

Report on an unannounced inspection of

HMYOI Cookham Wood

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

14–25 August 2017

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



Crown copyright 2018

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 material you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

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

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

Printed and published by:
Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons
Clive House
5th floor
70 Petty France
London
SW1H 9EX
England

Contents

Introduction	5
Fact page	7
About this inspection and report	9
Summary	13
Section 1. Safety	21
Section 2. Respect	35
Section 3. Purposeful activity	47
Section 4. Resettlement	55
Section 5. Summary of recommendations and good practice	61
Section 6. Appendices	67
Appendix I: Inspection team	67
Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report	69
Appendix III: Establishment population profile	75
Appendix IV: Summary of children and young people questionnaires and interviews	79

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

Cookham Wood young offender institution near Rochester in Kent has the capacity to accommodate 188 boys aged 15 to 18. At the time of our inspection there were 161 boys in residence from a catchment area extending across much of southern England. Boys were being detained for many reasons, and ranged from those recently remanded to those beginning lengthy and sometimes indeterminate sentences. Due to the risks, challenges and vulnerabilities presented by the profile of boys held in the youth estate, institutions like Cookham Wood are inspected annually. Our last inspection was in September 2016 when the establishment had made good progress and had improved in two of our healthy prison tests, respect and purposeful activity. We were therefore concerned that this progress had not been maintained over the last year, and in three areas – respect, purposeful activity and resettlement – it had declined.

Early days work continued to be a strength and boys were supported well in reception and on the induction unit. Governance of the yellow and green card reward system had improved. There was also a good range of interventions available to support boys and help them to progress.

However, one in four boys reported having felt unsafe, a figure which had more than doubled since the last inspection. Levels of violence and incidents of self-harm, two of the key indicators of safety, had increased. There was little evidence of an effective strategy to reduce the violence and address the poor behaviour. Instead we found under-reporting of incidents and behaviour management tools that were underused. We observed boys who were not challenged when they were deliberately holding up movement and making inappropriate comments to other boys and staff. Some serious incidents of violence also went without punishment due to the amount of adjudication hearings that were not proceeded with.

At the last inspection we praised the introduction of the integrated behaviour management system ‘positive attitudes created together’ (PACT) as a useful tool for managing violence and bullying and providing support for victims. We were also encouraged by newly implemented plans to progress boys out of segregation into units designed to provide enhanced support for those with complex needs and behaviours. On this inspection we were disappointed to find that the PACT system had fallen into disuse and there had been an inexplicable lack of progress in developing the enhanced support units. We found that the progression landing (BI) provided a regime akin to that offered on the segregation unit and that these regimes, as well as the regime on Cedar unit, were too frequently curtailed.

The main prison regime was also poor and unpredictable. The lack of time out of cell restricted access to education, interventions and meaningful interaction with staff and other boys. What was perhaps most unforgivable was that there were many skilled staff and partners who were keen to work with boys to help them progress but their efforts were frustrated by the failure to unlock boys on time, if at all. We were told by numerous professionals that this was not uncommon. The lack of a shared sense of purpose and integration between some residential staff and those delivering interventions was hindering the progress of boys at Cookham Wood. While we did not underestimate the risks presented by some of the boys at the establishment and the need to manage their movements carefully, some of the unlock procedures were unnecessarily cumbersome and created further delays to an already curtailed regime.

Finally, while the establishment recognised that they held many boys who posed significant risk, there was insufficient focus on the reduction of these risks. Sentence plans did not drive boys’ progression through their time at Cookham Wood. Objectives were not focused on the reduction of risk and reviews were not attended by the staff who needed to help them meet those objectives.

A new governor had been appointed just weeks before our visit. We were encouraged by his optimism and plans to address the issues we have highlighted in our report. Cookham Wood retains many redeeming features, not least an extended team of enthusiastic staff with a wide range of skills. They now need to focus on ensuring that boys can access the services they need to progress.

Peter Clarke CVO OBE QPM
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

October 2017

Fact page

Task of the establishment

Young offender institution for boys aged 15 to 18 years

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

Public

Region/Department

Youth Custody Service

Number held

161

Certified normal accommodation

188

Operational capacity

188

Date of last full inspection

September 2016

Brief history

HMYOI Cookham Wood was built in the 1970s, originally for young men, but its use was changed to meet the growing need for secure female accommodation at the time. In 2007-8, it changed its function to accommodate 15 to 17-year-old young men to reduce capacity pressures in London and the south-east for this age group.

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

Short description of residential units

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

One room to accommodate a young person with a disability.

Phoenix unit – seven-bed separation unit.

Cedar unit – 17-bed enhanced support unit

Name of governor/director

Paul Durham

Escort contractor

GeoAmey

Health service commissioner and providers

Primary Care – Oxleas NHS Foundation Trust

Health and well-being – Central and North West London NHS Foundation Trust

Substance misuse service – Addaction

Learning and skills providers

Novus (The Manchester College)

Independent Monitoring Board chair

Anne Finlayson

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 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** *Boys were received and inducted well and formal safeguarding procedures were in place. One in four boys felt unsafe and levels of violence were high. Efforts to reduce violence lacked coordination. Systems to manage bullying and support for victims had deteriorated. Levels of self-harm had increased significantly. Management of ACCT² was adequate. Work to progress boys with complex needs lacked rigour and too many boys remained segregated within the complex cohort group (CCG).³ There was better use of rewards to motivate good behaviour. Bad behaviour caused disruption to the regime, which affected the delivery of important work. Too many adjudications were not proceeded with and, as a result, some of the most serious violence went unpunished. Use of force was high but usually proportionate. Substance misuse services were good. **Outcomes for children and young people were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.***
- S2** *At the last inspection in 2016, we found that outcomes for children and young people in Cookham Wood were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test. We made 15 recommendations about safety. At this follow-up inspection we found that seven of the recommendations had been achieved, one had been partially achieved and seven had not been achieved.*
- S3** Boys continued to arrive at the prison late at night, even from local courts. They were treated well in reception and staff identified key information, including involvement in gangs. Movement to residential units was swift. Induction was good, and boys were given timely and comprehensive information. Boys spent too much time locked up between induction modules, although allocation to education was quick. The induction unit was calm, and staff were kind and reassuring. The peer mentor provided invaluable support to new arrivals.
- S4** Policies and procedures were in place to identify safeguarding issues. Allegations about staff were referred promptly to the local authority designated officer and joint evaluation meetings provided a good multidisciplinary assessment of incidents. However, there was a gap: the establishment had not defined a 'significant incident' within their policy, which meant that a small number of issues were not referred to the local authority.
- S5** One in four boys felt unsafe at Cookham Wood, more than double the number at the last inspection. Violence had increased over the same period, and not all incidents were recorded. There was no clear strategy to reduce violence and the pockets of good work that were in place were not coordinated effectively. Efforts by the newly formed conflict resolution team were promising but work to challenge gang culture required further development. Managers were not cognisant of the fact that systems to manage bullying and support for victims of bullying had deteriorated and were underused.
- S6** Levels of self-harm had increased and we found evidence that incidents had not been recorded. Some incidents of serious self-harm had not been subject to local investigation to identify lessons learned. Use of the constant watch cells had increased since the last inspection. The care for boys subject to ACCT case management and the quality of ACCT documentation were mostly adequate. All cases were discussed at the weekly safer regimes meeting, which was good.

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

³ Complex cohort group (CCG) is the collective name given to three areas of the establishment dedicated to the management of boys with complex needs and challenging behaviours (see paragraph 1.31 for full description).

- S7 The prison did not have an overarching behaviour management strategy. The aim of the CCG to manage boys out of segregated conditions and onto mainstream wings was sound. However, the plan was in its infancy at the last inspection and very little had been done to progress it since then. Too many boys remained locked up within the complex cohort and not enough was done to facilitate and maximise access to the important services and interventions in place to support them. It was positive that boys living on general wings did not spend excessive periods on the basic regime. The use of green cards to reward and encourage good behaviour was now proving to be a useful tool and governance of the system had improved. Some low-level bad behaviour, which often went unchallenged, caused disruption to the regime, which in turn delayed other boys' access to important services.
- S8 Not all of the security controls in place had been effective in reducing violence. Some procedural security arrangements were cumbersome and delayed the delivery of important work that may have been more effective in reducing violence. When staff submitted information to the security department the intelligence was good; however, some incidents were not reported. Adjudication charges were appropriate and hearings were fair. Oversight of the adjudication process was weak and 143 adjudications had not been proceeded with, some of which were for violent offences.
- S9 The use of force had once again increased since our previous inspection and remained higher than comparable prisons. In most cases, force was used appropriately to protect boys from violence.
- S10 The living conditions and regime in the segregation unit remained poor. The use of the segregation unit had reduced since our previous inspection but the first two stages of the regime on the progression landing (BI) were akin to segregation with boys being managed on good order in much the same way as they would be in the segregation unit. When they were unlocked, boys could access a range of quality interventions including harm minimisation and structured treatment, and their care was well coordinated.
- S11 Boys could access a range of quality interventions including harm minimisation, brief interventions and structured treatment. Their care was well co-ordinated and the overall strategic approach to substance misuse was developing.

Respect

S12 *The provision of telephones and screened showers in single cells was excellent. Too many cells were dirty and graffiti was widespread. Relationships were positive and most staff managed boys with care and patience. The youth council lacked impact, although there was good use of peer support. Equality work was not given appropriate priority and again there was little consultation with boys with protected characteristics. The chaplaincy provided a good service. Boys lacked confidence in the applications and complaints systems, with some justification. The quality of health services was good. The food was adequate and some boys could eat out together. **Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***

S13 *At the last inspection in 2016, we found that outcomes for children and young people in Cookham Wood were good against this healthy prison test. We made 20 recommendations about respect.⁴ At this follow-up inspection we found that four of the recommendations had been achieved, three had been partially achieved and 13 had not been achieved.*

S14 Cedar, A3 and B3 provided some of the better living accommodation. The provision of telephones and screened showers in single cells was excellent. The standard of cleanliness and tidiness in many cells and on some landings was poor. Offensive graffiti was widespread and promoted gang culture. Boys lacked confidence in the poorly managed applications system.

S15 Most interactions between boys and staff were positive, and we saw examples of staff from all disciplines demonstrating patience, resilience and care. While most staff were professional and committed, a few were less proactive and not fully occupied. This left boys locked up for longer than necessary, and hindered the delivery of important services. Regime issues and staffing shortfalls reduced the opportunity for some staff and boys to form meaningful relationships. Boys lacked confidence in the youth council. More was needed to ensure it captured the opinions and experiences of the young population and led to positive improvements for those it represented. Peer support work was developing well.

S16 Strategic management of equality work had weakened since the last inspection. There was an up-to-date policy but the equality action team did not meet regularly enough to be effective and there was no equality action plan. Responses to some discrimination incident report forms did not demonstrate sufficient investigation into the issue raised, although management oversight of this had been strengthened recently. There was some good promotion of diversity. In our survey, more boys from a black and minority ethnic background said they had been subject to use of force and disciplinary procedures than their white peers. There were no consultation arrangements to explore these issues. The chaplaincy offered an appropriate range of services and classes, and provided good pastoral support to boys.

S17 Responses to complaints were timely but there was no quality assurance and only a quarter of boys said that complaints were dealt with fairly.

S18 The quality of health services was good and appropriately child focused. Access to services was significantly hampered by delays in movements and frequent lockdowns which wasted valuable clinical resources. Partnership working and clinical governance were generally effective, although there was an under-reporting of clinical incidents. There was an

⁴ 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.

appropriate range of primary care services and age-appropriate screening programmes within acceptable timescales. Medicine management was very good. Many aspects of dental provision were reasonably good. Boys waited too long for an appointment. The health and well-being team continued to provide a very good child and adolescent focused multidisciplinary mental health service.

- S19 The quality and quantity of lunch and evening meals remained adequate but breakfast was inadequate for the age group. Some boys could eat together for the evening meal. A generous reception pack and pin credit was provided free to new receptions. However, boys could then wait up to 10 days to receive their first shop order.

Purposeful activity

S20 *Time out of cell was inadequate. Regime curtailments and unlock procedures hindered access to important services and support. Leadership and management of learning, skills and work required improvement. Attendance was poor. Punctuality had improved but was still not good enough. Once boys were at education the provision was good and the curriculum met the needs of learners. The quality of teaching, learning and assessment was good and boys achieved very well, including in English and mathematics. Behaviour in lessons was good and boys were motivated to learn. The library provision met boys' needs. PE was still limited to recreational sessions. **Outcomes for children and young people were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.***

S21 *At the last inspection in 2016, we found that outcomes for children and young people in Cookham Wood were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made eight recommendations about purposeful activity. At this follow-up inspection we found that two of the recommendations had been achieved and six had not been achieved.*

S22 Time out of cell had reduced since the last inspection and did not meet the needs of boys at all. The average weekday time out of cell was about 4.5 hours but many boys had considerably less. Poor management of the regime hindered access to services across the establishment and created a significant waste of resource. Access to association was unpredictable and poor for most boys.

S23 The leadership and management of learning and skills required improvement. There had been some improvement in the management of punctuality since the previous inspection but, on too many occasions, boys still arrived at activities up to 30 minutes late. Until very recently, regime restrictions had resulted in the closure of education classes and attendance was poor. However, this was now showing signs of improvement. Novus managed learning and skills very well and their flexible approach to learning pathways, which incorporated English and mathematics skills development, was effective.

S24 The curriculum met the needs of boys. There was now adequate provision for all, with more opportunities in education, vocational training and peer mentoring. Outreach provision was effective but the resource was stretched. Partnership working with other agencies provided a wide and interesting range of additional social and cultural activities.

S25 The vast majority of teaching, learning and assessment was good and boys achieved very well. Achievements in functional skills in English and mathematics had improved significantly and were very high. Boys were extremely respectful and behaved well. The majority were motivated to learn and several boys were following higher level learning, for example distance learning and peer mentoring.

- S26 The library was a good resource and access had improved despite the regime constraints. Access to the gym was not good enough. Provision was limited to recreational activities and work with the community remained underdeveloped.

Resettlement

S27 *The strategy to manage resettlement was not informed by an up-to-date needs analysis. Organisational uncertainties and staffing shortfalls affected the work of the department. The provision of release on temporary licence (ROTL) and early release was good, as were transition arrangements for boys moving on from Cookham Wood. There were regular remand and sentence planning meetings but caseloads were high which affected the frequency of contact and the quality of sentence planning. Public protection and MAPPA (multi-agency public protection arrangements) were mostly sound. Not all looked-after children received the support they were entitled to. Despite good efforts by caseworkers to reintegrate boys on release, outcomes on some important pathways required improvement. Provision for children and families had improved. **Outcomes for children and young people were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.***

S28 *At the last inspection in 2016, we found that outcomes for children and young people in Cookham Wood were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 11 recommendations about resettlement. At this follow-up inspection we found that three of the recommendations had been achieved and eight had not been achieved.*

- S29 The strategy to manage resettlement was not informed by a current needs analysis.
- S30 Uncertainty about the future management of the department was affecting the ability to plan effectively and had created staffing shortfalls. Despite this, the team continued to facilitate some good ROTL and early release opportunities, both of which motivated good behaviour in many boys. Transition planning for boys moving to new establishments was better than we usually see.
- S31 There continued to be regular remand and planning meetings for high-risk cases which were appropriately allocated among the casework team. However, meetings were often delayed by the regime and, with the exception of the mental health service, contributions from internal professionals was poor. Caseloads had increased since the previous inspection which affected one-to-one contact with boys, some of whom received no contact between reviews. The sentence plan was not central to the boys' progression, and in our survey fewer than half the boys knew they had a remand or sentence plan.
- S32 Boys who were likely to be subject to MAPPA on release were identified by caseworkers. Risk levels were determined in sufficient time before release for MAPPA levels two and three.
- S33 Looked-after children were identified by caseworkers on arrival and attempts were made to ensure that all boys received appropriate support from their local authority. However, we found boys who were not receiving the support they were entitled to.
- S34 Caseworkers ensured that practical arrangements for release were well organised and all boys were met on release. However, we saw one boy's release delayed until 3.30pm without adequate justification, even though his parents had been waiting outside the establishment since 9.30am. Information about boys' time in custody was not always shared appropriately with other agencies on release.

- S35 Despite efforts by caseworkers, too many boys did not have accommodation arranged in time for their final review and a minority of boys were released to inappropriate hostel type accommodation.
- S36 The Novus engagement and resettlement team worked well with young people and provided good support from induction to release. The virtual campus⁵ was working effectively to support job search and help with learning. Despite this, not enough boys entered education, training or employment on release.
- S37 Discharge arrangements for boys with ongoing health and substance misuse needs were generally good, with effective communication with community services.
- S38 Provision for children and families had improved since the previous inspection and now included the 'fathers in prison and healthy relationships' course. Access to visits was adequate but the visits facilities were basic. Family days now took place monthly and were well received.
- S39 There were not enough offending behaviour interventions to meet need. However, there was some good individual work to address harmful sexual behaviours and a few boys benefited from the 'most valuable player' programme, group work which focused on reducing violence.

⁵ Internet access for prisoners to community education, training and employment opportunities.

Main concerns and recommendations

S40 **Concern:** The number of violent incidents had increased and was high. Data on violence were inaccurate. Systems to manage violent and bullying behaviour, and support for victims of bullying, had deteriorated.

Recommendation: Accurate data should be used to inform a clear and effective strategy to reduce levels of violence. Systems to manage violent behaviour and support the victims of bullying should be strengthened.

S41 **Concern:** Little progress had been made on the progression landing (BI) since the last inspection and a large number of boys remained segregated on the unit. Management of the complex cohort lacked rigour and was not adequately resourced to progress boys effectively back to normal location.

Recommendation: The complex cohort units should be staffed and managed more effectively to fulfil their progressive purpose. Boys segregated within the cohort should have well communicated individual plans, with more meaningful targets, to support safe and swift reintegration.

S42 **Concern:** The regime was poor and unpredictable. Boys did not have enough time out of cell to facilitate education, interventions, exercise, communal eating and evening association. The unpredictable nature of the regime led to a significant waste of resource as professionals from departments across the establishment were left waiting for boys to arrive at sessions.

Recommendation: All boys should be able to access 10 hours out of their cell each day. The regime should be predictable to enable boys to access punctually the services designed to support their well-being and help to reduce their risk of reoffending.

S43 **Concern:** There was still no prison-wide approach to preventing reoffending and the sentence plan was not central to the boys' progression. Some training plans were of poor quality with not enough focus on risk and reoffending. Attendance at training planning meetings was not sufficiently multidisciplinary and written contributions were poor.

Recommendation: Individual training and remand plans should be central to a boy's progression. Targets should be specific and address identified risks of reoffending and harm. Staff from all relevant departments should be represented at training planning or remand management reviews, or submit a detailed report if they cannot attend.

Section 1. Safety

Courts, escorts and transfers

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.1** Most journey times for boys coming from local or London courts remained relatively short. However, some boys spent long periods at court or on the escort van. They still arrived late in the evening, most between 8 and 9pm and some later because adult prisoners were dropped off first. In our survey, 26% of boys said that they travelled with adults and only 46% that they were treated well by escort staff. When boys arrived, handovers were prompt and we observed courteous interactions between escort staff and boys.

Recommendation

- I.2** Boys should not travel with adults and their arrival at the prison should not be delayed.

Early days in custody

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.3** The reception area was shabby but clean and staff were welcoming. Boys could have a meal and a drink on arrival. They were provided with a free grocery pack and moved to the induction unit quickly (see paragraph 2.98). Most boys said in our survey that they spent less than two hours in reception. Some boys still arrived with limited information, especially if they were on remand. Reception staff gathered as much information as they could, including an initial identification of risk and vulnerability. In our survey, 79% of boys said that they had problems when they first arrived.
- I.4** All new arrivals spent their first night and induction period on B3, where the living conditions were reasonable apart from some graffiti in cells. The unit staff provided reassurance and prepared boys for what to expect. Boys were able to have a shower and were given a pack of basic provisions.
- I.5** Although staff ensured that boys received a free call home to their family, nearly half experienced problems getting phone numbers approved and transferred onto their accounts to make further calls.
- I.6** All boys were given a comprehensive induction booklet on arrival. The induction programme lasted for up to two weeks, although boys who had been at Cookham Wood recently were fast tracked. Induction started the morning after arrival, with a presentation explaining the regime and emphasising the benefits of positive behaviour. A peer mentor attended the presentation to give advice and support to new arrivals.

- 1.7** Boys were seen quickly by staff from other departments, including education and the conflict resolution team, a small team of officers who facilitated mediation and work with gangs (see paragraph 1.34).
- 1.8** The landing was quiet and calm during the day, and boys who had arrived recently said that it was quiet enough to sleep. During our night visit, some shouting and noise could be heard from the wings.

Good practice

- 1.9** *A peer mentor was based on the induction unit. He attended the induction presentation and offered valuable advice and support to new arrivals.*

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.

- 1.10** Safeguarding and child protection policies were in place. However, other relevant policies did not integrate or cross reference the safeguarding policy, particularly the bullying and victimisation policies. Opportunities to safeguard children subject to significant and prolonged bullying were missed. Safeguarding meetings were scheduled to take place monthly but the most recent meeting had been held in May 2017 and, although informal discussion took place, this was no substitute for formal management oversight. There was no representation from the local authority at the establishment safeguarding meeting.
- 1.11** The head of safeguarding had been in post for eight months and had started to develop links with the local safeguarding children board (LSCB). There had been no permanent local authority designated officer (LADO) until recently, but relationships and communications were improving and practice was starting to improve as a result. The LADO had established a weekly discussion clinic where incidents could be discussed quickly and advice on appropriate action given. Staff had attended an awareness session on the role of the LADO and work was planned to quality assure safeguarding referrals.
- 1.12** The safeguarding team had developed good working relationships with the social work team. However, there was a lack of clarity on the specific roles and responsibilities of the safeguarding, social work and case management teams.

Child protection

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.13 During the previous six months, 48 child protection cases had been referred to the local authority, most of which concerned allegations of excessive use of force. Referrals were made and responded to quickly, and the prison had an effective tracking system to follow up actions, allowing them to escalate problems if they occurred. However, notice of closure of referrals from the local authority was not always prompt, and some remained on the tracking system despite having been fully investigated and concluded.
- I.14 There was no definition or procedure for notifying the LSCB of a 'significant incident' so that they could provide independent scrutiny and potentially additional support. We found two such incidents, one involving a boy who was taken hostage and abused in front of other boys and another which involved a serious assault on a member of staff.
- I.15 There was an informal mechanism to identify any patterns and trends, including repeated complaints about staff, but no formal or systematic analysis.
- I.16 The LADO attended the weekly minimising and managing physical restraint meetings and advised on the suitability of proposed referrals. Use of force records were still often incomplete which hindered the review of incidents.
- I.17 The prison continued to notify the local authority of instances of boys being strip-searched under restraint. This notification was good practice.

Recommendation

- I.18 **The local safeguarding children board should be notified of all significant child protection incidents.**

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.19 In our survey, 51% of boys said they had felt unsafe at some point at Cookham Wood. Twenty-five per cent said they felt unsafe now against 10% at our previous inspection.
- I.20 There had been a decline in the identification of victims of bullying. We found examples of boys telling wing staff of their concerns which had not been referred to the safeguarding team for investigation. In our survey, 35% of boys said they had been victimised by other boys against 21% at our previous inspection.
- I.21 During the previous six months, 26 incidents of bullying had been reported, but entries in wing observation books showed a much higher number (see paragraph 1.61). We heard some staff challenging intimidating behaviour while others did not.

- I.22** Formal support for victims of bullying had deteriorated. Individual support plans were no longer used and there was no systematic support for victims. The establishment was unable to identify the full extent of bullying. Staff did, however, listen to messages left on the 24-hour hotline for families to report concerns about bullying and these concerns were followed up.

Recommendation

- I.23** **All incidents of bullying and intimidation should be reported, investigated and appropriately managed. Systems to identify and support victims of bullying should be improved.**

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.24** Recorded levels of self-harm had increased. During the previous six months, 39 acts of self-harm had been recorded compared with 15 at the time of the last inspection. Some incidents of self-harm were not recorded appropriately and managers were not aware of the actual levels of self-harm. We were told that there had been no serious self-harm incidents in the previous six months. However, we reviewed a number of incident reports that clearly described self-harm that should have been defined as serious and would have warranted investigation. We were concerned that there was no process for identifying a serious act of self-harm and then investigating it to provide appropriate support and learn lessons.
- I.25** The constant supervision cells had been used 11 times for seven boys in the previous six months. Cells used for constant watch were sparse and had graffiti on the walls. One cell had not been cleaned since it had been used two months previously.
- I.26** During the previous six months, 84 ACCT⁶ documents had been opened for boys at risk of suicide or self-harm, almost double the number at the last inspection. Some care maps had not been fully completed and observational entries did not always record interaction with staff. There was evidence of delays to post-closure reviews, which undermined the system. We were concerned that the quality assurance procedure to monitor the completion of ACCT documentation was not addressing the issues we found.
- I.27** All boys subject to ACCT case management were discussed at the weekly safer regimes meeting, which was good, although cases closed during the week were not discussed.

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

Recommendations

- I.28** There should be a procedure for the identification of incidents of serious self-harm so that they can be investigated and learned from.
- I.29** The quality of ACCT case management documents and support for boys in crisis should be improved.

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.30** The establishment lacked an effective overarching strategy to manage all aspects of behaviour management. Staff had stopped using the ‘positive attitudes created together’ (PACT) system that had been introduced in 2016. Despite this, some managers and documentation still referred to the system as a means to manage issues in a number of areas including use of force and within the complex cohort group (CCG)⁷ (see paragraph I.83).
- I.31** The CCG had been set up to manage boys with complex needs and challenging behaviour. This was a local initiative with an aim of managing the segregation of boys but also providing constructive alternatives to traditional segregation without increasing risk to the majority of boys on mainstream house blocks. The cohort consisted of three units: a traditional segregation unit (Phoenix), a progression landing on house block B (BI) to manage consistently disruptive or violent behaviour and to represent progression for boys who had been segregated in Phoenix, and an enhanced support unit (Cedar) for boys with complex needs who may have been violent but required additional support because they themselves were also vulnerable. The ultimate goal was to reintegrate all boys back to normal location. The aims of the group were sound in practice but it was not working as effectively as planned. Boys on BI were managed over four progressive stages. Those on stages one and two were managed on good order and discipline (GOOD) for long periods with a very limited regime which led us to conclude that this part of the process was no better than segregation (see paragraph I.79).
- I.32** We observed a number of examples of staff demonstrating patience and care in dealing with extremely complex and volatile boys. However, we also observed a lot of shouting through doors and boys being deliberately slow when being escorted to appointments, much of which went unchallenged. This low-level bad behaviour frequently slowed the regime down and often resulted in delayed or limited access to key services and interventions for other boys.
- I.33** The use of incentives to encourage good behaviour had improved: the ‘green card’ scheme (see paragraph I.41) enabled boys to gain instant rewards for achieving appropriate behaviour targets, which was good.
- I.34** The introduction of a new conflict resolution team was positive. The small team of staff were responsible for exploring and aiming to resolve issues relating to violence and gangs. They also helped mediate between boys who were in conflict with each other. The group was

⁷ Complex cohort group (CCG) is the collective name given to three areas of the establishment dedicated to the management of boys with complex needs and challenging behaviours (see paragraph I.31 for full description).

enthusiastic and their potential contribution was good. However, they were stretched and much of the work directed to them could have been dealt with by residential staff under general behaviour management procedures.

Recommendation

- I.35 An overarching behaviour management strategy should be developed to improve oversight of the various systems in place and make them more effective in improving behaviour.**

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.36** The local incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme had been reviewed in late 2016 and the focus on rewarding good behaviour had increased. The scheme operated on the three levels of basic, standard and enhanced, with about 20% on enhanced and 18% on basic level at the time of the inspection. A3 landing accommodated boys on the enhanced level and offered a more relaxed environment with access to additional games and facilities.
- I.37** The system for dealing with poor or positive behaviour was now integrated into the IEP scheme. Staff could issue a yellow card for low-level poor behaviour which required challenge but did not warrant adjudication. A yellow card had to be approved by a first line manager before issue and, if a sanction was invoked, the manager decided what it would be. Sanctions ranged from a caution to a move of location. Boys were spoken to when a sanction was issued and could appeal the decision if they felt it was unfair.
- I.38** The use of the sanctions that were sometimes imposed as well as the yellow cards was not adequately monitored. Some sanctions, such as the removal of kettles or the isolation of cell power, were not appropriate and managers were not aware of how often a particular sanction had been used or with how many boys. We found an example where a kettle had been removed for more than three days, allegedly in response to poor behaviour, and the reason for removal was not documented.
- I.39** If boys were issued with more than two yellow cards in seven days, a final written warning was issued and a manager met the boy to identify concerns and set short-term targets. The warning remained in place for 14 days and, if a further yellow card was issued, a move to basic level was considered.
- I.40** Boys on the basic regime were given sensible targets. They were still able to attend their educational pathways but aspects of association and enrichment were curtailed. Reviews for those on basic were prompt and most boys were returned to standard within less than a week.
- I.41** Green cards (see paragraph I.33) were used appropriately to motivate good behaviour. They could be issued by any member of staff and encouraged boys to attain short and achievable targets. The green cards had a nominal value of £1 and boys could exchange them for a small range of products such as pin credit and shower gels.

- I.42** Despite the positive effect of the green card system, there was no promotion of the scheme other than during induction or by individual staff on an ad hoc basis. This was reflected in our survey where only 44% of boys felt that the scheme encouraged them to change their behaviour.

Recommendations

- I.43** **The removal of basic amenities, such as kettles, should not form part of the incentives and earned privileges scheme.** (Repeated recommendation I.37)
- I.44** **The use of sanctions to supplement warnings for poor behaviour should be appropriately monitored to ensure proportionality and fairness and to provide assurance that sanctions are not awarded to individual boys frequently or for longer than authorised.**

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.45** While we acknowledged that the nature of the population at Cookham Wood demanded a robust approach to security, not all of the controls in place were contributing to a reduction in violence. Controlled unlocking processes were resource intensive and impacted on the contact time that boys had with important service providers. Movement to activities was often delayed because boys had to be kept apart from other boys. While much of this was necessary, some of these controls were cumbersome and were compounded by inefficiencies in the system. The security and activities department managed the 'keep apart' list but residential staff did not always have the most up-to-date information about boys on the list, which led to incidents when the wrong boys were unlocked together and access to activities was hindered further (see paragraphs 2.31 and 4.40). Sometimes decisions to allow boys to resume mixing were not well communicated to those managing unlock and movements were again delayed unnecessarily.
- I.46** The security department's support for the use of release on temporary licence (ROTL) was very good. However, until recently all boys going out on ROTL and newly arrived boys were subject to a routine strip-search.
- I.47** During the previous six months, 2,384 intelligence reports had been registered in the security department, although we were concerned to find examples in observation books of information that had not been appropriately submitted to security. The management and use of intelligence was generally good. Reports were processed quickly by trained staff and intelligence was communicated to appropriate areas. However, at the time of our inspection there was a backlog of 100 reports awaiting final quality checks by managers.
- I.48** The monthly security committee meeting was chaired by the head of security or the security custodial manager, rather than by the deputy governor. During the previous six months, some crucial areas such as safeguarding and substance misuse had not always been represented at the meetings. Trends and patterns were analysed and objectives were aligned with the risks faced by Cookham Wood.

- I.49** The establishment had a reasonable relationship with the local police who shared relevant information about the children and followed up cases referred to them.
- I.50** Drug use remained low. Mandatory drug testing (MDT) on suspicion had been used four times in the previous six months which had resulted in one positive and three negative tests. The MDT testing area was adequate. There was still no supply reduction strategy or action plan.
- I.51** During the previous six months, there had been 1,042 adjudications. Adjudications were conducted on AI light bay in a relaxed atmosphere. Documentation was issued the day before the hearing. Barnardo's advocacy service was available to all boys on request, although concerns had been raised at the adjudication review meeting that not all referrals were processed and Barnardo's were not always aware that a boy needed support. Adjudication charges that we examined were appropriate and the most serious offences were referred to the police or independent adjudicator.
- I.52** Management of adjudications had deteriorated since our last inspection. During the previous six months, 143 adjudications had not been proceeded with, most because of procedural errors such as being out of time. A further 57 adjudications had been remanded. This was concerning as some of these adjudications had been for violent incidents (see paragraph I.57).
- I.53** Most adjudication records that we reviewed indicated that boys were given enough opportunity to express their views and mitigation was taken into account. Punishments continued to reflect the published tariff and remained consistent and appropriate for the population.
- I.54** A quality check of adjudications was carried out each month by the deputy governor and was discussed at the quarterly adjudication review meeting. Not all actions from the meeting had been completed by the next meeting and the minutes of meetings that we looked at did not demonstrate sufficient analysis of trends or tariffs.

Recommendation

- I.55 All adjudications should be heard and adjudication review meetings should analyse trends.**

Bullying and violence reduction

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.56** Figures used by the establishment to calculate levels of violence were unclear. Data showed that assaults on staff had decreased since our last inspection, but overall violence was higher.
- I.57** The prison used the number of proven adjudications to monitor violence levels which underrepresented the actual number of violent incidents (see paragraph I.52).
- I.58** During the previous six months, recorded data on the information reporting system (IRS) showed 70 assaults, 69 fights and 13 assaults on staff. We quickly found an example of a violent incident which had not been recorded and we were concerned that the number of violent incidents on the IRS did not give an accurate picture.

- I.59** There was no systematic approach to managing violent behaviour. Some good initiatives to manage perpetrators of violent behaviour and provide support for victims were underused, for example Cedar unit (enhanced support), conflict resolution and gang work. There were limited opportunities for perpetrators to access interventions and address their behaviour.
- I.60** The conflict resolution team provided valuable help and support to boys. However, a large caseload, cross deployment, and staff shortages in the team affected their ability to deliver this support.
- I.61** There was inconsistency in investigating allegations of bullying. Safeguarding information report forms were available for wing staff to complete if they had concerns about bullying but we found examples in wing observation books of boys reporting bullying behaviour which had not been referred for investigation. Investigations we looked at lacked detail and were not used to identify trends and inform a strategy for violence reduction (see paragraph I.21).
- I.62** Useful consultations with boys on violence reduction had taken place in January, February and March 2017. These had lapsed and minutes that we examined lacked focus and action.

Recommendations

- I.63 All allegations of bullying should be recorded and investigated thoroughly and action taken where required.**
- I.64 A coherent approach should be taken to the management of violence and bullying, including meaningful analysis of data and a comprehensive action plan to maintain the safety of boys.**

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.65** The use of force had again increased significantly. During the previous six months, there had been 555 incidents of force, compared to 480 and 400 at the previous two inspections. All operational staff were now trained in the use of minimising and managing physical restraint (MMPR) and a regular refresher programme was in place.
- I.66** Fifty-eight per cent of incidents of use of force had involved restrictive physical intervention (RPI: higher use of force where mobility is restricted by two or more staff). In many incidents, RPI was used for a very short time, often less than one or two minutes, to safeguard boys from further harm or prevent the escalation of violent incidents. Eighty-six incidents of RPI involved the use of ratchet cuffs to assist in the de-escalation of the incident or remove the boy safely to another area of the prison.
- I.67** There were 42 planned uses of force, but most incidents of force were in reaction to a spontaneous incident. We viewed CCTV and body camera footage with supplementary documentation and statements which indicated an appropriate use of force, usually in response to a fight or assault involving several boys. Most boys were returned to their own cells following an incident. Although infrequent, pain infliction techniques had been used on six occasions in the previous six months.

- I.68** Oversight of planned and spontaneous interventions was reasonable. A dedicated MMPR team reporting to the head of safeguarding consisted of supervising officers with administrative support. MMPR coordinators were on duty during the hours of unlock but could often be re-deployed to cover establishment shortfalls. Coordinators attended planned interventions, which were recorded by body-worn camera and hand-held digital cameras, providing additional assurance for boys and staff.
- I.69** The MMPR administrators completed the documentation, including injury forms and staff statements. We were told that 12 staff statements were outstanding, although figures for the most recent months showed a higher number. A high number of F213 forms (a medical form to identify injuries to boys) required completion. Documentation for each incident was well ordered with better oversight than we see in many establishments.
- I.70** Incidents of force were reviewed by the MMPR team and any concerns were reported to the head of safeguarding. Coordinators met boys following any use of force and interviewed staff if required. More detailed analysis took place at the weekly use of force minimisation meeting chaired by the head of safeguarding. A wide range of stakeholders were invited to the meeting including the Independent Monitoring Board, local social work team, representatives from Barnardo's and key internal representatives. Attendance was often poor, which was disappointing.
- I.71** Incidents were reviewed at the weekly meeting and any concerns or best practice were disseminated appropriately. Emerging trends were evaluated and used to develop local training.
- I.72** Restraint handling plans were now in place to highlight risks to boys with a medical condition which could be adversely affected by restraint. Handling plans in a simple format were displayed clearly in the orderly office and in secure residential areas to ensure that staff were aware of the small number of boys affected in this way.

Recommendation

- I.73 All use of force documents should be completed promptly and comprehensively after incidents have taken place.**

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.74** The segregation unit (Phoenix) was used for boys who displayed the most challenging behaviour on residential units, most of whom were subject to good order or discipline (GOOD).
- I.75** The complex cohort group (CCG) had been established to manage the work of three units - Phoenix, Cedar and a progression landing on unit B1 (see paragraph 1.31). Cedar unit and B1 landing aimed to provide constructive and purposeful alternatives to segregation for boys with complex needs. As a result, the use of Phoenix unit to segregate boys had reduced: 75 boys had been located in Phoenix in the previous six months compared to 112 in 2016. The length of stay had also reduced and most boys were reintegrated to the B1 landing within two weeks.

- I.76** An effective multidisciplinary case team carried out GOOD reviews each week for boys on Phoenix. The reviews were well attended and we observed appropriate interaction with boys. Sensible targets were set for boys so that they understood how to progress from Phoenix. Professionals from other departments including mental health, psychology and education attended Phoenix each morning to spend time with individual boys and help them meet their GOOD review targets.
- I.77** Relationships between boys and staff on the Phoenix unit were good, and the boys we spoke to were relatively positive about their treatment while in segregation. However, with the exception of the occasional visit from various professionals (see paragraph I.76), the regime was limited to a daily telephone call and shower, and exercise in the open air only a few times a week. There was little provision for in-cell activity and access to basic amenities such as the library, which in reality amounted to a few books left in the corridor. Communal areas had not improved and cells were poorly ventilated with graffiti on walls and windows.
- I.78** BI had just been established at the time of our last inspection and we commended the establishment's aim to progress boys from segregation to a more productive environment with focused interventions designed to reduce their risk. However, on this visit, we were disappointed that the approach being taken had not been effective in reducing violence as planned. The establishment had not maximised the opportunities to work constructively with the boys on BI and for many the conditions were akin to segregation. Accommodation on BI was better, but many aspects of the limited regime were similar to those on Phoenix.
- I.79** Boys located on BI (19 during the inspection) were managed in four stages: stages one and two under the governance of GOOD and stages 3 and 4 supposedly using the PACT system. Boys subject to GOOD stages one and two were reviewed weekly by the multidisciplinary review board. These boys were segregated from others for excessive periods. Their regime was limited to a shower, short period of exercise and short spells of individual outreach work on the unit, if staff facilitated it.
- I.80** Not all boys who were located on BI had progressed from the segregation unit. Some moved from a mainstream house block into BI. As the first two stages of the unit were managed on GOOD, we would have expected to find that governance for these boys would have been the same as for those in segregation. However, in a number of cases the quality of record-keeping was inadequate and nearly all documents failed to address the risks of the first 24 hours in segregation. In one case a boy who had been on the periphery of a serious incident had been segregated on BI without written authority for more than eight days.
- I.81** Some boys had been located on BI for a considerable time, in one case for over seven months. Although appropriate authority had been given for the continued segregation and there had been attempts to reintegrate, we remained concerned about such lengthy periods of segregation for young boys.
- I.82** The psychology team had completed a number of short-term assessments of risk and need for boys. The most complex cases had been prioritised because of resource constraints and the assessments provided valuable information for all staff. It was disappointing that CCG staff on BI were often unaware of the assessments or did little follow-up work.
- I.83** Contrary to documentation and what we were told by some managers, the PACT system had lapsed as staff were not using it to manage boys on stages three and four. The use of individual plans and target setting in place at the previous inspection had declined. Although BI review boards were made up of broadly the same staff as those on the GOOD review boards on Phoenix, the targets set for boys on BI were less meaningful and were repetitive, and follow-up work was not always completed. Although boys attended the boards, they were not given copies of their targets. It appeared that cross-deployment of CCG staff was frustrating attempts to follow up and assist boys in the achievement of their targets.

- I.84** Attempts to chart progress were limited to superficial comments on P-Nomis electronic case records. There were options for the eight boys on stages 3 or 4 to access education and reintegrate to normal location dependent on their individual risk or keep apart issues. However, we observed unnecessary delays in facilitating some of this important work due to a lack of organisation or effort on the part of the staff in charge.
- I.85** There was evidence of some good work being done with individual boys on BI. For example, energetic members of the Kinetic Youth team attended the unit regularly to hold individual sessions which included delivery of qualifications through the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance. Boys engaged well and appreciated the time out of cell and positive interaction with the outreach workers. However, unlock protocols and restrictions in the BI regime limited the number of boys who could access outreach services. We observed a number of professionals waiting for long periods before boys were unlocked to meet with them and some whose contact was limited to discussions through locked doors, which was not appropriate.
- I.86** Oversight of the governance of segregation was discussed at the quarterly safeguarding meeting. A report was prepared which identified basic information on boys in the Phoenix unit with limited data on boys located on BI. There was no evidence of detailed analysis of the data to reduce the number of boys segregated across the CCG. In the first quarter of 2017, the report was not discussed at the safeguarding meeting at all because nobody from the CCG was in attendance.

Recommendations

- I.87** **Living conditions in the segregation unit should be improved and cells and communal areas should be kept clean, free of graffiti and well maintained.**
(Repeated recommendation I.62)
- I.88** **Risks, triggers and vulnerability identified when a boy is first segregated should be clearly documented and accessible to all staff.**
- I.89** **The regime for boys segregated as part of the CCG should be improved and time out of cell activities should be consistently available.**
- I.90** **A regular meeting with appropriate attendance should analyse comprehensive data to identify trends or patterns in relation to segregation. Appropriate governance should be provided to reduce the number of boys segregated across the CCG.**

Good practice

- I.91** *One-to-one work with the energetic Kinetic Youth team provided boys segregated on BI with valuable support and encouragement and assisted with reintegration.*

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.92** Psychosocial and clinical services were delivered by Addaction drug and alcohol treatment charity. The provider was changing to the Forward Trust who had subcontracted Open Road in Medway to deliver services from October 2017. Staff transfer arrangements were in progress and had not affected service delivery.
- I.93** The team consisted of a manager, an administrator and three substance misuse workers. Managerial supervision and team meetings occurred regularly and they had good working relationships with the establishment. SystemOne, the electronic clinical records system, was now used to record interventions which promoted integrated care with the health and well-being and primary care teams. In July 2017 the team had supported 79 boys, just under half the population. Boys we spoke to were positive about the support they received.
- I.94** All new arrivals were screened by a primary care nurse and substance misuse needs were identified. An on-call service provided clinical cover, with a GP and nurse available to attend if required. Since the last inspection, this service had been used once for a boy who needed opiate substitution therapy.
- I.95** Completion of the substance misuse section of the CHAT (comprehensive health assessment tool) and harm reduction information were generally delivered within five days. Boys with more complex needs were given individual care plans involving holistic and age-appropriate structured one-to-one sessions with their allocated substance misuse worker. However, provision remained hampered by the restricted regime and too many appointments had had to be rescheduled (see main recommendation S42).
- I.96** Boys had mainly used cannabis and alcohol previously, but prescription drugs mixed with energy drinks were increasing in the local community. The team provided drug awareness training for staff and had provided information to boys and staff when new psychoactive substances⁸ (NPS) were found in the establishment in an isolated episode.
- I.97** Information sharing between the security department and the team was reasonable. Substance misuse updates were given at some security committee and reducing re-offending meetings. However, there was no drug strategy to promote a whole establishment approach, although one was in draft.
- I.98** Substance awareness group sessions had started as part of the personal social and health education programme and further groups were planned under the new contract.

Recommendation

- I.99 A drug strategy for the establishment should be produced which contains an action plan with performance measures which are regularly reviewed and used to inform service delivery.**

⁸ Drugs that are developed or chosen to mimic the effects of illegal drugs such as cannabis, heroin or amphetamines and may have unpredictable and life-threatening effects.

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 Boys lived in single cells with screened showers and toilets. Cells were equipped with telephones so boys could keep in contact with family and friends. These facilities remained excellent.
- 2.2 Cedar, A3 and B3 provided some of the better living accommodation. However, there was widespread graffiti in most cells, some of which was offensive and much of it promoted gang culture. With the exception of those on A3, the enhanced wing, boys were clearly not encouraged to keep their cells clean. Communal residential units were often dirty and ill equipped, with little to occupy boys during association. The establishment lacked any effective quality assurance measures to ensure that boys lived in decent conditions.
- 2.3 Cell bells rang continually. Only 15% of boys in our survey said that bells were responded to within five minutes against the comparator of 27%. We observed some boys waiting up to 15 minutes before their bell was acknowledged.
- 2.4 Most prison-issue clothing was of a decent quality and fit and boys could now wear their own underwear. However, boys on remand were still only permitted to wear prison clothing. Boys released on temporary licence or to court were able to change into their own clothes and the establishment provided suitable clothes for those who needed them.
- 2.5 There were regular laundry days and boys were able to get their clothes washed each week. Bedding was also changed weekly, but some of it was torn and needed to be replaced.
- 2.6 Too many boys were not issued with a kettle or a radio. Some had them removed following a risk assessment or because they were on basic level of the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme. The establishment had recently instructed that any new issue or replacement would be charged at £10, which was an unfair policy. However, this was reviewed during the inspection and the governor assured us that all boys, subject to risk assessment, would now receive a kettle and radio free of charge.
- 2.7 Boys lacked confidence in the poorly managed application system. In our survey, only 41% said that applications were dealt with fairly and 18% that they were dealt with quickly against respective comparators of 56% and 41%. The establishment was confident that the recently introduced electronic kiosk system would improve the application process.

Recommendations

- 2.8 **Cells should be clean and free of graffiti.**
- 2.9 **There should be a range of games and activities for boys to use in association areas.**

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.

- 2.10** Most staff we observed were professional and committed in their dealings with the boys in their care. Staff from all disciplines demonstrated patience and resilience even when faced with challenging situations. However, a few staff were not proactive and some were office bound. This affected their colleagues, left boys locked up for longer than necessary, and hindered the delivery of important services designed to support and help boys.
- 2.11** Regime curtailment, resulting in boys being locked up for longer, had an effect on the development of positive and meaningful relationships in some areas. The personal officer scheme was not used and, although we identified some good entries in boys' records, they were not consistent or comprehensive.
- 2.12** Not all staff wore name badges which made it difficult for boys to know who they were.
- 2.13** Consultation with boys was underdeveloped. Some boys lacked knowledge of or confidence in the youth council. Minutes of the meeting indicated that more managers attended than boys and many of the issues raised by boys had not been fully discussed or dealt with.
- 2.14** Peer support work was developing and we saw some very effective use of mentors, including on induction and in health care. Boys appreciated the advice and support provided by their peers and the mentors themselves were developing good skills and experience.

Recommendation

- 2.15** Consultation with boys should be effective and lead to tangible outcomes.

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** There had been a decline in the quality of diversity and equality work since the previous inspection and it was clearly not a priority for the establishment. The policy had recently been reviewed and, as before, it covered protected characteristics, training and local governance. However, the policy was not being adhered to. The quarterly equality action team (EAT) meeting had last taken place in April 2017 and attendance at the meetings had

been poor which limited their effectiveness. There was no longer an equality action plan being monitored and driven at a senior level. Over the last year, only 19% of staff had completed the online training that required completion annually and there was no other cultural awareness training, despite the diverse population.

- 2.17** The equality officer was also a member of the safeguarding team which limited the time available for equality work, and the officer was sometimes cross deployed to residential units. More positively, notice boards on the residential units were kept up to date and there was a regular newsletter promoting equality themes throughout the year. There were five young people's equality representatives at the time of the inspection, some of whom had been newly appointed, and their photographs were displayed around the establishment. They were positive about their role, although they rarely met as a group or received any training. There was scope for them to get more involved by alerting staff to potential issues and attending EAT meetings to influence the strategic approach.
- 2.18** The EAT meeting reviewed a range of data about the population but there had been little effort to investigate negative trends. This was exacerbated by data from the HMPPS equality monitoring tool (EMT) being several months old before it was made available. In our survey, significantly more boys from a black and minority ethnic background than white boys said they had been subject to disciplinary procedures and physical restraint. The latter was consistent with the most recent published EMT data on use of force. Although ad hoc forums had taken place, there was no established, consistent programme of consultation with boys with protected characteristics.
- 2.19** During the previous six months, 33 discrimination incident report forms (DIRFs) had been submitted. The safeguarding team maintained a central log of DIRFs and now had a target of five working days to investigate and respond to complaints. Oversight of DIRFs had improved but the quality of completed forms varied: some did not demonstrate that the issue had been fully investigated or a full reply given. The introduction of quality assurance by a senior manager before the complainant received a response to his complaint was starting to address this.

Recommendations

- 2.20** **Equality work should be given greater priority and the equality action team should ensure that an up-to-date action plan addresses all identified weaknesses in the system.**
- 2.21** **Regular effective consultation should take place.**

Diverse needs

- 2.22** Boys with protected characteristics were identified on reception. The equality officer took part in induction, and health care and education staff completed thorough screenings which identified disabilities.
- 2.23** About two-thirds of boys were from a black and minority ethnic background. Most responses to our survey from boys from this background were similar to those of white boys, apart from on the use of force, disciplinary procedures (see paragraph 2.18) and access to daily association. Only 8% of black and minority ethnic boys in our survey said that they had been threatened or intimidated by other boys compared to 30% of white boys.

- 2.24** In our survey, 10% of boys said they were from a Gypsy/Roma/Traveller background which equated to a population of about 16, although the establishment was aware of only three. The equality officer had canvassed their views individually and was attempting to identify a source of external support for them.
- 2.25** A quarter of boys were Muslim. The responses to our survey from Muslim boys were similar to other boys, although 87% said their religious beliefs were respected compared with 41% of other boys. The most recent EMT data showed more use of adjudications with Muslim boys and less access to release on temporary licence. The EAT had not met to discuss their response to these data.
- 2.26** At the time of the inspection, 33 boys had been identified as foreign nationals, 21 of whom were on remand. A member of the casework team was responsible for liaison work with foreign national boys and appropriate agencies, which included informing the Home Office of their arrival at Cookham Wood. An immigration enforcement officer visited regularly to see all new arrivals and explain immigration procedures. The establishment no longer sourced community support or independent legal advice for boys with immigration issues. Boys could apply to have a free five-minute overseas telephone call each month, but only one was using this facility at the time of the inspection. We were told that boys had either spent most of their lives in Britain with their families or were displaced from families overseas with no way of contacting them. Dictionaries and books in other languages were available and the library could obtain material in other languages when a need was identified on induction. Little use was made of telephone interpretation.
- 2.27** In our survey, 16% of boys said they had a disability. The establishment had identified 38 boys with disabilities, mostly attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) and learning disabilities. There were no individual plans to help staff understand or manage behaviour that might be associated with a disability. Managers and staff were not aware of anyone with a personal emergency evacuation plan, although we observed one boy who was using crutches to move around the site. The large cell adapted for boys with mobility issues was on BI, the progression unit, which was an inappropriate location.
- 2.28** Very few boys identified themselves as gay or bisexual, and none was known to the establishment at the time of the inspection. No community support groups were available. The establishment had no experience of supporting young people who wished to transition but this was covered in the equality policy.

Recommendation

- 2.29** **The promotion of tolerance and support for gay and bisexual boys should be strengthened.**

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.

- 2.30** The managing chaplain and a small team of part-time and sessional chaplains carried out daily duties, including seeing new arrivals and boys held in the segregation unit, and attending key establishment meetings. Chaplains provided support to any boy who needed it, particularly

after receiving bad news or experiencing bereavement. They visited boys a week before release to identify any outstanding concerns.

- 2.31** The team covered all faiths and chaplains were on call when needed. The Church of England chaplain had recently left and cover had been identified pending recruitment. Services were conducted weekly for the main religions in the population. However, in our survey, only 30% of boys said it was easy to attend services against the comparator of 46%. They did not have to apply to attend, but the keep apart system meant that some boys had to alternate attendance at services. In this event, a chaplain visited the boy. Facilities for worship were reasonable. The principal multi-faith room was not suitable for Friday prayers and so these took place in another room with good washing facilities. A suitable range of classes was offered.
- 2.32** In our survey, only 47% of boys said it was easy to see a chaplain in private against the comparator of 63%. We observed the difficulties that non-operational staff experienced in getting boys unlocked when they wanted to talk to them because residential staff were either too busy or slow to assist. This was compounded by a scarcity of private rooms.

Recommendation

- 2.33** The establishment should investigate why boys feel it is not easy to attend faith services and address any issues identified.

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.

- 2.34** Boys had reasonable access to complaint forms, although it was harder for boys on restricted regimes. The on-site Barnardo's advocates (an independent advocacy service to assist young people in resolving issues relating to their welfare, care and treatment while detained) remained a good source of support for boys who wanted to make a complaint.
- 2.35** Only 13% of boys in our survey thought that complaints were dealt with quickly and only a quarter that they were dealt with fairly. Complaints were collected by the business hub team and records indicated that a substantive reply to a complaint was received within one week. During the previous six months, an average of 38 complaints a month had been submitted, 16% of which had been upheld.
- 2.36** The quality of responses to complaints varied. Some of the better responses demonstrated that the manager who was investigating the complaint had discussed it with the complainant. Others were not clear as to whether the complaint had been fully explored. Responses did not include information on how boys could appeal against the outcome of a complaint and there was no quality assurance. The monthly performance meeting continued to scrutinise the system using data provided by the business hub.

Recommendation

- 2.37 All complaints should be thoroughly investigated and quality assurance procedures should ensure that replies to boys' complaints cover fully all issues raised.**

Legal rights

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.38** Boys had their legal status and rights explained to them during induction. Remanded boys were supported by caseworkers and Barnardo's advocates to apply for bail. Those who were sentenced were helped to understand their sentence and key dates, for example early release, home detention curfew or moving to the adult estate.
- 2.39** Legal visits took place four afternoons each week in private legal booths. Other professional visitors increasingly used afternoon visits to see their clients and demand for the five booths was high. The facilities were usually fully booked several weeks ahead.

Recommendation

- 2.40 The establishment should review legal visits provision in the light of demand.**

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.

- 2.41** The inspection of health services was jointly undertaken by the Care Quality Commission (CQC)⁹ and HM Inspectorate of Prisons under a memorandum of understanding agreement between the agencies. The CQC found there were no breaches of the relevant regulations following the inspection.

Governance arrangements

- 2.42** Primary nursing services were provided by Oxleas NHS Foundation Trust and child and adolescent mental health services (CAMHS) were provided by Central and North West London NHS Foundation Trust (CNWL). Both contracts had been extended to March 2019.
- 2.43** Working relationships between the establishment, health providers, substance misuse service and commissioner were good. Strategic governance structures were embedded with

⁹ CQC is the independent regulator of health and adult social care in England. It monitors, inspects and regulates services to make sure they meet fundamental standards of quality and safety. For information on CQC's standards of care and the action it takes to improve services, please visit: <http://www.cqc.org.uk>.

effective partnership board meetings and quarterly contract review meetings. Well attended integrated quality board meetings covered essential areas. A health needs assessment was due to be updated.

- 2.44** In our survey, 52% said that the overall quality of health services was good. Boys we spoke to were very satisfied with the quality of health provision.
- 2.45** Both services delivered responsive and child-focused care by a flexible and dedicated staff group. Interactions that we observed were caring and nurturing. The primary care team had experienced staff shortages and was stretched, but had covered clinical services by using bank staff. Access to all health services was hindered by delays in movements and frequent lockdowns, which wasted valuable clinical resources (see main recommendation S42).
- 2.46** Service user feedback through exit surveys and ongoing patient surveys was positive.
- 2.47** Registered nurses were available between 7.30am and 9pm Monday to Friday, with slightly reduced hours at the weekend. Health care staff attended all incidents and follow-up appointments were routinely made to identify emerging health needs. This was positive. Clinical incidents were clearly documented in individual health records but too few had been formally reported by the primary care team through the separate incident reporting system. This prevented effective monitoring of trends and learning from incidents.
- 2.48** Annual appraisal and regular managerial and clinical supervision took place and staff felt supported. Mandatory training was well managed and professional development opportunities were available.
- 2.49** Health care staff had good awareness of their safeguarding responsibilities through appropriate training and had effective links with the safer regimes department. Consent to share medical information and the capacity to consent to treatment were routinely sought.
- 2.50** An appropriate range of policies were used and effective systems were in place for the management of communicable diseases.
- 2.51** Treatment rooms were clinically appropriate and cleaned each day. A recent infection control audit had scored 85% and the issues highlighted were being addressed.
- 2.52** Automated external defibrillators (AEDs) were strategically sited and available to all staff, but we found some out-of-date AED pads. There was no clear audit trail to verify routine checks and maintenance by the establishment. Other emergency equipment maintained by health staff was in date and checked regularly, although it was unclear if checks were comprehensive as the equipment and the list did not coincide.
- 2.53** All health staff had received annual resuscitation skills training. Approximately 31% of custody staff had completed first aid at work and basic life support training. Arrangements were in place to ensure that there were first aid trained custody staff on each shift. Ambulances were called promptly.
- 2.54** Health complaints were effectively managed through a confidential system and complaint forms were readily available on the units. Only a few complaints had been made and responses were respectful and timely. Several compliments had been received.
- 2.55** A wealth of health services promotion was delivered by trained 'support to recovery' workers, although there was not enough health promotion literature and posters.
- 2.56** Smoking cessation support included nicotine replacement patches. There was appropriate emphasis on continuity of age-appropriate immunisation and vaccination cover as well as

blood-borne virus protection. Uptake was variable. Sexual health screening was comprehensive and treatment was offered with good links with community specialist services. Barrier protection was discussed and available from nurses.

2.57 The CQC found there were no breaches of the relevant regulations.

Recommendations

2.58 Clinical incidents should be reported and monitored effectively so that lessons can be learned.

2.59 All automated external defibrillators should be in good working order with a clear audit trail to ensure they are regularly checked and maintained. Monitoring processes for other emergency equipment should be more robust.

Delivery of care (physical health)

2.60 The dedicated health care room in reception was small and separated from the main reception. Nurses said that custody staff stood outside the room on a risk assessed basis but potential safety issues remained because of the location of the room.

2.61 Boys were assessed on arrival for immediate health needs by a registered nurse, including late arrivals. Most health screening subsequently required, including physical health, mental health and neuro-disability, was completed within the recommended timescales. Attendance at court sometimes delayed health screenings but staff were tenacious in ensuring that screening was completed as soon as possible. All boys received a school health-equivalent sight and hearing screening and oral health assessment, which was positive. Nurse-led triage clinics were effective.

2.62 Boys with potentially life-threatening medical conditions were encouraged to wear a medical alert wristband to help custody staff to ensure their safety, which was good practice. They were also given written guidance about the medical conditions.

2.63 An appropriate range of primary care services was available, including an optician. Most clinics were carried out without undue delay.

2.64 Boys requested health services through pictorial applications which were collected daily. Urgent needs were prioritised well. Long-term conditions were managed by the GP and referred for specialist support where required.

2.65 The GPs from Kent Healthcare Consortium delivered four sessions a week, including Saturday morning. Routine appointments were made within two days, which was good. Emergency cover was provided at the same level as in the community.

2.66 All boys were visited each day by a nurse and were seen by a GP every 72 hours. We observed a GP seeing 34 boys on BI and Phoenix, and then undertaking a GP clinic and reviewing medication. This exceeded her contracted hours and was a regular occurrence. This needed to be reviewed to ensure there was enough GP cover.

2.67 External hospital appointments were well managed. Cancellations of non-urgent appointments mainly arose from court appearances and were rebooked.

Recommendation

- 2.68** The reception health treatment room should provide a safe environment for health staff and better visibility for prison staff. (Repeated recommendation 2.53)

Good practice

- 2.69** *Medical alert wristbands and the information given to custody staff on potentially life-threatening health conditions supported the safety and care of boys.*

Pharmacy

- 2.70** Medicines were supplied from the pharmacy at HMP Rochester. Medicine storage was very good, with clear differentiation of in-possession and supervised medicines. Nurses undertook weekly stock checks and there was good oversight by a pharmacist who visited monthly. The pharmacist completed medicine use reviews and was available to see boys for advice by request or referral from health staff. Relevant emergency stock was accessible.
- 2.71** Prescribing was age appropriate and most medicines were administered on a supervised basis at regular intervals in a confidential, safe and helpful manner. Boys could keep medicines, such as inhalers and ointments.
- 2.72** Over-the-counter medicines administered by nurses were appropriately recorded on SystmOne (the clinical IT system), under a homely remedy policy. Boys experiencing pain at night could request simple pain relief from wing staff, with appropriate recording by officers and effective monitoring by nurses.
- 2.73** Medicines such as insulin pens (for diabetes) and EpiPens (to counteract allergic reactions) were kept by nursing or custody staff and given to boys as required on a risk assessed basis.
- 2.74** Controlled drugs were prescribed mainly for ADHD and were received on a named-patient basis. Storage and administration were appropriate. Arrangements for the receipt of controlled drugs had improved and they were now always transported by two staff members.

Dentistry

- 2.75** A local dentist was subcontracted to provide a range of dental treatments equivalent to the community. The dentist delivered one session a week supported by a dental nurse. An additional monthly session had recently been introduced to address the long waiting list. Boys were sent to community providers for orthodontic work.
- 2.76** In our survey, 23% of boys said it was easy to see the dentist against the comparator of 39%. Boys had waited up to 13 weeks for an appointment, which was too long. This was compounded by the restricted regime which prevented sessions from being fully used. At the time of the inspection, 54 boys were on the waiting list, 14 of whom had been waiting 12 to 19 weeks, and nine 8 to 12 weeks. Several cases that we sampled on this list were waiting for routine six-monthly checks rather than urgent or ongoing treatment. The nurse said that she would create separate lists for clarity.
- 2.77** The use of oral health screening on reception and dental triage ensured that boys with urgent needs were prioritised. Oral health promotion was good.

- 2.78** The dental suite was clean and well equipped. There was no separate decontamination room, but best practice guidance for decontamination was followed within the constraints of the available facilities.
- 2.79** Dental equipment was suitably maintained and certificated.

Recommendations

- 2.80** **Boys should have timely access to dental care and treatment.**
- 2.81** **Maintenance schedules and contemporary safety certification should be readily available to demonstrate compliance.**

Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.82** The health and well-being team continued to provide a very good child and adolescent focused multidisciplinary mental health service, including ADHD and learning disability support.
- 2.83** The team comprised a CAMHS specialist psychiatrist, an operational manager, a nurse, a social worker, an art therapist, clinical psychologists and psychology assistants. Recruitment was in progress for staff vacancies, including a speech and language therapist. There were 62 boys on the team caseload with a range of mild to moderate and complex mental health problems. Cases were prioritised and triaged through an effective weekly multidisciplinary referral meeting. Urgent cases were responded to promptly through the team's duty rota. The clinical records that we examined demonstrated excellent levels of support.
- 2.84** Individual work was complemented by a range of focused group sessions, including art therapy and managing emotions and resilience groups. Difficulties remained in getting boys to group sessions, largely because of the lack of escort officers. Between April and June 2017, about 40% of planned groups had been cancelled, which was a considerable waste of this valuable resource (see main recommendation S42).
- 2.85** The sexual behaviour service provided a valuable psychological service, including assessment and interventions.
- 2.86** The service user development programme was an excellent initiative involving boys who had previous or current involvement with the health and well-being team in the promotion and enhancement of the service. The three service user representatives co-facilitated induction sessions and had participated in staff recruitment interviews. In March 2017, two service users had attended Parliament to appear before the Joint Committee on Human Rights.
- 2.87** The team worked effectively with other departments, including case workers, and offered a range of mental health and learning disability awareness training for officers.
- 2.88** There had been two transfers under the Mental Health Act 2014 to secure mental health units during the seven months to July 2017. The 14-day guideline had not been met in one case with a 15-week wait, which was excessive.

Recommendations

- 2.89** The regime should support sustained attendance by boys at therapeutic group sessions. (Repeated recommendation 2.74)
- 2.90** Boys who need a secure mental health bed should be transferred as soon as possible. (Repeated recommendation 2.75)

Good practice

- 2.91** *The service-user development programme was an excellent initiative to help de-stigmatise emotional and mental health needs and promote self-esteem.*

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.

- 2.92** In our survey, only 20% of boys said the food was good or very good, although boys who spoke to us made favourable comparisons with food at other young offender institutions. The catering manager carried out food surveys and was receptive to feedback or suggestions from boys when they saw him around the site, but there were no regular meetings in which boys could discuss food with him or make suggestions for menu changes.
- 2.93** Most food was prepared fresh in the small on-site kitchen. The kitchen and unit serveries were clean. Boys were still not able to work in the kitchen to gain skills and qualifications. Boys who worked on the serveries had level 1 food and hygiene training, wore protective clothing and were supervised appropriately during the serving of food. The evening meal left the kitchen in heated trolleys at about 3.30pm but was not served until at least 75 minutes later, which was unacceptable. Some boys could eat their evening meal together unless their regime kept them apart from their peers or there were staffing constraints or incidents on the units.
- 2.94** The four-week menu cycle catered for a range of diets and gave boys five options for lunch and evening meals. On weekdays there was a cold lunch with fruit, a drink and other supplements and a hot meal in the evening. At weekends the cold meal was in the evening. Breakfast packs were larger than in adult prisons but were still small for adolescents who had not had a substantial meal for over 12 hours. Other meals were adequate.

Recommendations

- 2.95** Boys should be employed to prepare food so that they can achieve related qualifications. (Repeated recommendation 2.80)
- 2.96** Food should not be left in heated trolleys or on serveries for extended periods before being served.
- 2.97** All meals should be issued at the servery and eaten in association. (Repeated recommendation 2.79)

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.

- 2.98** New arrivals continued to receive a free grocery pack and phone credit (see paragraph 1.3). It could take up to 10 days before they received their first order from the shop, but they could buy additional reception grocery packs if they wished.
- 2.99** In our survey, less than half the boys said the shop sold a wide enough variety of goods. The choice of goods was reasonable, but consultation through the youth council meeting had not taken place for some months. Arrangements to order newspapers and items from a small choice of catalogues were managed well and without incurring any administration fees on catalogue orders.

Recommendation

- 2.100** **Boys should be able to place a canteen order within 24 hours of their arrival.**
(Repeated recommendation 2.83)

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.¹⁰

- 3.1** The regime was undermined by a shortage of prison officers and poor planning by HMPPS. Managers at Cookham Wood had been unable to recruit for a period because of plans to close HMP Rochester and move staff to Cookham Wood. This closure had been postponed and the delay in recruitment had led to poor outcomes for boys.
- 3.2** Time out of cell had been poor and unpredictable for most boys since the previous inspection. The establishment had estimated the average time out of cell over the previous six months to be about 4.5 hours a day. However, a significant number of boys, particularly those living on B1, Cedar and the segregation unit, received far less.
- 3.3** Our roll checks showed that about a quarter of boys were locked in their cell during the working day. In our survey, only 13% of boys said they had association every day against the comparator of 55% and 34% at the previous inspection. Education cancellations had reduced during the previous two months, but evening association was frequently cancelled due to shortages of staff. The weekend regime rarely ran as scheduled.
- 3.4** The poor regime and delays in movements affected access to all services and represented a significant waste of resources as professionals waited in empty rooms for boys to arrive.

¹⁰ 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.

3.5 Ofsted¹¹ made the following assessments about the learning and skills and work provision:

Overall effectiveness of learning and skills and work: Requires improvement

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

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

Personal development and behaviour: Good

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

Management of education and learning and skills

3.6 The management of education and learning and skills required improvement. During the previous six months, regime restrictions had caused many units to be locked down and too many education classes were cancelled, particularly during May and June 2017. Attendance and punctuality had improved in recent months but were still poor in education and vocational training classes. Prison officers did not always inform Novus tutors when boys attended specialist intervention sessions and could not come to class.

3.7 The education and vocational training delivered by Novus was good. It was well led and very well managed, and had continued to improve since the previous inspection. Partnership working with the prison and community agencies remained strong. Caseworkers worked closely with Novus engagement and resettlement staff and tutors to support boys unable or reluctant to attend education. Managers ensured that boys on the progressive, Phoenix and Cedar units received visits from tutors to enable them to continue their education. However, frequent regime restrictions stretched staff resources and not all boys received enough time with tutors.

¹¹ 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** Novus senior managers supported staff very well and staff performance was well managed. Senior practitioners delivered a good range of training to tutors which had improved further the quality of teaching, learning and assessment. Staff managed challenging behaviour clearly and effectively in the classroom and vocational training. In the few cases that we observed where boys were poorly behaved, staff resolved issues sensitively and quickly reintegrated the boys into learning sessions.
- 3.9** The Ministry of Justice contract monitoring team still did not monitor the quality of provision adequately. Novus senior managers primarily monitored the quality of their own provision. Staff used morning meetings and lunchtime sessions effectively to monitor boys' progress and ensure that they were on track to succeed in education and training. Tutors and managers continued to use data very effectively to check boys' progress in education and training, monitor the provision overall and identify areas for further improvement.
- 3.10** Novus and prison staff worked well together to identify each boy's individual needs during induction. Staff were able to allocate boys quickly to the most appropriate learning pathway and the vast majority of boys started on the day after induction.
- 3.11** In recent months, senior prison staff had started to attend the quality improvement group and were now involved in the monitoring of boys' performance and achievement of qualifications and learning outcomes. The self-evaluation process was working effectively and the report provided clear judgements on improvements.

Recommendations

- 3.12 Senior prison managers should ensure that regimes are managed better to ensure that all boys arrive at activities on time. Education staff should be informed promptly when boys are not going to attend and given the reasons for non-attendance.**
- 3.13 Senior prison managers and Ministry of Justice staff should frequently monitor the performance and quality of all learning delivered by subcontractors to ensure that all boys make good progress.**

Provision of activities

- 3.14** Novus continued to provide enough education and training opportunities for all boys. Staff offered a wide range of interesting and relevant learning pathways. These included academic subjects, prison radio, music, art, and pre-apprenticeship vocational training in horticulture, painting and decorating and carpentry. Other pathways included interpersonal and social skills development, healthy living and catering. All the pathways emphasised development of English and mathematics skills. The range of provision had improved since the previous inspection and a few level 2 courses were available, such as peer mentoring. Activity clubs provided alternative interesting activities towards the end of the core day and in the evenings, which boys enjoyed.
- 3.15** Staff worked quickly and effectively to change learning pathways where necessary and boys were able to change pathways when needs were identified. Novus engagement and resettlement staff made contact with all boys each day and updated their records quickly. Caseworkers were kept well informed of boys' progress.
- 3.16** Induction and early assessments were used effectively to plan boys' time. Novus engagement and resettlement staff worked hard and were highly motivated to care for the boys. Staff

gained boys' confidence during interviews and established clear and appropriate learning pathways. One boy working as a peer mentor played an extremely effective role during induction. However, opportunities to work were limited. Managers had recognised this and plans were in place for boys to paint and decorate cells and rooms and work in the kitchens. Barista training was due to start in the near future.

Recommendation

- 3.17 Prison managers should provide more work opportunities in the establishment to enhance vocational training and provide boys with work experience.**

Quality of provision

- 3.18** Tutors and trainers continued to provide good teaching, learning and assessment. Staff planned learning sessions well. They developed and used a wide and interesting range of activities to develop boys' learning skills, for example community projects. Interactive learning technology was used extremely effectively. In a painting and decorating class the tutor displayed individual learning plans on a screen which were updated whenever a boy had achieved an objective. This information was electronically stored and printed during the session.
- 3.19** The vast majority of boys focused well on tasks and quickly and effectively adapted to independent and small group working. Learning support staff worked well with boys and tutors and provided effective support to boys who needed extra help, enabling them to make good progress, particularly in English and mathematics.
- 3.20** Tutors skilfully and enthusiastically developed learning into discussions about everyday life. For example, in a healthy living session about muscles in the body, boys related the information to their own bodies and gym exercise. Boys' level 3 distance learning workbooks showed a high level of understanding, interpretation and processing of information.
- 3.21** Boys received regular and constructive feedback on their written and practical work and tutors added feedback to an electronic record. Frequent reviews and tutorials enabled boys to determine the progress they had made and how to improve. Community specialists provided superb inspiration for boys in sessions which included a local music project and a popular life skills programme run by a bank.
- 3.22** Most boys developed good skills in English and mathematics sessions. In a few sessions the range of abilities was very wide. Some more able boys were not given sufficiently challenging exercises and lost interest and became distracted. In a few instances the pace of learning was slow and the more assertive boys dominated the sessions. Tutors were not always able to measure fully boys' understanding and progress.
- 3.23** In vocational training sessions, tutors used practical exercises to develop English and mathematics skills, for example cutting angles when hanging wallpaper, the names of tools and estimating sizes when buying materials and costing work. Boys laying out raised flower beds were able to explain sizes in square metres to estimate the quantity of compost needed. Standards of work were good in art, music and drama production and met the standard expected for the qualification in other areas.

Recommendation

- 3.24** The good standard of teaching and learning in education and vocational training should be improved further to ensure that the pace of sessions challenges all boys and helps them progress.

Personal development and behaviour

- 3.25** A good range of personal and social development programmes were delivered. These included the opportunity to fundraise for local disasters and to construct planters and bird tables for the local community. Three boys had been released on temporary licence to speak to school children about their experience in Cookham Wood. This was challenging for the boys but feedback from school staff, children and parents was extremely positive. Many commented on the boys' mature attitude and the way in which they presented themselves without glamorising their offences.
- 3.26** Boys valued work as peer mentors and said that it had helped them build relationships and understand cultural and social differences. Most boys were enthusiastic and motivated to gain a qualification and practical skills. They saw these opportunities as a way of entering education, training or employment on release.
- 3.27** Most boys behaved respectfully and responsibly in education and training sessions and on the units during association. Eleven boys had gained the peer mentoring qualification at level 2 but at the time of the inspection too few were working as peer mentors. Ten boys were studying distance learning courses which they had started at Cookham Wood, for example a few boys were studying for 'A' level and bookkeeping courses.

Recommendation

- 3.28** Prison managers should provide more peer mentoring opportunities for boys who have achieved the qualification.

Education and vocational achievements

- 3.29** Achievements in education and vocational training were outstanding. Boys who had previously been excluded from school achieved very well. Almost all boys who completed their courses gained a qualification. Significant improvements had been made in mathematics at level 2 and achievements were very high. Most boys passed functional skills in English and mathematics at the first attempt and a high proportion progressed at least one level higher than their starting point.
- 3.30** Boys who were released or transferred to another establishment and did not complete a full qualification were provided with a record of modules they had achieved. Boys who were only in the establishment for a very short time achieved their individual learning objectives.
- 3.31** Novus staff monitored boys' participation and achievement well and data showed that there was no discernible difference in the high achievements of boys from different backgrounds and/or those with learning difficulties.

Library

- 3.32** The library facilities provided by Medway Library Services remained good. The library was a bright, airy, spacious and visually stimulating room with a good range of books and resources. Boys enjoyed visiting the library and made effective use of it. The range of fiction and non-fiction books, graphic novels, manga books, newspapers, magazines and audio books was adequate for the population. Additional stock could be sourced from Rochester Prison library and Medway Library Services. Age-appropriate books were available for a range of ability levels and books in other languages were sourced on request.
- 3.33** Access to the library had improved since the previous inspection and most boys had regular library visits scheduled. Boys on Cedar and the progression units were visited by library staff and a comprehensive library catalogue enabled them to request books. However, the provision of books in the segregation unit was poor.
- 3.34** Library staff made good use of external speakers which enhanced the experience of the boys. Boys responded well to a range of quizzes and competitions, such as the 'reading ahead' scheme which encouraged them to engage in reading for pleasure and develop their reading skills.

Physical education and healthy living

Expected outcomes:

All children and young people understand the importance of healthy living, and are encouraged and enabled to participate in and enjoy physical education in safety, regardless of their ability. The programme of activities is inclusive and well planned. It is varied and includes indoor and outdoor activities.

- 3.35** The physical education staffing levels remained too low for all boys to have the minimum allocation of three hours a week. Too many boys did not go to the gym and too many sessions were cancelled. This was ameliorated when possible by residential officers attending PE sessions to allow more boys to attend.
- 3.36** The facilities for physical training and activities were adequate. Outdoor isometric equipment for the exercise yards had been delivered but not yet installed. All boys who wanted to attend the gym were given an induction and basic training in lifting techniques and Heartstart life support. Staff kept good records of boys who had been on induction.
- 3.37** All boys on learning programmes had access to the gym and boys on enhanced level could attend additional sessions in the evenings and at weekends. There were too few staff to offer any accredited courses and there were no community based sports games. There were no sessions for boys needing to lose weight, recovering from injury or with health care concerns.
- 3.38** Changing and shower facilities remained satisfactory. The all-weather pitches were still in need of refurbishment and repair.

Recommendations

- 3.39** The number of PE staff should be increased to ensure that boys have appropriate access to the gym.
- 3.40** PE staff should reintroduce appropriate accredited training courses. (Repeated recommendation 3.33)
- 3.41** There should be urgent maintenance and repair work to the all-weather sports facilities. (Repeated recommendation 3.34)

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 management of pre-release and resettlement work had deteriorated since the previous inspection. The reducing reoffending strategy was up to date and described all relevant pathways, including case management and transition planning. However, there was no needs analysis of the boys which hindered the planning of services across all areas of resettlement.
- 4.2 Monthly resettlement meetings were still held with the aim of discussing all resettlement pathways. Attendance was sometimes poor and some action points remained unresolved after a significant period.
- 4.3 The casework team consisted of six caseworkers through a contract with Medway Youth Offending Team (YOT) and four prison supervising officers. There had been uncertainty since late 2016 about the continuation of the contracted service and there had been problems filling posts in the team. The resulting staff shortages meant that boys had less contact with caseworkers. This continuing uncertainty over the future of the department reflected management shortcomings in both Medway Council and the establishment.
- 4.4 Despite these difficulties, the establishment was continuing to use release on temporary licence (ROTL). There had been 457 ROTLs during the previous six months. Up to eight boys were released each month to attend work experience, interviews and other community projects. Decision-making around ROTL was appropriate and based on comprehensive risk assessments. ROTL was supported well by the education provider and the MVP (most valuable player) programme (see paragraph 4.43). Early release arrangements and home detention curfew (HDC) were also used appropriately and 23 boys had achieved early release and two boys had been on HDC during the previous six months. ROTL and early release motivated boys and encouraged good behaviour and engagement.
- 4.5 Support for boys who would transfer to adult establishments was well managed, although it depended on support from receiving establishments. In the best cases, boys met staff from adult sites in person or by video link before moving.
- 4.6 There remained little follow-up data on boys' progress after their release. This prevented any assessment of the long-term effectiveness of work with boys at Cookham Wood.

Recommendations

- 4.7 **All boys should receive regular meaningful contact with their caseworker.**
- 4.8 **There should be a young people's estate-wide approach to enable young offender institutions to collect data systematically to determine the resettlement and reoffending outcomes for boys released into the community. (Repeated recommendation 4.8)**

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.

- 4.9** All boys at Cookham Wood had a training or remand plan but in too many cases these plans were generic and not integrated with other plans such as segregation reviews, short-term assessment of risk and need and ACCT¹² plans. Consequently, the training or remand plan was not central to the boys' progression. In our survey, only 44% of respondents said they had a remand or sentence plan.
- 4.10** Caseloads had increased since the previous inspection and most caseworkers managed 25 boys. Cases continued to be allocated according to risk and the skills in the team. Despite the increased workloads, remand and sentence review meetings continued to take place regularly and caseworkers invited a range of professionals and family members to attend. Attendance by YOTs and independent review officers was good. However, with the exception of mental health, attendance and written contributions from other prison departments, including residential units, were poor. Reviews were often delayed because boys were not moved around the establishment in a timely fashion.
- 4.11** The e-Asset tool was no longer used to record meetings, and in nearly half the cases we looked at, records of meetings were poor. Actions for professionals and targets for boys arising from the meetings were not fully explained and some records contained no information at all. In most cases, targets were set but too many remained generic and boys we spoke to were unaware of them. Not all screening for offending behaviour interventions was completed in a timely fashion which caused delays for boys in accessing interventions (see paragraph 4.40).

Recommendation

- 4.12 There should be a case management system in place to record a boy's progress in custody and facilitate information sharing with community agencies.**

Public protection

- 4.13** Boys were screened on arrival for any public protection concerns and appropriate restrictions or monitoring of contact were imposed. The monthly interdepartmental risk management board (IRMB) identified internal risks and boys who might pose risks on release. Attendance at these meetings was poor and in many cases minutes did not indicate any discussion or action points. This was mitigated in part by the work of other meetings, in particular the safer regimes meeting, and the work of individual caseworkers.
- 4.14** Caseworkers contacted YOTs to determine if new arrivals were subject to multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA). At the time of the inspection, 47 boys were subject to MAPPA and those at level two or three (the higher risk management level) were appropriately identified in sufficient time before release.

¹² Assessment, care in custody and teamwork case management of boys at risk of suicide or self-harm.

Recommendation

- 4.15 The role of the interdepartmental risk management board should be reviewed to ensure that it is a forum which consistently identifies and manages risk.**

Indeterminate sentence young people

- 4.16** Two boys were serving indeterminate sentences at the time of the inspection. Although there was still no specific provision for this group, the small numbers meant that the casework team were able to manage boys on indeterminate sentences appropriately.

Looked-after children

- 4.17** Children entitled to support from their local authority comprised the majority of boys at Cookham Wood, about 100 at any one time. These children were identified by caseworkers who referred to social workers if support from local authorities was not forthcoming. We were assured by social workers and caseworkers that all children were receiving the support they were entitled to. However, we found two examples of looked-after boys who had not received 'pocket money' since arriving at the establishment.
- 4.18** In our survey, looked-after children were more likely than other boys to say they had emotional or mental health difficulties and that they had been subject to adjudications. Funding was available for three social workers to support this group, although only two were in post at the time of the inspection. This represented a significant resource which needed better coordination with casework to ensure that all looked-after children received appropriate support.

Recommendation

- 4.19 Systems should be put in place to ensure that all looked-after children promptly receive the support they are entitled to on arrival at Cookham Wood.**

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.

- 4.20** Release planning continued to be discussed at an early stage of a boy's time at Cookham Wood. Despite this, in too many cases delays in finding suitable accommodation prevented meaningful reintegration planning until very close to the release date. Caseworkers ensured that practical arrangements for the day of release were well organised, including a suitable adult to meet all boys on release. However, during the inspection we witnessed a release delayed unnecessarily until 3.30pm despite the boy's parents arriving at the establishment at 9.30am.

Accommodation

- 4.21** Despite the efforts of caseworkers, too many boys did not have accommodation arranged in time for their final review. This undermined planning in other areas, particularly provision of education or employment and the coordination of health care services. No boy had been released without an address, but this was sometimes only arranged on the day of release. A few boys were provided with hostel type accommodation, which was inappropriate.
- 4.22** One case highlighted the significant national shortcomings in the provision of accommodation for children. The only accommodation that could be found for one 15-year-old boy was nearly 200 miles away from his previous address and the establishment. He rejected the transport provided and refused to go. The establishment had to release him but, as his social worker was not at the gate to meet him, they then had to report him as a missing person to the local police.

Recommendation

- 4.23** **The Youth Justice Board should work with relevant government departments to ensure that boys are not released from custody into bed and breakfast or hostel accommodation.** (Repeated recommendation 4.21)

Education, training and employment

- 4.24** Novus were contracted to provide careers advice and guidance. This was delivered by a well-qualified and motivated team of engagement and resettlement staff who played a key role at induction in helping boys to choose the most relevant pathway. Following induction, staff kept in contact with boys each day to ensure they remained motivated and progressed successfully during their sentence and on release. Staff did not always attend review meetings but provided written comments where appropriate.
- 4.25** Novus tutors and community agencies delivered a good pre-release course to help boys with resettlement. The certificated course included domestic chores, CV writing, dealing with disclosure and budgeting. This was well received by boys. A few boys were placed in work under ROTL.
- 4.26** The virtual campus¹³ worked well and boys used it effectively to research information for higher level courses and access to education, training and employment (ETE) opportunities. The collating and use of data to track boys' progression into ETE had improved, although only about a third of boys were recorded as entering ETE on release. This was too low.

Recommendations

- 4.27** **Engagement and resettlement workers should attend boys' review meetings to ensure that all aspects of their progress are considered when planning their time in the establishment.**
- 4.28** **Managers should maintain effective records to monitor the destinations and sustained employment or training of boys who leave.** (Repeated recommendation 4.25)

¹³ Internet access for prisoners to community education, training and employment opportunities.

Health care

- 4.29** Boys were given a pre-discharge appointment a week before release where take-home prescribed medicines and follow-up hospital care were identified. A summary of the clinical record was given to the boy and forwarded to his registered GP, including an up-to-date history of immunisations and vaccinations. The primary care team worked with the London GP Registration of Offenders Project to ensure that boys with no named GP were identified as early as possible. Health staff attended resettlement pre-release meetings for boys with complex needs. Boys with continuing mental health needs were linked with their local child and adolescent mental health service and/or adult services. There was good liaison with YOTs.

Drugs and alcohol

- 4.30** Substance misuse workers delivered a pre-release harm reduction session with boys who had engaged with the service. The team attended resettlement meetings and liaised effectively with caseworkers, community services and YOTs. Substance misuse workers followed up boys' progress two weeks after release.

Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.31** Work on finance, benefit and debt remained rudimentary. The pre-release course covered money management and caseworkers helped boys to obtain a National Insurance number if needed.

Recommendation

- 4.32** **Boys should receive comprehensive advice and guidance on finance, benefit and debt.** (Repeated recommendation 4.31)

Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.33** Work to support children and families had improved since the previous inspection. The health and well-being team had introduced a 'fathers in prison and healthy relationships' course earlier in 2017, but the number attending had been low.
- 4.34** Family days were organised by the casework team and now took place monthly. Each family day had a theme which was reflected in the activities and food provided for families and boys. The family days were now open to boys on standard and enhanced levels of the incentives and earned privileges scheme, but not for boys on basic or for most of the complex cohort group (CCG).
- 4.35** Social visits took place at weekends and on Wednesday afternoons, with an additional session on a Monday afternoon for boys with specific needs such as keep apart or the CCG.
- 4.36** The visitors' centre was staffed by the casework team who provided a friendly welcome to families. However, the actual centre was poorly signposted and we were given examples of families losing valuable visits time when directed to the wrong building. Families could use a small kitchen and a room was available for boys assessed as suitable to receive external visits under ROTL.

- 4.37** The visits room was basic. Refreshments had to be purchased from a vending machine. Efforts had been made to install a small play area for children, which was welcomed by families.
- 4.38** We observed a caseworker meeting a boy's family following a visit to address concerns they had about his release date and care. The time given to the family and the sensitive handling of the conversation was a good example of the positive relationships and care shown by many staff to boys and their families.

Recommendation

- 4.39** **The area in which the visitors' centre is located should be made more welcoming and appropriate signage should be installed to identify the location of the centre clearly.**

Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.40** The establishment continued to offer a range of accredited and non-accredited programmes. However, staff shortfalls, problems with the regime, and keep apart issues hindered access to all interventions. At the time of the inspection, more than 50 boys were awaiting allocation to accredited programmes. During the first half of 2017 to 2018, only 11 boys had completed a group programme.
- 4.41** The inability to deliver the full range of accredited programmes was mitigated in part by the delivery of one-to-one sessions (A to Z which focused on motivation to change or STAG - starve the anger gremlin), which had increased since the previous inspection. It was disappointing that even the delivery of this work was frustrated by a lack of facilities and delays in moving boys to interventions. The failure to reinforce learning from group and individual interventions on residential units remained a missed opportunity.
- 4.42** Boys who presented the highest risk were prioritised for programmes. Those located in the segregation unit and on BI were targeted for individual work. It was concerning that some boys with an assessed need left the establishment without receiving any offending behaviour intervention.
- 4.43** Good one-to-one work delivered by the health and well-being team was available to boys exhibiting sexually harmful behaviour. Caseworkers could refer a small number of boys to other programmes run by community agencies, including the MVP (most valuable player) programme focusing on reducing violence (see paragraph 4.4).

Recommendations

- 4.44** **Learning from programmes should be reinforced by staff across the establishment.** (Repeated recommendation 4.44)
- 4.45** **Staff who deliver interventions should be trained promptly to maximise the number of boys who can benefit from the programmes offered.** (Repeated recommendation 4.43)

Section 5. Summary of recommendations and good practice

The following is a listing of repeated and new 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, and in the previous report where recommendations have been repeated.

Main recommendations

To the governor

- 5.1** Accurate data should be used to inform a clear and effective strategy to reduce levels of violence. Systems to manage violent behaviour and support the victims of bullying should be strengthened. (S40)
- 5.2** The complex cohort units should be staffed and managed more effectively to fulfil their progressive purpose. Boys segregated within the cohort should have well communicated individual plans, with more meaningful targets, to support safe and swift reintegration. (S41)
- 5.3** All boys should be able to access 10 hours out of their cell each day. The regime should be predictable to enable boys to access punctually the services designed to support their well-being and help to reduce their risk of reoffending. (S42)
- 5.4** Individual training and remand plans should be central to a boy's progression. Targets should be specific and address identified risks of reoffending and harm. Staff from all relevant departments should be represented at training planning or remand management reviews, or submit a detailed report if they cannot attend. (S43)

Recommendation

To the Ministry of Justice and HMPPS

- 5.5** Senior prison managers and Ministry of Justice staff should frequently monitor the performance and quality of all learning delivered by subcontractors to ensure that all boys make good progress. (3.13)

Recommendation

To the Youth Justice Board

- 5.6** The Youth Justice Board should work with relevant government departments to ensure that boys are not released from custody into bed and breakfast or hostel accommodation. (4.23, repeated recommendation 4.21)

Recommendation

To HMPPS

- 5.7** There should be a young people's estate-wide approach to enable young offender institutions to collect data systematically to determine the resettlement and reoffending outcomes for boys released into the community. (4.8, repeated recommendation 4.8)

Recommendation To Prisoner Escort and Custody Services (PECS)

Courts, escort and transfers

- 5.8** Boys should not travel with adults and their arrival at the prison should not be delayed. (1.2)

Recommendations

To the governor

Child protection

- 5.9** The local safeguarding children board should be notified of all significant child protection incidents. (1.18)

Victims of bullying and intimidation

- 5.10** All incidents of bullying and intimidation should be reported, investigated and appropriately managed. Systems to identify and support victims of bullying should be improved. (1.23)

Suicide and self-harm protection

- 5.11** There should be a procedure for the identification of incidents of serious self-harm so that they can be investigated and learned from. (1.28)

- 5.12** The quality of ACCT case management documents and support for boys in crisis should be improved. (1.29)

Behaviour management

- 5.13** An overarching behaviour management strategy should be developed to improve oversight of the various systems in place and make them more effective in improving behaviour. (1.35)

Rewards and sanctions

- 5.14** The removal of basic amenities, such as kettles, should not form part of the incentives and earned privileges scheme. (1.43, repeated recommendation 1.37)

- 5.15** The use of sanctions to supplement warnings for poor behaviour should be appropriately monitored to ensure proportionality and fairness and to provide assurance that sanctions are not awarded to individual boys frequently or for longer than authorised. (1.44)

Security and disciplinary procedures

- 5.16** All adjudications should be heard and adjudication review meetings should analyse trends. (1.55)

Bullying and violence reduction

- 5.17** All allegations of bullying should be recorded and investigated thoroughly and action taken where required. (1.63)

- 5.18** A coherent approach should be taken to the management of violence and bullying, including meaningful analysis of data and a comprehensive action plan to maintain the safety of boys. (1.64)

The use of force

- 5.19** All use of force documents should be completed promptly and comprehensively after incidents have taken place. (1.73)

Separation/removal from normal location

- 5.20** Living conditions in the segregation unit should be improved and cells and communal areas should be kept clean, free of graffiti and well maintained. (1.87, repeated recommendation 1.62)
- 5.21** Risks, triggers and vulnerability identified when a boy is first segregated should be clearly documented and accessible to all staff. (1.88)
- 5.22** The regime for boys segregated as part of the CCG should be improved and time out of cell activities should be consistently available. (1.89)
- 5.23** A regular meeting with appropriate attendance should analyse comprehensive data to identify trends or patterns in relation to segregation. Appropriate governance should be provided to reduce the number of boys segregated across the CCG. (1.90)

Substance misuse

- 5.24** A drug strategy for the establishment should be produced which contains an action plan with performance measures which are regularly reviewed and used to inform service delivery. (1.99)

Residential units

- 5.25** Cells should be clean and free of graffiti. (2.8)
- 5.26** There should be a range of games and activities for boys to use in association areas. (2.9)

Relationships between staff and children and younger people

- 5.27** Consultation with boys should be effective and lead to tangible outcomes. (2.15)

Equality and diversity

- 5.28** Equality work should be given greater priority and the equality action team should ensure that an up-to-date action plan addresses all identified weaknesses in the system. (2.20)
- 5.29** Regular effective consultation should take place. (2.21)
- 5.30** The promotion of tolerance and support for gay and bisexual boys should be strengthened. (2.29)

Faith and religious activity

- 5.31** The establishment should investigate why boys feel it is not easy to attend faith services and address any issues identified. (2.33)

Complaints

- 5.32** All complaints should be thoroughly investigated and quality assurance procedures should ensure that replies to boys' complaints cover fully all issues raised. (2.37)

Legal rights

- 5.33** The establishment should review legal visits provision in the light of demand. (2.40)

Health services

- 5.34** Clinical incidents should be reported and monitored effectively so that lessons can be learned. (2.58)
- 5.35** All automated external defibrillators should be in good working order with a clear audit trail to ensure they are regularly checked and maintained. Monitoring processes for other emergency equipment should be more robust. (2.59)
- 5.36** The reception health treatment room should provide a safe environment for health staff and better visibility for prison staff. (2.68, repeated recommendation 2.53)
- 5.37** Boys should have timely access to dental care and treatment. (2.80)
- 5.38** Maintenance schedules and contemporary safety certification should be readily available to demonstrate compliance. (2.81)
- 5.39** The regime should support sustained attendance by boys at therapeutic group sessions. (2.89, repeated recommendation 2.74)
- 5.40** Boys who need a secure mental health bed should be transferred as soon as possible. (2.90, repeated recommendation 2.75)

Catering

- 5.41** Boys should be employed to prepare food so that they can achieve related qualifications. (2.95, repeated recommendation 2.80)
- 5.42** Food should not be left in heated trolleys or on serveries for extended periods before being served. (2.96)
- 5.43** All meals should be issued at the servery and eaten in association. (2.97, repeated recommendation 2.79)

Purchases

- 5.44** Boys should be able to place a canteen order within 24 hours of their arrival. (2.100, repeated recommendation 2.83)

Education, learning and skills

- 5.45** Senior prison managers should ensure that regimes are managed better to ensure that all boys arrive at activities on time. Education staff should be informed promptly when boys are not going to attend and given the reasons for non-attendance. (3.12)
- 5.46** Prison managers should provide more work opportunities in the establishment to enhance vocational training and provide boys with work experience. (3.17)
- 5.47** The good standard of teaching and learning in education and vocational training should be improved further to ensure that the pace of sessions challenges all boys and helps them progress. (3.24)
- 5.48** Prison managers should provide more peer mentoring opportunities for boys who have achieved the qualification. (3.28)

Physical education and healthy living

- 5.49** The number of PE staff should be increased to ensure that boys have appropriate access to the gym. (3.39)
- 5.50** PE staff should reintroduce appropriate accredited training courses. (3.40, repeated recommendation 3.33)
- 5.51** There should be urgent maintenance and repair work to the all-weather sports facilities. (3.41, repeated recommendation 3.34)

Pre-release and resettlement

- 5.52** All boys should receive regular meaningful contact with their caseworker. (4.7)

Training planning and remand management

- 5.53** There should be a case management system in place to record a boy's progress in custody and facilitate information sharing with community agencies. (4.12)
- 5.54** The role of the interdepartmental risk management board should be reviewed to ensure that it is a forum which consistently identifies and manages risk. (4.15)
- 5.55** Systems should be put in place to ensure that all looked-after children promptly receive the support they are entitled to on arrival at Cookham Wood. (4.19)

Reintegration planning

- 5.56** Engagement and resettlement workers should attend boys' review meetings to ensure that all aspects of their progress are considered when planning their time in the establishment. (4.27)
- 5.57** Managers should maintain effective records to monitor the destinations and sustained employment or training of boys who leave. (4.28, repeated recommendation 4.25)
- 5.58** Boys should receive comprehensive advice and guidance on finance, benefit and debt. (4.32, Repeated recommendation 4.31)

- 5.59** The area in which the visitors' centre is located should be made more welcoming and appropriate signage should be installed to identify the location of the centre clearly. (4.39)
- 5.60** Learning from programmes should be reinforced by staff across the establishment. (4.44, Repeated recommendation 4.44)
- 5.61** Staff who deliver interventions should be trained promptly to maximise the number of boys who can benefit from the programmes offered. (4.45, Repeated recommendation 4.43)

Examples of good practice

- 5.62** A peer mentor was based on the induction unit. He attended the induction presentation and offered valuable advice and support to new arrivals. (1.9)
- 5.63** One-to-one work with the energetic Kinetic Youth team provided boys segregated on B1 with valuable support and encouragement and assisted with reintegration. (1.91)
- 5.64** Medical alert wristbands and the information given to custody staff on potentially life-threatening health conditions supported the safety and care of boys. (2.69)
- 5.65** The service-user development programme was an excellent initiative to help de-stigmatise emotional and mental health needs and promote self-esteem. (2.91)

Section 6. Appendices

Appendix I: Inspection team

Peter Clarke	Chief inspector
Deborah Butler	Team leader
Ian Dickens	Inspector
Angela Johnson	Inspector
Yvonne McGuckian	Inspector
Angus Mulready-Jones	Inspector
Tamara Pattinson	Inspector
Maureen Jamieson	Health services inspector
Andrea Crosby-Josephs	Care Quality Commission inspector
Bob Cowdrey	Ofsted inspector
Judy Lye-Forster	Ofsted inspector
Helen Ranns	Researcher
Anna Fenton	Researcher
Emma Seymour	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 2016, too many boys continued to arrive late at Cookham Wood, but good early days work offset some of the risks this posed. Safeguarding and child protection procedures were sound. Levels of self-harm were low and case management for boys in crisis was good. Levels of violence were high and assaults on staff were common. A promising strategy to manage and reduce violence was very much in its early stages. The introduction of the PACT ('positive attitudes created together') scheme as a response to violence and bullying was beginning to be effective, and support for victims was good. Rewards and sanctions were well integrated into the overarching behaviour management strategy. Security was controlled but broadly proportionate. Use of force was very high although the cases we reviewed were proportionate. The segregation unit was a poor facility but case management was good. Outcomes for children and young people were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendation

Systems for reporting and managing violent behaviour should be accurate and used to reduce levels of violence. Case management for all boys on PACT, particularly those on the progression unit, should be multidisciplinary, and include a positive and decent regime. (S39)

Not achieved

Recommendations

Young people should be transported from court to the establishment as soon as possible after their hearing ends to reduce waiting and journey times, and assist early settlement on their first night. (1.4)

Not achieved

Boys should only be allocated to Cookham Wood when it is clear that the establishment can meet their needs. (1.6, repeated recommendation 1.8)

Achieved

Boys should arrive at the establishment with their Asset paperwork so that comprehensive risk assessments can be completed. (1.13)

Not achieved

Waits on cellular vehicles should be kept to a minimum, especially for new arrivals. (1.5)

Achieved

Cells on the first night unit should be fully equipped and ready for use before boys are accommodated in them. (1.12, repeated recommendation 1.19)

Achieved

Staff on the induction wing should hand over all relevant information about new boys to staff on the following shift. (1.14)

Achieved

Documentation supporting child protection referrals should be submitted to the local authority designated officer without delay. (1.21)

Not achieved

The role, working practices and aims of the progression unit on BI should be specified and published. (1.33)

Achieved

The removal of basic amenities, such as kettles, should not form part of the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme. (1.37)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 1.43)

Young people should not be punished without a full investigation of the facts. (1.38)

Achieved

Use of force documents should be completed fully, quickly and kept together. (1.57)

Partially achieved

Living conditions in the segregation unit should be improved, and cells and communal areas should be kept clean, graffiti-free and well maintained. (1.62)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 1.87)

The regime for young people in the segregation unit should be improved and include time out of cell activities that are consistently available. (1.63)

Not achieved

There should be robust and reliable provision of monitoring and observation services should any boy need clinical substance misuse services. (1.68)

Achieved

Respect

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

At the last inspection in 2016, the environment was generally clean, although some areas were poorly maintained. All cells were single and included showers and telephones. Prison-issue clothes were often ill-fitting, and there had been shortages of basic items. The professionalism and commitment of staff in general was a real strength. Strategic management of equality and diversity work remained weak in some areas but this was offset by some impressive work by the equality officer to support boys with protected characteristics. Complaints were managed well. Health services were good. Outcomes for children and young people were good against this healthy prison test.

Recommendations

Boys on remand should not have to wear prison clothes. (2.7)

Not achieved

All prison-issue clothing should fit and be in good repair. (2.8)

Achieved

Boys' telephone numbers should be cleared quickly to enable them to call close family and friends soon after their arrival. They should have longer time to make telephone calls, and be able to call support organisations such as Samaritans and Childline without restrictions. (2.9)

Not achieved

Applications should be tracked and subject to regular management checks. (2.10)

Not achieved

All staff should wear their names on their uniform. (2.14)

Not achieved

An effective personal officer scheme should be in place, ensuring that all boys have an identified officer with whom they meet regularly to discuss concerns and needs. (2.15)

Not achieved

Representatives from key departments, and equality representatives, should attend the equality action team meetings. (2.21)

Not achieved

The number of equality peer support representatives should be expanded. (2.22)

Achieved

Consultation for boys with protected characteristics should be formalised to monitor progress on supportive actions identified. (2.31)

Not achieved

Gay and bisexual boys should be reassured that support and advice was available for them and that homophobic behaviour would be robustly addressed. (2.32)

Not achieved

Subject to security concerns, all boys should be able to see a chaplain and attend corporate worship. (2.36)

Partially achieved

The establishment should investigate and address why boys from a black or minority ethnic background have worse perceptions than white boys about making a complaint. (2.39)

Achieved

The reception health treatment room should provide a safe environment for health staff and better visibility for prison staff. (2.53)

Partially achieved (Recommendation repeated, 2.68)

Two people should accompany all controlled drugs transported in the prison. (2.64)

Achieved

Boys should not have excessively long waits for dental services. Best practice guidance for instrument decontamination should be followed. (2.69)

Partially achieved

The regime should support young people's sustained attendance at therapeutic group sessions. (2.74)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 2.89)

Boys who need a secure mental health bed should be transferred as soon as possible. (2.75)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 2.90)

All meals should be issued at the servery and eaten in association. (2.79)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 2.97)

Boys should be employed to prepare food so that they can achieve related qualifications. (2.80)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 2.95)

Boys should be able to place a canteen order within 24 hours of their arrival. (2.83)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 2.100)

Purposeful activity

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

At the last inspection in 2016, time out of cell had improved for most boys but one in four were still locked up for too long during the core day. The management of learning and skills was good and there was sufficient training for all boys. Although there was a broad provision of education up to level 1, there were limited opportunities in vocational training and peer mentoring. Punctuality was poor but behaviour in class was generally good. The quality of teaching was good, and English and mathematics were very well integrated into sessions. Too many outreach sessions were cancelled due to regime restrictions, and one in five learners left before completing their courses. Access to the library was good. PE provision was limited to recreational sessions. Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendation

Cookham Wood should ensure that boys are able to attend on time the activities and specialist appointments necessary for their management and care. (S40)

Not achieved

Recommendations

All boys should spend at least 10 hours every day out of their cell and have the opportunity to spend at least one hour in the open air every day. (3.4)

Not achieved

More activities should be available during outside exercise. (3.5)

Not achieved

Senior prison staff should ensure that the allocation process enables boys to attend the education and training activities that meet their identified needs. (3.12)

Achieved

Senior prison managers should frequently monitor the performance and quality of all learning delivered by subcontractors to ensure that all learners make progress and that staff are suitably supported. (3.13)

Not achieved

There should be sufficient resources to support the practical teaching of vocational training, especially horticulture, and to extend learning to higher levels. (3.22)

Achieved

The gym should reintroduce appropriate accredited training courses. (3.33)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 3.40)

There should be urgent maintenance and repair work to the all-weather sports facilities. (3.34)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 3.41)

Resettlement

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

At the last inspection in 2016, strategic management of resettlement was reasonably good, and work on transition of boys to other establishments and release on temporary licence (ROTL) had improved. Boys were positive about the excellent support they received from their caseworker. Remand and training planning meetings were affected by delays in attendance by boys and non-attendance by some staff. Some sentence plan objectives were too generic and not clearly linked to risk factors, and some boys did not know they had a plan. Public protection arrangements were in place. The provision for looked-after boys had improved. Reintegration planning was good, with clear efforts to resettle boys back into their communities. The visits provision had improved but there were still some weaknesses in the family pathway. The establishment had recently introduced accredited interventions, which was a positive development. Outcomes for children and young people were reasonable good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendation

Individual training and remand planning targets should be specific and address identified risks of reoffending and harm. Staff from all relevant departments should be represented at training planning or remand management reviews, or submit a detailed report if they cannot attend. (S41)

Not achieved

Recommendations

There should be a young people's estate-wide approach to enable young offender institutions to collect data systematically to determine the resettlement and reoffending outcomes for boys released into the community. (4.8)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 4.8)

The Youth Justice Board should work with relevant government departments to ensure that boys are not released from custody into bed and breakfast or hostel accommodation. (4.21)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 4.23)

The establishment should maintain effective records to monitor the destinations and sustained employment or training of the young people who leave. (4.25)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 4.28)

The virtual campus should be used to enable boys to access up-to-date employment, education and training opportunities. (4.26)

Achieved

Boys should receive comprehensive advice and guidance on finance, benefit and debt. (4.31)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 4.32)

Children and families services should be developed further to meet the needs of boys who are fathers, such as parenting and relationship courses and Storybook Dads. (4.36)

Achieved

Family days should be available to boys on all levels of the IEP scheme. (4.37)

Not achieved

There should be a suitably equipped play area for younger children in the visits area. (4.38)

Achieved

Staff who deliver interventions should be trained promptly to maximise the number of boys who can benefit from the programmes offered. (4.43)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 4.45)

Learning from programmes should be reinforced by staff across the establishment. (4.44)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 4.44)

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	106	65.8
Recall	0	0
Convicted unsentenced	10	6.2
Remand	43	26.7
Detainees	0	0
Life	2	1.2
Total	161	100

Age	Number of young people	%
15 years	11	6.8
16 years	42	26.1
17 years	87	54
18 years	21	13
Other	0	0
Total	161	100

Nationality	Number of young people	%
British	130	80.7
Foreign nationals	31	19.3
Total		

Ethnicity	Number of young people	%
White		
British	48	29.8
Irish	1	0.6
Gypsy/Irish Traveller	2	1.2
Other white	8	5.0
Mixed		
White and black Caribbean	10	6.2
White and black African	3	1.9
White and Asian	0	0
Other mixed	7	4.3
Asian or Asian British		
Indian	0	0
Pakistani	5	3.1
Bangladeshi	2	1.2
Chinese	0	0
Other Asian	7	4.3
Black or black British		
Caribbean	20	12.4
African	20	12.4
Other black	23	14.3
Other ethnic group		
Arab	1	0.6
Other ethnic group	4	2.5
Not stated	0	0
Total	161	100

Religion	Number of young people	%
Baptist	0	0
Church of England	7	4.3
Roman Catholic	21	13
Other Christian denominations	32	19.9
Muslim	41	25.5
Sikh	0	0
Hindu	0	0
Buddhist	0	0
Jewish	0	0
Other	0	0
No religion	59	36.6
Not Stated	1	0.6
Total	161	100

Other demographics	Number of young people	%
Gypsy/Romany/Traveller	2	1.2
Total		

Sentenced only – length of stay by age

Length of stay	<1 mth	1–3 mths	3–6 mths	6–12 mths	1–2 yrs	2 yrs +	4 yrs +	Total
Age								
15 years	1	4	3	0	0	0		7.5
16 years	4	5	13	6	3	0		29.2
17 years	9	11	9	13	6	0		45.3
18 years	0	1	6	8	4	0		17.9
Total	14	21	31	27	13	0		100

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	1	2	0	0	0	0		5.5
16 years	2	5	3	1	0	0		20
17 years	19	9	6	5	0	0		70.9
18 years	1	1	0	0	0	0		3.6
Total	23	17	9	6	0	0		100

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

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

Sentence	<4 mths	<6 mths	<8 mths	<10 mths	<12 mths	<18 mths	<24 mths	24 mths	Total
Age									
15 years	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	10
16 years	1	0	3	1	4	5	4	0	36
17 years	3	0	1	1	2	4	9	1	42
18 years	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	12
Total	6	0	4	2	7	9	21	1	100

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	33.3
17 years	1	0	0	0	0	0	33.3
18 years	1	0	0	0	0	0	33.3
Total	3	0	0	0	0	0	100

Number of indeterminate sentences under Section 226b (extended determinate sentence) by age and length of tariff

Sentence	Section 90	Section 53(1)	Recall	ISPPCJ03	HMP		Total
Age							
15 years	0	0	0	0	0		0
16 years	0	0	0	0	0		0
17 years	0	0	0	0	2		100
18 years	0	0	0	0	0		0
Total					2		100

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

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

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

Children and young people survey methodology

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

Sampling

Questionnaires were offered to all young people.

Distributing and collecting questionnaires

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

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

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

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

Survey response

At the time of the survey on 14 August 2017 the young person population at HMYOI Cookham Wood was 159. Questionnaires were distributed to 156 young people¹⁴.

We received a total of 136 completed questionnaires, a response rate of 87%. This included five questionnaires completed via interview. Seven respondents refused to complete a questionnaire and 13 questionnaires were not returned.

¹⁴ Surveys were not distributed to four young people who had been released and three young people who were at court on the day of the survey.

Wing/unit	Number of completed survey returns
A1	23
A2	26
A3	26
B1	18
B2	23
B3	9
C	7
Care and separation unit	4

Presentation of survey results and analyses

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

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

We also present a number of comparative analyses. In all the comparative analyses that follow, statistically significant¹⁵ differences are indicated by shading. Results that are significantly better are indicated by green shading, results that are significantly worse are indicated by blue shading. If the difference is not statistically significant there is no shading. Orange shading has been used to show a statistically significant difference in young peoples' background details.

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

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

The following comparative analyses are presented

- The current survey responses from HMYOI Cookham Wood in 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 December 2016.
- The current survey responses from HMYOI Cookham Wood in 2017 compared with the responses of young people surveyed at HMYOI Cookham Wood in 2016.
- 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.

¹⁵ 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.

- A comparison within the 2017 survey between responses of young people who consider themselves to be Romany/Gypsy/Traveller and those who do not consider themselves to be Romany/Gypsy/Traveller.
- A comparison within the 2017 survey between the responses of young people on B1 wing and the responses of young people on all other wings.

Survey summary

SECTION I: ABOUT YOU

Q1	How old are you?	
	15	8 (6%)
	16	34 (26%)
	17	69 (52%)
	18	21 (16%)
Q2	Are you a British citizen?	
	Yes	120 (90%)
	No	13 (10%)
Q3	Do you understand spoken English?	
	Yes	132 (100%)
	No	0 (0%)
Q4	Do you understand written English?	
	Yes	128 (97%)
	No	4 (3%)
Q5	What is your ethnic origin?	
	White - British	43 (33%)
	White - Irish	2 (2%)
	White - Other	4 (3%)
	Black or Black British - Caribbean	29 (22%)
	Black or Black British - African	17 (13%)
	Black or Black British - Other	2 (2%)
	Asian or Asian British - Indian	0 (0%)
	Asian or Asian British - Pakistani	5 (4%)
	Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi	3 (2%)
	Asian or Asian British - Chinese	0 (0%)
	Asian or Asian British - Other	1 (1%)
	Mixed race - White and Black Caribbean	11 (9%)
	Mixed race - White and Black African	3 (2%)
	Mixed race - White and Asian	0 (0%)
	Mixed race - Other	2 (2%)
	Arab	4 (3%)
	Other ethnic group	3 (2%)
Q6	What is your religion?	
	None	46 (36%)
	Church of England	14 (11%)
	Catholic	18 (14%)
	Protestant	2 (2%)
	Other Christian denomination	14 (11%)
	Buddhist	0 (0%)
	Hindu	0 (0%)
	Jewish	0 (0%)
	Muslim	34 (27%)
	Sikh	0 (0%)

Q7	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	
	Yes	13 (10%)
	No.....	107 (83%)
	Don't know	9 (7%)
Q8	Do you have any children?	
	Yes	7 (5%)
	No.....	123 (95%)
Q9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability (i.e. do you need help with any long-term physical, mental or learning needs)?	
	Yes.....	21 (16%)
	No.....	109 (84%)
Q10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	
	Yes	57 (44%)
	No.....	72 (56%)

SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE

Q1	Are you sentenced?	
	Yes	86 (66%)
	No - unsentenced/on remand	45 (34%)
Q2	How long is your sentence (the full DTO sentence)?	
	Not sentenced.....	45 (35%)
	Less than 6 months.....	11 (8%)
	6 to 12 months.....	24 (18%)
	More than 12 months, up to 2 years.....	24 (18%)
	More than 2 years.....	26 (20%)
	Indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP).....	0 (0%)
Q3	How long have you been in this establishment?	
	Less than 1 month.....	23 (18%)
	1 to 6 months.....	65 (50%)
	More than 6 months, but less than 12 months.....	23 (18%)
	12 months to 2 years.....	16 (12%)
	More than 2 years.....	2 (2%)
Q4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	
	Yes	78 (59%)
	No.....	55 (41%)

SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS

Q1	On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?	
	Yes	97 (73%)
	No.....	20 (15%)
	Don't remember	15 (11%)
Q2	On your most recent journey here, were there any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females travelling with you?	
	Yes	33 (25%)
	No.....	76 (58%)
	Don't remember	21 (16%)

Q3	On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	62 (48%)
	<i>2 to 4 hours</i>	54 (42%)
	<i>More than 4 hours</i>	6 (5%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	8 (6%)
Q4	On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?	
	<i>My journey was less than 2 hours</i>	62 (49%)
	<i>Yes</i>	5 (4%)
	<i>No</i>	52 (41%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	8 (6%)
Q5	On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?	
	<i>My journey was less than 2 hours</i>	62 (48%)
	<i>Yes</i>	29 (23%)
	<i>No</i>	32 (25%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	5 (4%)
Q6	On your most recent journey here, how did you feel you were treated by the escort staff?	
	<i>Very well</i>	16 (12%)
	<i>Well</i>	44 (34%)
	<i>Neither</i>	41 (32%)
	<i>Badly</i>	9 (7%)
	<i>Very badly</i>	6 (5%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	13 (10%)
Q7	Before you arrived here, did you receive any information to help you prepare for coming here?	
	<i>Yes - and it was helpful</i>	17 (13%)
	<i>Yes - but it was not helpful</i>	16 (13%)
	<i>No - I received no information</i>	79 (63%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	14 (11%)

SECTION 4: FIRST DAYS

Q1	How long were you in reception?	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	105 (81%)
	<i>2 hours or longer</i>	16 (12%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	8 (6%)
Q2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	
	<i>Yes</i>	100 (78%)
	<i>No</i>	16 (12%)
	<i>Don't remember/Not applicable</i>	13 (10%)
Q3	How well did you feel you were treated in reception?	
	<i>Very well</i>	22 (17%)
	<i>Well</i>	56 (43%)
	<i>Neither</i>	37 (28%)
	<i>Badly</i>	7 (5%)
	<i>Very badly</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	4 (3%)

- 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 | 57 (46%) | Money worries | 14 (11%) |
| Loss of property | 22 (18%) | Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to | 30 (24%) |
| Feeling scared | 32 (26%) | Health problems | 71 (57%) |
| Gang problems | 73 (59%) | Getting phone numbers | 57 (46%) |
| Contacting family | 68 (55%) | Staff did not ask me about any of these | 16 (13%) |
- 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 | 42 (34%) | Money worries | 25 (20%) |
| Loss of property | 20 (16%) | Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to | 14 (11%) |
| Feeling scared | 18 (15%) | Health problems | 26 (21%) |
| Gang problems | 22 (18%) | Getting phone numbers | 60 (49%) |
| Contacting family | 56 (46%) | I did not have any problems | 26 (21%) |
- Q6 When you first arrived here, were you given any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**
- | | |
|---|-----------|
| Toiletries/basic items | 109 (85%) |
| The opportunity to have a shower | 102 (80%) |
| Something to eat | 98 (77%) |
| A free phone call to friends/family | 96 (75%) |
| PIN phone credit | 50 (39%) |
| Information about feeling worried/upset | 41 (32%) |
| Don't remember | 2 (2%) |
| I was not given any of these | 5 (4%) |
- Q7 Within your first 24 hours here, did you have access to the following people or services? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**
- | | |
|---|----------|
| Chaplain | 38 (31%) |
| Peer mentor | 19 (16%) |
| Childline/Samaritans | 22 (18%) |
| The prison shop/canteen | 16 (13%) |
| Don't remember | 18 (15%) |
| I did not have access to any of these | 52 (43%) |
- Q8 Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?**
- | | |
|----------------------|----------|
| Yes | 97 (75%) |
| No | 24 (19%) |
| Don't remember | 8 (6%) |
- Q9 Did you feel safe on your first night here?**
- | | |
|----------------------|----------|
| Yes | 95 (73%) |
| No | 24 (18%) |
| Don't remember | 11 (8%) |
- Q10 Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the establishment?**
- | | |
|--|----------|
| I have not been on an induction course | 13 (10%) |
| Yes | 52 (41%) |
| No | 40 (31%) |
| Don't remember | 22 (17%) |

SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT

Q1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	
	Yes	128 (98%)
	No	2 (2%)
	Don't know	0 (0%)
Q2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	
	Yes	20 (16%)
	No.....	103 (80%)
	Don't know	6 (5%)
Q3	What is the food like here?	
	Very good.....	1 (1%)
	Good.....	25 (20%)
	Neither	47 (37%)
	Bad	29 (23%)
	Very bad.....	24 (19%)
Q4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	
	I have not bought anything yet/Don't know.....	13 (10%)
	Yes	56 (44%)
	No.....	58 (46%)
Q5	How easy is it for you to attend religious services?	
	I don't want to attend religious services	34 (26%)
	Very easy.....	12 (9%)
	Easy	27 (21%)
	Neither	10 (8%)
	Difficult.....	13 (10%)
	Very difficult.....	8 (6%)
	Don't know	27 (21%)
Q6	Are your religious beliefs respected?	
	Yes	69 (53%)
	No.....	11 (8%)
	Don't know/Not applicable.....	50 (38%)
Q7	Can you speak to a Chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?	
	Yes	60 (47%)
	No.....	11 (9%)
	Don't know/Not applicable.....	57 (45%)
Q8	Can you speak to a peer mentor when you need to?	
	Yes	27 (21%)
	No.....	33 (26%)
	Don't know	68 (53%)
Q9	Can you speak to a member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board) when you need to?	
	Yes	16 (12%)
	No	37 (29%)
	Don't know	76 (59%)

Q10	Can you speak to an advocate (an outside person to help you) when you need to?	
	Yes	40 (32%)
	No.....	27 (21%)
	Don't know	59 (47%)

SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF

Q1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	
	Yes	79 (62%)
	No.....	49 (38%)

Q2	If you had a problem, who would you turn to? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	No-one	31 (25%)
	Personal officer	22 (18%)
	Wing Officer.....	28 (23%)
	Teacher/education staff	12 (10%)
	Gym staff	8 (7%)
	Chaplain.....	9 (7%)
	Independent Monitoring Board (IMB)	4 (3%)
	YOT worker	29 (24%)
	Social worker	15 (12%)
	Health services staff	10 (8%)
	Peer mentor	3 (2%)
	Another young person here.....	14 (11%)
	Case worker.....	41 (34%)
	Advocate.....	7 (6%)
	Family/friends.....	67 (55%)
	Childline/Samaritans	3 (2%)

Q3	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	
	Yes	42 (33%)
	No.....	87 (67%)

Q4	When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?	
	I still have not met him/her	56 (44%)
	In your first week	17 (13%)
	After your first week.....	28 (22%)
	Don't remember	25 (20%)

Q5	How often do you see your personal (named) officer?	
	I still have not met him/her	56 (47%)
	At least once a week	17 (14%)
	Less than once a week.....	45 (38%)

Q6	Do you feel your personal (named) officer tries to help you?	
	I still have not met him/her	56 (46%)
	Yes	36 (30%)
	No.....	30 (25%)

SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS

Q1	Is it easy to make an application?	
	Yes	71 (55%)
	No.....	33 (26%)
	Don't know	24 (19%)

Q2	Are applications sorted out fairly?	
	I have not made an application	24 (21%)
	Yes	37 (32%)
	No.....	54 (47%)

Q3	Are applications sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	
	<i>I have not made an application</i>	24 (20%)
	Yes	17 (14%)
	No.....	78 (66%)
Q4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	
	Yes	60 (47%)
	No.....	31 (24%)
	Don't know	36 (28%)
Q5	Are complaints sorted out fairly?	
	<i>I have not made a complaint</i>	36 (33%)
	Yes	18 (17%)
	No.....	54 (50%)
Q6	Are complaints sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	
	<i>I have not made a complaint</i>	36 (32%)
	Yes	9 (8%)
	No.....	66 (59%)
Q7	Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint?	
	Yes	18 (14%)
	No.....	77 (62%)
	Never needed to make a complaint.....	30 (24%)

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>	6 (5%)
	Enhanced (top)	23 (18%)
	Standard (middle)	80 (63%)
	Basic (bottom)	16 (13%)
	Don't know	3 (2%)
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>	6 (5%)
	Yes	37 (31%)
	No.....	61 (50%)
	Don't know	17 (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>	6 (5%)
	Yes	51 (44%)
	No.....	49 (43%)
	Don't know	9 (8%)
Q4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	
	Yes	38 (31%)
	No.....	35 (29%)
	Don't know	49 (40%)
Q5	If you have had a minor report, was the process explained clearly to you?	
	<i>I have not had a minor report</i>	84 (71%)
	Yes	22 (19%)
	No.....	12 (10%)

Q6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	
	Yes	93 (74%)
	No.....	29 (23%)
	Don't know	3 (2%)
Q7	If you have had an adjudication ('nicking'), was the process explained clearly to you?	
	<i>I have not had an adjudication</i>	32 (26%)
	Yes	77 (63%)
	No.....	13 (11%)
Q8	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	
	Yes	65 (53%)
	No.....	51 (41%)
	Don't know	7 (6%)
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>	99 (80%)
	Very well.....	2 (2%)
	Well.....	4 (3%)
	Neither	3 (2%)
	Badly.....	5 (4%)
	Very badly	10 (8%)

SECTION 9: SAFETY

Q1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	
	Yes	64 (51%)
	No.....	62 (49%)
Q2	Do you feel unsafe now?	
	Yes	31 (25%)
	No.....	94 (75%)
Q3	In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Never felt unsafe	62 (53%)
	Everywhere	17 (14%)
	Care and separation unit.....	3 (3%)
	Association areas	15 (13%)
	Reception area	2 (2%)
	At the gym	7 (6%)
	In an exercise yard	26 (22%)
	At work.....	1 (1%)
	At education	21 (18%)
	At religious services.....	8 (7%)
	At meal times	7 (6%)
	At healthcare	0 (0%)
	Visits area	20 (17%)
	In wing showers.....	0 (0%)
	In gym showers	2 (2%)
	In corridors/stairwells.....	11 (9%)
	On your landing/wing	13 (11%)
	During movement	17 (14%)
	In your cell	12 (10%)

Q4	Have you ever been victimised by another young person/group of young people here (e.g. insulted or assaulted you)?	
	Yes	44 (35%)
	No.....	82 (65%)
Q5	If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you, your family or friends)</i>	21 (17%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	21 (17%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	20 (16%)
	<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Medication</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Debt</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Drugs</i>	2 (2%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	2 (2%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	2 (2%)
	<i>Your nationality</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>You are from a different part of the country to others</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>You are from a Traveller community</i>	2 (2%)
	<i>Your sexuality</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your age</i>	2 (2%)
	<i>You having a disability</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>You were new here</i>	8 (6%)
	<i>Your offence/crime</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Gang related issues</i>	8 (6%)
Q7	Have you ever been victimised by staff here (e.g. insulted or assaulted you)?	
	Yes	31 (25%)
	No.....	95 (75%)
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>	19 (15%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	12 (10%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	11 (9%)
	<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i>	7 (6%)
	<i>Medication</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Debt</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Drugs</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Your nationality</i>	2 (2%)
	<i>You are from a different part of the country to others</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>You are from a Traveller community</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your sexuality</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your age</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>You having a disability</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>You were new here</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>Your offence/crime</i>	2 (2%)
	<i>Gang related issues</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Because you made a complaint</i>	7 (6%)
Q10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	
	Yes	34 (31%)
	No.....	52 (47%)
	Don't know	25 (23%)

Q11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	
	Yes	32 (26%)
	No.....	53 (44%)
	Don't know	36 (30%)

Q12	Is shouting through the windows a problem here?	
	Yes	53 (44%)
	No.....	55 (45%)
	Don't know	13 (11%)

SECTION 10: HEALTH SERVICES

Q1	Is it easy to see the following people if you need to?			
		Yes	No	Don't know
	The doctor	55 (44%)	49 (40%)	20 (16%)
	The nurse	73 (61%)	32 (27%)	14 (12%)
	The dentist	27 (23%)	70 (58%)	23 (19%)

Q2	What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?	
	<i>I have not been</i>	5 (4%)
	<i>Very good</i>	13 (11%)
	<i>Good</i>	48 (39%)
	<i>Neither</i>	29 (24%)
	<i>Bad</i>	17 (14%)
	<i>Very bad</i>	10 (8%)

Q3	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/all of it in your room?	
	<i>I am not taking any medication</i>	63 (52%)
	<i>Yes, all of my meds</i>	6 (5%)
	<i>Yes, some of my meds</i>	15 (12%)
	<i>No</i>	37 (31%)

Q4	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?	
	Yes	36 (30%)
	No.....	84 (70%)

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>	84 (70%)
	Yes	18 (15%)
	No.....	18 (15%)

Q6	Did you have problems with alcohol when you first arrived here?	
	Yes	4 (3%)
	No.....	122 (97%)

Q7	Have you received any help with alcohol problems here?	
	Yes	2 (2%)
	No.....	124 (98%)

Q8	Did you have problems with drugs when you first arrived here?	
	Yes	35 (28%)
	No.....	91 (72%)

Q9	Do you have problems with drugs now?	
	Yes	10 (8%)
	No.....	115 (92%)

Q10	Have you received any help with drugs problems here?	
	Yes	19 (15%)
	No.....	106 (85%)
Q11	How easy or difficult is it to get illegal drugs here?	
	Very easy.....	15 (13%)
	Easy	8 (7%)
	Neither	8 (7%)
	Difficult.....	4 (3%)
	Very difficult.....	14 (12%)
	Don't know	68 (58%)

SECTION 11: ACTIVITIES

Q1	How old were you when you were last at school?				
	14 or under	46 (38%)			
	15 or over.....	76 (62%)			
Q2	Have you ever been excluded from school?				
	Yes	102 (83%)			
	No.....	19 (15%)			
	Not applicable.....	2 (2%)			
Q3	Did you ever skip school before you came into custody?				
	Yes	81 (67%)			
	No.....	34 (28%)			
	Not applicable.....	6 (5%)			
Q4	Do you CURRENTLY take part in any of the following activities? (Please tick all that apply to you.)				
	Education.....	94 (78%)			
	A job in this establishment.....	8 (7%)			
	Vocational or skills training	12 (10%)			
	Offending behaviour programmes	27 (22%)			
	I am not currently involved in any of these.....	20 (17%)			
Q5	If you have been involved in any of the following activities here, do you think they will help you when you leave prison?				
		Not been involved	Yes	No	Don't know
	Education	4 (3%)	68 (59%)	30 (26%)	14 (12%)
	A job in this establishment	32 (41%)	20 (26%)	14 (18%)	12 (15%)
	Vocational or skills training	28 (36%)	22 (28%)	13 (17%)	15 (19%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	24 (28%)	36 (42%)	12 (14%)	14 (16%)
Q6	Do you usually have association every day?				
	Yes	15 (12%)			
	No.....	106 (88%)			
Q7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?				
	Don't want to go.....	8 (7%)			
	Yes	91 (76%)			
	No.....	21 (18%)			

Q8	How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?	
	<i>Don't want to go</i>	2 (2%)
	<i>None</i>	30 (25%)
	<i>One to two times</i>	71 (59%)
	<i>Three to five times</i>	18 (15%)
	<i>More than five times</i>	0 (0%)

SECTION 12: FAMILY AND FRIENDS

Q1	Are you able to use the telephone every day, if you want to?	
	<i>Yes</i>	103 (85%)
	<i>No</i>	17 (14%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	1 (1%)

Q2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?	
	<i>Yes</i>	63 (52%)
	<i>No</i>	48 (40%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	10 (8%)

Q3	How many visits do you usually have each week, from family or friends?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	28 (24%)
	<i>Less than one a week</i>	31 (26%)
	<i>About one a week</i>	45 (38%)
	<i>More than one a week</i>	3 (3%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	11 (9%)

Q4	How easy is it for your family and friends to visit you here?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	28 (23%)
	<i>Very easy</i>	10 (8%)
	<i>Easy</i>	27 (23%)
	<i>Neither</i>	17 (14%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	21 (18%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	13 (11%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	4 (3%)

Q5	Do your visits usually start on time?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	28 (24%)
	<i>Yes</i>	60 (50%)
	<i>No</i>	20 (17%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	11 (9%)

SECTION 13: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE

Q1	Do you think you will have a problem with any of the following things, when you are released? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Finding accommodation</i>	30 (26%)
	<i>Getting into school or college</i>	40 (35%)
	<i>Getting a job</i>	55 (48%)
	<i>Money/finances</i>	33 (29%)
	<i>Claiming benefits</i>	12 (11%)
	<i>Continuing health services</i>	3 (3%)
	<i>Opening a bank account</i>	16 (14%)
	<i>Avoiding bad relationships</i>	18 (16%)
	<i>I won't have any problems</i>	40 (35%)

Q2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan (i.e. a plan that is discussed in your DTO/planning meetings, which sets out your targets)?	
	Yes	53 (44%)
	No.....	32 (27%)
	Don't know	35 (29%)
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>	67 (57%)
	Yes	46 (39%)
	No.....	5 (4%)
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>	67 (57%)
	Yes	48 (41%)
	No.....	3 (3%)
Q5	Do you have a caseworker here?	
	Yes	117 (96%)
	No.....	4 (3%)
	Don't know	1 (1%)
Q6	Has your caseworker helped to prepare you for release?	
	<i>I don't have a caseworker</i>	5 (4%)
	Yes	50 (42%)
	No.....	46 (39%)
	Don't know	18 (15%)
Q7	Has your social worker been to visit you since you have been here?	
	<i>I don't have a social worker</i>	35 (29%)
	Yes	61 (51%)
	No.....	24 (20%)
Q8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	
	Yes	54 (46%)
	No.....	47 (40%)
	Don't know	17 (14%)
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>	42 (37%)
	<i>Getting into school or college</i>	39 (35%)
	<i>Getting a job</i>	39 (35%)
	<i>Help with money/finances</i>	28 (25%)
	<i>Help with claiming benefits</i>	20 (18%)
	<i>Continuing health services</i>	24 (21%)
	<i>Opening a bank account</i>	35 (31%)
	<i>Avoiding bad relationships</i>	27 (24%)
	<i>I don't know who to contact</i>	55 (49%)

Q10 What is most likely to stop you offending in the future? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

<i>Not sentenced</i>	45 (37%)	<i>Having a mentor (someone you can ask for advice)</i>	8 (7%)
<i>Nothing, it is up to me</i>	26 (21%)	<i>Having a YOT worker or social worker that I get on with</i>	18 (15%)
<i>Making new friends outside</i>	17 (14%)	<i>Having children</i>	16 (13%)
<i>Going back to live with my family</i>	16 (13%)	<i>Having something to do that isn't crime</i>	25 (21%)
<i>Getting a place of my own</i>	31 (26%)	<i>This sentence</i>	28 (23%)
<i>Getting a job</i>	40 (33%)	<i>Getting into school/college</i>	27 (22%)
<i>Having a partner (girlfriend or boyfriend)</i>	30 (25%)	<i>Talking about my offending behaviour with staff</i>	3 (2%)
<i>Staying off alcohol/drugs</i>	16 (13%)	<i>Anything else</i>	5 (4%)

Q11 Do you want to stop offending?

<i>Not sentenced</i>	45 (36%)
<i>Yes</i>	70 (56%)
<i>No</i>	3 (2%)
<i>Don't know</i>	7 (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>	45 (37%)
<i>Yes</i>	42 (34%)
<i>No</i>	36 (29%)

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



Survey responses from children and young people: HMYOI Cookham Wood 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

		Cookham Wood 2017	Young People's Comparator	Cookham Wood 2017	Cookham Wood 2016
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		136	459	136	141
SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU					
1.1	Are you 18 years of age?	16%	12%	16%	16%
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	10%	7%	10%	13%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%	100%	99%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	97%	99%	97%	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.)	62%	44%	62%	60%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	27%	21%	27%	26%
1.7	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	10%	6%	10%	10%
1.8	Do you have any children?	5%	10%	5%	8%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	16%	19%	16%	19%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	44%	43%	44%	40%
SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE					
2.1	Are you sentenced?	66%	82%	66%	78%
2.2	Is your sentence 12 months or less?	27%	32%	27%	34%
2.3	Have you been in this establishment for one month or less?	18%	15%	18%	21%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	59%	55%	59%	62%
SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS					
On your most recent journey here:					
3.1	Did you feel safe?	73%	80%	73%	78%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	26%	34%	26%	34%
3.3	Did you spend more than 4 hours in the van?	5%	8%	5%	9%
For those who spent 2 or more hours in the escort van:					
3.4	Were you offered a toilet break if you needed it?	8%	14%	8%	10%
3.5	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	44%	52%	44%	40%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	46%	56%	46%	53%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	14%	12%	14%	9%

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Cookham Wood 2017	Young People's Comparator	Cookham Wood 2017	Cookham Wood 2016
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		136	459	136	141
SECTION 4: YOUR FIRST FEW DAYS HERE					
4.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	82%	77%	82%	82%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	78%	79%	78%	78%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	60%	67%	60%	65%
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?	46%	54%	46%	48%
4.4b	Loss of property?	18%	19%	18%	16%
4.4c	Feeling scared?	26%	28%	26%	30%
4.4d	Gang problems?	59%	42%	59%	61%
4.4e	Contacting family?	55%	53%	55%	66%
4.4f	Money worries?	11%	18%	11%	18%
4.4g	Feeling worried/upset/needling someone to talk to?	24%	30%	24%	33%
4.4h	Health problems?	57%	53%	57%	65%
4.4i	Getting phone numbers?	46%	43%	46%	54%
4.5	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	79%	77%	79%	79%
When you first arrived, did you have problems with any of the following:					
4.5a	Not being able to smoke?	34%	45%	34%	39%
4.5b	Loss of property?	16%	11%	16%	13%
4.5c	Feeling scared?	15%	14%	15%	10%
4.5d	Gang problems?	18%	14%	18%	15%
4.5e	Contacting family?	46%	31%	46%	40%
4.5f	Money worries?	20%	17%	20%	15%
4.5g	Feeling worried/upset/needling someone to talk to?	11%	17%	11%	13%
4.5h	Health problems?	21%	16%	21%	11%
4.5i	Getting phone numbers?	49%	32%	49%	49%
When you first arrived, were you given any of the following:					
4.6a	Toiletries/basic items?	85%	80%	85%	90%
4.6b	The opportunity to have a shower?	80%	42%	80%	80%
4.6c	Something to eat?	77%	81%	77%	83%
4.6d	A free phone call to friends/family?	75%	76%	75%	71%
4.6e	PIN phone credit?	39%	54%	39%	52%
4.6f	Information about feeling worried/upset?	32%	29%	32%	37%

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

Key to tables

		Cookham Wood 2017	Young People's Comparator	Cookham Wood 2017	Cookham Wood 2016
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		136	459	136	141
Within your first 24 hours, did you have access to the following people or services:					
4.7a	A chaplain?	31%	42%	31%	54%
4.7b	A peer mentor?	15%	11%	15%	12%
4.7c	Childline/Samaritans	18%	17%	18%	20%
4.7d	The prison shop/canteen?	13%	12%	13%	8%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	75%	71%	75%	76%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	73%	74%	73%	74%
4.10	For those who have been on an induction course: did it cover everything you needed to know about the establishment?	46%	52%	46%	52%
SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT					
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	99%	63%	99%	98%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	15%	27%	15%	20%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	20%	15%	20%	15%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	44%	48%	44%	45%
5.5	Is it easy/very easy for you to attend religious services?	30%	46%	30%	35%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	53%	54%	53%	52%
Can you speak to:					
5.7	A chaplain of your faith in private?	47%	63%	47%	56%
5.8	A peer mentor?	21%	25%	21%	30%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	13%	17%	13%	18%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	32%	35%	32%	31%
SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF					
6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	62%	67%	62%	62%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	25%	25%	25%	19%
6.3	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	33%	36%	33%	31%
For those who have met their personal officer:					
6.4	Did you meet your personal (named) officer within the first week?	24%	36%	24%	25%
6.5	Do you see your personal (named) officer at least once a week?	27%	49%	27%	35%
6.6	Do you feel your personal (named) officer tries to help you?	55%	62%	55%	57%

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Cookham Wood 2017	Young People's Comparator	Cookham Wood 2017	Cookham Wood 2016
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		136	459	136	141
SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS					
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	55%	67%	55%	77%
For those who have made an application:					
7.2	Do you feel applications are sorted out fairly?	41%	56%	41%	44%
7.3	Do you feel applications are sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	18%	41%	18%	30%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	47%	49%	47%	49%
For those who have made a complaint:					
7.5	Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	25%	26%	25%	26%
7.6	Do you feel complaints are sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	13%	22%	13%	20%
7.7	Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint?	14%	10%	14%	11%
SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE					
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	18%	25%	18%	26%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	31%	40%	31%	35%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	44%	42%	44%	43%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	31%	49%	31%	37%
For those who have had a minor report:					
8.5	Was the process explained clearly to you?	65%	65%	65%	59%
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	75%	63%	75%	74%
For those who have had an adjudication ('nicking'):					
8.7	Was the process explained clearly to you?	86%	85%	86%	84%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (Cand R) since you have been here?	53%	42%	53%	50%
8.9	For those who had spent a night in the care and separation unit: did the staff treat you well/very well?	25%	40%	25%	32%
SECTION 9: SAFETY					
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	51%	40%	51%	37%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	25%	17%	25%	10%

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

Key to tables

		Cookham Wood 2017	Young People's Comparator	Cookham Wood 2017	Cookham Wood 2016
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		136	459	136	141
9.4	Have you ever been victimised by other young people here?	35%	30%	35%	21%
Since you have been here, have other young people:					
9.5a	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	17%	19%	17%	12%
9.5b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	17%	11%	17%	11%
9.5c	Sexually abused you?	0%	1%	0%	1%
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	16%	10%	16%	8%
9.5e	Taken your canteen/property?	3%	5%	3%	1%
9.5f	Victimised you because of medication?	1%	0%	1%	0%
9.5g	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	2%	0%	2%
9.5h	Victimised you because of drugs?	1%	2%	1%	1%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	1%	5%	1%	4%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	1%	3%	1%	1%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	3%	2%	3%	3%
9.5l	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	3%	3%	3%	1%
9.5m	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	1%	1%	1%	1%
9.5n	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	1%	0%	0%
9.5o	Victimised you because of your age?	1%	1%	1%	1%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	1%	1%	1%	1%
9.5q	Victimised you because you were new here?	6%	9%	6%	6%
9.5r	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	3%	3%	3%	3%
9.5s	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	6%	7%	6%	7%

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Cookham Wood 2017	Young People's Comparator	Cookham Wood 2017	Cookham Wood 2016
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		136	459	136	141
9.7	Have you ever been victimised by a member of staff here?	25%	29%	25%	24%
Since you have been here, have staff:					
9.8a	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	15%	16%	15%	15%
9.8b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	10%	6%	10%	12%
9.8c	Sexually abused you?	0%	0%	0%	3%
9.8d	Threatened or intimidated you?	9%	7%	9%	10%
9.8e	Taken your canteen/property?	5%	3%	5%	6%
9.8f	Victimised you because of medication?	1%	1%	1%	1%
9.8g	Victimised you because of debt?	1%	1%	1%	0%
9.8h	Victimised you because of drugs?	1%	1%	1%	0%
9.8i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	3%	6%	3%	5%
9.8j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	3%	2%	3%	5%
9.8k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	1%	1%	1%	2%
9.8k	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	3%	1%	3%	0%
9.8m	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%	0%	0%	1%
9.8n	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	1%	0%	1%
9.8o	Victimised you because of your age?	3%	2%	3%	4%
9.8p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	1%	1%	1%	0%
9.8q	Victimised you because you were new here?	3%	3%	3%	1%
9.8r	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	1%	2%	1%	2%
9.8s	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	1%	0%	1%
9.8t	Victimised you because you made a complaint?	5%	6%	5%	6%
9.10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	31%	28%	31%	27%
9.11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	26%	29%	26%	21%
9.12	Is shouting through the windows a problem here?	44%	41%	44%	43%

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

Key to tables

		Cookham Wood 2017	Young People's Comparator	Cookham Wood 2017	Cookham Wood 2016
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		136	459	136	141
SECTION 10: HEALTH SERVICES					
10.1a	Is it easy for you to see the doctor?	44%	59%	44%	51%
10.1b	Is it easy for you to see the nurse?	61%	72%	61%	68%
10.1c	Is it easy for you to see the dentist?	23%	39%	23%	24%
10.2	For those who have been to health services: Do you think the overall quality is good/very good?	52%	52%	52%	57%
10.3	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/all of it in your cell?	37%	49%	37%	44%
10.4	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?	30%	28%	30%	25%
10.5	If you have emotional or mental health problems, are you being helped by anyone here?	50%	52%	50%	60%
10.6	Did you have any problems with alcohol when you first arrived?	3%	9%	3%	7%
10.7	Have you received any help with any alcohol problems here?	1%	5%	1%	3%
10.8	Did you have any problems with drugs when you first arrived?	28%	33%	28%	24%
10.9	Do you have a problem with drugs now?	8%	8%	8%	6%
10.10	Have you received any help with any drug problems here?	15%	23%	15%	12%
10.11	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs here?	20%	24%	20%	16%
SECTION 11: ACTIVITIES					
11.1	Were you 14 or younger when you were last at school?	38%	43%	38%	38%
11.2	Have you ever been excluded from school?	83%	90%	83%	88%
11.3	Did you ever skip school before you came into custody?	67%	76%	67%	73%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:					
11.4a	Education?	78%	71%	78%	80%
11.4b	A job in this establishment?	6%	12%	6%	11%
11.4c	Vocational or skills training?	10%	8%	10%	7%
11.4d	Offending behaviour programmes?	23%	22%	23%	21%
11.4e	Nothing	16%	22%	16%	17%

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

Key to tables

		Cookham Wood 2017	Young People's Comparator	Cookham Wood 2017	Cookham Wood 2016
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		136	459	136	141
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?	61%	62%	61%	64%
11.5b	A job in this establishment?	43%	42%	43%	36%
11.5c	Vocational or skills training?	44%	41%	44%	30%
11.5d	Offending behaviour programmes?	58%	47%	58%	54%
11.6	Do you usually have association every day?	13%	55%	13%	34%
11.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	76%	62%	76%	78%
11.8	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	0%	3%	0%	1%
SECTION 12: KEEPING IN TOUCH WITH FAMILY AND FRIENDS					
12.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	85%	62%	85%	88%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	52%	41%	52%	53%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	41%	33%	41%	38%
12.4	Is it easy/very easy for your family and friends to visit you here?	31%	33%	31%	31%
12.5	Do your visits start on time?	50%	39%	50%	46%
SECTION 13: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE					
Do you think you will have a problem with the following, when you are released:					
13.1a	Finding accommodation?	26%	23%	26%	38%
13.1b	Getting into school or college?	35%	28%	35%	41%
13.1c	Getting a job?	48%	44%	48%	53%
13.1d	Money/finances?	29%	31%	29%	31%
13.1e	Claiming benefits?	11%	16%	11%	11%
13.1f	Continuing health services?	3%	9%	3%	11%
13.1g	Opening a bank account?	14%	14%	14%	13%
13.1h	Avoiding bad relationships?	16%	18%	16%	13%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	44%	41%	44%	43%
For those with a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan:					
13.3	Were you involved in the development of your plan?	90%	84%	90%	84%
13.4	Do you understand the targets set in your plan?	93%	93%	93%	91%
13.5	Do you have a caseworker here?	96%	96%	96%	94%
13.6	Has your caseworker helped to prepare you for release?	44%	46%	44%	56%
For those with a social worker:					
13.7	Has your social worker been to visit you since you have been here?	72%	70%	72%	70%
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	46%	41%	46%	42%

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

Key to tables

		Cookham Wood 2017	Young People's Comparator	Cookham Wood 2017	Cookham Wood 2016
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		136	459	136	141
Do you know who to contact for help with the following problems?					
13.9a	Finding accommodation	37%	33%	37%	32%
13.9b	Getting into school or college	35%	32%	35%	35%
13.9c	Getting a job	35%	36%	35%	33%
13.9d	Help with money/finances	25%	26%	25%	24%
13.9e	Help with claiming benefits	17%	21%	17%	19%
13.9f	Continuing health services	21%	21%	21%	19%
13.9g	Opening a bank account	31%	25%	31%	22%
13.9h	Avoiding bad relationships	24%	20%	24%	15%
For those who were sentenced:					
13.11	Do you want to stop offending?	87%	90%	87%	85%
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?	54%	51%	54%	55%

Diversity analysis



Key question responses (ethnicity and religion) HMYOI Cookham Wood 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	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference	Black and minority ethnic young people	White young people	Muslim young people	Non-Muslim young people
Number of completed questionnaires returned						80	49	34	94
1.2	Are you a foreign national?					12%	7%	21%	6%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?					100%	100%	100%	100%
1.4	Do you understand written English?					98%	96%	88%	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.)							90%	51%
1.6	Are you Muslim?					39%	7%		
1.5	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?					2%	23%	3%	13%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?					14%	23%	19%	15%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?					51%	38%	58%	39%
2.1	Are you sentenced?					67%	69%	53%	69%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?					55%	67%	48%	62%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?					27%	23%	29%	24%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?					46%	48%	50%	46%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?					9%	22%	3%	15%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?					78%	76%	71%	80%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?					59%	62%	54%	62%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?					75%	80%	78%	73%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?					76%	71%	72%	76%
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?					98%	100%	100%	98%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?					13%	20%	16%	13%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?					17%	27%	17%	24%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?					41%	46%	41%	44%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?					60%	40%	87%	41%
Can you speak to:									
5.7	A chaplain of your faith in private?					47%	49%	64%	42%
5.8	A peer mentor?					17%	29%	20%	22%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?					13%	13%	16%	12%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?					32%	33%	32%	33%

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		80	49	34	94
6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	63%	60%	61%	62%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	26%	19%	23%	25%
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	58%	53%	57%	58%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	51%	46%	37%	51%
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	15%	24%	13%	19%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	29%	37%	30%	33%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	40%	55%	42%	44%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	25%	42%	42%	30%
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	87%	54%	87%	69%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	65%	36%	56%	55%
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	43%	61%	43%	52%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	21%	29%	22%	26%
9.4	Have you been victimised by other young people here?	31%	43%	31%	36%
Since you have been here, have other young people:					
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	8%	30%	3%	21%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	1%	2%	3%	1%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	1%	2%	3%	1%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	2%	0%	3%	2%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	1%	0%	3%	0%
9.7	Have you been victimised by staff here?	24%	26%	24%	25%
Since you have been here, have staff:					
9.8d	Threatened or intimidated you?	13%	4%	5%	9%
9.8i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	5%	0%	3%	2%
9.8j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	5%	0%	5%	1%
9.8k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	2%	0%	3%	1%
9.8p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	1%	0%	0%	1%
9.10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	27%	37%	30%	32%
9.11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	24%	30%	21%	28%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic young people	White young people	Muslim young people	Non-Muslim young people
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		80	49	34	94
10.1a	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the doctor?	49%	37%	44%	44%
10.1b	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the nurse?	65%	59%	68%	62%
10.4	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	31%	35%	39%	26%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:					
11.4a	Education?	80%	76%	71%	78%
11.4b	A job in this establishment?	9%	4%	16%	5%
11.4c	Vocational or skills training?	8%	13%	7%	12%
11.4d	Offending behaviour programmes?	24%	24%	34%	21%
11.4e	Nothing?	16%	16%	22%	16%
11.6	Do you usually have association every day?	5%	26%	3%	15%
11.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	81%	70%	78%	74%
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?	90%	86%	87%	84%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	53%	52%	47%	55%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	34%	52%	29%	43%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	47%	39%	44%	43%
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	41%	52%	24%	51%

Diversity analysis - disability



Key question responses (disability analysis) HMYOI Cookham Wood 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		21	109
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	4%	10%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	100%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	92%	99%
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	48%	64%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	30%	25%
1.5	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	25%	7%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	50%	42%
2.1	Are you sentenced?	56%	67%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	63%	58%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	35%	23%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	50%	47%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	9%	15%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	70%	78%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	67%	58%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	67%	77%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	76%	73%
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	100%	98%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	25%	13%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	25%	21%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	30%	47%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	61%	54%
Can you speak to:			
5.7	A chaplain of your faith in private?	52%	46%
5.8	A peer mentor?	20%	23%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	24%	11%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	50%	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?	52%	63%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	18%	25%
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	44%	59%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	50%	48%
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	22%	16%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	36%	29%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	45%	45%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	38%	31%
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	73%	75%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	48%	54%
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	54%	50%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	30%	24%
9.4	Have you been victimised by other young people here?	52%	31%
Since you have been here, have other young people:			
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	28%	13%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	4%	1%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	4%	1%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	4%	2%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	4%	0%
9.7	Have you been victimised by staff here?	38%	22%
Since you have been here, have staff:			
9.8d	Threatened or intimidated you?	8%	8%
9.8i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	8%	1%
9.8j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	4%	2%
9.8k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	4%	1%
9.8p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	4%	0%
9.10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	40%	29%
9.11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	36%	24%

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?	39%	44%
10.1b	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the nurse?	64%	61%
10.4	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	70%	21%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:			
11.4a	Education?	70%	78%
11.4b	A job in this establishment?	4%	7%
11.4c	Vocational or skills training?	4%	12%
11.4d	Offending behaviour programmes?	25%	22%
11.4e	Nothing?	17%	18%
11.6	Do you usually have association every day?	30%	10%
11.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	83%	73%
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?	83%	86%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	75%	48%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	38%	41%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	50%	43%
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	27%	49%

Diversity analysis



Key question responses (Romany/Gypsy/Traveller) HMYOI Cookham Wood 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 be Romany/ Gypsy/ Traveller	Do not consider themselves to be Romany/ Gypsy/ Traveller
	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		13	116
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	0%	10%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	100%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	100%	96%
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	13%	67%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	7%	29%
1.5	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?		
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	40%	14%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	43%	44%
2.1	Are you sentenced?	75%	64%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	69%	58%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	25%	25%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	39%	48%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	7%	14%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	57%	79%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	36%	62%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	50%	78%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	50%	75%
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	100%	99%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	36%	12%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	43%	18%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	27%	46%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	50%	52%
Can you speak to:			
5.7	A chaplain of your faith in private?	57%	45%
5.8	A peer mentor?	27%	22%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	27%	12%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	27%	33%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to be Romany/ Gypsy/ Traveller	Do not consider themselves to be Romany/ Gypsy/ Traveller
	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		13	116
6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	43%	63%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	33%	24%
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	27%	58%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	39%	50%
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	27%	17%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	8%	32%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	39%	46%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	43%	31%
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	54%	76%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	43%	55%
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	57%	52%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	50%	23%
9.4	Have you been victimised by other young people here?	50%	33%
Since you have been here, have other young people:			
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	36%	15%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	2%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	2%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	2%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	1%
9.7	Have you been victimised by staff here?	39%	24%
Since you have been here, have staff:			
9.8d	Threatened or intimidated you?	8%	9%
9.8i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	3%
9.8j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	3%
9.8k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	2%
9.8p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	1%
9.10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	18%	32%
9.11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	39%	25%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to be Romany/ Gypsy/ Traveller	Do not consider themselves to be Romany/ Gypsy/ Traveller
	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		13	116
10.1a	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the doctor?	39%	45%
10.1b	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the nurse?	46%	64%
10.4	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	50%	28%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:			
11.4a	Education?	86%	76%
11.4b	A job in this establishment?	7%	7%
11.4c	Vocational or skills training?	14%	10%
11.4d	Offending behaviour programmes?	27%	24%
11.4e	Nothing?	7%	19%
11.6	Do you usually have association every day?	27%	11%
11.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	73%	76%
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?	92%	85%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	57%	51%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	58%	37%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	43%	45%
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	39%	74%

Wing comparator



Survey responses from children and young people: HMYOI Cookham Wood 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

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	B1 wing	All other wings
	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		18	114
SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU			
1.1	Are you 18 years of age?	0%	19%
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	0%	12%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	100%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	95%	97%
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other category.)	89%	57%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	33%	26%
1.7	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	0%	12%
1.8	Do you have any children?	0%	6%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	18%	16%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	50%	43%
SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE			
2.1	Are you sentenced?	62%	67%
2.2	Is your sentence 12 months or less?	33%	26%
2.3	Have you been in this establishment for one month or less?	10%	20%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	29%	64%
SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS			
On your most recent journey here:			
3.1	Did you feel safe?	91%	71%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	24%	26%
3.3	Did you spend more than 4 hours in the van?	0%	5%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	45%	47%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	11%	15%

Wing comparator

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	B1 wing	All other wings
	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		18	114
SECTION 4: YOUR FIRST FEW DAYS HERE			
4.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	90%	80%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	75%	80%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	70%	61%
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?	37%	49%
4.4b	Loss of property?	11%	19%
4.4c	Feeling scared?	11%	29%
4.4d	Gang problems?	42%	62%
4.4e	Contacting family?	32%	60%
4.4f	Money worries?	0%	13%
4.4g	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	0%	29%
4.4h	Health problems?	68%	57%
4.4i	Getting phone numbers?	21%	51%
4.5	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	60%	82%
When you first arrived, did you have problems with any of the following:			
4.5a	Not being able to smoke?	20%	37%
4.5b	Loss of property?	30%	13%
4.5c	Feeling Scared?	0%	18%
4.5d	Gang Problems?	10%	19%
4.5e	Contacting Family?	45%	44%
4.5f	Money worries?	20%	22%
4.5g	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	0%	13%
4.5h	Health problems?	20%	21%
4.5i	Getting phone numbers?	40%	49%
When you first arrived, were you given any of the following:			
4.6a	Toiletries/basic items?	75%	86%
4.6b	The opportunity to have a shower?	70%	82%
4.6c	Something to eat?	75%	78%
4.6d	A free phone call to friends/family?	75%	76%
4.6e	PIN phone credit?	40%	40%
4.6f	Information about feeling worried/upset?	25%	34%

Wing comparator

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	B1 wing	All other wings
	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		18	114
Within your first 24 hours, did you have access to the following people or services:			
4.7a	A chaplain?	28%	33%
4.7b	A peer mentor?	12%	16%
4.7c	Childline/Samaritans	6%	21%
4.7d	The prison shop/canteen?	22%	12%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	55%	79%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	90%	71%
SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT			
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	95%	99%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	11%	17%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	32%	20%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	45%	44%
5.5	Is it easy/very easy for you to attend religious services?	25%	31%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	75%	50%
Can you speak to:			
5.7	A Chaplain of your faith in private?	65%	43%
5.8	A peer mentor?	20%	22%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	10%	13%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	40%	32%
SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF			
6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	30%	69%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	44%	23%
6.3	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	30%	34%
SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS			
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	63%	56%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	40%	49%
7.7	Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint?	11%	13%

Wing comparator

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	B1 wing	All other wings
	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		18	114
SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE			
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	0%	22%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	42%	30%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	22%	50%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	40%	30%
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	100%	69%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (Cand R) since you have been here?	74%	48%
SECTION 9: SAFETY			
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	55%	50%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	20%	25%
9.4	Have you ever been victimised by other young people here?	37%	35%
Since you have been here, have other young people:			
9.5a	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	11%	18%
9.5b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	32%	15%
9.5c	Sexually abused you?	0%	0%
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	0%	19%
9.5e	Taken your canteen/property?	11%	1%
9.5f	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	1%
9.5g	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	0%
9.5h	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	2%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	2%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	2%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	3%
9.5l	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	0%	3%
9.5m	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%	2%
9.5n	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	0%
9.5o	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	2%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	1%
9.5q	Victimised you because you were new here?	0%	7%
9.5r	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	0%	3%
9.5s	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	7%

Wing comparator

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	B1 wing	All other wings
	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		18	114
9.7	Have you ever been victimised by a member of staff here?	37%	20%
Since you have been here, have staff:			
9.8a	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	21%	12%
9.8b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	32%	6%
9.8c	Sexually abused you?	0%	0%
9.8d	Threatened or intimidated you?	11%	7%
9.8e	Taken your canteen/property?	5%	3%
9.8f	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	0%
9.8g	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	0%
9.8h	Victimised you because of drugs?	5%	0%
9.8i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	2%
9.8j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	3%
9.8k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	2%
9.8k	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	0%	2%
9.8m	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%	0%
9.8n	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	0%
9.8o	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	3%
9.8p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	0%
9.8q	Victimised you because you were new here?	0%	3%
9.8r	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	0%	1%
9.8s	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	0%
9.8t	Victimised you because you made a complaint?	5%	5%
9.10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	26%	32%
9.11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	5%	31%
9.12	Is shouting through the windows a problem here?	20%	50%
SECTION 10: HEALTH SERVICES			
10.1a	Is it easy for you to see the doctor?	70%	41%
10.1b	Is it easy for you to see the nurse?	74%	59%
10.1c	Is it easy for you to see the dentist?	25%	23%
10.4	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?	28%	30%
10.6	Did you have any problems with alcohol when you first arrived?	0%	4%
10.7	Have you received any help with any alcohol problems here?	0%	2%
10.8	Did you have any problems with drugs when you first arrived?	30%	29%
10.9	Do you have a problem with drugs now?	5%	9%
10.10	Have you received any help with any drug problems here?	5%	17%
10.11	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs here?	5%	22%

Wing comparator

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	B1 wing	All other wings
	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		18	114
SECTION 11: ACTIVITIES			
11.1	Were you 14 or younger when you were last at school?	75%	31%
11.2	Have you ever been excluded from school?	90%	83%
11.3	Did you ever skip school before you came into custody?	60%	69%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:			
11.4a	Education?	60%	84%
11.4b	A job in this establishment?	0%	8%
11.4c	Vocational or skills training?	5%	11%
11.4d	Offending behaviour programmes?	25%	23%
11.4e	Nothing	25%	12%
11.6	Do you usually have association every day?	0%	15%
11.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	95%	75%
11.8	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	0%	0%
SECTION 12: KEEPING IN TOUCH WITH FAMILY AND FRIENDS			
12.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	75%	86%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	60%	50%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	40%	40%
12.4	Is it easy/very easy for your family and friends to visit you here?	37%	29%
12.5	Do your visits start on time?	40%	51%
SECTION 13: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE			
Do you think you will have a problem with the following, when you are released:			
13.1a	Finding accommodation?	30%	26%
13.1b	Getting into school or college?	45%	31%
13.1c	Getting a job?	35%	51%
13.1d	Money/finances?	20%	31%
13.1e	Claiming benefits?	5%	11%
13.1f	Continuing health services?	0%	2%
13.1g	Opening a bank account?	10%	14%
13.1h	Avoiding bad relationships?	20%	15%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	45%	43%
13.5	Do you have a caseworker here?	100%	95%
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	47%	47%

Diversity analysis



Key question responses (local authority care analysis) HMYOI Cookham Wood 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		57	72
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	11%	7%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	100%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	97%	99%
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	69%	56%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	33%	19%
1.5	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	9%	10%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	19%	14%
2.1	Are you sentenced?	70%	63%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	49%	66%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	28%	24%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	39%	53%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	9%	18%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	75%	81%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	55%	65%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	79%	73%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	77%	72%
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	100%	97%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	14%	17%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	18%	26%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	41%	46%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	60%	47%
Can you speak to:			
5.7	A chaplain of your faith in private?	51%	45%
5.8	A peer mentor?	25%	19%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	14%	10%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	38%	29%

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?	54%	68%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	32%	17%
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	65%	53%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	52%	47%
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	14%	18%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	30%	34%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	33%	55%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	28%	35%
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	86%	65%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	61%	47%
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	53%	46%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	23%	25%
9.4	Have you been victimised by other young people here?	39%	31%
Since you have been here, have other young people:			
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	14%	16%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	2%	1%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	2%	1%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	3%	0%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	1%
9.7	Have you been victimised by staff here?	25%	24%
Since you have been here, have staff:			
9.8d	Threatened or intimidated you?	11%	7%
9.8i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	3%	1%
9.8j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	3%	1%
9.8k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	3%	0%
9.8p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	1%
9.10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	24%	35%
9.11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	24%	27%

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?	45%	44%
10.1b	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the nurse?	66%	60%
10.4	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	43%	19%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:			
11.4a	Education?	77%	76%
11.4b	A job in this establishment?	13%	1%
11.4c	Vocational or skills training?	11%	8%
11.4d	Offending behaviour programmes?	26%	19%
11.4e	Nothing?	18%	18%
11.6	Do you usually have association every day?	8%	16%
11.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	77%	74%
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?	85%	85%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	53%	54%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	28%	50%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	43%	45%
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	42%	49%