

Report on an unannounced inspection of

HMYOI Feltham
**(Feltham A – children and
young people)**

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

23 January–3 February 2017

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



Crown copyright 2017

This publication (excluding logos) 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 or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email: 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

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	13
Section 1. Safety	21
Section 2. Respect	33
Section 3. Purposeful activity	45
Section 4. Resettlement	53
Section 5. Summary of recommendations and good practice	61
Section 6. Appendices	69
Appendix I: Inspection team	69
Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report	71
Appendix III: Establishment population profile	77
Appendix IV: Summary of children and young people questionnaires and interviews	81

Glossary of terms

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

Introduction

Feltham A young offender institution (YOI) held 126 boys at the time of this inspection, the vast majority of whom were 16 or 17 years old. This inspection can only be described as disappointing, with a decline in standards in three of our four healthy prison tests since the time of the last inspection in 2015. While this decline was of great concern, it was also deeply troubling that in an establishment of this kind the judgments awarded in the key areas of safety and purposeful activity had sunk to the lowest level.

As far as the safety of the establishment was concerned, levels of violence and the use of force had increased since the last inspection. Some of the violence was very serious, involving multiple assailants and the use of weapons. However, the response in terms of behaviour management was ineffective, with a focus on sanctions and regime restrictions. This had resulted in a cycle of violence and punitive responses, with no obvious strategy to break it. At the last inspection we made 17 recommendations to improve safety, and a mere three had been achieved.

Bearing in mind the age of the boys held at Feltham A, the restricted regime to which they were subjected did little or nothing to contribute to their education, socialisation or, clearly, their safety. Every single meal was taken alone, locked in their cells. We found that 40% of the boys were locked up during the school day, and 30% of the boys were out of their cells for just two hours each day. On average, boys were out of their cells for about 4.5 hours, a decrease from the still totally inadequate 5.5 hours at the time of the last inspection. The lack of exercise and sunlight must carry implications for the health and well-being of teenage boys.

There were sufficient school places and teachers, but fewer than half the boys were getting to school, and during the last year some 19,000 hours of schooling had been lost through non-attendance and cancellation of classes. On average, boys were receiving around 7.5 hours of schooling a week. The awarding of our lowest grade for purposeful activity was inevitable.

However, there was an extent to which Feltham A was a place of contrasts. There was no doubt that staff were working in very challenging circumstances, yet most of the interactions we observed between staff and the boys were polite. Inevitably relationships were hindered by the lack of time for meaningful contact because of the amount of time that boys were locked up. Nevertheless, health care was good and the work of the mental health team was excellent. Resettlement provision was also reasonably good, and preparation for release or for transition to the adult estate was well managed.

It would be wrong not to recognise the challenges faced by staff at Feltham A in creating a safe and decent facility. Violence was a serious problem, and during the inspection there was a serious assault on an officer. I understand very well that staff should be able to work in a safe environment, and not be in constant fear of being assaulted. The current approach is failing to deliver that reasonable expectation and, from the evidence available to us, is actually making it worse. The focus on keeping people apart rather than trying to change their behaviour has not worked. Feltham A is, quite simply, not safe for either staff or boys.

Perhaps one should not be surprised at the failure to improve when a mere 11 of the 55 recommendations made at the time of the last inspection in 2015 had been fully achieved. Thirty-four of those recommendations were not achieved, and nine were partially achieved. I would urge the leadership at both Feltham A, HM Prison and Probation Service (HMPPS) and the Youth Justice Board (YJB) to study this report carefully and, on this occasion, take its recommendations seriously.

Peter Clarke CVO OBE QPM
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

March 2017

Fact page

Task of the establishment

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

Establishment status

Public

Region/department

Young people's estate

Number held

126

Certified normal accommodation

240

Operational capacity

180

Date of last full inspection

August 2015

Brief history

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

The current HM Prison and Young Offender Institution Feltham was formed by the amalgamation of Ashford Remand Centre and Feltham Borstal in 1990/91.

Short description of residential units

Bittern	Induction
Curlew	Normal location
Dunlin	Normal location
Eagle	Normal location
Falcon	Closed
Grebe	Closed
Heron	Normal location
Jay	Normal location

Name of governor/director

Glenn Knight

Escort contractor

Serco

Health service commissioner and providers

NHS England (London)

Care UK who subcontracted mental health services to Barnet, Enfield and Haringey Mental Health Trust

Learning and skills providers

Prospects

Independent Monitoring Board chair

Caroline Langton

About this inspection and report

A1 Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons is an independent, statutory organisation which reports on the treatment and conditions of those detained in prisons, young offender institutions, immigration detention facilities and police custody.

A2 All inspections carried out by HM Inspectorate of Prisons contribute to the UK's response to its international obligations under the Optional Protocol to the UN Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (OPCAT). OPCAT requires that all places of detention are visited regularly by independent bodies – known as the National Preventive Mechanism (NPM) – which monitor the treatment of and conditions for detainees. HM Inspectorate of Prisons is one of several bodies making up the NPM in the UK.

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

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

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

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

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

A4 Under each test, we make an assessment of outcomes for children and young people and therefore of the establishment's overall performance against the test. In some cases, this performance will be affected by matters outside the establishment's direct control, which need to be addressed nationally.

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

- **outcomes for children and young people are poor against this healthy prison test.**
There is evidence that the outcomes for children and young people are seriously affected by current practice. There is a failure to ensure even adequate treatment of and/or conditions for children and young people. Immediate remedial action is required.

A5 Our assessments might result in one of the following:

- **recommendations:** will require significant change and/or new or redirected resources, so are not immediately achievable, and will be reviewed for implementation at future inspections
- **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 Care Quality Commission, 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 IV respectively.

A11 Findings from the survey of children and young people and a detailed description of the survey methodology can be found in Appendix V of this report. Please note that we only

refer to comparisons with other comparable establishments or previous inspections when these are statistically significant.¹

¹ The significance level is set at 0.01, which means that there is only a 1% chance that the difference in results is due to chance.

Summary

Safety

- S1** *Early days for boys at Feltham A were reasonably well managed but new arrivals spent too long in their cells on the induction unit. Internal safeguarding arrangements were sound but there were delays in child protection referrals. There was a comparatively low incidence of self-harm and care for those in crisis was reasonably good. The promising plans to improve behaviour seen at the previous inspection had not been implemented. The approach to behaviour management was now overwhelmingly punitive and ineffective. The level of violence, much of which was serious, continued to rise and was very high. Use of force and adjudications had also increased. The segregation unit was unsuitable for boys and we had significant concerns over the use of special accommodation. Substance misuse services remained good. **Outcomes for children and young people were poor against this healthy prison test***
- S2** *At the last inspection in July/August 2015, we found that outcomes for children and young people in Feltham A were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test. We made 17 recommendations about safety. At this follow-up inspection we found that three of the recommendations had been achieved, two had been partially achieved and 12 had not been achieved.*
- S3** Few boys had long journeys but some waited too long at court after their cases had finished. It was unacceptable that some children were still escorted with adults. Handover and information sharing between escorts and reception staff were good. New arrivals were supported and risk assessed appropriately and confidentially. The first night unit was welcoming and cells were well prepared for new arrivals. Boys spent too long in their cells during the first week. Induction was comprehensive and well supported by peer workers but some boys had to wait too long to receive key parts of it.
- S4** The safeguarding strategy was comprehensive and had been agreed by the local safeguarding children board. There were good links between the local authority, police and the prison and incidents were swiftly referred for external scrutiny once they were received by the safeguarding team. However, not all staff were aware of child protection procedures, leading to delays in investigations and action taken to prevent further harm.
- S5** Levels of self-harm were low and had reduced since our last inspection. Boys on open assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT)² documents were positive about the care they received. Many reviews lacked multidisciplinary input. The quality of ACCT documents was reasonable, although care maps were not comprehensive and daily entries by staff often reflected observation rather than interaction.
- S6** The number of violent incidents per boy had increased since the last inspection and was now very high. Many were very serious and involved multiple assailants and weapons. Various restricted regimes for perpetrators of violence remained difficult to manage on mainstream units and often meant that boys had very little time out of their cells. The quality of many 'positive attitudes created together' (PACT) plans we examined was poor. Targets were often superficial, and there was little evidence that progress in changing behaviour was followed up by residential officers. There remained an over-reliance on the regime

² Case management of prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm.

management meeting to manage violence reduction processes, although the meeting effectively identified boys at risk.

- S7 Support for victims was inadequate and many had no more than a very basic regime.
- S8 Behaviour management was concentrated on the use of sanctions and regime restrictions with too little incentive to encourage or motivate good behaviour. The two violence-free enhanced units that we saw at the last inspection had been discontinued, which was a backward step. While not the fault of the establishment, plans had not been realised to introduce an enhanced support unit and a discrete care and separation unit, to help reduce violence and manage more challenging behaviour.
- S9 The incentives and earned privileges scheme was not managed well and, in our survey, most boys said that it did not encourage changes in their behaviour. Adjudication hearings were carried out fairly, but were more suited to adults than to multidisciplinary work on behaviour change for children. Numbers had increased since the last inspection and were high.
- S10 There was a good flow of intelligence into the security department and links with community agencies were well developed. Measures to keep some boys separated affected access to a full regime. Monthly security objectives were not always consistent with current risks and were not effectively communicated to staff.
- S11 Use of force had increased since the last inspection and was very high. In many cases it was used to restrain and protect boys in fights and assaults. Supervision and monitoring arrangements were improving in some important areas, but there were delays and significant gaps in reporting. The use of special accommodation for boys was very high and unjustified.
- S12 Boys were still being held in segregation on the young adult site. The environment remained unsuitable for children.
- S13 Drug and alcohol use was minimal, the mandatory drug testing rate stood at 0% and finds were mainly of tobacco. Psychosocial support was good but more than half the interventions were lost because of regime constraints and lack of facilities.

Respect

S14 Residential units were in a reasonable condition, although showers were poor. Most interactions that we observed between staff and boys were polite, but we also saw some intolerance of adolescent behaviour. Consultation arrangements had deteriorated and the lack of time out of cell prevented the formation of effective relationships. The management of applications and complaints was good. The food was reasonable but boys had to eat all their meals in their cells. The management of equality was satisfactory but provision had deteriorated for some groups and there were gaps in the chaplaincy service. Health services remained good and mental health provision was excellent. **Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.**

S15 At the last inspection in July/August 2015, we found that outcomes for children and young people in Feltham A were good against this healthy prison test. We made 13 recommendations about respect.³ At this follow-up inspection we found that two of the recommendations had been achieved, four had been partially achieved and seven had not been achieved.

S16 The standard of accommodation was reasonably good with the exception of the showers, which were poor. Communal areas on residential units were clean and the small exercise yards were free of litter. The offensive display policy was now enforced and efforts to control graffiti were evident, although it remained a problem. Association equipment was in reasonable condition but there was not enough for the numbers wanting to use it. Notices and posters were mostly bright, age appropriate and comprehensive.

S17 Staff were working in very challenging circumstances and in most cases they remained supportive and sensitive towards the boys in their care. However, we saw examples of responses to adolescent behaviour which were too punitive. Some staff appeared overwhelmed by managing the regime and the arrangements to keep boys safe. The restricted regime offered some boys too few opportunities for pro-social time with staff. A personal officer scheme was in place but there was little evidence that personal officers were involved in supporting sentence progression or case work.

S18 The strategic management of equality work was weaker than at our last inspection and undermined by the redeployment of staff. Consultation arrangements with boys were poor and there was little engagement with community support groups. There was some good monitoring of the treatment of boys in different groups which showed no consistent difference in treatment in the activities measured. Discrimination complaints were generally investigated thoroughly and responses showed robust challenge of poor behaviour. Each boy received an excellent monthly equality newsletter which promoted diversity and the work of the team.

S19 In our survey, boys from a black or minority ethnic background reported broadly similar treatment in most areas, but felt less respected by staff. The lack of consultation left the prison poorly placed to understand this result. There was some good support for boys with disabilities, particularly from health care staff. Residential staff did not know enough about the needs of boys in their care and more understanding was needed to address the fears of boys in this group about their safety. Homophobic behaviour was not always challenged effectively.

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

- S20 Boys in our survey and those we spoke to were positive about faith provision. While the chaplaincy provided good support, the lack of faith-based classes was a concern.
- S21 The complaints that we reviewed were handled well, polite and mostly timely and we saw evidence that boys were spoken to about their concerns.
- S22 Support for legal rights was generally adequate, although we were concerned about the support offered to foreign national boys.
- S23 Health care services remained good. Governance systems were robust and the weekly risk and performance meetings supported positive outcomes for boys. Boys had short waits for primary care services, including the dentist, and access to external hospital appointments was generally good. The Wren unit had the resources to provide effective care for boys needing 24-hour nursing care, but prisoners located there for operational reasons severely undermined the therapeutic regime and function of the unit. Pharmacy services remained good, although boys sometimes could not access their prescribed medication because of unlock arrangements. Mental health support had been further improved by the developing services for boys with sexually harmful behaviours and was impressive.
- S24 Boys had a specially developed healthier menu but breakfast provision was still inadequate. In our survey, only 13% said the food was good, but those we spoke to were reasonably positive. Boys could not eat out and serveries were dirty and poorly managed.

Purposeful activity

S25 *The regime operating at the time of the inspection remained detrimental to the development and wellbeing of boys at Feltham. Time out of cell was inadequate and prevented boys from using basic amenities, including showers and telephones. Boys were still unable to access the hours of education they were entitled to. Attendance was poor and exacerbated by delays in movements and interruptions to lessons. Despite these problems the education provider had created a positive school ethos with high expectations of boys. Outcomes required further improvement. Access to the library and PE was too limited. **Outcomes for children and young people were poor against this healthy prison test.***

S26 *At the last inspection in July/August 2015, we found that outcomes for children and young people in Feltham A were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test. We made 15 recommendations about purposeful activity. At this follow-up inspection we found that five of the recommendations had been achieved, two had been partially achieved and eight had not been achieved.*

- S27 Time out of cell was inadequate. During our roll checks, about 40% of boys were locked in their cells during the school day. We assessed the average weekday time out of cell as 4.5 hours but many boys had considerably less. Movements were often late, affecting the delivery of activities and services. It was unacceptable that boys on the most restricted regime could have as little as 30 minutes out of their cells for showers, telephone calls and time outside. There was not enough access to association and the lack of time outside was a significant concern.
- S28 Attendance at purposeful activity remained too low. Data were not analysed well enough to evaluate or improve the provision or to set challenging targets. Too many training and education sessions were cancelled and only half the boys attended lessons. The outreach provision did not yet meet the education needs of learners who were not able to or prevented from attending lessons.

- S29 The education manager had been particularly effective at introducing a school ethos and held high aspirations for the boys to achieve. Since the previous inspection, the education manager had focused well on improving the quality of the learning experience. The number of GCSEs in English and mathematics had increased from none at the previous inspection but was still lower than comparable establishments.
- S30 Prison managers and staff did not fully support the promotion of a conducive learning environment in education. No effective provision had been made to keep the school clean.
- S31 The curriculum was well designed and education provision had increased, but most boys received only a few hours' education a day. The progress that they made was hindered by the limited time spent in lessons. Interventions in education to address poor behaviour by learners were effective.
- S32 Despite the high level of disruption, tutors were very effective at keeping learners engaged in tasks. However, the planning of learning was not good enough and in some lessons boys did not have enough tasks to complete.
- S33 Learners engaged well and were polite to their tutors and each other. Late arrival at many sessions prevented the promotion of awareness and understanding of a productive study and work ethic.
- S34 The library was well resourced but access was poor. A mobile service on all units was replenished regularly and boys could order books. Many were not aware of this facility.
- S35 Access to the gym and most sports facilities was not good enough. There were no accredited programmes for boys to achieve in physical education.
- S36 There was no provision to meet specific needs through remedial gym.

Resettlement

S37 *Strategic oversight of resettlement was reasonably good and informed by an up-to-date needs analysis. Very few boys were aware of their sentence, training or remand plan. These plans were not detailed enough and lacked meaningful targets. Contact between some caseworkers and boys was inadequate and residential staff did not attend review meetings. Release on temporary licence (ROTL) was used appropriately and public protection remained well organised. Preparation for release or transition to the adult estate was well organised but looked-after children still faced delays in securing suitable accommodation on release. Work with families was inconsistent and visitors faced unacceptable delays. Other pathway work was good. **Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***

S38 *At the last inspection in July/August 2015, we found that outcomes for children and young people in Feltham A were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 10 recommendations about resettlement. At this follow-up inspection we found that one of the recommendations had been achieved, one had been partially achieved, seven had not been achieved and one was no longer relevant.*

S39 The reducing reoffending strategy was based on a needs analysis for Feltham A and set out broadly appropriate pre-release and resettlement work for boys. The monthly reducing reoffending meeting was a suitable forum for strategic discussion, although an action plan would have provided more focus. ROTL continued to be used appropriately for boys who

would benefit and were suitable for it, although numbers were low. Positive work had been undertaken to strengthen the transition arrangements for boys who became adults while in custody and there was evidence that links with adult prisons were developing.

- S40 The number of boys in the survey who knew they had a training, sentence or remand plan was disappointing at only 17%. Significantly fewer boys than comparator prisons said their caseworker had helped them prepare for release. Training planning and remand management meetings were taking place, but some were not timely and there was not enough evidence in some of the cases that we reviewed of caseworkers maintaining contact with boys between meetings. There was no monitoring of how frequently meetings were cancelled. Planning documents were often descriptive rather than analytical and targets were generic. Quality assurance was starting to address this.
- S41 The risk management committee provided oversight of public protection. Relevant cases were managed appropriately.
- S42 Over two-thirds of the boys at Feltham A had entitlement to support from their local authority. The social workers advocated well on their behalf to ensure statutory reviews took place. In most cases, boys received some financial support and the social work team were persistent on behalf of those boys who did not. Boys who had been in the care of their local authority continued to experience delays in obtaining suitable release accommodation.
- S43 Despite early discussion of accommodation needs, in too many cases addresses were only provided close to the date of release. One boy in the previous six months had been released to a YMCA hostel and another four were not given an address until the day of their release. More support in financial management and budgeting was now available.
- S44 Boys received good careers advice during induction and were allocated a case worker and an education adviser.
- S45 Pre-discharge arrangements for health and substance misuse issues remained good. Boys who had been cared for by the mental health team received a welfare call seven days after release, which was good practice.
- S46 Family work was not strategic or coordinated. The visitors' centre offered information and support to families but their work was not integrated with the prison. The visits hall was an unwelcoming environment for boys and their families and visits often started late. The education and chaplaincy teams involved families in regular events to recognise boys' achievements, which was a positive initiative, and the casework and social work teams involved families effectively.
- S47 The introduction of accredited interventions was a positive step but the issue of gangs needed to be addressed more robustly. There were well developed plans to deliver an intervention for boys with sexually harmful behaviour.

Main concerns and recommendations

S48 **Concern:** The number of violent incidents was very high and increasing. Different restricted regimes for perpetrators of violence were difficult to manage and boys often had very little time out of their cells. Support for victims was inadequate and many experienced a very basic regime. Behaviour management focused too much on the use of sanctions and regime restrictions with too little incentive to encourage or motivate good behaviour.

Recommendation: A strategy should be developed and implemented to improve behaviour and reduce violence. Interventions based on need should be used and there should be sufficient incentives to encourage positive behaviour.

S49 **Concern:** Special accommodation had been used 13 times to hold nine boys during the previous six months. The justification given for each use was inadequate. There was evidence that some boys had been left in this accommodation in anti-tear gowns or just given a blanket following a strip-search.

Recommendation: Special accommodation should not be used for boys unless the circumstances are exceptional. No boy should be left without his own clothes unless a contemporaneous risk assessment identifies a threat to his life or wellbeing. In these circumstances, replacement clothes which maintain the boy's dignity should be provided.

S50 **Concern:** Time out of cell had further reduced since our last inspection and averaged about 4.5 hours on weekdays and much less at weekends. The behaviour management restrictions had created a system where too many boys were subject to a regime which was damaging to their emotional wellbeing.

Recommendation: HMPPS and the Youth Justice Board should take immediate action to ensure that all boys are able to access 10 hours out of their cell each weekday to attend activities safely.

S51 **Concern:** During the inspection, we saw some exercise periods of about 10 minutes. Many boys did not have enough physical activity or sunlight to ensure healthy physical and mental development. We were particularly concerned about the impact of this on black and minority ethnic boys, who need longer outside to produce as much vitamin D.

Recommendation: All boys should have the opportunity to have at least an hour outside every day.

S52 **Concern:** Levels of contact between caseworkers and boys varied. Some boys had no recorded contact with their caseworker between training planning review meetings. Not all review meetings were timely. Many of the plans prepared at these meetings did not demonstrate enough analysis of boys' progress to inform their future work. Targets were too often generic and did not describe how a boy would be helped to achieve them.

Recommendation: All boys should have regular, recorded contact with their caseworker between timely training planning review meetings. Plans agreed at these meetings should be specific to the boy and set out how he will be helped to achieve his targets. Targets should be reviewed and updated at each meeting based on information about the boy and his progress in the intervening period.

Section 1. Safety

Courts, escorts and transfers

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.1 Most boys had short journeys to Feltham but delays at court after their case had finished meant they often arrived late. About a third of boys lived outside Greater London. Some boys were still escorted in the same vans as adult prisoners, which was unacceptable. The adult prisoners were sometimes taken to their prisons first. In our survey, 80% of boys said they felt safe during transfer and we observed that they were not handcuffed. Vans we saw were clean and, in our survey and during the inspection, boys told us the escort staff were respectful.
- 1.2 The handover and sharing of information between escort and reception staff were good. Person escort records identified most areas of risk or concern. Since our previous inspection, the prison had initiated a regular monitoring meeting with the escort providers and the Youth Justice Board to try to ensure that boys arrived at a reasonable time.

Recommendations

- 1.3 **Boys should be transported from court to the establishment as soon as possible after their hearing ends to enable them to settle on their first night.**
- 1.4 **Boys should not be transported with adult prisoners.** (Repeated recommendation 1.5)

Early days in custody

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.5 An average of three to four boys arrived at Feltham each week, about half of whom had not been to prison before. The reception area was spacious and had recently been painted. The holding rooms were reasonable. Searching was risk led and boys whom we spoke to said searches were carried out respectfully. We observed reception staff carrying out procedures in a thorough and reassuring way. In our survey, 81% of boys said they were in reception for less than two hours. The microwave meals for boys who arrived late remained poor and were unpopular.
- 1.6 The first night unit (Bittern) was welcoming; cells were clean and well prepared. Not all boys were offered showers but all were given a reception telephone call. In our survey, 71% of boys said that they felt safe on their first night. Boys were well supported by reassuring staff and risk assessed appropriately and confidentially. They were asked about any immediate safety and welfare concerns and were assessed by health care on the first night. Wing staff

passed information about new arrivals to night staff so that additional checks could be carried out. New arrivals could have their televisions on overnight, which was a good initiative.

- 1.7** Induction was carried out individually, which was appropriate, but there was not always a private area for interviews. Boys were given a comprehensive induction pack to which other boys had contributed. All boys received an education assessment and were seen by other departments, including the chaplaincy, Barnardo's and Lifeline (alcohol and drugs services provider). The induction timetable was not clear and some boys did not know what was going to happen next.
- 1.8** Peer supporters were not always available if boys arrived late. They contributed well to induction, explaining the regime and prison rules, albeit only at weekends so that boys could wait a few days for this. Boys spent too long in their cells during their first week and could only use the gym on Saturdays, which was inadequate.
- 1.9** Most boys stayed on Bittern for about a week. They were risk assessed for gang affiliations by the behaviour management group and moved to a suitable wing. If they were assessed as needing additional support, they could stay longer on Bittern.

Recommendations

- 1.10 All boys should have the opportunity to have a shower and meet a peer supporter on their first night.** (Repeated recommendation 1.11)
- 1.11 The induction session on regime and rules should take place within 24 hours of arrival.**

Care and protection of children and young people

Safeguarding

Expected outcomes:

The establishment promotes the welfare of children and young people, particularly those most at risk, and protects them from all kinds of harm and neglect.

- 1.12** There was a comprehensive safeguarding strategy which had been agreed by the local safeguarding children board (LSCB).
- 1.13** Safeguarding committee meetings took place quarterly with appropriate designated membership, including the local authority. Meetings were chaired by the governor and focused on the strategic management of safeguarding. The monthly local safeguarding meetings, chaired by the head of safeguarding, continued to have a more operational focus.
- 1.14** Attendance at both meetings was good. The standing agenda was relevant and careful consideration was given to data analysis on the use of force, adjudications, complaints, child protection referrals, antisocial behaviour, injuries and incidents of self-harm. There was evidence that appropriate policy changes were made as a result.
- 1.15** Weekly risk management meetings, chaired by the head of safeguarding, remained a useful multidisciplinary forum to discuss boys of particular concern and agree their management.

- I.16** There were clear protocols on how staff should act on information that a boy may have been abused or injured while in custody. The LSCB monitored this at their monthly safeguarding meetings, but we were concerned that the board had not investigated the use of special accommodation in the segregation unit.

Child protection

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.17** During the previous six months, 19 child protection referrals had been made to the local authority for consultation, a similar number to the previous inspection. The majority continued to relate to the use of force by staff. There was evidence that investigations were delayed unnecessarily because some staff were confused about the procedure for notifying the establishment safeguarding team. The potential for delaying timely action to prevent further harm was concerning. The safeguarding team referred allegations to the local authority designated officer within 24 hours.
- I.18** The Feltham sub-group of the LSCB remained a useful forum for information sharing and working relationships between the agencies were good.

Recommendation

- I.19 All child protection concerns should be passed swiftly to the safeguarding team for referral to the designated officer within 24 hours for consultation and advice.**

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.20** The identification of bullying and the victims of bullying remained effective.
- I.21** The supervision of boys when they were unlocked was very controlled and CCTV in nearly all areas provided additional coverage. Residential staff remained alert to signs of bullying and recorded emerging issues in wing observation books and electronic history files. These were followed up by residential managers. We saw examples of officers taking appropriate action to manage potential incidents before they developed.
- I.22** Further identification of bullying was aided by the safeguarding team sharing information with other departments at weekly risk management meetings and informal communication between staff and managers.
- I.23** Support for victims of bullying on the residential units was poor and relied almost exclusively on keeping boys separated. The few individual support plans and safety systems managed by residential managers were not fully effective (see paragraph I.34). This was mitigated in part by the support that victims of bullying received from the mental health and psychology teams.

- I.24** We remained very concerned about a few boys who said they were too frightened of other boys to leave their cells. They had no access to a structured regime and remained locked in their cells for about 23 hours a day.

Recommendations

- I.25** Individual support plans for victims of bullying and intimidation should identify needs and how to meet them. Plans should be reviewed regularly with the boy concerned and their implementation monitored by residential managers.
- I.26** Victims of bullying should have access to a safe regime that includes adequate time out of their cells. (Repeated recommendation I.31)

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.27** The safer custody committee managed all aspects of suicide and self-harm. Monitoring and analysis of data were good and boys at risk were given appropriate support.
- I.28** The number of acts of self-harm had reduced since the last inspection and was very low, with 17 recorded incidents in the previous six months. Over that period, 51 assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT)⁴ documents had been opened and four were open at the start of the inspection.
- I.29** The quality of most ACCT documents that we examined was reasonably good, although care maps did not always address all the issues affecting the boy nor were they regularly followed up. Initial assessments were reasonable in most cases, but reviews were not always multidisciplinary.
- I.30** All boys on open ACCTs spoke to us positively of the care they received and there were examples of comprehensive support for boys needing complex care. They were able to attend all activities and most were out at activities when we visited Bittern wing. Staff knew the boys well and were sensitive to their individual circumstances.
- I.31** Samaritans telephones were available on all units and boys had access to support from Barnardo's advocates, social workers, psychology staff and the chaplaincy.

Recommendation

- I.32** All ACCT reviews should be multidisciplinary and contributions should be made by all departments involved in the boy's care.

⁴ Case management of prisoners at risk of suicide and self-harm.

Behaviour management

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.33** Behaviour management was heavily focused on the use of sanctions and regime restrictions with little incentive to encourage or motivate good behaviour. Two violence-free enhanced units in existence at the last inspection had clearly had a positive impact on encouraging responsible behaviour, but these had been discontinued. Planned initiatives such as an enhanced support unit and a dedicated care and separation unit for boys with more difficult and violent behaviour had not been implemented.
- I.34** The behaviour support system, 'positive attitudes created together' (PACT), in operation at the last inspection was poorly managed and not well integrated. The process of target setting and reviews was in abeyance and individual support plans managed on the wings were not effective.

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.35** The application of the rewards and sanctions scheme remained demotivating. Most case records relating to the scheme were negative, and some were petty and unhelpful. One entry concerned a boy given a warning for using an officer's first name and another for ringing his cell bell to ask for a piece of writing paper. There was little evidence of management checks identifying this poor practice.
- I.36** The scheme was not used to encourage or motivate good behaviour and progression to the enhanced level seemed to rely on staying out of trouble rather than demonstrating good behaviour (see paragraph I.33). Boys told us that there was not enough incentive to progress to the enhanced level.
- I.37** Reviews for boys on basic level of the scheme were timely but often cursory, poorly attended and unfocused.

Recommendation

- I.38** **The rewards and sanctions scheme should be applied with a clear emphasis on positive motivation.** (Repeated recommendation I.52)

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.39** The security team continued to work across both sites at Feltham. Physical security procedures were proportionate to the risks at Feltham A. However, many of the procedural security measures to keep boys apart too often affected full access to the regime.
- I.40** Flows of intelligence into the security department were good; during the previous six months, 3,339 intelligence reports had been submitted from across the site, of which more than a third related to Feltham A. All intelligence logs were processed promptly by a small team, but not all intelligence reports were acted on in a timely way by other functions.
- I.41** The prison had developed good links with several departments from the Mayor of London's Policing and Crime Unit, including the Trident central gangs unit, Hounslow police and a counter-terrorism officer from the Metropolitan Police. The oversight of gang activity outside the prison or concerns about extremism were well managed by these agencies with appropriate interaction with the prison. The senior management team was aware of its responsibility to prevent extremism and radicalisation and was supported by the regional prevention lead, who had organised a range of workshops during 2016.
- I.42** The monthly security committee meeting was attended by staff from all key areas of the prison and was chaired by the deputy governor or head of security. An intelligence challenge meeting took place in the security department before the meeting to analyse and discuss intelligence from the previous month. Security priorities and objectives for both sites were identified and presented to the security committee for ratification. Despite this scrutiny of intelligence, objectives set were not always consistent with the prevailing risks. At the December 2016 meeting, for example, the number of intelligence logs on escape and drugs had decreased in contrast to those on gangs and violent incidents, yet escape and drugs remained the priorities for discussion.
- I.43** All area, cell and strip-searching was now conducted on a risk-led basis, including in reception. The search logs indicated appropriate authorisation, although we were concerned that some boys segregated from Feltham A were strip-searched in special accommodation. This was not appropriate (see paragraph I.74).
- I.44** Drug availability was fairly low. There was very little evidence of the synthetic cannabinoid 'spice'⁵ on Feltham A, where finds were predominantly for tobacco.
- I.45** The formal adjudication system was used frequently to deal with more serious breaches of prison rules. Disciplinary hearings were carried out fairly, but were more suitable for adults than for boys where the focus should have been multidisciplinary work on behaviour change. Records of adjudications remained superficial and indicated that the procedure was little more than a ritual administration of punishment.

⁵ A synthetic drug that mimics the effects of cannabis but is much stronger, with no discernible odour and unpredictable effects.

- I.46** The number of adjudications had increased since the last inspection and was high. It remained the fact that many charges, some serious, were not likely to be completed or heard at all.

Recommendations

- I.47** Intelligence reports should be acted on promptly by all departments.
- I.48** Security intelligence should draw conclusions to inform appropriate objectives that are effectively communicated to relevant staff.
- I.49** Managers should analyse the impact of the formal adjudications system on the basis of evidence, and ensure that it plays an effective and age-appropriate part in the management of behaviour. (Repeated recommendation I.62)
- I.50** Effective tracking of adjourned adjudications should be implemented and overseen by senior managers so that all charges are heard and concluded within a reasonable timescale.

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.51** Levels of violence were very high. During the previous six months, 200 assaults and fights had been recorded, of which 45 were assaults against staff, 73 assaults on children and 82 fights. Since the last inspection, assaults on staff had risen from 27 to 36 per 100 of the population, assaults on children from 51 to 58 and fights from 47 to 65 per 100.
- I.52** Some incidents were serious enough to require hospital treatment. Many involved the use of weapons and groups of boys viciously attacking a single boy or member of staff. We watched CCTV recordings of groups of boys kicking and punching each other. Much of the violence was unpredictable and reckless.
- I.53** Many boys exhibiting violent behaviour remained on a restricted regime, which was managed on the residential units. These boys were not unlocked or permitted to attend activities such as education, work or corporate worship. Large groups of boys were temporarily unable to attend education because of single incidents, usually involving violence. On Eagle unit no boy had been allowed to attend education for more than a month because of an incident.
- I.54** Different unlocking arrangements for individual boys were confusing and difficult for staff to manage. At the time of the inspection, more than a quarter of the population were being managed on units on a restricted regime which excluded activities and meant that they were unlocked from their cells for less than an hour every day (see paragraph 3.1).
- I.55** Recording and analysis of violence to identify patterns and trends were good and incidents were investigated well. As at the last inspection, some positive work with boys with difficult behaviour was managed through the risk management meeting by a multidisciplinary staff group at well-attended weekly meetings. The mental health and psychology teams offered good one-to-one work with more complex cases but it was often difficult for them to see boys who could not be unlocked on their units. The extensive use of mediation that we observed at the last inspection had ceased.

- I.56** Implementation of the violence reduction strategy consisted largely of putting boys who were difficult to manage on the basic level of the rewards and sanctions scheme or another restricted regime. The few individual behaviour improvement plans that we saw were unfocused and of poor quality.

Recommendations

- I.57 Individual plans for perpetrators of violence should be fully developed and should include meaningful behaviour improvement targets based on rigorous assessments of need. They should be managed, monitored and reviewed by residential staff together with the safeguarding team and risk management meeting.** (Repeated recommendation I.74)
- I.58 Collective punishments, including removing units from education, should not be used.**
- I.59 An enhanced support unit, a care and separation unit for boys and psychology-led accredited programmes to help reduce violence should be implemented as a priority.**

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** There was a very high level of use of force, with 476 cases in the previous six months. This represented a rate of 378 per 100 of the population compared with 273 at the last inspection.
- I.61** The new Prison Service policy on use of force in the young people's estate had been implemented in October 2016 but not all staff working with children had been trained in it. For example, officers in the segregation unit, visits and the gym had not been trained in the techniques of managing and minimising physical restraint (MMPR). They continued to use control and restraint techniques designed for adult prisoners and carried batons.
- I.62** Most incidents involving the use of force were spontaneous in response to fights or assaults. Many started with little warning and involved groups of boys attacking each other or single victims (see paragraph I.52). As a result, a number of recordings of force being used were made during single violent incidents. We saw assaults on boys involving up to six assailants and fights involving many boys which were correctly recorded as separate use of force incidents.
- I.63** Governance of use of force had improved in some areas but there were also significant gaps. The safeguarding team discussed all aspects of use of force at monthly meetings and carried out long-term monitoring of statistics. Full-time MMPR coordinators scrutinised CCTV recordings of nearly all spontaneous incidents and all planned incidents, usually on the day they occurred, to deal with immediate issues. There was also a weekly use of force scrutiny meeting led by the head of safeguarding. Meetings were very well attended by representatives from key areas, including residential managers, case workers, Barnardo's advocates and security staff. All incidents were reviewed and all video recordings were examined.

- I.64** Body-worn video cameras were in use at the time of the inspection, although there were not enough to ensure that all incidents were recorded.
- I.65** Some important use of force paperwork had not been processed. Some of it was incomplete and written accounts by officers and accident reports from health care staff were missing in about 150 cases.

Recommendations

- I.66** **Control and restraint techniques should not be used on children and all staff who work with boys should be trained in MMPR.**
- I.67** **Batons should not be carried by staff working with boys who are under 18 years of age.** (Repeated recommendation I.81)
- I.68** **All aspects of use of force should be rigorously scrutinised and all associated documents relating to the use of force should be completed quickly and collated.**
- I.69** **Body-worn video cameras should be used to record all incidents where force is used.**

Separation/removal from normal location

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.70** The segregation unit was located on Ibis unit and remained a shared facility with the young adult site. During the previous six months, the number of instances of separation of boys had decreased from 295 to 235, although more boys from Feltham A were located in Ibis than young adults from the B site. No boys were located in Ibis at the time of the inspection; one had been moved to the health care facility shortly before.
- I.71** Ibis remained a grim environment for young people and unsuitable for this age group. The regime remained punitive with limited access to telephone calls, showers and exercise and resembled regimes in adult segregation units. The only room available for professional staff to support segregated boys was also used for adjudications and good order reviews. This limited the time that could be spent with boys subject to separation.
- I.72** Ibis was not used for removal from units (cellular confinement) for boys. Seventy per cent of boys were located there awaiting adjudication and very few (5%) were returned to their unit following a cool-down period.
- I.73** The regime was even more impoverished for these boys. Showers and telephone calls were not permitted until after the adjudication, which could take up to three days. This was inappropriate. Boys could borrow a range of books and other materials, but some were not age appropriate and were of little use.
- I.74** We also had serious concerns that special accommodation in the segregation unit (stark unfurnished cells with no beds, toilets or sinks), which should have been used in exceptional circumstances, was used frequently without sufficient justification. During the previous six months, these cells had been used on 14 occasions for angry and sometimes violent boys,

usually for short periods and often to facilitate a strip-search. There was evidence that boys had been stripped of their clothes and left in anti-tear gowns or just given a blanket during their time there.

- I.75** Regular reviews took place for boys held on good order, which focused on reintegration to the main units with good support by psychology staff. Relevant health screen assessments were carried out for all boys, but a health services professional was not always present at reviews to speak to the boy and advise the board appropriately.
- I.76** Governance was the responsibility of the segregation monitoring and review group which met monthly. A range of detailed statistics was provided to identify areas of concern or emerging patterns. The effectiveness of the meeting was reduced by poor attendance (two people in October 2016), which affected the focus on concerns and completion of actions.

Recommendation

- I.77** **Boys should not be held in the segregation unit. Those who need to be separated for their own or others' safety should experience a full regime and intensive intervention to address their behaviour in a suitable setting.** (Repeated recommendation I.87)

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.78** Appropriate clinical expertise, facilities and processes were in place to manage drug and/or alcohol dependent boys safely, but clinical need was very low. Detoxification from alcohol or drugs had not been required since our last inspection, but one boy had been admitted to the Wren unit for monitoring and observation because he had used cannabis and 'spice'.
- I.79** The care of boys with complex needs was planned and coordinated at weekly multi-agency meetings, which incorporated a dual diagnosis meeting attended by mental health and substance misuse teams. A joint working protocol and dual diagnosis pathway had been agreed and implemented.
- I.80** The substance misuse policy was out of date and had not been informed by a recent needs assessment. A drug and alcohol strategy committee met regularly and there was evidence of good joint working between prison departments and service providers.
- I.81** A highly motivated and committed team from Lifeline continued to provide age-appropriate support and actively engaged with 71% of the population. Boys had mainly used cannabis and alcohol, but experimental use of 'spice' and codeine was increasing.
- I.82** During the year, initial assessments had been delayed because of the difficulty in accessing boys. However, the team was now able to complete the substance misuse section of the CHAT (comprehensive health assessment tool) and provide harm reduction information within five days. Problems with seeing boys for comprehensive assessments and care planning remained, and more than half the planned, structured interventions were lost because of the regime. Boys we spoke to were very positive about the one-to-one support they received, but a lack of appropriate facilities meant that the Lifeline team were unable to run their six-week motivational group work programme.

- I.83** In our survey, only 9% of boys said it was easy to get illegal drugs against the comparator of 24% and 18% at the last inspection. Finds were predominantly of tobacco. The positive random mandatory drug testing (MDT) rate for the previous six months stood at zero, although no suspicion tests had been conducted on Feltham A during this time. MDT procedures were age appropriate but the MDT suite was located on Feltham B. It did not offer a respectful environment and had a leaking skylight.

Recommendations

- I.84** Boys should be able to access structured substance misuse interventions promptly and consistently according to their assessed needs, and appropriate facilities should be provided to deliver these.
- I.85** The MDT suite should provide a clean, safe and respectful environment.

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 Communal parts of the residential units were bright and clean. Corridors and exercise yards were well maintained and free of litter. The exercise yards had outdoor gym equipment but there was not enough room to run around or play sport. Association equipment was in reasonable condition but there was not enough for the number wanting to use it. There were pleasant, confidential interview rooms on all wings. Notices and posters were mostly attractive, age appropriate and comprehensive.
- 2.2 Most cells were reasonable, but some needed repainting and a few were poorly ventilated or too cold. Toilets had no screens or lids. Boys could personalise their cells. The offensive displays policy had been implemented and was well managed. There was much less graffiti on cell walls than at our last inspection but, although daily cell checks were carried out, it remained a problem. Cupboards and chairs were often broken or damaged by graffiti scratched in that was difficult to remove.
- 2.3 There was good access to cleaning materials and boys were encouraged to clean their cells. The standard of cell cleaning varied, but it was monitored appropriately and officers marked efforts out of ten.
- 2.4 There was one double cell per wing and they were considered a privilege by boys who wanted to share. Cell-sharing risk assessments were effective. Cell bells were responded to quickly, which was commendable, but a few staff took punitive action when boys used their cell bells during lock up to make reasonable requests.
- 2.5 Shower rooms were squalid. In our survey, 60% of boys said they could have a shower every day against the comparator of 88% and 86% at our last inspection. Our observations confirmed that some boys could not have a shower daily, including before court hearings or after exercising in the yard.
- 2.6 Post was well managed and families could use the email a prisoner scheme. Telephones were located in the wing corridors which afforded limited privacy. Lock-up prevented adequate access to telephones. There were sometimes delays in getting applications for pin phone numbers to the clerk, and boys sometimes had to wait too long to speak to family and friends.
- 2.7 Boys could collect items such as toothpaste and writing paper with their breakfast packs. Provision of clothing and bedding and access to laundry were adequate. Boys could wear their own clothes, but most boys chose to wear prison-issue clothing. T-shirts and underwear could be easily obtained.
- 2.8 In our survey, 27% of boys said that applications were sorted out fairly against the comparator of 52% and 50% at our last inspection. There was still no central system for storing or monitoring applications and no evidence of responses.

- 2.9** Property was reasonably managed. Families could post items or leave property for boys during visits, which was helpful. However, families visiting on Saturdays could not leave parcels for boys, which was unfair.

Recommendations

- 2.10** Showers should be refurbished and boys should be able to shower and make a telephone call each day.
- 2.11** The application process should be managed consistently. (Repeated recommendation 2.12)

Relationships between staff and children and young people

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.12** Staff were working in very challenging circumstances and in most cases they remained supportive and sensitive to the boys in their care. We witnessed the aftermath of a serious assault on a staff member where staff remained professional and engaged with the boys. We also saw examples of excessively punitive responses to adolescent behaviour, such as warnings for using a cell bell to make a reasonable request.
- 2.13** Some staff appeared overwhelmed by managing the regime and keeping boys safe. The restricted regime allowed some boys little opportunity for pro-social time with staff. In our survey, two-thirds of boys said that most staff treated them with respect. Boys told us that the staff were nice and friendly but in our survey 27% of boys said they had no-one to turn to if they had a problem. Staff needed more time to build trusting, supportive relationships with the boys.
- 2.14** A personal officer scheme was in place but there was little evidence that they were involved in supporting sentence progression or case work. Wing staff entries often focused on basic observations rather than meaningful interactions. There were not enough positive entries in wing records.

Recommendation

- 2.15** The personal officer scheme should be developed and personal officers should play an active part in sentence progression and case work.

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

- 2.16** The strategic management of equality work led by the governor was satisfactory, but implementation was undermined by the redeployment of equality staff. Work to achieve accreditation in Leaders in Diversity demonstrated the prison's commitment in this area.
- 2.17** There was a clear management structure for equality work, including management leads for each protected characteristic. Some leads were active and undertook meaningful work, but others were much less so. The equality policy was sound, but some key elements were not implemented effectively. Action planning was limited.
- 2.18** The monthly equality action team meeting was chaired by the governor. Some good work was done to advance the equality agenda, but there was not enough focus on structural weaknesses, such as the lack of consultation forums. A representative of the boys had attended only one of the previous four meetings.
- 2.19** Monthly monitoring of the treatment of most protected groups was good, although not for Muslim or foreign national boys. Data were presented and discussed at the equality action team meeting. There was no evidence of differential treatment in the activities measured.
- 2.20** The equality team included a full-time equality manager and equality officer. Regular redeployment prevented the officer from working more than one day a week in the department which undermined provision. Only three equality forums had been held in the last six months rather than monthly forums on each unit as specified in the equality policy. Boys were supposed to act as equality representatives for each unit, but we only identified one who was aware of his role.
- 2.21** The Zahid Mubarek Trust (ZMT) attended most equality action team meetings and provided independent scrutiny of responses to discrimination incident report forms (DIRFs). The DIRF log did not distinguish clearly between those submitted at Feltham A and at Feltham B, although it appeared that about 22 DIRFs had been submitted in Feltham A during the previous six months.
- 2.22** Investigations were thorough and written responses to the complainant and the person complained about were detailed and polite. They demonstrated challenge of discriminatory and offensive behaviour, but there were no dedicated interventions to address such behaviour.
- 2.23** There was limited engagement with community support groups apart from the ZMT. Staff redeployment prevented the equality team from organising as many cultural celebrations as previously. Equality themes were well embedded into the syllabus for boys attending education.

- 2.24** Each boy received an excellent equality newsletter each month which promoted diversity and the work of the team.

Recommendations

- 2.25** **The needs of all groups with protected characteristics should be identified and addressed, regular forums should be held for each group, and all aspects of equality and diversity should be promoted.**
- 2.26** **The treatment of boys in all protected groups should be monitored.**

Diverse needs

- 2.27** There were good systems for identifying new arrivals from protected groups, in particular boys with disabilities. Boys from Gypsy, Romany and Traveller backgrounds were often reluctant to disclose this.
- 2.28** In our survey, 7% of boys said they were from a Gypsy/Romany/Traveller background, suggesting a population of about four. There was no record of these boys and no dedicated provision for this group.
- 2.29** In our survey, 63% of boys said they were from a minority ethnic group against the comparator of 42%. They reported broadly similar treatment across most questions in our survey, but felt less respected by staff and had had more adjudications than the comparator. The lack of consultation left the prison poorly placed to understand this result. There was evidence in DIRF responses and in our interviews with boys of staff taking prompt action to challenge racist behaviour. Monitoring data showed no consistent difference in treatment of this group in almost all measured areas.
- 2.30** Prison records showed that 28% of boys were Muslim. The treatment of Muslim boys was not monitored, which was a significant omission. Muslim boys in our survey reported broadly similar treatment to other boys.
- 2.31** There were 27 foreign national boys at the time of the inspection. All boys in our survey said they understood spoken and written English. There was no monitoring of the treatment of foreign national boys. There were some translated information sheets, but they were out of date, referring to support groups and legal advice agencies which no longer existed. The foreign nationals policy was also out of date.
- 2.32** The Home Office held weekly surgeries, but they were no substitute for independent legal advice. There was not enough awareness among staff of the need for boys to receive prompt advice, for example concerning their immigration status. Staff, particularly those on the units, had little awareness of trafficking indicators. In other respects, these boys received good support from casework and Barnardo's staff. The chaplaincy ran support groups for boys in the larger nationality groups.
- 2.33** There was good identification of boys with disabilities and the case management system had records of 28 such boys. Most had conditions like dyslexia and attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD). There was good support for these boys, particularly from health care staff. The prison had recently been accredited by the National Autistic Society and there had been awareness training in autism and dyslexia. Nevertheless, residential staff did not know enough about the needs of these boys to be able to understand and act on their fears about

their safety. It was striking that 43% of boys who self identified as having a disability in our survey said they felt unsafe compared with 7% of other boys.

- 2.34** No boys had identified themselves to the prison as gay or bisexual. We observed homophobic behaviour during the inspection which was not always challenged effectively. It was encouraging that education had recently started a month of themed activities on lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender issues.

Recommendations

- 2.35** **Boys with disabilities should be readily identifiable to unit staff and unit care plans should be prepared when necessary to help staff meet the needs of these boys.**
- 2.36** **Homophobic and other offensive behaviour should be challenged effectively.**

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.

- 2.37** Faith provision was largely satisfactory, although there were some gaps. In our survey, 68% of boys said their religious beliefs were respected against the comparator of 53%. Although fewer boys than the comparator said they had access to a chaplain within their first 24 hours, records indicated that almost all were seen.
- 2.38** Attendance at services was generally good. However, all boys on the 'keep apart' list were excluded from attending corporate worship with no appropriate risk assessment of their attendance. They were seen separately by a member of the chaplaincy.
- 2.39** Worship facilities were very good, although the world faith room required refurbishment. Muslim boys responded similarly to other boys across almost all questions in our survey. Arrangements for the preparation of food and Ramadan were good.
- 2.40** There were no faith-based classes, which was very disappointing. However, the chaplaincy facilitated support groups for some foreign national boys, which we do not often see.
- 2.41** Boys we spoke to were very positive about the support they received from the chaplaincy. Pastoral support was strong and, despite unforeseeable staff shortages during the week of the inspection, chaplains were visible on the units. The chaplaincy saw all boys on assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management each week, but were rarely invited to attend ACCT reviews.
- 2.42** There were good links with faith groups in the community. The Feltham Community Chaplaincy Trust, which had previously only worked with young adults in Feltham B, was extending its through-the-gate mentoring service to boys in Feltham A, which was a welcome development.

Recommendations

- 2.43 Faith-based classes should be provided for boys of all faiths.**
- 2.44 Boys on the 'keep apart' list should only be excluded from corporate worship following a robust risk assessment.**

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.

- 2.45** Complaint forms were freely available and an average of 42 a month were received, compared with 32 at the last inspection. The complaints that we reviewed were well managed and polite. The complaints clerk worked hard to chase up responses from colleagues and they were generally timely. Responses were thorough and we saw evidence that most boys were spoken to about their complaint.
- 2.46** Some complaints concerned basic issues which could have been dealt with through the applications system. In our survey, only 15% of boys said that complaints were sorted out fairly. Some complaints that we examined concerned the impact of the regime, such as losing association or time in cell. One boy had written: '22 hours bang-up is nerve-wracking'.
- 2.47** Quality assurance was developing and all complaints against staff were reviewed and necessary action taken by the safeguarding lead. There was not enough systematic analysis of trends in complaints and no evidence that complaints were used to inform service development or generate improvement in practice.

Legal rights

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.48** Caseworkers were responsible for explaining legal rights to boys, including their sentence or remand status. Most boys were sentenced and were given written information about key dates, for example their early release date if serving a detention and training order or home detention curfew date if serving a longer sentence. Seventeen per cent of the population were on remand and the preparation of bail applications was carried out by community youth offending team (YOT) workers.
- 2.49** Caseworkers facilitated free telephone calls for boys to discuss their cases with their legal advisers. Prison records indicated that a fifth of boys were foreign nationals. The legal support available to them was not adequate. They had no access to independent legal advice or support from the prison to contact sources of assistance in the community over nationality concerns.

- 2.50** Legal and other professional visits took place in private rooms in the legal visits area. The rooms contained graffiti. Boys dressed in prison-issue clothing wore a coloured bib for legal visits, which was unnecessary.

Recommendation

- 2.51** Boys should have access to appropriate legal support to enable them to address nationality issues while in custody.

Health services

Expected outcomes:

Children and young people are cared for by a health service that assesses and meets their health needs while in custody and which promotes continuity of health and social care on release. The standard of health service provided is equivalent to that which children and young people could expect to receive elsewhere in the community.

- 2.52** The inspection of health services was jointly undertaken by the Care Quality Commission (CQC)⁶ and HM Inspectorate of Prisons under a memorandum of understanding agreement between the agencies.

Governance arrangements

- 2.53** Care UK provided health services and subcontracted Barnet, Enfield and Haringey Mental Health Trust to provide mental health services. Partnership working between health providers was excellent and was effective with the prison and commissioners. Although partnership board meetings had not taken place since May 2016, this was mitigated by alternate joint governance and strategic meetings. An up-to-date needs assessment and learning from audits and complaints informed service delivery. Consultation with boys about health services was underdeveloped.
- 2.54** Governance systems were mature and robust. The six health sub-teams (administration, primary care, mental health, inpatients, managers and pharmacy) held separate weekly meetings to identify risk and performance management issues and generate action plans, which were regularly reviewed. These meetings ensured that potential problems were managed promptly and effectively at all levels.
- 2.55** The senior clinical managers provided excellent leadership and team working was very good. Staffing levels and skill mix were appropriate. Vacancies were filled with regular agency staff, which provided consistency. Supervision was well embedded and health staff had good access to training. The health interactions that we observed were very good. Most records that we examined were very good and included pertinent care plans.
- 2.56** Boys we spoke to were positive about health services. In our survey, 42% said that the overall quality of health services was good.
- 2.57** Most health services for boys were provided from clinical rooms on Bittern, which had a comfortable, secure waiting area. Boys attended the main health department for specialist

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

services, including the dentist. Clinical rooms were clean, but most had fixtures and fittings which did not comply with infection control standards. Some services, including smoking cessation and mental health, were delivered on the units, although access was frequently hindered by a scarcity of rooms and unlock problems.

- 2.58** Appropriate emergency equipment was held in clinical areas across the prison and was regularly checked. Health care staff were always on site, but it could take several minutes to reach emergencies. The prison was increasing first aid provision by training operational staff in first aid and installing 10 defibrillators across the prison. However, at the time of the inspection, arrangements for first aid trained operational staff to be always on site were not adequate. Ambulances were not called immediately in a medical emergency, with the potential to affect outcomes adversely.
- 2.59** Boys could submit complaints easily through a separate confidential medical system and were usually seen face to face to resolve their concerns. The responses that we sampled were timely, courteous and focused.
- 2.60** There was still no whole-prison strategic approach to health promotion, but health staff delivered regular health awareness sessions throughout the prison, including mental health and sexual health. Boys had prompt access to immunisations, vaccinations, sexual health and smoking cessation services. Barrier protection was available, but was not advertised and health staff we spoke to were not clear about the policy.
- 2.61** The CQC found there were no breaches of the relevant regulations.

Recommendations

- 2.62 Regular consultation with the boys should inform health service delivery.**
- 2.63 All clinical environments should comply with infection control standards.**
- 2.64 More prison officers should be trained in first aid, including use of defibrillators. Ambulances should be called immediately to ensure a safe response to medical emergencies at all times.**
- 2.65 There should be an integrated whole-prison strategic approach to the promotion of health and wellbeing, including the provision of condoms.**

Good practice

- 2.66** *Robust risk and performance meetings each week contributed to a timely and effective whole team approach to risk and performance management.*

Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.67** Nurses assessed the immediate health needs of new arrivals on the induction unit, although access problems sometimes delayed the assessment. All required follow-up screens, including mental health and neurodisability, were completed promptly. Appropriate onward referrals were made.
- 2.68** Boys requested services using pictorial application forms which were collected daily. Health staff delivered appointments slips to all boys and followed up non-attendance. This

contributed to low non-attendance rates. Most primary care services were provided in house, although boys requiring podiatry and physiotherapy were referred to the hospital.

- 2.69** Waiting times for all services were satisfactory. GP clinics ran on Tuesday, Thursday and weekends to fit in with education. Dedicated primary care officers collected boys for appointments, which ensured that clinics ran effectively. GPs were on site daily and out-of-hours staff could contact a doctor for telephone advice. Boys with urgent health needs, including injuries, were seen promptly. Boys with life-long conditions or complex health needs received appropriate support from well trained health staff.
- 2.70** The in-patient unit on Wren unit supported up to 10 patients with significant health needs from Feltham A and B. Most patients were admitted for mental health support. The environment was satisfactory. The unit was resourced to deliver a good therapeutic regime, including 24-hour nursing cover and daily groups. The placement on the unit of prisoners with significant behaviour management problems destabilised the unit. Access to treatment was severely curtailed and outcomes were poorer for patients. At the time of the inspection, one boy from Feltham A was inappropriately located on Wren for operational reasons, but none was there as a patient.
- 2.71** Access to external hospital appointments was good. Appointments were sometimes rescheduled by the hospital or to accommodate emergencies, but this was monitored and managed effectively.

Recommendation

- 2.72 Prisoners should not be located on the in-patient unit for operational reasons.**

Pharmacy

- 2.73** Medicines were supplied promptly from the in-house pharmacy and stored correctly. Appropriate emergency stock was available. Controlled drugs, alerts and dispensing incidents were well managed. A pharmacist and pharmacy technician were on site Monday to Friday and governance was appropriate.
- 2.74** Medicines were prescribed and administered on SystmOne (electronic medical records). Medicines, including insulin, were given in possession following a risk assessment which was reviewed regularly. Boys in shared cells still did not have secure storage for medicines, although boys holding insulin always had a single cell. The administration of controlled drugs from the Wren unit was well supervised and safe. All other medications were administered up to four times daily at 7.45 and 11.30am and 4.30 and 6pm from the nurses' room on Bittern unit. We were concerned that the very short gap between the last two doses would make the medicines less effective and could potentially be harmful. We were told that boys sometimes missed their medication because of the complex unlock arrangements on the units and our observations confirmed this.
- 2.75** The range of medicines that nurses could administer without a prescription remained too limited, which created delays while a prescription was generated.

Recommendations

- 2.76** All boys should receive their prescribed medicines consistently and at clinically appropriate times. Boys in shared cells should have secure storage for in-possession medicines.
- 2.77** Nurses should be able to administer a wide range of medicines for minor injuries and illnesses without a prescription.

Dentistry

- 2.78** An independent dentist provided the full range of dental services in three sessions a week. Oral health promotion was good. Waiting times were short and appointments were allocated according to clinical need. Arrangements for emergencies were appropriate. The dentist used a specialist dental recording system and records were not accessible on SystemOne, which would affect continuity of care adversely on transfer to other prisons.
- 2.79** The flooring in the dental suite had been repaired. The room was small but adequate with appropriate infection control and decontamination procedures. All equipment was appropriately maintained, although actions remained outstanding from the 2016 radiation inspection.

Recommendation

- 2.80** A summary of dental care provided should be recorded on SystemOne.

Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.81** In our survey, 17% of boys said that they had mental health problems and 38% said they were being supported. Operational staff had received autism training and the prison had received National Autistic Society accreditation, which was a significant achievement. The community mental health team (CMHT) worked effectively with other prison departments, including case workers. The CMHT offered general mental health awareness training for officers, but the take-up was very low.
- 2.82** The CMHT remained very well resourced and provided an impressive range of age-appropriate mental health services, including specialist ADHD and learning disability support. The team included speech, language and communication therapists to help boys express themselves more clearly and improve social functioning. A mental health nurse was on site each day. All boys who had been assaulted were seen and offered individual support to manage any associated psychological trauma.
- 2.83** About 18 boys a month were referred to the CMHT through the open referral system. New referrals were seen promptly based on clinical need. At the time of the inspection, the team was supporting 12 boys with varying mental health needs. The records that we examined demonstrated excellent levels of support. Consent, capacity and decisions made in the best interests of boys who lacked capacity were recorded appropriately.
- 2.84** Two boys had been transferred under the Mental Health Act in 2016 in 15 and 20 days, which was much more timely than at our last inspection.

- 2.85** A psychological service was being developed for boys and adults in Feltham who exhibited sexually harmful behaviour. At the time of the inspection, the team was helping the prison to manage effectively the risk presented by identified boys and was developing a database of boys who required individual psychological input. They planned to progress to assessment, treatment and preventative psycho-educational groups in the next few months.

Recommendation

- 2.86** **All discipline officers should receive mental health awareness training to enable them to recognise and support prisoners with mental health problems.**

Good practice

- 2.87** *The well resourced mental health team provided an impressive range of timely and age-appropriate mental health support, which contributed to good outcomes for boys.*

Catering

Expected outcomes:

Children and young people are offered varied meals to meet their individual requirements and food is prepared and served according to religious, cultural and prevailing food safety and hygiene regulations.

- 2.88** Boys had a special healthier menu which had been developed in conjunction with similar establishments. In our survey, only 13% thought the food was good, although boys we spoke to were more positive. The food that we tasted was reasonably good and portions for lunch and dinner were adequate. During the week, lunch consisted of a baguette and dinner a hot meal which was reversed at weekends.
- 2.89** Provision for breakfast was inadequate. Boys received a pack, usually on the same morning but sometimes the night before, which was insufficient for this age group, despite the addition of two small cereal bars. We saw boys supplementing meals with slices of bread. No fresh milk was available and there were no toasters. The limited supply of kettles prevented some boys from making a hot drink in their cell.
- 2.90** Servery queues were very closely supervised. The serveries were dirty and coated in grease. These areas were poorly managed, with food left in trolleys overnight.
- 2.91** Regime restrictions prevented boys from eating communally, which was a missed opportunity to experience the normality of sharing meals together. Instead boys had to eat in their cells next to an unscreened toilet.
- 2.92** The catering manager consulted the boys about the menu in six-monthly surveys, which received a good response rate and led to some improvements.

Recommendations

- 2.93 All boys should have the opportunity to eat communally out of their cells.**
(Repeated recommendation 2.95)
- 2.94 The size of breakfast portions should be increased.**
- 2.95 Serveries should be cleaned after every meal and food should not be left out overnight.**

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.

- 2.96** Boys placed their canteen order on Tuesday for delivery on Friday afternoon. Boys who arrived mid-week had to wait up to 10 days to receive their first order.
- 2.97** There were limited options for ordering fresh fruit. Boys were also unable to buy tinned goods, a decision which frustrated them and deprived them of healthy options such as tuna. This decision reflected concerns about potential weapons which were not supported by recent intelligence.
- 2.98** Boys were now able to order from catalogues. There was no administration fee and delivery costs were split fairly. However, there were sometimes delays of several weeks between debit from a boy's account and delivery of items. Staff told us that these delays contributed to frustration and tension on the units.
- 2.99** Consultation about the canteen list had recently been initiated and was underdeveloped.

Recommendations

- 2.100 Boys should be able to place a canteen order within 24 hours of their arrival.**
(Repeated recommendation 2.100)
- 2.101 Regular consultation with boys should take place to ensure that the range of goods on the canteen list meets the diverse needs of the population.** (Repeated recommendation 2.101)
- 2.102 Prohibition of items on the canteen list should be supported by up-to-date intelligence.**

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.⁷

- 3.1** Time out of cell was very poor. During our roll checks, about 40% of boys were locked in their cell during the school day and only 48% were involved in purposeful activity. We assessed the average time out of cell on weekdays as 4.5 hours, but many boys had considerably less. Boys on the most restricted regimes - safe ways of working or on basic level of the rewards and sanctions scheme - could have as little as 30 minutes out of their cells for showers, telephone calls and time outside (see paragraph 1.54). This was unacceptable.
- 3.2** Movements were often late, affecting the delivery of activities and services. Access to association was inadequate. Boys who were unlocked by themselves had little opportunity for meaningful social contact with their peers or with staff.
- 3.3** Boys could have as little as 10 minutes in the open air, which was of significant concern for their health, development and wellbeing. This was particularly worrying for boys from black and minority ethnic backgrounds who needed longer outside to produce the same amount of vitamin D.

⁷ 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.

3.4 Ofsted⁸ made the following assessments about the learning and skills and work provision:

Overall effectiveness of learning and skills and work:	Inadequate
<i>Outcomes for children and young people engaged in learning and skills and work activities:</i>	<i>Requires improvement</i>
<i>Quality of learning and skills and work activities, including the quality of teaching, training, learning and assessment:</i>	<i>Requires improvement</i>
<i>Personal development and behaviour:</i>	<i>Requires improvement</i>
<i>Effectiveness of leadership and management of learning and skills and work activities:</i>	<i>Inadequate</i>

Management of education and learning and skills

3.5 The education manager had been particularly effective at introducing a school ethos in the education area and held high aspirations for boys' potential to achieve. Since the previous inspection, the education manager had introduced an advisory governance board which had supported teachers' professional development well. Observations of teaching and learning were broadly accurate and identified further improvements needed in teaching practice.

3.6 Improvements had been made to the curriculum to meet the needs of the boys and to enhance their achievement of qualifications, but these were seriously affected by poor attendance at purposeful activity because of the prison regime. Attendance had improved following the previous inspection, but this had not been sustained and less than half the boys attended lessons. Boys were not receiving their entitlement to mandatory hours of education and actions to improve and sustain attendance had not been effective. Leaders and managers did not use data competently to set challenging targets for improvement.

3.7 Too many training and education sessions were cancelled. Staff shortages, high authorised absences and late attendance caused by prison movements further reduced the time that boys spent in activities.

⁸ Inspection of the provision of education and educational standards, as well as vocational training in YOIs for young people, is undertaken by the Office for Standards in Education Children's Services and Skills (Ofsted) working under the general direction of HM Inspectorate of Prisons. It reports directly to the UK Parliament and is independent and impartial. It (inter alia) inspects and regulates services that provide education and skills for all ages, including those in custody. For information on Ofsted's inspection framework, please visit: <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk>.

- 3.8** Outreach work failed to meet the education needs of boys who were not able to attend lessons. The education team made considerable efforts to visit these boys on their units, but were restricted by the little time that many boys were unlocked. Boys excluded from education were not receiving high-quality learning opportunities to occupy them throughout the day. There was no appropriate re-integration plan to support individual boys back into education classes.
- 3.9** The prison managers and staff did not fully support the promotion of a conducive learning environment in education. No effective provision had been made to keep the school clean and the classroom in Eagle unit was dirty and uncared for. The requirement for classrooms to be locked led to boys pleading and waiting for officers to escort them to the toilet, which was demeaning. Long-standing classroom repairs had not been carried out. Too many visitors were allowed to interrupt lessons and remove boys from classes for a range of rehabilitation appointments.

Recommendations

- 3.10** Prison leaders should significantly and swiftly improve boys' attendance at education to ensure that the requirement to deliver the mandatory hours of education is met.
- 3.11** Effective plans to re-integrate boys excluded from education should be implemented to ensure their smooth and rapid transition back into class.
- 3.12** The prison regime should be reviewed to ensure that start and finish times of classes and the number of authorised visitors do not affect the boys' time for learning.
- 3.13** A culture of respect for learning in education should be developed to ensure that boys can thrive in a conducive learning environment.

Provision of activities

- 3.14** The education manager and teaching staff had developed the curriculum since the previous inspection to provide sufficient access to core subjects such as information and communication technology (ICT), English and mathematics, from entry level to level 2, including GCSEs. The range of subjects offered had been enhanced to provide opportunities for all boys to develop practical skills in mechanics and catering and multi-skills while attending education.
- 3.15** The allocation of boys to education was appropriate and fair but managers acknowledged that the needs of boys who wished to spend longer in the vocational or academic areas were not being met.
- 3.16** Education provision had been increased to deliver the required 30 hours of learning but most boys received considerably less than this. The morning and afternoon learning sessions had been split into shorter lessons to enable boys to participate in a variety of topics each day, to give them equitable access to core subjects and facilitate engagement in learning.
- 3.17** Interventions available in education to tackle the initial stages of poor behaviour, such as time out and the reflective learning class, helped many boys to continue engaging with education.

Recommendations

- 3.18 Leaders and managers should ensure that all boys receive their full entitlement to the required education hours.**
- 3.19 Leaders and managers should review the current delivery model to ensure it meets the needs of the boys who prefer to follow a mostly academic or vocational route.**

Quality of provision

- 3.20** There were high levels of disruption in education and lessons were cancelled because of prison staff shortages and frequent changes of classroom. Despite this, tutors kept learners engaged in tasks very effectively. They knew the boys and their learning needs well and used this information to establish a swift rapport with them.
- 3.21** Tutors were patient and provided helpful explanations and strategies to support learners with the more difficult topics, demonstrating a good knowledge of their subject areas. In the vocational areas, most boys applied themselves well to learning new skills and followed instructions.
- 3.22** Boys were nearly always praised by tutors for their achievements in class. However, the feedback they received on their work varied in quality and, in a few cases, did not explain clearly how they could improve.
- 3.23** The planning of learning to meet the needs of boys of different abilities was not always good enough. Many tutors limited excessively the boys' opportunities to interact and develop their confidence further. All boys attended English and mathematics lessons together, regardless of their level, but too few learning support assistants were available to ensure that they all made good progress.
- 3.24** Tutors did not use all available resources to support learning; activities were not varied enough and focused mainly on completing worksheets. Tutors did not use technology to help boys to develop their ICT skills.
- 3.25** Boys responded well to the limited incentives and rewards for making good progress in education. Learners used the skills passport purposefully to establish a record of their development. However, targets were too general and, at times, did not focus on improving learners' skills.
- 3.26** Equality and diversity were well promoted in learning through topical monthly discussions. Tutors and managers had developed an inclusive and calm learning atmosphere despite the unpredictability of the learning day.

Recommendations

- 3.27 The planning of learning should be improved by better use of learning support assistants and resources, to ensure that the needs of learners of different abilities are being met.**
- 3.28 The system of rewards should be developed further to recognise progress and achievement and ensure that targets are specific and lead to improvement.**

Personal development and behaviour

- 3.29** Boys were knowledgeable and demanding of their entitlement to education. Most were keen to be in class and wanted to use their time in prison to improve their prospects. Boys engaged well and enjoyed their time in education. However, regime constraints prevented many from attending lessons regularly or for long enough.
- 3.30** The education manager and tutors developed good relationships with the boys and showed them respect. Boys often supported each other in class and worked well together to share resources. Most learners were well behaved in lessons.
- 3.31** Boys participated well in classroom discussions, which increased their confidence and helped them to develop their speaking skills. Swearing and inappropriate language were rarely heard during the inspection.
- 3.32** Boys readily adhered to safe working practices in the multi-skills workshops. However, personal protective clothing and equipment were not consistently available to learners in catering, and they were not developing well enough their understanding of food safety.
- 3.33** Many sessions started late and finished early which did not help boys to develop a productive study and work ethic.

Recommendation

- 3.34** **Safe working practices should be promoted effectively in all vocational areas, including catering, and the appropriate clothing and equipment should be provided.**

Education and vocational achievements

- 3.35** A number of boys had achieved GCSE qualifications in English and mathematics during the past year compared with none at the previous inspection.
- 3.36** The percentage of attempted and completed qualification units had improved and was high in English and mathematics, catering and mechanics. However, some of these units were at a very low level. Achievement was low in ICT and required improvement in other areas such as painting, employability and personal and social development.
- 3.37** The standard of boys' work in lessons was adequate but the quality of their written work needed improvement. Spelling mistakes were not always corrected by tutors. Overall, learners' work met the learning expectations of the units they were studying.
- 3.38** Learners in vocational training could complete simple decorating tasks adequately, such as preparing surfaces for painting. In motor mechanics, boys performed useful vehicle maintenance tasks.
- 3.39** Progress was hindered by low attendance, but most boys who had attended well enough to complete their course over the previous year had progressed by one level in English and/or mathematics. Managers did not take account of prior attainment in education to measure effectively the progress made by learners.

Recommendations

- 3.40** The achievement of qualifications in ICT and other areas should be improved.
- 3.41** The prison should ensure that all boys have the opportunity to progress and achieve substantial qualifications commensurate with their prior attainment and the length of their sentence at Feltham.

Library

- 3.42** The library was run by Carillion. It was well resourced and offered a good learning environment for independent and group study. However, boys' access to the library was far too limited. Operational constraints required boys to reach the library through the young adults' education department and most boys could only use the library for 25 minutes every fortnight.
- 3.43** The librarian gathered data on the number of boys visiting the library and their ethnicity. However, managers did not use this information to encourage under-represented groups to use the library more frequently.
- 3.44** A good mobile service visited all wings to provide in-cell learning packs and reading materials. The service was not used well because most boys spent much of their time locked in their cells. Boys could order books to be delivered to their cells, but many boys did not know of this service and did not benefit from it.
- 3.45** Boys did not have access to the virtual campus⁹. Computers had only recently been delivered and were not yet in operation.

Recommendations

- 3.46** Prison managers should use data effectively to identify which groups of boys are using the library.
- 3.47** Opportunities and time available for boys to use the library should be increased, including boys from under-represented groups.
- 3.48** The system for ordering books should be promoted more effectively to encourage boys to read in their units.
- 3.49** The virtual campus should be established swiftly and boys should be able to use it regularly.

⁹ Prisoner access to community education, training and employment opportunities via the internet.

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.

- 3.50** The facilities and resources for PE were good and included two indoor sports halls, cardiovascular fitness machines and a climbing wall. Boys had very limited use of significant outdoor facilities, especially over the winter months. The goal posts needed maintenance as did the boys' football boots.
- 3.51** Boys had scheduled access to a three-hour session each week, with additional time at the weekends. In reality, their attendance at the gym and PE was low. Sessions were often curtailed because of slow movements to the gym and showers and transfer times from the gym. Attendance at the gym was monitored, but not analysed effectively enough to identify the percentage of boys attending. There were enough appropriately qualified staff to manage and operate the gym and associated facilities, but some sessions were cancelled without notice or explanation to the boys.
- 3.52** Boys felt motivated, safe and comfortable in PE and the changing and shower facilities were clean and adequate. Exclusion from PE was kept to a minimum and was usually only imposed on boys who posed a safety risk in PE.
- 3.53** Healthy living and wellbeing were not included in induction to the gym or during exercise sessions. There were no sessions for boys needing to lose weight, recovering from injury or with specific health concerns. Coordination with health care to support recovery through remedial gym had not yet been established.
- 3.54** Exercise yards were adequate and fitted with static exercise facilities. Boys in the Eagle unit had access to only 30 minutes a day outside which was not enough. Partnerships with community organisations to organise competitive sports had still not been developed.
- 3.55** There were no accredited qualifications in PE or support for boys who had been taking PE qualifications before arrival at Feltham.

Recommendations

- 3.56 Attendance at PE and outdoor exercise should be improved to ensure that all boys have the appropriate hours of exercise time.**
- 3.57 Appropriate accredited training courses should be introduced to the gymnasium and physical education.**
- 3.58 The promotion of healthy living and wellbeing should be enhanced in exercise sessions and through links with the health care department.**

Section 4. Resettlement

Pre-release and resettlement

Expected outcomes:

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

- 4.1 The strategic focus on the reducing reoffending needs of boys had been strengthened since the last inspection. A needs analysis conducted in 2015, to be repeated in 2017, had informed the reducing reoffending strategy for Feltham A. The reducing reoffending committee met monthly to discuss Feltham A and B, and Feltham A representatives attended regularly. There was no action plan for Feltham A for the meeting to monitor, and data and discussion were more focused on outcomes in the previous month than driving improvements. There was still no follow up of boys after they were released.
- 4.2 Links with North and South London resettlement consortia had developed since the previous inspection. Managers had also visited youth offending teams (YOTs) with boys to develop relationships and to try to meet parents who did not attend review meetings at Feltham. We were told that this had not been successful in increasing parental involvement. A more strategic approach was being taken to monitoring late provision of licence conditions with a view to raising these at more senior levels in the responsible YOTs.
- 4.3 Boys at Feltham came from a wide geographic spread, covering all regions of England and sometimes Wales. Over 30 different YOT areas could be represented in the population at one time. Many boys were at Feltham because it was the catchment young offender institution (YOI) for the court that they appeared in. Others were there for a fresh start or had experienced difficulties associating with boys at a previous YOI. These boys were often long distances from home, family and friends and professional agencies involved in their care.
- 4.4 The casework team consisted of five operational supervising officers and four non-operational staff. Caseworkers continued to take the lead in identifying risk and resettlement needs, liaising with community YOT workers and social workers (for boys who were in the care of their local authority). Each caseworker managed an average caseload of 17 boys which included remanded and sentenced boys of all sentence lengths. New receptions were allocated according to capacity. The operational caseworkers were sometimes cross-deployed to other general officer duties, more often at weekends.
- 4.5 Caseworkers were assigned soon after a boy's arrival and, in our survey, most boys knew they had a caseworker. Only just over a quarter thought their caseworker had helped them to prepare for release, which was worse than at similar YOIs. Records indicated varying degrees of contact between caseworkers and boys: some had no recorded contact with their caseworker between training planning review meetings, which was poor. Other cases showed more frequent contact, including with boys' families.
- 4.6 Boys serving a detention and training order were eligible to be considered for early release and this was used appropriately with boys whose behaviour and work towards their targets merited early release. Consideration for release on home detention curfew was used for boys serving longer sentences.

- 4.7** Boys who became adults while at Feltham A usually moved to a young adult or adult prison. The transition to the main prison estate was discussed with boys in their remand or training planning review meetings. Boys on remand usually went to the prison in their court catchment area after their 18th birthday, but clear instructions had been given that they should not move directly after a court appearance but should have a properly managed transfer from Feltham A. Some sentenced young men moved to Feltham B, but most went to other prisons based on individual needs. Links with receiving prisons were developing and some were more engaged with Feltham than others. A few receiving prisons attended a transition meeting with the boy either at Feltham or via video-link. Others relied on information provided by Feltham A. The casework team had recognised the need to prepare families for the changes they would experience, such as ongoing contact with the prison, once the boy moved to an adult prison.
- 4.8** Opportunities for release on temporary licence (ROTL) had been maintained since the previous inspection. After their suitability had been fully assessed, a few boys had been given ROTL to take part in the Duke of Edinburgh award scheme and then progress to community work. Sixteen boys had taken part in ROTL in 2016, with another five due to have their first ROTLs the week after the inspection.

Recommendations

- 4.9** **Feltham A should identify key actions to be taken in their strategic approach to reducing reoffending work and progress against these actions should be regularly monitored.**
- 4.10** **Post-release follow up of boys should be in place to inform the ongoing analysis of needs.**

Training planning and remand management

Expected outcomes:

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

- 4.11** In our survey, only 17% of boys knew they had a remand, training planning or sentence plan against the comparator of 50%. Boys were not given a copy of their plan. With the lack of contact that some had with their caseworkers between reviews and the lack of attendance by residential staff at review meetings, it was not surprising that so few were aware they had a plan or targets to work towards. The quality of the plans that we examined varied. They held a lot of information about the boy and his behaviour but the degree of analysis and use of this information was underdeveloped. Targets were often too generic and did not specify the support available to help the boys meet their targets. In other cases, more was being done to personalise the plan and explain why the targets were needed. Regular supervision by a manager in the casework team was being introduced for caseworkers to include quality assurance of documentation and frequency of contact with boys. It was too early to determine the effectiveness of this.
- 4.12** Most review meetings were timely, although electronic case notes indicated that some were cancelled and had to be rearranged. There was no monitoring of the number of cancellations or the reasons for them. Attendance by YOTs was mostly good but families attended less

often. As we found at the previous inspection, too few staff who worked with boys routinely attended the meetings to give progress reports, answer questions from family or community professionals, discuss options for the boy and agree targets. Information sharing often relied on written updates or electronic case notes which could quickly become out of date. We saw one example where a reasonably positive education report was undermined because the boy had not been able to attend education for over a week and was not consistently receiving education support on his unit. Boys were involved in their reviews but the rooms used for meetings quickly became stuffy and some boys were easily distracted by other boys walking past the rooms. Boys had to wear coloured bibs over their prison-issue clothing while in the individual, locked meeting rooms, which was unnecessary.

Recommendation

- 4.13 Monitoring should be in place of the cancellation of training planning and remand management review meetings and the reasons for cancellations should be addressed to avoid recurrence.**

Public protection

- 4.14** Screening after arrival identified boys who might present a risk to the public. They were referred to the monthly interdepartmental risk management meeting (IDRM) which covered Feltham A and B. There was appropriate attendance at the meeting. Feltham A casework managers and caseworkers were routinely present to inform discussion about boys referred to the meeting.
- 4.15** Boys who needed to be considered under multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPAs) were identified on arrival. At the time of the inspection, six boys were assessed as requiring management at the middle MAPPA level and another five at the lowest level on release. Community agencies were asked to confirm MAPPA levels eight months before release and the IDRM checked the position one month before release. Information was not always timely and the process for escalating the MAPPA level request was not clearly defined. In one recent case the MAPPA level was only received three days before the boy's release. In many cases, information was more timely and the earliest release without a confirmed MAPPA level at the time of the inspection was May 2017. The YOI provided written contributions (MAPPA Fs) to multidisciplinary community MAPPA boards. The information was useful but the level of analysis of the information was not strong enough.
- 4.16** Restrictions on whom boys could have contact with while in Feltham were overseen by the IDRM. At the time of the inspection, three boys were subject to monitoring of mail and telephone calls. These arrangements were kept under monthly review and removed when it was deemed safe to do so.

Indeterminate sentence young people

- 4.17** Two boys with indeterminate sentences were at Feltham A at the time of the inspection. A further seven boys had extended sentences for public protection. There were also boys on remand for offences which could attract an indeterminate sentence. Boys with these sentences had the same regular review meetings as other boys. Feltham A was not resourced as a long-term unit and did not offer the range of interventions or education programmes to meet the needs of boys with long or indeterminate sentences. In the absence of national training, managers were arranging for staff with more experience of the juvenile estate to provide training in the management of this group of boys.

Recommendation

- 4.18 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

- 4.19** In our survey, 46% of boys said they had been in the care of their local authority. Figures provided by the on-site social workers indicated that over two-thirds of boys were entitled to some form of support from their local authority. A quarter of boys were looked after by virtue of their remand status.
- 4.20** Arrangements to identify looked-after boys and contact their responsible local authority were well organised. The small team of social workers seconded to Feltham A notified local authorities when a boy was received and set out their obligations, including looked-after children reviews on site. Reminders were sometimes needed to ensure that reviews took place. Financial support for boys from their local authority varied. Although social workers were tenacious in pursuing this, some boys had to wait for long periods. At the time of the inspection, 13 boys were waiting for this support from their local authority. Obtaining accommodation for boys with looked-after status on release was a continuing problem for many boys (see paragraph 4.23). We were told that in a few cases local authorities had provided a key worker for accommodation when a problem had arisen, but these were the exception rather than the rule.

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.

- 4.21** Release plans were discussed during final training planning meetings. If accommodation had not been identified in good time for release, licence conditions could not be finalised and discussed with the boy in advance. We were told that licence conditions were only provided close to the date of release for some boys, which afforded them little opportunity to ask for clarification or to comment if they thought the conditions were inappropriate. Caseworkers went through licences with boys just before their release date.
- 4.22** On the day of release boys were escorted to Feltham B reception, where they were kept apart from young adults. Holdalls were provided for their property and any money or valuable property they had with them when they arrived was returned to them. A manager went through their licence with them before they went to the main gate for release. Travel warrants were provided. The YOI asked for boys to be met by a suitable person on release, but this did not happen in all cases and these boys returned home alone on public transport.

Accommodation

- 4.23** In our survey, more boys at Feltham than similar YOIs said they knew who to contact for help with accommodation problems. Accommodation on release was discussed in training planning reviews but addresses were still not provided in good time for some, particularly boys who had been in the care of their local authority. Barnardo's advocates and the social

work team provided additional support when addresses were not forthcoming. Despite these best efforts, in the previous six months records showed that four boys had only been given an address on the day of release and another had been released to a YMCA hostel.

- 4.24** It is recognised that some boys are hard to place and demand for limited accommodation is high. However, late notification of an address affects other areas of pre-release planning adversely, for example school or college placements, and does not give boys the best chance of successful reintegration and avoidance of reoffending.

Recommendation

- 4.25** **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.**

Education, training and employment

- 4.26** Boys received good-quality careers advice during induction which helped them with their future careers. A case worker and education adviser were allocated promptly to help them with training or employability queries or choices. They had both developed good relationships with the YOTs to help the boys secure further training or learning on release. Data on the progress that boys made with placements were starting to be collected.

Recommendation

- 4.27** **Data on the education, training and employment placements that boys go to when they are released should be collated and analysed to determine their progress in improving their training and employability chances in the community.**

Health care

- 4.28** Health care staff attended release preparation meetings and saw all boys a few days before release to finalise continuity of care plans. All boys received a discharge letter and adequate supplies of prescribed medication.
- 4.29** The mental health team liaised effectively with community services and contacted boys seven days after release to check on their wellbeing.

Good practice

- 4.30** *The mental health team contacted boys seven days after discharge to check on their welfare. This supported effective continuity of care.*

Drugs and alcohol

- 4.31** The team from Lifeline updated case workers and YOT workers following completion of the substance misuse assessment. They attended weekly allocation meetings and contributed to the meeting to prepare for release. Case notes demonstrated structured relapse prevention

work, detailed release planning and the provision of harm reduction and overdose prevention information.

- 4.32** A behavioural change mentor in the team focused on boys with gang affiliations and continued this work through the gate. A family worker supported boys with family concerns while they were in prison and provided support and contact with families in the community.
- 4.33** Links with community YOTs and youth services were good and Lifeline workers attended the London Resettlement consortia to update the appropriate agencies on boys' progress.

Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.34** There had been some improvement in support in this area since the last inspection. Money management and budgeting was now incorporated into the employability curriculum delivered to all boys by the education provider. Boys were helped to complete paperwork to open a bank account but they could not open the account until they left custody. Boys who had their 18th birthday while at Feltham A could access the Job Centre Plus support provided on Feltham B, which included setting up initial community appointments on release.

Recommendation

- 4.35** **Boys should be able to open a bank account while at Feltham.**

Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.36** There was no strategy for family work, and no policy or named lead to coordinate work to maintain family relationships.
- 4.37** The visitors' centre, run by Spurgeons, offered information and assistance to families, but their work was not integrated with the prison and their engagement with prison staff focused on operational matters rather than developing services for families. In our survey, 29% of boys said they had a visit at least once a week. In December 2016, only 30 boys had received a visit and, at the time of our inspection, 10% of boys had not received a visit at all while at Feltham. There was an active official prison visits scheme, which was good, but it was concerning that there was no policy to develop family engagement.
- 4.38** Searching was carried out sensitively, but staff were not fully aware of safeguarding concerns. There were often delays in starting visits, mainly because moving boys through the prison while managing boys who had to be kept apart was challenging. The visits hall was an unwelcoming, austere environment. There was a reasonable play area, but the only refreshments were from a vending machine. Plans to open a new visitors' centre for boys' families were well developed and appeared much more appropriate. There was no systematic consultation with visitors. Boys on closed visits wore coloured sashes, which was unacceptable. They were in full view of other visitors in the hall, which was disrespectful to them and their families.
- 4.39** No family days were organised by prison staff but other departments engaged well with families. Casework, education and the chaplaincy involved families in regular events to recognise the achievements of boys who had taken courses. Education also provided one-to-one parenting courses for expectant fathers. The casework and social work teams involved families effectively in remand and sentence planning.

Recommendation

4.40 There should be a clear strategy and named lead for family work.

Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

4.41 Accredited interventions approved for use across the young people's estate had been introduced at Feltham A since the previous inspection. This was a positive step. Boys could be referred for assessment for an intervention by any department, but referrals were linked back to caseworkers to ensure consistency with sentence planning. The interventions were delivered by a multidisciplinary team of staff with psychologists as treatment managers. The interventions addressed thinking skills, anger management and motivation to change. Although designed as group work programmes, they were also offered on a one-to-one basis to boys who could not engage in group work. Boys could also access one-to-one interventions and counselling delivered by specialist services. There was no specific programme to address gang membership which was a serious concern at Feltham A.

4.42 The number of boys whose offences involved sexually harmful behaviour remained relatively low but there was no on-site intervention for them, which was a gap in provision. As part of health services provision, a small team was assisting with risk management of these boys and expected to have an assessment and treatment service available later in the year.

Recommendation

4.43 Targeted work should be available to address gang membership.

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 recommendation To the Youth Justice Board and HMPPS

- 5.1** HMPPS and the Youth Justice Board should take immediate action to ensure that all boys are able to access 10 hours out of their cell each weekday to attend activities safely. (S50)

Main recommendations To the governor

- 5.2** A strategy should be developed and implemented to improve behaviour and reduce violence. Interventions based on need should be used and there should be sufficient incentives to encourage positive behaviour. (S48)
- 5.3** Special accommodation should not be used for boys unless the circumstances are exceptional. No boy should be left without his own clothes unless a contemporaneous risk assessment identifies a threat to his life or wellbeing. In these circumstances, replacement clothes which maintain the boy's dignity should be provided. (S49)
- 5.4** All boys should have the opportunity to have at least an hour outside every day. (S51)
- 5.5** All boys should have regular, recorded contact with their caseworker between timely training planning review meetings. Plans agreed at these meetings should be specific to the boy and set out how he will be helped to achieve his targets. Targets should be reviewed and updated at each meeting based on information about the boy and his progress in the intervening period. (S52)

Recommendation To the Youth Justice Board and HMPPS

- 5.6** Boys with indeterminate sentences should be placed in custodial settings that are equipped to meet the specific needs presented by their sentence. (4.18)

Recommendations To the Youth Justice Board

- 5.7** Boys should be transported from court to the establishment as soon as possible after their hearing ends to enable them to settle on their first night. (1.3)
- 5.8** Boys should not be transported with adult prisoners. (1.4)
- 5.9** 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. (4.25)

Recommendations

To the governor

Early days in custody

- 5.10** All boys should have an opportunity to have a shower and meet a peer supporter on the first night. (1.10)
- 5.11** The induction session on regime and rules should take place within 24 hours of arrival. (1.11)

Care and protection of children and young people

- 5.12** All child protection concerns should be passed swiftly to the safeguarding team for referral to the designated officer within 24 hours for consultation and advice. (1.19)

Victims of bullying and intimidation

- 5.13** Individual support plans for victims of bullying and intimidation should identify needs and how to meet them. Plans should be reviewed regularly with the boy concerned and their implementation monitored by residential managers. (1.25)
- 5.14** Victims of bullying should have access to a safe regime that includes adequate time out of their cells. (1.26)

Suicide and self-harm protection

- 5.15** All ACCT reviews should be multidisciplinary and contributions should be made by all departments involved in the boy's care. (1.32)

Rewards and sanctions

- 5.16** The rewards and sanctions scheme should be applied with a clear emphasis on positive motivation. (1.38)

Security and disciplinary procedures

- 5.17** Intelligence reports should be acted on promptly by all departments. (1.47)
- 5.18** Security intelligence should draw conclusions to inform appropriate objectives that are effectively communicated to relevant staff. (1.48)
- 5.19** Managers should analyse the impact of the formal adjudications system on the basis of evidence, and ensure that it plays an effective and age-appropriate part in the management of behaviour. (1.49)
- 5.20** Effective tracking of adjourned adjudications should be implemented and overseen by senior managers in all order that all charges can be heard and concluded within a reasonable timescale. (1.50)

Bullying and violence reduction

- 5.21** Individual plans for perpetrators of violence should be fully developed and should include meaningful behaviour improvement targets based on rigorous assessments of need. They should be managed, monitored and reviewed by residential staff together with the safeguarding team and risk management meeting. (1.57, repeated recommendation 1.74)
- 5.22** Collective punishments, including removing units from education, should not be used. (1.58)
- 5.23** An enhanced support unit, a care and separation unit for boys and psychology-led accredited programmes to help reduce violence should be implemented as a priority. (1.59)

The use of force

- 5.24** Control and restraint techniques should not be used on children and all staff who work with boys should be trained in MMPPR. (1.66)
- 5.25** Batons should not be carried by staff working with boys who are under 18 years of age. (1.67)
- 5.26** All aspects of use of force should be rigorously scrutinised and all associated documents relating to the use of force should be completed quickly and collated. (1.68)
- 5.27** Body-worn video cameras should be used to record all incidents where force is used. (1.69)

Separation/removal from normal location

- 5.28** Boys should not be held in the segregation unit. Those who need to be separated for their own or others' safety should experience a full regime and intensive intervention to address their behaviour in a suitable setting. (1.77)

Substance misuse

- 5.29** Boys should be able to access structured substance misuse interventions promptly and consistently according to their assessed needs, and appropriate facilities should be provided to deliver these. (1.84)
- 5.30** The MDT suite should provide a clean, safe and respectful environment. (1.85)

Residential units

- 5.31** Showers should be refurbished and boys should be able to shower and make a phone call each day. (2.10)
- 5.32** The application process should be managed consistently. (2.11)

Relationships between staff and children and young people

- 5.33** The personal officer scheme should be developed and personal officers should play an active part in sentence progression and case work. (2.15)

Equality and diversity

- 5.34** The needs of all groups with protected characteristics should be identified and addressed, regular forums should be held for each group, and all aspects of equality and diversity should be promoted. (2.25)
- 5.35** The treatment of boys in all protected groups should be monitored. (2.26)
- 5.36** Boys with disabilities should be readily identifiable to unit staff and unit care plans should be prepared when necessary to help staff meet the needs of these boys. (2.35)
- 5.37** Homophobic and other offensive behaviour should be challenged effectively. (2.36)

Faith and religious activity

- 5.38** Faith-based classes should be provided to boys of all faiths. (2.43)
- 5.39** Boys on the 'keep apart' list should only be excluded from corporate worship following a robust risk assessment. (2.44)

Legal rights

- 5.40** Boys should have access to appropriate legal support to enable them to address nationality issues while in custody. (2.51)

Health services

- 5.41** Regular consultation with the boys should inform health service delivery. (2.62)
- 5.42** All clinical environments should comply with infection control standards. (2.63)
- 5.43** More prison officers should be trained in first aid, including use of defibrillators. Ambulances should be called immediately to ensure a safe response to medical emergencies at all times. (2.64)
- 5.44** There should be an integrated whole-prison strategic approach to the promotion of health and wellbeing, including the provision of condoms. (2.65)
- 5.45** Prisoners should not be located on the in-patient unit for operational reasons. (2.72)
- 5.46** All boys should receive their prescribed medicines consistently and at clinically appropriate times. Boys in shared cells should have secure storage for in-possession medicines. (2.76)
- 5.47** Nurses should be able to administer a wide range of medicines for minor injuries and illnesses without a prescription. (2.77)
- 5.48** A summary of dental care provided should be recorded on SystmOne. (2.80)
- 5.49** All discipline officers should receive mental health awareness training to enable them to recognise and support prisoners with mental health problems. (2.86)

Catering

- 5.50** All boys should have the opportunity to eat communally out of their cells. (2.93)
- 5.51** The size of breakfast portions should be increased. (2.94)
- 5.52** Serveries should be cleaned after every meal and food should not be left out overnight. (2.95)

Purchases

- 5.53** Boys should be able to place a canteen order within 24 hours of their arrival. (2.100)
- 5.54** Regular consultation with boys should take place to ensure that the range of goods on the canteen list meets the diverse needs of the population. (2.101)
- 5.55** Prohibition of items on the canteen list should be supported by up-to-date intelligence. (2.102)

Education, learning and skills

- 5.56** Prison leaders should significantly and swiftly improve boys' attendance at education to ensure that the requirement to deliver the mandatory hours of education is met. (3.10)
- 5.57** Effective plans to re-integrate boys excluded from education should be implemented to ensure their smooth and rapid transition back into class. (3.11)
- 5.58** The prison regime should be reviewed to ensure that start and finish times of classes and the number of authorised visitors do not affect the boys' time for learning. (3.12)
- 5.59** A culture of respect for learning in education should be developed to ensure that boys can thrive in a conducive learning environment. (3.13)
- 5.60** Leaders and managers should ensure that all boys receive their full entitlement to the required education hours. (3.18)
- 5.61** Leaders and managers should review the current delivery model to ensure it meets the needs of the boys who prefer to follow a mostly academic or vocational route. (3.19)
- 5.62** The planning of learning should be improved by better use of learning support assistants and resources, to ensure that the needs of learners of different abilities are being met. (3.27)
- 5.63** The system of rewards should be developed further to recognise progress and achievement and ensure that targets are specific and lead to improvement. (3.28)
- 5.64** Safe working practices should be promoted effectively in all vocational areas, including catering, and the appropriate clothing and equipment should be provided. (3.34)
- 5.65** The achievement of qualifications in ICT and other areas should be improved. (3.40)
- 5.66** The prison should ensure that all boys have the opportunity to progress and achieve substantial qualifications commensurate with their prior attainment and the length of their sentence at Feltham. (3.41)

- 5.67** Prison managers should use data effectively to identify which groups of boys are using the library. (3.46)
- 5.68** Opportunities and time available for boys to use the library should be increased, including boys from under-represented groups. (3.47)
- 5.69** The system for ordering books should be promoted more effectively to encourage boys to read in their units. (3.48)
- 5.70** The virtual campus should be established swiftly and boys should be able to use it regularly. (3.49)

Physical education and healthy living

- 5.71** Attendance at PE and outdoor exercise should be improved to ensure that all boys have the appropriate hours of exercise time. (3.56)
- 5.72** Appropriate accredited training courses should be introduced to the gymnasium and physical education. (3.57)
- 5.73** The promotion of healthy living and wellbeing should be enhanced in exercise sessions and through links with the health care department. (3.58)

Pre-release and resettlement

- 5.74** Feltham A should identify key actions to be taken in their strategic approach to reducing reoffending work and progress against these actions should be regularly monitored. (4.9)
- 5.75** Post-release follow up of boys should be in place to inform the ongoing analysis of needs. (4.10)

Training planning and remand management

- 5.76** Monitoring should be in place of the cancellation of training planning and remand management review meetings and the reasons for cancellations should be addressed to avoid recurrence. (4.13)

Reintegration planning

- 5.77** 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. (4.25)
- 5.78** Data on the education, training and employment placements that boys go to when they are released should be collated and analysed to determine their progress in improving their training and employability chances in the community. (4.27)
- 5.79** Boys should be able to open a bank account while at Feltham. (4.35)
- 5.80** There should be a clear strategy and named lead for family work. (4.40)
- 5.81** Targeted work should be available to address gang membership. (4.43)

Examples of good practice

- 5.82** Robust risk and performance meetings each week contributed to a timely and effective whole team approach to risk and performance management. (2.66)
- 5.83** The well resourced mental health team provided an impressive range of timely and age-appropriate mental health support, which contributed to good outcomes for boys. (2.87)
- 5.84** The mental health team contacted boys seven days after discharge to check on their welfare. This supported effective continuity of care. (4.30)

Section 6. Appendices

Appendix I: Inspection team

Peter Clarke	Chief inspector
Angus Mulready-Jones	Team leader
Francesca Cooney	Inspector
Ian Dickens	Inspector
Karen Dillon	Inspector
Deri Hughes-Roberts	Inspector
Angela Johnson	Inspector
Gordon Riach	Inspector
Jonathan Tickner	Inspector
Sigrid Engelen	Substance misuse inspector
Maureen Jamieson	Health services inspector
Majella Pearce	Health services inspector
Nicola Carlisle	Pharmacist
Malcolm Irons	Care Quality Commission inspector
Maria Navarro	Ofsted inspector
Martin Hughes	Ofsted inspector
Chris Dearnley	Ofsted inspector
Laura Green	Researcher
Emma Seymour	Researcher
Patricia Taflan	Researcher

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 2015, the early days for boys at Feltham were reasonably well managed and most boys felt safe during this time. Safeguarding and child protection procedures had improved and were sound. There was a comparatively low incidence of self-harm and the quality of ACCT documentation was mostly good. Too many vulnerable boys were still isolated for lengthy periods. Violence towards staff and boys was high and remained a serious concern. Use of force and adjudications were also at a high level and the new simplified procedure for managing poor behaviour was not yet effective. The segregation environment was unsuitable for boys and its use had increased. The prison was aware of these problems and had some credible plans to address them. The future strategy was innovative and creative, focusing appropriately on a balance of reward and sanction. Substance misuse services had improved and were excellent. Outcomes for children and young people were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test

Main recommendation

Feltham A should continue its current strategy to improve behaviour and reduce violence and bring existing initiative to fruition. Individual support plans for victims of bullying and intimidation should identify needs and the ways in which they will be met. They should be reviewed regularly with the child and monitored by residential managers. (S50)

Not achieved

Recommendations

Key staff at the establishment, NOMS, the Youth Justice Board and the escort providers should meet regularly to monitor and resolve problems relating to escort arrangements and ensure that children arrive at the establishment in good time to be assessed and settled on their first night. (1.4)

Achieved

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

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 1.4)

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

Partially achieved (Recommendation repeated, 1.10)

Victims of bullying should have access to a safe regime which includes adequate time out of their cells. (1.31)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 1.26)

All children on ACCTs should have access to a regime which provides purposeful activity and a reasonable amount of time out of cell. (I.39)

Achieved

Care maps should be detailed and updated regularly. (I.40)

Not achieved

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

Not achieved

The regime for boys on basic level of the rewards and sanctions scheme should be improved and not lead to boys being effectively isolated for long periods. (I.51)

Partially achieved

The rewards and sanctions scheme should be applied with a clear emphasis on positive motivation. (I.52)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, I.38)

Managers should analyse the impact of the formal adjudications system on the basis of evidence, and ensure that it plays a clear and constructive part in the management of behaviour. (I.62)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, I.49)

Initiatives such as an enhanced support unit, a care and separation unit for boys and psychology-led accredited programmes to help reduce violence should be implemented as a priority. (I.73)

Not achieved

Individual plans for perpetrators of violence should be fully developed and should include meaningful behaviour improvement targets based on rigorous assessments of need. They should be managed, monitored and reviewed by residential staff together with the safeguarding team and risk management meeting. (I.74)

Not achieved (Repeated recommendation, I.57)

A full and meaningful regime should be offered to boys on PACT. (I.75)

Not achieved

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

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, I.67)

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

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, I.77)

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

Achieved

Respect

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

At the last inspection in 2015, most communal areas were clean and bright but some areas required refurbishment. Jay and Curlew units stood out as better environments and relationships were particularly strong on these wings. Relationships between most other staff and boys were positive but opportunities to interact were sometimes lost because boys were locked up for long periods. The management of applications was inconsistent but quality assurance and the use of advocates strengthened the complaints procedure. Some food portions were inadequate. The management of equality and diversity was good and given a high priority. The provision of faith and religious services was equally impressive. Health services had improved and were excellent. Outcomes for children and young people were good against this healthy prison test.

Recommendations

All cells and communal areas, including showers, should be clean. (2.10)

Partially achieved

The offensive display policy should be properly managed and implemented. (2.11)

Achieved

The application system should be managed consistently. (2.12)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 2.11)

All staff should engage positively with boys. (2.17)

Partially achieved

There should be a prison-wide strategy to promote health and wellbeing. (2.57)

Not achieved

The approach to the resuscitation of collapsed prisoners should be considered by the partnership board to define and deliver an optimal state of readiness. (2.58)

Partially achieved

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

Partially achieved

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

Not achieved

All boys should have the opportunity to eat communally out of their cells. (2.95)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 2.93)

The quantity of food available to boys during the day should be increased. (2.96)

Not achieved

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

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 2.100)

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

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 2.101)

Boys should be able to order items from catalogues. (2.102)

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 2015, time out of cell had reduced since our last inspection and was inadequate. Boys did not have enough time in the fresh air, which was detrimental to their health. The regime and access to activities on Jay and Curlew units were much better than other units. There were enough purposeful activity places for all boys to take part but too many missed out because of security risks or poor behaviour. Attendance at education was poor but good in workshops. Qualification outcomes were unacceptable in mathematics and English, and poor in many other subjects. Teaching and learning in education required improvement, although vocational training and related qualification outcomes were good. The library provided a reasonable service but needed to do more to ensure all boys benefitted from it. PE provision was adequate but attendance was poor. Outcomes for children and young people were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendations

All boys should have the opportunity of at least one hour of exercise in the open air each day. (S52)

Not achieved

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

Not achieved

Recommendations

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

Partially achieved

The establishment should ensure that the quality improvement group is an effective driver of improvements across learning, skills and work. (3.13)

Partially achieved

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

Achieved

Teachers should be helped to improve the quality of sessions by supporting them to set challenging learning targets and to make lessons more engaging and interactive. (3.26)

Not achieved

Teachers should help boys to use spoken English to communicate more effectively, especially in formal situations, and to support successful resettlement. (3.27)

Achieved

Teachers should promote equality and diversity thoroughly during learning sessions, including integrating equality themes with the taught subject. (3.28)

Achieved

The establishment, in partnership with the learning provider, should improve the standard of outreach work by ensuring that teachers are equipped with resources and facilities to deliver learning effectively on the accommodation blocks. (3.29)

Not achieved

Teachers should identify the reasons for learners' poor performance, especially in English and mathematics, and take swift corrective action. (3.32)

Achieved

The establishment and education provider should collaborate to determine why learners continue to miss classroom sessions and implement an effective strategy to improve attendance. (3.33)

Not achieved

The library should have accurate data on library use so that it can be determined whether all boys are using the facility. (3.37)

Not achieved

An appropriate procedure should be implemented immediately to monitor the loss of stock. (3.38)

Achieved

Opportunities should be provided for boys to play competitive sports against visiting teams. (3.45)

Not achieved

Attendance at gym sessions should be improved by establishing the reasons for boys' absence and taking appropriate action. (3.46)

Not achieved

Resettlement

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

At the last inspection in 2015, the reducing reoffending policy covered both the A and B sides and had not developed sufficiently since the last inspection. The monthly meeting did not focus on the specific needs of the younger population. Less than a third of boys said they had a training plan and, although the real figure was much higher, boys were not provided with a copy and training plans were not central to their care. However, a committed and capable team of caseworkers worked hard to support the boys. The commitment to release on temporary licence (ROTL) was commendable, as was the use of early release, both of which demonstrated a strategic focus on rewarding good behaviour. Public protection was managed well and dedicated social workers ensured that the needs of looked-after children were met. Integration planning was good and resettlement needs were broadly met well, with the exception of the visits facilities which needed improvement. Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendation

A reducing re-offending policy and structures specific to the needs of boys on the A side should be developed. Every boy should have a copy of their plan in an age-appropriate format which should be regularly reviewed and linked to other processes for encouraging the boys' progress. (S53)

Not achieved

Recommendations

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

Not achieved

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

Not achieved

All boys should participate in appropriate pre-release training. (4.29)

No longer relevant

All boys should receive high quality careers information, advice and guidance interventions as needed. (4.30)

Achieved

Community links should be strengthened to enable boys to apply for jobs and training before their release. (4.31)

Not achieved

The virtual campus should be available to boys to support resettlement. (4.32)

Not achieved

Boys should be helped to open bank accounts. (4.36)

Partially achieved

All aspects of the visits experience should be reviewed and problems addressed, including the booking and timeliness of visits. (4.40)

Not achieved

The number of family days should be increased and open to all boys. (4.41)

Not achieved

Appendix III: Establishment population profile

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

Population breakdown by:

Status	Number of young people	%
Sentenced	94	74%
Recall	4	3%
Convicted unsentenced	7	6%
Remand	21	17%
Detainees	0	0%
Total	126	100%

Age	Number of young people	%
15 years	7	5%
16 years	40	32%
17 years	66	52%
18 years	13	10%
Total	126	99%

Nationality	Number of young people	%
British	99	79%
Foreign nationals	27	21%
Total	126	100%

Ethnicity	Number of young people	%
White		
British	31	25%
Irish	4	3%
Gypsy/Irish Traveller	0	0
Other white	9	7%
Mixed		
White and black Caribbean	5	4%
White and black African	3	2%
White and Asian	0	0
Other mixed	9	7%
Asian or Asian British		
Indian	2	2%
Pakistani	2	2%
Bangladeshi	1	1%
Chinese		
Other Asian	6	5%
Black or black British		
Caribbean	20	16%
African	21	17%
Other black	10	8%
Other ethnic group		
Arab		
Other ethnic group	1	1%
Not stated	2	2%
Total	126	100%

Religion	Number of young people	%
Baptist	0	0
Church of England	10	8%
Roman Catholic	25	20%
Other Christian denominations	33	26%
Muslim	35	28%
Sikh	1	1%
Hindu	1	1%
Buddhist	0	0
Jewish	0	0
Other	4	3%
No religion	17	13%
Total	126	100%

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

Sentenced only – length of stay by age

Length of stay	<1 mth	1–3 mths	3–6 mths	6–12 mths	1–2 yrs	2 yrs +	4 yrs +	Total
Age								
15 years	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	5
16 years	0	1	4	10	2	9	3	29
17 years	0	1	9	8	10	8	13	49
18 years	0	0	0	5	7	2	1	15
Total	0	2	13	26	21	19	17	98

Unsentenced only – length of stay by age

Length of stay	<1 mth	1–3 mths	3–6 mths	6–12 mths	1–2 yrs	2 yrs+	4 yrs +	Total
Age								
15 years	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3
16 years	5	2	2	0	0	0	0	9
17 years	7	3	4	1	0	0	0	15
18 years	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Total	12	6	9	1	0	0	0	28

Main offence	Number of young people	%
Violence against the person	43	34%
Sexual offences	2	2%
Burglary	13	10%
Robbery	25	20%
Theft and handling	0	0
Fraud and forgery	0	0
Drugs offences	16	13%
Other offences	26	21%
Offence not recorded / holding warrant	0	0
Total	124	100%

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

Sentence	4 mths	6 mths	8 mths	10 mths	12 mths	18 mths	24 mths	Recall	Total
Age									
15 years	0	0	0	0	3 + 1 (16months)	1	0	0	5
16 years	4	0	2	1	7	2	2	1	19
17 years	3	6	2	2	4	5 + 1(20months)	5	1	29
18 years	0	0	0	0	5 + 1(16months)	4 + 1(months)	1	0	12
Total	7	6	4	3	21	14	8	2	64

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

Sentence	Under 2 yrs	2–3 yrs	3–4 yrs	4–5 yrs	5 yrs +	Recall	Total
Age							
15 years	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16 years	0	0	5	1	0	2	8
17 years	0	4	4	6	1	0	15
18 years	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Total	0	5	9	7	1	2	24

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

Sentence	Under 2 yrs	2–3 yrs	3–4 yrs	4–5 yrs	5 yrs +	Recall	Total
Age							
15 years	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
Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Sentence	Under 2 yrs	2–5 yrs	5–10 yrs	10–15 yrs	15–20 yrs	Recall	Total
Age							
15 years	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16 years	0	0	1	1	0	0	2
17 years	0	0	1	3	0	0	4
18 years	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Total	0	0	3	4	0	0	7

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

Sentence	Under 2 yrs	2–5 yrs	5–10 yrs	10–15 yrs	15–20 yrs	20 yrs +	Total
Age							
15 years	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16 years	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
17 years	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
18 years	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0	1	1	0	2

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

Children and young people survey methodology

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

Sampling

Questionnaires were offered to all young people.

Distributing and collecting questionnaires

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

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

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

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

Survey response

At the time of the survey on 23 January 2017 the young person population at HMYOI Feltham A was 126. Questionnaires were distributed to 120 young people¹⁰.

We received a total of 104 completed questionnaires, a response rate of 87%. Two respondents refused to complete a questionnaire and 14 questionnaires were not returned.

¹⁰ Surveys were not distributed to six young people who were at court on the day of the survey.

Wing/unit	Number of completed survey returns
Bittern	14
Curlew	23
Dunlin	22
Eagle	17
Heron	10
Jay	15
Wren (health care)	2
Ibis (care and separation unit)	1

Presentation of survey results and analyses

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

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 significant¹¹ differences are indicated by shading. Results that are significantly better are indicated by green shading, results that are significantly worse are indicated by blue shading. If the difference is not statistically significant there is no shading. Orange shading has been used to show a statistically significant difference in young people's background details.

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

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

The following comparative analyses are presented:

- The current survey responses from HMYOI Feltham A in 2017 compared with responses from young people surveyed in all other young offender institutions. This comparator is based on all responses from young people surveys carried out in five YOIs since April 2015.
- The current survey responses from HMYOI Feltham A in 2017 compared with the responses of young people surveyed at HMYOI Feltham A in 2015.
- A comparison within the 2017 survey between the responses of white young people and those from a black and minority ethnic group.
- A comparison within the 2017 survey between the responses of Muslim young people and non-Muslim young people.
- A comparison within the 2017 survey between the responses of young people who consider themselves to have a disability and those who do not consider themselves to have a disability.
- A comparison within the 2017 survey between responses of young people who have been in local authority care and those who have not been in local authority care.

¹¹ 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

Q1	How old are you?	
	15	9 (9%)
	16	28 (27%)
	17	54 (53%)
	18	11 (11%)
Q2	Are you a British citizen?	
	Yes	92 (90%)
	No.....	10 (10%)
Q3	Do you understand spoken English?	
	Yes	103 (100%)
	No.....	0 (0%)
Q4	Do you understand written English?	
	Yes	100 (100%)
	No.....	0 (0%)
Q5	What is your ethnic origin?	
	White - British	26 (26%)
	White - Irish	5 (5%)
	White - Other.....	6 (6%)
	Black or Black British - Caribbean	14 (14%)
	Black or Black British - African.....	20 (20%)
	Black or Black British - Other	4 (4%)
	Asian or Asian British - Indian	1 (1%)
	Asian or Asian British - Pakistani.....	2 (2%)
	Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi.....	1 (1%)
	Asian or Asian British - Chinese.....	0 (0%)
	Asian or Asian British - Other	3 (3%)
	Mixed race - White and Black Caribbean	6 (6%)
	Mixed race - White and Black African.....	5 (5%)
	Mixed race - White and Asian	1 (1%)
	Mixed race - Other	6 (6%)
	Arab.....	1 (1%)
	Other ethnic group	0 (0%)

Q6	What is your religion?	
	None.....	15 (15%)
	Church of England.....	20 (20%)
	Catholic.....	20 (20%)
	Protestant.....	0 (0%)
	Other Christian denomination.....	8 (8%)
	Buddhist.....	1 (1%)
	Hindu.....	1 (1%)
	Jewish.....	0 (0%)
	Muslim.....	32 (33%)
	Sikh.....	1 (1%)
Q7	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	
	Yes.....	7 (7%)
	No.....	91 (90%)
	Don't know.....	3 (3%)
Q8	Do you have any children?	
	Yes.....	5 (5%)
	No.....	95 (95%)
Q9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability (i.e. do you need help with any long-term physical, mental or learning needs)?	
	Yes.....	12 (12%)
	No.....	90 (88%)
Q10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	
	Yes.....	45 (46%)
	No.....	52 (54%)

SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE

Q1	Are you sentenced?	
	Yes.....	76 (77%)
	No - unsentenced/on remand.....	23 (23%)
Q2	How long is your sentence (the full DTO sentence)?	
	Not sentenced.....	23 (24%)
	Less than 6 months.....	16 (16%)
	6 to 12 months.....	18 (19%)
	More than 12 months, up to 2 years.....	18 (19%)
	More than 2 years.....	21 (22%)
	Indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP).....	1 (1%)
Q3	How long have you been in this establishment?	
	Less than 1 month.....	14 (14%)
	1 to 6 months.....	50 (51%)
	More than 6 months, but less than 12 months.....	24 (24%)
	12 months to 2 years.....	11 (11%)
	More than 2 years.....	0 (0%)
Q4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	
	Yes.....	51 (52%)
	No.....	47 (48%)

SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS

Q1	On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?	
	Yes	81 (79%)
	No.....	9 (9%)
	Don't remember	12 (12%)
Q2	On your most recent journey here, were there any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females travelling with you?	
	Yes	41 (41%)
	No.....	42 (42%)
	Don't remember	16 (16%)
Q3	On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?	
	Less than 2 hours	56 (55%)
	2 to 4 hours.....	33 (32%)
	More than 4 hours	6 (6%)
	Don't remember	7 (7%)
Q4	On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?	
	My journey was less than 2 hours	56 (55%)
	Yes	4 (4%)
	No.....	37 (37%)
	Don't remember	4 (4%)
Q5	On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?	
	My journey was less than 2 hours	56 (55%)
	Yes	22 (22%)
	No.....	17 (17%)
	Don't remember	6 (6%)
Q6	On your most recent journey here, how did you feel you were treated by the escort staff?	
	Very well.....	14 (14%)
	Well.....	41 (40%)
	Neither	32 (31%)
	Badly.....	5 (5%)
	Very badly	2 (2%)
	Don't remember	8 (8%)
Q7	Before you arrived here, did you receive any information to help you prepare for coming here?	
	Yes - and it was helpful.....	10 (10%)
	Yes - but it was not helpful.....	12 (12%)
	No - I received no information	66 (65%)
	Don't remember	14 (14%)

SECTION 4: FIRST DAYS

Q1	How long were you in reception?	
	Less than 2 hours	83 (81%)
	2 hours or longer	9 (9%)
	Don't remember	10 (10%)
Q2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	
	Yes	79 (77%)
	No.....	13 (13%)
	Don't remember/Not applicable	10 (10%)

Q3	How well did you feel you were treated in reception?		
	Very well.....	19 (19%)	
	Well.....	43 (43%)	
	Neither.....	28 (28%)	
	Badly.....	5 (5%)	
	Very badly.....	5 (5%)	
	Don't remember.....	1 (1%)	
Q4	When you first arrived here, did staff ask if you needed help or support with any of the following things? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	Not being able to smoke.....	41 (43%)	Money worries..... 13 (14%)
	Loss of property.....	17 (18%)	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to..... 17 (18%)
	Feeling scared.....	15 (16%)	Health problems..... 47 (49%)
	Gang problems.....	57 (60%)	Getting phone numbers..... 42 (44%)
	Contacting family.....	47 (49%)	Staff did not ask me about any of these..... 17 (18%)
Q5	When you first arrived here, did you have any of the following problems? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	Not being able to smoke.....	37 (39%)	Money worries..... 13 (14%)
	Loss of property.....	11 (12%)	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to..... 7 (7%)
	Feeling scared.....	7 (7%)	Health problems..... 13 (14%)
	Gang problems.....	20 (21%)	Getting phone numbers..... 31 (33%)
	Contacting family.....	24 (26%)	I did not have any problems..... 27 (29%)
Q6	When you first arrived here, were you given any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	Toiletries/basic items.....	63 (63%)	
	The opportunity to have a shower.....	37 (37%)	
	Something to eat.....	80 (80%)	
	A free phone call to friends/family.....	73 (73%)	
	PIN phone credit.....	57 (57%)	
	Information about feeling worried/upset.....	18 (18%)	
	Don't remember.....	8 (8%)	
	I was not given any of these.....	0 (0%)	
Q7	Within your first 24 hours here, did you have access to the following people or services? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	Chaplain.....	33 (33%)	
	Peer mentor.....	11 (11%)	
	Childline/Samaritans.....	17 (17%)	
	The prison shop/canteen.....	10 (10%)	
	Don't remember.....	25 (25%)	
	I did not have access to any of these.....	40 (40%)	
Q8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?		
	Yes.....	57 (59%)	
	No.....	34 (35%)	
	Don't remember.....	6 (6%)	
Q9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?		
	Yes.....	70 (71%)	
	No.....	19 (19%)	
	Don't remember.....	10 (10%)	

Q10	Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the establishment?	
	<i>I have not been on an induction course</i>	7 (7%)
	Yes	49 (49%)
	No.....	24 (24%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	20 (20%)

SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT

Q1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	
	Yes	59 (60%)
	No	37 (37%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	3 (3%)
Q2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	
	Yes	46 (46%)
	No.....	40 (40%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	13 (13%)
Q3	What is the food like here?	
	<i>Very good</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Good</i>	12 (12%)
	<i>Neither</i>	26 (26%)
	<i>Bad</i>	31 (31%)
	<i>Very bad</i>	30 (30%)
Q4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	
	<i>I have not bought anything yet/Don't know</i>	7 (7%)
	Yes	40 (40%)
	No.....	53 (53%)
Q5	How easy is it for you to attend religious services?	
	<i>I don't want to attend religious services</i>	15 (15%)
	<i>Very easy</i>	17 (17%)
	<i>Easy</i>	27 (27%)
	<i>Neither</i>	8 (8%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	16 (16%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	5 (5%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	11 (11%)
Q6	Are your religious beliefs respected?	
	Yes	68 (69%)
	No.....	8 (8%)
	<i>Don't know/Not applicable</i>	23 (23%)
Q7	Can you speak to a Chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?	
	Yes	59 (61%)
	No.....	10 (10%)
	<i>Don't know/Not applicable</i>	28 (29%)
Q8	Can you speak to a peer mentor when you need to?	
	Yes	23 (24%)
	No.....	32 (33%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	41 (43%)

Q9	Can you speak to a member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board) when you need to?	
	Yes	16 (16%)
	No	30 (30%)
	Don't know	53 (54%)
Q10	Can you speak to an advocate (an outside person to help you) when you need to?	
	Yes	28 (28%)
	No.....	27 (27%)
	Don't know	44 (44%)

SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF

Q1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	
	Yes	62 (66%)
	No.....	32 (34%)
Q2	If you had a problem, who would you turn to? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	No-one	26 (27%)
	Personal officer	22 (23%)
	Wing Officer.....	24 (25%)
	Teacher/education staff	10 (10%)
	Gym staff.....	2 (2%)
	Chaplain.....	8 (8%)
	Independent Monitoring Board (IMB)	2 (2%)
	YOT worker	23 (24%)
	Social worker	13 (14%)
	Health services staff.....	3 (3%)
	Peer mentor	4 (4%)
	Another young person here.....	12 (13%)
	Case worker.....	25 (26%)
	Advocate.....	6 (6%)
	Family/friends.....	47 (49%)
	Childline/Samaritans	2 (2%)
Q3	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	
	Yes	29 (29%)
	No.....	70 (71%)
Q4	When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?	
	I still have not met him/her	20 (20%)
	In your first week.....	20 (20%)
	After your first week.....	28 (29%)
	Don't remember	30 (31%)
Q5	How often do you see your personal (named) officer?	
	I still have not met him/her	20 (24%)
	At least once a week	31 (36%)
	Less than once a week.....	34 (40%)
Q6	Do you feel your personal (named) officer tries to help you?	
	I still have not met him/her	20 (22%)
	Yes	38 (41%)
	No.....	35 (38%)

SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS

Q1	Is it easy to make an application?	
	Yes	49 (52%)
	No.....	16 (17%)
	Don't know	29 (31%)

Q2	Are applications sorted out fairly?	
	<i>I have not made an application</i>	29 (36%)
	Yes	14 (18%)
	No.....	37 (46%)
Q3	Are applications sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	
	<i>I have not made an application</i>	29 (37%)
	Yes	11 (14%)
	No.....	38 (49%)
Q4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	
	Yes	48 (49%)
	No.....	12 (12%)
	Don't know	37 (38%)
Q5	Are complaints sorted out fairly?	
	<i>I have not made a complaint</i>	37 (45%)
	Yes	7 (8%)
	No.....	39 (47%)
Q6	Are complaints sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	
	<i>I have not made a complaint</i>	37 (46%)
	Yes	10 (12%)
	No.....	34 (42%)
Q7	Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint?	
	Yes	9 (9%)
	No.....	53 (55%)
	Never needed to make a complaint.....	34 (35%)

SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE

Q1	What level of the rewards and sanctions scheme are you on?	
	<i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i>	5 (5%)
	Enhanced (top)	11 (11%)
	Standard (middle)	66 (69%)
	Basic (bottom)	10 (10%)
	Don't know	4 (4%)
Q2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the rewards and sanctions scheme?	
	<i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i>	5 (6%)
	Yes	27 (31%)
	No.....	44 (50%)
	Don't know	12 (14%)
Q3	Do the different levels of the rewards and sanctions scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	
	<i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i>	5 (5%)
	Yes	31 (34%)
	No.....	49 (53%)
	Don't know	7 (8%)
Q4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	
	Yes	41 (43%)
	No.....	27 (28%)
	Don't know	28 (29%)

Q5	If you have had a minor report, was the process explained clearly to you?	
	<i>I have not had a minor report</i>	55 (57%)
	Yes	28 (29%)
	No.....	13 (14%)
Q6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	
	Yes	67 (69%)
	No.....	26 (27%)
	Don't know	4 (4%)
Q7	If you have had an adjudication ('nicking'), was the process explained clearly to you?	
	<i>I have not had an adjudication</i>	30 (31%)
	Yes	56 (58%)
	No.....	10 (10%)
Q8	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	
	Yes	45 (46%)
	No.....	47 (48%)
	Don't know	5 (5%)
Q9	If you have spent a night in the care and separation unit (CSU), how were you treated by staff?	
	<i>I have not been to the care and separation unit</i>	63 (66%)
	Very well.....	3 (3%)
	Well.....	4 (4%)
	Neither	14 (15%)
	Badly.....	4 (4%)
	Very badly	7 (7%)

SECTION 9: SAFETY

Q1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	
	Yes	37 (39%)
	No.....	59 (61%)
Q2	Do you feel unsafe now?	
	Yes	11 (11%)
	No.....	85 (89%)

Q3	In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Never felt unsafe	59 (66%)
	Everywhere	8 (9%)
	Care and separation unit	4 (4%)
	Association areas	10 (11%)
	Reception area	1 (1%)
	At the gym	2 (2%)
	In an exercise yard	8 (9%)
	At work.....	0 (0%)
	At education	10 (11%)
	At religious services.....	4 (4%)
	At meal times	0 (0%)
	At healthcare	4 (4%)
	Visits area	13 (14%)
	In wing showers.....	8 (9%)
	In gym showers	1 (1%)
	In corridors/stairwells.....	8 (9%)
	On your landing/wing	6 (7%)
	During movement.....	11 (12%)
	In your cell	4 (4%)
Q4	Have you ever been victimised by another young person/group of young people here (e.g. insulted or assaulted you)?	
	Yes	22 (23%)
	No.....	74 (77%)
Q5	If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Insulting remarks (about you, your family or friends).....	9 (9%)
	Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)	10 (10%)
	Sexual abuse	0 (0%)
	Feeling threatened or intimidated.....	4 (4%)
	Having your canteen/property taken.....	2 (2%)
	Medication.....	0 (0%)
	Debt	1 (1%)
	Drugs.....	2 (2%)
	Your race or ethnic origin.....	3 (3%)
	Your religion/religious beliefs	2 (2%)
	Your nationality	3 (3%)
	You are from a different part of the country to others	1 (1%)
	You are from a Traveller community.....	1 (1%)
	Your sexuality	0 (0%)
	Your age.....	4 (4%)
	You having a disability	0 (0%)
	You were new here.....	6 (6%)
	Your offence/crime.....	2 (2%)
	Gang related issues.....	11 (11%)
Q7	Have you ever been victimised by staff here (e.g. insulted or assaulted you)?	
	Yes	23 (24%)
	No.....	73 (76%)

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

<i>Insulting remarks (about you, your family or friends)</i>	14 (15%)
<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	4 (4%)
<i>Sexual abuse</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	4 (4%)
<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i>	2 (2%)
<i>Medication</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Debt</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Drugs</i>	2 (2%)
<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	4 (4%)
<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Your nationality</i>	0 (0%)
<i>You are from a different part of the country to others</i>	1 (1%)
<i>You are from a Traveller community</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Your sexuality</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Your age</i>	5 (5%)
<i>You having a disability</i>	0 (0%)
<i>You were new here</i>	3 (3%)
<i>Your offence/crime</i>	3 (3%)
<i>Gang related issues</i>	3 (3%)
<i>Because you made a complaint</i>	5 (5%)

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

Yes	25 (31%)
No.....	36 (45%)
Don't know	19 (24%)

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

Yes	29 (32%)
No.....	31 (34%)
Don't know	32 (35%)

Q12 Is shouting through the windows a problem here?

Yes	25 (27%)
No.....	51 (55%)
Don't know	16 (17%)

SECTION 10: HEALTH SERVICES

Q1 Is it easy to see the following people if you need to?

	Yes	No	Don't know
The doctor	51 (55%)	34 (37%)	7 (8%)
The nurse	61 (66%)	24 (26%)	7 (8%)
The dentist	34 (37%)	43 (47%)	15 (16%)

Q2 What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?

<i>I have not been</i>	4 (4%)
<i>Very good</i>	8 (9%)
<i>Good</i>	30 (32%)
<i>Neither</i>	29 (31%)
<i>Bad</i>	14 (15%)
<i>Very bad</i>	9 (10%)

Q3	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/all of it in your room?	
	<i>I am not taking any medication</i>	55 (61%)
	<i>Yes, all of my meds</i>	13 (14%)
	<i>Yes, some of my meds</i>	8 (9%)
	<i>No</i>	14 (16%)
Q4	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?	
	<i>Yes</i>	16 (17%)
	<i>No</i>	77 (83%)
Q5	Are you being helped by anyone here with your emotional or mental health problems (e.g. a psychologist, doctor, counsellor, personal officer or another member of staff)?	
	<i>I do not have any emotional or mental health problems</i>	77 (81%)
	<i>Yes</i>	7 (7%)
	<i>No</i>	11 (12%)
Q6	Did you have problems with alcohol when you first arrived here?	
	<i>Yes</i>	6 (6%)
	<i>No</i>	90 (94%)
Q7	Have you received any help with alcohol problems here?	
	<i>Yes</i>	2 (2%)
	<i>No</i>	94 (98%)
Q8	Did you have problems with drugs when you first arrived here?	
	<i>Yes</i>	21 (22%)
	<i>No</i>	74 (78%)
Q9	Do you have problems with drugs now?	
	<i>Yes</i>	4 (4%)
	<i>No</i>	92 (96%)
Q10	Have you received any help with drugs problems here?	
	<i>Yes</i>	14 (15%)
	<i>No</i>	82 (85%)
Q11	How easy or difficult is it to get illegal drugs here?	
	<i>Very easy</i>	5 (5%)
	<i>Easy</i>	3 (3%)
	<i>Neither</i>	4 (4%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	2 (2%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	19 (21%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	59 (64%)

SECTION II: ACTIVITIES

Q1	How old were you when you were last at school?	
	<i>14 or under</i>	39 (41%)
	<i>15 or over</i>	56 (59%)
Q2	Have you ever been excluded from school?	
	<i>Yes</i>	83 (87%)
	<i>No</i>	8 (8%)
	<i>Not applicable</i>	4 (4%)

Q3	Did you ever skip school before you came into custody?				
	Yes				67 (71%)
	No.....				18 (19%)
	Not applicable.....				9 (10%)
Q4	Do you CURRENTLY take part in any of the following activities? (Please tick all that apply to you.)				
	Education				61 (64%)
	A job in this establishment.....				9 (9%)
	Vocational or skills training				10 (11%)
	Offending behaviour programmes				18 (19%)
	I am not currently involved in any of these.....				30 (32%)
Q5	If you have been involved in any of the following activities here, do you think they will help you when you leave prison?				
		<i>Not been involved</i>	Yes	No	Don't know
	Education	12 (14%)	49 (56%)	19 (22%)	8 (9%)
	A job in this establishment	25 (40%)	14 (22%)	11 (17%)	13 (21%)
	Vocational or skills training	27 (41%)	14 (21%)	10 (15%)	15 (23%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	23 (34%)	18 (26%)	12 (18%)	15 (22%)
Q6	Do you usually have association every day?				
	Yes				42 (44%)
	No.....				53 (56%)
Q7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?				
	Don't want to go.....				10 (11%)
	Yes.....				41 (44%)
	No.....				42 (45%)
Q8	How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?				
	Don't want to go.....				4 (4%)
	None.....				19 (21%)
	One to two times				65 (71%)
	Three to five times.....				4 (4%)
	More than five times				0 (0%)

SECTION 12: FAMILY AND FRIENDS

Q1	Are you able to use the telephone every day, if you want to?				
	Yes				63 (66%)
	No.....				30 (32%)
	Don't know				2 (2%)
Q2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?				
	Yes				32 (33%)
	No.....				51 (53%)
	Don't know				13 (14%)
Q3	How many visits do you usually have each week, from family or friends?				
	I don't get visits				19 (20%)
	Less than one a week.....				33 (34%)
	About one a week.....				20 (21%)
	More than one a week.....				8 (8%)
	Don't know				16 (17%)

Q4	How easy is it for your family and friends to visit you here?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	19 (20%)
	<i>Very easy</i>	11 (12%)
	<i>Easy</i>	26 (27%)
	<i>Neither</i>	11 (12%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	15 (16%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	10 (11%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	3 (3%)

Q5	Do your visits usually start on time?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	19 (20%)
	<i>Yes</i>	17 (18%)
	<i>No</i>	46 (48%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	13 (14%)

SECTION 13: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE

Q1	Do you think you will have a problem with any of the following things, when you are released? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Finding accommodation</i>	20 (22%)
	<i>Getting into school or college</i>	34 (37%)
	<i>Getting a job</i>	37 (40%)
	<i>Money/finances</i>	26 (28%)
	<i>Claiming benefits</i>	7 (8%)
	<i>Continuing health services</i>	7 (8%)
	<i>Opening a bank account</i>	11 (12%)
	<i>Avoiding bad relationships</i>	18 (20%)
	<i>I won't have any problems</i>	34 (37%)

Q2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan (i.e. a plan that is discussed in your DTO/planning meetings, which sets out your targets)?	
	<i>Yes</i>	16 (17%)
	<i>No</i>	38 (40%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	41 (43%)

Q3	Were you involved in the development of your plan?	
	<i>I don't have a plan/don't know if I have a plan</i>	79 (86%)
	<i>Yes</i>	10 (11%)
	<i>No</i>	3 (3%)

Q4	Do you understand the targets that have been set in your plan?	
	<i>I don't have a plan/don't know if I have a plan</i>	79 (85%)
	<i>Yes</i>	13 (14%)
	<i>No</i>	1 (1%)

Q5	Do you have a caseworker here?	
	<i>Yes</i>	85 (89%)
	<i>No</i>	3 (3%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	7 (7%)

Q6	Has your caseworker helped to prepare you for release?	
	<i>I don't have a caseworker</i>	10 (11%)
	<i>Yes</i>	22 (24%)
	<i>No</i>	41 (45%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	19 (21%)

Q7	Has your social worker been to visit you since you have been here?		
	<i>I don't have a social worker.....</i>	20 (22%)	
	<i>Yes.....</i>	55 (59%)	
	<i>No.....</i>	18 (19%)	
Q8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?		
	<i>Yes.....</i>	32 (36%)	
	<i>No.....</i>	37 (41%)	
	<i>Don't know.....</i>	21 (23%)	
Q9	Do you know who to contact for help with any of the following problems, before your release? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	<i>Finding accommodation.....</i>	34 (42%)	
	<i>Getting into school or college.....</i>	34 (42%)	
	<i>Getting a job.....</i>	26 (32%)	
	<i>Help with money/finances.....</i>	22 (27%)	
	<i>Help with claiming benefits.....</i>	16 (20%)	
	<i>Continuing health services.....</i>	16 (20%)	
	<i>Opening a bank account.....</i>	16 (20%)	
	<i>Avoiding bad relationships.....</i>	16 (20%)	
	<i>I don't know who to contact.....</i>	34 (42%)	
Q10	What is most likely to stop you offending in the future? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	<i>Not sentenced.....</i>	23 (24%)	<i>Having a mentor (someone you can ask for advice).....</i> 6 (6%)
	<i>Nothing, it is up to me.....</i>	27 (28%)	<i>Having a YOT worker or social worker that I get on with.....</i> 14 (15%)
	<i>Making new friends outside.....</i>	7 (7%)	<i>Having children.....</i> 9 (9%)
	<i>Going back to live with my family.....</i>	11 (12%)	<i>Having something to do that isn't crime</i> 21 (22%)
	<i>Getting a place of my own.....</i>	20 (21%)	<i>This sentence.....</i> 23 (24%)
	<i>Getting a job.....</i>	31 (33%)	<i>Getting into school/college.....</i> 20 (21%)
	<i>Having a partner (girlfriend or boyfriend).....</i>	17 (18%)	<i>Talking about my offending behaviour with staff.....</i> 3 (3%)
	<i>Staying off alcohol/drugs.....</i>	8 (8%)	<i>Anything else.....</i> 5 (5%)
Q11	Do you want to stop offending?		
	<i>Not sentenced.....</i>	23 (24%)	
	<i>Yes.....</i>	64 (68%)	
	<i>No.....</i>	1 (1%)	
	<i>Don't know.....</i>	6 (6%)	
Q12	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here, that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?		
	<i>Not sentenced.....</i>	23 (25%)	
	<i>Yes.....</i>	33 (36%)	
	<i>No.....</i>	35 (38%)	

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



Survey responses from children and young people: HMYOI Feltham A 2017

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 Feltham A	Young People's Comparator	HMYOI Feltham A 2017	HMYOI Feltham A 2015
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		104	490	104	146
SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU					
1.1	Are you 18 years of age?	11%	15%	11%	8%
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	10%	7%	10%	6%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%	100%	99%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	100%	98%	100%	99%
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other category.)	63%	42%	63%	70%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	33%	21%	33%	32%
1.7	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	7%	8%	7%	6%
1.8	Do you have any children?	5%	9%	5%	5%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	12%	20%	12%	15%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	46%	35%	46%	41%
SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE					
2.1	Are you sentenced?	77%	80%	77%	71%
2.2	Is your sentence 12 months or less?	35%	33%	35%	29%
2.3	Have you been in this establishment for one month or less?	14%	17%	14%	16%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	52%	62%	52%	59%
SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS					
On your most recent journey here:					
3.1	Did you feel safe?	80%	77%	80%	76%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	42%	33%	42%	39%
3.3	Did you spend more than 4 hours in the van?	6%	9%	6%	5%
For those who spent 2 or more hours in the escort van:					
3.4	Were you offered a toilet break if you needed it?	9%	13%	9%	6%
3.5	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	49%	44%	49%	31%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	54%	53%	54%	51%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	10%	10%	10%	13%

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

Key to tables

		HMYOI Feltham A	Young People's Comparator	HMYOI Feltham A 2017	HMYOI Feltham A 2015
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		104	490	104	146
SECTION 4: YOUR FIRST FEW DAYS HERE					
4.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	81%	74%	81%	86%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	77%	79%	77%	76%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	62%	65%	62%	57%
When you first arrived, did staff ask if you needed help or support with any of the following:					
4.4a	Not being able to smoke?	44%	47%	44%	33%
4.4b	Loss of property?	18%	18%	18%	13%
4.4c	Feeling scared?	16%	28%	16%	17%
4.4d	Gang problems?	60%	38%	60%	61%
4.4e	Contacting family?	50%	53%	50%	42%
4.4f	Money worries?	14%	15%	14%	13%
4.4g	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	18%	32%	18%	25%
4.4h	Health problems?	50%	54%	50%	47%
4.4i	Getting phone numbers?	44%	38%	44%	31%
4.5	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	71%	79%	71%	78%
When you first arrived, did you have problems with any of the following:					
4.5a	Not being able to smoke?	40%	47%	40%	47%
4.5b	Loss of property?	12%	13%	12%	14%
4.5c	Feeling scared?	7%	15%	7%	11%
4.5d	Gang problems?	21%	13%	21%	34%
4.5e	Contacting family?	25%	34%	25%	21%
4.5f	Money worries?	14%	15%	14%	21%
4.5g	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	7%	18%	7%	15%
4.5h	Health problems?	14%	14%	14%	16%
4.5i	Getting phone numbers?	33%	34%	33%	28%
When you first arrived, were you given any of the following:					
4.6a	Toiletries/basic items?	63%	87%	63%	68%
4.6b	The opportunity to have a shower?	37%	51%	37%	24%
4.6c	Something to eat?	80%	78%	80%	71%
4.6d	A free phone call to friends/family?	73%	70%	73%	77%
4.6e	PIN phone credit?	57%	50%	57%	55%
4.6f	Information about feeling worried/upset?	18%	30%	18%	16%

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

Key to tables

		HMYOI Feltham A	Young People's Comparator	HMYOI Feltham A 2017	HMYOI Feltham A 2015
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		104	490	104	146
Within your first 24 hours, did you have access to the following people or services:					
4.7a	A chaplain?	33%	47%	33%	31%
4.7b	A peer mentor?	11%	10%	11%	7%
4.7c	Childline/Samaritans	18%	15%	18%	15%
4.7d	The prison shop/canteen?	10%	9%	10%	9%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	59%	74%	59%	53%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	71%	75%	71%	71%
4.10	For those who have been on an induction course: did it cover everything you needed to know about the establishment?	53%	52%	53%	45%
SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT					
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	60%	88%	60%	86%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	47%	18%	47%	33%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	13%	17%	13%	13%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	40%	48%	40%	41%
5.5	Is it easy/very easy for you to attend religious services?	44%	45%	44%	47%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	68%	53%	68%	67%
Can you speak to:					
5.7	A chaplain of your faith in private?	61%	63%	61%	63%
5.8	A peer mentor?	24%	25%	24%	31%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	16%	16%	16%	21%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	28%	31%	28%	33%
SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF					
6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	66%	61%	66%	67%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	27%	21%	27%	26%
6.3	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	29%	32%	29%	31%
For those who have met their personal officer:					
6.4	Did you meet your personal (named) officer within the first week?	26%	27%	26%	48%
6.5	Do you see your personal (named) officer at least once a week?	48%	47%	48%	47%
6.6	Do you feel your personal (named) officer tries to help you?	52%	59%	52%	65%

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

Key to tables

		HMYOI Feltham A	Young People's Comparator	HMYOI Feltham A 2017	HMYOI Feltham A 2015
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		104	490	104	146
SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS					
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	52%	64%	52%	40%
For those who have made an application:					
7.2	Do you feel applications are sorted out fairly?	27%	52%	27%	50%
7.3	Do you feel applications are sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	22%	39%	22%	29%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	50%	43%	50%	35%
For those who have made a complaint:					
7.5	Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	15%	29%	15%	37%
7.6	Do you feel complaints are sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	23%	22%	23%	23%
7.7	Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint?	10%	16%	10%	11%
SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE					
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	11%	27%	11%	18%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	31%	37%	31%	42%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	34%	44%	34%	42%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	43%	52%	43%	32%
For those who have had a minor report:					
8.5	Was the process explained clearly to you?	68%	58%	68%	66%
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	69%	69%	69%	60%
For those who have had an adjudication ('nicking'):					
8.7	Was the process explained clearly to you?	85%	75%	85%	88%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (Cand R) since you have been here?	46%	45%	46%	53%
8.9	For those who had spent a night in the care and separation unit: did the staff treat you well/very well?	21%	41%	21%	22%
SECTION 9: SAFETY					
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	39%	44%	39%	51%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	11%	17%	11%	16%

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMYOI Feltham A	Young People's Comparator	HMYOI Feltham A 2017	HMYOI Feltham A 2015
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		104	490	104	146
9.4	Have you ever been victimised by other young people here?	23%	33%	23%	37%
Since you have been here, have other young people:					
9.5a	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	10%	20%	10%	19%
9.5b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	10%	14%	10%	17%
9.5c	Sexually abused you?	0%	2%	0%	1%
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	4%	15%	4%	10%
9.5e	Taken your canteen/property?	2%	8%	2%	2%
9.5f	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	1%	0%	2%
9.5g	Victimised you because of debt?	1%	2%	1%	1%
9.5h	Victimised you because of drugs?	2%	2%	2%	1%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	3%	5%	3%	8%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	2%	3%	2%	6%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	3%	3%	3%	8%
9.5l	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	1%	4%	1%	5%
9.5m	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	1%	3%	1%	1%
9.5n	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	1%	0%	0%
9.5o	Victimised you because of your age?	4%	1%	4%	1%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	2%	0%	3%
9.5q	Victimised you because you were new here?	6%	10%	6%	14%
9.5r	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	2%	4%	2%	5%
9.5s	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	11%	7%	11%	15%

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

Key to tables

		HMYOI Feltham A	Young People's Comparator	HMYOI Feltham A 2017	HMYOI Feltham A 2015
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		104	490	104	146
9.7	Have you ever been victimised by a member of staff here?	24%	33%	24%	32%
Since you have been here, have staff:					
9.8a	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	15%	16%	15%	16%
9.8b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	4%	11%	4%	9%
9.8c	Sexually abused you?	0%	1%	0%	2%
9.8d	Threatened or intimidated you?	4%	9%	4%	9%
9.8e	Taken your canteen/property?	2%	5%	2%	7%
9.8f	Victimised you because of medication?	1%	2%	1%	1%
9.8g	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	0%	0%	1%
9.8h	Victimised you because of drugs?	2%	1%	2%	1%
9.8i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	4%	6%	4%	5%
9.8j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	1%	4%	1%	3%
9.8k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	2%	0%	4%
9.8k	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	1%	1%	1%	2%
9.8m	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	1%	1%	1%	1%
9.8n	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	1%	0%	0%
9.8o	Victimised you because of your age?	5%	2%	5%	2%
9.8p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	0%	0%	2%
9.8q	Victimised you because you were new here?	3%	2%	3%	7%
9.8r	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	3%	2%	3%	5%
9.8s	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	3%	1%	3%	3%
9.8t	Victimised you because you made a complaint?	5%	5%	5%	6%
9.10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	31%	31%	31%	16%
9.11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	32%	21%	32%	31%
9.12	Is shouting through the windows a problem here?	27%	46%	27%	32%

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

Key to tables

		HMYOI Feltham A	Young People's Comparator	HMYOI Feltham A 2017	HMYOI Feltham A 2015
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		104	490	104	146
SECTION 10: HEALTH SERVICES					
10.1a	Is it easy for you to see the doctor?	55%	50%	55%	42%
10.1b	Is it easy for you to see the nurse?	66%	65%	66%	55%
10.1c	Is it easy for you to see the dentist?	37%	26%	37%	26%
10.2	For those who have been to health services: Do you think the overall quality is good/very good?	42%	51%	42%	40%
10.3	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/all of it in your cell?	60%	47%	60%	64%
10.4	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?	17%	27%	17%	15%
10.5	If you have emotional or mental health problems, are you being helped by anyone here?	38%	53%	38%	44%
10.6	Did you have any problems with alcohol when you first arrived?	6%	7%	6%	5%
10.7	Have you received any help with any alcohol problems here?	2%	4%	2%	3%
10.8	Did you have any problems with drugs when you first arrived?	22%	33%	22%	26%
10.9	Do you have a problem with drugs now?	4%	8%	4%	8%
10.10	Have you received any help with any drug problems here?	15%	20%	15%	18%
10.11	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs here?	9%	24%	9%	18%
SECTION 11: ACTIVITIES					
11.1	Were you 14 or younger when you were last at school?	41%	38%	41%	35%
11.2	Have you ever been excluded from school?	87%	87%	87%	84%
11.3	Did you ever skip school before you came into custody?	71%	72%	71%	68%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:					
11.4a	Education?	64%	77%	64%	64%
11.4b	A job in this establishment?	10%	15%	10%	19%
11.4c	Vocational or skills training?	10%	9%	10%	11%
11.4d	Offending behaviour programmes?	19%	19%	19%	11%
11.4e	Nothing	31%	16%	31%	23%

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

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		HMYOI Feltham A	Young People's Comparator	HMYOI Feltham A 2017	HMYOI Feltham A 2015
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse					
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details					
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference					
Number of completed questionnaires returned		104	490	104	146
For those who have taken part in the following activities while in this establishment, do you think that they will help you when you leave prison:					
11.5a	Education?	64%	60%	64%	49%
11.5b	A job in this establishment?	37%	37%	37%	39%
11.5c	Vocational or skills training?	36%	37%	36%	44%
11.5d	Offending behaviour programmes?	40%	47%	40%	38%
11.6	Do you usually have association every day?	44%	53%	44%	83%
11.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	44%	63%	44%	78%
11.8	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	0%	2%	0%	2%
SECTION 12: KEEPING IN TOUCH WITH FAMILY AND FRIENDS					
12.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	66%	80%	66%	82%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	34%	52%	34%	50%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	29%	36%	29%	27%
12.4	Is it easy/very easy for your family and friends to visit you here?	39%	28%	39%	33%
12.5	Do your visits start on time?	18%	40%	18%	27%
SECTION 13: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE					
Do you think you will have a problem with the following, when you are released:					
13.1a	Finding accommodation?	22%	28%	22%	28%
13.1b	Getting into school or college?	37%	34%	37%	38%
13.1c	Getting a job?	40%	53%	40%	46%
13.1d	Money/finances?	28%	35%	28%	32%
13.1e	Claiming benefits?	7%	15%	7%	10%
13.1f	Continuing health services?	7%	9%	7%	8%
13.1g	Opening a bank account?	12%	16%	12%	12%
13.1h	Avoiding bad relationships?	20%	14%	20%	17%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	17%	50%	17%	30%
For those with a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan:					
13.3	Were you involved in the development of your plan?	75%	84%	75%	82%
13.4	Do you understand the targets set in your plan?	94%	89%	94%	92%
13.5	Do you have a caseworker here?	90%	92%	90%	87%
13.6	Has your caseworker helped to prepare you for release?	27%	46%	27%	36%
For those with a social worker:					
13.7	Has your social worker been to visit you since you have been here?	75%	72%	75%	78%
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	36%	38%	36%	39%

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

Key to tables

		HMYOI Feltham A	Young People's Comparator	HMYOI Feltham A 2017	HMYOI Feltham A 2015
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		104	490	104	146
Do you know who to contact for help with the following problems?					
13.9a	Finding accommodation	42%	26%	42%	20%
13.9b	Getting into school or college	42%	30%	42%	28%
13.9c	Getting a job	32%	31%	32%	27%
13.9d	Help with money/finances	28%	24%	28%	20%
13.9e	Help with claiming benefits	19%	17%	19%	14%
13.9f	Continuing health services	19%	16%	19%	12%
13.9g	Opening a bank account	19%	21%	19%	16%
13.9h	Avoiding bad relationships	19%	13%	19%	12%
For those who were sentenced:					
13.11	Do you want to stop offending?	91%	89%	91%	87%
13.12	Have you done anything or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?	49%	54%	49%	52%

Diversity analysis



Key question responses (ethnicity and religion) HMYOI Feltham A 2017

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

Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic young people	White young people	Muslim young people	Non-Muslim young people
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		64	37	32	66
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	8%	14%	13%	9%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)			87%	51%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	46%	11%		
1.5	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	0%	18%	3%	8%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	9%	16%	10%	13%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	37%	61%	50%	45%
2.1	Are you sentenced?	78%	73%	82%	76%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	53%	51%	49%	54%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	45%	39%	58%	35%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	51%	60%	65%	49%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	9%	11%	13%	9%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	70%	89%	71%	81%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	56%	73%	65%	62%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	60%	59%	63%	57%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	71%	67%	78%	68%
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	50%	76%	64%	56%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	40%	57%	58%	40%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	10%	18%	16%	10%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	37%	48%	35%	42%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	69%	71%	81%	65%
Can you speak to:					
5.7	A chaplain of your faith in private?	71%	44%	69%	57%
5.8	A peer mentor?	26%	20%	20%	24%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	16%	16%	19%	14%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	30%	27%	41%	23%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic young people	White young people	Muslim young people	Non-Muslim young people
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		64	37	32	66
6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	56%	83%	64%	67%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	31%	19%	32%	25%
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	45%	65%	47%	57%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	47%	53%	50%	48%
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	9%	17%	11%	13%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	26%	41%	29%	33%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	28%	45%	22%	41%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	47%	39%	53%	39%
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	78%	52%	86%	62%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	53%	34%	60%	41%
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	40%	39%	41%	40%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	9%	16%	3%	16%
9.4	Have you been victimised by other young people here?	23%	25%	22%	24%
Since you have been here, have other young people:					
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	6%	2%	3%	5%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	3%	2%	3%	3%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	3%	0%	3%	1%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	3%	2%	3%	3%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	0%	0%	0%
9.7	Have you been victimised by staff here?	26%	23%	23%	24%
Since you have been here, have staff:					
9.8d	Threatened or intimidated you?	6%	2%	6%	3%
9.8i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	6%	2%	11%	0%
9.8j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	1%	0%	3%	0%
9.8k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	0%	0%	0%
9.8p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	0%	0%	0%
9.10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	25%	46%	26%	34%
9.11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	24%	45%	29%	34%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic young people	White young people	Muslim young people	Non-Muslim young people
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		64	37	32	66
10.1a	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the doctor?	55%	55%	51%	57%
10.1b	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the nurse?	64%	69%	63%	69%
10.4	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	12%	27%	14%	18%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:					
11.4a	Education?	61%	69%	66%	66%
11.4b	A job in this establishment?	10%	9%	14%	8%
11.4c	Vocational or skills training?	15%	5%	11%	11%
11.4d	Offending behaviour programmes?	22%	17%	14%	23%
11.4e	Nothing?	32%	31%	34%	28%
11.6	Do you usually have association every day?	34%	61%	46%	44%
11.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	44%	46%	49%	43%
11.8	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	0%	0%	0%	0%
12.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	61%	74%	71%	61%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	34%	31%	49%	25%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	27%	35%	29%	31%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	14%	19%	17%	15%
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	32%	44%	33%	39%

Diversity analysis - disability



Key question responses (disability analysis) HMYOI Feltham A 2017

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		12	90
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	7%	10%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	100%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	100%	100%
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	50%	65%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	29%	33%
1.5	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	7%	7%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	67%	44%
2.1	Are you sentenced?	73%	77%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	62%	51%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	50%	40%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	54%	54%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	15%	9%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	62%	79%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	46%	64%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	50%	60%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	62%	71%
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	62%	59%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	43%	46%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	7%	14%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	54%	39%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	67%	68%
Can you speak to:			
5.7	A chaplain of your faith in private?	58%	61%
5.8	A peer mentor?	29%	24%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	7%	17%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	27%	29%

Diversity analysis - disability

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	54%	67%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	7%	30%
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	71%	50%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	73%	45%
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	7%	12%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	17%	32%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	29%	35%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	67%	40%
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	86%	67%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	57%	44%
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	50%	38%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	43%	7%
9.4	Have you been victimised by other young people here?	33%	22%
Since you have been here, have other young people:			
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	14%	2%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	7%	2%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	7%	1%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	7%	2%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	0%
9.7	Have you been victimised by staff here?	57%	19%
Since you have been here, have staff:			
9.8d	Threatened or intimidated you?	7%	4%
9.8i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	7%	4%
9.8j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	1%
9.8k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	0%
9.8p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	0%
9.10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	36%	31%
9.11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	14%	34%

Diversity analysis - disability

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
10.1a	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the doctor?	50%	56%
10.1b	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the nurse?	57%	67%
10.4	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	57%	11%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:			
11.4a	Education?	43%	66%
11.4b	A job in this establishment?	0%	11%
11.4c	Vocational or skills training?	7%	11%
11.4d	Offending behaviour programmes?	7%	21%
11.4e	Nothing?	50%	30%
11.6	Do you usually have association every day?	46%	44%
11.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	39%	46%
11.8	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	0%	0%
12.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	86%	63%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	50%	30%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	33%	29%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	14%	16%
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	39%	36%

Diversity analysis



Key question responses (local authority care analysis) HMYOI Feltham A 2017

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Young people who have been in local authority care	Young people who have not been in local authority care
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		45	52
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	11%	8%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	100%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	100%	100%
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	50%	73%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	35%	30%
1.5	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	4%	8%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	18%	8%
2.1	Are you sentenced?	80%	75%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	31%	65%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	47%	37%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	53%	54%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	7%	11%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	82%	73%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	61%	61%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	64%	53%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	72%	68%
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	61%	59%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	44%	48%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	13%	12%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	39%	40%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	71%	62%
Can you speak to:			
5.7	A chaplain of your faith in private?	53%	67%
5.8	A peer mentor?	19%	32%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	20%	14%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	35%	22%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Young people who have been in local authority care	Young people who have not been in local authority care
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	64%	70%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	23%	30%
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	55%	55%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	49%	50%
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	11%	13%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	32%	32%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	30%	40%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	53%	39%
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	70%	68%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	45%	49%
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	45%	30%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	11%	11%
9.4	Have you been victimised by other young people here?	25%	20%
Since you have been here, have other young people:			
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	4%	4%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	2%	4%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	4%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	2%	4%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	0%
9.7	Have you been victimised by staff here?	30%	21%
Since you have been here, have staff:			
9.8d	Threatened or intimidated you?	9%	0%
9.8i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	4%	4%
9.8j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	2%
9.8k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	0%
9.8p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	0%
9.10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	38%	24%
9.11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	33%	33%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Young people who have been in local authority care	Young people who have not been in local authority care
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
10.1a	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the doctor?	58%	48%
10.1b	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the nurse?	75%	56%
10.4	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	22%	15%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:			
11.4a	Education?	56%	69%
11.4b	A job in this establishment?	10%	11%
11.4c	Vocational or skills training?	8%	13%
11.4d	Offending behaviour programmes?	19%	20%
11.4e	Nothing?	42%	24%
11.6	Do you usually have association every day?	42%	46%
11.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	40%	50%
11.8	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	0%	0%
12.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	67%	69%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	37%	29%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	21%	35%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	21%	13%
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	40%	34%