

Report on an unannounced inspection of

# **HMYOI Cookham Wood**

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

**5 – 15 May 2015**

We are grateful for the work of the following organisations on this inspection:

- Care Quality Commission
- General Pharmaceutical Council
- Ofsted

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	9
About this inspection and report	11
Summary	15
Section 1. Safety	23
Section 2. Respect	37
Section 3. Purposeful activity	49
Section 4. Resettlement	55
Section 5. Summary of 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	81
Appendix IV: Summary of children and young people questionnaires and interviews	85

### **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/>

# Introduction

At the time of this inspection, HM Young Offenders Institution Cookham Wood in Rochester, Kent held 166 boys. Most were sixteen or seventeen years old and a few were a year younger or older. We had last inspected this establishment in May 2014 when the population had been reduced to facilitate the opening of impressive new accommodation to replace the inadequate former units; that transition was now complete and the population had increased again. Since it became a young offenders institution (YOI) successive inspections have noted the very challenging and vulnerable profile of the boys held, but now, for the first time, about 10% of the boys held had been convicted of, or were charged with, a capital offence – taking a life - and at just 16 or 17 years of age faced many years in prison serving indeterminate sentences. The challenge of managing all these boys, whatever their offence or sentence, safely and positively was great. Staff required significant skills and experience in working with this age group and needed to know the boys in their care very well; but about 25% of staff working in the establishment were on detached duty and many of them did not know the work, the institution or the boys. Faced with a larger, more challenging population and significant staffing issues, it was not surprising that outcomes for the boys held had deteriorated overall.

The level of risk in YOIs holding children is now such that we inspect them annually, although we recognise that the degree of scrutiny that Cookham Wood receives from us and other bodies is itself a pressure. Despite the difficulties, it is important to recognise that Cookham Wood had made important progress in some areas in a comparatively short period of time. Boys sometimes still arrived at the establishment very late and some placement decisions appeared to be inappropriate, but the reception area had improved and boys continued to be well cared for when they first arrived. At the last inspection we had been concerned about weaknesses in child protection procedures. Oversight of safeguarding had now improved, although there were still some weaknesses. We had been concerned about use of force and although significant concerns remained, staff were now being trained in the new restraint procedure ‘Minimising and Managing Physical Restraint (MMPR)’ that emphasised de-escalation techniques. Levels of self-harm had fallen since the last inspection and were much lower than at similar establishments. Primary health care had improved and health care staffing was now more stable.

Arrangements for boys with the highest level of need was much better. The environment and the regime in the Phoenix Unit which held boys who needed to be segregated for reasons of good order and discipline had improved significantly since the last inspection. Boys with complex needs who might previously have been held in the Phoenix Unit were now held in the Cedar Unit which provided good levels of care. For all the boys, family contact was important, and it was good to see that a new visits room was under construction to replace the poor existing arrangements.

Important though these improvements were, they cannot disguise the fact that overall our concerns have grown. Forty one per cent of boys told us they had felt unsafe in the establishment at some time compared with 27% at the last inspection, although this was now similar to other establishments. Twenty one per cent of boys told us they felt unsafe at the time of the inspection – worse than the last inspection (10%), and worse than at similar establishments (14%). Boys also reported more negatively about relationships with staff than at the last inspection. In our survey 62% told us that staff treated them with respect compared with 86% at the last inspection, although once again results were now similar to other YOIs.

Our inspection evidence confirmed the deteriorating survey results. The number of violent incidents remained very high. In the six months leading up to March 2015 there had been 61 assaults and 92 fights. Some of these were very serious involving attacks by multiple assailants on a single boy and the use of improvised weapons such as sharpened cutlery and solid items in socks. There had been an increase in the number of boys requiring hospital treatment, many with head injuries sustained by

their attackers jumping on their heads. Staff assaults had almost doubled since the last inspection with 21 in the preceding six months, some resulting in serious injury.

Although there are no easy answers to this, behaviour management processes were weak. Low-level poor behaviour was not promptly, consistently and decisively challenged and so it escalated; good behaviour was not effectively rewarded or publicly recognised and so there was little incentive to behave well. On one of the wings during our night visit, we witnessed boys shouting very aggressively out of their doors, in effect holding a 'kangaroo court' of another boy. This behaviour was not challenged by staff until we insisted they do so. Boys were not expected to clean up after themselves in communal areas – we saw uniformed staff carrying out basic cleaning duties and tables in association areas were left littered and dirty after meals - despite the fact that many boys had far too little to occupy themselves. The adjudication system – the formal discipline system for more serious offences – was in disarray. The number of adjudications had risen significantly and was used too often for low-level behaviour that should have been dealt with by residential staff on the spot on the units. As a consequence, at the time of the inspection there was a backlog of 200 adjudications waiting to be heard, some for serious offence. Many of these were unlikely to be heard and so there was no action taken to address the behaviour concerned.

On the other hand, there were too few meaningful opportunities for boys to demonstrate good behaviour, be rewarded for doing so, or set a good example to others. For example, unlike other establishments, there were no boys used as peer supporters to assist with the reception process, help put new arrivals at ease and to set a good example of the kind of behaviour expected. Reception staff told us there were no boys who could be trusted to do this, although staff on the enhanced unit readily identified boys suitable for this work. Enhanced status brought few other benefits than access to a play station; other privileges that might be a more effective demonstration of trust and responsibility such as better jobs and leadership roles, access to temporary release, more opportunities to wear their own clothes and simply just prompt, public recognition of good behaviour was not happening.

Better behaviour management would not solve all the problems but staff told us they wanted to take a more proactive approach towards discipline and behaviour management. In its absence, the establishment relied heavily on procedural security measures. There were extensive and complex 'keep apart' lists. At the time of the inspection this was necessary in most cases but the consequence was that movement around the establishment was severely restricted which limited access to education and other activities. In contrast, the implementation of other security measures such as prompt searching for suspected weapons was weak. Some boys were segregated for their own protection. One immature looking and frightened 16 year old I met in the segregation unit - who had been remanded on a murder charge - was too scared to go onto normal location and staff confirmed his fears were justified. The use of force was high; there had been 400 use of force incidents in the six months before this inspection compared with 282 before the last inspection. Most of these incidents were spontaneous and in the CCTV footage we reviewed, we saw examples of officers responding bravely to protect boys from attacks. Pain compliance techniques were used but not all were recorded. Incidents involving the mandibular angle technique (pressure applied to a point below the ear) were recorded, but pain applied through the wrists or calf was not. Three boys had required hospital treatment after restraint.

Our concerns about safety reflected poor 'dynamic', or relationship based security. The poor survey results were confirmed by the inconsistent and distant relationships we observed. Discussion with staff often revealed low expectations and we saw staff backing off from dealing with difficult issues with boys. Work on equality and diversity issues had improved, although there was still more to do. On the whole, boys from black and minority ethnic backgrounds and Muslim boys reported similarly to other boys in the establishment, although monitoring data revealed some differences in outcomes. Boys with disabilities which were often mental health issues were more concerned about their safety than others but the special educational needs co-ordinator provided good support for boys classed as autistic or with a learning difficulty.

Boys had much too little time out of their cells. Staff shortages meant the establishment was running a restricted regime and evening and week-end association was only offered in rotation. Boys who were attending all their scheduled activities could have nine hours out of their cell on week days, while boys with no activity just two hours. The establishment reported an average of five hours out of cell a day and we found 36% of boys locked in their cells during the core day. Some boys were too frightened to go to activities and mix with others, some activities were cancelled and other boys had restrictions placed on what they could do because they had to be kept apart from other boys. These restrictions also affected punctuality. Outdoor exercise was limited to 30 minutes a day – which cannot have been healthy - and offered too little opportunity to burn off excess energy. Access to the gym had been reduced since the last inspection and there were no opportunities for competitive sports with local teams.

Security issues restricted the range of activities on offer. There were too few opportunities for boys to do some paid work to contribute to the running of the establishment in peer mentor or orderly roles, and too few opportunities to gain experience working outside the establishment on temporary release. Security restrictions disproportionately restricted the level of vocational training offered. Many of the boys held had a history of school refusal or exclusion and had few or no qualifications. Many boys just stayed in the centre for short periods and came to Cookham Wood part way through exam courses. Despite these severe challenges, for the boys who got there, the overall effectiveness of education, learning and skills was good. The Manchester College - the learning and skills provider - needed to do more to meet the recommendations that Ofsted had made at the last inspection, but work was underway to prepare for the implementation of a new Youth Justice Board contract and the improvements in the curriculum that were required. There was an appropriate range of education. The quality of teaching was good and had improved since the last inspection and boys achieved well in most areas.

Education was an essential part of preparing boys for release and reducing the risk that they would reoffend. Resettlement was the best performing area of the establishment and a comprehensive needs assessment was under way to inform a new resettlement strategy. All boys had training plans and these were regularly reviewed. Public protection arrangements were sound. The establishment was not yet responding adequately to the needs of the new part of its population who had, or were facing, indeterminate sentences. Forty-one per cent of the boys told us they had been in local authority care, these boys were effectively identified, but absences in the establishment's social worker posts meant that liaison with these boys' home local authority were not fully effective and it was particularly difficult to ensure these boys had appropriate secure accommodation when they left. Other aspects of practical planning for boys release was generally well organised. Arrangements for visits to boys were being improved, but there was little work done with the 17% of boys who told us they were themselves parents.

Cookham Wood reflects the systemic problems we have identified across the YOI estate. The welcome fall in the number of children in custody means that those who remain represent a more concentrated mix of very challenging young people, held in a smaller number of establishments that are increasingly unsuitable to meet their needs, and cared for by a staff group beset by shortages and a lack of training for their complex and demanding role. This report makes recommendations about what Cookham Wood could and should do to improve, but a much wider political and policy response is needed if we are to fulfil our responsibilities to care for these, our most damaged children safely, and help them to grow into adults who are valued, not feared.

**Nick Hardwick**  
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

September 2015



# Fact page

**Task of the establishment**

Young offender institution for boys aged 15 to 18 years

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

Public

**Region/Department**

Youth Justice Board

**Number held**

166

**Certified normal accommodation**

196

**Operational capacity**

196

**Date of last full inspection**

June 2014

**Brief history**

HMYOI Cookham Wood was built in the 1970s, originally for young men, but its use was changed to meet the growing need for secure female accommodation at the time.

In 2007-8 Cookham Wood underwent a change in function to accommodate 15-17 year-old young men to reduce capacity pressures in London and the south-east for this particular age group.

In January 2014 a new purpose-built residential unit was opened incorporating integrated facilities and designed to meet the needs of the young people and improve safety.

**Short description of residential units**

179 single cells, integral telephone and showers in rooms spread over six self-contained landings.

One disabled accommodation room

Phoenix unit – 7-bed separation unit

Cedar unit – 17-bed enhanced support unit

**Name of governor/director**

Jonathan French

**Escort contractor**

GEOAmey

**Health service commissioner and providers**

Oxleas NHS Foundation Trust – primary care

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

**Learning and skills providers**

The Manchester College

**Independent Monitoring Board chair**

Richard Baker

# About this inspection and report

A1 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.

A2 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.

A3 All Inspectorate of Prisons reports include a summary of an establishment's performance against the model of a healthy prison. The four tests of a healthy prison are:

**Safety** children and young people, particularly the most vulnerable, are held safely

**Respect** children and young people are treated with respect for their human dignity

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

**Resettlement** children and young people are prepared for their release into the community and helped to reduce the likelihood of reoffending.

A4 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.

A5 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.

A6 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.

A7 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).

A8 All inspections of young offender institutions are conducted jointly with Ofsted or Estyn (Wales), the Care Quality Commission or Healthcare Inspectorate Wales and the General Pharmaceutical Council (GPhC). This joint work ensures expert knowledge is deployed in inspections and avoids multiple inspection visits.

## This report

A9 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.

A10 Details of the inspection team and the establishment population profile can be found in Appendices I and III respectively.

All 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** *Too many boys arrived late at the establishment and there were still long waits in court cells. The reception environment was good and boys were well cared for. First night cells were not always adequately prepared and the behaviour of other residents was intimidating. Induction was reasonably good. Child protection procedures required further improvement. Suicide and self-harm prevention measures were mostly good. Behaviour management was not sufficiently effective in response to significant challenges. Procedural security was mostly appropriate but dynamic security required greater emphasis. Adjudications were in disarray. Levels of violence remained high and measures to reduce violent behaviour were poorly applied. The Cedar unit was a good intervention. Use of force was high and records were not complete. Segregation had improved and boys were well cared for there. Substance misuse services were good. **Outcomes for children and young people were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.***
- S2** *At the last inspection in June 2014, we found that outcomes for children and young people in Cookham Wood were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test. We made 29 recommendations in the area of safety. At this follow-up inspection we found that seven of the recommendations had been achieved, five had been partially achieved, 16 had not been achieved and one was no longer relevant.*
- S3** In our survey and in groups, most boys told us that they felt safe on their journey to Cookham Wood and the vehicles that we saw were clean and well equipped. Too many boys had long waits in court cells before being returned to the establishment. Many of those returning from court and new arrivals did not reach the establishment until after 7pm and missed the opportunity to meet other boys on their wing and settle in. Video link with courts was underused.
- S4** We identified the placement of some boys in Cookham Wood who were not suitable for it because of their vulnerability or particular needs.
- S5** The reception environment was clean and bright. Since the last inspection it had been redecorated and extended to provide more holding rooms. We observed good interactions between reception staff and new arrivals.
- S6** The vulnerability of new arrivals was checked in private using a risk assessment and those who had not been in custody previously were subject to hourly checks. Preparation of accommodation for new arrivals was inadequate. Rooms were tidy, but they did not always contain all the necessary equipment. Boys occupying the first night landing shouted through their doors at new arrivals. This was intimidating for boys new to custody and was not challenged by staff.
- S7** A comprehensive induction included meetings with representatives of different departments but a PowerPoint presentation was not designed well enough to be engaging and informative. There was no formal peer mentor scheme to provide support to boys new to the establishment.
- S8** Arrangements with the local authority for making safeguarding referrals were good. Progress had been made in making child protection referrals but there were significant gaps in practice. Too many referrals contained insufficient information, delaying investigations by the

- local authority designated officer. There was inadequate oversight and limited confidence that recommended actions had been taken.
- S9 Incidents of self-harm were low and much lower than similar establishments. Most assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT)<sup>2</sup> documentation demonstrated that boys needing increased support were well cared for and boys subject to ACCT whom we spoke to confirmed this.
- S10 Behaviour management was not effective. It was used inconsistently and there were not enough incentives for good behaviour. Too often low-level poor behaviour was not challenged and was allowed to escalate. Staff had low expectations of boys and there were few opportunities for boys to demonstrate good behaviour.
- S11 Mediation was a good initiative but it was not used frequently enough.
- S12 Physical and procedural security, including searching and supervision of movements, were commensurate with the prevailing risk of violence, but searches under restraint were inappropriate. There was not enough emphasis on dynamic security and the management of security required improvement. Security meetings took place inconsistently and were poorly attended, and actions were not recorded. A significant backlog of information reports had not been processed which diluted their value.
- S13 The number of adjudications had doubled since the previous inspection and the system was in disarray, with more than 200 remanded cases, some for serious violence. A number were already out of time and many more were not likely to be resolved so that boys who had committed serious offences were not being punished. This was compounded by too many trivial matters being submitted for adjudication which could have been dealt with through the rewards and sanctions scheme.
- S14 In our survey, many more young people said they felt unsafe than at our previous inspection. Levels of violence remained too high and many incidents involved multiple assailants and improvised weapons. Assaults on staff had increased.
- S15 The Cedar unit was a good initiative to manage the more complex needs of children held there.
- S16 Safeguarding team information reports and 'team around the child' processes were in principle good reporting and management systems but they were not being used effectively to monitor and address violent behaviour. Bullying and the identity of victims were identified adequately but there was not enough focus on addressing the underlying behaviour of perpetrators. The support provided to victims and the few self-isolating boys required improvement.
- S17 Units were often noisy with a lot of shouting, some bad language, serious threats and kicking of doors which went unchallenged by staff.
- S18 Use of force was high and increasing, mostly in response to assaults and fights, but we were not confident that it was always justified. Pain-inducing techniques continued to be used, which was inappropriate, and they were not always recorded or reviewed. Training of staff in managing and minimising physical restraint had started but practice varied: in some incidents there was poor application of restraint and management of the incident required improvement. Use of force documentation and oversight remained poor.

---

<sup>2</sup> Assessment, care in custody and teamwork case management of children at risk of suicide or self-harm

- S19 The Phoenix unit now had a well-defined purpose. Relationships between staff and boys were excellent and staff demonstrated good knowledge of boys in their care. The environment and regime had also improved. Throughput had reduced and staff worked well to reintegrate most boys to normal location. The recording and oversight of boys segregated on normal location pending adjudication were poor.
- S20 Drug and alcohol use was not a significant problem and finds consisted of small amounts of tobacco and cannabis, and very occasionally alcohol. There was no strategic approach to substance misuse service delivery or supply reduction. A clinical service had been introduced but this was not robust enough for the safe management of children with high levels of dependency or complex needs. The substance misuse service offered good quality one-to-one work and a range of group interventions, but it was short staffed and stretched.

## Respect

**S21** *Residential accommodation was reasonable. Access to telephones was delayed for many boys. Relationships between staff and boys varied and the personal officer scheme was not effective. Equality work was improving but more needed to be done to address disadvantage and to improve the management of discrimination complaints. Complaints were managed reasonably well. Health services were mostly good but compromised by poor access to some services. There was impressive mental health provision. Food was reasonable but not enough meals were eaten in association. **Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***

**S22** *At the last inspection in June 2014, we found that outcomes for children and young people in Cookham Wood were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 37 recommendations in the area of respect.<sup>3</sup> At this follow-up inspection we found that 15 of the recommendations had been achieved, five had been partially achieved, and 17 had not been achieved.*

- S23 Accommodation was reasonable, although some cells were very dirty, not all had shower curtains and a small amount of graffiti was visible.
- S24 Boys on remand could not wear their own clothes, which was unreasonable, but prison clothing was of an acceptable standard.
- S25 In our survey, only 17% of boys said their cell bell was normally answered within five minutes, and we observed some remaining unanswered for some time.
- S26 There were telephones in cells, but staff and boys reported long delays in numbers being added to PIN phones. There were some delays in delivering mail and parcels, particularly at weekends.
- S27 In our survey, 62% of boys said staff treated them with respect compared with 86% at the previous inspection. Staff were inconsistent in their interactions with boys and, while we observed some very good interactions, some staff were distant or did not challenge poor behaviour. Detached duty staff comprised a quarter of the staff complement.

<sup>3</sup> This included recommendations about the incentives and earned privileges scheme which, in our updated Expectations (Version 3, 2012), now appear under the healthy prison area of safety.

- S28 The personal officer scheme was not operating effectively; some boys did not know who their personal officer was and case records indicated little interaction. Consultation arrangements were adequate.
- S29 The delivery of the equality agenda and promotion of equality had improved and the service for minority groups was reasonable. The identification of boys from a minority group was good but there were no consultation arrangements with most minority groups.
- S30 Local monitoring data were out of range in a number of areas and, although some work had been undertaken to understand this, more needed to be done to address this inequality.
- S31 The number of discrimination incident report forms (DIRFs) was much lower than the comparator and a significant number of complaints about discrimination were inappropriately dealt with through the regular complaints system. DIRFs were inadequately investigated and quality assurance was ineffective.
- S32 Provision for foreign national children and boys with disabilities was generally good and the inadequacy of services for Travellers was being rectified.
- S33 Members of the chaplaincy were visible around the establishment and provided an appropriate range of opportunities for worship, supplemented by classes. However, the multi-faith room in the main residential building was not large enough and remained a stark environment for religious observance.
- S34 Complaint forms were more freely available on units than at the last inspection and boxes were emptied daily. Complaint responses that we saw were polite and timely, although issues raised were not always adequately addressed.
- S35 Caseworkers helped boys to access legal advice and to understand their sentence. Legal visits did not afford adequate privacy but work was under way to provide interview rooms.
- S36 The primary health care and pharmacy services were good, but the health complaints system was not sufficiently confidential. Health care staffing had improved but clinical supervision was not fully embedded. Preparation for medical emergencies had improved, and a sustainable training plan was being implemented. There were not enough consultation and therapy rooms which had caused clinical time to be wasted, but there were plans to remedy this.
- S37 Boys were not able to access health care reliably which led to unacceptable delays in treatment. Access to dental care was poor with a low rate of attendance and a long waiting list. Mental health care had improved substantially with an impressive range of clinical and therapy options.
- S38 The food that we sampled was reasonable but there were too few opportunities to eat meals in association. In our survey, 61% of boys said the canteen sold a wide enough variety of products against the comparator of 47%. Some boys had to wait up to seven days to make their first canteen order.

## Purposeful activity

**S39** *There was significant slippage in the published core day and we found 36% of boys locked in their cells during the working day. The management of learning and skills had improved and there was some good partnership working, although there were missed opportunities to provide meaningful work. There was a broad education curriculum but vocational training had reduced and delays in movement to activities restricted activity hours. The quality of practical and academic teaching and learning was good but disrupted by some poor behaviour in education. Achievements were also good. Library provision was reasonable but a few boys had no access. PE provision was inadequate.*  
**Outcomes for children and young people were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.**

**S40** *At the last inspection in June 2014, we found that outcomes for children and young people in Cookham Wood were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 12 recommendations in the area of purposeful activity. At this follow-up inspection we found that one of the recommendations had been achieved, five had been partially achieved and six had not been achieved.*

- S41** In principle, a boy who was fully occupied could experience about nine hours out of cell a day, while those with no activity had only two hours. The establishment reported an average of five hours out of cell, which was low. There was significant slippage in the regime which had affected time out of cell. During our roll checks we found 36% of boys locked in their cells during the core day, which was too many.
- S42** Management of learning and skills had not improved sufficiently since the previous inspection. There continued to be good partnership working with community agencies. The self-assessment and quality improvement processes had improved, but there had not been enough progress to raise the quality of all provision.
- S43** There were missed opportunities to provide meaningful work around the establishment to support boys' resettlement needs and contribute to a safe and respectful environment.
- S44** The education curriculum provided a good range of learning opportunities but the breadth of vocational training provision had been reduced.
- S45** Most boys were allocated to activities based on an assessment of their education and vocational training preference. There were enough activity places but we found an average of only 106 boys engaged in education, vocational training and other activities during the working day. Delays in movement to activities often meant that activity hours were significantly reduced.
- S46** Teaching, learning and behaviour in practical sessions were good. Teaching and learning in academic sessions were good, and in a few cases outstanding, with good support for boys with learning difficulties, but poor behaviour often went unchallenged and disrupted learning.
- S47** Vocational training was not always accredited and the level was limited by security restrictions. Achievement of accredited qualifications in education, including English and mathematics, continued to be good and in a few cases outstanding.
- S48** There was a range of material in the library to meet the needs of the population. Access for most was reasonable, although some boys had no allocated time.

- S49 There were too few opportunities for boys to participate in gym and outdoor sport. Facilities were good but the sports hall roof continued to leak following repairs. Only one accredited gym programme was offered and no Heart Start or manual handling programmes were provided.

## Resettlement

**S50** *A comprehensive needs analysis was being undertaken. Temporary release opportunities were no longer available but plans to reinstate them were progressing. All boys had training plans and review meetings were appropriately focused. Public protection arrangements were sound. We were not confident that the needs of boys with or facing indeterminate sentences were being met. Looked-after children were identified but there was not enough support for them from social workers in the establishment. Reintegration planning was well organised and delivered. Pathway provision was generally good but the children and families pathway was underdeveloped. Some valuable group work programmes and individual work were provided and new interventions were being developed. **Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***

S51 *At the last inspection in June 2014, we found that outcomes for children and young people in Cookham Wood were good against this healthy prison test. We made 10 recommendations in the area of resettlement. At this follow-up inspection we found that two of the recommendations had been achieved, one had been partially achieved and seven had not been achieved.*

- S52 The resettlement strategy had not been reviewed since 2013 and a comprehensive needs analysis was under way to inform a revised strategy to address the needs of the population. Release on temporary licence had ceased since the previous inspection but plans to reinstate a scheme were being developed. Links with the relevant resettlement consortia were developing well.
- S53 The monthly resettlement meeting provided a forum to discuss work on resettlement, although there was too little evidence of progress in some pathways.
- S54 The casework team maintained effective links with others involved in boys' care and with their families, but caseworkers were still undertaking tasks more appropriate to residential staff.
- S55 All boys had relevant training or remand management plans, although some boys we spoke to were unaware what their plans contained or the targets they were working towards. Some review meetings with external attendees had to be curtailed because of delays in getting boys to the meetings on time. Other than this, meetings were well run and boys fully involved, but attendance by other departments in the establishment was poor.
- S56 Public protection cases were identified quickly after arrival and the risk management committee met regularly to discuss boys identified as a risk. Boys subject to MAPPA (multi-agency public protection arrangements) were identified and restrictions on release were well planned. Restrictions placed on boys' communication with others were assessed carefully and kept under regular review.
- S57 We were told that 10% of boys were remanded or sentenced for a capital offence - usually involves taking a life, which had resulted in, or could lead to, an indeterminate sentence - but we were not confident that all measures were in place to meet their needs.

- S58 There were good systems to identify children who had looked-after status and to alert their local authority, but the lack of consistent on-site social worker input compromised their effectiveness. The recruitment of two looked-after apprentices to work with caseworkers was a positive initiative.
- S59 Reintegration planning continued to be well organised and all children leaving were met at the gate by a parent, carer or professional.
- S60 Work to prepare boys for transition to the adult estate was appropriate but the task of identifying a prison willing to take a boy after his 18th birthday could be time consuming. Accommodation needs were identified and discussed early on, but, despite this, obtaining suitable accommodation for some boys required sustained efforts from advocates to resolve.
- S61 Good information, advice and guidance were provided by The Manchester College. Caseworkers and community agencies helped boys to identify suitable employment and training opportunities in the community on release, but the valuable ROTL opportunities found at the last inspection had ceased.
- S62 Health care and substance misuse discharge arrangements and communication with providers in the community were good. Kinetic Youth undertook some financial management work and boys were now able to open a bank account.
- S63 The children and families pathway was underdeveloped; there was no central record of how many boys had children, no parenting or relationship courses and no provision such as Storybook Dads. Bimonthly family days were organised, but only boys on enhanced level of the rewards and sanctions scheme were eligible for them.
- S64 The visits environment was being refurbished but the existing visits hall was unnecessarily untidy, visits started late and were not well organised.
- S65 There were credible plans to introduce accredited programmes and boys had access to relevant one-to-one and group work with specialist youth services. Work with boys with sexually harmful behaviour, or who were victims, had developed well.

## Main concerns and recommendations

- S66 Concern: Levels of violence against boys and staff were high. Although there were appropriate systems for reporting and managing violent incidents, they were not being used effectively to deal with the underlying causes of violent behaviour or to protect victims. Many more boys than at our last inspection reported feeling unsafe and a few were too frightened to leave their cells and participate in the regime.

**Recommendation: Systems for reporting, analysing and managing violent behaviour should be used effectively to reduce levels of violence, support victims and to make boys feel safe.**

- S67 Concern: Behaviour was not managed effectively which reflected inconsistent relationships between staff and the boys in their care. Poor behaviour was not consistently challenged and there were not enough incentives for good behaviour. Staff had low expectations of boys which did not promote good behaviour.

**Recommendation: There should be high expectations of boys and a good range of opportunities to demonstrate good behaviour in all areas of the establishment. The behaviour management policy should be underpinned by the**

**promotion of constructive relationships and its application should ensure that poor behaviour is consistently challenged and good behaviour rewarded.**

S68 Concern: Too few boys were engaged in activities during the working day and many classes started late, reducing the amount of time for delivering activities.

**Recommendation: All boys should attend activities during the working day and sessions should start and finish on time.**

S69 Concern: The children and families pathway was not well enough developed. No attention was paid to improving boys' understanding of relationships or supporting boys with parental responsibilities.

**Recommendation: The children and families pathway should be improved by development of relationships programmes and support for boys with parental responsibilities.**

# 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 said they felt safe on their journey to the establishment. Escort vehicles were clean and well equipped. Boys were still spending lengthy periods in court cells after their case had finished, and arriving at the prison late in the evening. We were concerned about the placement of some boys at Cookham Wood.*

**I.2** In our survey, 80% of boys said they felt safe on their journey to the establishment, and this was confirmed by boys in our groups. Escort vehicles were clean and well equipped and boys were not handcuffed while getting on and off vehicles at the establishment.

**I.3** Many boys attending court were left waiting too long in court cells after their case had been heard, including one whose case was completed at 9.40am who did not arrive at the establishment until 7.25pm. Two thirds of boys arrived at the establishment after 7pm which was particularly difficult for new boys as they lost the chance to meet others on their wing and settle in before being locked up for the night.

**I.4** A video link with courts had been used only 14 times during the six weeks before the inspection, a similar rate to last time, which was not exploiting the full potential for avoiding disruptive court appearances for short hearings.

**I.5** We had concerns about some boys who had been placed at Cookham Wood who did not seem suitable because of their vulnerability or particular needs. One was a Vietnamese boy about whom very little was known and who turned out to have health problems, and another undergoing drug detoxification required 24-hour medical supervision.

### Recommendations

**I.6** **Key staff at the establishment, NOMS, the YJB and the escort providers should meet regularly to monitor and resolve problems relating to escort arrangements and ensure that children arrive at the establishment in good time to be assessed and settled on their first night.** (Repeated main recommendation S80)

**I.7** **More use should be made of video links with courts.**

**I.8** **Boys should only be allocated to Cookham Wood when it is clear that the establishment can meet their needs.**

## 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.9** *The environment in reception had improved and boys were well cared for on arrival. There was a comprehensive risk assessment of new arrivals and regular first night observations. Cells on the first night unit had not been prepared to receive new arrivals. Aggressive shouting through doors on the first night landing was intimidating for boys new to custody and went unchallenged. Induction was comprehensive but not always engaging and informative.*
- I.10** In our survey, 67% of boys said they were treated well in reception, although black and minority ethnic and Muslim boys reported more negatively.
- I.11** The reception environment was clean and bright. Since the last inspection it had been decorated and extended to provide more holding rooms. Staff were welcoming, and we observed good interactions between them and new arrivals. There was no routine strip-searching.
- I.12** In our survey, 42% of boys said they had problems contacting family on arrival against the comparator of 29%. However, we observed a boy arriving who was offered a free facilitated call to a family member or friend.
- I.13** An initial health assessment was undertaken by a nurse in reception and we were assured that late arrivals were seen either by the nurse or an on-call GP.
- I.14** We found risk assessment to be comprehensive; a detailed assessment was carried out in private and staff had access to a range of information such as the e-Asset<sup>4</sup>.
- I.15** All new arrivals were housed on the first night and induction landing where they were checked hourly by staff for the first 24 hours, or 72 hours if they had not previously been in custody or had arrived with little documentation. Preparation of accommodation for new arrivals was not reliable; cells were clean, but many were not fully equipped.
- I.16** Boys occupying the first night landing shouted loudly through their doors at new arrivals which was aggressive and potentially intimidating, particularly for boys new to custody. This was not challenged by staff (see section on relationships between staff and young people).
- I.17** Boys stayed on the induction landing for two weeks where they received a comprehensive multidisciplinary induction. A new induction booklet was issued during the inspection, which was informative and more appealing to children than the previous one. The induction presentation delivered on the morning after arrival was too long and detailed. It was not designed well enough to be engaging and informative.
- I.18** There was no formal peer mentor scheme to provide support to boys new to the establishment.

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

## Recommendations

- I.19** Cells on the first night unit should be fully equipped and ready for use before boys are accommodated in them.
- I.20** Induction sessions should be designed and delivered in an engaging way. (Repeated recommendation I.18)
- I.21** There should be a formal peer mentor scheme to provide support to all boys new to the establishment. (Repeated recommendation I.17)

## Housekeeping point

- I.22** Reception should be well stocked with canteen packs which should be provided to all children on arrival.

## 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.23** *External safeguarding arrangements were good. Oversight of safeguarding had improved since our last inspection but there were still gaps in practice. The weekly safer regimes meeting provided a good forum to support boys with complex needs.*

- I.24** There continued to be good links with Medway Safeguarding Children Board and the prison was an active member of the main board and a number of sub-groups. All staff, with the exception of some detached duty officers, had received the NOMS 'Working with Young People' training.
- I.25** The monthly safeguarding meeting had been re-established and was well attended. There was a focus on violence reduction, suicide and self-harm and use of force. Analysis of patterns and trends had highlighted the increasing levels of violence in recent months (see section on violence reduction) and a strategy was being developed to address this. The health care team collected this information but it did not include the number and type of unexplained injuries and it was not shared with the safeguarding team.
- I.26** Safeguarding team information reports (STIRs) remained the mechanism for staff to alert the safeguarding team to concerns or information. During the six months to April 2015, 316 STIRs had been submitted, about 200 of which required action. This number had reduced significantly from the previous six months and the safeguarding team had raised concerns at the monthly safeguarding meeting about the fall in submitted reports while levels of violence were rising. STIRs were not always investigated or acted on swiftly. Staff in the safeguarding team were regularly deployed to other duties (see section on violence reduction).

- I.27** Boys with complex needs were discussed at the weekly multidisciplinary safer regime meeting, which was a good information-sharing forum focused on providing additional support to vulnerable children.

## Recommendations

- I.28** **Safeguarding team information reports (STIRs) should be submitted on every appropriate occasion.**
- I.29** **The work of the safeguarding team should be undertaken thoroughly and consistently.**

## Child protection

### Expected outcomes:

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

- I.30** *There was an appropriate child protection policy and child protection concerns were now routinely referred to the local authority designated officer (LADO). However, there were significant delays in investigations because of gaps in the information submitted.*

- I.31** Awareness of child protection had improved since the previous inspection. There had been 26 child protection referrals to the LADO in the previous six months, a substantial increase since the previous inspection. We were now confident that concerns raised by staff and boys were referred for external investigation. Children were able to raise concerns with a range of people and could readily access advice and support from independent advocates.
- I.32** Many boys were held for short periods at Cookham Wood so it was particularly important that investigations started swiftly. While the LADO confirmed that initial referrals were made quickly, we found that delays in investigations were often caused by documentation not being provided by the establishment at the point of referral. Most external referrals involved use of force incidents and there was a particular problem with incomplete use of force documentation (see section on the use of force). The safeguarding team did not systematically record the chronology of investigations and could not consistently identify or challenge these delays. The recording of internal investigations and actions also required improvement.
- I.33** About 80% of staff had undergone child protection training and staff whom we spoke to knew how to record concerns and refer them to the safeguarding team.
- I.34** Child protection was a key element at monthly safeguarding meetings. There was a positive relationship with the LADO, who attended the quarterly safeguarding meeting.

## Recommendation

- I.35** **Child protection investigations should be carried out without delay and should be systematically recorded, including actions taken internally.**

## 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.36** *Not all incidents of bullying were reported or adequately investigated. Threatening and intimidating behaviour was not consistently challenged. Support for victims of bullying required improvement.*

**I.37** All children were given a presentation on safer custody during induction. There was a 24-hour hotline for families to report concerns about bullying. The identification of victims of bullying and intimidation was reasonably good but not all incidents were reported for investigation through an STIR. When they were reported, we were not confident that they were always adequately investigated (see section on safeguarding). During the six months before the inspection, 43 incidents of bullying had been reported, but entries in the wing observation book showed that the number of incidents was higher. Staff supervision of boys on the residential units varied. Some staff challenged intimidating behaviour while others did not. This was particularly evident when we heard boys locked in their cells kicking their doors and shouting threatening abuse at another boy, which went unchallenged by staff.

**I.38** Formal support for victims of bullying was through the 'team around the child' (TAC) policy which was underused. Only two documents were open on the main wings at the time of the inspection which did not reflect the number of violent incidents and the number of boys who were isolating themselves because of threats and intimidation (see section on violence reduction and main recommendation S66).

## 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** *Incidents of self-harm were low and the quality of ACCT<sup>5</sup> documents was generally good.*

**I.40** The incidence of self-harm was commendably low. There had been 14 incidents during the previous six months which was lower than at the previous inspection and much lower than similar establishments. Most injuries were superficial and caused by scratching or punching walls. Over the same period, 50 ACCT documents had been opened which was similar to the previous inspection.

**I.41** The quality of ACCT documents was generally good. Reviews were consistently multidisciplinary, care maps were comprehensive and most entries in records reflected good levels of care. Quality assurance did not always address effectively some inconsistency in the records. Boys subject to ACCT oversight said they were well cared for by staff.

<sup>5</sup> assessment, care in custody and teamwork case management of children at risk of suicide or self-harm

- I.42** The constant observation cell in the segregation unit was no longer in use. Cedar unit and the main wing now housed the two constant observation cells and these provided a much better environment.
- I.43** The nature and extent of self-harm were discussed at the monthly safeguarding meeting. There were few discernible patterns. Boys subject to ACCT case management were discussed at the weekly multidisciplinary safer regimes meeting. This forum worked well in providing care for the most vulnerable boys.

## Behaviour management

### Expected outcomes:

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

**I.44** *Behaviour management was not effective. Staff across the establishment did not consistently challenge poor behaviour, opportunities to promote good behaviour were missed and there were not enough rewards for good behaviour.*

- I.45** The establishment was managing an increasingly complex group of boys and we found significant levels of poor behaviour and violence in all areas. We observed aggressive shouting through doors at night, disruption in education, threats to staff and children and unpredictable incidents of serious violence. There was a comprehensive behaviour management policy but implementation of the policy required significant improvement in several areas to address the challenges faced.
- I.46** Poor behaviour was not addressed consistently by staff in residential units, education or activity and low-level disruption was allowed to escalate before it was challenged. The adjudication system, used to deal with more serious issues, needed immediate attention to ensure that all adjudications were heard (see section on security and disciplinary procedures).
- I.47** Low expectations of boys resulted in limited opportunities for them to contribute to the prison community through wing work or peer support roles. There were not enough incentives for boys who demonstrated good behaviour: instant rewards were handed out infrequently by staff and the enhanced level of the incentives and earned privileges scheme offered few additional benefits.
- I.48** Mediation remained a good initiative to encourage better relationships between boys in conflict with one another. However, use of mediation had reduced as a consequence of staff shortages. There remained insufficient oversight of some aspects of behaviour management, including use of force and violence reduction.

## Rewards and sanctions

### Expected outcomes:

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

**I.49** *The incentives and earned privileges (IEP) and rewards and sanctions schemes were not consistently used to address poor behaviour. The differentials between levels of the IEP scheme were not adequate to encourage good behaviour and instant rewards were not issued often enough.*

**I.50** Staff continued to use two schemes. The IEP scheme had three levels: basic, standard and enhanced. Staff could give behaviour warnings for minor infringements of rules, which could result in demotion, or boys could be promoted to a higher level if they behaved well. The rewards and sanctions scheme provided similar sanctions to minor reports systems in other establishments but without a hearing. Staff could give green cards, attracting financial awards of up to £2. Yellow cards resulted in instant sanctions of up to three days' loss of privileges. We saw examples of the same incident attracting sanctions under both schemes, which was inappropriate. At other times, comparable incidents went unpunished.

**I.51** Staff preferred the rewards and sanctions scheme but used it inconsistently. The same poor behaviour did not always result in the same sanction and green cards were awarded too infrequently. We saw examples of informal appeals to supervising officers leading to sanctions being overturned.

**I.52** Children and staff confirmed that the differentials between the levels of the IEP scheme were not enough to encourage good behaviour. However, we were pleased to find that the basic regime, which was mainly applied following incidents of violence, was not excessively punitive and provided opportunities for boys to demonstrate improved behaviour. IEP reviews were held regularly and tailored to individual need.

**I.53** Boys to whom we spoke were clear about how both schemes operated but were understandably confused about what behaviour would attract a reward or punishment.

## Security and disciplinary procedures

### Expected outcomes:

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

**I.54** *Procedural and physical measures were broadly appropriate to the prevailing risks of violence. However, there was too little emphasis on dynamic security. Security meetings were poorly attended and recorded. Intelligence reports were shared promptly but many actions were delayed. There continued to be incidents of strip-searching under restraint. The adjudication system was unable to cope with high volumes and too many adjudications were remanded. Access to advocates remained good.*

- I.55** Physical security was proportionate but effective dynamic security was undermined by inconsistent relationships and interactions between staff and boys.
- I.56** Many aspects of security management required improvement. Security meetings, scheduled to take place monthly, had not been held consistently. The meetings were poorly attended, and the minutes did not record any actions.
- I.57** Over 1,700 intelligence reports had been submitted during the previous six months. They were not always processed swiftly and, at the time of the inspection, there was a backlog of 300 information reports. There were also delays in carrying out actions, including searches. There was little analysis of trends and patterns but it was clear that many intelligence reports related to violence and weapons. A recent wing search had recovered 15 improvised weapons, most of which were items placed in socks or sharpened cutlery. The type of socks that boys wore had been changed and the establishment was looking into procuring safer cutlery. There was a high number of rub-down searches, which was appropriate to keep boys safe.
- I.58** The establishment had a reasonable relationship with the local police who shared relevant information about the children and followed up cases referred to them.
- I.59** Boys were moved to activities class by class and there were often significant delays in start times for work and education. Many boys were unable to attend activities for some or all the day because they needed to be kept apart from other boys.
- I.60** The establishment only carried out cell or strip-searches on an intelligence and risk-led basis, which was commendable, although the authorisation paperwork required improvement. There were still instances of boys being strip-searched under restraint before less intrusive methods had been exhausted, which was not acceptable.
- I.61** The number of adjudications had risen significantly since the previous inspection and was very high. We found a system unable to cope with this high volume and about a third of adjudications were remanded. At the time of the inspection, over 200 adjudications had been remanded, most of which, including some for serious violence, were unlikely ever to be heard. There were often delays in the referral of adjudications to the police; these delays were not routinely escalated by the prison at an early enough point. The main charges were for fights and assaults but some were for more minor issues which should have been addressed by the rewards and sanctions scheme.
- I.62** Adjudication documentation was appropriately issued the day before the hearing and boys could be accompanied by an advocate during the hearing. Advocacy services remained well embedded and boys spoke highly of the support they had been given by advocates.
- I.63** The adjudication documentation that we reviewed varied. Most documentation demonstrated that boys were given enough opportunity to express their views and mitigation was taken into account, but a minority did not. Punishments continued to reflect the published tariff and remained consistent and appropriate for the population. Removal from unit was no longer used as a punishment. A sample of adjudications was quality checked by the deputy governor but this was not recorded.
- I.64** Adjudication review meetings took place every two months but the report we looked at did not contain sufficient analysis of trends or tariffs.

## Recommendations

- I.65** Children should not be strip-searched under restraint unless all other options have been exhausted, there is a risk to the safety of the child or others, and it has been authorised at a senior level and recorded accordingly.
- I.66** Security should be effectively managed with a regular, well attended security meeting which analyses current information about incidents and sets clear objectives to improve safety and security in the establishment. Information reports should be analysed immediately and intelligence-led searches carried out promptly.
- I.67** Adjudications should not be used for trivial matters and all adjudications should be heard.

## Housekeeping points

- I.68** Searching authorisation documentation should always outline the reasons for and level of the search.
- I.69** Adjudication review meetings should analyse trends and compliance with the tariff.

## Bullying and violence reduction

### Expected outcomes:

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

**I.70** *The number of incidents of violence remained high and many involved multiple assailants on one boy. Improvised weapons were used in many incidents. Strategies to manage perpetrators of violent behaviour and support victims were underused. The Cedar unit to support and reintegrate the most complex children was a good initiative.*

- I.71** The number of violent incidents was similar to our previous inspection and remained too high. During the six months to March 2015, there had been 61 assaults on boys and 92 fights. Some of the incidents remained serious with multiple assailants on a single boy and the use of improvised weapons, which was not uncommon. There had been an increase in the number of boys requiring outside hospital attention, many with head injuries sustained by assailants jumping on their head. Staff assaults had nearly doubled since the last inspection to 21 in the previous six months, and some had resulted in serious injuries. In our survey, 41% of boys said they had ever felt unsafe compared to 27% at the previous inspection and 21% said they felt unsafe now against the comparator of 14% and 10% at the previous inspection.
- I.72** STIR forms were used by staff to report concerns about safeguarding issues to the safeguarding team (see section on safeguarding) and a TAC (Team Around the Child, a multi-disciplinary method of managing victims and perpetrators) document was opened where appropriate to support victims and monitor perpetrators of violence and bullying. The TAC policy was a good procedure, involving multidisciplinary management of a child, but very underused to monitor and reduce violent behaviour. Only two documents were open on the main wings at the time of the inspection, one for a perpetrator and one a victim. Daily entries did not reflect engagement by staff and reviews had not been conducted. There was

not enough focus on supporting victims and addressing the underlying behaviour of perpetrators of violence and bullying.

- I.73** Seven boys had been identified as self-isolating through fear of being attacked (see section on victims of bullying and intimidation.) Some attended an education class together but otherwise spent most of the day in their cells. These boys felt particularly unsafe and more work was required to ensure they were supported and received an adequate regime.
- I.74** The extensive 'keep apart' list was used to manage boys who could not come into contact with others because of the risk of violence. Mediation had previously been successfully used to reduce the list but staff shortages in the safeguarding team had prevented regular use of mediation (see section on safeguarding.) It was planned to rectify this shortfall with the imminent arrival of more staff in the safeguarding team.
- I.75** Boys involved in persistent or violent behaviour were managed through the rewards and sanctions scheme, or managed in segregation or on the Cedar unit. The Cedar unit had been developed since our last inspection to support and reintegrate the most complex children and was a good initiative. A TAC document was used to record progress and the psychology team were involved in interventions.
- I.76** The establishment was involved in the development of a national violence reduction strategy for use across the young people's estate and was also developing a number of local strategies to address the high levels of violence. These had yet to be implemented.

## Good practice

- I.77** *The Cedar Unit was being developed as a resource to manage boys with complex needs without subjecting them to the segregation regime. The behaviour management system was used consistently and boys there had access to psychologists which led to reintegration for many of them.*

## The use of force

### Expected outcomes:

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

- I.78** *The use of force had continued to increase and was high. While most force was used in response to fights and assaults, we were not confident that all incidents in response to non-compliance were justified. We saw some examples of poor application of restraint and incident management. Use of force oversight and documentation remained poor. Training in minimising and managing physical restraint (MMPR) had started.*

- I.79** Use of force had continued to increase since the previous inspection and was high. There had been nearly 400 incidents involving force during the previous six months compared with 282 at the previous inspection. Over the same period three children had required treatment in hospital following restraint. Most use of force incidents were spontaneous in response to fights or assaults and involved full control and restraint techniques. Pain compliance had been recorded on three occasions during the previous quarter. The establishment had only recorded use of the mandibular angle technique (a form of restraint which involves pressure

being applied at a point below the ear), while we found examples of pain being applied through the wrist or calf that had not been recorded as pain compliance.

- I.80** There were very few planned incidents. These were recorded appropriately and CCTV footage was available for most spontaneous incidents. Documentation did not always show justification for the use of force, particularly in response to non-compliance. In one incident a boy was restrained for refusing to leave a room after an ACCT review. Force was instigated quickly and escalated to the infliction of pain by an officer kicking a boy in the calf with his heel.
- I.81** Most CCTV footage that we reviewed showed evidence of de-escalation by staff and in some instances bravery in protecting boys from attack. However, in some incidents inappropriate techniques were used, including neck holds. On other occasions, poor communication resulted in staff attempting to apply holds at the wrong time, increasing the risk of injury to children. In many of the recordings we observed, too many response staff remained present once the incident was under control.
- I.82** Health care staff attended all response calls and saw every boy after the incident. Debriefs with boys were also carried out. These were now undertaken by the MMPR coordinators in an attempt to reduce delays. The debriefs that we saw varied in quality. Boys were given the opportunity to speak to an advocate following restraint and all complaints made were now appropriately referred to the LADO for external investigation.
- I.83** At the time of the inspection, the establishment was preparing for the implementation within three months of MMPR, a new system of restraint with greater emphasis on de-escalation, and training was taking place.
- I.84** Oversight of use of force continued to require improvement. There were unacceptable delays in completing use of force reports with too many contributions from staff missing from records of recent incidents. As a consequence, the weekly restraint minimisation meeting spent most of its time reviewing incidents from three months ago, rather than reviewing all CCTV footage and use of force paperwork for incidents during the previous seven days, for which the meeting had been set up. We were not confident that all incidents requiring further investigation had been identified by the committee.

## Recommendations

- I.85** **Pain inducement techniques should not be used during use of force.** (Repeated recommendation I.84)
- I.86** **Force should only be used as a last resort and not to gain compliance.** (Repeated recommendation I.85)
- I.87** **Use of force documentation should be completed and use of force recordings should be reviewed swiftly after each incident.**

## Separation/removal from normal location

### Expected outcomes:

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

**I.88** *The environment and regime in Phoenix unit had improved significantly since the last inspection and it now had a well-defined purpose. Throughput had fallen since the previous inspection and staff worked well to reintegrate most boys to normal location. Relationships between staff and boys were excellent. The recording and oversight of boys segregated on normal location pending adjudication were poor.*

**I.89** Phoenix unit now had a well-defined purpose and was used to separate children from the main population for reasons of good order or discipline (GOOD). The environment on the unit had improved since the previous inspection. Cells were clean with adequately screened toilets, were reasonably well furnished and contained very little graffiti.

**I.90** The designation of Cedar unit for boys with complex needs had led to a reduction in the number segregated on Phoenix unit. During the previous six months, 63 children had been held in Phoenix unit, all for GOOD. The average stay on Phoenix unit was two weeks. However, at the time of the inspection, three of the seven residents had been there for much longer, up to four months, which was too long. Relationships between staff and children were excellent; boys spoke highly of staff who we found to be knowledgeable about the children in their care. Staff worked well to reintegrate boys and records showed the overwhelming majority of residents successfully returned to normal location at the establishment.

**I.91** GOOD reviews that we observed were multidisciplinary and appropriately focused on reintegration. However, boys were not explicitly told their weekly targets and none could recall what these were after the meeting. GOOD documentation showed that segregation was appropriately authorised. Boys received timely reviews but these were sometimes signed off by people who were not present at the review.

**I.92** Three children had been segregated while on an open ACCT document during the previous six months, with the authorisation by a senior manager for exceptional reasons. In one case the safety algorithm completed by health care incorrectly recorded that a boy was not on an open ACCT, which was a serious oversight.

**I.93** There were not enough exercise periods but otherwise the regime on the unit was reasonably good and improving. Boys had access to 30 minutes' exercise in an austere yard, a telephone call and shower each day. They were also encouraged to participate in activities off the unit, including education. Plans to improve outreach from education were advanced and the weekly input by a psychiatrist and psychologists was particularly good.

**I.94** Monitoring and review of segregation was conducted at the quarterly segregation monitoring and review group meeting. This meeting had failed to address the lack of recording or oversight of boys separated for short periods pending adjudication on normal location.

## Recommendations

- I.95** Boys should be separated for the shortest time possible. (Repeated recommendation I.95).
- I.96** All targets set at **GOOD** reviews should be explained to boys clearly and their understanding checked.
- I.97** Safety algorithms should be completed accurately for all boys.
- I.98** The establishment should record and monitor the number of boys segregated pending adjudication.
- I.99** **GOOD** documentation should only be signed by those present at reviews.

## Housekeeping point

- I.100** Children should be able to have one hour of exercise every day.

## Substance misuse

### Expected outcomes:

**Children and young people with drug and/or alcohol problems are identified at reception and receive effective treatment and support throughout their stay in custody.**

**I.101** *A strategic approach to substance misuse was still lacking but boys could access good quality interventions, and their care was well coordinated. A newly commissioned clinical service was not robust enough to manage safely drug or alcohol dependent boys with a high level of need.*

- I.102** The establishment did not have an up-to-date substance misuse strategy or a detailed service delivery plan informed by a needs analysis. Drug and alcohol service updates were provided at resettlement meetings, but there was no strategic approach to service development.
- I.103** The substance misuse service provider, Kent Council for Addiction, was merging with the national drug and alcohol charity, Addaction. All new receptions were seen within three days and referrals were appropriately prioritised.
- I.104** There was evidence of good quality casework and 104 boys were in contact with the service at the time of the inspection. Interventions consisted of harm reduction advice, one-to-one work, and a range of group work modules suitable for the age group, such as cannabis awareness and drug dealing. Service user involvement was sought through focus groups, surveys and attendance at contract reviews.
- I.105** There were good joint working arrangements with primary and mental health teams and case workers, and the service was represented at safer regimes and interdepartmental risk management meetings. All substance misuse staff had undertaken safeguarding training.
- I.106** There was provision for smoking cessation support but demand was low.

- I.107** A clinical service had been commissioned since the previous inspection. The first boy requiring detoxification had arrived in April 2015, although not all necessary arrangements, such as a drug testing kit, were in place and prescribing protocols had not been finalised. A substance misuse nurse had joined the drug and alcohol team, but, in the absence of 24-hour health care provision, agency staff would be required for night cover, and we were concerned about the adequacy of monitoring and observation arrangements.
- I.108** Drug use remained low and, in our survey, only 14% of boys said it was easy to get illegal drugs. Finds consisted of small amounts of cannabis and tobacco, and very occasionally 'hooch'. Mandatory drug testing on a suspicion basis had ceased but would be reintroduced as necessary. Appropriate supply reduction measures, such as intelligence-led searching and the use of drug dogs, were in place. Visits had been identified as the main route of supply, but there was a backlog of intelligence reports to be analysed (see section on security).
- I.109** Information sharing between the security department and substance misuse services was good, but there was no supply reduction strategy or action plan. Security meetings had been sporadic and there were no designated substance misuse strategy meetings to discuss and analyse trends.

## Recommendations

- I.110** Boys with a high level of clinical need should not be placed at the establishment in the absence of 24-hour health care cover and finalised treatment protocols.
- I.111** A supply reduction strategy should be developed and integrated with the substance misuse strategy so that trends can be identified quickly and remedial action taken.

## 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** *Accommodation was reasonable. Boys on remand could not wear their own clothes, which was unreasonable, but prison clothing was of an acceptable standard. Cell bells were not always answered promptly. Telephone access was good but there were delays in getting numbers added to PIN phones. There were delays in delivering mail and parcels.*
- 2.2** All accommodation was in modern single cells with integral shower and toilet. They were well equipped with a television, radio/CD player and kettle. Boys were responsible for cleaning their own cells, but some were very dirty. A small amount of graffiti was visible in some, and the offensive displays policy was not always enforced. Not all cells had shower curtains. Some of the landings were very dirty, with food on the floor and dirty tables. Boys were not expected to clean up after themselves in communal areas and we saw uniformed staff carrying out basic domestic tasks. The mutual lack of respect this demonstrated was demeaning for all concerned.
- 2.3** Prison clothing was of an acceptable standard, but it was unreasonable that boys on remand could not wear their own clothes. Each wing had a laundry where clothes were washed weekly but bedding was only washed fortnightly.
- 2.4** Landings were very noisy (see section on relationships between staff and children). Cell bells were constantly ringing; in our survey only 17% of boys said their cell bell was answered within five minutes against the comparator of 39% and 38% at the last inspection. We observed a number of cell bells ringing for some time and others being reset by staff without going to the boy's cell to see what he needed.
- 2.5** In our survey, 75% of respondents said it was easy to make an application but only 25% of boys said applications were dealt with quickly, against the comparator of 44% and 58% at the last inspection. Staff did not log the receipt of responses and there was no record of timeliness.
- 2.6** Each cell had a telephone, but there were significant delays in numbers being added to PIN phones. Incoming mail was processed daily and boys were required to open legal mail in front of staff. There were some delays in distributing mail and parcels at weekends because of a lack of staff, which had led to complaints from boys.

#### Recommendations

- 2.7** **All accommodation, including landings, should be kept clean and free of graffiti.**
- 2.8** **Boys should be responsible for cleaning communal areas under the direction of staff.**

- 2.9 Boys on remand should not have to wear prison clothes.** (Repeated recommendation 2.8)
- 2.10 All applications should be answered promptly.**
- 2.11 PIN numbers should be added to phones promptly to ensure that boys can communicate with friends and family.**
- 2.12 Mail and parcels should be delivered to boys promptly.**

### Housekeeping points

- 2.13** Items which contravene the offensive displays policy should be removed.
- 2.14** All cells should have shower curtains.

## 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.**

**2.15** *Far fewer boys than at the previous inspection said that staff treated them with respect. Staff were inconsistent in their interactions and some bad behaviour went unchallenged. Detached duty staff comprised a quarter of the staff complement. The personal officer scheme was not operating effectively. Consultation arrangements were adequate.*

- 2.16** In our survey, 62% of boys said most staff treated them with respect against 86% at the last inspection. Staff were inconsistent in their interactions with boys; we observed some very good interactions where staff clearly felt confident and at ease with the boys. Other staff were distant and less helpful. Boys told us they waited for the helpful staff to be on duty before asking for something. Not all staff challenged bad behaviour; for example the landings, including the first night landing (see section on early days in custody), were routinely noisy with shouting, swearing, and banging and kicking of cell doors. We observed this regularly go unchallenged by staff. A quarter of the staff were on detached duty and it was not clear if this contributed to the inconsistency of relationships. (See main recommendation S67.)
- 2.17** The personal officer scheme was not operating effectively; some boys did not know who their personal officer was and staff told us they did not have time to undertake effective personal officer checks. Case records showed little interaction, although we noted entries from managers undertaking quality assurance indicating that personal officer checks were required. Not all staff wore names on their uniforms.
- 2.18** There were adequate consultation arrangements via the youth council, which comprised a number of boys acting as representatives for their peers.

## Recommendations

- 2.19** An effective personal officer scheme should be in place, ensuring that all boys have an identified officer with whom they meet regularly to discuss concerns and needs.
- 2.20** All staff should wear their names on their uniform.

## 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.

- 2.21** *The delivery and promotion of the equality agenda had improved but there were still some gaps in provision. Discrimination incident report forms were poorly investigated and boys had little confidence in them. Out-of-range monitoring data had been investigated but not addressed. Consultation arrangements with boys from minority groups required improvement. Provision for foreign national boys and boys with disabilities was generally good.*

## Strategic management

- 2.22** The delivery of the equality agenda had improved since our last inspection. Although only one member of staff led on equality, the service had developed from a low base to reasonable provision for most minority groups. The equality and diversity policy was good and focused on the services available to support boys from each minority group. Equality and diversity were discussed at senior management team (SMT) meetings and at the monthly youth council.
- 2.23** The monthly equality meeting was chaired by the governor. Attendance was generally good, including representatives of the boys. Each protected characteristic and related issues were discussed and monitored through the equality action plan. The impact of the regime was monitored through the local monitoring assessment tool. Data showed that black children were consistently out of range for adjudications, segregation and the basic level of the incentives and earned privileges process. A strategy was being developed to address this over-representation but had yet to be implemented.
- 2.24** The promotion of equality was better than previously with displays on notice boards around the establishment. Diversity was promoted mainly through the education department. A calendar of events included plans to promote Travellers month in June 2015. Four equality representatives were well supported by the equality manager. Consultation with boys from minority groups took place through the representatives, with the exception of foreign national boys. Opportunities for the equality representatives to see boys on other landings were restricted by wing staff which reduced their effectiveness.

- 2.25** With the exception of Gypsy, Romany and Traveller boys, the identification of boys from a minority group was good. Information sharing between health care and the equality department about boys with a disability required improvement.
- 2.26** Ten discrimination incident report forms (DIRFs) had been submitted so far in 2015, which was much lower than similar establishments. Most of these concerned inappropriate racial language. In our structured groups, young people said they had no faith in the DIRF process. None of the DIRFs had been investigated to a reasonable quality and, although quality assurance had highlighted significant shortfalls, this had not been effective in improving quality. There was no external quality assurance. We found a number of regular complaints containing an element of alleged discrimination which should have been managed as a DIRF. DIRFs were freely available on each landing.

## Recommendations

- 2.27 Inequality identified through monitoring data should be investigated and addressed.**
- 2.28 The quality of investigations into discrimination incident reports should be improved and should include effective quality assurance.**

## Diverse needs

- 2.29** At the time of the inspection, about 60% of boys were of black or minority ethnic origin compared to only 4% of staff. Equality representatives and boys in our structured groups voiced concerns that staff lacked cultural awareness and that this affected how they were treated. Cultural awareness training was included in the equality action plan but had not yet been implemented.
- 2.30** In our survey, black and minority ethnic and Muslim boys held similar perceptions about their treatment to white boys, although in groups black and minority ethnic boys described different responses from staff to black boys asking for everyday items such as a newspaper. We saw no evidence of black and minority ethnic or Muslim boys being treated differently but specific consultation with black and minority ethnic boys which we recommended at our previous inspection had not taken place.
- 2.31** In our survey, 9% of boys said they were from a Gypsy, Romany or Traveller background. The prison had identified only one in formal records but was aware of at least six. There was no forum for Gypsy, Romany, Travellers to meet. In education, Traveller boys were helped with reading, writing and mathematics in a group learning environment. The planned celebration of Travellers month was a positive development.
- 2.32** There were 27 foreign national boys at the time of the inspection. We saw interpretation services being used at a case review for a Vietnamese boy and records showed that interpretation services were used when required. The foreign national coordinator had good links with Home Office immigration who attended when required. ESOL (English for speakers of other languages) was available through education and there was a small selection of books and dictionaries in the library.
- 2.33** In our survey, 24 young people described themselves as having a disability. Their perceptions about safety were more negative than other boys: 50% of boys with disabilities against the comparator of 17% said they felt unsafe now. There was no forum for boys with disabilities to raise issues. The prison had identified 39 boys with a disability, most of whom had learning

difficulties. The special educational needs coordinator provided good support for those boys classed as autistic or having a learning difficulty. There were no personal emergency evacuation plans but we were assured that systems were in place to provide them if required.

- 2.34** No boys had identified themselves as gay, bisexual or transgender but there were processes in place to provide individual support. There were some posters addressing homophobia but not enough had been done to reassure gay and bisexual boys that the establishment provided a safe and supportive environment.

## Recommendations

- 2.35** **Cultural awareness should be promoted and staff should receive refresher training in equality.** (Repeated recommendation 2.43)
- 2.36** **Regular meaningful consultation should be held with all minority groups.**
- 2.37** **Gay and bisexual boys should be reassured that support and advice was available for them and that homophobic behaviour would be robustly addressed.**

## 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.**

- 2.38** *The provision of faith services was appropriate to the population, but the multi-faith rooms required improvement.*

- 2.39** Members of the chaplaincy were available every day and, with the help of some sessional chaplains, provided for the boys' faith needs. Some faith classes were offered and more were planned. Chaplains were visible around the establishment, but sometimes found it difficult to see boys in private if staff were not available to unlock and search the boys. Chaplains said this could sometimes prevent boys attending services or faith classes. A member of the team met new arrivals on their first full day in custody.
- 2.40** The multi-faith room in the accommodation block remained stark and unfit for purpose. It was too small for Muslim prayers and there were no washing facilities nearby so that a multi-faith room in the old accommodation had to be used. A business plan was being prepared to improve both multi-faith rooms.
- 2.41** Boys did not have to make a weekly application to attend a religious service of their choice, provided there were no security or 'keep apart' concerns. Options for alternative group worship were limited and boys who could not attend services were visited by a chaplain. The chaplains supported all boys who were experiencing bereavement, other bad news or a personal crisis, irrespective of their faith.

## Recommendation

- 2.42 Subject to security concerns, all boys should be able to see a chaplain and attend corporate worship.**

## Complaints

### Expected outcomes:

**Effective complaints procedures are in place for children and young people, which are easy to access and use and provide timely responses. Children and young people are provided with the help they need to make a complaint. Children and young people feel safe from repercussions when using these procedures and are aware of an appeal procedure.**

- 2.43** *Complaint forms were more freely available on units than at the last inspection and boxes were emptied daily. Responses to complaints that we saw were generally polite and timely, although some did not adequately address the issues raised.*

- 2.44** Complaint forms were now available on landings as well as in the communal area of units. Boxes were emptied daily by a complaints clerk. A system for quality assurance of all complaints by the governor had yet to be implemented.

- 2.45** In the first quarter of 2015, an average of 30 complaints a month had been submitted. In April there had been a spike with around 75 complaints, which required further investigation. Complaints were broken down each month by ethnicity, location and theme and reported to the SMT, although there was little evidence in SMT meeting minutes of any discussion or analysis.

- 2.46** In our survey, 25% of boys said they thought complaints were sorted out quickly, compared with 49% at the previous inspection. However, the responses we saw were timely and generally polite, although some did not adequately address the issues raised.

## Recommendations

- 2.47 Complaints should be quality assured and data and analysis discussed at senior management team meetings.**
- 2.48 The responses to complaints should adequately address the issues raised.**

## Legal rights

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.49** *Caseworkers ensured that boys understood their legal rights and status. Arrangements for boys to contact their legal advisers were reasonable. Legal visits were not held in sufficient privacy.*

- 2.50** Caseworkers explained boys' legal rights and custodial status to them. Nearly a quarter of boys were on remand. At their initial meeting caseworkers checked if they wanted to make a bail application and liaised with community YOT workers to facilitate this.
- 2.51** Boys could make free private telephone calls to their legal advisers through their caseworkers. Legal visits were held in the mornings in the main visits hall which was not sufficiently private. The new visits facility, scheduled to open within weeks, included six private visit booths which was a big improvement on the existing arrangements.
- 2.52** Early and late release provisions were explained to boys who were serving a detention and training order. Boys we spoke to were aware of significant dates in their sentence and discussed trying to obtain early release during their planning reviews. Early release had been used appropriately, and there had been no use of the late release provisions.

## 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.**

- 2.53** *Primary care services had improved and there was a more stable staffing profile. Service provision continued to be hampered by insufficient consulting rooms and boys had limited access to health care appointments. The dental service was good, but waiting times were too long. Pharmacy and mental health services were very good.*
- 2.54** *The inspection of health services was jointly undertaken by the Care Quality Commission (CQC)<sup>6</sup> and HM Inspectorate of Prisons under a memorandum of understanding agreement between the agencies. The Care Quality Commission contributed to this inspection and they found there were no breaches of the relevant regulations.*

## Governance arrangements

- 2.55** The CQC found there were no breaches of the relevant regulations.
- 2.56** NHS England Kent, Surrey and Sussex commissioned Oxleas NHS Foundation Trust to provide primary care services and Central and North West London NHS Trust (CNWL) to provide mental health services. There was an effective monitoring meeting for the Oxleas contract and further developments were planned. Working relationships between health services and the establishment were very good.
- 2.57** A joint quality group monitored governance arrangements, including the health improvement plan which had been amended following an audit of the CHAT (comprehensive health assessment tool).

<sup>6</sup> CQC is the independent regulator of health and adult social care in England. It monitors, inspects and regulates services to make sure they meet fundamental standards of quality and safety. For information on CQC's standards of care and the action it takes to improve services, please visit: <http://www.cqc.org.uk>

- 2.58** A new health needs assessment had been published in February 2015, which lacked consideration of dentistry and immunisation and vaccination.
- 2.59** There was no separate health complaints process, which compromised medical confidentiality, but responses to those made through the central system were appropriate. Receipt of complaints was noted in the boy's clinical record, which was not appropriate. Reported adverse incidents were managed appropriately.
- 2.60** Health services had contributed to the prison forum and had conducted a patient survey; however, there was no health services users' forum to inform service development.
- 2.61** A registered nurse was on site from 7.30am to 9pm Monday to Friday with shorter hours at weekends. Staffing had improved and there were now enough staff to provide a continuous service. Staff mandatory training was up to date and consideration was being given to preparing nurses to lead long-term condition clinics. Clinical supervision was not consistently used or documented. There were sufficient GP clinics and out-of-hours cover, which was occasionally used, was provided by a Maidstone practice.
- 2.62** Several primary care policies were now in place, although some were generic Oxleas policies which were not tailored for use at the establishment.
- 2.63** In our survey, 55% of boys said it was easy see a nurse against the comparator of 66%, though we observed nurses to be accessible. Primary care services were delivered from the A&B medical unit and the dental suite located in the old centre, which was not a suitable location. The restricted capacity of the A&B medical rooms limited the ability to run simultaneous clinics. We were told of plans to create further therapy space. A recent Oxleas infection control audit had indicated 93% compliance, which was very good. An action plan addressed areas for improvement.
- 2.64** Automated external defibrillators were easily accessible to custody staff, half of whom had been trained to use them; there were trained custody staff on every shift. Ambulance response times remained good.
- 2.65** Nurses were readily identifiable and knew their patients. We observed excellent interactions with boys. The electronic clinical records, SystemOne, that we sampled were complete. All new arrivals received information about health services.
- 2.66** There was a systematic approach to health promotion, although it was limited on the wings. There was no health and wellbeing plan for young offender institutions. There were age-appropriate health screening and immunisation and vaccination clinics, including chlamydia testing, measles, mumps and rubella immunisation, and meningitis C vaccination. Nicotine replacement therapy and barrier protection were readily available, although the latter was poorly advertised and rarely requested.

## Recommendations

- 2.67** **The health needs assessment should assess the boys' need for dentistry and immunisation and vaccination.**
- 2.68** **Health complaints should be separate from the main complaints system and receipt of complaints should not be recorded in boys' clinical notes.**
- 2.69** **Staff members should receive regular documented clinical supervision.**

## Housekeeping points

- 2.70 Generic health care policies and procedures should be localised to reflect the needs of the establishment.
- 2.71 Health promotion and harm minimisation should be advertised more prominently.

## Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.72 Primary care nurses saw all new arrivals in reception for a private initial assessment using the CHAT. A further comprehensive component was completed the next day which included learning disability and neurological screenings. There was good liaison with community services to ensure continuity of care.
- 2.73 Boys asked nurses for services or submitted confidential pictorial applications. Waiting times were reasonable, but considerable delays in escorting boys wasted a lot of appointment time. Clinical time was also wasted because there was no waiting area and there were gaps in boys arriving to be seen.
- 2.74 There were clinics for health promotion, asthma, sexual health, physiotherapy and vaccinations. There were plans to introduce an oral hygiene education clinic to complement dental clinics. The non-urgent waiting time to see a GP was very good at around two working days. The GP did-not-attend rate was under control at 6%, but the rate for the optician was an unacceptable 30%.
- 2.75 The nursing manager was awaiting the new health needs assessment before creating a staff development plan. Nurses led a number of clinics and the GP managed lifelong conditions, which were uncommon.
- 2.76 Any boy reported as being involved in a physical incident was seen promptly and followed up the next day, which offered good support. All boys subject to adjudication were seen to ensure they were fit to interview, which was commendable.
- 2.77 Access to external health care appointments was good and well managed.

## Recommendation

- 2.78 **Children should be able to attend their health appointments on time and did-not-attend rates should be minimised.**

## Pharmacy

- 2.79 Pharmacy staff visited the establishment weekly to audit stock and procedures, undertake medicine use reviews and give individual advice to the boys. Health care workers felt well supported by pharmacy staff.
- 2.80 Prescribing levels were low and appropriate to the population. Stock management was good; medicines were stored correctly and refrigerator temperatures were recorded daily. There was careful and audited management of controlled drugs by both Oxleas and Addaction.
- 2.81 Most medicines were given as supervised doses from hatches at the A&B medical centre. Some medicine queues were not well supervised as boys tended to intrude at the hatches

unchallenged. There was less in-possession medication than in 2014; risk assessments were available on SystemOne. Nurses could administer a range of over-the-counter medicines, but no triage guidance was available to nurses and there was a limited range of patient group directions<sup>7</sup> but these were both being developed.

## Recommendation

- 2.82 Medicine queues should be regulated to ensure that crowding at the hatches does not occur.**

## Dentistry

- 2.83** There was a weekly dental clinic on Friday afternoon and occasional Saturday morning clinics. Despite this, only 18% of boys in our survey said it was easy to see the dentist compared to 35% in 2014. The did-not-attend rate was 46% in the past year, which was unacceptable. The waiting list was too long and 55 boys had been waiting for an excessive time: 13 for longer than eight weeks with one waiting 13 weeks. We were told that this was because boys had not been brought to their appointments.
- 2.84** At the time of the inspection, 24% of boys were Muslim. It was not known if any declined health appointments on Fridays for religious observance. NHS-equivalent dental treatment was available and appropriate entries were made on SystemOne. We were unable to observe a consultation.
- 2.85** The dental surgery was large and well equipped but was now isolated from the A&B medical centre. Separate decontamination facilities were needed to comply with best practice. Dental equipment was appropriately maintained and certificated. Dental waste was disposed of professionally.

## Recommendation

- 2.86 Access to dental services should be improved to reduce the non-attendance rate to acceptable levels and best practice guidance for decontamination should be followed.**

## Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.87** In our survey, 27% of boys said that they had emotional or mental health problems and 64% of them reported that someone in the establishment was helping them with their problem. One in five custody staff had received mental health awareness training in 2015 and CNWL was assisting with an ongoing training programme.
- 2.88** There was a rich mix of skills in the health and wellbeing team (HWBT) including art therapy, mental health nursing, clinical psychology, psychiatry and speech and language therapy. Staff training and clinical supervision were appropriate. Between 35 and 50 boys were in contact with the HWBT at any one time, their needs ranging from emotional support to severe mental disorders.

---

<sup>7</sup> Enable the supply and administration of prescription-only medicine by persons other than a doctor or pharmacist, usually a nurse

- 2.89** A good range of therapeutic options was offered in one-to-one and group settings, including the innovative sexual behaviour service. Enhanced support was offered each week to the Phoenix unit and custody staff felt supported by this.
- 2.90** The ability of children to access consultation and therapy was an ongoing problem because of the lack of rooms and boys arriving late, or not at all, for their appointments. In January 2015, clinicians had audited the time lost, which was 110 days, including 21 days of medical time, 31 days of psychology time and 59 days of nursing time – an alarming misuse of the resource. The establishment had tried to respond and the situation had improved, albeit not enough.
- 2.91** Care planning and record keeping on SystemOne were exemplary. Coordination with other departments was very good and families of boys subject to the care programme approach were invited to participate in regular reviews. No boy had been transferred to community mental health services during the previous year. We were told that there were very good relationships with the NHS Wells Unit (forensic child and adolescent mental health services).

## Recommendations

- 2.92** **Boys should be able to access mental health consultations and treatment as clinically indicated.**
- 2.93** **Health care professionals should not be hampered from seeing their patients.**

## 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.**

**2.94** *The food we sampled was reasonable but there were too few opportunities to eat meals in association.*

- 2.95** Boys were given a breakfast pack in the morning, a cold packed lunch around midday, and a hot meal at 5pm. In our survey, only 11% of boys said the food was good, although the food that we sampled during the evening meal was reasonable and portion sizes were adequate.
- 2.96** Boys were able to eat breakfast and evening meal in association on the landings, although in practice staff and boys told us that breakfast was rarely eaten on landings because of staffing issues. We saw instances of boys not being allowed to eat their evening meal in association for the same reason. Breakfast and lunch packs were left on the floor outside cells, which was disrespectful and potentially unhygienic.
- 2.97** A varied menu operated on a four-week cycle and catered for a range of diets. Fresh fruit and vegetables were available each day. A chocolate biscuit and milk was given to boys as a snack for the evening, although it was provided at teatime and most boys ate it with their meal.
- 2.98** Boys worked on the serveries, and two worked in the kitchen, but none was involved in cooking food nor could they achieve qualifications through their work.

- 2.99** Consultation arrangements had improved; food comments forms had been introduced, a twice yearly survey was conducted and a catering representative attended the youth council meetings.

## Recommendations

- 2.100 All meals should be issued at the servery and eaten in association.** (Repeated recommendation 2.106)
- 2.101 Boys should be employed to prepare food so that they can achieve related qualifications.** (Repeated recommendation 2.108)

## 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.**

**2.102** *In our survey, 61% of boys said the canteen sold a wide enough variety of products. Some boys had to wait up to seven days to submit a canteen order. The provision of emergency canteen packs was not well publicised.*

**2.103** Most new arrivals were given a free canteen pack of basic items in reception, although supplies had run out during the inspection week (see section on early days in custody). Canteen orders were submitted on a Tuesday for delivery by staff on a Saturday. Boys arriving after Tuesday had to wait up to seven days to make their first canteen order. An emergency canteen pack could be purchased, but this was not well publicised and was not offered to a boy we observed arriving on a Tuesday night (see section on early days in custody).

**2.104** In our survey, 61% of boys said the canteen sold a wide enough variety of products against the comparator of 47%, although Muslim boys reported more negatively at 45%. Three catalogues were available and no administration fee was applied to orders. Canteen was discussed at youth council meetings, and minutes of the meetings showed that action was taken to address concerns raised.

## Recommendation

- 2.105 Boys should be able to place a canteen order within 24 hours of their arrival.**

## 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>8</sup>**

**3.1** *Staff shortages and significant slippage in the regime had affected time out of cell. Too many boys were locked in their cell during the core day. Exercise periods were too short and the yards were stark.*

**3.2** The restricted core day put in place before the last inspection remained because of persistent staff shortages. Evening and weekend association periods continued to be on rotation. In our survey, only 14% of boys said they had association every day against the comparator of 74% and 37% at our last inspection. During the inspection, the shortfall of posts was filled with detached duty staff and there were immediate plans to provide daily association for boys. The published core day for a boy attending all his scheduled activities allowed about nine hours out of cell, while boys with no activity had only two hours. The establishment reported an average of five hours out of cell, which was low. Significant slippage in the regime further eroded this time.

**3.3** At roll checks during the core day, we found an average of 36% of boys locked in their cells, which was much higher than we find in similar establishments. Reasons for boys being in cell included refusing activity, cancellation of activity and being on the 'keep apart' list.

**3.4** Access to daily exercise was limited to 30 minutes and exercise was cancelled in inclement weather. Exercise yards had seats but were otherwise stark.

### Recommendations

**3.5 All children should spend a minimum of 10 hours every day out of their cell.** (Repeated recommendation 3.4)

**3.6 Boys should be given the opportunity to spend at least one hour in the open air every day.** (Repeated recommendation, 3.5)

**3.7 More activities should be available during outside exercise.** (Repeated recommendation, 3.6)

<sup>8</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

### 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** *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) 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.*

**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: Requires improvement*

**3.10** *The overall effectiveness of education, learning and skills was good. The leadership and management of education, learning and skills required improvement and had not improved sufficiently since the previous inspection, nor had there been enough progress on most recommendations. Quality improvement processes had been established, with clear targets to drive performance. Managers used data well to monitor progress. Attendance and punctuality had not improved enough, and boys arrived late for a number of activities. Boys' behaviour had shown a small improvement and was good in most practical sessions, but was not consistently good enough in a minority of education sessions. Teaching, learning and assessment had improved and were good in most education and training sessions, though too many sessions still required improvement. Achievement of accredited qualifications and the development of boys' personal and social skills were good. The range of education provision was good, but vocational training opportunities required improvement. Staff supported boys with complex learning difficulties particularly well. Access to the library required improvement. PE provision was inadequate.*

## Management of education and learning and skills

**3.11** *Management of education and learning and skills had not improved sufficiently and required further improvement. Senior managers were focused on meeting the demands of the increased population, many of whom had complex learning needs, but had failed to deal adequately with recommendations from the previous inspection report. The Offender Learning and Skills Service (OLASS) provision, delivered by The Manchester College (TMC), was good. However, implementation of the OLASS contract had been delayed and it had*

only started functioning effectively from February 2014. Good use continued to be made of programmes leading to the achievement of partial qualifications. This was particularly effective in motivating boys and addressing the needs of those with short sentences.

- 3.12** Senior education and establishment managers worked very well with community agencies such as Kinetic, who provided high levels of individual support to boys to help them improve their personal and social development skills and enable them to reintegrate into classroom based learning sessions. Kinetic staff also provided a youth club environment in the evenings and a few boys were being supported to achieve Duke of Edinburgh awards.
- 3.13** The Manchester College continued to provide a wide range of good education programmes which reflected the national curriculum and included information technology (IT) courses at level 3. A few vocational training programmes were offered by TMC and prison staff, but these had reduced recently because of delays in the change of OLASS contractor and the implementation of a new Youth Justice Board contract to start in August 2015. The contract will provide qualified prison training staff working for the OLASS provider alongside TMC staff and will increase the number of hours of learning and skills training for boys. Plans were well advanced to introduce an improved curriculum developed through firmly established self-assessment and improvement planning.
- 3.14** Monitoring by the quality improvement group (QIG) had improved since the previous inspection, but there had not been enough progress to raise the quality of all aspects of provision. Staff benefited from a good staff development programme which provided a range of opportunities for continuing professional development and sharing good practice in teaching, learning and assessment. TMC had supported prison staff well since November 2014 and had successfully trained a few prison staff as qualified trainers.
- 3.15** Attendance and punctuality were poor for some activities. The increase in the number of boys at the establishment and security issues had affected the regime and movement processes and too many boys did not arrive on time to activities.

## Recommendations

- 3.16 Vocational training provision should be increased to provide more opportunities to meet boys' resettlement needs and aspirations.**
- 3.17 All boys should be able to attend activities regularly and punctually.**

## Provision of activities

- 3.18** All boys received an induction to education and vocational training as part of a two-week induction programme, identifying their English, mathematics and IT skills. There were enough activity places for all boys and where possible they were allocated a place swiftly but attendance was adversely affected by safety considerations and refusals (see section on time out of cell).
- 3.19** At the time of the inspection, too few boys were able to gain employment in meaningful work such as peer mentors, orderlies and workers in the laundry and gardens. Most of the available prison-funded vocational training was not formally accredited and security restrictions meant that only qualifications at level 1 were offered in a few areas.

- 3.20** The education curriculum continued to offer a good variety of programmes. It included drama, creative arts, employability skills and media studies. TMC offered boys the opportunity to gain qualifications, including in functional English and mathematics, information and communications technology (ICT), business studies, catering, painting and decorating and personal and social development. Individual ESOL provision was offered as required. Managers coordinated staff in the inclusion unit very well and staff provided very effective support for boys with complex learning difficulties. Many boys made good progress, particularly with reading skills.
- 3.21** Activities included independent living, a murals workshop, prison radio and an introduction to mechanics. The range and level of qualifications offered progression pathways from entry level to level 2 and a few level 3 programmes. Boys were able to continue preparation for GCSE examinations that they had started in the community. TMC and Kinetic staff successfully delivered individual personal and social development learning sessions on the Phoenix and Cedar units.

### Recommendations

- 3.22** **The number and range of work activities around the establishment should be increased so that all boys are engaged fully in purposeful activity which meets their resettlement needs.**
- 3.23** **Security arrangements should be reviewed to ensure that vocational training programmes above level 1 are offered where appropriate.**

### Quality of provision

- 3.24** The quality of teaching, learning and assessment had improved since the previous inspection and remained good. Boys clearly enjoyed the sessions and were well behaved in most settings. There was good deployment of qualified learning support assistants and orderlies who helped boys to develop skills.
- 3.25** Teaching, learning and assessment in most education classes were good. Careful planning ensured that all individual needs were met. Teaching staff engaged and motivated boys with diverse needs but in a small minority of education sessions teachers did not always manage boys' behaviour effectively which disrupted learning for all boys.
- 3.26** The more able boys were stretched and given suitably challenging tasks, for example, developing the content for the radio station including interviews with staff. Staff used the murals workshop to engage boys with complex needs successfully in projects in a safe environment. Information and learning technology was well used to engage boys, who developed high level IT skills in some areas. All boys were issued with an individual learning plan (ILP) folder during induction for planning, reviewing and recording learning which provided boys with clear targets to help them improve. The assessment of boys' written and graphical work was good and contained useful, constructive comments. Work was still needed to ensure that targets for the development of personal and social skills were recognised and recorded.

### Recommendations

- 3.27** **Teachers should ensure that disruptive behaviour during learning sessions is challenged.**

- 3.28 Staff should set specific targets to develop and record the boys' personal and social skills.**

### Education and vocational achievements

- 3.29** Achievement data were only available from August 2014 to February 2015 because of change to the OLASS provider contract. Achievement in education and vocational training, including English and mathematics, was good and in some cases, such as ICT, was outstanding. Most boys completed short accredited qualification units across their selected learning pathway, which included subject related qualifications, English, mathematics, and personal and social skills. Many boys had a history of school refusal or exclusion and had few or no qualifications. Units of study offered the opportunity to complete a full or partial award and were particularly effective for boys staying for a short period. Boys enjoyed their learning and made good progress in developing practical skills and knowledge that would assist them with employability and independent living.
- 3.30** Development of personal and social skills was particularly good. Boys produced good written work and some artwork was of a very high standard. It had been successfully nominated for seven Koestler awards in 2014 and at the time of the inspection 73 applications for awards had been made. Boys' written work required improvement in a few learning sessions.

### Library

- 3.31** The library was a large, well-lit room with adequate space for the book stock and tables and chairs. The range of books was varied and sufficient to meet the needs of the boys. There were adequate reference books and a few inter-library loans had been effected during the previous year. The assistant librarian visited Cedar and Phoenix units once a week to supply books for the boys housed there at their request.
- 3.32** A new library schedule had been planned to be implemented when the new librarian was in place to extend opening from three to four days a week and include access by all classes. All boys received an induction to the library. The weekly scheduled session was 30 minutes which was enough to meet the needs of most library users. Only one event had been held over the last year to promote literacy and this had not been successful. Book issues had increased significantly over the last year which reflected the rise in population. There were no opportunities for boys to become library orderlies or to gain a qualification in the library.

### Recommendation

- 3.33 The library should improve the promotion of literacy across the establishment.**  
(Repeated recommendation 3.30)

## 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.**

**3.34** *Access to the gym and sports facilities required improvement. PE sessions were often cancelled and only one accredited programme was offered. PE staff no longer provided accredited courses in Heart Start or manual handling during induction. Facilities required improvement; the sports hall roof continued to leak despite recent repairs. Formal links between health care and PE staff needed improvement.*

**3.35** The standard of PE facilities was good and staff actively encouraged participation in sports activities.

**3.36** Access to recreational PE required improvement. The staffing level had reduced from eight to six and PE sessions were often cancelled. Attempts to repair the sports hall roof had not been successful and it still leaked. A large all-weather outdoor pitch offered good facilities but the smaller pitch needed urgent maintenance. There were still no opportunities to participate in competitive sports with the local community.

**3.37** The gym only had one functioning toilet. Showers were adequate. Most boys preferred to use the facilities on the wings. At the time of the inspection, PE staff offered only one accredited gym leader's award. PE staff no longer offered Heart Start or manual handling courses during induction.

**3.38** All boys received a detailed and timely induction to PE which included screening to ensure their fitness to participate. Partnership working with health care required improvement. Rehabilitation sessions were delivered to support health improvements, for example, weight loss, physical injury and mental health. However, there was an over-reliance on informal links to ensure that boys were fit to participate in PE after injuries. Instructors were generally successful in motivating boys to participate in PE to promote healthy living.

### Recommendations

**3.39** **Maintenance work should be carried out on the all-weather facilities and the sports hall should be repaired as a matter of urgency.**

**3.40** **Opportunities should be provided for children to engage in community based competitive sports.** (Repeated recommendation 3.36)

**3.41** **More accredited programmes should be offered to support boys' resettlement needs.**

**3.42** **Formal links between the gym and health care staff should be strengthened to ensure that information is shared about boys deemed unfit to participate in activities.**

## 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** *A needs analysis was being carried out to update the reducing reoffending strategy to meet the needs of the population. Links with resettlement consortia were developing well. Caseworkers offered good support to the boys, albeit with little input from other departments. Release on temporary licence (ROTL) had not been used for several months.*
- 4.2** A needs analysis of the population was being carried out to inform a revised resettlement policy. The existing policy had not been updated since 2013. A monthly resettlement meeting oversaw work on the strategy and resettlement pathways. Attendance by key departments in the establishment and external partners was reasonably good. However, although each pathway had an allocated lead, they did not always attend the meetings and progress on some pathways was inadequate.
- 4.3** There were no data to facilitate the follow-up of resettlement and reoffending outcomes for boys after they left Cookham Wood, although this was being pursued through the resettlement consortia. Links with the north and south London resettlement consortia were strengthening, and included some joint training (see section on attitudes, thinking and behaviour).
- 4.4** Caseworkers had primary responsibility for identifying risk and resettlement needs and ensuring there was a focus on preventing reoffending. The casework team consisted of social workers, youth offending team (YOT) workers and supervising officers from Cookham Wood. They each had a caseload of sentenced and remanded boys, with the social workers in the team taking more of the high-risk boys. Although managers tried not to use the uniformed caseworkers for generic officer duties, they were sometimes cross deployed, most often at weekends. We found that caseworkers sometimes dealt with issues which were the responsibility of residential staff.
- 4.5** In our survey, 93% of boys said they had a caseworker. Boys were allocated to a caseworker soon after their arrival, and there was always a duty caseworker to ensure that boys had access when they needed it. Far fewer boys than at the previous inspection said their caseworker had helped to prepare them for release (38% against 55%). The reasons for this were not clear as boys had regular reviews with their caseworkers. Caseworkers acted as the main point of contact with families.
- 4.6** The appointment of two looked-after apprentices in the casework team was a very positive initiative. They took a full role in the team, working with boys and caseworkers. As care leavers themselves, they were able to talk to boys who were looked after with an insider's understanding of the care system, to explain their experience of the system to professionals and to facilitate more constructive discussion between individual boys and those involved in their care outside the establishment.

- 4.7** Early release arrangements were used appropriately for boys serving a detention and training order which many boys identified as motivation to behave well. Obtaining suitable accommodation could be a problem (see section on accommodation). Late release provisions were not being used, despite the poor behaviour exhibited by some boys.
- 4.8** Transition arrangements for boys preparing for a move to the adult prison estate were appropriate, but caseworkers explained the difficulties they faced in getting prisons to accept boys. Many were turned down by more than one prison, irrespective of how well an establishment matched their identified needs. Staff helped boys to understand the differences they would find in an adult prison.
- 4.9** Opportunities for release on temporary licence (ROTL) had not been offered since August 2014. When boys reached their ROTL eligibility date, their suitability was not being assessed. There were well advanced plans to address this weakness and reinstate the appropriate use of ROTL for boys whose behaviour and identified resettlement needs warranted the opportunity.

## Recommendations

- 4.10** **Resettlement and reoffending outcomes for boys released into the community should be systematically collected and used to inform future provision.**
- 4.11** **ROTL opportunities should be made available and all eligible children should be considered for ROTL suitability in good time.**

## Housekeeping point

- 4.12** Caseworkers should not deal with matters for boys which are the responsibility of other staff.

## Good practice

- 4.13** *Apprentices with a background of being looked after children who worked in the casework team were a valuable source of support for boys who were in the care of a local authority and provided a service users' perspective for professional colleagues.*

## 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.**

**4.14** *Training and remand management planning arrangements remained good, but attendance at review meetings by staff other than caseworkers still needed improvement. Public protection arrangements were good, but the management of boys on indeterminate sentences needed development. Identification of boys who had looked-after status was efficient but more needed to be done to ensure that local authorities provided the support the boys were entitled to.*

**4.15** Training and remand plans appropriate to the boys' needs were developed by caseworkers within the appropriate timescales, but less than half the boys in our survey said they had a plan. Boys were not always given a copy of their plan or the targets they were working towards. At reviews that we observed, boys were encouraged to take part and their understanding of the discussion was checked.

**4.16** Training planning and remand management meetings were timely, with good attendance by community YOTs. Attendance by other departments in the establishment was poor and needed to be given greater priority by staff who had important roles to play in helping boys to work towards their training plan targets. At reviews that we attended, external professionals, families and boys asked questions which caseworkers could not answer but could have been fielded by staff from the appropriate departments.

**4.17** Problems with getting the boys to their reviews had a negative impact. During the inspection, we observed reviews attended by family members and community professionals which were curtailed because of the late attendance by the boy who was the subject of the review.

### Recommendation

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

### Housekeeping points

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

**4.20** Boys should be escorted to review meetings at the required time.

### Public protection

**4.21** Boys who might present a risk to the public were identified in reception and the duty caseworker alerted. The caseworker followed this up at their initial meeting with the boy and his details were recorded on the establishment public protection database and discussed at the monthly interdepartmental risk management team meeting. Attendance at the meeting was variable, but notes of meetings showed good discussion of boys aided by detailed

information. Boys who needed to be considered under multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) were identified and the relevant documentation submitted. Caseworkers attended a few MAPPA reviews, usually for boys for whom the highest level of concern had been identified. Otherwise, they submitted written reports.

- 4.22** Proper attention continued to be paid to the need for restrictions on contacts some boys had with people outside the establishment. When it was deemed necessary to do so, appropriate restrictions were placed on mail, telephone contact and visits. These restrictions were kept under review as boys' circumstances changed and a proportionate approach was taken.

### Indeterminate sentence young people

- 4.23** Four boys were serving indeterminate sentences, and we were told that about 10% of the population was remanded or convicted of an offence with the potential for an indeterminate sentence. At the previous inspection there had been no boys with indeterminate sentences and the establishment had taken advice from other establishments to learn how to manage the life sentence processes and documentation. Boys with indeterminate sentences continued to have the same regular review and planning meetings as other boys, with involvement of family members if they wished.
- 4.24** The establishment did not have a long-term unit and was unable to provide the longer-term interventions or education programmes that boys with these sentences needed to understand how they would be managed within the criminal justice system.

### Recommendation

- 4.25** **Appropriate measures should be developed to ensure that boys with, or facing, indeterminate sentences have the services and support that they need.**

### Looked-after children

- 4.26** In our survey, 41% of boys said they had spent time in the care of their local authority. Arrangements to identify looked-after boys were effective and the establishment had 77 boys with looked-after status on their database, many of whom were on remand.
- 4.27** Local authorities were contacted to advise them that a boy whom they were responsible for had been admitted to Cookham Wood, and to remind them of their obligations. This work was undertaken by the safeguarding and equality team in the temporary absence of the social workers who had been appointed to support this group of boys. Staff we spoke to were not aware of any checks on whether boys had their reviews on time or which boys received financial or other support from their local authority. Caseworkers helped to facilitate reviews when they were in contact with local authority social workers, but there was no follow up of local authorities to ensure that they fulfilled these obligations.

### Recommendation

- 4.28** **The establishment should be clear whether boys with looked-after status receive the support they are entitled to from their local authority. They should make robust efforts on behalf of boys who are not receiving support and check that they are receiving the help they need following release.**

## Reintegration planning

### Expected outcomes:

**Children and young people's resettlement needs are addressed prior to release.**

**An effective multi-agency response is used to meet the specific needs of each individual young person in order to maximise the likelihood of successful reintegration into the community.**

**4.29** *Reintegration planning remained effective, although there was no pre-release course. It was difficult to obtain suitable accommodation for some boys. Careers information and guidance were good. Health care and drugs and alcohol planning for boys after release was good and some progress had been made with finance, benefit and debt. The children and families pathway was underdeveloped. An appropriate range of group and one-to-one interventions was available and there were well advanced plans to enhance this. Provision for boys with a sexual element to their offending had developed since the previous inspection.*

**4.30** Boys' release plans were discussed during training planning meetings so that they were prepared for and understood the conditions on which they were to be released, for example the necessity for somebody to collect them on release.

**4.31** Practical arrangements for the day of release were organised well. Boys had access to their money and were given a hold-all for their belongings. There was a stock of clothing for boys who did not have any suitable clothes to wear on release or boys could apply to have their stored clothes washed ready for release. Boys were asked in reception on the day of release if there were any issues they wanted to raise, but very few took this opportunity. There were no other exit interview arrangements.

### Accommodation

**4.32** In our survey, more than a quarter of boys said they thought they would have a problem with finding accommodation on release. This was discussed at review meetings soon after the boys' arrival but in many cases suitable accommodation for boys who were not returning to their family was only found close to release. We were told it was particularly difficult to find accommodation for children who were looked after or who had their 18th birthday while in custody. Problems with sourcing accommodation were being addressed by the resettlement consortia. The on-site Barnardo's advocates worked hard to escalate the needs of boys without suitable accommodation, taking legal action where necessary to get local authorities to meet their responsibilities.

### Education, training and employment

**4.33** Careers, information and guidance provided by The Manchester College (TMC) were good. Boys benefited from the effective setting and review of targets to complete their sentence plan. They received good quality information, advice and guidance from dedicated engagement and resettlement team workers and the Medway Youth Trust while they were in custody. Links with community advice services were routinely established to facilitate appropriate support.

**4.34** Links between caseworkers and the engagement and resettlement team were very good. There was no pre-release course, but boys were able to develop job application skills by

participating in TMC programmes and attending the wing-based youth club organised by Kinetic Youth.

- 4.35** The prison had a good range of community links, although ROTL was not available at the time of the inspection (see section on pre-release and resettlement). There were effective partnerships to support children's move into employment, education or training on release, for example One Connect (formerly Working Links and NACRO) supported boys from London. The virtual campus<sup>9</sup> was not yet fully available to help boys to access up-to-date education, training and employment opportunities.

## Recommendations

- 4.36** **A pre-release course on education, training and employment and resettlement issues should be offered.**
- 4.37** **The virtual campus should be used better to enable boys to access up-to-date employment and education and training opportunities.**

## Health care

- 4.38** Health care was notified in advance of a boy's release or transfer. Boys were seen in health care on the day of discharge and given health promotion advice, harm minimisation packs and medication to take home, as necessary. The health and wellbeing team started discharge planning early and arranged community follow up as required. They involved families in the care programme approach wherever possible. There was good communication with GPs, YOTs and community services.

## Drugs and alcohol

- 4.39** The substance misuse service contributed to training planning and prioritised attendance at final DTO reviews. Good links had been established with community YOTs. Substance misuse workers followed boys up two weeks after they had left the establishment and attended their first community review when possible.

## Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.40** Boys were able to open a bank account while in custody, a positive initiative since the previous inspection. This was facilitated by Kinetic Youth and actively advertised to boys during evening association periods. Kinetic also offered money management courses to boys, but there was no pre-release course to explore this in more detail.

## Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.41** The children and families pathway was underdeveloped. Caseworkers were aware of which boys in their caseload had children of their own, but no central record was kept which was a missed opportunity to provide appropriate services. There were no parenting or relationship courses and no other provision such as Storybook Dads<sup>10</sup> which was a retrograde step since

<sup>9</sup> Enables prisoners to have internet access to community education, training and employment opportunities

<sup>10</sup> Through which prisoners record stories for their children

the previous inspection. Bimonthly family days were organised and were well attended. Only boys on enhanced level of the rewards and sanctions scheme were eligible to attend family days, which was inappropriate.

- 4.42** Social visits took place three times a week on Saturday, Sunday and Wednesday evenings. Newly arrived boys could have a reception visit within the first few days. The visitors' centre was basic, but staff there were welcoming and provided a good service to families. The centre was open before and after each visit session and provided a vending machine with refreshments.
- 4.43** A new and larger visits area was under construction at the time of the inspection. The existing visits room was a small, dark facility which was unnecessarily untidy, with posters on the floor, grubby walls and stained chairs. It had an unstaffed children's play area and vending machines providing snacks. There was no toilet for boys to use and they had to return to their cell if they needed to use facilities. Boys had to wear a yellow sash during visits, which was unnecessary.
- 4.44** We observed an evening visits session at which five boys had visitors. The session started 15 minutes late and was badly organised. Visitors were let into the room while a member of staff was still trying to identify where the boys should sit and a number of boys and visitors gathered in the middle of the room, which was potentially unsafe. We observed good management of an incident by an officer when a boy decided he did not wish to go ahead with his visit.

## Recommendations

- 4.45 Children and families services should be established to meet the identified needs of boys, such as parenting and relationship courses and Storybook Dads.**
- 4.46 Family days should be available to boys on all levels of the IEP scheme.**
- 4.47 Toilets should be available near the visits hall for children to use.** (Repeated recommendation 4.44)
- 4.48 All visits sessions should start on time and be properly organised in a safe manner.**

## Housekeeping points

- 4.49** A central record should be maintained of boys who have children.
- 4.50** Boys should not be required to wear coloured bands in the visits hall.

## Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.51** Boys had access to group and one-to-one interventions delivered by specialist services and there were well advanced plans to introduce interventions accredited for use across the NOMS young people estate, such as the juvenile enhanced thinking skills (JETS) course. The 'most valuable player' programme delivered by the PYE Project continued to be valued by caseworkers and the boys who participated. There was no reinforcement of learning from interventions on the residential units. During the inspection, staff attended a training course

organised by North London Resettlement Consortium to enable them to deliver aggression replacement training to boys who could continue the work on release.

- 4.52** Work with boys with sexually harmful behaviour had developed well since the previous inspection. The health and wellbeing team undertook one-to-one work with boys with a sexual offence and offered support to boys who had been victims. Families and community professionals were involved as appropriate. The team had delivered training sessions to staff from all other disciplines and were integrated into meetings where the care of boys was discussed.

## Recommendation

- 4.53 Learning from programmes should be reinforced by staff across the establishment.** (Repeated recommendation 4.51)

## Section 5. Summary of recommendations and housekeeping points

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

### Main recommendations

To the governor

- 5.1 Systems for reporting, analysing and managing violent behaviour should be used effectively to reduce levels of violence, support victims and to make boys feel safe. (S66)
- 5.2 There should be high expectations of boys and a good range of opportunities to demonstrate good behaviour in all areas of the establishment. The behaviour management policy should be underpinned by the promotion of constructive relationships and its application should ensure that poor behaviour is consistently challenged and good behaviour rewarded. (S67)
- 5.3 All boys should attend activities during the working day and sessions should start and finish on time. (S68)
- 5.4 The children and families pathway should be improved by development of relationships programmes and support for boys with parental responsibilities. (S69)

### Recommendation

To the Youth Justice Board

Courts, escort and transfers

- 5.5 Boys should only be allocated to Cookham Wood when it is clear that the establishment can meet their needs. (1.8)

### Recommendation

To the Youth Justice Board and NOMS

Courts, escort and transfers

- 5.6 Key staff at the establishment, NOMS, the YJB and the escort providers should meet regularly to monitor and resolve problems relating to escort arrangements and ensure that children arrive at the establishment in good time to be assessed and settled on their first night. (1.6)

### Recommendations

To the governor

Courts, escort and transfers

- 5.7 More use should be made of video links with courts. (1.7)

### Early days in custody

- 5.8** Cells on the first night unit should be fully equipped and ready for use before boys are accommodated in them. (1.19)
- 5.9** Induction sessions should be designed and delivered in an engaging way. (1.20)
- 5.10** There should be a formal peer mentor scheme to provide support to all boys new to the establishment. (1.21)

### Care and protection of children and young people

- 5.11** Safeguarding team information reports (STIRs) should be submitted on every appropriate occasion. (1.28)
- 5.12** The work of the safeguarding team should be undertaken thoroughly and consistently. (1.29)
- 5.13** Child protection investigations should be carried out without delay and should be systematically recorded, including actions taken internally. (1.35)

### Behaviour management

- 5.14** Children should not be strip-searched under restraint unless all other options have been exhausted, there is a risk to the safety of the child or others, and it has been authorised at a senior level and recorded accordingly. (1.65)
- 5.15** Security should be effectively managed with a regular, well attended security meeting which analyses current information about incidents and sets clear objectives to improve safety and security in the establishment. Information reports should be analysed immediately and intelligence-led searches carried out promptly. (1.66)
- 5.16** Adjudications should not be used for trivial matters and all adjudications should be heard. (1.67)
- 5.17** Pain inducement techniques should not be used during use of force. (1.85)
- 5.18** Force should only be used as a last resort and not to gain compliance. (1.86)
- 5.19** Use of force documentation should be completed and use of force recordings should be reviewed swiftly after each incident. (1.87)
- 5.20** Boys should be separated for the shortest time possible. (1.95)
- 5.21** All targets set at GOOD reviews should be explained to boys clearly and their understanding checked. (1.96)
- 5.22** Safety algorithms should be completed accurately for all boys. (1.97)
- 5.23** The establishment should record and monitor the number of boys segregated pending adjudication. (1.98)
- 5.24** GOOD documentation should only be signed by those present at reviews. (1.99)

### Substance misuse

- 5.25** Boys with a high level of clinical need should not be placed at the establishment in the absence of 24-hour health care cover and finalised treatment protocols. (1.110)
- 5.26** A supply reduction strategy should be developed and integrated with the substance misuse strategy so that trends can be identified quickly and remedial action taken. (1.111)

### Residential units

- 5.27** All accommodation, including landings, should be kept clean and free of graffiti. (2.7)
- 5.28** Boys should be responsible for cleaning communal areas under the direction of staff. (2.8)
- 5.29** Boys on remand should not have to wear prison clothes. (2.9)
- 5.30** All applications should be answered promptly. (2.10)
- 5.31** PIN numbers should be added to phones promptly to ensure that boys can communicate with friends and family. (2.11)
- 5.32** Mail and parcels should be delivered to boys promptly. (2.12)

### Relationships between staff and children and young people

- 5.33** An effective personal officer scheme should be in place, ensuring that all boys have an identified officer with whom they meet regularly to discuss concerns and needs. (2.19)
- 5.34** All staff should wear their names on their uniform. (2.20)

### Equality and diversity

- 5.35** Inequality identified through monitoring data should be investigated and addressed. (2.27)
- 5.36** The quality of investigations into discrimination incident reports should be improved and should include effective quality assurance. (2.28)
- 5.37** Cultural awareness should be promoted and staff should receive refresher training in equality. (2.35)
- 5.38** Regular meaningful consultation should be held with all minority groups. (2.36)
- 5.39** Gay and bisexual boys should be reassured that support and advice was available for them and that homophobic behaviour would be robustly addressed. (2.37)

### Faith and religious activity

- 5.40** Subject to security concerns, all boys should be able to see a chaplain and attend corporate worship. (2.42)

## Complaints

- 5.41** Complaints should be quality assured and data and analysis discussed at senior management team meetings. (2.47)
- 5.42** The responses to complaints should adequately address the issues raised. (2.48)

## Health services

- 5.43** The health needs assessment should assess the boys' need for dentistry and immunisation and vaccination. (2.67)
- 5.44** Health complaints should be separate from the main complaints system and receipt of complaints should not be recorded in boys' clinical notes. (2.68)
- 5.45** Staff members should receive regular documented clinical supervision. (2.69)
- 5.46** Children should be able to attend their health appointments on time and did-not-attend rates should be minimised. (2.78)
- 5.47** Medicine queues should be regulated to ensure that crowding at the hatches does not occur. (2.82)
- 5.48** Access to dental services should be improved to reduce the non-attendance rate to acceptable levels and best practice guidance for decontamination should be followed. (2.86)
- 5.49** Boys should be able to access mental health consultations and treatment as clinically indicated. (2.92)
- 5.50** Health care professionals should not be hampered from seeing their patients. (2.93)

## Catering

- 5.51** All meals should be issued at the servery and eaten in association. (2.100)
- 5.52** Boys should be employed to prepare food so that they can achieve related qualifications. (2.101)

## Purchases

- 5.53** Boys should be able to place a canteen order within 24 hours of their arrival. (2.105)

## Time out of cell

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

### Education, learning and skills

- 5.57** Vocational training provision should be increased to provide more opportunities to meet boys' resettlement needs and aspirations. (3.16)
- 5.58** All boys should be able to attend activities regularly and punctually. (3.17)
- 5.59** The number and range of work activities around the establishment should be increased so that all boys are engaged fully in purposeful activity which meets their resettlement needs. (3.22)
- 5.60** Security arrangements should be reviewed to ensure that vocational training programmes above level 1 are offered where appropriate. (3.23)
- 5.61** Teachers should ensure that disruptive behaviour during learning sessions is challenged. (3.27)
- 5.62** Staff should set specific targets to develop and record the boys' personal and social skills. (3.28)
- 5.63** The library should improve the promotion of literacy across the establishment. (3.33)

### Physical education and healthy living

- 5.64** Maintenance work should be carried out on the all-weather facilities and the sports hall should be repaired as a matter of urgency. (3.39)
- 5.65** Opportunities should be provided for children to engage in community based competitive sports. (3.40)
- 5.66** More accredited programmes should be offered to support boys' resettlement needs. (3.41)
- 5.67** Formal links between the gym and health care staff should be strengthened to ensure that information is shared about boys deemed unfit to participate in activities. (3.42)

### Pre-release and resettlement

- 5.68** Resettlement and reoffending outcomes for boys released into the community should be systematically collected and used to inform future provision. (4.10)
- 5.69** ROTL opportunities should be made available and all eligible children should be considered for ROTL suitability in good time. (4.11)

### Training planning and remand management

- 5.70** Training planning and remand management meetings should include staff from all areas who work with the children. (4.18)
- 5.71** Appropriate measures should be developed to ensure that boys with, or facing, indeterminate sentences have the services and support that they need. (4.25)
- 5.72** The establishment should be clear whether boys with looked-after status receive the support they are entitled to from their local authority. They should make robust efforts on behalf of

boys who are not receiving support and check that they are receiving the help they need following release. (4.28)

### Reintegration planning

- 5.73** A pre-release course on education, training and employment and resettlement issues should be offered. (4.36)
- 5.74** The virtual campus should be used better to enable boys to access up-to-date employment and education and training opportunities. (4.37)
- 5.75** Children and families services should be established to meet the identified needs of boys, such as parenting and relationship courses and Storybook Dads. (4.45)
- 5.76** Family days should be available to boys on all levels of the IEP scheme. (4.46)
- 5.77** Toilets should be available near the visits hall for children to use. (4.47)
- 5.78** All visits sessions should start on time and be properly organised in a safe manner. (4.48)
- 5.79** Learning from programmes should be reinforced by staff across the establishment. (4.53)

## Housekeeping points

### Early days in custody

- 5.80** Reception should be well stocked with canteen packs which should be provided to all children on arrival. (1.22)

### Behaviour management

- 5.81** Searching authorisation documentation should always outline the reasons for and level of the search. (1.68)
- 5.82** Adjudication review meetings should analyse trends and compliance with the tariff. (1.69)
- 5.83** Children should be able to have one hour of exercise every day. (1.100)

### Residential units

- 5.84** Items which contravene the offensive displays policy should be removed. (2.13)
- 5.85** All cells should have shower curtains. (2.14)

### Health services

- 5.86** Generic health care policies and procedures should be localised to reflect the needs of the establishment. (2.70)
- 5.87** Health promotion and harm minimisation should be advertised more prominently. (2.71)

### Pre-release and resettlement

- 5.88** Caseworkers should not deal with matters for boys which are the responsibility of other staff. (4.12)

### Training planning and remand management

- 5.89** Boys should be given a copy of the targets they are working towards. (4.19)
- 5.90** Boys should be escorted to review meetings at the required time. (4.20)

### Reintegration planning

- 5.91** A central record should be maintained of boys who have children. (4.49)
- 5.92** Boys should not be required to wear coloured bands in the visits hall. (4.50)

## Examples of good practice

- 5.93** The Cedar Unit was being developed as a resource to manage boys with complex needs without subjecting them to the segregation regime. The behaviour management system was used consistently and boys there had access to psychologists which led to reintegration for many of them. (1.77)
- 5.94** Apprentices with a background of being looked after children who worked in the casework team were a valuable source of support for boys who were in the care of a local authority and provided a service users' perspective for professional colleagues. (4.13)



## Section 6. Appendices

### Appendix I: Inspection team

Nick Hardwick	Chief inspector
Andy Rooke	Team leader
Deborah Butler	Team leader (shadowing)
Bev Alden	Inspector
Angela Johnson	Inspector
Andy Lund	Inspector
Angus Mulready-Jones	Inspector
Tim McSweeney	Researcher
Michelle Bellham	Researcher
Joe Simmonds	Researcher

#### **Specialist inspectors**

Sigrid Engelen	Substance misuse inspector
Paul Tarbuck	Health services inspector
Andrea Crosby-Josephs	Care Quality Commission inspector
Dr Chinn	CQC adviser
Bob Cowdrey	Ofsted inspector
Charles Clark	Ofsted inspector



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

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

### Safety

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

*At the last inspection in 2014, some boys spent too long at court after their cases had been dealt with. Reception and first night procedures were thorough. Feedback from boys about the quality of induction was mixed. The safeguarding and child protection arrangements were weak. The level of self-harm was low; while we saw good support provided to vulnerable individuals, the associated documentation was poor. Use of force was high and the governance of it was weak. Levels of violence were high and incidents resulting in serious injury were not uncommon. Discipline procedures were administered fairly. The rewards and sanctions scheme was confusing and not well regulated. There was limited demand for substance misuse support but the quality of the service had improved and was appropriate. Outcomes for children and young people were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.*

#### Main recommendations

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

**Not achieved** (Recommendation repeated, 1.6)

If there has been an allegation of maltreatment of a child by a member of staff, or if abuse of a child is alleged or suspected, a prompt and appropriate investigation should be carried out and followed up to protect the child. (S81)

**Partially achieved**

A single rewards and sanctions scheme should be devised which sets out expected levels of behaviour, how children can progress to the highest level and how poor behaviour will be managed. Sanctions should only be awarded after a hearing and appeal procedures should be explained clearly. (S82)

**Not achieved**

The number of incidents of use of force should be reduced. All incidents should be reviewed quickly and any issues identified addressed. Child protection issues identified should at all times be referred for further investigation by the local authority designated officer. (S83)

**Not achieved**

#### Recommendations

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

**Not achieved**

All children should have access to canteen packs on arrival. (1.16)

**Not achieved**

There should be a formal peer mentor scheme to provide support to all boys new to the establishment. (1.17)

**Not achieved** (Recommendation repeated, 1.21)

Induction sessions should be coordinated and delivered in an engaging way. (1.18)

**Not achieved** (Recommendation repeated, 1.20)

The safeguarding meeting should take place monthly in line with the safeguarding strategy and should be attended by all relevant departments. Relevant data should be analysed and used to inform discussion on key areas of safety. (1.24)

**Achieved**

The safeguarding team should be adequately resourced so that work is undertaken thoroughly and consistently. (1.25)

**Partially achieved**

Children in custody should never be subject to a strip-search under restraint. If this does take place, the case should always be referred to the local authority for external scrutiny. (1.31)

**Partially achieved**

Measures to support victims of bullying should be strengthened so that effective help is always provided. (1.36)

**Not achieved**

The collection and analysis of data should be improved. (1.43)

**Achieved**

The quality of ACCT documents should be improved. (1.44)

**Achieved**

The constant watch cell in the segregation unit should not be used to accommodate children at risk of suicide or self-harm. (1.45)

**Achieved**

All aspects of the behaviour management strategy should be fully monitored to identify trends and action should be taken to address any issues. (1.50)

**Not achieved**

Children should not be searched under restraint. (1.67)

**Not achieved** (Recommendation repeated, 1.65)

The adjudication rooms should provide a child-friendly environment and staff should play a supportive role. (1.68)

**Not achieved**

The establishment should develop and implement an effective and comprehensive strategy to understand and reduce the high levels of violence among children. (1.75)

**Not achieved**

Monthly safeguarding meetings should be well attended and the analysis of data on levels of violence should be improved. (1.76)

**Achieved**

The TAC initiative to manage and address violent behaviour should be fully implemented. (1.77)

**Partially achieved**

Pain inducement techniques should not be used during use of force. (1.84)

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

Force should only be used as a last resort and not to gain compliance. (1.85)

**Not achieved** (Recommendation repeated, 1.85)

Debriefs of children following use of force should include a full account of the incident. (1.86)

**Not achieved**

Children needing to be separated for discipline reasons or because they have complex needs should be held in a suitable environment. (1.94)

**Achieved**

Children should be separated for the shortest time possible. (1.95)

**Partially achieved** (Recommendation repeated, 1.94)

All separated children should have time-bound targets. (1.96)

**Achieved**

A substance misuse strategy should be produced which is informed by a comprehensive needs analysis. It should contain an action plan with performance measures which are reviewed at substance misuse strategy meetings. (1.103)

**Not achieved**

The mandatory drug testing programme should be adequately resourced to undertake all requested suspicion tests. (1.104)

**No longer relevant**

## Respect

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

*At the last inspection in 2014, the living conditions in the new accommodation were very good and offered potential for effective supervision and relationships. Relationships between staff and boys were generally positive. Work on diversity was poor which had adverse consequences for minority groups. Children received adequate support from the chaplaincy. The complaints process was sound and boys had suitable access to their solicitors. Staff shortages in primary health care were having a negative impact but mental health support was good. The food was very unpopular with boys but the meals we sampled were adequate. Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.*

### Recommendations

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

**Not achieved** (Recommendation repeated, 2.8)

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

**Not achieved**

Staff should model the behaviour expected from children and poor behaviour by boys should be challenged consistently. (2.16)

**Not achieved**

The personal officer scheme should be relaunched and effective quality assurance put in place. (2.17)

**Not achieved**

Up-to-date equality and diversity policies and an action plan should be put in place, and effective recording, monitoring and analysis of equality data should be started immediately. (2.26)

**Achieved**

Specific, regular equality meetings, particularly diversity and equality action team (DEAT) meetings, should be re-established. The senior management team should address and monitor equality issues regularly. (2.27)

**Partially achieved**

A dedicated equality officer with adequate time and resources should be appointed to coordinate and promote equality work. (2.28)

**Not achieved**

Equality representatives should be appointed and publicised and should attend DEAT meetings. (2.29)

**Achieved**

Equality and diversity should be promoted at all levels of the establishment and should be explained to boys on arrival and throughout their sentence. (2.30)

**Achieved**

Equality and diversity issues or requests raised in the youth council should be addressed immediately and followed up, and reasons should be given for decisions. (2.31)

**Achieved**

The DIRF system should be explained and promoted to children and forms should be readily available on landings by the cells. (2.32)

**Partially achieved**

The negative perceptions of black and minority ethnic children should be investigated further and acted on. (2.42)

**Not achieved**

Cultural awareness should be promoted and staff should receive refresher training in equality. (2.43)

**Not achieved** (Recommendation repeated, 2.35)

Regular forums or events to promote equality should be held for children from all protected characteristic groups. (2.44)

**Not achieved**

Boys from a foreign national background should have regular access to professional interpretation services. (2.45)

**Achieved**

A disability liaison officer should be appointed. (2.46)

**Not achieved**

Children with physical disabilities should have care plans and should receive practical support. (2.47)

**Achieved**

The negative perceptions of safety and respect that many Muslim boys have should be investigated and addressed. (2.48)

**Not achieved**

Monitoring by characteristics other than race should be undertaken to check that other minority groups are not at a disadvantage. (2.49)

**Partially achieved**

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

**Achieved**

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

**Achieved**

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

**Partially achieved**

Legal visits should take place in private. (2.66)

**Not achieved**

There should be sufficient well trained and supported staff and facilities to provide all required services. (2.77)

**Partially achieved**

Children requiring emergency first aid out of hours should have prompt access to appropriately trained staff. (2.78)

**Achieved**

Barrier protection should be available supported by a policy which specifically considers the needs of children. (2.79)

**Achieved**

Children should be able to attend their health appointments on time. (2.83)

**Not achieved**

Children should have regular access to pharmacy clinics, including medicines use reviews. (2.88)

**Achieved**

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

**Achieved**

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

**Not achieved**

All meals should be issued at the servery and eaten in association. (2.106)

**Not achieved** (Recommendation repeated, 2.97)

The menu should be assessed for nutritional content. (2.107)

**Achieved**

Boys should be employed to prepare food so that they can achieve related qualifications. (2.108)

**Not achieved** (Recommendation repeated, 2.98)

Consultation arrangements should be improved. Food comments books should be introduced, a catering representative should attend the youth council and a bi-annual food survey should be carried out. (2.109)

**Achieved**

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

**Not achieved**

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

**Not achieved**

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

**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 2014, the introduction of a restricted regime had led to deterioration in time out of cell. Access to exercise remained limited. Ofsted's overall judgement was that provision in learning and skills was good. Leadership and management in learning and skills required improvement. The overall quality of teaching and learning was good. Behaviour management was effective. There was an adequately stocked library and access to it had improved slightly but was still not sufficient. Children had adequate opportunity to participate in PE but the facilities needed renovation and extension. Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.*

### Recommendations

All children should spend a minimum of 10 hours every day out of their cell. (3.4)

**Not achieved** (Recommendation repeated, 3.5)

Boys should be given the opportunity to spend at least one hour in the open air every day. (3.5)

**Not achieved** (Recommendation repeated, 3.6)

More activities should be available during outside exercise. (3.6)

**Not achieved** (Recommendation repeated, 3.7)

Attendance and punctuality should be improved. (3.12)

**Not achieved**

Comprehensive quality improvement arrangements should be applied across all the provision to monitor and raise standards. (3.13)

**Partially achieved**

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

**Partially achieved**

Planning of learning should include tailored targets to monitor and direct the progress of individual learners. (3.23)

**Partially achieved**

Spelling and grammar in children's completed work should always be corrected and teachers should provide constructive feedback to guide improvement. (3.24)

**Partially achieved**

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

**Achieved**

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

**Partially achieved**

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

**Not achieved** (Recommendation repeated, 3.32)

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

**Not achieved** (Recommendation repeated, 3.39)

## 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 2014, resettlement was managed effectively and the training and remand planning arrangements continued to be thorough. Public protection arrangements were sound and children who were looked after were supported well by staff. A few boys continued to have opportunities on release on temporary licence (ROTL). Provision under the resettlement pathways was generally good. Staff succeeded in helping boys to maintain contact with their family and friends. Outcomes for children and young people were good against this healthy prison test.*

### Recommendations

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

**Not achieved**

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

**Not achieved**

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

**Not achieved** (Recommendation repeated, 4.17)

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

**Achieved**

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

**Not achieved**

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

**Achieved**

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

**Not achieved** (Recommendation repeated, 4.46)

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

**Not achieved**

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

**Partially achieved**

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

**Not achieved** (Recommendation repeated, 4.52)

## Appendix III: Establishment population profile

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

### Population breakdown by:

Status	Number of young people	%
Sentenced	107	68.2
Recall	3	1.9
Convicted unsentenced	4	2.5
Remand	40	24.4
Detainees	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>100</b>

Age	Number of young people	%
15 years	4	2.5
16 years	34	21.7
17 years	105	66.9
18 years	14	8.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>100</b>

Nationality	Number of young people	%
British	126	80.3
Foreign nationals	27	17.2
Not stated	4	2.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>100</b>

Ethnicity	Number of young people	%
White		
British	48	30.6
Irish	1	0.6
Gypsy/Irish Traveller	1	0.6
Other white	11	7.0
Mixed		
White and black Caribbean	13	8.3
White and black African	3	1.9
White and Asian	2	1.3
Other mixed	7	4.5
Asian or Asian British		
Indian	1	0.6
Pakistani	1	0.6
Bangladeshi	4	2.5
Chinese	0	0
Other Asian	5	3.2
Black or black British		
Caribbean	18	11.5
African	20	12.7
Other black	18	11.5
Other ethnic group		
Arab	0	0
Other ethnic group	3	1.9
Not stated	1	0.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>100</b>

Religion	Number of young people	%
Baptist	0	0
Church of England	5	3.2
Roman Catholic	14	8.9
Other Christian denominations	24	15.3
Muslim	39	24.8
Sikh	1	0.6
Hindu	0	0
Buddhist	0	0
Jewish	0	0
Other	0	0
No religion	74	47.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>100</b>

Other demographics	Number of young people	%
Gypsy/Romany/Traveller	1	0.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0.6</b>

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

Length of stay	<1 mth	1–3mths	3–6 mths	6–12mths	1–2 yrs	2 yrs +	4 yrs +	Total
<b>Age</b>								
15 years	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
16 years	3	7	7	5	0	0	0	22
17 years	9	16	19	22	9	0	0	75
18 years	0	1	3	5	1	0	0	10
<b>Total</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>110</b>

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

Length of stay	<1 mth	1–3 mths	3–6 mths	6–12 mths	1–2 yrs	2 yrs+	4 yrs +	Total
<b>Age</b>								
15 years	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
16 years	1	5	2	0	0	0	0	8
17 years	11	9	0	0	0	0	0	20
18 years	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>

Main offence	Number of young people	%
Violence against the person		
Sexual offences		
Burglary		
Robbery		
Theft and handling		
Fraud and forgery		
Drugs offences		
Other offences		
Offence not recorded / holding warrant		
<b>Total</b>		

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

Sentence	4 mths	6 mths	8 mths	10 mths	12 mths	18 mths	24 mths	Recall	Total
<b>Age</b>									
15 years	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	4
16 years	0	0	0	4	3	2	3	0	12
17 years	6	0	2	1	7	6	7	0	29
18 years	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	0	8
<b>Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>

**Number of Section 9 Is, (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	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
17 years	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
18 years	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>

**Number of indeterminate sentences by age**

Age	Total
15 years	0
16 years	1
17 years	3
18 years	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>

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

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



## 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 5 May 2015 the young person population at HMYOI Cookham Wood was 167. Questionnaires were distributed to 163 young people<sup>11</sup>.

We received a total of 139 completed questionnaires, a response rate of 85%. This included one questionnaire completed via interview. Ten respondents refused to complete a questionnaire, 10 questionnaires were not returned and four were returned blank.

Wing/unit	Number of completed survey returns
A	68
B	60
Cedar	6
Phoenix	5

<sup>11</sup> Surveys were not distributed to three young people who were at court on the day of the survey and one young person who was in hospital on the day of the survey.

## Presentation of survey results and analyses

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

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

We also present a number of comparative analyses. In all the comparative analyses that follow, statistically significant<sup>12</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 Cookham Wood 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 five YOIs since April 2014.
- The current survey responses from HMYOI Cookham Wood in 2015 compared with the responses of young people surveyed at HMYOI Cookham Wood in 2014.
- 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.

---

<sup>12</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 .....	4 (3%)
	16 .....	29 (21%)
	17 .....	91 (66%)
	18 .....	14 (10%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Are you a British citizen?</b>	
	Yes .....	125 (92%)
	No .....	11 (8%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>Do you understand spoken English?</b>	
	Yes .....	135 (99%)
	No .....	2 (1%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Do you understand written English?</b>	
	Yes .....	131 (95%)
	No .....	7 (5%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>What is your ethnic origin?</b>	
	White - British .....	46 (34%)
	White - Irish .....	4 (3%)
	White - Other .....	4 (3%)
	Black or Black British - Caribbean .....	19 (14%)
	Black or Black British - African .....	25 (18%)
	Black or Black British - Other .....	1 (1%)
	Asian or Asian British - Indian .....	1 (1%)
	Asian or Asian British - Pakistani .....	3 (2%)
	Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi .....	5 (4%)
	Asian or Asian British - Chinese .....	0 (0%)
	Asian or Asian British - Other .....	0 (0%)
	Mixed race - White and Black Caribbean .....	16 (12%)
	Mixed race - White and Black African .....	4 (3%)
	Mixed race - White and Asian .....	1 (1%)
	Mixed race - Other .....	4 (3%)
	Arab .....	2 (1%)
	Other ethnic group .....	1 (1%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>What is your religion?</b>	
	None .....	30 (23%)
	Church of England .....	28 (21%)
	Catholic .....	28 (21%)
	Protestant .....	1 (1%)
	Other Christian denomination .....	11 (8%)
	Buddhist .....	0 (0%)
	Hindu .....	0 (0%)
	Jewish .....	0 (0%)
	Muslim .....	33 (25%)
	Sikh .....	1 (1%)

<b>Q7</b>	<b>Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?</b>	
	Yes .....	12 (9%)
	No.....	116 (89%)
	Don't know .....	2 (2%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>Do you have any children?</b>	
	Yes .....	22 (17%)
	No.....	111 (83%)
<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 (17%)
	No.....	109 (83%)
<b>Q10</b>	<b>Have you ever been in local authority care?</b>	
	Yes .....	54 (41%)
	No.....	77 (59%)

### SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Are you sentenced?</b>	
	Yes .....	91 (67%)
	No - unsentenced/on remand .....	44 (33%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>How long is your sentence (the full DTO sentence)?</b>	
	Not sentenced.....	44 (33%)
	Less than 6 months.....	20 (15%)
	6 to 12 months.....	16 (12%)
	More than 12 months, up to 2 years.....	21 (16%)
	More than 2 years.....	32 (24%)
	Indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP).....	1 (1%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>How long have you been in this establishment?</b>	
	Less than 1 month.....	22 (16%)
	1 to 6 months .....	71 (53%)
	More than 6 months, but less than 12 months.....	30 (22%)
	12 months to 2 years.....	11 (8%)
	More than 2 years.....	0 (0%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?</b>	
	Yes .....	74 (55%)
	No.....	61 (45%)

### SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS

<b>Q1</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?</b>	
	Yes .....	107 (80%)
	No.....	10 (7%)
	Don't remember .....	17 (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 .....	34 (25%)
	No.....	80 (58%)
	Don't remember .....	23 (17%)

<b>Q3</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?</b>	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i> .....	54 (39%)
	<i>2 to 4 hours</i> .....	64 (47%)
	<i>More than 4 hours</i> .....	8 (6%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	11 (8%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?</b>	
	<i>My journey was less than 2 hours</i> .....	54 (40%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	5 (4%)
	<i>No</i> .....	71 (53%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	5 (4%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?</b>	
	<i>My journey was less than 2 hours</i> .....	54 (40%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	33 (24%)
	<i>No</i> .....	45 (33%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	4 (3%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, how did you feel you were treated by the escort staff?</b>	
	<i>Very well</i> .....	15 (11%)
	<i>Well</i> .....	55 (40%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....	47 (35%)
	<i>Badly</i> .....	5 (4%)
	<i>Very badly</i> .....	4 (3%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	10 (7%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>Before you arrived here, did you receive any information to help you prepare for coming here?</b>	
	<i>Yes - and it was helpful</i> .....	19 (14%)
	<i>Yes - but it was not helpful</i> .....	18 (13%)
	<i>No - I received no information</i> .....	75 (56%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	23 (17%)

#### SECTION 4: FIRST DAYS

<b>Q1</b>	<b>How long were you in reception?</b>	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i> .....	110 (81%)
	<i>2 hours or longer</i> .....	8 (6%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	18 (13%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	116 (86%)
	<i>No</i> .....	7 (5%)
	<i>Don't remember/Not applicable</i> .....	12 (9%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>How well did you feel you were treated in reception?</b>	
	<i>Very well</i> .....	17 (13%)
	<i>Well</i> .....	74 (54%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....	30 (22%)
	<i>Badly</i> .....	4 (3%)
	<i>Very badly</i> .....	4 (3%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	7 (5%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>When you first arrived here, did staff ask if you needed help or support with any of the following things? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Not being able to smoke</i> ..... 59 (45%)	<i>Money worries</i> ..... 20 (15%)

Loss of property .....	21 (16%)	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to .....	41 (32%)
Feeling scared.....	30 (23%)	Health problems.....	79 (61%)
Gang problems.....	71 (55%)	Getting phone numbers.....	57 (44%)
Contacting family .....	75 (58%)	Staff did not ask me about any of these	14 (11%)

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

Not being able to smoke .....	56 (43%)	Money worries .....	30 (23%)
Loss of property .....	14 (11%)	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to .....	13 (10%)
Feeling scared.....	12 (9%)	Health problems.....	24 (18%)
Gang problems.....	21 (16%)	Getting phone numbers.....	55 (42%)
Contacting family .....	54 (42%)	I did not have any problems .....	25 (19%)

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

Toiletries/basic items .....	99 (73%)
The opportunity to have a shower .....	107 (79%)
Something to eat.....	121 (90%)
A free phone call to friends/family.....	110 (81%)
PIN phone credit.....	90 (67%)
Information about feeling worried/upset.....	48 (36%)
Don't remember .....	2 (1%)
I was not given any of these .....	4 (3%)

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

Chaplain.....	55 (42%)
Peer mentor.....	12 (9%)
Childline/Samaritans.....	24 (18%)
The prison shop/canteen.....	11 (8%)
Don't remember .....	26 (20%)
I did not have access to any of these .....	46 (35%)

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

Yes .....	101 (74%)
No.....	24 (18%)
Don't remember .....	11 (8%)

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

Yes .....	107 (79%)
No.....	21 (15%)
Don't remember .....	8 (6%)

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

I have not been on an induction course .....	15 (11%)
Yes .....	75 (56%)
No.....	29 (21%)
Don't remember .....	16 (12%)

## SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT

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

Yes .....	130 (95%)
No .....	7 (5%)
Don't know .....	0 (0%)

<b>Q2</b>	<b>Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?</b>	
	Yes .....	23 (17%)
	No.....	106 (79%)
	Don't know .....	6 (4%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>What is the food like here?</b>	
	Very good.....	0 (0%)
	Good.....	15 (11%)
	Neither .....	38 (29%)
	Bad .....	50 (38%)
	Very bad.....	30 (23%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?</b>	
	I have not bought anything yet/Don't know.....	7 (5%)
	Yes .....	83 (61%)
	No.....	46 (34%)
<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.....	23 (17%)
	Easy.....	39 (29%)
	Neither .....	8 (6%)
	Difficult.....	14 (10%)
	Very difficult.....	9 (7%)
	Don't know .....	18 (13%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>Are your religious beliefs respected?</b>	
	Yes .....	81 (62%)
	No.....	18 (14%)
	Don't know/Not applicable.....	32 (24%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>Can you speak to a Chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?</b>	
	Yes .....	85 (63%)
	No.....	12 (9%)
	Don't know/Not applicable.....	39 (29%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>Can you speak to a peer mentor when you need to?</b>	
	Yes .....	30 (23%)
	No.....	27 (20%)
	Don't know .....	76 (57%)
<b>Q9</b>	<b>Can you speak to a member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board) when you need to?</b>	
	Yes .....	15 (11%)
	No .....	34 (26%)
	Don't know .....	83 (63%)
<b>Q10</b>	<b>Can you speak to an advocate (an outside person to help you) when you need to?</b>	
	Yes .....	59 (44%)
	No.....	26 (19%)
	Don't know .....	49 (37%)

## SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Do most staff treat you with respect?</b>	
	Yes .....	82 (62%)

	No.....		51 (38%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>If you had a problem, who would you turn to? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>		
	No-one .....	27 (21%)	Social worker.....
	Personal officer .....	19 (15%)	Health services staff.....
	Wing Officer.....	16 (12%)	Peer mentor.....
	Teacher/education staff .....	6 (5%)	Another young person here .....
	Gym staff .....	2 (2%)	Case worker .....
	Chaplain.....	10 (8%)	Advocate .....
	Independent Monitoring Board (IMB) ..	4 (3%)	Family/friends .....
	YOT worker .....	28 (22%)	Childline/Samaritans.....
			19 (15%)
			5 (4%)
			1 (1%)
			21 (16%)
			49 (38%)
			11 (9%)
			71 (55%)
			3 (2%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?</b>		
	Yes .....		27 (20%)
	No.....		108 (80%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?</b>		
	I still have not met him/her .....		40 (30%)
	In your first week .....		18 (13%)
	After your first week .....		50 (37%)
	Don't remember .....		26 (19%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>How often do you see your personal (named) officer?</b>		
	I still have not met him/her .....		40 (31%)
	At least once a week .....		19 (15%)
	Less than once a week.....		70 (54%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>Do you feel your personal (named) officer tries to help you?</b>		
	I still have not met him/her .....		40 (31%)
	Yes .....		42 (33%)
	No.....		46 (36%)

## SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Is it easy to make an application?</b>		
	Yes .....		101 (75%)
	No.....		23 (17%)
	Don't know .....		11 (8%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Are applications sorted out fairly?</b>		
	I have not made an application .....		18 (13%)
	Yes .....		65 (49%)
	No.....		51 (38%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>Are applications sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?</b>		
	I have not made an application .....		18 (13%)
	Yes .....		29 (22%)
	No.....		87 (65%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Is it easy to make a complaint?</b>		
	Yes .....		72 (54%)
	No.....		20 (15%)
	Don't know .....		42 (31%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>Are complaints sorted out fairly?</b>		
	I have not made a complaint .....		68 (52%)
	Yes .....		24 (18%)

	No.....	39 (30%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>Are complaints sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?</b>	
	<i>I have not made a complaint</i> .....	68 (52%)
	Yes .....	16 (12%)
	No.....	48 (36%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint?</b>	
	Yes .....	12 (9%)
	No.....	88 (67%)
	<i>Never needed to make a complaint</i> .....	31 (24%)

## 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> .....	7 (5%)
	<i>Enhanced (top)</i> .....	29 (21%)
	<i>Standard (middle)</i> .....	67 (49%)
	<i>Basic (bottom)</i> .....	30 (22%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	3 (2%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the rewards and sanctions scheme?</b>	
	<i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i> .....	7 (6%)
	Yes .....	52 (42%)
	No.....	53 (42%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	13 (10%)
<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> .....	7 (6%)
	Yes .....	45 (37%)
	No.....	50 (41%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	20 (16%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Have you had a minor report since you have been here?</b>	
	Yes .....	50 (38%)
	No.....	31 (23%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	51 (39%)
<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> .....	82 (62%)
	Yes .....	33 (25%)
	No.....	17 (13%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?</b>	
	Yes .....	99 (73%)
	No.....	34 (25%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	2 (1%)
<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> .....	36 (28%)
	Yes .....	79 (61%)
	No.....	15 (12%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?</b>	
	Yes .....	60 (44%)
	No.....	70 (52%)

Don't know ..... 5 (4%)

**Q9 If you have spent a night in the care and separation unit (CSU), how were you treated by staff?**

*I have not been to the care and separation unit* ..... 112 (85%)  
 Very well ..... 3 (2%)  
 Well ..... 8 (6%)  
 Neither ..... 3 (2%)  
 Badly ..... 3 (2%)  
 Very badly ..... 3 (2%)

### SECTION 9: SAFETY

**Q1 Have you ever felt unsafe here?**

Yes ..... 56 (41%)  
 No ..... 80 (59%)

**Q2 Do you feel unsafe now?**

Yes ..... 28 (21%)  
 No ..... 106 (79%)

**Q3 In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**

*Never felt unsafe* ..... 80 (61%)  
*Everywhere* ..... 22 (17%)  
*Care and separation unit* ..... 5 (4%)  
*Association areas* ..... 9 (7%)  
*Reception area* ..... 6 (5%)  
*At the gym* ..... 14 (11%)  
*In an exercise yard* ..... 12 (9%)  
*At work* ..... 5 (4%)  
*At education* ..... 17 (13%)  
*At religious services* ..... 4 (3%)  
*At meal times* ..... 7 (5%)  
*At healthcare* ..... 3 (2%)  
*Visits area* ..... 13 (10%)  
*In wing showers* ..... 2 (2%)  
*In gym showers* ..... 3 (2%)  
*In corridors/stairwells* ..... 9 (7%)  
*On your landing/wing* ..... 13 (10%)  
*During movement* ..... 10 (8%)  
*In your cell* ..... 8 (6%)

**Q4 Have you ever been victimised by another young person/group of young people here? (e.g. insulted or assaulted you)**

Yes ..... 36 (27%)  
 No ..... 98 (73%)

**Q5 If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**

*Insulting remarks (about you, your family or friends)* ..... 21 (16%)  
*Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)* ..... 15 (11%)  
*Sexual abuse* ..... 0 (0%)  
*Feeling threatened or intimidated* ..... 17 (13%)  
*Having your canteen/property taken* ..... 3 (2%)  
*Medication* ..... 0 (0%)  
*Debt* ..... 1 (1%)  
*Drugs* ..... 1 (1%)  
*Your race or ethnic origin* ..... 3 (2%)

Your religion/religious beliefs .....	0 (0%)
Your nationality .....	1 (1%)
You are from a different part of the country to others .....	4 (3%)
You are from a Traveller community.....	2 (1%)
Your sexuality .....	0 (0%)
Your age.....	2 (1%)
You having a disability .....	1 (1%)
You were new here.....	4 (3%)
Your offence/crime.....	6 (4%)
Gang related issues.....	10 (7%)

<b>Q7</b>	<b>Have you ever been victimised by staff here? (e.g. insulted or assaulted you)</b>	
	Yes .....	34 (26%)
	No.....	99 (74%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	Insulting remarks (about you, your family or friends).....	20 (15%)
	Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted) .....	11 (8%)
	Sexual abuse .....	2 (2%)
	Feeling threatened or intimidated .....	4 (3%)
	Having your canteen/property taken.....	6 (5%)
	Medication.....	2 (2%)
	Debt .....	1 (1%)
	Drugs.....	0 (0%)
	Your race or ethnic origin.....	5 (4%)
	Your religion/religious beliefs .....	2 (2%)
	Your nationality .....	5 (4%)
	You are from a different part of the country to others .....	3 (2%)
	You are from a Traveller community.....	2 (2%)
	Your sexuality .....	1 (1%)
	Your age.....	2 (2%)
	You having a disability .....	1 (1%)
	You were new here.....	2 (2%)
	Your offence/crime.....	2 (2%)
	Gang related issues.....	2 (2%)
	Because you made a complaint .....	4 (3%)
<b>Q10</b>	<b>If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?</b>	
	Yes .....	30 (25%)
	No.....	72 (61%)
	Don't know .....	17 (14%)

<b>Q11</b>	<b>Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?</b>	
	Yes .....	29 (22%)
	No.....	56 (43%)
	Don't know .....	45 (35%)
<b>Q12</b>	<b>Is shouting through the windows a problem here?</b>	
	Yes .....	54 (41%)
	No.....	60 (46%)
	Don't know .....	17 (13%)

### 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 .....	55 (41%)	58 (43%)	21 (16%)

	The nurse .....	73 (55%)	41 (31%)	18 (14%)
	The dentist .....	24 (18%)	78 (59%)	30 (23%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?</b>			
	<i>I have not been</i> .....			12 (9%)
	<i>Very good</i> .....			8 (6%)
	<i>Good</i> .....			54 (41%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....			32 (24%)
	<i>Bad</i> .....			19 (14%)
	<i>Very bad</i> .....			8 (6%)
<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> .....			74 (57%)
	<i>Yes, all of my meds</i> .....			6 (5%)
	<i>Yes, some of my meds</i> .....			17 (13%)
	<i>No</i> .....			33 (25%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?</b>			
	<i>Yes</i> .....			34 (27%)
	<i>No</i> .....			93 (73%)
<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> .....			93 (74%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....			21 (17%)
	<i>No</i> .....			12 (10%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>Did you have problems with alcohol when you first arrived here?</b>			
	<i>Yes</i> .....			6 (5%)
	<i>No</i> .....			127 (95%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>Have you received any help with alcohol problems here?</b>			
	<i>Yes</i> .....			3 (2%)
	<i>No</i> .....			130 (98%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>Did you have problems with drugs when you first arrived here?</b>			
	<i>Yes</i> .....			38 (29%)
	<i>No</i> .....			93 (71%)
<b>Q9</b>	<b>Do you have problems with drugs now?</b>			
	<i>Yes</i> .....			4 (3%)
	<i>No</i> .....			128 (97%)
<b>Q10</b>	<b>Have you received any help with drugs problems here?</b>			
	<i>Yes</i> .....			20 (15%)
	<i>No</i> .....			111 (85%)
<b>Q11</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it to get illegal drugs here?</b>			
	<i>Very easy</i> .....			8 (7%)
	<i>Easy</i> .....			9 (7%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....			4 (3%)
	<i>Difficult</i> .....			0 (0%)
	<i>Very difficult</i> .....			15 (12%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....			86 (70%)

## SECTION 11: ACTIVITIES

<b>Q1</b>	<b>How old were you when you were last at school?</b>				
	14 or under .....				56 (42%)
	15 or over .....				77 (58%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Have you ever been excluded from school?</b>				
	Yes .....				118 (88%)
	No.....				15 (11%)
	Not applicable.....				1 (1%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>Did you ever skip school before you came into custody?</b>				
	Yes .....				93 (72%)
	No.....				32 (25%)
	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 .....				110 (81%)
	A job in this establishment.....				16 (12%)
	Vocational or skills training .....				18 (13%)
	Offending behaviour programmes .....				14 (10%)
	I am not currently involved in any of these.....				22 (16%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>If you have been involved in any of the following activities here, do you think they will help you when you leave prison?</b>				
		<i>Not been involved</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
	Education	3 (2%)	82 (65%)	28 (22%)	14 (11%)
	A job in this establishment	25 (30%)	17 (20%)	17 (20%)	24 (29%)
	Vocational or skills training	24 (29%)	21 (25%)	16 (19%)	23 (27%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	23 (28%)	19 (23%)	21 (25%)	20 (24%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>Do you usually have association every day?</b>				
	Yes .....				19 (14%)
	No.....				117 (86%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?</b>				
	Don't want to go.....				12 (9%)
	Yes .....				83 (62%)
	No.....				38 (29%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?</b>				
	Don't want to go .....				6 (5%)
	None.....				28 (21%)
	One to two times .....				67 (51%)
	Three to five times.....				11 (8%)
	More than five times .....				20 (15%)

## SECTION 12: FAMILY AND FRIENDS

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Are you able to use the telephone every day, if you want to?</b>	
	Yes .....	112 (85%)
	No.....	19 (14%)
	Don't know .....	1 (1%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?</b>	
	Yes .....	63 (48%)

	No.....	60 (46%)
	Don't know .....	7 (5%)
<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>	34 (26%)
	<i>Less than one a week.....</i>	39 (30%)
	<i>About one a week.....</i>	39 (30%)
	<i>More than one a week.....</i>	5 (4%)
	<i>Don't know .....</i>	15 (11%)
<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>	34 (26%)
	<i>Very easy.....</i>	7 (5%)
	<i>Easy.....</i>	33 (25%)
	<i>Neither .....</i>	15 (11%)
	<i>Difficult.....</i>	23 (18%)
	<i>Very difficult.....</i>	10 (8%)
	<i>Don't know .....</i>	9 (7%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>Do your visits usually start on time?</b>	
	<i>I don't get visits .....</i>	34 (27%)
	<i>Yes .....</i>	52 (41%)
	<i>No.....</i>	31 (24%)
	<i>Don't know .....</i>	11 (9%)

### 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>	35 (27%)
	<i>Getting into school or college.....</i>	39 (30%)
	<i>Getting a job.....</i>	66 (51%)
	<i>Money/finances .....</i>	46 (35%)
	<i>Claiming benefits.....</i>	14 (11%)
	<i>Continuing health services.....</i>	11 (8%)
	<i>Opening a bank account.....</i>	23 (18%)
	<i>Avoiding bad relationships .....</i>	20 (15%)
	<i>I won't have any problems.....</i>	40 (31%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan? (i.e. a plan that is discussed in your DTO/planning meetings, which sets out your targets)</b>	
	<i>Yes .....</i>	62 (46%)
	<i>No.....</i>	30 (22%)
	<i>Don't know .....</i>	42 (31%)
<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>	72 (56%)
	<i>Yes .....</i>	51 (40%)
	<i>No.....</i>	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>	72 (56%)
	<i>Yes .....</i>	55 (43%)
	<i>No.....</i>	2 (2%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>Do you have a caseworker here?</b>	
	<i>Yes .....</i>	125 (93%)

	No.....	5 (4%)
	Don't know .....	5 (4%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>Has your caseworker helped to prepare you for release?</b>	
	<i>I don't have a caseworker.....</i>	10 (8%)
	Yes .....	45 (35%)
	No.....	57 (45%)
	Don't know .....	16 (13%)
<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>	38 (29%)
	Yes .....	74 (56%)
	No.....	21 (16%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?</b>	
	Yes .....	58 (44%)
	No.....	49 (37%)
	Don't know .....	24 (18%)
<b>Q9</b>	<b>Do you know who to contact for help with any of the following problems, before your release? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Finding accommodation .....</i>	35 (29%)
	<i>Getting into school or college.....</i>	37 (31%)
	<i>Getting a job.....</i>	32 (27%)
	<i>Help with money/finances .....</i>	26 (22%)
	<i>Help with claiming benefits .....</i>	11 (9%)
	<i>Continuing health services .....</i>	17 (14%)
	<i>Opening a bank account.....</i>	21 (18%)
	<i>Avoiding bad relationships .....</i>	19 (16%)
	<i>I don't know who to contact.....</i>	71 (60%)
<b>Q10</b>	<b>What is most likely to stop you offending in the future? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Not sentenced.....</i> 44 (34%)	<i>Having a mentor (someone you can ask for advice) .....</i> 8 (6%)
	<i>Nothing, it is up to me .....</i> 26 (20%)	<i>Having a YOT worker or social worker that I get on with.....</i> 18 (14%)
	<i>Making new friends outside.....</i> 18 (14%)	<i>Having children.....</i> 19 (15%)
	<i>Going back to live with my family .....</i> 23 (18%)	<i>Having something to do that isn't crime</i> 31 (24%)
	<i>Getting a place of my own.....</i> 32 (25%)	<i>This sentence .....</i> 35 (27%)
	<i>Getting a job.....</i> 46 (36%)	<i>Getting into school/college.....</i> 34 (27%)
	<i>Having a partner (girlfriend or boyfriend).....</i> 24 (19%)	<i>Talking about my offending behaviour with staff.....</i> 6 (5%)
	<i>Staying off alcohol/drugs .....</i> 23 (18%)	<i>Anything else.....</i> 5 (4%)
<b>Q11</b>	<b>Do you want to stop offending?</b>	
	<i>Not sentenced.....</i>	44 (33%)
	Yes .....	86 (64%)
	No.....	2 (1%)
	Don't know .....	2 (1%)
<b>Q12</b>	<b>Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here, that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?</b>	
	<i>Not sentenced.....</i>	44 (33%)
	Yes .....	46 (35%)
	No.....	43 (32%)

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



### Survey responses from children and young people: HMYOI Cookham Wood 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

		2015 Cookham Wood	Young people's comparator	2015 Cookham Wood	2014 Cookham Wood
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>139</b>	<b>467</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>104</b>
<b>SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU</b>					
1.1	Are you 18 years of age?	10%	14%	10%	10%
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	8%	5%	8%	6%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	99%	99%	99%	99%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	95%	98%	95%	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)	60%	41%	60%	47%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	25%	22%	25%	19%
1.7	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	9%	7%	9%	9%
1.8	Do you have any children?	16%	8%	16%	17%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	17%	17%	17%	24%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	41%	36%	41%	44%
<b>SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE</b>					
2.1	Are you sentenced?	67%	76%	67%	74%
2.2	Is your sentence 12 months or less?	27%	37%	27%	35%
2.3	Have you been in this establishment for one month or less?	16%	16%	16%	17%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	55%	58%	55%	56%
<b>SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS</b>					
On your most recent journey here:					
3.1	Did you feel safe?	80%	82%	80%	83%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	25%	39%	25%	25%
3.3	Did you spend more than 4 hours in the van?	6%	6%	6%	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?	6%	12%	6%	13%
3.5	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	40%	42%	40%	55%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	52%	53%	52%	60%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	14%	16%	14%	19%
<b>SECTION 4: YOUR FIRST FEW DAYS HERE</b>					
4.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	81%	81%	81%	78%

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

### Key to tables

		2015 Cookham Wood	Young people's comparator	2015 Cookham Wood	2014 Cookham Wood
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>139</b>	<b>467</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>104</b>
<b>4.2</b>	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	<b>86%</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>84%</b>
<b>4.3</b>	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	<b>67%</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>77%</b>
When you first arrived, did staff ask if you needed help or support with any of the following:					
<b>4.4a</b>	Not being able to smoke?	<b>46%</b>	<b>52%</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>46%</b>
<b>4.4b</b>	Loss of property?	<b>16%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>17%</b>
<b>4.4c</b>	Feeling scared?	<b>23%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>36%</b>
<b>4.4d</b>	Gang problems?	<b>55%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>60%</b>
<b>4.4e</b>	Contacting family?	<b>58%</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>57%</b>
<b>4.4f</b>	Money worries?	<b>15%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>16%</b>
<b>4.4g</b>	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	<b>31%</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>39%</b>
<b>4.4h</b>	Health problems?	<b>61%</b>	<b>52%</b>	<b>61%</b>	<b>62%</b>
<b>4.4i</b>	Getting phone numbers?	<b>44%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>40%</b>
<b>4.5</b>	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	<b>81%</b>	<b>73%</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>71%</b>
When you first arrived, did you have problems with any of the following:					
<b>4.5a</b>	Not being able to smoke?	<b>43%</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>34%</b>
<b>4.5b</b>	Loss of property?	<b>11%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>10%</b>
<b>4.5c</b>	Feeling scared?	<b>9%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>10%</b>
<b>4.5d</b>	Gang problems?	<b>16%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>14%</b>
<b>4.5e</b>	Contacting family?	<b>42%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>38%</b>
<b>4.5f</b>	Money worries?	<b>23%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>16%</b>
<b>4.5g</b>	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	<b>10%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>8%</b>
<b>4.5h</b>	Health problems?	<b>19%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>14%</b>
<b>4.5i</b>	Getting phone numbers?	<b>42%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>30%</b>
When you first arrived, were you given any of the following:					
<b>4.6a</b>	Toiletries/basic items?	<b>74%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>74%</b>	<b>73%</b>
<b>4.6b</b>	The opportunity to have a shower?	<b>79%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>74%</b>
<b>4.6c</b>	Something to eat?	<b>90%</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>82%</b>
<b>4.6d</b>	A free phone call to friends/family?	<b>82%</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>82%</b>	<b>70%</b>
<b>4.6e</b>	PIN phone credit?	<b>67%</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>60%</b>
<b>4.6f</b>	Information about feeling worried/upset?	<b>36%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>35%</b>
Within your first 24 hours, did you have access to the following people or services:					
<b>4.7a</b>	A chaplain?	<b>42%</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>59%</b>
<b>4.7b</b>	A peer mentor?	<b>9%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>20%</b>

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

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	2015 Cookham Wood	Young people's comparator	2015 Cookham Wood	2014 Cookham Wood
	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>139</b>	<b>467</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>104</b>
<b>4.7c</b>	Childline/Samaritans	19%	14%	19%	34%
<b>4.7d</b>	The prison shop/canteen?	8%	12%	8%	13%
<b>4.8</b>	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	74%	65%	74%	83%
<b>4.9</b>	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	79%	77%	79%	83%
<b>4.10</b>	For those who have been on an induction course: did it cover everything you needed to know about the establishment	63%	57%	63%	71%
<b>SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT</b>					
<b>5.1</b>	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	95%	85%	95%	96%
<b>5.2</b>	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	17%	39%	17%	38%
<b>5.3</b>	Do you find the food here good/very good?	11%	17%	11%	20%
<b>5.4</b>	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	61%	47%	61%	65%
<b>5.5</b>	Is it easy/very easy for you to attend religious services?	46%	53%	46%	56%
<b>5.6</b>	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	62%	57%	62%	56%
Can you speak to:					
<b>5.7</b>	A chaplain of your faith in private?	63%	68%	63%	64%
<b>5.8</b>	A peer mentor?	23%	30%	23%	36%
<b>5.9</b>	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	11%	23%	11%	29%
<b>5.10</b>	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	44%	43%	44%	57%
<b>SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF</b>					
<b>6.1</b>	Do most staff treat you with respect?	62%	67%	62%	86%
<b>6.2</b>	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	21%	28%	21%	32%
<b>6.3</b>	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	20%	36%	20%	36%
For those who have met their personal officer:					
<b>6.4</b>	Did you meet your personal (named) officer within the first week?	20%	39%	20%	34%
<b>6.5</b>	Do you see your personal (named) officer at least once a week?	22%	54%	22%	42%
<b>6.6</b>	Do you feel your personal (named) officer tries to help you?	48%	63%	48%	61%
<b>SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS</b>					
<b>7.1</b>	Is it easy to make an application?	75%	66%	75%	88%
For those who have made an application:					
<b>7.2</b>	Do you feel applications are sorted out fairly?	56%	63%	56%	69%
<b>7.3</b>	Do you feel applications are sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	25%	44%	25%	58%
<b>7.4</b>	Is it easy to make a complaint?	54%	59%	54%	55%
For those who have made a complaint:					
<b>7.5</b>	Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	38%	40%	38%	53%

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

### Key to tables

		2015 Cookham Wood	Young people's comparator	2015 Cookham Wood	2014 Cookham Wood
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>139</b>	<b>467</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>104</b>
<b>7.6</b>	Do you feel complaints are sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	<b>25%</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>49%</b>
<b>7.7</b>	Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint?	<b>9%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>10%</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>22%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>25%</b>
<b>8.2</b>	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	<b>41%</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>59%</b>
<b>8.3</b>	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	<b>37%</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>45%</b>
<b>8.4</b>	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	<b>38%</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>40%</b>
For those who have had a minor report:					
<b>8.5</b>	Was the process explained clearly to you?	<b>67%</b>	<b>76%</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>79%</b>
<b>8.6</b>	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	<b>74%</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>74%</b>	<b>69%</b>
For those who have had an adjudication ('nicking'):					
<b>8.7</b>	Was the process explained clearly to you?	<b>84%</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>85%</b>
<b>8.8</b>	Have you been physically restrained (Cand R) since you have been here?	<b>44%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>43%</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>54%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>43%</b>
<b>SECTION 9: SAFETY</b>					
<b>9.1</b>	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	<b>41%</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>27%</b>
<b>9.2</b>	Do you feel unsafe now?	<b>21%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>10%</b>
<b>9.4</b>	Have you ever been victimised by other young people here?	<b>27%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>19%</b>
Since you have been here, have other young people:					
<b>9.5a</b>	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	<b>16%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>8%</b>
<b>9.5b</b>	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	<b>11%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>8%</b>
<b>9.5c</b>	Sexually abused you?	<b>0%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.5d</b>	Threatened or intimidated you?	<b>13%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>6%</b>
<b>9.5e</b>	Taken your canteen/property?	<b>3%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>6%</b>
<b>9.5f</b>	Victimised you because of medication?	<b>0%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>1%</b>
<b>9.5g</b>	Victimised you because of debt?	<b>1%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>4%</b>
<b>9.5h</b>	Victimised you because of drugs?	<b>1%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>6%</b>
<b>9.5i</b>	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	<b>3%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>2%</b>
<b>9.5j</b>	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	<b>0%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>1%</b>
<b>9.5k</b>	Victimised you because of your nationality?	<b>1%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>2%</b>
<b>9.5l</b>	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	<b>3%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>2%</b>
<b>9.5m</b>	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	<b>1%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0%</b>

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

### Key to tables

		2015 Cookham Wood	Young people's comparator	2015 Cookham Wood	2014 Cookham Wood
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>139</b>	<b>467</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>104</b>
<b>9.5n</b>	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	<b>0%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.5o</b>	Victimised you because of your age?	<b>1%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>1%</b>
<b>9.5p</b>	Victimised you because you have a disability?	<b>1%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>2%</b>
<b>9.5q</b>	Victimised you because you were new here?	<b>3%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>4%</b>
<b>9.5r</b>	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	<b>4%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>2%</b>
<b>9.5s</b>	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	<b>8%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>6%</b>
<b>9.7</b>	Have you ever been victimised by a member of staff here?	<b>26%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>20%</b>
Since you have been here, have staff:					
<b>9.8a</b>	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	<b>15%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>8%</b>
<b>9.8b</b>	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	<b>8%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>2%</b>
<b>9.8c</b>	Sexually abused you?	<b>1%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.8d</b>	Threatened or intimidated you?	<b>3%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>2%</b>
<b>9.8e</b>	Taken your canteen/property?	<b>4%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>2%</b>
<b>9.8f</b>	Victimised you because of medication?	<b>1%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>2%</b>
<b>9.8g</b>	Victimised you because of debt?	<b>1%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.8h</b>	Victimised you because of drugs?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>2%</b>
<b>9.8i</b>	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	<b>4%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>6%</b>
<b>9.8j</b>	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	<b>1%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>4%</b>
<b>9.8k</b>	Victimised you because of your nationality?	<b>4%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>3%</b>
<b>9.8k</b>	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	<b>3%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>1%</b>
<b>9.8m</b>	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	<b>1%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>1%</b>
<b>9.8n</b>	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	<b>1%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>1%</b>
<b>9.8o</b>	Victimised you because of your age?	<b>1%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>2%</b>
<b>9.8p</b>	Victimised you because you have a disability?	<b>1%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>3%</b>
<b>9.8q</b>	Victimised you because you were new here?	<b>1%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>2%</b>
<b>9.8r</b>	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	<b>1%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>3%</b>
<b>9.8s</b>	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	<b>1%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>1%</b>
<b>9.8t</b>	Victimised you because you made a complaint?	<b>3%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>7%</b>
<b>9.10</b>	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	<b>25%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>20%</b>
<b>9.11</b>	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	<b>22%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>29%</b>
<b>9.12</b>	Is shouting through the windows a problem here?	<b>41%</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>36%</b>
<b>SECTION 10: HEALTH SERVICES</b>					
<b>10.1a</b>	Is it easy for you to see the doctor?	<b>41%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>51%</b>
<b>10.1b</b>	Is it easy for you to see the nurse?	<b>55%</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>57%</b>

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

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	2015 Cookham Wood	Young people's comparator	2015 Cookham Wood	2014 Cookham Wood
	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>139</b>	<b>467</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>104</b>
<b>10.1c</b>	Is it easy for you to see the dentist?	<b>18%</b>	31%	<b>18%</b>	<b>35%</b>
<b>10.2</b>	For those who have been to health services: Do you think the overall quality good/very good?	51%	48%	51%	60%
<b>10.3</b>	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/all of it in your cell?	41%	53%	41%	48%
<b>10.4</b>	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?	27%	23%	27%	28%
<b>10.5</b>	If you have emotional or mental health problems, are you being helped by anyone here?	64%	63%	64%	53%
<b>10.6</b>	Did you have any problems with alcohol when you first arrived?	4%	7%	4%	10%
<b>10.7</b>	Have you received any help with any alcohol problems here?	3%	4%	3%	4%
<b>10.8</b>	Did you have any problems with drugs when you first arrived?	29%	37%	29%	30%
<b>10.9</b>	Do you have a problem with drugs now?	3%	7%	3%	7%
<b>10.10</b>	Have you received any help with any drug problems here?	15%	22%	15%	24%
<b>10.11</b>	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs here?	14%	17%	14%	12%
<b>SECTION 11: ACTIVITIES</b>					
<b>11.1</b>	Were you 14 or younger when you were last at school?	42%	41%	42%	49%
<b>11.2</b>	Have you ever been excluded from school?	88%	84%	88%	90%
<b>11.3</b>	Did you ever skip school before you came into custody?	72%	74%	72%	73%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:					
<b>11.4a</b>	Education?	<b>82%</b>	70%	82%	86%
<b>11.4b</b>	A job in this establishment?	<b>12%</b>	31%	12%	15%
<b>11.4c</b>	Vocational or skills training?	14%	10%	<b>14%</b>	29%
<b>11.4d</b>	Offending behaviour programmes?	11%	14%	<b>11%</b>	30%
<b>11.4e</b>	Nothing	16%	21%	<b>16%</b>	6%
For those who have taken part in the following activities while in this establishment, do you think that they will help you when you leave prison:					
<b>11.5a</b>	Education?	66%	58%	66%	73%
<b>11.5b</b>	A job in this establishment?	<b>29%</b>	44%	29%	45%
<b>11.5c</b>	Vocational or skills training?	35%	43%	<b>35%</b>	61%
<b>11.5d</b>	Offending behaviour programmes?	32%	42%	<b>32%</b>	59%
<b>11.6</b>	Do you usually have association every day?	<b>14%</b>	74%	<b>14%</b>	37%
<b>11.7</b>	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	63%	61%	63%	55%
<b>11.8</b>	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	<b>15%</b>	6%	15%	19%
<b>SECTION 12: KEEPING IN TOUCH WITH FAMILY AND FRIENDS</b>					
<b>12.1</b>	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	<b>85%</b>	76%	85%	85%
<b>12.2</b>	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	49%	45%	49%	46%

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

### Key to tables

		2015 Cookham Wood	Young people's comparator	2015 Cookham Wood	2014 Cookham Wood
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>139</b>	<b>467</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>104</b>
<b>12.3</b>	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	33%	37%	33%	31%
<b>12.4</b>	Is it easy/very easy for your family and friends to visit you here?	31%	32%	31%	29%
<b>12.5</b>	Do your visits start on time?	41%	30%	41%	46%
<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%	23%	27%	32%
<b>13.1b</b>	Getting into school or college?	30%	28%	30%	33%
<b>13.1c</b>	Getting a job?	51%	52%	51%	61%
<b>13.1d</b>	Money/finances?	35%	35%	35%	40%
<b>13.1e</b>	Claiming benefits?	11%	15%	11%	14%
<b>13.1f</b>	Continuing health services?	8%	8%	8%	13%
<b>13.1g</b>	Opening a bank account?	18%	16%	18%	20%
<b>13.1h</b>	Avoiding bad relationships?	15%	16%	15%	22%
<b>13.2</b>	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	46%	42%	46%	37%
For those with a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan:					
<b>13.3</b>	Were you involved in the development of your plan?	90%	86%	90%	91%
<b>13.4</b>	Do you understand the targets set in your plan?	97%	94%	97%	98%
<b>13.5</b>	Do you have a caseworker here?	93%	89%	93%	92%
<b>13.6</b>	Has your caseworker helped to prepare you for release?	38%	41%	38%	55%
For those with a social worker:					
<b>13.7</b>	Has your social worker been to visit you since you have been here?	78%	72%	78%	70%
<b>13.8</b>	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	44%	40%	44%	42%
Do you know who to contact for help with the following problems?					
<b>13.9a</b>	Finding accommodation	29%	29%	29%	30%
<b>13.9b</b>	Getting into school or college	31%	27%	31%	25%
<b>13.9c</b>	Getting a job	27%	33%	27%	29%
<b>13.9d</b>	Help with money/finances	22%	23%	22%	20%
<b>13.9e</b>	Help with claiming benefits	9%	19%	9%	12%
<b>13.9f</b>	Continuing health services	14%	14%	14%	14%
<b>13.9g</b>	Opening a bank account	18%	16%	18%	24%
<b>13.9h</b>	Avoiding bad relationships	16%	13%	16%	19%
For those who were sentenced:					
<b>13.11</b>	Do you want to stop offending?	95%	89%	95%	97%
<b>13.12</b>	Have you done anything or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?	51%	51%	51%	53%



## Diversity analysis

### Key question responses (ethnicity/religion) HMYOI Cookham Wood 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>82</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>99</b>
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	7%	8%	5%	7%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	99%	100%	97%	100%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	95%	97%	95%	96%
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)			95%	48%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	40%	3%		
1.5	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	1%	19%	0%	12%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	9%	28%	10%	20%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	38%	45%	30%	46%
2.1	Are you sentenced?	62%	75%	49%	75%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	53%	55%	49%	56%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	27%	20%	21%	27%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	47%	57%	49%	51%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare coming here?	14%	15%	10%	16%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	83%	89%	82%	88%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	56%	83%	51%	71%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	69%	82%	72%	76%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	74%	85%	73%	80%
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	93%	99%	90%	97%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	16%	19%	18%	15%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	11%	13%	14%	11%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	55%	71%	45%	65%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	59%	65%	68%	60%
Can you speak to:					
5.7	A chaplain of your faith in private?	57%	70%	60%	62%

## 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>82</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>99</b>
<b>5.8</b>	A peer mentor?	21%	23%	16%	24%
<b>5.9</b>	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	12%	9%	10%	12%
<b>5.10</b>	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	44%	44%	37%	47%
<b>6.1</b>	Do most staff treat you with respect?	59%	67%	66%	59%
<b>6.2</b>	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	25%	16%	20%	21%
<b>7.1</b>	Is it easy to make an application?	71%	80%	65%	78%
<b>7.4</b>	Is it easy to make a complaint?	50%	59%	42%	59%
<b>8.1</b>	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	17%	29%	11%	24%
<b>8.2</b>	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	35%	50%	39%	41%
<b>8.3</b>	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	30%	45%	27%	39%
<b>8.4</b>	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	38%	39%	37%	37%
<b>8.6</b>	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	77%	66%	69%	75%
<b>8.8</b>	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	50%	35%	42%	45%
<b>9.1</b>	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	43%	41%	44%	42%
<b>9.2</b>	Do you feel unsafe now?	21%	21%	30%	20%
<b>9.4</b>	Have you been victimised by other young people here?	24%	32%	22%	30%
Since you have been here, have other young people:					
<b>9.5d</b>	Threatened or intimidated you?	7%	21%	5%	15%
<b>9.5i</b>	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	2%	2%	3%	2%
<b>9.5j</b>	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>9.5k</b>	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	2%	0%	1%
<b>9.5p</b>	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	2%	0%	1%
<b>9.7</b>	Have you been victimised by staff here?	30%	19%	19%	28%

## 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>82</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>99</b>
Since you have been here, have staff:					
<b>9.8d</b>	Threatened or intimidated you?	2%	3%	3%	3%
<b>9.8i</b>	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	6%	0%	5%	3%
<b>9.8j</b>	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	1%	2%	3%	1%
<b>9.8k</b>	Victimised you because of your nationality?	5%	2%	11%	2%
<b>9.8p</b>	Victimised you because you have a disability?	1%	0%	3%	0%
<b>9.10</b>	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	20%	35%	27%	24%
<b>9.11</b>	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	17%	29%	28%	21%
<b>10.1a</b>	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the doctor?	37%	46%	33%	42%
<b>10.1b</b>	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the nurse?	51%	63%	46%	58%
<b>10.4</b>	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	18%	37%	24%	26%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:					
<b>11.4a</b>	Education?	85%	78%	84%	81%
<b>11.4b</b>	A job in this establishment?	6%	20%	5%	14%
<b>11.4c</b>	Vocational or skills training?	14%	13%	19%	12%
<b>11.4d</b>	Offending behaviour programmes?	12%	9%	11%	11%
<b>11.4e</b>	Nothing?	15%	17%	16%	16%
<b>11.6</b>	Do you usually have association every day?	14%	13%	14%	15%
<b>11.7</b>	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	62%	64%	47%	67%
<b>11.8</b>	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	14%	18%	11%	17%
<b>12.1</b>	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	85%	84%	86%	84%
<b>12.2</b>	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	48%	48%	42%	50%
<b>12.3</b>	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	34%	32%	39%	32%
<b>13.2</b>	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	41%	52%	44%	46%
<b>13.8</b>	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	42%	46%	34%	47%

## Diversity analysis - disability



### Key question responses (disability analysis) HMYOI Cookham Wood 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>109</b>
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	0%	9%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	92%	96%
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	31%	65%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	15%	27%
1.5	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	15%	9%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	50%	40%
2.1	Are you sentenced?	63%	69%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	54%	55%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	31%	24%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	54%	50%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	19%	14%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	69%	91%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	77%	64%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	62%	78%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	73%	79%
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	96%	95%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	0%	19%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	15%	10%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	69%	58%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	59%	62%

## 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?	77%	59%
5.8	A peer mentor?	29%	20%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	17%	10%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	29%	46%
6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	63%	61%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	8%	23%
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	76%	74%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	54%	53%
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	24%	22%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	27%	43%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	22%	40%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	46%	36%
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	72%	73%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	32%	47%
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	62%	39%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	50%	17%
9.4	Have you been victimised by other young people here?	42%	26%
Since you have been here, have other young people:			
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	29%	10%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	3%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	0%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	1%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	4%	0%
9.7	Have you been victimised by staff here?	24%	26%

## 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>8%</b>	<b>2%</b>
<b>9.8i</b>	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	<b>8%</b>	<b>3%</b>
<b>9.8j</b>	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	<b>0%</b>	<b>2%</b>
<b>9.8k</b>	Victimised you because of your nationality?	<b>0%</b>	<b>5%</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>48%</b>	<b>22%</b>
<b>9.11</b>	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	<b>29%</b>	<b>21%</b>
<b>10.1a</b>	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the doctor?	<b>54%</b>	<b>37%</b>
<b>10.1b</b>	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the nurse?	<b>78%</b>	<b>50%</b>
<b>10.4</b>	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	<b>55%</b>	<b>21%</b>
Do you currently take part in any of the following:			
<b>11.4a</b>	Education?	<b>72%</b>	<b>83%</b>
<b>11.4b</b>	A job in this establishment?	<b>20%</b>	<b>11%</b>
<b>11.4c</b>	Vocational or skills training?	<b>20%</b>	<b>13%</b>
<b>11.4d</b>	Offending behaviour programmes?	<b>4%</b>	<b>12%</b>
<b>11.4e</b>	Nothing?	<b>28%</b>	<b>14%</b>
<b>11.6</b>	Do you usually have association every day?	<b>8%</b>	<b>15%</b>
<b>11.7</b>	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	<b>44%</b>	<b>67%</b>
<b>11.8</b>	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	<b>4%</b>	<b>18%</b>
<b>12.1</b>	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	<b>85%</b>	<b>84%</b>
<b>12.2</b>	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	<b>54%</b>	<b>47%</b>
<b>12.3</b>	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	<b>25%</b>	<b>36%</b>
<b>13.2</b>	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	<b>56%</b>	<b>43%</b>
<b>13.8</b>	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	<b>46%</b>	<b>44%</b>

## Diversity analysis



### Key question responses (local authority care analysis) HMYOI Cookham Wood 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>54</b>	<b>77</b>
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	6%	8%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	99%	94%
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	55%	62%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	17%	29%
1.5	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	13%	7%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	20%	14%
2.1	Are you sentenced?	78%	60%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	36%	67%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	20%	28%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	52%	51%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	19%	12%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	91%	83%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	71%	65%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	78%	74%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	88%	72%
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	100%	92%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	16%	17%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	13%	9%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	72%	52%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	63%	60%

## 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		
Can you speak to:			
5.7	A chaplain of your faith in private?	65%	59%
5.8	A peer mentor?	21%	24%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	17%	7%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	64%	31%
6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	65%	60%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	22%	20%
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	84%	68%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	59%	51%
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	25%	20%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	48%	35%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	33%	39%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	44%	35%
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	81%	68%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	55%	37%
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	39%	45%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	16%	26%
9.4	Have you been victimised by other young people here?	29%	28%
Since you have been here, have other young people:			
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	19%	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%	0%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	2%	0%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	1%
9.7	Have you been victimised by staff here?	25%	26%
Since you have been here, have staff:			

## Diversity analysis

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Young people who have been in local authority care	Young people who have not been in local authority care
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>9.8d</b>	Threatened or intimidated you?	<b>0%</b>	<b>6%</b>
<b>9.8i</b>	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	<b>6%</b>	<b>2%</b>
<b>9.8j</b>	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	<b>0%</b>	<b>2%</b>
<b>9.8k</b>	Victimised you because of your nationality?	<b>3%</b>	<b>4%</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>25%</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>20%</b>	<b>22%</b>
<b>10.1a</b>	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the doctor?	<b>45%</b>	<b>39%</b>
<b>10.1b</b>	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the nurse?	<b>66%</b>	<b>48%</b>
<b>10.4</b>	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	<b>30%</b>	<b>23%</b>
Do you currently take part in any of the following:			
<b>11.4a</b>	Education?	<b>71%</b>	<b>88%</b>
<b>11.4b</b>	A job in this establishment?	<b>17%</b>	<b>9%</b>
<b>11.4c</b>	Vocational or skills training?	<b>22%</b>	<b>8%</b>
<b>11.4d</b>	Offending behaviour programmes?	<b>17%</b>	<b>7%</b>
<b>11.4e</b>	Nothing?	<b>26%</b>	<b>11%</b>
<b>11.6</b>	Do you usually have association every day?	<b>15%</b>	<b>13%</b>
<b>11.7</b>	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	<b>66%</b>	<b>60%</b>
<b>11.8</b>	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	<b>10%</b>	<b>20%</b>
<b>12.1</b>	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	<b>83%</b>	<b>85%</b>
<b>12.2</b>	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	<b>48%</b>	<b>47%</b>
<b>12.3</b>	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	<b>17%</b>	<b>47%</b>
<b>13.2</b>	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	<b>51%</b>	<b>42%</b>
<b>13.8</b>	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	<b>50%</b>	<b>42%</b>