

Report on an unannounced inspection of

**Juvenile unit at**

**HMYOI Parc**

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

**5–16 December 2016**

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



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

Crown copyright 2017

This publication is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. To view this licence, visit [nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3](http://nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3) or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email: [psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk).

Where we have identified any third party copyright information 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	27
Section 3. Purposeful activity	37
Section 4. Resettlement	43
Section 5. Summary of recommendations and good practice	51
Section 6. Appendices	55
Appendix I: Inspection team	55
Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report	57
Appendix III: Establishment population profile	63
Appendix IV: Summary of children and young people questionnaires and interviews	67

### **Glossary of terms**

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

# Introduction

This report concerns the small juvenile institution for up to 64 boys aged under 18 located in the much larger Parc prison in South Wales. The unit and wider prison are operated by the private company G4S. Owing to the risks and accountabilities associated with such facilities, and in consultation with the Youth Justice Board, we inspect all young offender institutions (YOIs) annually.

We last inspected the institution in January 2016. At the time – and in keeping with previous inspections – we reported positively, although on that occasion we did record some deterioration in our assessments for our healthy prison tests of safety and respect, and cautioned the prison against complacency. Unfortunately that warning was not heeded sufficiently and at this inspection we recorded yet further deterioration in outcomes related to safety and respect.

It was a particular concern that procedures and practice to support child safeguarding and child protection had worsened significantly. The administration of arrangements as well as the consistency and rigour with which referrals and investigations were managed was lacking. We address this concern and seek immediate improvements in the first of our main recommendations.

Safety in general was not good enough. Some 42% of boys told us they felt victimised by others and 60% felt victimised by staff – a significant increase and worse than at comparable prisons. In our survey nearly a third of boys indicated they felt unsafe. In the six previous months, although most were minor, there had been in excess of 100 violent incidents. As an example, the number of assaults on staff had increased from two to 22 when compared to the six months prior to our previous visit. At this inspection we found four boys self-isolating in cell for their own protection.

Strategies, policies and initiatives existed with the intention of reducing violence and intimidation as well as promoting positive behaviour, but they were not applied consistently or effectively and were not working. Of particular concern was the insufficient visible leadership on the unit, and staff, whilst generally caring, lacked authority or confidence. All too often we saw staff failing in their duty to confront poor behaviour or set acceptable boundaries. The needs for much better management initiative, more effective strategies to confront poor behaviour, and more effective staff supervision are the subjects of our two other main recommendations.

Security procedures on the unit were proportionate and evidence suggested the influence of illegal drugs was not strong. Use of force, in contrast, was much higher than we would expect and the quality of supervision and oversight needed to be better. Formal segregation was used infrequently. It was the case, however, that too many boys at risk of self-harm and subject to case management support were left isolated and alone in cell. The number of self-harm incidents on the unit remained relatively high.

The YOI at Parc is a relatively small, arguably claustrophobic facility. During our inspection some refurbishment was taking place but, environmentally, standards and cleanliness were not good enough. The unit was shabby and too often the atmosphere on the wings was described by inspectors as unruly. The absence of visible leadership to set consistent standards and model expected behaviour was very obvious to us.

The promotion of equality and diversity remained very limited and rudimentary, but health care services were mostly good. The quality of food was reasonable overall.

The amount of time boys spent out of cell had worsened but the delivery of learning and skills was beginning to improve. Our colleagues in Estyn judged provision to be 'good' overall, with good-quality teaching and good achievements by boys. Boys behaved well in class and there were enough places on offer, but punctuality was poor.

Resettlement services were similarly improving, supported by an up-to-date needs analysis. All boys had a sentence plan but needed to be better engaged with the process and its requirements. Release planning was generally satisfactory, although there was a need to consider how offending behaviour work might be improved. Work with families was excellent.

The YOI at Parc has over recent years been one about which we have been very positive. It was arguably one of the best such institutions and had a number of advantages, not least its small size. There remained much still to commend, notably the provision of learning and skills and resettlement services. We also acknowledged that the small number of boys held on the units presented significant individual and behavioural challenges. That said, the deterioration in safety and general standards on the unit needed to be arrested. Systems and procedures were in place but they were not working. A firmer grip and visible leadership were needed urgently. Staff needed guidance and support and they needed greater confidence in establishing their authority and exercising better control over what was happening in the institution.

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

February 2017

# Fact page

**Task of the establishment**

Category B training prison with operational capacity of 1,723 for offenders aged 18 plus. Young people's unit with an operational capacity of 64 remanded and convicted young people.

**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**

47

**Certified normal accommodation**

64

**Operational capacity**

64

**Date of last full inspection**

January 2016

**Brief history**

The young people's unit opened in 2002 as a 28-room facility for remanded young people aged 15 to 18 years. In 2004 the unit expanded to house 36 young people, accommodating both remand and sentenced. In 2007 the unit expanded further to 64 young people. The facility was for courts in south and mid Wales.

In 2013 the court catchment area for the unit extended from Wales to south-west England to include Somerset, Devon and Cornwall.

In April 2014 the court catchment area increased further to include Bristol, Swindon and Wiltshire.

**Short description of residential units**

The unit, known as the John Charles unit, has two residential units. G1 houses up to 36 young people and E1 up to 28 young people

**Name of director**

Janet Wallsgrove

**Escort contractor**

GeoAmey

**Health service commissioner and providers**

G4S Health (UK) Ltd

**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
- **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 0.01, which means that there is only a 1% chance that the difference in results is due to chance.

# Summary

## Safety

**S1** *A third of boys at Parc felt unsafe. Boys were inducted well, but spent too long locked up during their early days. There was a lack of operational grip on safety. Levels of violence had increased, safeguarding practice had deteriorated, and the high number of boys on ACCTs<sup>2</sup> spent long periods locked in their cells. Half the population were on the lowest level of the rewards and sanctions scheme, but this was not effective in stopping some of the unruly behaviour. Some poor behaviour went unchallenged. Security measures were proportionate but the use of force had increased again and governance was less robust. Substance misuse services remained good. **Outcomes for children and young people were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.***

**S2** *At the last inspection in January 2016, we found that outcomes for children and young people in Parc were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 12 recommendations about safety. At this follow-up inspection we found that one of the recommendations had been achieved, one had been partially achieved and 10 had not been achieved.*

**S3** Boys still faced unacceptable delays at court, long journeys with adult prisoners and late arrivals at Parc before being placed in stark admissions cells. Our survey results indicated that the process was a negative experience for many. The individual induction process remained good practice but boys spent too long locked in their cells during their first week at Parc.

**S4** Safeguarding practice had deteriorated since the previous inspection. The monthly and quarterly safeguarding meetings were now poorly attended and no longer provided adequate analysis of key areas of life on the unit. The number of external child protection referrals was very low and not all allegations against staff were subject to external scrutiny. An inadequate oversight of child protection logs delayed investigations and three out of four investigations over the last six months had no recorded outcome.

**S5** In our survey, 32% of boys reported feeling unsafe. A concerning 60% said they had been victimised by a member of staff. This represented a significant increase at Parc over the last three years and was higher than the comparator of 31%. Levels of all types of violence had increased since the last inspection. The efforts being made to reduce violence, much of which was relatively low level, were not fully effective. The systems to manage perpetrators of violence and support victims were applied inconsistently and were not sufficiently accountable.

**S6** The number of self-harm incidents remained relatively high. ACCT documentation was reasonable, although observations were predictable and reviews that we observed did not adequately involve boys in care planning. We also found that too many boys on ACCTs spent long periods locked in their cells.

**S7** Young offender institution (YOI) rules and expectations of behaviour were explained to boys on induction and were displayed on residential units. Half the population were on the bronze (basic) regime and 17% (nine boys) were on the higher levels of gold or platinum, which indicated that the system was not credible. Some staff were not confident in challenging poor

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

behaviour or maintaining appropriate boundaries, but there was also little to motivate positive behaviour.

- S8 Security remained well managed and was proportionate to the risks posed. Despite the increase in violence and challenging behaviour, the use of adjudication and minor reports had not increased since the last inspection.
- S9 Use of force remained very high. Most incidents were handled appropriately in response to violence. However, there were examples of poor incident management which prolonged restraints. Oversight of force had deteriorated since the previous inspection, with too many procedural shortfalls and a failure to review all body-worn video footage. The use of segregation remained commendably low, although the number of boys self-isolating for their own protection was much higher than at the previous inspection.
- S10 Psychosocial support for substance use was good and remained well integrated with all other departments.

## Respect

**S11** *Residential areas were shabby and too many cells were dirty. Access to information kiosks and in-cell telephones remained a strength. Units were noisy and unruly at times. Relationships on residential units had deteriorated further and poor behaviour was not challenged consistently. The strategic management of equality and diversity was weak and lacked focus on the needs of boys. Faith services remained good. Complaints were managed well. Health services, particularly access, remained good. Food was not popular, although breakfast was better than we see elsewhere. **Outcomes for children and young people were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.***

**S12** *At the last inspection in January 2016, we found that outcomes for children and young people in Parc were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 12 recommendations about respect.<sup>3</sup> At this follow-up inspection we found that one of the recommendations had been achieved, one had been partially achieved and 10 had not been achieved.*

- S13** Communal areas were run down and dirty, although a refurbishment project was under way. The standard of cells was variable and some were poor. Cell toilets remained stained and unscreened and cell cleaning was not facilitated adequately. Some cell call bells went unanswered and observation glass panels were blocked. Units were noisy and unruly at times and many boys felt unsafe out of their cells. More positively, most cells were free of graffiti and offensive displays, bedding was changed weekly, and boys could wear and launder their own clothes. Boys also had good access to in-cell telephones and electronic information kiosks.
- S14** There was an absence of visible leadership to set consistent standards and model expected behaviour. In our survey, fewer boys than at other establishments said that staff treated them with respect. We did not see disrespectful treatment on units and many interactions were relaxed. There were also examples of caring treatment and proportionate responses to challenging situations. However, too many unit staff lacked authority and did not always challenge poor behaviour. Many boys did not know their key worker. Key worker entries on

<sup>3</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.

- P-NOMIS and paper files were infrequent but some did demonstrate efforts to help boys. Relationships between boys and staff in specialist areas were good. Attendance at consultation meetings by both staff and boys was poor and few issues raised were actually addressed.
- S15 The leadership of equality and diversity remained weak. There was no dedicated action plan or policy for the unit and the prison-wide equality team paid too little attention to boys' experiences. Investigations into discrimination incidents were good and boys were appropriately challenged following proven incidents. Consultation with minority groups was rudimentary. Boys from a black and minority ethnic background rarely reported discrimination but, in our survey, significantly more black and minority ethnic boys than white boys said that they had received a minor report and adjudication. The chaplaincy provided good faith services and pastoral support.
- S16 During the previous six months, there had been far fewer complaints than we find at other YOIs. Most replies were polite and easy to read and offered apologies and compensation when needed. Boys were supported by the casework team to understand and exercise their legal rights, including making bail applications.
- S17 Health care services remained mostly good and the dedicated unit nurse continued to provide consistent support for the boys. Waiting times for primary care services remained short, but most comprehensive health assessment tool (CHAT) assessments were still delayed. Pharmacy services were generally good but medication administration facilities remained unsatisfactory. In our survey, 51% of boys said it was easy to see a dentist against the comparator of 25%. The care provided was good. Very few boys in our survey said they were being helped with mental health issues. The range of interventions was too limited but overall the service remained good.
- S18 Unlike many other YOIs, boys received fresh milk and toast for breakfast and ate their meals together. Consultation about food was reasonable but in our survey only 18% of boys said that the food was good. Some of the food we saw was unappetising, although portions were substantial. Boys could easily purchase a wide range of reasonably priced goods.

## Purposeful activity

- S19 *Time out of cell was worse than at the previous inspection. Management of learning and skills was beginning to improve with the introduction of a new manager and curriculum. More effort was needed to ensure that all boys attended education and had an opportunity to progress. There was sufficient provision and a good range of activities for all boys. Punctuality was poor. Educational and vocational achievements were good, as was the quality of teaching. Boys behaved well in most classes and took pride in their work. The library operated well and provided a good service. Boys reported having less time at the gym than at the last inspection. **Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***
- S20 *At the last inspection in January 2016, we found that outcomes for children and young people in Parc were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made five recommendations about purposeful activity. At this follow-up inspection we found that two of the recommendations had been achieved, one had been partially achieved and two had not been achieved.*
- S21 In our roll checks during the inspection, 29% of boys were locked up which was worse than at the time of the last inspection. More work was required to get these boys out of their cells. Time out of cell for other boys was good.

- S22 The appointment of a new, temporary curriculum manager had raised staff morale and improved their focus on the aims of the unit. Good co-operation between the young people's unit and adult education had improved the cover for absent teachers. Useful continuing professional development had helped teachers to start embedding literacy into lessons. Improved curriculum planning and good partnership working had extended the range of options for learners and strengthened quality assurance procedures. There were good systems to collect and analyse data, which staff used well to inform evaluation and monitor key performance indicators (KPIs) in monthly meetings. However, the unit did not review individual learners' progress systematically. Literacy and numeracy strategies were not clear enough to guide teachers in improving boys' skills. Teaching staff promoted equality and diversity well, and most boys were respectful in class.
- S23 Boys had prompt access to education and training after arrival at Parc and there was enough provision for every boy to attend full time. Initial assessment was good and outcomes informed the planning of learning. Most classrooms were well equipped and the range of activities had been extended to include vocational and engagement activities from January 2017. Punctuality was poor in many classes. Teachers followed up learners who were absent and gave positive encouragement which helped them to participate in education. However, operational staff did not do enough to ensure that boys went to and stayed in education. Boys who did attend took pride in their work and achievements.
- S24 The unit performed well against its KPIs. Most boys attended consistently and participated well in class, and most improved their literacy and numeracy skills. Boys developed skills that prepared them for employment or further education, but opportunities for work experience were limited. Many boys produced practical and written work of a good standard.
- S25 Overall the quality of teaching was good and met the needs of most boys.
- S26 Teachers marked work regularly and gave boys positive feedback. However, literacy errors were frequently overlooked. Individual education plans were clear and personal to the boy but improvement targets in literacy and numeracy were not simple enough or focused. Teachers used a good range of learning resources.
- S27 The library was well stocked and many boys made good use of the facility. The librarian encouraged them to read and borrow books and a resident reader supported their reading development.
- S28 In our survey, 11% of boys said that they went to the gym more than five times a week compared with 53% at the previous inspection. However, this was better than the comparator of 2%. Internal PE equipment and classroom facilities on the unit were in poor repair and access to the main facilities at weekends was limited to boys on the gold and platinum regimes.

## Resettlement

- S29** *The strategic management of resettlement had improved since the last inspection and was informed by an up-to-date needs analysis. All boys had a training plan but had not been given a copy. Some plans did not identify risk of harm factors adequately. Review meetings were managed well with contributions from key workers and boys. Public protection was well organised. Support from local authorities for the high number of looked-after boys was inconsistent. Release planning and pathways work were generally good. Accommodation work had improved but there remained a need for further offending behaviour interventions. Work with families was excellent. **Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***
- S30** *At the last inspection in January 2016, we found that outcomes for children and young people in Parc were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 11 recommendations about resettlement. At this follow-up inspection we found that none of the recommendations had been achieved, three had been partially achieved and eight had not been achieved.*
- S31** The management of resettlement had improved since the last inspection. Work was informed by an up-to-date needs analysis and an action plan which addressed the resettlement pathways. The approach to work on the unit and the resettlement meeting had become more strategic, and work with community partners had improved. Home detention curfew and early release provisions were used appropriately. There was very little use of release on temporary licence and none to improve family ties.
- S32** All boys had a sentence plan but in our survey only half the boys knew of this and they were not given a copy. Despite staffing issues, the casework team ensured that boys had regular sentence plan reviews. We observed conversations between boys, caseworkers and community youth offending team staff which demonstrated that risk of harm issues were considered but the plans did not always reflect these risk factors. Review meetings were still managed well and boys were encouraged to contribute. Attendance by key workers was monitored and had improved since the previous inspection. Public protection arrangements continued to be organised appropriately.
- S33** Local authorities had a statutory responsibility for over 60% of the boys but the level of their support remained inconsistent. The unit provided good assistance to help boys access the input they were entitled to from their local authority.
- S34** Release planning was discussed from early in the sentence and practical arrangements for the day of release were well organised.
- S35** Work to improve accommodation outcomes for boys was good. Boys had access to employment skills classes and an impartial careers advice service but the use of video conferencing to enable learners from England to link with the National Careers Service was underdeveloped. More work was needed to strengthen the finance, benefit and debt support available.
- S36** Pre-discharge arrangements for health and substance misuse issues remained good.
- S37** Support for boys to maintain family ties remained good despite the loss of the family support worker. Visits facilities and the use of Skype for family contact were excellent.
- S38** Further work was required to improve the range of offending behaviour interventions.

## Main concerns and recommendations

S39 Concern: A high number of boys reported victimisation by other boys and staff. There was a lack of strategic oversight and operational grip on the processes designed to keep boys safe. Meetings were poorly attended and provided little analysis of issues and the child protection system was weak.

**Recommendation: Managers should investigate the reasons for the poor perceptions of boys about safety. Safeguarding and child protection systems should be consistently applied. Strategic meetings should be well attended and take action to provide boys with a safe and secure environment. All allegations of mistreatment by staff and other boys should be subject to swift, well documented external investigations.**

S40 Concern: There was a lack of managerial oversight of bullying and violence reduction. Managers were not able to provide evidence of the number of perpetrators or victims of violence nor actions that had been taken to support or challenge them and to ensure boys felt safe and were safe.

**Recommendation: The juvenile unit management team should review current strategy to ensure that perpetrators of violence are appropriately identified and managed and their behaviour challenged. All data on violence should be collated and analysed to inform a relevant action plan to improve the safety of boys on the unit.**

S41 Concern: Some residential staff lacked authority when supervising boys and poor behaviour was not challenged consistently. There were not enough staff to supervise communal areas effectively and at times the units became noisy and unruly. There was too little visible leadership to support unit staff, set and monitor consistent standards and model the behaviour expected from all staff when working with the boys.

**Recommendation: There should be sufficient staff to supervise boys safely. Staff should be trained and supported to challenge poor behaviour consistently and appropriately. Managers at all levels should be visible to staff and boys to model the behaviours expected of them.**



# Section 1. Safety

## Courts, escorts and transfers

### Expected outcomes:

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

- I.1 Boys were held at court for long periods after their cases had concluded and then had to endure convoluted journeys with adult prisoners before arriving at Parc. Many arrived late and we saw evidence of one boy arriving after midnight. The establishment had raised these issues with the escort contractor without resolution but action was needed at a national level.
- I.2 In our survey, 14% of boys reported journeys of more than four hours and less than half of those who had had a journey of more than two hours had been offered food. Just 12% had been offered a toilet break. Very few boys remembered being given information at court or in their previous establishment to prepare them for life at Parc.
- I.3 The large catchment area from Cornwall to the Midlands and much of Wales meant that many boys continued to be held a long way from home.

### Recommendation

- I.4 **Boys should be transported to custody as soon as their case has finished. They should be transported separately from adults and arrive into custody before 7pm.**

## Early days in custody

### Expected outcomes:

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

- I.5 In our survey, only 36% of boys said they were treated well in reception against the comparator of 65%. We spoke to new arrivals who described being placed in the smaller, stark holding cells rather than the larger, more welcoming facilities used for adult prisoners.
- I.6 Boys reported having a range of problems on arrival at Parc; half the respondents to our survey said they had had problems contacting their family and significantly fewer than the comparator said they were given a free telephone call or PIN phone credit on arrival. Twenty per cent of boys said they had felt scared and 29% said they were worried or upset and needed someone to talk when they arrived.
- I.7 Most boys did not spend long in reception and staff from the young people's unit undertook the first night interview, health care assessment and cell-sharing risk assessment in a more appropriate room. These were comprehensive and made good use of information received in advance. Boys were told what to expect over the coming week and were given two

booklets on life at Parc, including advice on rules and routines in an accessible format. An abridged version of these booklets had been translated into foreign languages in response to young people arriving who could not speak English.

- 1.8** Boys were allocated a cell and those we spoke to said it was clean and contained most essential items, although some cells did not have a chair.
- 1.9** More boys than at comparable establishments said that the induction course covered everything they needed to know about the establishment. The week-long induction started the first weekday after arrival. It was designed to meet the individual needs of boys and gave ample opportunity for questions and feedback. On completion, a thorough check was made to ensure that boys had been given all the information they needed. However, the induction sessions did not always fill the allocated time and boys spent too long locked up during their first week.

## Recommendation

- 1.10** **Boys should spend more time out of their cells during their first week at Parc.**

## Good practice

- 1.11** *The individual induction was comprehensive and gave boys a realistic understanding of life at Parc. The handbook they were given was well designed and ensured that boys knew what to expect during their first few days at Parc.*

# 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.**

- 1.12** The strategic framework of safeguarding remained unchanged with quarterly strategic and monthly operational meetings, combined with daily, multidisciplinary staff briefings. However, we found significant deterioration in practice since the previous inspection.
- 1.13** The daily multidisciplinary briefing remained a well attended forum for sharing information about risk and vulnerability of boys on the unit. In contrast, attendance at monthly operational safeguarding and violence reduction meetings was very poor; only three people had attended two of the previous three meetings and minutes showed little analysis of issues.
- 1.14** At the previous inspection, quarterly meetings chaired by the head of unit were well attended, including representatives from community agencies. It was unclear how many meetings had taken place since then. We saw one set of minutes from June 2016 and staff could remember another poorly attended meeting in October, although there was no evidence of an agenda or minutes.
- 1.15** There was evidence that the protection of boys from harm had deteriorated in a number of areas including suicide and self-harm prevention, violence reduction and use of force (see sections on suicide and self-harm prevention, bullying and violence reduction and use of

force). We were particularly concerned at a lack of external oversight in key areas, including child protection and use of force.

- I.16 Consultation with boys on safety needed to improve. The community forum was poorly attended and, while boys raised legitimate issues, there was no evidence of actions to resolve them.
- I.17 A review of safeguarding was being conducted by the prison and Youth Justice Board with a view to improving practice in this area.

## Child protection

### Expected outcomes:

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

- I.18 Boys were given clear information about child protection procedures in the induction booklet together with contact details for the Independent Monitoring Board, Barnardo's advocate and prison social worker.
- I.19 Child protection policies and procedures were unchanged but the relationships between G4S managers, the prison social worker and local authority children's services were weaker than at the previous inspection. Despite a high number of use of force incidents, typically the main reason for external child protection referrals, only four incidents had been referred to the local authority for investigation during the previous six months. This was far from adequate. During the inspection, we reviewed an allegation against staff which was not subject to a child protection referral or external investigation.
- I.20 We also had concerns about poor records and delays in investigating incidents which had resulted in a child protection referral. All records were incomplete which made it impossible for managers to track the progress of the investigation. There was evidence of avoidable delays in referral by G4S and investigation by the local authority. The poor records hampered efforts to challenge these delays. Three of the four referrals made in the last six months had no recorded outcome, which was unacceptable. In one case the last recorded action was a telephone message left for children's services in June 2016. In cases where no action had been taken by the local authority, the establishment did not record its own response to allegations.
- I.21 The intermittent frequency and poor attendance at monthly and quarterly meetings prevented these issues from being properly addressed (see paragraph I.13 and main recommendation S39).

## 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.22 Boys' responses to questions about victimisation in our survey gave cause for significant concern: 42% said they had been victimised by other boys and only 16% said they would have the confidence to tell staff if they were being victimised.

- I.23** Sixty per cent of boys said that they had been victimised by staff compared with 42% and 20% at our previous inspections. This was now significantly higher than the comparator of 31%. A third said staff had made insulting remarks about them or their family and a quarter that staff had victimised them because of their race or ethnic origin. Despite recommendations following our previous inspections, there was no evidence that managers had investigated the causes of these poor perceptions.
- I.24** Safer custody managers from the adult site had conducted focus groups involving nearly all the boys in the juvenile unit, to gain insight into several issues, including bullying and violence. This was a welcome initiative, although no action plan had been implemented.
- I.25** At the time of the inspection, staff were aware of four boys who were choosing to isolate themselves. In reality the number was higher, with some refusing to shower or eat communally, and others barely leaving their cell. There was no systematic monitoring of boys who were victims of bullying or self-isolation and the behaviour of perpetrators of violence was only challenged sporadically (see section on bullying and violence reduction).
- I.26** There had been no consultation or survey to determine the views of families on safety, although we found good examples of parents or carers of boys being made aware of any behavioural or safety concerns that had been raised.

## Recommendations

- I.27** **Boys should feel confident to report bullying without fear of further intimidation.**  
(Repeated recommendation I.31)
- I.28** **Appropriate actions should be taken to understand the perceptions of boys in relation to victimisation by staff and measures introduced to address these concerns.**

## 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.29** Levels of self-harm remained relatively high. During the previous six months, boys had been supported 41 times through ACCT<sup>4</sup> procedures and there had been 32 self-harm incidents.
- I.30** Seven boys were on open ACCTs at the time of our inspection, most of whom did not feel well cared for. Anxiety about mixing with other boys resulted in many of these vulnerable boys spending long periods locked in cells with little to occupy them. Basic in-cell work was provided for boys who did not attend education, but we saw one boy on an open ACCT who did not have a pencil and another with no chair to sit on to do the work.
- I.31** The quality of ACCT documentation was reasonably good. Initial assessments and action plans were conducted promptly. Care maps contained meaningful actions but they were not always followed up or quality assured. Most observational entries were detailed but the

---

<sup>4</sup> Assessment, care in custody and teamwork case management of prisoners at risk of suicide and self-harm.

timing of observations was still too predictable. Boys continued to be reviewed about a week after the closure of the ACCT and were asked for feedback on their care.

- I.32** Case reviews were not always multidisciplinary and we saw reviews held in the middle of a wing which was a noisy and inappropriate location. In some reviews the boy was not involved in the development of care maps and most boys left their review not knowing what would happen next.
- I.33** There continued to be an over reliance on cameras in cells to monitor boys who required frequent observation. This limited the interactions between staff and boys in crisis and increased the time locked in a cell with nobody to talk to. The monitoring screens showing boys in their cells were also visible to other boys, which was unacceptable.
- I.34** Oversight of suicide and self-harm reduction had deteriorated (see section on safeguarding). However, in-cell telephones ensured that boys had direct access to the Samaritans, and most boys we spoke to said they could speak to a member of Barnardo's staff if they had a problem.

## Recommendations

- I.35** **Boys in crisis should be provided with activities and opportunities for engagement with staff. Routine use of CCTV for monitoring boys at heightened risk should cease.**
- I.36** **Case reviews should take place in an appropriate environment and should involve the boy. Boys should leave reviews with an understanding of any changes to their plan.**

## 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.37** A comprehensive behaviour management strategy was in place and expectations of behaviour were clearly displayed in residential areas and were explained on induction. In practice, the implementation of the strategy required improvement.
- I.38** Staff regularly dealt with difficult situations and there were examples of positive management and tolerant responses. In contrast, we observed occasions when some staff did not challenge poor behaviour confidently, including boys refusing to return to their cells or drifting in and out of education. We observed one incident where boys refused to lock up to allow staff to deal with a difficult situation and they were clearly inciting others returning from education not to lock up either. Despite this, they were immediately rewarded with extra bags of crisps served at lunchtime, while vulnerable boys who were afraid to eat communally missed out on this additional snack. We found no evidence that the boys responsible had been challenged.
- I.39** The use of adjudications and minor reports remained at a similar level. We found an emphasis on warnings rather than incentives for good behaviour (see paragraph I.42).

- I.40** Behaviour management was discussed at the community forum, but limited actions were taken. Peer support was not used to encourage good behaviour.

## Recommendation

- I.41** All poor conduct should be appropriately challenged to encourage good behaviour through positive role modelling.

## 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.42** The rewards and sanctions scheme had lost some focus since the previous inspection. It was implemented inconsistently and did little to demonstrate that poor behaviour would be challenged or positive behaviour rewarded. In our survey, only 39% of boys said they felt they had been treated fairly under the scheme.
- I.43** At the time of the inspection, 51% of the boys were on the bronze (basic) level of privileges while nine boys (17%) were on gold or platinum (enhanced) levels. This indicated that the system was not credible. One boy who had displayed violent behaviour towards his peers on a number of occasions was on the gold level while subject to separation and monitoring. Staff told us that this was to give him access to some regime during the evening when he was able to associate with a few other boys. While this demonstrated a caring desire to ensure that the boy was not constantly locked up, the same outcome could have been achieved through an individual behaviour management plan without bringing the incentive scheme into disrepute.
- I.44** Boys who were on the bronze level had some association every day but for those who refused to go to education or were excluded this could mean as little as 90 minutes a day out of their cells. Boys on the gold and platinum levels felt that incentives were limited to access to higher earnings.
- I.45** An operational manager oversaw weekly reviews of boys on bronze level. However, boys were not involved in the reviews and were not always told of the outcome or the steps they needed to take to improve their behaviour and return to standard level.

## Recommendations

- I.46** The rewards and sanctions scheme should be reviewed to ensure it is applied consistently with a focus on motivating good behaviour.
- I.47** Rewards and sanctions reviews for boys on basic level should be tailored to the needs of the individual and provide opportunity to progress. Boys should be given the opportunity to be involved in reviews and be made aware of the outcome.

## 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.48** Security procedures were well managed and proportionate to the risk posed. The number of intelligence reports remained broadly the same as at the last inspection, and most related to assaults and violence. The security team remained responsible for the adult site and the young people's unit. Intelligence was processed promptly and actions were passed to relevant managers on the unit.
- I.49** All cell and strip-searching was conducted only on the basis of risk and had to be authorised by a senior manager. During the previous six months, 16 strip-searches had been conducted on boys following good analysis of intelligence. There had been a number of finds, including five mobile phones. None of the searches had involved the use of force.
- I.50** Our survey indicated that illicit drugs were not widely available and this was reflected in finds from searches, security intelligence and comments from the boys. However, there had been some instances of NPS<sup>5</sup> intoxication, and nicotine replacement patches and lozenges were sometimes misused. Mandatory drug testing continued to be managed effectively. There had been no positive random tests since our last inspection. Suspicion testing was completed promptly, although the positive rate was low at 21.9% for the 10 months to November 2016. Six of the seven positive suspicion tests were for cannabis.
- I.51** Despite the increase in violence, the use of adjudications and minor reports had not significantly increased since the last inspection apart from a spike of 141 adjudications in August 2016. In our survey, 100% of boys from a black and minority ethnic background said that they had been subject to a minor report and 93% to adjudication (see paragraph 2.18).
- I.52** Boys were given written information about security procedures and staff checked that it had been understood. The support of an advocate was offered and hearings were adjourned if advocates were not available. However, advocate support was rarely requested.
- I.53** Hearings were held in a relaxed environment and the boy's understanding of the process was monitored throughout. Boys whom we spoke to said that the process was fair. However, we found a number of adjudications and minor reports where the facts had not been fully explored. Some cases could have been dealt with more informally.
- I.54** The monitoring of outcomes of disciplinary procedures was poor. Despite being on the agenda of the monthly violence reduction meetings, there was sometimes no discussion. There was little analysis of trends from the data presented or identification of actions to address areas of concern. Attendance at the meetings was poor.

---

<sup>5</sup> New psychoactive substances: 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.

## Recommendation

- I.55 The outcomes of all disciplinary procedures (adjudications and minor reports) should be scrutinised. There should be more focus on analysing trends and protected characteristics with monitored actions to address concerns.**

## 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.56** In our survey, 32% of boys said that they currently felt unsafe. During the previous six months, there had been 68 assaults on prisoners, 45 fights and seven incidents of serious violence. Over the same period, there had been 22 assaults on staff compared with two at the previous inspection.
- I.57** The strategy for managing violence was comprehensive, but support for perpetrators and victims was disjointed and needed attention.
- I.58** When an incident took place or staff raised concerns, a violence reduction monitoring (VRM) form was opened. These forms indicated a good level of investigation into the incident and regular use of mediation. In the first nine months of the year, 54 VRM forms had been opened.
- I.59** A system of separation and monitoring logs for boys involved in violence was not being implemented and there was no managerial oversight or accountability. We were told that only three monitoring logs had been opened during the previous six months, but only two could be located. An electronic register to monitor separation did not identify who had been subject to monitoring either as a victim or a perpetrator.

## 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.60** The use of force remained at a high level. Force had been used on 242 occasions, significantly more than at comparable establishments. Force was mainly used in response to the high number of spontaneous violent incidents. The implementation of minimising and managing physical restraint (MMPR: a restraint system designed specifically for establishments holding children) had been delayed and control and restraint (C&R: the system that operates in the adult estate) was still being used. Staff from the adult site were still used to respond to incidents on the young people's unit and there were still incidents of staff inflicting pain on boys to gain compliance.
- I.61** We reviewed documentation, CCTV and body-worn video camera footage for 25 incidents during the previous month. We also reviewed historical incidents where boys had made complaints. While most incidents were handled appropriately, we found examples of staff using lower-level personal protection techniques instead of approved C&R holds which would have been more appropriate and safer for both the boy and staff. Some incidents were prolonged unnecessarily when staff released holds early only to have to reapply them; in one



case a boy was restrained on three occasions during one attempt to locate him in a cell. We also saw an example of lack of communication with a boy during a restraint, missing the opportunity to de-escalate the incident.

- I.62** Many incidents ended with boys being restrained into their cells. Body-worn video cameras were used to provide cover in areas, such as cells, that did not have CCTV. There were not enough cameras available to ensure coverage of each incident and we saw many examples of staff not turning on their camera when they could have done so. No body-worn footage had been reviewed for more than a month and footage recorded by staff from the adult site was never reviewed.
- I.63** Internal and external oversight of use of force incidents required significant improvement. There were delays in the completion of some documentation, learning points were not always identified by managers and there was no systematic external oversight of use of force incidents. Oversight provided by safeguarding meetings was weak (see section on safeguarding).
- I.64** Debriefs with boys should have taken place shortly after every restraint incident. Operational managers carried out these debriefs inconsistently; some spoke to the boy as soon as possible while others waited for all the documentation to be completed which reduced the effectiveness of the debrief. Documentation was missing for many incidents during the previous two months.
- I.65** All boys subject to force were given the opportunity to speak to an advocate but few took up this offer.

## Recommendations

- I.66** **Pain-inducing techniques should not be used on boys.**
- I.67** **Oversight of use of force should be improved: use of force reports and post-incident debriefs should be completed swiftly; body-worn cameras should be routinely used and reviewed; and a robust system of external oversight should be put in place.**
- I.68** **Staff from the adult prison should not be routinely used to respond to incidents in the children's unit.** (Repeated recommendation I.69)

## 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.69** There was no dedicated segregation facility on the unit. Two cells in the adult prison could be used if it was necessary to separate boys from their peers, but these were rarely used. During the previous six months, the designated cells had been used on four occasions for short periods and the regime on the segregation unit was decent.
- I.70** In almost all cases, boys were managed through separation on normal location following an adjudication or minor report. Boys on separation were reviewed regularly, could attend education and had access to exercise and a shower every day.

- I.71** The number of boys self-isolating for their own protection had increased significantly since the previous inspection and we were concerned that support for these boys was inconsistent (see paragraph I.25).

## 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.72** Methods to tackle drug and alcohol issues were included in the overarching prison strategy, a specific standard operating procedure, and within the resettlement strategy. A drugs and alcohol needs assessment in 2016 was informing a developing action plan. The wider prison held regular drug and alcohol strategy meetings, although the young people's unit was not consistently represented.
- I.73** Two caseworkers provided psychosocial substance misuse support for the boys. Their generic caseload had increased due to staff shortages but the support provided remained good. Every boy was seen promptly during induction to assess the support needed and to provide basic drug education. Boys who declined to engage were followed up to encourage participation. During the previous six months, 24 boys who used substances regularly had received a comprehensive assessment and individual treatment plan. Most interventions remained one to one and took place regularly, using an appropriate range of work books including drug supply, NPS and relapse prevention. Record keeping was good.
- I.74** Boys received an initial assessment on arrival and a subsequent comprehensive assessment of their substance misuse needs. No boy had required clinical detoxification from drugs or alcohol in over two years, although services by competent staff were available if required. One boy who had required additional monitoring to assess the need for clinical services had received good 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 Residential units at Parc were spacious and airy and staff had good sightlines to all the cells. The communal areas were run down and dirty. Notice boards were broken and pictures of staff and managers were missing from the wing photo boards. There was limited association equipment, and much of it was damaged or had missing components.
- 2.2 Some cells were clean and tidy, and almost all were free of graffiti and inappropriate displays. Boys had good access to in-cell telephones and most could shower each day. However, too many cells were dirty and boys spoke of problems gaining access to the wing vacuum cleaner to clean the carpeted floors. Few of the cells we inspected had soap and some boys had to use the same towel for a week which gave off a pungent smell as they tried to dry them on bed frames. In-cell ventilation remained variable. Showers were often dirty, an issue raised by several boys. A refurbishment of the residential units was in progress. This included replacing all carpets with vinyl flooring but not improvement of toilets which remained stained and unscreened. Double cells were cramped, some boys had no chair (see paragraph 1.30) and there were no lockable cabinets.
- 2.3 Boys were able to wear their own clothes and we were told that there was an opportunity to do laundry every week, including bedding. They were encouraged to order meals, manage their finances and book appointments by using electronic information kiosks located in the communal area. Some boys said that letters from their family did not arrive for weeks, and one said that staff read his letters to his girlfriend aloud to embarrass him.
- 2.4 During our inspection, a number of cell call bells went unanswered while the limited number of staff dealt with other issues. Some boys had blocked their observation glass panel, apparently without challenge. The units were noisy and unruly at times, and we were not confident that this was adequately challenged. Some boys said that it was safer to stay in their cells than mix with other boys during chaotic meal services. Although there was good CCTV coverage of the communal areas, there were too few staff to supervise effectively and not enough management oversight.

#### Recommendations

- 2.5 **Cells should have effective ventilation.** (Repeated recommendation 2.12)
- 2.6 **All cells and communal areas should be kept clean.**
- 2.7 **Toilets should be fully screened.** (Repeated recommendation 2.13)
- 2.8 **Boys should have access to a lockable cupboard.** (Repeated recommendation 2.14)

## Relationships between staff and children and young people

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.9** Many boys held negative perceptions of staff. In our survey only 41% of boys against the comparator of 63% said that most staff treated them with respect. Unit staff did not challenge all poor behaviour and too many officers lacked authority. One officer told us: 'We tolerate things here that I would never allow my kids to do at home'. Boys often ignored staff when they were challenged with little consequence. Senior managers were not consistently present on residential units to model expected standards of behaviour. Despite this we did see some relaxed and caring interactions and relationships between boys and specialist staff were generally good.
- 2.10** In theory each boy had a key worker, but in our survey 19% of boys said they had not met their key worker. Records demonstrated good interaction between key workers and boys, with evidence of staff trying to understand and support them. However, many recorded interactions were not frequent enough.
- 2.11** A monthly community forum was held to inform and consult boys. The agenda covered a wide range of relevant issues, but attendance by staff and boys was poor. Not all issues raised were resolved by the end of the next meeting. For example, at the time of our inspection boys could not have their hair cut properly, a situation that had prevailed for some months without resolution.

### Recommendation

- 2.12 Managers should investigate and address boys' negative perceptions of staff.**  
(Repeated recommendation 2.19)

## 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.**

### Strategic management

- 2.13** The strategic management and leadership of equality and diversity remained weak. There was no policy or action plan to ensure equal outcomes across the unit. The prison-wide equality strategy was being redrafted but too little attention was being paid to the unit.

There was no standing agenda item for the younger population at the equality team meetings which were held every two months. Little of the detailed monthly equality report focused on the experience and treatment of boys. Identification of protected characteristics was not robust enough. The establishment could not provide us with the number of boys who were gay and bisexual or those with a disability. The HM Prison and Probation Service (HMPPS) equality monitoring tool was not used to address inequitable treatment or access to the regime in the unit.

- 2.14** Six discrimination incidents had been reported in the last six months compared with 28 at the last inspection. We reviewed five investigations; the sixth could not be found. All five involved racial discrimination: three were upheld and two dismissed. Investigations were thorough and boys and staff involved in the incidents were interviewed and challenged if they were involved in upheld incidents. The director of the prison reviewed all investigations into discrimination incidents.
- 2.15** Consultation with protected groups was rudimentary. Community diversity groups did not attend the unit to support boys as they did on the adult site. Boys attending citizenship classes learned about diversity and equality (see paragraph 3.36).

## Recommendations

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

## Diverse needs

- 2.18** Sixty-four percent of the population were white and 36% were from a black and minority ethnic background. On the whole, boys did not speak to us of direct discrimination. In our survey, 100% of black and minority ethnic boys said they had received a minor report against 38% of white boys, and 93% compared to 44% said they had been through the adjudication process. Managers were unable to provide us with any data to confirm or challenge this perception. Since our last inspection, unit managers had made efforts to consult black and minority ethnic and Gypsy, Romany and Traveller boys. However, few boys attended these meetings and little of value was learned from them.
- 2.19** Two foreign national boys were held at the time of the inspection. The prison-wide foreign national policy did not deal adequately with the needs of young foreign nationals and was out of date. Foreign national boys were given additional phone credit to maintain family ties abroad. Unit staff still had limited awareness of trafficking indicators.
- 2.20** There were seven Muslim boys and, although we did not find evidence that this group was treated unfairly, the poor arrangements for Friday prayers remained unchanged since our last inspection (see paragraph 2.25).
- 2.21** Managers did not respond to our request for a list of boys with a disability. There were no adapted cells for use by boys with physical disabilities, although we were not aware of

anyone who needed such a cell at the time of our inspection. We found one supported living plan for a boy with dyslexia which was of a reasonably good standard.

- 2.22** No transgender boys were held at the time of our inspection and staff could not recall any in the past. The prison policy and procedures for transgender prisoners was not tailored to the young people's unit and had not been updated following the new Prison Service instruction on the care and management of transgender offenders.
- 2.23** Managers said that it would be difficult for young gay or bisexual boys to declare their sexual orientation to other boys. Managers were not aware of any gay or bisexual boys on the unit.

## 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.**

- 2.24** Unit records showed that 60% of boys had no religion, 24% were Christian and 16% were Muslim. The chaplaincy continued to provide good faith services and pastoral support. A member of the chaplaincy visited the unit each day. Chaplains recorded issues raised by boys in a log which was only accessible to other chaplains. Not all these entries were copied on to P-NOMIS records to ensure the information was accessible to a wider range of staff.
- 2.25** There were only two Muslim chaplains to cover both the young people's unit and the adult prison. This meant that Muslim boys could not attend a Friday service where they could see the Muslim chaplain face to face. Instead, they gathered in the chapel for prayers while the Muslim chaplain led the service in the world faith room and his words were relayed to the chapel through a microphone and speakers. This enabled the boys and adult prisoners to be kept separate. Two further Muslim chaplains had been appointed and were awaiting security clearance. A weekly Muslim discussion group was held on the unit. Christian boys could not attend the chapel on Sundays but attended an ecumenical service on Thursdays which Catholics and Protestants attended together. The prison chapel was fit for purpose but the world faith room was austere despite being carpeted. There was still no Buddhist chaplain.

### Recommendation

- 2.26** Access to appropriate faith services should be equitable for boys and adults at Parc.

## 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.**

- 2.27** During the previous six months, only 18 complaints had been submitted, fewer than at our last inspection and a quarter of the number we find at other establishments. Complaint forms were displayed in a disorganised manner and appeal forms were not available. The

standard prison service complaint form was used which was not age appropriate and complaint boxes were located too close to officers' desks. Most replies were easy to read and polite, although a few were flippant and dismissive. Apologies and compensation were offered when appropriate. In our survey, only a third of boys who had made a complaint said that it had been resolved fairly. Only 5% of the complaints made across both the adult site and young people's unit were quality assured which in reality meant that very few replies to boys' complaints were likely to be quality assured.

## Recommendation

- 2.28 All complaints should be thoroughly investigated and quality assurance procedures should ensure that sufficient replies to boys' complaints are included.**

## Legal rights

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.29** Boys had their legal status and rights explained to them during induction, including arrangements for early and late release for boys subject to a detention and training order. Boys who were remanded were supported to apply for bail, and had regular reviews which informed their remand management plans. They had the same access to regime and activities as sentenced boys. Boys who were sentenced had the opportunity to appeal. Caseworkers facilitated free telephone calls for boys to legal advisers.
- 2.30** Legal visits took place in private rooms on the main site. Unit staff escorted boys to and from legal visits and remained nearby during the visit. Arrangements were well organised for boys to have an appropriate adult if interviewed by the police.

## 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.**

## Governance arrangements

- 2.31** G4S Health (UK) Ltd continued to provide health services. Joint working between the health provider, the prison and the Youth Justice Board remained good. The well attended quarterly partnership board addressed key areas. The 2014 health needs assessment was out of date. Incidents and complaints from the young people's unit were merged with those from the adult prison, reducing the opportunity to apply lessons learned systematically. There was no mechanism for acquiring feedback from boys about health services, other than the generic consultation groups which were not adequate to inform service delivery effectively. The health provider had completed a self audit of health service delivery on the unit in May 2016 and was addressing identified deficits.

- 2.32** Clinical management in the prison health care centre remained good. A senior nurse had taken a leadership role for the unit since August 2016, but it was too early to assess the impact. The prison provided 24-hour nursing cover. A dedicated mental health nurse was based on the unit Monday to Friday from 7.30am to 4.30pm, and nurses from the wider team attended the unit at other times.
- 2.33** In our survey, 53% of boys said that the quality of health services was good and this was reflected by most boys we spoke to. Health staff were clearly identifiable and the interactions that we observed were good. Training was managed well and access was satisfactory. The unit nurse and all senior nurses were appropriately trained in child safeguarding to level three. Take up of supervision was variable, but adequate. There was a suite of policies specific to the unit. Consent and capacity was consistently checked before interventions. Most clinical records and care plans that we examined were good and were stored securely.
- 2.34** At our two previous inspections, we identified that neither health care room on the unit met infection control standards. This was unchanged. A new medicine administration room was being established but its implementation was severely delayed and there was no planned completion date.
- 2.35** Health staff had good access to emergency equipment. Checking procedures in the main prison had improved, although we found expired items in the unit bag despite regular checks. This was addressed immediately when we raised it. All officers were trained in first aid and understood the emergency medical code system. Ambulances were called promptly in an emergency.
- 2.36** Prison complaint forms were used, but boys were advised to put them into confidential envelopes and they were appropriately managed by health staff. Three complaints had been received since our last inspection. Responses were prompt and courteous, but none of the responses we looked at addressed the issues adequately.
- 2.37** Health promotion occurred during individual health appointments, but there were no systematic health promotion campaigns. Access to immunisations and sexual health screening was good. Condoms were accessible, but were poorly advertised.

## Recommendations

- 2.38** **Health services should be informed by an up-to-date health, wellbeing and social care assessment and by regular feedback from the boys.**
- 2.39** **All clinical areas should be safe and fully compliant with infection control guidelines.** (Repeated recommendation 2.74)
- 2.40** **There should be systematic health promotion activity linked to relevant national and local health campaigns.**

## Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.41** New arrivals were assessed promptly by a nurse and appropriate referrals were made. Liaison with the community was good. Boys should have received further CHAT (comprehensive health assessment tool) assessments over the following 10 days. The unit nurse completed most mental health and substance misuse assessments promptly. General and learning disability nurses were allocated to complete the physical and neurodisability



assessments at weekends. However, high workload in the adult prison meant that most were delayed and we found several instances where one or both had not been completed several months after the boys' arrival.

- 2.42** Boys requested services using the information kiosk. The range of primary care services was appropriate. Services in the main health department were open exclusively to the unit between 9 and 10am Monday to Friday. Waiting times for all services were thus very short and boys spoke positively about access. Non-attendance at appointments was high, but was monitored. Urgent appointments were available each day. The same GP practice provided daytime and out-of-hours cover, which gave consistency of care.
- 2.43** Boys with chronic health conditions were regularly reviewed by the practice nurses in the main health department. Access to external appointments was good and they were rarely cancelled.

## Recommendation

- 2.44 All comprehensive health assessment tool assessments should be completed within the required time frame.**

## Pharmacy

- 2.45** Medicines were supplied promptly by the in-house pharmacy and levels of prescribing were low and age appropriate. Medicines were supplied on a named patient basis in pre-packed doses. Notices were displayed advertising access to the pharmacist for advice.
- 2.46** All medicines, excluding topical preparations, inhalers and nicotine replacement treatments, were administered as supervised consumption to ensure adherence. The in-possession policy was in date and risk assessments were completed as necessary.
- 2.47** Controlled drugs were administered in the main health department. All other medicines were administered from the unit health rooms three times a day. Neither room was suitable for this purpose (see paragraph 2.34). The timing of the evening medication administration round was more consistent than we reported previously. Night time medication was administered at the correct time.
- 2.48** Medicines were stored in the treatment unit in safer custody and then transported to the boys in shopping bags, which was not secure. However, new lockable bags for use across the prison arrived during the inspection. Officers supervised administration effectively.
- 2.49** Nurses could administer a small range of medicines without a GP prescription, but new arrivals often experienced delays accessing nicotine replacement therapy which was not available without a prescription.

## Recommendation

- 2.50 Nicotine replacement products should be provided promptly, including on the day of arrival if required.**

## Dentistry

**2.51** The dental provider 'Time for Teeth' delivered dentist sessions three times a week. Boys had access to the full range of services and were referred externally for orthodontic services. In our survey, 51% of boys against the comparator of 25% said it was easy to see the dentist. Waiting times remained very short at under a week. Oral health promotion was completed during appointments. Record keeping was very good. The damaged floor in the dental suite had been repaired and the suite remained excellent. Equipment was appropriately maintained.

## Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.52** In our survey, a third of boys reported mental health issues, although only 7% of these said they were being helped against the comparator of 55%. We found that overall the care provided remained good but the range of interventions was too limited.
- 2.53** Six of the unit operational staff (11%) had received mental health awareness training since our last inspection. There was still no clear operational policy for the mental health service, although this was being addressed and there was a referral flowchart.
- 2.54** Mental health concerns were identified promptly through the varied admission screens and effective joint working between prison and health staff. The unit nurse was a registered mental health nurse and held a small caseload of about three to five boys. Opportunities for regular one-to-one interventions were limited by other work commitments.
- 2.55** The Forensic Adolescent Consultation and Treatment Service from Cwm Taf University Health board provided specialist mental health services. They were supporting 10 boys at the time of our inspection. Many of the boys required support for attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. A lead nurse held a weekly clinic and a psychiatrist attended fortnightly. Waiting times were short and boys were seen regularly, although there was no access to interventions. From January 2017, the number of nurse clinics was increasing to 10 a fortnight and a psychologist was being recruited. No boy had been referred to speech and language therapy to support improved mental health outcomes since our last inspection.
- 2.56** Two boys had been transferred under the Mental Health Act since our last inspection, within four and two weeks from assessment.

## Recommendation

**2.57** Boys should have access to an appropriate range of mental health interventions.

## 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.**

**2.58** Some of the food we saw was unappetising. In our survey, only 18% of boys said that the food was good. Most of it was prepared outside the prison and heated up in the prison's regeneration kitchen. Sandwiches and wraps were prepared off site. Very little food was freshly prepared with soups made from powder and supplemented with frozen vegetables.

Portion sizes were large and some boys were unable to eat all their serving which was thrown away. Second helpings were given to those with bigger appetites. Most boys ate together, but it was disappointing that staff no longer ate with them. This was a missed opportunity to model pro-social behaviour.

- 2.59** The menu was on a pre-select four-week cycle. Lunch consisted of five choices of sandwich, soup and fresh fruit. The hot evening meal consisted of six choices, including halal, vegan and vegetarian options. Fresh fruit was offered in the evening. Breakfast was served on the day it was eaten and boys were given toast and a pint of fresh milk, something we rarely see elsewhere. At weekends boys were given a full hot lunch instead of sandwiches and soup.
- 2.60** Consultation arrangements were reasonably good. Boys could comment on food directly to the catering manager using the touch screen information kiosks on the units. However, the catering manager did not attend the community forum, where boys often raised the issue of food.
- 2.61** Six boys were part of the catering academy and were studying for basic qualifications. During our inspection they cooked a Christmas meal for all the boys.

## 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.**

- 2.62** Boys could buy goods easily using the touch screen information kiosks, which also enabled them to check the balance of money in their accounts. A wide range of goods were available and many were sold at prices comparable to supermarkets. Purchases were all managed in-house and G4S was not tied to a national contract. Local managers could decide on products and set prices in conjunction with the Ministry of Justice controller. Access to the shop shortly after arrival had improved since our last inspection. In our survey, 25% of boys said they could access the prison shop within 24 hours of arrival against the comparator of 8%.



## 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>6</sup>**

- 3.1** Time out of cell was better than in many comparable establishments but worse than at the previous inspection. In our roll checks we found 29% of boys locked in their cells during the day, which was poor. In theory, the few boys on the platinum level of the rewards scheme could spend more than 11 hours a day out of their cells and boys on the bronze level could spend more than eight hours out of their cells at weekends. In practice, too many boys were locked up. Staff knew of four boys who were self-isolating and some tried to get them out of their cells but with little success. In addition, we found other boys who isolated themselves in various ways (see paragraphs 1.25 and 1.71).
- 3.2** Boys could go outside at least three times a day but those who went out chose to stand around rather than use the exercise equipment provided. Most boys spent association time sitting around, although staff had organised table tennis tournaments. Boys on the top level of the rewards scheme had access to a dedicated association room with some additional activities.

---

<sup>6</sup> Time out of cell, in addition to formal 'purposeful activity', includes any time children and young people are out of their cells to associate or use communal facilities to take showers or make telephone calls.

## Education, learning and skills

### Expected outcomes:

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

**3.3** *Estyn<sup>7</sup> made the following assessments about the learning and skills and work provision:*

<b>Overall effectiveness of learning and skills and work:</b>	<b>Good</b>
<i>Outcomes for children and young people engaged in learning and skills and work activities:</i>	<i>Good</i>
<i>Quality of learning and skills and work activities, including the quality of teaching, training, learning and assessment:</i>	<i>Adequate</i>
<i>Effectiveness of leadership and management of learning and skills and work activities: Good</i>	

### Management of education and learning and skills

- 3.4** At the time of the inspection, there were 46 boys in the unit. There were 54 places for academic and vocational education.
- 3.5** Since the last inspection, the effectiveness of the young people's education unit management team had been reviewed. Appropriate measures had been taken to strengthen the operational management of the unit by appointing a new curriculum manager in October 2016. This had already improved staff morale. Three new teaching staff had been appointed, two of whom were awaiting security clearance.
- 3.6** There was good cooperation between the unit education team and the adult education provision. Cover arrangements for staff absence had improved, ensuring greater continuity of access to and engagement with education. In a few cases, the cover did not match the subjects that boys were learning. Nevertheless, they enjoyed the classes and made progress towards their learning objectives.
- 3.7** The prison had supported staff well to help them embed the development of literacy skills into their lesson planning. A useful partnership had been developed with a local college which would offer additional support to teachers to embed literacy and numeracy into their lessons from January 2017.

<sup>7</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.

- 3.8** The education unit had reviewed curriculum planning and revised the timetables of options for boys. This had improved the consistency of the number of lessons for each pathway.
- 3.9** The education team had developed partnerships with two community education providers with the aim of extending the range of vocational qualifications and reducing reoffending. Procedures to monitor the quality of provision had been enhanced. It was too early to evaluate the impact of these partnerships.
- 3.10** Systems for the collection and analysis of data were well established. Data were used effectively by managers to monitor the overall performance of the unit against previous outcomes and to identify trends. The unit was performing well against its key performance indicators. There were regular meetings with staff to discuss performance, but team meetings to monitor the progress of individual boys were underdeveloped.
- 3.11** Attainment rates were satisfactory and showed steady improvement over recent years. However, the unit was no longer benchmarking learners' attainment rates against those in other education institutions.
- 3.12** Managers used data analysis well to inform self-assessment. The self-assessment report was informative and evaluative and drew on first-hand evidence. It identified areas for development and used these to inform quality development planning.
- 3.13** On too many occasions, officers missed opportunities to collaborate with education staff to support and encourage boys to make best use of education and to progress.
- 3.14** Staff promoted equality and diversity well through informative citizenship programmes.

## Recommendations

- 3.15** **Team meetings should be introduced to review boys' progress and to develop team-wide strategies to support individual boys to achieve their learning targets.**
- 3.16** **Attainment rates should be benchmarked against those of other institutions.**
- 3.17** **Prison officers should take an active role in helping boys to progress in education.**

## Provision of activities

- 3.18** Most boys were able to access a good range of activities within a few days of induction.
- 3.19** The needs of boys were identified well through detailed individual education plans which reflected their previous learning and future aspirations.
- 3.20** Boys had a satisfactory choice of learning pathways which included literacy, numeracy, personal and social education, citizenship, cookery and physical education. The range of vocational subjects had improved and was due to increase further in January 2017. Most boys were able to attend the pathway of their choice. Boys who had been following a GCSE course before coming to the unit were able to continue these qualifications.
- 3.21** The department carried out appropriate initial assessments of literacy and numeracy skills. Teachers followed this up with appropriate diagnostic assessment. However, the outcomes of assessment were not used well enough to inform short smart targets for learning and

there was no planning to ensure that these skills were developed in all lessons across the curriculum.

- 3.22** There was good provision for discrete literacy and numeracy tuition and most tutors had started to incorporate development of these skills into their mainstream sessions. However, this approach was not yet being implemented consistently.
- 3.23** There was a literacy strategy in place, which guided staff to support boys to improve their reading. There was not yet a common approach to the development of writing and numeracy skills. Targets for these areas in boys' education plans had improved, but they were still not customised or simple enough for boys to understand. Monitoring of progress towards short-term, achievable targets in these areas was not systematic enough.
- 3.24** In many classes, particularly those at the start of the day and after lunch, punctuality was poor. Boys who were absent from education were followed up consistently by education staff but staff on the units could have done more to encourage punctuality.

## Recommendations

- 3.25** **A common approach should be established for staff to support the development of writing and numeracy skills. This should include procedures for monitoring the progress of individual boys in achieving simple, short-term targets.**
- 3.26** **All tutors should embed literacy and numeracy into their lessons consistently and effectively to maximise development of these skills.**

## Quality of provision

- 3.27** Nearly all teachers and boys enjoyed positive and supportive relationships. A few boys refused to engage in formal education. Education staff worked well with these boys on the residential unit, providing them with work and enabling them to achieve qualifications.
- 3.28** The quality of teaching was good. Teachers set clear objectives for learners in all lessons. They used a wide range of teaching methods, planned activities well and amended their plans during sessions to suit the emerging needs of learners. A variety of activities engaged the interest of boys and encouraged constructive discussions.
- 3.29** All teachers used informal assessment methods well to evaluate understanding of lessons. The pace of all lessons was good. In a very few lessons, opportunities were missed to help boys develop problem-solving skills.
- 3.30** Individual education plans contained relevant information on boys' preferred learning styles and needs. Literacy targets were customised to individual need. However, they were not adapted to short-term, achievable targets to develop and measure learners' skills and to help them identify their progress.
- 3.31** Teachers marked work regularly and gave encouraging feedback which reflected the efforts boys had made. However, in most cases, opportunities to help them develop literacy and numeracy were overlooked.
- 3.32** Nearly all classrooms were well equipped, and displayed stimulating resources and examples of boys' work. A few displays were bilingual and featured key Welsh words relevant to the subjects taught.



## Education and vocational achievements

- 3.33** Most boys attended well and participated enthusiastically in lessons. They made good progress in their work and there were many examples of learners regarding education as a positive step towards reducing reoffending behaviour.
- 3.34** All boys who remained on the unit for six months or more improved their literacy and numeracy by at least one level.
- 3.35** Most boys achieved qualifications which helped them to progress to higher levels of education or training and prepared them for work. Tutors gave good support to boys due to transfer to the adult prison to plan their progression to other learning opportunities. Most boys achieved their learning goals in vocational subjects. They produced good quality practical work in carpentry and catering.
- 3.36** Many boys made good progress in personal and social development, demonstrating respect and working cooperatively in class. A citizenship programme helped them to gain awareness of global citizenship and current affairs and to discuss their ideas with others.
- 3.37** Boys learned to work independently and in teams. Employment skills classes helped learners understand what employers would require of them.
- 3.38** Behaviour in education was generally good. A few instances of poor behaviour were managed well by teachers. Use of inappropriate language was usually challenged consistently during lessons, although our inspectors witnessed loud offensive lyrics coming from a music class. We also observed poor behaviour from boys in one class.
- 3.39** Nearly all boys took pride in their work and achievements. Tutors used appropriate levels of praise, which helped to improve confidence and self-image.

## Library

- 3.40** The library was well stocked. There was a good range of age-appropriate fiction and non-fiction, accessible resources for boys with limited reading skills, and useful periodicals and materials relating to learning pathways. There were audio books, and a good selection of books in Welsh and other languages.
- 3.41** Access to the library was good with a resident librarian present on most days. The librarian encouraged boys to read and visited the residential unit regularly so that all boys could borrow books. There were good arrangements in place for boys to borrow books from the main prison library.
- 3.42** All boys were aware of the library resources and many used it regularly as a leisure resource or to develop their interests in the academic path they were pursuing.
- 3.43** A few boys attended sessions with a resident reader. They had found these sessions helpful in improving their confidence in reading and their awareness of reading as a recreational activity.

## 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.**

- 3.44** Access to PE had deteriorated since the last inspection, mainly because of staff sickness and vacancies. In our survey, 11% of boys said they could attend the gym five or more times a week compared to 53% at our previous inspection, a significant reduction. However, the figure was 2% at comparator sites.
- 3.45** Numbers in most PE classes, particularly the evening recreational periods, had reduced by about half, although there was a concerted effort to maintain continuity by using sports and games officers from the unit to supplement shortfalls in the PE staff group.
- 3.46** All boys arriving at Parc received a prompt induction into the gymnasium. This was supplemented by input from the substance misuse team and the dedicated young people's nurse to raise awareness of the impact of using new psychoactive substances and steroids.
- 3.47** Some new equipment had been purchased and we were told of plans to upgrade the gym and the PE classroom. At the time of the inspection, the gym was in poor repair with an uneven floor and the PE classroom was an unwelcoming environment, not conducive to learning. There were no showers and boys had to return to their units to shower. Staff told us that this often affected the gym timetable.
- 3.48** The wider establishment drug supply reduction action plan had restricted boys' access to the better facilities on the adult site. Only the few boys on gold or platinum regimes could attend and even then only on weekend evenings. Boys had regular use of the all-weather outdoor sports area to play a variety of team games.
- 3.49** No qualifications had been achieved in the fitness academy and PE pathways during the first half of 2016 and only 82 (mostly entry level) in the second half. The lead instructor in this area had been used for PE cover during staff shortages. There were advanced plans to introduce The Prince's Trust personal development and employability qualification, with associated investment, which was a welcome initiative.

### Recommendation

- 3.50** **The PE and classroom facilities should be improved to ensure that boys have the opportunity to engage in a wider range of activities during core PE lessons.**  
(Repeated recommendation, 3.51)

## 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 had been strengthened since the previous inspection. A needs analysis had been completed and used to inform the resettlement strategy and action plan. Implementation of the strategy was overseen by the resettlement committee who were only scheduled to meet twice a year, which was too infrequent. The establishment had recognised this and the committee did meet for a third time in 2016 to maintain focus on the strategic work of the function. Attendance was broadly appropriate and included a resettlement broker (a community partner who facilitated links between custody and community services). The focus of the meeting had been changed to make it forward looking rather than a review of the preceding period. Regular casework team meetings also took place at which issues relating to individual boys' resettlement needs were discussed and action agreed.
- 4.2 The catchment area for the unit remained very wide, covering the whole of Wales and south-west England to Wiltshire (see section on looked-after children). The unit was also used to give a fresh start to boys from outside the catchment area.
- 4.3 Casework staff attended reintegration and resettlement panels which were set up in Wales to improve the links between custody and community services. Any boy whose resettlement needs were of particular concern was discussed in good time for his release. However, there was nothing similar in place for English boys.
- 4.4 The unit casework team comprised four full-time caseworkers, two dual-role substance misuse workers/caseworkers, two interventions officers and a family support worker. The team was supplemented by a seconded youth offending service officer who was the caseworker for remanded boys, and a seconded social worker who helped boys who were looked after to receive their legal entitlement from the responsible local authority. The team was managing vacancies at the time of the inspection and had been flexible in taking on additional caseloads and responsibilities (see paragraph 4.42).
- 4.5 Each boy was allocated to a caseworker who made contact with his responsible adult, sending them an information pack. Caseworkers arranged appropriate and regular reviews with boys, community professionals and family/carers and saw boys between meetings as needed. Caseworkers took the lead in ensuring that risk and resettlement needs were addressed.
- 4.6 Release on temporary licence (ROTL) had only been used twice since the previous inspection for a boy to attend a training course and then take an exam. ROTL had not been used to facilitate family contact. Eligible boys were being reviewed for suitability, and managers were considering how to develop use of ROTL to support resettlement planning.
- 4.7 Early release and home detention curfew (HDC) were used appropriately. Three boys serving detention and training orders had achieved early release over the previous six

months and in the same period one boy had been granted release on HDC. No use was made of late release provisions.

- 4.8** Most boys were released from the unit but some moved to the adult estate when they reached 18. Arrangements to support boys moving to the adult estate were more developed for boys who moved to the Parc adult site. They were able to make a familiarisation visit to the unit they would move to and meet relevant staff. Preparation for transfer elsewhere focused on the general differences to expect in the adult estate.
- 4.9** Work was starting to develop on effective monitoring of outcomes for boys after their release. The Youth Justice Board Cymru had adapted their indicators to make resettlement outcomes more explicit relating to accommodation and education, training and employment. Feedback was not yet being provided to Parc and it was too soon to determine the effect of the monitoring of outcomes. There was nothing similar in place for boys released to England although new processes to obtain data from English youth offending teams (YOTs) were to start in January 2017. Caseworkers continued to follow boys up at their initial community reviews (usually about 10 days after release), but there was no systematic recording of this. A proposal to extend this follow up had been prepared by one of the caseworkers.

## Recommendation

- 4.10 The unit should make more use of release on temporary licence to support release planning and maintenance of family ties.**

## 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** Training planning and remand management review meetings were arranged by caseworkers and took place regularly in private rooms away from the residential units. Attendance by community YOTs was generally good and family members/carers attended some reviews. The attendance of residential staff had been prioritised and monitored and there was evidence of more reviews with residential staff present. There was less frequent attendance by the education team, although written progress reports were usually provided. Reviews observed during the inspection were managed well. Community professionals had the opportunity to meet the boy they were working with before the review meeting.
- 4.12** In our survey, only half the boys knew they had a sentence or remand plan. While all boys had a plan, they were not given a copy of it, or the targets agreed during their review meeting. This prevented them from focusing on their targets between reviews. Plans that we looked at did not specify risk of harm issues but the reviews we attended and the conversations we observed between boys, caseworkers and community professionals showed that risk issues were discussed. Quality assurance of planning documentation was at an early stage. There was some oversight by a senior manager, but feedback was given verbally and no written record was maintained. Managers had identified that some targets were generic and needed to be personalised.

- 4.13** Boys on remand were usually managed by a seconded YOT caseworker. There were eight remanded boys at the start of the inspection but we were told that there had been 17 which had necessitated other caseworkers taking some on to their caseloads temporarily. Remanded boys had more frequent reviews than sentenced boys and were supported to make a bail application if they wanted to. In other respects, they had access to the same services as sentenced boys.
- 4.14** Most sentenced boys were serving detention and training orders but there were some with longer determinate sentences. They were subject to the same sentence planning and review arrangements and caseworkers were familiar with the processes for assessing suitability for release on HDC or the preparation of parole documentation.

## Recommendations

- 4.15 All departments which work with a boy regularly should be represented at his training or remand planning meeting to provide consistent feedback and reinforcement to help boys achieve their agreed targets.**
- 4.16 Boys should be issued with a copy of their targets and encouraged to achieve them between reviews.**
- 4.17 Quality assurance of planning documentation should be introduced.** (Repeated recommendation 4.18)

## Public protection

- 4.18** Boys were screened during the admissions process and any public protection concerns were identified. YOTs were contacted to check if new arrivals were subject to multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) and for details of any restraining or harassment orders or potential risk to boys. Restrictions and monitoring were put in place when there was an identified need to do so. These were kept under review. One boy was subject to monitoring at the time of the inspection.
- 4.19** Eight boys were subject to MAPPA level one (the lowest level) and one boy was subject to MAPPA level two (the middle level). Caseworkers confirmed MAPPA levels with YOTs before release as part of the sentence planning review and planning for release process. Caseworkers completed MAPPA F reports for the few boys released at MAPPA levels two or three, and attended community reviews when needed.

## Indeterminate sentence young people

- 4.20** Parc was not resourced to be a long-term unit or to meet the needs of boys subject to indeterminate sentences. The unit continued to hold low numbers of such boys, but did not offer the range of interventions or education programmes to meet their long-term needs. The sentence management processes were properly completed but in a small unit where most boys spent just months, there was no specific support for boys with a very different type of sentence.

## Recommendation

- 4.21 Boys with indeterminate sentences should be placed in custodial settings that are equipped to meet the specific needs presented by their sentence.**

## Looked-after children

- 4.22** There were 13 boys who were looked after at the time of the inspection, but over 60% were boys for whom a local authority had statutory responsibility. Local records showed that 32 local authorities had had boys placed at Parc.
- 4.23** Boys who were entitled to support from their local authority were identified on reception. A seconded social worker took the lead in informing local authorities and reminding them of their obligations when a boy they had responsibility for was admitted. The level of support provided by local authorities remained variable. Statutory reviews for looked-after boys usually took place within the required timescales, but in four cases in 2016 remanded boys had been bailed between four and six weeks after arrival without the initial looked-after review taking place. The level of pocket money provided remained inconsistent and there was often a lack of understanding that boys were dependent on this money to maintain telephone contact with people and to buy items not provided by the unit.
- 4.24** Obtaining suitable release accommodation continued to be an issue for some looked-after boys. Data provided by the on-site Barnardo's advocate (an independent source of advice and support for the boys) showed that of 14 boys in 2016 who had required legal support to obtain suitable release accommodation, 10 were boys for whom their local authority had statutory responsibility.

## Recommendation

- 4.25 All boys with looked-after status should receive consistent and adequate levels of support from their local authority.**

## 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.**

- 4.26** Arrangements for the day of release were organised in training planning meetings. Licence conditions were discussed and explained and caseworkers clarified who would meet a boy at the prison gate when he was released. Boys were not taken to the gate until staff were told that the person meeting them had arrived at the visitors' centre. Although boys had to go through the adult reception area to be released, they were supervised by unit staff and kept separate from adult prisoners.

## Accommodation

- 4.27** No boys had been released without an address over the previous six months which was an improvement on the previous inspection. One boy had been released to unsuitable accommodation (bed and breakfast). In addition to the improving links with reintegration and resettlement panels (see section on pre-release and resettlement), the casework team now alerted senior managers in local authorities and YOTs after a boy's initial review meeting to any potential problems in obtaining suitable release accommodation. Boys approaching release were discussed at weekly casework team meetings and, as release dates approached, unit senior managers were more involved in escalating issues to their community counterparts.
- 4.28** Many boys returned to their family on release. Those who had been in the care of their local authority could experience the most uncertainty about release accommodation. The Barnardo's advocate provided important additional support in such circumstances and could facilitate legal intervention to secure appropriate accommodation through the Howard League for Penal Reform. Decisions on accommodation continued to be made too close to release date for some boys.

## Recommendation

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

## Education, training and employment

- 4.30** Boys had access to a Careers Wales careers adviser who offered impartial advice. The use of video conferencing was underdeveloped, particularly for boys from England to link with the National Careers Service.
- 4.31** A few boys had attended interviews or work experience in the past. However, opportunities for work experience were very limited.
- 4.32** Most boys had good contact with their YOT workers.
- 4.33** Boys transferring to the adult prison received good advice from teachers about progression opportunities. Recently introduced employment skills classes helped boys to plan their progression into opportunities on leaving the unit.

## Health care

- 4.34** All boys were seen by a nurse before discharge to identify and address any health needs. Those on medication received seven days' supply on release. Boys in receipt of controlled medication received their medication from pharmacy staff outside the prison, to prevent any diversion. The specialist mental health team liaised effectively with community services and provided valuable consistency while boys transitioned to adult services.

## Drugs and alcohol

- 4.35** Substance misuse work was well integrated into casework, including planning for release and transition to adult services. All boys received harm reduction information before they were released. Links with community drug services were good. Some community workers continued to work with boys on their caseload while they were in custody, which supported positive outcomes.

## Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.36** Provision for this pathway was underdeveloped. Arrangements to enable boys to open a bank account were still being finalised, although there was opportunity to do so through the adult site if there was a specific need. Practical support was available from caseworkers, for example in obtaining a national insurance number. Some boys would be released to semi-independent living and there was not enough focus on equipping them with appropriate skills, for example, to budget and manage their money, avoid expensive loan agreements or access financial support from the benefits system when they became adults.

## Recommendation

- 4.37** **Boys should have access to information and guidance to enable them to develop the financial awareness and skills they need when released.** (Repeated recommendation 4.40)

## Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.38** Boys had their visits in a discrete area above the main visits area which had a lift. There was a small play area for children. Visitors could use the café in the main visits area to buy hot and cold food and drinks for themselves and the boy they were visiting. Visitors could use toilets in the visits hall, but there were no toilet facilities for boys.
- 4.39** Visits were supervised by unit staff and we observed unobtrusive supervision. Boys were in the visits area on time and staff checked with the visitors' centre for updates on visitors who were late arriving. The visitors' centre was a good resource.
- 4.40** Boys' visits were longer than those available to adult prisoners at Parc and took place on weekday evenings and during the day at the weekend. Boys could book their own visits using the information kiosk on their unit. Double visits could be booked at the weekend if visitors had long journeys. A free bus to and from the local station was provided by the prison, which was excellent.
- 4.41** Boys had phones in their cells on which they could make outgoing calls. In addition, the residential units had communal telephones with small privacy hoods for boys to use.
- 4.42** Family support work was carried out by members of the casework team pending a replacement to fill the family support worker vacancy. Caseworkers made contact with the responsible adult when a boy arrived and acted as a point of contact for the family/carer. A member of the team was responsible for informing each boy's responsible adult promptly if the boy was involved in any significant events. Two other members of the team had jointly organised family days. One had taken place in July 2016 and another, involving 10 boys and their families, was to take place the week after the inspection. Although most boys who attended were on the higher rewards and sanctions levels, all boys were eligible for family



days and the July event had included a boy on the middle level of the scheme. There were no parenting groups for boys who had children or family mediation work.

- 4.43** Skype continued to be available to boys for family and professional contacts. Use of Skype did not affect visits entitlements and a few families used the facility regularly.

### Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.44** Two prison custody officers delivered a range of non-accredited one-to-one interventions. These included conflict resolution, problem solving, anger management and knife crime. The interventions available were explained to boys at their initial planning reviews and the facilitators followed up referrals with one-to-one interviews. Boys were generally prioritised for interventions according to their release date. There was still no formal evaluation of the effectiveness of the interventions. Work to address substance misuse issues was delivered by two specialist substance misuse workers who were part of the casework team.
- 4.45** The needs analysis conducted earlier in the year was informing a review of the range of interventions available. Work was at an early stage to introduce interventions used by other young offender institutions holding boys. Training linking experience of trauma with offending behaviour was starting in early 2017 for all staff working with boys.
- 4.46** There were still no on-site interventions for boys with sexually related offences. The number of boys was relatively low, but it was inappropriate that they were placed in a unit with no opportunity to address their offending behaviour. A proposal to provide appropriate interventions for these boys had been submitted to address this weakness in provision.

### Recommendations

- 4.47** **Evaluation of interventions should be put in place.** (Repeated recommendation 4.52)
- 4.48** **Interventions should be put in place for boys to address sexually harmful behaviour.** (Repeated recommendation 4.53)



## Section 5. Summary of recommendations and good practice

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

### Main recommendations

To the director

- 5.1 Managers should investigate the reasons for the poor perceptions of boys about safety. Safeguarding and child protection systems should be consistently applied. Strategic meetings should be well attended and take action to provide boys with a safe and secure environment. All allegations of mistreatment by staff and other boys should be subject to swift, well documented external investigations. (S39)
- 5.2 The juvenile unit management team should review current strategy to ensure that perpetrators of violence are appropriately identified and managed and their behaviour challenged. All data on violence should be collated and analysed to inform a relevant action plan to improve the safety of boys on the unit. (S40)
- 5.3 There should be sufficient staff to supervise boys safely. Staff should be trained and supported to challenge poor behaviour consistently and appropriately. Managers at all levels should be visible to staff and boys to model the behaviours expected of them. (S41)

### Recommendation

To the Ministry of Justice

- 5.4 Work with other government departments should be undertaken to ensure that all boys leaving custody are provided with appropriate accommodation in good time for their release. (4.29, repeated recommendation 4.32)

### Recommendation

To the YJB Cymru and England

- 5.5 All boys with looked-after status should receive consistent and adequate levels of support from their local authority. (4.25)

### Recommendation

To the YJB, HMPPS and G4S

- 5.6 Boys with indeterminate sentences should be placed in custodial settings that are equipped to meet the specific needs presented by their sentence. (4.21)

### Recommendation

To the Youth Justice Board and Prisoner Escort

Custody Services

- 5.7 Boys should be transported to custody as soon as their case has finished. They should be transported separately from adults and arrive into custody before 7pm. (1.4)

## Recommendations

To the director

### Early days in custody

**5.8** Boys should spend more time out of their cells during their first week at Parc. (1.10)

### Care and protection of children and young people

**5.9** Boys should feel confident to report bullying without fear of further intimidation. (1.27, repeated recommendation 1.31)

**5.10** Appropriate actions should be taken to understand the perceptions of boys in relation to victimisation by staff and measures introduced to address these concerns. (1.28)

**5.11** Boys in crisis should be provided with activities and opportunities for engagement with staff. Routine use of CCTV for monitoring boys at heightened risk should cease. (1.35)

**5.12** Case reviews should take place in an appropriate environment and should involve the boy. Boys should leave reviews with an understanding of any changes to their plan. (1.36)

### Behaviour management

**5.13** All poor conduct should be appropriately challenged to encourage good behaviour through positive role modelling. (1.41)

**5.14** The rewards and sanctions scheme should be reviewed to ensure it is applied consistently with a focus on motivating good behaviour. (1.46)

**5.15** Rewards and sanctions reviews for boys on basic level should be tailored to the needs of the individual and provide opportunity to progress. Boys should be given the opportunity to be involved in reviews and be made aware of the outcome. (1.47)

**5.16** The outcomes of all disciplinary procedures (adjudications and minor reports) should be scrutinised. There should be more focus on analysing trends and protected characteristics with monitored actions to address concerns. (1.55)

**5.17** Pain-inducing techniques should not be used on boys. (1.66)

**5.18** Oversight of use of force should be improved: use of force reports and post-incident debriefs should be completed swiftly; body-worn cameras should be routinely used and reviewed; and a robust system of external oversight should be put in place. (1.67)

**5.19** Staff from the adult prison should not be routinely used to respond to incidents in the children's unit. (1.68, repeated recommendation 1.69)

### Residential units

**5.20** Cells should have effective ventilation. (2.5, repeated recommendation 2.12)

**5.21** All cells and communal areas should be kept clean. (2.6)

**5.22** Toilets should be fully screened. (2.7, repeated recommendation 2.13)

**5.23** Boys should have access to a lockable cupboard. (2.8, repeated recommendation 2.14)

### Relationships between staff and children and young people

**5.24** Managers should investigate and address boys' negative perceptions of staff. (2.12, repeated recommendation 2.19)

### Equality and diversity

**5.25** A regular equality management meeting should take place to ensure that policy, planning and consultation are effective, boys' perceptions and needs are addressed, and comprehensive monitoring data are considered. (2.16, repeated recommendation 2.28)

**5.26** Engagement by the young people's unit with community diversity groups should be improved to the level achieved by the adult prison. (2.17, repeated recommendation 2.29)

### Faith and religious activity

**5.27** Access to appropriate faith services should be equitable for boys and adults at Parc. (2.26)

### Complaints

**5.28** All complaints should be thoroughly investigated and quality assurance procedures should ensure that sufficient replies to boys' complaints are included. (2.28)

### Health services

**5.29** Health services should be informed by an up-to-date health, wellbeing and social care assessment and by regular feedback from the boys. (2.38)

**5.30** All clinical areas should be safe and fully compliant with infection control guidelines. (2.39, repeated recommendation 2.74)

**5.31** There should be systematic health promotion activity linked to relevant national and local health campaigns. (2.40)

**5.32** All comprehensive health assessment tool assessments should be completed within the required time frame. (2.44)

**5.33** Nicotine replacement products should be provided promptly, including on the day of arrival if required. (2.50)

**5.34** Boys should have access to an appropriate range of mental health interventions. (2.57)

### Education, learning and skills

**5.35** Team meetings should be introduced to review boys' progress and to develop team-wide strategies to support individual boys to achieve their learning targets. (3.15)

**5.36** Attainment rates should be benchmarked against those of other institutions. (3.16)

**5.37** Prison officers should take an active role in helping boys to progress in education. (3.17)

**5.38** A common approach should be established for staff to support the development of writing and numeracy skills. This should include procedures for monitoring the progress of individual boys in achieving simple, short-term targets. (3.25)

**5.39** All tutors should embed literacy and numeracy into their lessons consistently and effectively to maximise development of these skills. (3.26)

### Physical education and healthy living

**5.40** The PE and classroom facilities should be improved to ensure that boys have the opportunity to engage in a wider range of activities during core PE lessons. (3.50, repeated recommendation 3.51)

### Pre-release and resettlement

**5.41** The unit should make more use of release on temporary licence to support release planning and maintenance of family ties. (4.10)

### Training planning and remand management

**5.42** All departments which work with a boy regularly should be represented at his training or remand planning meeting to provide consistent feedback and reinforcement to help boys achieve their agreed targets. (4.15)

**5.43** Boys should be issued with a copy of their targets and encouraged to achieve them between reviews. (4.16)

**5.44** Quality assurance of planning documentation should be introduced. (4.17, repeated recommendation 4.18)

### Reintegration planning

**5.45** Boys should have access to information and guidance to enable them to develop the financial awareness and skills they need when released. (4.37, repeated recommendation 4.40)

**5.46** Evaluation of interventions should be put in place. (4.47, repeated recommendation 4.52)

**5.47** Interventions should be put in place for boys to address sexually harmful behaviour. (4.48, Repeated recommendation 4.53)

## Example of good practice

**5.48** The individual induction was comprehensive and gave boys a realistic understanding of life at Parc. The handbook they were given was well designed and ensured that boys knew what to expect during their first few days at Parc. (1.11)

## Section 6. Appendices

### Appendix I: Inspection team

Martin Lomas	Deputy chief inspector
Deborah Butler	Team leader
Colin Carroll	Inspector
Ian Dickens	Inspector
Angela Johnson	Inspector
Angus Mulready-Jones	Inspector
Majella Pearce	Health services and substance misuse inspector
Yvonne McGuckian	Inspector (observer)
Alissa Redmond	Researcher
Emma Seymour	Researcher
Joanna Morgan	Health Inspectorate Wales (observer)
Alun Connick	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 2016, 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.*

### Recommendations

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. (1.6)

**Not achieved**

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

**Not achieved**

All staff who have direct contact with children should receive refresher training in child protection. (1.27)

**Not achieved**

Steps should be taken to ensure that all staff are aware of and knowledgeable about the whistle-blowing policy. (1.28)

**Not achieved**

Children should feel confident to report bullying without fear of further intimidation. (1.31)

**Not achieved** (Recommendation repeated, 1.27)

The reasons for the increase in children reporting victimisation by staff should be investigated and the findings acted on. (1.32)

**Partially achieved**

Children in crisis requiring constant observation should be monitored face to face by staff and not by CCTV. (1.39)

**Not achieved**

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. (1.44)

**Not achieved**

Strip-searching under restraint and pain-inducing techniques should not be used on children. (1.67)

**Not achieved**

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. (1.68)

**Not achieved**

Staff from the adult prison should not be routinely used to respond to incidents in the children's unit. (1.69)

**Not achieved** (Recommendation repeated, 1.68)

The location of boys with immediate alcohol and drug withdrawal needs should ensure their safe monitoring and support. (1.84)

**Achieved**

## Respect

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

*At the last inspection in 2016, 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.*

### Recommendations

Cells should have effective ventilation. (2.12)

**Not achieved** (Recommendation repeated, 2.5)

Toilets should be fully screened. (2.13)

**Not achieved** (Recommendation repeated, 2.7)

Children should have access to a lockable cupboard. (2.14)

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

Managers should investigate and address children's negative perceptions of staff. (2.19)

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

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. (2.28)

**Not achieved** (Recommendation repeated, 2.16)

Engagement by the children's unit with community diversity groups should be improved to the level achieved by the adult prison. (2.29)

**Not achieved** (Recommendation repeated, 2.17)

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

**Not achieved**

All clinical areas should be safe and fully compliant with infection control guidelines. (2.74)

**Not achieved** (Recommendation repeated, 2.39)

There should be sufficient nursing capacity to ensure that all clinical activities such as CHAT assessments can be completed in a timely way. (2.75)

**Not achieved**

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

**Achieved**

Children should have timely access to speech and language therapy as clinically indicated. (2.99)

**Not achieved**

Local policies for the provision of mental health services should be agreed. (2.100)

**Partially 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 2016, 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 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.*

## Recommendations

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

**Not achieved**

There should be effective oversight and quality assurance of the education provision. (3.16)

**Achieved**

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. (3.23)

**Achieved**

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

**Partially achieved**

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. (3.51)

**Not achieved** (Recommendation repeated, 3.50)

## 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 2016, 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 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.*

### Recommendations

The use of ROTL should be reinstated to support release planning and maintenance of family ties. (4.9)

**Not achieved**

The Youth Justice Board should develop procedures to enable effective monitoring of resettlement outcomes for boys following their release from YOIs. (4.10)

**Partially achieved**

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. (4.17)

**Partially achieved**

Quality assurance of planning documentation should be introduced. (4.18)

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

All children with looked-after status should receive adequate levels of support from their local authority. (4.26)

**Not achieved**

The views of looked-after children should be explored to identify any underlying difficulties in the way they experience custody. (4.27)

**Not achieved**

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. (4.32)

**Partially achieved** (Recommendation repeated, 4.29)

Boys should be able to open a bank account while at Parc. (4.39)

**Not achieved**

Boys should have access to information and guidance to enable them to develop the financial awareness and skills they need when released. (4.40)

**Not achieved** (Recommendation repeated, 4.37)

Evaluation of interventions should be put in place. (4.52)

**Not achieved** (Recommendation repeated, 4.47)

Interventions should be put in place for boys to address sexually harmful behaviour. (4.53)

**Not achieved** (Recommendation repeated, 4.48)



## Appendix III: Establishment population profile

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

### Population breakdown by:

Status	Number of young people	%
Sentenced	37	82
Recall	0	0
Convicted unsentenced	4	9
Remand	4	9
Detainees	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>100</b>

Age	Number of young people	%
15 years	1	2
16 years	11	24
17 years	33	74
18 years	18	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>100</b>

Nationality	Number of young people	%
British	43	96
Foreign nationals	2	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>100</b>

<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>Number of young people</b>	<b>%</b>
White		
British	27	60
Irish	1	2
Gypsy/Irish Traveller	0	0
Other white	1	2
Mixed		
White and black Caribbean	4	10
White and black African	1	2
White and Asian	0	0
Other mixed	2	4
Asian or Asian British		
Indian	0	0
Pakistani	1	2
Bangladeshi	2	4
Chinese	0	0
Other Asian	1	2
Black or black British		
Caribbean	2	4
African	3	8
Other black	0	0
Other ethnic group		
Arab	0	0
Other ethnic group	0	0
Not stated	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>100</b>

<b>Religion</b>	<b>Number of young people</b>	<b>%</b>
Baptist	0	0
Church of England	0	0
Roman Catholic	2	4
Other Christian denominations	9	20
Muslim	7	16
Sikh	0	0
Hindu	0	0
Buddhist	0	0
Jewish	0	0
Other	0	0
No religion	27	60
<b>Total</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>100</b>

<b>Other demographics</b>	<b>Number of young people</b>	<b>%</b>
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	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
16 years	3	1	4	0	0	0	0	8
17 years	3	9	12	4	0	0	0	28
18 years	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>37</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	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	3
17 years	0	3	1	1	0	0	0	5
18 years	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>

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

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

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

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

<b>Sentence</b>	Under 2 yrs	2–3 yrs	3–4 yrs	4–5 yrs	5 yrs +	Recall	<b>Total</b>
<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	2	0	0	0	3
18 years	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</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**

<b>Sentence</b>	Under 2 yrs	2–3 yrs	3–4 yrs	4–5 yrs	5 yrs +	Recall	<b>Total</b>
<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**

<b>Sentence</b>	Under 2 yrs	2–5 yrs	5–10 yrs	10–15 yrs	15–20 yrs	Recall	<b>Total</b>
<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	1	0	0	0	1
18 years	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>

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

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

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

### Children and young people survey methodology

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

### Distributing and collecting questionnaires

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

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

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

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

### Survey response

At the time of the survey on 5 December 2016 the young person population at HMYOI Parc Juvenile Unit was 46. Questionnaires were distributed to 46 young people.

We received a total of 31 completed questionnaires, a response rate of 67%. Six respondents refused to complete a questionnaire and nine questionnaires were not returned.

Wing/unit	Number of completed survey returns
E	19
G	12

### Presentation of survey results and analyses

Over the following pages we present the survey results for HMYOI Parc Juvenile Unit.

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>8</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 peoples' 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 has been weighted to enable valid statistical comparison between establishments.

The following comparative analyses are presented:

- The current survey responses from HMYOI Parc Juvenile Unit 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 YOI's since July 2015.
- The current survey responses from HMYOI Parc Juvenile Unit in December 2016 compared with the responses of young people surveyed at HMYOI Parc Juvenile Unit in January 2016.
- A comparison within the 2016 survey between the responses of white young people and those from a black and minority ethnic group.

---

<sup>8</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. In order to appropriately adjust p-values in light of multiple testing,  $p < 0.01$  was considered statistically significant for all comparisons undertaken. This means there is only a 1% 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	6 (21%)
	17	21 (72%)
	18	2 (7%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Are you a British citizen?</b>	
	Yes	27 (96%)
	No	1 (4%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>Do you understand spoken English?</b>	
	Yes	27 (96%)
	No	1 (4%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Do you understand written English?</b>	
	Yes	28 (97%)
	No	1 (3%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>What is your ethnic origin?</b>	
	White - British	15 (52%)
	White - Irish	1 (3%)
	White - Other	1 (3%)
	Black or Black British - Caribbean	2 (7%)
	Black or Black British - African	1 (3%)
	Black or Black British - Other	0 (0%)
	Asian or Asian British - Indian	0 (0%)
	Asian or Asian British - Pakistani	1 (3%)
	Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi	2 (7%)
	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	3 (10%)
	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	18 (62%)
	Church of England	3 (10%)
	Catholic	2 (7%)
	Protestant	0 (0%)
	Other Christian denomination	1 (3%)
	Buddhist	0 (0%)
	Hindu	0 (0%)
	Jewish	0 (0%)
	Muslim	5 (17%)
	Sikh	0 (0%)

<b>Q7</b>	<b>Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?</b>	
	Yes	1 (3%)
	No	28 (93%)
	Don't know	1 (3%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>Do you have any children?</b>	
	Yes	0 (0%)
	No	28 (100%)
<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	3 (11%)
	No	25 (89%)
<b>Q10</b>	<b>Have you ever been in local authority care?</b>	
	Yes	8 (30%)
	No	19 (70%)

### SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Are you sentenced?</b>	
	Yes	23 (79%)
	No - unsentenced/on remand	6 (21%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>How long is your sentence (the full DTO sentence)?</b>	
	Not sentenced	6 (21%)
	Less than 6 months	6 (21%)
	6 to 12 months	5 (17%)
	More than 12 months, up to 2 years	2 (7%)
	More than 2 years	9 (31%)
	Indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP)	1 (3%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>How long have you been in this establishment?</b>	
	Less than 1 month	7 (24%)
	1 to 6 months	15 (52%)
	More than 6 months, but less than 12 months	4 (14%)
	12 months to 2 years	1 (3%)
	More than 2 years	2 (7%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?</b>	
	Yes	18 (62%)
	No	11 (38%)

### SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS

<b>Q1</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?</b>	
	Yes	24 (83%)
	No	3 (10%)
	Don't remember	2 (7%)
<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	9 (31%)
	No	16 (55%)
	Don't remember	4 (14%)

<b>Q3</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?</b>	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	12 (41%)
	<i>2 to 4 hours</i>	10 (34%)
	<i>More than 4 hours</i>	4 (14%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	3 (10%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?</b>	
	<i>My journey was less than 2 hours</i>	12 (41%)
	<i>Yes</i>	2 (7%)
	<i>No</i>	14 (48%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	1 (3%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?</b>	
	<i>My journey was less than 2 hours</i>	12 (40%)
	<i>Yes</i>	8 (27%)
	<i>No</i>	7 (23%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	3 (10%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, how did you feel you were treated by the escort staff?</b>	
	<i>Very well</i>	2 (7%)
	<i>Well</i>	9 (32%)
	<i>Neither</i>	9 (32%)
	<i>Badly</i>	3 (11%)
	<i>Very badly</i>	5 (18%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	0 (0%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>Before you arrived here, did you receive any information to help you prepare for coming here?</b>	
	<i>Yes - and it was helpful</i>	2 (7%)
	<i>Yes - but it was not helpful</i>	3 (11%)
	<i>No - I received no information</i>	19 (68%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	4 (14%)

#### SECTION 4: FIRST DAYS

<b>Q1</b>	<b>How long were you in reception?</b>	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	19 (68%)
	<i>2 hours or longer</i>	5 (18%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	4 (14%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i>	14 (50%)
	<i>No</i>	10 (36%)
	<i>Don't remember/Not applicable</i>	4 (14%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>How well did you feel you were treated in reception?</b>	
	<i>Very well</i>	2 (7%)
	<i>Well</i>	8 (29%)
	<i>Neither</i>	12 (43%)
	<i>Badly</i>	2 (7%)
	<i>Very badly</i>	3 (11%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	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>		
	<i>Not being able to smoke</i>	15 (60%)	<i>Money worries</i> 2 (8%)
	<i>Loss of property</i>	2 (8%)	<i>Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to</i> 4 (16%)
	<i>Feeling scared</i>	5 (20%)	<i>Health problems</i> 9 (36%)
	<i>Gang problems</i>	4 (16%)	<i>Getting phone numbers</i> 6 (24%)
	<i>Contacting family</i>	9 (36%)	<i>Staff did not ask me about any of these</i> 4 (16%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>When you first arrived here, did you have any of the following problems? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>		
	<i>Not being able to smoke</i>	10 (42%)	<i>Money worries</i> 6 (25%)
	<i>Loss of property</i>	7 (29%)	<i>Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to</i> 7 (29%)
	<i>Feeling scared</i>	5 (21%)	<i>Health problems</i> 5 (21%)
	<i>Gang problems</i>	3 (13%)	<i>Getting phone numbers</i> 6 (25%)
	<i>Contacting family</i>	12 (50%)	<i>I did not have any problems</i> 3 (13%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>When you first arrived here, were you given any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>		
	<i>Toiletries/basic items</i>		22 (81%)
	<i>The opportunity to have a shower</i>		9 (33%)
	<i>Something to eat</i>		18 (67%)
	<i>A free phone call to friends/family</i>		9 (33%)
	<i>PIN phone credit</i>		4 (15%)
	<i>Information about feeling worried/upset</i>		4 (15%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>		0 (0%)
	<i>I was not given any of these</i>		1 (4%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>Within your first 24 hours here, did you have access to the following people or services? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>		
	<i>Chaplain</i>		12 (50%)
	<i>Peer mentor</i>		3 (13%)
	<i>Childline/Samaritans</i>		5 (21%)
	<i>The prison shop/canteen</i>		6 (25%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>		7 (29%)
	<i>I did not have access to any of these</i>		3 (13%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?</b>		
	<i>Yes</i>		17 (65%)
	<i>No</i>		5 (19%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>		4 (15%)
<b>Q9</b>	<b>Did you feel safe on your first night here?</b>		
	<i>Yes</i>		20 (77%)
	<i>No</i>		4 (15%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>		2 (8%)
<b>Q10</b>	<b>Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the establishment?</b>		
	<i>I have not been on an induction course</i>		2 (8%)
	<i>Yes</i>		18 (69%)
	<i>No</i>		3 (12%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>		3 (12%)



**SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT**

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?</b>	
	Yes	20 (77%)
	No	6 (23%)
	Don't know	0 (0%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?</b>	
	Yes	10 (38%)
	No	16 (62%)
	Don't know	0 (0%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>What is the food like here?</b>	
	Very good	1 (4%)
	Good	4 (15%)
	Neither	6 (23%)
	Bad	10 (38%)
	Very bad	5 (19%)
<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>	2 (8%)
	Yes	13 (50%)
	No	11 (42%)
<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>	5 (19%)
	Very easy	2 (7%)
	Easy	6 (22%)
	Neither	5 (19%)
	Difficult	2 (7%)
	Very difficult	1 (4%)
	Don't know	6 (22%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>Are your religious beliefs respected?</b>	
	Yes	6 (22%)
	No	7 (26%)
	Don't know/Not applicable	14 (52%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>Can you speak to a Chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?</b>	
	Yes	13 (50%)
	No	2 (8%)
	Don't know/Not applicable	11 (42%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>Can you speak to a peer mentor when you need to?</b>	
	Yes	0 (0%)
	No	8 (31%)
	Don't know	18 (69%)
<b>Q9</b>	<b>Can you speak to a member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board) when you need to?</b>	
	Yes	1 (4%)
	No	10 (37%)
	Don't know	16 (59%)

<b>Q10</b>	<b>Can you speak to an advocate (an outside person to help you) when you need to?</b>	
	Yes	11 (41%)
	No	8 (30%)
	Don't know	8 (30%)

### SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Do most staff treat you with respect?</b>	
	Yes	10 (40%)
	No	15 (60%)

<b>Q2</b>	<b>If you had a problem, who would you turn to? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	No-one	8 (32%)
	Personal officer	2 (8%)
	Wing Officer	2 (8%)
	Teacher/education staff	1 (4%)
	Gym staff	0 (0%)
	Chaplain	0 (0%)
	Independent Monitoring Board (IMB)	0 (0%)
	YOT worker	1 (4%)
	Social worker	1 (4%)
	Health services staff	1 (4%)
	Peer mentor	0 (0%)
	Another young person here	5 (20%)
	Case worker	4 (16%)
	Advocate	0 (0%)
	Family/friends	11 (44%)
	Childline/Samaritans	0 (0%)

<b>Q3</b>	<b>Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?</b>	
	Yes	8 (30%)
	No	19 (70%)

<b>Q4</b>	<b>When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?</b>	
	I still have not met him/her	5 (19%)
	In your first week	10 (37%)
	After your first week	6 (22%)
	Don't remember	6 (22%)

<b>Q5</b>	<b>How often do you see your personal (named) officer?</b>	
	I still have not met him/her	5 (19%)
	At least once a week	10 (37%)
	Less than once a week	12 (44%)

<b>Q6</b>	<b>Do you feel your personal (named) officer tries to help you?</b>	
	I still have not met him/her	5 (19%)
	Yes	11 (42%)
	No	10 (38%)

### SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Is it easy to make an application?</b>	
	Yes	22 (85%)
	No	1 (4%)
	Don't know	3 (12%)

<b>Q2</b>	<b>Are applications sorted out fairly?</b>	
	I have not made an application	4 (18%)
	Yes	10 (45%)
	No	8 (36%)

<b>Q3</b>	<b>Are applications sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?</b>	
	<i>I have not made an application</i>	4 (18%)
	Yes	7 (32%)
	No	11 (50%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Is it easy to make a complaint?</b>	
	Yes	10 (37%)
	No	5 (19%)
	Don't know	12 (44%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>Are complaints sorted out fairly?</b>	
	<i>I have not made a complaint</i>	12 (50%)
	Yes	4 (17%)
	No	8 (33%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>Are complaints sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?</b>	
	<i>I have not made a complaint</i>	12 (52%)
	Yes	2 (9%)
	No	9 (39%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint?</b>	
	Yes	4 (15%)
	No	11 (42%)
	Never needed to make a complaint	11 (42%)

## 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>	1 (4%)
	Enhanced (top)	4 (16%)
	Standard (middle)	6 (24%)
	Basic (bottom)	14 (56%)
	Don't know	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>	1 (4%)
	Yes	10 (38%)
	No	7 (27%)
	Don't know	8 (31%)
<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>	1 (4%)
	Yes	12 (46%)
	No	10 (38%)
	Don't know	3 (12%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Have you had a minor report since you have been here?</b>	
	Yes	15 (58%)
	No	8 (31%)
	Don't know	3 (12%)
<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>	11 (42%)
	Yes	8 (31%)
	No	7 (27%)

<b>Q6</b>	<b>Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?</b>	
	Yes	17 (63%)
	No	9 (33%)
	Don't know	1 (4%)
<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>	10 (37%)
	Yes	12 (44%)
	No	5 (19%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?</b>	
	Yes	14 (54%)
	No	11 (42%)
	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>	
	<i>I have not been to the care and separation unit</i>	22 (92%)
	Very well	0 (0%)
	Well	1 (4%)
	Neither	0 (0%)
	Badly	1 (4%)
	Very badly	0 (0%)

### SECTION 9: SAFETY

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Have you ever felt unsafe here?</b>	
	Yes	11 (42%)
	No	15 (58%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Do you feel unsafe now?</b>	
	Yes	8 (32%)
	No	17 (68%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	Never felt unsafe	15 (63%)
	Everywhere	6 (25%)
	Care and separation unit	0 (0%)
	Association areas	0 (0%)
	Reception area	0 (0%)
	At the gym	1 (4%)
	In an exercise yard	0 (0%)
	At work	0 (0%)
	At education	1 (4%)
	At religious services	0 (0%)
	At meal times	0 (0%)
	At healthcare	0 (0%)
	Visits area	0 (0%)
	In wing showers	2 (8%)
	In gym showers	0 (0%)
	In corridors/stairwells	0 (0%)
	On your landing/wing	1 (4%)
	During movement	1 (4%)
	In your cell	0 (0%)

<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	11 (42%)
	No	15 (58%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you, your family or friends)</i>	7 (27%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	3 (12%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i>	1 (4%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	3 (12%)
	<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Medication</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Debt</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Drugs</i>	1 (4%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	1 (4%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your nationality</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>You are from a different part of the country to others</i>	1 (4%)
	<i>You are from a Traveller community</i>	1 (4%)
	<i>Your sexuality</i>	1 (4%)
	<i>Your age</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>You having a disability</i>	1 (4%)
	<i>You were new here</i>	3 (12%)
	<i>Your offence/crime</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Gang related issues</i>	0 (0%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>Have you ever been victimised by staff here (e.g. insulted or assaulted you)?</b>	
	Yes	15 (60%)
	No	10 (40%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you, your family or friends)</i>	8 (32%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	2 (8%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	3 (12%)
	<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i>	3 (12%)
	<i>Medication</i>	2 (8%)
	<i>Debt</i>	1 (4%)
	<i>Drugs</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	6 (24%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	2 (8%)
	<i>Your nationality</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>You are from a different part of the country to others</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>You are from a Traveller community</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your sexuality</i>	1 (4%)
	<i>Your age</i>	2 (8%)
	<i>You having a disability</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>You were new here</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your offence/crime</i>	2 (8%)
	<i>Gang related issues</i>	1 (4%)
	<i>Because you made a complaint</i>	4 (16%)
<b>Q10</b>	<b>If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?</b>	
	Yes	4 (16%)
	No	16 (64%)
	Don't know	5 (20%)

<b>Q11</b>	<b>Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?</b>		
	Yes		6 (21%)
	No		10 (36%)
	Don't know		12 (43%)
<b>Q12</b>	<b>Is shouting through the windows a problem here?</b>		
	Yes		9 (32%)
	No		14 (50%)
	Don't know		5 (18%)

### 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	14 (58%)	8 (33%)	2 (8%)
	The nurse	17 (71%)	5 (21%)	2 (8%)
	The dentist	13 (52%)	7 (28%)	5 (20%)
<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 (4%)
	<i>Very good</i>			4 (14%)
	<i>Good</i>			10 (36%)
	<i>Neither</i>			5 (18%)
	<i>Bad</i>			6 (21%)
	<i>Very bad</i>			2 (7%)
<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>			14 (52%)
	<i>Yes, all of my meds</i>			2 (7%)
	<i>Yes, some of my meds</i>			2 (7%)
	<i>No</i>			9 (33%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?</b>			
	Yes			9 (35%)
	No			17 (65%)
<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>			17 (63%)
	Yes			1 (4%)
	No			9 (33%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>Did you have problems with alcohol when you first arrived here?</b>			
	Yes			1 (4%)
	No			25 (96%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>Have you received any help with alcohol problems here?</b>			
	Yes			0 (0%)
	No			26 (100%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>Did you have problems with drugs when you first arrived here?</b>			
	Yes			9 (35%)
	No			17 (65%)
<b>Q9</b>	<b>Do you have problems with drugs now?</b>			
	Yes			4 (15%)
	No			23 (85%)

<b>Q10</b>	<b>Have you received any help with drugs problems here?</b>	
	Yes	4 (15%)
	No	22 (85%)
<b>Q11</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it to get illegal drugs here?</b>	
	Very easy	1 (4%)
	Easy	3 (11%)
	Neither	4 (15%)
	Difficult	0 (0%)
	Very difficult	4 (15%)
	Don't know	15 (56%)

### SECTION 11: ACTIVITIES

<b>Q1</b>	<b>How old were you when you were last at school?</b>				
	14 or under	13 (50%)			
	15 or over	13 (50%)			
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Have you ever been excluded from school?</b>				
	Yes	21 (81%)			
	No	5 (19%)			
	Not applicable	0 (0%)			
<b>Q3</b>	<b>Did you ever skip school before you came into custody?</b>				
	Yes	21 (78%)			
	No	5 (19%)			
	Not applicable	1 (4%)			
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Do you CURRENTLY take part in any of the following activities? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>				
	Education	16 (62%)			
	A job in this establishment	1 (4%)			
	Vocational or skills training	0 (0%)			
	Offending behaviour programmes	3 (12%)			
	I am not currently involved in any of these	9 (35%)			
<b>Q5</b>	<b>If you have been involved in any of the following activities here, do you think they will help you when you leave prison?</b>				
		<i>Not been involved</i>	Yes	No	Don't know
	Education	5 (19%)	11 (42%)	8 (31%)	2 (8%)
	A job in this establishment	9 (50%)	1 (6%)	2 (11%)	6 (33%)
	Vocational or skills training	10 (53%)	2 (11%)	2 (11%)	5 (26%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	9 (47%)	2 (11%)	2 (11%)	6 (32%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>Do you usually have association every day?</b>				
	Yes	18 (75%)			
	No	6 (25%)			
<b>Q7</b>	<b>Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?</b>				
	Don't want to go	5 (19%)			
	Yes	16 (59%)			
	No	6 (22%)			

<b>Q8</b>	<b>How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?</b>	
	<i>Don't want to go</i>	4 (16%)
	<i>None</i>	3 (12%)
	<i>One to two times</i>	5 (20%)
	<i>Three to five times</i>	10 (40%)
	<i>More than five times</i>	3 (12%)

### SECTION 12: FAMILY AND FRIENDS

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Are you able to use the telephone every day, if you want to?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i>	22 (81%)
	<i>No</i>	3 (11%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	2 (7%)

<b>Q2</b>	<b>Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i>	11 (42%)
	<i>No</i>	11 (42%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	4 (15%)

<b>Q3</b>	<b>How many visits do you usually have each week, from family or friends?</b>	
	<b><i>I don't get visits</i></b>	3 (11%)
	<i>Less than one a week</i>	8 (30%)
	<i>About one a week</i>	8 (30%)
	<i>More than one a week</i>	4 (15%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	4 (15%)

<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 (12%)
	<i>Very easy</i>	2 (8%)
	<i>Easy</i>	8 (31%)
	<i>Neither</i>	3 (12%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	5 (19%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	3 (12%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	2 (8%)

<b>Q5</b>	<b>Do your visits usually start on time?</b>	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	3 (12%)
	<i>Yes</i>	13 (52%)
	<i>No</i>	7 (28%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	2 (8%)

### SECTION 13: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Do you think you will have a problem with any of the following things, when you are released? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Finding accommodation</i>	7 (30%)
	<i>Getting into school or college</i>	6 (26%)
	<i>Getting a job</i>	12 (52%)
	<i>Money/finances</i>	8 (35%)
	<i>Claiming benefits</i>	5 (22%)
	<i>Continuing health services</i>	1 (4%)
	<i>Opening a bank account</i>	2 (9%)
	<i>Avoiding bad relationships</i>	2 (9%)
	<i>I won't have any problems</i>	10 (43%)



<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	14 (52%)
	No	6 (22%)
	Don't know	7 (26%)
<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>	13 (52%)
	Yes	9 (36%)
	No	3 (12%)
<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>	13 (52%)
	Yes	10 (40%)
	No	2 (8%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>Do you have a caseworker here?</b>	
	Yes	23 (88%)
	No	1 (4%)
	Don't know	2 (8%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>Has your caseworker helped to prepare you for release?</b>	
	<i>I don't have a caseworker</i>	3 (12%)
	Yes	9 (36%)
	No	10 (40%)
	Don't know	3 (12%)
<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>	7 (27%)
	Yes	14 (54%)
	No	5 (19%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?</b>	
	Yes	11 (42%)
	No	11 (42%)
	Don't know	4 (15%)
<b>Q9</b>	<b>Do you know who to contact for help with any of the following problems, before your release? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Finding accommodation</i>	5 (24%)
	<i>Getting into school or college</i>	9 (43%)
	<i>Getting a job</i>	9 (43%)
	<i>Help with money/finances</i>	4 (19%)
	<i>Help with claiming benefits</i>	3 (14%)
	<i>Continuing health services</i>	4 (19%)
	<i>Opening a bank account</i>	4 (19%)
	<i>Avoiding bad relationships</i>	3 (14%)
	<i>I don't know who to contact</i>	9 (43%)

<b>Q10</b>	<b>What is most likely to stop you offending in the future? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>		
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	6 (23%)	<i>Having a mentor (someone you can ask for advice)</i> 2 (8%)
	<i>Nothing, it is up to me</i>	8 (31%)	<i>Having a YOT worker or social worker that I get on with</i> 2 (8%)
	<i>Making new friends outside</i>	6 (23%)	<i>Having children</i> 4 (15%)
	<i>Going back to live with my family</i>	4 (15%)	<i>Having something to do that isn't crime</i> 7 (27%)
	<i>Getting a place of my own</i>	4 (15%)	<i>This sentence</i> 6 (23%)
	<i>Getting a job</i>	9 (35%)	<i>Getting into school/college</i> 6 (23%)
	<i>Having a partner (girlfriend or boyfriend)</i>	7 (27%)	<i>Talking about my offending behaviour with staff</i> 1 (4%)
	<i>Staying off alcohol/drugs</i>	6 (23%)	
<b>Q11</b>	<b>Do you want to stop offending?</b>		
	<i>Not sentenced</i>		6 (23%)
	<i>Yes</i>		19 (73%)
	<i>No</i>		0 (0%)
	<i>Don't know</i>		1 (4%)
<b>Q12</b>	<b>Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here, that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?</b>		
	<i>Not sentenced</i>		6 (24%)
	<i>Yes</i>		12 (48%)
	<i>No</i>		7 (28%)

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



### Survey responses from children and young people: HMYOI Parc Juvenile Unit 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

		HMYOI Parc Juvenile Unit 2016	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Parc Juvenile Unit December 2016	HMYOI Parc Juvenile Unit January 2016
	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>31</b>	<b>605</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU</b>					
1.1	Are you 18 years of age?	7%	14%	7%	0%
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	2%	7%	2%	3%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	98%	100%	98%	100%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	98%	99%	98%	100%
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other category.)	42%	48%	42%	21%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	16%	24%	16%	0%
1.7	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	2%	8%	2%	3%
1.8	Do you have any children?	0%	8%	0%	8%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	10%	20%	10%	19%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	30%	37%	30%	39%
<b>SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE</b>					
2.1	Are you sentenced?	79%	78%	79%	97%
2.2	Is your sentence 12 months or less?	37%	31%	37%	45%
2.3	Have you been in this establishment for one month or less?	23%	16%	23%	13%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	63%	61%	63%	61%
<b>SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS</b>					
On your most recent journey here:					
3.1	Did you feel safe?	84%	76%	84%	72%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	30%	34%	30%	68%
3.3	Did you spend more than 4 hours in the van?	14%	8%	14%	8%
For those who spent 2 or more hours in the escort van:					
3.4	Were you offered a toilet break if you needed it?	12%	12%	12%	20%
3.5	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	44%	41%	44%	50%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	39%	53%	39%	54%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	7%	11%	7%	14%

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

### Key to tables

		HMYOI Parc Juvenile Unit 2016	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Parc Juvenile Unit December 2016	HMYOI Parc Juvenile Unit January 2016
	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>31</b>	<b>605</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>SECTION 4: YOUR FIRST FEW DAYS HERE</b>					
<b>4.1</b>	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	<b>68%</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>76%</b>
<b>4.2</b>	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	<b>50%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>61%</b>
<b>4.3</b>	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	<b>36%</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>46%</b>
When you first arrived, did staff ask if you needed help or support with any of the following:					
<b>4.4a</b>	Not being able to smoke?	<b>60%</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>44%</b>
<b>4.4b</b>	Loss of property?	<b>8%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>19%</b>
<b>4.4c</b>	Feeling scared?	<b>19%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>19%</b>
<b>4.4d</b>	Gang problems?	<b>16%</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>22%</b>
<b>4.4e</b>	Contacting family?	<b>35%</b>	<b>51%</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>60%</b>
<b>4.4f</b>	Money worries?	<b>8%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>22%</b>
<b>4.4g</b>	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	<b>16%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>22%</b>
<b>4.4h</b>	Health problems?	<b>35%</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>44%</b>
<b>4.4i</b>	Getting phone numbers?	<b>24%</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>49%</b>
<b>4.5</b>	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	<b>89%</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>89%</b>	<b>74%</b>
When you first arrived, did you have problems with any of the following:					
<b>4.5a</b>	Not being able to smoke?	<b>42%</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>56%</b>
<b>4.5b</b>	Loss of property?	<b>29%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>19%</b>
<b>4.5c</b>	Feeling scared?	<b>20%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>11%</b>
<b>4.5d</b>	Gang problems?	<b>11%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>11%</b>
<b>4.5e</b>	Contacting family?	<b>50%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>51%</b>
<b>4.5f</b>	Money worries?	<b>25%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>11%</b>
<b>4.5g</b>	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	<b>29%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>11%</b>
<b>4.5h</b>	Health problems?	<b>20%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>22%</b>
<b>4.5i</b>	Getting phone numbers?	<b>25%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>37%</b>
When you first arrived, were you given any of the following:					
<b>4.6a</b>	Toiletries/basic items?	<b>83%</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>89%</b>
<b>4.6b</b>	The opportunity to have a shower?	<b>33%</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>39%</b>
<b>4.6c</b>	Something to eat?	<b>68%</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>61%</b>
<b>4.6d</b>	A free phone call to friends/family?	<b>33%</b>	<b>74%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>46%</b>
<b>4.6e</b>	PIN phone credit?	<b>15%</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>39%</b>
<b>4.6f</b>	Information about feeling worried/upset?	<b>15%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>24%</b>

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

### Key to tables

		HMYOI Parc Juvenile Unit 2016	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Parc Juvenile Unit December 2016	HMYOI Parc Juvenile Unit January 2016
	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>31</b>	<b>605</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>29</b>
Within your first 24 hours, did you have access to the following people or services:					
<b>4.7a</b>	A chaplain?	50%	43%	50%	29%
<b>4.7b</b>	A peer mentor?	11%	9%	11%	11%
<b>4.7c</b>	Childline/Samaritans	20%	14%	20%	11%
<b>4.7d</b>	The prison shop/canteen?	25%	8%	25%	14%
<b>4.8</b>	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	66%	70%	66%	50%
<b>4.9</b>	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	77%	74%	77%	86%
<b>4.10</b>	For those who have been on an induction course: did it cover everything you needed to know about the establishment	75%	49%	75%	77%
<b>SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT</b>					
<b>5.1</b>	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	77%	88%	77%	97%
<b>5.2</b>	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	39%	20%	39%	57%
<b>5.3</b>	Do you find the food here good/very good?	18%	16%	18%	18%
<b>5.4</b>	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	50%	46%	50%	53%
<b>5.5</b>	Is it easy/very easy for you to attend religious services?	30%	46%	30%	45%
<b>5.6</b>	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	23%	58%	23%	43%
Can you speak to:					
<b>5.7</b>	A chaplain of your faith in private?	50%	64%	50%	66%
<b>5.8</b>	A peer mentor?	0%	28%	0%	22%
<b>5.9</b>	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	3%	18%	3%	8%
<b>5.10</b>	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	40%	31%	40%	35%
<b>SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF</b>					
<b>6.1</b>	Do most staff treat you with respect?	41%	63%	41%	55%
<b>6.2</b>	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	32%	22%	32%	37%
<b>6.3</b>	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	30%	32%	30%	37%
For those who have met their personal officer:					
<b>6.4</b>	Did you meet your personal (named) officer within the first week?	46%	31%	46%	59%
<b>6.5</b>	Do you see your personal (named) officer at least once a week?	46%	47%	46%	39%
<b>6.6</b>	Do you feel your personal (named) officer tries to help you?	52%	61%	52%	71%

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

### Key to tables

		HMYOI Parc Juvenile Unit 2016	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Parc Juvenile Unit December 2016	HMYOI Parc Juvenile Unit January 2016
	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>31</b>	<b>605</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS</b>					
<b>7.1</b>	Is it easy to make an application?	<b>85%</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>81%</b>
For those who have made an application:					
<b>7.2</b>	Do you feel applications are sorted out fairly?	<b>56%</b>	<b>52%</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>55%</b>
<b>7.3</b>	Do you feel applications are sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	<b>39%</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>27%</b>
<b>7.4</b>	Is it easy to make a complaint?	<b>38%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>60%</b>
For those who have made a complaint:					
<b>7.5</b>	Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	<b>33%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>19%</b>
<b>7.6</b>	Do you feel complaints are sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	<b>19%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>18%</b>
<b>7.7</b>	Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint?	<b>15%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>11%</b>
<b>SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE</b>					
<b>8.1</b>	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	<b>16%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>28%</b>
<b>8.2</b>	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	<b>39%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>44%</b>
<b>8.3</b>	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	<b>46%</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>49%</b>
<b>8.4</b>	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	<b>58%</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>71%</b>
For those who have had a minor report:					
<b>8.5</b>	Was the process explained clearly to you?	<b>55%</b>	<b>59%</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>78%</b>
<b>8.6</b>	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	<b>63%</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>63%</b>	<b>79%</b>
For those who have had an adjudication ('nicking'):					
<b>8.7</b>	Was the process explained clearly to you?	<b>72%</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>90%</b>
<b>8.8</b>	Have you been physically restrained (Cand R) since you have been here?	<b>54%</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>43%</b>
<b>8.9</b>	For those who had spent a night in the care and separation unit: did the staff treat you well/very well?	<b>50%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>10%</b>
<b>SECTION 9: SAFETY</b>					
<b>9.1</b>	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	<b>42%</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>28%</b>
<b>9.2</b>	Do you feel unsafe now?	<b>32%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>11%</b>

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

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMYOI Parc Juvenile Unit 2016	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Parc Juvenile Unit December 2016	HMYOI Parc Juvenile Unit January 2016
	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>31</b>	<b>605</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>9.4</b>	Have you ever been victimised by other young people here?	<b>42%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>35%</b>
Since you have been here, have other young people:					
<b>9.5a</b>	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	<b>26%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>22%</b>
<b>9.5b</b>	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	<b>11%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>24%</b>
<b>9.5c</b>	Sexually abused you?	<b>3%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.5d</b>	Threatened or intimidated you?	<b>11%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>11%</b>
<b>9.5e</b>	Taken your canteen/property?	<b>0%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>8%</b>
<b>9.5f</b>	Victimised you because of medication?	<b>0%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.5g</b>	Victimised you because of debt?	<b>0%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3%</b>
<b>9.5h</b>	Victimised you because of drugs?	<b>3%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>3%</b>
<b>9.5i</b>	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	<b>3%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>3%</b>
<b>9.5j</b>	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	<b>0%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3%</b>
<b>9.5k</b>	Victimised you because of your nationality?	<b>0%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>8%</b>
<b>9.5l</b>	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	<b>3%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>11%</b>
<b>9.5m</b>	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	<b>3%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.5n</b>	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	<b>3%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.5o</b>	Victimised you because of your age?	<b>0%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3%</b>
<b>9.5p</b>	Victimised you because you have a disability?	<b>3%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.5q</b>	Victimised you because you were new here?	<b>11%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>8%</b>
<b>9.5r</b>	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	<b>0%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.5s</b>	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	<b>0%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3%</b>

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

### Key to tables

		HMYOI Parc Juvenile Unit 2016	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Parc Juvenile Unit December 2016	HMYOI Parc Juvenile Unit January 2016
	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>31</b>	<b>605</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>9.7</b>	Have you ever been victimised by a member of staff here?	<b>60%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>42%</b>
Since you have been here, have staff:					
<b>9.8a</b>	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	<b>32%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>26%</b>
<b>9.8b</b>	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	<b>8%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>3%</b>
<b>9.8c</b>	Sexually abused you?	<b>0%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3%</b>
<b>9.8d</b>	Threatened or intimidated you?	<b>11%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>11%</b>
<b>9.8e</b>	Taken your canteen/property?	<b>11%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>8%</b>
<b>9.8f</b>	Victimised you because of medication?	<b>8%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.8g</b>	Victimised you because of debt?	<b>3%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.8h</b>	Victimised you because of drugs?	<b>0%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3%</b>
<b>9.8i</b>	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	<b>24%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>3%</b>
<b>9.8j</b>	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	<b>8%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.8k</b>	Victimised you because of your nationality?	<b>0%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.8k</b>	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	<b>0%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>8%</b>
<b>9.8m</b>	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	<b>0%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.8n</b>	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	<b>3%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.8o</b>	Victimised you because of your age?	<b>8%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>3%</b>
<b>9.8p</b>	Victimised you because you have a disability?	<b>0%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.8q</b>	Victimised you because you were new here?	<b>0%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3%</b>
<b>9.8r</b>	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	<b>8%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.8s</b>	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	<b>3%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>3%</b>
<b>9.8t</b>	Victimised you because you made a complaint?	<b>16%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>18%</b>
<b>9.10</b>	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	<b>16%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>28%</b>
<b>9.11</b>	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	<b>21%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>22%</b>
<b>9.12</b>	Is shouting through the windows a problem here?	<b>32%</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>50%</b>



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

### Key to tables

		HMYOI Parc Juvenile Unit 2016	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Parc Juvenile Unit December 2016	HMYOI Parc Juvenile Unit January 2016
	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>31</b>	<b>605</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>SECTION 10: HEALTH SERVICES</b>					
<b>10.1a</b>	Is it easy for you to see the doctor?	58%	48%	58%	74%
<b>10.1b</b>	Is it easy for you to see the nurse?	71%	63%	71%	85%
<b>10.1c</b>	Is it easy for you to see the dentist?	51%	25%	51%	63%
<b>10.2</b>	For those who have been to health services: Do you think the overall quality is good/very good?	53%	49%	53%	50%
<b>10.3</b>	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/all of it in your cell?	32%	52%	32%	25%
<b>10.4</b>	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?	34%	24%	34%	33%
<b>10.5</b>	If you have emotional or mental health problems, are you being helped by anyone here?	7%	55%	7%	25%
<b>10.6</b>	Did you have any problems with alcohol when you first arrived?	3%	7%	3%	19%
<b>10.7</b>	Have you received any help with any alcohol problems here?	0%	4%	0%	11%
<b>10.8</b>	Did you have any problems with drugs when you first arrived?	34%	31%	34%	57%
<b>10.9</b>	Do you have a problem with drugs now?	15%	7%	15%	11%
<b>10.10</b>	Have you received any help with any drug problems here?	15%	20%	15%	43%
<b>10.11</b>	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs here?	15%	23%	15%	37%
<b>SECTION 11: ACTIVITIES</b>					
<b>11.1</b>	Were you 14 or younger when you were last at school?	50%	36%	50%	39%
<b>11.2</b>	Have you ever been excluded from school?	82%	87%	82%	86%
<b>11.3</b>	Did you ever skip school before you came into custody?	78%	71%	78%	86%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:					
<b>11.4a</b>	Education?	62%	75%	62%	82%
<b>11.4b</b>	A job in this establishment?	3%	17%	3%	0%
<b>11.4c</b>	Vocational or skills training?	0%	10%	0%	8%
<b>11.4d</b>	Offending behaviour programmes?	11%	18%	11%	26%
<b>11.4e</b>	Nothing	34%	17%	34%	11%

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

### Key to tables

		HMYOI Parc Juvenile Unit 2016	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Parc Juvenile Unit December 2016	HMYOI Parc Juvenile Unit January 2016
	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>31</b>	<b>605</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>29</b>
For those who have taken part in the following activities while in this establishment, do you think that they will help you when you leave prison:					
<b>11.5a</b>	Education?	52%	59%	52%	56%
<b>11.5b</b>	A job in this establishment?	8%	39%	8%	22%
<b>11.5c</b>	Vocational or skills training?	23%	39%	23%	17%
<b>11.5d</b>	Offending behaviour programmes?	20%	47%	20%	28%
<b>11.6</b>	Do you usually have association every day?	75%	58%	75%	87%
<b>11.7</b>	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	60%	66%	60%	72%
<b>11.8</b>	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	11%	2%	11%	53%
<b>SECTION 12: KEEPING IN TOUCH WITH FAMILY AND FRIENDS</b>					
<b>12.1</b>	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	83%	80%	83%	97%
<b>12.2</b>	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	42%	52%	42%	68%
<b>12.3</b>	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	45%	34%	45%	45%
<b>12.4</b>	Is it easy/very easy for your family and friends to visit you here?	39%	29%	39%	46%
<b>12.5</b>	Do your visits start on time?	51%	36%	51%	39%
<b>SECTION 13: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE</b>					
Do you think you will have a problem with the following, when you are released:					
<b>13.1a</b>	Finding accommodation?	29%	28%	29%	37%
<b>13.1b</b>	Getting into school or college?	27%	35%	27%	45%
<b>13.1c</b>	Getting a job?	53%	51%	53%	55%
<b>13.1d</b>	Money/finances?	35%	34%	35%	47%
<b>13.1e</b>	Claiming benefits?	21%	13%	21%	32%
<b>13.1f</b>	Continuing health services?	3%	9%	3%	32%
<b>13.1g</b>	Opening a bank account?	9%	16%	9%	24%
<b>13.1h</b>	Avoiding bad relationships?	9%	15%	9%	42%
<b>13.2</b>	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	53%	46%	53%	74%
For those with a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan:					
<b>13.3</b>	Were you involved in the development of your plan?	77%	85%	77%	95%
<b>13.4</b>	Do you understand the targets set in your plan?	83%	90%	83%	87%
<b>13.5</b>	Do you have a caseworker here?	90%	91%	90%	100%
<b>13.6</b>	Has your caseworker helped to prepare you for release?	41%	44%	41%	51%
For those with a social worker:					
<b>13.7</b>	Has your social worker been to visit you since you have been here?	75%	73%	75%	78%
<b>13.8</b>	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	42%	38%	42%	56%

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

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMYOI Parc Juvenile Unit 2016	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Parc Juvenile Unit December 2016	HMYOI Parc Juvenile Unit January 2016
	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>31</b>	<b>605</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>29</b>
Do you know who to contact for help with the following problems?					
<b>13.9a</b>	Finding accommodation	<b>23%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>39%</b>
<b>13.9b</b>	Getting into school or college	<b>42%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>36%</b>
<b>13.9c</b>	Getting a job	<b>42%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>39%</b>
<b>13.9d</b>	Help with money/finances	<b>19%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>31%</b>
<b>13.9e</b>	Help with claiming benefits	<b>13%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>27%</b>
<b>13.9f</b>	Continuing health services	<b>19%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>31%</b>
<b>13.9g</b>	Opening a bank account	<b>19%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>31%</b>
<b>13.9h</b>	Avoiding bad relationships	<b>13%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>31%</b>
For those who were sentenced:					
<b>13.11</b>	Do you want to stop offending?	<b>97%</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>91%</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>64%</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>64%</b>	<b>45%</b>

## Diversity analysis



### Key question responses (ethnicity) HMYOI Parc Juvenile Unit December 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

		Black and minority ethnic young people	White young people
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>12</b>	<b>17</b>
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	0%	4%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	96%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	100%	96%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	41%	0%
1.5	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	0%	4%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	6%	13%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	38%	25%
2.1	Are you sentenced?	77%	84%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	77%	52%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	41%	24%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	38%	40%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	6%	4%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	38%	60%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	38%	36%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	50%	75%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	80%	75%
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	60%	88%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	7%	57%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	29%	13%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	50%	50%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	7%	28%
Can you speak to:			
5.7	A chaplain of your faith in private?	60%	44%
5.8	A peer mentor?	0%	0%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	0%	4%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	29%	48%

## Diversity analysis

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	<b>Black and minority ethnic young people</b>	<b>White young people</b>
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>12</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>6.1</b>	Do most staff treat you with respect?	<b>8%</b>	<b>57%</b>
<b>6.2</b>	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	<b>8%</b>	<b>44%</b>
<b>7.1</b>	Is it easy to make an application?	<b>92%</b>	<b>84%</b>
<b>7.4</b>	Is it easy to make a complaint?	<b>29%</b>	<b>40%</b>
<b>8.1</b>	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	<b>9%</b>	<b>16%</b>
<b>8.2</b>	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	<b>23%</b>	<b>48%</b>
<b>8.3</b>	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	<b>69%</b>	<b>30%</b>
<b>8.4</b>	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	<b>100%</b>	<b>38%</b>
<b>8.6</b>	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	<b>93%</b>	<b>44%</b>
<b>8.8</b>	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	<b>80%</b>	<b>38%</b>
<b>9.1</b>	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	<b>40%</b>	<b>44%</b>
<b>9.2</b>	Do you feel unsafe now?	<b>31%</b>	<b>30%</b>
<b>9.4</b>	Have you been victimised by other young people here?	<b>40%</b>	<b>46%</b>
Since you have been here, have other young people:			
<b>9.5d</b>	Threatened or intimidated you?	<b>0%</b>	<b>18%</b>
<b>9.5i</b>	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	<b>7%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.5j</b>	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.5k</b>	Victimised you because of your nationality?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.5p</b>	Victimised you because you have a disability?	<b>0%</b>	<b>5%</b>
<b>9.7</b>	Have you been victimised by staff here?	<b>92%</b>	<b>44%</b>
Since you have been here, have staff:			
<b>9.8d</b>	Threatened or intimidated you?	<b>23%</b>	<b>4%</b>
<b>9.8i</b>	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	<b>69%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.8j</b>	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	<b>23%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.8k</b>	Victimised you because of your nationality?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.8p</b>	Victimised you because you have a disability?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.10</b>	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	<b>0%</b>	<b>25%</b>
<b>9.11</b>	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	<b>29%</b>	<b>17%</b>

## Diversity analysis

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	<b>Black and minority ethnic young people</b>	<b>White young people</b>
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>12</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>10.1a</b>	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the doctor?	25%	73%
<b>10.1b</b>	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the nurse?	54%	80%
<b>10.4</b>	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	31%	41%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:			
<b>11.4a</b>	Education?	64%	57%
<b>11.4b</b>	A job in this establishment?	0%	4%
<b>11.4c</b>	Vocational or skills training?	0%	0%
<b>11.4d</b>	Offending behaviour programmes?	9%	13%
<b>11.4e</b>	Nothing?	36%	38%
<b>11.6</b>	Do you usually have association every day?	60%	88%
<b>11.7</b>	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	31%	75%
<b>11.8</b>	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	8%	14%
<b>12.1</b>	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	69%	88%
<b>12.2</b>	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	54%	30%
<b>12.3</b>	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	40%	50%
<b>13.2</b>	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	54%	50%
<b>13.8</b>	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	46%	41%

## Wing comparator



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

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	E Wing	G Wing
	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>19</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU</b>			
1.1	Are you 18 years of age?	11%	0%
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	4%	0%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	96%	100%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	96%	100%
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other category.)	27%	63%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	15%	19%
1.7	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	0%	6%
1.8	Do you have any children?	0%	0%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	4%	19%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	36%	20%
<b>SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE</b>			
2.1	Are you sentenced?	78%	81%
2.2	Is your sentence 12 months or less?	33%	44%
2.3	Have you been in this establishment for one month or less?	33%	6%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	73%	44%
<b>SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS</b>			
On your most recent journey here:			
3.1	Did you feel safe?	73%	100%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	27%	38%
3.3	Did you spend more than 4 hours in the van?	0%	38%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	36%	44%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	4%	6%

## Wing comparator

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	E Wing	G Wing
	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>19</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>SECTION 4: YOUR FIRST FEW DAYS HERE</b>			
<b>4.1</b>	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	<b>52%</b>	<b>94%</b>
<b>4.2</b>	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	<b>60%</b>	<b>38%</b>
<b>4.3</b>	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	<b>36%</b>	<b>38%</b>
When you first arrived, did staff ask if you needed help or support with any of the following:			
<b>4.4a</b>	Not being able to smoke?	<b>82%</b>	<b>29%</b>
<b>4.4b</b>	Loss of property?	<b>14%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>4.4c</b>	Feeling scared?	<b>27%</b>	<b>7%</b>
<b>4.4d</b>	Gang problems?	<b>18%</b>	<b>7%</b>
<b>4.4e</b>	Contacting family?	<b>41%</b>	<b>29%</b>
<b>4.4f</b>	Money worries?	<b>14%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>4.4g</b>	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	<b>18%</b>	<b>7%</b>
<b>4.4h</b>	Health problems?	<b>41%</b>	<b>29%</b>
<b>4.4i</b>	Getting phone numbers?	<b>18%</b>	<b>29%</b>
<b>4.5</b>	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	<b>86%</b>	<b>92%</b>
When you first arrived, did you have problems with any of the following:			
<b>4.5a</b>	Not being able to smoke?	<b>46%</b>	<b>31%</b>
<b>4.5b</b>	Loss of property?	<b>18%</b>	<b>46%</b>
<b>4.5c</b>	Feeling Scared?	<b>27%</b>	<b>8%</b>
<b>4.5d</b>	Gang Problems?	<b>18%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>4.5e</b>	Contacting Family?	<b>55%</b>	<b>46%</b>
<b>4.5f</b>	Money worries?	<b>32%</b>	<b>8%</b>
<b>4.5g</b>	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	<b>32%</b>	<b>23%</b>
<b>4.5h</b>	Health problems?	<b>18%</b>	<b>23%</b>
<b>4.5i</b>	Getting phone numbers?	<b>14%</b>	<b>46%</b>
When you first arrived, were you given any of the following:			
<b>4.6a</b>	Toiletries/basic items?	<b>88%</b>	<b>75%</b>
<b>4.6b</b>	The opportunity to have a shower?	<b>25%</b>	<b>44%</b>
<b>4.6c</b>	Something to eat?	<b>63%</b>	<b>75%</b>
<b>4.6d</b>	A free phone call to friends/family?	<b>38%</b>	<b>25%</b>
<b>4.6e</b>	PIN phone credit?	<b>17%</b>	<b>6%</b>
<b>4.6f</b>	Information about feeling worried/upset?	<b>17%</b>	<b>6%</b>



## Wing comparator

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	E Wing	G Wing
	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>19</b>	<b>12</b>
Within your first 24 hours, did you have access to the following people or services:			
<b>4.7a</b>	A chaplain?	<b>50%</b>	<b>50%</b>
<b>4.7b</b>	A peer mentor?	<b>13%</b>	<b>9%</b>
<b>4.7c</b>	Childline/Samaritans	<b>30%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>4.7d</b>	The prison shop/canteen?	<b>25%</b>	<b>25%</b>
<b>4.8</b>	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	<b>63%</b>	<b>71%</b>
<b>4.9</b>	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	<b>75%</b>	<b>80%</b>
<b>SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT</b>			
<b>5.1</b>	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	<b>83%</b>	<b>71%</b>
<b>5.2</b>	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	<b>50%</b>	<b>20%</b>
<b>5.3</b>	Do you find the food here good/very good?	<b>13%</b>	<b>29%</b>
<b>5.4</b>	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	<b>38%</b>	<b>71%</b>
<b>5.5</b>	Is it easy/very easy for you to attend religious services?	<b>28%</b>	<b>29%</b>
<b>5.6</b>	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	<b>28%</b>	<b>7%</b>
Can you speak to:			
<b>5.7</b>	A Chaplain of your faith in private?	<b>44%</b>	<b>60%</b>
<b>5.8</b>	A peer mentor?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>5.9</b>	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	<b>4%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>5.10</b>	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	<b>52%</b>	<b>20%</b>
<b>SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF</b>			
<b>6.1</b>	Do most staff treat you with respect?	<b>48%</b>	<b>25%</b>
<b>6.2</b>	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	<b>25%</b>	<b>46%</b>
<b>6.3</b>	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	<b>28%</b>	<b>29%</b>
<b>SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS</b>			
<b>7.1</b>	Is it easy to make an application?	<b>84%</b>	<b>92%</b>
<b>7.4</b>	Is it easy to make a complaint?	<b>40%</b>	<b>29%</b>
<b>7.7</b>	Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint?	<b>12%</b>	<b>23%</b>

## Wing comparator

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	E Wing	G Wing
	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>19</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE</b>			
<b>8.1</b>	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	<b>16%</b>	<b>9%</b>
<b>8.2</b>	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	<b>40%</b>	<b>31%</b>
<b>8.3</b>	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	<b>39%</b>	<b>64%</b>
<b>8.4</b>	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	<b>50%</b>	<b>75%</b>
<b>8.6</b>	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	<b>50%</b>	<b>92%</b>
<b>8.8</b>	Have you been physically restrained (Cand R) since you have been here?	<b>40%</b>	<b>77%</b>
<b>SECTION 9: SAFETY</b>			
<b>9.1</b>	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	<b>48%</b>	<b>31%</b>
<b>9.2</b>	Do you feel unsafe now?	<b>36%</b>	<b>25%</b>
<b>9.4</b>	Have you ever been victimised by other young people here?	<b>40%</b>	<b>46%</b>
Since you have been here, have other young people:			
<b>9.5a</b>	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	<b>28%</b>	<b>23%</b>
<b>9.5b</b>	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	<b>12%</b>	<b>8%</b>
<b>9.5c</b>	Sexually abused you?	<b>0%</b>	<b>8%</b>
<b>9.5d</b>	Threatened or intimidated you?	<b>12%</b>	<b>8%</b>
<b>9.5e</b>	Taken your canteen/property?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.5f</b>	Victimised you because of medication?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.5g</b>	Victimised you because of debt?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.5h</b>	Victimised you because of drugs?	<b>0%</b>	<b>8%</b>
<b>9.5i</b>	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	<b>4%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.5j</b>	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.5k</b>	Victimised you because of your nationality?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.5l</b>	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	<b>0%</b>	<b>8%</b>
<b>9.5m</b>	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	<b>0%</b>	<b>8%</b>
<b>9.5n</b>	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	<b>4%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.5o</b>	Victimised you because of your age?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.5p</b>	Victimised you because you have a disability?	<b>4%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.5q</b>	Victimised you because you were new here?	<b>16%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.5r</b>	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.5s</b>	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>

## Wing comparator

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	E Wing	G Wing
	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>19</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>9.7</b>	Have you ever been victimised by a member of staff here?	<b>52%</b>	<b>75%</b>
Since you have been here, have staff:			
<b>9.8a</b>	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	<b>28%</b>	<b>36%</b>
<b>9.8b</b>	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	<b>12%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.8c</b>	Sexually abused you?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.8d</b>	Threatened or intimidated you?	<b>4%</b>	<b>25%</b>
<b>9.8e</b>	Taken your canteen/property?	<b>4%</b>	<b>25%</b>
<b>9.8f</b>	Victimised you because of medication?	<b>0%</b>	<b>25%</b>
<b>9.8g</b>	Victimised you because of debt?	<b>0%</b>	<b>9%</b>
<b>9.8h</b>	Victimised you because of drugs?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.8i</b>	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	<b>16%</b>	<b>36%</b>
<b>9.8j</b>	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	<b>4%</b>	<b>9%</b>
<b>9.8k</b>	Victimised you because of your nationality?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.8k</b>	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.8m</b>	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.8n</b>	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	<b>0%</b>	<b>9%</b>
<b>9.8o</b>	Victimised you because of your age?	<b>4%</b>	<b>9%</b>
<b>9.8p</b>	Victimised you because you have a disability?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.8q</b>	Victimised you because you were new here?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.8r</b>	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	<b>4%</b>	<b>9%</b>
<b>9.8s</b>	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	<b>0%</b>	<b>9%</b>
<b>9.8t</b>	Victimised you because you made a complaint?	<b>12%</b>	<b>25%</b>
<b>9.10</b>	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	<b>24%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.11</b>	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	<b>22%</b>	<b>20%</b>
<b>9.12</b>	Is shouting through the windows a problem here?	<b>33%</b>	<b>29%</b>
<b>SECTION 10: HEALTH SERVICES</b>			
<b>10.1a</b>	Is it easy for you to see the doctor?	<b>63%</b>	<b>50%</b>
<b>10.1b</b>	Is it easy for you to see the nurse?	<b>75%</b>	<b>64%</b>
<b>10.1c</b>	Is it easy for you to see the dentist?	<b>48%</b>	<b>64%</b>
<b>10.4</b>	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?	<b>36%</b>	<b>31%</b>
<b>10.6</b>	Did you have any problems with alcohol when you first arrived?	<b>4%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>10.7</b>	Have you received any help with any alcohol problems here?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>10.8</b>	Did you have any problems with drugs when you first arrived?	<b>36%</b>	<b>31%</b>
<b>10.9</b>	Do you have a problem with drugs now?	<b>16%</b>	<b>7%</b>
<b>10.10</b>	Have you received any help with any drug problems here?	<b>12%</b>	<b>23%</b>
<b>10.11</b>	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs here?	<b>12%</b>	<b>20%</b>

## Wing comparator

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	E Wing	G Wing
	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>19</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>SECTION 11: ACTIVITIES</b>			
11.1	Were you 14 or younger when you were last at school?	48%	54%
11.2	Have you ever been excluded from school?	76%	92%
11.3	Did you ever skip school before you came into custody?	85%	69%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:			
11.4a	Education?	62%	64%
11.4b	A job in this establishment?	4%	0%
11.4c	Vocational or skills training?	0%	0%
11.4d	Offending behaviour programmes?	11%	9%
11.4e	Nothing	33%	36%
11.6	Do you usually have association every day?	83%	64%
11.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	72%	40%
11.8	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	5%	20%
<b>SECTION 12: KEEPING IN TOUCH WITH FAMILY AND FRIENDS</b>			
12.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	88%	71%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	40%	46%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	60%	20%
12.4	Is it easy/very easy for your family and friends to visit you here?	40%	31%
12.5	Do your visits start on time?	60%	36%
<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?	41%	9%
13.1b	Getting into school or college?	27%	25%
13.1c	Getting a job?	59%	36%
13.1d	Money/finances?	32%	36%
13.1e	Claiming benefits?	27%	9%
13.1f	Continuing health services?	5%	0%
13.1g	Opening a bank account?	5%	9%
13.1h	Avoiding bad relationships?	14%	0%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	44%	69%
13.5	Do you have a caseworker here?	85%	100%
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	24%	77%