

Report on an unannounced inspection of

HMYOI Feltham (children and young people)

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

27 July – 2 August 2015

This inspection was carried out with assistance from colleagues at the General Pharmaceutical Council and in partnership with the following bodies:



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

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

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

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

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

Contents

Introduction	5
Fact page	7
About this inspection and report	9
Summary	13
Section 1. Safety	21
Section 2. Respect	35
Section 3. Purposeful activity	47
Section 4. Resettlement	55
Section 5. Recommendations and housekeeping points	63
Section 6. Appendices	69
Appendix I: Inspection team	69
Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report	71
Appendix III: Establishment population profile	77
Appendix IV: Summary of children and young people questionnaires and interviews	81

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.justiceinspectors.gov.uk/hmiprisons/about-our-inspections/>

Introduction

Staff and managers at Feltham young offenders institution (YOI) have one of the most difficult jobs in the prison system. The Feltham A, which we inspected on this occasion, held 180 boys, most aged 16 or 17, with very complex and challenging behaviour, some of whom were a danger to themselves and to other boys and staff. Feltham has had a troubled history and is subject to intense scrutiny, but all too often the boys it holds have been written off by community agencies, and the resources and staff Feltham has to meet the needs of the boys held are insufficient for the task. Nevertheless, despite continuing serious concerns, this inspection found Feltham A making real progress with credible and positive plans for the future. There is much to be learnt from the history of Feltham and some of the impressive staff and managers who work there. The review the government has recently started into youth justice should look, listen and learn.

The number of violent incidents remained very high although it had reduced since the last inspection. There had been 209 violent incidents in the six months before this inspection compared with 262 in a similar period at the last inspection. A third of boys said they had felt unsafe at some time and the number who said they had been victimised by other boys had increased from 21% to 37% since the last inspection. A small number of boys were too frightened to leave their cells and spent about 23 hours a day hiding, locked away behind their doors. Some incidents involved very violent group attacks on a single victim. We watched CCTV of one incident in which a very courageous female officer crouched over the fallen victim of a group attack and used her body to shield his head from blows while she was kicked and punched herself. In the seven months from January to July 2015, 49 officers had been injured that had resulted in 683 days absence. 40 assaults on staff had been referred to the police.

Levels of use of force were also high but had reduced since the last inspection. Most incidents were to protect and restrain boys involved in fights. We were pleased that progress was being made on the introduction of new restraint processes that emphasised de-escalation. At the time of the inspection, the use of segregation in the bleak, unsuitable care and separation unit shared with young adults, was also high and an informal system of 'basic for violence' resulted in some boys being only allowed half an hour out of their cell a day. There were also a high number of adjudications using a cumbersome and slow process designed for adults.

It was impressive that managers were responding to these huge challenges in a positive and thoughtful way. There was a clear strategy to provide greater incentives for good behaviour as well as sanctions for bad. It started simply with encouraging staff to acknowledge and praise good behaviour. Two units had been designated as violence and gang free and provided tangible incentives to aim for. Feltham A had even started offering release on temporary licence to boys who demonstrated they could be trusted. There were well developed plans to open an enhanced support unit for the boys with greater needs and a new care and separation unit, separate from that used for young adults, and designed to meet the needs of the Feltham A age group. These new facilities would be combined with psychologically led programmes to address behaviour. The use of body worn cameras by staff appeared to be having a positive effect and there were effective relationships with the police. Substance misuse services had improved since the last inspection and were excellent.

The safeguarding team and a weekly risk management meeting were effective at identifying the most vulnerable boys and coordinating action between different departments to protect them. Support of boys at risk of self-harm was generally good – but undermined by the length of time some of these boys spent locked up with too little to distract them. The strategy and work of specialist teams was not yet fully demonstrated by staff as a whole. It was welcome that the plethora of different behaviour management schemes which had been confusing and ineffective at the last inspection had been replaced by one system, 'positive attitudes created together' (PACT); this was promising but not yet fully understood by staff or consistently implemented.

The levels of violence and poor behaviour were impacting on Feltham's ability to get boys out of their cells and into purposeful activity. The average amount of time boys had out of their cell had reduced since the last inspection and averaged just 5.5 hours on week days and 4.35 hours at weekends. We found 38% of boys locked in their rooms during the peak working day. CQC colleagues were shocked by how little outside exercise the boys had – 30 minutes a day or less – and the detrimental impact this was likely to have on the health of the adolescent boys. As this report was being finalised we were told that a new core day offered at least two one-hour exercise slots each day. This needs to be consistently implemented. Education staff had made good plans to meet the new requirement to offer 30 hours education a week – but it was hard to see how this could be achieved unless the discipline staff were better able to manage the behaviour that so severely restricted attendance. Outcomes in vital English and mathematics were too low. More needed to be done to motivate boys who struggled in the classroom by improving the quality of teaching and a better mix with vocational training.

The improvements were most noticeable in – despite everything – the improved relationships between staff and boys. These were the best they have been for many years. The environment was generally good and work on equality and diversity issues was effective. Feltham A made good use of advocates to ensure the complaints process was effective. Health care was excellent. Boys complained to us that they were often hungry and portions did indeed appear small for boys in this age group – this was hardly likely to improve their behaviour or concentration in education. There was a Feltham-wide reducing reoffending policy that did not sufficiently focus on the needs of boys in Feltham A and their distinct needs. Most boys said they did not have a training plan; in fact they did, but their inability to recognise it reflected that it was not central to their time in Feltham, easy to understand or given to them to keep. However, a team of committed caseworkers worked hard to provide good support, social workers ensured local authorities met their obligations to 'looked after' boys and meet practical resettlement needs despite some significant obstacles. We know that families have a crucial role to play in resettlement and visit arrangements and family work needed improvement.

Feltham A has a long way to go and at present there are very serious concerns about the safety of the boys held there. However, it is making real progress and it has the right strategy to make more. It has impressive, committed, leadership and staff are responding to that. Sustained, consistent effort will be needed to make the further improvements required, there may well be setbacks, and it will be important that managers and staff receive equivalent sustained and consistent support from both the YJB and NOMS.

Nick Hardwick
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

September 2015

Fact page

Task of the establishment

To keep in custody young people aged 15 to 18 years who are on remand or have been convicted by the courts and young adults aged 18 to 21 years placed in custody by the courts.

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

Public

Region/Department

Young people's estate

Number held

180

Certified normal accommodation

240

Operational capacity

210

Date of last full inspection

August 2014

Brief history

The original Feltham was built in 1854 as an industrial school and was taken over in 1910 by the Prison Commissioners as their second Borstal institution. The existing building opened as a remand centre in March 1988.

HMP/YOI Feltham was formed by the amalgamation of Ashford Remand Centre and Feltham Borstal in 1990/91

Short description of residential units

There are eight units, each holding 30 young people, and a care and separation unit shared with Feltham B. Almost all cells are single occupation. All cells have integral sanitation and television.

Bittern - first night and induction

Curlew - full-time workers' unit

Dunlin - normal location

Eagle - normal location

Falcon - normal location

Grebe - normal location (closed)

Heron - normal location

Jay - full-time education

Ibis – care and separation unit

Name of governor

Glenn Knight

Escort contractor

Serco

Health service commissioner and providers

Commissioner: NHS England

Provider: Care UK

Learning and skills providers

Prospects

Independent Monitoring Board chair

Caroline Langton

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.¹

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

Summary

Safety

- S1 *The early days for boys at Feltham were reasonably well managed and most boys felt safe during this time. Safeguarding and child protection procedures had improved and were sound. There was a comparatively low incidence of self-harm and the quality of ACCT² documentation was mostly good. Too many vulnerable boys were still isolated for lengthy periods. Violence towards staff and boys was high and remained a serious concern. Use of force and adjudications were also at a high level and the new simplified procedure for managing poor behaviour was not yet effective. The segregation environment was unsuitable for boys and its use had increased. The prison was aware of these problems and had some credible plans to address them. The future strategy was innovative and creative, focusing appropriately on a balance of reward and sanction. Substance misuse services had improved and were excellent. **Outcomes for children and young people were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.***
- S2 *At the last inspection in August 2014, we found that outcomes for children and young people in Feltham A were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test. We made 13 recommendations about safety. At this follow-up inspection we found that four of the recommendations had been achieved, three had been partially achieved and six had not been achieved.*
- S3 Many boys arrived late at Feltham after long journeys with adult prisoners. The grubby reception area did not create a positive first impression but boys moved quickly on to the induction unit where they were made to feel welcome by staff.
- S4 In our survey and in groups, most boys said they felt safe on their first night. First night interviews were detailed and appropriately focused on risk, but some boys did not have access to a shower or peer support workers on their first night. Cells on the first night unit were clean and well prepared for new arrivals but some needed redecoration. Induction was fragmented and drawn out and boys spent too long locked up between modules.
- S5 There was a comprehensive and well managed safeguarding policy. The effective working relationship with the local authority ensured quick and appropriate responses to referrals.
- S6 The analysis of data to determine patterns and trends of self-harming behaviour was very good and incidence of self-harm was comparatively low. The quality of ACCT documents was reasonably good but some care maps needed improvement. Attendance at reviews had improved and was usually very good. Some boys on ACCT documents were locked up for too long with nothing to do and their documents confirmed that a number had self-harmed because of the isolation of these restricted regimes.
- S7 The number of violent incidents had reduced since the last inspection but remained very high. Many incidents were serious and over 40% involved multiple assailants. There had been a number of very serious assaults on staff.
- S8 Perpetrators and victims of bullying were supported through the weekly multi-disciplinary risk management meeting but there was an over-reliance on this to manage individual cases.

² Assessment, care in custody and teamwork case management of prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm

- The new 'positive attitudes created together' (PACT) system to manage behaviour was promising but not yet fully understood or embedded.
- S9 Fewer boys were on the basic level of the rewards and sanctions scheme, but the informal 'basic for violence' level that we had concerns about at the last inspection was still in use, and in many cases these boys had only half an hour out of cell each day. Boys felt strongly that there was not enough incentive to aim for the enhanced level and there were firm plans to address this.
- S10 The development of Curlew and Jay units as violence and gang-free units was a good initiative and the development of new specialist units to replace the existing adult segregation unit would help reduce levels of violence on other wings.
- S11 The number of information reports had increased and there was a processing backlog. The Metropolitan police had put more staff resources into following up assaults and intelligence, and into working with gang members in Feltham. Searching was carried out in a manner proportionate to risk.
- S12 Although in our survey a number of boys said it was easy to get drugs, the mandatory drug testing rate had remained at 0% for the past 12 months. There was little evidence of new psychoactive substances³ (NPS) or any other drug use.
- S13 Use of force remained high but had reduced since the last inspection. Supervision and governance were reasonably sound, but there were delays and omissions in recording incidents. The monitoring of trends in the use of force had improved and it was predominantly used to restrain and protect boys involved in fights and assaults. We again saw examples of staff behaving very bravely in these situations. However, since the last inspection batons had been drawn four times in the presence of boys and this was unacceptable.
- S14 The use of segregation had increased markedly and boys were still being held in the segregation unit on the young adult site. Too many of these periods of separation were brief stays awaiting adjudication. The segregation environment remained grim and quite inappropriate for children, with no suitable facility for face-to-face interventions, such as education. There were well-developed plans to replace the existing unit with a new enhanced facility for boys with the most complex needs and a specific separation unit just for boys. Together with the introduction of psychology-led programmes, these initiatives were designed to help the most challenging boys rather than rely solely on punishment.
- S15 The number of adjudications had doubled since 2013 and they were of dubious value in managing the behaviour of children because they followed an adult model. Adjudications were not well integrated into the wider behaviour management policy.
- S16 Substance misuse psychosocial services were much improved since the last inspection. Over 70% of the population were receiving support appropriate to assessed needs, from a well-led and highly competent team.

³ A chemical substance which acts on the central nervous system to alter brain function – perception, mood, consciousness, cognition and behaviour

Respect

S17 *Most communal areas were clean and bright but some areas required refurbishment. Jay and Curlew units stood out as better environments and relationships were particularly strong on these wings. Relationships between most other staff and boys were positive but opportunities to interact were sometimes lost because boys were locked up for long periods. The management of applications was inconsistent but quality assurance and the use of advocates strengthened the complaints procedure. Some food portions were inadequate. The management of equality and diversity was good and given a high priority. The provision of faith and religious services was equally impressive. Health services had improved and were excellent. **Outcomes for children and young people were good against this healthy prison test.***

S18 *At the last inspection in August 2014, we found that outcomes for children and young people in Feltham A were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 34 recommendations about respect.⁴ At this follow-up inspection we found that 19 of the recommendations had been achieved, seven had been partially achieved and eight had not been achieved.*

S19 Most communal areas were reasonably clean and bright but some cells were dirty, with graffiti on walls and scratched into windows. The offensive display policy was not implemented appropriately in some areas. Conditions in shower rooms were poor but access to a daily shower was good. The environment on Jay and Curlew units was better than other units. The management of applications was inconsistent but the system was under review.

S20 Relationships between staff and boys were usually good and we saw many examples of staff engaging positively with boys. Most staff demonstrated care and optimism for the boys they managed, but some were dismissive and appeared uninterested in the boys.

S21 The amount of time boys spent locked up continued to limit contact with staff. Consultation arrangements were good.

S22 The strategic management and promotion of diversity were very good and given a high priority in the establishment. Links between the equality team and other departments were impressive and this fostered a whole-prison approach to the delivery of the equality agenda.

S23 Faith provision was good and the chaplaincy was well integrated into most aspects of prison life. Recent arrangements to manage Ramadan were good.

S24 Survey results indicated that just over a third of boys thought it was easy to make a complaint, worse than the comparator and the 2014 inspection. Most responses were polite and focused, and advocates had provided good support to boys who needed help to make a complaint. Less satisfactory replies were appropriately identified through quality assurance.

S25 Legal support was provided by caseworkers and telephone calls to solicitors funded by youth offending teams. We were concerned that boys had to wear bibs for legal and other professional visits.

S26 Physical and mental health services had improved since our last inspection and some aspects were very impressive. There was a meticulous health appointments system with fewer

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

patients waiting shorter times and lower did-not-attend rates. There were too many cancelled external health appointments and, although there was a good range of clinics and health promotion opportunities, there was no health and wellbeing strategy across the establishment. Pharmacy and dental services were very good.

- S27 The inpatient unit provided suitable accommodation and a therapeutic regime, supported by effective integrated working between health teams and health care officers. Mental health services were impressive and an innovative range of assessment and interventions was provided by an extensive multidisciplinary team. However, we were concerned that too many boys were not transferred out in a timely manner to a mental health unit.
- S28 There was a reasonable range of menu options which included cultural and religious diets and the quality of food was reasonably good. Regular consultation with boys had led to improvements in the menu but we observed that portions were small and many boys told us they were hungry.
- S29 Some boys had to wait too long to submit their first shop order and receive goods.

Purposeful activity

S30 *Time out of cell had reduced since our last inspection and was inadequate. Boys did not have enough time in the fresh air, which was detrimental to their health. The regime and access to activities on Jay and Curlew units were much better than other units. There were enough purposeful activity places for all boys to take part but too many missed out because of security risks or poor behaviour. Attendance at education was poor but good in workshops. Qualification outcomes were unacceptable in mathematics and English, and poor in many other subjects. Teaching and learning in education required improvement, although vocational training and related qualification outcomes were good. The library provided a reasonable service but needed to do more to ensure all boys benefitted from it. PE provision was adequate but attendance was poor. **Outcomes for children and young people were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.***

S31 *At the last inspection in August 2014, we found that outcomes for children and young people in Feltham A were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test. We made 10 recommendations about purposeful activity. At this follow-up inspection we found that two of the recommendations had been achieved, four had been partially achieved and four had not been achieved.*

- S32 The average recorded time out of cell was 5.5 hours on weekdays, and 4.35 hours at weekends. In our roll checks, 38% of boys were locked in their cells and only 40% were engaged in purposeful activity. Time unlocked was better for boys on Curlew and Jay units. Some exercise periods lasted only 30 minutes which was unacceptably short and potentially deprived boys of enough physical activity and the exposure to sunlight needed to promote healthy growth.
- S33 Boys were provided with a range of purposeful activities based on an appropriate needs analysis, although more full-time spaces were needed. There were not enough vocational training places with embedded skills to occupy boys who struggled in the classroom. Quality assurance had not resulted in sufficient improvement to the overall standard of provision. While education staff were ready to meet the new requirement to offer 30 hours of education a week, we were not confident that the establishment would be able to deliver this before the enhanced support unit was set up.

- S34 Performance management arrangements had not led to improvements in the quality of teaching and learning in the classroom but standards were good in the workshops. Teachers did not challenge inappropriate language in their classes unless of a racist or sexist nature. The wider promotion of equality and diversity in the taught curriculum required improvement. Assessment of special educational needs was particularly thorough and robust. Education outreach work was not given enough priority despite a high level of need.
- S35 Outcomes in vocational training courses were good but low in many other subjects, most notably in functional skills in English and mathematics where they were unacceptably low. Attendance at classroom-based sessions was inadequate.
- S36 The library was well stocked and opening hours were satisfactory, but library staff had not collected data to determine whether all boys were receiving their entitlement to one library visit a week. Loss of material resources was not monitored and the stock needed review.
- S37 Access to PE was good and facilities were very good but attendance at sessions was often low. Links with community sports organisations and teams had improved but boys did not have opportunities to play competitive sports against visiting teams. The range and level of accredited courses was limited but achievement of gym-related qualifications was good.
- S38 Links with health care had recently improved and the reintegration of boys temporarily excluded from PE was well managed.

Resettlement

S39 *The reducing reoffending policy covered both the A and B sides and had not developed sufficiently since the last inspection. The monthly meeting did not focus on the specific needs of the younger population. Less than a third of boys said they had a training plan and, although the real figure was much higher, boys were not provided with a copy and training plans were not central to their care. However, a committed and capable team of caseworkers worked hard to support the boys. The commitment to release on temporary licence (ROTL) was commendable, as was the use of early release, both of which demonstrated a strategic focus on rewarding good behaviour. Public protection was managed well and dedicated social workers ensured that the needs of looked-after children were met. Integration planning was good and resettlement needs were broadly met well, with the exception of the visits facilities which needed improvement. **Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***

S40 *At the last inspection in August 2014, we found that outcomes for children and young people in Feltham A were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 10 recommendations about resettlement. At this follow-up inspection we found that two of the recommendations had been achieved, three had been partially achieved and five had not been achieved.*

- S41 Little progress had been made since the last inspection on the actions set out in the reducing reoffending policy and the establishment-wide reducing reoffending meeting did not focus on the specific needs of boys.
- S42 Despite the challenges the establishment faced, time and resources had been invested in a commendable ROTL scheme, demonstrating the strategic focus on reward as an incentive to good behaviour. Appropriate use had been made of early release and home detention curfew to recognise boys who had progressed well and transition arrangements for boys who became adults while in custody were appropriate. It was encouraging that there was some follow up of boys after release but this needed further development.

- S43 Training and remand management plans were based on boys' identified needs, but targets were often too generic. Boys were not given a copy of their plan and fewer boys than the comparator said they had one (30% v 49%). Attendance at training, planning and remand management meetings by other departments remained poor and more needed to be done to place casework and reducing reoffending at the centre of boys' care.
- S44 Public protection cases were properly identified, and the risk management committee met regularly. Social workers had developed effective systems to manage and support boys with looked-after status, but not all local authorities were willing to provide financial support to these boys in custody.
- S45 Reintegration planning was well organised and needs continued to be identified early. Accommodation needs were discussed at planning meetings with relevant community agencies, although obtaining suitable accommodation for some boys in time for their release was difficult.
- S46 Finance, benefit and debt provision was inadequate but there were promising plans for two new courses. There was not enough support for boys to find education, training or employment on release, but again, improvement plans were in place.
- S47 The substance misuse team had good links with community agencies and the team's behaviour change mentor scheme had been effective in addressing gang affiliation issues. Pre-release preparation by health care was very good.
- S48 Visits provision was reasonable but booking a visit was a protracted process and some visitors had to wait an hour to get into the visits room. Some departments had good links with families but there were no family or parenting courses. The criteria to attend family days were too restrictive and only one had been held so far in 2015.
- S49 Boys had access to a limited range of non-accredited courses to address attitudes, thinking and behaviour, but there were developed plans to introduce a suite of accredited courses, delivered by a newly established team of psychologists.

Main concerns and recommendations

- S50 **Concern:** The prison had a good strategic approach to dealing with violence which emphasised encouraging good behaviour and developing new facilities to provide intense support and supervision to the most challenging boys. However, at an individual level, the PACT ('positive attitudes created together') system, although positive in principle was not yet working effectively. The quality of the individual support plans that we examined was poor and targets were often superficial. There was little evidence that progress in changing behaviour was being monitored or followed up by residential officers. Reviews were cursory and not well attended by staff who knew the boys.

Recommendation: Feltham A should continue its current strategy to improve behaviour and reduce violence and bring existing initiative to fruition. Individual support plans for victims of bullying and intimidation should identify needs and the ways in which they will be met. They should be reviewed regularly with the child and monitored by residential managers.

- S51 **Concern:** Time out of cell had reduced since the last inspection and on average was now just 5.5 hours on week days and 4.35 hours at weekends. For some boys it was much less. Behaviour problems and regime restrictions reduced time out of cell. The establishment was preparing to meet the requirement to provide 30 hours education a week.

Recommendation: NOMS and the YJB should work with Feltham to determine how reasonable amounts of time unlocked can be achieved for all boys, who should have access to appropriate, purposeful activity while unlocked without compromising their or others' safety. (Repeated main recommendation S71.)

S52 **Concern:** At the time of the inspection some exercise periods lasted only 30 minutes. This was unacceptable and potentially deprived boys of sufficient physical activity and the exposure to sunlight needed to promote healthy growth.

Recommendation: All boys should have the opportunity of at least one hour of exercise in the open air each day.

S53 **Concern:** Feltham did not have a reducing re-offending policy and structures specific to the needs of boys on the A side. Little progress had been made in these areas since the last inspection. Training plans were not central to boys' care and many told us they did not know they had one.

Recommendation: A reducing re-offending policy and structures specific to the needs of boys on the A side should be developed. Every boy should have a copy of their plan in an age-appropriate format which should be regularly reviewed and linked to other processes for encouraging the boys' progress.

Section 1. Safety

Courts, escorts and transfers

Expected outcomes:

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

1.1 *Boys spent many hours in court cells and too often arrived late at the prison. Escort vehicles were well maintained. The use of video link continued to be promoted.*

1.2 Some boys had unnecessarily lengthy waits in holding rooms after court appearances and records showed that waits of over six hours were not uncommon. Boys arrived at the prison from all over Greater London and further afield and journey times to the prison were often long. Records showed that some boys arrived after 7.30pm and in some cases as late as 9pm. Boys were not given information about the prison at court. Escort vehicles were clean, well maintained and contained little graffiti, but boys continued to share escort vans with adult prisoners. Boys were not handcuffed while getting on and off vehicles at the establishment and the escort staff we observed treated them with respect.

1.3 Good efforts continued to be made to increase the use of the court video-link facility.

Recommendations

1.4 **Key staff at the establishment, NOMS, the Youth Justice Board 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.**

1.5 **Boys should not be transported with adult prisoners.** (Repeated recommendation 1.5)

Early days in custody

Expected outcomes:

Children and young people are treated with respect and feel safe on their arrival into 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.

1.6 *Most boys felt safe during their early days at Feltham. The reception area was in the process of being refurbished and boys had been consulted about its development. First night procedures were sound and staff were welcoming. First night cells were properly equipped but needed decorating. Induction was comprehensive but took too long and boys were locked up for too long between sessions.*

- 1.7** The entrance to reception and some holding rooms were grubby which gave a poor first impression. This was rectified during the inspection. Reception was undergoing refurbishment and the colour scheme, layout and accessible wall displays of important information had been decided after consultation with boys. In our survey, 86% of boys against the comparator of 79% said they were held in reception for less than two hours, but only 57% against the comparator of 73% said they were treated well in reception. Reception procedures were quick but thorough and we observed staff treating boys well. New arrivals were not strip-searched. The microwave meals that boys were given after lengthy waits in court holding rooms were inadequate and of poor quality.
- 1.8** In our survey and groups, most boys said they felt safe on their first night. New arrivals went to Bittern unit where a welcoming officer conducted a comprehensive risk assessment interview in private. Good use was made of available documentation when assessing levels of risk and there was an appropriate focus on gang allegiances. Boys were allowed to make a telephone call, given a reception pack and £2 phone credit, all free of charge. In our survey, only 24% of boys said they were given the opportunity to have a shower when they first arrived against the comparator of 57%. As at the last inspection, boys who arrived during the evening were still unable to have a shower or meet peer supporters until the following day. An induction booklet devised in discussion with boys was given to all new arrivals and induction information was available on a television channel.
- 1.9** Communal areas of the induction unit were reasonably clean and attempts had been made to remove graffiti. Cells were prepared well for new arrivals, with clean bedding and writing materials. However, cells required redecoration and did not help to put anxious boys at ease on their first night in prison. Handover arrangements between day and night staff were good. The night officer knew where new arrivals were located and there was a system of enhanced checks.
- 1.10** In our survey, fewer boys (45% v 62%) than the comparator said that induction told them everything they needed to know. However, the package was comprehensive and delivered in modules. It was designed to be completed within the first five days but often took longer than this and boys spent long periods locked in their cells between sessions.

Recommendation

- 1.11** **Boys should have the opportunity to have a shower and meet a peer supporter on their first night.**

Housekeeping point

- 1.12** The decoration of first night cells should be improved.

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.13 *There was a comprehensive and well managed safeguarding policy with strong links to the local authority.*

I.14 There had been little change to safeguarding structures since the last inspection. The safeguarding strategy was comprehensive, integrated with associated policies and had been agreed by the local safeguarding children board.

I.15 Quarterly safeguarding committee meetings took place with appropriate designated membership, including the local authority. Meetings were chaired by the governor and focused correctly on the strategic management of safeguarding. The monthly local safeguarding meetings, chaired by the head of safeguarding, continued to have a more operational focus. The head of safeguarding also attended a quarterly meeting with the local safeguarding children board in Hounslow to discuss child protection referrals.

I.16 Attendance at meetings was very good. The standing agenda was relevant and thorough consideration was given to the analysis of data on issues such as the use of force, adjudications, complaints, child protection referrals, antisocial behaviour, use of mediation, injuries and incidents of self-harm. There was evidence that the safeguarding committee made appropriate policy changes as a result.

I.17 Weekly risk management meetings remained a useful multidisciplinary forum to discuss children of the most concern and agree how to manage them.

I.18 There were clear protocols for actions to be taken if any member of staff received information that a child at risk may have been abused or injured while in custody. These actions were monitored at the monthly local safeguarding meetings.

Child protection

Expected outcomes:

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

I.19 *Child protection arrangements in the establishment were supported by effective liaison with the local authority and other agencies.*

I.20 All staff had received child protection training. During the previous six months, 23 child protection referrals had been made to the local authority, all concerning use of force, except one relating to court staff and one on searching. The local authority always responded very promptly. One case had been judged to meet the criteria for a Section 47 inquiry, which

brought to bear the valuable perspectives of community professionals in supporting a child with complex needs⁵.

- I.21 The Feltham sub-group of the local safeguarding children board received quarterly presentations from departments in the establishment, and working relationships were good.
- I.22 The number of child protection referrals had been decreasing during 2015. The decrease had coincided with the new social work team in the establishment liaising with community social workers when a child was admitted to Feltham.
- I.23 A useful leaflet was given to visitors and families, giving information about child protection and contact details for a direct line to Hounslow children's services.

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.24 *Procedures to support victims of bullying and intimidation were reasonably good but still required improvement. It was evident that victimisation remained a serious issue.*

- I.25 Systems for identifying bullying and its victims continued to be good.
- I.26 Formal information-sharing arrangements among departments, through the dedicated safeguarding team and the security department, were effective and informal communication between staff and managers helped to identify incidents of bullying that had not been reported elsewhere.
- I.27 The supervision of boys when they were unlocked was also very good and CCTV coverage of nearly all areas provided further support. Residential staff remained alert to the signs of bullying and regularly identified emerging issues which they recorded in wing observation books and electronic history files. These were followed up by residential managers and safeguarding staff. We also saw officers taking appropriate action to deal with potential incidents before they developed.
- I.28 However, opportunities for bullying remained evident and, in our survey, 37% of respondents said that they had been victimised by other boys compared with 21% at the last inspection.
- I.29 Formal support for victims of bullying on residential units was developing but we were not confident that individual support plans generated through the PACT system ('positive attitudes created together') and managed by residential staff were fully effective (see paragraphs 1.67 and 1.68). This was partially mitigated by the support victims of bullying received from the safeguarding team and the weekly risk management meeting.

⁵ Under Section 47 of the Children Act 1989, if a child is taken into police protection or is the subject of an Emergency Protection Order or there are reasonable grounds to suspect that a child is suffering or is likely to suffer significant harm, a Section 47 inquiry is initiated. This is to enable the local authority to decide whether they need to take any further action to safeguard and promote the child's welfare.

- I.30** We remained very concerned that at least eight boys said that they were too frightened of other boys to leave their cells. They had no access to a structured regime and remained locked in their cells for on average, 23 hours a day.

Recommendation

- I.31** **Victims of bullying should have access to a safe regime which includes adequate time out of their cells.**

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.32 *The analysis of data to determine patterns and trends of self-harming behaviour was very good. The incidence of self-harm was comparatively low. The quality of ACCT⁶ documents was reasonably good but some care maps lacked detail. Attendance at reviews had improved. We found examples of boys on ACCTs who were locked up for too long with nothing to do and a few cases of boys who said that isolation brought about by restricted regimes had caused them to self-harm.*

- I.33** The well-established safer custody committee monitored the implementation of the suicide and self-harm prevention strategy across the site (Feltham A and B). The collection and analysis of information was very good and a wide range of information was used to identify trends and patterns of behaviour.
- I.34** The head of safeguarding and the small safeguarding team continued to provide a central point for advice and guidance for staff on Feltham A.
- I.35** There had been 42 incidents of self-harm during the six months before the inspection, which was higher than at the previous inspection but lower than at similar establishments. About 30 boys accounted for a disproportionate number of these incidents, all of which were minor. There had been no serious self-inflicted injuries or deaths since the previous inspection.
- I.36** In the last six months, 60 ACCT documents had been opened, but there was only one open ACCT at the time of the inspection. The quality of ACCTs that we examined was generally very good. Many entries were detailed and indicated that residential staff knew and cared about the personal circumstances of individual boys. Case reviews were timely and attendance by staff who knew the boy had improved and was generally very good.
- I.37** Some care maps lacked detail and were not always updated adequately.
- I.38** We also found examples of boys on ACCT documents who had been locked up for too long with nothing to do and a few cases where documents confirmed that isolation brought about by restricted regimes had contributed to their self-harm.

⁶ Assessment, care in custody and teamwork case management of prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm

Recommendations

- I.39 All children on ACCTs should have access to a regime which provides purposeful activity and a reasonable amount of time out of cell.**
- I.40 Care maps should be detailed and updated regularly.**

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.41 *The behaviour management policy indicated a commitment to managing behaviour through motivation and reward, rather than an exclusive reliance on sanctions. The PACT process for behaviour support was promising, but not yet embedded into the broader range of approaches to behaviour, which tended to be just punitive. The weekly risk management meeting was an effective basis for supporting boys with particular behavioural needs, and there were promising plans for new units which would develop this work.*

- I.42** There was an up-to-date behaviour management policy which had a very helpful, evidence-based focus on reward, particularly immediate verbal recognition, as a motivational tool stronger than punishment. This approach was not carried out consistently in practice, where there was an over-reliance on the threat of sanctions.
- I.43** The plethora of different systems which were criticised in the last inspection report had been reduced. A single behaviour support system, 'positive attitudes created together' (PACT), had recently been introduced which was psychologically informed, and followed a cycle of target-setting and review. However, the individual support plans were not fully effective (see paragraph I.68). PACT was not well integrated into other behaviour management processes and tended to function independently.
- I.44** The weekly risk management meeting provided the main focus for multidisciplinary case management. It continued to function well and reviewed the progress of the most challenging 20% of the population each week (see paragraph I.69).
- I.45** There were well-developed plans for an enhanced support unit, which included a team of psychologists and weekly clinical supervision for operational staff.
- I.46** Mediation was well integrated into the routine management of conflict but it had become such a familiar process to many boys that it sometimes became a formal and perfunctory process.

Recommendation

- I.47 The PACT system should be integrated into a single coherent approach to supporting behaviour change, which is reflected in all aspects of practice.**

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.48 *The incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme was not sufficiently motivational. Boys perceived that the enhanced level was not worth striving for, and there was a continuing negative focus in the application of the scheme.*

I.49 There was a reasonable distribution among the levels of the IEP scheme, with 10% on basic and 15% on enhanced level. Staff were still using the 'basic for violence' level for boys who had been a perpetrator in a fight or assault. This put boys on a restricted regime similar to the basic regime under the IEP system, such that they only had half an hour out of cell each day. It was not defined in any policy nor authorised by any managers. Thirteen boys were on this level at the beginning of the inspection but its use was stopped during the inspection week.

I.50 The main concern expressed by boys was that there was not enough incentive to progress to the enhanced level. The establishment was addressing this with plans for one-off rewards and additional phone credit for boys on the enhanced level, to be implemented with ring-fenced Youth Justice Board funding. The application of the scheme still had a negative focus: most case record entries relating to the scheme were negative, and in the self-assessment form for the scheme the first nine of 16 questions concerned negative behaviour.

Recommendations

- I.51** **The regime for boys on basic level of the rewards and sanctions scheme should be improved and not lead to boys being effectively isolated for long periods.**
(Repeated recommendation I.52)
- I.52** **The rewards and sanctions scheme should be applied with a clear emphasis on positive motivation.**

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.53 *The flow of information from staff to the security team had increased, but information was not processed in a timely way. Body cameras were a useful addition. Joint working with police and other agencies had improved further since the last inspection. Searching practices were proportionate. The number of disciplinary hearings had continued to rise sharply. They were carried out fairly, but in a way more suited to adults than to multidisciplinary work on behaviour change for children. The mandatory drug testing (MDT) rate had remained at 0% for the past 12 months and there was little evidence of new psychoactive substances (NPS)⁷ or any other drug use.*

I.54 The flow of information from staff had increased since the previous inspection and averaged 272 reports a month. Assaults and threats were by far the most frequent themes, and there were few relating to drugs. Two full-time staff carried out the telephone monitoring, which provided consistency. The security team was about to be restructured and was short of staff at the time of the inspection, which had created a backlog in the processing of information.

I.55 Body-worn video cameras had been introduced to record incidents and had been effective in providing evidence to follow up incidents and may have provided a deterrent. There was a camera on each unit, worn by a patrol officer, and orderly officers wore them. They were switched on only when an incident began or seemed likely to begin

I.56 Joint working with the police had continued to strengthen. New Metropolitan police resources were about to be deployed in Feltham to follow up assaults and intelligence and to work with boys affected by gang issues and criminality in the institution and in the community. The security team worked closely with community agencies on radicalisation issues, and focused work was being carried out with some individuals.

I.57 Searching practice was proportionate; strip-searches were only carried out on the basis of specific intelligence, and on the authority of a senior manager.

I.58 There had been a further substantial rise in the number of adjudications: an average of 165 a month in the previous six months, more than twice the average in 2013. The adjudication system was not well integrated into the overall behaviour management strategy.

I.59 Adjudications were carried out fairly and records showed that correct procedures were followed. The high number of 'guilty' pleas, particularly in relation to violence, and the superficial interaction recorded did not instil confidence that the process was anything other than a ritual administration of punishment, not well suited to children.

I.60 The positive random mandatory drug testing (MDT) rate for the six months to the end of July 2015 was 0%. No suspicion tests had been requested during this period. The MDT suite,

⁷ A chemical substance which acts on the central nervous system to alter brain function – perception, mood, consciousness, cognition and behaviour

situated on the Feltham B side of the establishment, was clean, tidy and appropriately equipped.

- I.61** Drug finds for the six months to July 2015 comprised four items, including one cannabis, one Spice⁸ and two unknown substances.

Recommendation

- I.62** **Managers should analyse the impact of the formal adjudications system on the basis of evidence, and ensure that it plays an effective and age-appropriate part in the management of behaviour.** (Repeated recommendation I.59)

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.63 *The number of violent incidents had reduced since the last inspection but remained very high. Many were serious and just over 40% involved multiple assailants. The severity of attacks on staff was particularly concerning. Restricted regimes for perpetrators of violence remained confusing and difficult to manage despite the introduction of new planning processes and good use of interventions. The use of Curlew and Jay as violence-free units worked well. There were well developed plans to introduce other initiatives such as an enhanced support unit and care and separation unit, together with psychology-led programmes to help reduce violence. These were encouraging.*

- I.64** There was a clear violence reduction strategy focused as much on rewards as sanctions and a behaviour management policy which described protocols to manage specific aspects of antisocial behaviour (see paragraph I.41).
- I.65** Two residential units, Curlew and Jay, had been developed as units free of violence and gangs. This had clearly had a positive impact on encouraging responsible behaviour. Boys on these units were unlocked for most of the day and nearly all had purposeful activity.
- I.66** There were well-developed, funded plans to introduce other initiatives, such as an enhanced support unit, a care and separation unit for young people, and accredited programmes led by psychology to help reduce violence.
- I.67** Most of the restricted regimes and formal measures to manage violent and antisocial behaviour that existed at the previous inspection had been replaced by the promising PACT system (see paragraph I.43). This was based on individual plans, drawn up and managed by residential staff, to set and monitor targets to improve behaviour and to support vulnerable boys.
- I.68** However, the quality of many PACT plans that we examined was poor. Targets were often superficial, and there was little evidence that progress in changing behaviour was being monitored or followed up by residential officers. Reviews were cursory and not well attended by staff who knew the boy.

⁸ A so-called 'legal high', or 'new psychoactive substance', which induces effects akin to cannabis'

- I.69** Most of the work with boys who demonstrated antisocial behaviour was delivered by the safeguarding team, a small team of specialist staff. This included very good bespoke interventions, such as anger management, conflict intervention, a trauma clinic for victims, mediation and victim awareness. Individual cases were reviewed each week by an effective multidisciplinary staff group at well-attended risk management meetings, chaired by the head of safeguarding.
- I.70** Most boys on PACT plans were on a restricted regime. Many could not be unlocked with other boys and were not allowed to attend activities such as education, work or corporate worship. It remained difficult for them to access interventions. Some boys who had been excluded from work and education received less than an hour a day unlocked (see paragraphs 1.49 and 3.1).
- I.71** The number of violent incidents remained high, although it had reduced from 262 during the six months before our last inspection to 209 in the current year. Eighty-one of these had been recorded as assaults on boys, 43 assaults on staff and 85 fights between boys. Some of these incidents were very serious and involved gangs of boys attacking a single boy: 40% of all assaults involved multiple assailants. We observed courageous efforts by prison officers to deal proportionately with these incidents and saw video recordings of officers being punched and kicked repeatedly in the face and body, while protecting boys who were being attacked.
- I.72** The severity and number of staff injuries were particularly concerning. From January to the end of July 2015, 49 officers had received injuries that resulted in a total of 683 days' sickness absence. Forty of these cases had been referred to the police.

Recommendations

- I.73** **Initiatives such as an enhanced support unit, a care and separation unit for boys and psychology-led accredited programmes to help reduce violence should be implemented as a priority.**
- I.74** **Individual plans for perpetrators of violence should be fully developed and should include meaningful behaviour improvement targets based on rigorous assessments of need. They should be managed, monitored and reviewed by residential staff together with the safeguarding team and risk management meeting.**
- I.75** **A full and meaningful regime should be offered to boys on PACT.**

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.76** *Use of force was high but it was generally appropriate, well controlled and closely monitored. However, the drawing of batons had recurred since the last inspection, and was not acceptable.*

- I.77** There was a very high level of use of force, with 427 cases in the previous six months. Use of control and restraint techniques had been higher in the previous quarter than any of the four previous quarters.
- I.78** A good start had been made on the training programme for minimising and managing physical restraint (MMPR), which was to be implemented in early 2016. Staff welcomed the stronger focus on de-escalation without force encompassed by MMPR.
- I.79** Batons had been drawn four times since the previous inspection in the presence of boys under 18 years. Each incident occurred during fights involving more than one boy, but there was no evidence that drawing the baton had contributed to stopping the incident. The carrying of batons by staff managing boys under 18 remained unacceptable, and a notice to this effect had been issued to staff.
- I.80** The terms of reference for the weekly use of force meeting had been broadened, with more attention to trends and patterns. Training had been delivered to staff who supervised incidents to improve the orderly response to incidents involving multiple perpetrators. Records of the use of force were often not made in a timely way, and in some cases were missing altogether.

Recommendation

- I.81** **Batons should not be carried by staff working with boys who are under 18 years of age.**

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.82 *The segregation unit was built and managed on an adult model, but without the facilities of a contemporary isolation unit. The incidence of segregation had risen sharply, reflecting the increase in adjudications. There was a clear focus on minimising and monitoring the isolation of individual boys, but the level was still too high.*

- I.83** The segregation environment remained unsuitable for children. It was grim and featureless, with a small amount of graffiti.
- I.84** There had been 295 instances of separation in the previous six months, an increase of 37% since the previous inspection. The average daily population in the unit was five boys, and the average length of stay about three days. The segregation regime resembled that of an adult prison, with the added disadvantage of no in-cell electricity and no interview rooms, so that teachers, for example, could not work face-to-face with segregated boys.
- I.85** Nearly 60% of those segregated in the first six months of 2015 had been awaiting adjudication. Adjudications were heard in the segregation unit on the adult site, and children spent hours (and often a night) segregated awaiting adjudication, whether or not there were risks justifying segregation.

- I.86** Managers had maintained a focus on the problem of isolating children, in particular the cumulative effect of a period in the segregation unit followed by a very restricted regime on a residential unit, which in some cases meant over 22 hours a day locked in a cell. A daily report on isolated boys, including the cumulative period of isolation, was presented to the morning meeting and considered at the weekly risk management meeting, with a view to keeping periods of isolation as short as possible. Further funding had been secured for Kinetic Youth to work with boys who were isolated for their own protection or because they were a risk to others.

Recommendation

- I.87** **Boys should not be held in the segregation unit. Those who need to be separated for their own or others' safety should experience a full regime and intensive intervention to address their behaviour in a suitable setting.** (Repeated recommendation I.74)

Substance misuse

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.88** *Psychosocial services had much improved since the previous inspection, with over 70% of the population receiving support, appropriate to assessed needs, from a highly competent team. While there had been no demand for clinical treatment since the last inspection, clinical staff competencies and assessment protocols had improved.*

- I.89** Psychosocial services were provided by Lifeline, operating under the name Lifeline4U. Clinical drug treatment services were delivered by Care UK.
- I.90** At the time of the inspection and during the preceding 12 months, no boys had required clinical drug treatment and only two had received alcohol detoxification. Nevertheless, nursing staff on the Albatross unit were qualified to RCGPI level in the management of clinical drug treatment.
- I.91** The assessment of clinical treatment needs had improved: the prescribing doctor and a multidisciplinary team determined whether a boy would be more appropriately treated on normal location rather than the acute mental health/detox unit (Albatross).
- I.92** Psychosocial services had also much improved. The Lifeline4U team worked with 71% of the population. About half of all boys (98 boys) were assessed as requiring specialist structured treatment – the highest level of intervention. Yet, in our survey, only 26% of boys against the comparator of 39% said they had arrived with drug problems, predominantly because boys had normalised cannabis use and did not see it as a problem.
- I.93** Lifeline4U comprised a well-led, highly competent team who demonstrated a skilful approach to challenging boys' attitudes to substance use, particularly the misuse of cannabis and new psychoactive substances prior to custody. Boys with substance use issues and gang affiliations had access to a behaviour change mentor in the Lifeline team.

- I.94** At the time of the inspection, the team was delivering an average of 120 interventions a week. There was concern that the imminent introduction of the requirement for 30 hours of education a week would reduce the team's capacity to 50 interventions a week, with a detrimental effect on substance use treatment outcomes. It was too early for us to judge the impact of the imminent changes but we were assured that the relevant managers would be monitoring this closely.
- I.95** Boys with substance use and mental health problems received good care from both services, although there was still no dual diagnosis pathway or protocol in place. Information was shared at multidisciplinary meetings, but there was no joint care planning or consultations.

Recommendation

- I.96** **A dual diagnosis care pathway and joint working protocol should be developed by Lifeline4U and the mental health team to improve outcomes for boys with substance use and mental health problems.**

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 *Many communal areas were reasonably clean but floors and walls were grubby on some units. Some cells, particularly on Dunlin, Eagle and Falcon units, were dirty, with graffiti on walls and scratched into windows. The offensive display policy was not implemented adequately. Conditions in shower rooms were poor but access was good. The environments on Jay and Curlew units were better than other wings. The management of applications was inconsistent and disorganised.*

2.2 Accommodation had not changed since the last inspection and was provided over seven identical residential units, each housing up to 30 boys. At the time of the inspection, Grebe unit was closed for refurbishment. Most cells were for single occupancy but there was also one double cell on each unit. Double cells remained popular and many boys wanted to share these cells. This was only permitted after a settling-in period and thorough risk assessment, correctly.

2.3 Living conditions on residential units were mixed. Communal areas on Eagle, Dunlin and Falcon were reasonably clean but some of the flooring was scuffed and dirty and walls were grubby. Shower rooms were dirty and stained. Some cells were also dirty, and there was graffiti on the backs of cell doors and windows, some of which was offensive. Despite daily cell checks by residential officers, the offensive display policy was not enforced.

2.4 The environment on Curlew and Jay units was much better. Communal areas, including shower rooms, were cleaner and cells were also clean and generally free of graffiti.

2.5 On all units, up-to-date notices were displayed and posters decorated some walls. Association equipment was in reasonably good condition and soft furnishings in quiet rooms and in the association areas continued to contribute to normalising the environment. The open galleried landings were wide and bright and afforded good sightlines for the supervision of boys.

2.6 All cells were fitted with cell call bells and we observed that they were answered quickly by officers.

2.7 The provision of clean prison clothing was adequate and had improved since the last inspection. Boys had weekly clothing exchanges but could have clean T-shirts and underwear every day. They could wear their own clothes and fresh bedding and towels were issued every week. Boys could have a shower every day.

2.8 Arrangements for sending and receiving mail had not altered and remained good. Boys could send two free letters a week, and family and friends could use the 'email a prisoner' scheme. Telephones had privacy hoods and were located in quiet areas. Boys could make a telephone call every day.

2.9 Management of the applications system had not improved and its implementation across the prison was disorganised, with no reliable way of checking the timeliness of responses or

whether they had been dealt with at all. In our survey, 40% of boys said that it was easy to make an application and half said that they were dealt with quickly against respective comparators of 72% and 66% at the last inspection.

Recommendations

- 2.10 All cells and communal areas, including showers, should be clean.**
- 2.11 The offensive display policy should be properly managed and implemented.**
- 2.12 The application system should be managed consistently.** (Repeated recommendation 2.12)

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.

2.13 *The relationships between most staff and boys were good but we also observed distant relationships and saw a few staff who were dismissive of boys and appeared uninterested. The personal officer scheme was not working effectively.*

- 2.14** Our observations indicated that relationships between staff and boys were generally good and in our survey two-thirds of boys said that most staff treated them with respect. We saw many officers engage positively with boys, appearing to have an interest in their welfare and a good awareness of their needs.
- 2.15** Most responses from staff to demanding behaviour were not over-reactive or heavy handed and we saw occasions when residential officers dealt patiently with difficult situations in a calm and mature way. However, there remained a few officers who expressed low expectations of boys, spoke of them in dismissive terms and adopted a passive approach to dealing with simple requests. We were reassured that managers had started to take a robust approach to address this.
- 2.16** The personal officer scheme was not working effectively and the scale of lock-up limited contact between staff and boys (see paragraph 3.1). Entries in boys' records did not indicate that staff were involved in supporting them through formal sentence planning processes.

Recommendation

- 2.17 All staff should engage positively with boys.**

Equality and diversity

Expected outcomes:

The establishment demonstrates a clear and coordinated approach to eliminating discrimination, promoting equitable outcomes and fostering good relations, and ensures that no child or young person is unfairly disadvantaged. This is underpinned by effective processes to identify and resolve any inequality. The diverse needs of each young person are recognised and addressed: these include, but are not restricted to, race equality, nationality, religion, disability (including mental, physical and learning disabilities and difficulties), gender, transgender issues and sexual orientation.

2.18 *There was a clear focus on a whole-prison approach to the delivery of equality and diversity. Investigations into discrimination were good. Equality data were mostly in range. Consultation arrangements were reasonable. Provision for most protected characteristic groups was good.*

Strategic management

- 2.19** The strategic management of equality was very good and the promotion of diversity was given a high priority by the senior management team (SMT). The prison was working towards leaders in diversity accreditation and there was a clear focus on a whole-prison approach. About a quarter of staff were from a black or minority ethnic background. The equality team was proactive and visible and their work with other departments, particularly education, to promote equality and diversity was impressive. The equality action team (EAT) met monthly, chaired by the governor, and was well attended, including by a representative of the boys. Each member of the SMT led on a protected characteristic and meaningful work was being undertaken to inform a comprehensive action plan. Regular cultural awareness events continued to be organised and were promoted through the diversity newsletter, 'news from the wings'. Most wings now had an equality representative.
- 2.20** Boys with a protected characteristic were identified through an effective equality questionnaire.
- 2.21** Equality data were monitored monthly for trends and were normally in range. When they were out of range, this was investigated and action taken.
- 2.22** The extensive 'keep apart' list made consultation groups for each protected characteristic difficult. However, the equality officer held regular focus groups on each unit with a diverse range of boys. Equality and diversity issues were taken to the EAT by a peer representative.
- 2.23** Between February and July 2015, 34 discrimination incident report forms (DIRFs) had been submitted, similar to comparator prisons but fewer than at the last inspection. DIRFs were available on all the wings. Investigations were thorough and were quality assured by the governor. Independent scrutiny carried out by the Zahid Mubarek Trust (a charity set up to challenge discrimination in the criminal justice system) continued to provide good oversight and had been effective in raising standards.

Diverse needs

- 2.24** Seventy-eight per cent of boys were from a black or minority ethnic background and 35% of boys were recorded by the prison as Muslims. In our survey, boys from a black and minority ethnic background and Muslim boys held similar perceptions to white boys and non-Muslim

boys across a wide range of indicators. At our last inspection, both groups had been less positive than their counterparts in our survey and this had been investigated through consultation groups. The Black Training and Enterprise Group visited regularly to coach boys in positive self image and overcoming obstacles. Six boys identified as Travellers met regularly in the chapel and were happy that their needs were being met.

- 2.25** At the time of the inspection, there were 29 foreign nationals in Feltham A. Home Office surgeries continued to be run fortnightly and were well attended. Regular updates on each boy were provided to caseworkers by the Home Office. Information in other languages included application forms and the library stocked a good range of books in other languages. The equality team had good links with foreign embassies and could supply books and DVDs to boys. English for speakers of other languages was available through the education department.
- 2.26** About 40 boys had identified themselves or had been identified by the establishment as having learning difficulties and special educational needs support was very good. The establishment and the education provider were working towards accreditation by the National Autistic Society which demonstrated commitment to working with boys with special educational needs. One boy had been identified with a physical disability and he had a personal evacuation plan which wing staff were aware of.
- 2.27** No gay or bisexual boys had identified themselves at the time of the inspection. Gay and bisexual boys now had access to a community support agency. West London gay man project had attended the prison earlier in the year and provided health advice.

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.

2.28 *Faith provision and facilities were good and attendance at services had improved. The chaplaincy was well integrated into the prison and provided valuable support to boys. Arrangements for Ramadan had been good.*

- 2.29** Faith provision was monitored regularly and reflected the population of 49% Christian, 35% Muslim and 15% with no religion. In our survey, 67% of boys said their religious beliefs were respected against the comparator of 57%.
- 2.30** The chaplaincy was well integrated into prison life, attended a wide range of meetings and met all new arrivals within 24 hours. Apart from the world faith room which required refurbishment, worship facilities were very good. In our survey, about half the boys said it was easy to attend religious services. Records showed that attendance at some services had doubled in the previous six months and adequate alternatives were in place for boys excluded for security reasons.
- 2.31** The chaplaincy facilitated a wide range of classes, groups and pastoral care, including the 'God life universe and everything' course (GLUE) and advice and guidance for boys involved in violent incidents to help them manage conflict. The chapel provided a selection of religious texts. Community engagement through the chaplaincy was good and included the Feltham Community Chaplaincy Trust which provided mentors for boys about to be released.

- 2.32** Recent arrangements to manage Ramadan, including consultation with boys and the Muslim chaplain, had been well received.

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.

2.33 *Complaint forms were freely available on units and boxes were emptied daily. Responses to complaints that we saw were generally polite and quality assurance was robust, but timeliness was not good enough in some cases.*

2.34 In our survey, 35% of boys thought it was easy to make a complaint against the comparator of 58% and 59% at the previous inspection. During the six months before the inspection, the average number of complaints each month had reduced to 32 compared with 62 at the previous inspection. The reasons for this were not clear and required further investigation.

2.35 Complaint forms were available on all the units. Boxes were emptied each night by an orderly officer and passed to the complaints clerk. All complaints were scanned and replies typed. A useful guide to responding to complaints was in use and responses were mostly polite and focused. Some responses took too long to be made. Quality assurance was effective with good involvement from the safeguarding function.

2.36 Complaints covered a range of issues, with no clear trends identified; a breakdown was reported monthly to the SMT. Good support was available from the Barnardo's advocates for boys needing help to submit a complaint.

Legal rights

Expected outcomes:

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

2.37 *Caseworkers explained to boys their legal rights and status. There were reasonable arrangements for boys to contact their legal adviser. Legal visits arrangements were mostly good with the exception of the coloured bibs boys had to wear during the visit.*

2.38 Boys' legal rights and custodial status were discussed with them by their caseworker. Just under 20% of boys were on remand. Caseworkers checked during initial meetings whether remanded boys wanted to make a bail application and liaised with community youth offending team (YOT) workers who took the lead in preparing bail packages.

2.39 Boys could make free telephone calls to their legal advisers through their caseworkers, although only eight boys had taken advantage of this over the previous two months. Legal

visits took place in a large hall reserved for professional visits and there were some private booths available. Boys attending legal visits had to wear a coloured bib which was not required for social visits.

- 2.40** Early release provisions were explained fully to boys who were serving a detention and training order (see paragraph 4.7).

Housekeeping point

- 2.41** Boys should not have to wear coloured bibs when attending legal and other professional visits.

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.

- 2.42** *Physical and mental health services were age appropriate and had improved since our last inspection. Some aspects were impressive. Boys expressed dissatisfaction with access to nurses and doctors and with the quality of health services but we found shorter waiting lists and times and lower did-not-attend rates. There were too many cancelled external health appointments, mainly by the hospital concerned. Too many boys were not transferred in a timely manner to a mental health unit.*
- 2.43** *The inspection of health services was jointly undertaken by the Care Quality Commission (CQC)⁹ and HM Inspectorate of Prisons under a memorandum of understanding agreement between the agencies.*

Governance arrangements

- 2.44** The CQC found there were no breaches of the relevant regulations.
- 2.45** Health care was commissioned by NHS England and provided by Care UK, with a sub-contract to Barnet, Enfield and Haringey Mental Health NHS Trust (BEH). Other providers such as the dentist and optician had separate contracts. Despite parallel contractual arrangements, there was a collegiate approach to health care provision, excellent clinical information sharing, and a shared local risk matrix. There had been a recent health needs analysis though the service provider had not yet seen it.
- 2.46** Clinical governance was robust with a partnership board, contract and governance meetings which functioned effectively. Seven untoward incidents had been reported in 2015 but these were of a minor nature.

⁹ 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>.

- 2.47** Staff numbers were adequate to deliver a 24-hour service. The clinical skill mix was very good; administrative and business support was excellent. There was less reliance on agency staff than in 2014. Staff had good access to training and to cascade clinical supervision, which was documented. We observed that relationships between health care staff and boys had improved and were caring.
- 2.48** Some policies needed review and few were specific to the establishment. Health care contributed to the safeguarding meeting as necessary.
- 2.49** The main health centre provided a suitable environment and the waiting area was furnished appropriately for the population. The new pharmacy room was impressive. There had been an audit of infection control requirements and some actions had been taken. Deep cleaning was under way at the time of our visit. The health care rooms in reception and Bittern unit were good.
- 2.50** In our survey, 40% of boys said that the quality of health care was good against the comparator of 57% and 20% at the previous inspection. In our focus groups boys expressed mixed views about health care. Boys were able to influence developments in health care through monthly prisoner forums. Care UK had engaged the Royal Holloway College University of London to conduct an independent survey of boys about their experiences of health care, which was commendable.
- 2.51** There had been an average of seven complaints a month since April 2015. There was now a separate system for health care complaints, which was an improvement. Every boy making a complaint was seen personally, which was highly commendable. Complaints were of a minor nature and responses were timely, focused and polite, with apologies as necessary.
- 2.52** Health promotion had been developed since 2014. There was a project to improve 'health marketing' literature to make it accessible to the age group. There were several new initiatives to encourage boys to take responsibility for their health, for example training boys to re-order medication before the supply ran out. Health champions were to be introduced, which was a welcome initiative.
- 2.53** Literature on a range of health care topics applicable to the age and gender of the group was accessible in health locations, but some of it was too complex for boys with reading difficulties. The introductory leaflet was good but had little useful information about substance misuse services. There was no regular coordination of health and wellbeing activities but there had been a multi-departmental event before the inspection to promote a healthy lifestyle. Mental health services were very active in promoting wellbeing (see mental health section).
- 2.54** Out-of-hours medical cover was very good with registered nurses on site; the prison doctor was available to provide telephone advice and Harmoni on-call services operated out of hours. Ambulance response times were reasonable.
- 2.55** Resuscitation kits including automated external defibrillators (AEDs) were kept in health care treatment rooms and checked regularly. It was good to see health care staff receiving intermediate life support training during the inspection.
- 2.56** About 15 officers had been trained to use AEDs, an improvement on 2014. It was anticipated that all officers would be trained with the introduction of MMPR (minimising and managing physical restraint). New guidance on the use of emergency codes was in print at the time of the inspection, which was designed to reduce errors in an emergency.

Recommendations

- 2.57** There should be a prison-wide strategy to promote health and wellbeing.
- 2.58** The approach to the resuscitation of collapsed prisoners should be considered by the partnership board to define and deliver an optimal state of readiness.

Housekeeping point

- 2.59** Policies and procedures should be in date and reflect local circumstances.

Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.60** Initial screening and follow-on assessment were conducted using the CHAT (comprehensive health assessment tool) which enabled medication and referral needs to be met. Plans were advanced to introduce enhanced screening for blood-borne viruses and tuberculosis, though the latter required modern digital X-ray equipment.
- 2.61** A good range of primary care clinics were held in the main health centre. Several GP clinics were held on the wings, which ensured good access for the boys. There were also visiting specialists, including optometry and sexual health services. The visiting consultant in sexual health believed Feltham to have 'the best sexual health service of any prison'. Health services were age appropriate and included screening for chlamydia and other sexually transmitted diseases, immunisation for MMR (measles, mumps and rubella), with meningitis C to be available from September 2015. An individual approach was taken to smoking cessation.
- 2.62** About 33 boys had long-term conditions such as asthma and diabetes. They received suitable support and follow up and were monitored via weekly, multidisciplinary complex case meetings. Care planning was very good and regularly audited. We found a glucometer that could not be accurately calibrated because of a low battery and expiry of testing fluid. This was rectified immediately when we pointed it out.
- 2.63** In our survey, only 42% of boys said they had good access to a doctor and 55% a nurse against comparators of 53% and 68% respectively. We found access to be good. Nurses were accessible several times a day and medical appointments were available the following day.
- 2.64** Boys could request a health appointment using a picture-based application form. Appointments were allocated following triage. Health care staff were meticulous in planning appointments; all boys received a reminder before their appointments and those who did not attend (DNA) were followed up. The overall DNA rate had fallen from 33% in 2013 to 8%. At the time of the inspection, the DNA for the doctor was 8% and subject to further action to drive it down. Waiting lists and times were short. This was a very impressive performance with this age group. Thought was being given to addressing the boys' expectations and perceptions of health care, which we would encourage.
- 2.65** The Albatross in-patient unit lacked published admission criteria, although decisions to admit boys were made by clinicians. Bed occupancy was about 50% and there were advanced plans to move to a smaller unit (Wren). The therapeutic environment was positive with an excellent programme of activities. There was an impressive therapy room designed in association with the King's Fund. Subject to risk assessment, boys had access to mainstream prison services. The weekly ward round enabled boys to contribute to decisions about their

treatment. There was good liaison with prison staff to ensure transfer back to the units was carefully managed.

- 2.66** On average, a quarter of external hospital appointments had been cancelled since April 2015, which was disappointing. Administrative staff managed the process effectively, but they were frustrated by hospital cancellations and occasional internal problems. They believed their allocated 'slots' to escort boys out of the prison were inadequate.

Recommendation

- 2.67** **The partnership board should review the provision of external health care escorts and the reasons for cancellations, and take action to minimise lost appointments.**

Housekeeping point

- 2.68** The partnership board should consider the benefits of digital X-ray equipment in screening and diagnostics procedures.

Pharmacy

- 2.69** There was a full-time prescribing pharmacist and pharmacy technician offering an in-house registered pharmacy service. The supply of medication, stock storage, control, checking and auditing were exemplary.
- 2.70** In our survey, 64% of boys held their medicines in possession against the comparator of 50%; however, not all boys could store their medicines securely. Suitable risk assessments were recorded on SystemOne (electronic patient record). The risk assessment prompted prescribers to consider the Fraser competency test¹⁰, which was commendable.
- 2.71** Nurses administered medicines up to four times a day with effective supervision by officers. A limited number of patient group directions (PGDs)¹¹ authorised the administration of a few medicines and vaccinations with a suitable audit process. Simple remedies were available on the canteen list. Boys had appropriate access to medication out of hours.
- 2.72** The medicines management committee met bimonthly with suitable representation. The committee ratified standard operating procedures and the electronic formulary and discussed prescribing trends. Medicines management and clinical governance procedures were very good.

Recommendation

- 2.73** **All boys should have secure storage for their in-possession medications.**

¹⁰ Used to assess whether a child has the maturity to make their own decisions and to understand the implications of those decisions

¹¹ Enable the supply and administration of prescription-only medicine by persons other than a doctor or pharmacist, usually a nurse

Dentistry

- 2.74** Not all boys were screened for dental health on arrival but boys could request a dental appointment using the application system. All applications were triaged by the dentist, following direct contact with the boy on the unit and a brief assessment of his problems. Appointments were then prioritised according to clinical need. There was liaison with community dentists to ensure continuity of treatment which was excellent practice.
- 2.75** Four dental sessions were available each week for the whole site. Waiting times to see the dentist were reasonable, monitored and well managed by administrative staff. At the time of the inspection, 44 boys were on the waiting list to see the dentist for the first time; however, the longest wait was only two weeks five days and there were vacant slots during the inspection week.
- 2.76** A full range of treatments were available, including minor oral and dental surgical techniques. Oral health information and advice were routinely offered, supported by demonstration and illustration where required. Boys could buy dental care items from the canteen.
- 2.77** The dental suite was clean with a new floor. Equipment was serviced and maintained by the establishment and radiological protection checks were up to date. There had recently been an infection control audit. The suite was compliant with basic standards but did not meet national best practice standards.

Housekeeping point

- 2.78** Boys should have access to routine dental screening on arrival.

Good practice

- 2.79** *The importance given to liaison with community dental services meant that a boy could continue treatment started in the community while at Feltham.*

Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.80** In our survey, 15% of boys said they had emotional or mental health problems against the comparator of 27%. The use of CHAT enabled the identification of potential need through screening and assessment. There was an open referral system to access services.
- 2.81** BEH offered high quality mental health services with a rich skill mix available from specialist practitioners in learning disability, nursing, occupational therapy, psychiatry, psychology and speech and language therapy. A consultant child and adolescent psychiatrist visited weekly and a psychiatrist offered 24-hour advice to officers. Not all staff members were up to date with safeguarding training. Joint working with other health and prison departments was unusually good.
- 2.82** Training for officers was available via the 'See Think Act' course, though only about 30% of officers had received some form of mental health awareness training. A new training programme was to start in September 2015, which was more focused on the needs of adolescents.
- 2.83** An integrated model of care was underpinned by an effective mental health care pathway that enabled boys to be seen within 24 hours for an urgent referral and 48 hours for a non-

urgent referral. About 40 boys were in contact with BEH services at any one time. The range of therapeutic options was impressive with both individual and group approaches. There was access to counselling, solution-based one-to-one sessions, neurodisability and attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) clinics.

- 2.84 Therapeutic groups included anger management, skills for life, relaxation and wider social skills.
- 2.85 During the six months to the end of July 2015, six boys had waited longer than two weeks to be transferred to external hospitals in the community, which was unacceptable.

Housekeeping point

- 2.86 All staff should be up to date with safeguarding training.

Good practice

- 2.87 *The accessibility and comprehensive nature of the mental health services ensured that the diverse needs of children and adolescents with emotional and mental health problems could be met.*

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.

- 2.88 *The range and quality of food was reasonably good but many boys said that they did not have enough food and some portion sizes were inadequate.*

- 2.89 The kitchen was clean and well maintained. There were adequate chilled and frozen food storage facilities, with a separate area for halal products. A kitchen journal recorded the dates, times and temperatures of food from leaving the kitchen on trolleys to arriving on the units to be served.
- 2.90 Serveries on residential units were reasonably clean but, apart from Jay and Curlew units, boys were not permitted to eat their meals together out of their cells.
- 2.91 Lunch and dinner were selected from a four-week rolling menu with a reasonable variety of healthy options. Menu options included vegetables, and fruit was available at lunch and dinner. In our survey, however, only 13% of respondents said that the food was good or very good.
- 2.92 Lunch was served at noon and dinner at about 5pm which was reasonable and an improvement on the previous inspection.
- 2.93 Breakfast packs were issued in the morning which contained a small amount of cereal, a small carton of milk, a few slices of bread, butter and a very small portion of jam. The teatime meal seemed of a reasonable quantity but portions at lunch were smaller and many boys

complained that they were often hungry between meals. No mid-morning or afternoon snack was provided.

- 2.94** Consultation arrangements had improved. There were food comments books on each wing and boys were surveyed twice a year. The catering manager attended consultation meetings with boys and there was evidence that their views were taken seriously and their suggestions acted on.

Recommendations

- 2.95 All boys should have the opportunity to eat communally out of their cells.** (Repeated recommendation 2.124)

- 2.96 The quantity of food available to boys during the day should be increased.**

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.

- 2.97** *In our survey, 41% of boys against the comparator of 54% said the canteen sold a wide enough variety of products. Some boys had to wait up to seven days to submit their first canteen order, although all boys now received a free pack of basic items when they arrived. Consultation arrangements needed improvement.*

- 2.98** All new arrivals were given a free pack of basic items in reception, including snacks and squash; several boys told us they consumed their packs on their first night. Canteen orders were submitted on a Tuesday for delivery at the weekend. Boys who arrived after Tuesday had to wait up to seven days to make their first canteen order, depending on the day they arrived. This increased the potential for them to get into debt.

- 2.99** In our survey, 41% of boys said the canteen sold a wide enough variety of products, against the comparator of 54%. Boys told us they did not know how to influence the choice of goods available to buy. Some consultation specific to purchases had recently taken place and this needed to be developed further. Boys were not able to order from catalogues.

Recommendations

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

- 2.101 Regular consultation with boys should take place to ensure that the range of goods on the canteen list meets the diverse needs of the population.** (Repeated recommendation 2.133)

- 2.102 Boys should be able to order items from catalogues.**

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.¹²

3.1 *Most boys did not have enough time out of their cells and, apart from two units, evening association was rare for most boys. The lack of time in the open air – less than half an hour a day for most boys – was a significant health issue.*

3.2 Average recorded time out of cell was 5.5 hours on weekdays, and 4.35 hrs at weekends: less than the weekday figure of seven hours at our previous inspection. Two units, Curlew and Jay, were set aside for boys in full-time work or education, who had more frequent evening association, so that the average for boys in other units was lower than 5.5 hours. In our two roll checks during peak work times, 38% of boys were locked in their cells and 40% were engaged in purposeful activity. (See main recommendation S51)

3.3 Evening association was rare for most boys. Access to exercise was inadequate with a maximum entitlement of only 30 minutes. In practice, many boys had less time in the open air: we saw exercise periods of less than 15 minutes. Some boys on the most restricted regimes had to choose between a shower, telephone call or exercise within a 30-minute period. The CQC judged that being deprived of time in the open air was seriously detrimental to the health, development and wellbeing of growing boys.¹³ (See main recommendation S52)

3.4 A limited variety of activities was available on the residential units, and Kinetic Youth provided some youth club activities. Staff trained in sports and games were identified on daily rosters, and there was evidence of activities organised by them.

Education, learning and skills

Inspection of the provision of education and educational standards, as well as vocational training in YOIs for young people, is undertaken by the Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted¹⁴) working under the general direction of HM Inspectorate of Prisons. For information on how Ofsted inspects education and training see the Ofsted framework and handbook for inspection.

Expected outcomes:

All children and young people engage well in education, learning and skills that enable them to gain confidence and experience success. Expectations of children and young

¹² 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.

¹³ As this report was being finalised we were told that a new core day offered at least two one-hour exercise slots each day.

¹⁴ Ofsted is the Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills. It reports directly to the UK Parliament and is independent and impartial. It (inter alia) inspects and regulates services that provide education and skills for all ages, including those in custody. For information on Ofsted's inspection framework, please visit: <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk>.

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.

3.5 *Teaching and learning required improvement, largely because leaders and managers had failed to apply robust performance management procedures to challenge the least effective teachers. Quality assurance arrangements were not effective in raising standards. However, internal partnership working was effective and the quality of workshop provision was particularly good. Boys attended workshops and achieved relevant vocational units, but the development of their functional skills in English and mathematics at best required improvement, as did their achievement in these subjects. Attendance in education was poor. The range of provision was satisfactory and the allocations process efficient. The library provided a reasonable service but needed to do more to ensure that all boys benefited from its services.*

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

Overall effectiveness of learning and skills and work: Requires improvement

Outcomes for children and young people engaged in learning and skills and work activities: Requires improvement

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

Effectiveness of leadership and management of learning and skills and work activities: Requires improvement

Management of education and learning and skills

3.7 The leadership and management of learning and skills required improvement, largely because of failures in the performance management of the least effective teaching staff. Although the observation of teaching and learning was well established, it had not been used effectively to set challenging improvement targets and action plans for teachers whose classroom performance continued to cause concern to managers. The current learning provider, Prospects, had taken over about five months before the inspection and managers had swiftly recognised the weaknesses in teaching and had begun to implement a more effective performance management scheme for teachers.

3.8 Prospects had carried out an appropriately detailed needs analysis which made good use of labour market information and reflected the boys' views, as well as employer requirements. This had resulted in a relatively narrow but appropriate curriculum focused on developing boys' functional skills in English and mathematics and providing them with opportunities to learn a range of vocational skills. Well-advanced plans were in place to extend vocational training opportunities in horticulture and industrial cleaning.

3.9 Internal partnerships were good. The prison worked well with Prospects and with the security, health and casework teams to provide boys with an appropriate range of purposeful activities which met their needs. Partnerships with employers, however, were not well developed.

- 3.10** Quality assurance arrangements, including self-assessment and action planning, had not resulted in sufficiently rapid improvements to the standard of provision. Self-assessment was an inclusive process, but it did not give enough weight to weaknesses in classroom-based teaching. Managers made appropriate use of data on recruitment, retention, achievement and success to arrive at judgements that were generally accurate. Prospects' action plan was relatively new and had yet to achieve many of the identified objectives. The establishment's quality improvement group had been ineffective for some time and the newly-appointed head of learning and skills had recently implemented plans to re-launch the group.
- 3.11** At the time of the inspection, the prison was moving towards a regime that would meet the new requirement to provide every boy with 30 hours' purposeful activity, a significant increase from the current 15 hours' provision. Although the education team had clearly taken significant steps to prepare for this transition, we were not confident that the establishment would be able to deliver it in advance of the establishment of the enhanced support unit. The establishment currently managed potential conflicts by operating a split regime with some boys attending activities in the morning and some in the afternoon. The new units would enable staff to work intensively with the most complex boys away from the main population and so reduce the need for a split regime and increase the boys' access to activities.

Recommendations

- 3.12** **The learning provider should implement robust procedures for performance management, the observation of teaching and learning and self-assessment, to ensure that teaching and learning rapidly improves.**
- 3.13** **The establishment should ensure that the quality improvement group is an effective driver of improvements across learning, skills and work.**

Provision of activities

- 3.14** Sufficient activity places were provided to meet the needs of the population, although there were not enough full-time places. Most boys were engaged in purposeful activity but on too many occasions, the regime prevented boys, sometimes unfairly, from attending activities because of security concerns or previous poor behaviour.
- 3.15** The range of classroom-based provision and workshop training met the needs of most of the population. Prospects offered discrete English and mathematics classes, but attendance was poor. Boys were enthusiastic about vocational training courses, which were well attended and oversubscribed. Prospects' managers rightly acknowledged the value of offering vocational training with embedded functional skills of English and mathematics to help boys thrive in the practical environment of the workshop. However, plans to implement this strategy were at a very early stage.
- 3.16** Prospects had recently strengthened the allocations process which now ensured that boys benefited from attending activities which reflected their prior educational attainment, preferences, and security and health considerations. Allocations meetings which were well attended by internal partners enabled boys to be scheduled to activities likely to benefit them.

Recommendation

3.17 Sufficient full-time activity places should be provided and these should support the development of boys' functional skills in English and mathematics.

Quality of provision

- 3.18** The education and vocational training provided by Prospects required improvement. The standard of teaching and learning in vocational training was good. Learners were well behaved, enthusiastic and gained useful skills, which they valued. Learners had very high regard for their vocational tutors.
- 3.19** Teachers planned most classroom-based lessons well to ensure learning activities matched the level and ability of each boy. In better lessons, learners received good individual learning which promoted progress and led to the achievement of high standards. Teachers managed boys' behaviour well and made good use of question-and-answer sessions to check and reinforce understanding. Classes included effective recapping of learning points and promoted a supportive ethos for boys to take ownership of their learning.
- 3.20** In too many sessions, learners became disinterested and were slow to achieve because they were working at a level too low or too high for them. Teachers did not always adapt strategies to engage and inspire the boys in their care or to challenge the more able.
- 3.21** Boys developed appropriate written English and mathematics skills. However, too many used urban slang or inappropriately colourful language when communicating with teachers and visitors, which went unchallenged by staff. Teachers did not pay enough attention to developing boys' spoken English to help them communicate effectively, particularly in formal situations like job interviews or talking to work supervisors.
- 3.22** Teachers challenged racist and sexist comments during learning and skills sessions but the wider promotion of equality and diversity required improvement. Teachers placed suitable emphasis on ensuring that boys adhered to health and safety rules in the classroom and in workshops.
- 3.23** The monitoring of progress was generally appropriate but did not always ensure that boys were clear about progress they had made and what they still needed to do to achieve. Teachers provided informative and constructive comments on boys' written work which helped them to improve their skills. They monitored targets well, but a few targets were not detailed enough and did not help teachers to review boys' progress accurately. Personal targets to help boys improve their behaviour in the classroom were rarely set.
- 3.24** Boys received an appropriate initial assessment of their English and mathematics skills during induction. Assessment of special educational needs was particularly robust and learning support assistants provided good quality support in class.
- 3.25** Learning took place in appropriately resourced classrooms and workshops with informative wall displays and posters celebrating success and promoting high aspirations. Few teachers made use of information learning technology to make sessions more interesting. The low attendance at many education classes restricted the variety of teaching strategies available to the teacher. This was often exacerbated by the removal of boys from class by officers for many reasons unrelated to learning. Education outreach provision on the accommodation blocks reintegrated learners successfully into mainstream provision, but teachers did not have enough resources and learning spaces to perform this role effectively.

Recommendations

- 3.26** Teachers should be helped to improve the quality of sessions by supporting them to set challenging learning targets and to make lessons more engaging and interactive.
- 3.27** Teachers should help boys to use spoken English to communicate more effectively, especially in formal situations, and to support successful resettlement.
- 3.28** Teachers should promote equality and diversity thoroughly during learning sessions, including integrating equality themes with the taught subject.
- 3.29** The establishment, in partnership with the learning provider, should improve the standard of outreach work by ensuring that teachers are equipped with resources and facilities to deliver learning effectively on the accommodation blocks.

Education and vocational achievements

- 3.30** Achievements were good in vocational training and much better than in classroom based provision. Outcomes were particularly poor in information and communication technology and personal and social development. More significantly, boys' achievements in functional skills in English and mathematics were low, though they had increased a little recently in mathematics.
- 3.31** Boys particularly enjoyed vocational training and there was high attendance in workshops. Attendance in classroom-based subjects was very poor and had declined since the previous inspection. The reasons for this had not yet been identified. Behaviour was generally better in vocational training than in classrooms. Most boys developed useful skills to help them find work on release.

Recommendations

- 3.32** Teachers should identify the reasons for learners' poor performance, especially in English and mathematics, and take swift corrective action.
- 3.33** The establishment and education provider should collaborate to determine why learners continue to miss classroom sessions and implement an effective strategy to improve attendance.

Library

- 3.34** The London Borough of Hounslow provided library services for the establishment through a subcontracting arrangement with Carillion. The library was understaffed at the time of the inspection with just one full-time librarian. It was well stocked with books and resources to meet the needs of the population. Boys could access foreign language texts, legal materials, fiction, magazines, and easy-read books. The librarian ran a number of well attended groups to encourage boys to participate in learning.
- 3.35** The library opening hours were satisfactory. The librarian maintained weekly records of the number of boys from each accommodation block using the library. However, no data were

available to identify how many boys visited the library once a week, which was their entitlement, or how many did not use the library.

- 3.36** Books and resources were generally appropriate, but inspectors found some that were not suitable for the age of the boys at Feltham. There was no procedure for monitoring stock loss.

Recommendations

- 3.37** The library should have accurate data on library use so that it can be determined whether all boys are using the facility.
- 3.38** An appropriate procedure should be implemented immediately to monitor the loss of stock.

Housekeeping point

- 3.39** An audit of library resources, including the DVD collection, should be carried out to ensure that all materials are age appropriate.

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.

3.40 *Access to the gym and sports facilities was good but attendance was low. The range of accredited courses was limited but improvements were planned. Unit and full qualification achievements were good. Staff managed well the reintegration of boys temporarily excluded from gym use. Boys were motivated to engage in an appropriate level of physical exercise. Links with community sports organisations had improved but boys did not have the opportunity to play competitive sports against visiting teams. Links with health care, to meet specific need through remedial gym, were underdeveloped.*

- 3.41** PE facilities were very good and boys had scheduled access to one of two sports halls providing a good range of team sports and activities to promote personal fitness. The cardiovascular suite included resistance and weight training equipment. Each exercise yard housed a small selection of body weight equipment. Staff carefully supervised boys during sessions, including monitoring their use of weights, which was restricted to a maximum of 40kg. The good outside facilities included full-sized football and rugby pitches. Links with community sports organisations had improved and boys had recently participated in football and rugby training. However, boys did not have opportunities to play competitive sports against visiting teams.
- 3.42** Access to recreational PE was good. Boys on basic level privileges were able to attend two sessions a week while others could attend four sessions. Boys attending workshops full time and those released on temporary license were given priority to attend sessions during the evening and the weekend. However, overall session attendance rates were low. The range

and level of accredited courses was limited, but well-advanced plans were in place to introduce additional programmes. Unit and full qualification achievements were good.

- 3.43** All boys received an appropriate induction which included health screening to ensure that they were fit to participate. Boys were able to complete relevant health and safety qualifications including 'heart start' and manual handling. Partnership working with the substance misuse team was good. Links with health care were under-developed, and health staff made few routine referrals for rehabilitation sessions to improve boys' health and wellbeing. Recent initiatives were beginning to correct this.
- 3.44** Staff were well qualified and experienced in dealing with boys with multiple and complex needs. Reintegration of boys temporarily excluded from PE was managed well. Staff were generally successful in motivating reluctant gym users to engage in an appropriate level of physical exercise to promote healthy living and lifestyles. Boys could participate in the Duke of Edinburgh award and a few had been released on temporary licence to help them complete the award.

Recommendations

- 3.45 Opportunities should be provided for boys to play competitive sports against visiting teams.**
- 3.46 Attendance at gym sessions should be improved by establishing the reasons for boys' absence and taking appropriate action.**

Section 4. Resettlement

Pre-release and resettlement

Expected outcomes:

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

- 4.1** *The strategic focus on the reducing reoffending needs of boys required improvement. A needs analysis was being completed to assist with this and there were improving links with resettlement consortia. Caseworkers offered individual support to boys and use of release on temporary licence (ROTL) had improved.*
- 4.2** Little progress had been made since the previous inspection with many of the actions in the reducing reoffending strategy. Much planning and preparation had taken place to facilitate closer working between the casework team and the education provider and this was clearly reflected in the strategy. A needs analysis of the population had recently been completed which was to inform a revised reducing reoffending strategy drawing on the range of interventions being accredited for use across the young people's estate.
- 4.3** A monthly resettlement meeting oversaw work on the strategy and resettlement pathways. Attendance by key departments was reasonably good, but much of the discussion focused on the needs of young adults at Feltham B. Community partners involved in the resettlement of boys were not involved in the meeting and we were not confident that enough strategic attention was being given to the needs of boys at Feltham A. (See main recommendation S53)
- 4.4** Caseworkers were starting to attend first community reviews for boys released from Feltham, providing the opportunity to follow progress soon after release. There were no data on resettlement and reoffending outcomes for boys after they left Feltham, although the developing links with resettlement consortia provided an avenue to pursue this.
- 4.5** Caseworkers had primary responsibility for identifying risk and resettlement needs. The casework team comprised staff from a variety of backgrounds, including some uniformed staff. These staff were sometimes cross deployed to generic officer duties, particularly at weekends. Each caseworker had a caseload of sentenced and remanded boys, and new arrivals were allocated according to capacity.
- 4.6** In our survey, 87% of boys said they had a caseworker. They were assigned to a caseworker soon after their arrival, but only a third of boys thought their caseworker had helped them to prepare for release. A member of the casework team attended the weekly meeting which allocated boys to activities and this improved the coordination between educational and sentence plans. Caseworkers also acted as the main point of contact for families.
- 4.7** Early release arrangements were used appropriately to reflect good behaviour by boys serving a detention and training order. Boys expressed a desire to stay out of trouble and to gain early release. Obtaining suitable accommodation remained a problem (see paragraph

4.25). No use had been made of late release provisions, despite the poor behaviour exhibited by some boys.

- 4.8** Some boys who had their 18th birthday while in custody had to move to the adult estate depending on whether they were on remand or the type of sentence they were serving. Transition arrangements were appropriate. Some boys moved to Feltham B and there were established arrangements to facilitate this in a planned way. Others went to prisons further away. Only one receiving prison regularly attended transition meetings at Feltham before a transfer took place. Caseworkers told us it could be difficult to get prisons to accept 18-year-olds, even if the boy met their criteria and the prison matched his identified needs.
- 4.9** The needs of boys serving longer sentences were adequately met, with parole reports completed and suitability for home detention curfew (HDC) determined. Three boys had been granted HDC in the previous six months.
- 4.10** Opportunities for ROTL had improved with boys involved in work in the community and the Duke of Edinburgh award scheme. Boys were properly assessed for suitability, and 15 had taken part in ROTL during the four months before the inspection. Other boys were inspired to apply for ROTL opportunities which rewarded positive behaviour and provided the opportunity to meet identified resettlement needs.

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.

4.11 *Too few boys knew they had a training or remand management plan despite regular reviews at which the plans were discussed. Few staff other than caseworkers attended the reviews. Public protection arrangements were organised well and the few boys with indeterminate sentences were managed adequately. Identification of boys who had looked-after status was efficient and the support available to them had been enhanced by the appointment of on-site social workers.*

- 4.12** Caseworkers continued to take the lead in ensuring that boys had individual training or remand plans. Only 30% of boys in the survey said they had a plan against the comparator of 49%. Boys were not given a copy of the targets in their plan, and too many of these targets were not specific to the boy's identified needs (see main recommendation S53). The absence of staff from other disciplines at planning review meetings meant there were few people to reinforce the targets and help boys to work towards them between reviews. Training for the casework team in addressing issues such as agreeing focused, relevant targets was to take place the week after the inspection. Good preparatory work had recently been undertaken to receive more input from the education provider at review meetings and ensure consistency between education and training/remand plans.
- 4.13** Training planning and remand management meetings were timely, with good attendance by community youth offending teams (YOTs) and some families. Attendance by other departments in the establishment needed greater priority. Too few staff who worked with boys attended the meetings to give progress reports, answer questions from family and community professionals, discuss options for the boy and agree on targets. Information

sharing needed improvement so that caseworkers were familiar with the boy's care since the last review. Boys were encouraged to share their views and concerns at their meetings. At one meeting that we observed, the caseworker advocated strongly on behalf of the boy to ensure that his thoughts on what would prevent him re-offending were acknowledged by community professionals. Video link continued to be used to facilitate some meetings.

Recommendation

- 4.14 Training planning and remand management meetings should include staff from all areas who work with the boys to ensure that all relevant activity is captured in their remand or training plans and there is consistent reinforcement across the establishment to help boys achieve their targets.**

Public protection

- 4.15** The public protection policy was comprehensive and provided useful guidance for staff. Screening identified newly arrived boys who might present a risk to the public and they were referred to the interdepartmental risk management team (IDRMT) meeting which covered the whole site. The meeting was well attended, the casework team was always represented and boys from Feltham A were discussed appropriately.
- 4.16** Boys who needed to be considered under multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) were identified and the relevant documentation submitted as required. Community agencies were reminded of the need to confirm MAPPA levels six months before release, but in some cases information was not timely. Three boys due to be released in the next two months still required MAPPA levels.
- 4.17** The IDRMT also oversaw restrictions on the contact some boys had with people outside the establishment. When it was deemed necessary, appropriate restrictions were placed on mail, telephone contact and visits. These restrictions were kept under review and removed as boys' circumstances changed and the level of risk had reduced sufficiently.

Indeterminate sentence young people

- 4.18** There was no long-term unit and boys serving indeterminate sentences were not often held at Feltham. Boys held on remand were potentially facing an indeterminate sentence. When a boy received such a sentence, the appropriate assessments and documentation were completed and caseworkers helped him to understand the implications of his sentence. Boys with indeterminate sentences had the same regular review and planning meetings as other boys and plans for their future were kept under regular review at the IDRMT meeting.

Looked-after children

- 4.19** In our survey, 41% of boys said they had spent time in the care of their local authority. Support available to boys with looked-after status had been enhanced by the involvement of seconded social workers based at Feltham. Their records showed that they had seen 157 new arrivals with looked-after status so far in 2015. About half were looked after by virtue of their remand status.
- 4.20** There were effective arrangements for identifying looked-after boys and local authorities were contacted by a social worker to advise that a child they had responsibility for was at

Feltham. Some local authorities were more proactive than others in meeting their obligations to boys. The social workers described having to cajole some local authorities to book reviews with boys and taking an advocacy role on behalf of many looked-after children with their local authority. They felt there were often misconceptions about Feltham, its role and what it could provide for a boy in custody. A recent open day for independent reviewing officers had helped to address this. Although all local authorities were asked to provide financial support for boys in their care, some did not do so. Obtaining accommodation for boys with looked-after status on release was a continuing problem (see paragraph 4.25).

Good practice

- 4.21** *The open day for independent reviewing officers was a positive step to improve the support provided to looked-after boys.*

Reintegration planning

Expected outcomes:

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

- 4.22** *Practical arrangements for the day of release were well organised, but obtaining suitable accommodation for some boys remained a problem. Education, training and employment provision needed improvement, but health care and drugs and alcohol support for boys after release was good. Finance, benefit and debt provision was inadequate, though work was under way to address this. Some work was undertaken by education and caseworkers to involve families but the children and families pathway required attention, particularly regarding visits arrangements. Boys had access to a range of non-accredited interventions and one-to-one work, including from community partners, and there were well developed plans to introduce accredited programmes. A few boys had taken part in restorative justice work.*

- 4.23** Release plans were discussed with boys during training planning meetings which enabled them to ask about the conditions of release. In a review that we observed, this discussion took place well before the boy's release date. Caseworkers and the establishment social workers for looked-after boys always requested that the boy be picked up when he was released but this did not always happen which was very poor.
- 4.24** Practical arrangements for the day of release were organised well. Boys were released through reception in Feltham B and were kept apart from any young adults in reception. Boys had access to their money and were given holdalls for their belongings. There was a stock of clothing for boys who did not have any suitable clothes of their own or boys could apply to have their stored clothes washed ready for release, or have clothes handed in on a visit. Rail warrants were prepared for all boys in case they were not met at the gate.

Accommodation

- 4.25** In our survey, more than a quarter of boys said they thought they would have a problem with finding accommodation when they were released and, for some, this was the case. Although accommodation on release was discussed at training planning reviews from an early

stage, in many cases suitable accommodation for boys not returning to their family was only found close to release. We were told of one boy whose address had been confirmed at 5.15pm the day before his release. It was particularly difficult to find suitable accommodation for children who were looked after or who reached 18 years while in custody. The social workers had had to threaten legal action in some cases to get local authorities to provide an address. The resettlement consortium that Feltham worked with was starting to look at ways of addressing the problem.

Recommendation

- 4.26 All boys should be provided with a suitable address in good time for their release.** (Repeated recommendation 4.28)

Education, training and employment

- 4.27** Up to four weeks before release, all boys were offered support to prepare for resettlement, including completion of a CV. No pre-release course was available. Prospects offered an employability course, but attendance was low. Boys were adequately supported in applying for further education courses. Partnership working to support successful moves into employment or training on release was weak.
- 4.28** Links with YOTs had improved since the previous inspection. Arrangements for all boys to receive appropriate careers information, advice and guidance throughout their learning and development required improvement. There was an adequate range of community links to support the release on temporary licence of about 25 boys each month. Until very recently, data were not held on the destination of all boys released. The virtual campus (internet access for boys to community education, training and employment opportunities) was not available.

Recommendations

- 4.29 All boys should participate in appropriate pre-release training.**
- 4.30 All boys should receive high quality careers information, advice and guidance interventions as needed.**
- 4.31 Community links should be strengthened to enable boys to apply for jobs and training before their release.**
- 4.32 The virtual campus should be available to boys to support resettlement.**

Health care

- 4.33** Pre-release preparation for health care was very good. Only 27% of boys entering the prison had a GP and it was a priority to rectify this on release. Boys were seen by primary care staff in the week before release and were given assistance to identify a GP and dentist after release. Take-home medication was arranged as necessary and boys were given a 'health passport' discharge summary. Communications with mental health services, and information sharing with community agencies, such as YOTs, was very good.

Drugs and alcohol

- 4.34** The Lifeline4U service had good links with community YOTs and third sector organisations which provided substance use support and treatment after release. Newly released boys could be accompanied to their first appointments by a Lifeline4U worker. The team included a behaviour change mentor who worked with boys with gang affiliations and a family worker who offered a range of interventions aimed at family reintegration and support.

Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.35** In our survey, about a third of boys said they would have a problem with money and finances when they were released and only a fifth knew whom to go to for advice. Provision on finance, benefit and debt was inadequate. Money management was only covered by the education department as part of the functional mathematics course. However, two new education courses in enterprise and employability were starting imminently which covered finance planning in more depth. There continued to be no opportunity for boys to open a bank account.

Recommendation

- 4.36** **Boys should be helped to open bank accounts.** (Repeated recommendation 4.37)

Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.37** The visitors' centre continued to be run by Spurgeons, a charity providing services to children and their families. Good support and advice was provided, particularly for those visiting for the first time. The centre was open before and after visits and provided hot drinks and a small play area. Visitors were positive about their treatment by staff but negative about other aspects of the visits experience. We found that staff treated visitors with respect but there were considerable delays with the telephone booking service.
- 4.38** Visits continued to take place on two weekdays and Saturday afternoons and alternate Sundays. In our survey, only 27% of boys said their visit started on time and we saw considerable delays of up to an hour in visitors entering the visits hall. Boys on the 'keep apart' list could not have visits at the same time which created logistical challenges for staff and often resulted in shorter visits of 30 minutes for boys on the list. Despite these measures, there were still issues with violence in the visits hall. The visits hall was large and well presented with a well-stocked play area, although this was closed when we inspected. Vending machines continued to be in use and were unpopular with visitors. Boys wore coloured sashes for security reasons. No visitors' survey had been conducted in the previous 12 months. The assisted visits scheme was advertised on wings.
- 4.39** The criteria to attend family days were too strict and only one had been organised since the beginning of 2015. The Time for Families - Building Bridges course to strengthen family or carer relationships with the boys had ceased and there was no parenting course for the small number of boys who had children. Some departments had good links with families including the casework team and education, which had organised a parents' evening and life course events. These events were attended by outside agencies including the fire brigade. Presentations to boys who completed the course were attended by parents and carers.

Recommendations

- 4.40 All aspects of the visits experience should be reviewed and problems addressed, including the booking and timeliness of visits.**
- 4.41 The number of family days should be increased and open to all boys.**

Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.42** Boys had access to a range of non-accredited courses and one-to-one interventions delivered by specialist services. A few boys had undertaken anger management and reflective learning which focused on reintegrating boys who were difficult to manage. A newly formed psychology team had well advanced plans to introduce interventions accredited for use across the NOMS young people's estate, including aggression replacement training and motivational one-to-one work. During the inspection the psychology team held a staff awareness event which was well received. Developed plans were in place through the health care provider to work with boys to address sexually harmful behaviour. Community organisations, including Hounslow youth counselling service and Barnardo's, continued to provide advice and support to boys. A few boys had been involved in a restorative justice conference.

Section 5. Recommendations and housekeeping points

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

Main recommendations

To the governor

- 5.1 Feltham A should continue its current strategy to improve behaviour and reduce violence and bring existing initiatives to fruition. Individual support plans for victims of bullying and intimidation should identify needs and the ways in which they will be met. They should be reviewed regularly with the child and monitored by residential managers. (S50)
- 5.2 All boys should have the opportunity of at least one hour of exercise in the open air each day. (S52)
- 5.3 A reducing re-offending policy and structures specific to the needs of boys on the A side should be developed. Every boy should have a copy of their plan in an age-appropriate format which should be regularly reviewed and linked to other processes for encouraging the boys' progress. (S53)

Main recommendation

To the Youth Justice Board and NOMS

- 5.4 NOMS and the YJB should work with Feltham to determine how reasonable amounts of time unlocked can be achieved for all boys, who should have access to appropriate, purposeful activity while unlocked without compromising their or others' safety. (S51, repeated main recommendation S71)

Recommendation

To the Youth Justice Board, NOMS and the governor

Courts, escorts and transfers

- 5.5 Key staff at the establishment, NOMS, the Youth Justice Board 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. (1.4)

Recommendation

To the Youth Justice Board and NOMS

Courts, escorts and transfers

- 5.6 Boys should not be transported with adult prisoners. (1.5, repeated recommendation 1.5)

Recommendations

To the governor

Early days in custody

- 5.7** Boys should have the opportunity to have a shower and meet a peer supporter on their first night. (1.11)

Care and protection of children and young people

- 5.8** Victims of bullying should have access to a safe regime which includes adequate time out of their cells. (1.31)
- 5.9** All children on ACCTs should have access to a regime which provides purposeful activity and a reasonable amount of time out of cell. (1.39)
- 5.10** Care maps should be detailed and updated regularly. (1.40)

Behaviour management

- 5.11** The PACT system should be integrated into a single coherent approach to supporting behaviour change, which is reflected in all aspects of practice. (1.47)
- 5.12** The regime for boys on basic level of the rewards and sanctions scheme should be improved and not lead to boys being effectively isolated for long periods. (1.51)
- 5.13** The rewards and sanctions scheme should be applied with a clear emphasis on positive motivation. (1.52)
- 5.14** Managers should analyse the impact of the formal adjudications system on the basis of evidence, and ensure that it plays a clear and constructive part in the management of behaviour. (1.62)
- 5.15** Initiatives such as an enhanced support unit, a care and separation unit for boys and psychology-led accredited programmes to help reduce violence should be implemented as a priority. (1.73)
- 5.16** Individual plans for perpetrators of violence should be fully developed and should include meaningful behaviour improvement targets based on rigorous assessments of need. They should be managed, monitored and reviewed by residential staff together with the safeguarding team and risk management meeting. (1.74)
- 5.17** A full and meaningful regime should be offered to boys on PACT. (1.75)
- 5.18** Batons should not be carried by staff working with boys who are under 18 years of age. (1.81)
- 5.19** Boys should not be held in the segregation unit. Those who need to be separated for their own or others' safety should experience a full regime and intensive intervention to address their behaviour in a suitable setting. (1.87, repeated recommendation 1.74)

Substance misuse

- 5.20** A dual diagnosis care pathway and joint working protocol should be developed by Lifeline4U and the mental health team to improve outcomes for boys with substance use and mental health problems. (1.96)

Residential units

- 5.21** All cells and communal areas, including showers, should be clean. (2.10)
- 5.22** The offensive display policy should be properly managed and implemented. (2.11)
- 5.23** The application system should be managed consistently. (2.12)

Relationships between staff and children and young people

- 5.24** All staff should engage positively with boys. (2.17)

Health services

- 5.25** There should be a prison-wide strategy to promote health and wellbeing. (2.57)
- 5.26** The approach to the resuscitation of collapsed prisoners should be considered by the partnership board to define and deliver an optimal state of readiness. (2.58)
- 5.27** The partnership board should review the provision of external health care escorts and the reasons for cancellations, and take action to minimise lost appointments. (2.67)
- 5.28** All boys should have secure storage for their in-possession medications. (2.73)

Catering

- 5.29** All boys should have the opportunity to eat communally out of their cells. (2.95, repeated recommendation 2.124)
- 5.30** The quantity of food available to boys during the day should be increased. (2.96)

Purchases

- 5.31** Boys should be able to place a canteen order within 24 hours of their arrival. (2.100)
- 5.32** Regular consultation with boys should take place to ensure that the range of goods on the canteen list meets the diverse needs of the population. (2.101, repeated recommendation 2.133)
- 5.33** Boys should be able to order items from catalogues. (2.102)

Education, learning and skills

- 5.34** The learning provider should implement robust procedures for performance management, the observation of teaching and learning and self-assessment, to ensure that teaching and learning rapidly improves. (3.12)

- 5.35** The establishment should ensure that the quality improvement group is an effective driver of improvements across learning, skills and work. (3.13)
- 5.36** Sufficient full-time activity places should be provided and these should support the development of boys' functional skills in English and mathematics. (3.17)
- 5.37** Teachers should be helped to improve the quality of sessions by supporting them to set challenging learning targets and to make lessons more engaging and interactive. (3.26)
- 5.38** Teachers should help boys to use spoken English to communicate more effectively, especially in formal situations, and to support successful resettlement. (3.27)
- 5.39** Teachers should promote equality and diversity thoroughly during learning sessions, including integrating equality themes with the taught subject. (3.28)
- 5.40** The establishment, in partnership with the learning provider, should improve the standard of outreach work by ensuring that teachers are equipped with resources and facilities to deliver learning effectively on the accommodation blocks. (3.29)
- 5.41** Teachers should identify the reasons for learners' poor performance, especially in English and mathematics, and take swift corrective action. (3.32)
- 5.42** The establishment and education provider should collaborate to determine why learners continue to miss classroom sessions and implement an effective strategy to improve attendance. (3.33)
- 5.43** The library should have accurate data on library use so that it can be determined whether all boys are using the facility. (3.37)
- 5.44** An appropriate procedure should be implemented immediately to monitor the loss of stock. (3.38)

Physical education and healthy living

- 5.45** Opportunities should be provided for boys to play competitive sports against visiting teams. (3.45)
- 5.46** Attendance at gym sessions should be improved by establishing the reasons for boys' absence and taking appropriate action. (3.46)

Training planning and remand management

- 5.47** Training planning and remand management meetings should include staff from all areas who work with the boys to ensure that all relevant activity is captured in their remand or training plans and there is consistent reinforcement across the establishment to help boys achieve their targets. (4.14)

Reintegration planning

- 5.48** All boys should be provided with a suitable address in good time for their release. (4.26, repeated recommendation 4.28)
- 5.49** All boys should participate in appropriate pre-release training. (4.29)

- 5.50** All boys should receive high quality careers information, advice and guidance interventions as needed. (4.30)
- 5.51** Community links should be strengthened to enable boys to apply for jobs and training before their release. (4.31)
- 5.52** The virtual campus should be available to boys to support resettlement. (4.32)
- 5.53** Boys should be helped to open bank accounts. (4.36, repeated recommendation 4.37)
- 5.54** All aspects of the visits experience should be reviewed and problems addressed, including the booking and timeliness of visits. (4.40)
- 5.55** The number of family days should be increased and open to all boys. (4.41)

Housekeeping points

Early days in custody

- 5.56** The decoration of first night cells should be improved. (1.12)

Legal rights

- 5.57** Boys should not have to wear coloured bibs when attending legal and other professional visits. (2.41)

Health services

- 5.58** Policies and procedures should be in date and reflect local circumstances. (2.59)
- 5.59** The partnership board should consider the benefits of digital X-ray equipment in screening and diagnostics procedures. (2.68)
- 5.60** Boys should have access to routine dental screening on arrival. (2.78)
- 5.61** All staff should be up to date with safeguarding training. (2.86)

Education, learning and skills

- 5.62** An audit of library resources, including the DVD collection, should be carried out to ensure that all materials are age appropriate. (3.39)

Examples of good practice

- 5.63** The importance given to liaison with community dental services meant that a boy could continue treatment started in the community while at Feltham. (2.79)
- 5.64** The accessibility and comprehensive nature of the mental health services ensured that the diverse needs of children and adolescents with emotional and mental health problems could be met. (2.87)

5.65 The open day for independent reviewing officers was a positive step to improve the support provided to looked-after boys. (4.21)

Section 6. Appendices

Appendix I: Inspection team

Nick Hardwick	Chief inspector
Deborah Butler	Team leader
Angela Johnson	Inspector
Martin Kettle	Inspector
Andy Lund	Inspector
Gordon Riach	Inspector
Louise Finer	Senior policy officer
Colette Daoud	Researcher
Rachel Murray	Researcher
Alissa Redmond	Researcher
Patricia Taflan	Researcher (observer)

Specialist inspectors

Paul Roberts	Substance misuse inspector
Paul Tarbuck	Health services inspector
Professor Stephen Field	GP and Chief Inspector of Primary Care, Integrated Care and General Practice at the Care Quality Commission
Jan Fooks-Bale	Care Quality Commission inspector
Jai Sharda	Ofsted inspector
Nigel Bragg	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 also provided.

Safety

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

At the last inspection in 2014, boys' experience on arrival was generally positive. Good work was being done to develop the use of video-link. Safeguarding and child protection arrangements were sound. Self-harm was managed effectively. Security was proportionate and staff tried to achieve an effective balance between care and control. The number of fights and assaults remained high and the unpredictable and reckless nature of the violence was very concerning. Although staff dealt with these incidents well, the risk of serious injury continued to be ever present. Use of force remained high but was well managed. The rewards and sanctions scheme was only partially effective. Less use was made of the segregation unit than we had found previously and conditions there had improved. Outcomes for children and young people were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendation

The YJB should instigate an independent expert review of its policies and resources to prevent bullying and support victims across all YOIs that hold children and young people. (S70)

Partially achieved

Recommendations

Boys should not be transported with adult prisoners. (1.5)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 1.5)

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

Not achieved

Boys should be involved in making the induction programme more useful to them. (1.13)

Achieved

Boys on ACCTs should have a regime which maximises time out of cell and keeps them engaged in constructive activity. (1.42)

Partially achieved

Systems for managing individual boys to reduce risk and foster positive behaviour should be simplified so that all staff and boys can understand and make effective use of them. (1.47)

Partially achieved

The regime for boys on basic level of the rewards and sanctions scheme should be improved and not lead to boys being effectively isolated for long periods. (1.52)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 1.52)

Managers should analyse the impact of the formal adjudications system on the basis of evidence, and ensure that it plays a clear and constructive part in the management of behaviour. (1.59)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 1.63)

Boys should not be held in the segregation unit. Those who need to be separated for their own or others' safety should experience a full regime and intensive intervention to address their behaviour in a suitable setting. (1.74)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 1.88)

The substance misuse psychosocial service should be sufficiently well staffed to deliver a service which meets assessed needs. (1.82)

Achieved

A dual diagnosis care pathway should be developed and joint working improved between the substance misuse and mental health services. (1.83)

Not achieved

Substance misuse staff should have the knowledge and skills required to provide safe clinical treatment in line with national guidance. (1.84)

Achieved

The need to use the Albatross inpatient unit for opiate or alcohol detoxification should be assessed for each patient. The assessment of non-complex cases should include consideration of the appropriateness of treatment on normal location, especially once clinical stabilisation is achieved. (1.85)

Achieved

Respect

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

At the last inspection in 2014, the living environment had improved significantly, but further improvements were still necessary. Refurbished areas were of a good standard but too many cells were still dirty. Efforts to remove graffiti had been very successful. Relationships between staff and boys were consistently good. Diversity continued to receive careful consideration but the quality of discrimination incident report forms was not always good enough. Faith provision for boys who were able to attend religious services was good, but too many did not get this opportunity. Boys had good access to reasonable health provision. Boys still expressed very negative views about the food. Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

Recommendations

All communal areas including shower rooms should be clean. (2.10)

Not achieved

All cells should be clean, properly furnished and well ventilated. (2.11)

Not achieved

The application system should be managed consistently. (2.12)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 2.12)

Boys' equality representatives should be appointed. (2.22)

Achieved

Boys should be able to declare their protected characteristics confidentially on arrival. (2.23)

Achieved

All boys should have access to equality awareness raising events. (2.24)

Not achieved

DIRF investigations should be more thorough and there should be independent oversight. (2.25)

Achieved

The negative perceptions of black and minority ethnic and Muslim boys should be investigated and acted on. (2.31)

Achieved

Foreign national support groups should be made available to boys. (2.32)

Partially achieved

Traveller boys should be able to attend Traveller support groups. (2.33)

Achieved

A cell and shower should be adapted for use by wheelchair users. (2.34)

Not achieved

Gay and bisexual boys should be supported by specific groups and activities in the establishment and by referral to community support networks. (2.35)

Partially achieved

The full range of support groups and classes run by the chaplaincy should be available to the boys in Feltham A. (2.44)

Achieved

Adequate alternatives should be put in place for all boys prevented from attending corporate worship, and chaplaincy and security staff should work together to ensure the number of boys prevented from attending corporate worship is minimised. (2.45)

Partially achieved

More effective consultations should take place with Muslim boys on the provision of food for Ramadan. (2.46)

Achieved

Replies to complaints that are perfunctory or dismissive should be immediately addressed and work undertaken to prevent this from recurring. (2.52)

Achieved

The health needs analysis should be updated to reflect the population. (2.72)

Achieved

Complaints about health services should be channelled directly to health care. Responses should focus on the complaint and apologies should be offered when appropriate. (2.73)

Achieved

Health literature should be targeted at the age and literacy level of young people. (2.74)

Achieved

All health care staff and discipline staff should receive basic practical resuscitation skills training and defibrillators should be available for all staff to use. (2.75)

Partially achieved

All clinical areas and treatment rooms should comply with infection control requirements. (2.76)

Achieved

The waiting list for external podiatry appointments should reflect the waiting list in the local community. (2.84)

Achieved

The needs of all boys on the Albatross unit should be considered when decisions are made to locate severely disturbed boys there. (2.85)

Achieved

All consultations and interventions, including prescribing and administration of medicines and dental care, should be recorded on SystemOne to support safe care and enable more effective audit and analysis, including medicines. (2.95)

Achieved

Boys should have blood-testing equipment and insulin pens in possession subject to a risk assessment, and a lockable cupboard should be provided in cells to store medicines securely. (2.96)

Partially achieved

A wider range of medication should be available without a prescription through appropriate policies and PGDs that are ratified by the medicines management committee. (2.97)

Achieved

Boys should be supplied with an appropriate quantity of medication for court appearances. (2.98)

Partially achieved

The floor in the dental suite should be replaced to meet infection control requirements. (2.109)

Achieved

All boys should have the opportunity to eat communally out of their cells. (2.124)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 2.94)

Lunch should not be served before noon and the evening meal not before 5pm. (2.125)

Not achieved

Consultation with boys about food should be improved by the introduction of food focus groups, food comments books and well-promoted surveys. Appropriate changes should be made to the menus as a result of consultation. (2.126)

Achieved

Muslim boys should be consulted about food during Ramadan and their concerns addressed. (2.127)

Achieved

Regular consultation with boys should take place to ensure the range of goods on the canteen list meets the diverse needs of the population. (2.132)

Partially achieved (Recommendation repeated, 2.100)

Long delays to ordering and delivery of canteen goods for newly arrived boys should be avoided. (2.133)

Not achieved

Purposeful activity

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

At the last inspection in 2014, boys had limited time out of their cell. A significant number were locked up for most of the day. Outcomes for those attending vocational training were good but only satisfactory for education. Attendance at education was too low. Planning arrangements between the education department and the regime needed improvement. Outcomes for children and young people were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendation

NOMS and the YJB should work with Feltham to determine how reasonable amounts of time unlocked can be achieved for all boys, who should have access to appropriate, purposeful activity while unlocked without compromising their, or others' safety. (S71)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 3.5)

Recommendations

Arrangements to ensure that all boys receive their entitlement to high quality education and training should be urgently reviewed. (3.11)

Achieved

Sanctions should not be imposed which prevents boys from attending education. (3.12)

Achieved

Outreach work in cells should be reviewed to ensure that it forms a coherent component of the education programme and has maximum impact. (3.15)

Partially achieved

Teachers and trainers should encourage boys to demonstrate their learning throughout sessions to identify their progress. (3.24)

Partially achieved

Appropriate information learning technology resources should be provided to support high quality teaching and learning. (3.25)

Not achieved

Low achievement rates should be improved, particularly in mathematics. (3.29)

Not achieved

Access to library services should be improved for boys. (3.34)

Not achieved

The library should establish links with all departments to ensure that all boys receive a good service which promotes literacy and supports their educational needs. (3.35)

Partially achieved

An effective strategy should be put in place to ensure that boys have access to activities in association with community sports organisations. (3.42)

Partially achieved

Resettlement

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

At the last inspection in 2014 the strategic management of resettlement had improved and there was now a dedicated policy. The planning arrangements remained sound. Public protection work was thorough and the needs of looked-after children were identified clearly. Use of release on temporary licence had decreased. Pathway work was generally adequate but securing suitable accommodation and education, training and employment placements continued to be difficult. Visiting arrangements were good. A reasonable range of interventions was available for boys with complex needs. Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

Recommendations

Release on temporary licence opportunities should be extended. (4.8)

Achieved

Boys should be followed up post release and the results used to inform the reducing reoffending policy. (4.9)

Partially achieved

Boys and staff working with them should be clear about their remand or training plan targets and there should be a whole establishment approach to the development and achievement of targets related to reducing the risk of reoffending and preparing for release. (4.18)

Not achieved

There should be greater participation in remand and training planning meetings by internal departments working with boys to ensure that all relevant work is captured in their remand or training plans. (4.19)

Not achieved

All boys should be provided with a suitable address in good time for their release. (4.28)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 4.28)

The establishment should work with the local authority and key agencies to review protocols to support boys into education, training and employment on release. (4.31)

Partially achieved

Boys released without a registered GP should be asked if a summary of health information can be forwarded to their YOT worker to ensure continuity of care. (4.34)

Achieved

Boys should be helped to open bank accounts. (4.37)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated 4.38)

Boys on the 'keep apart' list should have visits of the same length as the other boys and delays to visitors should be avoided. (4.44)

Not achieved

Offending behaviour management programmes should be promoted so that all boys are aware of them. Referrals to programmes should be extended to benefit all boys. (4.50)

Partially achieved

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	105	67.3
Recall	9	5.8
Convicted unsentenced	13	8.3
Remand	29	18.6
Detainees	0	0
Total	156	

Age	Number of young people	%
15 years	4	2.6
16 years	44	28.2
17 years	97	62.1
18 years	11	7.1
Total	156	

Nationality	Number of young people	%
British	127	81.4
Foreign nationals	29	18.6
Total	156	

Ethnicity	Number of young people	%
White		
British	37	23.7
Irish	3	1.9
Gypsy/Irish Traveller		
Other white	8	5.1
Mixed		
White and black Caribbean	10	6.4
White and black African	4	2.6
White and Asian	1	0.6
Other mixed	8	5.1
Asian or Asian British		
Indian		
Pakistani	8	5.1
Bangladeshi	6	3.8
Chinese		
Other Asian	8	5.1
Black or black British		
Caribbean	19	12.2
African	25	16.0
Other black	15	9.6

Other ethnic group		
Arab		
Other ethnic group	4	2.6
Not stated		
Total	156	

Religion	Number of young people	%
Baptist	0	
Church of England	11	7.1
Roman Catholic	33	21.2
Other Christian denominations	32	20.5
Muslim	54	34.6
Sikh	0	
Hindu	1	.6
Buddhist	0	
Jewish	0	
Other	2	1.3
No religion	23	14.7
Total	156	

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

Sentenced only – length of stay by age

Length of stay	<1 mth	1–3 mths	3–6 mths	6–12 mths	1–2 yrs	2 yrs +	4 yrs +	Total
Age								
15 years	1	1	2					4
16 years	5	8	17					30
17 years	12	17	23	11	6			69
18 years		3	3	5				11
Total	18	29	45	16	6			114

Unsentenced only – length of stay by age

Length of stay	<1 mth	1–3 mths	3–6 mths	6–12 mths	1–2 yrs	2 yrs+	4 yrs +	Total
Age								
15 years								
16 years	6	6	2					14
17 years	13	6	6	3				28
18 years								
Total	19	12	8	3				42

Main offence	Number of young people	%
Violence against the person	48	30.8
Sexual offences	3	1.9
Burglary	15	9.6
Robbery	42	26.9
Theft and handling	2	1.3
Fraud and forgery	1	.6
Drugs offences	20	12.8
Other offences	25	16.0
Offence not recorded / holding warrant		
Total	156	

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

Sentence	4 mths	6 mths	8 mths	10 mths	12 mths	18 mths	24 mths	Recall	Total
Age									
15 years	1	1			1				3
16 years	2	5	5	1	1	3	1	7	25
17 years	11	2	3	1	7	4	7	3	38
18 years					3	5	2		10
Total	14	8	8	2	12	12	10	10	76

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

Sentence	Under 2 yrs	2–3 yrs	3–4 yrs	4–5 yrs	5 yrs +	Recall	Total
Age							
15 years							
16 years		1	1	2			4
17 years			14	9	4	3	30
18 years			1				1
Total		1	16	11	4	3	35

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Children and young people survey methodology

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

Sampling

Questionnaires were offered to all young people.

Distributing and collecting questionnaires

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

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

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

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

Survey response

At the time of the survey on 27 July 2015 the young person population at HMYOI Feltham was 159. Questionnaires were distributed to 158 young people¹⁵.

We received a total of 146 completed questionnaires, a response rate of 92%. This included one questionnaire completed via interview. Six respondents refused to complete a questionnaire, four questionnaires were not returned and two were returned blank.

¹⁵A survey was not distributed to one young person who was at court on the day of the survey.

Wing/unit	Number of completed survey returns
Bittern	12
Curlew	21
Dunlin	16
Eagle	26
Falcon	19
Heron	20
Jay	21
Ibis (care and separation unit)	7
Albatross (health care)	4

Presentation of survey results and analyses

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

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 significant¹⁶ 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 Feltham 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 Feltham in 2015 compared with the responses of young people surveyed at HMYOI Feltham 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.

¹⁶ 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.

- A comparison within the 2015 survey between responses of young people who have been in local authority care and those who have not been in local authority care.
- A comparison within the 2015 survey between responses of young people who said they had ever felt unsafe and those who had not.
- A best and worst comparison within the 2015 survey comparing Curlew, Dunlin, Eagle, Falcon, Heron and Jay units.

Survey summary

SECTION I: ABOUT YOU

Q1	How old are you?	
	15	4 (3%)
	16	41 (29%)
	17	87 (61%)
	18	11 (8%)
Q2	Are you a British citizen?	
	Yes	132 (94%)
	No	8 (6%)
Q3	Do you understand spoken English?	
	Yes	141 (99%)
	No	1 (1%)
Q4	Do you understand written English?	
	Yes	141 (99%)
	No	1 (1%)
Q5	What is your ethnic origin?	
	White - British	26 (19%)
	White - Irish	7 (5%)
	White - other	9 (6%)
	Black or Black British - Caribbean	22 (16%)
	Black or Black British - African	22 (16%)
	Black or Black British - Other	3 (2%)
	Asian or Asian British - Indian	2 (1%)
	Asian or Asian British - Pakistani	6 (4%)
	Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi	6 (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	9 (6%)
	Mixed race - White and Asian	0 (0%)
	Mixed race - other	2 (1%)
	Arab	8 (6%)
	Other ethnic group	1 (1%)
Q6	What is your religion?	
	None	22 (16%)
	Church of England	28 (20%)
	Catholic	36 (26%)
	Protestant	2 (1%)
	Other Christian denomination	4 (3%)
	Buddhist	0 (0%)
	Hindu	1 (1%)
	Jewish	1 (1%)
	Muslim	45 (32%)
	Sikh	1 (1%)

Q7	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	
	Yes	8 (6%)
	No.....	125 (89%)
	Don't know	7 (5%)
Q8	Do you have any children?	
	Yes	7 (5%)
	No.....	133 (95%)
Q9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability? (i.e. do you need help with any long-term physical, mental or learning needs)	
	Yes	21 (15%)
	No.....	116 (85%)
Q10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	
	Yes	56 (41%)
	No.....	80 (59%)

SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE

Q1	Are you sentenced?	
	Yes	102 (71%)
	No - unsentenced/on remand	41 (29%)
Q2	How long is your sentence (the full DTO sentence)?	
	Not sentenced.....	41 (29%)
	Less than 6 months.....	19 (14%)
	6 to 12 months.....	21 (15%)
	More than 12 months, up to 2 years.....	24 (17%)
	More than 2 years.....	31 (22%)
	Indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP).....	4 (3%)
Q3	How long have you been in this establishment?	
	Less than 1 month.....	23 (16%)
	1 to 6 months	79 (56%)
	More than 6 months, but less than 12 months	26 (18%)
	12 months to 2 years.....	11 (8%)
	More than 2 years.....	3 (2%)
Q4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	
	Yes	82 (59%)
	No.....	58 (41%)

SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS

Q1	On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?	
	Yes	110 (76%)
	No.....	15 (10%)
	Don't remember	19 (13%)
Q2	On your most recent journey here, were there any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females travelling with you?	
	Yes	55 (38%)
	No.....	71 (50%)
	Don't remember	17 (12%)

Q3	On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	82 (57%)
	<i>2 to 4 hours</i>	48 (33%)
	<i>More than 4 hours</i>	7 (5%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	7 (5%)
Q4	On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?	
	<i>My journey was less than 2 hours</i>	82 (58%)
	<i>Yes</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>No</i>	51 (36%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	5 (4%)
Q5	On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?	
	<i>My journey was less than 2 hours</i>	82 (57%)
	<i>Yes</i>	19 (13%)
	<i>No</i>	37 (26%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	5 (3%)
Q6	On your most recent journey here, how did you feel you were treated by the escort staff?	
	<i>Very well</i>	21 (15%)
	<i>Well</i>	51 (36%)
	<i>Neither</i>	48 (34%)
	<i>Badly</i>	9 (6%)
	<i>Very badly</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	8 (6%)
Q7	Before you arrived here, did you receive any information to help you prepare for coming here?	
	<i>Yes - and it was helpful</i>	18 (13%)
	<i>Yes - but it was not helpful</i>	18 (13%)
	<i>No - I received no information</i>	92 (65%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	14 (10%)

SECTION 4: FIRST DAYS

Q1	How long were you in reception?	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	120 (86%)
	<i>2 hours or longer</i>	7 (5%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	12 (9%)
Q2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	
	<i>Yes</i>	107 (76%)
	<i>No</i>	19 (13%)
	<i>Don't remember/Not applicable</i>	15 (11%)
Q3	How well did you feel you were treated in reception?	
	<i>Very well</i>	25 (18%)
	<i>Well</i>	55 (39%)
	<i>Neither</i>	37 (26%)
	<i>Badly</i>	14 (10%)
	<i>Very badly</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	7 (5%)
Q4	When you first arrived here, did staff ask if you needed help or support with any of the following things? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Not being able to smoke</i> 45 (33%) <i>Money worries</i> 17 (13%)	

Loss of property	17 (13%)	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to	33 (24%)
Feeling scared.....	23 (17%)	Health problems.....	63 (47%)
Gang problems.....	83 (61%)	Getting phone numbers	42 (31%)
Contacting family	57 (42%)	Staff did not ask me about any of these.....	27 (20%)

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	63 (47%)	Money worries.....	28 (21%)
Loss of property	19 (14%)	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to	20 (15%)
Feeling scared.....	15 (11%)	Health problems.....	21 (16%)
Gang problems.....	46 (34%)	Getting phone numbers	38 (28%)
Contacting family	28 (21%)	I did not have any problems.....	30 (22%)

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

Toiletries/basic items	96 (68%)
The opportunity to have a shower	34 (24%)
Something to eat.....	101 (72%)
A free phone call to friends/family.....	108 (77%)
PIN phone credit.....	77 (55%)
Information about feeling worried/upset.....	23 (16%)
Don't remember	7 (5%)
I was not given any of these	8 (6%)

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

Chaplain.....	42 (31%)
Peer mentor.....	9 (7%)
Childline/Samaritans.....	20 (15%)
The prison shop/canteen.....	12 (9%)
Don't remember	33 (24%)
I did not have access to any of these	55 (40%)

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

Yes	74 (53%)
No.....	51 (36%)
Don't remember	15 (11%)

Q9 Did you feel safe on your first night here?

Yes	99 (71%)
No.....	27 (19%)
Don't remember	13 (9%)

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

I have not been on an induction course	16 (12%)
Yes	55 (40%)
No.....	38 (28%)
Don't remember	29 (21%)

SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT

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

Yes	119 (86%)
No	14 (10%)
Don't know	5 (4%)

Q2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	
	Yes	45 (33%)
	No.....	73 (54%)
	Don't know	17 (13%)
Q3	What is the food like here?	
	Very good.....	1 (1%)
	Good.....	16 (12%)
	Neither	35 (26%)
	Bad	42 (31%)
	Very bad.....	42 (31%)
Q4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	
	I have not bought anything yet/Don't know.....	6 (4%)
	Yes	57 (41%)
	No.....	75 (54%)
Q5	How easy is it for you to attend religious services?	
	I don't want to attend religious services	15 (11%)
	Very easy.....	37 (27%)
	Easy.....	28 (20%)
	Neither	19 (14%)
	Difficult.....	19 (14%)
	Very difficult.....	13 (9%)
	Don't know	8 (6%)
Q6	Are your religious beliefs respected?	
	Yes	93 (67%)
	No.....	24 (17%)
	Don't know/Not applicable.....	21 (15%)
Q7	Can you speak to a Chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?	
	Yes	87 (63%)
	No.....	15 (11%)
	Don't know/Not applicable.....	37 (27%)
Q8	Can you speak to a peer mentor when you need to?	
	Yes	43 (31%)
	No.....	24 (17%)
	Don't know	71 (51%)
Q9	Can you speak to a member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board) when you need to?	
	Yes	29 (21%)
	No	21 (15%)
	Don't know	89 (64%)
Q10	Can you speak to an advocate (an outside person to help you) when you need to?	
	Yes	45 (33%)
	No.....	26 (19%)
	Don't know	66 (48%)

SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF

Q1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	
	Yes	85 (67%)
	No.....	41 (33%)
Q2	If you had a problem, who would you turn to? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	No-one	34 (26%)
	Personal officer	35 (26%)
	Wing Officer.....	32 (24%)
	Teacher/education staff	7 (5%)
	Gym staff.....	6 (5%)
	Chaplain.....	11 (8%)
	Independent Monitoring Board (IMB)	9 (7%)
	YOT worker	38 (29%)
	Other (please specify)	7 (100%)
	Social worker.....	36 (27%)
	Health services staff.....	4 (3%)
	Peer mentor.....	8 (6%)
	Another young person here	24 (18%)
	Caseworker.....	48 (36%)
	Advocate	8 (6%)
	Family/friends.....	54 (41%)
	Childline/Samaritans.....	4 (3%)
Q3	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	
	Yes	41 (31%)
	No.....	92 (69%)
Q4	When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?	
	I still have not met him/her	31 (23%)
	In your first week.....	50 (37%)
	After your first week.....	28 (21%)
	Don't remember	26 (19%)
Q5	How often do you see your personal (named) officer?	
	I still have not met him/her	31 (24%)
	At least once a week	46 (36%)
	Less than once a week.....	51 (40%)
Q6	Do you feel your personal (named) officer tries to help you?	
	I still have not met him/her	31 (23%)
	Yes	67 (50%)
	No.....	37 (27%)

SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS

Q1	Is it easy to make an application?	
	Yes	56 (40%)
	No.....	27 (19%)
	Don't know	56 (40%)
Q2	Are applications sorted out fairly?	
	I have not made an application	56 (42%)
	Yes	39 (29%)
	No.....	39 (29%)
Q3	Are applications sorted out quickly (within seven days)?	
	I have not made an application	56 (41%)
	Yes	23 (17%)
	No.....	57 (42%)

Q4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	
	Yes	49 (35%)
	No.....	19 (14%)
	Don't know	71 (51%)
Q5	Are complaints sorted out fairly?	
	<i>I have not made a complaint</i>	71 (53%)
	Yes	23 (17%)
	No.....	39 (29%)
Q6	Are complaints sorted out quickly (within seven days)?	
	<i>I have not made a complaint</i>	71 (53%)
	Yes	15 (11%)
	No.....	49 (36%)
Q7	Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint?	
	Yes	15 (12%)
	No.....	69 (53%)
	Never needed to make a complaint.....	45 (35%)

SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE

Q1	What level of the rewards and sanctions scheme are you on?	
	<i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>Enhanced (top)</i>	25 (18%)
	<i>Standard (middle)</i>	75 (55%)
	<i>Basic (bottom)</i>	24 (18%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	8 (6%)
Q2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the rewards and sanctions scheme?	
	<i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i>	4 (3%)
	Yes	56 (42%)
	No.....	49 (37%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	24 (18%)
Q3	Do the different levels of the rewards and sanctions scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	
	<i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i>	4 (3%)
	Yes	55 (42%)
	No.....	51 (39%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	21 (16%)
Q4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	
	Yes	43 (32%)
	No.....	40 (30%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	50 (38%)
Q5	If you have had a minor report, was the process explained clearly to you?	
	<i>I have not had a minor report</i>	90 (68%)
	Yes	28 (21%)
	No.....	15 (11%)
Q6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	
	Yes	81 (60%)
	No.....	47 (35%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	8 (6%)

Q7	If you have had an adjudication ('nicking'), was the process explained clearly to you?	
	<i>I have not had an adjudication.....</i>	55 (43%)
	<i>Yes.....</i>	65 (50%)
	<i>No.....</i>	9 (7%)
Q8	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	
	<i>Yes.....</i>	71 (53%)
	<i>No.....</i>	51 (38%)
	<i>Don't know.....</i>	11 (8%)
Q9	If you have spent a night in the care and separation unit (CSU), how were you treated by staff?	
	<i>I have not been to the care and separation unit.....</i>	82 (62%)
	<i>Very well.....</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>Well.....</i>	7 (5%)
	<i>Neither.....</i>	19 (14%)
	<i>Badly.....</i>	6 (5%)
	<i>Very badly.....</i>	14 (11%)

SECTION 9: SAFETY

Q1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	
	<i>Yes.....</i>	68 (52%)
	<i>No.....</i>	64 (48%)
Q2	Do you feel unsafe now?	
	<i>Yes.....</i>	20 (15%)
	<i>No.....</i>	110 (85%)
Q3	In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Never felt unsafe.....</i>	64 (50%)
	<i>Everywhere.....</i>	16 (13%)
	<i>Care and separation unit.....</i>	11 (9%)
	<i>Association areas.....</i>	19 (15%)
	<i>Reception area.....</i>	9 (7%)
	<i>At the gym.....</i>	6 (5%)
	<i>In an exercise yard.....</i>	12 (9%)
	<i>At work.....</i>	6 (5%)
	<i>At education.....</i>	28 (22%)
	<i>At religious services.....</i>	12 (9%)
	<i>At meal times.....</i>	9 (7%)
	<i>At healthcare.....</i>	5 (4%)
	<i>Visits area.....</i>	33 (26%)
	<i>In wing showers.....</i>	10 (8%)
	<i>In gym showers.....</i>	5 (4%)
	<i>In corridors/stairwells.....</i>	25 (20%)
	<i>On your landing/wing.....</i>	10 (8%)
	<i>During movement.....</i>	20 (16%)
	<i>In your cell.....</i>	10 (8%)
Q4	Have you ever been victimised by another young person/group of young people here? (e.g. insulted or assaulted you)	
	<i>Yes.....</i>	49 (37%)
	<i>No.....</i>	84 (63%)

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

<i>Insulting remarks (about you, your family or friends)</i>	26 (20%)
<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	23 (17%)
<i>Sexual abuse</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	13 (10%)
<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i>	3 (2%)
<i>Medication</i>	3 (2%)
<i>Debt</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Drugs</i>	2 (2%)
<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	11 (8%)
<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	8 (6%)
<i>Your nationality</i>	10 (8%)
<i>You are from a different part of the country to others</i>	6 (5%)
<i>You are from a Traveller community</i>	2 (2%)
<i>Your sexuality</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Your age</i>	2 (2%)
<i>You having a disability</i>	5 (4%)
<i>You were new here</i>	18 (14%)
<i>Your offence/crime</i>	6 (5%)
<i>Gang related issues</i>	19 (14%)

Q7 Have you ever been victimised by staff here? (e.g. insulted or assaulted you)

Yes	41 (32%)
No.....	88 (68%)

Q8 If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

<i>Insulting remarks (about you, your family or friends)</i>	21 (16%)
<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	11 (9%)
<i>Sexual abuse</i>	3 (2%)
<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	11 (9%)
<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i>	9 (7%)
<i>Medication</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Debt</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Drugs</i>	2 (2%)
<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	6 (5%)
<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	4 (3%)
<i>Your nationality</i>	5 (4%)
<i>You are from a different part of the country to others</i>	3 (2%)
<i>You are from a Traveller community</i>	2 (2%)
<i>Your sexuality</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Your age</i>	3 (2%)
<i>You having a disability</i>	3 (2%)
<i>You were new here</i>	9 (7%)
<i>Your offence/crime</i>	6 (5%)
<i>Gang related issues</i>	4 (3%)
<i>Because you made a complaint</i>	8 (6%)

Q10 If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?

Yes	19 (16%)
No.....	76 (65%)
Don't know	22 (19%)

Q11 Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?

Yes	39 (30%)
No.....	50 (39%)
Don't know	40 (31%)

Q12	Is shouting through the windows a problem here?		
	Yes	42 (32%)	
	No.....	70 (54%)	
	Don't know	18 (14%)	

SECTION 10: HEALTH SERVICES

Q1	Is it easy to see the following people if you need to?			
		Yes	No	Don't know
	The doctor	56 (42%)	53 (40%)	23 (17%)
	The nurse	71 (55%)	39 (30%)	20 (15%)
	The dentist	33 (26%)	71 (55%)	24 (19%)

Q2	What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?	
	<i>I have not been</i>	7 (5%)
	<i>Very good</i>	10 (8%)
	<i>Good</i>	39 (30%)
	<i>Neither</i>	28 (22%)
	<i>Bad</i>	23 (18%)
	<i>Very bad</i>	22 (17%)

Q3	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/all of it in your room?	
	<i>I am not taking any medication</i>	63 (48%)
	<i>Yes, all of my meds</i>	20 (15%)
	<i>Yes, some of my meds</i>	24 (18%)
	<i>No</i>	25 (19%)

Q4	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?	
	Yes	19 (15%)
	No.....	109 (85%)

Q5	Are you being helped by anyone here with your emotional or mental health problems? (e.g. a psychologist, doctor, counsellor, personal officer or another member of staff)	
	<i>I do not have any emotional or mental health problems</i>	109 (84%)
	Yes	9 (7%)
	No.....	12 (9%)

Q6	Did you have problems with alcohol when you first arrived here?	
	Yes	6 (5%)
	No.....	124 (95%)

Q7	Have you received any help with alcohol problems here?	
	Yes	4 (3%)
	No.....	128 (97%)

Q8	Did you have problems with drugs when you first arrived here?	
	Yes	34 (26%)
	No.....	99 (74%)

Q9	Do you have problems with drugs now?	
	Yes	10 (8%)
	No.....	113 (92%)

Q10	Have you received any help with drugs problems here?	
	Yes	23 (18%)
	No.....	103 (82%)

Q11	How easy or difficult is it to get illegal drugs here?	
	Very easy.....	11 (9%)
	Easy.....	11 (9%)
	Neither.....	9 (7%)
	Difficult.....	2 (2%)
	Very difficult.....	16 (13%)
	Don't know.....	75 (60%)

SECTION II: ACTIVITIES

Q1	How old were you when you were last at school?				
	14 or under.....	46 (35%)			
	15 or over.....	84 (65%)			
Q2	Have you ever been excluded from school?				
	Yes.....	109 (84%)			
	No.....	14 (11%)			
	Not applicable.....	6 (5%)			
Q3	Did you ever skip school before you came into custody?				
	Yes.....	89 (68%)			
	No.....	34 (26%)			
	Not applicable.....	7 (5%)			
Q4	Do you CURRENTLY take part in any of the following activities? (Please tick all that apply to you.)				
	Education.....	82 (64%)			
	A job in this establishment.....	25 (19%)			
	Vocational or skills training.....	14 (11%)			
	Offending behaviour programmes.....	15 (12%)			
	I am not currently involved in any of these.....	30 (23%)			
Q5	If you have been involved in any of the following activities here, do you think they will help you when you leave prison?				
		Not been involved	Yes	No	Don't know
	Education	13 (11%)	52 (44%)	41 (34%)	13 (11%)
	A job in this establishment	35 (35%)	26 (26%)	24 (24%)	16 (16%)
	Vocational or skills training	37 (38%)	27 (28%)	17 (17%)	17 (17%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	36 (37%)	23 (24%)	17 (18%)	21 (22%)
Q6	Do you usually have association every day?				
	Yes.....	102 (83%)			
	No.....	21 (17%)			
Q7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?				
	Don't want to go.....	4 (3%)			
	Yes.....	98 (78%)			
	No.....	24 (19%)			
Q8	How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?				
	Don't want to go.....	7 (6%)			
	None.....	13 (11%)			
	One to two times.....	30 (25%)			
	Three to five times.....	70 (57%)			
	More than five times.....	2 (2%)			

SECTION 12: FAMILY AND FRIENDS

Q1	Are you able to use the telephone every day, if you want to?	
	Yes	103 (82%)
	No.....	20 (16%)
	Don't know	3 (2%)
Q2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?	
	Yes	62 (50%)
	No.....	53 (42%)
	Don't know	10 (8%)
Q3	How many visits do you usually have each week, from family or friends?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	21 (15%)
	<i>Less than one a week</i>	44 (32%)
	<i>About one a week</i>	29 (21%)
	<i>More than one a week</i>	8 (6%)
	Don't know	35 (26%)
Q4	How easy is it for your family and friends to visit you here?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	21 (17%)
	<i>Very easy</i>	14 (11%)
	<i>Easy</i>	27 (22%)
	<i>Neither</i>	19 (15%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	32 (26%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	5 (4%)
	Don't know	6 (5%)
Q5	Do your visits usually start on time?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	21 (17%)
	Yes	33 (26%)
	No.....	60 (48%)
	Don't know	11 (9%)

SECTION 13: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE

Q1	Do you think you will have a problem with any of the following things, when you are released? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Finding accommodation</i>	35 (28%)
	<i>Getting into school or college</i>	47 (38%)
	<i>Getting a job</i>	57 (46%)
	<i>Money/finances</i>	39 (32%)
	<i>Claiming benefits</i>	12 (10%)
	<i>Continuing health services</i>	9 (7%)
	<i>Opening a bank account</i>	15 (12%)
	<i>Avoiding bad relationships</i>	21 (17%)
	<i>I won't have any problems</i>	43 (35%)
Q2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan? (i.e. a plan that is discussed in your DTO/planning meetings, which sets out your targets)	
	Yes	37 (30%)
	No.....	40 (33%)
	Don't know	46 (37%)

Q3	Were you involved in the development of your plan?		
	<i>I don't have a plan/don't know if I have a plan</i>	86	(72%)
	Yes	28	(23%)
	No.....	6	(5%)
Q4	Do you understand the targets that have been set in your plan?		
	<i>I don't have a plan/don't know if I have a plan</i>	86	(70%)
	Yes	33	(27%)
	No.....	3	(2%)
Q5	Do you have a caseworker here?		
	Yes	106	(87%)
	No.....	6	(5%)
	Don't know	10	(8%)
Q6	Has your caseworker helped to prepare you for release?		
	<i>I don't have a caseworker</i>	16	(13%)
	Yes	38	(31%)
	No.....	47	(39%)
	Don't know	20	(17%)
Q7	Has your social worker been to visit you since you have been here?		
	<i>I don't have a social worker</i>	18	(15%)
	Yes	82	(67%)
	No.....	23	(19%)
Q8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?		
	Yes	48	(39%)
	No.....	50	(41%)
	Don't know	24	(20%)
Q9	Do you know who to contact for help with any of the following problems, before your release? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	<i>Finding accommodation</i>	23	(20%)
	<i>Getting into school or college</i>	31	(27%)
	<i>Getting a job</i>	30	(27%)
	<i>Help with money/finances</i>	22	(19%)
	<i>Help with claiming benefits</i>	16	(14%)
	<i>Continuing health services</i>	14	(12%)
	<i>Opening a bank account</i>	18	(16%)
	<i>Avoiding bad relationships</i>	14	(12%)
	<i>I don't know who to contact</i>	72	(64%)
Q10	What is most likely to stop you offending in the future? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	41	(31%)
	<i>Nothing, it is up to me</i>	40	(31%)
	<i>Making new friends outside</i>	21	(16%)
	<i>Going back to live with my family</i>	18	(14%)
	<i>Getting a place of my own</i>	34	(26%)
	<i>Getting a job</i>	37	(28%)
	<i>Having a partner (girlfriend or boyfriend)</i>	24	(18%)
	<i>Staying off alcohol/drugs</i>	15	(11%)
	<i>Having a mentor (someone you can ask for advice)</i>	8	(6%)
	<i>Having a YOT worker or social worker that I get on with</i>	16	(12%)
	<i>Having children</i>	11	(8%)
	<i>Having something to do that isn't crime</i>	29	(22%)
	<i>This sentence</i>	22	(17%)
	<i>Getting into school/college</i>	28	(21%)
	<i>Talking about my offending behaviour with staff</i>	3	(2%)
	<i>Anything else</i>	8	(6%)

Q11	Do you want to stop offending?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	41 (31%)
	Yes	80 (60%)
	No.....	2 (2%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	10 (8%)

Q12	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here, that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	41 (32%)
	Yes	46 (36%)
	No.....	42 (33%)

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



Survey responses from children and young people: HMYOI Feltham 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 Feltham	Young people's comparator	2015 Feltham	2014 Feltham
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		146	474	146	132
SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU					
1.1	Are you 18 years of age?	8%	12%	8%	15%
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	6%	6%	6%	5%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	99%	99%	99%	99%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	99%	97%	99%	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.	70%	37%	70%	74%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	32%	19%	32%	36%
1.7	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	6%	9%	6%	5%
1.8	Do you have any children?	5%	11%	5%	4%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	15%	19%	15%	9%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	41%	39%	41%	33%
SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE					
2.1	Are you sentenced?	71%	79%	71%	57%
2.2	Is your sentence 12 months or less?	29%	35%	29%	32%
2.3	Have you been in this establishment for one month or less?	16%	18%	16%	9%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	59%	56%	59%	60%
SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS					
On your most recent journey here:					
3.1	Did you feel safe?	76%	82%	76%	80%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	39%	33%	39%	42%
3.3	Did you spend more than 4 hours in the van?	5%	7%	5%	2%
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%	11%	6%	12%
3.5	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	31%	46%	31%	25%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	51%	55%	51%	44%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	13%	18%	13%	8%

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

Key to tables

		2015 Feltham	Young people's comparator	2015 Feltham	2014 Feltham
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		146	474	146	132
SECTION 4: YOUR FIRST FEW DAYS HERE					
4.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	86%	79%	86%	89%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	76%	84%	76%	76%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	57%	73%	57%	47%
When you first arrived, did staff ask if you needed help or support with any of the following:					
4.4a	Not being able to smoke?	33%	54%	33%	41%
4.4b	Loss of property?	13%	19%	13%	17%
4.4c	Feeling scared?	17%	28%	17%	22%
4.4d	Gang problems?	61%	38%	61%	64%
4.4e	Contacting family?	42%	59%	42%	44%
4.4f	Money worries?	13%	17%	13%	12%
4.4g	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	25%	36%	25%	32%
4.4h	Health problems?	47%	55%	47%	50%
4.4i	Getting phone numbers?	31%	45%	31%	34%
4.5	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	78%	75%	78%	74%
When you first arrived, did you have problems with any of the following:					
4.5a	Not being able to smoke?	47%	47%	47%	33%
4.5b	Loss of property?	14%	11%	14%	14%
4.5c	Feeling scared?	11%	12%	11%	5%
4.5d	Gang problems?	34%	12%	34%	27%
4.5e	Contacting family?	21%	34%	21%	27%
4.5f	Money worries?	21%	15%	21%	18%
4.5g	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	15%	13%	15%	7%
4.5h	Health problems?	16%	14%	16%	12%
4.5i	Getting phone numbers?	28%	31%	28%	34%
When you first arrived, were you given any of the following:					
4.6a	Toiletries/basic items?	68%	78%	68%	81%
4.6b	The opportunity to have a shower?	24%	57%	24%	24%
4.6c	Something to eat?	71%	86%	71%	79%
4.6d	A free phone call to friends/family?	77%	79%	77%	81%
4.6e	PIN phone credit?	55%	57%	55%	56%
4.6f	Information about feeling worried/upset?	16%	35%	16%	23%

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

Key to tables

		2015 Feltham	Young people's comparator	2015 Feltham	2014 Feltham
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		146	474	146	132
Within your first 24 hours, did you have access to the following people or services:					
4.7a	A chaplain?	31%	47%	31%	30%
4.7b	A peer mentor?	7%	10%	7%	6%
4.7c	Childline/Samaritans	15%	16%	15%	11%
4.7d	The prison shop/canteen?	9%	11%	9%	12%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	53%	72%	53%	52%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	71%	78%	71%	75%
4.10	For those who have been on an induction course: did it cover everything you needed to know about the establishment	45%	62%	45%	44%
SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT					
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	86%	90%	86%	77%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	33%	31%	33%	41%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	13%	17%	13%	9%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	41%	54%	41%	37%
5.5	Is it easy/very easy for you to attend religious services?	47%	54%	47%	41%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	67%	57%	67%	60%
Can you speak to:					
5.7	A chaplain of your faith in private?	63%	66%	63%	69%
5.8	A peer mentor?	31%	30%	31%	23%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	21%	17%	21%	30%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	33%	46%	33%	35%
SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF					
6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	67%	69%	67%	55%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	26%	27%	26%	25%
6.3	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	31%	34%	31%	27%
For those who have met their personal officer:					
6.4	Did you meet your personal (named) officer within the first week?	48%	35%	48%	33%
6.5	Do you see your personal (named) officer at least once a week?	47%	45%	47%	52%
6.6	Do you feel your personal (named) officer tries to help you?	65%	62%	65%	53%

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

Key to tables

		2015 Feltham	Young people's comparator	2015 Feltham	2014 Feltham
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		146	474	146	132
SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS					
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	40%	72%	40%	56%
For those who have made an application:					
7.2	Do you feel applications are sorted out fairly?	50%	66%	50%	42%
7.3	Do you feel applications are sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	29%	41%	29%	27%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	35%	58%	35%	59%
For those who have made a complaint:					
7.5	Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	37%	36%	37%	46%
7.6	Do you feel complaints are sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	23%	34%	23%	30%
7.7	Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint?	11%	8%	11%	12%
SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE					
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	18%	26%	18%	18%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	42%	48%	42%	32%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	42%	46%	42%	35%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	32%	51%	32%	30%
For those who have had a minor report:					
8.5	Was the process explained clearly to you?	66%	76%	66%	64%
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	60%	67%	60%	67%
For those who have had an adjudication ('nicking'):					
8.7	Was the process explained clearly to you?	88%	86%	88%	78%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (Cand R) since you have been here?	53%	36%	53%	57%
8.9	For those who had spent a night in the care and separation unit: did the staff treat you well/very well?	22%	54%	22%	20%
SECTION 9: SAFETY					
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	51%	38%	51%	33%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	16%	17%	16%	10%
9.4	Have you ever been victimised by other young people here?	37%	30%	37%	21%
Since you have been here, have other young people:					
9.5a	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	19%	15%	19%	12%
9.5b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	17%	12%	17%	8%
9.5c	Sexually abused you?	1%	1%	1%	0%
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	10%	13%	10%	6%
9.5e	Taken your canteen/property?	2%	3%	2%	1%

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

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		2015 Feltham	Young people's comparator	2015 Feltham	2014 Feltham
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse					
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details					
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference					
Number of completed questionnaires returned		146	474	146	132
9.5f	Victimised you because of medication?	2%	1%	2%	1%
9.5g	Victimised you because of debt?	1%	2%	1%	0%
9.5h	Victimised you because of drugs?	1%	0%	1%	0%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	8%	3%	8%	3%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	6%	1%	6%	1%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	8%	2%	8%	1%
9.5l	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	5%	4%	5%	3%
9.5m	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	1%	1%	1%	1%
9.5n	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	1%	0%	0%
9.5o	Victimised you because of your age?	1%	1%	1%	0%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	3%	2%	3%	1%
9.5q	Victimised you because you were new here?	14%	6%	14%	4%
9.5r	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	5%	5%	5%	0%
9.5s	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	15%	6%	15%	5%
9.7	Have you ever been victimised by a member of staff here?	32%	24%	32%	33%
Since you have been here, have staff:					
9.8a	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	16%	12%	16%	18%
9.8b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	9%	7%	9%	8%
9.8c	Sexually abused you?	2%	1%	2%	1%
9.8d	Threatened or intimidated you?	9%	4%	9%	11%
9.8e	Taken your canteen/property?	7%	3%	7%	8%
9.8f	Victimised you because of medication?	1%	1%	1%	0%
9.8g	Victimised you because of debt?	1%	0%	1%	0%
9.8h	Victimised you because of drugs?	1%	0%	1%	0%
9.8i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	5%	3%	5%	5%
9.8j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	3%	1%	3%	6%
9.8k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	4%	2%	4%	2%
9.8k	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	2%	2%	2%	2%
9.8m	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	1%	1%	1%	1%
9.8n	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	1%	0%	0%
9.8o	Victimised you because of your age?	2%	1%	2%	1%
9.8p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	2%	0%	2%	0%

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

Key to tables

		2015 Feltham	Young people's comparator	2015 Feltham	2014 Feltham
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		146	474	146	132
9.8q	Victimised you because you were new here?	7%	1%	7%	6%
9.8r	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	5%	1%	5%	3%
9.8s	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	3%	1%	3%	1%
9.8t	Victimised you because you made a complaint?	6%	3%	6%	6%
9.10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	16%	29%	16%	18%
9.11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	31%	31%	31%	20%
9.12	Is shouting through the windows a problem here?	32%	41%	32%	27%
SECTION 10: HEALTH SERVICES					
10.1a	Is it easy for you to see the doctor?	42%	53%	42%	32%
10.1b	Is it easy for you to see the nurse?	55%	68%	55%	48%
10.1c	Is it easy for you to see the dentist?	26%	31%	26%	17%
10.2	For those who have been to health services: Do you think the overall quality is good/very good?	40%	57%	40%	20%
10.3	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/all of it in your cell?	64%	50%	64%	52%
10.4	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?	15%	27%	15%	15%
10.5	If you have emotional or mental health problems, are you being helped by anyone here?	44%	66%	44%	44%
10.6	Did you have any problems with alcohol when you first arrived?	5%	7%	5%	3%
10.7	Have you received any help with any alcohol problems here?	3%	4%	3%	2%
10.8	Did you have any problems with drugs when you first arrived?	26%	39%	26%	23%
10.9	Do you have a problem with drugs now?	8%	6%	8%	6%
10.10	Have you received any help with any drug problems here?	18%	23%	18%	11%
10.11	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs here?	18%	18%	18%	10%
SECTION 11: ACTIVITIES					
11.1	Were you 14 or younger when you were last at school?	35%	44%	35%	32%
11.2	Have you ever been excluded from school?	84%	87%	84%	79%
11.3	Did you ever skip school before you came into custody?	68%	76%	68%	63%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:					
11.4a	Education?	64%	77%	64%	59%
11.4b	A job in this establishment?	19%	30%	19%	15%
11.4c	Vocational or skills training?	11%	12%	11%	6%
11.4d	Offending behaviour programmes?	11%	16%	11%	3%
11.4e	Nothing	23%	17%	23%	29%

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

Key to tables

		2015 Feltham	Young people's comparator	2015 Feltham	2014 Feltham
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		146	474	146	132
For those who have taken part in the following activities while in this establishment, do you think that they will help you when you leave prison:					
11.5a	Education?	49%	66%	49%	39%
11.5b	A job in this establishment?	39%	43%	39%	37%
11.5c	Vocational or skills training?	44%	44%	44%	31%
11.5d	Offending behaviour programmes?	38%	44%	38%	22%
11.6	Do you usually have association every day?	83%	53%	83%	83%
11.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	78%	57%	78%	76%
11.8	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	2%	10%	2%	4%
SECTION 12: KEEPING IN TOUCH WITH FAMILY AND FRIENDS					
12.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	82%	79%	82%	75%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	50%	45%	50%	47%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	27%	35%	27%	41%
12.4	Is it easy/very easy for your family and friends to visit you here?	33%	32%	33%	31%
12.5	Do your visits start on time?	27%	35%	27%	23%
SECTION 13: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE					
Do you think you will have a problem with the following, when you are released:					
13.1a	Finding accommodation?	28%	24%	28%	25%
13.1b	Getting into school or college?	38%	27%	38%	35%
13.1c	Getting a job?	46%	52%	46%	51%
13.1d	Money/finances?	32%	35%	32%	38%
13.1e	Claiming benefits?	10%	15%	10%	10%
13.1f	Continuing health services?	8%	9%	8%	3%
13.1g	Opening a bank account?	12%	18%	12%	10%
13.1h	Avoiding bad relationships?	17%	17%	17%	12%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	30%	49%	30%	25%
For those with a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan:					
13.3	Were you involved in the development of your plan?	82%	88%	82%	81%
13.4	Do you understand the targets set in your plan?	92%	95%	92%	91%
13.5	Do you have a caseworker here?	87%	89%	87%	93%
13.6	Has your caseworker helped to prepare you for release?	36%	44%	36%	29%
For those with a social worker:					
13.7	Has your social worker been to visit you since you have been here?	78%	72%	78%	79%
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	39%	44%	39%	33%

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	2015 Feltham	Young people's comparator	2015 Feltham	2014 Feltham
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		146	474	146	132
Do you know who to contact for help with the following problems?					
13.9a	Finding accommodation	20%	28%	20%	30%
13.9b	Getting into school or college	28%	27%	28%	30%
13.9c	Getting a job	27%	32%	27%	28%
13.9d	Help with money/finances	20%	23%	20%	22%
13.9e	Help with claiming benefits	14%	17%	14%	14%
13.9f	Continuing health services	12%	15%	12%	11%
13.9g	Opening a bank account	16%	18%	16%	10%
13.9h	Avoiding bad relationships	12%	15%	12%	10%
For those who were sentenced:					
13.11	Do you want to stop offending?	87%	91%	87%	89%
13.12	Have you done anything or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future	52%	52%	52%	48%

Diversity analysis



Key question responses (ethnicity/religion) HMYOI Feltham 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	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		Black and minority ethnic young people	White young people	Muslim young people	Non-Muslim young people
Number of completed questionnaires returned						97	42		45	95
1.2	Are you a foreign national?					7%	4%		9%	4%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?					99%	100%		100%	99%
1.4	Do you understand written English?					99%	100%		100%	99%
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)								90%	63%
1.6	Are you Muslim?					41%	12%			
1.5	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?					0%	20%		0%	9%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?					10%	27%		17%	15%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?					40%	41%		33%	44%
2.1	Are you sentenced?					72%	71%		74%	70%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?					63%	52%		68%	54%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?					39%	42%		35%	39%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?					49%	61%		46%	55%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?					12%	18%		15%	13%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?					76%	76%		79%	73%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?					53%	64%		55%	56%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?					50%	56%		55%	52%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?					68%	73%		66%	73%
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?					83%	93%		85%	87%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?					31%	41%		34%	33%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?					12%	11%		17%	10%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?					38%	47%		31%	46%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?					69%	64%		74%	63%
Can you speak to:										
5.7	A chaplain of your faith in private?					64%	61%		62%	63%
5.8	A peer mentor?					31%	34%		24%	35%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?					19%	26%		11%	24%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?					33%	35%		24%	37%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic young people	White young people	Muslim young people	Non-Muslim young people
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		97	42	45	95
6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	66%	76%	64%	70%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	27%	24%	28%	24%
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	39%	43%	49%	37%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	36%	30%	47%	31%
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	16%	27%	26%	15%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	40%	49%	40%	42%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	42%	47%	55%	37%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	33%	26%	38%	28%
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	65%	44%	62%	59%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	62%	33%	52%	54%
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	55%	41%	64%	46%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	16%	16%	25%	12%
9.4	Have you been victimised by other young people here?	37%	40%	46%	32%
Since you have been here, have other young people:					
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	12%	7%	15%	8%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	10%	7%	15%	5%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	7%	5%	4%	7%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	10%	5%	11%	5%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	4%	2%	7%	2%
9.7	Have you been victimised by staff here?	37%	23%	41%	28%
Since you have been here, have staff:					
9.8d	Threatened or intimidated you?	12%	2%	10%	8%
9.8i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	4%	2%	7%	3%
9.8j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	2%	5%	2%	3%
9.8k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	4%	2%	2%	4%
9.8p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	1%	5%	2%	2%
9.10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	14%	25%	13%	17%
9.11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	30%	37%	36%	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				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		97	42	45	95
10.1a	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the doctor?	40%	38%	40%	41%
10.1b	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the nurse?	52%	56%	54%	54%
10.4	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	15%	18%	5%	20%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:					
11.4a	Education?	64%	63%	56%	69%
11.4b	A job in this establishment?	15%	28%	16%	23%
11.4c	Vocational or skills training?	7%	17%	12%	10%
11.4d	Offending behaviour programmes?	10%	17%	7%	13%
11.4e	Nothing?	26%	20%	28%	22%
11.6	Do you usually have association every day?	83%	80%	78%	85%
11.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	76%	79%	66%	82%
11.8	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	2%	0%	0%	2%
12.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	82%	88%	79%	85%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	56%	40%	54%	49%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	27%	27%	33%	25%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	24%	37%	24%	30%
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	37%	50%	39%	39%

Diversity analysis - disability



Key question responses (disability analysis) HMYOI Feltham 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	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		21	116
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	5%	4%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	96%	100%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	96%	100%
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	46%	74%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	35%	32%
1.5	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	5%	6%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	57%	39%
2.1	Are you sentenced?	57%	74%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	52%	60%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	39%	40%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	57%	49%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	17%	10%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	52%	80%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	48%	57%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	23%	58%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	52%	73%
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	65%	90%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	23%	36%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	9%	12%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	46%	40%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	44%	72%
Can you speak to:			
5.7	A chaplain of your faith in private?	52%	65%
5.8	A peer mentor?	32%	32%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	13%	22%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	13%	38%

Diversity analysis - disability

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	62%	69%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	17%	27%
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	35%	43%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	48%	34%
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	15%	20%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	33%	45%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	48%	41%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	25%	33%
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	48%	63%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	25%	60%
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	62%	50%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	26%	14%
9.4	Have you been victimised by other young people here?	57%	34%
Since you have been here, have other young people:			
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	10%	10%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	15%	8%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	5%	7%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	5%	8%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	15%	2%
9.7	Have you been victimised by staff here?	45%	31%
Since you have been here, have staff:			
9.8d	Threatened or intimidated you?	11%	9%
9.8i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	11%	3%
9.8j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	16%	1%
9.8k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	11%	3%
9.8p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	16%	0%
9.10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	29%	13%
9.11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	26%	32%

Diversity analysis - disability

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
10.1a	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the doctor?	40%	43%
10.1b	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the nurse?	60%	55%
10.4	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	50%	11%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:			
11.4a	Education?	53%	68%
11.4b	A job in this establishment?	11%	21%
11.4c	Vocational or skills training?	22%	9%
11.4d	Offending behaviour programmes?	17%	11%
11.4e	Nothing?	37%	20%
11.6	Do you usually have association every day?	77%	83%
11.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	72%	79%
11.8	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	0%	2%
12.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	63%	86%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	63%	47%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	36%	28%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	35%	30%
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	42%	39%

Wing comparator



Survey responses from children and young people: HMYOI Feltham 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

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Boys who have ever felt unsafe	Boys who have never felt unsafe
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		68	64
SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU			
1.1	Are you 18 years of age?	10%	7%
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	1%	12%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	100%	99%
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other category.)	75%	63%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	38%	24%
1.7	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	4%	7%
1.8	Do you have any children?	3%	3%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	18%	12%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	45%	37%
SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE			
2.1	Are you sentenced?	75%	71%
2.2	Is your sentence 12 months or less?	28%	31%
2.3	Have you been in this establishment for one month or less?	14%	18%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	62%	58%
SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS			
On your most recent journey here:			
3.1	Did you feel safe?	70%	84%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	31%	47%
3.3	Did you spend more than 4 hours in the van?	3%	3%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	43%	57%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	7%	16%

Wing comparator

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Boys who have ever felt unsafe	Boys who have never felt unsafe
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		68	64
SECTION 4: YOUR FIRST FEW DAYS HERE			
4.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	86%	86%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	74%	81%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	50%	64%
When you first arrived, did staff ask if you needed help or support with any of the following:			
4.4a	Not being able to smoke?	33%	35%
4.4b	Loss of property?	12%	14%
4.4c	Feeling scared?	15%	22%
4.4d	Gang problems?	58%	73%
4.4e	Contacting family?	44%	46%
4.4f	Money worries?	11%	16%
4.4g	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	23%	27%
4.4h	Health problems?	42%	56%
4.4i	Getting phone numbers?	23%	40%
4.5	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	83%	74%
When you first arrived, did you have problems with any of the following:			
4.5a	Not being able to smoke?	54%	41%
4.5b	Loss of property?	18%	8%
4.5c	Feeling Scared?	10%	12%
4.5d	Gang Problems?	35%	31%
4.5e	Contacting Family?	23%	16%
4.5f	Money worries?	24%	15%
4.5g	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	20%	8%
4.5h	Health problems?	23%	8%
4.5i	Getting phone numbers?	34%	23%
When you first arrived, were you given any of the following:			
4.6a	Toiletries/basic items?	66%	73%
4.6b	The opportunity to have a shower?	16%	32%
4.6c	Something to eat?	70%	78%
4.6d	A free phone call to friends/family?	77%	80%
4.6e	PIN phone credit?	48%	60%
4.6f	Information about feeling worried/upset?	14%	19%

Wing comparator

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Boys who have ever felt unsafe	Boys who have never felt unsafe
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		68	64
Within your first 24 hours, did you have access to the following people or services:			
4.7a	A chaplain?	24%	37%
4.7b	A peer mentor?	4%	11%
4.7c	Childline/Samaritans	13%	20%
4.7d	The prison shop/canteen?	3%	15%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	45%	63%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	55%	89%
SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT			
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	84%	94%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	28%	39%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	1%	22%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	33%	52%
5.5	Is it easy/very easy for you to attend religious services?	41%	54%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	64%	70%
Can you speak to:			
5.7	A Chaplain of your faith in private?	61%	63%
5.8	A peer mentor?	25%	37%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	22%	19%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	32%	36%
SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF			
6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	60%	75%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	18%	35%
6.3	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	24%	37%
SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS			
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	53%	31%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	47%	23%
7.7	Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint?	18%	5%

Wing comparator

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Boys who have ever felt unsafe	Boys who have never felt unsafe
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		68	64
SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE			
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	19%	17%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	35%	49%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	45%	36%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	36%	28%
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	68%	53%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (Cand R) since you have been here?	57%	52%
SECTION 9: SAFETY			
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?		
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	31%	0%
9.4	Have you ever been victimised by other young people here?	57%	15%
Since you have been here, have other young people:			
9.5a	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	34%	4%
9.5b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	28%	6%
9.5c	Sexually abused you?	1%	0%
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	16%	3%
9.5e	Taken your canteen/property?	3%	1%
9.5f	Victimised you because of medication?	4%	0%
9.5g	Victimised you because of debt?	1%	0%
9.5h	Victimised you because of drugs?	1%	1%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	15%	1%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	12%	0%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	14%	1%
9.5l	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	9%	0%
9.5m	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	1%	0%
9.5n	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	0%
9.5o	Victimised you because of your age?	1%	1%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	5%	1%
9.5q	Victimised you because you were new here?	22%	4%
9.5r	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	7%	1%
9.5s	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	25%	3%
9.7	Have you ever been victimised by a member of staff here?	47%	16%

Wing comparator

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Boys who have ever felt unsafe	Boys who have never felt unsafe
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		68	64
Since you have been here, have staff:			
9.8a	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	21%	12%
9.8b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	14%	3%
9.8c	Sexually abused you?	3%	2%
9.8d	Threatened or intimidated you?	14%	3%
9.8e	Taken your canteen/property?	6%	8%
9.8f	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	2%
9.8g	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	2%
9.8h	Victimised you because of drugs?	1%	2%
9.8i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	4%	5%
9.8j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	4%	2%
9.8k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	6%	2%
9.8k	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	3%	2%
9.8m	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	1%	2%
9.8n	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	0%
9.8o	Victimised you because of your age?	1%	3%
9.8p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	3%	2%
9.8q	Victimised you because you were new here?	11%	3%
9.8r	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	7%	2%
9.8s	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	3%	3%
9.8t	Victimised you because you made a complaint?	11%	2%
9.10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	19%	13%
9.11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	21%	40%
9.12	Is shouting through the windows a problem here?	47%	15%
SECTION 10: HEALTH SERVICES			
10.1a	Is it easy for you to see the doctor?	37%	48%
10.1b	Is it easy for you to see the nurse?	57%	52%
10.1c	Is it easy for you to see the dentist?	29%	24%
10.4	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?	21%	8%
10.6	Did you have any problems with alcohol when you first arrived?	4%	3%
10.7	Have you received any help with any alcohol problems here?	3%	1%
10.8	Did you have any problems with drugs when you first arrived?	34%	18%
10.9	Do you have a problem with drugs now?	15%	2%
10.10	Have you received any help with any drug problems here?	25%	12%
10.11	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs here?	18%	16%

Wing comparator

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Boys who have ever felt unsafe	Boys who have never felt unsafe
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		68	64
SECTION 11: ACTIVITIES			
11.1	Were you 14 or younger when you were last at school?	41%	28%
11.2	Have you ever been excluded from school?	86%	84%
11.3	Did you ever skip school before you came into custody?	69%	70%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:			
11.4a	Education?	57%	72%
11.4b	A job in this establishment?	20%	19%
11.4c	Vocational or skills training?	10%	12%
11.4d	Offending behaviour programmes?	15%	10%
11.4e	Nothing	24%	21%
11.6	Do you usually have association every day?	80%	86%
11.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	66%	89%
11.8	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	1%	2%
SECTION 12: KEEPING IN TOUCH WITH FAMILY AND FRIENDS			
12.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	77%	88%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	66%	32%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	27%	32%
12.4	Is it easy/very easy for your family and friends to visit you here?	28%	41%
12.5	Do your visits start on time?	24%	30%
SECTION 13: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE			
Do you think you will have a problem with the following, when you are released:			
13.1a	Finding accommodation?	35%	21%
13.1b	Getting into school or college?	44%	34%
13.1c	Getting a job?	54%	36%
13.1d	Money/finances?	41%	21%
13.1e	Claiming benefits?	11%	8%
13.1f	Continuing health services?	11%	3%
13.1g	Opening a bank account?	16%	8%
13.1h	Avoiding bad relationships?	17%	18%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	33%	26%
13.5	Do you have a caseworker here?	90%	84%
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	38%	41%

Wing comparator



Survey responses from children and young people: < A MC= Feltham 2015

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

Key to tables

		Curlew Unit	Dunlin Unit	Eagle Unit	Falcon Unit	Heron Unit	Jay Unit	Overall
	Percentages highlighted in green show the best score across wings							
	Percentages highlighted in blue show the worst score across wings							
Number of completed questionnaires returned		21	16	26	19	20	21	123
SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU								
1.1	Are you 18 years of age?	23%	0%	0%	10%	0%	9%	7%
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	13%	0%	4%	11%	10%	0%	6%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	100%	100%	95%	100%	100%	99%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	100%	100%	100%	95%	100%	100%	99%
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other category.)	64%	73%	85%	80%	75%	57%	72%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	52%	25%	19%	40%	36%	23%	33%
1.7	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	9%	0%	0%	5%	14%	9%	6%
1.8	Do you have any children?	0%	13%	7%	0%	5%	4%	5%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	19%	13%	8%	26%	5%	5%	12%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	9%	27%	60%	45%	40%	55%	40%
SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE								
2.1	Are you sentenced?	77%	88%	59%	65%	68%	83%	72%
2.2	Is your sentence 12 months or less?	14%	20%	25%	35%	36%	39%	29%
2.3	Have you been in this establishment for one month or less?	0%	0%	15%	33%	9%	4%	11%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	65%	85%	58%	57%	55%	61%	62%
SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS								
On your most recent journey here:								
3.1	Did you feel safe?	83%	50%	72%	75%	81%	87%	76%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	39%	47%	39%	33%	24%	39%	37%
3.3	Did you spend more than 4 hours in the van?	0%	7%	4%	10%	9%	0%	5%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	61%	33%	39%	47%	43%	65%	49%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	17%	13%	4%	22%	0%	13%	11%
SECTION 4: YOUR FIRST FEW DAYS HERE								
4.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	91%	87%	89%	82%	76%	96%	87%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	91%	93%	71%	37%	68%	91%	75%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	70%	67%	46%	28%	50%	65%	54%

Wing comparator

Key to tables

Percentages highlighted in green show the best score across wings		Curlew Unit	Dunlin Unit	Eagle Unit	Falcon Unit	Heron Unit	Jay Unit	Overall
Percentages highlighted in blue show the worst score across wings								
Number of completed questionnaires returned		21	16	26	19	20	21	123
When you first arrived, did staff ask if you needed help or support with any of the following:								
4.4a	Not being able to smoke?	33%	36%	25%	50%	10%	46%	33%
4.4b	Loss of property?	10%	7%	11%	21%	10%	14%	12%
4.4c	Feeling scared?	15%	7%	29%	16%	5%	32%	19%
4.4d	Gang problems?	75%	71%	71%	65%	52%	50%	64%
4.4e	Contacting family?	62%	21%	44%	50%	33%	36%	42%
4.4f	Money worries?	10%	7%	11%	21%	15%	14%	13%
4.4g	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	25%	14%	32%	16%	15%	19%	21%
4.4h	Health problems?	52%	53%	52%	55%	38%	36%	48%
4.4i	Getting phone numbers?	48%	21%	29%	45%	15%	32%	32%
4.5	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	83%	73%	69%	78%	83%	96%	80%
When you first arrived, did you have problems with any of the following:								
4.5a	Not being able to smoke?	57%	44%	43%	63%	37%	46%	48%
4.5b	Loss of property?	13%	7%	24%	22%	11%	5%	14%
4.5c	Feeling Scared?	13%	0%	14%	6%	0%	9%	8%
4.5d	Gang Problems?	30%	44%	35%	22%	42%	36%	35%
4.5e	Contacting Family?	35%	7%	24%	11%	6%	19%	19%
4.5f	Money worries?	30%	20%	28%	11%	0%	24%	20%
4.5g	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	30%	7%	24%	6%	0%	14%	15%
4.5h	Health problems?	23%	13%	18%	6%	6%	9%	13%
4.5i	Getting phone numbers?	30%	33%	31%	17%	22%	24%	27%
When you first arrived, were you given any of the following:								
4.6a	Toiletries/basic items?	57%	50%	66%	78%	68%	76%	66%
4.6b	The opportunity to have a shower?	30%	13%	7%	11%	19%	41%	21%
4.6c	Something to eat?	70%	80%	69%	58%	64%	81%	70%
4.6d	A free phone call to friends/family?	77%	87%	72%	78%	64%	91%	77%
4.6e	PIN phone credit?	57%	44%	61%	47%	41%	68%	54%
4.6f	Information about feeling worried/upset?	17%	0%	24%	0%	9%	24%	14%

Wing comparator

Key to tables

Percentages highlighted in green show the best score across wings		Curlew Unit	Dunlin Unit	Eagle Unit	Falcon Unit	Heron Unit	Jay Unit	Overall
Percentages highlighted in blue show the worst score across wings								
Number of completed questionnaires returned		21	16	26	19	20	21	123
Within your first 24 hours, did you have access to the following people or services:								
4.7a	A chaplain?	19%	7%	15%	29%	24%	55%	26%
4.7b	A peer mentor?	9%	0%	0%	6%	0%	9%	4%
4.7c	Childline/Samaritans	5%	7%	0%	12%	14%	24%	10%
4.7d	The prison shop/canteen?	9%	0%	0%	6%	9%	9%	6%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	48%	64%	50%	47%	46%	61%	52%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	48%	79%	66%	71%	68%	87%	69%
SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT								
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	91%	86%	71%	77%	86%	100%	85%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	52%	0%	11%	24%	52%	46%	32%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	13%	8%	0%	0%	14%	23%	10%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	32%	36%	50%	35%	41%	48%	41%
5.5	Is it easy/very easy for you to attend religious services?	83%	29%	11%	60%	55%	46%	47%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	81%	71%	41%	78%	76%	70%	68%
Can you speak to:								
5.7	A Chaplain of your faith in private?	81%	29%	44%	65%	76%	77%	63%
5.8	A peer mentor?	46%	21%	8%	35%	24%	48%	30%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	14%	7%	11%	16%	24%	30%	18%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	36%	21%	29%	26%	46%	36%	33%
SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF								
6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	79%	64%	42%	47%	84%	81%	66%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	15%	36%	28%	18%	21%	24%	23%
6.3	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	25%	7%	15%	37%	41%	46%	29%
SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS								
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	61%	29%	35%	26%	55%	39%	42%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	48%	36%	39%	26%	46%	17%	36%
7.7	Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint?	24%	14%	12%	7%	14%	0%	12%

Wing comparator

Key to tables

Percentages highlighted in green show the best score across wings		Curlew Unit	Dunlin Unit	Eagle Unit	Falcon Unit	Heron Unit	Jay Unit	Overall
Percentages highlighted in blue show the worst score across wings								
Number of completed questionnaires returned		21	16	26	19	20	21	123
SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE								
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	65%	0%	4%	12%	5%	19%	19%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	57%	21%	20%	18%	36%	76%	39%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	80%	21%	27%	18%	43%	59%	43%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	14%	50%	52%	18%	50%	19%	34%
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	39%	100%	92%	42%	76%	41%	64%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (Cand R) since you have been here?	30%	85%	74%	42%	68%	43%	56%
SECTION 9: SAFETY								
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	77%	47%	64%	44%	46%	41%	54%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	9%	14%	16%	25%	19%	5%	14%
9.4	Have you ever been victimised by other young people here?	52%	14%	48%	37%	41%	43%	41%
Since you have been here, have other young people:								
9.5a	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	17%	7%	36%	11%	32%	15%	21%
9.5b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	13%	7%	32%	11%	32%	20%	21%
9.5c	Sexually abused you?	0%	0%	0%	6%	0%	0%	1%
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	4%	0%	20%	6%	14%	5%	9%
9.5e	Taken your canteen/property?	0%	0%	0%	0%	9%	5%	2%
9.5f	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	0%	8%	6%	0%	0%	2%
9.5g	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	0%	4%	0%	0%	0%	1%
9.5h	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%	0%	1%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	13%	0%	8%	11%	9%	5%	8%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	9%	0%	8%	6%	9%	5%	7%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	9%	0%	8%	0%	19%	5%	7%
9.5l	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	4%	0%	12%	0%	5%	5%	5%
9.5m	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	4%	0%	0%	6%	0%	0%	2%
9.5n	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
9.5o	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%	0%	1%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	7%	0%	6%	9%	0%	3%
9.5q	Victimised you because you were new here?	23%	0%	12%	6%	19%	15%	13%
9.5r	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	9%	7%	4%	0%	5%	0%	4%
9.5s	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	13%	7%	20%	6%	24%	15%	15%

Wing comparator

Key to tables

Percentages highlighted in green show the best score across wings		Curlew Unit	Dunlin Unit	Eagle Unit	Falcon Unit	Heron Unit	Jay Unit	Overall
Percentages highlighted in blue show the worst score across wings								
Number of completed questionnaires returned		21	16	26	19	20	21	123
9.7	Have you ever been victimised by a member of staff here?	20%	39%	32%	50%	41%	14%	32%
Since you have been here, have staff:								
9.8a	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	10%	31%	27%	24%	14%	0%	17%
9.8b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	0%	15%	4%	18%	9%	5%	8%
9.8c	Sexually abused you?	0%	0%	4%	6%	5%	0%	3%
9.8d	Threatened or intimidated you?	5%	0%	4%	24%	14%	0%	8%
9.8e	Taken your canteen/property?	0%	15%	12%	12%	0%	5%	7%
9.8f	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	0%	0%	6%	0%	0%	1%
9.8g	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	0%	0%	6%	0%	0%	1%
9.8h	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	0%	0%	6%	5%	0%	2%
9.8i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	8%	0%	18%	5%	0%	4%
9.8j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	0%	0%	12%	5%	0%	3%
9.8k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	0%	4%	18%	5%	0%	4%
9.8k	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	0%	8%	0%	12%	0%	0%	3%
9.8m	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%	0%	0%	12%	0%	0%	2%
9.8n	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
9.8o	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	0%	4%	6%	0%	0%	2%
9.8p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	8%	0%	12%	0%	0%	3%
9.8q	Victimised you because you were new here?	0%	8%	8%	6%	19%	0%	7%
9.8r	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	10%	0%	4%	6%	0%	0%	3%
9.8s	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	15%	0%	6%	5%	0%	3%
9.8t	Victimised you because you made a complaint?	10%	15%	4%	6%	0%	0%	5%
9.10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	17%	15%	4%	13%	5%	24%	12%
9.11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	32%	7%	16%	24%	20%	48%	25%
9.12	Is shouting through the windows a problem here?	48%	7%	40%	24%	41%	32%	34%
SECTION 10: HEALTH SERVICES								
10.1a	Is it easy for you to see the doctor?	50%	23%	42%	42%	32%	48%	41%
10.1b	Is it easy for you to see the nurse?	62%	71%	52%	50%	36%	52%	53%
10.1c	Is it easy for you to see the dentist?	25%	14%	12%	53%	19%	25%	24%
10.4	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?	0%	8%	19%	19%	10%	19%	13%
10.6	Did you have any problems with alcohol when you first arrived?	0%	0%	4%	12%	9%	5%	5%
10.7	Have you received any help with any alcohol problems here?	0%	0%	4%	6%	5%	5%	3%
10.8	Did you have any problems with drugs when you first arrived?	15%	31%	29%	35%	36%	38%	31%
10.9	Do you have a problem with drugs now?	5%	17%	8%	18%	5%	0%	8%
10.10	Have you received any help with any drug problems here?	16%	17%	15%	24%	15%	40%	21%
10.11	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs here?	11%	8%	26%	19%	19%	5%	16%

Wing comparator

Key to tables

Percentages highlighted in green show the best score across wings		Curlew Unit	Dunlin Unit	Eagle Unit	Falcon Unit	Heron Unit	Jay Unit	Overall
Percentages highlighted in blue show the worst score across wings								
Number of completed questionnaires returned		21	16	26	19	20	21	123
SECTION 11: ACTIVITIES								
11.1	Were you 14 or younger when you were last at school?	35%	15%	41%	42%	41%	38%	37%
11.2	Have you ever been excluded from school?	79%	85%	82%	82%	91%	91%	85%
11.3	Did you ever skip school before you came into custody?	60%	77%	75%	63%	59%	75%	68%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:								
11.4a	Education?	25%	69%	68%	82%	85%	80%	68%
11.4b	A job in this establishment?	43%	15%	11%	18%	25%	5%	19%
11.4c	Vocational or skills training?	43%	0%	4%	6%	0%	5%	10%
11.4d	Offending behaviour programmes?	15%	15%	7%	6%	10%	15%	11%
11.4e	Nothing	10%	31%	19%	12%	15%	20%	17%
11.6	Do you usually have association every day?	100%	75%	74%	78%	76%	95%	83%
11.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	40%	92%	85%	71%	80%	95%	77%
11.8	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%	2%
SECTION 12: KEEPING IN TOUCH WITH FAMILY AND FRIENDS								
12.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	94%	75%	80%	82%	81%	95%	85%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	58%	75%	56%	44%	50%	38%	52%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	36%	31%	15%	21%	24%	36%	27%
12.4	Is it easy/very easy for your family and friends to visit you here?	42%	25%	30%	18%	41%	38%	33%
12.5	Do your visits start on time?	21%	8%	29%	24%	20%	48%	27%
SECTION 13: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE								
Do you think you will have a problem with the following, when you are released:								
13.1a	Finding accommodation?	25%	50%	36%	29%	26%	21%	30%
13.1b	Getting into school or college?	20%	36%	52%	61%	40%	26%	40%
13.1c	Getting a job?	43%	36%	56%	71%	45%	45%	50%
13.1d	Money/finances?	43%	36%	32%	29%	35%	26%	34%
13.1e	Claiming benefits?	0%	9%	12%	12%	11%	11%	9%
13.1f	Continuing health services?	5%	0%	20%	6%	5%	0%	7%
13.1g	Opening a bank account?	0%	27%	12%	12%	11%	16%	12%
13.1h	Avoiding bad relationships?	15%	18%	12%	18%	26%	5%	15%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	45%	33%	27%	18%	22%	35%	30%
13.5	Do you have a caseworker here?	95%	100%	92%	75%	89%	95%	91%
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	50%	33%	32%	20%	35%	57%	39%

Diversity analysis



Key question responses (local authority care analysis) HMYOI Feltham 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		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		56	80
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	2%	10%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	100%	99%
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	70%	70%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	27%	37%
1.5	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	2%	9%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	20%	11%
2.1	Are you sentenced?	77%	69%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	42%	68%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	50%	33%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	56%	50%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	18%	9%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	72%	81%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	53%	60%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	54%	55%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	78%	68%
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	85%	91%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	34%	34%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	7%	16%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	45%	41%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	59%	74%
Can you speak to:			
5.7	A chaplain of your faith in private?	64%	62%
5.8	A peer mentor?	36%	28%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	30%	14%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	39%	31%

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		
6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	64%	70%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	24%	28%
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	53%	34%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	43%	29%
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	12%	25%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	41%	44%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	47%	40%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	44%	25%
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	71%	51%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	61%	47%
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	56%	48%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	21%	10%
9.4	Have you been victimised by other young people here?	43%	31%
Since you have been here, have other young people:			
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	13%	6%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	6%	10%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	6%	6%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	6%	8%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	7%	1%
9.7	Have you been victimised by staff here?	36%	28%
Since you have been here, have staff:			
9.8d	Threatened or intimidated you?	7%	10%
9.8i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	6%	4%
9.8j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	6%	1%
9.8k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	2%	4%
9.8p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	4%	1%
9.10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	26%	7%
9.11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	24%	35%

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		
10.1a	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the doctor?	51%	39%
10.1b	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the nurse?	69%	49%
10.4	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	23%	10%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:			
11.4a	Education?	72%	58%
11.4b	A job in this establishment?	19%	22%
11.4c	Vocational or skills training?	8%	13%
11.4d	Offending behaviour programmes?	15%	10%
11.4e	Nothing?	23%	24%
11.6	Do you usually have association every day?	72%	89%
11.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	83%	74%
11.8	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	2%	1%
12.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	77%	86%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	55%	45%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	21%	32%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	40%	23%
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	44%	36%