private?	65%	62%
<b>5.8</b>	A peer mentor?	32%	27%
<b>5.9</b>	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	18%	16%
<b>5.10</b>	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	60%	35%
<b>6.1</b>	Do most staff treat you with respect?	74%	69%
<b>6.2</b>	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	29%	33%
<b>7.1</b>	Is it easy to make an application?	68%	64%
<b>7.4</b>	Is it easy to make a complaint?	60%	50%
<b>8.1</b>	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	25%	21%
<b>8.2</b>	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	56%	42%
<b>8.3</b>	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	36%	38%
<b>8.4</b>	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	71%	55%
<b>8.6</b>	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	67%	58%
<b>8.8</b>	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	42%	31%
<b>9.1</b>	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	33%	30%
<b>9.2</b>	Do you feel unsafe now?	18%	13%
<b>9.4</b>	Have you been victimised by other young people here?	37%	27%
Since you have been here, have other young people:			
<b>9.5d</b>	Threatened or intimidated you?	17%	12%
<b>9.5i</b>	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	6%	4%
<b>9.5j</b>	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	2%	3%
<b>9.5k</b>	Victimised you because of your nationality?	2%	3%
<b>9.5p</b>	Victimised you because you have a disability?	2%	0%

## Diversity analysis

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	<b>Young people who have been in local authority care</b>	<b>Young people who have not been in local authority care</b>
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>9.7</b>	Have you been victimised by staff here?	<b>20%</b>	<b>18%</b>
Since you have been here, have staff:			
<b>9.8d</b>	Threatened or intimidated you?	<b>0%</b>	<b>4%</b>
<b>9.8i</b>	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	<b>0%</b>	<b>4%</b>
<b>9.8j</b>	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.8k</b>	Victimised you because of your nationality?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.8p</b>	Victimised you because you have a disability?	<b>0%</b>	<b>1%</b>
<b>9.10</b>	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	<b>22%</b>	<b>27%</b>
<b>9.11</b>	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	<b>35%</b>	<b>26%</b>
<b>10.1a</b>	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the doctor?	<b>62%</b>	<b>54%</b>
<b>10.1b</b>	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the nurse?	<b>72%</b>	<b>66%</b>
<b>10.4</b>	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	<b>34%</b>	<b>23%</b>
Do you currently take part in any of the following:			
<b>11.4a</b>	Education?	<b>64%</b>	<b>64%</b>
<b>11.4b</b>	A job in this establishment?	<b>38%</b>	<b>52%</b>
<b>11.4c</b>	Vocational or skills training?	<b>6%</b>	<b>9%</b>
<b>11.4d</b>	Offending behaviour programmes?	<b>11%</b>	<b>9%</b>
<b>11.4e</b>	Nothing?	<b>26%</b>	<b>26%</b>
<b>11.6</b>	Do you usually have association every day?	<b>76%</b>	<b>82%</b>
<b>11.7</b>	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	<b>56%</b>	<b>61%</b>
<b>11.8</b>	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	<b>2%</b>	<b>1%</b>
<b>12.1</b>	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	<b>82%</b>	<b>73%</b>
<b>12.2</b>	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	<b>50%</b>	<b>49%</b>
<b>12.3</b>	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	<b>17%</b>	<b>33%</b>
<b>13.2</b>	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	<b>44%</b>	<b>44%</b>
<b>13.8</b>	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	<b>46%</b>	<b>32%</b>

## Wing comparator



### Survey responses from children and young people (best and worst wing): HMYOI Wetherby 2015

Survey responses (missing data have been excluded for each question).

#### Key to tables

Percentages highlighted in green show the best score across wings		A wing	C wing	D wing	F wing	Total
Percentages highlighted in blue show the worst score across wings						
Number of completed questionnaires returned		28	42	38	40	148
<b>SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU</b>						
1.1	Are you 18 years of age?	0%	8%	23%	6%	10%
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	9%	6%	6%	0%	5%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	92%	100%	100%	98%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	100%	92%	100%	100%	98%
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other category.)	36%	35%	6%	22%	24%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	18%	15%	7%	12%	13%
1.7	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	0%	10%	2%	12%	7%
1.8	Do you have any children?	0%	8%	13%	12%	9%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	18%	19%	9%	16%	15%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	32%	29%	38%	31%	32%
<b>SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE</b>						
2.1	Are you sentenced?	100%	79%	89%	78%	85%
2.2	Is your sentence 12 months or less?	0%	46%	46%	52%	39%
2.3	Have you been in this establishment for one month or less?	3%	10%	13%	57%	22%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	68%	54%	50%	49%	54%
<b>SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS</b>						
On your most recent journey here:						
3.1	Did you feel safe?	85%	78%	83%	80%	81%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	32%	56%	27%	41%	40%
3.3	Did you spend more than 4 hours in the van?	29%	0%	2%	2%	7%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	71%	49%	44%	61%	55%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	31%	0%	21%	20%	17%
<b>SECTION 4: YOUR FIRST FEW DAYS HERE</b>						
4.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	78%	81%	76%	84%	80%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	89%	80%	87%	88%	86%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	74%	59%	60%	84%	69%
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?	48%	61%	58%	67%	59%
4.4b	Loss of property?	19%	13%	33%	24%	23%
4.4c	Feeling scared?	25%	20%	28%	50%	31%
4.4d	Gang problems?	32%	20%	28%	44%	31%

## Wing comparator

### Key to tables

Percentages highlighted in green show the best score across wings		A wing	C wing	D wing	F wing	Total
Percentages highlighted in blue show the worst score across wings						
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>28</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>148</b>
<b>4.4e</b>	Contacting family?	48%	53%	64%	70%	60%
<b>4.4f</b>	Money worries?	13%	7%	17%	33%	18%
<b>4.4g</b>	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	44%	36%	33%	44%	39%
<b>4.4h</b>	Health problems?	65%	50%	67%	61%	60%
<b>4.4i</b>	Getting phone numbers?	44%	42%	39%	53%	45%
<b>4.5</b>	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	50%	70%	74%	89%	72%
When you first arrived, did you have problems with any of the following:						
<b>4.5a</b>	Not being able to smoke?	36%	46%	50%	60%	49%
<b>4.5b</b>	Loss of property?	14%	9%	14%	13%	12%
<b>4.5c</b>	Feeling Scared?	3%	11%	7%	17%	10%
<b>4.5d</b>	Gang Problems?	14%	11%	12%	6%	11%
<b>4.5e</b>	Contacting Family?	17%	21%	38%	35%	28%
<b>4.5f</b>	Money worries?	14%	9%	12%	9%	11%
<b>4.5g</b>	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	3%	21%	9%	6%	11%
<b>4.5h</b>	Health problems?	14%	17%	7%	2%	10%
<b>4.5i</b>	Getting phone numbers?	11%	30%	33%	30%	27%
When you first arrived, were you given any of the following:						
<b>4.6a</b>	Toiletries/basic items?	74%	78%	91%	74%	79%
<b>4.6b</b>	The opportunity to have a shower?	32%	31%	28%	33%	31%
<b>4.6c</b>	Something to eat?	88%	79%	87%	90%	86%
<b>4.6d</b>	A free phone call to friends/family?	74%	67%	80%	80%	75%
<b>4.6e</b>	PIN phone credit?	47%	59%	47%	43%	49%
<b>4.6f</b>	Information about feeling worried/upset?	18%	22%	30%	33%	26%
Within your first 24 hours, did you have access to the following people or services:						
<b>4.7a</b>	A chaplain?	58%	49%	46%	45%	49%
<b>4.7b</b>	A peer mentor?	0%	6%	7%	8%	6%
<b>4.7c</b>	Childline/Samaritans	9%	13%	14%	17%	14%
<b>4.7d</b>	The prison shop/canteen?	24%	6%	11%	6%	11%
<b>4.8</b>	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	78%	63%	56%	60%	63%
<b>4.9</b>	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	76%	75%	72%	75%	74%
<b>SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT</b>						
<b>5.1</b>	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	86%	90%	91%	92%	90%
<b>5.2</b>	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	31%	35%	25%	30%	31%
<b>5.3</b>	Do you find the food here good/very good?	17%	19%	24%	31%	23%
<b>5.4</b>	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	41%	59%	53%	58%	54%
<b>5.5</b>	Is it easy/very easy for you to attend religious services?	76%	55%	52%	57%	59%

## Wing comparator

### Key to tables

Percentages highlighted in green show the best score across wings		A wing	C wing	D wing	F wing	Total
Percentages highlighted in blue show the worst score across wings						
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>28</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>148</b>
<b>5.6</b>	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	77%	42%	44%	52%	52%
Can you speak to:						
<b>5.7</b>	A Chaplain of your faith in private?	77%	61%	57%	61%	63%
<b>5.8</b>	A peer mentor?	18%	25%	29%	33%	27%
<b>5.9</b>	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	12%	17%	18%	16%	16%
<b>5.10</b>	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	59%	42%	41%	36%	43%
<b>SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF</b>						
<b>6.1</b>	Do most staff treat you with respect?	86%	60%	60%	87%	73%
<b>6.2</b>	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	31%	36%	14%	38%	30%
<b>6.3</b>	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	50%	27%	37%	39%	37%
<b>SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS</b>						
<b>7.1</b>	Is it easy to make an application?	82%	65%	66%	53%	65%
<b>7.4</b>	Is it easy to make a complaint?	68%	51%	57%	36%	51%
<b>7.7</b>	Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint?	9%	2%	2%	6%	5%
<b>SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE</b>						
<b>8.1</b>	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	38%	14%	34%	16%	24%
<b>8.2</b>	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	57%	43%	57%	33%	47%
<b>8.3</b>	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	38%	33%	50%	33%	38%
<b>8.4</b>	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	71%	70%	64%	33%	58%
<b>8.6</b>	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	71%	68%	68%	36%	59%
<b>8.8</b>	Have you been physically restrained (Cand R) since you have been here?	44%	44%	25%	20%	32%
<b>SECTION 9: SAFETY</b>						
<b>9.1</b>	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	29%	34%	23%	29%	29%
<b>9.2</b>	Do you feel unsafe now?	12%	14%	14%	12%	13%
<b>9.4</b>	Have you ever been victimised by other young people here?	29%	23%	27%	33%	28%
Since you have been here, have other young people:						
<b>9.5a</b>	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	12%	9%	19%	17%	14%
<b>9.5b</b>	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	3%	7%	12%	13%	9%
<b>9.5c</b>	Sexually abused you?	3%	2%	0%	2%	2%
<b>9.5d</b>	Threatened or intimidated you?	9%	9%	12%	19%	12%
<b>9.5e</b>	Taken your canteen/property?	0%	2%	0%	10%	4%
<b>9.5f</b>	Victimised you because of medication?	3%	0%	2%	0%	1%
<b>9.5g</b>	Victimised you because of debt?	3%	2%	0%	6%	3%
<b>9.5h</b>	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	2%	0%	0%	1%
<b>9.5i</b>	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	3%	0%	0%	8%	3%
<b>9.5j</b>	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	0%	0%	6%	2%
<b>9.5k</b>	Victimised you because of your nationality?	3%	0%	0%	2%	1%
<b>9.5l</b>	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	3%	0%	7%	8%	5%

## Wing comparator

### Key to tables

Percentages highlighted in green show the best score across wings		A wing	C wing	D wing	F wing	Total
Percentages highlighted in blue show the worst score across wings						
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>28</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>148</b>
<b>9.5m</b>	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>9.5n</b>	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>9.5o</b>	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	0%	0%	2%	1%
<b>9.5p</b>	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	2%	0%	0%	1%
<b>9.5q</b>	Victimised you because you were new here?	0%	7%	2%	10%	5%
<b>9.5r</b>	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	12%	2%	0%	2%	4%
<b>9.5s</b>	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	12%	0%	2%	10%	6%
<b>9.7</b>	Have you ever been victimised by a member of staff here?	8%	23%	24%	12%	17%
Since you have been here, have staff:						
<b>9.8a</b>	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	3%	9%	19%	8%	10%
<b>9.8b</b>	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	3%	7%	2%	6%	5%
<b>9.8c</b>	Sexually abused you?	0%	2%	2%	0%	1%
<b>9.8d</b>	Threatened or intimidated you?	3%	2%	0%	2%	2%
<b>9.8e</b>	Taken your canteen/property?	3%	2%	2%	2%	2%
<b>9.8f</b>	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	2%	0%	0%	1%
<b>9.8g</b>	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	0%	0%	2%	1%
<b>9.8h</b>	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>9.8i</b>	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	7%	0%	0%	2%
<b>9.8j</b>	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>9.8k</b>	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>9.8k</b>	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	0%	0%	0%	2%	1%
<b>9.8m</b>	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>9.8n</b>	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>9.8o</b>	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	0%	2%	0%	1%
<b>9.8p</b>	Victimised you because you have a disability?	3%	0%	0%	0%	1%
<b>9.8q</b>	Victimised you because you were new here?	0%	0%	0%	2%	1%
<b>9.8r</b>	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	0%	0%	0%	2%	1%
<b>9.8s</b>	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	3%	0%	0%	0%	1%
<b>9.8t</b>	Victimised you because you made a complaint?	0%	0%	0%	2%	1%
<b>9.10</b>	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	27%	26%	26%	31%	27%
<b>9.11</b>	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	41%	23%	30%	29%	30%
<b>9.12</b>	Is shouting through the windows a problem here?	32%	32%	35%	40%	35%
<b>SECTION 10: HEALTH SERVICES</b>						
<b>10.1a</b>	Is it easy for you to see the doctor?	47%	63%	65%	53%	57%
<b>10.1b</b>	Is it easy for you to see the nurse?	77%	67%	67%	62%	68%
<b>10.1c</b>	Is it easy for you to see the dentist?	27%	39%	42%	33%	35%
<b>10.4</b>	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?	29%	25%	27%	19%	25%
<b>10.6</b>	Did you have any problems with alcohol when you first arrived?	0%	2%	12%	8%	6%

## Wing comparator

### Key to tables

Percentages highlighted in green show the best score across wings		A wing	C wing	D wing	F wing	Total
Percentages highlighted in blue show the worst score across wings						
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>28</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>148</b>
<b>10.7</b>	Have you received any help with any alcohol problems here?	0%	2%	7%	0%	2%
<b>10.8</b>	Did you have any problems with drugs when you first arrived?	22%	56%	45%	38%	41%
<b>10.9</b>	Do you have a problem with drugs now?	0%	12%	9%	6%	7%
<b>10.10</b>	Have you received any help with any drug problems here?	17%	27%	26%	10%	20%
<b>10.11</b>	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs here?	15%	21%	33%	8%	19%
<b>SECTION 11: ACTIVITIES</b>						
<b>11.1</b>	Were you 14 or younger when you were last at school?	61%	62%	35%	43%	49%
<b>11.2</b>	Have you ever been excluded from school?	88%	88%	91%	90%	89%
<b>11.3</b>	Did you ever skip school before you came into custody?	74%	85%	86%	74%	80%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:						
<b>11.4a</b>	Education?	82%	73%	77%	43%	67%
<b>11.4b</b>	A job in this establishment?	53%	56%	65%	29%	50%
<b>11.4c</b>	Vocational or skills training?	12%	7%	9%	6%	8%
<b>11.4d</b>	Offending behaviour programmes?	18%	13%	9%	6%	11%
<b>11.4e</b>	Nothing	15%	15%	7%	51%	24%
<b>11.6</b>	Do you usually have association every day?	76%	76%	86%	88%	82%
<b>11.7</b>	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	41%	67%	62%	63%	59%
<b>11.8</b>	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	0%	7%	0%	0%	2%
<b>SECTION 12: KEEPING IN TOUCH WITH FAMILY AND FRIENDS</b>						
<b>12.1</b>	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	83%	81%	70%	77%	78%
<b>12.2</b>	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	50%	49%	47%	52%	49%
<b>12.3</b>	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	40%	25%	24%	31%	29%
<b>12.4</b>	Is it easy/very easy for your family and friends to visit you here?	46%	40%	12%	17%	27%
<b>12.5</b>	Do your visits start on time?	29%	31%	35%	11%	26%
<b>SECTION 13: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE</b>						
Do you think you will have a problem with the following, when you are released:						
<b>13.1a</b>	Finding accommodation?	27%	11%	23%	13%	18%
<b>13.1b</b>	Getting into school or college?	18%	11%	23%	30%	21%
<b>13.1c</b>	Getting a job?	56%	42%	46%	42%	46%
<b>13.1d</b>	Money/finances?	38%	24%	39%	33%	34%
<b>13.1e</b>	Claiming benefits?	15%	11%	15%	11%	13%
<b>13.1f</b>	Continuing health services?	12%	3%	10%	7%	8%
<b>13.1g</b>	Opening a bank account?	12%	14%	20%	20%	17%
<b>13.1h</b>	Avoiding bad relationships?	15%	8%	13%	20%	14%
<b>13.2</b>	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	56%	39%	69%	27%	47%
<b>13.5</b>	Do you have a caseworker here?	97%	88%	85%	65%	83%
<b>13.8</b>	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	19%	45%	49%	38%	39%