

Report on an announced inspection of

# **Juvenile unit at**

# **HMYOI Parc**

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

**11–22 January 2016**

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



Arolygiaeth Ei Mawrhydi dros Addysg a Hyfforddiant yng Nghymru  
Her Majesty's Inspectorate for Education and Training in Wales

Crown copyright 2016

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

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

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

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

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

# Contents

Introduction	5
Fact page	7
About this inspection and report	9
Summary	11
Section 1. Safety	17
Section 2. Respect	29
Section 3. Purposeful activity	41
Section 4. Resettlement	47
Section 5. Recommendations and housekeeping points	55
Section 6. Appendices	59
Appendix I: Inspection team	59
Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report	61
Appendix III: Establishment population profile	65
Appendix IV: Summary of children and young people questionnaires and interviews	69

### **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

Parc juvenile unit is a distinct and generally well separated part of a much larger prison near Bridgend in South Wales. The young person's unit was opened in 2002 as a 28-room facility, and over the years has expanded to the point where its capacity is now 64 young people, although only 38 were in residence at the time of this inspection. Its catchment area encompasses south and mid-Wales, and much of south-west England. The establishment is run under contract by G4S Central Government Services.

At the time of the last full inspection in May 2014 our judgement was that young people were well cared for and that overall they experienced positive outcomes. The inspection report said that 'Parc is a safe institution'. In particular, safeguarding and child protection arrangements were robust, and young people said that they felt safe on arrival and during their stay.

During this inspection our judgement had moderated, so that outcomes in the vitally important areas of 'safety' and 'respect' had declined from 'good' to 'reasonably good'. The reasons for this change were clear. While reception, safeguarding and child protection arrangements remained effective, there were concerns in other areas. The fact that 42% of the children reported being victimised by staff is of concern, particularly as this had more than doubled from 20% at the time of the last inspection. There is obviously a need to understand these survey findings, particularly as only 55% of boys felt they were treated with respect by staff. Other relevant survey findings were that while a majority of children said it was easy to make a complaint, most also said that once made, those complaints were not dealt with fairly or in a timely fashion.

The survey results cannot be dismissed as being merely subjective views from the detained children. In terms of objective evidence, the use of force, as recorded by the establishment had tripled since the previous inspection. Force had been used on more than 200 occasions in the six months prior to the inspection, mostly in response to violent incidents. Almost a quarter of the boys reported having been assaulted by other boys at Parc.

Some of this level of violence was ascribed by staff to the destabilising effect of two particularly difficult children who were transferred into Parc during the autumn of 2015. If that was indeed the case, then management need to be sure that they have understood how this was able to happen and ensure that the necessary plans are in place to stop it happening again.

In light of the recent allegations that have been made about the treatment of children elsewhere in the young people's secure estate, it is imperative that our recommendations about refresher training in child protection, and knowledge about the whistle-blowing policy, are acted upon as a matter of urgency. Similarly, the reasons why children have reported an increase in victimisation by staff must be investigated and understood. In summary, while overall we were still able confidently to judge that outcomes under the 'safety' element of the healthy prison test were 'reasonably good', there is a real need for the leadership team at Parc to understand what sits behind the negative aspects of these findings.

There was much to commend at Parc, and there was no doubt that the leadership team of the YOI were committed to providing a safe and decent environment for the children in their care. This report points out many instances where good work by staff and partners had beneficial impacts on the children's experiences. This was most apparent in purposeful activity where, in particular, boys at Parc continued to access significantly more time out of cell than their counterparts in other YOIs. This included regular association and exercise periods. It was also positive that segregation was rarely used despite the challenging behaviour exhibited during the autumn of 2015.

On occasions, children's outcomes were poor where the solution lay outside the control of the staff, a stark example being where we became aware of a child who had been released to an unsuitable bed and breakfast hostel, despite the best efforts of Parc staff to find suitable accommodation. The inability to secure a suitable address in good time before release prevented any education, training or employment arrangements being made for him on release.

Despite all the positive things that were happening at Parc, there can be no room for complacency, as the judgements in the areas of 'safety' and 'respect' had declined since the last inspection. I am sure the leadership at Parc will give this their full attention, and strive to return the establishment to its previous high performance in these key areas.

**Peter Clarke CVO OBE QPM**  
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

March 2016

# Fact page

**Task of the establishment**

Category B training prison for adult male prisoners. Young people's unit for remanded and convicted boys.

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

Private (G4S Central Government Services)

**Region/Department**

Wales and the south west

**Number held**

38

**Certified normal accommodation**

64

**Operational capacity**

64

**Date of last full inspection**

May 2014

**Brief history**

The young person's unit opened in March 2002 as a 28-room facility for remanded young people. In October 2004 the unit expanded to house 36 remanded and sentenced young people and further expanded in 2007 to accommodate 64 young people.

The unit originally served courts in south and mid Wales. In March 2013 the court catchment area was extended to north and south Somerset, Devon and Cornwall and in April 2014 to Bristol, Swindon and Wiltshire.

**Short description of residential units**

The unit, known as the John Charles unit, has two residential units, GI housing 36 young people and EI housing 28 young people.

**Name of director**

Janet Wallsgrove

**Escort contractor**

GeoAmey

**Health service commissioner and providers**

G4S

**Learning and skills providers**

G4S

**Independent Monitoring Board chair**

Jean Davies





# 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, all our inspections have been unannounced, other than in exceptional circumstances. This replaces the previous system of announced and unannounced full main inspections with full or short follow-ups to review progress. All our inspections now follow up recommendations from the last full inspection.
- A8 All inspections of prisons are conducted jointly with Ofsted or Estyn (Wales), the General Pharmaceutical Council (GPhC) and HM Inspectorate of Probation. 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.
- A11 Findings from the survey of children and young people and a detailed description of the survey methodology can be found in Appendix IV of this report. Please note that we only refer to comparisons with other comparable establishments or previous inspections when these are statistically significant.<sup>1</sup>

---

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

# Summary

## Safety

**S1** *Children continued to arrive late at night after long journeys. New arrivals were well cared for and early days procedures were very good. The safeguarding and child protection arrangements remained effective. Self-harm was well managed and children in crisis felt well supported. There were more fights and assaults than at the time of the previous inspection and autumn 2015 had been a particularly turbulent time for boys and staff. In our survey, 42% of boys reported being victimised by staff. Use of disciplinary procedures and force were high but oversight was reasonably good. The rewards and sanctions scheme was better than we normally see and boys were rarely segregated. Substance misuse services were good. **Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***

**S2** *At the last inspection in May 2014, we found that outcomes for children and young people in Parc were good against this healthy prison test. We made four recommendations about safety. At this follow-up inspection we found that one of the recommendations had been partially achieved and three had not been achieved.*

**S3** Children still faced unacceptable delays at court, long journeys with adult prisoners and late arrivals at Parc. In our individual interviews, children described their experience of reception as adequate in contrast to negative survey results. We observed reception staff treating a boy with care and sensitivity. The induction process was thorough and engaged the boys well. The induction handbook was well designed and provided a realistic account of life in the unit.

**S4** Daily multidisciplinary staff briefings combined with monthly operational and quarterly strategic meetings provided a sound framework for managing safeguarding. The number of child protection referrals had increased slightly, most relating to use of force. These were appropriately referred for external investigation. The director had recently taken robust action to dismiss a member of staff who had used excessive force during a spontaneous incident when force had been used.

**S5** Boys in crisis felt well cared for, and staff were knowledgeable about their individual circumstances. During the previous six months, 47 ACCTs<sup>2</sup> had been opened, similar to our last inspection. The quality of ACCT documentation was excellent.

**S6** In our survey, too many boys did not feel that staff would take it seriously if they reported victimisation. Despite this, we found good interventions to challenge bullying and intimidation. More work was needed to reassure boys that staff took bullying seriously. We were particularly concerned that twice as many boys reported being victimised by staff than at the previous inspection.

**S7** Almost a quarter of boys said that they had been hit, kicked or assaulted by another boy at Parc. There had been 79 assaults on children in the previous six months, more than at other young offender institutions, and staff had identified violence by two boys as contributing to the high number. Investigations into bullying and violent incidents were prompt and thorough. Perpetrators were robustly challenged and, if necessary, monitored. Five violence reduction booklets had been opened in the previous six months, more than at the last

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

inspection. Observational entries, support plans and case reviews were all very good. Mediation was regularly offered and often successful.

- S8 The unit had experienced significant challenges with behaviour during autumn 2015 with high levels of violence, force and adjudications. At the time of the inspection, the unit was more stable, but action was needed to ensure that a few children did not have a similar impact in the future.
- S9 Boys understood the incentives scheme and were motivated to reach the higher levels. There were fewer boys on the gold level than at the previous inspection and survey results showed that fewer boys believed they were treated fairly within the scheme. However, boys were able to appeal against decisions and were sometimes successful.
- S10 Security was well managed and proportionate. Intelligence was swiftly acted on and security measures did not unduly restrict access to the regime.
- S11 Use of the adjudication system had more than doubled since the previous inspection, reflecting the rise in violence over the previous six months. Records indicated that adjudications continued to be conducted well and punishments were fair and consistent. The minor report system was appropriately used for less serious infringements.
- S12 The use of force had tripled since the previous inspection and was higher than comparable establishments. Eighty per cent of incidents did not involve control and restraint techniques and we saw examples of successful de-escalation. A minority of footage that we viewed showed poor de-escalation by staff. It was inappropriate that staff from the adult units were used to respond to incidents involving children.
- S13 Oversight of use of force was reasonably good. However, in interviews some boys told us they had been hurt during restraint that occurred in areas not covered by CCTV. The establishment had recently introduced body-worn cameras for managers but more were needed to safeguard boys and staff.
- S14 Use of segregation remained commendably low. Use of single separation for short periods on normal location was more frequent. Boys on separation were reviewed regularly and were given support to help them reintegrate. All separated children had access to a full activity regime, exercise and a daily shower. The number of boys self isolating for their own protection was low.
- S15 Mandatory drug testing was appropriate and unpredictable. Suspicion tests were carried out promptly. There had been four positive tests during the last year, all but one for cannabis. A suitable range of interventions covered all commonly used substances, including cannabis, alcohol and new psychoactive substances<sup>3</sup>, and there was a balance between awareness raising, coping strategies and harm reduction.

---

<sup>3</sup> New drugs that are developed or chosen to mimic the effects of illegal drugs such as cannabis, heroin or amphetamines and may have unpredictable and life-threatening effects.

## Respect

**S16** *Living conditions were reasonable. The introduction of in-cell telephones and unit electronic terminals was positive. Relationships between staff and children were not as good as at the last inspection. We observed some excellent interactions but also a lack of engagement by some staff. Equality management was poor but this was mitigated by provision to meet individual needs. The chaplaincy remained engaged with unit staff and provided boys with valued support. The complaints system worked well. Health care remained good. Food was reasonable and boys continued to eat communally. **Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***

**S17** *At the last inspection in May 2014, we found that outcomes for children and young people in Parc were good against this healthy prison test. We made 12 recommendations about respect.<sup>4</sup> At this follow-up inspection we found that two of the recommendations had been achieved, one had been partially achieved, eight had not been achieved and one was no longer relevant.*

**S18** The residential units were well maintained but the windows in cells were in poor condition, badly scratched and dirty. Some cells, including some first night accommodation, had grubby mattresses and stained pillows. Ventilation in some cells was poor and toilet screening in double cells remained inadequate. Shared cells were too cramped for each boy to have a chair, and we found some cells with no chairs. The introduction of in-cell telephones and electronic machines was positive. Access to showers remained good but some screening required improvement.

**S19** Relationships between staff and children were more variable than at the time of the last inspection. While most interaction that we observed was positive, some relationships were more distant. In our survey, only 55% of children said that most staff treated them with respect and over a third said they would have no one to turn to if they had a problem.

**S20** Strategic management of equality work was poor. Unit staff did not attend the community inclusion action team meeting, at which there was no discussion of children's experiences and no action planning for the unit. Most discrimination incident report form responses were adequate and there were good interventions for children who had been found to be discriminatory, something we rarely see. Consultation about equality required improvement. The education team had developed some particularly good classes on diversity issues.

**S21** Boys from a black and minority ethnic background told us they did not think they were treated differently and did not experience much racism. Staff we spoke to had a good knowledge of the special needs of children in their care. Faith provision was generally good and pastoral support was strong.

**S22** There was good access to complaints forms on the wings with visible boxes. Staff often helped boys to write their complaints. Responses we sampled were usually by operational managers and were timely, polite and age appropriate.

**S23** All boys were assessed by a nurse for immediate needs; this was followed by a series of comprehensive health assessments for physical, mental health, learning disabilities and substance misuse needs. A few assessments were overdue for completion. In our survey, more boys said they had good access to the nurse, doctor and dentist than at comparator prisons. We found that they had very good daily access to a nurse on the unit and were able

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

to attend GP, dentist and other primary care appointments within a protected time slot in the prison health care unit.

- S24 Boys knew the unit nurse and she contributed to all key meetings and individual reviews; health staff demonstrated good rapport with boys. Most health promotion work was individual and opportunistic and there was scope for targeted work on age-appropriate themes. Immunisation for blood-borne viruses and childhood diseases was well promoted with effective monitoring of take up. Medicines management was reasonable.
- S25 Access to the child and adolescent mental health service was excellent but there was no speech and language therapy for boys, many of whom had poor communication and language skills.
- S26 The range and quality of food was reasonable, although the children we spoke to did not enjoy it. All meals were eaten communally in a calm atmosphere, providing an opportunity for socialising. Canteen arrangements were reasonably good.

## Purposeful activity

**S27** *Time out of cell was better than we usually see. The strategic management of education, learning and skills had deteriorated and was now adequate. The core curriculum was broad and balanced. The vocational curriculum was only adequate and boys had fewer options than we had found previously. Teaching staff had a very effective professional relationship with the boys and behaviour was very good. Boys engaged well with their learning. Levels of attainment were good and most boys made progress in lessons. Progress in literacy, numeracy and information and communication technology (ICT) was adequate. There were limited opportunities for work experience. Boys made good use of the library. **Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***

S28 *At the last inspection in May 2014, we found that outcomes for children and young people in Parc were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made six recommendations about purposeful activity. At this follow-up inspection we found that three of the recommendations had been achieved, one had been partially achieved and two had not been achieved.*

- S29 Most boys continued to have good amounts of time out of their cells each day, including time for association and outside in the fresh air. However, time outside was limited to small yards. For the few boys who self isolated, time out of cell was much reduced and inadequate.
- S30 Educational oversight had deteriorated since the last inspection. Systems to collect and analyse data were well developed and managers made effective use of benchmarks to assess their own performance. Quality assurance of qualification work was robust and internal verification systems were secure. However, quality checks of learner work and progress required improvement. Staff promoted equality and diversity well.
- S31 Children were allocated promptly to classes and most were able to attend the learning pathway of their choice. However, these pathways did not provide a structured learning programme. Children's needs, including literacy and numeracy, were identified well through an informative individual education plan. However, targets for literacy, numeracy and ICT skills were too generic. Boys had access to a suitable standard core curriculum but the range of vocational options was not extensive. Boys' self-esteem and self-confidence were enhanced through their education. Behaviour in education was generally good. Poor behaviour was efficiently managed and there were very few exclusions from education.

- S32 Boys made limited progress in literacy and numeracy. In contrast, they made good progress in vocational subjects and in personal and social development through a well-planned and appropriate citizenship programme. Most boys were developing appropriate knowledge, understanding and skills to prepare them for future employment or further education. Boys gained relevant and useful certificates and qualifications which provided them with a good base for future educational or work-based learning.
- S33 Teachers set clear learning objectives in most lessons and made effective use of a wide range of teaching strategies. However, in a few lessons learning activities did not challenge boys enough. Literacy, numeracy and ICT skills were not coordinated across the curriculum. Although most marking was up to date and provided appropriate encouragement, it did not tell boys what they needed to do to improve their work.
- S34 The newly restocked library provided an appropriate range of titles, including a good selection of books in the Welsh language. Many boys used the library effectively to choose books to read for pleasure or to support their education programmes.
- S35 Access to physical exercise was good but a lack of suitable facilities limited the range of indoor activities. Boys following the Fitness Academy and PE pathways had good access to a well-planned PE curriculum that covered a wide range of activities, enabling them to gain meaningful qualifications.

## Resettlement

**S36** *The management of resettlement was reasonably good. A team of committed caseworkers ensured that training or remand management plans were in place and reviews were meaningful. Release on temporary licence (ROTL) had not been used in the previous six months. Despite the efforts of unit staff, looked-after children received variable support from local authorities. Resettlement provision was well organised but boys could no longer open bank accounts and too often accommodation was not identified in good time before release. Support to maintain family ties remained very good and the introduction of Skype was commendable. **Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***

S37 *At the last inspection in May 2014, we found that outcomes for children and young people in Parc were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made nine recommendations about resettlement. At this follow-up inspection we found that two of the recommendations had been achieved, two had been partially achieved and five had not been achieved.*

- S38 The resettlement policy was reasonably comprehensive and work was under way to start the needs analysis due in 2016. Early release was used appropriately to recognise boys who progressed well and boys who were eligible for home detention curfew had their suitability properly assessed. There had been no use of ROTL since May 2015. Transition arrangements for boys who moved to the adult site at Parc were managed well, but less controlled for those who moved to other adult prisons. Systematic post-release follow up was not in place.
- S39 A team of committed caseworkers took the lead in planning for release or transition and all boys had a caseworker and a training or remand management plan. Training planning and remand management meetings were timely with generally good attendance, but key workers were often not present. The meetings were managed well and staff enabled boys to contribute well.

- S40 The risk management committee met whenever a boy was identified to be a risk and public protection cases were properly identified and managed.
- S41 Looked-after children were three times more likely to report experience of victimisation by other boys than their counterparts. Despite the best efforts of prison staff, local authorities continued to provide inconsistent and sometimes inadequate support to children during their time at Parc and on release.
- S42 Accommodation needs were identified early, discussed with relevant community agencies at planning meetings and escalated to senior managers and other sources of assistance where necessary. Despite efforts by unit staff, too many boys had to wait until close to their release dates for an address to be confirmed. One child had been released without an address to go to, which was unacceptable. Caseworkers took the lead in helping boys to access support with financial issues. They were no longer able to open bank accounts before leaving Parc.
- S43 There were appropriate plans in place for boys moving to an adult prison to continue their education. Boys benefited from careers advice and guidance during their learning and staff had a clear focus on their future needs and aspirations.
- S44 All children were seen before discharge by a nurse who had effective links with local health services and community drug and alcohol agencies through the youth offending teams.
- S45 Visits facilities were adequate and the session that we observed was very relaxed. Boys had phones in their cells which had greatly improved their ability to keep in touch with their family. The unit kept family members up to date promptly with all significant events. Staff were aware of the boys who did not receive visits and staff provided support to help them deal with this. Skype had been introduced to help boys maintain contact with family members. Although take up had been low to date, this was a significant development with great potential, particularly for boys from a foreign national background.
- S46 Boys had access to a range of interventions delivered by unit staff, although there were no interventions for boys convicted of sexual offences.



# 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.**

- |  |
|--|
| <p><b>I.1</b> <i>Longstanding difficulties remained over the transport of children to the prison. Although they were well documented by the prison, there was no mechanism to enable their resolution.</i></p> |
|--|
- I.2** Children were still being held regularly at court for four or five hours after their cases had been dealt with. Our survey results showed that 8% of boys spent more than four hours in the van travelling to the prison, similar to the previous inspection.
- I.3** It was concerning to note that 68% of children in our survey reported sharing transport with adults against the comparator of 34% and 41% at the previous inspection.
- I.4** Children continued to be admitted late to the establishment on occasion. The prison kept detailed records of the time children remained at court after their cases had finished and of late arrivals. The source of the problems could be identified from the monthly returns. Although they were invited, the escort provider did not attend the safeguarding meetings where these matters should have been discussed.
- I.5** Prison records indicated that the distance children at Parc lived from home had not changed much since the last inspection. Just over half lived less than 50 miles away.

### Recommendation

- I.6 Children should be transported to custody as soon as their case has finished. They should be transported separately from adults and arrive at Parc before 7pm.**

### Housekeeping point

- I.7** A representative of the escort provider should attend safeguarding meetings so that problems concerning the transport of children to the prison can be discussed.

## Early days in custody

### Expected outcomes:

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

**I.8** *Our survey results concerning treatment on arrival were worse than at the previous inspection, but in contrast we received reasonable feedback from individual interviews and one positive observation. Overall, boys were treated reasonably well on admission.*

**I.9** Admission procedures remained the same, but in our survey 61% of boys said that they were searched respectfully and 46% that they were treated well in reception against 83% and 78% respectively at the previous inspection.

**I.10** Fifty-one per cent of boys said they had difficulty contacting their family when they first arrived compared with 24% previously, and significantly fewer than the comparator said they were given a free telephone call on arrival or PIN phone credit.

**I.11** In contrast, the feedback about reception from boys during individual interviews was less critical and they described provision as adequate. The one new admission which we observed was carried out well and staff behaved in a friendly and reassuring way towards the boy.

**I.12** Risk assessment and management forms were completed thoroughly and staff made good use of assessment material they received in advance and information obtained from the boys to reach balanced judgements.

**I.13** The induction process was thorough and engaged the boys well. The officer who delivered most of the sessions treated the boys as individuals. He was skilled and took pride in his work. The induction handbook was well designed and provided a realistic account of life in the unit. However, it was not available in other languages. On completion of induction, a thorough check was made to ensure that boys had been given all the information they needed.

## Recommendation

**I.14** **The induction handbook should be available in the main languages spoken by foreign national children.** (Repeated recommendation I.14)

## Good practice

**I.15** *The induction handbook was well designed and provided a realistic account of life in the unit.*

## 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.16** *Quarterly strategic and monthly operational meetings, combined with daily, multidisciplinary staff briefings, provided a sound framework to manage safeguarding.*

- I.17** A multidisciplinary meeting took place on the unit every day attended by staff who worked on the unit. Relevant information was shared about risk and vulnerability of all children on the unit.
- I.18** Monthly operational safeguarding meetings were well attended. Detailed, comparative information on all aspects of safeguarding was collated and discussed which helped to provide a clear picture of trends in areas such as self-harm and use of force. In addition, a detailed monthly analysis was conducted of all complaints submitted by children. Equality and diversity issues were referred to at some of the meetings but the community inclusion manager responsible for this work seldom attended.
- I.19** Governance of safeguarding was overseen by a quarterly safeguarding meeting, chaired by the unit manager, which was held just outside the prison wall to make it easier for community representatives to attend. The meeting focused on strategic matters, using summary data from the monthly meetings. Representatives from two key participants, Bridgend social services and South Wales police, regularly attended. It was intended to try to align the quarterly meeting with other strategic forums to increase the level of attendance from other quarters.

## Child protection

### Expected outcomes:

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

**I.20** *Child protection work was efficient and effective. Child protection refresher training was needed and staff were not sufficiently aware of the whistle-blowing policy.*

- I.21** The induction booklet contained a clear and straightforward account of child protection procedures in the prison, including a list of accessible people whom boys could speak to if they needed help. The information was written in a reassuring way, emphasising the importance of keeping everyone safe.
- I.22** Links between the prison social worker, who was the child protection coordinator, and the local authority children's services had been strengthened further since the previous inspection. Several social workers could be contacted directly and we were told that they responded well to requests for assistance from the unit. The community social workers were consulted frequently about incidents in the unit and often came in to view CCTV footage. They carried out case reviews in more serious cases.
- I.23** Since the previous inspection, the average number of child protection referrals had increased slightly to about two a month, most of which concerned use of force. One recent, more unusual case reflected good attention to due process. A child alleged that he had been mistreated by staff escorting him during a transfer from another establishment. His complaint was taken shortly after he arrived at Parc and he was interviewed promptly by local police and social service staff. At the time of the inspection, the prison social worker was continuing to track the case.

- I.24** All child protection referrals were considered at the internal safeguarding meetings. Police and social services representatives regularly attended the quarterly safeguarding meetings and the prison social worker attended the local safeguarding children board (LSCB) meetings.
- I.25** All unit staff had received basic awareness training in child protection during their induction, but there was a need for refresher training. A whistle-blowing policy was displayed in parts of the prison which encouraged staff to speak out if they saw anything wrong, but we were told that it had never been used. It was not clear if staff were sufficiently aware of this policy and it needed to be given more prominence.
- I.26** The director took a close interest in child protection and signed off the log in each case, when all the work had been completed. She had recently taken robust action to dismiss a member of staff who had used excessive force during a spontaneous incident where force had been used.

## Recommendations

- I.27** **All staff who have direct contact with children should receive refresher training in child protection.**
- I.28** **Steps should be taken to ensure that all staff are aware of and knowledgeable about the whistle-blowing policy.**

## 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.29** *Too many boys did not feel confident enough to report victimisation and many felt victimised by staff.*

- I.30** In our survey, only 22% of boys against 48% at the previous inspection said that staff would take it seriously if they told them that they had been victimised. Care plans were not used to protect boys who reported bullying from further intimidation or victimisation. We found one boy who had isolated himself in his cell and refused to come out. Staff had tried different methods to no avail to encourage him out of his cell and plans were in hand to transfer him to a different young offender institution (YOI). In our survey, 42% of children against 20% at the previous inspection said that they had been victimised by staff. Despite this, there was a comprehensive policy to manage challenging behaviour and a violence reduction strategy. Interventions to challenge bullying and intimidation were good (see section on bullying and violence reduction).

## Recommendations

- I.31** **Children should feel confident to report bullying without fear of further intimidation.**

- I.32 The reasons for the increase in children reporting victimisation by staff should be investigated and the findings acted on.**

## 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.33** *The number of ACCTs<sup>5</sup> was similar to our last inspection. The number of self-harm incidents was higher than at other YOIs. ACCT procedures and support for boys in crisis were very good. Boys requiring constant observation were monitored on CCTV rather than face to face. Monitoring and trend analysis were good.*

- I.34** During the previous six months, children had been supported 47 times through ACCT procedures, a similar number to our last inspection. There had been 31 self-harm incidents involving 18 boys, high figures compared with other YOIs. Many self-harm incidents involved boys losing their temper and punching hard surfaces.
- I.35** The three young people who were on open ACCTs at the time of our inspection felt supported and cared for. Staff were knowledgeable about the boys' individual circumstances.
- I.36** The quality of ACCT documentation was very good. Immediate action plans and initial assessments were conducted promptly. Care maps contained meaningful actions that were followed up and signed off. Multidisciplinary case reviews were constructive and focused on the child. In one case, a boy's mother had attended the review. Most observational entries were detailed and of a very high standard: they recorded genuine interaction with the child and reflected his mood. All boys were reviewed about a week after the closure of the ACCT and asked for feedback on their care.
- I.37** During the previous six months, seven boys whose high risk level had required a constant watch were placed in a cell and monitored by CCTV rather than in person by a member of staff. This limited the opportunity for boys in crisis to interact with staff and increased the time spent locked in a cell with no one to talk to.
- I.38** The comprehensive suicide and self-harm prevention strategy was underpinned by a good safer custody continuous action plan. The safeguarding committee met monthly. Monitoring and trend analysis were very good. Boys could now telephone the Samaritans directly from their cells.

### Recommendation

- I.39 Children in crisis requiring constant observation should be monitored face to face by staff and not by CCTV.**

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

## Behaviour management

### Expected outcomes:

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

**I.40** *The unit had recently experienced significant behaviour management problems. It was more settled at the time of the inspection and the approach to behaviour management was reasonably good.*

**I.41** The unit had experienced significant challenges with behaviour during autumn 2015, with high levels of violence, force and adjudications. Many staff and children told us that this was a difficult period to work and live at Parc. At the time of the inspection, the unit was more stable.

**I.42** In our private interviews, children demonstrated that they understood the rules and could explain the consequences of poor behaviour. The expectations of behaviour were clearly explained to children individually during induction. Unit rules and routines were displayed and children could raise issues individually or through unit meetings.

**I.43** In our survey, children were more negative about some aspects of behaviour management than at the previous inspection. While we found that a comprehensive policy was in place and practice was reasonably good, a review of the approach to behaviour management was needed to implement any lessons from the previous autumn and to ensure that a few boys could not have a similar impact in the future.

### Recommendation

**I.44** **A detailed analysis should be carried out of the management of behaviour during autumn 2015, taking account of the views of staff and children, so that lessons can be learned and deficiencies addressed.**

## 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.45** *Although not quite as effective as previously, the rewards and sanctions scheme continued to work relatively well and remained an effective way of motivating boys to behave well.*

**I.46** The rewards and sanctions scheme had become a well established part of the unit regime. It was clearly described in the induction booklet and staff and boys were familiar with how it worked.

**I.47** The scheme comprised four levels and all boys started on the third level, silver, unless they were transferred in on a higher level. At the time the inspection took place, no boys were

on platinum, the highest level of the scheme. There was enough distinction between levels to motivate boys to move up and the gold level gave them access to a well equipped recreation room in the evening. Conditions on the lowest level, bronze, were restrictive but not punitive. Boys retained some time unlocked for association, while their pay and ability to spend were limited. We were pleased to see that access to family days was no longer restricted to boys on the two higher levels of the scheme.

- I.48** The number of boys on the two higher levels of the scheme had reduced from about half to about a third since the previous inspection. In our survey, 44% of boys believed they were treated fairly within the scheme compared to 78% at the previous inspection. There was an appeal process and just before the inspection one boy had been successful in retaining his silver status.

## 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.49** *Security was well managed and proportionate. Intelligence was swiftly acted on and security measures did not unduly restrict access to the regime. Use of the adjudication system had more than doubled since the previous inspection. Records indicated that adjudications continued to be conducted well and punishments were fair and consistent. The minor report system was appropriately used for less serious infringements.*

- I.50** Security was well managed and proportionate to the risks posed. Security measures did not prevent children from accessing a full regime. Routine strip-searching did not take place, although we found an example of strip-searching under restraint, which was inappropriate.
- I.51** The security team were responsible for the adult site and children's unit. Dynamic security remained strong; the small size of the unit and stability within the staff group resulted in a good flow of intelligence. The number of intelligence reports (IRs) on the children's unit had doubled since the previous inspection to about 80 a month. Assaults and threats remained the main themes with little intelligence on drugs. IRs continued to be swiftly analysed and actions were carried out in a timely manner.
- I.52** Security meetings were well attended, although the report presented contained little information about trends in the children's unit and focused predominantly on the adult prison.
- I.53** The approach to supply reduction was appropriate. In our survey, 37% of children said that it was easy to get illegal drugs at Parc against the comparator of 19%. We found no evidence to support this; there had been no positive mandatory drug tests during the previous six months and children we interviewed said that drugs and new psychoactive substances (NPS)<sup>6</sup> were rare on the unit. Tobacco was more readily available, much of it coming in through the

<sup>6</sup> New drugs that are developed or chosen to mimic the effects of illegal drugs such as cannabis, heroin or amphetamines and may have unpredictable and life-threatening effects.

adult prison, although it was still a low-level concern. Reducing opportunities for children to use adult areas of the site had been an appropriate response.

- I.54** The number of adjudications had more than doubled to an average of 77 a month during the previous six months, reflecting the higher levels of violence over this period. An average of 13 minor reports a month had been used for minor infringements of the rules.
- I.55** The adjudications and minor reports that we reviewed demonstrated that the system was fair and hearings were well managed. Boys were informed of their adjudication or minor report in good time before their hearing and staff checked that they understood it. They were offered the help of an advocate for their adjudication but this was rarely taken up. Records of hearings that we examined were generally good; punishments were consistent and boys were able to put across their version of events. Following a guilty verdict and the imposition of a loss of privileges, boys were given a further opportunity to demonstrate good behaviour which could lead to some of their punishment being revoked.
- I.56** Monthly statistics on the number and nature of adjudications and minor reports were presented to the safeguarding committee. The deputy director carried out quality assurance checks on records and fed back learning points to individual managers.

## 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.57** *Almost a quarter of boys said that they had been hit, kicked or assaulted. The number of recorded assaults was high. Good violence monitoring enabled staff to identify the reasons for these high numbers. Bullying and violence reduction procedures were very good. Mediation successfully resolved many disputes.*

- I.58** In our survey, 24% of boys said that they had been hit, kicked or assaulted by another boy at Parc, 11% said that they currently felt unsafe and 28% said that they had felt unsafe in the past. During the previous six months, there had been 79 assaults on boys, more than at other YOIs. Some incidents were serious, including a boy with a broken jaw following an unprovoked assault. The perpetrator was arrested by the police.
- I.59** Good trend monitoring had been used to analyse these high numbers. Staff had identified the destabilising effect on the unit of two particularly difficult boys during October and November 2015. These boys had split the YOI into two opposing groups of boys. Much of the other violence was triggered by name calling, insults, debt and gambling.
- I.60** Procedures to manage violence and bullying were very good. All antisocial behaviour and bullying incidents were reported on violence reduction reporting forms. Investigations were prompt, detailed and constructive. Perpetrators were robustly challenged and moved on to 'separation/monitoring of young people' forms if necessary. This formal monitoring involved very good support plans and case reviews. The quality of observational entries was very good and demonstrated constructive challenge. During the previous six months, five boys had been formally monitored, more than at the previous inspection. Mediation was regularly offered to resolve disputes between boys and was often successful. Boys made purchases via touch-screen machines which gave staff more opportunity to monitor bullying and debt.



## 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.61** *The use of force had tripled since the previous inspection and was higher than comparable establishments. Eighty per cent of incidents did not involve control and restraint and we saw examples of successful de-escalation. A minority of footage that we viewed showed poor de-escalation by staff. It was inappropriate for staff from the adult prison to respond to incidents on the children's units. Oversight of use of force was reasonably good.*

**I.62** Force had been used on 202 occasions during the previous six months compared to 67 before the previous inspection. Nearly half these incidents had occurred in October 2015 and there was some evidence that the number of incidents was returning to previous levels. There had been delays in rolling out a new restraint system and Parc continued to use the control and restraint (C and R) system, which included pain compliant locks. We also found an example of strip-searching under restraint, which was inappropriate.

**I.63** About 80% of incidents were low level and did not require C and R to be applied. Nearly all incidents were spontaneous and force was predominantly used in response to violent incidents. The documentation and footage that we reviewed for spontaneous and planned interventions were generally of good quality and showed good examples of de-escalation. Staff from the adult prison were still used to respond to all incidents on the children's unit. Many of them did not know the children which inhibited their ability to de-escalate incidents. We saw one example of poor de-escalation in the footage that we reviewed.

**I.64** Oversight of use of force was good. A senior manager, usually the head of young people, reviewed CCTV coverage of most spontaneous incidents. Children were debriefed immediately after the incident by an operational manager and a day later by a unit senior manager who had reviewed the documentation. The unit had identified an example of unacceptable practice and taken appropriate action (see section on child protection). However, in interviews some boys told us they had been hurt during restraint in areas not covered by CCTV, including cells. Body-worn cameras had recently been introduced for managers but there were not enough to obtain footage, including audio, of every incident.

**I.65** Complaints about use of force were appropriately referred for external oversight. A comprehensive report on use of force was collated and presented to the monthly safeguarding meetings.

**I.66** There was no unfurnished accommodation on the children's unit. Staff sometimes turned off amenities, including water. While this seemed appropriate in the cases that we looked at, it had not been recorded as use of special accommodation.

### Recommendations

**I.67** **Strip-searching under restraint and pain-inducing techniques should not be used on children.**

- I.68 All incidents where force is used should be recorded, including by audio, and, once appropriate safeguards and procedures have been put in place, body-worn cameras should be used to achieve this.**
- I.69 Staff from the adult prison should not be routinely used to respond to incidents in the children's unit.**

## 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.70** *Use of segregation for children remained commendably low. Single separation for short periods on normal location was used more frequently. Boys on separation were reviewed regularly and given support to help them reintegrate. All separated children had access to a full activity regime, exercise and a daily shower. The number of boys self isolating for their own protection was low.*

- I.71** There continued to be no segregation unit for children and the unit functioned well without one. The intensive support cells in the adult safer custody unit were no longer used and there were plans to create two 'time out' cells on E wing. At the time of the inspection, managers used two cells on T wing for exceptionally disruptive children. Segregation had been used on 14 occasions during the previous six months and on most occasions boys returned to the units after one day.
- I.72** In the overwhelming majority of cases boys were managed through single separation on normal location. Use of single separation had increased to about 30 instances a month. In most cases separation stemmed from an adjudication or minor report resulting in loss of association. Boys on separation were reviewed regularly, could attend education and had access to exercise and a shower every day.
- I.73** Individual care plans continued to be used for separated children. While targets in these plans were generic, they demonstrated the involvement of a wide range of professionals who responded to individual circumstances and supported children to improve their behaviour.
- I.74** The number of boys isolating for their own protection was low. Only one boy was self isolating at the time of the inspection and we saw examples of staff successfully reintegrating boys into education.

## 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.75** *There was good early identification of clinical needs and clinical provision was reasonable. Psychosocial support services for children were good and supported by effective integrated working between young people's substance misuse service (YPSMS) workers and the wider unit team, including health care.*

- I.76** All children were screened on arrival for drug and alcohol use and this was followed by a CHAT (comprehensive health assessment tool) substance misuse assessment. The unit nurse had been trained to Royal College of General Practitioners level 1 and was supported by the wider prison clinical substance misuse team. There had been no use of clinical services during the last year and there were no boys on opiate substitution at the time of our inspection.
- I.77** There was reasonable identification of immediate drug and alcohol needs. Suitable policies provided detoxification and ongoing clinical support with input from the GP and the main clinical substance misuse team. It was rare for boys to arrive with symptoms of alcohol or drug withdrawal and no boys had required detoxification during the previous year. There was provision to locate boys in a separate unit (T6) in the main prison with arrangements for suitable monitoring by health care staff.
- I.78** All boys were seen by the YPSMS workers during their induction and each received an individual assessment of their drug and alcohol needs with regular follow-up contact.
- I.79** The two workers also carried small generic caseloads of boys on the unit. They were an integral part of the multidisciplinary unit team and attended all key multidisciplinary unit meetings.
- I.80** Mandatory drug testing was appropriate and unpredictable and always carried out separately from the adult population. Suspicion tests were carried out promptly and risk tests had only been conducted in relation to closed visits. There had been four positive tests (three suspicion) during the last year, all but one for cannabis. There was no evidence of NPS use on the unit.
- I.81** About 90% of psychosocial work comprised individual interventions, with a small amount of group work. A suitable range of interventions covered awareness raising, coping strategies and harm reduction, focusing on all drug and alcohol misuse but with specific attention to the drugs of choice for this population in the community, tobacco, cannabis, alcohol and NPS.
- I.82** Psychosocial records on paper were clear and well organised and reflected key issues well. There was scope for further detail on individual drug and alcohol use to enhance continuity of care.
- I.83** The workers had good access to specialist drug and alcohol training through local community agencies.

## Recommendation

- I.84** **The location of boys with immediate alcohol and drug withdrawal needs should ensure their safe monitoring and support.**



## Section 2. Respect

### Residential units

#### Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.1** *The units were well maintained, although cell ventilation and toilet screening remained unsatisfactory. Shower screening was being improved and access to showers was good. The introduction of in-cell telephones and automated machines for boys to order food and canteen purchases, book visits and make some applications were positive initiatives.*
- 2.2** Boys were located on two wings, E and G, each of which had single and double cells. Between them they contained five cells with CCTV which could be used for regular observation of boys when needed.
- 2.3** Communal areas were kept clean and well maintained, although E wing often smelt unpleasant. Managers had plans to address this, including changing the flooring. Cells were clean but windows were badly scratched and were very dirty between the sealed glazing units. Many had been stuffed with paper by their occupants which cut out light and further hampered the often poor ventilation. There was very little graffiti and any that was found was quickly removed.
- 2.4** Cells were reasonably well equipped, although not all cells had chairs. Cells that we were shown ready for new arrivals had stained pillows and grubby mattresses. Shared cells were cramped with space for only one chair and the in-cell toilets were not adequately screened. Nevertheless, shared cells were popular with some boys. Boys still did not have access to lockable cupboards.
- 2.5** The introduction of in-cell telephones was a positive step and there was information in cells about free numbers. The wings each had communal telephones equipped with privacy hoods for boys who wanted to use a telephone while out of their cells. Boys could send two free letters each week.
- 2.6** In our survey, 57% of boys said their cell call bell was responded to quickly against the comparator of 27%. There was no central monitoring of cell bell response times. We observed speedy responses to bells and to boys calling to staff from their cells.
- 2.7** Both wings had dining areas with tables and seats for all the boys. New tables and seats had been provided on E wing since the last inspection.
- 2.8** In our survey, just under three-quarters of boys said they usually went outside every day. Boys on G wing said they went out less often as their exercise area did not have any protection from rain and their chance to go outside was sometimes cancelled because of the weather. Lightweight rain jackets were available. The steel grid above the exercise yard on G wing remained in place.
- 2.9** In our survey, 97% of boys said they were able to shower daily. The screening of showers on E wing had improved since the previous inspection and there were advanced plans to do the

same on G wing following consultation with boys about the balance between decency and their feelings of safety while using the showers.

- 2.10** Boys could submit applications using automated CMS machines (central management system) for some processes, including booking visits and ordering food and canteen purchases. Other applications, for example access to their property, were made on paper and tracking of these was not adequate.
- 2.11** All boys could wear their own clothes and had daily access to laundry facilities. Stocks of new underwear and socks and prison-issue clothing were available to boys who needed it. Bedding was exchanged weekly and laundered off wing.

## Recommendations

- 2.12** **Cells should have effective ventilation.** (Repeated recommendation 2.13)
- 2.13** **Toilets should be fully screened.** (Repeated recommendation 2.16)
- 2.14** **Children should have access to a lockable cupboard.** (Repeated recommendation 2.17)

## Relationships between staff and children and young people

### Expected outcomes:

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

**2.15** *Relationships between staff and children were more variable than at the last inspection. Most of the interaction that we observed was positive, but some relationships were more distant.*

- 2.16** Children's perceptions of staff had deteriorated since the previous inspection. In our survey, only 55% of children said that most staff treated them with respect and over a third said they would have no one to turn to if they had a problem. Forty-two per cent of children reported victimisation by staff compared with 20% at the previous inspection, and 18% said they had been victimised after making a complaint. In our interviews, children were more positive but many were concerned about staff favouritism. We found that, while relationships had deteriorated, they remained reasonably good. Most interaction that we observed was positive, although some relationships were more distant.
- 2.17** Photo boards on both units enabled children to identify staff. Not all staff wore name badges. We saw examples of staff challenging poor behaviour appropriately in education and on the residential units.
- 2.18** Consultation arrangements were unchanged and monthly forums enabled boys to raise concerns. The key worker scheme worked reasonably well but key worker input to training and remand plan reviews needed improvement.

## Recommendation

- 2.19** Managers should investigate and address children's negative perceptions of staff.

## 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.

- 2.20** *Strategic management of equality work was not effective. In contrast to the adult prison, there was far less engagement with community groups to promote diversity. There was some good one-to-one support for children on diversity issues and education classes promoted diversity well.*

## Strategic management

- 2.21** Strategic management of equality and diversity was weak. The brief equality and diversity policy was specific to children, but it did not reflect current practice.
- 2.22** Work was led by the unit manager and the community inclusion manager for children. Operational governance of equality work for the whole prison was undertaken at the community inclusion action team meeting. However, neither the unit manager nor the equality lead had attended the last six meetings and there was no evidence that the unit had been discussed. The equality report presented to the community inclusion action team contained no dedicated data on the unit.
- 2.23** There was no dedicated children's action plan. Planning for both the adult site and the unit was supposed to be covered by a single plan, but this contained no specific actions for the unit and had not been used since June 2015. No dedicated equality impact assessments had been conducted for the unit during 2015.
- 2.24** The equality manager was unaware of data from the equality monitoring tool for the unit and the main site which showed disproportionate treatment of 15- to 18-year olds in the adjudication process and incentives and earned privileges scheme. Limited data were presented to the unit safeguarding meeting on the ethnic background of children and on the use of separation, use of force and self-harm by ethnicity. There were no monitoring data for other protected characteristics.
- 2.25** During the previous six months, 28 discrimination incident report forms (DIRFs) had been submitted, most concerning children's use of racist language. Investigations were carried out and appropriate action taken when discrimination was found to have taken place, including good one-to-one interventions. DIRFs were quality assured by the director and a community agency checked a sample of completed DIRFs bi-annually.
- 2.26** There were no longer any children's equality representatives. During the previous six months, two community inclusion children's focus groups had been held but there had been

little discussion of equality issues. A third meeting in autumn 2015 had been cancelled because of the levels of violence (see section on bullying and violence reduction) and eight children had been spoken to individually. Few substantive actions were recorded in the brief note of these discussions.

- 2.27** There was far less engagement with community groups than on the adult site. Classes in the education department, often linked with diversity events such as Holocaust memorial day, promoted diversity very well and were impressive (see section on management of education, learning and skills).

## Recommendations

- 2.28** **A regular equality management meeting should take place to ensure that policy, planning and consultation are effective, prisoners' perceptions and needs are addressed, and comprehensive monitoring data are considered.**
- 2.29** **Engagement by the children's unit with community diversity groups should be improved to the level achieved by the adult prison.**

## Diverse needs

- 2.30** There were six black and minority ethnic children at the time of the inspection. They told us that there was little racism and they did not feel they were treated differently by staff on account of their race. However, evidence from DIRFs suggested some continuing, low-level issues. There was no dedicated forum for black and minority ethnic children to discuss their experience with staff. The unit was not aware of any Gypsy, Romany or Traveller children.
- 2.31** There was one practising Muslim prisoner and, although still not ideal, arrangements for worship had improved since the last inspection (see section on faith and religious activity).
- 2.32** The unit accommodated few foreign national boys. A member of staff from the adult site was responsible for foreign national children who had access to Home Office surgeries on the adult site.
- 2.33** Two Vietnamese children had recently been held on remand for offences concerning the cultivation of cannabis. We were told that the children's community youth offending team worker had made referrals under the national referral mechanism (NRM) as they were possible victims of trafficking. It was a matter of considerable concern that these children had been prosecuted and held on remand in the meantime. There was poor awareness among custody staff of the NRM and trafficking indicators.
- 2.34** Appropriate use had been made of telephone and face-to-face interpreters when needed. There was some material in the unit for Vietnamese speaking children, but little in other languages. Foreign national children could have a free 10-minute international telephone call each month if they had not received any family visits. The unit was piloting the use of Skype which, although not yet used for this purpose, was a good resource for the support of foreign national children.
- 2.35** There was good identification of children with disabilities. Supported living plans, which had been prepared by health care staff to assist custodial staff to understand and meet need, appeared to have lapsed. We were assured that staff were aware of most needs through daily multidisciplinary briefings and other contact with health care staff.



- 2.36** There were no adapted facilities for children with physical disabilities, but there were no children who required them at the time of the inspection.
- 2.37** At the time of the inspection, no children on the unit had identified themselves as gay. Staff told us that homophobic attitudes were the most difficult diversity issue that they faced and the unit would benefit from the range of activities organised in the adult prison to challenge such attitudes.
- 2.38** There was a policy for the management of transgender children. The unit had not so far held a transgender child.

## Recommendation

- 2.39 All staff should be trained in the identification of trafficking victims and the national referral mechanism.**

## 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.**

- 2.40** *Chaplaincy services were well organised and the team was an active and very visible presence in the unit.*

- 2.41** In our survey, only 43% of boys said their religious beliefs were respected.
- 2.42** Multi-denominational Christian worship and study groups were held weekly. Information on the unit described faith activities and encouraged children to request a visit from a chaplain of a particular faith.
- 2.43** There was one practising Muslim prisoner at the time of the inspection, who attended Friday prayers on the adult site. Prayers with adult prisoners took place in the multi-faith room which were relayed to the boy over an intercom to the chapel. This arrangement was not ideal, but an improvement on the previous inspection when a boy had attended prayers in the multi-faith room with adult prisoners.
- 2.44** Despite the best efforts of the chaplaincy, there were no chaplains for some faith groups, including Buddhists and Hindus. At the time of the inspection, there were no children from these faith groups.
- 2.45** In our survey, only 29% of boys said they had access to a chaplain or religious leader when they first arrived in the unit compared with 54% at the previous inspection and 56% on the adult site. Well-maintained chaplaincy records showed that all children were seen within 24 hours of arrival, although not always on the same day if boys arrived in the evening.
- 2.46** The chaplaincy had a high profile on the unit and made a point of talking to all children each day. Two-thirds of children in our survey said they had access in private to a religious leader of their faith if they wished.

- 2.47** The chaplaincy provided excellent pastoral care and played a significant part in facilitating and supporting boys moving to the main site when they reached 18 years of age.

## 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.**

**2.48** *Children in our survey said it was easy to make a complaint. Responses were timely and age appropriate. There was good investigation and oversight, with attention to potential safeguarding risks.*

- 2.49** Boys could make a complaint through the main prison system and staff often helped them to write their complaints. There was good access to complaint forms on the wings, including confidential complaints. Complaint boxes were visible and operational managers emptied the boxes. Staff tried to mediate and resolve complaints informally where possible.
- 2.50** There had been 88 complaints in the previous year, comparable to other juvenile establishments. There were 31 complaints about staff attitudes or behaviour, only one of which was upheld.
- 2.51** Responses were completed by operational managers. They provided a suitable explanation and were proportionate, polite and age appropriate. We noted several responses that included evidence of further investigation, including review of CCTV footage, to confirm or refute the complaint. Boys signed to confirm that they had received the response.
- 2.52** Appeal forms against complaint decisions were available alongside complaint forms. There had been no appeals during the previous year.
- 2.53** The unit manager reviewed all complaints and responses and complaints were also reviewed through unit performance reports. Anonymised details, including the outcome of all complaints, were included in reports to the monthly unit safeguarding meeting and minuted.

### Good practice

- 2.54** *The inclusion of all complaint summaries and outcomes in the monthly safeguarding meeting minutes supported a transparent and safe environment for children.*

## Legal rights

### Expected outcomes:

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

**2.55** *Children were aware of their legal rights and had appropriate access to their legal advisers. There was a good service for boys on remand and legal assistance was given to those who made bail applications.*

**2.56** Children had their legal rights explained to them during induction. Caseworkers facilitated access to legal advisers with free telephone calls, and there were private facilities for legal visits. However, we were concerned that some foreign national children might not have access to publicly funded legal representation for their immigration cases (see section on diverse needs).

**2.57** We spoke to staff and Barnardo's advocates who were not clear on children's entitlement to support from public funds for legal representation in their immigration cases. However, we were satisfied that advocates would seek appropriate advice if a child was refused legal aid, for example, from Coram Children's Legal Centre.

**2.58** Appropriate adults were used when police interviews took place. Arrangements for early and late release of boys on a detention and training order were explained by caseworkers at the start of the sentence.

**2.59** Boys on remand were well supported by a caseworker in applying for bail. We were told that securing appropriate accommodation was often the most difficult aspect of making a bail application. Staff described a good working relationship with Barnardo's who assisted with accommodation issues and the Howard League for Penal Reform which took referrals of difficult cases. Remand children had the same access to regime activities as sentenced children, and they had full remand management plans with regular reviews. Sentenced children were given the opportunity to appeal and boys who had been recalled to custody had access to suitable legal advice.

## 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.**

**2.60** *Boys had good access to primary care services, including a dedicated unit nurse and protected GP sessions. Some comprehensive health assessments had been delayed. The clinical rooms on both wings were unsuitable for clinical use. Access to the dentist was good. Care for the small number of boys with long-term conditions was reasonable. Individual health promotion was good with scope for wider targeted health promotion. Some boys had experienced delays in receiving their medicines. Mental health provision was good but there remained a disappointing lack of speech and language therapy to support communication difficulties. Discharge arrangements were effective.*

## Governance arrangements

**2.61** The Youth Justice Board (YJB) commissioned G4S to deliver health services for children as part of the main prison health provision. Cwm Taff Health Board provided forensic adolescent and children's treatment services (FACTS). A quarterly partnership board

meeting had appropriate representation from the YJB, the health provider and the prison. Regular, well attended, integrated governance meetings for health services addressed all essential areas.

- 2.62** A targeted health needs assessment for children and young people had been published in March 2014.
- 2.63** A designated unit nurse with mental health training was based on the unit with support from the wider nursing team for specific activities, emergency response and out-of-hours cover. Overall the model provided good continuity and support to boys and an active health care contribution to individual reviews and multidisciplinary unit meetings. However, nursing capacity was inadequate to fulfil all clinical activities consistently alongside unit meeting requirements, and we noted some delays in completing comprehensive health assessments (CHAT). There was an opportunity for a more strategic and preventative approach to improving children's health and life chances, but this was not yet being taken.
- 2.64** Health care staff were easily identifiable and we observed courtesy and care from health professionals towards boys.
- 2.65** Clinical records were clear and detailed and used by all health professionals. There was secure access to electronic records but some identifiable patient paper records were not stored in locked cabinets in a clinical room.
- 2.66** Care plans were used to support specific health needs for the very small number of boys with long-term conditions, although we noted that when one boy was discharged from hospital a care plan had not been used and would have been helpful (see section on delivery of care – physical health).
- 2.67** Boys could make confidential health complaints using sealed envelopes. Learning from adverse incidents, audits and complaints informed service improvement. There was no forum for boys to express their views about health services.
- 2.68** Consent to share medical information was sought routinely and staff ensured that under 16-year olds were competent to consent.
- 2.69** Health staff had good awareness of their safeguarding responsibilities and we noted a referral made by health staff during our inspection. Nursing staff were visible and attentive during use of restraint and we observed some good attempts by the nurse to support de-escalation with a boy.
- 2.70** Emergency response arrangements were part of the wider health response for the prison; regular equipment checks were strengthened during our inspection. All operational staff were first aid trained and most were trained to use the automated defibrillator.
- 2.71** The two wing health care rooms were not compliant with infection control requirements and were unsuitable for clinical activities; neither room provided suitable opportunity for confidential consultation. Alternative plans were being developed.
- 2.72** Health promotion was largely individual and conducted during health consultations. The unit nurse had good links with gym staff. Immunisation for blood-borne viruses and childhood diseases was well promoted and previous immunisation records were requested from community GPs. Seventeen boys had received measles, mumps and rubella vaccine in the last year.
- 2.73** Boys were able to request condoms.

## Recommendations

- 2.74** All clinical areas should be safe and fully compliant with infection control guidelines. (Repeated recommendation 2.64)
- 2.75** There should be sufficient nursing capacity to ensure that all clinical activities such as CHAT assessments can be completed in a timely way.

## Housekeeping points

- 2.76** All patient identifiable records should be stored in a locked cabinet.
- 2.77** Care plans should be used to ensure continuity of care for boys with specific needs, including discharge from hospital.

## Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.78** In our survey, 74% of boys said they had good access to the doctor, 85% to the nurse and 63% to the dentist against respective comparators of 48%, 62% and 26%. We found that boys had good access to a dedicated unit nurse and there were daily protected appointments with the GP. There was some loss of clinical time when boys sometimes refused to attend appointments despite encouragement from the unit nurse, in preference for other activities.
- 2.79** All boys were assessed by a nurse for immediate needs shortly after arrival and referred appropriately to the GP and other services as needed. Previous GP records were requested promptly. We observed one boy whose initial health screening and risk assessment on arrival were completed by a nurse with care and sensitivity; he had arrived late in the evening and waited about 40 minutes to be seen by the nurse because she had been diverted to other operational issues in the main prison (see recommendation 2.75).
- 2.80** During the first few days after arrival, a series of comprehensive health assessments were completed for physical and mental health, substance misuse and neurodisability/brain injury. Some assessments had been delayed at the time of our inspection. This was partly mitigated by daily access to the unit nurse and a high level of detailed and shared knowledge among unit staff which helped to ensure that health and wider needs did not go unnoticed.
- 2.81** In our survey, fewer boys said that health services were good (50%) than at our last inspection (80%). We found a generally good quality and responsive service where boys knew the unit nurse and the nurse attended and contributed to key meetings and a large proportion of individual review meetings.
- 2.82** The small number of boys with long-term conditions were cared for by the GP and could access the relevant lead nurse in the wider health team. There was good access to other primary health services, including optician, physiotherapist, podiatrist and sexual health services.
- 2.83** The main GP service provided out-of-hours cover and GPs came into the prison if required.
- 2.84** Both emergency hospital visits and planned appointments for boys were appropriately prioritised.

## Pharmacy

- 2.85** Medicines management was reasonable. Prescribing and most administration was carried out electronically on SystemOne (electronic clinical information system). There was no access to SystemOne on E wing and the nurse used printed prescriptions to check against the pre-packed Venalink dosage packs. Morning doses were given at approximately 8am and evening doses at 6pm; boys on more frequent doses were given them as required.
- 2.86** No medicines were stored on the unit and paracetamol and ibuprofen were transported to the units without a locked container.
- 2.87** Prescribing was age appropriate with suitably low levels. Specialist prescribing for mental health problems and ADHD (attention deficit hyperactivity disorder) was initiated by the CAMHS (child and adolescent mental health services) psychiatrist with close working between mental health practitioners and GPs to ensure continuity and consistency. All children were asked to sign a compact on arrival; a very limited range of medicines, mostly topical creams, were available for boys to have in possession.
- 2.88** Morning medicines were administered by the unit nurse and the prison nursing team covered at other times. The nurse sometimes had to follow boys to their education sessions to ensure they received their medication. Records showed variations of up to two hours in the timing of evening medications. One boy had missed two evening doses of an antibiotic with no clear reason recorded. Boys on controlled drugs were taken to the main health care unit to receive them.
- 2.89** Boys who were regular smokers before they arrived could receive nicotine lozenges on prescription, but these were unpopular. There was now a patient group direction<sup>7</sup> (PGD) for smoking replacement therapy that included nicotine patches, but it had not yet been used.

## Recommendation

- 2.90** **Young people should receive their medicines in a timely way to ensure clinical effectiveness.**

## Housekeeping point

- 2.91** Stock medicines such as paracetamol and ibuprofen should be transported in a locked container.

## Dentistry

- 2.92** Young people had very good access to protected dental appointments with suitable focus on oral and dental health.
- 2.93** At the time of our inspection, boys could see a dentist within a week for a routine appointment and were prioritised more quickly for urgent needs.

---

<sup>7</sup> authorise appropriate health care professionals to supply and administer prescription-only medicine

## Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.94** The unit nurse was a registered mental health nurse which enabled early identification and continuity of care for boys with emotional and mental health needs. Mental health CHATs were completed promptly.
- 2.95** The FACTS service provided a responsive and effective in-reach service. A senior CAMHS nurse visited weekly and there were regular visits by a CAMHS psychiatrist: both practitioners were responsive to urgent need. During our inspection, one boy with potential mental health needs was seen within 24 hours of the request. The FACTS service had seen 87 boys during the previous year.
- 2.96** Many boys had low levels of education and presented with clear difficulties in expressing their anxieties and problems; this was often characterised by angry outbursts or self isolation. The lack of speech and language therapy to support boys with poor communication and language skills remained a disappointing gap in an otherwise good service.
- 2.97** There was no operational pathway or policy that described the referral pathway and criteria to the FACTS service, to ensure a consistent, flexible approach to children.
- 2.98** There had been one assessment and no transfers under the Mental Health Act during the last year; the boy was deemed not to require hospital admission following an assessment.

## Recommendations

- 2.99 Children should have timely access to speech and language therapy as clinically indicated.** (Repeated recommendation 2.93)
- 2.100 Local policies for the provision of mental health services should be agreed.** (Repeated recommendation 2.94)

## 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.**

**2.101** *Many children continued to be unhappy with the food. However, the dishes that we sampled were of reasonable quality and the range was adequate to meet the varying needs of the children.*

- 2.102** Portion sizes were adequate, particularly when second helpings were available. However, many children we spoke to said they would like bigger portions and only 18% in our survey said that the food was good.
- 2.103** Lunches consisted of a choice of baguette, wrap or soup. The evening meal offered five main meal choices, including vegan and halal options, and a range of fruit and vegetables was available.

- 2.104** The evening meal continued to be served early but was now supplemented by an evening snack for each child. All meals were eaten communally in a calm atmosphere, providing a positive opportunity for socialising.
- 2.105** Once a week the children attending the catering pathway prepared a hot lunch for both units and this was much enjoyed by the other children. On these days the baguette was served in the evening.
- 2.106** Breakfast packs containing cereal were distributed in the morning and, although accompanied by two slices of toast prepared on the unit, were insubstantial. This was particularly so when the previous evening meal had consisted of a baguette.
- 2.107** The new CMS terminals provided a much improved system for children to look at menus and choose their food. Icons added to the list of dishes helped the children to identify easily the main contents, food allergens, healthy eating options and compliance with religious requirements.
- 2.108** Food continued to arrive on the unit about half an hour before it was served but it was kept warm enough during that time.
- 2.109** All storage facilities were adequate and hygienic and the kitchen was well organised with Halal, vegan and Kosher food stored separately.
- 2.110** All those working in the kitchen and on the servery wore appropriate clothing.
- 2.111** Managers checked the food comments book held on each unit. Most entries complained about the size of portions.

## Purchases

### Expected outcomes:

**Children and young people can purchase a suitable range of goods at reasonable prices to meet their diverse needs, and can do so safely.**

**2.112** *A reasonably wide range of products were available for children to buy at a comparable cost.*

- 2.113** The full list of products and catalogues available to children were held on the CMS electronic machines. This enabled them to scan all items with ease and to order and track products. They could also access full information about their earnings, what they had spent and what they still had available. Costs of products were comparable to high street stores.
- 2.114** Deliveries were received on the unit each Thursday and orders had to be placed by the previous Sunday.
- 2.115** Children arriving at Parc were given an induction pack and were able to access the electronic system soon after arrival to make purchases and order their choice of meals from the menu.
- 2.116** Community forum meetings were held regularly at which children were able to ask for additional items to be put on the canteen list.



## Section 3. Purposeful activity

### Time out of cell

#### Expected outcomes:

**Children and young people spend most of their time out of their cell, engaged in activities such as education, leisure and cultural pursuits, seven days a week.<sup>8</sup>**

**3.1** *Boys had good amounts of time unlocked each day apart from the very few who did not want to leave their cells. Access to outdoor areas remained somewhat limited.*

**3.2** Boys could spend good amounts of time out of their cells each day. Those on the highest level of the rewards and sanctions scheme could have 11 hours unlocked during the week while those on the lowest level could have nearly eight hours unlocked at weekends. Some weekday evening association was available to all boys (unless removed as an adjudication punishment). Boys placed on separation on the unit had access to a full activities regime. There was little evidence of late unlocking or other regime slippage.

**3.3** Sometimes a few boys refused to leave their cells and participate in the regime, mostly because they had concerns about their safety when mixing with other boys. During our roll checks we found three such boys. Time out of cell for them was too low at an hour or so each day. Staff made good efforts to resolve issues and concerns for these boys and there was evidence that they had successfully helped boys to re-engage gradually with the regime. During the inspection one of the three boys who would not leave his cell began to attend education each day, and another was released having completed his sentence.

**3.4** Most boys were positive about their access to daily association. The range of activities included gym sessions, table tennis, board games and some play station games. Boys on the highest level of the rewards and sanctions scheme could use an additional association room with some extra activities. Several periods outside were built into the core day. These happened regularly during the inspection but boys were restricted to two small exercise areas. This enabled boys to have fresh air, but they stood and chatted in groups despite the availability of exercise equipment.

#### Recommendation

**3.5** **Children should have better access to outdoor facilities.** (Repeated recommendation 3.5)

### Education, learning and skills

#### Expected outcomes:

**All children and young people engage well in education, learning and skills that enable them to gain confidence and experience success. Expectations of children and young people are high. Children and young people are encouraged and enabled to make progress in their learning and their personal and social development to increase their**

<sup>8</sup> Time out of cell, in addition to formal 'purposeful activity', includes any time children and young people are out of their cells to associate or use communal facilities to take showers or make telephone calls.

**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.**

**3.6** *The strategic management of education, learning and skills was adequate. Managers collated data well and used the information to compare their results to other local providers. The core curriculum was broad and balanced. The vocational curriculum was adequate but boys had fewer options than we had found previously. Teaching staff had a very effective professional relationship with the boys and behaviour was very good. Boys engaged well with their learning. Levels of attainment were good and most boys made progress in lessons. Progress in literacy, numeracy and information and communication technology was only adequate. There were limited opportunities for work experience. Boys made good use of the library.*

**3.7** *Estyn<sup>9</sup> made the following assessments about the learning and skills and work provision:*

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

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

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

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

## Management of education and learning and skills

**3.8** The management team of the unit education department had changed since the previous inspection, and many of the post-holders were new to the role or were covering staff absence. The team had secure plans in place for improvements to enhance the work of the department. It was too early to see the outcomes of these initiatives.

**3.9** Systems to collect and analyse data were well established and were used effectively by senior managers to evaluate the work of the department. Managers had developed useful data benchmarks by using learner outcome data from three local further education colleges. This provided them with a relevant measurable comparison to assess their own performance.

**3.10** Managers used the data analysis well in self-assessment. The self-assessment report was an informative document that drew on first-hand evidence and clearly identified areas for development.

**3.11** The quality assurance of the children's qualification work was robust and internal verification processes were reliable. However, leaders and managers did not routinely quality check teachers' records of the progress made by the boys or evaluate the consistency of marking and assessment of their work.

<sup>9</sup> Inspection of the provision of education and educational standards, as well as vocational training in YOIs for young people, is undertaken by Estyn, the office of Her Majesty's Inspectorate for Education and Training in Wales, working under the general direction of HM Inspectorate of Prisons. Estyn is independent of, but funded by, the National Assembly for Wales. The purpose of Estyn is to inspect quality and standards in education and training in Wales.

- 3.12** A wide range of partnerships enhanced advice and guidance to the children. Teachers used their partnerships with clubs such as Cardiff City Football Club and Saracens rugby club to provide added motivation.
- 3.13** Staff routinely attended morning meetings to discuss issues that had occurred overnight and to plan for the boys that day. However, regular formal staff meetings to focus on the outcomes and achievements of the boys were underdeveloped. This inhibited opportunities to concentrate on improving the quality of teaching and learning.
- 3.14** Staff promoted equality and diversity well through a very informative citizenship programme that included appropriate personal and social education.
- 3.15** In general, boys felt safe in education.

## Recommendation

- 3.16** **There should be effective oversight and quality assurance of the education provision.**

## Provision of activities

- 3.17** Children were allocated to classes promptly after their induction. Their needs were identified well through detailed individual education plans (IEPs) which reflected their previous learning and future aspirations.
- 3.18** Boys had a choice of learning pathways that included vocational and academic subjects. Most were able to attend the pathway of their choice. However, the planning of pathway programmes did not meet their needs effectively. There was inequality in the number of lessons between the pathways, an overlap with core subjects and a few examples of boys repeating pathways without making progress.
- 3.19** The department carried out appropriate initial assessments of boys' literacy and numeracy skills. Teachers followed this up with an informative on-line diagnostic assessment. However, the outcomes of these were not used well enough to inform short smart targets for learning and there was no planning to make sure these skills were developed in all lessons across the curriculum.
- 3.20** Boys had access to a suitable core curriculum of literacy, numeracy, creative arts, personal and social education (PSE), citizenship, cookery and physical education (PE). They had the option of selecting from an adequate, but not extensive, range of learning pathways to develop their vocational and work-based skills. Boys who had been following a GCSE course previously were able to continue with these qualifications.
- 3.21** Most boys enhanced their self-esteem and gained in self-confidence through their learning. They developed a robust sense of belief in their own ability to achieve and established positive attitudes to learning and education.
- 3.22** Behaviour in education was generally good. The very occasional poor behaviour was quickly and efficiently managed by teachers. Very few boys were returned to their residential unit. There were very few exclusions from education.

## Recommendation

- 3.23** The curriculum planning of the learning pathways should be reviewed to ensure that each pathway offers children an equal number of lessons and to prevent duplication of learning.

## Quality of provision

- 3.24** Nearly all teachers and children enjoyed positive and supportive working relationships. Attendance was good and managers provided work to be completed on the residential unit for the very few boys who did not attend. However, the quality of this work varied and it was not always challenging enough.
- 3.25** In most lessons, teachers set clear learning objectives and made effective use of a wide range of teaching methods. They planned activities that engaged children's interest and met their individual needs well. However, in a few lessons teachers did not give boys enough opportunities to apply their knowledge and find solutions to problems by themselves. In these lessons, learning activities did not provide boys with enough challenge.
- 3.26** IEPs contained relevant information on learners' preferred learning styles and their attitudes to learning. However, the IEPs did not set out clear strategies for staff and pupils for achieving the learning goals. Generally, teachers did not use the information from literacy and numeracy assessments well enough when planning lessons and setting learning goals.
- 3.27** Nearly all teachers marked boys' work regularly and provided comments to encourage and reward them for their effort and completion of the task. However, most marking did not tell boys what they needed to do to improve their work.
- 3.28** There were good processes in place to gather children's views as part of the self-evaluation process.
- 3.29** Classrooms and circulation areas were brightly decorated with examples of boys' artwork, valuable information celebrating equality and diversity and informative displays promoting healthy lifestyle choices.
- 3.30** Overall, resources for education were of good quality and enabled boys to make progress.

## Recommendation

- 3.31** All boys should have individual literacy and numeracy targets that reflect the areas for development in their diagnostic assessment.

## Education and vocational achievements

- 3.32** The overall department success rates for vocational subjects, literacy and numeracy in 2014 to 2015 was around 80%. Attainment rates were adequate at about 75% and attainment data showed an improving trend over the last four years.
- 3.33** Overall data showed that boys were succeeding at slightly lower rates than their local college comparators. Achievements in construction were significantly higher and catering, art and social sciences were comparable. Success rates in literacy and numeracy were well below.

- 3.34** All boys had equal access to the curriculum. There was no discernible difference in the attainment of specific groups, including boys with learning disabilities and difficulties and those from ethnic minority backgrounds.
- 3.35** Most boys achieved useful qualifications for progression to higher levels of learning, particularly if they transferred to the adult prison. Most achieved their learning goals in vocational subjects and the standard of work produced in construction, multi-skills and creative arts was very good. However, a few did not attain qualifications which met industry standards.
- 3.36** Most boys achieved a qualification one level higher than their initial assessment in literacy and numeracy. However, they made limited progress in improving the skills identified in their individual diagnostic assessments.
- 3.37** Children made very good progress in their personal and social development through a well-planned and appropriate citizenship programme that allowed them time to explore their thoughts and to challenge their beliefs. Most boys developed appropriate understanding and skills to prepare them for future employment or further education. However, opportunities for work experience were very limited.
- 3.38** Department records on individual boys were up to date. Teachers completed useful reviews of each learner at regular times through the year and recorded these well on boys' individual IEPs.

## Library

- 3.39** The newly refurbished and restocked library provided a good range of age-appropriate fiction and non-fiction titles. These included a good stock of easy readers, books based on popular films and games and useful reference books linked to learning pathways. Audio books were also available as were books in other languages for the few boys whose first language was not English. There was a good selection of books in the Welsh language.
- 3.40** Boys had good access to the library which included four mornings each week when library staff were present. Teachers also encouraged boys to withdraw books and research topics linked to their learning pathways.
- 3.41** All boys received an introduction to the library during induction and the library was promoted well through colourful information displays and the reader in residence scheme.
- 3.42** Many boys made good use of the library to choose books to read for pleasure or to support their education programmes. There was an efficient request service for books from the library in the adult prison and boys were able to suggest titles for new library stock.
- 3.43** Arrangements for teachers to order learning resources and books to support learning programmes were well developed. This enabled boys to further their learning outside lessons.
- 3.44** Most boys took good care of the books they borrowed and book losses were low. The library did not provide access to ICT and boys were not able to develop their on-line research skills.

## 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.**

**3.45** *Boys had regular access to physical exercise which met individual needs. An adequate range of outdoor games were available but indoor activities were more limited and some machines in the gym needed replacing. Boys following the Fitness Academy and PE pathways valued the qualifications they gained.*

**3.46** All boys had access to timetabled physical exercise of at least two hours a week. Staff assessed their aptitude and abilities during induction and planned physical activities and fitness programmes to meet individual needs.

**3.47** The boys benefited from the use of an all-weather sports area to play an adequate range of outdoor team games including football, rugby and volleyball. However, a lack of suitable facilities limited the range of indoor activities available during formal lessons.

**3.48** Boys made good use of the gym to develop their general fitness levels through circuit training and weight training. Equipment included a good selection of free weights, a few machines to develop cardiovascular fitness and multi-gym equipment. A few machines were in poor condition and required updating.

**3.49** Physical activities were timetabled to enable boys to return to their units to shower at the end of sessions.

**3.50** Boys following the Fitness Academy and PE pathways had extensive access to a well-planned curriculum which enabled them to gain meaningful qualifications, including personal fitness, sports leadership and mentoring skills. They valued these qualifications highly. The PE learning pathways helped boys to make a positive contribution to the wider life of the prison through volunteering and mentoring.

### Recommendation

**3.51** **The PE facilities should be improved to ensure that children have the opportunity to engage in a wider range of activities during core PE lessons.**

## 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 management of resettlement was reasonable, and a new needs analysis was being planned. There had been no use of release on temporary licence for several months. Early release arrangements were used appropriately. Resettlement outcomes were not monitored systematically, but this was being addressed.*
- 4.2** The resettlement strategy was comprehensive and was reviewed regularly, most recently in December 2015. Implementation of the strategy was overseen by the resettlement committee which met twice a year. Attendance was appropriate and the most recent meeting had included a community partner. Minutes of the meeting indicated a focus on the preceding period rather than using it as a strategic forum to inform and drive provision. Managers were planning to develop the meetings to take a more strategic approach. A needs analysis was being prepared to replace the 2014 resettlement needs analysis.
- 4.3** The unit continued to have a wide catchment area covering Wales and several English counties. Boys from even further afield were sometimes accommodated if they needed a fresh start away from their catchment area young offender institution or secure training centre.
- 4.4** Boys received good support from a small team of caseworkers who undertook all the core resettlement work. Some of the team also undertook substance misuse work which was reflected in casework workloads. Boys on remand continued to be managed by a seconded youth offending team (YOT) officer, while sentenced boys were allocated among caseworkers. Caseworkers took the main responsibility for identifying risk and resettlement needs and ensuring there was a focus on preventing reoffending.
- 4.5** In our survey, 100% of boys said they had a caseworker and during the inspection several mentioned them as people they would go to if they had a problem. In the temporary absence of the family support worker, caseworkers were the first point of contact for families and carers, providing them with an information pack when the boy first arrived, keeping them informed of significant incidents and dealing with families' concerns.
- 4.6** Use of release on temporary licence (ROTL) had declined since the previous inspection and it had not been used for six months. We were told of plans to address this following the provision of new guidance and training in early 2016.
- 4.7** Early release provisions were used appropriately for boys serving detention and training orders. Eight boys had been granted early release in the previous six months. No use had been made of late release provision, although boys were told that it was possible if their behaviour warranted it. Home detention curfew and parole applications, which were both few in number, were handled appropriately.

- 4.8** Caseworkers attended initial community reviews for boys released from Parc if the boy was relatively local, or they contributed by telephone. This facilitated an immediate assessment of the boy's progress in the community but there was no systematic monitoring of outcomes for boys after their release. At the time of the inspection, a protocol with youth offending services in Wales was in development which would facilitate the sharing of information to enable follow up and analysis of successful resettlement outcomes for Welsh boys from Parc.

## Recommendations

- 4.9** **The use of ROTL should be reinstated to support release planning and maintenance of family ties.**
- 4.10** **The Youth Justice Board should develop procedures to enable effective monitoring of resettlement outcomes for boys following their release from YOIs.**

## 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** *Each boy had an individual training planning or remand management plan which reflected his needs and circumstances. The written records of the meetings did not reflect the quality of the meetings that we observed. Reviews were timely and generally well attended with the exception of residential officers. Public protection arrangements were organised appropriately. Looked-after children were supported by a seconded social worker but difficulties remained with getting home local authorities to meet their responsibilities towards these boys. The standard of support in relation to accommodation was often inadequate.*

**4.12** Planning review meetings were generally timely with good attendance by community YOTs and, in some cases, family members or carers. There was good attendance by other unit staff who worked with the boy, with the exception of residential staff. Shift patterns too often prevented them from attending, although we were told of a key worker attending a review on their day off. Key workers provided information about boys' progress if they were unable to attend. The reviews that we observed were effective. They were chaired well by caseworkers who ensured that boys had the opportunity to put their point of view and, when necessary, reinforced it to the professionals attending the review.

**4.13** The training and remand management plans that we looked at did not fully reflect the quality of discussion at the meetings that we observed. There was no quality assurance of planning documentation. Nearly three-quarters of boys in our survey knew that they had a plan against the comparator of 43%. Plans contained clear targets but it was not evident from the records that they were always followed up at meetings. In the absence of residential staff at many reviews, it was unclear how the need to work towards targets was being reinforced or if boys were helped to achieve their targets. Most boys who had a plan said they were involved in its development and understood their targets.



- 4.14 Boys on remand had access to the same services as sentenced boys. The caseworker dedicated to their management helped boys to make a bail application if they wished to do so and reviewed their remand plans regularly.
- 4.15 Some boys had long determinate sentences. Caseworkers were familiar with the procedures, including the preparation of parole documentation or assessing suitability for release on home detention curfew (HDC) (see section on indeterminate sentence young people).
- 4.16 Some boys transferred to the adult estate at the age of 18. The arrangements for boys who moved to the adult site at Parc were good, with appropriate preparation and sharing of information. The unit had less control over arrangements for boys who moved to a different adult prison and preparation with the boy consisted of more general information about the differences between a YOI and an adult prison and the kind of behaviour that would be expected. Attempts were made to share relevant information about the boy with the receiving prison, but we were told that it was not always clear if the information was acted on to prepare for the boy's arrival.

## Recommendations

- 4.17 **Training planning and remand management meetings should include residential staff who regularly work with the boys to ensure that all relevant activity is captured in their remand or training plans and there is consistent reinforcement to help boys achieve their targets.**
- 4.18 **Quality assurance of planning documentation should be introduced.**

## Public protection

- 4.19 Initial public protection procedures were managed appropriately. New arrivals were screened on reception using available information and reviewed the following morning by a multidisciplinary team. Community YOTs were contacted to confirm details of multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) levels, restraining or harassment orders and potential risk to children. Restrictions were placed on mail, telephone and visits where it was deemed necessary. Restrictions were reviewed regularly and removed when it was appropriate to do so. Caseworkers explained monitoring restrictions to boys. Three boys were subject to mail and telephone monitoring at the time of the inspection.
- 4.20 MAPPA arrangements were generally effective, and caseworkers confirmed MAPPA management levels with community YOTs before release. Caseworkers were responsible for the completion of MAPPA F reports for the small number of boys released as level two or three, and attended community reviews when they had relevant information to share.

## Indeterminate sentence young people

- 4.21 Parc rarely held boys serving indeterminate sentences. It was not a long-term unit and did not provide appropriate education programmes and interventions. There was expertise in the casework team, and more widely in the adult prison offender management unit, to ensure that boys received the appropriate case management and that paperwork and processes were completed when required. If a boy with an indeterminate sentence was received, staff facilitated his transfer to a long-term unit.

## Looked-after children

- 4.22** On average about half the boys on the unit were looked-after children. Their status was identified immediately on admission, and shortly after arrival they were each interviewed by the prison social worker. The community social worker was notified of their location, reminded of their obligations and asked to arrange support from the local authority.
- 4.23** The level of help provided by the local authority social worker varied greatly. Lack of consistency in providing pocket money was common: some authorities provided a standard rate, while others used discretion and took into account any monies the boy might receive through the prison. In a few cases this resulted in no additional financial support. Statutory care reviews for looked-after children usually took place within the required timescale, often only after persistent reminders.
- 4.24** The most serious challenge that unit staff faced with looked-after children was obtaining suitable release accommodation in good time. Over the past two months, despite advocacy and the best efforts of prison staff, eight young people had not known where they were going to live a month before release. This caused the boys considerable uncertainty and anxiety and undermined the success of the resettlement process.
- 4.25** In our survey, there were two particularly stark findings in relation to looked-after children. Only 20% said they had been treated well in reception compared with 64% of children who were not looked after. It was very concerning that 64% of looked-after children said they had been victimised by other young people, compared to 19% of other children. The reason for these negative findings was not clear and needed investigation.

## Recommendations

- 4.26 All children with looked-after status should receive adequate levels of support from their local authority.** (Repeated recommendation 4.22)
- 4.27 The views of looked-after children should be explored to identify any underlying difficulties in the way they experience custody.**

## 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.**

**4.28** *Provision and outcomes across the resettlement pathways were variable. Accommodation and finance, benefit and debt required attention but there was good provision for health care and substance misuse and work to enable boys to maintain family ties was particularly strong. Boys had access to some interventions to address their offending behaviour, but there was a lack of interventions for boys with sexually harmful behaviour.*

- 4.29** Practical arrangements to prepare boys for release remained sound. Plans for the day of release were discussed in training planning meetings which gave boys a chance to clarify the conditions of their release. They were released separately through the adult reception area

and in most cases staff ensured that they did not travel unaccompanied. In the rare cases where there was nobody to collect a boy from the prison gate, staff took them to the local station and made sure they got on the right train.

## Accommodation

- 4.30** Many boys returned to live with their family on release, but for others there was often uncertainty about where they would be living until close to their release date. Too often these were children with looked-after status who were sometimes told where they would be living only a day or two before release. Caseworkers were adept at raising accommodation needs at an early stage, and escalating lack of suitable accommodation to senior managers. Despite this, in too many instances the prison had to resort to Barnardo's advocates and the Howard League for assistance.
- 4.31** Despite efforts made by the unit and other agencies, one 17-year old boy had been released with no address after declining a foster placement. He had been collected by his YOT worker and placed in a bed and breakfast hostel where he remained for five days until more suitable accommodation was available. The lack of an address at the time of release prevented any education, training or employment (ETE) arrangements being made for him and, in general, it was very difficult to organise ETE for boys who had not been given addresses in good time. Caseworkers said that eight boys had been released to unacceptable accommodation in the previous six months: seven to bed and breakfast and one to a hotel.

## Recommendation

- 4.32** **Work with other government departments should be undertaken to ensure that all children leaving custody are provided with appropriate accommodation in good time for their release.**

## Education, training and employment

- 4.33** There were robust plans in place to ensure the prompt transfer of education information for boys moving to adult prisons. Teachers provided case workers and relevant partners with a detailed account of the boy's learning to date. Teachers identified likely educational pathways for these boys and provided easy progression routes to higher qualifications.
- 4.34** Boys transferring to other providers were given good advice on managing interviews. Teachers made good use of ROTL to accompany boys to interviews for further education or work-based learning courses.

## Health care

- 4.35** All boys were seen before discharge by a nurse and there were effective links with local health services through the YOTs to ensure continuity of care. Where appropriate, up to five days of prescribed medication was given.

## Drugs and alcohol

- 4.36** The young people's substance misuse service (YPSMS) workers attended the final detention and training order planning meeting and links with community drug and alcohol agencies were made through the local YOTs or other community agencies.
- 4.37** YPSMS workers occasionally attended post-release community meetings for boys released within Wales.

## Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.38** Provision for this pathway needed development. Boys were not able to open bank accounts while at Parc and there was no longer any input from the bank which had previously visited to give boys advice. Money management was included in some courses delivered by the education department and caseworkers offered practical support, including getting national insurance numbers for boys who needed one.

## Recommendations

- 4.39** **Boys should be able to open a bank account while at Parc.**
- 4.40** **Boys should have access to information and guidance to enable them to develop the financial awareness and skills they need when released.**

## Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.41** The visits area had been moved since the previous inspection. Visits were now held in an upper section of the main visits area, which was completely separate from the adult prisoners. There was no natural light in the new facility, which had a low ceiling and little space. The walls were decorated with eye-catching murals and there was a small children's area. The facilities were adequate and the environment was reasonably comfortable. We were told that the current arrangements were temporary and that plans were in place to relocate visits to a more spacious venue where there would be more emphasis on joint work with family members.
- 4.42** The visits session that we observed was very relaxed with staff maintaining an unobtrusive presence. Visitors were able to buy hot food from the main visits canteen downstairs and take it to the unit visits area.
- 4.43** There was capacity for up to eight visits which took place on weekday evenings and during the day at the weekend. Most requests for visits could be accommodated and, if visitors were travelling a long distance, double visits could be provided at weekends. The free bus to and from the local bus station, which was run by the prison at visit times, continued to operate.
- 4.44** Boys were now able to book their visits using the automated machine. This gave them more control and was popular. It also avoided the necessity for visitors to provide photographic ID every time they visited.
- 4.45** Boys all had phones in their cells which allowed them to make outgoing calls. The rates were expensive, but it greatly improved their ability to keep in touch with their family.

- 4.46** The family support worker continued to play a very active role in advising the families of newly admitted boys about the regime on the unit. She also kept in touch by telephone with the boy's responsible adult, telling them promptly about significant events for their child.
- 4.47** Since the previous inspection, Skype had been introduced, to help young people maintain contact with family members. Although so far take up had been low, this was a very important initiative with the potential to transform the way boys maintained contact with the outside world.
- 4.48** A few boys did not receive visits. Staff were aware of who these boys were and provided them with encouragement and support to help them deal with this.
- 4.49** No parenting groups were being run, which staff acknowledged was a weakness. They told us that a suitable programme was planned as part of the remodelling of the visits function.

### **Attitudes, thinking and behaviour**

- 4.50** A range of non-accredited interventions were provided, including conflict resolution, problem solving, anger management and knife crime. Two prison custody officers delivered these in response to identified need, mostly as one-to-one interventions. There was no formal evaluation of the effectiveness of the interventions but some evidence of boys' behaviour changing, for example progress within the rewards and sanctions scheme or less involvement in poor behaviour on the wing. The two facilitators attended initial planning reviews to discuss how they could work with a boy and reported on progress at subsequent meetings. Boys were prioritised for interventions according to their release date.
- 4.51** A review of the range of interventions was planned. There were no on-site interventions for boys with sexually related offences and nothing was done to address their offending behaviour while they were on the unit. The unit did not hold many such boys, but this was a weakness.

### **Recommendations**

- 4.52** **Evaluation of interventions should be put in place.**
- 4.53** **Interventions should be put in place for boys to address sexually harmful behaviour.**



## 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.

### Recommendation

#### To the Ministry of Justice

- 5.1** Work with other government departments should be undertaken to ensure that all children leaving custody are provided with appropriate accommodation in good time for their release.

### Recommendations

#### To the Youth Justice Board

- 5.2** The Youth Justice Board should develop procedures to enable effective monitoring of resettlement outcomes for boys following their release from YOIs.
- 5.3** All children with looked-after status should receive adequate levels of support from their local authority.

### Recommendations

#### To the governor

#### Courts, escort and transfers

- 5.4** Children should be transported to custody as soon as their case has finished. They should be transported separately from adults and arrive at Parc before 7pm.

#### Early days in custody

- 5.5** The induction handbook should be available in the main languages spoken by foreign national children.

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

- 5.6** All staff who have direct contact with children should receive refresher training in child protection.
- 5.7** Steps should be taken to ensure that all staff are aware of and knowledgeable about the whistle-blowing policy.
- 5.8** Children should feel confident to report bullying without fear of further intimidation.
- 5.9** The reasons for the increase in children reporting victimisation by staff should be investigated and the findings acted on.

- 5.10** Children in crisis requiring constant observation should be monitored face to face by staff and not by CCTV.

### **Behaviour management**

- 5.11** A detailed analysis should be carried out of the management of behaviour during autumn 2015, taking account of the views of staff and children, so that lessons can be learned and deficiencies addressed.
- 5.12** Strip-searching under restraint and pain-inducing techniques should not be used on children.
- 5.13** All incidents where force is used should be recorded, including by audio, and, once appropriate safeguards and procedures have been put in place, body-worn cameras should be used to achieve this.
- 5.14** Staff from the adult prison should not be routinely used to respond to incidents in the children's unit.

### **Substance misuse**

- 5.15** The location of boys with immediate alcohol and drug withdrawal needs should ensure their safe monitoring and support.

### **Residential units**

- 5.16** Cells should have effective ventilation.
- 5.17** Toilets should be fully screened.
- 5.18** Children should have access to a lockable cupboard.

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

- 5.19** Managers should investigate and address children's negative perceptions of staff.

### **Equality and diversity**

- 5.20** A regular equality management meeting should take place to ensure that policy, planning and consultation are effective, prisoners' perceptions and needs are addressed, and comprehensive monitoring data are considered.
- 5.21** Engagement by the children's unit with community diversity groups should be improved to the level achieved by the adult prison.
- 5.22** All staff should be trained in the identification of trafficking victims and the national referral mechanism.

### **Health services**

- 5.23** All clinical areas should be safe and fully compliant with infection control guidelines.
- 5.24** There should be sufficient nursing capacity to ensure that all clinical activities such as CHAT assessments can be completed in a timely way.



- 5.25** Young people should receive their medicines in a timely way to ensure clinical effectiveness.
- 5.26** Children should have timely access to speech and language therapy as clinically indicated.
- 5.27** Local policies for the provision of mental health services should be agreed.

#### Time out of cell

- 5.28** Children should have better access to outdoor facilities.

#### Education, learning and skills

- 5.29** There should be effective oversight and quality assurance of the education provision.
- 5.30** The curriculum planning of the learning pathways should be reviewed to ensure that each pathway offers children an equal number of lessons and to prevent duplication of learning.
- 5.31** All boys should have individual literacy and numeracy targets that reflect the areas for development in their diagnostic assessment.

#### Physical education and healthy living

- 5.32** The PE facilities should be improved to ensure that children have the opportunity to engage in a wider range of activities during core PE lessons.

#### Pre-release and resettlement

- 5.33** The use of ROTL should be reinstated to support release planning and maintenance of family ties.

#### Training planning and remand management

- 5.34** Training planning and remand management meetings should include residential staff who regularly work with the boys to ensure that all relevant activity is captured in their remand or training plans and there is consistent reinforcement to help boys achieve their targets.
- 5.35** Quality assurance of planning documentation should be introduced.
- 5.36** The views of looked-after children should be explored to identify any underlying difficulties in the way they experience custody.

#### Reintegration planning

- 5.37** Boys should be able to open a bank account while at Parc.
- 5.38** Boys should have access to information and guidance to enable them to develop the financial awareness and skills they need when released.
- 5.39** Evaluation of interventions should be put in place.
- 5.40** Interventions should be put in place for boys to address sexually harmful behaviour.

## Housekeeping points

### Courts, escort and transfers

- 5.41** A representative of the escort provider should attend safeguarding meetings so that problems concerning the transport of children to the prison can be discussed.

### Health services

- 5.42** All patient identifiable records should be stored in a locked cabinet.
- 5.43** Care plans should be used to ensure continuity of care for boys with specific needs, including discharge from hospital.
- 5.44** Stock medicines such as paracetamol and ibuprofen should be transported in a locked container.

## Good practice

- 5.45** The induction handbook was well designed and provided a realistic account of life in the unit.
- 5.46** The inclusion of all complaint summaries and outcomes in the monthly safeguarding meeting minutes supported a transparent and safe environment for children.

## Section 6. Appendices

### Appendix I: Inspection team

Nick Hardwick	Chief inspector
Peter Clarke	Chief inspector (shadowing)
Angus Mulready-Jones	Team leader
Colin Carroll	Inspector
Deri Hughes-Roberts	Inspector
Angela Johnson	Inspector
Ian Macfadyen	Inspector
Fran Russell	Inspector
Joe Simmonds	Researcher
Sophie Skinner	Research trainee
Nicola Rabjohns	Health services and substance misuse inspector
Gill Sims	Estyn inspector
Anthony Mulcahy	Estyn 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, children said they were treated well on escort to the prison and when they arrived. The reception and first night procedures were thorough and induction was well organised. The safeguarding and child protection arrangements remained effective. Self-harm was well managed. Use of force was proportionate and reducing. Levels of violence were not high and incidents resulting in serious injury were rare. Discipline procedures were administered fairly and the rewards and sanctions scheme was motivational. The young people's substance misuse service provided excellent support. Children generally reported feeling safe. Outcomes for children and young people were good against this healthy prison test.*

### Recommendations

Children should not spend lengthy periods waiting in court after their case has been completed, and NOMS should ensure that waits are kept to a minimum. (1.6)

**Not achieved**

Children should be transported separately to adult prisoners. (1.7)

**Not achieved**

The induction booklet should be available in the main languages spoken by foreign national children. (1.14)

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

Children should receive clinical support services from appropriately trained staff guided by comprehensive policies which reflect best practice. (1.77)

**Partially achieved**

### Respect

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

*At the last inspection in 2014, overall the living conditions were reasonable. Relationships between staff and children were a strength which had a positive impact across many areas. There was an individual approach to diversity but more needed to be done to identify potential concerns. Children benefited from an energetic and engaged chaplaincy. The complaints process was sound and children had suitable access to their solicitors.*

*Health care continued to be good. The food provided was not popular but the meals we sampled were adequate. Outcomes for children and young people were good against this healthy prison test.*

## Recommendations

Cells should have effective ventilation. (2.13)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.12)

The steel grid over the exercise yard on G wing should be removed. (2.14)

**Not achieved**

Walls in front of showers should be sufficiently high to maintain decency. (2.15)

**Partially achieved**

Toilets should be fully screened. (2.16)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.13)

Children should have access to a lockable cupboard. (2.17)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.14)

Monitoring by protected characteristics should be put in place and equality reports should be regularly discussed at safeguarding meetings. (2.30)

**Not achieved**

All clinical areas should be safe and fully compliant with infection control guidelines. (2.64)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.74)

Condoms should be available and the supporting policy should specifically consider the needs of children. (2.65)

**Achieved**

Children should have regular access to pharmacy clinics, including medicine use reviews. (2.81)

**No longer relevant**

Children should have timely access to speech and language therapy as clinically indicated. (2.93)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.99)

Local policies for the provision of mental health services should be agreed. (2.94)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.100)

All notes and correspondence related to a boy's care should be included on SystemOne. (2.95)

**Achieved**

## Purposeful activity

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

*At the last inspection in 2014, all children were able to spend enough time out of their cell and adequate time outside for exercise. Better use needed to be made of the outside space. Estyn's overall judgement was*

*that provision in learning and skills was good. The quality of teaching and learning was good, but about half the boys did not achieve well enough in core skills. Behaviour management was effective and boys felt safe in class. Children with additional learning needs did not receive enough support. There was a well stocked library, but access to it was too limited. The range of PE was narrow and access was variable. Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.*

## Recommendations

Children should have better access to outdoor facilities. (3.5)

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

All children should receive good access to impartial careers guidance and support. (3.14)

**Partially achieved**

The curriculum for the core skills of literacy, numeracy and ICT should be strengthened and attainment rates improved to a good level. (3.32)

**Not achieved**

All children with additional learning needs should receive appropriate support. (3.33)

**Achieved**

More time should be allocated to a professional librarian to develop library services. (3.38)

**Achieved**

Opportunities for children to develop sports theory knowledge and skills training in PE should be improved. (3.45)

**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 management of resettlement had improved and was now well organised. The training and remand planning arrangements continued to be thorough and comprehensive. Children who were looked after were supported well by prison staff. Opportunities for release on temporary licence (ROTL) had increased, but not to maintain family relationships. Provision under the resettlement pathways was generally good but the education, training and employment input was weak and it was not always possible to obtain suitable accommodation for boys. The proportion of children who lived more than 50 miles away had increased significantly, which made the achievement of successful resettlement outcomes more difficult. The family support worker continued to provide good individual support to boys by maintaining contact with family and friends. Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.*

## Recommendations

All children should have access to the same level of resettlement support from their home area. (4.7)

**Not achieved**

The unit should work with their regional resettlement consortia, youth offending services and the Youth Justice Board to ensure that information on resettlement outcomes is collected after children leave the unit. (4.8)

**Partially achieved**

All children with looked-after status should receive the same minimum levels of support from their local authority. (4.22)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 4.26)

Distance from home should be a key factor in planning the custody of children. (4.44)

**Not achieved**

The visits area should be made comfortable and welcoming, particularly for children. (4.45)

**Achieved**

Visitors should not be turned away if they do not have identification on every visit. (4.46)

**Achieved**

Family days should be open to all children. (4.47)

**Partially achieved**

ROTL should be used to help maintain family relationships. (4.48)

**Not achieved**

A framework of training, independent evaluation and feedback should be put in place for interventions work, while preserving the existing child-focused approach. (4.51)

**Not achieved**



## Appendix III: Establishment population profile

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

Status	Number of young people	%
Sentenced	35	94.60
Recall	0	0
Convicted unsentenced	0	0
Remand	2	5.40
Detainees	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>100</b>

Age	Number of young people	%
15 years	1	2.70
16 years	6	16.23
17 years	28	75.67
18 years	2	5.40
<b>Total</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>100</b>

Nationality	Number of young people	%
British	31	83.78
Foreign nationals	6	16.22
<b>Total</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>100</b>

Ethnicity	Number of young people	%
White		
British	30	81.08
Irish	0	0
Gypsy/Irish Traveller	0	0
Other white	1	2.70
Mixed		
White and black Caribbean	0	0
White and black African	1	2.70
White and Asian	0	0
Other mixed	0	0
Asian or Asian British		
Indian	0	0
Pakistani	0	0
Bangladeshi	0	0
Chinese	0	0
Other Asian	1	2.70
Black or black British		
Caribbean	0	0
African	1	2.70
Other black	2	5.40
Other ethnic group		
Arab	0	0
Other ethnic group	1	2.70

Not stated	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>100</b>

Religion	Number of young people	%
Baptist	0	0
Church of England	1	2.70
Roman Catholic	3	8.11
Other Christian denominations	14	37.84
Muslim	3	8.11
Sikh	0	0
Hindu	0	0
Buddhist	0	0
Jewish	0	0
Other	0	0
No religion	16	43.24
<b>Total</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>100</b>

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

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

Length of stay	<1 mth	1–3 mths	3–6 mths	6–12 mths	1–2 yrs	2 yrs +	4 yrs +	Total
<b>Age</b>								
15 years	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
16 years	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	6
17 years	4	9	5	6	1	1	0	26
18 years	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>35</b>

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

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

Main offence	Number of young people	%
Violence against the person		
Sexual offences		
Burglary		
Robbery		
Theft and handling		

Fraud and forgery		
Drugs offences		
Other offences		
Offence not recorded / holding warrant		
<b>Total</b>		

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

Sentence	4 mths	6 mths	8 mths	10 mths	12 mths	18 mths	24 mths	24 mth+	Total
<b>Age</b>									
15 years	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
16 years	2	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	5
17 years	1	1	1	0	1	2	2	2	10
18 years	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>16</b>

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### Children and young people survey methodology

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

### Sampling

Questionnaires were offered to all young people.

### Distributing and collecting questionnaires

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

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

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

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

### Survey response

At the time of the survey on 11 January 2016 the young person population at HMP & YOI Parc was 38. Questionnaires were distributed to all 38 young people.

We received a total of 29 completed questionnaires, a response rate of 76%. This included one questionnaire completed via interview. Four respondents refused to complete a questionnaire and five questionnaires were not returned.

Wing/unit	Number of completed survey returns
E	14
G	15

### Presentation of survey results and analyses

Over the following pages we present the survey results for HMP & YOI Parc.

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

We also present a number of comparative analyses. In all the comparative analyses that follow, statistically significant<sup>10</sup> differences are indicated by shading. Results that are significantly better are indicated by green shading, results that are significantly worse are indicated by blue shading. If the difference is not statistically significant there is no shading. Orange shading has been used to show a statistically significant difference in young people's background details.

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

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

The following comparative analyses are presented:

- The current survey responses from HMP & YOI Parc in 2016 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 2015.
- The current survey responses from HMP & YOI Parc in 2016 compared with the responses of young people surveyed at HMP & YOI Parc in 2014.
- A comparison within the 2016 survey between responses of young people who have been in local authority care and those who have not been in local authority care.

---

<sup>10</sup> A statistically significant difference between the two samples is one that is unlikely to have arisen by chance alone, and can therefore be assumed to represent a real difference between the two populations. Our significance level is set at 0.05 which means that there is only a 5% likelihood that the difference is due to chance.

## Survey summary

### SECTION I: ABOUT YOU

<b>Q1</b>	<b>How old are you?</b>	
	15 .....	0 (0%)
	16 .....	4 (14%)
	17 .....	25 (86%)
	18 .....	0 (0%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Are you a British citizen?</b>	
	Yes .....	28 (97%)
	No .....	1 (3%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>Do you understand spoken English?</b>	
	Yes .....	28 (100%)
	No .....	0 (0%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Do you understand written English?</b>	
	Yes .....	28 (100%)
	No .....	0 (0%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>What is your ethnic origin?</b>	
	White - British .....	21 (72%)
	White - Irish .....	1 (3%)
	White - Other .....	1 (3%)
	Black or Black British - Caribbean .....	2 (7%)
	Black or Black British - African .....	0 (0%)
	Black or Black British - Other .....	1 (3%)
	Asian or Asian British - Indian .....	0 (0%)
	Asian or Asian British - Pakistani .....	0 (0%)
	Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi .....	0 (0%)
	Asian or Asian British - Chinese .....	0 (0%)
	Asian or Asian British - Other .....	0 (0%)
	Mixed race - White and Black Caribbean .....	2 (7%)
	Mixed race - White and Black African .....	0 (0%)
	Mixed race - White and Asian .....	0 (0%)
	Mixed race - Other .....	1 (3%)
	Arab .....	0 (0%)
	Other ethnic group .....	0 (0%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>What is your religion?</b>	
	None .....	14 (48%)
	Church of England .....	8 (28%)
	Catholic .....	2 (7%)
	Protestant .....	0 (0%)
	Other Christian denomination .....	5 (17%)
	Buddhist .....	0 (0%)
	Hindu .....	0 (0%)
	Jewish .....	0 (0%)
	Muslim .....	0 (0%)
	Sikh .....	0 (0%)

<b>Q7</b>	<b>Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?</b>	
	Yes .....	1 (4%)
	No.....	26 (93%)
	Don't know .....	1 (4%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>Do you have any children?</b>	
	Yes .....	2 (7%)
	No.....	26 (93%)
<b>Q9</b>	<b>Do you consider yourself to have a disability (i.e. do you need help with any long-term physical, mental or learning needs)?</b>	
	Yes .....	5 (18%)
	No.....	23 (82%)
<b>Q10</b>	<b>Have you ever been in local authority care?</b>	
	Yes .....	11 (39%)
	No.....	17 (61%)

## SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Are you sentenced?</b>	
	Yes .....	28 (97%)
	No - unsentenced/on remand .....	1 (3%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>How long is your sentence (the full DTO sentence)?</b>	
	<b>Not sentenced</b> .....	1 (3%)
	<i>Less than 6 months</i> .....	6 (21%)
	<i>6 to 12 months</i> .....	7 (24%)
	<i>More than 12 months, up to 2 years</i> .....	7 (24%)
	<i>More than 2 years</i> .....	8 (28%)
	<i>Indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP)</i> .....	0 (0%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>How long have you been in this establishment?</b>	
	<i>Less than 1 month</i> .....	4 (14%)
	<i>1 to 6 months</i> .....	16 (55%)
	<i>More than 6 months, but less than 12 months</i> .....	5 (17%)
	<i>12 months to 2 years</i> .....	3 (10%)
	<i>More than 2 years</i> .....	1 (3%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?</b>	
	Yes .....	17 (61%)
	No.....	11 (39%)

## SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS

<b>Q1</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?</b>	
	Yes .....	20 (71%)
	No.....	3 (11%)
	Don't remember .....	5 (18%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, were there any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females travelling with you?</b>	
	Yes .....	19 (68%)
	No.....	7 (25%)
	Don't remember .....	2 (7%)



<b>Q3</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?</b>	
	Less than 2 hours .....	13 (46%)
	2 to 4 hours.....	13 (46%)
	More than 4 hours .....	2 (7%)
	Don't remember .....	0 (0%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?</b>	
	<b>My journey was less than 2 hours</b> .....	13 (46%)
	Yes .....	3 (11%)
	No.....	11 (39%)
	Don't remember .....	1 (4%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?</b>	
	<b>My journey was less than 2 hours</b> .....	13 (48%)
	Yes .....	7 (26%)
	No.....	7 (26%)
	Don't remember .....	0 (0%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, how did you feel you were treated by the escort staff?</b>	
	Very well.....	2 (7%)
	Well.....	13 (46%)
	Neither .....	7 (25%)
	Badly.....	4 (14%)
	Very badly .....	0 (0%)
	Don't remember .....	2 (7%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>Before you arrived here, did you receive any information to help you prepare for coming here?</b>	
	Yes - and it was helpful.....	4 (14%)
	Yes - but it was not helpful.....	7 (25%)
	No - I received no information .....	17 (61%)
	Don't remember .....	0 (0%)

#### SECTION 4: FIRST DAYS

<b>Q1</b>	<b>How long were you in reception?</b>	
	Less than 2 hours .....	21 (75%)
	2 hours or longer .....	2 (7%)
	Don't remember .....	5 (18%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?</b>	
	Yes .....	17 (61%)
	No.....	5 (18%)
	Don't remember/Not applicable .....	6 (21%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>How well did you feel you were treated in reception?</b>	
	Very well.....	3 (11%)
	Well.....	10 (36%)
	Neither .....	9 (32%)
	Badly.....	3 (11%)
	Very badly .....	2 (7%)
	Don't remember .....	1 (4%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>When you first arrived here, did staff ask if you needed help or support with any of the following things? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	Not being able to smoke .....	12 (44%)
	Money worries.....	6 (22%)

Loss of property .....	5 (19%)	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to .....	6 (22%)
Feeling scared.....	5 (19%)	Health problems .....	12 (44%)
Gang problems.....	6 (22%)	Getting phone numbers .....	13 (48%)
Contacting family .....	16 (59%)	<b>Staff did not ask me about any of these</b> .....	6 (22%)

**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 .....	15 (56%)	Money worries.....	3 (11%)
Loss of property .....	5 (19%)	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to .....	3 (11%)
Feeling scared.....	3 (11%)	Health problems .....	6 (22%)
Gang problems.....	3 (11%)	Getting phone numbers .....	10 (37%)
Contacting family .....	14 (52%)	<b>I did not have any problems</b> .....	7 (26%)

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

Toiletries/basic items .....	25 (89%)
The opportunity to have a shower .....	11 (39%)
Something to eat.....	17 (61%)
A free phone call to friends/family .....	13 (46%)
PIN phone credit.....	11 (39%)
Information about feeling worried/upset .....	7 (25%)
Don't remember .....	2 (7%)
<b>I was not given any of these</b> .....	1 (4%)

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

Chaplain.....	8 (30%)
Peer mentor .....	3 (11%)
Childline/Samaritans.....	3 (11%)
The prison shop/canteen.....	4 (15%)
Don't remember .....	8 (30%)
<b>I did not have access to any of these</b> .....	9 (33%)

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

Yes .....	14 (50%)
No.....	11 (39%)
Don't remember .....	3 (11%)

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

Yes .....	24 (86%)
No.....	3 (11%)
Don't remember .....	1 (4%)

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

<b>I have not been on an induction course</b> .....	2 (7%)
Yes .....	20 (71%)
No.....	4 (14%)
Don't remember .....	2 (7%)

## SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT

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

Yes .....	27 (96%)
No .....	1 (4%)

	Don't know .....	0 (0%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?</b>	
	Yes .....	16 (57%)
	No.....	11 (39%)
	Don't know .....	1 (4%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>What is the food like here?</b>	
	Very good.....	0 (0%)
	Good.....	5 (17%)
	Neither .....	10 (34%)
	Bad .....	9 (31%)
	Very bad.....	5 (17%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?</b>	
	<i>I have not bought anything yet/Don't know</i> .....	1 (3%)
	Yes .....	15 (52%)
	No.....	13 (45%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>How easy is it for you to attend religious services?</b>	
	<i>I don't want to attend religious services</i> .....	4 (14%)
	Very easy.....	7 (24%)
	Easy .....	6 (21%)
	Neither .....	4 (14%)
	Difficult.....	2 (7%)
	Very difficult.....	1 (3%)
	Don't know .....	5 (17%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>Are your religious beliefs respected?</b>	
	Yes .....	12 (43%)
	No.....	9 (32%)
	Don't know/Not applicable.....	7 (25%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>Can you speak to a Chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?</b>	
	Yes .....	19 (66%)
	No.....	3 (10%)
	Don't know/Not applicable.....	7 (24%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>Can you speak to a peer mentor when you need to?</b>	
	Yes .....	6 (21%)
	No.....	7 (25%)
	Don't know .....	15 (54%)
<b>Q9</b>	<b>Can you speak to a member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board) when you need to?</b>	
	Yes .....	2 (7%)
	No .....	10 (36%)
	Don't know .....	16 (57%)
<b>Q10</b>	<b>Can you speak to an advocate (an outside person to help you) when you need to?</b>	
	Yes .....	10 (36%)
	No.....	7 (25%)
	Don't know .....	11 (39%)

## SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Do most staff treat you with respect?</b>		
	Yes .....	16	(55%)
	No.....	13	(45%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>If you had a problem, who would you turn to? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>		
	No-one .....	10	(37%)
	Personal officer .....	4	(15%)
	Wing Officer.....	5	(19%)
	Teacher/education staff .....	2	(7%)
	Gym staff.....	4	(15%)
	Chaplain.....	4	(15%)
	Independent Monitoring Board (IMB).....	1	(4%)
	YOT worker .....	4	(15%)
	Social worker.....	2	(7%)
	Health services staff.....	2	(7%)
	Peer mentor.....	1	(4%)
	Another young person here .....	6	(22%)
	Case worker .....	6	(22%)
	Advocate .....	1	(4%)
	Family/friends .....	13	(48%)
	Childline/Samaritans.....	2	(7%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?</b>		
	Yes .....	11	(38%)
	No.....	18	(62%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?</b>		
	<i>I still have not met him/her</i> .....	2	(7%)
	In your first week .....	15	(54%)
	After your first week.....	6	(21%)
	Don't remember .....	5	(18%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>How often do you see your personal (named) officer?</b>		
	<i>I still have not met him/her</i> .....	2	(7%)
	At least once a week .....	10	(37%)
	Less than once a week.....	15	(56%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>Do you feel your personal (named) officer tries to help you?</b>		
	<i>I still have not met him/her</i> .....	2	(7%)
	Yes .....	18	(64%)
	No.....	8	(29%)

## SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Is it easy to make an application?</b>		
	Yes .....	23	(82%)
	No.....	5	(18%)
	Don't know.....	0	(0%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Are applications sorted out fairly?</b>		
	<i>I have not made an application</i> .....	4	(14%)
	Yes .....	13	(46%)
	No.....	11	(39%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>Are applications sorted out quickly (within seven days)?</b>		
	<i>I have not made an application</i> .....	4	(15%)
	Yes .....	6	(22%)
	No.....	17	(63%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Is it easy to make a complaint?</b>		
	Yes .....	16	(59%)
	No.....	5	(19%)

	<i>Don't know</i> .....	6 (22%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>Are complaints sorted out fairly?</b>	
	<i>I have not made a complaint</i> .....	9 (36%)
	Yes .....	3 (12%)
	No .....	13 (52%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>Are complaints sorted out quickly (within seven days)?</b>	
	<i>I have not made a complaint</i> .....	9 (35%)
	Yes .....	3 (12%)
	No .....	14 (54%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint?</b>	
	Yes .....	3 (11%)
	No .....	14 (52%)
	<i>Never needed to make a complaint</i> .....	10 (37%)

## SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE

<b>Q1</b>	<b>What level of the rewards and sanctions scheme are you on?</b>	
	<i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Enhanced (top)</i> .....	8 (29%)
	<i>Standard (middle)</i> .....	12 (43%)
	<i>Basic (bottom)</i> .....	8 (29%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	0 (0%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the rewards and sanctions scheme?</b>	
	<i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i> .....	0 (0%)
	Yes .....	12 (44%)
	No .....	12 (44%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	3 (11%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>Do the different levels of the rewards and sanctions scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?</b>	
	<i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i> .....	0 (0%)
	Yes .....	12 (48%)
	No .....	8 (32%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	5 (20%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Have you had a minor report since you have been here?</b>	
	Yes .....	18 (69%)
	No .....	7 (27%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	1 (4%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>If you have had a minor report, was the process explained clearly to you?</b>	
	<i>I have not had a minor report</i> .....	8 (31%)
	Yes .....	14 (54%)
	No .....	4 (15%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?</b>	
	Yes .....	23 (79%)
	No .....	5 (17%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	1 (3%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>If you have had an adjudication ('nicking'), was the process explained clearly to you?</b>	
	<i>I have not had an adjudication</i> .....	6 (21%)
	Yes .....	20 (71%)

No..... 2 (7%)

<b>Q8</b>	<b>Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?</b>	
	Yes .....	12 (43%)
	No.....	15 (54%)
	Don't know .....	1 (4%)

<b>Q9</b>	<b>If you have spent a night in the care and separation unit (CSU), how were you treated by staff?</b>	
	<b><i>I have not been to the care and separation unit</i></b> .....	18 (69%)
	Very well.....	0 (0%)
	Well.....	1 (4%)
	Neither.....	4 (15%)
	Badly.....	1 (4%)
	Very badly.....	2 (8%)

## SECTION 9: SAFETY

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Have you ever felt unsafe here?</b>	
	Yes .....	8 (29%)
	No.....	20 (71%)

<b>Q2</b>	<b>Do you feel unsafe now?</b>	
	Yes .....	3 (10%)
	No.....	26 (90%)

<b>Q3</b>	<b>In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<b>Never felt unsafe</b> .....	20 (71%)
	Everywhere .....	7 (25%)
	Care and separation unit.....	0 (0%)
	Association areas .....	2 (7%)
	Reception area .....	0 (0%)
	At the gym .....	2 (7%)
	In an exercise yard .....	3 (11%)
	At work.....	0 (0%)
	At education .....	2 (7%)
	At religious services.....	0 (0%)
	At meal times .....	2 (7%)
	At healthcare.....	1 (4%)
	Visits area .....	0 (0%)
	In wing showers.....	3 (11%)
	In gym showers .....	1 (4%)
	In corridors/stairwells.....	2 (7%)
	On your landing/wing .....	1 (4%)
	During movement.....	2 (7%)
	In your cell .....	1 (4%)

<b>Q4</b>	<b>Have you ever been victimised by another young person/group of young people here (e.g. insulted or assaulted you)?</b>	
	Yes .....	10 (36%)
	No.....	18 (64%)

<b>Q5</b>	<b>If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	Insulting remarks (about you, your family or friends).....	6 (21%)
	Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted) .....	7 (25%)
	Sexual abuse .....	0 (0%)
	Feeling threatened or intimidated .....	3 (11%)

Having your canteen/property taken.....	2 (7%)
Medication.....	0 (0%)
Debt.....	1 (5%)
Drugs.....	1 (5%)
Your race or ethnic origin.....	1 (5%)
Your religion/religious beliefs.....	1 (5%)
Your nationality.....	2 (7%)
You are from a different part of the country to others.....	3 (11%)
You are from a Traveller community.....	0 (0%)
Your sexuality.....	0 (0%)
Your age.....	1 (5%)
You having a disability.....	0 (0%)
You were new here.....	2 (7%)
Your offence/crime.....	0 (0%)
Gang related issues.....	1 (5%)

- Q7 Have you ever been victimised by staff here (e.g. insulted or assaulted you)?**
- |          |          |
|----------|----------|
| Yes..... | 12 (41%) |
| No.....  | 17 (59%) |
- Q8 If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**
- |   |         |
|---|---------|
| Insulting remarks (about you, your family or friends).....  | 8 (28%) |
| Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted).....        | 1 (3%)  |
| Sexual abuse.....   | 1 (3%)  |
| Feeling threatened or intimidated.....                      | 3 (10%) |
| Having your canteen/property taken.....                     | 2 (7%)  |
| Medication.....   | 0 (0%)  |
| Debt.....   | 0 (0%)  |
| Drugs.....  | 1 (3%)  |
| Your race or ethnic origin.....                             | 1 (3%)  |
| Your religion/religious beliefs.....                        | 0 (0%)  |
| Your nationality.....                                       | 0 (0%)  |
| You are from a different part of the country to others..... | 2 (7%)  |
| You are from a Traveller community.....                     | 0 (0%)  |
| Your sexuality.....   | 0 (0%)  |
| Your age.....   | 1 (3%)  |
| You having a disability.....                                | 0 (0%)  |
| You were new here.....                                      | 1 (3%)  |
| Your offence/crime.....                                     | 0 (0%)  |
| Gang related issues.....                                    | 1 (3%)  |
| Because you made a complaint.....                           | 5 (17%) |
- Q10 If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?**
- |                 |          |
|-----------------|----------|
| Yes.....        | 6 (27%)  |
| No.....         | 11 (50%) |
| Don't know..... | 5 (23%)  |
- Q11 Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?**
- |                 |          |
|-----------------|----------|
| Yes.....        | 6 (21%)  |
| No.....         | 15 (54%) |
| Don't know..... | 7 (25%)  |
- Q12 Is shouting through the windows a problem here?**
- |                 |          |
|-----------------|----------|
| Yes.....        | 14 (50%) |
| No.....         | 11 (39%) |
| Don't know..... | 3 (11%)  |

## SECTION 10: HEALTH SERVICES

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Is it easy to see the following people if you need to?</b>			
		Yes	No	Don't know
	The doctor .....	19 (73%)	4 (15%)	3 (12%)
	The nurse .....	21 (84%)	1 (4%)	3 (12%)
	The dentist .....	17 (63%)	5 (19%)	5 (19%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?</b>			
	<i>I have not been</i> .....			1 (3%)
	<i>Very good</i> .....			3 (10%)
	<i>Good</i> .....			11 (38%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....			11 (38%)
	<i>Bad</i> .....			0 (0%)
	<i>Very bad</i> .....			3 (10%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/all of it in your room?</b>			
	<i>I am not taking any medication</i> .....			15 (56%)
	<i>Yes, all of my meds</i> .....			2 (7%)
	<i>Yes, some of my meds</i> .....			1 (4%)
	<i>No</i> .....			9 (33%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?</b>			
	<i>Yes</i> .....			9 (33%)
	<i>No</i> .....			18 (67%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>Are you being helped by anyone here with your emotional or mental health problems (e.g. a psychologist, doctor, counsellor, personal officer or another member of staff)?</b>			
	<i>I do not have any emotional or mental health problems</i> .....			18 (67%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....			2 (7%)
	<i>No</i> .....			7 (26%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>Did you have problems with alcohol when you first arrived here?</b>			
	<i>Yes</i> .....			5 (18%)
	<i>No</i> .....			23 (82%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>Have you received any help with alcohol problems here?</b>			
	<i>Yes</i> .....			3 (11%)
	<i>No</i> .....			25 (89%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>Did you have problems with drugs when you first arrived here?</b>			
	<i>Yes</i> .....			16 (57%)
	<i>No</i> .....			12 (43%)
<b>Q9</b>	<b>Do you have problems with drugs now?</b>			
	<i>Yes</i> .....			3 (11%)
	<i>No</i> .....			25 (89%)
<b>Q10</b>	<b>Have you received any help with drugs problems here?</b>			
	<i>Yes</i> .....			12 (43%)
	<i>No</i> .....			16 (57%)
<b>Q11</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it to get illegal drugs here?</b>			
	<i>Very easy</i> .....			6 (22%)
	<i>Easy</i> .....			4 (15%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....			3 (11%)



Difficult.....	0 (0%)
Very difficult.....	5 (19%)
Don't know .....	9 (33%)

## SECTION 11: ACTIVITIES

<b>Q1</b>	<b>How old were you when you were last at school?</b>				
	14 or under .....				11 (39%)
	15 or over.....				17 (61%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Have you ever been excluded from school?</b>				
	Yes.....				24 (86%)
	No.....				3 (11%)
	Not applicable.....				1 (4%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>Did you ever skip school before you came into custody?</b>				
	Yes.....				24 (86%)
	No.....				4 (14%)
	Not applicable.....				0 (0%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Do you CURRENTLY take part in any of the following activities? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>				
	Education.....				24 (83%)
	A job in this establishment.....				0 (0%)
	Vocational or skills training.....				2 (7%)
	Offending behaviour programmes.....				8 (28%)
	<i>I am not currently involved in any of these</i> .....				3 (10%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>If you have been involved in any of the following activities here, do you think they will help you when you leave prison?</b>				
		<b>Not been involved</b>	Yes	No	Don't know
	Education	0 (0%)	15 (56%)	5 (19%)	7 (26%)
	A job in this establishment	3 (14%)	4 (19%)	5 (24%)	9 (43%)
	Vocational or skills training	3 (14%)	3 (14%)	6 (29%)	9 (43%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	1 (4%)	6 (26%)	8 (35%)	8 (35%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>Do you usually have association every day?</b>				
	Yes.....				25 (86%)
	No.....				4 (14%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?</b>				
	<b>Don't want to go</b> .....				3 (11%)
	Yes.....				20 (71%)
	No.....				5 (18%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?</b>				
	<b>Don't want to go</b> .....				0 (0%)
	None.....				1 (3%)
	One to two times.....				10 (34%)
	Three to five times.....				3 (10%)
	More than five times.....				15 (52%)

## SECTION 12: FAMILY AND FRIENDS

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Are you able to use the telephone every day, if you want to?</b>	
	Yes.....	27 (96%)

	No.....	1 (4%)
	Don't know .....	0 (0%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?</b>	
	Yes .....	19 (68%)
	No.....	8 (29%)
	Don't know .....	1 (4%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>How many visits do you usually have each week, from family or friends?</b>	
	<i>I don't get visits</i> .....	3 (10%)
	Less than one a week.....	12 (41%)
	About one a week.....	10 (34%)
	More than one a week.....	3 (10%)
	Don't know .....	1 (3%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>How easy is it for your family and friends to visit you here?</b>	
	<i>I don't get visits</i> .....	3 (11%)
	Very easy.....	4 (14%)
	Easy.....	9 (32%)
	Neither.....	5 (18%)
	Difficult.....	0 (0%)
	Very difficult.....	3 (11%)
	Don't know .....	4 (14%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>Do your visits usually start on time?</b>	
	<i>I don't get visits</i> .....	3 (11%)
	Yes .....	11 (39%)
	No.....	11 (39%)
	Don't know .....	3 (11%)

### SECTION 13: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Do you think you will have a problem with any of the following things, when you are released? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	Finding accommodation .....	11 (38%)
	Getting into school or college.....	13 (45%)
	Getting a job.....	16 (55%)
	Money/finances.....	14 (48%)
	Claiming benefits.....	9 (31%)
	Continuing health services.....	9 (31%)
	Opening a bank account.....	7 (24%)
	Avoiding bad relationships .....	12 (41%)
	<i>I won't have any problems</i> .....	6 (21%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan (i.e. a plan that is discussed in your DTO/planning meetings, which sets out your targets)?</b>	
	Yes .....	20 (74%)
	No.....	5 (19%)
	Don't know .....	2 (7%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>Were you involved in the development of your plan?</b>	
	<i>I don't have a plan/don't know if I have a plan</i> .....	7 (32%)
	Yes .....	14 (64%)
	No.....	1 (5%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Do you understand the targets that have been set in your plan?</b>	
	<i>I don't have a plan/don't know if I have a plan</i> .....	7 (29%)

	Yes .....	15 (63%)		
	No.....	2 (8%)		
<b>Q5</b>	<b>Do you have a caseworker here?</b>			
	Yes .....	27 (100%)		
	No.....	0 (0%)		
	Don't know .....	0 (0%)		
<b>Q6</b>	<b>Has your caseworker helped to prepare you for release?</b>			
	<i>I don't have a caseworker</i> .....	0 (0%)		
	Yes .....	14 (52%)		
	No.....	12 (44%)		
	Don't know .....	1 (4%)		
<b>Q7</b>	<b>Has your social worker been to visit you since you have been here?</b>			
	<i>I don't have a social worker</i> .....	9 (33%)		
	Yes .....	14 (52%)		
	No.....	4 (15%)		
<b>Q8</b>	<b>Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?</b>			
	Yes .....	15 (56%)		
	No.....	11 (41%)		
	Don't know .....	1 (4%)		
<b>Q9</b>	<b>Do you know who to contact for help with any of the following problems, before your release? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>			
	<i>Finding accommodation</i> .....	10 (40%)		
	<i>Getting into school or college</i> .....	9 (36%)		
	<i>Getting a job</i> .....	10 (40%)		
	<i>Help with money/finances</i> .....	8 (32%)		
	<i>Help with claiming benefits</i> .....	7 (28%)		
	<i>Continuing health services</i> .....	8 (32%)		
	<i>Opening a bank account</i> .....	8 (32%)		
	<i>Avoiding bad relationships</i> .....	8 (32%)		
	<i>I don't know who to contact</i> .....	12 (48%)		
<b>Q10</b>	<b>What is most likely to stop you offending in the future? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>			
	<b>Not sentenced</b> .....	1 (4%)	<i>Having a mentor (someone you can ask for advice)</i> .....	2 (7%)
	<i>Nothing, it is up to me</i> .....	8 (30%)	<i>Having a YOT worker or social worker that I get on with</i> .....	4 (15%)
	<i>Making new friends outside</i> .....	3 (11%)	<i>Having children</i> .....	7 (26%)
	<i>Going back to live with my family</i> .....	6 (22%)	<i>Having something to do that isn't crime</i> .....	9 (33%)
	<i>Getting a place of my own</i> .....	6 (22%)	<i>This sentence</i> .....	7 (26%)
	<i>Getting a job</i> .....	12 (44%)	<i>Getting into school/college</i> .....	6 (22%)
	<i>Having a partner (girlfriend or boyfriend)</i> .....	11 (41%)	<i>Talking about my offending behaviour with staff</i> .....	1 (4%)
	<i>Staying off alcohol/drugs</i> .....	8 (30%)	<i>Anything else</i> .....	1 (4%)
<b>Q11</b>	<b>Do you want to stop offending?</b>			
	<b>Not sentenced</b> .....	1 (4%)		
	Yes .....	23 (88%)		
	No.....	0 (0%)		
	Don't know .....	2 (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?**

<b>Not sentenced</b> .....	1 (4%)
Yes .....	11 (44%)
No.....	13 (52%)

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



### Survey responses from children and young people: HMP & YOI Parc 2016

**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

		HMP & YOI Parc 2016	Young people's comparator	HMP & YOI Parc 2016	HMP & YOI Parc 2014
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		29	557	29	45
<b>SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU</b>					
1.1	Are you 18 years of age?	0%	11%	0%	8%
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	3%	5%	3%	6%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%	100%	100%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	100%	98%	100%	98%
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other category.)	21%	47%	21%	27%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	0%	23%	0%	26%
1.7	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	3%	8%	3%	4%
1.8	Do you have any children?	8%	11%	8%	16%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	19%	20%	19%	19%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	39%	40%	39%	42%
<b>SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE</b>					
2.1	Are you sentenced?	97%	77%	97%	84%
2.2	Is your sentence 12 months or less?	45%	33%	45%	50%
2.3	Have you been in this establishment for one month or less?	13%	18%	13%	16%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	61%	57%	61%	47%
<b>SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS</b>					
On your most recent journey here:					
3.1	Did you feel safe?	72%	78%	72%	90%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	68%	34%	68%	41%
3.3	Did you spend more than 4 hours in the van?	8%	7%	8%	6%
For those who spent 2 or more hours in the escort van:					
3.4	Were you offered a toilet break if you needed it?	20%	9%	20%	9%
3.5	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	50%	39%	50%	50%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	54%	55%	54%	67%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	14%	16%	14%	25%
<b>SECTION 4: YOUR FIRST FEW DAYS HERE</b>					
4.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	76%	80%	76%	92%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	61%	83%	61%	83%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	46%	70%	46%	78%

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

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP & YOJ Parc 2016	Young people's comparator	HMP & YOJ Parc 2016	HMP & YOJ Parc 2014
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>29</b>	<b>557</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>45</b>
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?	44%	47%	44%	66%
4.4b	Loss of property?	19%	18%	19%	15%
4.4c	Feeling scared?	19%	27%	19%	30%
4.4d	Gang problems?	22%	45%	22%	26%
4.4e	Contacting family?	60%	53%	60%	55%
4.4f	Money worries?	22%	16%	22%	17%
4.4g	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	22%	34%	22%	40%
4.4h	Health problems?	44%	55%	44%	40%
4.4i	Getting phone numbers?	49%	40%	49%	45%
4.5	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	74%	78%	74%	76%
When you first arrived, did you have problems with any of the following:					
4.5a	Not being able to smoke?	56%	47%	56%	51%
4.5b	Loss of property?	19%	12%	19%	7%
4.5c	Feeling scared?	11%	14%	11%	11%
4.5d	Gang problems?	11%	20%	11%	9%
4.5e	Contacting family?	51%	32%	51%	24%
4.5f	Money worries?	11%	17%	11%	18%
4.5g	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	11%	15%	11%	9%
4.5h	Health problems?	22%	16%	22%	7%
4.5i	Getting phone numbers?	37%	32%	37%	16%
When you first arrived, were you given any of the following:					
4.6a	Toiletries/basic items?	89%	76%	89%	67%
4.6b	The opportunity to have a shower?	39%	50%	39%	62%
4.6c	Something to eat?	61%	83%	61%	76%
4.6d	A free phone call to friends/family?	46%	76%	46%	74%
4.6e	PIN phone credit?	39%	57%	39%	31%
4.6f	Information about feeling worried/upset?	24%	29%	24%	45%
Within your first 24 hours, did you have access to the following people or services:					
4.7a	A chaplain?	29%	42%	29%	54%
4.7b	A peer mentor?	11%	9%	11%	6%
4.7c	Childline/Samaritans	11%	16%	11%	21%
4.7d	The prison shop/canteen?	14%	10%	14%	6%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	50%	67%	50%	69%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	86%	75%	86%	90%
4.10	For those who have been on an induction course: did it cover everything you needed to know about the establishment?	77%	53%	77%	86%

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

Key to tables

		HMP & YOI Parc 2016	Young people's comparator	HMP & YOI Parc 2016	HMP & YOI Parc 2014
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>29</b>	<b>557</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT</b>					
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	97%	88%	97%	98%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	57%	27%	57%	69%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	18%	18%	18%	16%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	53%	54%	53%	53%
5.5	Is it easy/very easy for you to attend religious services?	45%	52%	45%	43%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	43%	60%	43%	51%
Can you speak to:					
5.7	A chaplain of your faith in private?	66%	63%	66%	74%
5.8	A peer mentor?	22%	30%	22%	38%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	8%	19%	8%	25%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	35%	41%	35%	67%
<b>SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF</b>					
6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	55%	68%	55%	67%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	37%	25%	37%	26%
6.3	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	37%	32%	37%	65%
For those who have met their personal officer:					
6.4	Did you meet your personal (named) officer within the first week?	59%	34%	59%	63%
6.5	Do you see your personal (named) officer at least once a week?	39%	45%	39%	78%
6.6	Do you feel your personal (named) officer tries to help you?	71%	64%	71%	74%
<b>SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS</b>					
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	81%	60%	81%	90%
For those who have made an application:					
7.2	Do you feel applications are sorted out fairly?	55%	59%	55%	71%
7.3	Do you feel applications are sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	27%	34%	27%	66%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	60%	47%	60%	82%
For those who have made a complaint:					
7.5	Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	19%	38%	19%	35%
7.6	Do you feel complaints are sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	18%	29%	18%	40%
7.7	Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint?	11%	11%	11%	5%
<b>SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE</b>					
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	28%	22%	28%	57%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	44%	44%	44%	78%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	49%	42%	49%	70%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	71%	48%	71%	35%
For those who have had a minor report:					
8.5	Was the process explained clearly to you?	78%	73%	78%	80%
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	79%	67%	79%	49%

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

Key to tables

		HMP & YO1 Parc 2016	Young people's comparator	HMP & YO1 Parc 2016	HMP & YO1 Parc 2014
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>29</b>	<b>557</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>45</b>
For those who have had an adjudication ('nicking'):					
8.7	Was the process explained clearly to you?	90%	83%	90%	88%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (Cand R) since you have been here?	43%	43%	43%	29%
8.9	For those who had spent a night in the care and separation unit: did the staff treat you well/very well?	10%	42%	10%	58%
<b>SECTION 9: SAFETY</b>					
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	28%	44%	28%	19%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	11%	19%	11%	4%
9.4	Have you ever been victimised by other young people here?	35%	35%	35%	23%
Since you have been here, have other young people:					
9.5a	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	22%	19%	22%	11%
9.5b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	24%	14%	24%	4%
9.5c	Sexually abused you?	0%	1%	0%	0%
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	11%	15%	11%	9%
9.5e	Taken your canteen/property?	8%	5%	8%	2%
9.5f	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	2%	0%	0%
9.5g	Victimised you because of debt?	3%	2%	3%	0%
9.5h	Victimised you because of drugs?	3%	1%	3%	0%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	3%	4%	3%	4%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	3%	3%	3%	2%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	8%	3%	8%	2%
9.5l	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	11%	4%	11%	4%
9.5m	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%	2%	0%	0%
9.5n	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	1%	0%	0%
9.5o	Victimised you because of your age?	3%	1%	3%	0%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	2%	0%	2%
9.5q	Victimised you because you were new here?	8%	9%	8%	4%
9.5r	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	0%	5%	0%	2%
9.5s	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	3%	9%	3%	2%
9.7	Have you ever been victimised by a member of staff here?	42%	27%	42%	20%
Since you have been here, have staff:					
9.8a	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	26%	14%	26%	4%
9.8b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	3%	9%	3%	2%
9.8c	Sexually abused you?	3%	1%	3%	0%
9.8d	Threatened or intimidated you?	11%	5%	11%	0%
9.8e	Taken your canteen/property?	8%	4%	8%	0%
9.8f	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	1%	0%	0%
9.8g	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	1%	0%	0%
9.8h	Victimised you because of drugs?	3%	1%	3%	2%



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

### Key to tables

		HMP & YOJ Parc 2016	Young people's comparator	HMP & YOJ Parc 2016	HMP & YOJ Parc 2014
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>29</b>	<b>557</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>9.8i</b>	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	3%	4%	3%	4%
<b>9.8j</b>	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	2%	0%	0%
<b>9.8k</b>	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	2%	0%	7%
<b>9.8k</b>	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	8%	2%	8%	7%
<b>9.8m</b>	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%	1%	0%	0%
<b>9.8n</b>	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>9.8o</b>	Victimised you because of your age?	3%	2%	3%	0%
<b>9.8p</b>	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	1%	0%	0%
<b>9.8q</b>	Victimised you because you were new here?	3%	3%	3%	2%
<b>9.8r</b>	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	0%	2%	0%	0%
<b>9.8s</b>	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	3%	2%	3%	0%
<b>9.8t</b>	Victimised you because you made a complaint?	18%	3%	18%	0%
<b>9.10</b>	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	28%	29%	28%	38%
<b>9.11</b>	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	22%	29%	22%	48%
<b>9.12</b>	Is shouting through the windows a problem here?	50%	43%	50%	33%
<b>SECTION 10: HEALTH SERVICES</b>					
<b>10.1a</b>	Is it easy for you to see the doctor?	74%	48%	74%	59%
<b>10.1b</b>	Is it easy for you to see the nurse?	85%	62%	85%	80%
<b>10.1c</b>	Is it easy for you to see the dentist?	63%	26%	63%	41%
<b>10.2</b>	For those who have been to health services: Do you think the overall quality is good/very good?	50%	50%	50%	80%
<b>10.3</b>	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/all of it in your cell?	25%	54%	25%	14%
<b>10.4</b>	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?	33%	26%	33%	11%
<b>10.5</b>	If you have emotional or mental health problems, are you being helped by anyone here?	25%	60%	25%	100%
<b>10.6</b>	Did you have any problems with alcohol when you first arrived?	19%	7%	19%	4%
<b>10.7</b>	Have you received any help with any alcohol problems here?	11%	4%	11%	4%
<b>10.8</b>	Did you have any problems with drugs when you first arrived?	57%	34%	57%	48%
<b>10.9</b>	Do you have a problem with drugs now?	11%	6%	11%	4%
<b>10.10</b>	Have you received any help with any drug problems here?	43%	20%	43%	24%
<b>10.11</b>	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs here?	37%	19%	37%	16%
<b>SECTION 11: ACTIVITIES</b>					
<b>11.1</b>	Were you 14 or younger when you were last at school?	39%	39%	39%	40%
<b>11.2</b>	Have you ever been excluded from school?	86%	88%	86%	93%
<b>11.3</b>	Did you ever skip school before you came into custody?	86%	73%	86%	85%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:					
<b>11.4a</b>	Education?	82%	72%	82%	80%
<b>11.4b</b>	A job in this establishment?	0%	27%	0%	9%
<b>11.4c</b>	Vocational or skills training?	8%	12%	8%	22%

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

### Key to tables

		HMP & YOJ Parc 2016	Young people's comparator	HMP & YOJ Parc 2016	HMP & YOJ Parc 2014
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		29	557	29	45
11.4d	Offending behaviour programmes?	26%	14%	26%	26%
11.4e	Nothing	11%	18%	11%	7%
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?	56%	61%	56%	71%
11.5b	A job in this establishment?	22%	40%	22%	40%
11.5c	Vocational or skills training?	17%	43%	17%	63%
11.5d	Offending behaviour programmes?	28%	41%	28%	63%
11.6	Do you usually have association every day?	87%	59%	87%	83%
11.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	72%	64%	72%	89%
11.8	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	53%	6%	53%	30%
<b>SECTION 12: KEEPING IN TOUCH WITH FAMILY AND FRIENDS</b>					
12.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	97%	79%	97%	91%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	68%	49%	68%	34%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	45%	32%	45%	52%
12.4	Is it easy/very easy for your family and friends to visit you here?	46%	31%	46%	48%
12.5	Do your visits start on time?	39%	32%	39%	51%
<b>SECTION 13: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE</b>					
Do you think you will have a problem with the following, when you are released:					
13.1a	Finding accommodation?	37%	25%	37%	27%
13.1b	Getting into school or college?	45%	30%	45%	23%
13.1c	Getting a job?	55%	51%	55%	48%
13.1d	Money/finances?	47%	35%	47%	35%
13.1e	Claiming benefits?	32%	14%	32%	16%
13.1f	Continuing health services?	32%	9%	32%	7%
13.1g	Opening a bank account?	24%	17%	24%	18%
13.1h	Avoiding bad relationships?	42%	17%	42%	18%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	74%	43%	74%	58%
For those with a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan:					
13.3	Were you involved in the development of your plan?	95%	85%	95%	79%
13.4	Do you understand the targets set in your plan?	87%	92%	87%	92%
13.5	Do you have a caseworker here?	100%	89%	100%	92%
13.6	Has your caseworker helped to prepare you for release?	51%	38%	51%	65%
For those with a social worker:					
13.7	Has your social worker been to visit you since you have been here?	78%	76%	78%	66%
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	56%	40%	56%	58%

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

**Key to tables**

		HMP & YOJ Parc 2016	Young people's comparator	HMP & YOJ Parc 2016	HMP & YOJ Parc 2014
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>29</b>	<b>557</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>45</b>
Do you know who to contact for help with the following problems?					
<b>13.9a</b>	Finding accommodation	<b>39%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>32%</b>
<b>13.9b</b>	Getting into school or college	<b>36%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>24%</b>
<b>13.9c</b>	Getting a job	<b>39%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>46%</b>
<b>13.9d</b>	Help with money/finances	<b>31%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>18%</b>
<b>13.9e</b>	Help with claiming benefits	<b>27%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>14%</b>
<b>13.9f</b>	Continuing health services	<b>31%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>11%</b>
<b>13.9g</b>	Opening a bank account	<b>31%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>11%</b>
<b>13.9h</b>	Avoiding bad relationships	<b>31%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>14%</b>
For those who were sentenced:					
<b>13.11</b>	Do you want to stop offending?	<b>91%</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>91%</b>	<b>87%</b>
<b>13.12</b>	Have you done anything or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?	<b>45%</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>48%</b>

## Diversity analysis



### Key question responses (local authority care analysis) HMP & YOI Parc 2016

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

#### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Young people who have been in local authority care	Young people who have not been in local authority care
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>11</b>	<b>17</b>
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	0%	0%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	100%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	100%	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.)	20%	18%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	0%	0%
1.5	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	0%	5%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	29%	13%
2.1	Are you sentenced?	100%	96%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	53%	64%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	71%	64%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	36%	64%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	7%	18%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	47%	70%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	20%	64%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	47%	55%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	93%	82%
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	93%	100%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	53%	59%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	20%	13%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	47%	55%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	47%	41%
Can you speak to:			
5.7	A chaplain of your faith in private?	64%	70%
5.8	A peer mentor?	0%	36%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	0%	13%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	36%	36%

## 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%	46%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	31%	41%
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	71%	87%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	53%	62%
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	47%	19%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	36%	47%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	53%	44%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	80%	60%
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	93%	70%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	53%	38%
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	29%	30%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	7%	13%
9.4	Have you been victimised by other young people here?	64%	19%
Since you have been here, have other young people:			
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	7%	14%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	5%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	5%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	7%	5%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	0%
9.7	Have you been victimised by staff here?	53%	36%
Since you have been here, have staff:			
9.8d	Threatened or intimidated you?	7%	13%
9.8i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	7%	0%
9.8j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	0%
9.8k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	0%
9.8p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	0%
9.10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	9%	33%
9.11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	20%	19%

## Diversity analysis

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Young people who have been in local authority care	Young people who have not been in local authority care
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>10.1a</b>	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the doctor?	71%	74%
<b>10.1b</b>	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the nurse?	92%	80%
<b>10.4</b>	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	39%	30%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:			
<b>11.4a</b>	Education?	71%	87%
<b>11.4b</b>	A job in this establishment?	0%	0%
<b>11.4c</b>	Vocational or skills training?	7%	5%
<b>11.4d</b>	Offending behaviour programmes?	47%	18%
<b>11.4e</b>	Nothing?	20%	5%
<b>11.6</b>	Do you usually have association every day?	93%	82%
<b>11.7</b>	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	80%	62%
<b>11.8</b>	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	53%	46%
<b>12.1</b>	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	93%	100%
<b>12.2</b>	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	80%	59%
<b>12.3</b>	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	29%	59%
<b>13.2</b>	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	69%	81%
<b>13.8</b>	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	50%	57%