

Report on an unannounced short follow-up inspection of

HMYOI Ashfield

11-13 October 2011

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

Crown copyright 2012

Printed and published by:
Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons
1st Floor, Ashley House
Monck Street
London SW1P 2BQ
England

Contents

	Introduction	5
	Fact page	7
1	Summary	9
2	Progress since the last report	15
3	Summary of recommendations	35
	Appendices	
	I Inspection team	39
	II Prison population profile	40
	III Summary of young people's questionnaires and interviews	43

Introduction

HMYOI Ashfield is a young offender institution located near Bristol. This inspection was a follow-up to a full inspection in which we reported that outcomes for young people were good against our healthy prison tests of safety, purposeful activity and resettlement and reasonably good regarding respect. We described examples of excellent and innovative practice, with the caveat that the establishment was only half full at the time of the inspection. On our return 17 months later the population had increased by 50%. In our survey, young people reported feeling less safe and this was a particular concern on their first night.

In this report we have described a number of problems which impacted upon the safety of young people and that were not necessarily within the control of the establishment. In common with other recent inspections, we identified lengthy waits at court and serious problems with late arrivals of court vehicles. Significant efforts had been made to involve the local safeguarding children board in the oversight of safeguarding and child protection at Ashfield. Although an agreement had been drafted, it had not been implemented and there had been no changes in practice.

Reports of bullying were significant but bullying was tackled robustly. The safeguarding team provided good support to vulnerable young people including victims of bullying and young people who self-harmed. However, residential staff had limited involvement and needed to have a clearer role in the day-to-day support of young people. Our survey indicated deterioration in the level of support offered by staff to young people and our observations supported that view. Previously we identified a lack of confidence in staff when it came to challenging poor behaviour and this remained the case despite good efforts by the establishment to provide appropriate training. A particular problem had been highlighted regarding the management of young people from black and minority ethnic groups and this was being addressed by the diversity equality action team.

A violence reduction survey had been carried out and there was more coherence to the variety of meetings in which challenging young people were discussed. There had been a drive to decrease the use of adjudications in favour of less formal procedures, such as minor reports, with some success but the use of both remained extremely high. Governance of the use of single separation and strip-searching was inadequate. Incidents of strip-searching were high and the evidence suggested many were unnecessary. Governance of the use of force was thorough and there were good links with safeguarding but actual incidents of use of force had increased significantly. Debriefing sessions for young people following the use of force were not consistently taking place which was a missed opportunity.

The refurbishment programme that was under way at the previous inspection had resulted in improvements to cells, although standards of cleanliness could have been better in some. The quality of personal officer work was very variable, and more needed to be done to encourage and enable personal officers to attend important meetings concerning the care of the young people for whom they were responsible.

Diversity was an area with which staff engaged well, and notable improvements had been made with the introduction of some innovative programmes. Work with foreign nationals had improved a great deal with the introduction of a foreign national coordinator. The disability liaison officer had a high profile and young people with learning disabilities had a good level of support.

Consultation with young people about health care provision was still lacking as was access to a confidential appointment system. However, health services overall were excellent with particularly good mental health provision.

Good overall progress had been made with regard to our learning and skills recommendations. Data collection and analysis by the education department were used very effectively to support improvement. Efforts to improve punctuality to education however, something which had been identified as an ongoing problem in our last report, had so far proved unsuccessful. Young people were benefitting from a wider range of courses and good learning support, particularly for young people whose language was not English. New accreditation had been introduced, including in PE, and levels of achievement were high. Excellent work was being carried out in the Bistro and in business through industrial cleaning. The PE department continued to build on existing strengths and the library had improved considerably as a learning resource.

There was still work to be done to improve the strategic management of resettlement, although there had been improvement in other areas of resettlement, notably with regard to family contact and programmes. The role of the family support worker had developed well and young people and their families who had difficulty visiting the establishment received a good deal of help. Family days took place monthly – far more frequently than in the majority of comparable establishments. The care and management of looked-after children had improved. The designated unit for young people serving indeterminate sentences (the Phoenix unit) was a well ordered environment, with psychology staff offering ongoing individual support and all staff had been trained. A comprehensive substance use needs analysis had been carried out and substance use services were good.

This report charts sufficient progress against recommendations in three of our four healthy prison tests: respect, purposeful activity and resettlement, which is commendable in the light of the significant increase in the population since the previous inspection. However, against that backdrop it is of concern that some important recommendations in relation to safety had not been met and young people reported feeling less safe and less well supported. Following the contraction in the number of establishments for children and young people under 18, it is likely that the current situation, operating at or near full capacity, will continue. The need to ensure safeguarding and behaviour management procedures are operating well will be of greater importance than ever.

Nick Hardwick
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

December 2011

Fact page

Task of the establishment

Ashfield is a young offender institution for sentenced and remand male young people (aged between 15 and 18), serving courts from West Wales to London.

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

Private (Serco)

Region/Department

South West

Number held

332

Certified normal accommodation

407

Operational capacity

383

Date of last full inspection

May 2010

Brief history

Ashfield opened on 1 November 1999, following the award of a design, construct, manage and finance contract to Premier Prison Services Ltd. It is built on the site of the former Pucklechurch remand centre. The establishment was re-roled in 2004 to accommodate solely juveniles after investment from the Youth Justice Board and has been run by Serco (previously Premier) since July 2005.

Short description of residential units

There are two housing units, each x-shaped and divided into four wings. Each wing can hold between 40 and 64 young people in a mixture of single and double cells which have integral sanitation. The Phoenix long-term unit holds 24 young people.

Escort contractor

GeoAmey and Serco

Health service commissioner and providers

Serco Health

Learning and skills providers

Serco

Section 1: Summary

Introduction

- 1.1 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.
- 1.2 All inspections carried out by HM Inspectorate of Prisons contribute to the UK's response to its international obligations under the UN Optional Protocol to the 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.
- 1.3 The purpose of this inspection was to follow up the recommendations made in our last full inspection of 2010 and examine the progress achieved. All full inspection reports include a summary of outcomes for children and young people against the model of a healthy prison. The four criteria of a healthy prison are:

Safety	young people, particularly the most vulnerable, are held safely
Respect	young people are treated with respect for their human dignity
Purposeful activity	young people are able, and expected, to engage in activity that is likely to benefit them
Resettlement	young people are prepared for their release into the community and helped to reduce the likelihood of reoffending.

- 1.4 Follow-up inspections are proportionate to risk. Short follow-up inspections are conducted where the previous full inspection and our intelligence systems suggest that there are comparatively fewer concerns. Sufficient inspector time is allocated to enable inspection of progress. Inspectors draw up a brief healthy prison summary setting out the progress of the establishment in the areas inspected and giving an overall assessment against the following definitions:

Making insufficient progress

Overall progress against our recommendations has been slow or negligible and/or there is little evidence of improvements in outcomes for children and young people.

Making sufficient progress

Overall there is evidence that efforts have been made to respond to our recommendations in a way that is having a discernible positive impact on outcomes for children and young people.

Safety

- 1.5 At our inspection in 2010 we found that outcomes for young people against this healthy prison test were good. We made 29 recommendations in this area, including one main recommendation, of which 13 had been achieved, seven partially achieved and nine had not been achieved, including the main recommendation. We have made one further recommendation.
- 1.6 Young people were still spending lengthy periods in court cells and there had been serious problems with late arrivals. Problems were abating slowly and regular discussions took place with Serco, but there was no forum or arrangements to routinely discuss and resolve transport problems with the new provider GeoAmey.
- 1.7 All new arrivals were strip-searched even though very few inadmissible items were found. In our survey, significantly fewer young people compared with the previous survey said that they felt safe on their first night. A proposal to develop a first night information leaflet had not been implemented.
- 1.8 The safeguarding team had robust procedures for investigating incidents of self-harm and ensuring that relevant messages were passed on to staff and quality assurance arrangements relating to the care of young people at risk of self-harm were thorough.
- 1.9 A violence reduction survey had been carried out as part of an overall review of safety and the recommendations were being implemented. The anti-bullying workbooks which had been operating for eight years were being reviewed. In the meantime, staff using the workbooks had not had the training or support that we recommended. The anti-bullying coordinator attended the residential units regularly and was well known to staff and young people. Staff made good use of the bullying referral systems and bullying was tackled robustly. Our survey indicated that victimisation of young people because they were new had increased since the previous inspection and young people felt less safe.
- 1.10 The safeguarding team were very active in helping to support vulnerable young people but there was still no record that any of the recommendations made by the safeguarding team about the day-to-day care of young people was followed up. The newly designed young person's support plan was a good attempt to design a more coordinated process for care planning but those we examined were completed poorly and staff did not have a clear understanding of the process. Residential staff needed to be more involved in the day-to-day care of young people and the development of a clear policy and procedures as we previously recommended would help to achieve this. Great efforts had been made to involve the local safeguarding children board in the oversight of safeguarding and child protection, but without improvement.
- 1.11 There had been a recent initiative to increase the use of minor reports and decrease the number of adjudications which had had some success, but the number of adjudications and minor reports was exceptionally high.
- 1.12 Arrangements to manage the most problematic young people had been clarified. There was a central log to register the use of single separation (locking young people in their cells for short periods until they calmed down), but governance and monitoring overall remained inadequate. The number of incidents of strip-searching was very high. The procedure lacked governance and we were not satisfied that strip-searches were necessary in the majority of instances.

- 1.13 Records indicated that there had been a significant increase in the use of force, which was extremely high, although the majority of incidents did not involve the use of full control and restraint. Monitoring of the use of force was wide ranging and there was good use of the data with effective links with safeguarding. Quality assurance of use of force documentation had improved and planned use of force was now video recorded, but a high number of planned incidents were carried out. Young people no longer routinely had a formal debrief session following the use of force.
- 1.14 On the basis of this short follow-up inspection, we considered that the establishment was making insufficient progress against our recommendations.

Respect

- 1.15 At our inspection in 2010 we found that outcomes for young people against this healthy prison test were reasonably good. We made 24 recommendations in this area, including two main recommendations, of which 11 had been achieved including one main recommendation, four partially achieved including one main recommendation and nine had not been achieved.
- 1.16 The state of the cells had improved overall and some, particularly those on the Phoenix unit, were in a very good state of decoration and cleanliness. Others were reasonably well decorated but were not being kept clean.
- 1.17 A range of initiatives had been tried to equip staff with the necessary skills to deal with challenging behaviour and generally improve engagement between staff and young people, but there were still examples of residential staff not addressing issues directly and instead making referrals to the safeguarding team. There were a number of responses to questions in our survey about staff support which were significantly worse than the comparators for the previous inspection. We observed little evidence of good engagement between staff and young people and our overall view of relationships was that they were neutral at best.
- 1.18 Personal officers were told about important meetings relating to the care of young people they were responsible for but they did not often attend, nor did they always send written contributions to training planning meetings even though there was a system in place to do so. Our survey results and wing files indicated that personal officer contact and the quality of the work were inconsistent.
- 1.19 Efforts had been made to involve community groups in the work of the diversity equality action team (DEAT) but with limited success. The meetings were otherwise well attended, including representation from young people, and equality monitoring was efficient. There were designated leads for all equality strands and commendably a number of programmes had been delivered to staff and young people to raise awareness of cultural and equality issues. Innovative work was being carried out to challenge discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender.
- 1.20 The identification of young people with disabilities was sound. The special educational needs coordinator (SENCO) was the designated disability liaison officer (DLO) and she had a high profile throughout the establishment. The DLO role had a greater emphasis on learning disability and more needed to be done to clarify the role in relation to physical disability and links with health care. The DLO worked with residential staff to improve their knowledge of learning disability but care plans and reviews for young people with disabilities needed to be developed so that the role of residential staff and the support they needed to provide to young people with disabilities were clear.

- 1.21 A foreign national coordinator post had been established. Consultation and communication with foreign nationals had improved and their day-to-day needs were well met. Links with the UK Border Agency had recently been established and young people had easy access to independent legal advice when required. Four young people had been detained under immigration powers in the last 12 months despite the government's commitment to end detention of children for immigration purposes. We considered it unacceptable for a young person under the age of 18 to be held in a prison beyond their sentence expiry date.
- 1.22 Good smoking cessation support was now available and there was a dedicated nurse. The system for young people to make an application for health care services still lacked confidentiality and no dedicated health care forum had been established. Dental services were good and the surgery had been refurbished. There was access to a pharmacist and procedures relating to medication had improved. Overall health care was good and mental health services remained particularly impressive.
- 1.23 On the basis of this short follow-up inspection, we considered that the establishment was making sufficient progress against our recommendations.

Purposeful activity

- 1.24 At our inspection in 2010 we found that outcomes for young people against this healthy prison test were good. We made seven recommendations in this area, of which four had been achieved, one partially achieved and two had not been achieved.
- 1.25 Initial assessment of young people's literacy and numeracy, including the assessment of the needs of young people whose language was not English, was comprehensive and thorough, as was induction. Developmental work had been carried out on individual learning plans with some success, although more noticeably in the workshops than in classroom based lessons.
- 1.26 The range of courses on offer had broadened and more courses were available at higher levels, including a small range of AS levels. Learning support was effective and supported inclusion well. Levels of accreditation were high. Excellent work was being carried out in the Bistro and in business through industrial cleaning. The facilities for carpentry and brickwork remained inadequate.
- 1.27 The education department collected and used data extremely well to monitor the quality of provision and to identify strengths, trends and areas for improvement. Punctuality to education remained poor. The number of young people being returned to the wings for poor behaviour was high, although usually for short periods. Regular student feedback was undertaken and indicated that young people were much more positive about what they were learning than our survey suggested.
- 1.28 There was much better integration of the library and mainstream education provision. The library had improved considerably as a learning resource.
- 1.29 The progress made by the PE department remained outstanding. Sports academies, including a dance academy, all of which included external community partners, were innovative, inclusive and successful. New accreditation had been introduced and levels of accreditation remained very high. Links with external partners were extremely strong and productive. The Astro turf pitch had been refurbished and was now a good quality facility, used well and contributing significantly to the success of the sports fixtures with external teams.

- 1.30 On the basis of this short follow-up inspection, we considered that the establishment was making sufficient progress against our recommendations.

Resettlement

- 1.31 At our inspection in 2010 we found that outcomes for young people against this healthy prison test were good. We made 17 recommendations in this area, of which six had been achieved, four partially achieved and seven had not been achieved.
- 1.32 The resettlement strategy had been updated but was still in draft and some gaps remained, for example in relation to the needs of looked-after children and young people serving indeterminate sentences. Attendance at resettlement committee meetings had improved but was still not broad enough. The data presented to the resettlement committee mainly focused on education and did not adequately reflect all the resettlement pathways. Good efforts had been made to improve family attendance at training planning meetings with some success. There was a high level of consultation with families through the family support worker who attended all visits sessions. It was disappointing to learn that the family group conferences which we had previously commended had ceased.
- 1.33 The visits area had not improved but young people were no longer required to wear bibs. Family days were held monthly which was commendable, but they were only available to young people on the highest level of the incentives scheme. The family support worker provided a good level of support to young people who had problems arranging family visits and arranged additional visits when appropriate. The monthly Dad's day was innovative. Arrangements to transfer young people to adult establishments had improved, although staff felt that their input regarding transfers of young people at short notice for discipline reasons were not always taken into account.
- 1.34 Caseworkers identified young people with looked-after status efficiently and referred them to the advocates who had robust systems in place to ensure that their needs were met.
- 1.35 A wide range of relevant locally approved programmes was available. All young people were assessed by a psychologist to ensure that they were referred to a programme which met their individual need. The juvenile enhanced thinking skills programme was due to be introduced in spring 2012. There was still no systematic or routine assessment process to ensure that all young people convicted of a sex offence received the intervention they needed at an appropriate time, although at the time of the inspection all but one young person at Ashfield was receiving a specialist sex offender treatment service.
- 1.36 The Phoenix unit was a good environment for young people who were serving indeterminate sentences. All staff were lifer trained and all young people were allocated a psychologist.
- 1.37 A comprehensive substance use needs analysis had been carried out and action plans and performance measures were in place. The large team of substance use workers now had good casework supervision every six weeks. There was a good skill mix delivering the full range of interventions required.
- 1.38 On the basis of this short follow-up inspection, we considered that the establishment was making sufficient progress against our recommendations.

Section 2: Progress since the last report

The paragraph reference number at the end of each recommendation below refers to its location in the previous inspection report.

Main recommendations (from the previous report)

- 2.1 **There should be a clear policy which clarifies and coordinates existing systems for the identification, assessment, care planning and management of vulnerable young people. (HP 53)**

Not achieved. The different systems for the identification, assessment and care planning of vulnerable young people still lacked coordination. A newly designed young person's support plan had been introduced. It was a good attempt to design a more comprehensive process for individual care planning but the support plans that we examined were completed poorly. Staff had received very little training and were unclear how to complete the plans or how they linked with other care planning systems such as ACCT (assessment, care in custody and teamwork) care maps and training plans.

We repeat the recommendation.

- 2.2 **There should be a foreign national coordinator who is fully conversant with the needs of young people who are foreign nationals, promotes these to staff and provides relevant reports to the REAT. (HP 54)**

Achieved. There was now a foreign national coordinator in post with a clear job description, and good efforts were being made to promote the role. There were effective systems in place to identify foreign nationals and their day-to-day needs were well met by the coordinator and caseworkers. Consultation and communication with foreign nationals had improved. The foreign national coordinator had begun to provide regular reports to the diversity equality action team (DEAT). Foreign nationals had easy access to independent legal advice and good links had been established with the UK Border Agency (UKBA) which had proved helpful to some young people, although regular access to UKBA had yet to be agreed.

- 2.3 **The role of the disability liaison officers relating to the identification, monitoring and support of young people with a disability should be clarified and this should be clearly conveyed to staff and young people. (HP 55)**

Partially achieved. The special educational needs coordinator (SENCO) was the designated disability liaison officer (DLO). Her role as DLO was clear in relation to the identification of and support for young people with special educational needs but not so well defined in relation to young people with a physical disability. The DLO was well known to staff, and young people were able to identify her from photograph boards displayed throughout the prison, which identified her as a member of the diversity team. There were three learning disability nurses who supported the DLO well and student support practitioners provided some day-to-day support to young people on the residential units.

Recommendations

Courts, escorts and transfers

2.4 Young people should not be routinely strip-searched on arrival. (1.5)

Not achieved. All new arrivals continued to be routinely strip-searched and were also seated on the BOSS (body orifice security scanner) chair. We were told that very few inadmissible items were found (see also section on security).

We repeat the recommendation.

2.5 There should be regular discussions with escort providers to ensure that young people are not held for unnecessarily lengthy periods in court cells, are not transported with adults or females, and arrive at their destination before 7pm. (1.6)

Partially achieved. Young people continued to be held for lengthy periods following the disposal of their case at court and frequently arrived at the establishment after 8pm. On one occasion during the previous month, a number of young people had arrived between 11pm and 3am. Young people still sometimes travelled with adult prisoners, which was permitted under the new contract.

2.6 Young people still experienced long journeys. In our survey, 16% of young people said that they had spent more than four hours in the van against 7% at the previous inspection and the national comparator of 5%. Young people who arrived late could not be guaranteed a shower, telephone call or an initial vulnerability assessment, which had serious implications for their safety.

2.7 A representative from Serco, one of the escort providers, attended the establishment safeguarding committee and staff reported that their input helped to resolve local problems. No arrangement had yet been made to involve the more recent escort provider, GeoAmey.

2.8 A meeting had recently been convened by Serco, involving Ashfield and other establishments, to discuss the difficulties associated with late arrivals. We were told that the meeting had been productive and problems were beginning to abate but it was too early to judge whether a long-term resolution had been reached.

We repeat the recommendation.

First days in custody

2.9 Essential first night information should be provided in a variety of accessible formats so that new arrivals know what to expect within the first 24 hours in custody and the sources of support available to them. (1.20)

Not achieved. There had been a proposal to produce a first night information leaflet after consulting young people, but it had not been implemented. In our survey, 74% of young people said they felt safe on their first night against the comparator of 83% at the previous inspection. This was reinforced by some young people in our groups who described fear and uncertainty when they were locked up on their first night because they had not been told what would happen next. In our survey, 23% of young people said they were given information about feeling low or upset when they first arrived against the national comparator of 32%.

We repeat the recommendation.

Residential units

2.10 All cells should be maintained in a good state of cleanliness and repair. (2.10)

Partially achieved. The majority of cells that we inspected were in a good state of repair and cleanliness. Cells on the Phoenix unit were particularly well decorated and clean, while on other units some cells were not maintained to a good standard of cleanliness. Some young people said it was very difficult to get cleaning materials so that they could keep their own cells clean.

We repeat the recommendation.

Relationships between staff and children and young people

2.11 Managers should ensure effective strategies are in place for supporting all staff in setting and maintaining appropriate boundaries at all times. (2.17)

Partially achieved. The lack of staff engagement with young people continued to be a problem and managers felt that this often stemmed from a lack of confidence in some staff in dealing with difficult situations. Residential staff frequently made referrals to the safeguarding team on issues that they should have tackled themselves. A range of training initiatives had been carried out to equip staff with the necessary skills to work with challenging behaviour and generally improve engagement between staff and young people. There had been no follow-up action to measure any change or test the effectiveness of the training.

2.12 A number of responses to questions in our survey about staff engagement and support indicated a deterioration since the previous inspection. For example, 34% of young people said that staff had checked on them personally in the last week to see how they were getting on against the comparator of 44%, and 65% of respondents said there was a member of staff they could turn to with a problem against the comparator of 80%.

2.13 In focus groups several young people told us that staff were wary of black young people and avoided challenging them, and some staff confirmed that view. The diversity group had begun to address this issue. During the inspection we observed little evidence of good engagement between staff and young people and our overall view of relationships was that they were neutral at best.

We repeat the recommendation.

Personal officers

2.14 Meetings and reviews relating to the care and management of young people should be arranged so that personal officers are able to attend to support the young people they are responsible for. (2.23)

Not achieved. The establishment continued to maintain that it was not possible to schedule meetings to enable personal officers to attend and they only attended training planning and ACCT reviews if they happened to be available. Records kept by the casework team indicated that only approximately 40% of training planning meetings were attended by personal officers and that only a few personal officers sent a written contribution to the meeting, despite a good system in place to ensure that written reports were provided.

We repeat the recommendation.

Additional information

- 2.15 In our survey, only 38% of young people said they had met their personal officer in the first week and only 53% said that they saw their personal officer at least once a week against comparators at the previous inspection of 61% and 64% respectively.
- 2.16 Personal officers were allocated to cells rather than individuals. In the records we examined it was not always clear who the young person's personal officer was and some of the young people in our focus groups said that they did not know their personal officer. Personal officer entries in wing files varied in quality and, while some demonstrated a good level of ongoing engagement, others did not. Personal officers were required to meet young people they were responsible for at least once a week and set targets to help them progress, but records showed that this meeting did not always take place.

Safeguarding children

- 2.17 **The stay safe committee should have effective oversight from senior managers who should ensure its focus remains strategic and appropriate issues are referred up to the senior management team. (3.12)**
- Partially achieved.** The safeguarding committee meetings were now chaired by a senior manager but there was no representation from the local authority. Comprehensive safeguarding data were presented to the safeguarding committee but minutes of the meetings indicated that the main focus continued to be on operational issues rather than maintaining strategic oversight and developing the safeguarding strategy. Relevant reports were provided to the senior management team who were responsible for overseeing the implementation of the safeguarding strategy, but there was no opportunity for an independent contribution in the forum which was a weakness.
- 2.18 **Efforts should be made to better engage the LSCB to increase their involvement in the strategic management and oversight of all aspects of safeguarding children at Ashfield. (3.13)**
- Partially achieved.** Establishment staff continued to be involved in the local safeguarding children board (LSCB) meetings and relevant subcommittees. There had been good efforts by the establishment to engage more effectively with the LSCB: an agreement setting out responsibilities of both parties had been drafted but had not yet been signed or implemented.
We repeat the recommendation.
- 2.19 **The safeguarding team should follow up the recommendations they make about the care of individual young people. (3.14)**
- Not achieved.** The safeguarding team continued to interview all young people during their first week in the establishment and highlight any concerns that they had. However, there were still no formal arrangements to ensure that the safeguarding team or residential managers addressed these concerns effectively. Wing files that we examined did not clarify whether unit staff were following the recommendations of the safeguarding team.
We repeat the recommendation.
- 2.20 **The role of the violence reduction coordinator should be clearly defined and appropriate links established with related departments. (3.15)**

Achieved. The violence reduction coordinator was a member of the safeguarding team and had a clearly defined role and responsibilities that linked with other relevant departments, such as security. Members of the safeguarding team and security department regularly attended the safeguarding committee and security meetings.

2.21 The needs of looked-after children should be properly identified and addressed. (3.16)

Achieved. There had been a significant improvement in the development of procedures to meet the needs of looked-after children. Caseworkers were clear about the importance of identifying looked-after children on arrival and a database had been created. Young people with looked-after status were routinely referred to the internal advocacy team who had the specialist knowledge to assist them. Local authorities were contacted to ensure that statutory reviews took place as required. Young people were given access to specialist legal advice if they or establishment staff felt they were not getting the support they were entitled to from their local authority.

Child protection

2.22 The establishment and the local authority should develop a written protocol describing their working arrangements, which should include regular scrutiny of child protection files and the effectiveness of child protection procedures. (3.26)

Partially achieved. We were advised that the local authority continued to respond quickly to referrals and that strategy meetings were held when required. If referrals did not meet the criteria for independent investigations, the local authority directed internal investigations and were advised of outcomes. A written protocol describing child protection procedures had been drafted but not formally agreed (see also safeguarding section). It included an agreement that the local authority designated officer (LADO) would regularly scrutinise child protection files and the robustness of internal child protection procedures. However, at the time of the inspection there was no external scrutiny of the establishment child protection procedures.

We repeat the recommendation.

2.23 Young people should be given details of the local authority to enable them to make direct contact if they wish. (3.27)

Achieved. Young people had this information in their induction packs and were able to make personal calls in private in their cells. The information was also made available to families and friends.

2.24 There should be a whistle-blowing policy to inform staff of their duty to raise legitimate concerns about the conduct of any member of staff, describing how the referral will be managed and how the member of staff will be supported. (3.28)

Partially achieved. The establishment had a whistle-blowing policy which covered professional standards and described reporting procedures and support for staff but did not refer to child protection concerns. The child protection policy described the procedure for reporting concerns about the behaviour of staff towards young people and how the referral would be managed. However, it did not describe how the member of staff making the allegation would be supported in potentially extremely difficult circumstances.

Housekeeping point

- 2.25 The child protection policy should include a clear commitment to support staff who report child protection concerns which relate to the behaviour of their colleagues.

Self-harm and suicide prevention

- 2.26 **An effective quality assurance scheme for the ACCT process should be implemented and areas of concern taken forward with clearly identified objectives. (3.38)**

Achieved. The self-harm and suicide prevention policy had been updated to include quality assurance arrangements. Daily and weekly checks were undertaken by unit managers, the duty director and a member of the safeguarding team and there had been some training on how to carry out the checks. The manager responsible provided relevant feedback to staff involved in the completion of the ACCT documentation.

- 2.27 **All incidents of serious self-harm should be investigated as part of a 'lessons to be learned' exercise and the findings should be communicated to all staff by way of clear practice guidance. (3.39)**

Achieved. Incidents of serious self-harm were investigated by the safeguarding team and results shared with staff during monthly staff meetings and as guidance in the regular safeguarding newsletter sent to all staff. There were examples of incidents of self-harm which had triggered an enquiry from the safeguarding team and improvements to practice made as a consequence. One investigation had identified that the anti-ligature knives issued to staff had not been effective and not all staff had known where alternative knives were kept on the units. Guidance had been issued and the blades on all anti-ligature knives had been replaced.

Additional information

- 2.28 In the 12 months prior to the inspection an average of 29 ACCTs had been opened each month compared with 34 at the previous inspection. The average number of, mostly minor, self-harm incidents had also declined from an average of 10 each month to five. Young people who self-harmed or were at risk of self-harm were particularly well supported by the safeguarding team.

Bullying

- 2.29 **A member of the safeguarding team should attend the monthly consultation meetings to address the standing agenda items of violence reduction and anti-bullying. (3.49)**

Not achieved. The monthly consultation meetings were not always attended by a member of the safeguarding team. Eight meetings had been held from January to August 2011 and the minutes recorded attendance by a member of the team on only three occasions.

We repeat the recommendation.

- 2.30 **Recommendations identified in the 2009 anti-bullying review should be considered by the stay safe committee which should oversee their implementation as appropriate. (3.50)**

Achieved. The 2009 bullying survey had not been repeated, although a survey on violence prevention in January 2011 had generated some useful information about bullying. The anti-bullying strategy was a standing agenda item at the SMT meetings and a separate group had been formed to take forward the recommendations of the violence prevention review. Appropriate operational changes had been made as a result of survey findings that highlighted some particular issues for some young people attending the gym and others attending the education access group.

2.31 Staff involved in the implementation of workbooks for young people identified as bullies should have ongoing training and support from the psychology department to enhance the effectiveness of their work. (3.51)

Not achieved. The workbooks for young people identified as bullies were still being reviewed by the psychology department and we were told that training would be provided following the introduction of revised workbooks. In the meantime, staff involved in the completion of bullying workbooks with young people had still not had suitable training, although we were told that the anti-bullying coordinator provided advice and support on an ad hoc basis. .

We repeat the recommendation.

Additional information

- 2.32 The anti-bullying coordinator was well known to young people and staff around the establishment. Staff raised safeguarding referrals when they had any concerns that a young person was being intimidated in any way and an average of just over 100 bullying referrals a month had been made to the coordinator in the six months prior to the inspection. A database was maintained which included useful information such as the reasons for making a bullying referral, age and ethnicity of the victims and the bullies, and the location of the bullying incident. This enabled patterns and trends to be identified and, overall, bullying was tackled robustly. Young people could raise concerns about bullying in a variety of ways. The anti-bullying coordinator visited the wings regularly and was approachable. Young people could ask to see a member of the safeguarding team in private through the ATM machines. We were told that the exit survey previously carried out with young people leaving Ashfield was no longer being used. Appropriate information about reporting bullying was sent to young people's families but when we tested the advertised anti-bullying hotline we did not find it user friendly.
- 2.33 In our survey, 36% of respondents compared with 21% at the previous inspection said they had felt unsafe at Ashfield. Thirteen per cent compared with 3% at the previous inspection said they had been victimised by another young person or group of young people because they were new to Ashfield.

Complaints

2.34 There should be regular analysis of complaints to identify any patterns or trends and action should be taken accordingly. (3.58)

Achieved. Regular analysis of formal complaints had been introduced and the data and analysis were presented to the monthly senior management team meetings. Two issues frequently raised by young people had been highlighted for discussion: the harshness of adjudication punishments and the loss of property, specifically laundry. In our focus groups, young people expressed little faith in the complaints system and in our survey 78% of young people said that they knew how to make a complaint against the comparator of 87% at the previous inspection.

Substance use

- 2.35 **Joint working protocols between health services and the substance misuse service should be developed. (3.87)**

Not achieved. A senior registered mental health nurse with qualifications and experience in substance use had been recruited and had started to assess the health and substance use needs of young people. We were assured that protocols between health care and the Ashfield substance misuse service (ASMS) would be implemented once new staff had settled in.
We repeat the recommendation.

- 2.36 **Young people undergoing stabilisation/detoxification/maintenance regimes should not be automatically placed on ACCT as a means of close observation, and alternative means of observation and monitoring that meets their specific needs should be introduced. (3.88)**

Not achieved. The use of ACCT to monitor young people undergoing stabilisation/detoxification and maintenance regimes remained in place. However, this was being reviewed by the new specialist substance misuse nurse as part of the long-term strategy.
We repeat the recommendation.

Diversity

- 2.37 **The DREAT should include appropriate community representation. (4.32,)**

Partially achieved. Efforts had been made to include appropriate community representation in the diversity equality action team (DEAT), but with limited success by way of occasional attendance from representatives of ethnic and religious groups.
We repeat the recommendation.

Additional information

- 2.38 The DEAT meetings were chaired by the director and had good internal representation, including young people representatives. There were designated leads for all diversity strands. Comprehensive reports were provided to the DEAT, including ethnic data on all the behaviour management indicators and other possible areas of discrimination, for example access to activities such as education and training and wing work and release on temporary licence.
- 2.39 Raising awareness of difference and cultural awareness was given a high profile. The diversity team had been involved in the development of an ongoing programme of cultural and equality awareness training and a significant number of staff had been trained. The psychology staff had introduced a programme for young people to address negative attitudes towards women. The diversity lead on sexual equality had developed teaching modules and provided individual support to some young people. Some good work had been done with a local voluntary group to tackle discrimination relating to sexual orientation.

Foreign nationals

- 2.40 **Children and young people should not be held in Prison Service custody solely under administrative powers pending removal or deportation. (4.33)**

Not achieved. Four young people had been held beyond their sentence solely under immigration powers in the previous 12 months with a longest stay of 19 days. Three young people had been transferred to immigration removal centres and the fourth to an adult prison. The action plan contained a response from UKBA that they would continue to detain some children in prisons beyond their sentence if they were considering them for deportation. This was incompatible with the government's commitment to end detention of children for immigration purposes.

We repeat the recommendation.

2.41 There should be consultation and ongoing communication with young foreign nationals. (4.34)

Achieved. Significant efforts had been made by the foreign nationals coordinator to engage effectively with foreign national young people. Monthly meetings had been arranged and, although they had not been well attended by young people, different ways of improving communication had been explored. A representative from UKBA had attended one of the meetings.

2.42 Foreign nationals were routinely told about the facility to make free international telephone calls and send free mail. Young people who were unable to speak English had good access to interpretation services, and there was a qualified teacher of English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) (see also learning and skills section). However some core documents still needed to be translated into other languages.

Disability

2.43 All young people with a disability should have an up-to-date care plan that sets out how their assessed needs will be met. (4.35)

Not achieved. A small number of care plans had been produced for young people with a high level of need relating to their disability but other young people who had been identified as having a disability did not have care plans. A discreet code on the education timetable was used to notify residential staff of young people with particular needs and staff were provided with information leaflets on the characteristics of specific learning disabilities. The SENCO provided ongoing training to help residential staff to identify and support young people with specific educational needs, but this was not an adequate substitute for a care plan to ensure that individual needs were identified and kept under regular review.

We repeat the recommendation.

2.44 Individual care plans for young people with a disability should be subject to regular multidisciplinary review and accessible to all staff involved in the care of the young person. (4.36)

Not achieved. Some young people who had been identified as having a disability were discussed at the safeguarding meetings but there was no systematic review of the small number of young people who had care plans or those who did not have a care plan.

We repeat the recommendation.

Sexual orientation

- 2.45 **An action plan should be developed to support and meet the needs of young people who are gay or bisexual and to ensure that young people are not discriminated against on the basis of their sexual orientation. (4.37)**

Achieved. The equalities manager had sought advice from a local voluntary organisation on managing the issue of sexuality for adolescents in a custodial setting. A teacher had been allocated the lead diversity role on sexuality. She had developed and delivered teaching modules designed to promote constructive discussions with young people and tolerance and understanding of those with a different sexual orientation. She had also provided personal support to two young people who had confided in her about their sexuality.

- 2.46 Following feedback from staff about the need to address negative attitudes towards female members of staff, a member of the psychology department had introduced a programme and run a pilot course designed to work with young people and challenge beliefs and behaviours based on gender related discrimination.

Health services

- 2.47 **All health care information should be provided in a range of languages appropriate to the population. (5.7)**

Not achieved. There was no facility for health care information to be translated into other languages.

We repeat the recommendation.

- 2.48 **The health care reception room and equipment should be accessible solely to health care staff. (5.8)**

Achieved. The reception health care room and its contents were only accessible to dedicated health care staff.

- 2.49 **Young people should have access to a dedicated health care forum. (5.18)**

Not achieved. A member of the health care team attended the monthly joint communication committee for young people but there was no dedicated health care forum for young people. In our survey, only 60% of young people said the overall quality of health care was good or very good against the comparator of 74% at the previous inspection. A dedicated health care forum chaired by a senior nurse needed to be introduced as soon as possible to explore these negative perceptions.

We repeat the recommendation.

- 2.50 **Health promotion information should be provided on all residential units and accessible in a range of languages. (5.23)**

Not achieved. No health promotion material in languages other than English was available on residential units or in health care.

We repeat the recommendation.

- 2.51 **Smoking cessation courses should be an option for young people. (5.24)**

Achieved. A dedicated registered nurse (RN) provided smoking cessation support. All new arrivals were seen by a health worker and referred to the RN if they wanted support to stop smoking. Young people were offered nicotine patches, psychological support and regular carbon monoxide monitoring throughout their time in custody.

2.52 Health care applications should be confidential and managed by health care staff. (5.25)

Not achieved. The health care application system was not confidential. There were no dedicated health care boxes on the wings and young people gave their health care applications to their wing officers or placed the application under the wing health care treatment room door. Neither system provided confidentiality and applications were not audited.

We repeat the recommendation.

2.53 Young people should have access to a pharmacist for advice and consultation if required. (5.31)

Achieved. Young people had access to a pharmacist on request, but the facility was rarely used and it was unclear whether the service was advertised. In our survey, 23% of young people said it was easy to see the pharmacist against the comparator of 33% at the previous inspection. Nurses often acted as a filter and answered many of the queries about medicines.

2.54 All in-possession medication must be provided in appropriately labelled containers. (5.32)

Achieved. In-possession medication was appropriately labelled with the patient's name and the medicine supplied. There was no evidence of young people receiving medication inappropriately labelled.

2.55 Prescriptions for controlled drugs for individuals leaving the establishment should be written on forms FP10PCD. (5.33)

Achieved. Controlled drugs were supplied at the time of release to young people needing them. There was no evidence that controlled drugs were prescribed on incorrect prescription forms.

2.56 All young people should be dentally examined at induction and a treatment plan started when required. (5.41)

Not achieved. The recommendation had been rejected on the basis that it was not necessary or practical for all young people to be seen by the dentist and to do so would severely lengthen the dental waiting list for existing patients. We were satisfied that all young people needing dental treatment received it in a timely fashion. During the health care screening process all young people were asked if they wanted to see the dentist and were added to the waiting list if so. Any young person presenting with dental pain on admission was added to the next dental treatment session. In the meantime, they were seen by the GP and given pain relief as necessary. At the time of the inspection, the dental waiting list was long following the refurbishment of the dental surgery but the dental team were working very hard to reduce it.

2.57 Health education for young people should include oral health promotion. (5.42)

Achieved. The dentist and dental technician promoted oral health while the patient was in the chair. Health care staff had recently organised a health and wellbeing event which had

included oral health promotion and the distribution of free toothbrushes and toothpaste to all young people.

2.58 The dental surgery should be modernised to provide sufficient storage space and dedicated sterilisation room in compliance with the new cross-infection control regulations. (5.43)

Achieved. The dental surgery had recently been completely refurbished, including new equipment, to meet cross-infection control guidelines and to provide additional storage space. Sterilisation equipment had also been replaced to meet the guidelines.

Additional information

- 2.59 Health care continued to provide a very good service to young people, particularly the child and adolescent mental health team which provided excellent care to young people on their caseload. Primary mental health provision was very good and joint working between primary and secondary provision was commendable.

Learning and skills

2.60 There should be a language assessment tool for young people whose first language is not English. (6.19)

Achieved. A specific assessment tool for young people whose first language was not English had been developed and was in use. Young people in this category also benefitted from a separate induction to education to introduce them to the programme of language learning they would be following. Levels of language learning support were good at six hours per week with a qualified teacher of ESOL. The ESOL policy dealt effectively with the wide range of individual language needs among the population.

2.61 More courses at levels 2 and 3 and mainstream humanities based courses and drama should be developed. (6.20)

Achieved. More courses had been developed at levels 2 and 3, leading to the identification of clear progression routes for young people. For example, courses were available from entry level to level 3 in ceramics, life skills, world and community, art and music. Level 2 courses were now provided in almost all other subjects in the broad curriculum. National vocational qualifications were available in hospitality and catering through the excellent work being carried out in the Bistro, and in business through the link with Enterprise and industrial cleaning. The range of AS levels had been increased and now included mathematics, English, law and sociology. Humanities subjects were included in the world and community aspect of the curriculum, and drama was delivered as enrichment in partnership with the Bristol Old Vic theatre.

2.62 Punctuality to lessons should be improved. (6.21)

Not achieved. Punctuality to education remained poor. The education department held very high quality data on punctuality but strategies to improve had been unsuccessful, including the relatively new system of moving one residential unit at a time. Since March 2011, the percentage of movements that had been more than 15 minutes late was very high, for example in May 2011 it had been 83% and in June 95%. Data indicated that delays were principally due to altercations between young people as they walked to education and staff interventions.

2.63 **The quality and consistency of individual learning plans should be improved and they should be properly linked to training plans. (6.22)**

Partially achieved. Some developmental work had been carried out on individual learning plans (ILPs) since the last inspection. The ILPs used in the vocational workshops were effective in supporting target setting and recording progress and were of higher quality than those used in classroom based lessons. A new two-part ILP had been developed in consultation with staff and young people but had yet to be coordinated with young people's training plans.

2.64 **Facilities for carpentry and brickwork should be made fit for purpose. (6.23)**

Not achieved. The facilities for carpentry and brickwork remained inadequate and there was no facility to carry out theoretical work. The carpentry workshop was too cramped to accommodate all the young people wishing to take the subject. Plans had been drawn up for a new dedicated construction facility and these were being costed.

2.65 **The work of the library should be integrated into main education provision. (6.24)**

Achieved. The librarian now attended English and literacy and other curriculum team meetings to develop closer curriculum links. A study skills guide had been produced and several authors had visited the library for discussions. An evening reading club had been established and the library was open in the evenings and on Saturdays. The prison had taken part in the Bath Literary Festival. There was provision for foreign national young people and a good selection of materials for young people with lower reading abilities. The librarian also assisted teaching staff by regularly providing book boxes for lessons.

Additional information

2.66 The work carried out in the Bistro was outstanding, providing young people with excellent work experience. The number of young people gaining employment in the catering industry on release continued to be impressive.

2.67 The number of young people being returned to the wings for poor behaviour was relatively high, although many were held back for a relatively short time to calm down and were returned quickly to their lesson.

2.68 The introduction of the Green Speech consultation process which extended an invitation to all young people to attend was innovative and successful.

Physical education and health promotion

2.69 **The Astro turf pitch should be replaced. (6.24)**

Achieved. Young people benefitted from a high quality Astro turf pitch which could accommodate football, hockey, rugby, cricket and five-a-side football. This facility was used well and contributed significantly to the success of sports fixtures with external teams.

Additional information

2.70 Progress made by the PE department had been outstanding. Sports academies, including a dance academy, all of which included external community partners were innovative, inclusive

and successful. New accreditation had been introduced since the previous inspection and levels of accreditation remained very high. Links with external partners were extremely strong and productive.

Behaviour management

2.71 Proper governance should be introduced to ensure that the use of single separation is proportionate, fairly applied and non-discriminatory. (7.38)

Not achieved. A central log was designed to meet the requirement to report all incidents of single separation to the Youth Justice Board (YJB) each month. Only periods in excess of two hours were being reported to the YJB and managers said that shorter periods were not likely to be recorded. There was no analysis of the use of single separation to check for fairness and consistency of application.

We repeat the recommendation.

2.72 There should be clear terms of reference for the relocation meetings and their links with the behaviour management and violence reduction strategies should be clarified. (7.39,)

Achieved. The terms of reference for the relocation meetings were clear, with a focus on the safe location of young people following completion of their induction or a period of separation in the Brunel unit. The links with behaviour management and violence prevention strategies were clear.

Additional information

2.73 Since the previous inspection there had been some changes to the terms of reference for the relocation meetings. Weekly incident management meetings had been reintroduced to consider reports completed after fights or assaults or threatening behaviour and the detail of these were no longer considered at the relocation meetings. All young people involved in incidents during the previous week were discussed at the incident management meeting and, if deemed appropriate, individuals were referred to the behaviour management meeting. The behaviour management meetings focused on the management of individual young people with the most problematic behaviour, for example young people who had been temporarily suspended from education, young people who remained on bronze for longer than one week, young people involved in repeated violent behaviour or young people who had been identified as particularly vulnerable through a safeguarding referral (see also bullying section). Managers had recently identified duplication between the incident management and violence prevention meetings and steps were being taken to merge the two meetings.

2.74 Incident reports should be completed in a timely manner. (7.40)

Achieved. Incident reports were completed promptly and were kept in a central log for use at the weekly incident management meetings. Between October 2010 and September 2011 an average of 45 fights had taken place each month. A worrying trend had been identified involving incidents where several young people took part in an assault on one young person.

Security

2.75 Security data should be analysed to identify any relevant patterns and trends. (7.41)

2.76 **Partially achieved.** Weekly and monthly security briefs were prepared for staff which provided useful information on a range of security related topics, including the reasons for submission of security information reports (SIRs), finds during searches, numbers of assaults, and failed drug tests. In the three months prior to the inspection, an average of 556 SIRs had been submitted. The data and relevant patterns and trends were discussed at the monthly security committee meetings which were well attended by a range of departments.

2.77 **Visits under close staff supervision in an open setting should be used as an alternative to closed visits. (7.42)**

Not achieved. During the 12 months before the inspection, 26 young people had been placed on closed visits, mainly after being found in possession of a contraband item. Periods on closed visits were subject to review by the director every 28 days and in recent months most young people had been removed from closed visits at the first review.

Additional information

2.78 Detailed information was collected relating to strip-searching. The number of incidents of strip-searching was very high and we were not satisfied that strip-searches were necessary in the majority of instances. All young people were routinely strip-searched on first reception and final discharge, when they went to or from court, and when they went out and returned from release on temporary licence (see section on courts, escorts and transfers).

2.79 In September 2011 there had been 480 searches in reception and a further 92 intelligence-led searches in other parts of the establishment. No unauthorised items had been found as a result of the 480 searches. Other data showed 669 strip-searches as part of intelligence-led cell searches over the previous nine-month period, an average of 56 a month. An average of 16 significant finds had been made each month between July and September 2011. These were mainly tobacco and home-made weapons found in cells, some were found in visits, and others were handed in by young people. None of the items was found during a strip-search.

2.80 It was not possible to identify the intelligence that had led to authorisation of searches, nor was the establishment able to provide documentation to confirm that they had been properly authorised, and we were told that the majority were authorised verbally.

2.81 In our survey, 85% of young people against a national comparator of 77% said they were searched in an understanding way in reception but the survey results were significantly less favourable for young people from black and minority ethnic groups, foreign nationals and Muslims.

Rewards and sanctions

2.82 **A change of status within the rewards and sanctions scheme should only take place following a full review. (7.43)**

Achieved. At the previous inspection, young people who had been found guilty on adjudication of an act of violence were automatically downgraded to bronze but reviews now took place with young people prior to a change in status.

Additional information

- 2.83 In our survey, 39% of young people against the national comparator of 48% thought they had been treated fairly in their experience of the rewards and sanctions scheme. A high number of young people were on the basic level. Figures provided at the start of the inspection showed that 25% of young people were on gold level, 57% were on silver and 18% were on bronze level of the scheme.

Adjudications

- 2.84 **Adjudications should be used as a last resort to deal with the most difficult and challenging behaviour and more use should be made of the minor reports system for less serious behaviour. (7.44)**

Partially achieved. Greater use was being made of minor reports: 312 had been issued in the six months prior to the inspection. However, the number of adjudications remained extremely high: 1,935 had taken place during the same period. Just over half the adjudications had been for fights or assaults. Nine per cent were recorded as disobeying an order or endangering health and safety which suggested that more could be done to encourage less formal resolutions. Senior managers told us that they made efforts to encourage staff to use minor reports appropriately and 11% of adjudications during the previous six months had been dismissed. Some use was made of suspended punishments on both minor reports and adjudications.

We repeat the recommendation.

- 2.85 **Managers chairing adjudications should always ensure that the young people involved are clear about the option of having an advocate present. (7.45)**

Achieved. Adjudication documentation indicated that young people had been asked if they wanted an advocate with them at their adjudication. There were also examples of the adjournment of adjudications to allow a young person to have an advocate with him.

Use of force

- 2.86 **Force should only be used when there is an immediate risk to the safety of a young person or others or of serious damage to property, always as a last resort and when all other alternatives have been explored. It should not be used simply to obtain compliance with staff instructions. (7.46)**

Not achieved. The use of force was extremely high and had increased since the previous inspection from an average of 17 each month to almost 150 a month over the previous 12 months, a third of which involved full control and restraint. In our survey, 42% of young people said they had been restrained against the comparator at the previous inspection of 25%. The increase in part reflected a larger population and, although it was not possible to verify the assertion, managers said that the increase was also in part due to better recording which now included all levels of intervention by staff involving any form of contact with the young person. There was evidence that full control and restraint was being used proportionately less than other less intrusive forms of control. Data analysis indicated that the majority of use of force which did not involve full control and restraint took place when young people were moving to activities.

2.87 In five of the preceding six months, failure to obey staff instructions was frequently recorded as the issue leading to the use of force. Managers assured us that this analysis was not a true reflection of the main reason for the use of force and that in most instances where non-compliance had been recorded as the reason for restraint it had actually been used to prevent escalation of altercations between young people. In the small sample we checked it was apparent that this had been the case. However, in the light of the considerable increase in the use of force, the data analysis needed to be more precise especially concerning the reasons for the application of control and restraint techniques.

We repeat the recommendation.

2.88 **The use of force should be correctly authorised and certified. (7.47)**

Achieved. All the use of force paperwork that we examined had been correctly authorised and certified. Adherence to this requirement was monitored by the compliance team.

2.89 **Planned use of force should always be recorded on video tape. (7.48)**

Achieved. Additional staff had been trained to use the video cameras since the previous inspection and all planned uses of force were recorded. The tapes were kept by the investigations officer. Planned use of force was high: 76 planned incidents had taken place in the six months prior to the inspection.

2.90 **Monitoring and analysis of the use of force should be improved to determine any relevant patterns and trends requiring attention. (7.49)**

Achieved. Monthly monitoring of the use of force was wide ranging and included the identification of individual young people or members of staff who were repeatedly involved in the use of force. Concerns about young people were reported to the safeguarding team. When required, the investigations officer reviewed CCTV footage with the member of staff involved to consider their actions and learn lessons. Any ongoing concerns about members of staff were monitored by the investigations officer and the director.

2.91 Use of force data analysis was reported to the security committee, senior management team, weekly incident management meetings and safeguarding committee meetings. The data analysis was being used to examine problems between individual young people or gang affiliations before moving young people from the induction wing to a residential unit.

Additional information

2.92 Not all young people who were subject to the use of force were subsequently spoken to by a member of staff as part of a formal debrief and the debriefs that we were told took place were not recorded.

Further recommendation

2.93 Young people should be given the opportunity to talk about their experience with someone impartial as soon as possible following restraint. This should be recorded and linked to any other care and management plans for the young person.

Strategic management of resettlement

- 2.94 **The resettlement policy should be updated to include the resettlement needs of looked-after children and young people serving long sentences who are released to the community or transferred to a young adult establishment. (9.9)**

Not achieved. The resettlement policy had been updated recently but was still in draft form. The draft policy did not provide measurable targets and there was no reference to the needs of looked-after children or young people serving long sentences (see also safeguarding section). **We repeat the recommendation.**

- 2.95 **Key data on resettlement issues should be presented to the resettlement committee. (9.10)**

Not achieved. Statistical information was produced for the quarterly resettlement committee but concentrated on performance data relating to education and not the majority of the resettlement pathways. In our survey, young people reported less favourably than at the previous inspection on knowing who to contact for support across all areas relating to preparation for release. **We repeat the recommendation.**

Training planning and remand management

- 2.96 **A consultation exercise should be carried out to seek the views of families to find ways to improve their participation in the training planning process. (9.22)**

Achieved. There had been no formal consultation exercise but the family support worker attended every domestic visit session, made herself available to visitors and consulted them on a range of issues. Following suggestions from families, family members were able to have an additional domestic visit following a young person's training planning review. There had been no data collection or analysis, but casework staff were confident that this initiative had increased the level of attendance by family members at training planning reviews.

- 2.97 **There should be an age-appropriate sentence planning process for children and young people serving indeterminate sentences. (9.23)**

Not achieved. The YJB were developing a process for young people under 18 serving indeterminate sentences and staff at Ashfield had contributed to a national consultation. Meanwhile, the sentence planning process remained unchanged and staff continued to use the standard adult documentation. **We repeat the recommendation.**

- 2.98 **Transfers between individual establishments in the young people's secure estate and young adult estate should be overseen by the Youth Justice Board placements service and population management service, who should have a role in assisting when difficulties arise. (9.24)**

Achieved. Previous problems in getting young people transferred to the adult estate when they reached 18 had been resolved and young people were usually transferred to Portland or Isis without undue delay. All transfers followed an agreed protocol and transfers of young people between establishments in the under-18 estate were subject to approval and overseen

by the YJB placements team. Decisions about individual young people were usually taken at a case conference. Staff said they found the procedures for planned transfers useful as they felt able to make a contribution to decision making and their views were taken into account. However, when transfers were organised at short notice, usually for disciplinary reasons, staff did not believe that their views about individual young people were always taken into account and that this sometimes resulted in inappropriate placements.

Resettlement pathways

- 2.99 **The substance misuse strategy should be informed by a comprehensive population needs assessment and should contain detailed annual action plans and performance measures. (9.47)**

Partially achieved. An analysis of smoking, drinking and drug use had been completed in September 2011. However, the report lacked an identifiable action plan and performance measures to inform the development of the strategy.

We repeat the recommendation.

- 2.100 **Substance misuse workers should receive regular casework supervision from a suitably qualified practitioner. (9.48)**

Achieved. All staff attended a staff development session every six weeks to discuss their work. Group supervision was provided by an external British Psychological Society practitioner and the substance misuse manager held monthly one-to-one meetings with substance misuse workers.

- 2.101 **There should be sufficient specialist substance misuse workers available to assess fully, within the required timescales, and plan young people's care, and to offer consistent contact and high quality interventions. (9.49)**

Achieved. Staffing levels for specialist substance misuse workers had improved significantly. The young people's substance misuse service (YPSMS) comprised a service manager, three senior care managers, 21 dual role Ashfield substance misuse service (ASMS) workers, one high risk worker, assessments worker and lifer ASMS worker, and administrative support. Staff training was fully supported by managers and met the Drugs and Alcohol National Occupational Standards.

- 2.102 **A member of the substance misuse service should attend relevant training planning meetings to contribute to overall care planning. (9.50)**

Achieved. ASMS workers attended training planning meetings whenever possible and always attended the initial and final meetings.

- 2.103 **The visits area should not have fixed furniture. (9.62)**

Not achieved. The visits area was still fitted with uncomfortable, low fixed tables and chairs.
We repeat the recommendation.

- 2.104 **Young people should not have to wear bibs during domestic visits. (9.63)**

Achieved. Young people were no longer required to wear bibs during their visits.

- 2.105 **There should be regular family days for all young people. (9.64)**

Partially achieved. Family days took place each month for up to 10 young people and this level of frequency was commendable. However, family days were still restricted to young people on the top level of the rewards and sanctions scheme. Our survey indicated that difficulties in getting visits had increased for young people: 27% said that they had one or more visits a week against the comparator of 38% at the previous inspection. The family support worker worked with young people and their families when difficulties were identified and sometimes arranged visits additional to the standard entitlement. There were additional visiting opportunities for young people located on the Phoenix unit, young people serving indeterminate sentences and young people who were fathers. A monthly Dad's day had been introduced which was innovative.

2.106 The use of family group conferences should be extended. (9.65)

Not achieved. Family group conferences had previously been run by Barnardo's but had not operated since 2010. The family support worker had been trained to run family group conferences and there were plans to train another member of staff so that the scheme could be reinstated later in the year.

We repeat the recommendation.

2.107 An age-appropriate accredited thinking skills programme should be introduced. (9.72)

Partially achieved. There was no accredited thinking skills programme in place at the time of the inspection but funding had been secured and staff trained, and the juvenile enhanced thinking skills (JETS) programme would be introduced early in 2012. In the meantime, a wide range of relevant locally approved programmes continued to be available. The current range of options was not based on a needs analysis, although when allocating programme places, the psychology department was responsive to individual needs.

2.108 All young people convicted of a sexual offence should be assessed and receive specialist treatment when appropriate. (9.73)

Partially achieved. Young people convicted of sexual offences were considered by the YJB for their suitability for assessment for a sex offender treatment programme, taking into account their offence, the length of their sentence and their suitability for treatment. The YJB provided funding for seven young people to receive the specialist service from the Lucy Faithfull Foundation at Ashfield. One other young person in the prison who had been convicted of a sex offence was not receiving a service and had not been assessed for a treatment programme.

We repeat the recommendation.

Additional information

2.109 Attendance at resettlement committee meetings had improved but was still not broad enough. There was limited evidence that resettlement data were being used to develop services.

2.110 The Phoenix unit provided a good environment for young people serving indeterminate sentences. There were clear selection criteria, all staff were lifer trained and a psychologist was allocated to all young people located there.

Section 3: Summary of recommendations

The following is a list of both repeated and further recommendations included in this report. The reference numbers in brackets refer to the paragraph location in the main report.

Recommendation	To the Youth Justice Board and NOMS
----------------	-------------------------------------

Foreign nationals

- 3.1 Children and young people should not be held in Prison Service custody solely under administrative powers pending removal or deportation. (2.40)

Recommendations	To the director
-----------------	-----------------

Courts, escorts and transfers

- 3.2 Young people should not be routinely strip-searched on arrival. (2.4)
- 3.3 There should be regular discussions with escort providers to ensure that young people are not held for unnecessarily lengthy periods in court cells, are not transported with adults or females, and arrive at their destination before 7pm. (2.5)

First days in custody

- 3.4 Essential first night information should be provided in a variety of accessible formats so that new arrivals know what to expect within the first 24 hours in custody and the sources of support available to them. (2.9)

Residential units

- 3.5 All cells should be maintained in a good state of cleanliness and repair. (2.10)

Relationships between staff and children and young people

- 3.6 Managers should ensure effective strategies are in place for supporting all staff in setting and maintaining appropriate boundaries at all times. (2.11)

Personal officers

- 3.7 Meetings and reviews relating to the care and management of young people should be arranged so that personal officers are able to attend to support the young people they are responsible for. (2.14)

Safeguarding children

- 3.8 There should be a clear policy which clarifies and coordinates existing systems for the identification, assessment, care planning and management of vulnerable young people. (2.1)
- 3.9 Efforts should be made to better engage the LSCB to increase their involvement in the strategic management and oversight of all aspects of safeguarding children at Ashfield. (2.18)
- 3.10 The safeguarding team should follow up the recommendations they make about the care of individual young people. (2.19)

Child protection

- 3.11 The establishment and the local authority should develop a written protocol describing their working arrangements, which should include regular scrutiny of child protection files and the effectiveness of child protection procedures. (2.22)

Bullying

- 3.12 A member of the safeguarding team should attend the monthly consultation meetings to address the standing agenda items of violence reduction and anti-bullying. (2.29)
- 3.13 Staff involved in the implementation of workbooks for young people identified as bullies should have ongoing training and support from the psychology department to enhance the effectiveness of their work. (2.31)

Substance use

- 3.14 Joint working protocols between health services and the substance misuse service should be developed. (2.35)
- 3.15 Young people undergoing stabilisation/detoxification/maintenance regimes should not be automatically placed on ACCT as a means of close observation, and alternative means of observation and monitoring that meets their specific needs should be introduced. (2.36)

Diversity

- 3.16 The DREAT should include appropriate community representation. (2.37)

Disability

- 3.17 All young people with a disability should have an up-to-date care plan that sets out how their assessed needs will be met. (2.43)
- 3.18 Individual care plans for young people with a disability should be subject to regular multidisciplinary review and accessible to all staff involved in the care of the young person. (2.44)

Health services

- 3.19 All health care information should be provided in a range of languages appropriate to the population. (2.47)
- 3.20 Young people should have access to a dedicated health care forum. (2.49)
- 3.21 Health promotion information should be provided on all residential units and accessible in a range of languages. (2.50)
- 3.22 Health care applications should be confidential and managed by health care staff. (2.52)

Behaviour management

- 3.23 Proper governance should be introduced to ensure that the use of single separation is proportionate, fairly applied and non-discriminatory. (2.71)

Adjudications

- 3.24 Adjudications should be used as a last resort to deal with the most difficult and challenging behaviour and more use should be made of the minor reports system for less serious behaviour. (2.84)

Use of force

- 3.25 Force should only be used when there is an immediate risk to the safety of a young person or others or of serious damage to property, always as a last resort and when all other alternatives have been explored. It should not be used simply to obtain compliance with staff instructions. (2.86)
- 3.26 Young people should be given the opportunity to talk about their experience with someone impartial as soon as possible following restraint. This should be recorded and linked to any other care and management plans for the young person. (2.93)

Strategic management of resettlement

- 3.27 The resettlement policy should be updated to include the resettlement needs of looked- after children and young people serving long sentences who are released to the community or transferred to a young adult establishment. (2.94)
- 3.28 Key data on resettlement issues should be presented to the resettlement committee. (2.95)

Training planning and remand management

- 3.29 There should be an age-appropriate sentence planning process for children and young people serving indeterminate sentences. (2.97)

Resettlement pathways

- 3.30 The substance misuse strategy should be informed by a comprehensive population needs assessment and should contain detailed annual action plans and performance measures. (2.99)
- 3.31 The visits area should not have fixed furniture. (2.103)
- 3.32 The use of family group conferences should be extended. (2.106)
- 3.33 All young people convicted of a sexual offence should be assessed and receive specialist treatment when appropriate. (2.108)

Housekeeping point

Child protection

- 3.34 The child protection policy should include a clear commitment to support staff who report child protection concerns which relate to the behaviour of their colleagues. (2.25)

Appendix I: Inspection team

Fay Deadman	Team leader
Ian MacFadyen	Inspector
Ian Thomson	Inspector
Angela Johnson	Inspector

Specialist inspectors

Bridget McEilly	Health services inspector
Martyn Rhowbotham	Ofsted inspector

Appendix II: Prison population profile

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

Status	Number of young people	%
Sentenced	243	76.7
Recalls	24	7.6
Convicted unsentenced	17	5.4
Remand	33	10.4
Detainee		
Total	317	100

Age	Number of young people	%
15 years	19	6
16 years	76	24
17 years	213	67.2
18 years	9	2.8
Total	317	100

Nationality	Number of young people	%
British	283	89.3
Foreign nationals	34	10.7
Total	317	100

Ethnicity	Number of young people	%
<i>White</i>		
British	143	45.1
Irish	3	0.9
Other white	15	4.7
<i>Mixed</i>		
White and black Caribbean	21	6.6
White and black African	4	1.3
White and Asian	1	0.3
Other mixed	10	3.2
<i>Asian or Asian British</i>		
Indian	4	1.3
Pakistani	7	2.2
Bangladeshi	4	1.3
Other Asian	11	3.5
<i>Black or black British</i>		
Caribbean	47	14.8
African	27	8.5
Other black	20	6.3
<i>Chinese or other ethnic group</i>		
Chinese		
Other ethnic group		
<i>Not stated</i>		
Total	317	100

Religion	Number of young people	%
Baptist		
Church of England	31	9.8
Roman Catholic	35	11
Other Christian denominations	46	14.5
Muslim	80	25.2
Sikh	1	0.3
Hindu	1	0.3
Buddhist		
Jewish		
Other	4	1.3
No religion	119	37.5
Total	317	100

Main offence	Number of young people	%
Violence against the person	65	20.5
Sexual offences	9	2.8
Burglary	50	15.8
Robbery	99	31.2
Theft and handling	9	2.8
Fraud and forgery		
Drugs offences	21	6.6
Other offences	64	20.2
Offence not recorded/holding warrant		
Total	317	100

Number of Section 53 (2)/91s (determinate sentences only) by age and sentence

Sentence	Under 2 yrs	2-3 yrs	3-4 yrs	4-5 yrs	5 yrs +	Total
Age						
15 years						
16 years		7	3		2	12
17 years		20	7	8	6	41
18 years		1				1
Total		28	10	8	8	54

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

Sentence	4 mths	6 mths	8 mths	10 mths	12 mths	18 mths	24 mths	Total
Age								
15 years	2				5	2	1	10
16 years	5	1	5	1	13	11	8	44
17 years	11	13	12	2	35	22	18	113
18 years	1	2			2	1	1	7
Total	19	16	17	3	55	36	28	174

Number of extended sentences under Section 228 (extended sentence for public protection)

Sentence	Under 2 yrs	2-3 yrs	3-4 yrs	4-5 yrs	5 yrs +	Total
Age						
15 years						
16 years					2	2
17 years			4	1		5
18 years						
Total			4	1	2	7

Number of indeterminate sentences by age

Sentence	Section 90	Section 53 (1)	ISPPCJ03	Recall	HMP	Total
Age						
15 years	1			3		4
16 years	2			5		7
17 years	5			15		20
18 years				1		1
Total	8			24		32

Appendix III: Summary of young people's questionnaires and interviews

Prisoner survey methodology

A voluntary, confidential and anonymous survey of a representative proportion of the population of children and young people (15–18 years) was carried out by HM Inspectorate of Prisons as part of an annual report on the young people's estate.

Choosing the sample size

At the time of the survey on 19 September 2011, the population of young people at HMYOI Ashfield was 326. Questionnaires were offered to 163 young people.

Completion of the questionnaire was voluntary. Refusals were noted and no attempts were made to replace them.

Interviews were carried out with any respondents with literacy difficulties. In total, one respondent was interviewed.

Methodology

Every attempt was made to distribute the questionnaires to each respondent on an individual basis. This gave researchers an opportunity to explain the independence of the Inspectorate and the purpose of the questionnaire, as well as to answer questions.

All completed questionnaires were confidential – only members of the Inspectorate saw them. In order to ensure confidentiality, respondents were asked to do one of the following:

- have their questionnaire ready to hand back to a member of the research team at a specified time
- seal the questionnaire in the envelope provided and hand it to a member of staff, if they were agreeable, or
- seal the questionnaire in the envelope provided and leave it in their room for collection.

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.

Response rates

In total, 135 respondents completed and returned their questionnaires. This represented 41% of children and young people in the establishment at the time. The response rate from the sample was 83%.

Two respondents refused to complete a questionnaire, 18 questionnaires were not returned and eight were returned blank.

Comparisons

The following document details the results from the survey. All missing responses are excluded from the analysis. All data from each establishment have been weighted, in order to mimic a consistent percentage sampled in each establishment.

Presented alongside the results from this survey are the comparator figures for all children and young people surveyed in young offender institutions. This comparator is based on all responses from surveys carried out in the other eight male establishments surveyed since 2010.

Additional documents show significant differences between the responses of young people from black and minority ethnic backgrounds and young people from white backgrounds, significant differences between foreign nationals and British nationals, significant differences between young Muslims and young non-Muslims, and significant differences between young people who consider themselves to have a disability and those who do not.

Also included are statistically significant differences between the responses of young people surveyed at HMYOI Ashfield in 2010 and the responses of this 2011 survey. It should be noted that, in order for statistical comparisons to be made between the most recent survey data and that of the previous survey, both sets of data have been coded in the same way. This may result in percentages from previous surveys looking higher or lower as some of our survey questions have changed. However, both percentages are true of the populations they were taken from, and the statistical significance is correct.

In all the above documents, statistically significant differences are highlighted. Statistical significance merely indicates whether there is a real difference between the figures; that is the difference is not due to chance alone. Results that are significantly better are indicated by green shading, results that are significantly worse are indicated by blue shading, and where there is no significant difference there is no shading. Orange shading has been used to show a significant difference in demographic background details. Some questions have been filtered according to the response to a previous question. Filtered questions are clearly indented and preceded by an explanation as to which respondents are included in the filtered questions. Otherwise, percentages provided refer to the entire sample. All missing responses are excluded from the analysis.

Summary

In addition, a summary of the survey results has been included, which shows a breakdown of responses for each question. Percentages have been rounded and therefore may not add up to 100%.

No questions have been filtered within the summary so all percentages refer to responses from the entire sample. The percentages to certain responses within the summary, for example 'not sentenced' options across questions, may differ slightly. This is due to different response rates across questions, meaning that the percentages have been calculated out of different totals (all missing data are excluded). The actual numbers will match up as the data are cleaned to be consistent.

Percentages shown in the summary may differ by 1% or 2% from that shown in the comparison data as the comparator data have been weighted for comparison purposes.

Survey results

SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU

Q1	How old are you?	
	15.....	8 (6%)
	16.....	26 (19%)
	17.....	83 (62%)
	18.....	17 (13%)
Q2	Are you a British citizen?	
	Yes.....	118 (90%)
	No.....	13 (10%)
Q3	Is English your first language?	
	Yes.....	106 (83%)
	No.....	22 (17%)
Q4	What is your ethnic origin?	
	<i>White - British</i>	55 (42%)
	<i>White - Irish</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>White - other</i>	7 (5%)
	<i>Black or black British - Caribbean</i>	23 (18%)
	<i>Black or black British - African</i>	10 (8%)
	<i>Black or black British - other</i>	2 (2%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Indian</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Pakistani</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - other</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Mixed heritage - white and black Caribbean</i>	9 (7%)
	<i>Mixed heritage - white and black African</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Mixed heritage - white and Asian</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Mixed heritage - other</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>Chinese</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Other ethnic group</i>	3 (2%)
Q5	What is your religion?	
	<i>None</i>	33 (26%)
	<i>Church of England</i>	20 (16%)
	<i>Catholic</i>	27 (21%)
	<i>Protestant</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Other Christian denomination</i>	16 (13%)
	<i>Buddhist</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Hindu</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Jewish</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Muslim</i>	28 (22%)
	<i>Sikh</i>	0 (0%)

Q6	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	
	Yes	5 (4%)
	No	115 (93%)
	Don't know.....	4 (3%)
Q7	Do you have any children?	
	Yes	16 (13%)
	No	111 (87%)
Q8	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	
	Yes	12 (9%)
	No	115 (91%)
Q10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	
	Yes	40 (31%)
	No	88 (69%)

SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE

Q1	Are you sentenced?	
	Yes	105 (80%)
	No - unsentenced/on remand	26 (20%)
Q2	How long is your sentence (the full DTO sentence)?	
	Not sentenced	26 (20%)
	<i>Less than six months</i>	19 (15%)
	<i>Six to twelve months</i>	25 (19%)
	<i>More than twelve months, up to two years</i>	27 (21%)
	<i>More than two years</i>	30 (23%)
	<i>Indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP)</i>	2 (2%)
Q3	How long have you been in this establishment?	
	<i>Less than one month</i>	25 (19%)
	<i>One to six months</i>	66 (51%)
	<i>More than six months, but less than twelve months</i>	25 (19%)
	<i>Twelve months to two years</i>	13 (10%)
	<i>More than two years</i>	0 (0%)
Q4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	
	Yes	75 (57%)
	No	56 (43%)

SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS

Q1	On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?	
	Yes	61 (46%)
	No	51 (39%)
	Don't remember.....	18 (14%)
	Not applicable.....	2 (2%)

Q2	On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?	
	Yes	104 (78%)
	No	19 (14%)
	Don't remember	10 (8%)
Q3	On your most recent journey here, were there any adults (over 18) or people of a different gender, travelling with you?	
	Yes	30 (23%)
	No	83 (63%)
	Don't remember	18 (14%)
Q4	On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?	
	Less than two hours	30 (23%)
	Two to four hours	73 (56%)
	More than four hours	21 (16%)
	Don't remember	7 (5%)
Q5	On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?	
	My journey was less than two hours	30 (23%)
	Yes	14 (11%)
	No	79 (60%)
	Don't remember	9 (7%)
Q6	On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?	
	My journey was less than two hours	30 (23%)
	Yes	27 (21%)
	No	66 (52%)
	Don't remember	5 (4%)
Q7	On your most recent journey here, how did you feel you were treated by the escort staff?	
	Very well	13 (10%)
	Well	48 (37%)
	Neither	46 (36%)
	Badly	14 (11%)
	Very badly	4 (3%)
	Don't remember	4 (3%)
Q8	Before you arrived, from court or another establishment, were you told that you would be coming here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Yes, someone told me	90 (69%)
	Yes, I received written information	23 (18%)
	No, I was not told anything	39 (30%)
	Don't remember	12 (9%)

SECTION 4: FIRST DAYS

Q1	How long were you in reception?	
	Less than two hours	106 (82%)
	Two hours or longer	10 (8%)

	<i>Don't remember</i>	13 (10%)	
Q2	When you were searched, was this carried out in an understanding way?		
	<i>Yes</i>	110 (85%)	
	<i>No</i>	12 (9%)	
	<i>Don't remember</i>	8 (6%)	
Q3	Overall, how well did you feel you were treated in reception?		
	<i>Very well</i>	26 (20%)	
	<i>Well</i>	65 (50%)	
	<i>Neither</i>	27 (21%)	
	<i>Badly</i>	7 (5%)	
	<i>Very badly</i>	1 (1%)	
	<i>Don't remember</i>	3 (2%)	
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.)		
	<i>Not being able to smoke</i>	70 (57%)	<i>Money worries</i> 22 (18%)
	<i>Loss of property</i> 23 (19%)		<i>Feeling low/upset/needing someone to talk to</i> 44 (36%)
	<i>Housing problems</i> 23 (19%)		<i>Health problems</i> 67 (55%)
	<i>Needing protection from other young people</i>	28 (23%)	<i>Getting phone numbers</i> 64 (52%)
	<i>Letting family know where you are</i> 69 (57%)		Staff did not ask me about any of these 14 (11%)
Q5	When you first arrived here, did you have any of the following problems? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	<i>Not being able to smoke</i>	59 (50%)	<i>Money worries</i> 30 (25%)
	<i>Loss of property</i> 17 (14%)		<i>Feeling low/upset/needing someone to talk to</i> 25 (21%)
	<i>Housing problems</i> 16 (14%)		<i>Health problems</i> 15 (13%)
	<i>Needing protection from other young people</i>	8 (7%)	<i>Getting phone numbers</i> 38 (32%)
	<i>Letting family know where you are</i> 25 (21%)		I did not have any problems 28 (24%)
Q6	When you first arrived here, were you given any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	<i>A reception pack</i>	82 (66%)	
	<i>The opportunity to have a shower</i>	23 (18%)	
	<i>Something to eat</i>	97 (78%)	
	<i>A free phone call to friends/family</i>	77 (62%)	
	<i>Information about the PIN telephone system</i>	64 (51%)	
	<i>Information about feeling low/upset</i>	29 (23%)	
	<i>Don't remember</i>	6 (5%)	
	I was not given any of these	5 (4%)	

Q7	Within your first 24 hours here, did you have access to the following people or services? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Chaplain or religious leader</i>	35 (29%)
	<i>Peer support/peer mentor/Listener/Samaritans</i>	19 (16%)
	<i>The prison shop/canteen</i>	35 (29%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	34 (28%)
	<i>I did not have access to any of these</i>	36 (30%)
Q8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a member of health care staff?	
	<i>Yes</i>	83 (68%)
	<i>No</i>	24 (20%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	15 (12%)
Q9	Did you feel safe on your first night at this establishment?	
	<i>Yes</i>	93 (74%)
	<i>No</i>	20 (16%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	12 (10%)
Q10	Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the establishment?	
	<i>I have not been on an induction course</i>	6 (5%)
	<i>Yes</i>	80 (65%)
	<i>No</i>	21 (17%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	17 (14%)

SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT

Q1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	
	<i>Yes</i>	101 (80%)
	<i>No</i>	24 (19%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	2 (2%)
Q2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	
	<i>Yes</i>	63 (50%)
	<i>No</i>	33 (26%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	29 (23%)
Q3	What is the food like here?	
	<i>Very good</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>Good</i>	45 (35%)
	<i>Neither</i>	47 (37%)
	<i>Bad</i>	22 (17%)
	<i>Very bad</i>	10 (8%)
Q4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	
	<i>I have not bought anything yet</i>	2 (2%)
	<i>Yes</i>	69 (55%)
	<i>No</i>	49 (39%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	6 (5%)

Q5 How easy is it for you to attend religious services?

<i>I don't want to attend religious services</i>	18 (14%)
<i>Very easy</i>	31 (25%)
<i>Easy</i>	48 (38%)
<i>Neither</i>	15 (12%)
<i>Difficult</i>	4 (3%)
<i>Very difficult</i>	4 (3%)
<i>Don't know</i>	6 (5%)

Q6 Please answer the following questions about religion:

	Yes	No	Don't know/ NA
Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	79 (63%)	18 (14%)	28 (22%)
Can you speak to a religious leader in private if you want to?	76 (65%)	9 (8%)	32 (27%)

Q7 Please answer the following about staff here:

	Yes	No
Is there a member of staff you feel you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	82 (65%)	44 (35%)
Do most staff treat you with respect?	80 (68%)	37 (32%)

SECTION 6: HEALTH SERVICES

Q1 Did you have a full health assessment the day after your arrival?

Yes	81 (65%)
No	20 (16%)
Don't know.....	24 (19%)

Q2 What do you think of the overall quality of the health care?

<i>I have not been to health care</i>	22 (17%)
<i>Very good</i>	23 (18%)
<i>Good</i>	39 (31%)
<i>Neither</i>	31 (25%)
<i>Bad</i>	9 (7%)
<i>Very bad</i>	2 (2%)

Q3 Is it easy to see the following people if you need to?

	Yes	No	Don't know
The doctor	57 (48%)	38 (32%)	24 (20%)
The nurse	93 (76%)	15 (12%)	14 (11%)
The dentist	38 (31%)	54 (45%)	29 (24%)
The optician	27 (23%)	45 (38%)	48 (40%)
The pharmacist.....	26 (22%)	34 (29%)	56 (48%)

Q4 If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep it in your cell?

<i>I am not taking any medication</i>	57 (46%)
Yes	17 (14%)
No	35 (28%)

Don't know..... 15 (12%)

Q5 Please answer the following about alcohol:

	Yes	No
Did you have problems with alcohol when you first arrived here?	21 (17%)	104 (83%)
Have you received any help with alcohol problems in this prison?	10 (8%)	118 (92%)

Q6 Please answer the following about drugs:

	Yes	No
Did you have problems with drugs when you first arrived here?	46 (36%)	83 (64%)
Do you have problems with drugs now?	10 (8%)	116 (92%)
Have you received any help with drug problems in this prison?	26 (21%)	99 (79%)

Q7 How easy is it to get illegal drugs here?

Very easy	10 (8%)
Easy	13 (10%)
Neither	18 (14%)
Difficult	4 (3%)
Very difficult	12 (10%)
Don't know.....	68 (54%)

Q8 Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?

Yes	44 (35%)
No	81 (65%)

Q9 If you feel you have emotional or mental health problems, are you being helped by anyone here (for example; a psychologist, doctor, counsellor, personal officer or another member of prison staff)?

<i>I do not have any emotional or mental health problems</i>	81 (65%)
Yes	19 (15%)
No	25 (20%)

SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS

Q1 Do you know how to make an application?

Yes	103 (81%)
No	24 (19%)

Q2 Is it easy to make an application?

Yes	91 (72%)
No	15 (12%)
Don't know.....	21 (17%)

Q3	Please answer the following questions about applications:			
		<i>I have not made one</i>	Yes	No
	Do you feel applications are sorted out fairly?	42 (35%)	49 (40%)	30 (25%)
	Do you feel applications are sorted out promptly? (Within seven days)	42 (35%)	33 (28%)	45 (38%)
Q4	Do you know how to make a complaint?			
	Yes			93 (78%)
	No			27 (23%)
Q5	Is it easy to make a complaint?			
	Yes			75 (60%)
	No			12 (10%)
	Don't know.....			37 (30%)
Q6	Please answer the following questions about complaints:			
		<i>I have not made one</i>	Yes	No
	Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	73 (58%)	17 (13%)	36 (29%)
	Do you feel complaints are sorted out promptly? (Within seven days)	73 (60%)	14 (12%)	34 (28%)
Q7	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?			
	Yes			21 (17%)
	No			100 (83%)
Q8	Can you speak to the following people when you need to?			
		Yes	No	Don't know
	A peer mentor/peer support/listener	30 (24%)	28 (23%)	65 (53%)
	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)	23 (19%)	28 (24%)	67 (57%)
	An advocate (an outside person to help you)	52 (43%)	18 (15%)	50 (42%)

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>			9 (7%)
	<i>Enhanced (top)</i>			32 (25%)
	<i>Standard (middle)</i>			63 (50%)
	<i>Basic (bottom)</i>			19 (15%)
	<i>Don't know</i>			4 (3%)
Q2	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the rewards and sanctions scheme?			
	<i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i>			9 (7%)
	Yes			49 (39%)
	No			60 (48%)
	Don't know.....			8 (6%)

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>	9 (7%)
	Yes	65 (53%)
	No	39 (32%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	9 (7%)
Q4	Have you had a 'nicking' (adjudication) since you have been in this establishment?	
	Yes	71 (56%)
	No	50 (39%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	6 (5%)
Q5	If you have had a 'nicking' (adjudication), was the process explained clearly to you?	
	<i>I have not had an adjudication</i>	50 (40%)
	Yes	62 (50%)
	No	12 (10%)
Q6	If you have been physically restrained (C and R), how many times has this happened since you have been in this establishment?	
	<i>I have not been restrained</i>	72 (58%)
	<i>Once</i>	21 (17%)
	<i>Twice</i>	8 (6%)
	<i>Three times</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>More than three times</i>	20 (16%)
Q7	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>	103 (84%)
	<i>Very well</i>	5 (4%)
	<i>Well</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>Neither</i>	8 (7%)
	<i>Badly</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Very badly</i>	2 (2%)

SECTION 9: SAFETY

Q1	Have you ever felt unsafe in this establishment?	
	Yes	44 (35%)
	No	80 (65%)
Q2	If you have ever felt unsafe, in which areas of this establishment do you/have you ever felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Never felt unsafe</i>	80 (65%)
	<i>Everywhere</i>	13 (11%)
	<i>Care and separation unit</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Association areas</i>	16 (13%)
	<i>Reception area</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>At meal times</i>	7 (6%)
	<i>At health care</i>	6 (5%)
	<i>Visits area</i>	9 (7%)
	<i>In wing showers</i>	6 (5%)
	<i>In gym showers</i>	10 (8%)

<i>At the gym</i>	13 (11%)	<i>In corridors/stairwells</i>	12 (10%)
<i>In an exercise yard</i>	12 (10%)	<i>On your landing/wing</i>	14 (11%)
<i>At work</i>	4 (3%)	<i>In your cell</i>	8 (7%)
<i>At education</i>	12 (10%)		

Q3 Has another young person or group of young people victimised you in this establishment? (E.g. insulted or assaulted you)

Yes	33 (28%)	
No	85 (72%)	If No, go to question 6

Q4 If yes, what did the incidents involve/what were they about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

<i>Insulting remarks (about you, your family or friends)</i>	17 (14%)	<i>Because of drugs</i>	5 (4%)
<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	10 (8%)	<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i>	9 (8%)
<i>Sexual abuse</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Because you were new here</i> ..	15 (13%)
<i>Because of your race or ethnic origin</i>	4 (3%)	<i>Because you are from a different part of the country</i>	4 (3%)
<i>Because of your religious beliefs</i>	2 (2%)	<i>Because of gang related issues</i>	6 (5%)
<i>Because you have a disability</i> ..	1 (1%)	<i>Because of my offence/crime</i> ..	3 (3%)

Q6 Has a member of staff or group of staff victimised you in this establishment? (E.g. insulted or assaulted you)

Yes	23 (20%)	
No	94 (80%)	If No, go to question 9

Q7 If yes, what did the incidents involve/what were they about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

<i>Insulting remarks (about you, your family or friends)</i>	10 (9%)	<i>Because of drugs</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	2 (2%)	<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i>	3 (3%)
<i>Sexual abuse</i>	1 (1%)	<i>Because you were new here</i>	5 (4%)
<i>Because of your race or ethnic origin</i>	6 (5%)	<i>Because you are from a different part of the country</i>	6 (5%)
<i>Because of your religious beliefs</i>	7 (6%)	<i>Because of gang related issues</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Because you have a disability</i> ..	1 (1%)	<i>Because of my offence/crime</i>	1 (1%)

Q9 If you were being victimised who would you tell?

<i>No-one</i>	45 (44%)	<i>Teacher/education staff</i>	9 (9%)
<i>Personal officer</i>	29 (28%)	<i>Gym staff</i>	6 (6%)
<i>Wing officer</i>	22 (22%)	<i>Listener/Samaritan/Buddy</i>	8 (8%)
<i>Chaplain</i>	12 (12%)	<i>Another young person here</i>	19 (19%)
<i>Health care staff</i>	4 (4%)	<i>Family/friends</i>	35 (34%)

Q10	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	
	Yes	33 (28%)
	No	43 (36%)
	Don't know.....	43 (36%)
Q11	Is shouting through the windows a problem here?	
	Yes	50 (42%)
	No	51 (43%)
	Don't know.....	18 (15%)
Q12	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	
	Yes	41 (34%)
	No	81 (66%)

SECTION 10: ACTIVITIES

Q1	How old were you when you were last at school?	
	14 or under.....	37 (31%)
	15 or over.....	82 (69%)
Q2	Please answer the following questions about school:	
		Yes No Not applicable
	Have you ever been excluded from school?	101 (83%) 14 (12%) 6 (5%)
	Did you used to truant from school?	79 (70%) 23 (20%) 11 (10%)
Q3	Do you CURRENTLY take part in any of the following activities? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Education	108 (89%)
	A job in this establishment.....	18 (15%)
	Vocational or skills training.....	27 (22%)
	Offending behaviour programmes.....	36 (30%)
	I am not currently involved in any of these	13 (11%)
Q4	If you have been involved in any of the following activities, in this establishment, do you think they will help you when you leave prison?	
		Not been involved Yes No Don't know
	Education	6 (5%) 74 (63%) 22 (19%) 16 (14%)
	A job in this establishment	16 (21%) 24 (32%) 16 (21%) 19 (25%)
	Vocational or skills training	11 (13%) 39 (48%) 15 (18%) 17 (21%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	12 (15%) 32 (40%) 17 (21%) 20 (25%)
Q5	Do you usually have association every day?	
	Yes	86 (73%)

No 28 (24%)
 Don't know..... 4 (3%)

Q6 How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?

Don't want to go 11 (9%)
 None..... 17 (14%)
 One to two times 57 (47%)
 Three to five times 21 (17%)
 More than five times 9 (7%)
 Don't know..... 7 (6%)

Q7 Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?

Don't want to go 13 (11%)
 Yes 72 (60%)
 No 27 (22%)
 Don't know..... 9 (7%)

SECTION 11: FAMILY AND FRIENDS

Q1 Are you able to use the telephone every day if you want to?

Yes 97 (79%)
 No 21 (17%)
 Don't know..... 5 (4%)

Q2 Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?

Yes 58 (47%)
 No 49 (40%)
 Don't know..... 17 (14%)

Q3 How easy is it for your family and friends to visit you here?

Very easy 14 (12%)
 Easy 24 (20%)
 Neither 14 (12%)
 Difficult 28 (23%)
 Very difficult 35 (29%)
 Don't know..... 6 (5%)

Q4 How many visits do you usually have each week, from family or friends?

Not been here a week yet 3 (3%)
 I don't get visits..... 41 (34%)
 Less than one a week 38 (32%)
 About one a week 30 (25%)
 More than one a week..... 2 (2%)
 Don't know..... 6 (5%)

Q5 Do your visits usually start on time?

I don't get visits 41 (34%)
 Yes 48 (40%)
 No 23 (19%)
 Don't know..... 8 (7%)

Q6	How are you and your family/friends usually treated by visits staff?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	41 (34%)
	<i>Very well</i>	16 (13%)
	<i>Well</i>	28 (23%)
	<i>Neither</i>	12 (10%)
	<i>Badly</i>	7 (6%)
	<i>Very badly</i>	2 (2%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	14 (12%)

SECTION 12: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE

Q1	When did you first meet your personal officer?	
	<i>I still have not met him/her</i>	25 (20%)
	<i>In your first week</i>	37 (30%)
	<i>After your first week</i>	30 (24%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	31 (25%)

Q2	How often do you see your personal officer?	
	<i>I still have not met him/her</i>	25 (22%)
	<i>At least once a week</i>	48 (41%)
	<i>Less than once a week</i>	43 (37%)

Q3	Do you feel your personal officer has helped you?	
	<i>I still have not met him/her</i>	25 (21%)
	<i>Yes</i>	51 (44%)
	<i>No</i>	41 (35%)

Q4	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	
	<i>Yes</i>	58 (48%)
	<i>No</i>	28 (23%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	35 (29%)

Q5	Please answer the following questions about training plans, sentence plans or remand plans:				
		<i>Don't have a plan</i>	Yes	No	<i>Don't know</i>
	Were you involved in the development of your plan?	28 (24%)	44 (38%)	9 (8%)	36 (31%)
	Do you understand the targets that have been set in your plan?	28 (24%)	56 (48%)	7 (6%)	26 (22%)

Q6	Has your YOT worker been in touch since you arrived at this establishment?	
	<i>Yes</i>	95 (81%)
	<i>No</i>	23 (19%)

Q7	Do you know how to get in touch with your YOT worker?	
	<i>Yes</i>	69 (58%)
	<i>No</i>	50 (42%)

Q8	Please answer the following questions about your release:			
		Yes	No	Don't know
	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	43 (35%)	59 (48%)	20 (16%)
	Are you planning on going to school or college after release?	71 (59%)	29 (24%)	20 (17%)
	Do you have a job to go to on release?	29 (24%)	77 (63%)	16 (13%)

Q9	Do you know who to contact for help with any of the following problems, before your release? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Finding accommodation</i>	42 (37%)
	<i>Getting into school or college</i>	48 (42%)
	<i>Getting a job</i>	45 (39%)
	<i>Help with money/finances</i>	35 (30%)
	<i>Help with claiming benefits</i>	26 (23%)
	<i>Continuing health services</i>	20 (17%)
	<i>Opening a bank account</i>	30 (26%)
	<i>Avoiding bad relationships</i>	24 (21%)
	<i>I don't know who to contact</i>	51 (44%)

Q10	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>	28 (25%)
	<i>Getting into school or college</i>	38 (34%)
	<i>Getting a job</i>	59 (52%)
	<i>Money/finances</i>	53 (47%)
	<i>Claiming benefits</i>	32 (28%)
	<i>Continuing health services</i>	17 (15%)
	<i>Opening a bank account</i>	21 (19%)
	<i>Avoiding bad relationships</i>	21 (19%)
	<i>I won't have any problems</i>	32 (28%)

Q11	What is most likely to stop you offending in the future? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	26 (21%)
	<i>Nothing, it is up to me</i>	32 (26%)
	<i>Making new friends outside</i>	17 (14%)
	<i>Going back to live with my family</i>	25 (21%)
	<i>Getting a place of my own</i>	28 (23%)
	<i>Getting a job</i>	53 (44%)
	<i>Having a partner (girlfriend or boyfriend)</i>	36 (30%)
	<i>Staying off alcohol/drugs</i>	37 (31%)
	<i>Having a mentor (someone you can ask for advice)</i>	15 (12%)
	<i>Having a YOT worker or social worker that I get on with</i>	19 (16%)
	<i>Having children</i>	19 (16%)
	<i>Having something to do that isn't crime</i>	36 (30%)
	<i>This sentence</i>	33 (27%)
	<i>Getting into school/college</i>	34 (28%)
	<i>Talking about my offending behaviour with staff</i>	11 (9%)
	<i>Anything else</i>	10 (8%)

Q12	Do you want to stop offending?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	26 (21%)

Yes	88 (70%)
No	3 (2%)
Don't know.....	9 (7%)

Q13 Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you in this establishment, that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?

Not sentenced	26 (21%)
Yes	46 (38%)
No	49 (40%)

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



Survey responses from children and young people: HMYOI Ashfield 2011

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 Ashfield 2011	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Ashfield 2011	HMYOI Ashfield 2010
	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		135	809	135	127
SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU					
1.1	Are you 18 years of age?	13%	13%	13%	22%
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	10%	5%	10%	7%
1.3	Is English your first language?	83%	90%	83%	89%
1.4	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other category)?	50%	38%	50%	33%
1.5	Are you Muslim?	22%	18%	22%	7%
1.6	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	4%	5%	4%	5%
1.7	Do you have any children?	13%	14%	13%	11%
1.8	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	10%	10%	10%	10%
1.9	Have you ever been in local authority care?	31%	27%	31%	
SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE					
2.1	Are you sentenced?	80%	72%	80%	81%
2.2	Is your sentence 12 months or less?	34%	36%	34%	24%
2.3	Have you been in this establishment for one month or less?	19%	20%	19%	15%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	57%	52%	57%	52%
SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS					
For your most recent journey, either to or from court or between prisons, we want to know:					
3.1	Was the van clean?	46%	41%	46%	46%
3.2	Did you feel safe?	78%	81%	78%	84%
3.3	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or anyone of a different gender?	23%	24%	23%	27%
3.4	Did you spend more than four hours in the van?	16%	5%	16%	7%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:					
3.5	Were you offered a toilet break if you needed it?	14%	13%	14%	12%
3.6	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	28%	31%	28%	27%
3.7	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	47%	52%	47%	53%
3.8	Before you arrived here (either from court or another establishment), were you told that you would be coming to this establishment?	69%	76%	69%	81%
3.9	Before you arrived here (either from court or another establishment), were you given written information about coming to this establishment?	18%	8%	18%	4%

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

Key to tables

		HMYOI Ashfield 2011	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Ashfield 2011	HMYOI Ashfield 2010
	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		135	809	135	127
SECTION 4: YOUR FIRST FEW DAYS HERE					
4.1	Were you in reception for less than two hours?	82%	78%	82%	83%
4.2	When you were searched was this carried out in an understanding way?	85%	77%	85%	80%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	70%	66%	70%	71%
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?	58%	56%	58%	50%
4.4b	Loss of property?	19%	19%	19%	24%
4.4c	Housing problems?	19%	19%	19%	19%
4.4d	Needing protection from other young people?	23%	24%	23%	28%
4.4e	Letting family know where you are?	57%	60%	57%	66%
4.4f	Money worries?	18%	15%	18%	17%
4.4g	Feeling low/upset/needng someone to talk to?	36%	39%	36%	40%
4.4h	Health problems?	55%	57%	55%	62%
4.4i	Getting phone numbers?	52%	42%	52%	45%
4.5	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	76%	74%	76%	78%
When you first arrived, did you have problems with any of the following:					
4.5a	Not being able to smoke?	50%	47%	50%	44%
4.5b	Loss of property?	14%	16%	14%	17%
4.5c	Housing problems?	14%	16%	14%	13%
4.5d	Needing protection from other young people?	7%	10%	7%	4%
4.5e	Letting family know where you are?	21%	22%	21%	21%
4.5f	Money worries?	25%	19%	25%	15%
4.5g	Feeling low/upset/needng someone to talk to?	21%	17%	21%	15%
4.5h	Health problems?	13%	11%	13%	9%
4.5i	Getting phone numbers?	32%	31%	32%	28%
When you first arrived, were you given any of the following:					
4.6a	A reception pack?	66%	72%	66%	66%
4.6b	The opportunity to have a shower?	18%	40%	18%	22%
4.6c	Something to eat?	78%	79%	78%	85%
4.6d	A free phone call to friends/family?	62%	76%	62%	74%
4.6e	Information about the PIN telephone system?	51%	55%	51%	81%
4.6f	Information about feeling low/upset?	23%	32%	23%	30%
Within your first 24 hours, did you have access to the following people or services:					
4.7a	The chaplain or religious leader?	29%	47%	29%	30%
4.7b	A peer mentor, Listener or the Samaritans?	16%	22%	16%	19%
4.7c	Did you have access to the prison shop/canteen?	29%	13%	29%	30%

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

Key to tables

		HMYOI Ashfield 2011	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Ashfield 2011	HMYOI Ashfield 2010
	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		135	809	135	127
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a member of health care staff?	68%	71%	68%	66%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	74%	78%	74%	83%
4.10	For those who have been on an induction course: did it cover everything you needed to know about the establishment	68%	61%	68%	81%
SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT					
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	79%	69%	79%	76%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	51%	34%	51%	39%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	38%	15%	38%	42%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	55%	42%	55%	64%
5.5	Is it easy/very easy for you to attend religious services?	63%	54%	63%	73%
5.6a	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	63%	54%	63%	62%
5.6b	Can you speak to a religious leader in private if you want to?	65%	65%	65%	68%
5.7	Is there a member of staff you can turn to with a problem?	65%	63%	65%	80%
5.8	Do you feel that most of the staff here treat you with respect?	68%	61%	68%	69%
SECTION 6: HEALTH SERVICES					
6.1	Did you have a full health assessment the day after your arrival?	65%	61%	65%	57%
6.2	For those who have been to health care: do you think the overall quality is good/very good?	60%	61%	60%	74%
6.3a	Is it easy for you to see the doctor?	48%	52%	48%	68%
6.3b	Is it easy for you to see the nurse?	76%	73%	76%	83%
6.3c	Is it easy for you to see the dentist?	32%	32%	32%	41%
6.3d	Is it easy for you to see the optician?	23%	26%	23%	31%
6.3e	Is it easy for you to see the pharmacist?	23%	27%	23%	33%
6.4	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep it in your cell?	25%	34%	25%	22%
6.5a	Did you have any problems with alcohol when you first arrived?	17%	13%	17%	20%
6.5b	Have you received any help with any alcohol problems here?	8%	7%	8%	13%
6.6a	Did you have any problems with drugs when you first arrived?	36%	35%	36%	40%
6.6b	Do you have any problems with drugs now?	8%	9%	8%	9%
6.6c	Have you received any help with any drug problems here?	21%	20%	21%	30%
6.7	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs here?	18%	18%	18%	27%
6.8	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	35%	25%	35%	18%
6.9	If you feel you have emotional or mental health problems, are you being helped by anyone here?	43%	48%	43%	73%

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

Key to tables

		HMYOI Ashfield 2011	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Ashfield 2011	HMYOI Ashfield 2010
	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		135	809	135	127
SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS					
7.1	Do you know how to make an application?	81%	86%	81%	94%
7.2	Is it easy to make an application?	72%	76%	72%	84%
For those who have made an application:					
7.3a	Do you feel applications are sorted out fairly?	62%	68%	62%	66%
7.3b	Do you feel applications are sorted out promptly (within seven days)?	43%	65%	43%	60%
7.4	Do you know how to make a complaint?	78%	83%	78%	87%
7.5	Is it easy to make a complaint?	61%	63%	61%	64%
For those who have made a complaint:					
7.6a	Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	32%	34%	32%	31%
7.6b	Do you feel complaints are sorted out promptly (within seven days)?	29%	42%	29%	35%
7.7	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	18%	18%	18%	22%
Can you speak to the following people when you need to:					
7.8a	A peer mentor or Listener?	24%	32%	24%	40%
7.8b	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)	19%	28%	19%	35%
7.8c	An advocate (an outside person to help you)	43%	33%	43%	62%
SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE					
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	25%	28%	25%	25%
8.2	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	39%	48%	39%	46%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	53%	51%	53%	54%
8.4	Have you had a 'nicking' (adjudication) since you have been here?	56%	59%	56%	52%
8.5	Was the 'nicking' (adjudication) process explained clearly to you?	84%	82%	84%	83%
8.6	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	42%	37%	42%	25%
8.7	For those who had spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit: did the staff treat you well/very well	48%	49%	48%	63%

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

Key to tables

		HMYOI Ashfield 2011	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Ashfield 2011	HMYOI Ashfield 2010
	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		135	809	135	127
SECTION 9: SAFETY					
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	36%	32%	36%	21%
9.3	Has another young person or group of young people victimised (insulted or assaulted) you here?	28%	27%	28%	21%
If you have felt victimised by another young person/group of young people, did the incident involve:					
9.4a	Insulting remarks?	14%	16%	14%	14%
9.4b	Physical abuse?	9%	11%	9%	9%
9.4c	Sexual abuse?	0%	2%	0%	0%
9.4d	Racial or ethnic abuse?	4%	5%	4%	4%
9.4e	Your religious beliefs?	2%	3%	2%	1%
9.4f	Your disability?	1%	2%	1%	2%
9.4g	Drugs?	4%	3%	4%	4%
9.4h	Having your canteen/property taken?	8%	7%	8%	3%
9.4i	Because you were new here?	13%	9%	13%	3%
9.4j	Being from a different part of the country than others?	4%	6%	4%	6%
9.4k	Gang related issues?	5%	7%	5%	4%
9.4l	Your offence/crime?	3%	4%	3%	3%
9.6	Has a member of staff or group of staff victimised (insulted or assaulted) you here?	20%	27%	20%	31%
If you have felt victimised by a member of staff/group of staff members, did the incident involve:					
9.7a	Insulting remarks?	9%	17%	9%	23%
9.7b	Physical abuse?	2%	6%	2%	3%
9.7c	Sexual abuse?	1%	2%	1%	0%
9.7d	Racial or ethnic abuse?	5%	5%	5%	7%
9.7e	Your religious beliefs?	6%	2%	6%	5%
9.7f	Your disability?	1%	2%	1%	2%
9.7g	Drugs?	1%	3%	1%	5%
9.7h	Having your canteen/property taken?	3%	3%	3%	7%
9.7i	Because you were new here?	4%	5%	4%	4%
9.7j	Being from a different part of the country than others?	5%	4%	5%	4%
9.7k	Gang related issues?	0%	2%	0%	4%
9.7l	Your offence/crime?	1%	3%	1%	3%
9.9	If you were being victimised by another young person or a member of staff would you be able to tell anyone about it	56%	57%	56%	59%
9.10	If you did tell a member of staff that you were being victimised do you think it would be taken seriously?	28%	30%	28%	36%
9.11	Is shouting through the windows a problem here?	42%	43%	42%	40%
9.12	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	34%	36%	34%	44%

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

Key to tables

		HMYOI Ashfield 2011	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Ashfield 2011	HMYOI Ashfield 2010
	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		135	809	135	127
SECTION 10: ACTIVITIES					
10.1	Were you 14 or younger when you were last at school?	31%	39%	31%	41%
10.2a	Have you ever been excluded from school?	84%	89%	84%	85%
10.2b	Have you ever truanted from school?	70%	70%	70%	76%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:					
10.3a	Education?	88%	74%	88%	88%
10.3b	A job in this establishment?	15%	36%	15%	28%
10.3c	Vocational or skills training?	22%	20%	22%	28%
10.3d	Offending behaviour programmes?	30%	23%	30%	41%
For those who have taken part in the following activities while in this prison: do you think that they will help you when you leave prison?					
10.4a	Education?	66%	63%	66%	79%
10.4b	A job in this establishment?	41%	55%	41%	68%
10.4c	Vocational or skills training?	55%	52%	55%	74%
10.4d	Offending behaviour programmes?	46%	51%	46%	59%
10.5	Do you usually have association every day?	73%	66%	73%	76%
10.6	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	8%	11%	8%	9%
10.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	60%	42%	60%	77%
SECTION 11: KEEPING IN TOUCH WITH FAMILY AND FRIENDS					
11.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	79%	65%	79%	67%
11.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	47%	39%	47%	34%
11.3	Is it easy/very easy for your family and friends to visit you here?	32%	47%	32%	40%
11.4	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	27%	39%	27%	38%
11.5	Do your visits start on time?	40%	44%	40%	46%
11.6	Are you and your visitors treated well/very well by visits staff?	37%	50%	37%	46%
SECTION 12: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE					
For those who have met their personal officer:					
12.1	Did you meet your personal officer within the first week?	38%	51%	38%	61%
12.2	Do you see your personal officer at least once a week?	53%	59%	53%	64%
12.3	Do you feel your personal officer has helped you?	55%	56%	55%	50%
12.4	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	48%	48%	48%	62%
For those with a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan:					
12.5a	Were you involved in the development of your plan?	50%	55%	50%	63%
12.5b	Do you understand the targets set in your plan?	63%	68%	63%	77%
12.6	Has your YOT worker been in touch with you since your arrival here?	81%	84%	81%	92%
12.7	Do you know how to get in touch with your YOT worker?	58%	55%	58%	74%

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

Key to tables

		HMYOI Ashfield 2011	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Ashfield 2011	HMYOI Ashfield 2010
	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		135	809	135	127
Please answer the following about your preparation for release:					
12.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	35%	42%	35%	45%
12.8	Are you going to school or college on release?	59%	60%	59%	61%
12.8	Do you have a job to go to on release?	24%	19%	24%	21%
Do you know who to contact for help with the following in preparation for your release:					
12.9	Finding accommodation	37%	36%	37%	49%
12.9	Getting into school or college	42%	46%	42%	58%
12.9	Getting a job	39%	41%	39%	60%
12.9	Help with money/finances	30%	32%	30%	44%
12.9	Help with claiming benefits	23%	28%	23%	35%
12.9	Continuing health services	17%	21%	17%	29%
12.9	Opening a bank account	26%	29%	26%	40%
12.9	Avoiding bad relationships	21%	24%	21%	33%
Do you think you will have a problem with the following, when you are released:					
12.10	Finding accommodation?	25%	26%	25%	23%
12.10	Getting into school or college?	34%	28%	34%	20%
12.10	Getting a job?	52%	49%	52%	48%
12.10	Help with money/finances?	47%	40%	47%	47%
12.10	Help with claiming benefits?	28%	27%	28%	26%
12.10	Continuing health services?	15%	12%	15%	13%
12.10	Opening a bank account?	19%	18%	19%	14%
12.10	Avoiding bad relationships?	19%	20%	19%	22%
For those who were sentenced:					
12.12	Do you want to stop offending?	88%	90%	88%	98%
12.13	Have you done anything or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future	49%	43%	49%	50%

Children and Young People: Diversity Analysis



Diversity comparator (ethnicity/nationality/religion) HMYOI Ashfield 2011

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		Black and minority ethnic young people	White young people	Foreign nationals	British nationals	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		65	66	13	118	28	98
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	9%	11%			15%	8%
1.3	Is English your first language?	76%	89%	23%	90%	63%	88%
1.4	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?			45%	50%	90%	37%
1.5	Are you Muslim?	41%	5%	35%	21%		
1.6	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	0%	8%	16%	3%	0%	5%
1.9	Have you ever been in local authority care?	21%	42%	23%	33%	21%	35%
2.1	Are you sentenced?	81%	78%	69%	81%	93%	77%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	67%	48%	77%	54%	60%	54%
3.3	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or anyone of a different gender?	20%	26%	16%	23%	26%	23%
3.7	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	40%	55%	59%	47%	43%	50%
3.8	Before you arrived here, were you told that you would be coming to this establishment?	64%	74%	55%	70%	54%	73%
4.2	When you were searched was this carried out in an understanding way?	76%	92%	69%	86%	72%	88%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	59%	81%	84%	68%	57%	74%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a member of health care staff?	66%	69%	46%	71%	59%	70%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	75%	73%	59%	76%	63%	77%
4.10	Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the establishment?	67%	68%	66%	69%	52%	71%
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	81%	77%	76%	80%	79%	80%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	54%	50%	73%	49%	38%	55%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	45%	31%	35%	39%	29%	41%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	48%	59%	63%	53%	44%	58%
5.6a	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	66%	62%	66%	63%	71%	61%
5.7	Is there a member of staff you can turn to with a problem?	55%	74%	59%	67%	45%	71%
5.8	Do you feel that most of the staff here treat you with respect?	56%	80%	63%	68%	47%	73%
6.3a	Is it easy for you to see the doctor?	46%	51%	46%	48%	48%	48%
6.3b	Is it easy for you to see the nurse?	73%	80%	66%	78%	74%	79%
6.7	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs here?	15%	20%	19%	19%	26%	16%
6.8	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	28%	41%	27%	36%	37%	34%
7.2	Is it easy to make an application?	68%	74%	54%	73%	74%	69%
7.5	Is it easy to make a complaint?	57%	64%	58%	60%	63%	59%

Children and Young People: Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic young people	White young people	Foreign nationals	British nationals	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		65	66	13	118	28	98
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	24%	26%	37%	24%	41%	21%
8.2	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	31%	44%	54%	36%	34%	41%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	41%	67%	82%	51%	41%	57%
8.4	Have you had a 'nicking' (adjudication) since you have been here?	67%	46%	54%	57%	66%	54%
8.6	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	53%	31%	27%	44%	41%	41%
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	30%	40%	37%	35%	23%	39%
9.3	Has another young person or group of young people victimised (insulted or assaulted) you here?	23%	34%	41%	27%	19%	31%
If you have felt victimised by another young person/group of young people, did the incident involve:							
9.4d	Racial or ethnic abuse?	4%	4%	17%	2%	8%	2%
9.4e	Your religious beliefs?	4%	0%	0%	2%	8%	0%
9.6	Has a member of staff or group of staff victimised (insulted or assaulted) you here?	28%	13%	21%	20%	40%	15%
If you have felt victimised by a member of staff/group of staff, did the incident involve:							
9.5d	Racial or ethnic abuse?	9%	1%	0%	6%	16%	2%
9.5e	Your religious beliefs?	9%	3%	0%	7%	20%	2%
9.9	If you were being victimised by another young person or a member of staff would you be able to tell anyone about it?	52%	59%	55%	57%	55%	56%
9.10	If you did tell a member of staff that you were being victimised do you think it would be taken seriously?	23%	33%	8%	29%	19%	30%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:							
10.3a	Education?	87%	90%	63%	91%	81%	90%
10.3b	A job in this establishment?	15%	15%	8%	16%	23%	13%
10.3c	Vocational or skills training?	19%	27%	8%	24%	11%	27%
10.3d	Offending behaviour programmes?	25%	35%	46%	28%	27%	31%
10.5	Do you usually have association everyday?	71%	74%	63%	74%	64%	76%
10.6	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	7%	8%	8%	7%	8%	8%
10.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	67%	51%	46%	61%	65%	58%
11.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	80%	80%	54%	81%	69%	82%
11.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	55%	41%	37%	49%	68%	41%
11.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	22%	32%	37%	25%	16%	31%
12.3	Do you feel your personal officer has helped you?	49%	61%	67%	54%	42%	58%
12.4	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	48%	49%	63%	47%	44%	48%
12.5b	Do you understand the targets set in your plan?	68%	59%	71%	62%	56%	63%
12.6a	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	33%	36%	37%	36%	31%	36%
12.6b	Are you going to school or college on release?	64%	55%	63%	59%	67%	58%
12.14	Have you done anything or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?	50%	48%	74%	45%	29%	54%

Diversity Analysis - Disability



Key questions (disability analysis) HMYOI Ashfield 2011

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		12	115
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	7%	11%
1.3	Is English your first language?	82%	82%
1.4	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other category)?	41%	50%
1.5	Are you Muslim?	24%	22%
1.6	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	0%	4%
2.1	Are you sentenced?	76%	81%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	54%	56%
3.3	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or anyone of a different gender?	35%	23%
3.7	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	50%	49%
3.8	Before you arrived here, were you told that you would be coming to this establishment?	41%	72%
4.2	When you were searched was this carried out in an understanding way?	76%	86%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	59%	72%
4.4e	When you first arrived, did staff ask if you needed help or support with letting family know where you were?	46%	58%
4.4g	When you first arrived, did staff ask if you needed help or support with feeling low/upset/needing someone to talk to?	19%	38%
4.4h	When you first arrived, did staff ask if you needed help or support with health problems?	37%	56%
4.5	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	82%	76%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a member of health care staff?	50%	70%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	63%	74%
4.10	Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the establishment?	58%	69%
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	66%	81%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	58%	51%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	41%	38%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	46%	54%
5.6a	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	63%	64%
5.7	Is there a member of staff you can turn to with a problem?	71%	65%
5.8	Do you feel that most of the staff here treat you with respect?	92%	65%
6.3a	Is it easy for you to see the doctor?	41%	49%
6.3b	Is it easy for you to see the nurse?	92%	76%
6.4	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep it in your cell?	33%	22%
6.8	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	63%	32%
6.9	If you feel you have emotional or mental health problems, are you being helped by anyone here?	74%	36%

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		
7.2	Is it easy to make an application?	66%	73%
7.5	Is it easy to make a complaint?	63%	61%
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	17%	27%
8.4	Have you had a 'nicking' (adjudication) since you have been here?	59%	58%
8.6	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	50%	41%
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	66%	31%
9.3	Has another young person or group of young people victimised (insulted or assaulted) you here?	63%	24%
9.4f	Has another young person or group of young people victimised (insulted or assaulted) you because you have a disability?	8%	0%
9.6	Has a member of staff or group of staff victimised (insulted or assaulted) you here?	37%	19%
9.7f	Has a member of staff or group of staff victimised (insulted or assaulted) you because you have a disability?	8%	0%
9.9	If you were being victimised by another young person or a member of staff would you be able to tell anyone about it?	46%	56%
9.10	If you did tell a member of staff that you were being victimised do you think it would be taken seriously?	24%	28%
9.12	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	59%	30%
10.3a	Do you currently take part in education?	92%	88%
10.3b	Do you currently have a job in this establishment?	19%	15%
10.3c	Do you currently take part in vocational or skills training?	27%	23%
10.3d	Do you currently take part in offending behaviour programmes?	19%	32%
10.5	Do you usually have association every day?	59%	75%
10.6	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	17%	7%
10.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	54%	60%
11.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	92%	78%
12.3	If you have a personal officer, do you feel your personal officer has helped you?	58%	54%
12.5a	For those with a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan: were you involved in the development of your plan?	41%	50%
12.5b	For those with a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan: do you understand the targets set in your plan?	13%	66%
12.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	50%	33%