

Report on an unannounced inspection of

HMYOI Feltham

(Feltham A – children and young people)

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

20–21 December 2017, 8–12 January 2018

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

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

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

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

Contents

Introduction	5
Fact page	7
About this inspection and report	9
Summary	11
Section 1. Safety	19
Section 2. Respect	29
Section 3. Purposeful activity	41
Section 4. Resettlement	49
Section 5. Summary of recommendations and good practice	57
Section 6. Appendices	63
Appendix I: Inspection team	63
Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report	65
Appendix III: Establishment population profile	73
Appendix IV: Summary of children and young people questionnaires and interviews	77

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

HMYOI Feltham (Feltham A) manages young people on remand and those who have been sentenced by the courts. At the time of this inspection, the establishment held 140 young people, the vast majority of whom were aged 16 or 17 years old. The last inspection was in early 2017, and was very disappointing. There had been a decline in three of the four healthy prison tests since the last inspection in 2015, and of particular concern was the fact that the key areas of safety and purposeful activity had slumped to the lowest possible assessment of 'poor'. It is pleasing to be able to report that both these areas had improved at this inspection. Safety had improved quite dramatically, so that on this occasion it was found to be 'reasonably good'. These improvements had not come about by accident, but were the result of clear, focused leadership. In my view, it was no coincidence that in both these areas the majority of recommendations made at the last inspection were either fully or at least partially achieved.

Overall violence had reduced, with an 80% reduction in assaults on staff and assaults on boys down by a third. London gang culture had a significant impact in Feltham and violence was still high, but progress had been made. This was at least in part due to a new behaviour management philosophy that was, at the time of this inspection, still being embedded. Last year we reported how the focus had been on sanctions and regime restrictions; there was a cycle of violence and punitive responses, with no obvious strategy in place to break it. This had changed, and on this occasion we found a new focus on rewards and incentives for good behaviour. An enhanced support unit (ESU) had also opened, which was well resourced and was managing three of the most challenging boys. Removing these boys from mainstream wings had a positive effect on the rest of the establishment. It had also given them a better regime and psychological input to understand and hopefully improve their behaviour. It was early days, but the new mindset offered more hope than the previous unremittingly negative approach to behaviour management. There had also been improvements in child protection, safeguarding and governance of the use of force.

The area of respect remained reasonably good. Overall, we found that staff were patient, enthusiastic and dedicated. Consultation with the boys had improved. There was potential for Feltham to achieve the highest assessment in this area in the future, but there would need to be an improvement in some of the standards in accommodation, where some areas were worn and neglected, for this to happen. More also needed to happen to instil in the boys the necessary discipline to keep their cells and communal areas clean.

At the time of the last inspection, we found a totally unacceptable 40% of the boys were locked up during the school day. In the space of a year this had dropped to 17%, largely as a result of managers and staff being determined to get boys to education and training. The knock-on effect from this was that there were not enough staff to ensure that boys also got to other important appointments. However, there was still work to do in terms of getting the boys to understand the value of education, with low engagement having an adverse impact on all aspects of behaviour and learning in some classes. The details of this can be found in the report.

The focus on safety and purposeful activity, which was entirely appropriate, meant that there was still work to be done to ensure that sentence planning was used effectively to drive boys' progress throughout their sentences. There were a large number of looked-after children at Feltham, who did not always receive the support to which they were entitled from local authorities, in particular in ensuring suitable accommodation on release had been secured.

Overall, there had been excellent progress made at Feltham since the last inspection, and good leadership played a huge role in this achievement. There had been some very good initiatives and, following our last very critical report, it is pleasing to be able to report that there had been some significant investment in Feltham. However, the progress could easily prove to be fragile if investment falls away or leadership loses its focus. Feltham is an institution that over the years has seen peaks

and troughs in performance. This latest inspection marks something of a peak after the trough of the previous one in 2017. It would be a great achievement if the improvement turns out not only to be sustainable but to give firm foundations for future improvement.

Peter Clarke CVO OBE QPM
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

March 2018

Fact page

Task of the establishment

Feltham manages young people on remand and those who have been convicted by the courts.

Establishment status

Public

Region/Department

Youth Custody Service

Number held

140

Certified normal accommodation

240

Operational capacity

180

Date of last full inspection

23 January – 3 February 2017

Brief history

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

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

Short description of residential units

Bittern	induction
Curlew	normal location enhanced unit
Dunlin	normal location
Eagle	normal location
Falcon	closed - conflict resolution area
Grebe	closed - youth club
Heron	normal location
Jay	normal location
Albatross	enhanced support unit

Name of governor

Glenn Knight

Escort contractor

Serco Wincanton

Health service commissioner and providers

NHS England (London)

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

Learning and skills providers

Prospects

Independent Monitoring Board chair

Caroline Langton

About this inspection and report

- A1 Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons is an independent, statutory organisation which reports on the treatment and conditions of those detained in prisons, young offender institutions, immigration detention facilities and police custody.
- A2 All inspections carried out by HM Inspectorate of Prisons contribute to the UK's response to its international obligations under the Optional Protocol to the UN Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (OPCAT). OPCAT requires that all places of detention are visited regularly by independent bodies – known as the National Preventive Mechanism (NPM) – which monitor the treatment of and conditions for detainees. HM Inspectorate of Prisons is one of several bodies making up the NPM in the UK.
- A3 All Inspectorate of Prisons reports include a summary of an establishment's performance against the model of a healthy prison. The four tests of a healthy prison are:
- | | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Safety | children and young people, particularly the most vulnerable, are held safely |
| Respect | children and young people are treated with respect for their human dignity |
| Purposeful activity | children and young people are able, and expected, to engage in activity that is likely to benefit them |
| Resettlement | children and young people are prepared for their release into the community and helped to reduce the likelihood of reoffending. |
- A4 Under each test, we make an assessment of outcomes for children and young people and therefore of the establishment's overall performance against the test. In some cases, this performance will be affected by matters outside the establishment's direct control, which need to be addressed nationally.
- **outcomes for children and young people are good against this healthy prison test.**
There is no evidence that outcomes for children and young people are being adversely affected in any significant areas.
 - **outcomes for children and young people are reasonably good against this healthy prison test.**
There is evidence of adverse outcomes for children and young people in only a small number of areas. For the majority, there are no significant concerns. Procedures to safeguard outcomes are in place.
 - **outcomes for children and young people are not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.**
There is evidence that outcomes for children and young people are being adversely affected in many areas or particularly in those areas of greatest importance to their well-being. Problems/concerns, if left unattended, are likely to become areas of serious concern.

- **outcomes for children and young people are poor against this healthy prison test.**

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

A5 Our assessments might result in one of the following:

- **recommendations:** will require significant change and/or new or redirected resources, so are not immediately achievable, and will be reviewed for implementation at future inspections
- **examples of good practice:** impressive practice that not only meets or exceeds our expectations, but could be followed by other similar establishments to achieve positive outcomes for children and young people.

A6 Five key sources of evidence are used by inspectors: observation; children and young people surveys; discussions with children and young people; discussions with staff and relevant third parties; and documentation. During inspections we use a mixed-method approach to data gathering and analysis, applying both qualitative and quantitative methodologies. Evidence from different sources is triangulated to strengthen the validity of our assessments.

A7 Since April 2013, all our inspections have been unannounced, other than in exceptional circumstances. This replaces the previous system of announced and unannounced full main inspections with full or short follow-ups to review progress. All our inspections now follow up recommendations from the last full inspection.

A8 All inspections of prisons are conducted jointly with Ofsted or Estyn (Wales), the Care Quality Commission, the General Pharmaceutical Council (GPhC) and HM Inspectorate of Probation. This joint work ensures expert knowledge is deployed in inspections and avoids multiple inspection visits.

This report

A9 This explanation of our approach is followed by a summary of our inspection findings against the four healthy prison tests. There then follow four sections each containing a detailed account of our findings against our *Expectations. Criteria for assessing the treatment of children and young people and conditions in prisons*. The reference numbers at the end of some recommendations indicate that they are repeated, and provide the paragraph location of the previous recommendation in the last report. Section 5 collates all recommendations 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** *Work to support boys during their early days at Feltham was reasonably good. Safeguarding and child protection systems were sound. Incidents of self-harm were lower than comparators and care for boys in crisis was good. A clear focus on reducing violence had led to an impressive reduction in assaults on boys and staff. However, levels of violence were still too high. Systems to challenge bullying and support victims required greater management oversight at unit level. A promising new behaviour management strategy was showing some early results. Use of force was proportionate and governance was good. The segregation unit was unfit for purpose but the management of boys who were segregated on residential units had significantly improved. The quality of substance misuse services was very good. **Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***
- S2** *At the last inspection in January/February 2017, we found that outcomes for children and young people in Feltham A were poor against this healthy prison test. We made 25 recommendations about safety. At this follow-up inspection we found that 14 of the recommendations had been achieved, two had been partially achieved and nine had not been achieved.*
- S3** Some boys arrived late in the day following long journeys from court or other establishments but reception processes were relatively swift. Initial reception screening and first night interviews were conducted in private and most staff demonstrated care for boys in their early days at Feltham. Dedicated first night accommodation was reasonably clean and appropriately prepared, but new boys were not always offered a shower or provided with a kettle to make a hot drink. The modular induction programme met the needs of new arrivals with good support from peer workers.
- S4** Safeguarding and child protection systems had improved since the last inspection and were now good. The service was well managed and benefited from external scrutiny, and boys were well supported during investigations.
- S5** Incidents of self-harm and the number of boys supported on ACCT² documents were much fewer than in similar prisons. Management of ACCT was good, although entries in ACCT documents did not always provide evidence of meaningful interactions. Reviews were often multidisciplinary and care plans were relevant to the needs of boys. Those we spoke to were positive about the support they had received while on an ACCT and we observed good levels of care.
- S6** Levels of violence, some of which was serious, were still too high. That said, it was clear that managers had focused on reducing violence over the last year with some success. Assaults on boys had reduced by a third and assaults on staff had reduced by more than 80%. This was a significant achievement given the complex population. All incidents were investigated and an impressive team of trained officers facilitated some effective conflict resolution. Well attended weekly behaviour management meetings directed work with perpetrators and the victims of bullying and violence. However, bullying was not always monitored effectively on residential units and care plans aimed at supporting victims still required improvement.

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

- S7 Excellent multidisciplinary work had led to many improvements in behaviour management since the previous inspection. The strategy was now very much reward focused. It included a new incentives scheme and merit scheme, and the creation of a platinum unit where boys on the highest incentive level lived. Key areas of the strategy were relatively new and not yet embedded. They required continued management oversight to ensure that the improvements being made would be sustainable. The opening of a new enhanced support unit was very positive. It provided a decent regime for a small number of boys with complex needs and behaviour, who would otherwise be disruptive in the general population or isolated in the segregation unit. However, staff on the unit needed clear direction in the application of behaviour management techniques before the number of boys located there increased.
- S8 Levels of force had reduced significantly since the previous inspection and were now broadly comparable to similar establishments. The cases we examined were necessary and proportionate in response to violence. We also observed good de-escalation in some challenging situations. Governance of the use of force was good.
- S9 The segregation unit remained a grim environment with a poor regime and was unsuitable for young people. Stays on the unit were frequent but short, and usually pending adjudication. Special accommodation had been used on four occasions in the previous six months and we were not assured that it was justified in all cases. The management of boys who were locked up on normal location, either because they were self-isolating or to maintain good order, had improved significantly and was good.
- S10 Substance misuse services remained of a high quality for the 20 boys who were receiving treatment. However, an unacceptable two-thirds of these boys did not get to their scheduled appointments in the Quadrant unit and the team had to make alternative arrangements to treat them. The number of staff vacancies in the team had also led to less frequent contacts for treatment.

Respect

S11 *Living conditions were reasonable but there were poor standards of cleanliness in some areas. The new application system was not yet fully effective. Consultation with boys had improved and was effective. Relationships between staff and boys were good. Equality work and consultation with boys with protected characteristics were reasonably good. Peer mentoring was underdeveloped. The chaplaincy provided good spiritual and pastoral support to boys. Complaints were managed well. Health services were delivered to a high standard when boys had access to them. Food was of a reasonable quality and some boys could now eat together. **Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***

S12 *At the last inspection in January/February 2017, we found that outcomes for children and young people in Feltham A were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 25 recommendations about respect.³ At this follow-up inspection we found that nine of the recommendations had been achieved, six had been partially achieved and 10 had not been achieved.*

S13 The overall standard of accommodation was reasonable, although some communal areas were grubby, particularly on D and E wings. Some showers were in a poor condition and too many cells were dirty. Boys could wear their own clothes and had access to laundry facilities.

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

- Clean bedding was readily available. In our survey, less than half of respondents said that it was easy to make an application. We found that applications were managed inconsistently across the residential units and the new system was not yet fully implemented. Consultation arrangements had improved and were now good. We found evidence of changes in response to suggestions made by the boys.
- S14 Relationships between boys and staff from all disciplines were good. Many staff displayed patience and care in their dealings with boys. There was appropriate praise for small but incremental changes in behaviour to motivate boys who struggled to comply. Most poor behaviour was challenged constructively.
- S15 However, a few officers were distant, had low expectations of boys and spoke of them in dismissive terms. The personal officer scheme was not effective. Two peer mentors worked alongside staff on the induction unit, but wider peer mentoring was underdeveloped.
- S16 The strategic management of equality work was reasonably good. Support for boys with protected characteristics was developing and Kinetic Youth facilitated good consultation. Boys with diverse needs were identified early and provided with some good support, particularly from health care and education staff. Residential staff were less informed about the additional needs of some of the boys in their care. Work to challenge discriminatory attitudes towards sexuality and race needed further development. The discrimination incident report form process remained robust and well managed. Support for foreign national boys had improved and was good.
- S17 Access to faith provision had improved and boys who could not safely attend religious services were supported individually. The chaplaincy was well integrated and provided good support for boys.
- S18 Complaints were dealt with promptly and replies were helpful and courteous. However, too many concerned low-level issues which could have been dealt with quickly by staff on residential units. Support for legal rights was good.
- S19 Health services, including governance, primary care, dentistry and mental health, remained of a high standard. Boys told us that it was sometimes difficult to access nurses and the GP. An unacceptable 35% of appointments at the health centre were missed, although health care professionals mitigated the impact of this with an out-reach service. X-ray equipment delivered over a year previously was still not available for use, leading to needless journeys to local hospitals. Pharmacy services were of a high standard, incorporating innovations to improve outcomes for boys, although the safe storage of medicines in cells had still not been addressed.
- S20 The continuing practice of placing boys on Wren unit for non-clinical reasons had a detrimental effect on the therapeutic regime for in-patients. Mental Health Act transfers, which had involved five boys since the last inspection, occurred promptly within five days.
- S21 Menus were varied and the food that we tasted was reasonably good. Portions for lunch and dinner were adequate but the breakfast provision was insufficient. Wing serveries were dirty. Some boys were permitted to eat together, which was a positive step. Canteen arrangements were reasonable and boys could buy a suitable range of goods from the prison shop.
- S22 Leadership and management focus had clearly been on making sure that boys were unlocked and that they got to education, which was commendable. Wing and cell cleanliness and attendance at health appointments now required greater management oversight.

Purposeful activity

S23 *Time out of cell had improved significantly since the last inspection and there had been a clear drive to get boys to education. Slippage in the delivery of other parts of the regime limited access to some important services and amenities. There had been significant improvement in the strategic and operational management of learning and skills but further improvement was needed. There were sufficient activity spaces for all boys, although learning opportunities for more able boys were limited. Most boys behaved well in classes. The quality of teaching required improvement. Movement to education had improved but still took too long and punctuality was often poor. Achievement rates were inconsistent. Access to the library was restricted but more boys could now benefit from good gym facilities. **Outcomes for children and young people were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.***

S24 *At the last inspection in January/February 2017, we found that outcomes for children and young people in Feltham A were poor against this healthy prison test. We made 20 recommendations about purposeful activity. At this follow-up inspection we found that seven of the recommendations had been achieved, seven had been partially achieved and six had not been achieved.*

S25 *Time unlocked had improved significantly since the last inspection and most boys could have just over seven hours out of their cells during weekdays. However, slippage in the delivery of the published core day and regular curtailment of evening association limited access to important services and amenities. We were not confident that all boys had sufficient time in the open air.*

S26 *The overall effectiveness of purposeful activity had improved and was no longer inadequate. Much improved operational and strategic leadership and management of education, learning and skills had significantly improved boys' attendance in education. It had also markedly reduced cancellations and cut the time taken for movement to activities by about half. Leaders' assessments of further improvements for purposeful activity were accurate, evaluative and realistic. Purposeful activity required further improvement to be good and improvement actions were all at an early stage.*

S27 *Sufficient activity places were available for every boy during the core day. The great majority of courses were designed for boys with entry level skills which equated to about half the population. Such courses were not suitable for the more able boys, including those who had already achieved qualifications at an equivalent or higher level.*

S28 *Much of the teaching observed by inspectors was effective, and boys were positively involved in learning in most sessions. Teachers were well motivated and keen for boys to succeed. Out-reach and reintegration provision was much improved. Thorough systems were in place to identify and support boys with additional learning needs, but too few learning support assistants were available in classroom sessions. Teachers' planning of learning did not always take sufficient account of each boy's needs. Most teachers managed poor behaviour competently but in a small minority of sessions boys' behaviour was so bad that no learning took place at all.*

S29 *In most sessions that we observed, boys were well behaved and respectful to teachers. Teachers set clear standards of conduct, which the majority of boys respected, and most teachers applied sanctions appropriately. Although incidents of violence, disruptive behaviour, threatening language and vandalism had reduced, they continued to be the main cause of exclusion from education. Despite some improvement, movement to education still took too long and punctuality was too often poor. Ensuring that boys understood and valued*

learning, and its potentially positive impact on their personal and professional lives, remained challenging.

- S30 Boys' achievement of qualifications was inconsistent: high on some courses, including English, mathematics, personal and social development and art, but too low on others, including catering, employability and IT.
- S31 The library facility was good but access was difficult. Managers were considering locating a dedicated library facility in Feltham A to resolve the access issue.
- S32 Access to the gym had improved and now included a wider range of groups. Gym resources and facilities were good. A healthy living course was being piloted and a training programme involving a premiership football club was in development.

Resettlement

S33 *The reducing reoffending policy was based on the needs of the young population. Partnership working was broadly effective. Public protection arrangements were sound. Sentence review meetings were timely and contact time with boys had improved. The sentence plan was not being used effectively to drive boys' progress through their sentence. There was insufficient support from the community to secure suitable and timely housing for this vulnerable age group. Work with families was reasonably good. Interventions work was now good. Looked-after children were supported well at Feltham but lacked adequate support from community providers. **Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***

S34 *At the last inspection in January/February 2017, we found that outcomes for children and young people in Feltham A were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 10 recommendations about resettlement. At this follow-up inspection we found that two of the recommendations had been achieved, three had been partially achieved and five had not been achieved.*

- S35 A reducing reoffending policy based on the needs of boys was in place. The monthly reducing reoffending forum was well attended but the focus of discussion was not sufficiently strategic to drive improvement across the site. Opportunities for early release and home detention curfew helped to encourage good behaviour. The establishment was proactive in building relationships with community partners and developing relationships with the prisons that boys would transition to. Public protection arrangements were managed appropriately.
- S36 The casework team continued to arrange regular remand and sentence planning meetings with boys, but attendance by other departments was not good enough. The sentence plan was not being used to drive boys' progress through their sentence both in Feltham and on release. Boys were expected to follow a number of plans from various departments but these were not sufficiently integrated with the sentence plan. All boys now received a copy of their sentence or remand plan but this was a recent initiative and only half the boys in our survey were aware of their plan. Many of the objectives set were generic and demonstrated little input from youth offending teams. Vacancies in the team had created higher caseloads but, despite this, one-to-one contact between boys and caseworkers had improved since the previous inspection.
- S37 The high proportion of looked-after children were identified quickly and supported well by the establishment social workers. However, too many looked-after children still did not receive their entitlements from their local authority.

- S38 The failure of community partners to secure timely and suitable accommodation on release presented risks for too many boys. Family work remained uncoordinated but there were some good initiatives in place. The new visits area was an improvement on the previous facility and boys had access to family visits through education and interventions. However, regime closures meant that boys had restricted access to telephones to call home.
- S39 Boys received useful careers support from the skilled engagement and resettlement team during induction and a month before release. Limited release on temporary licence and work experience opportunities were available. Too little reliable information was being gathered regarding boys' involvement in education, training or employment after release. Finance, benefit and debt provision was adequate but lacked coordination.
- S40 The provision of interventions to address offending behaviour and provide support had increased. Boys now had access to a good range of group and one-to-one work and counselling support. Support for boys with sexually harmful behaviour was in place but this intervention still required further development. Preparation for the release or transfer of boys in contact with substance misuse and health services was very good.
- S41 Senior management attention had understandably been focused on safety and purposeful activity. Therefore, managers and staff in the resettlement function had done well to sustain or improve some important areas of their work. However, there had been insufficient management oversight to ensure that sentence plans were central to boys' progress and incorporated targets from other important plans.

Main concerns and recommendations

- S42 **Concern:** The segregation unit remained a grim environment for young people and unsuitable for this age group. The regime remained impoverished with limited access to telephone calls, showers and exercise and replicated regimes in adult segregation units.
- Recommendation: Boys should not be held in the segregation unit in Feltham B. Those who need to be separated for their own or others' safety should experience a full regime and intensive intervention to address their behaviour in a suitable setting.** (Repeated recommendation 1.77)
- S43 **Concern:** Too many boys saw education as a way to pass the time rather than a chance to gain useful skills. Punctuality was often poor. Although lower than previously, the incidence of disruptive behaviour, threatening language and vandalism in the classrooms was still too high. Too few boys engaged with and valued learning or the potentially positive impact it could have on them.
- Recommendation: Leaders and managers should focus strongly on improving poor behaviour in classrooms and implement practical initiatives which encourage willing engagement in education.**
- S44 **Concern:** Too many boys were unaware of their sentence or remand plan and it was not central to their progression. Many boys were subject to other plans relating to their behaviour or risk and these were not sufficiently integrated with the sentence or remand plan. Attendance at training planning meetings was not sufficiently multidisciplinary and written contributions were often not available to inform discussions. Some training plans were too generic and focused on outcomes in custody.
- Recommendation: Individual training and remand plans should be central to a boy's progress and other plans and targets should be consistent with and**

reflected in training and remand plans. Staff from all relevant departments should be represented at training planning or remand management reviews, or submit a detailed report if they cannot attend. Training plans should demonstrate multidisciplinary input to targets to be achieved both in custody and in the community, with necessary support identified.

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 Regular monitoring meetings still took place between the prison and escort contractors, but boys continued to arrive at the prison late in the evening, even from local courts where most cases were completed by early afternoon.
- I.2 One in four boys said in our survey that they had travelled with adult prisoners which was unacceptable and contributed to longer journey times. Only 30% of boys whose journeys were two hours or longer said they received refreshments against the comparator of 52%. The vans we examined were equipped with refreshments for boys on longer journeys. Our survey also indicated that most escort staff treated the boys with respect.
- I.3 When boys arrived at Feltham, handovers were prompt and information shared between escort and reception staff identified the primary areas of risk and concern.

Recommendation

- I.4 **Boys should be transported from court to the establishment as soon as possible after their hearing ends to enable them to settle on their first night.** (Repeated recommendation I.3)

Early days in custody

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.5 An average of seven boys arrived from court or other establishments each week. The reception area was spacious. Most of the holding rooms were equipped with televisions and we found no graffiti. However, several areas were dirty and unkempt. There were no regular orderlies or peer support workers in reception.
- I.6 The general process was reasonably swift and most boys spent less than two hours in reception. However, first night screening processes in reception were limited to basic requirements when boys arrived late.
- I.7 All new arrivals were located to dedicated first night accommodation on Bittern unit. The unit was bright and welcoming and cells were clean and equipped with toiletries and bedding. There were sufficient shower facilities in reception and on the first night unit, but many boys we spoke to were not offered a shower on their first day. This was reflected in our survey where only 33% of boys against the comparator of 55% said they had the opportunity to take a shower on the day of their arrival.

- I.8** First night interviews were conducted in private and induction staff used Asset⁴ assessments to inform risk assessment management plans. Any gaps in the information provided in the plans were addressed by observations and an interview with a member of the safeguarding team to establish immediate concerns such as gang affiliations. Initial health screening was done on Bittern unit but boys were not always seen by health care on their first night, which was not acceptable (see paragraph 2.57).
- I.9** All boys started a modular induction programme the day after arrival and were given a comprehensive induction booklet in an age-appropriate format. During the first week, boys were assessed by a range of staff including a member of staff from the education department, a social worker and an advocate, to supplement information in the risk assessment management plan. The programme was meant to be supported by peer mentors, although at the time of our inspection the only two mentors appointed were attending release on temporary licence (ROTL) placements and were not always available to see new arrivals.
- I.10** Access to association had improved for boys on Bittern and they could now eat their breakfast and evening meals together. Some decisions on the management of new prisoners remained risk averse. Boys could not always access exercise on the morning after arrival and those on induction were not issued with a kettle until they left Bittern unit, which was unnecessary and unintentionally punitive.

Recommendations

- I.11 Private assessments by health care professionals should be conducted on the day of arrival.**
- I.12 All boys should be given the opportunity to shower on their first night and have access to a kettle during their time on the induction unit.**

Care and protection of children and young people

Safeguarding

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.13** There was a range of policies to safeguard and protect children, and a comprehensive safeguarding strategy agreed with the local safeguarding children board (LSCB) was in place.
- I.14** Quarterly safeguarding committee meetings focused on the strategic management of safeguarding for both Feltham A and B. Actions taken in respect of Feltham A were clearly identified and, since the last inspection, the LSCB had undertaken reviews of a range of safeguarding measures to ensure that they complied with LSCB expectations. A number of actions had been identified which the safeguarding coordinator had started to address.
- I.15** The local monthly safeguarding meetings continued to provide an operational overview, and over the last six months had monitored the impact of the new restraint system minimising and managing physical restraint (MMPR).

⁴ Youth Justice Board assessment documentation completed by youth offending teams.

- I.16** The child protection coordinator attended all meetings which enabled her to identify potential issues and take appropriate action.

Child protection

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.17** During the previous six months, 25 child protection referrals had been made to Hounslow Children's Services. Most referrals continued to relate to the use of force by staff and all referrals were appropriate. Since the last inspection, work had been undertaken to raise awareness of child protection procedures and arrangements were good. All staff we spoke to knew how to raise concerns and were confident that they would receive good advice and guidance from the child protection coordinator.
- I.18** Child protection referrals reflected the prison's child protection policy and were made promptly. Discussions took place with the local authority designated officer and investigations started promptly. Records of child protection referrals that we examined were detailed and provided a good chronology of events.
- I.19** Established links with the LSCB remained and they provided good scrutiny of child protection procedures. We found examples of improvements to safeguarding practice as a direct result of the oversight provided by the local authority.
- I.20** A formal risk assessment process had been developed so that any member of staff who repeatedly came to the attention of the safeguarding team could be identified, supported and managed. This provided prison managers with a documented and fair system to make decisions about staff deployment.
- I.21** The child protection coordinator had a single point of contact with a member of the Hounslow child abuse investigation team. Any disclosures of abuse made by a child could be referred to the police quickly and initial investigations undertaken without unnecessary delay.
- I.22** Children who made allegations of abuse or harm were well supported by the independent social workers and safeguarding officers.

Good practice

- I.23** *The prison had developed strong partnership arrangements with the local authority and developed robust systems to protect the children in their care.*

Victims of bullying and intimidation

Expected outcomes:

Everyone feels safe from bullying and victimisation. Children and young people at risk/subject to victimisation are protected through active and fair systems known to staff, young people and visitors which inform all aspects of the regime.

- I.24** In our survey, only 8% of respondents said they felt unsafe at the time of the inspection against the comparator of 20%. Twenty-two per cent said they had been victimised by other boys and 23% by staff. We remained concerned that only 30% of boys said they would

report victimisation to a member of staff and only 20% thought that staff would take a report of victimisation seriously.

- I.25** There was a bullying reduction policy in place but only 22 boys had been monitored for bullying during the previous six months. This was far lower than elsewhere and did not reflect our private interviews with boys who told us about a number of violent incidents, gang issues and gambling.
- I.26** Residential staff were aware of boys who were vulnerable to bullying but they were not always clear on how the bullying reduction policy required them to protect or monitor these individuals. Most care plans that we reviewed were blank or incomplete. These shortcomings were mitigated in part by a well-attended weekly behaviour management meeting which directed the work of departments such as health care, education and interventions to support the victims and perpetrators of bullying and violence.
- I.27** Support for boys who were self-isolating had significantly improved since the previous inspection. They were now managed using the good order or discipline process designed for segregated boys. Six boys were managed on normal location in this way and were able to access two to three hours out of their cell each day. This was still too little but much better than the 30 minutes they received at the time of the previous inspection.

Recommendation

- I.28 Managers should ensure that meaningful care plans are in place for victims of bullying and violence. Monitoring of victims and perpetrators should take place on residential units and should be recorded.**

Suicide and self-harm prevention

Expected outcomes:

The establishment provides a safe and secure environment which reduces the risk of self-harm and suicide. Children and young people are identified at an early stage and given the necessary support. All staff are aware of and alert to vulnerability issues, are appropriately trained and have access to proper equipment and support.

- I.29** Recorded levels of harm remained lower than in similar establishments. During the previous six months, 42 ACCT⁵ documents had been opened. Over the same period there had been 34 incidents of self-harm involving 22 boys. None of these incidents was classed as serious and no boys had required hospital treatment.
- I.30** The safeguarding team provided governance of self-harm procedures and any boys of particular concern were identified and discussed at the monthly safeguarding meeting. The team analysed data on incidents of self-harm and identified trends that required action. Incidents of potential concern were identified by the child protection coordinator who was a member of the safeguarding team.
- I.31** The quality of ACCT documentation was good. Records demonstrated a good level of care and initial assessments were comprehensive. Case reviews were multidisciplinary and tailored to meet the needs of the boy while care maps identified and addressed concerns raised during reviews. Most ACCT documents were only open for short periods because the concerns were appropriately addressed.

⁵ Assessment, care in custody and teamwork case management of boys at risk of suicide or self-harm.

- I.32** We observed good quality interactions between staff and boys who were being monitored on ACCTs and boys spoke positively about the care they received from staff. That said, some of the in-depth discussions that took place were not always fully documented to assist with case management and day-to-day care.
- I.33** Boys on open ACCTs continued to be given good multidisciplinary support by social workers, advocates, chaplaincy and health care. All units had access to Samaritans telephones.

Recommendation

- I.34** **Daily entries in ACCT documents should record all important conversations and observations to assist in future case management.**

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.35** Managers had made significant changes to the approach to behaviour management since the previous inspection with the objective of instilling a reward-led culture. This was an ambitious aim given the heavy focus on sanctions that we had observed at the previous inspection. While it had not yet been fully realised, it was commendable that important progress had been made over a relatively short period.
- I.36** Improvements had been made to the incentives and earned privileges scheme to reduce the time it took boys to reach the highest level (gold) of the scheme and an instant reward scheme had been introduced (see paragraph 1.41).
- I.37** Curlew had been designated as a platinum unit. Residents on this unit had to be on or working towards the gold level of the incentives scheme and be willing to mix with other boys without resorting to violent behaviour. Regular community meetings with staff gave boys responsibility and they made a meaningful contribution to establishing the rules and routines. Boys on Curlew could eat their breakfast and evening meal together and had access to more time out of cell which provided a meaningful incentive for boys on other wings. Boys who engaged in violence were expected to undergo mediation or move units and any boy who took part in two acts of violence was required to move units. These were appropriate measures and it was positive that all boys left Curlew with a reintegration plan.
- I.38** Albatross unit had been designated an enhanced support unit (ESU), the first in the country. A significant investment had been made to develop provision for some of the most vulnerable and difficult to manage children. The aim of the ESU was for boys to have all their activities, including education, psychology interventions and recreational gym, either on the unit or separate from the main population. The unit had been open for two months and three boys were resident at the time of our inspection. There were potentially spaces for six boys at the time of the inspection but two cells were damaged and out of use. When all of the refurbishment work had been completed, there would be space for 16 boys. Some of the intervention rooms were not yet in use. Despite this, we found that the boys living on this unit received a far better regime than they would on any alternative provision in use. Boys had at least five hours out of their cell each day, attended daily education and ate most of their meals together.

- I.39** The opening of the ESU represented significant progress in the management of the most challenging behaviour at Feltham. We observed the regular multidisciplinary staff on the unit managing boys with care and patience and providing much needed in-depth support. However, while we accepted that the unit was a work in progress, we were concerned that some basic processes including the unit routine, approach to incentives and criteria for placing a boy on the unit had not yet been established. This led to inconsistency and frustration, and we observed avoidable conflicts between boys and unit staff as a result.

Recommendation

- I.40** **Procedures and routines for placing boys on the enhanced support unit and managing them while there should be clarified to improve consistency and ensure staff and boys understand what is expected of them. The population on the unit should not increase until these measures are in place.**

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.41** The new incentives and earned privileges policy was far more focused on incentives than at the previous inspection. A merit scheme offered boys an immediate reward for good behaviour which could be exchanged for confectionery at the merit shop. The length of time that it took boys to reach gold had been reduced and automatic reviews for all boys had been introduced. This had led to a dramatic increase in the number of boys on gold. In our survey, 35% of respondents were on the gold regime compared to 12% at the time of the previous inspection.
- I.42** Boys we spoke to cited the ability to reach gold and the merit scheme as particularly positive.
- I.43** The new scheme was not fully embedded: group and inter-unit competitions had not been implemented; some residential staff were reluctant to give out merits; and interventions for those who spent long periods on the lowest level of the regime were not yet in place. Managers were aware of these shortfalls and had plans to address them.

Recommendation

- I.44** **The incentives and earned privileges scheme should be fully implemented to embed a rewards-led culture at Feltham.**

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** The security department was a shared resource across both sites at Feltham. The team had received over 1,600 intelligence reports over the previous six months which were processed by trained analysts and actions allocated across the site. However, lack of resources prevented some actions from being carried out, including suspicion drug testing and targeted searches. The monthly security committee meeting continued to be well attended and set appropriate security objectives for Feltham A based on intelligence received.
- I.46** The security department was appropriately focused on reducing violent incidents in Feltham A and continued to have good links with internal and external departments and agencies, including safeguarding, the Metropolitan Police Trident unit and Hounslow Police. This assisted with the investigation of incidents in Feltham and the resettlement of boys with gang affiliations.
- I.47** Drug availability remained low and the positive random mandatory drug test (MDT) over the previous six months was 2.5% for cannabis. The MDT suite had been moved and the new site in Feltham B reception was fit for purpose.
- I.48** Physical security was appropriate but we found unlock arrangements on some wings that were not proportionate to risk. This included examples of staff not unlocking any boys on a unit despite the presence of two officers.
- I.49** Adjudications continued to be used frequently to deal with more serious breaches of prison rules. Adjudication documentation that we reviewed showed that hearings were carried out fairly, but the system remained more appropriate for adults. Most charges were appropriate, although boys' frustration at lack of access to showers and telephones lay behind many charges.
- I.50** The number of adjudications had increased to more than 1,000 over the previous six months, but the number of remanded charges was comparatively low.

Recommendation

- I.51 All security actions, including targeted searching and drug testing, should take place.**

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.52** During the previous six months, there had been 161 violent incidents which was lower than the 200 recorded at the previous inspection despite an increase of 10% in the population. However, this was still too many. There had been a decline in staff assaults of over 80% and

a 30% reduction in the number of assaults on boys. The number of fights remained similar. Many incidents were low level, but there remained a number of concerning incidents of significant injuries requiring medical treatment.

- I.53** The reduction in violence had coincided with the introduction of meaningful incentives, an improved regime for boys and a much-improved response to violence (see paragraph I.37).
- I.54** All violent incidents were now investigated by managers. A team of four specially trained and enthusiastic officers carried out conflict resolution across the site in response to conflict between boys as well as between boys and staff. Each month the team facilitated about 40 initial interviews and 12 mediation meetings. They also managed the non-association list and focused on reducing the number of restrictions.
- I.55** Boys exhibiting violent behaviour continued to experience restricted access to the regime but their time out of cell had improved. The collective punishments that we saw previously were no longer used, which was positive.
- I.56** Perpetrators and victims of bullying and violence were managed through the weekly behaviour management meetings. These meetings ensured that work was coordinated between departments and actions for individual boys did not drift. However, monitoring of boys displaying antisocial behaviour on residential units was poor (see recommendation I.28).

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.57** Levels of force had reduced significantly since the last inspection to 361 incidents in the previous six months, about half of which involved the use of low-level guiding holds. Pain-inducing techniques had been used in 17 incidents, which was not appropriate.
- I.58** Most incidents of use of force occurred to prevent further injury to other boys following an incident of violence. CCTV, body camera footage and documentation that we reviewed demonstrated that force was necessary and proportionate with a good focus on de-escalation. Most boys returned to their normal unit following an incident of force.
- I.59** There had only been one MMPR coordinator in recent weeks, but daily oversight of the use of force was good. All planned interventions were recorded and body-worn cameras provided further assurance. A high number of staff statements were still outstanding (just under 200), although managers were taking appropriate action to address this.
- I.60** A weekly MMPR review meeting was chaired by the governor with an impressive multi-disciplinary attendance by managers, health care, psychology, safeguarding staff, child protection coordinators and a member of the Youth Custody Service. All incidents of force were reviewed using CCTV or body camera footage and the MMPR coordinator provided a detailed overview. Any concerns or issues identified were discussed and actions identified were dealt with promptly.

Recommendation

- I.61 All use of force documentation should be completed promptly following any incident of force.**

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.62** The segregation unit in Feltham B was still used as a shared facility for boys and young adult prisoners. During the previous six months, segregation had been used 162 times for boys which, while still high, was much lower than the 235 cases found at the last inspection. Stays were comparatively short at three days and in most cases (82%) boys had been segregated following violent incidents and were awaiting adjudication.
- I.63** Living conditions remained extremely poor and the environment was unsuitable for children. Cells were stark and poorly furnished and many were dirty. Communal areas were dirty and shabby. Conditions in the special accommodation cells (stark, unfurnished cells with no beds, toilets or sinks) were particularly grim. Use of these cells had reduced since the last inspection from 14 to four instances, but we were not assured that use was justified on every occasion. In some of the cases we examined, authorisation paperwork did not provide sufficient detail about the exceptional circumstances of individual incidents and did not always offer sufficient justification for the use of special cells.
- I.64** Staff treated boys well and we saw examples of angry boys being dealt with patiently by calm officers. However, the regime was impoverished and remained punitive. Boys had limited access to telephone calls, showers and exercise which mirrored poor regimes in adult segregation units. Boys were not permitted televisions and had little access to education facilities.

Recommendation

- I.65 Special accommodation should not be used for boys unless the circumstances are exceptional and it is fully justified by the manager authorising its use.**

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.66** Care UK had the clinical expertise, facilities and procedures to manage drug and alcohol dependent boys safely, although clinical services had not been required in the previous year. Multidisciplinary working was very good and regular, minuted meetings were attended by appropriate professionals.
- I.67** Since our last inspection, Barnet, Enfield and Haringey NHS Trust had become responsible for providing psychosocial services and was in the initial stages of integrating the substance

misuse and mental health teams. Drug workers expressed concerns about access to training under the new provider and vacancies had not been filled since the summer of 2017. This had led to workload pressures on the drug workers. While 111 boys (70%) were in psychosocial treatment, reduced staff availability had resulted in a focus on the initial assessment needs of boys and less frequent contact for treatments.

- I.68** Problems for boys accessing psychosocial services had improved since the previous inspection and good facilities had been provided in the Quadrant area of Feltham A for drug workers to see the boys. However, two-thirds of the 20 boys being treated had failed to attend their appointments in the six months to November 2017, which was unacceptable. The team had made alternative arrangements to see the boys in most cases and actions had been taken to improve attendance in 2018.
- I.69** The substance misuse policy had been revised following a recent needs assessment. A drug and alcohol strategy committee met regularly and there was evidence of good joint working between prison departments and service providers.

Recommendation

- I.70** **Boys should be able to access substance misuse interventions promptly.**

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 Overall, the standard of accommodation across the seven residential units was reasonable, although some areas were dirty. Units were bright and airy and landings were wide and afforded good sight lines to supervise boys.
- 2.2 Conditions on Dunlin and Eagle were worse than other units. Floors in communal areas were ingrained with dirt and walls and cell doors were stained. Many cells were dirty and some toilets required deep cleaning. There was reasonable access to cleaning materials but we found little to indicate that boys were actively encouraged to clean their cells. Showers were dirty and strewn with dirty clothes.
- 2.3 Communal areas on other units were cleaner and reasonably well decorated. Many cells were clean and well maintained, although ventilation was generally poor and some cells were cold. Most were reasonably well furnished but lockable cupboards were not provided.
- 2.4 All boys could personalise their cells with photographs and cards on notice boards. The offensive displays policy was adhered to and cells were generally free of graffiti. Cell call bells were responded to quickly by staff.
- 2.5 The exercise yards had outdoor gym equipment but space was limited and there was still not enough room to run around or play sport. Association equipment was in reasonable condition, but there was not enough to meet demand. Notices and posters were age appropriate and up to date.
- 2.6 Boys had decent access to toiletries and the provision of clean clothes and bedding was good. Boys could wear their own clothes and have them washed in wing laundries. T-shirts and underwear could be easily obtained. Property was well managed. Families could post items or leave property, including clothes, for boys during visits which was helpful.
- 2.7 Access to showers and telephones was restricted because the regime was curtailed in the evening and not all boys could make a phone call or have a shower every day (see paragraph 3.3). In our survey, only 39% of respondents said they could have a shower every day against the comparator of 74% and 60% at the previous inspection.
- 2.8 There were still delays in getting applications for pin phone numbers to the administrator, and boys sometimes had to wait too long to speak to family and friends. Telephones were located in the wing corridors which afforded limited privacy. Post was well managed and families could use the 'email a prisoner' scheme.
- 2.9 Applications were managed inconsistently across the residential units and the newly introduced applications system had not been fully implemented. We found no reliable way of checking the timeliness of responses or whether applications had been addressed. In our survey, only 49% of respondents against the comparator of 65% said that it was easy to make an application.

Recommendations

- 2.10 All cells, showers and communal areas on residential units should be clean and well maintained.**
- 2.11 Boys should be able to shower and make a telephone call each day.**
- 2.12 The application process should be managed consistently. (Repeated recommendation 2.11)**

Relationships between staff and children and young people

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.13** The quality of relationships between staff of all disciplines and boys was generally very good. Most of the staff group were clearly well motivated and committed. Many officers we spoke to reflected a sense of pride in their work and staff morale appeared good. Most staff were keen to try and help boys and there was a sense of community in the prison. Formal consultation with boys, through the young people's council, was very good and we found evidence of the introduction of changes suggested by boys.
- 2.14** Residential staff no longer appeared overwhelmed by managing the regime and more time out of cell for boys afforded better opportunity for pro-social time with staff. We saw many examples of staff dealing with difficult behaviour in a calm and caring way to good effect. Attention was paid to praising even small but incremental changes in behaviour and to challenging behaviour appropriately.
- 2.15** We also saw a few officers who appeared distant and spoke to boys dismissively, with low expectations of them. A personal officer scheme was in place but there was still little evidence that personal officers were involved in supporting sentence progression or case work.

Recommendation

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

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

- 2.17** The strategic management of equality work was led by the governor and was reasonably good. Consultation with boys had improved since the last inspection but attention to individual protected characteristics was variable. The equality manager continued to provide good oversight and support, but the permanent redeployment of the equality officer had resulted in a loss of focus in some work, including raising awareness of equality and diversity among residential staff.
- 2.18** Policies on equality and diversity did not specifically refer to the difficulties some boys had in accepting difference. This was particularly important for boys with gang-related offences, who showed intolerance to others.
- 2.19** Work to progress support for boys with protected characteristics had been allocated to different managers and varied in quality. This was under review.
- 2.20** The monthly equality action team meeting continued to be chaired by the governor and it was good to see that boys had been able to attend most meetings.
- 2.21** The Zahid Mubarek Trust continued to provide independent scrutiny of discrimination incident report forms. There had been 35 discrimination complaints in the previous six months, all of which had been investigated thoroughly. Responses were detailed and respectful. The equality manager, who was responsible for investigations, took time to talk to the boys and to help them understand what constituted discrimination.

Recommendation

- 2.22** **Equality and diversity policies should recognise and respond to the specific issues of gang-related discrimination.**

Diverse needs

- 2.23** There was effective identification of diverse needs, starting at reception and followed up during induction. Boys completed an equality questionnaire, in which they could ask for help and support. This questionnaire asked boys about their nationality, and this information was used to help identify boys of potential interest to UK Visas and Immigration. The prison tried to identify quickly boys who were classed as foreign nationals, as many were unaware of the implications of a custodial sentence on their status.
- 2.24** Twenty-five boys were foreign nationals, about a sixth of the population. Since our last inspection, additional support had been provided and boys could now access independent

advice from Coram children's legal centre. Clinics had also been held and boys could be supported to apply for visas or find a solicitor.

- 2.25** Just under 70% of boys were from a black and minority ethnic background. They reported broadly similar treatment to white boys in our survey.
- 2.26** There was good identification of boys with disabilities. A detailed analysis of needs indicated that 21 boys had additional needs such as attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), 15 had learning difficulties and 26 boys had social, emotional and mental health needs. A range of support was available and the prison held autism accreditation.
- 2.27** Boys with a range of disabilities received good support from education and health care, but we found that residential staff were largely unaware of any additional needs. We also found little awareness of personal emergency evacuation plans.
- 2.28** Few boys identified themselves to the prison as gay or bisexual and it was not possible to identify if any boys had made such a disclosure. A number of boys told us that it would not be safe to make a disclosure.
- 2.29** Work had been undertaken to address our previous recommendation that all homophobic abuse should be challenged. This problem had still not been resolved and we heard frequent homophobic name-calling. However, we also came across instances of boys using racist and discriminatory language and observed staff challenging them with tact and sensitivity.
- 2.30** Consultation with boys had improved since the last inspection. Kinetic Youth had held a number of forums and the outcomes had been discussed at equality action group meetings.

Recommendations

- 2.31 Residential staff should be aware of and support boys with identified disabilities.**
- 2.32 Homophobic attitudes should be explored and challenged, so that boys who are gay or bisexual feel safe to disclose their sexuality if they choose to do so.**

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.

- 2.33** The facilities and provision for religious activities were good. The chaplaincy was integrated into prison life, attending key meetings to drive strategy. The team included a range of volunteers and there was provision for most of the main faiths. Boys who were Muslim could worship in dedicated facilities.
- 2.34** Access for boys to attend religious services and the range of provision had improved since the last inspection. Most boys could attend services, and those on the non-association list who were unable to attend met a member of the chaplaincy privately which was appreciated by the boys we spoke to.
- 2.35** The chaplaincy saw all boys during induction and supported boys who were struggling with prison life or experiencing crisis.

- 2.36** There were still no faith-based classes, although work had started to facilitate this. The chaplaincy had contact with community faith agencies which could provide some resettlement support for boys on release, including mentoring and home visits.

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.

- 2.37** The quality of replies to complaints was generally good, but too many complaints concerned low-level issues that should have been dealt with through the applications system (see paragraph 2.9). Some complaint forms clearly indicated boys' frustration at not being able to get simple matters dealt with quickly.
- 2.38** Replies that we examined were polite, addressed the issues raised and reflected a full and speedy investigation.
- 2.39** Complaints were analysed thoroughly to identify trends and patterns, and quality assurance was effective.

Legal rights

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.40** Caseworkers remained responsible for explaining legal rights to boys, including their sentence or remand status. Sentenced boys were given written information about key dates, such as early release date if serving a detention and training order or home detention curfew date if serving a longer sentence.
- 2.41** Boys recalled to custody after release were identified quickly by the casework team and given documentation explaining their status. Returning boys were usually allocated to their original caseworker.
- 2.42** Caseworkers facilitated free telephone calls for boys to discuss their cases with their legal advisers.
- 2.43** Legal and other professional visits took place in private rooms in a discrete area in Feltham A (the Quadrant). Rooms were clean and bright and afforded good levels of privacy. Boys could wear their own clothes during visits and were no longer required to wear coloured bibs.

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.

2.44 The inspection of health services was jointly undertaken by the Care Quality Commission (CQC)⁶ and HM Inspectorate of Prisons under a memorandum of understanding agreement between the agencies. The CQC found there were no breaches of the relevant regulations.

Governance arrangements

- 2.45** Care UK provided health services and subcontracted Barnet Enfield and Haringey Mental Health Trust (BEH) to provide mental health services. Partnership working between health providers was excellent. However, there had not been a partnership board meeting since June 2017, a similar situation to 2016, and the public record of discussions between the service commissioner and governor was intermittent. There was an up-to-date needs assessment and learning from audits and complaints informed service delivery.
- 2.46** In our survey, only 32% of boys against the comparator of 55% said the quality of care was good. Consultation with boys about health services was being developed and boys' views on health services had been sought. A clinic-by-clinic review of health care provision involving boys was about to start, which was commendable.
- 2.47** Governance systems were robust. A regular, minuted multidisciplinary governance group was well attended and trends and emerging problems were effectively addressed.
- 2.48** Leadership of the service remained excellent and staff levels and skills mix were appropriate. Reliance on agency staff had reduced to almost none, leading to better continuity of care. Nurses were on site 24 hours a day, their supervision was well embedded and primary care staff had good access to training.
- 2.49** In our survey, 51% of boys told us it was easy to see a nurse against the comparator of 71%. Two health care assistants who had visited residential units each day had left, and the visibility of health workers had reduced. Action had been taken to fill the vacancies. Interactions between the boys and health care professionals were very good, and the nurses knew their patients, which was excellent.
- 2.50** Clinical records that we sampled were of a high standard, although care plans were embedded in the narrative rather than in the template. Care UK audits of documentation took place regularly.
- 2.51** Most health services for boys were provided from the health centre on Teal unit and the treatment room on Bittern. We were very disappointed to see that a sink had still not been fitted to the GP consultation room on Bittern, work outstanding for over two years. Its absence created an unnecessary infection control risk. Work had begun to establish a treatment room on Albatross. However, we were alarmed to see nurses using torches in the room to administer controlled drugs because they could not locate the light switch. Despite some rooms showing signs of wear and tear, health facilities were reasonably clean.

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

- 2.52** The X-ray equipment on Teal had been on site for over a year but had yet to be installed, which was unacceptable. Boys who required X-ray diagnostics had to attend external hospital appointments, which affected the prison's resources.
- 2.53** Both Care UK and the prison had appropriate health emergency equipment sited in Feltham A. Equipment was subject to regular, documented checks. A few officers had been trained in the use of automated external defibrillators and most staff we spoke to knew where the equipment was. Ambulances were now called immediately in a medical emergency, and communications room staff and nurses told us that ambulance responses were very good. The health care team had recently produced a useful emergency card for all staff, which clearly explained the correct procedure to follow when responding to a medical emergency.
- 2.54** Only three complaints had been made in 2017 and the responses were timely, courteous and focused. Concerns were resolved by face-to-face discussion with a clinician where possible, which was good practice.
- 2.55** Work had started to create a whole-prison strategic approach to health and wellbeing, and health staff continued to deliver regular health awareness sessions throughout the prison, including mental health and sexual health. Boys had prompt access to age-appropriate immunisations and vaccinations, sexual health and smoking cessation services. Barrier protection was available, but was not well advertised.

Recommendation

- 2.56 All clinical environments should comply with infection control standards.**
(Repeated recommendation 2.63)

Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.57** When boys arrived at the prison, their initial health screening was undertaken on Bittern (the induction unit) but, as in 2017, screening was sometimes unacceptably delayed (see paragraph 1.8). A full CHAT assessment (comprehensive health assessment tool) was completed the day after, and appropriate referrals for further work were completed efficiently. It was good to see an age-appropriate focus on identifying developmental disorders such as autism, ADHD and neuro-disability.
- 2.58** Boys could request access to health services using pictorial application forms which were collected daily. Health staff delivered appointment slips to all boys and followed up non-attendance, which ensured that nobody was missed.
- 2.59** The GP ran clinics on Tuesdays and Thursdays, and was available each day to provide urgent care. Another GP attended every weekend to accommodate boys in education, and GP advice was available by telephone out of hours. A nurse was available 24 hours a day and GPs could be seen the same day. Waiting times for all services were exceptionally low. Only three boys had potentially life-long physical conditions and the GP provided their care. However, did-not-attend rates were too high (35% from June to November 2017) because not enough custody officers were available to escort the boys. The clinical time wasted was unacceptable, although health staff mitigated this by running some clinics in Bittern and providing domiciliary visits when appropriate (see recommendation 3.5).
- 2.60** General primary care services were provided in house, but boys requiring podiatry and physiotherapy were referred to the hospital. Escorts to hospital were rarely cancelled.

- 2.61** The in-patient unit on Wren supported up to 12 patients with significant health needs from Feltham A and B. Most patients were admitted for mental health support. The therapeutic regime was very good.
- 2.62** Bed occupancy varied between 66% and 75%, which was appropriate given the compact nature of the unit and the mix of patients with significantly different needs. We were very disappointed to see that four of the eight patients on the unit at the time of the inspection were there for non-clinical reasons. In fact, 39 prisoners had been admitted to the unit by governors in 2017, which perpetuated the unsatisfactory situation that we had reported previously.
- 2.63** We observed one prisoner with no clinical needs on the unit making a loud noise over several hours, which disturbed patients in the nearby cells and caused problems in getting patients out of their cells in a safe way. This affected good health care outcomes for patients, particularly those who were withdrawn or needed to socialise.

Recommendation

- 2.64** **The in-patient unit should only be used for health and therapeutic purposes. Boys should not be located on the in-patient unit to address operational issues.**

Pharmacy

- 2.65** Pharmacy services remained of a high calibre with tight control of stock management and safe and audited systems.
- 2.66** Boys had good access to a pharmacist and pharmacy technician, who were on site Monday to Friday. A further technician was to start shortly so that technicians could assist nurses as intended with medicines administration and ensure that good practice in medicines optimisation was maintained. This would improve governance. Systems for prescribing and supplying medicines were very good and prescribing trends were monitored by the drugs and therapeutics committee.
- 2.67** Few boys were on medicines and still fewer had medicines in possession. In-possession risk assessment was practised appropriately but secure in-cell storage lockers had still not been fitted despite the issue being raised at inspection more than two years previously. This did not enable boys to take responsibility for their own medicines which was very disappointing.
- 2.68** The pharmacy department had developed an innovative monitoring system which ensured that boys ordered their follow-up medications, and an information system informed boys of any delays in the supply of medicines. These measures encouraged a responsible approach to personal medicines.
- 2.69** We observed medicines administration to boys on Bittern, which was good. However, we were told of almost daily difficulties in getting boys to Bittern for their medicines because of a shortage of officers. We observed two nurses waiting for an hour from 8am for boys to arrive for their controlled drugs, which was a waste of clinical time. The nurses were so frustrated they went to the units to try to extract the boys and their escorts, but to no avail. One boy who demonstrated behavioural problems later in the day had not received his anti-ADHD drug, which was entirely avoidable.

Recommendations

- 2.70** All boys should receive their prescribed medicines consistently and at clinically appropriate times.
- 2.71** Boys in shared cells should have secure storage for in-possession medicines.

Dentistry

- 2.72** NHS England commissioned an independent dentist to deliver a full range of treatments. The dentist ran sessions twice a week supported by another dentist for cover and two dental nurses.
- 2.73** Boys waited about four weeks for routine appointments, which compared favourably with the community, and those with urgent needs were seen promptly. However, did-not-attend rates had been too high at 34% from June to November 2017.
- 2.74** There was no separate decontamination room, but the dental suite complied with infection control standards and was well equipped. Equipment was maintained and certified appropriately. Clear governance processes were shared with Care UK. Oral health promotion was very good.
- 2.75** Clinical records that we examined were comprehensive, and the dentist shared information electronically when boys left Feltham with on-going treatment needs, to ensure continuity of care.

Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.76** BEH continued to work in partnership with Care UK to deliver mental health services five days a week. The team was well staffed with a rich skills mix including nursing, occupational therapy, psychology, psychiatry and speech and language therapy. Recruitment was in progress to employ a child and adolescent mental health nurse to address the needs of younger boys.
- 2.77** Needs were initially identified through early screening, and boys could self-refer or be referred by primary health or prison staff. Following triage, boys identified as needing support were usually assessed within a week. There were effective weekly multidisciplinary team meetings to review the caseload and allocate new referrals. At the time of the inspection, the team was supporting 38 boys with a range of mild to moderate and more complex mental health problems.
- 2.78** Practitioners spoke of difficulty in accessing boys and booking rooms to provide treatment. Non-attendance rates were unacceptably high, averaging 30% in October to November 2017. However, the team was diligent in following up boys who did not attend and rebooking treatment.
- 2.79** Clinical records were of a high standard and indicated excellent levels of support. An appropriate range of interventions were delivered to boys suffering from anxiety, depression and trauma. Specialist support was provided for ADHD, autism spectrum disorders and learning disabilities. Mental health staff also met boys who had been assaulted, and attended all ACCT⁷ reviews, which was good practice. Services for boys who exhibited sexually harmful behaviour were still in development.

⁷ Assessment, care in custody and teamwork case management of boys at risk of suicide or self-harm.

- 2.80 Over half the custody staff had received mental health training and all new staff received training from the mental health team, which was a positive development.
- 2.81 The mental health team had engaged some of the boys to help to develop the branding of the newly-integrated wellbeing team, and consulted them when developing self-help materials. This engaged the boys effectively in responsible activities.
- 2.82 During 2017, five boys had been transferred very quickly for treatment in hospital under the Mental Health Act with an average of eight days, well within the contemporary transfer guideline.

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.

- 2.83 The main kitchen was clean and well maintained but serveries on residential units were dirty.
- 2.84 The prison had moved to the young people's estate standardised menu and operated a four-week cycle with five options at lunch and the evening meal. Lunch consisted of a sandwich with some snacks and a hot meal was provided in the evening. The evening meal portions and sandwich lunches were adequate, but the breakfast pack remained inadequate despite the addition of two small cereal bars. Boys received the pack, usually on the same morning but sometimes the night before. No fresh milk was available and only boys on Bittern unit had access to a toaster.
- 2.85 The quality of the food that we tasted was reasonably good. The menus met the needs of different diets, including vegetarian, vegan and halal. A supply of fresh fruit was kept on all wings and was available to boys between meals. The catering manager continued to consult the boys about the menu through six-monthly surveys, which received a good response rate and led to some improvements.
- 2.86 Boys on the gold level of the incentives and earned privileges scheme on Curlew unit could eat their breakfast and evening meal together out of their cells. There were well developed plans to extend this to other units.

Recommendations

- 2.87 **Serveries should be kept clean.**
- 2.88 **The size of breakfast portions should be increased and always served on the day they are to be eaten.**

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.

- 2.89** Boys could purchase goods weekly from a range of products, which were reviewed quarterly. Orders could only be submitted on one day a week and new arrivals could wait up to 10 days to receive goods. Boys could also buy goods from a range of catalogues with no administration charge and property could be handed in at visits.
- 2.90** Boys were still unable to buy tinned goods, such as tuna and fruit, which continued to frustrate them and deprive them of some healthy options. This decision had been based on concerns about potential weapons but was not supported by recent intelligence. In our survey, only 33% of respondents told us that they could purchase a wide enough range of goods to meet their needs against the comparator of 48%.

Recommendations

- 2.91** **Boys should be able to place a canteen order within 24 hours of their arrival.** (Repeated recommendation 2.100)
- 2.92** **Prohibition of items on the canteen list should be regularly reviewed and supported by up-to-date intelligence.** (Repeated recommendation 2.102)

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.⁸

- 3.1** The time that boys could spend out of their cells had significantly improved since the last inspection. We observed that most boys received just over seven hours out of their cells compared with just over four hours previously. During roll checks in the mornings and afternoons, we found an average of 17% locked in cells compared with 40% at the last inspection.
- 3.2** A new core day had recently been introduced which prioritised the delivery of purposeful activity for most boys during the day and provided some time for association in the evening. The daily regime was predictable in terms of access to education, work and activities, and these were now rarely cancelled.
- 3.3** There was slippage in the delivery of other aspects of the regime. Evening association was regularly curtailed and limited time was allocated to domestic activities. Boys could not always have a shower and a telephone call every day and exercise was restricted to 30 minutes in the morning. In addition, while the prison had understandably focused on getting boys to education and work, attendance at other important appointments had slipped (see paragraph 2.59).

Recommendations

- 3.4 All boys should have enough time to make a telephone call, shower, and spend at least an hour outside every day.**
- 3.5 Attendance at all important scheduled appointments should be facilitated.**

⁸ 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.

3.6 Ofsted⁹ made the following assessments about the learning and skills and work provision:

Overall effectiveness of learning and skills and work: Requires improvement

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

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

Personal development and behaviour: Requires improvement

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

Management of education and learning and skills

3.7 The overall effectiveness of purposeful activity had improved since the previous inspection, but leaders and managers had assessed accurately that further improvement was needed. The education provider's staff, including teachers, were well qualified and highly motivated, but the education and vocational provision by Prospects required improvement.

3.8 The governor had made the improvement of purposeful activity a key priority for the prison. He provided good support to staff who were working increasingly successfully together to implement change and improvement plans. For example, managers had been very successful in reducing the number of cancelled sessions to a very low level. Teachers now provided largely effective out-reach sessions for boys who could not attend mainstream education classes. Managers and teachers had improved the effectiveness of interventions to reintegrate excluded boys into education sessions.

3.9 In particular, managers had ensured that nearly three-quarters of boys now left their cells during the core day and attended education sessions. This was a substantial increase compared to the previous inspection. However, this was still not enough. Prison and education managers had successfully halved movement times by changing the way boys were

⁹ 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>.

moved from their accommodation to education sessions. However, movement still took too long and reduced the time available for teaching and learning. The virtual campus¹⁰ was not operational at the time of inspection.

- 3.10 The education provider's self-assessment was honest, largely realistic and appropriately evaluative. Managers' assessments of how improvements to purposeful activity could be effected were mostly accurate, but the judgement on the overall effectiveness of the provision was overstated. Leaders and managers did not have enough datasets or use existing data well enough to monitor and manage all aspects of the effectiveness of purposeful activity.
- 3.11 The quality improvement group was now chaired by the deputy governor, but it was an ineffective forum for overall and focused improvement planning. It dealt primarily with operational matters and did not focus closely on further improving attendance, the quality of teaching, learning and assessment or the outcomes for boys.
- 3.12 Managers were planning further improvement initiatives which they recognised were particularly challenging. These were at early stages and included improving teaching, learning and assessment to become consistently good, reviewing and substantially reorganising the curriculum and, not least, motivating and involving boys to respect and engage in academic or vocational learning.

Recommendations

- 3.13 **Leaders and managers should ensure that boys' attendance at education is consistently high.**
- 3.14 **Leaders and managers should further speed up movement from accommodation units to education to improve punctuality at sessions and increase the time boys spend in learning.**
- 3.15 **Leaders and managers should ensure that the virtual campus is fully functional and routinely available to boys for job search and to support their learning.**
- 3.16 **Leaders and managers should identify and use the datasets required to monitor and manage the effectiveness of purposeful activities in the prison.**
- 3.17 **Leaders should restructure the quality improvement group to ensure that it focuses tightly on aspects for improvement, including teaching and learning.**

Provision of activities

- 3.18 Leaders and managers had ensured that sufficient activity places were available for every boy to attend an academic or vocational session during the core day. Managers had taken effective action to reduce the frequency of interruptions to sessions, for example for boys' legal visits or to health care.
- 3.19 The great majority of the courses offered were at a level which suited about half the population with entry level English, mathematics and information, communications and technology skills. Vocational options in car mechanics, painting and decorating and construction skills were offered to level 2 in well-equipped workshops, but too few boys chose to do them.

¹⁰ Prisoner access to community education, training and employment opportunities via the internet.

- 3.20** The curriculum did not reflect the prior achievements, sentence length or aptitudes of all boys. Boys who had already achieved qualifications at an equivalent or higher level than those offered by the prison did not have meaningful options available to them. Those who were already taking GCSEs at school when they came to Feltham received support from teachers to complete the qualification but otherwise no discrete GCSE courses were available.
- 3.21** Allocation to education courses was fair and informed by a good knowledge of each boy's prior attainment and support needs, and their ability to mix with other boys. However, security staff did not always complete risk assessments in a timely way, leading at times to lengthy delays in placing a boy on a course. Most boys we interviewed regarded the allocation system as largely influenced by the rigid keep-apart rules, and not tailored sufficiently to the individual.
- 3.22** Terms were scheduled into six-week blocks which restricted the range and depth of course content and the potential level of learners' achievement. A few boys with long sentences claimed they were repeating courses, leading to frustration and resentment.
- 3.23** Managers were considering initiatives including the introduction of longer school terms, higher level and sports-based programmes.

Recommendations

- 3.24 Leaders and managers should review and substantially reorganise the curriculum to meet the widely varying backgrounds, needs and interests of boys.**
- 3.25 Prison managers should ensure that risk assessments are timely.**

Quality of provision

- 3.26** Teaching staff were highly motivated and caring and keen for boys to succeed. Even the most reluctant of learners acknowledged that their teachers routinely tried hard to encourage individual learning and skills development.
- 3.27** Teachers carefully and skilfully guided boys through the induction process to ensure they captured all the necessary information to make informed decisions about support for learning. Special educational needs (SEN) staff conducted timely and thorough assessments of SEN needs and the outcomes were communicated effectively to teaching, support and wing staff. However, too few learning support assistants were available to support boys in classroom sessions and not all of those were used well enough.
- 3.28** Most teaching observed by inspectors in classrooms was lively and well intentioned. In the most effective sessions boys were positively engaged in learning and making at least some progress. Nevertheless, teachers did not always plan well enough to provide stimulating and engaging activities for all boys. In mixed ability classes the gap between entry and higher-level boys restricted the learning of the most and least able, notably in English and mathematics. In some classes the range of tasks was unchallenging. Teaching and learning in one of the two workshops was effective, but only involved two boys. No learning took place in the other workshop, again only involving two boys, because they refused to engage with the session.
- 3.29** Most teachers managed boys' behaviour in the classroom effectively and challenged inappropriate language, setting clear standards of behaviour and using sanctions appropriately. However, teachers regularly spent too much time on corrective actions which interrupted the flow of teaching and learning.

- 3.30** Boys valued very highly the informal learning sessions run by Kinetic Youth staff. These sessions focused successfully on engaging boys in discussion and developing their understanding of themes including morality, democracy, the value of rules and the use of power. Most boys particularly enjoyed formal education sessions which combined interactive and practical tasks, but such sessions were in the minority.
- 3.31** Boys who could not attend sessions in the education centre received useful individual or small-group out-reach teaching in their units. In one session, boys developed language skills and learned to express their emotions clearly. One boy who had been excluded from education had a reflective learning session which helped him to consider how to change his poor behaviour.
- 3.32** Teachers' assessment of and planning for learning did not always reflect each boy's needs adequately. Too many individual learning plans were not sufficiently personalised and did not contain incremental targets. Target setting was based narrowly on the goal of completing units and did not reflect the skills and knowledge that learners needed to acquire.
- 3.33** Systems had been introduced to monitor boys' progress across all aspects of their development but these were not fully established, functional or effective at capturing a complete picture of each boy.

Recommendations

- 3.34** **Leaders and managers should provide further training and development to teaching staff so that teaching, learning and assessment are consistently effective.**
- 3.35** **Leaders and managers should ensure that sufficient learning support assistants are available to support boys in classroom sessions and that they are used well.**

Personal development and behaviour

- 3.36** The majority of education and out-reach sessions that we observed involved boys who were well behaved and respectful to each other and their teachers.
- 3.37** Teachers did not manage boys' poor behaviour well in a minority of sessions where boys did not engage with the session or the teacher. Poor behaviour included talking loudly with others, walking about, throwing things across the classroom and generally demonstrating a lack of respect for the teacher, learning, resources and equipment. Such poor behaviour was highly disruptive to the learning of other boys and in a few cases so bad that no learning took place at all.
- 3.38** Boys' attendance at sessions was improving over time, although it was still not good enough. In most of the sessions that we observed, most boys who were expected attended.
- 3.39** Boys now followed safe working practices conscientiously in the multi-skills workshops and used personal protective clothing and equipment consistently.
- 3.40** Boys were not as demanding of their entitlement to education as at the previous inspection. Too many boys whom we interviewed saw education as a way of passing time rather than gaining useful skills.

- 3.41** Punctuality at most sessions was often poor because many factors disrupted or delayed movement from the residential units to education. In the worst case that we saw, boys turned up for a workshop session nearly an hour later than specified. One group was always the last to arrive in education and the first to return so that they had much less time in education than others.
- 3.42** Most boys understood that learning could be of value to them, but too many had a patchy previous experience of classroom-based learning in mainstream education and did not understand how the provision at Feltham might be different.
- 3.43** Disruptive behaviour, use of threatening language and vandalism in the classrooms had reduced over the past year, and there had been no assaults on staff. However, prison leaders and managers recognised that there were still too many such incidents which led to exclusion or temporary removal from education.
- 3.44** Leaders, managers, teaching and support staff recognised that a particular challenge over the coming year was to ensure that all boys engaged with and valued learning and its potential to have a positive impact on their personal and professional lives.

Education and vocational achievements

- 3.45** The achievement of qualifications was not high enough in many subjects. Achievement was high on courses including English, mathematics, personal and social development and art, but low in employability, catering and mechanics courses and very low in information and communication technology. Too many of the qualifications achieved were at a low level and of limited value.
- 3.46** The standard of boys' work that we observed in classrooms and workshops generally met but did not exceed the standards required by the qualification.

Recommendation

- 3.47** **Leaders and managers should ensure that boys' achievement of qualifications is high on all courses and at levels which are meaningful and of practical value.**

Library

- 3.48** The library, operated by Hounslow Council, stocked an extensive and varied range of DVDs, games, fiction and non-fiction titles suitable for readers of all levels and ages, and Prison Service orders. The facility was well managed and adequately staffed. The chief librarian used data well to identify the number of boys attending and the unit they came from.
- 3.49** The library was based in Feltham B and was difficult for boys to access because there were not enough officers to supervise them in transit.
- 3.50** Opening hours for Feltham A boys were too short. They could only attend the library for one hour in the evening once a fortnight. A mobile library service for Feltham A had operated intermittently but was suspended at the time of inspection because it was costly and time-consuming and offered only limited choice to boys.
- 3.51** Discussions to establish a separate library facility in Feltham A were at a very early stage.

Recommendation

- 3.52** Leaders and managers should introduce library provision which is accessible, attractive and useful to boys.

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.

- 3.53** Access to the gym had improved and extended and now included the enhanced support unit (ESU) and segregation unit. The resources and facilities in the gym were good and well maintained. Additional equipment was awaiting installation. A small fitness suite had been acquired for the ESU to increase participation in PE.
- 3.54** Attendance at gym sessions had improved by an impressive 25% since the previous inspection.
- 3.55** Boys in all units had a three-hour weekly gym session and those in non-specialist units had access to a good range of activities such as circuits, indoor football, fitness training, climbing wall, basketball and cricket nets. Boys also had recreational sessions of nearly two hours at weekends. Good quality outdoor facilities were available for rounders, football and rugby.
- 3.56** The physical education instructors (PEIs) had very good knowledge and shared this with the boys to help them understand the benefits of exercise. PEIs received the special educational needs list each week and noted the needs of individual boys when planning sessions.
- 3.57** Boys' behaviour in sessions was good. They participated well and interacted positively with PEIs and each other. They recognised the physical progress they were making through PE.
- 3.58** An accredited Active IQ healthy living programme was being piloted at the time of inspection. In the training session that we observed, boys were very focused and eager to learn and were developing their skills and knowledge.
- 3.59** Prison managers had developed useful relationships with Richmond Rugby Club and Chelsea Football Club. Two community-based sports training programmes were due to start shortly after the inspection.

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 reducing reoffending policy had been informed by a recent review of the needs analysis. Useful recommendations had been made to improve the support provided to boys. A reducing reoffending committee met monthly chaired by a senior manager. Attendance was generally good but there was no action plan of work and discussion was not sufficiently focused on improving provision.
- 4.2 Contacts established through the North and South London resettlement consortia had been maintained to progress boys' cases, although these forums no longer existed. Hounslow Youth Counselling Service, the London Fire Service and Road Light were used to provide individual and group support, and opportunities to meet identified needs and risks. Internally, the casework team, psychology and interventions team and seconded social workers had developed closer working over the year. Caseworkers participated in sequencing meetings to allocate boys to interventions, and in local intervention management team meetings. Social workers and caseworkers worked together to resolve issues such as release accommodation and in one recent case had attended an external MAPPA (multi-agency public protection arrangements) board to discuss a boy approaching release.
- 4.3 The casework team comprised operational and non-operational staff. The operational team members were sometimes used for other duties such as supervising attendance at religious services. Some caseworkers were relatively new and there were three vacancies so some boys had experienced a change of caseworker. The seven caseworkers in post had caseloads of up to 23 boys depending on their experience. New receptions continued to be allocated according to capacity. Levels of engagement with boys had improved and electronic case notes demonstrated more regular contact between formal sentence and remand planning meetings. In our survey, fewer boys than the comparator knew they had a caseworker, which was concerning.
- 4.4 Release on temporary licence (ROTL) was available but for only a relatively small number of boys assessed as suitable. Placements had included Duke of Edinburgh Award exercises, resettlement day release, and some very limited work placements. During 2017, only 175 ROTL activities had been successfully completed by just 17 boys. Early-release arrangements and home detention curfew (HDC) were used appropriately. During the previous six months, 21 boys (43% of those eligible) had achieved early release and two boys had been released on HDC. Early release and ROTL were used to motivate and encourage boys, and to acknowledge good engagement and behaviour.
- 4.5 Transition to an adult prison was discussed with boys who would become 18 while in custody. Arrangements for transfer started about four months before their 18th birthday, and the interdepartmental risk management meeting (IDRM) reviewed boys who were within two months of their birthday. Transition work was managed well but was dependent on the cooperation of the receiving prisons. Some were more engaged than others, for example

attending a transition meeting or holding a video link meeting with the boy. Others continued to rely solely on information provided by Feltham A.

- 4.6** Since the last inspection, the establishment had introduced some follow-up work of boys after they were released but it was at an early stage; the response from community partners was intermittent and it was not clear how the information would be used.

Recommendation

- 4.7** **Feltham A should identify key actions to be taken in their strategic approach to reducing reoffending work and progress against these actions should be regularly monitored.** (Repeated recommendation 4.9)

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.

- 4.8** Boys had regular remand and sentence review meetings. Monitoring of reviews that were cancelled and rearranged had improved so that the reasons for the cancellation could be addressed. Attendance by community partners was reasonable but often poor by internal departments and provision of written contributions was inconsistent. Review meetings now took place in private rooms in the Quadrant area of Feltham A which afforded a better environment and more privacy, natural light and fresh air than the previous venue.
- 4.9** The establishment had only recently started to give boys a copy of their plan, and while more boys than at the previous inspection knew they had a remand, training planning or sentence plan, this was still too low at 39%. Many boys had other plans, for example learning plans, ACCT¹¹ plans or segregation reviews. It was not clear how these plans were coordinated to ensure a consistent approach to the support and management of the boy or how they were helped to understand their different plans and targets. Some targets were too generic and focused only on what could be achieved in custody. The responsible youth offending service and Feltham A were not sufficiently coordinated to manage the planning process and agree targets with boys which would address their needs and risk in custody and in the community.
- 4.10** Casework supervision had been introduced since the last inspection and frequency of contact and timely completion of documentation had improved. A greater focus was needed on the quality of the work being undertaken with boys.

Public protection

- 4.11** Boys were screened on arrival to identify public protection concerns, and appropriate restrictions or monitoring of contact were imposed. Four boys were subject to monitoring of mail and telephone calls at the time of the inspection. These were kept under regular review at monthly IDRMs which were now specific to Feltham A. Security and case

¹¹ Assessment, care in custody and teamwork case management of boys at risk of suicide or self-harm.

workers attended regularly and an appropriate agenda was covered at each meeting, including reviewing boys subject to MAPPA who were approaching release within the next two months.

- 4.12** The casework team continued to identify boys on arrival who needed to be considered under MAPPA. At any one time between 60 and 70 boys fell into this category. Youth offending services were asked to confirm MAPPA levels in sufficient time before release but these were not always provided promptly despite escalation from Feltham A. IDRMs indicated that if a MAPPA level was felt to be wrong, this would be challenged with community partners.

Indeterminate sentence young people

- 4.13** Feltham A had held a small number of boys with indeterminate sentences during 2017. Other boys were held on remand having been charged with offences that could result in an indeterminate sentence. The management of this group of boys was the same as other boys. They had access to the same interventions and education but had no access to some of the opportunities available to their peers, for example ROTL or early release. The prison had started to look at how it supported this small number of boys, who could be there for two or more years before becoming adults. The psychology team conducted in-depth assessments to inform long-term sentence planning for these boys, and their transition to the adult estate.

Recommendation

- 4.14** **Boys with, or facing, indeterminate sentences should be provided with support and a regime that meets their specific needs.**

Looked-after children

- 4.15** Over half the boys at Feltham A had 'looked-after' status, with a statutory responsibility on local authorities to support them. Arrangements to identify boys were good, and social workers quickly notified local authorities of their arrival. Despite this diligent work, some boys did not receive their statutory entitlements and others experienced delays.
- 4.16** Some boys received very late notification of where they would be living on release, which was a particular concern. Social workers and Barnardo's put boys in touch with specialist services, including the Howard League for Penal Reform, but too many boys remained anxious about their release arrangements. The social workers highlighted the problems in an annual report to the local safeguarding children board, but there had been little improvement.
- 4.17** During the previous year, the social work team had not been at full capacity but had maintained a good service, which was to their credit. Social workers and Barnardo's workers maintained good contact and supported boys well, providing them with access to independent advocacy.

Recommendation

- 4.18** **The statutory entitlements of looked-after children should be met promptly and suitable release addresses identified at the earliest opportunity.**

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.

- 4.19** Plans for release were discussed with boys at an early stage but too often difficulties in finding accommodation delayed reintegration planning until close to release (see paragraph 4.21). Once they were provided by the supervising youth offending service, licence conditions were discussed at final review meetings to ensure that boys understood the basis for release. These were then discussed again with the boy in reception on the day of release.
- 4.20** Practical arrangements for release were reasonable. All boys were met at the gate by a responsible adult. In the absence of family members, youth offending teams or social workers did this. At the time of the inspection, one boy had to wait in reception until after lunch for a social worker to take him to his new address.

Accommodation

- 4.21** In our survey, just under a quarter of boys thought they would have a problem finding accommodation on release and only a quarter knew whom they could contact for help with accommodation. Records showed that, while accommodation had been identified for most boys by the time of release, caseworkers had been notified of an address for 36% of boys only 10 days before their release. In a few cases, the address was only obtained on the day of release. The uncertainty about accommodation had consequences for other aspects of release planning, including education, training or employment, and links with community services, all of which were needed for successful reintegration. Caseworkers, managers, the social work team and Barnardo's workers escalated the needs of boys with community partners with legal support from the Howard League when needed.

Recommendation

- 4.22 A strategy should be developed to ensure that boys leaving custody are provided with suitable accommodation in time for other elements of release planning to be completed.**

Education, training and employment

- 4.23** Boys received useful advice, guidance and careers support from the skilled engagement and resettlement team during induction and more detailed guidance a month before release. Careers guidance was sensitive and realistic, reflecting learners' ambitions, needs and interests. Very limited ROTL opportunities were available and only two boys were working outside the prison at the time of the inspection. There were almost no opportunities for work experience in the prison. Initiatives were being developed, but some boys complained to us that they were not being paid for their involvement in these emerging work programmes.
- 4.24** Some post-release follow-up of boys' involvement in education, training or employment was made at 6, 12 and 24 weeks after release but very little reliable information was gathered. The prison was reviewing its data collection practice and the effectiveness of partnership

working in and outside the prison to ensure that boys were guided and supported to enter education, training or employment on release, and that data on the number doing so were more reliable.

Health care

- 4.25** The GP ensured that boys being released had an NHS number and were registered with a community GP. The mental health team similarly followed up recently released patients with multidisciplinary teams after their release.

Drugs and alcohol

- 4.26** Preparation for the release or transfer of boys in contact with substance misuse services was very good and through-the-gate support was provided by Barnet, Enfield and Haringey NHS Mental Health Trust. A behavioural change mentor in the team focused on boys with gang affiliations and continued this work through the gate. The worker had created a support network of 26 designated bases (community support network) in the London boroughs which the boys viewed as neutral. This encouraged them to remain engaged.

Good practice

- 4.27** *The borough community support network was sited in neutral venues which the boys found acceptable, such as boxing clubs. This encouraged their continuing engagement with a substance misuse support service in a non-stigmatising or threatening environment.*

Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.28** Money management and budgeting were included as part of the curriculum delivered by the education provider. Boys were asked by their caseworkers about debt and bank accounts and could open a bank account if they needed one. There was no specialist support for debts incurred before custody or acquired while at Feltham A. Some boys told us that gambling took place and that it was possible to get into debt on the residential units. Staff whom we spoke to were aware of the potential for boys to accrue debt through gambling with their peers, but there was no strategy to alert boys to the risks involved in any form of gambling.

Recommendation

- 4.29** **Work to address gambling should be developed.**

Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.30** A named lead had recently been identified for family work but the strategy remained underdeveloped. Visits arrangements had progressed since the last inspection.
- 4.31** The visitors' centre, which was available to families and professional visitors, contained toilets, lockers, toys, a small tea bar and a facility for handing in property. It was run by Spurgeons, whose staff continued to provide relevant information and assistance to visitors but were not involved in the development of services for families.

- 4.32** A new visits area provided better facilities and a more welcoming environment for visitors and boys. It was located with the coffee shop and visitors could buy freshly prepared food and hot drinks. There was no play area, although one was planned. The new visits room was closer to Feltham A and some boys told us they felt safer not having to walk through the establishment to visits. Transport was provided to take visitors from the gate to the visits room. Closed visits facilities were located in the same area and six boys were on closed visits at the time of the inspection.
- 4.33** Visits entitlements for convicted boys depended on incentive and earned privileges levels and only those on the highest level could have a weekly visit. This penalised the boys on lower levels unfairly. In our survey only a quarter of boys said their visits started on time. Boys were not escorted to visits until confirmation was received that their visitor had arrived so that they did not wait in the visits room for visitors who did not turn up. Boys were generally in the visits room by the time their visitors had completed identification and searching and had been driven to the visits room. Each visit entitlement was one hour and the start time was noted so that those whose visits started later were not disadvantaged.
- 4.34** Family days were organised by different departments, often to recognise boys' achievements or discuss progress with families and carers. These included, for example, the completion of some interventions or programmes such as a week's course with the Fire Service, and parent/carer events organised by the education department. Consideration was being given to extending this to the completion of other interventions.
- 4.35** The casework and social work teams continued to involve families in remand and sentence planning. Boys' ability to maintain family contact by telephone was restricted by regime closures (see paragraph 2.7). Work with boys who were fathers was underdeveloped.

Recommendations

- 4.36** **There should be a clear strategy and implementation plan for family work based on the needs of boys.**
- 4.37** **Access to visits should not be restricted because of the boys' level on the incentives and earned privileges scheme.**

Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.38** A range of accredited and non-accredited interventions were delivered and they were more integrated into the establishment than previously. Dedicated intervention rooms had been set up and the importance of boys attending their allocated intervention was highlighted to staff. Appropriate arrangements were in place to identify the needs of newly arrived boys who were discussed and allocated to interventions at a fortnightly referrals meeting.
- 4.39** Accredited programmes included JETS (juvenile enhanced thinking skills), A-Z (motivation to engage), STAG (anger management) and ART (aggression replacement therapy). The interventions were delivered by trained facilitators and treatment was managed by a team of psychologists. Boys completed interventions in small groups or individually with a facilitator as appropriate. We were told that collaborative working with the conflict resolution officers was increasing the number of boys who could participate in group work. Awareness sessions were provided for staff from other disciplines, but there was little evidence of learning from interventions being reinforced by staff across the establishment.

- 4.40** Individually tailored work was also offered, often for boys with the most complex needs or whose behaviour caused the most concern. In-depth assessments to inform sentence management were undertaken with boys with indeterminate sentences. At the time of the inspection, 45 boys were involved in group or individual work with the intervention and psychology teams. This included access to counselling in house and by referral to Hounslow Youth Counselling Service.
- 4.41** Work to address gang membership was developing, including involvement of the substance misuse service team, a community organisation Road Light and access to London Gang Exit¹².
- 4.42** Relatively few boys had committed offences involving sexually harmful behaviour. Some assessment and treatment had been introduced into health services provision but was still in development.

Recommendations

- 4.43 Learning from programmes should be reinforced by staff across the establishment.**
- 4.44 Appropriate interventions should be consistently available to help boys to address sexually harmful behaviour.**

¹² A pan-London service for young people offering holistic interventions for those involved in or affected by gangs.

Section 5. Summary of recommendations and good practice

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

Main recommendations

To the governor

- 5.1** Boys should not be held in the segregation unit in Feltham B. Those who need to be separated for their own or others' safety should experience a full regime and intensive intervention to address their behaviour in a suitable setting. (S42, repeated recommendation 1.77)
- 5.2** Leaders and managers should focus strongly on improving poor behaviour in classrooms and implement practical initiatives which encourage willing engagement in education. (S43)
- 5.3** Individual training and remand plans should be central to a boy's progress and other plans and targets should be consistent with and reflected in training and remand plans. Staff from all relevant departments should be represented at training planning or remand management reviews, or submit a detailed report if they cannot attend. Training plans should demonstrate multidisciplinary input to targets to be achieved both in custody and in the community, with necessary support identified. (S44)

Recommendations

To the Youth Custody Service and Ministry of Justice

- 5.4** The statutory entitlements of looked-after children should be met promptly and suitable release addresses identified at the earliest opportunity. (4.18)
- 5.5** A strategy should be developed to ensure that boys leaving custody are provided with suitable accommodation in time for other elements of release planning to be completed. (4.22)

Recommendation

To Prisoner Escort and Custody Services

Courts, escort and transfers

- 5.6** Boys should be transported from court to the establishment as soon as possible after their hearing ends to enable them to settle on their first night. (1.4, repeated recommendation 1.3)

Recommendations

To the governor

Early days in custody

- 5.7** Private assessments by health care professionals should be conducted on the day of arrival. (1.11)
- 5.8** All boys should be given the opportunity to shower on their first night and have access to a kettle during their time on the induction unit. (1.12)

Victims of bullying and intimidation

- 5.9** Managers should ensure that meaningful care plans are in place for victims of bullying and violence. Monitoring of victims and perpetrators should take place on residential units and should be recorded. (1.28)

Suicide and self-harm protection

- 5.10** Daily entries in ACCT documents should record all important conversations and observations to assist in future case management. (1.34)

Behaviour management

- 5.11** Procedures and routines for placing boys on the enhanced support unit and managing them while there should be clarified to improve consistency and ensure staff and boys understand what is expected of them. The population on the unit should not increase until these measures are in place. (1.40)

Rewards and sanctions

- 5.12** The incentives and earned privileges scheme should be fully implemented to embed a rewards-led culture at Feltham. (1.44)

Security and disciplinary procedures

- 5.13** All security actions, including targeted searching and drug testing, should take place. (1.51)

The use of force

- 5.14** All use of force documentation should be completed promptly following any incident of force. (1.61)

Separation/removal from normal location

- 5.15** Special accommodation should not be used for boys unless the circumstances are exceptional and it is fully justified by the manager authorising its use. (1.65)

Substance misuse

- 5.16** Boys should be able to access substance misuse interventions promptly. (1.70)

Residential units

- 5.17** All cells, showers and communal areas on residential units should be clean and well maintained. (2.10)
- 5.18** Boys should be able to shower and make a telephone call each day. (2.11)
- 5.19** The application process should be managed consistently. (2.12, repeated recommendation 2.11)

Relationships between staff and children and younger people

- 5.20** The personal officer scheme should be developed and personal officers should play an active part in sentence progression and case work. (2.16, repeated recommendation 2.15)

Equality and diversity

- 5.21** Equality and diversity policies should recognise and respond to the specific issues of gang-related discrimination. (2.22)
- 5.22** Residential staff should be aware of and support boys with identified disabilities. (2.31)
- 5.23** Homophobic attitudes should be explored and challenged, so that boys who are gay or bisexual feel safe to disclose their sexuality if they choose to do so. (2.32)

Health services

- 5.24** All clinical environments should comply with infection control standards. (2.56, repeated recommendation 2.63)
- 5.25** The in-patient unit should only be used for health and therapeutic purposes. Boys should not be located on the in-patient unit to address operational issues. (2.64)
- 5.26** All boys should receive their prescribed medicines consistently and at clinically appropriate times. (2.70)
- 5.27** Boys in shared cells should have secure storage for in-possession medicines. (2.71)

Catering

- 5.28** Serveries should be kept clean. (2.87)
- 5.29** The size of breakfast portions should be increased and always served on the day they are to be eaten. (2.88)

Purchases

- 5.30** Boys should be able to place a canteen order within 24 hours of their arrival. (2.91, repeated recommendation 2.100)
- 5.31** Prohibition of items on the canteen list should be regularly reviewed and supported by up-to-date intelligence. (2.92, repeated recommendation 2.102)

Time out of cell

- 5.32** All boys should have enough time to make a telephone call, shower, and spend at least an hour outside every day. (3.4)
- 5.33** Attendance at all important scheduled appointments should be facilitated. (3.5)

Education, learning and skills

- 5.34** Leaders and managers should ensure that boys' attendance at education is consistently high. (3.13)
- 5.35** Leaders and managers should further speed up movement from accommodation units to education to improve punctuality at sessions and increase the time boys spend in learning. (3.14)
- 5.36** Leaders and managers should ensure that the virtual campus is fully functional and routinely available to boys for job search and to support their learning. (3.15)
- 5.37** Leaders and managers should identify and use the datasets required to monitor and manage the effectiveness of purposeful activities in the prison. (3.16)
- 5.38** Leaders should restructure the quality improvement group to ensure that it focuses tightly on aspects for improvement, including teaching and learning. (3.17)
- 5.39** Leaders and managers should review and substantially reorganise the curriculum to meet the widely varying backgrounds, needs and interests of boys. (3.24)
- 5.40** Prison managers should ensure that risk assessments are timely. (3.25)
- 5.41** Leaders and managers should provide further training and development to teaching staff so that teaching, learning and assessment are consistently effective. (3.34)
- 5.42** Leaders and managers should ensure that sufficient learning support assistants are available to support boys in classroom sessions and that they are used well. (3.35)
- 5.43** Leaders and managers should ensure that boys' achievement of qualifications is high on all courses and at levels which are meaningful and of practical value. (3.47)
- 5.44** Leaders and managers should introduce library provision which is accessible, attractive and useful to boys. (3.52)

Pre-release and resettlement

- 5.45** Feltham A should identify key actions to be taken in their strategic approach to reducing reoffending work and progress against these actions should be regularly monitored. (4.7, repeated recommendation 4.9)

Training planning and remand management

- 5.46** Boys with, or facing, indeterminate sentences should be provided with support and a regime that meets their specific needs. (4.14)

Reintegration planning

- 5.47** Work to address gambling should be developed. (4.29)
- 5.48** There should be a clear strategy and implementation plan for family work based on the needs of boys. (4.36)
- 5.49** Access to visits should not be restricted because of the boys' level on the incentives and earned privileges scheme. (4.37)
- 5.50** Learning from programmes should be reinforced by staff across the establishment. (4.43)
- 5.51** Appropriate interventions should be consistently available to help boys to address sexually harmful behaviour. (4.44)

Examples of good practice

- 5.52** The prison had developed strong partnership arrangements with the local authority and developed robust systems to protect the children in their care. (1.23)
- 5.53** The borough community support network was sited in neutral venues which the boys found acceptable, such as boxing clubs. This encouraged their continuing engagement with a substance misuse support service in a non-stigmatising or threatening environment. (4.27)

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
Gordon Riach	Inspector
Michelle Bellham	Researcher
Helen Ranns	Researcher
Joe Simmonds	Researcher
Emily Spilman	Researcher
Beth Wilson	Researcher
Paul Tarbuck	Health services inspector
Tim Byrom	Care Quality Commission inspector
Nick Crombie	Ofsted inspector
Judy Lye-Foster	Ofsted inspector

Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report

The following is a summary of the main findings from the last report and a list of all the recommendations made, organised under the four tests of a healthy prison. The reference numbers at the end of each recommendation refer to the paragraph location in the previous report. If a recommendation has been repeated in the main report, its new paragraph number is also provided.

Safety

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

At the last inspection in 2017, early days for boys at Feltham A were reasonably well managed but new arrivals spent too long in their cells on the induction unit. Internal safeguarding arrangements were sound but there were delays in child protection referrals. There was a comparatively low incidence of self-harm and care for those in crisis was reasonably good. The promising plans to improve behaviour seen at the previous inspection had not been implemented. The approach to behaviour management was now overwhelmingly punitive and ineffective. The level of violence, much of which was serious, continued to rise and was very high. Use of force and adjudications had also increased. The segregation unit was unsuitable for boys and we had significant concerns over the use of special accommodation. Substance misuse services remained good. Outcomes for children and young people were poor against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendations

A strategy should be developed and implemented to improve behaviour and reduce violence. Interventions based on need should be used and there should be sufficient incentives to encourage positive behaviour. (S48)

Achieved

Special accommodation should not be used for boys unless the circumstances are exceptional. No boy should be left without his own clothes unless a contemporaneous risk assessment identifies a threat to his life or wellbeing. In these circumstances, replacement clothes which maintain the boy's dignity should be provided. (S49)

Not achieved

Recommendations

Boys should be transported from court to the establishment as soon as possible after their hearing ends to enable them to settle on their first night. (1.3)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 1.4)

Boys should not be transported with adult prisoners. (1.4)

Not achieved

All boys should have an opportunity to have a shower and meet a peer supporter on the first night. (1.10)

Not achieved

The induction session on regime and rules should take place within 24 hours of arrival. (1.11)

Achieved

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

Achieved

Individual support plans for victims of bullying and intimidation should identify needs and how to meet them. Plans should be reviewed regularly with the boy concerned and their implementation monitored by residential managers. (1.25)

Not achieved

Victims of bullying should have access to a safe regime that includes adequate time out of their cells. (1.26)

Partially achieved

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

Achieved

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

Achieved

Intelligence reports should be acted on promptly by all departments. (1.47)

Not achieved

Security intelligence should draw conclusions to inform appropriate objectives that are effectively communicated to relevant staff. (1.48)

Achieved

Managers should analyse the impact of the formal adjudications system on the basis of evidence, and ensure that it plays an effective and age-appropriate part in the management of behaviour. (1.49)

Not achieved

Effective tracking of adjourned adjudications should be implemented and overseen by senior managers in order that all charges can be heard and concluded within a reasonable timescale. (1.50)

Achieved

Individual plans for perpetrators of violence should be fully developed and should include meaningful behaviour improvement targets based on rigorous assessments of need. They should be managed, monitored and reviewed by residential staff together with the safeguarding team and risk management meeting. (1.57)

Achieved

Collective punishments, including removing units from education, should not be used. (1.58)

Achieved

An enhanced support unit, a care and separation unit for boys and psychology-led accredited programmes to help reduce violence should be implemented as a priority. (1.59)

Achieved

Control and restraint techniques should not be used on children and all staff who work with boys should be trained in MMPR. (1.66)

Achieved

Batons should not be carried by staff working with boys who are under 18 years of age. (1.67)

Achieved

All aspects of use of force should be rigorously scrutinised and all associated documents relating to the use of force should be completed quickly and collated. (1.68)

Partially achieved

Body-worn video cameras should be used to record all incidents where force is used. (1.69)

Achieved

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

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, S42)

Boys should be able to access structured substance misuse interventions promptly and consistently according to their assessed needs, and appropriate facilities should be provided to deliver these. (1.84)

Not achieved

The MDT suite should provide a clean, safe and respectful environment. (1.85)

Achieved

Respect

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

At the last inspection in 2017, residential units were in a reasonable condition, although showers were poor. Most interactions that we observed between staff and boys were polite, but we also saw some intolerance of adolescent behaviour. Consultation arrangements had deteriorated and the lack of time out of cell prevented the formation of effective relationships. The management of applications and complaints was good. The food was reasonable but boys had to eat all their meals in their cells. The management of equality was satisfactory but provision had deteriorated for some groups and there were gaps in the chaplaincy service. Health services remained good and mental health provision was excellent. Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

Recommendations

Showers should be refurbished and boys should be able to shower and make a phone call each day. (2.10)

Not achieved

The application process should be managed consistently. (2.11)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 2.12)

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

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 2.16)

The needs of all groups with protected characteristics should be identified and addressed, regular forums should be held for each group, and all aspects of equality and diversity should be promoted. (2.25)

Partially achieved

The treatment of boys in all protected groups should be monitored. (2.26)

Achieved

Boys with disabilities should be readily identifiable to unit staff and unit care plans should be prepared when necessary to help staff meet the needs of these boys. (2.35)

Not achieved

Homophobic and other offensive behaviour should be challenged effectively. (2.36)

Partially achieved

Faith-based classes should be provided to boys of all faiths. (2.43)

Not achieved

Boys on the 'keep apart' list should only be excluded from corporate worship following a robust risk assessment. (2.44)

Achieved

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

Achieved

Regular consultation with the boys should inform health service delivery. (2.62)

Achieved

All clinical environments should comply with infection control standards. (2.63)

Achieved (Recommendation repeated, 2.56)

More prison officers should be trained in first aid, including use of defibrillators. Ambulances should be called immediately to ensure a safe response to medical emergencies at all times. (2.64)

Achieved

There should be an integrated whole-prison strategic approach to the promotion of health and wellbeing, including the provision of condoms. (2.65)

Partially achieved

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

Not achieved

All boys should receive their prescribed medicines consistently and at clinically appropriate times. Boys in shared cells should have secure storage for in-possession medicines. (2.76)

Partially achieved

Nurses should be able to administer a wide range of medicines for minor injuries and illnesses without a prescription. (2.77)

Achieved

A summary of dental care provided should be recorded on SystemOne. (2.80)

Achieved

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

Partially achieved

All boys should have the opportunity to eat communally out of their cells. (2.93)

Partially achieved

The size of breakfast portions should be increased. (2.94)

Not achieved

Serveries should be cleaned after every meal and food should not be left out overnight (2.95)

Not achieved

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

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 2.91)

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

Achieved

Prohibition of items on the canteen list should be supported by up-to-date intelligence. (2.102)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 2.92)

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 2017, the regime operating at the time of the inspection remained detrimental to the development and wellbeing of boys at Feltham. Time out of cell was inadequate and prevented boys from using basic amenities, including showers and telephones. Boys were still unable to access the hours of education they were entitled to. Attendance was poor and exacerbated by delays in movements and interruptions to lessons. Despite these problems the education provider had created a positive school ethos with high expectations of boys. Outcomes required further improvement. Access to the library and PE was too limited. Outcomes for children and young people were poor against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendations

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

Partially achieved

All boys should have the opportunity to have at least an hour outside every day. (S51)

Not achieved

Recommendations

Prison leaders should significantly and swiftly improve boys' attendance at education to ensure that the requirement to deliver the mandatory hours of education is met. (3.10)

Achieved

Effective plans to reintegrate boys excluded from education should be implemented to ensure their smooth and rapid transition back into class. (3.11)

Achieved

The prison regime should be reviewed to ensure that start and finish times of classes and the number of authorised visitors do not affect the boys' time for learning. (3.12)

Partially achieved

A culture of respect for learning in education should be developed to ensure that boys can thrive in a conducive learning environment. (3.13)

Not achieved

Leaders and managers should ensure that all boys receive their full entitlement to the required education hours. (3.18)

Achieved

Leaders and managers should review the current delivery model to ensure it meets the needs of the boys who prefer to follow a mostly academic or vocational route. (3.19)

Achieved

The planning of learning should be improved by better use of learning support assistants and resources, to ensure that the needs of learners of different abilities are being met. (3.27)

Partially achieved

The system of rewards should be developed further to recognise progress and achievement and ensure that targets are specific and lead to improvement. (3.28)

Partially achieved

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

Achieved

The achievement of qualifications in ICT and other areas should be improved. (3.40)

Not achieved

The prison should ensure that all boys have the opportunity to progress and achieve substantial qualifications commensurate with their prior attainment and the length of their sentence at Feltham. (3.41)

Not achieved

Prison managers should use data effectively to identify which groups of boys are using the library. (3.46)

Not achieved

Opportunities and time available for boys to use the library should be increased, including boys from under-represented groups. (3.47)

Partially achieved

The system for ordering books should be promoted more effectively to encourage boys to read in their units. (3.48)

Not achieved

The virtual campus should be established swiftly and boys should be able to use it regularly. (3.49)

Partially achieved

Attendance at PE and outdoor exercise should be improved to ensure that all boys have the appropriate hours of exercise time. (3.56)

Achieved

Appropriate accredited training courses should be introduced to the gymnasium and physical education. (3.57)

Achieved

The promotion of healthy living and wellbeing should be enhanced in exercise sessions and through links with the health care department. (3.58)

Partially achieved

Resettlement

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

At the last inspection in 2017, strategic oversight of resettlement was reasonably good and informed by an up-to-date needs analysis. Very few boys were aware of their sentence, training or remand plan. These plans were not detailed enough and lacked meaningful targets. Contact between some caseworkers and boys was inadequate and residential staff did not attend review meetings. Release on temporary licence (ROTL) was used appropriately and public protection remained well organised. Preparation for release or transition to the adult estate was well organised but looked-after children still faced delays in securing suitable accommodation on release. Work with families was inconsistent and visitors faced unacceptable delays. Other pathway work was good. Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendation

All boys should have regular, recorded contact with their caseworker between timely training planning review meetings. Plans agreed at these meetings should be specific to the boy and set out how he will be helped to achieve his targets. Targets should be reviewed and updated at each meeting based on information about the boy and his progress in the intervening period. (S52)

Partially achieved

Recommendations

Feltham A should identify key actions to be taken in their strategic approach to reducing reoffending work and progress against these actions should be regularly monitored. (4.9)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 4.7)

Post-release follow up of boys should be in place to inform the ongoing analysis of needs. (4.10)

Partially achieved

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

Achieved

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

Not achieved

Work with other government departments should be undertaken to ensure that all boys leaving custody are provided with appropriate accommodation in good time for their release. (4.25)

Not achieved

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

Not achieved

Boys should be able to open a bank account while at Feltham. (4.35)

Achieved

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

Not achieved

Targeted work should be available to address gang membership. (4.43)

Partially achieved

Appendix III: Establishment population profile

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

Population breakdown by:

Status	Number of young people	%
Sentenced	103	71.5
Recall		
Convicted unsentenced	10	6.9
Remand	30	20.8
Detainees	0	
Unknown	1	0.7
Total	144	100

Age	Number of young people	%
15 years	4	2.8
16 years	34	23.6
17 years	93	64.6
18 years	13	9
Other		
Total	144	100

Nationality	Number of young people	%
British	125	86.8
Foreign nationals	19	13.2
Total	144	100

Ethnicity	Number of young people	%
White		
British	35	24.3
Irish	4	2.8
Gypsy/Irish Traveller	1	0.7
Other white	9	6.3
Mixed		
White and black Caribbean	11	7.6
White and black African	0	
White and Asian	0	
Other mixed	1	0.7
Asian or Asian British		
Indian	3	2
Pakistani	4	2.8
Bangladeshi	2	1.4
Chinese	0	4.9
Other Asian	7	
Black or black British		
Caribbean	26	18
African	28	19.4
Other black	8	5.6

Other ethnic group		
Arab	0	
Other ethnic group	5	3.5
Not stated		
Total	144	100

Religion	Number of young people	%
Baptist	0	
Church of England	10	6.9
Roman Catholic	20	13.9
Other Christian denominations	31	21.5
Muslim	51	35.4
Sikh	1	0.7
Hindu	1	0.7
Buddhist	0	
Jewish	0	
Other	1	0.7
No religion	29	20.1
Total	144	100

Other demographics	Number of young people	%
Gypsy/Romany/Traveller	1	0.7
Total	1	0.7

Sentenced only – length of stay by age

Length of stay	<1 mth	1–3 mths	3–6 mths	6–12 mths	1–2 yrs	2 yrs +	4 yrs +	Total
Age								
15 years	0	1	1	1	0	0		3
16 years	3	6	8	3	1	0		21
17 years	13	17	10	17	10	1		68
18 years	0	0	5	5	0	0		10
Total	16	24	24	26	11	1		102

Unsentenced only – length of stay by age

Length of stay	<1 mth	1–3 mths	3–6 mths	6–12 mths	1–2 yrs	2 yrs+	4 yrs +	Total
Age								
15 years	0	0	1	0				1
16 years	4	4	1	4				13
17 years	8	13	1	3				25
18 years	0	3	0	0				3
Total	12	20	3	7				42

Main offence	Number of young people	%
Violence against the person	60	40
Sexual offences	3	2
Burglary	12	8
Robbery	28	18.7
Theft and handling	0	0
Fraud and forgery	0	0
Drugs offences	18	12
Other offences	29	19.3
Offence not recorded / holding warrant	0	0
Total	150	100

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

Sentence	4 mths	6 mths	8 mths	10 mths	12 mths	18 mths	24 mths	24 mths+	Recall		Total
Age											
15 years	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0		2
16 years	1	1	3	1	1	2	2	0	0		11
17 years	5	2	2	0	4	3	3	5	12		36
18 years	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6		6
Total	6	3	6	1	5	5	5	6	18		55

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

Sentence	Under 2 yrs	Over 2 yrs	Recall	Total
Age				
15 years	1			1
16 years	5			5
17 years	27	2		29
18 years	1			1
Total	34	2		36

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							
16 years					1		1
17 years							
18 years							
Total					1		1

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							0

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

Children and young people survey methodology

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

Sampling

Questionnaires were offered to all young people.

Distributing and collecting questionnaires

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

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

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

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

Survey response

At the time of the survey on 23 January 2017 the young person population at HMYOI Feltham A was 126. Questionnaires were distributed to 120 young people¹³.

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

¹³ Surveys were not distributed to six young people who were at court on the day of the survey.

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

Presentation of survey results and analyses

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

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

We also present a number of comparative analyses. In all the comparative analyses that follow, statistically significant¹⁴ differences are indicated by shading. Results that are significantly better are indicated by green shading, results that are significantly worse are indicated by blue shading. If the difference is not statistically significant there is no shading. Orange shading has been used to show a statistically significant difference in young people's background details.

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

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

The following comparative analyses are presented:

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

¹⁴ A statistically significant difference between the two samples is one that is unlikely to have arisen by chance alone, and can therefore be assumed to represent a real difference between the two populations. In order to appropriately adjust p-values in light of multiple testing, $p < 0.01$ was considered statistically significant for all comparisons undertaken. This means there is only a 1% likelihood that the difference is due to chance.

Survey summary

SECTION I: ABOUT YOU

Q1	How old are you?	
	15.....	5 (5%)
	16.....	30 (29%)
	17.....	64 (61%)
	18.....	6 (6%)
Q2	Are you a British citizen?	
	Yes.....	97 (94%)
	No.....	6 (6%)
Q3	Do you understand spoken English?	
	Yes.....	104 (100%)
	No.....	0 (0%)
Q4	Do you understand written English?	
	Yes.....	98 (97%)
	No.....	3 (3%)
Q5	What is your ethnic origin?	
	White - British.....	22 (22%)
	White - Irish.....	3 (3%)
	White - Other.....	4 (4%)
	Black or Black British - Caribbean.....	25 (25%)
	Black or Black British - African.....	17 (17%)
	Black or Black British - Other.....	2 (2%)
	Asian or Asian British - Indian.....	0 (0%)
	Asian or Asian British - Pakistani.....	5 (5%)
	Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi.....	2 (2%)
	Asian or Asian British - Chinese.....	0 (0%)
	Asian or Asian British - Other.....	1 (1%)
	Mixed race - White and Black Caribbean.....	11 (11%)
	Mixed race - White and Black African.....	0 (0%)
	Mixed race - White and Asian.....	0 (0%)
	Mixed race - Other.....	5 (5%)
	Arab.....	3 (3%)
	Other ethnic group.....	1 (1%)
Q6	What is your religion?	
	None.....	11 (11%)
	Church of England.....	25 (25%)
	Catholic.....	19 (19%)
	Protestant.....	3 (3%)
	Other Christian denomination.....	5 (5%)
	Buddhist.....	0 (0%)
	Hindu.....	1 (1%)
	Jewish.....	0 (0%)
	Muslim.....	37 (37%)
	Sikh.....	0 (0%)

Q7	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	
	Yes	3 (3%)
	No.....	93 (95%)
	Don't know	2 (2%)
Q8	Do you have any children?	
	Yes	5 (5%)
	No.....	97 (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	16 (15%)
	No.....	89 (85%)
Q10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	
	Yes	39 (38%)
	No.....	65 (63%)

SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE

Q1	Are you sentenced?	
	Yes	72 (69%)
	No - unsentenced/on remand	33 (31%)
Q2	How long is your sentence (the full DTO sentence)?	
	Not sentenced.....	33 (32%)
	Less than 6 months.....	9 (9%)
	6 to 12 months.....	18 (18%)
	More than 12 months, up to 2 years.....	15 (15%)
	More than 2 years.....	25 (25%)
	Indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP).....	2 (2%)
Q3	How long have you been in this establishment?	
	Less than 1 month.....	21 (20%)
	1 to 6 months	51 (49%)
	More than 6 months, but less than 12 months.....	21 (20%)
	12 months to 2 years.....	9 (9%)
	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	58 (59%)
	No.....	41 (41%)

SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS

Q1	On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?	
	Yes	80 (76%)
	No.....	10 (10%)
	Don't remember	15 (14%)
Q2	On your most recent journey here, were there any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females travelling with you?	
	Yes	26 (25%)
	No.....	61 (59%)
	Don't remember	17 (16%)

Q3	On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	47 (45%)
	<i>2 to 4 hours</i>	42 (40%)
	<i>More than 4 hours</i>	5 (5%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	10 (10%)
Q4	On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?	
	<i>My journey was less than 2 hours</i>	47 (45%)
	<i>Yes</i>	4 (4%)
	<i>No</i>	50 (48%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	3 (3%)
Q5	On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?	
	<i>My journey was less than 2 hours</i>	47 (45%)
	<i>Yes</i>	17 (16%)
	<i>No</i>	36 (35%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	4 (4%)
Q6	On your most recent journey here, how did you feel you were treated by the escort staff?	
	<i>Very well</i>	12 (12%)
	<i>Well</i>	48 (47%)
	<i>Neither</i>	28 (27%)
	<i>Badly</i>	5 (5%)
	<i>Very badly</i>	3 (3%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	7 (7%)
Q7	Before you arrived here, did you receive any information to help you prepare for coming here?	
	<i>Yes - and it was helpful</i>	11 (11%)
	<i>Yes - but it was not helpful</i>	10 (10%)
	<i>No - I received no information</i>	72 (71%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	9 (9%)

SECTION 4: FIRST DAYS

Q1	How long were you in reception?	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	87 (84%)
	<i>2 hours or longer</i>	6 (6%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	11 (11%)
Q2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	
	<i>Yes</i>	82 (79%)
	<i>No</i>	10 (10%)
	<i>Don't remember/Not applicable</i>	12 (12%)
Q3	How well did you feel you were treated in reception?	
	<i>Very well</i>	13 (13%)
	<i>Well</i>	52 (50%)
	<i>Neither</i>	28 (27%)
	<i>Badly</i>	2 (2%)
	<i>Very badly</i>	2 (2%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	6 (6%)

- 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 | 34 (34%) | Money worries | 12 (12%) |
| Loss of property | 12 (12%) | Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to..... | 24 (24%) |
| Feeling scared..... | 12 (12%) | Health problems..... | 51 (52%) |
| Gang problems..... | 64 (65%) | Getting phone numbers | 32 (32%) |
| Contacting family | 45 (45%) | Staff did not ask me about any of these | 15 (15%) |
- 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 | 36 (36%) | Money worries | 18 (18%) |
| Loss of property | 9 (9%) | Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to..... | 9 (9%) |
| Feeling scared..... | 4 (4%) | Health problems..... | 14 (14%) |
| Gang problems..... | 24 (24%) | Getting phone numbers | 32 (32%) |
| Contacting family | 30 (30%) | I did not have any problems | 29 (29%) |
- Q6 When you first arrived here, were you given any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**
- | | |
|--|----------|
| Toiletries/basic items | 74 (71%) |
| The opportunity to have a shower | 34 (33%) |
| Something to eat..... | 83 (80%) |
| A free phone call to friends/family..... | 83 (80%) |
| PIN phone credit..... | 47 (45%) |
| Information about feeling worried/upset..... | 20 (19%) |
| Don't remember | 0 (0%) |
| I was not given any of these | 2 (2%) |
- 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..... | 28 (28%) |
| Peer mentor..... | 5 (5%) |
| Childline/Samaritans..... | 12 (12%) |
| The prison shop/canteen..... | 12 (12%) |
| Don't remember | 23 (23%) |
| I did not have access to any of these | 40 (40%) |
- Q8 Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?**
- | | |
|----------------------|----------|
| Yes | 65 (63%) |
| No..... | 32 (31%) |
| Don't remember | 6 (6%) |
- Q9 Did you feel safe on your first night here?**
- | | |
|----------------------|----------|
| Yes | 72 (70%) |
| No..... | 16 (16%) |
| Don't remember | 15 (15%) |
- Q10 Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the establishment?**
- | | |
|---|----------|
| I have not been on an induction course..... | 11 (11%) |
| Yes..... | 45 (45%) |
| No..... | 32 (32%) |
| Don't remember | 13 (13%) |

SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT

Q1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	
	Yes	39 (39%)
	No	62 (61%)
	Don't know	0 (0%)
Q2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	
	Yes	33 (33%)
	No.....	64 (63%)
	Don't know	4 (4%)
Q3	What is the food like here?	
	Very good.....	1 (1%)
	Good.....	11 (11%)
	Neither	30 (29%)
	Bad	35 (34%)
	Very bad.....	25 (25%)
Q4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	
	<i>I have not bought anything yet/Don't know</i>	2 (2%)
	Yes	33 (33%)
	No.....	64 (65%)
Q5	How easy is it for you to attend religious services?	
	<i>I don't want to attend religious services</i>	13 (12%)
	Very easy.....	10 (9%)
	Easy.....	37 (35%)
	Neither	7 (7%)
	Difficult.....	14 (13%)
	Very difficult.....	13 (12%)
	Don't know	12 (11%)
Q6	Are you religious beliefs respected?	
	Yes	63 (62%)
	No.....	12 (12%)
	Don't know/Not applicable.....	27 (26%)
Q7	Can you speak to a Chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?	
	Yes	53 (52%)
	No.....	10 (10%)
	Don't know/Not applicable.....	39 (38%)
Q8	Can you speak to a peer mentor when you need to?	
	Yes	24 (24%)
	No.....	20 (20%)
	Don't know	58 (57%)
Q9	Can you speak to a member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board) when you need to?	
	Yes	15 (15%)
	No	14 (14%)
	Don't know	73 (72%)

Q10	Can you speak to an advocate (an outside person to help you) when you need to?	
	Yes	33 (33%)
	No.....	20 (20%)
	Don't know	48 (48%)

SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF

Q1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	
	Yes	54 (56%)
	No.....	42 (44%)

Q2	If you had a problem, who would you turn to? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	No-one	25 (25%)
	Personal officer	21 (21%)
	Wing Officer.....	16 (16%)
	Teacher/education staff	2 (2%)
	Gym staff	2 (2%)
	Chaplain.....	4 (4%)
	Independent Monitoring Board (IMB).....	2 (2%)
	YOT worker	26 (26%)
	Social worker	17 (17%)
	Health services staff.....	0 (0%)
	Peer mentor	0 (0%)
	Another young person here.....	15 (15%)
	Case worker.....	28 (28%)
	Advocate.....	0 (0%)
	Family/friends.....	45 (45%)
	Childline/Samaritans	0 (0%)

Q3	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	
	Yes	31 (30%)
	No.....	71 (70%)

Q4	When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?	
	I still have not met him/her	22 (21%)
	In your first week.....	31 (30%)
	After your first week.....	23 (22%)
	Don't remember	27 (26%)

Q5	How often do you see your personal (named) officer?	
	I still have not met him/her	22 (22%)
	At least once a week	44 (45%)
	Less than once a week.....	32 (33%)

Q6	Do you feel your personal (named) officer tries to help you?	
	I still have not met him/her	22 (23%)
	Yes	43 (44%)
	No.....	32 (33%)

SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS

Q1	Is it easy to make an application?	
	Yes	50 (49%)
	No.....	27 (26%)
	Don't know	26 (25%)

Q2	Are applications sorted out fairly?	
	I have not made an application	26 (29%)
	Yes	30 (33%)
	No.....	34 (38%)

Q3	Are applications sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	
	<i>I have not made an application</i>	26 (29%)
	Yes	14 (16%)
	No	50 (56%)
Q4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	
	Yes	47 (46%)
	No	20 (20%)
	Don't know	35 (34%)
Q5	Are complaints sorted out fairly?	
	<i>I have not made a complaint</i>	35 (38%)
	Yes	17 (19%)
	No	39 (43%)
Q6	Are complaints sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	
	<i>I have not made a complaint</i>	35 (39%)
	Yes	10 (11%)
	No	44 (49%)
Q7	Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint?	
	Yes	6 (6%)
	No	63 (64%)
	Never needed to make a complaint.....	30 (30%)

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>	1 (1%)
	Enhanced (top)	36 (35%)
	Standard (middle)	50 (49%)
	Basic (bottom)	12 (12%)
	Don't know	4 (4%)
Q2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the rewards and sanctions scheme?	
	<i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i>	1 (1%)
	Yes	32 (33%)
	No	47 (48%)
	Don't know	17 (18%)
Q3	Do the different levels of the rewards and sanctions scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	
	<i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i>	1 (1%)
	Yes	47 (49%)
	No	40 (42%)
	Don't know	8 (8%)
Q4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	
	Yes	33 (33%)
	No	29 (29%)
	Don't know	38 (38%)
Q5	If you have had a minor report, was the process explained clearly to you?	
	<i>I have not had a minor report</i>	67 (67%)
	Yes	23 (23%)
	No	10 (10%)

Q6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	
	Yes	64 (64%)
	No.....	33 (33%)
	Don't know	3 (3%)
Q7	If you have had an adjudication ('nicking'), was the process explained clearly to you?	
	<i>I have not had an adjudication</i>	36 (37%)
	Yes	52 (53%)
	No.....	10 (10%)
Q8	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	
	Yes	46 (46%)
	No.....	51 (50%)
	Don't know	4 (4%)
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>	50 (52%)
	Very well.....	2 (2%)
	Well.....	9 (9%)
	Neither	19 (20%)
	Badly.....	6 (6%)
	Very badly	11 (11%)

SECTION 9: SAFETY

Q1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	
	Yes	35 (35%)
	No.....	65 (65%)
Q2	Do you feel unsafe now?	
	Yes	8 (8%)
	No.....	94 (92%)
Q3	In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Never felt unsafe	65 (66%)
	Everywhere	8 (8%)
	Care and separation unit	4 (4%)
	Association areas	10 (10%)
	Reception area	3 (3%)
	At the gym	5 (5%)
	In an exercise yard	8 (8%)
	At work.....	2 (2%)
	At education	7 (7%)
	At religious services.....	5 (5%)
	At meal times	3 (3%)
	At healthcare	3 (3%)
	Visits area	17 (17%)
	In wing showers.....	7 (7%)
	In gym showers	6 (6%)
	In corridors/stairwells.....	11 (11%)
	On your landing/wing	7 (7%)
	During movement	17 (17%)
	In your cell	7 (7%)

Q4	Have you ever been victimised by another young person/group of young people here (e.g. insulted or assaulted you.?)	
	Yes	22 (22%)
	No.....	77 (78%)
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>	12 (12%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	9 (9%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	4 (4%)
	<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i>	2 (2%)
	<i>Medication</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Debt</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Drugs</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	2 (2%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	2 (2%)
	<i>Your nationality</i>	3 (3%)
	<i>You are from a different part of the country to others</i>	2 (2%)
	<i>You are from a Traveller community</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your sexuality</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your age</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>You having a disability</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>You were new here</i>	2 (2%)
	<i>Your offence/crime</i>	3 (3%)
	<i>Gang related issues</i>	8 (8%)
Q7	Have you ever been victimised by staff here (e.g. insulted or assaulted you)?	
	Yes	23 (23%)
	No.....	76 (77%)
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>	12 (12%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	4 (4%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i>	2 (2%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	3 (3%)
	<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Medication</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Debt</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Drugs</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	5 (5%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	2 (2%)
	<i>Your nationality</i>	2 (2%)
	<i>You are from a different part of the country to others</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>You are from a Traveller community</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Your sexuality</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your age</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>You having a disability</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>You were new here</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Your offence/crime</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Gang related issues</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Because you made a complaint</i>	4 (4%)
Q10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	
	Yes	27 (30%)
	No.....	45 (49%)
	Don't know	19 (21%)

Q11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?		
	Yes	19 (20%)	
	No.....	42 (44%)	
	Don't know	34 (36%)	

Q12	Is shouting through the windows a problem here?		
	Yes	24 (25%)	
	No.....	56 (58%)	
	Don't know	17 (18%)	

SECTION 10: HEALTH SERVICES

Q1	Is it easy to see the following people if you need to?			
		Yes	No	Don't know
	The doctor	43 (45%)	40 (42%)	13 (14%)
	The nurse	48 (51%)	37 (39%)	10 (11%)
	The dentist	28 (30%)	45 (48%)	21 (22%)

Q2	What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?		
	<i>I have not been</i>	4 (4%)	
	<i>Very good</i>	5 (5%)	
	<i>Good</i>	24 (25%)	
	<i>Neither</i>	31 (32%)	
	<i>Bad</i>	26 (27%)	
	<i>Very bad</i>	6 (6%)	

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>	50 (52%)	
	<i>Yes, all of my meds</i>	10 (10%)	
	<i>Yes, some of my meds</i>	10 (10%)	
	<i>No</i>	27 (28%)	

Q4	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?		
	Yes	24 (26%)	
	No.....	70 (74%)	

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>	70 (73%)	
	Yes	11 (11%)	
	No.....	15 (16%)	

Q6	Did you have problems with alcohol when you first arrived here?		
	Yes	6 (6%)	
	No.....	91 (94%)	

Q7	Have you received any help with alcohol problems here?		
	Yes	3 (3%)	
	No.....	95 (97%)	

Q8	Did you have problems with drugs when you first arrived here?		
	Yes	19 (19%)	
	No.....	79 (81%)	

Q9	Do you have problems with drugs now?		
	Yes	3 (3%)	
	No.....	95 (97%)	

Q10	Have you received any help with drugs problems here?	
	Yes	12 (13%)
	No.....	84 (88%)
Q11	How easy or difficult is it to get illegal drugs here?	
	Very easy.....	7 (7%)
	Easy	4 (4%)
	Neither	4 (4%)
	Difficult.....	3 (3%)
	Very difficult.....	16 (17%)
	Don't know	62 (65%)

SECTION II: ACTIVITIES

Q1	How old were you when you were last at school?				
	14 or under	34 (35%)			
	15 or over.....	62 (65%)			
Q2	Have you ever been excluded from school?				
	Yes	87 (89%)			
	No.....	8 (8%)			
	Not applicable.....	3 (3%)			
Q3	Did you ever skip school before you came into custody?				
	Yes	72 (74%)			
	No.....	19 (20%)			
	Not applicable.....	6 (6%)			
Q4	Do you CURRENTLY take part in any of the following activities? (Please tick all that apply to you.)				
	Education	74 (76%)			
	A job in this establishment.....	16 (16%)			
	Vocational or skills training	11 (11%)			
	Offending behaviour programmes	18 (19%)			
	I am not currently involved in any of these.....	21 (22%)			
Q5	If you have been involved in any of the following activities here, do you think they will help you when you leave prison?				
		Not been involved	Yes	No	Don't know
	Education	13 (15%)	47 (55%)	19 (22%)	6 (7%)
	A job in this establishment	29 (67%)	8 (19%)	5 (12%)	1 (2%)
	Vocational or skills training	29 (74%)	8 (21%)	1 (3%)	1 (3%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	26 (60%)	12 (28%)	3 (7%)	2 (5%)
Q6	Do you usually have association every day?				
	Yes	40 (41%)			
	No.....	57 (59%)			
Q7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?				
	Don't want to go.....	5 (5%)			
	Yes	54 (55%)			
	No.....	39 (40%)			

Q8	How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?	
	<i>Don't want to go</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>None</i>	18 (18%)
	<i>One to two times</i>	72 (73%)
	<i>Three to five times</i>	6 (6%)
	<i>More than five times</i>	1 (1%)

SECTION 12: FAMILY AND FRIENDS

Q1	Are you able to use the telephone every day, if you want to?	
	<i>Yes</i>	43 (45%)
	<i>No</i>	53 (55%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	0 (0%)

Q2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?	
	<i>Yes</i>	39 (40%)
	<i>No</i>	43 (44%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	15 (15%)

Q3	How many visits do you usually have each week, from family or friends?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	15 (15%)
	<i>Less than one a week</i>	28 (29%)
	<i>About one a week</i>	34 (35%)
	<i>More than one a week</i>	10 (10%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	10 (10%)

Q4	How easy is it for your family and friends to visit you here?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	15 (16%)
	<i>Very easy</i>	15 (16%)
	<i>Easy</i>	19 (20%)
	<i>Neither</i>	20 (21%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	18 (19%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	5 (5%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	4 (4%)

Q5	Do your visits usually start on time?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	15 (16%)
	<i>Yes</i>	23 (24%)
	<i>No</i>	50 (53%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	7 (7%)

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>	21 (22%)
	<i>Getting into school or college</i>	36 (38%)
	<i>Getting a job</i>	41 (43%)
	<i>Money/finances</i>	25 (26%)
	<i>Claiming benefits</i>	5 (5%)
	<i>Continuing health services</i>	4 (4%)
	<i>Opening a bank account</i>	10 (11%)
	<i>Avoiding bad relationships</i>	9 (9%)
	<i>I won't have any problems</i>	41 (43%)

Q2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan (i.e. a plan that is discussed in your DTO/planning meetings, which sets out your targets)?	
	Yes	37 (39%)
	No.....	31 (32%)
	Don't know	28 (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>	59 (63%)
	Yes	27 (29%)
	No.....	8 (9%)
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>	59 (61%)
	Yes	34 (35%)
	No.....	3 (3%)
Q5	Do you have a caseworker here?	
	Yes	86 (89%)
	No.....	6 (6%)
	Don't know	5 (5%)
Q6	Has your caseworker helped to prepare you for release?	
	<i>I don't have a caseworker</i>	11 (12%)
	Yes	31 (33%)
	No.....	32 (34%)
	Don't know	21 (22%)
Q7	Has your social worker been to visit you since you have been here?	
	<i>I don't have a social worker</i>	15 (15%)
	Yes	59 (61%)
	No.....	23 (24%)
Q8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	
	Yes	43 (44%)
	No.....	39 (40%)
	Don't know	15 (15%)
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>	21 (24%)
	<i>Getting into school or college</i>	24 (28%)
	<i>Getting a job</i>	23 (27%)
	<i>Help with money/finances</i>	18 (21%)
	<i>Help with claiming benefits</i>	12 (14%)
	<i>Continuing health services</i>	11 (13%)
	<i>Opening a bank account</i>	14 (16%)
	<i>Avoiding bad relationships</i>	11 (13%)
	<i>I don't know who to contact</i>	55 (64%)

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

<i>Not sentenced</i>	33 (34%)	<i>Having a mentor (someone you can ask for advice)</i>	5 (5%)
<i>Nothing, it is up to me</i>	23 (24%)	<i>Having a YOT worker or social worker that I get on with</i>	13 (13%)
<i>Making new friends outside</i>	9 (9%)	<i>Having children</i>	9 (9%)
<i>Going back to live with my family</i>	15 (15%)	<i>Having something to do that isn't crime</i>	16 (16%)
<i>Getting a place of my own</i>	16 (16%)	<i>This sentence</i>	17 (18%)
<i>Getting a job</i>	33 (34%)	<i>Getting into school/college</i>	11 (11%)
<i>Having a partner (girlfriend or boyfriend)</i>	18 (19%)	<i>Talking about my offending behaviour with staff</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Staying off alcohol/drugs</i>	12 (12%)	<i>Anything else</i>	4 (4%)

Q11 Do you want to stop offending?

<i>Not sentenced</i>	33 (34%)
<i>Yes</i>	56 (57%)
<i>No</i>	5 (5%)
<i>Don't know</i>	4 (4%)

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>	33 (34%)
<i>Yes</i>	29 (30%)
<i>No</i>	34 (35%)

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



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

Survey responses (missing data have been excluded for each question). Please note: where there are apparently large differences, which are not indicated as statistically significant, this is likely to be due to chance. NB: This document shows a comparison between the responses from all young people surveyed in this establishment with all young people surveyed for the comparator.

Key to tables

		HMYOI Feltham A December 2017	All other CYP establishments	HMYOI Feltham A December 2017	HMYOI Feltham A January 2017
	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		106	498	106	104
SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU					
1.1	Are you 18 years of age?	6%	14%	6%	11%
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	6%	7%	6%	10%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%	100%	100%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	97%	99%	97%	100%
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other category.)	71%	44%	71%	63%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	37%	20%	37%	33%
1.7	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	3%	8%	3%	7%
1.8	Do you have any children?	5%	10%	5%	5%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	15%	21%	15%	12%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	38%	43%	38%	46%
SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE					
2.1	Are you sentenced?	69%	78%	69%	77%
2.2	Is your sentence 12 months or less?	27%	29%	27%	35%
2.3	Have you been in this establishment for one month or less?	20%	15%	20%	14%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	59%	58%	59%	52%
SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS					
On your most recent journey here:					
3.1	Did you feel safe?	76%	77%	76%	79%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	25%	31%	25%	41%
3.3	Did you spend more than 4 hours in the van?	5%	7%	5%	6%
For those who spent 2 or more hours in the escort van:					
3.4	Were you offered a toilet break if you needed it?	7%	14%	7%	9%
3.5	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	30%	52%	30%	49%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	58%	56%	58%	54%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	11%	14%	11%	10%

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMYOI Feltham A December 2017	All other CYP establishments	HMYOI Feltham A December 2017	HMYOI Feltham A January 2017
	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		106	498	106	104
SECTION 4: YOUR FIRST FEW DAYS HERE					
4.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	84%	77%	84%	81%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	79%	80%	79%	78%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	63%	68%	63%	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?	34%	55%	34%	43%
4.4b	Loss of property?	12%	19%	12%	18%
4.4c	Feeling scared?	12%	31%	12%	16%
4.4d	Gang problems?	65%	42%	65%	60%
4.4e	Contacting family?	46%	55%	46%	50%
4.4f	Money worries?	12%	18%	12%	14%
4.4g	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	24%	32%	24%	18%
4.4h	Health problems?	52%	57%	52%	50%
4.4i	Getting phone numbers?	32%	45%	32%	44%
4.5	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	71%	78%	71%	71%
When you first arrived, did you have problems with any of the following:					
4.5a	Not being able to smoke?	36%	44%	36%	39%
4.5b	Loss of property?	9%	11%	9%	12%
4.5c	Feeling scared?	4%	16%	4%	7%
4.5d	Gang problems?	24%	13%	24%	21%
4.5e	Contacting family?	30%	35%	30%	26%
4.5f	Money worries?	18%	17%	18%	14%
4.5g	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	9%	17%	9%	7%
4.5h	Health problems?	14%	17%	14%	14%
4.5i	Getting phone numbers?	32%	36%	32%	33%
When you first arrived, were you given any of the following:					
4.6a	Toiletries/basic items?	71%	86%	71%	63%
4.6b	The opportunity to have a shower?	33%	55%	33%	37%
4.6c	Something to eat?	80%	79%	80%	80%
4.6d	A free phone call to friends/family?	80%	78%	80%	73%
4.6e	PIN phone credit?	45%	50%	45%	57%
4.6f	Information about feeling worried/upset?	19%	34%	19%	18%

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMYOI Feltham A December 2017	All other CYP establishments	HMYOI Feltham A December 2017	HMYOI Feltham A January 2017
	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		106	498	106	104
Within your first 24 hours, did you have access to the following people or services:					
4.7a	A chaplain?	28%	41%	28%	33%
4.7b	A peer mentor?	5%	11%	5%	11%
4.7c	Childline/Samaritans	12%	16%	12%	17%
4.7d	The prison shop/canteen?	12%	12%	12%	10%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	63%	76%	63%	59%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	70%	74%	70%	71%
4.10	For those who have been on an induction course: did it cover everything you needed to know about the establishment?	50%	49%	50%	53%
SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT					
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	39%	74%	39%	60%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	33%	20%	33%	47%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	12%	16%	12%	13%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	33%	48%	33%	40%
5.5	Is it easy/very easy for you to attend religious services?	44%	43%	44%	44%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	62%	51%	62%	69%
Can you speak to:					
5.7	A chaplain of your faith in private?	52%	59%	52%	61%
5.8	A peer mentor?	24%	26%	24%	24%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	15%	18%	15%	16%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	33%	35%	33%	28%
SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF					
6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	56%	68%	56%	66%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	25%	24%	25%	27%
6.3	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	30%	38%	30%	29%
For those who have met their personal officer:					
6.4	Did you meet your personal (named) officer within the first week?	38%	37%	38%	26%
6.5	Do you see your personal (named) officer at least once a week?	58%	48%	58%	48%
6.6	Do you feel your personal (named) officer tries to help you?	57%	65%	57%	52%

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMYOI Feltham A December 2017	All other CYP establishments	HMYOI Feltham A December 2017	HMYOI Feltham A January 2017
	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		106	498	106	104
SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS					
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	49%	65%	49%	52%
For those who have made an application:					
7.2	Do you feel applications are sorted out fairly?	47%	58%	47%	28%
7.3	Do you feel applications are sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	22%	39%	22%	22%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	46%	51%	46%	50%
For those who have made a complaint:					
7.5	Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	30%	27%	30%	15%
7.6	Do you feel complaints are sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	19%	18%	19%	23%
7.7	Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint?	6%	12%	6%	9%
SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE					
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	35%	28%	35%	12%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	33%	40%	33%	31%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	49%	45%	49%	34%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	33%	45%	33%	43%
For those who have had a minor report:					
8.5	Was the process explained clearly to you?	70%	66%	70%	68%
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	64%	65%	64%	69%
For those who have had an adjudication ('nicking'):					
8.7	Was the process explained clearly to you?	84%	86%	84%	85%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (Cand R) since you have been here?	46%	44%	46%	46%
8.9	For those who had spent a night in the care and separation unit: did the staff treat you well/very well?	23%	41%	23%	22%
SECTION 9: SAFETY					
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	35%	44%	35%	39%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	8%	20%	8%	12%

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

Key to tables

		HMYOI Feltham A December 2017	All other CYP establishments	HMYOI Feltham A December 2017	HMYOI Feltham A January 2017
	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		106	498	106	104
9.4	Have you ever been victimised by other young people here?	22%	35%	22%	23%
Since you have been here, have other young people:					
9.5a	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	12%	20%	12%	9%
9.5b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	10%	14%	10%	10%
9.5c	Sexually abused you?	1%	0%	1%	0%
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	4%	14%	4%	4%
9.5e	Taken your canteen/property?	2%	6%	2%	2%
9.5f	Victimised you because of medication?	1%	0%	1%	0%
9.5g	Victimised you because of debt?	1%	2%	1%	1%
9.5h	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	2%	0%	2%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	2%	4%	2%	3%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	2%	3%	2%	2%
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?	2%	4%	2%	1%
9.5m	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%	1%	0%	1%
9.5n	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	0%	0%	0%
9.5o	Victimised you because of your age?	1%	0%	1%	4%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	1%	0%	0%
9.5q	Victimised you because you were new here?	2%	9%	2%	6%
9.5r	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	3%	3%	3%	2%
9.5s	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	9%	6%	9%	12%

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

Key to tables

		HMYOI Feltham A December 2017	All other CYP establishments	HMYOI Feltham A December 2017	HMYOI Feltham A January 2017
	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		106	498	106	104
9.7	Have you ever been victimised by a member of staff here?	23%	28%	23%	24%
Since you have been here, have staff:					
9.8a	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	12%	15%	12%	15%
9.8b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	4%	8%	4%	4%
9.8c	Sexually abused you?	2%	1%	2%	0%
9.8d	Threatened or intimidated you?	3%	8%	3%	4%
9.8e	Taken your canteen/property?	0%	3%	0%	2%
9.8f	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	0%	0%	1%
9.8g	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	1%	0%	0%
9.8h	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	1%	0%	2%
9.8i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	5%	4%	5%	4%
9.8j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	2%	3%	2%	1%
9.8k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	2%	2%	2%	0%
9.8k	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	1%	2%	1%	1%
9.8m	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	1%	0%	1%	1%
9.8n	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	0%	0%	0%
9.8o	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	2%	0%	5%
9.8p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	1%	0%	0%
9.8q	Victimised you because you were new here?	3%	3%	3%	3%
9.8r	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	0%	1%	0%	3%
9.8s	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	1%	0%	1%	3%
9.8t	Victimised you because you made a complaint?	4%	5%	4%	5%
9.10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	30%	29%	30%	31%
9.11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	20%	30%	20%	32%
9.12	Is shouting through the windows a problem here?	25%	45%	25%	27%

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMYOI Feltham A December 2017	All other CYP establishments	HMYOI Feltham A December 2017	HMYOI Feltham A January 2017
	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		106	498	106	104
SECTION 10: HEALTH SERVICES					
10.1a	Is it easy for you to see the doctor?	45%	57%	45%	55%
10.1b	Is it easy for you to see the nurse?	51%	71%	51%	66%
10.1c	Is it easy for you to see the dentist?	30%	36%	30%	37%
10.2	For those who have been to health services: Do you think the overall quality is good/very good?	32%	55%	32%	42%
10.3	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/all of it in your cell?	43%	42%	43%	60%
10.4	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?	26%	31%	26%	17%
10.5	If you have emotional or mental health problems, are you being helped by anyone here?	42%	59%	42%	39%
10.6	Did you have any problems with alcohol when you first arrived?	6%	9%	6%	6%
10.7	Have you received any help with any alcohol problems here?	3%	6%	3%	2%
10.8	Did you have any problems with drugs when you first arrived?	19%	35%	19%	22%
10.9	Do you have a problem with drugs now?	3%	9%	3%	4%
10.10	Have you received any help with any drug problems here?	13%	24%	13%	15%
10.11	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs here?	12%	27%	12%	9%
SECTION 11: ACTIVITIES					
11.1	Were you 14 or younger when you were last at school?	35%	41%	35%	41%
11.2	Have you ever been excluded from school?	89%	90%	89%	87%
11.3	Did you ever skip school before you came into custody?	74%	74%	74%	71%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:					
11.4a	Education?	76%	76%	76%	64%
11.4b	A job in this establishment?	17%	11%	17%	10%
11.4c	Vocational or skills training?	11%	8%	11%	11%
11.4d	Offending behaviour programmes?	19%	23%	19%	19%
11.4e	Nothing	22%	17%	22%	32%

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

Key to tables

		HMYOI Feltham A December 2017	All other CYP establishments	HMYOI Feltham A December 2017	HMYOI Feltham A January 2017
	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		106	498	106	104
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?	65%	63%	65%	65%
11.5b	A job in this establishment?	57%	45%	57%	37%
11.5c	Vocational or skills training?	80%	44%	80%	36%
11.5d	Offending behaviour programmes?	71%	53%	71%	40%
11.6	Do you usually have association every day?	41%	47%	41%	44%
11.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	55%	69%	55%	44%
11.8	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	1%	2%	1%	0%
SECTION 12: KEEPING IN TOUCH WITH FAMILY AND FRIENDS					
12.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	45%	67%	45%	66%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	40%	46%	40%	33%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	45%	36%	45%	29%
12.4	Is it easy/very easy for your family and friends to visit you here?	35%	31%	35%	39%
12.5	Do your visits start on time?	24%	45%	24%	18%
SECTION 13: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE					
Do you think you will have a problem with the following, when you are released:					
13.1a	Finding accommodation?	22%	24%	22%	22%
13.1b	Getting into school or college?	38%	27%	38%	37%
13.1c	Getting a job?	43%	47%	43%	40%
13.1d	Money/finances?	26%	31%	26%	28%
13.1e	Claiming benefits?	5%	16%	5%	8%
13.1f	Continuing health services?	4%	8%	4%	8%
13.1g	Opening a bank account?	11%	15%	11%	12%
13.1h	Avoiding bad relationships?	10%	18%	10%	20%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	39%	48%	39%	17%
For those with a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan:					
13.3	Were you involved in the development of your plan?	77%	88%	77%	77%
13.4	Do you understand the targets set in your plan?	92%	94%	92%	93%
13.5	Do you have a caseworker here?	89%	97%	89%	90%
13.6	Has your caseworker helped to prepare you for release?	37%	51%	37%	27%
For those with a social worker:					
13.7	Has your social worker been to visit you since you have been here?	72%	70%	72%	75%
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	44%	44%	44%	36%

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMYOI Feltham A December 2017	All other CYP establishments	HMYOI Feltham A December 2017	HMYOI Feltham A January 2017
	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		106	498	106	104
Do you know who to contact for help with the following problems?					
13.9a	Finding accommodation	24%	33%	24%	42%
13.9b	Getting into school or college	28%	30%	28%	42%
13.9c	Getting a job	27%	37%	27%	32%
13.9d	Help with money/finances	21%	26%	21%	27%
13.9e	Help with claiming benefits	14%	20%	14%	20%
13.9f	Continuing health services	13%	22%	13%	20%
13.9g	Opening a bank account	16%	29%	16%	20%
13.9h	Avoiding bad relationships	13%	22%	13%	20%
For those who were sentenced:					
13.11	Do you want to stop offending?	86%	88%	86%	90%
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?	46%	51%	46%	49%



Diversity analysis

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

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

Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic young people	White young people	Muslim young people	Non-Muslim young people
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		72	29	37	64
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	6%	7%	8%	5%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	100%	93%	97%	97%
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)			91%	58%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	47%	10%		
1.5	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	2%	7%	0%	5%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	10%	31%	8%	20%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	32%	48%	31%	41%
2.1	Are you sentenced?	65%	79%	78%	64%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	58%	57%	56%	59%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	28%	17%	33%	22%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	59%	54%	46%	65%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	11%	7%	14%	10%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	80%	76%	76%	79%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	62%	68%	51%	71%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	66%	55%	64%	64%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	69%	69%	69%	70%
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	32%	57%	31%	44%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	30%	39%	39%	28%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	11%	11%	8%	15%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	30%	39%	29%	35%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	66%	48%	76%	56%
Can you speak to:					
5.7	A chaplain of your faith in private?	54%	48%	60%	49%
5.8	A peer mentor?	21%	30%	19%	26%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	13%	22%	11%	18%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	31%	33%	33%	34%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic young people	White young people	Muslim young people	Non-Muslim young people
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		72	29	37	64
6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	52%	64%	49%	61%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	29%	15%	26%	23%
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	49%	50%	38%	57%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	46%	44%	32%	53%
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	35%	33%	32%	36%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	31%	38%	26%	39%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	51%	50%	46%	55%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	33%	27%	30%	33%
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	65%	58%	73%	57%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	42%	48%	49%	42%
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	30%	50%	35%	36%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	9%	7%	3%	12%
9.4	Have you been victimised by other young people here?	15%	41%	22%	24%
Since you have been here, have other young people:					
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	3%	8%	3%	5%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	3%	0%	3%	2%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	3%	0%	3%	2%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	3%	4%	3%	4%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	0%	0%	0%
9.7	Have you been victimised by staff here?	22%	30%	23%	22%
Since you have been here, have staff:					
9.8d	Threatened or intimidated you?	2%	7%	3%	3%
9.8i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	6%	4%	3%	7%
9.8j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	3%	0%	6%	0%
9.8k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	3%	0%	3%	2%
9.8p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	0%	0%	0%
9.10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	25%	48%	17%	39%
9.11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	20%	24%	21%	21%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic young people	White young people	Muslim young people	Non-Muslim young people
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		72	29	37	64
10.1a	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the doctor?	42%	56%	38%	50%
10.1b	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the nurse?	45%	67%	44%	58%
10.4	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	19%	48%	15%	33%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:					
11.4a	Education?	76%	73%	82%	72%
11.4b	A job in this establishment?	17%	15%	15%	17%
11.4c	Vocational or skills training?	11%	15%	15%	10%
11.4d	Offending behaviour programmes?	14%	27%	21%	19%
11.4e	Nothing?	21%	27%	18%	24%
11.6	Do you usually have association every day?	38%	54%	35%	47%
11.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	51%	62%	50%	59%
11.8	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	2%	0%	3%	0%
12.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	36%	64%	35%	51%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	39%	44%	32%	45%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	45%	44%	47%	43%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	42%	32%	47%	35%
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	45%	40%	32%	50%

Diversity analysis - disability



Key question responses (disability analysis) HMYOI Feltham A 2017

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		16	89
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	6%	6%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	100%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	93%	98%
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	44%	77%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	19%	40%
1.5	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	8%	2%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	44%	36%
2.1	Are you sentenced?	69%	69%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	57%	59%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	6%	28%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	67%	57%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	20%	9%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	80%	79%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	87%	59%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	57%	64%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	64%	71%
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	54%	36%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	23%	34%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	0%	14%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	15%	36%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	57%	63%
Can you speak to:			
5.7	A chaplain of your faith in private?	36%	55%
5.8	A peer mentor?	14%	25%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	14%	15%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	7%	37%

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?	50%	57%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	21%	24%
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	50%	48%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	57%	44%
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	21%	38%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	23%	35%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	36%	52%
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?	64%	64%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	64%	42%
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	50%	33%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	20%	6%
9.4	Have you been victimised by other young people here?	33%	21%
Since you have been here, have other young people:			
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	8%	4%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	3%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	3%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	8%	3%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	0%
9.7	Have you been victimised by staff here?	40%	21%
Since you have been here, have staff:			
9.8d	Threatened or intimidated you?	0%	4%
9.8i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	7%	5%
9.8j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	7%	1%
9.8k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	2%
9.8p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	0%
9.10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	23%	31%
9.11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	0%	23%

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?	54%	43%
10.1b	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the nurse?	58%	49%
10.4	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	69%	19%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:			
11.4a	Education?	77%	76%
11.4b	A job in this establishment?	15%	17%
11.4c	Vocational or skills training?	15%	11%
11.4d	Offending behaviour programmes?	31%	17%
11.4e	Nothing?	23%	22%
11.6	Do you usually have association every day?	46%	41%
11.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	46%	56%
11.8	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	8%	0%
12.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	46%	44%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	46%	40%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	31%	47%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	46%	38%
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	23%	47%

Diversity analysis



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

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Young people who have been in local authority care	Young people who have not been in local authority care
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		39	65
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	3%	8%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	100%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	97%	97%
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	62%	76%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	30%	40%
1.5	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	5%	2%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	18%	14%
2.1	Are you sentenced?	82%	60%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	30%	76%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	26%	25%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	58%	58%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	5%	14%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	76%	80%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	68%	59%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	58%	66%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	71%	69%
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	35%	41%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	18%	40%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	5%	16%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	27%	38%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	53%	67%
Can you speak to:			
5.7	A chaplain of your faith in private?	53%	51%
5.8	A peer mentor?	21%	25%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	16%	14%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	32%	32%

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?	56%	56%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	27%	22%
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	42%	52%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	45%	47%
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	40%	33%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	36%	31%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	40%	54%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	29%	33%
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	69%	60%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	57%	39%
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	40%	33%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	14%	5%
9.4	Have you been victimised by other young people here?	29%	19%
Since you have been here, have other young people:			
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	9%	2%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	6%	0%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	6%	0%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	9%	0%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	0%
9.7	Have you been victimised by staff here?	33%	19%
Since you have been here, have staff:			
9.8d	Threatened or intimidated you?	3%	3%
9.8i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	9%	3%
9.8j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	3%	2%
9.8k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	3%	2%
9.8p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	0%
9.10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	31%	30%
9.11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	17%	22%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Young people who have been in local authority care	Young people who have not been in local authority care
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
10.1a	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the doctor?	44%	46%
10.1b	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the nurse?	53%	50%
10.4	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	31%	23%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:			
11.4a	Education?	82%	72%
11.4b	A job in this establishment?	15%	18%
11.4c	Vocational or skills training?	15%	10%
11.4d	Offending behaviour programmes?	21%	18%
11.4e	Nothing?	18%	25%
11.6	Do you usually have association every day?	31%	47%
11.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	49%	57%
11.8	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	0%	2%
12.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	34%	51%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	49%	37%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	29%	55%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	40%	37%
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	49%	40%

Wing comparator



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

Survey responses (missing data have been excluded for each question). Please note: where there are apparently large differences, which are not indicated as statistically significant, this is likely to be due to chance. NB: This document shows a comparison between the responses from all young people surveyed in this establishment with all young people surveyed for the comparator.

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Enhanced Wing (C Wing)	Rest of the Establishment
	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	87
SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU			
1.1	Are you 18 years of age?	0%	7%
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	0%	7%
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 category.)	50%	77%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	18%	41%
1.7	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	0%	4%
1.8	Do you have any children?	6%	5%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	17%	15%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	61%	33%
SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE			
2.1	Are you sentenced?	72%	67%
2.2	Is your sentence 12 months or less?	24%	26%
2.3	Have you been in this establishment for one month or less?	6%	23%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	47%	61%
SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS			
On your most recent journey here:			
3.1	Did you feel safe?	83%	76%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	33%	24%
3.3	Did you spend more than 4 hours in the van?	0%	6%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	67%	57%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	11%	11%

Wing comparator

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Enhanced Wing (C Wing)	Rest of the Establishment
	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	87
SECTION 4: YOUR FIRST FEW DAYS HERE			
4.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	94%	81%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	78%	79%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	72%	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?	28%	36%
4.4b	Loss of property?	0%	15%
4.4c	Feeling scared?	6%	14%
4.4d	Gang problems?	78%	61%
4.4e	Contacting family?	28%	50%
4.4f	Money worries?	0%	15%
4.4g	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	11%	28%
4.4h	Health problems?	39%	54%
4.4i	Getting phone numbers?	22%	35%
4.5	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	72%	70%
When you first arrived, did you have problems with any of the following:			
4.5a	Not being able to smoke?	39%	35%
4.5b	Loss of property?	6%	10%
4.5c	Feeling Scared?	0%	5%
4.5d	Gang Problems?	28%	24%
4.5e	Contacting Family?	33%	30%
4.5f	Money worries?	0%	23%
4.5g	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	6%	10%
4.5h	Health problems?	17%	14%
4.5i	Getting phone numbers?	39%	31%
When you first arrived, were you given any of the following:			
4.6a	Toiletries/basic items?	61%	73%
4.6b	The opportunity to have a shower?	39%	32%
4.6c	Something to eat?	78%	80%
4.6d	A free phone call to friends/family?	94%	77%
4.6e	PIN phone credit?	67%	41%
4.6f	Information about feeling worried/upset?	33%	17%

Wing comparator

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Enhanced Wing (C Wing)	Rest of the Establishment
	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	87
Within your first 24 hours, did you have access to the following people or services:			
4.7a	A chaplain?	44%	25%
4.7b	A peer mentor?	11%	4%
4.7c	Childline/Samaritans	17%	11%
4.7d	The prison shop/canteen?	22%	10%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	61%	64%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	67%	70%
SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT			
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	33%	39%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	24%	34%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	17%	11%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	38%	33%
5.5	Is it easy/very easy for you to attend religious services?	44%	45%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	61%	63%
Can you speak to:			
5.7	A Chaplain of your faith in private?	67%	49%
5.8	A peer mentor?	33%	22%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	17%	15%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	33%	32%
SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF			
6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	67%	53%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	22%	26%
6.3	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	28%	31%
SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS			
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	61%	46%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	39%	48%
7.7	Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint?	12%	4%

Wing comparator

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Enhanced Wing (C Wing)	Rest of the Establishment
	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	87
SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE			
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	56%	31%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	44%	31%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	56%	48%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	18%	37%
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	47%	67%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (Cand R) since you have been here?	35%	47%
SECTION 9: SAFETY			
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	35%	34%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	17%	6%
9.4	Have you ever been victimised by other young people here?	39%	18%
Since you have been here, have other young people:			
9.5a	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	17%	10%
9.5b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	22%	6%
9.5c	Sexually abused you?	6%	0%
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	0%	6%
9.5e	Taken your canteen/property?	0%	3%
9.5f	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	1%
9.5g	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	1%
9.5h	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	0%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	3%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	3%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	4%
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%	0%
9.5n	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	0%
9.5o	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	1%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	0%
9.5q	Victimised you because you were new here?	0%	3%
9.5r	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	6%	3%
9.5s	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	11%	7%

Wing comparator

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Enhanced Wing (C Wing)	Rest of the Establishment
	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	87
9.7	Have you ever been victimised by a member of staff here?	33%	20%
Since you have been here, have staff:			
9.8a	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	22%	9%
9.8b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	6%	3%
9.8c	Sexually abused you?	6%	1%
9.8d	Threatened or intimidated you?	6%	1%
9.8e	Taken your canteen/property?	0%	0%
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?	0%	0%
9.8i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	6%	5%
9.8j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	3%
9.8k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	6%	1%
9.8k	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	0%	1%
9.8m	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	6%	0%
9.8n	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	0%
9.8o	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	0%
9.8p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	0%
9.8q	Victimised you because you were new here?	6%	3%
9.8r	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	0%	0%
9.8s	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	1%
9.8t	Victimised you because you made a complaint?	0%	4%
9.10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	44%	27%
9.11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	28%	18%
9.12	Is shouting through the windows a problem here?	44%	19%
SECTION 10: HEALTH SERVICES			
10.1a	Is it easy for you to see the doctor?	35%	47%
10.1b	Is it easy for you to see the nurse?	50%	51%
10.1c	Is it easy for you to see the dentist?	35%	29%
10.4	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?	35%	22%
10.6	Did you have any problems with alcohol when you first arrived?	6%	6%
10.7	Have you received any help with any alcohol problems here?	0%	4%
10.8	Did you have any problems with drugs when you first arrived?	28%	17%
10.9	Do you have a problem with drugs now?	6%	3%
10.10	Have you received any help with any drug problems here?	24%	10%
10.11	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs here?	29%	8%

Wing comparator

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Enhanced Wing (C Wing)	Rest of the Establishment
	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	87
SECTION 11: ACTIVITIES			
11.1	Were you 14 or younger when you were last at school?	44%	34%
11.2	Have you ever been excluded from school?	89%	89%
11.3	Did you ever skip school before you came into custody?	71%	75%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:			
11.4a	Education?	82%	76%
11.4b	A job in this establishment?	18%	17%
11.4c	Vocational or skills training?	18%	10%
11.4d	Offending behaviour programmes?	18%	19%
11.4e	Nothing	12%	23%
11.6	Do you usually have association every day?	47%	41%
11.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	41%	59%
11.8	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	0%	1%
SECTION 12: KEEPING IN TOUCH WITH FAMILY AND FRIENDS			
12.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	59%	41%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	29%	42%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	41%	47%
12.4	Is it easy/very easy for your family and friends to visit you here?	38%	35%
12.5	Do your visits start on time?	38%	22%
SECTION 13: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE			
Do you think you will have a problem with the following, when you are released:			
13.1a	Finding accommodation?	19%	22%
13.1b	Getting into school or college?	44%	37%
13.1c	Getting a job?	50%	42%
13.1d	Money/finances?	25%	26%
13.1e	Claiming benefits?	13%	4%
13.1f	Continuing health services?	13%	3%
13.1g	Opening a bank account?	19%	9%
13.1h	Avoiding bad relationships?	13%	9%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	38%	39%
13.5	Do you have a caseworker here?	82%	90%
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	47%	44%