

Report on an unannounced inspection of

**HMP/YOI Feltham  
(Feltham A – children and  
young people)**

21 – 25 January 2013

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

### Glossary of terms

We try to make our reports as clear as possible, but if you find terms that you do not know, please see the Glossary of terms on our website at: [http://www.justice.gov.uk/downloads/about/hmipris/Glossary-for-web-rps\\_.pdf](http://www.justice.gov.uk/downloads/about/hmipris/Glossary-for-web-rps_.pdf)

Crown copyright 2013

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

# Contents

	<b>Introduction</b>	5
	<b>Fact page</b>	9
	<b>Healthy prison summary</b>	11
<b>1</b>	<b>Safety</b>	21
<hr/>		
<b>2</b>	<b>Respect</b>	35
<hr/>		
<b>3</b>	<b>Purposeful activity</b>	47
<hr/>		
<b>4</b>	<b>Resettlement</b>	53
<hr/>		
<b>5</b>	<b>Recommendations, housekeeping points and good practice</b>	61
<hr/>		
	<b>Appendices</b>	
<hr/>		
	I Inspection team	67
	II Establishment population profile	68
	III Summary of children and young people questionnaires and interviews	71



# Introduction

HMP/YOI Feltham is divided into two parts. 'Feltham A side' holds male children and young people, most of whom are 16 or 17 years of age – with a few a year younger or older. Feltham B holds young adult men aged 18 to 21. This inspection looked at Feltham A, the children and young people's side.

We had serious concerns about the safety of young people held at Feltham A. Many told us they were frightened at the time of the inspection, and that they had little confidence in staff to keep them safe. Gang-related graffiti was endemic. There was an average of almost two fights or assaults every day. Some of these were very serious and involved groups of young people in very violent, pre-meditated attacks on a single individual with a risk of very serious injury resulting.

Although the level of violent incidents remained much too high, some good work had actually reduced the number of fights and assaults by 10% in the 12 months before the inspection. An effective security department made good use of internally and externally generated intelligence to manage gang-related activity and keep apart young people who might be a risk to each other. The very good behaviour management group worked directly with young people involved in these incidents to address their behaviour, and supported wing staff in doing so. In CCTV recordings we viewed of some of the incidents, staff put themselves in harm's way to protect young people, and the force that was used to break up fights was proportionate and necessary.

Young people felt safer on their first night than at the previous inspection, although there was room for further improvement. Care of young people at risk of self-harm was good, and child protection arrangements were sound.

The use of disciplinary measures and sanctions were the least effective part of the establishment's response to the need to keep young people safe. Essentially adult measures were too slow and cumbersome for children and young people, and some staff told us persuasively that they wanted to be able to react more quickly and in smaller incremental steps to good or bad behaviour.

This worked successfully in the education department where behaviour had improved since the last inspection. An incentive scheme quickly acknowledged good work and behaviour, but this did not feed into reviews under the rewards and sanctions scheme. The Phoenix room in the education department worked successfully to reintegrate into education young people whose behaviour was a problem.

In contrast, while use of the adult segregation unit had reduced since the last inspection, it remained an unsuitable environment in for children and young people – living conditions were poor and the regime was very limited. Young people might be held in the segregation unit for up to 10 days and a few, on the basic regime, might then be confined to their cells for 22 hours a day for long periods after they returned to the wings. It was necessary to separate some young people for the protection of themselves or others, but children and young people should not be isolated for long periods for the purposes of punishment.

The overall environment and relationships were a crucial part of the 'dynamic security' necessary to keep children and young people safe. The residential units did not help with this

or foster self-respect and high expectations – they were shabby, graffiti was everywhere, and some areas needed a deep clean.

We observed generally good relationships between staff and young people and we were satisfied this was normally the case, although fewer young people said that staff treated them with respect than in comparable establishments, and those from black and minority ethnic groups and young Muslim people were particularly negative. The Zahid Mubarak Trust, established after the murder of Zahid Mubarak at Feltham in 2000, helped quality assure responses to complaints about discrimination. Overall, work on diversity and equality issues had improved since the last inspection.

The chaplaincy provided a good service and young people were positive about the support they received. Health care was reasonable. Meals were served much too early and there were very few opportunities for young people to eat together out of their cells. Young people complained to us, with some justification, that they were hungry.

The good and purposeful behaviour we saw in education reflected effective leadership, and the quality and outcomes of education, learning and skills provision had much improved since the last inspection – this needed to continue. Too many young people were excluded from the provision, which consequently operated below capacity.

The establishment-wide reducing reoffending strategy did not effectively assess or address the specific needs of children and young people, and offender management was not well coordinated. Young people told us they did not know who to ask for assistance with practical resettlement needs. Effective work by a range of community agencies and staff offset the practical effects of this, but their efforts needed to be better coordinated.

No young people left Feltham without an address to go to, although the establishment did not know if these arrangements were sustained. Out of 171 young people released in the previous year, 117 had a training, education or employment place arranged. The appointment of a social work team had improved support for children and young people who had been looked after by a local authority.

At our last inspection, the funding and support provided by the Mayor of London had led to promising work in the Heron Unit, where 'resettlement brokers' had helped ensure young people had access to sustainable accommodation and work, training or education on release. The funding had now ended and, although staff on the unit worked hard to maintain its resettlement focus, the loss of the resettlement brokers was a real setback and seemed at odds with the government's wider efforts to give greater priority to rehabilitation.

Some of the young people held at Feltham were among the most difficult to manage safely in the entire youth custody estate, and the levels of violence between some of them were very concerning. There are things that Feltham itself can do to make it a safer place, and this inspection identified some good practice it could build on. However, ultimately the causes and solutions to these levels of violence lie outside the establishment.

In the short term, the Youth Justice Board needs to work with the establishment and the other agencies involved to understand better, and then reduce, levels of violence and the likelihood that the young people held there will reoffend after their release. In the medium and longer term, the role of Feltham within the youth custody estate should be reviewed, the efforts and resources of all the bodies involved coordinated on a sustainable basis, and ministers should

consider the findings of this inspection as they plan the future of the youth custody estate as a whole.

Nick Hardwick  
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

May 2013





# Fact page

## Task of the establishment in relation to young people

To keep in custody young people aged 15 to 18 years who are deemed unsuitable for or do not warrant secure local authority accommodation (Feltham A). The establishment also holds young adults aged 18-21 years placed in custody by the courts (Feltham B).

## Establishment status

Public

## Region

Greater London

## Number held

181 (at unlock on 18 January 2013)

## Certified normal accommodation

240

## Operational capacity

240

## Date of last full inspection

July 2011

## Brief history

**The original** Feltham was built in 1854 as an industrial school and was taken over in 1910 by the Prison Commissioners as their second Borstal institution. The existing building opened as a Remand Centre in March 1988. The current HM Prison and Young Offender Institution Feltham was formed by the amalgamation of Ashford Remand Centre and Feltham Borstal in 1990/91.

The establishment is split into Feltham A, which holds young people (aged 15-18), and Feltham B, which holds young adults (aged 18-21); this report relates to Feltham A.

## Short description of residential units

Young adults and young people occupy separate residential units. There are currently eight units for young people, including Bittern as first night and induction unit. Each unit holds 30 young people. Almost all the cells are single occupation. All cells have integral sanitation and television.

Bittern	Induction
Dunlin	Normal location
Curlew	Normal location
Eagle	Normal location
Falcon	Normal location
Grebe	Normal location
Jay	Normal location
Heron	Resettlement unit
Ibis	Segregation unit

## Name of governor

Cathy Robinson

**Escort contractor**

Serco

**Health service commissioner and provider**

NHS Hounslow

Central North West London NHS Trust

**Learning and skills provider**

CFBT

**Independent Monitoring Board chair**

Marion Rider

# Healthy prison summary

## Introduction

---

HP1 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.

HP2 All inspections carried out by HM Inspectorate of Prisons contribute to the UK's response to its international obligations under the Optional Protocol to the UN Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (OPCAT). OPCAT requires that all places of detention are visited regularly by independent bodies – known as the National Preventive Mechanism (NPM) – which monitor the treatment of and conditions for detainees. HM Inspectorate of Prisons is one of several bodies making up the NPM in the UK.

HP3 All Inspectorate of Prisons reports carry a summary of the conditions and treatment of children and young people, based on the four tests of a healthy prison that were first introduced in this inspectorate's thematic review *Suicide is everyone's concern*, published in 1999. The criteria are:

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

HP4 Under each test, we make an assessment of outcomes for children and young people and therefore of the establishment's overall performance against the test. In some cases, this performance will be affected by matters outside the establishment's direct control, which need to be addressed by the National Offender Management Service.

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

There is no evidence that outcomes for children and young people are being adversely affected in any significant areas.

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

There is evidence of adverse outcomes for children and young people in only a small number of areas. For the majority, there are no significant concerns. Procedures to safeguard outcomes are in place.

- **outcomes for children and young people are not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.**

There is evidence that outcomes for children and young people are being adversely affected in many areas or particularly in those areas of greatest importance to their well-being. Problems/concerns, if left unattended, are likely to become areas of serious concern.

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

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

HP5 Our assessments might result in one of the following:

- **recommendations:** will require significant change and/or new or redirected resources, so are not immediately achievable, and will be checked for implementation at future inspections

- **housekeeping points:** achievable within a matter of days, or at most weeks, through the issue of instructions or changing routines

- **examples of good practice:** impressive practice that not only meets or exceeds our expectations, but could be followed by other similar establishments to achieve positive outcomes for prisoners.

## Safety

---

HP6 Some aspects of early days provision needed improvement and young people reported negatively about treatment on escort and in reception. Levels of self-harm were low and young people subject to ACCT (assessment, care in custody and teamwork) procedures to manage the risk of self-harm were well cared for. Child protection arrangements were sound. The number of fights and assaults between young people was very high and included some serious and extremely concerning incidents. While these situations were usually managed well, the risk of serious injury was ever present. The basic regime of the rewards and sanctions scheme was too restrictive and kept young people isolated for too long. Use of force was high but it was managed well. The segregation unit did not provide suitable treatment and conditions for young people. Outcomes for young people against this healthy prison test were not sufficiently good.

HP7 Young people told us they spent long periods of time at court before being transported to the prison. We were confident staff in the establishment did as much as they could to address this. Missing background information on young people arriving and late arrivals were not significant problems but, where they did occur, they were dealt with efficiently. Young people were more negative about their escort experience than young people at other establishments. In our survey, only 76% said they felt safe on the journey and all the cellular accommodation in one of the vans that we saw was covered in graffiti. The video link continued to be promoted as an alternative to court appearances.

- HP8 In our survey<sup>1</sup>, 58% of young people said that they were treated well in reception against the comparator of 68%, although the young people whom we observed there were treated respectfully. Routine strip-searching still took place on reception. This was unnecessary and intrusive and only 75% of young people said it was carried out respectfully. The reception process was efficient with an emphasis on moving young people to the first night unit promptly. Safety was not compromised for speed, and we saw staff ensure that young people returning from court who needed additional supervision because of gang affiliations, were returned to their wings only when it was safe to do so.
- HP9 The risk assessment and management documentation which we examined was generally completed properly, but in some cases the immediate concerns identified were not always followed through.
- HP10 In our survey, 76% of young people said that they had felt safe on their first night compared with 59% in 2011. However, on a number of occasions we observed a lack of engagement by officers on the first night centre. Young people on induction still spent time locked up during the core day, and there was no written material to reinforce what they were told during induction.
- HP11 The establishment was well represented at the local safeguarding children board. Although working relationships remained good, social services had not attended the equivalent internal forum since April 2012. Data collection and monitoring of safeguarding at internal meetings were good. Young people causing most concern were discussed at the weekly behaviour management group (BMG) meeting which was an effective forum for staff to manage and coordinate the care of these young people.
- HP12 Child protection referrals were managed well and the local authority responded appropriately when cases were referred to them. There was good oversight of child protection by senior managers and, in some cases, internal investigations were undertaken when the local authority and police had decided not to pursue the initial referral. The whistle-blowing strategy had been used effectively and, where warranted, disciplinary action had been taken following investigation.
- HP13 Too many young people said they did not feel safe. Bullying was evident and although the number of violent incidents had reduced since the previous inspection, it remained too high. The potential for violent incidents to result in serious injury was high and many involved groups of young people attacking a single boy. Most of the violent conflict took place between young people and the number of assaults on staff was relatively low.

---

<sup>1</sup> **Inspection methodology:** There are five key sources of evidence for inspection: observation; prisoner surveys; discussions with prisoners; discussions with staff and relevant third parties; and documentation. During inspections, we use a mixed-method approach to data gathering, applying both qualitative and quantitative methodologies. All findings and judgements are triangulated, which increases the validity of the data gathered. Survey results show the collective response (in percentages) from prisoners in the establishment being inspected compared with the collective response (in percentages) from respondents in all establishments of that type (the comparator figure). Where references to comparisons between these two sets of figures are made in the report, these relate to statistically significant differences only. Statistical significance is a way of estimating the likelihood that a difference between two samples indicates a real difference between the populations from which the samples are taken, rather than being due to chance. If a result is very unlikely to have arisen by chance, we say it is 'statistically significant'. The significance level is set at 0.05, which means that there is only a 5% chance that the difference in results is due to chance. (Adapted from Towl et al (eds), *Dictionary of Forensic Psychology*.)

- HP14 The behaviour management strategy had strong links with other relevant policies. Its application was monitored effectively by a senior governor through the BMG. The BMG was a small team of staff who were responsible for implementing the behaviour management strategy. They gathered data and closely monitored all violence related incidents. Members of the team were well integrated within the prison but worked closely with residential staff to support them in dealing with young people who were presenting problems. A case work approach had recently been introduced to manage and change unacceptable behaviour using individual support plans. There was some evidence that this approach was having an impact on reducing the number of violent incidents. Improvements in the behaviour of young people in education, visits and the gym had been identified. The collection of data relating to the number and nature of violent incidents was better than we usually see and monitoring arrangements were very good.
- HP15 The level of self-harm remained relatively low and most cases involved scratching. Care of young people at risk of self-harm was good. ACCT reviews were multidisciplinary and took place on time. The quality assurance of ACCT documents was effective and the standard of documentation was good.
- HP16 The rewards and sanctions scheme was used as part of a strategy to encourage responsible behaviour. There was reasonable differentiation between levels. The regime for young people on basic level was over restrictive and kept some young people isolated for long periods.
- HP17 The security department identified and dealt effectively with the more sophisticated and covert forms of bullying associated with gang activity. Information received from security information reports (SIRs), custodial history records and police reports was collated and used to inform a range of violence reduction interventions. The security committee operated effectively, with appropriate internal and external representation. Data were used well to inform intelligence-based risk management systems and security procedures were proportionate.
- HP18 The number of formal adjudications was high at just over 80 a month and the charges were appropriate. Most hearings were conducted fairly and punishments were consistent. Good use was made of the advocacy service to support young people during disciplinary hearings.
- HP19 The total number of recorded uses of force was high and included many single incidents involving several young people. Most uses of force did not involve full control techniques. Documentation was completed correctly and written accounts from officers confirmed that force was used as a last resort. In most cases, young people were well debriefed following restraint. Members of staff sometimes put themselves at risk to protect young people during violent incidents. On two occasions, batons had inappropriately been drawn by staff working with young adults when young people were present.
- HP20 Use of the segregation unit had reduced since the last inspection but the number of young people located there remained too high. Conditions on the unit were poor. The cells were dirty with graffiti on walls and scratches on windows. Staff dealt with young people respectfully but the regime was poor and young people spent most of the day alone in their cells with little of value to do.

HP21 Only a few young people had serious alcohol or drug problems and they received appropriate support from specialist staff. There was little support for young people with less serious problems. Mandatory drug testing results indicated very limited availability of illegal drugs.

## Respect

---

HP22 Residential units were in poor condition and cells were covered in gang-related graffiti. Relationships between staff and young people were mostly good. Diversity had improved. Young people did not have confidence in the complaints system. The chaplaincy provided a popular, comprehensive service and the contribution of health care staff was reasonable. Young people did not like the food and said they were hungry. Outcomes for young people against this healthy prison test were reasonably good.

HP23 The residential units were shabby, some areas required deep cleaning and gang-related graffiti in cells was endemic. Despite recent refurbishment, the condition of many of the showers was poor. Laundry arrangements were good and young people on remand could wear their own clothes. Emergency cell bells were answered promptly. Young people had good access to telephones and the mail service was efficient.

HP24 In our survey, only 59% of young people said that most staff treated them respectfully. We saw mainly positive interactions, with a small number of exceptions. The introduction of unit focus groups was a welcome development. Not all young people saw their personal officer within a week of arrival. Personal officer entries on P-Nomis (electronic case notes) were balanced but too infrequent.

HP25 There was no overarching local equality strategy. Equality impact assessments were used constructively. Discrimination incidents were investigated reasonably well and there was good independent scrutiny. Young people were not involved enough in developing equality work and there were no young people representatives.

HP26 In our survey, black and minority ethnic young people reported much more negatively than white young people across a range of areas. In particular, only 53% said that staff treated them with respect, compared to 93% of white young people. Only 45% of Muslim young people said they were treated respectfully against 71% of non-Muslim young people. Ethnic monitoring data were scrutinised regularly but more work was needed to address areas which were consistently out of range.

HP27 The UK Border Agency attended the establishment each week to update young people about their immigration cases, but independent advice was not regularly available.

HP28 There were effective systems for identifying young people with a disability and good work was carried out with young people with a learning difficulty, although there were no multidisciplinary care plans to support them. Travellers were well supported but little support was available for gay and bisexual young people.

- HP29 The chaplaincy was well integrated into the regime and offered a wide range of services and classes. Young people in our survey and discussion groups reported extremely positively about the help they received from the chaplaincy.
- HP30 In our survey, 42% of young people said it was easy to make a complaint against the comparator of 59% and only 22% of young people felt complaints were sorted out fairly or quickly enough. We found that responses to complaints were generally polite and focused, although further investigations should have been carried out in a few cases.
- HP31 Young people had their legal rights explained to them on induction and they were helped by their offender supervisors to contact their legal representatives and to make free telephone calls. There was no written information about the nature of a young person's sentence or their entitlements on remand.
- HP32 The management of health care was in a state of flux which was affecting the retention of staff and delivery of services. Despite this, the quality of health care was reasonably good. Governance arrangements were good and there was clear evidence of clinical audit. Some clinical areas were not compliant with infection control requirements, including the decontamination area of the dental suite.
- HP33 Despite negative survey findings, we found that young people were offered prompt appointments with the nurse or GP, although the availability of escort staff made it more difficult to see the GP at weekends. Health clinics were well established and there was evidence of health promotion, although this was not always age appropriate. All young people had good access to sexual health services and to a speech and language therapist.
- HP34 The pharmacy service was adequate and the management of medicines generally sound, although nurses were only able to administer a narrow range of medication without a prescription from a doctor. There were long waiting lists for the optician and the dentist, but the quality of these services was good.
- HP35 Mental health services were generally good and young people needing treatment at NHS mental health units were transferred promptly. Health care staff no longer provided anger management training for young people or mental health awareness training for staff.
- HP36 Young people and dieticians were consulted about the menu. In our survey, only 16% of young people said the food was good. The breakfast packs were inadequate, lunch and evening meals were served too early and young people told us they were consistently hungry. There were some opportunities for young people on Heron unit to eat together.

## Purposeful activity

---

- HP37 Most young people had limited time unlocked and a few received very little time out of their cell. Young people benefitted from an improving education and training service and accreditation had improved significantly. About 15% of young people did not attend education for disciplinary reasons and provision for them was inadequate.



Access to the gym and library was good. Despite our concerns about time out of cell, outcomes for young people against this healthy prison test were reasonably good.

- HP38 Young people had less time unlocked than at the previous inspection. Time out of cell averaged about six hours a day for most young people, but for a few subject to the most severe restrictions, this could be less than two hours a day. During the checks that we carried out, most young people were engaged in some form of activity out of their cell, but during one morning check we found over a quarter of young people locked up. In our survey, 84% of young people said they had association every day against the comparator of 69%, but only 42% of young people said they had outside exercise each day.
- HP39 Levels of accreditation had improved significantly since the previous inspection and the behaviour of young people was now good. Approximately 15% of young people did not attend education or training, as a result of disciplinary measures, and they did not receive enough input from the education department. The standard of teaching and learning remained variable but it was now at least satisfactory. The curriculum was well planned and in the early stages of implementation.
- HP40 There was good support in the Phoenix room for vulnerable young people. The incentive scheme worked well in education and there was scope for it to be linked to the rewards and sanctions scheme. The reflective learning programme was an effective way of reintegrating into education young people who had been excluded from class, and there was scope for it to be extended to young people involved in wing-based conflict.
- HP41 Young people had good access to high quality PE, but PE was not available in the evenings.
- HP42 The library was a good, well managed resource.

## Resettlement

---

- HP43 The Feltham-wide reducing reoffending strategy did not give sufficient emphasis to the needs of children and young people, and their sentence and remand plans were not fully coordinated by the offender management unit. Resettlement pathway work was well organised. Staff made good attempts to help young people obtain decent accommodation and education, training and employment (ETE) placements on release, particularly on the Heron unit. Young people had the opportunity to participate in a range of interventions, but these were not evaluated. Outcomes for young people against this healthy prison test were reasonably good.
- HP44 The reducing reoffending strategy was designed to cover both Feltham A and Feltham B and did not properly address the distinctive needs of children and young people. Initial assessments were not carried out effectively, and consequently sentence plans were not well developed and resources were not allocated according to need. The offender management unit was not operating effectively and needed to be re-established at the centre of sentence and remand planning.
- HP45 Practical resettlement needs were assessed early and there were good links with appropriate community agencies to help young people make the transition to the

community. However, in our survey, significantly fewer young people than the comparator said that they knew where to get help with a range of practical problems prior to release.

- HP46 Initial resettlement outcomes for young people on the unit were good, but external funding for the Heron unit had ceased and although separate funding was no longer available, staff working there had maintained links with community agencies and potential employers. It was more difficult to maintain these outcomes in the community in the absence of the resettlement brokers whose role had been to support young people through their time in custody and back into the community.
- HP47 Overall, opportunities for release on temporary licence were inadequate.
- HP48 In our survey, 30% of young people said they had a sentence or remand plan and 86% that they understood the targets set against respective comparators of 54% and 96%. Review meetings were timely and reviews that we observed were appropriately child focused and complex issues were dealt with sensitively. Offender supervisors had good links with the BMG but coordination with other departments needed improvement. Offender supervisors had a good understanding of young people's needs, but this was not always reflected in the documentation. Completion of the recently introduced training planning documentation was unsatisfactory.
- HP49 Public protection was well managed. All young people meeting the relevant criteria were identified and restrictions on contact and the monitoring of letters and telephone calls were properly assessed and regularly reviewed. Decisions on public protection cases were defensible and proportionate.
- HP50 There were good systems in place to identify young people with looked-after status. The establishment social workers worked effectively with local authorities to ensure that looked- after young people received their entitlements.
- HP51 Accommodation needs were identified early in the young person's sentence and significant efforts were made to find accommodation for all young people who were not returning home. In the previous 12 months, no young people had left the establishment without a named address.
- HP52 Information, advice and guidance to young people were effective. Over the previous year, 171 young people had been discharged, 117 of whom had had ETE places organised in advance. Young people on the Heron unit accounted for a significant proportion of these successful outcomes.
- HP53 Pre-release preparation of young people was good and there was effective communication between health care staff and relevant community services. Suitable arrangements were in place to ensure that young people needing it received continuing support with drug and alcohol problems. Young people received help to manage their money and deal with debt.
- HP54 Most young people at Feltham were less than 50 miles from home. In our survey, 38% of young people said it was easy for friends and family to visit. The visitors' centre was an excellent resource and visits facilities were adequate. In our survey, only 26% of young people said that visits started on time, against the comparator of 49%. 'A time for families – Building Bridges' course was run regularly and involved young people working with their families to strengthen relationships.

HP55 Community organisations delivered a range of interventions to young people, although there was no formal evaluation. There were no offending behaviour programmes, which was an omission.

## Main concerns and recommendations

---

HP56 Concern: Despite some effective work, too many young people told us they did not feel safe at the time of the inspection and more than the comparator feared victimisation because of gang related issues. The level of fights and assaults had reduced over the previous 12 months but remained very high. Some of these incidents were extremely serious. There was a corresponding high level of use of force by staff. Only one in five of young people told us they would tell a member of staff if they were being victimised by other young people.

**Recommendation: The Youth Justice Board should work with the establishment to develop and implement an effective and comprehensive strategy to understand and reduce high levels of violence among young people at Feltham, building on existing good practice where appropriate, so that young people held there are safe and feel confident to report their concerns.**

HP57 Concern: The living conditions and treatment in the segregation unit did not meet the basic requirements of young people who needed to be separated. Children and young people who served a punishment in the segregation unit followed by a period on the basic regime with very little time out of cell were isolated for too long.

**Recommendation: Children and young people should not be held in the segregation unit. Those who need to be separated for their own or others' safety should experience a full regime and intensive intervention to address their behaviour in a suitable setting.**

HP58 Concern: The establishment's reducing reoffending strategy did not assess or address the needs of children and young people and offender management was not central to the work of the establishment. Young people told us they did not know who to ask for assistance with practical resettlement needs. A range of community agencies carried out good work but their efforts were not effectively linked to the needs of individual young people. The loss of external funding raised concerns about the sustainability of the positive work done by the Heron Unit.

**Recommendation: The YJB and NOMS should work with the establishment to develop and implement an effective children and young people reducing reoffending strategy for Feltham, coordinating this with other relevant agencies.**



# Section 1: Safety

## Courts, escorts and transfers

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.1 A quarter of young people said they did not feel safe on their journey to Feltham, and some arrived late following a wait at court after their case had been dealt with. Young people were sometimes transported with adult prisoners. One van contained graffiti in each of the cubicles.
- 1.2 In our survey, a quarter of young people said they did not feel safe during their journey to Feltham and over half said they had travelled with adults or female prisoners. One van which arrived during the inspection had held one young person and four female prisoners who had been taken to their prison first after being collected from different courts. Twenty-one per cent of young people said they had been offered food or drink during the journey against the comparator of 38%. The vans that we inspected had drinking water. One had a lot of graffiti in each of the cubicles.
- 1.3 In the last three months of 2012, 10% of young people had arrived after 8pm, with the latest arrival at 10.50pm. This was consistent with what young people told us in our discussion groups. Some young people arrived late because they had waited for long periods at court after their case had been completed, and there was evidence that the establishment had raised complaints with the contractors. Good use was made of the establishment video conference facilities but an average of 160 young people were discharged to court each month.

### Recommendations

---

- 1.4 Young people should not be transported with adult prisoners.
- 1.5 Young people should not be held in court cells for unnecessarily long periods.

## Early days in custody

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.6 Reception procedures were carried out efficiently, but only 58% of young people said they had been treated well and all were routinely strip-searched. First night interviews took place in

private and more young people than previously said they had felt safe on their first night. Only about half the young people said that the induction programme told them all they needed to know.

- 1.7 In our survey, 58% of young people said they had been treated well in reception against the comparator of 68%. All young people were routinely strip-searched on arrival and fewer than at comparator establishments said their search was carried out in a respectful way.
- 1.8 Over the previous three months, an average of 150 young people had arrived at reception each month. They were seen individually at a reception desk in a busy area. We observed staff reassuring young people, checking how they were feeling, and asking about gang affiliations and if they were worried about meeting particular young people. One young person was quietly advised not to talk about the nature of his alleged offence. Not all young people arrived with the necessary background information, but there were procedures to follow this up and young people were placed on enhanced baseline supervision until the information was received. Proper attention was paid to the safety of young people, and reception staff made sure that young people returning from court could move safely around the establishment.
- 1.9 The reception area was clean but the toilets were dirty and needed deep cleaning. The larger holding rooms had televisions and information on the walls, but the smaller holding rooms only had seating. Health care staff carried out their initial screening of young people in a private room. Young people were offered hot food when they arrived, and we saw one young person being encouraged to eat before he went to the first night unit.
- 1.10 First night procedures were carried out on Bittern unit where young people had an interview in private with a first night officer. A first night officer was on duty all night to interview late arrivals and ensure continuity of care. The initial risk assessment and management form was completed during this interview using the young person's answers and information provided electronically. There was a lack of consistency in the use of trigger factors to develop the risk management plan. In our survey, 34% of young people said they had had a shower on their first night, against the comparator of 48% and 11% at the previous inspection. Seventy-six per cent of young people said they felt safe on their first night against 59% at the previous inspection.
- 1.11 Cell-sharing risk assessments were completed, but young people did not share on their first night. Peer mentors visited the first night unit when young people arrived but were not routinely present for association each day. Young people could make a free telephone call on arrival. A basic grocery pack was provided but some young people said they did not realise it had to last until they received their first canteen order. Cells on the first night unit were clean, but many toilets required a deep clean and graffiti was a repeated problem. Cells were equipped with clean bedding and basic hygiene products.
- 1.12 Induction started on the day after arrival and lasted five days. There was little written information and young people told us that they found it difficult to remember what they were told about key issues such as arranging visiting orders. In our survey, 55% of young people against a comparator of 65% said induction covered everything they needed to know. Young people told us that they were not fully occupied during induction and there were times when they were locked up during the day. We saw two young people returning to their cells before 9.30am one day, having completed their education assessments. Young people's views on induction were not captured to inform changes to the process. Young people had evening association which had not been available at the time of the previous inspection. We observed them mixing well together but we did not see staff interacting with young people or getting involved in any of the activities.

## Recommendations

---

- 1.13 Young people's negative views of their treatment on reception should be explored and addressed.
- 1.14 Young people should be involved in making the induction programme more useful to them.

## Housekeeping points

---

- 1.15 Peer mentors should be available to young people on Bittern each day.
- 1.16 Risk management plans should address all identified triggers for each young person.

# Care and protection of children and young people

---

## Safeguarding

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.17 There was a comprehensive safeguarding strategy and close links with the local authority. Analysis of safeguarding data was effective and the management of young people causing particular concern was discussed and actions agreed at an effective weekly meeting.
- 1.18 The safeguarding strategy was agreed by the local safeguarding children board (LSCB) following annual reviews. The head of safeguarding attended main meetings and a subgroup of the Board. The safeguarding strategy was integrated with associated policies. All staff new to the establishment received training in safeguarding and child protection delivered by the head of safeguarding and the child protection coordinator. All staff who worked with young people were scheduled to attend the new 'Working with young people' training developed by the National Offender Management Service.
- 1.19 The governor chaired a quarterly safeguarding meeting at which a range of safeguarding data and other safeguarding issues were discussed. Staff from key areas of the establishment attended, but the local authority had not been represented for nine months. The chair of the LSCB and the local authority designated officer (LADO) had visited the establishment in August 2012 to carry out the annual review of restraint.
- 1.20 Safer custody meetings took place monthly, chaired by the deputy governor, and were well attended. Separate data for young people and young adults were presented to enable informed discussions to take place.
- 1.21 The weekly meeting facilitated by the behaviour management group (BMG) (see paragraph 1.42) was an effective forum for discussing young people of particular concern and agreeing actions. Staff attended from all areas contributing to the management and care of young people. Young people did not attend but were seen individually after the meeting to talk

through what had been discussed and agreed. Individual support plans were used as the basis of care plans for these young people, which were an effective tool.

## Recommendation

---

- 1.22 The governor in conjunction with the local authority should ensure the local authority is represented regularly at safeguarding meetings.

## Child protection

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.23 There was a clear, up-to-date child protection policy and referrals were dealt with efficiently by the child protection coordinator. There was good support from the local authority and local police and rigorous internal oversight of referrals by senior managers.
- 1.24 The child protection policy had been implemented in May 2012. It was reviewed annually and ratified by the LSCB.
- 1.25 There had been 33 child protection referrals during 2012 from Feltham A. Referrals came from a range of sources, including young people, advocates and members of staff with concerns about colleagues or escort, police or court staff. Referrals were managed efficiently and good records were kept. All complaints about staff or the use of restraint were referred to the local authority and local police child abuse investigation team. Responses were prompt, and some young people had been interviewed by a police officer following the initial referral. There had been no strategy meetings since the previous inspection and none of the referrals completed in 2012 had been pursued by the external agencies.
- 1.26 If the local authority and police took no further action, consideration was given in consultation with the deputy governor to an internal investigation. Internal investigations since the previous inspection had led to disciplinary action against members of staff. The governor reviewed child protection referrals each month and signed off any that had been completed. Records were subject to additional scrutiny by the deputy director of custody for London and the LADO. Child protection referrals were a standing agenda item at the quarterly safeguarding meeting.

## Victims of bullying and intimidation

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.27 Procedures to support victims of bullying and intimidation had improved, but survey results indicated that young people did not have the confidence to report incidents to staff.



- 1.28 Systems for identifying bullying and its victims had improved, and information-sharing arrangements among departments, usually through the BMG, were very good. Less formal communication, particularly between residential managers, education staff and the security department, also helped to identify incidents of bullying that had not been reported through channels such as security information reports. We observed good supervision on wings, with officers regularly patrolling landings and association areas when young people were unlocked. Staff took appropriate action to deal with potential incidents.
- 1.29 Residential staff regularly identified bullying which they recorded in wing observation books and electronic history files. These were followed up by officers from the BMG.
- 1.30 Formal support for victims of bullying was less well developed. We were told that individual support plans were raised for identified victims of bullying but there was little evidence of this. In our survey, 31% of young people told us they had been victimised by a member of staff. This was significantly higher than the 22% comparator. Seven per cent of young people told us they had been victimised by other young people because of gang-related issues. This was significantly higher than the 3% comparator.
- 1.31 The quality of investigations into alleged incidents of bullying was good, but it was not clear if young people always had the confidence to report incidents to staff. In our survey, only 20% of young people said they would tell a member of staff if they felt intimidated and 20% that they thought staff would take their complaint seriously against respective comparators of 31% and 32% (see main recommendation HP56).

## Recommendation

---

- 1.32 Support plans should be developed and used to help victims of bullying.

## Suicide and self-harm prevention

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.33 Oversight of suicide and self-harm prevention work, and the management of young people identified as being at risk of self-harm, were effective. Levels of self-harm were consistent with those in 2011 and none had been of a serious nature. Day-to-day care of young people on ACCTs (assessment, care in custody and teamwork) was good.
- 1.34 Suicide and self-harm prevention was managed by the safeguarding team. A suicide prevention coordinator advised staff how to support young people thought to be at risk of self-harm. He undertook thorough quality checks of ACCT documents and highlighted areas for improvement.
- 1.35 There was no local policy on the care of young people at risk and staff followed the appropriate Prison Service Instruction, which had been designed for use by adult prisoners. Staff had previously received regular refresher training but this was no longer a requirement and was to be provided when a training need was identified.

- 1.36 The nature and extent of self-harm was monitored by the safeguarding committee and the monthly safer custody meeting, with data provided by the suicide prevention coordinator to inform discussion of patterns or trends. There had been 47 incidents of self-harm in 2012 and 102 ACCTs had been opened in the same period, similar levels to 2011. Scratching was the most common form of self-harm. No young people had required outside hospital treatment following self-harm since the previous inspection. Two young people had been given anti-ligature clothing and their clothes had been returned within hours when it was deemed safe to do so.
- 1.37 Information about young people on open ACCTs was included in the daily briefing. Dates and times of reviews were published two days in advance. The establishment had placed emphasis on the need for multidisciplinary reviews and records showed that the number of reviews involving a range of staff had increased.
- 1.38 Staff had electronic access to a list of on-site trained ACCT assessors, and trained senior officers undertook the role of case manager. ACCT reviews took place on time and records of reviews were thorough. ACCT documents were completed fully and observation logs indicated meaningful interaction with young people. Young people were offered a copy of their care map, although few opted to have one. A small number of young people on ACCTs were subject to a restricted regime for other reasons, which limited their opportunity for out-of-cell activities; in survey comments and safety interviews, young people identified increased feelings of isolation and loneliness when they were locked in their cells.

## Recommendations

---

- 1.39 A local policy should be produced on the care of young people who are at risk.
- 1.40 Young people on ACCTs should have a regime which maximises time out of cell and keeps them engaged in constructive activity.

## Behaviour management

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.41 The comprehensive behaviour management strategy was integrated effectively with other relevant policies. Its application was monitored effectively by a senior governor.
- 1.42 The behaviour management strategy was comprehensive and linked to other relevant policies, such as violence reduction, adjudication, segregation and the rewards and sanctions scheme. The implementation of the strategy was the responsibility of the effective BMG, which was a small team of specialist staff reporting to the head of young people. The BMG was responsible for implementing the behaviour management strategy. They gathered good quality data and closely monitored all violence related incidents. Members of the team were well integrated within the prison and worked closely with residential staff, security, education and safeguarding to support them in dealing with young people who were presenting problems.

- 1.43 The organisational procedures for managing the behaviour of young people were good and had developed since the previous inspection. A case work approach to managing and changing unacceptable behaviour through individual support plans had recently been introduced by the BMG.
- 1.44 There was evidence that young people understood the expected standard of behaviour, and local rules and routines were displayed throughout residential and communal areas. Rules and routines appeared proportionate and were, on the whole, applied fairly. However, we found some use of over-restrictive measures, such as the basic regime, and high use of segregation (see sections on segregation and rewards and sanctions).
- 1.45 Young people were consulted about the fairness of the behaviour management procedures through group forums and one-to-one interviews, but there was little evidence that their views were taken seriously.

## Rewards and sanctions

---

### Expected outcomes:

**Children and young people are motivated by an incentives scheme which rewards effort and good behaviour and applies sanctions appropriately for poor behaviour. The scheme is applied fairly, transparently and consistently, and is motivational.**

- 1.46 There was evidence that the rewards and sanctions scheme was being used to encourage responsible behaviour. There was a reasonable difference between the levels but the regime for young people on basic level was too restrictive and meant they spent most of the day locked in their cells.
- 1.47 The rewards and sanction scheme policy described the three incentive levels, enhanced, standard and basic, how young people could progress, and the standard of behaviour that was expected of them. New arrivals were placed on standard level unless they had earned enhanced status at a previous establishment. The scheme offered differentials in access to private cash, computer games, visits and time out of cell. The scheme was used strategically to support behaviour management protocols and there was evidence that it had begun to encourage responsible behaviour (see section on violence reduction).
- 1.48 Young people were considered for immediate demotion to basic level following single acts of violence or alleged bullying following an investigation. The regime for young people on basic level was too restrictive with curtailment of visits and time out of cell, exclusion from attendance at education and no access to evening association. A few young people on basic would be confined to their cell for 22 hours a day. Weekly incentives and earned privileges case reviews were well attended by staff who knew the young person. Many young people spent too long on the basic level of the scheme and staff told us persuasively that they wanted to be able to react more quickly and in smaller incremental steps to young people's good and bad behaviour.

## Recommendation

---

- 1.49 **The regime for young people on basic level of the rewards and sanctions scheme should be improved and not lead to young people being effectively isolated for long periods.**

## Security and disciplinary procedures

---

### Expected outcomes:

Security and good order are maintained through an attention to physical and procedural matters, including effective security intelligence as well as positive relationships between staff and children and young people. Disciplinary procedures are applied fairly and for good reason. Children and young people understand why they are being disciplined and can appeal against any sanctions imposed on them.

- 1.50 The flow of information into the security department was good and the large number of security information reports (SIRs) were processed quickly. There were strong links with local police and a good exchange of information on gang activity. Dynamic security arrangements were sound. There was good use of information to develop intelligence-based risk management systems and, on the whole, security procedures were proportionate. The number of formal adjudications was high but most records of hearings showed that they were conducted fairly and that punishment was consistent. Good use was made of advocacy services.
- 1.51 Procedural security was managed well and security committee meetings were well attended by appropriate staff representatives. The standing agenda was comprehensive and included a thorough analysis of SIRs. Monthly security objectives were agreed through appropriate consideration of intelligence. Reports from other areas, such as residential areas, the use of force coordinator and the BMG, were discussed.
- 1.52 Staff engagement with young people was reasonable and small residential units helped officers to become familiar with young people's personal circumstances which underpinned important elements of dynamic security. The security department received more than 500 SIRs each month which were processed and categorised and intelligence communicated to other areas of the establishment, particularly the behaviour management and safeguarding committee, to enable them to make informed decisions about young people or to take necessary action (see section on violence reduction).
- 1.53 Risk assessment and management systems were effective and included the use of information about the young person's recent behaviour in custody and historic data.
- 1.54 Close links had been established with the local police, particularly in dealing with gang related issues. Police intelligence officers provided information about incoming young people to help inform and develop strategies. The security department had become increasingly effective at identifying young people who needed to be kept apart, usually as a result of external gang activity. The 'known conflict' list developed to manage young people with gang affiliations was accessible to all relevant staff and could be updated quickly, usually by security or the BMG which were well integrated. The allocations department used this to inform decisions about safe access for young people around the establishment.
- 1.55 The BMG interviewed all new arrivals to help to identify gang or other custodial violence issues so that safe allocation to one of the residential units could be made.
- 1.56 Drug availability remained low and, in our survey, 13% of young people said it was easy to get illegal drugs against the comparator of 20%. Since April 2012, only one young person had tested positive under random mandatory drug testing (MDT) (1.2%) and one other under suspicion drug testing. Both results were for cannabis. MDT procedures did not involve strip-

searching, officers had received child protection training, and young people applying for release on temporary licence were risk assessed before testing. Security procedures were appropriate and drug finds consisted of small amounts of cannabis and tobacco. Good intelligence was available and supply reduction was discussed at monthly security meetings.

- 1.57 The number of governor's adjudications remained high at about 80 a month, many of which derived from the high number of reported fights and assaults (see section on behaviour management). Young people were given written information before adjudication which explained what to expect from the process, and staff checked that they understood it. Good use was made of The Voice advocacy services and there was evidence that young people were encouraged to use it.
- 1.58 The adjudication room in the segregation unit was small, but well decorated. Most records of hearings that we examined showed that they were conducted fairly and that punishment tariffs were used consistently and appropriately; we saw nothing to indicate that young people were not given the opportunity to put across their version of events fully.
- 1.59 Monthly statistics on the number and nature of adjudications were presented to the senior management team, the BMG and the safeguarding committee. Results of proven offences were recorded, categorised and communicated to managers to identify and address trends.
- 1.60 Adjudication standardisation meetings took place quarterly and were usually chaired by the governor. There was no use of a minor reports system.

## **Bullying and violence reduction**

---

### **Expected outcomes:**

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

- 1.61 The collection of data on the number and nature of violent incidents was better than we see at other establishments, and monitoring of outcomes to deal with poor behaviour was also good. There had been a reduction in the number of fights and assaults in the previous year, although the number of violent incidents remained very high and bullying was evident. Some incidents were very serious and involved groups of young people attacking a single young person.
- 1.62 The violence reduction strategy was clear and policies and procedures to deal with antisocial behaviour were well publicised. These policies, including anti-bullying, restraint minimisation, gang recognition, mediation and behaviour intervention, were coordinated by the BMG based on Dunlin unit (see paragraph 1.42).
- 1.63 The collection of data on the number and nature of violent incidents was better than we see at other establishments and monitoring of the implementation of protocols to deal with poor behaviour was also good.
- 1.64 Work with young people on antisocial behaviour was organised by the BMG through individual support plans (ISPs), which was an improvement over the previous inspection and a sensible way to coordinate a number of bespoke interventions, such as one-to-one work, anger management, conflict intervention, gang issues and victim awareness. The group provided wing staff with assessments and detailed plans, enabling them to engage in addressing problem behaviour.

- 1.65 Young people subject to ISPs were reviewed each week by an effective multidisciplinary group. However, information about the progress made by young people continued to be held in too many different places, such as wing files, observation books, individual unlock plans, and safe systems of work plans. This was confusing and hindered the coordination of the work.
- 1.66 There was evidence that this case work approach was beginning to drive down the number of violent incidents, for example there had been a 10% reduction in the number of fights and assaults in the 12 months prior to inspection and a reduction in the number of young people involved in separate acts of violence.
- 1.67 Nevertheless, the number of violent incidents remained too high and 300 acts of violence had been recorded by the establishment in the six months before our inspection. Some of these incidents were very serious and involved gangs of young people attacking a single young person. We watched CCTV recordings showing groups of young people kicking and punching each other. We also saw courageous efforts by prison officers to deal proportionately with these incidents (see section on use of force). In light of this, we were not surprised that in our survey 17% of young people told us they did not feel safe at the time of the inspection. This was significantly higher than the 8% comparator.
- 1.68 We were told by senior prison staff that these cases of extreme violence were no longer referred to the police because they were reluctant to pursue them.

## Recommendation

---

- 1.69 Cases of serious violence should always be reported to the police.

## The use of force

---

### Expected outcomes:

**Force is used only as a last resort and if applied is used legitimately and safely by trained staff. The use of force is minimised through preventive strategies and alternative approaches and this is monitored through robust governance arrangements.**

- 1.70 The total number of recorded uses of force was high but most cases did not involve full control techniques and there was evidence that de-escalation was used as a preferred response. Young person debriefing forms were completed in most cases, and were very good. Documentation that we examined was completed correctly, and written accounts by officers gave assurance that force was used as a last resort. There was evidence that staff had put themselves at personal risk to protect young people during violent incidents.
- 1.71 The number of incidents involving the use of force was high at 312 in the six months before our inspection. This number reflected the high number of violent incidents and included many single incidents involving a number of different young people (see section on violence reduction). Nearly 90% of incidents did not involve the use of full control and restraint techniques, which was an improvement since the previous inspection. In the last six months, batons had been drawn twice when children and young people were present. These incidents took place during fights in areas shared with young adults. Staff working with young adults drew their batons but did not use them.
- 1.72 Good monitoring arrangements had been put in place with excellent links to the BMG, the security committee, the senior management and safeguarding teams. Information on the

nature and location of the incident, the ethnicity and age of the young person was collated and presented for analysis each month. Incidents were discussed at the monthly security committee and at all safeguarding meetings. Security managers reviewed CCTV coverage of most spontaneous incidents and reported concerns to the head of young people and the BMG.

- 1.73 Spontaneous intervention was carried out particularly well and it was evident that staff focused on keeping young people safe during incidents. We saw examples where staff had put themselves at risk to protect vulnerable young people (see section on violence reduction).
- 1.74 Young people received a de-briefing from one of the behaviour management officers following an incident. The quality of the debriefs was very good and included a full account of the young person's feelings and understanding of the incident.

## Recommendation

---

- 1.75 **Batons should not be drawn when children and young people are involved in incidents with young adults.**

## Separation/removal from normal location

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.76 Conditions in the segregation unit were poor and the unit was not a suitable environment for young people. Use of segregation had reduced since the last inspection but it was still used too much and the regime was poor. Young people spent most of the day locked in their cells with little of interest to do. Staff engaged respectfully with young people.
- 1.77 The segregation unit (Ibis unit) was located in the young adult side of the establishment just off the main corridor leading to the residential units. The unit also accommodated young adults. Living conditions were poor. Corridors were narrow and cramped, and there was ingrained dirt on floors and walls. Cells were dirty with graffiti on walls and scratches on the plastic cell windows. Toilets were also dirty and ventilation was poor. Some effort had been made to brighten communal areas with paint but this did little to mitigate the generally poor environment (see main recommendation HP57).
- 1.78 The use of segregation for young people remained high but had declined since the previous inspection. During the period July to December 2012, we calculated 214 separate cases of young people being segregated, about 20% less than the previous inspection. The number of young people segregated awaiting adjudication had reduced but the number of those segregated as punishment following adjudication had increased slightly. The number of young people segregated for good order or discipline remained constant at 21.
- 1.79 At the time of the inspection, 11 young people were in segregation, of whom nine had been segregated as punishment and two for good order or discipline. The average length of stay was about seven days and young people were rarely segregated for more than 10 days.

- 1.80 Case reviews for young people in segregation were timely and well attended but planning for their return to normal location was underdeveloped. Care plans that we examined were superficial and did not adequately address behaviour.
- 1.81 We were told that segregated young people were allowed to attend education and activities off the unit subject to risk assessment, but we found no evidence that this ever happened. A basic daily activity programme included showers, a 30-minute exercise period, access to telephones and in-cell education if requested. Staff from the education department visited every weekday but rarely engaged with young people. We estimated that a young person fully engaged in activities that were offered could spend a maximum of two hours a day out of his cell.
- 1.82 Relationships between staff and young people were good and to some extent mitigated the poor environment. Officers dealt patiently and kindly with challenging young people.

## Recommendation

- 1.83 The number of young people in segregation should be reduced.

## Substance misuse

### Expected outcomes:

**Children and young people with drug and/or alcohol problems are identified at reception and receive effective treatment and support throughout their stay in custody.**

- 1.84 Young people with a high level of drug or alcohol use received immediate care and support but services for young people needing a lower level of intervention were inadequate. The drug and alcohol policy was out of date and the committee had not met for some time.
- 1.85 Young people identified with a high level of drug and/or alcohol use during initial screening were immediately referred to the clinical substance misuse service. Appropriate first night treatment was available, but clinical need was low. In the past 12 months, 13 young people had been admitted to the drug treatment unit (Wren) on the young adult side for observation and treatment, most of whom had completed alcohol detoxification; three had required opiate substitute regimes. Prescribing regimes were flexible and the 14-bed unit provided a safe and comfortable environment.
- 1.86 An experienced, specialist clinical substance misuse team offered a high level of clinical and psychosocial support. During the previous year, they had provided structured interventions on an out-patient basis to 10 young people with complex needs, for example a high level of cannabis or stimulant use and mental health concerns. Care was well coordinated at weekly multidisciplinary meetings which included representatives of mental health services.
- 1.87 Primary care and substance misuse nurses were trained to deliver smoking cessation advice and young people could receive nicotine replacement therapy on their first day after a follow-up health screen. An average of 15 to 20 young people a month used nicotine replacement therapy.
- 1.88 The drug and alcohol strategy related to young people and young adults. It was out of date and had not been reviewed following the recent comprehensive needs analysis. The substance misuse strategy committee had not met for five months.



- 1.89 Substance misuse and offender management roles had been combined, to the detriment of drug and alcohol work. Substance misuse offender managers felt that the roles conflicted and that they lacked consistent management and supervision. An improvement plan had been developed six months previously but had not been implemented adequately.
- 1.90 Initial assessments of young people were carried out promptly, usually on their first day, but the substance misuse awareness programme was not delivered consistently during induction. Young people requiring targeted interventions did not receive enough support. At the time of the inspection, only 16 substance misuse case files were open and these did not contain comprehensive assessments or detailed care plans. Record keeping was very poor and we only came across one example of good quality case work. Our survey findings reflected the lack of adequate service provision. Fewer young people than the comparator reported drug or alcohol problems on arrival, but 0% said they had received help with their alcohol problem and 3% their drug problem against respective comparators of 8% and 26%.

## Recommendations

---

- 1.91 The drug and alcohol strategy should be updated and action plans should be informed by the recent needs analysis.
- 1.92 The strategy committee should meet regularly to develop, coordinate and monitor drug and alcohol services.
- 1.93 Young people should have access to a range of age-appropriate psychosocial interventions to meet their identified needs. Interventions should be delivered by competent staff, who are appropriately managed and supervised.



# Section 2: Respect

## Residential units

---

### Expected outcomes:

Children and young people live in a safe, clean and decent environment which is in a good state of repair and suitable for adolescents.

- 2.1 Communal areas were run down and some needed deep cleaning. Graffiti in cells was widespread. Cell call bells were answered promptly. Facilities for association and outside exercise were good. Showers were in poor condition. The applications process needed improvement. There was good access to mail and telephones. Laundry arrangements were efficient and young people on remand could wear their own clothes.
- 2.2 Communal areas were shabby and some required deep cleaning. Young people who remained on the units during the day were encouraged to clean the communal areas. Most furniture needed replacing.
- 2.3 Most of the cells that we inspected were covered in graffiti and this was often gang related. We were shown two cells which were to be occupied by two young people who had recently arrived: the plastic mattress and pillows in both cells were covered in graffiti.
- 2.4 All but one cell on each unit were single occupancy. Each cell had a cupboard, kettle, chair and table and some had curtains. Staff told us that mould sometimes grew in cells which were poorly ventilated. Young people were encouraged to clean their cells and had easy access to cleaning materials. Many of the toilets in cells required deep cleaning. Young people could personalise their cells with photographs and cards on notice boards. The offensive displays policy was adhered to. The spacious double cell on each wing contained a screened toilet. Many young people wanted to share a cell but this was only permitted after a settling-in period and thorough risk assessment. Staff gave young people a score out of 10 each day for the cleanliness of their cells: if young people were awarded a full score three times in a week, they were allowed electricity in their cells for 24 hours at weekends.
- 2.5 In our survey, 47% of young people against the comparator of 37% said that their cell bell was answered within five minutes, and our observations and wing records confirmed this. Shouting out was common at night and led to fights.
- 2.6 Most young people had at least one period of association a day when they could play table tennis and table football or watch television in the communal areas. Outdoor exercise equipment had been installed in the exercise yards.
- 2.7 Extractors had recently been installed to ventilate the shower units, which remained in poor condition. One shower had a blocked drain and many had peeling paint and hard water stains. Shampoo sachets and dirty clothes had been left on the floor.
- 2.8 In our survey, young people consistently reported less positively than the comparator across a range of questions about applications. Application forms were freely available on units. We were told by staff and young people that most issues were resolved informally. Applications were not tracked consistently across wings, with some having written records and others not.

- 2.9 Arrangements for sending and receiving mail were good. Young people could send two free letters a week, and family and friends could use the 'email a prisoner' scheme. Young people had easy access to the telephones and this was well managed by staff. Telephones had privacy hoods and were located in quiet areas. In our survey, 75% of young people said they were able to use the telephone every day against the comparator of 62%.
- 2.10 Young people on remand could wear their own clothes but most young people chose to wear prison clothes. They put dirty clothes in buckets in the shower units for washing in a central laundry. Fresh bedding and prison clothes were issued once a week. Young people's own clothes were washed on the units and irons were available. Property was held securely and could be retrieved easily.

## Recommendations

---

- 2.11 Communal areas on residential units should be clean and furniture should be in a good state of repair.
- 2.12 Cells should be free of graffiti.

## Housekeeping point

---

- 2.13 Applications should be processed fairly and quickly.

# Relationships between staff and children and young people

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.14 We observed respectful relationships between staff and young people, but this was not reflected in our survey. A few staff spoke negatively to us about young people. Not all young people met their personal officer within 24 hours of arrival. Focus groups were held on each unit. Entries on P-Nomis were balanced but not always detailed.
- 2.15 In our survey, 59% of young people said that staff treated them with respect and 26% that staff had checked on them personally in the last week against respective comparators of 70% and 42%. Thirty-one per cent said they had been victimised by a member of staff against the comparator of 22%.
- 2.16 Despite these negative results, we observed positive interactions between staff and young people. Staff referred to young people by their preferred name, and some played games with them during association and engaged in appropriate banter. In our discussion groups, young people described staff as 'firm but fair'. In our safety interviews, one young person said: 'Some staff give you little cheeky comments but I think the wing staff are nice, they say good morning to you and stuff'. Another said: 'They all behave correctly and very well. They are all great

people to me'. In our discussions with staff, they made some negative comments about young people. Focus groups were held on each unit. Discussion covered a range of issues but we did not see written evidence that actions were followed up.

- 2.17 All young people knew who their personal officers were and expressed different views about them in our groups. In our survey, only 34% of young people against the comparator of 46% said they met their personal officer within the first week and this was confirmed in our analysis of P-Nomis records. Records on P-Nomis of young people's behaviour were balanced but sometimes not detailed enough, and some personal officers did not make weekly entries.

## Housekeeping points

---

- 2.18 Young people should meet their personal officer within 24 hours of arrival.
- 2.19 Personal officers should make weekly contact with young people in their care.

## Equality and diversity

---

### Expected outcomes:

The establishment demonstrates a clear and coordinated approach to eliminating discrimination, promoting equitable outcomes and fostering good relations, and ensures that no child or young person is unfairly disadvantaged. This is underpinned by effective processes to identify and resolve any inequality. The diverse needs of each young person are recognised and addressed: these include, but are not restricted to, race equality, nationality, religion, disability (including mental, physical and learning disabilities and difficulties), gender, transgender issues and sexual orientation.

- 2.20 Equality action team meetings were productive and well attended, but there was no local equality policy and no young people equality representatives. The discrimination incident reporting system required promotion. Discrimination incidents were reasonably well investigated and replies were scrutinised by an external organisation. Black and minority ethnic young people had consistently more negative perceptions of prison life. There was good support for Travellers and Gypsies. Foreign national young people had good access to the UK Border Agency but not to independent immigration advice. Young people with learning difficulties were supported, but there were no multidisciplinary care plans. No gay or bisexual young people had disclosed their sexuality to the equality team.

## Strategic management

---

- 2.21 The equality action team (EAT) comprised the head of safety and equality, a manager, senior officer and administrator. Monthly meetings chaired by the governor were well attended and underpinned by a useful action plan which was followed up each month. Despite a distinctive population, there was no local equality policy and no young people equality representatives.
- 2.22 Young people completed an equality questionnaire on arrival which covered all protected characteristics. They completed it in the presence of a member of staff.
- 2.23 A programme of equality impact assessments was informed by the young people's focus groups.

## Recommendations

---

- 2.24 An equality and diversity policy should be drawn up to ensure that the needs of all groups within the establishment are identified and addressed.
- 2.25 Young people equality representatives should be appointed.
- 2.26 Young people should be able to declare their protected characteristics confidentially on arrival.

## Housekeeping points

---

- 2.27 Young people should be made aware of discrimination incident reporting procedures.
- 2.28 Discrimination incident report forms should be available in foreign languages.

## Diverse needs

---

- 2.29 Black and minority ethnic young people comprised 84% of the population. In our survey, 53% of black and minority ethnic young people said that staff treated them with respect and 21% said that they currently felt unsafe against respective comparators for white young people of 93% and 4%. Thirty-four percent said they had been victimised by staff compared with 13% for white young people. The reasons for these negative perceptions needed investigation and action.
- 2.30 Ethnic monitoring data on black and minority ethnic young people were analysed at the EAT meeting and out-of-range indicators were discussed. Use of force and proven adjudications had been high and out of range for six months. More work was needed by the equality team to try to bring them back within range. Black History Month was celebrated.
- 2.31 In our survey, 3% of young people identified themselves as a Gypsy or Traveller. Travellers and Gypsies received good support and it had recently been decided that Travellers could transfer additional credit of their own money from their private account to their telephone account because their families were less likely to be accessible to cheaper calls on landline. A Travellers group led by a member of the chaplaincy met fortnightly but no minutes were taken.
- 2.32 At the time of the inspection, there were 23 foreign nationals in the establishment. Support groups run by the chaplaincy for the larger nationality groups met regularly. A UK Border Agency representative attended once a week to update young people on developments in their cases. There was no regular on-site immigration advice and the equality team made referrals to the Detention Advice Service which was sometimes able to find immigration lawyers for young people. During the six months before our inspection, telephone interpretation had been used 278 times, more than at other establishments. Staff who spoke other languages could be called on to interpret. Foreign nationals who did not receive visits could apply for a free five-minute telephone call to their country of origin. The library stocked a good range of foreign language books and newspapers.
- 2.33 At the time of the inspection, 50 young people had been identified with a disability. Good work was carried out with young people with learning difficulties but there were no multidisciplinary care plans. The canteen list contained photographs to help young people with literacy needs.

- 2.34 In our survey, 45% of Muslim young people said that most staff treated them with respect against the comparator of 71%.
- 2.35 Some young people did not know that they could report discrimination. Discrimination incident report forms were available on all wings, but only in English. Incidents were investigated reasonably well and responses were polite and timely. The governor and an independent charity, the Zahid Mubarek Trust, carefully scrutinised the investigations, and incidents were discussed and analysed at EAT meetings.
- 2.36 No gay or bisexual young people had identified themselves to the equality team. Young people were asked on arrival if they wanted help from the establishment's gay support group, but not in a confidential manner. Gay and bisexual young people did not have access to community support agencies and there were no displays promoting positive images of gay people.

## Recommendations

---

- 2.37 The negative perceptions of black and minority ethnic and Muslim young people should be investigated and acted on.
- 2.38 Gay and bisexual prisoners should be supported by specific groups and activities in the establishment and by referral to community support networks.

## Good practice

---

- 2.39 *Young Travellers and Gypsies were able to transfer additional credit to their telephone accounts to ensure the same opportunity for maintaining family contact as settled young people.*
- 2.40 *The canteen list contained photographs of products which assisted young people who could not read.*

## Faith and religious activity

---

### Expected outcomes:

**All children and young people are able to practise their religion. The chaplaincy plays a full part in establishment life and contributes to young people's overall care, support and resettlement.**

- 2.41 Young people's religious beliefs were respected. There was a good range of faith services and classes and all major faiths were catered for. Facilities for Christian and Muslim services were excellent. The chaplaincy was well integrated into establishment life.
- 2.42 At the time of the inspection, 50% of young people were Christian, 37% Muslim and 11% had no religion. In our survey, 69% of young people against the comparator of 56% said that their religious beliefs were respected and, in our groups, young people spoke positively of the opportunity to practise their faith. The chaplaincy comprised an acting coordinating chaplain and four full-time chaplains, two of whom were shortly to be made redundant. There were 12 sessional chaplains and 80 volunteers. All major faiths were provided for and a good range of services and classes were available. Facilities for religious services were excellent and the three dedicated areas for Church of England, Roman Catholic and Islamic services were large

enough to accommodate the congregations. The chaplaincy was well integrated into establishment life and attended a range of meetings. They worked with Feltham Community Chaplaincy Trust to provide support for young people after release. The chaplaincy ran support groups for foreign national and Travellers groups (see section on equality and diversity).

## Complaints

---

### Expected outcomes:

**Effective complaints procedures are in place for children and young people, which are easy to access and use and provide timely responses. Children and young people are provided with the help they need to make a complaint. Children and young people feel safe from repercussions when using these procedures and are aware of an appeal procedure.**

**2.43** A minority of young people said it was easy to make a complaint and, of those who had, few had been satisfied with the outcome or the speed of response. Complaints forms were available on all the units, and responses to complaints were satisfactory.

**2.44** In our survey, 42% of young people said it was easy to make a complaint against the comparator of 59%. Twenty-two per cent said complaints had been sorted out fairly and quickly against respective comparators of 40% and 44%. In the six months before the inspection, 154 complaints had been submitted. The most common causes for complaint were staff, property, gym and telephones.

**2.45** Complaint forms were freely available on the wings and most complaint boxes were out of sight of staff work areas. Boxes were emptied daily by the night orderly officer and allocated to relevant managers by a member of the equality team. Data on complaints were considered at the safeguarding meetings.

**2.46** In the sample of complaints that we examined, most responses were polite, pertinent and timely. Further investigation of a few complaints could have been carried out. Some replies were encouraging in tone, and it was evident in some cases that the responder had already discussed the complaint with the young person. All replies had been quality assured by a senior manager.

## Recommendation

---

**2.47** Young people's poor perceptions of the complaints process should be explored with assistance from an external agency and remedial action taken if required.

## Legal rights

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

**2.48** Young people were given information verbally about their sentence or remand, but not in writing. They had good access to legal advice and were helped to contact their legal advisers



and to make free confidential telephone calls. Remanded young people were helped to make bail applications. There were adequate facilities for confidential legal visits.

- 2.49 Although not specifically trained, offender supervisors took responsibility for advising young people of their legal rights. Young people were seen by offender supervisors within two days of arrival and the nature of their sentence or remand status was explained to them. The most common sentence was the detention and training order, but there was no written information about the sentence and the potential for early and late release from custody. There were no formal procedures in place for the establishment to apply to a court for a young person to be released late.
- 2.50 Remanded young people were able to make a bail application, and records indicated that offender supervisors facilitated young people's contact with their legal adviser and community YOT worker. There had been 92 successful bail applications in the previous six months.
- 2.51 Young people serving section 91 sentences (determinate), indeterminate sentences or extended licences for public protection were given written information about significant dates in their sentence.
- 2.52 Young people said that they had good access to legal advice. Offender supervisors helped young people to contact their legal advisers and to make free confidential telephone calls. There were good facilities for confidential legal visits.

## Recommendation

---

- 2.53 **Sentenced and remanded young people should be given written information about their sentence or remand, including the potential for early and late release for those serving detention and training orders. Young people should confirm in writing that they have understood the conditions and nature of their sentence or remand period.**

## Health services

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.54 The quality of health services was good and comparable to the previous inspection, but the environment did not meet infection control standards. Partnership and clinical governance arrangements were good. Well man clinics were well established. There was evidence of health promotion but this was not always age appropriate. Pharmacy services were reasonably good. Initial access to dental services was adequate but the wait for follow-up appointments was increasing. The quality of and access to mental health services were good.

## Governance arrangements

---

- 2.55 Health services were commissioned by NHS Hounslow. Primary care, mental health and pharmacy services were provided by Central North West London Primary Care Trust which subcontracted mental health services to West London Mental Health Trust. Effective medical and out-of-hours services were provided by Medacs. Governance and monitoring arrangements were good and a range of clinical audit and action plans were in place to improve services. Services were being transferred to Care UK from April 2013. In our survey, 32% of young people said that health care was good against the comparator of 66%.
- 2.56 An infection control audit had recently been undertaken and action had been taken to improve cleanliness, although some areas still required refurbishment to comply with expected standards. The health needs assessment had been updated in December 2012. Appropriate policies and procedures reflected the requirements of the establishment. Clinical supervision was available. There was a reasonably good training programme, although some training had not been delivered as a result of organisational change.
- 2.57 Emergency resuscitation equipment, including oxygen and automated electronic defibrillators, were available in the health care areas and were checked daily. Not all officers were up to date with first aid training and there was limited first aid equipment. We observed a respectful approach by health care staff to young people. Complaints were well managed and monitored.

## Recommendation

---

- 2.58 All clinical areas and equipment should comply with infection control guidance.

## Delivery of care (physical health)

---

- 2.59 SystemOne, the electronic clinical record system, was used. Record keeping was adequate, although some records were not complete and did not reflect the care being delivered.
- 2.60 In our survey, 40% of young people said it was easy to see the doctor against the comparator of 65% and 29% at the previous inspection, and young people in our groups complained about the difficulty of seeing a doctor or nurse. There were short waiting lists and opportunities for emergency appointments if required. GP services were provided at the primary care centre at weekends and we were told that escort staff were not always available to take young people to the centre. There was a high level of 'did not attends'. The establishment had held two events to survey young people's views on primary care services and the attitude of staff.
- 2.61 Nurse triage was available every morning and expertise had been developed in asthma, smoking cessation, and immunisations. There was very good access to a sexual health clinic and a speech and language therapist, but a long waiting list for the optician. Some useful health promotion events had been organised, but the health promotion literature was not age appropriate or provided in a variety of media to enhance learning.
- 2.62 At the time of the inspection, there were no young people on the inpatient wings (Albatross and Wren). There had been 13 admissions of young people with physical health conditions during the past year, although all nurses were registered mental health nurses and there was no programme to address their training needs.

- 2.63 The administrator managed external hospital appointments. No appointments had been cancelled for lack of escorts.

## Recommendations

---

- 2.64 There should be an ongoing audit to enhance the quality of record keeping.
- 2.65 The views of young people on health care should be further investigated and the high number of 'did not attends' should be reduced.
- 2.66 A training needs analysis should be undertaken to identify the training needs of nursing staff.

## Pharmacy

---

- 2.67 A full-time pharmacist and technician were available to give advice, which young people were able to request on health care application forms available on the units. The pharmacist assisted with asthma advice and undertook medication use reviews. Medication was dispensed and supplied by a local pharmacy.
- 2.68 Stock medication was stored in a treatment room in primary care, although, with the exception of insulin and vaccines, not routinely administered from there. Treatment rooms on Albatross (mental health) and Wren (substance misuse) units were used for medicine storage and administration. Most medication was distributed from Bittern unit where a locked medication trolley was kept in the treatment room. There was 24-hour nursing care and medication could be administered out of hours; supplies were appropriately recorded and monitored.
- 2.69 The level of prescribing was low and appropriate to the population. More than half the prescribed medication was supplied as in possession. A list of medication not permitted in possession included basic analgesia, insulin and nicotine replacement therapy, which were considered high risk in this population. Risk assessments were undertaken by the doctor based on a point score system; young people signed an agreement which was recorded on SystemOne.
- 2.70 Nursing staff administered medicines not allowed in possession at approximately 8am, noon, 4pm and 8pm; security officers accompanied nurses with medication around the establishment. We observed medication which had already been placed in pots being administered from the kitchen on one wing, which was not acceptable.
- 2.71 There was an agreed stock list, but use of stock was not strictly audited. Stock was occasionally supplied as split packs with labels. With sufficient notice, supplies of medicines were provided on discharge or transfer if held in possession.
- 2.72 Patient medication records for dispensed medicines were held by the pharmacy supplier and were not accessible. There was no facility to label medication. Review and analysis of prescribing data could not be done electronically.
- 2.73 Controlled drugs were held and administered from Albatross and Wren units; ordering and record keeping at both locations were good, although registers did not comply with legislation and this had been highlighted to the accountable officer at a previous inspection.

- 2.74 Nursing staff could provide soluble paracetamol for analgesia, Mucogel for indigestion and a sunscreen as special sick (immediate treatment without an appointment), and these were recorded on the charts. A limited range of over-the-counter remedies could be purchased from the canteen list. Patient group directions (PGDs) for sexual health and substance misuse were provided by different suppliers. A PGD for nurse supply of salbutamol inhaler was due to be implemented by the medicines management group. Most basic medication had to be prescribed by a doctor.
- 2.75 There were comprehensive pharmacy procedures, but no evidence that staff had signed these. A medicines and therapeutics group attended by all relevant stakeholders met approximately every two months.

## Recommendations

---

- 2.76 **SystmOne should be used to record prescribing and administration of medicines and enable more effective audit and analysis of medicines used.**
- 2.77 **A wider range of patient group directions should be introduced to enable more potent medication to be supplied by the pharmacist or nurse, and to avoid unnecessary consultations with the doctor.**

## Housekeeping points

---

- 2.78 Wholesale stock should be supplied as complete packs and should not be labelled.
- 2.79 Staff should read and sign the agreed pharmacy procedures and policies.
- 2.80 Controlled drugs registers should be compliant with the current legislation.

## Dentistry

---

- 2.81 The dentist and dental nurse delivered three sessions a week. Initial treatment by the dentist took three weeks and there was a seven-week wait for ongoing treatment. The dentist or dental nurse attended the wings regularly to triage young people.
- 2.82 All the equipment was in working order. Infection control was satisfactory, but the newly installed decontamination area had not yet been completed.
- 2.83 In our survey, 17% of young people said it was easy to see the dentist against the comparator of 43%. Oral health information was provided individually but it was not age appropriate.

## Recommendations

---

- 2.84 **The decontamination area should be fully compliant with infection control requirements.**
- 2.85 **There should be age-appropriate health promotion information.**

## Delivery of care (mental health)

---

- 2.86 Mental health services were good. Psychiatrists attended each day and there was good access to local child and adolescent mental health services. The in-reach team and primary care mental health worker worked well together. At the time of the inspection, there were no young people in the inpatient unit (Albatross). Weekly team meetings were held to discuss referrals, inpatients and young people with complex mental health needs.
- 2.87 Staff vacancies and sick leave were affecting the delivery of primary care and in-reach services. There was no mental health awareness training for staff.

## Recommendation

---

- 2.88 Mental health awareness training, including learning disabilities and personality disorders, should be available to all staff.

## Catering

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.89 Young people complained about the quality and quantity of food. Most young people could not eat out of their cells. Lunch and evening meals were served too early. Breakfast packs were inadequate. There was poor consultation with young people about the menu.
- 2.90 In our survey, only 16% of young people said the food was good. In our groups, young people complained about the quality and quantity of food, although some of the hot meals that we tasted were reasonably good. Young people could not dine out of their cells, except on Heron. Lunch was served at 11.45am and the evening meal at 4.45pm. The daily budget was £2.10 per head. One hot meal a day was served during the week and two at weekends. Young people were issued with an evening snack, often a Penguin biscuit, and bread for their breakfast at the same time as their evening meal. Breakfast packs issued in the morning contained cereal, UHT milk, butter and jam and were inadequate. There were five different menu options, and vegetarians, vegans, religious and medical diets were provided for.
- 2.91 Dieticians were consulted when menus were changed but only young people working in the kitchens were consulted. A survey was conducted every six months but the response rates were low. There were no food comments books on the wings, but young people could request a food complaints form from a member of staff.
- 2.92 Young people working in the kitchens could gain a range of qualifications up to NVQ level 2.

## Recommendations

---

- 2.93 All young people should have the opportunity to eat out of their cells.

2.94 Lunch should not be served before noon and the evening meal not before 5pm.

2.95 The food consultation arrangements should be improved.

## Purchases

---

Expected outcomes:

**Children and young people can purchase a suitable range of goods at reasonable prices to meet their diverse needs, and can do so safely.**

2.96 Young people said that the canteen list did not contain a wide enough range of goods. Products in tins could not be purchased. Young people had to wait up to 11 days after arrival before receiving an order.

2.97 Young people could buy products from a canteen list but not from catalogues. There was consultation with young people about the contents of the canteen list, although, in our survey, 40% of young people against the comparator of 50% said that the shop sold a wide enough range of products. Young people could not buy products in tins for safety reasons. Canteen orders were submitted on Tuesdays and young people arriving after this had to wait until the following Tuesday to place their order, resulting in a potential delay of 11 days before receiving their first order. Despite this, young people told us that the system worked well and orders were fulfilled correctly. There was an excellent canteen list with photographs for young people who had difficulty reading.

## Recommendation

---

2.98 The shop should hold a wide range of stock to meet the diverse needs of the population.

# Section 3: Purposeful activity

## Time out of cell

---

### Expected outcomes:

Children and young people spend most of their time out of their cell, engaged in activities such as education, leisure and cultural pursuits, seven days a week.<sup>2</sup>

- 3.1 Most young people had limited time out of their cell during the week, and less at the weekend. Some young people on punishments received very little time unlocked. Time for outside exercise was scheduled every day, and records showed that over half the young people participated.
- 3.2 The establishment reported an average of six hours a day unlock time, which varied significantly for different young people. Young people who had been involved in violence and had lost access to activities with other young people potentially spent 22 hours locked up. They were kept under review and gradually reintroduced to activities. Unlock time for other young people depended on which activities they could safely undertake with their peer group and whether they were subject to disciplinary punishments. We estimated that most young people spent more than seven hours out of their cells each day, and young people on Heron unit had more time unlocked than other units. Time out of cell at weekends was limited for all young people, with lock-up time at 5pm.
- 3.3 During our roll checks, we found over a quarter of young people locked in their cells one morning and a much lower number during the afternoon. Young people in their cells had been excluded from group education, had refused activity, or were subject to another form of restriction. Young people who did not attend group education had one-to-one sessions of about 20 minutes with education staff on the units and there were interventions to help them return to group activities.
- 3.4 In our survey, 84% of young people said they had association each day against the comparator of 69%. The association sessions that we observed were lively and on some units we saw staff taking part in activities with young people.
- 3.5 In our survey, less than half the young people said they could go outside for exercise every day. Records showed that time outside was offered each day on all units. Young people had been given jackets to wear outside. The external areas had been improved since the previous inspection with the addition of some exercise equipment.

## Recommendations

---

- 3.6 All young people should spend a minimum of 10 hours every day out of their cell.
- 3.7 Provision for young people who receive education on the units should be increased.

---

<sup>2</sup> Time out of cell, in addition to formal 'purposeful activity', includes any time children and young people are out of their cells to associate or use communal facilities to take showers or make telephone calls.

# Education, learning and skills

---

*Inspection of the provision of education and educational standards, as well as vocational training in YOIs for young people, is undertaken by the Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted<sup>3</sup>) working under the general direction of HM Inspectorate of Prisons. For information on how Ofsted inspects education and training see the Ofsted framework and handbook for inspection.*

## Expected outcomes:

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

- 3.8 Levels of accreditation had improved since the previous inspection and young people's behaviour had also improved. Fifteen per cent of young people did not attend education or training for safety or security reasons. The standard of teaching and learning remained variable. The curriculum was well planned but in the early stages of implementation. There was good support for vulnerable young people. The incentive scheme in education was not linked to the establishment rewards and sanctions scheme. The reflective learning programme effectively reintegrated into education young people who had been excluded. Young people who were unable to attend formal classes did not receive enough education. Vocational tutors worked hard to motivate their students. The library was a good, well managed resource.
- 3.9 Ofsted made the following assessments about the learning and skills and work provision:
- |  |              |
|--|--------------|
| Outcomes for prisoners engaged in learning and skills and work activities:   | Satisfactory |
| Quality of learning and skills and work activities (including the quality of teaching, training, learning and assessment): | Satisfactory |
| Effectiveness of leadership and management of learning and skills and work activities:                                     | Good         |

## Management of education and learning and skills

---

- 3.10 Managers had successfully identified weaknesses in the delivery of education and had effected significant improvement since the previous inspection, for example in the behaviour of young people. It was too early to assess the impact of these changes but early indications were positive.
- 3.11 Senior managers had a realistic view of the quality of education and training and the areas that needed strengthening. They had developed an appropriately self-critical culture which provided a firm foundation for continuing improvement. Relationships between the establishment and the education contractor were very good.

---

<sup>3</sup> Ofsted is the Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills. It reports directly to the UK Parliament and is independent and impartial. It (inter alia) inspects and regulates services that provide education and skills for all ages, including those in custody. For information on Ofsted's inspection framework, please visit: <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk>.



- 3.12 Attendance was satisfactory, although occupation of the workshops during the week of the inspection was poor. At best the workshops were half full and some were only a quarter full. Punctuality was good. Movements to education and between lessons were calm and orderly.
- 3.13 A thorough review of the curriculum had taken place and a more appropriate curriculum had been implemented recently. Additional higher level courses were now available and young people could more easily choose courses appropriate to their needs and aspirations.
- 3.14 The roles and responsibilities of staff were clear and performance management was effective. Class cancellations were very rare. Lesson observations were carried out regularly. The progress made by young people in lessons was not adequately assessed or recorded.

## Recommendation

---

- 3.15 **The progress made by young people in education should be formally monitored and recorded.**

## Provision of activities

---

- 3.16 Young people attended an induction into the education department during which they were assessed for literacy and numeracy skills and interviewed to identify their experience of education and their aspirations. These assessments were used to allocate young people to courses and to identify any special educational needs. The assessments were shared with education and workshop staff so that additional learning support could be provided, but not with residential staff. This information was sometimes not used to maximum effect by teachers.
- 3.17 The special educational needs coordinator had compiled a register which contained details of 39 young people with additional needs. Classes were not running at full capacity and staffing levels were sufficient to meet the needs of these young people in classrooms and workshops. Six learning support assistants were being recruited at the time of the inspection to provide more individual support for young people. There was a full-time tutor to support young people whose first language was not English and two learning support tutors to support young people who had behavioural problems or were particularly vulnerable.
- 3.18 Fifteen per cent of young people did not attend mainstream education for safety or security reasons. Work packs were issued for them to complete in their cells and there was not enough support to meet their individual needs.
- 3.19 Information, advice and guidance were provided during induction and education, and by other departments in the establishment and community agencies.

## Quality of provision

---

- 3.20 The quality of teaching and learning had improved significantly since the previous inspection, when it was inadequate. Most teaching was now at least satisfactory and progress made by young people in lessons was sometimes good or very good.
- 3.21 In the more stimulating lessons, tasks were innovative, interesting and enjoyable. Young people focused well on their work because they understood the relevance of what they were doing, and there was a productive and purposeful atmosphere. Young people responded well to the pace and challenge of the lesson and were encouraged to be independent and effective

learners. In a hospitality and catering lesson, young people made very good progress in researching and compiling information about different food outlets. In the Phoenix room, a young person had made very good progress in producing a montage which displayed different ways of life. Tutors in the vocational workshops guided young people to aspire to high standards, often from a very low starting point.

- 3.22 In the less successful lessons, it was difficult for young people to see the relevance of what they were doing: work was too simplistic and young people did not always reach their full potential. Printed worksheets were relied upon too much and the lack of focus prevented young people from progressing.
- 3.23 Young people's behaviour had improved very significantly since the previous inspection. It was now at least satisfactory and often good. Few young people were returned to the wings for poor behaviour. We observed no confrontational behaviour and we heard virtually no swearing or use of inappropriate language. Young people showed respect for teachers and for each other, and relationships in lessons were relaxed and professional. Many young people spoke articulately and enthusiastically about their work, although some of their files and folders were disorganised.
- 3.24 Standards of work were at least satisfactory and in some areas, such as catering and graphics, they were good. The standard of work in the vocational workshops was good, with some exceptional pieces of work, for example in brickwork. Tutors in workshops developed young people's social and personal skills while supporting them to gain vocational skills. In education, appropriate emphasis was placed on personal and social development as well as employability skills. An incentive scheme was operating within the classroom setting which worked successfully to reward good behaviour and discourage bad. There was potential to increase the value of this by linking it to the predominantly wing based rewards and sanctions scheme.
- 3.25 The assessment and marking of young people's work was variable. Some exemplary marking gave young people clear advice on how to progress in the subject. In some cases, work had not been marked at all or consisted only of ticks. Not enough attention was given to the correction of spelling and grammar. Young people clearly made progress during their time in education but this was not monitored or recorded formally.
- 3.26 The Phoenix room provided very good support for vulnerable young people through a range of innovative activities which successfully helped them to gain confidence and self-esteem. Reflective learning for young people temporarily excluded from education effectively encouraged them to analyse their behaviour and to discuss very sensitive aspects of their lives. Most young people who undertook this programme were successfully reintegrated into education. There was scope to extend this work to other areas of the regime.

## Recommendations

---

- 3.27 **The incentive scheme operating in education should be linked to the rewards and sanctions scheme.**
- 3.28 **Marking and assessment should include advice on how to improve; attention should be paid to the correction of spelling and grammar.**

## Education and vocational achievements

---

- 3.29 Levels of accreditation had improved significantly since the previous inspection. Most young people now achieved worthwhile qualifications of importance to colleges, training providers and employers. Most qualifications achieved were at entry level and level one, although the number of qualifications gained at higher levels was now increasing as a result of the new curriculum.
- 3.30 There was an appropriate focus on employability. For example, during 2012 over 120 young people had gained a City and Guilds qualification in hospitality and catering, complemented by the achievement of certificates in food safety in catering and customer service. There were over 300 qualifications in information and communications technology and many young people gained qualifications in construction, motor vehicle studies, and painting and decorating. There was scope to develop literacy and numeracy qualifications and accreditations at higher levels.
- 3.31 During 2012, 25 young people had gained a GCSE in mathematics and 18 in English.

## Library

---

- 3.32 The library was spacious and well equipped and a range of young people's work was displayed. Young people had good access to the library and books were also available on the residential wings. The computers were still not in use and the appropriate software was lacking.
- 3.33 There was a good range of age-appropriate books, including quick read texts and an excellent stock of foreign language books and magazines. The stock was reviewed regularly to meet the changing needs of the population. All the required legal texts and Prison Service Instructions were available. There were no CDs or DVDs because the damage or loss rate had been considered unacceptably high.
- 3.34 The library had continued to host the Six Book Challenge very successfully, with 120 completions over the previous year. Several authors had given talks and the library had organised events to celebrate the Jubilee year and the Olympic Games.
- 3.35 Links with the education department were not sufficiently strong.

## Physical education and healthy living

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 3.36 There was a good range of activities and most young people benefited from good access to high quality physical education. There was no PE available for young people in the evenings.

- 3.37 A well-planned and balanced programme of PE activities was available to most young people. The programme reflected the national curriculum and included team games and sports, minor games and fitness training, and indoor and outdoor activities.
- 3.38 Recreational PE was available for young people on the enhanced level of the rewards and sanctions scheme; there was no PE for young people in the evenings.
- 3.39 Levels of accreditation were good and had improved since the previous inspection. Higher level qualifications were offered, such as the Duke of Edinburgh award (which included release on temporary licence) and Active IQ at level two, as well as qualifications from sports governing bodies such as basketball, football and volleyball. Good attention was paid to young people's personal development and team working through projects such as Get Onside and Football Changing Lives.
- 3.40 The department had developed an appropriate policy to restrict the overuse of free weights. There were good links with health care and remedial PE was provided when required. All accidents and injuries were reported to health care and health and safety departments.
- 3.41 The opportunity for young people to work as orderlies alongside young adult prisoners had been a successful innovation. The very good facilities were clean and tidy; showering facilities were adequate and well managed given the number of young people using them.
- 3.42 Relationships between staff and young people were good, although more could have been done to seek the views of young people. Gym bans were rare and only authorised by the PE senior officer.

## Recommendations

---

- 3.43 Recreational PE should be available in the evenings.
- 3.44 Young people's views on PE should be regularly sought by formal and informal means.

# Section 4: Resettlement

## Pre-release and resettlement

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 4.1 The reducing re-offending strategy related to young people and young adults and there had been no child-focused needs analysis. The reducing re-offending committee received good data and managed the large number of community organisations involved in resettlement effectively, although it was not clear how this translated into a whole establishment approach to meet the needs of young people. The Heron unit continued to focus on resettlement, although we were concerned about the sustainability of education, training and employment (ETE) and accommodation placements. Overall, the number of release on temporary licence (ROTL) placements was inadequate.
- 4.2 There was no child-focused needs analysis to draw together the specific resettlement and reducing re-offending needs of young people. The reducing re-offending strategy, which included young people and young adults, did not adequately capture the precise needs of young people or define the actions needed to address them (see main recommendation HP58).
- 4.3 A well attended, monthly reducing re-offending committee monitored the implementation of the strategy and there was a proportionate focus on the work undertaken with young people. A good range of resettlement data was collected, which provided an overview of the effectiveness of resettlement work, and services to deliver the resettlement pathways were reviewed systematically. There was very good engagement with community agencies, which delivered a range of resettlement interventions, and effective oversight of these services by the committee. The contribution of these agencies to resettlement was clear. However, despite the best efforts of the committee, we found that these activities were not properly communicated and coordinated so that offender supervisors could assess the risks and needs of a young person and develop an appropriate sentence or remand plan. Further work was required to develop a whole establishment approach to meeting the needs of young people.
- 4.4 Offender supervisors working in the offender management unit were responsible for the development of sentence and remand management plans which coordinated reducing re-offending plans and practical resettlement arrangements for each young person. Despite strategic frailties, it was evident that offender supervisors had a good understanding of the resettlement needs of young people and worked hard to address them. This also applied to residential staff on Heron unit, who continued to focus on the resettlement needs of young people.
- 4.5 Our previous report described the funding and central support delivered to young people on the Heron unit as part of the Mayor of London's Time for Action project, which aimed to address complex long-term root causes of teenage violence by improving opportunities for young Londoners. The Heron unit aimed to support young people due to be released from

custody by moving them on to sustainable ETE placements and ensuring that they had suitable accommodation on release. The project had ended in May 2012 and the additional funding had been significantly reduced. This had resulted in the departure of the resettlement brokers, who had supported young people through their sentence and into the community, and the cessation of the accredited juvenile enhanced thinking skills (JETS) programme.

- 4.6 The independent report on the effectiveness of the unit during the period of the project was generally positive, although it did point to some areas for development, such as the difficulty of placing young people into suitable ETE placements. The staff complement on Heron unit remained greater than other units, the focus on resettlement continued, and staff had maintained their links with community agencies and potential employers. Initial resettlement outcomes for young people were more positive than other units, and a number moved on to college placements or found employment. However, we were concerned that the loss of the resettlement brokers would make it more difficult for these placements to be sustained in the community.
- 4.7 In our survey, young people on all units reported similarly on problems they might face following release. However, 21% of young people on Heron said that they knew where to get help with accommodation against 56% in 2012 and 11% said they knew where to get help to get into school or college against 59% in 2012.
- 4.8 There continued to be a lack of ROTL opportunities across the whole establishment. With one exception, Heron was the only unit to organise ROTL placements. In 2012 there had been 52 placements, involving 21 young people, with 34 of the placements involving the Duke of Edinburgh Scheme. Two young people had retail work experience placements with Sainsbury's, both of which resulted in full-time employment on release.

## Recommendation

---

- 4.9 Release on temporary licence opportunities should be extended.

## Training planning and remand management

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 4.10 The assessment, planning and review of individual sentence and remand plans were not always coordinated across the establishment and the offender management unit needed to take the lead on this. Young people said that they did not fully understand the process or where to get help with practical resettlement problems. Resettlement issues were addressed promptly and there were good links with community youth offending teams. The training planning review that we observed was excellent. There were good transition arrangements for young people moving to the young adult site, when they reached the age of 18 years.

- 4.11 All young people were allocated an offender supervisor who was responsible for developing and managing sentence and remand plans. Initial assessments were timely and training plans

were developed, although in the plans that we scrutinised the assessment, planning and review process was not always clear and some plans had not been coordinated across the establishment. Offender supervisors said that other departments sometimes agreed interventions with young people without consultation. The lack of coordination made it difficult to develop coherent plans and review their effectiveness, and there was no certainty that young people were receiving the most appropriate services and interventions to meet their individual needs.

- 4.12 In our survey, only 30% of young people said they had a sentence or remand plan against the comparator of 54%, and 86% of young people who said they had a plan said that they understood the targets set for them against the comparator of 96%. Young people also reported very negatively against the comparator when asked if they knew where to get help on a range of practical resettlement issues.
- 4.13 Despite weaknesses in the assessment, planning and review process and the negative feedback from young people, practical resettlement issues were addressed promptly with positive outcomes for young people. There were good links with youth offending teams (YOTs) and other community agencies to help young people move back into the community.
- 4.14 Offender supervisors had a good understanding of young people, but this was not always reflected in documentation and the new training planning documents were not being completed satisfactorily.
- 4.15 Training planning and remand management meetings were well organised and timely. There was good attendance by community YOTs, but participation by internal departments was erratic and attendance by education, residential and health care departments required improvement. Planning meetings that we observed were only attended by the young person and his YOT worker. Meetings were well planned by the offender supervisor and focused upon the young person's safety, welfare, education and resettlement. Information was provided by different departments and the young person was given every opportunity to participate. One meeting involving a foreign national young person facing deportation was handled very sensitively.
- 4.16 Young people serving detention and training orders (DTOs) who reached the age of 18 years were able to stay on the juvenile site if they wished and were assessed as not being a risk to others. All other young people moved across to the young adult site. Transition arrangements were good: where possible staff from the young adult site attended reviews and young people were able to visit their new unit in advance.
- 4.17 Young people serving life sentences were rarely held, but the relevant assessments and documentation could be completed if required. Young people serving long determinate sentences received the same services as those on DTOs, and the establishment prepared parole reports and assessed suitability for early release on home detention curfews.

## Recommendations

---

- 4.18 The offender management unit should be re-established at the centre of sentence and remand planning in a whole establishment approach to reducing re-offending.
- 4.19 Young people should be told where they can receive help on practical resettlement issues.

## Housekeeping points

---

- 4.20 In collaboration with other departments, offender supervisors should assess individual need, develop plans to reduce re-offending and address practical resettlement needs, and review plans systematically.
- 4.21 Offender supervisors should be given training in completion of the new training planning documentation.

## Public protection

---

- 4.22 There was a comprehensive public protection policy. The monthly inter-departmental risk management committee (IDRM) was well attended and minutes of the meetings indicated thorough discussion of individual young people considered to be a risk.
- 4.23 The establishment had clear criteria for identifying young people who might present a risk to the public. They were each allocated an offender supervisor, entered on a database and discussed at the earliest IDRM. The public protection manager or offender supervisor attended the reviews of young people at external multi-agency public protection panels.
- 4.24 There were appropriate procedures to ensure that young people were protected while in custody. Decisions about whom they had contact with were made by the IDRM and approved by the head of reducing re-offending. Very few young people had their mail and telephone calls monitored and these were regularly reviewed and restrictions lifted when it was felt that the risks had reduced. There were comprehensive assessments of young people who were considered a risk to children in the community. Restrictions on contact were rare, but any that were imposed were proportionate and defensible.

## Looked-after children

---

- 4.25 In our survey, 27% of young people said that they had been in the care of the local authority against the local comparator of 17% in 2011. During 2012, 472 young people who had been looked after by their local authority were located at the establishment. Since August 2012, two young people with complex needs had been assessed as children in need.
- 4.26 In August 2012, the establishment had appointed a senior social worker and two social workers experienced in working with looked-after children in the community. Looked-after young people were identified through scrutiny of the documentation accompanying them into custody and during induction. Arrangements to interview all young people during their first week in custody were in abeyance because of a vacancy in the social work team.
- 4.27 An assessment and care plan was completed and integrated into the young person's sentence or remand plan. Social workers offered regular counselling to some young people, primarily to address emotional need. The social workers actively encouraged local authorities to meet their responsibilities to looked-after young people. They wrote to local authorities who were not providing an appropriate level of support indicating the minimum standard of financial support of £10 a week, and in most cases they had been successful.
- 4.28 Good efforts were made to ensure that looked-after children were properly reviewed by their local authority while they were in custody, but this did not always happen. Looked-after children reviews were coordinated with sentence and remand planning meetings.



- 4.29 The establishment had no policy on responding appropriately to the needs of looked-after children, which was an omission.

## Recommendation

---

- 4.30 There should be a looked-after children policy.

## Reintegration planning

---

### Expected outcomes:

Children and young people's resettlement needs are addressed prior to release. An effective multi-agency response is used to meet the specific needs of each individual young person in order to maximise the likelihood of successful reintegration into the community.

- 4.31 Pre-release plans were comprehensive and no young people left the establishment without a named address. Information, advice and guidance to young people were effective and a significant number of education, training and employment (ETE) places were arranged in advance. Preparation of young people for release was reasonable and communication between establishment health care and community services was adequate. Arrangements were made for young people to continue receiving support in relation to drug and alcohol problems. Young people were helped to manage their money and deal with debt and they had good access to family and friends. A wide range of interventions were delivered by community organisations, although there were no offending behaviour programmes.
- 4.32 Pre-release plans were written collaboratively with the community YOT. Those that we examined were detailed and indicated accommodation arrangements and supervision requirements for the young person on release. In the previous year, only four young people had not been certain of their address at the pre-release review 10 days before their release.
- 4.33 Practical arrangements for release were thorough, including ensuring that financial matters were in order and providing a proper bag for the young person's belongings if required. Young people were able to launder their clothes, which had been in storage, if they wished. Travel arrangements were made at the final review meetings.

## Accommodation

---

- 4.34 Accommodation needs were assessed at an early stage and young people who were not returning to a suitable address were referred to their YOT or local authority in the case of a looked-after child. Advocates said that, since the appointment of the social workers, the need for them to advocate on behalf of young people on accommodation issues had reduced significantly. All looked-after young people were provided with accommodation by their local authority. The establishment had made contact with the New Horizons youth centre, which provided additional advice and support for young people with complex accommodation needs. The St Mungo's project for young adults also gave advice to young people in exceptional cases.
- 4.35 In our survey, 27% of young people said they thought that finding accommodation would be a problem. Establishment data stated that in the previous 12 months no young people had been

released to unsuitable accommodation, and 85% had returned to their family home. No data were collected on the sustainability of the accommodation.

## Education, training and employment

---

- 4.36 Young people benefited from good advice and guidance soon after their arrival and further advice was given on completion of courses. Young people developed skills in the vocational workshops and there was an appropriate emphasis on employability skills. Of the 171 young people released in the previous year, 117 had had ETE places arranged before their release, including almost all the young people on the Heron unit.

## Health care

---

- 4.37 Health care discharge arrangements were reasonably good. There were very good links with local secure services for young people with complex mental health needs.

## Drugs and alcohol

---

- 4.38 Care was well coordinated for young people with a high level of need requiring specialist interventions, and the clinical substance misuse team worked with YOTs to ensure continuing treatment on release. Young people with a lower level of need were not consistently provided with harm reduction advice by substance misuse offender supervisors pre release, and the supervisors were not linked with community drug and alcohol services to ensure post-release support.

## Recommendation

---

- 4.39 **Young people should be consistently prepared for release and should receive harm reduction information. Post-release care should be planned effectively.**

## Finance, benefit and debt

---

- 4.40 In our survey, 42% of young people said they thought they would have a problem with money/finances when they were released and 25% thought that claiming benefits would be a problem. A few young people felt they would have a problem opening a bank account. Plans were in place for Barclays Bank to run courses in financial management and assist in opening bank accounts.
- 4.41 Advice on housing and other benefits was given by an adviser from Hounslow Job Centre Plus. Some young people told us that their personal officer gave them advice on how to manage their money while in custody, and advice on money management was also provided in education. NACRO delivered a 'Managing money and dealing with debt' course, but only 10 young people had participated in the past three months. Young people had access to their financial records and there were systems to ensure that they received the correct amount on release.

## Children, families and contact with the outside world

---

- 4.42 At the time of the inspection, 91% of young people lived in a 50-mile radius of the establishment, and the remainder between 50 and 100 miles away. One young person lived over 100 miles from the establishment. In our survey, 37% of young people said that it was easy or very easy for their family or friends to visit and 38% that they usually received one or more visits each week.
- 4.43 There was an excellent visitors' centre run by the charity, Spurgeons, which families and friends could use before and after their visits. Refreshments were provided and a helpful information pack and range of leaflets was available to give practical advice to families. Visitors' centre staff offered emotional support to visitors and help with practical problems such as enabling young people to access their property. Centre staff said that staff in the establishment were helpful when approached to deal with a problem raised by a family.
- 4.44 The visits hall was adequate and included a play area for small children, which was staffed at weekends by qualified child care workers from Spurgeons. Visits took place on two weekdays and Saturday afternoons and on alternate Sundays. The visits session that we observed was relaxed, with appropriate supervision by staff, and families were able to have private conversations. Young people wore coloured bands, but they were not obtrusive. Visits lasted from 1.30 to 4pm, but if young people needed to be kept apart, their visits lasted for half this time so that all young people could be accommodated. All young people were given a rub-down search before and after their visit.
- 4.45 There were facilities for six closed visits at any one time, but staff said that they would only allow one visit at a time, so that they could be held in private. Closed visits were agreed by security department and the behaviour management group, and regularly reviewed.
- 4.46 In our survey, only 26% of young people said that their visit started on time against the comparator of 49%. Young people in our groups confirmed that this was a problem, although staff in the visitors' centre had not received complaints from families and friends. Young people were able to attend activities before a visit and movements to the visits hall could cause the visits to start late.
- 4.47 Four family days were organised each year, which young people on the standard and enhanced levels of the rewards and sanctions scheme were able to attend. Feedback from young people was very positive.
- 4.48 Residential staff and offender supervisors knew which young people had not received visits and in some cases allowed additional telephone calls to maintain contact. Young people who did not have visits could be seen by a volunteer prison visitor. Volunteers made themselves known to young people on the units and, from September to December 2012, had made 112 visits.
- 4.49 The Time for Families - Building Bridges course aimed to strengthen relationships between young people and their parent or carer. The course was run regularly and involved five young people working with their families over a four-week period. Sessions included formal teaching and group work and time for families to talk together. There was no work done with young people who had children of their own.

## Housekeeping point

---

- 4.50 Visiting arrangements should enable young people to get to their visits on time.

## Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

---

- 4.51 An impressive number of community organisations worked in the establishment to support young people in custody and contribute to their resettlement. Many agencies provided practical advice and support, and the Hounslow Youth Counselling Service offered individual counselling, enabling young people to explore their feelings and discuss personal problems. Over the previous three months, they had conducted 105 sessions with young people.
- 4.52 The accredited juvenile enhanced thinking skills (JETS) programme, previously delivered on the Heron unit, had ceased and there were no longer any offending behaviour or life skills programmes for young people. This was a significant gap in provision. At the time of the inspection, there were no anger management courses for young people.

## Recommendations

---

- 4.53 Offending behaviour and life skills programmes should be available to young people.
- 4.54 An anger management training programme should be introduced for young people.

# Section 5: Recommendations, housekeeping points and good practice

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

## Main recommendations

To YJB, NOMS and the governor

- 
- 5.1 The Youth Justice Board should work with the establishment to develop and implement an effective and comprehensive strategy to understand and reduce high levels of violence among young people at Feltham, building on existing good practice where appropriate, so that young people held there are safe and feel confident to report their concerns. (HP56)
  - 5.2 The YJB and NOMS should work with the establishment to develop and implement an effective children and young people reducing reoffending strategy for Feltham, coordinating this with other relevant agencies. (HP58)

## Main recommendation

To the governor

- 
- 5.3 Children and young people should not be held in the segregation unit. Those who need to be separated for their own or others' safety should experience a full regime and intensive intervention to address their behaviour in a suitable setting. (HP57)

### Recommendation

To YJB and NOMS

#### Courts, escorts and transfers

- 
- 5.4 Young people should not be transported with adult prisoners. (1.4)

### Recommendation

To the escort contractor

#### Courts, escorts and transfers

- 
- 5.5 Young people should not be held in court cells for unnecessarily long periods. (1.5)

### Recommendations

To the governor

#### Early days in custody

- 
- 5.6 Young people's negative views of their treatment on reception should be explored and addressed. (1.13)
  - 5.7 Young people should be involved in making the induction programme more useful to them. (1.14)

## **Care and protection of children and young people**

---

- 5.8 The governor in conjunction with the local authority should ensure the local authority is represented regularly at safeguarding meetings. (1.22)
- 5.9 Support plans should be developed and used to help victims of bullying. (1.32)
- 5.10 A local policy should be produced on the care of young people who are at risk. (1.39)
- 5.11 Young people on ACCTs should have a regime which maximises time out of cell and keeps them engaged in constructive activity. (1.40)

## **Behaviour management**

---

- 5.12 The regime for young people on basic level of the rewards and sanctions scheme should be improved and not lead to young people being effectively isolated for long periods. (1.49)
- 5.13 Cases of serious violence should always be reported to the police. (1.69)
- 5.14 Batons should not be drawn when children and young people are involved in incidents with young adults. (1.75)
- 5.15 The number of young people in segregation should be reduced. (1.83)

## **Substance misuse**

---

- 5.16 The drug and alcohol strategy should be updated and action plans should be informed by the recent needs analysis. (1.91)
- 5.17 The strategy committee should meet regularly to develop, coordinate and monitor drug and alcohol services. (1.92)
- 5.18 Young people should have access to a range of age-appropriate psychosocial interventions to meet their identified needs. Interventions should be delivered by competent staff, who are appropriately managed and supervised. (1.93)

## **Residential units**

---

- 5.19 Communal areas on residential units should be clean and furniture should be in a good state of repair. (2.11)
- 5.20 Cells should be free of graffiti. (2.12)

## **Equality and diversity**

---

- 5.21 An equality and diversity policy should be drawn up to ensure that the needs of all groups within the establishment are identified and addressed. (2.24)
- 5.22 Young people equality representatives should be appointed. (2.25)

- 5.23 Young people should be able to declare their protected characteristics confidentially on arrival. (2.26)
- 5.24 The negative perceptions of black and minority ethnic and Muslim young people should be investigated and acted on. (2.37)
- 5.25 Gay and bisexual prisoners should be supported by specific groups and activities in the establishment and by referral to community support networks. (2.38)

### **Complaints**

---

- 5.26 Young people's poor perceptions of the complaints process should be explored with assistance from an external agency and remedial action taken if required. (2.47)

### **Legal rights**

---

- 5.27 Sentenced and remanded young people should be given written information about their sentence or remand, including the potential for early and late release for those serving detention and training orders. Young people should confirm in writing that they have understood the conditions and nature of their sentence or remand period. (2.53)

### **Health services**

---

- 5.28 All clinical areas and equipment should comply with infection control guidance. (2.58)
- 5.29 There should be an ongoing audit to enhance the quality of record keeping. (2.64)
- 5.30 The views of young people on health care should be further investigated and the high number of 'did not attends' should be reduced. (2.65)
- 5.31 A training needs analysis should be undertaken to identify the training needs of nursing staff. (2.66)
- 5.32 SystemOne should be used to record prescribing and administration of medicines and enable more effective audit and analysis of medicines used. (2.76)
- 5.33 A wider range of patient group directions should be introduced to enable more potent medication to be supplied by the pharmacist or nurse, and to avoid unnecessary consultations with the doctor. (2.77)
- 5.34 The decontamination area should be fully compliant with infection control requirements. (2.84)
- 5.35 There should be age-appropriate health promotion information. (2.85)
- 5.36 Mental health awareness training, including learning disabilities and personality disorders, should be available to all staff. (2.88)

### **Catering**

---

- 5.37 All young people should have the opportunity to eat out of their cells. (2.93)

- 5.38 Lunch should not be served before noon and the evening meal not before 5pm. (2.94)
- 5.39 The food consultation arrangements should be improved. (2.95)

### **Purchases**

---

- 5.40 The shop should hold a wide range of stock to meet the diverse needs of the population. (2.98)

### **Time out of cell**

---

- 5.41 All young people should spend a minimum of 10 hours every day out of their cell. (3.6)
- 5.42 Provision for young people who receive education on the units should be increased. (3.7)

### **Education, learning and skills**

---

- 5.43 The progress made by young people in education should be formally monitored and recorded. (3.15)
- 5.44 The incentive scheme operating in education should be linked to the rewards and sanctions scheme. (3.27)
- 5.45 Marking and assessment should include advice on how to improve; attention should be paid to the correction of spelling and grammar. (3.28)

### **Physical education and healthy living**

---

- 5.46 Recreational PE should be available in the evenings. (3.43)
- 5.47 Young people's views on PE should be regularly sought by formal and informal means. (3.44)

### **Pre-release and resettlement**

---

- 5.48 Release on temporary licence opportunities should be extended. (4.9)

### **Training planning and remand management**

---

- 5.49 The offender management unit should be re-established at the centre of sentence and remand planning in a whole establishment approach to reducing re-offending. (4.18)
- 5.50 Young people should be told where they can receive help on practical resettlement issues. (4.19)
- 5.51 There should be a looked-after children policy. (4.30)

### **Reintegration planning**

---

- 5.52 Young people should be consistently prepared for release and should receive harm reduction information. Post-release care should be planned effectively. (4.39)



- 5.53 Offending behaviour and life skills programmes should be available to young people. (4.53)
- 5.54 An anger management training programme should be introduced for young people. (4.54)

## Housekeeping points

---

### Early days in custody

---

- 5.55 Peer mentors should be available to young people on Bittern each day. (1.15)
- 5.56 Risk management plans should address all identified triggers for each young person. (1.16)

### Residential units

---

- 5.57 Applications should be processed fairly and quickly. (2.13)

### Relationships between staff and children and young people

---

- 5.58 Young people should meet their personal officer within 24 hours of arrival. (2.18)
- 5.59 Personal officers should make weekly contact with young people in their care. (2.19)

### Equality and diversity

---

- 5.60 Young people should be made aware of discrimination incident reporting procedures. (2.27)
- 5.61 Discrimination incident report forms should be available in foreign languages. (2.28)

### Health services

---

- 5.62 Wholesale stock should be supplied as complete packs and should not be labelled. (2.78)
- 5.63 Staff should read and sign the agreed pharmacy procedures and policies. (2.79)
- 5.64 Controlled drugs registers should be compliant with the current legislation. (2.80)

### Training planning and remand management

---

- 5.65 In collaboration with other departments, offender supervisors should assess individual need, develop plans to reduce re-offending and address practical resettlement needs, and review plans systematically. (4.20)
- 5.66 Offender supervisors should be given training in completion of the new training planning documentation. (4.21)

### Reintegration planning

---

- 5.67 Visiting arrangements should enable young people to get to their visits on time. (4.50)

## Good practice

---

### **Equality and diversity**

---

- 5.68 Young Travellers and Gypsies were able to transfer additional credit to their telephone accounts to ensure the same opportunity for maintaining family contact as settled young people. (2.39)
- 5.69 The canteen list contained photographs of products which assisted young people who could not read. (2.40)

## Appendix I: Inspection team

---

Nick Hardwick	Chief Inspector
Ian Macfadyen	Team leader
Angela Johnson	Inspector
Colin Carroll	Inspector
Gordon Riach	Inspector
Ian Thomson	Inspector
Maneer Afsar	Observer
Amy Radford	Researcher
Rachel Murray	Researcher
<b>Specialist inspectors</b>	
Sigrid Engelen	Substance misuse inspector
Helen Carter	Health services inspector
Jackie Izzard	Care Quality Commission
Sharon Monks	Pharmacist
Martyn Rhowbotham	Ofsted inspector
Charles Clark	Ofsted inspector
Ken Jones	Ofsted inspector
Sanjit Grewal	Youth Justice Board observer

## Appendix II: Establishment 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	107	60.12
Recalls	12	6.75
Convicted unsentenced	4	2.24
Remand	55	30.89
Detainee	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>178</b>	<b>100</b>

Age	Number of young people	%
15 years	5	2.8
16 years	47	26.4
17 years	108	60.68
18 years	18	10.12
<b>Total</b>	<b>178</b>	<b>100</b>

Nationality	Number of young people	%
British	152	85.4
Foreign nationals	26	14.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>178</b>	<b>100</b>

Ethnicity	Number of young people	%
White		
British	3	1.68
Irish	1	0.56
Other white	12	6.74
Mixed		
White and black Caribbean	15	8.42
White and black African	4	2.24
White and Asian	1	0.56
Other mixed	5	2.8
Asian or Asian British		
Indian	4	2.24
Pakistani	10	5.61
Bangladeshi		
Other Asian	2	1.12
Black or black British		
Caribbean	35	19.66
African	36	20.22
Other black	9	5.03
Not stated	21	11.79
<b>Total</b>	<b>178</b>	<b>100</b>

Religion	Number of young people	%
Baptist		
Church of England	16	8.98
Roman Catholic	28	15.74
Other Christian denominations	43	24.15
Muslim	64	35.95
Sikh	1	0.57
Hindu	1	0.57
Buddhist		
Jewish		
Other	1	0.57
No religion	19	10.67
	<b>173</b>	<b>97.2</b>

Other demographics	Number of young people	%
Gypsy/Romany/Traveller	5	2.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>178</b>	<b>100</b>

#### Sentenced only – length of stay by age

Length of stay	<1 mth	1–3 mths	3–6 mths	6–12 mths	1–2 yrs	2 yrs +	4 yrs +	Total
<b>Age</b>								
15 years					1	1		2
16 years		1	1	3	7	6		18
17 years		1	3	22	25	24		75
18 years			1	6	3	4		14
<b>Total</b>		2	5	31	36	20		109

#### Unsentenced only – length of stay by age

Length of stay	<1 mth	1–3 mths	3–6 mths	6–12 mths	1–2 yrs	2 yrs+	4 yrs +	Total
<b>Age</b>								
15 years		3	9	4	1			17
16 years	1	2	5	11	3			22
17 years		2	12	13	1			27
18 years			1	1				2
<b>Total</b>	1	7	27	29	5			69

Main offence	Number of young people	%
Violence against the person	37	30.08
Sexual offences	1	0.82
Burglary	11	8.94
Robbery	43	34.95
Theft and handling	2	1.62
Fraud and forgery	1	0.82
Drugs offences	12	9.75
Other offences	15	12.2
Offence not recorded/holding warrant	1	0.82
<b>Total</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>100</b>

Number of DTO's by age and full sentence length, including the time in the community

Sentence	4 mths	6 mths	8 mths	10 mths	12 mths	18 mths	24 mths	Recall	Total
Age									
15 years		1			1		1		3
16 years	1	2	2	1	7	4	2		19
17 years	2	9	11	3	13	11	3		52
18 years		1			4	12	2		19
<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>8</b>		<b>93</b>

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

Sentence	Under 2 yrs	2-3 yrs	3-4 yrs	4-5 yrs	5 yrs +	Recall	Total
Age							
15 years		1					1
16 years		2		1		2	5
17 years		2		4		3	9
18 years							
<b>Total</b>		<b>5</b>		<b>5</b>		<b>5</b>	<b>15</b>

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

Sentence	Under 2 yrs	2-3 yrs	3-4 yrs	4-5 yrs	5 yrs +	Recall	Total
Age							
15 years							
16 years							
17 years							
18 years							
<b>Total</b>							

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

Sentence	Under 2 yrs	2-5 yrs	5 - 10 yrs	10 - 15 yrs	15 - 20 yrs	Recall	Total
Age							
15 years							
16 years							
17 years			1				1
18 years							
<b>Total</b>			<b>1</b>				<b>1</b>

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

Sentence	Under 2 yrs	2-5 yrs	5 - 10 yrs	10 - 15 yrs	15 - 20 yrs	20yrs +	Total
Age							
15 years							
16 years							
17 years			1				1
18 years							
<b>Total</b>			<b>1</b>				<b>1</b>

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

---

## Survey methodology

---

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

## Selecting the sample

---

At the time of the survey on 15 January 2013, the population of young people at HMYOI Feltham was 183. Every young person was offered a survey, this represented 100% of the population of children and young people.

Questionnaires were offered to all 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, two respondents were 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, 155 respondents completed and returned their questionnaires. This represented 85% of children and young people in the establishment at the time.

Seven respondents refused to complete a questionnaire, eight questionnaires were not returned and 13 were returned blank.

## Comparisons

---

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 nine male establishments surveyed since April 2011. Within the statistical analyses all data have been weighted in order to mimic a consistent percentage sampled in each establishment.

A further comparator compares the responses of young people in 2013 against the responses of young people surveyed at HMYOI Feltham in 2011. Whereas in previous inspections the Heron unit has been sampled separately, during the current inspection the Heron unit was incorporated into the main sample as it no longer acts as a specialist unit with a discrete function. 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 the survey questions may have changed. However, both percentages are true of the populations they were taken from, and the statistical significance (see below) is correct.

On occasion, the analysis comparing the most recent survey findings to the previous survey findings at an establishment will be different in the stand-alone findings document and in the appendices of an inspection report. This occurs when the current survey is being used for an inspection but the previous survey carried out at the establishment was not; for inspection purposes it is more helpful to compare the current survey to the survey that was carried out for the last inspection and so this version will appear in the inspection report, while the comparison between the current survey and the last survey at the establishment will appear in the stand-alone document.

In addition, the following analyses were conducted:

- The current survey responses in 2013 against the responses of children and young people surveyed at Feltham in 2011, excluding responses from the Heron unit in 2011.
- The current survey responses for the Heron unit in 2013 against the responses of children and young people surveyed within the Heron unit in 2011.
- A comparison within the 2013 survey between the responses of white young people and those from a black and minority ethnic group.
- A comparison within the 2013 survey between the responses of Muslim young people and non-Muslim young people.

In all the above documents, statistically significant differences are highlighted. Statistical significance indicates whether there is a real difference between the figures, i.e. 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 summary

## SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU

<b>Q1</b>	<b>How old are you?</b>	
	15.....	2 (1%)
	16.....	43 (28%)
	17.....	92 (60%)
	18.....	16 (10%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Are you a British citizen?</b>	
	Yes.....	139 (93%)
	No.....	10 (7%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>Do you understand spoken English?</b>	
	Yes.....	151 (99%)
	No.....	2 (1%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Do you understand written English?</b>	
	Yes.....	149 (99%)
	No.....	2 (1%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>What is your ethnic origin?</b>	
	White - British.....	19 (13%)
	White - Irish.....	0 (0%)
	White - Other.....	8 (5%)
	Black or black British - Caribbean.....	29 (19%)
	Black or black British - African.....	42 (28%)
	Black or black British - Other.....	3 (2%)
	Asian or Asian British - Indian.....	2 (1%)
	Asian or Asian British - Pakistani.....	5 (3%)
	Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi.....	11 (7%)
	Asian or Asian British - Chinese.....	1 (1%)
	Asian or Asian British - Other.....	3 (2%)
	Mixed race - White and black Caribbean.....	16 (11%)
	Mixed race - White and black African.....	6 (4%)
	Mixed race - White and Asian.....	1 (1%)
	Mixed race - Other.....	2 (1%)
	Arab.....	4 (3%)
	Other ethnic group.....	0 (0%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>What is your religion?</b>	
	None.....	14 (9%)
	Church of England.....	36 (24%)
	Catholic.....	22 (14%)
	Protestant.....	1 (1%)
	Other Christian denomination.....	12 (8%)
	Buddhist.....	0 (0%)
	Hindu.....	1 (1%)
	Jewish.....	0 (0%)
	Muslim.....	66 (43%)
	Sikh.....	0 (0%)

Q7	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	
	Yes.....	4 (3%)
	No.....	139 (94%)
	Don't know .....	5 (3%)
Q8	Do you have any children?	
	Yes.....	17 (11%)
	No.....	133 (89%)
Q9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability (i.e. do you need help with any long-term physical, mental or learning needs)?	
	Yes.....	10 (7%)
	No.....	141 (93%)
Q10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	
	Yes.....	40 (27%)
	No.....	109 (73%)

## SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE

Q1	Are you sentenced?	
	Yes.....	101 (67%)
	No - unsentenced/on remand.....	50 (33%)
Q2	How long is your sentence (the full DTO sentence)?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i> .....	50 (34%)
	<i>Less than 6 months</i> .....	15 (10%)
	<i>6 to 12 months</i> .....	37 (25%)
	<i>More than 12 months, up to 2 years</i> .....	19 (13%)
	<i>More than 2 years</i> .....	27 (18%)
	<i>Indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP)</i> .....	1 (1%)
Q3	How long have you been in this establishment?	
	<i>Less than 1 month</i> .....	20 (13%)
	<i>1 to 6 months</i> .....	95 (63%)
	<i>More than 6 months, but less than 12 months</i> .....	23 (15%)
	<i>12 months to 2 years</i> .....	10 (7%)
	<i>More than 2 years</i> .....	3 (2%)
Q4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	
	Yes.....	82 (55%)
	No.....	68 (45%)

## SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS

Q1	On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?	
	Yes.....	116 (76%)
	No.....	21 (14%)
	Don't remember.....	16 (10%)
Q2	On your most recent journey here, were there any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females travelling with you?	
	Yes.....	79 (51%)
	No.....	45 (29%)
	Don't remember.....	30 (19%)

Q3	On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i> .....	83 (54%)
	<i>2 to 4 hours</i> .....	51 (33%)
	<i>More than 4 hours</i> .....	11 (7%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	8 (5%)
Q4	On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?	
	<i>My journey was less than 2 hours</i> .....	83 (54%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	4 (3%)
	<i>No</i> .....	59 (39%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	7 (5%)
Q5	On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?	
	<i>My journey was less than 2 hours</i> .....	83 (55%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	14 (9%)
	<i>No</i> .....	49 (32%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	5 (3%)
Q6	On your most recent journey here, how did you feel you were treated by the escort staff?	
	<i>Very well</i> .....	16 (11%)
	<i>Well</i> .....	57 (38%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....	53 (35%)
	<i>Badly</i> .....	6 (4%)
	<i>Very badly</i> .....	9 (6%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	9 (6%)
Q7	Before you arrived here, did you receive any information to help you prepare for coming here?	
	<i>Yes - and it was helpful</i> .....	18 (12%)
	<i>Yes - but it was not helpful</i> .....	20 (13%)
	<i>No - I received no information</i> .....	93 (62%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	19 (13%)

#### SECTION 4: FIRST DAYS

Q1	How long were you in reception?	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i> .....	124 (82%)
	<i>2 hours or longer</i> .....	11 (7%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	16 (11%)
Q2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	113 (75%)
	<i>No</i> .....	24 (16%)
	<i>Don't remember/not applicable</i> .....	14 (9%)
Q3	How well did you feel you were treated in reception?	
	<i>Very well</i> .....	18 (12%)
	<i>Well</i> .....	69 (46%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....	35 (23%)
	<i>Badly</i> .....	11 (7%)
	<i>Very badly</i> .....	7 (5%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	11 (7%)

Q4	<p><b>When you first arrived here, did staff ask if you needed help or support with any of the following things? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b></p> <p><i>Not being able to smoke</i> ..... 47 (33%)</p> <p><i>Loss of property</i> ..... 27 (19%)</p> <p><i>Feeling scared</i>..... 34 (24%)</p> <p><i>Gang problems</i>..... 89 (62%)</p> <p><i>Contacting family</i>..... 66 (46%)</p>	<p><i>Money worries</i>..... 22 (15%)</p> <p><i>Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to</i>..... 43 (30%)</p> <p><i>Health problems</i> ..... 73 (51%)</p> <p><i>Getting phone numbers</i>..... 59 (41%)</p> <p><b><i>Staff did not ask me about any of these</i></b>..... 21 (15%)</p>
Q5	<p><b>When you first arrived here, did you have any of the following problems? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b></p> <p><i>Not being able to smoke</i> ..... 53 (38%)</p> <p><i>Loss of property</i> ..... 11 (8%)</p> <p><i>Feeling scared</i>..... 6 (4%)</p> <p><i>Gang problems</i>..... 21 (15%)</p> <p><i>Contacting family</i>..... 30 (22%)</p>	<p><i>Money worries</i>..... 23 (17%)</p> <p><i>Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to</i>..... 4 (3%)</p> <p><i>Health problems</i> ..... 6 (4%)</p> <p><i>Getting phone numbers</i>..... 34 (24%)</p> <p><b><i>I did not have any problems</i></b>..... 52 (37%)</p>
Q6	<p><b>When you first arrived here, were you given any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b></p> <p><i>Toiletries/basic items</i>..... 112 (75%)</p> <p><i>The opportunity to have a shower</i>..... 51 (34%)</p> <p><i>Something to eat</i>..... 132 (88%)</p> <p><i>A free phone call to friends/family</i> ..... 121 (81%)</p> <p><i>PIN phone credit</i> ..... 86 (57%)</p> <p><i>Information about feeling worried/upset</i> ..... 38 (25%)</p> <p><i>Don't remember</i>..... 1 (1%)</p> <p><b><i>I was not given any of these</i></b>..... 6 (4%)</p>	
Q7	<p><b>Within your first 24 hours here, did you have access to the following people or services? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b></p> <p><i>Chaplain</i>..... 48 (34%)</p> <p><i>Peer mentor</i> ..... 14 (10%)</p> <p><i>Childline/Samaritans</i> ..... 16 (11%)</p> <p><i>The prison shop/canteen</i>..... 16 (11%)</p> <p><i>Don't remember</i>..... 35 (25%)</p> <p><b><i>I did not have access to any of these</i></b> ..... 56 (39%)</p>	
Q8	<p><b>Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?</b></p> <p><i>Yes</i>..... 68 (46%)</p> <p><i>No</i>..... 63 (43%)</p> <p><i>Don't remember</i>..... 17 (11%)</p>	
Q9	<p><b>Did you feel safe on your first night here?</b></p> <p><i>Yes</i>..... 113 (76%)</p> <p><i>No</i>..... 22 (15%)</p> <p><i>Don't remember</i>..... 13 (9%)</p>	
Q10	<p><b>Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the establishment?</b></p> <p><b><i>I have not been on an induction course</i></b>..... 17 (12%)</p> <p><i>Yes</i>..... 70 (48%)</p> <p><i>No</i>..... 42 (29%)</p> <p><i>Don't remember</i>..... 16 (11%)</p>	

## SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT

Q1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	
	Yes.....	109 (74%)
	No.....	28 (19%)
	Don't know.....	11 (7%)
Q2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	
	Yes.....	68 (47%)
	No.....	52 (36%)
	Don't know.....	25 (17%)
Q3	What is the food like here?	
	Very good.....	2 (1%)
	Good.....	21 (14%)
	Neither.....	46 (31%)
	Bad.....	28 (19%)
	Very bad.....	50 (34%)
Q4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	
	<i>I have not bought anything yet/don't know</i> .....	8 (5%)
	Yes.....	60 (40%)
	No.....	82 (55%)
Q5	How easy is it for you to attend religious services?	
	<i>I don't want to attend religious services</i> .....	10 (7%)
	Very easy.....	48 (32%)
	Easy.....	46 (31%)
	Neither.....	20 (13%)
	Difficult.....	13 (9%)
	Very difficult.....	6 (4%)
	Don't know.....	6 (4%)
Q6	Are your religious beliefs respected?	
	Yes.....	101 (69%)
	No.....	27 (18%)
	Don't know/not applicable.....	18 (12%)
Q7	Can you speak to a chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?	
	Yes.....	102 (70%)
	No.....	10 (7%)
	Don't know/not applicable.....	33 (23%)
Q8	Can you speak to a peer mentor when you need to?	
	Yes.....	40 (27%)
	No.....	29 (20%)
	Don't know.....	79 (53%)
Q9	Can you speak to a member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board) when you need to?	
	Yes.....	35 (24%)
	No.....	28 (19%)
	Don't know.....	85 (57%)
Q10	Can you speak to an advocate (an outside person to help you) when you need to?	
	Yes.....	43 (29%)

No.....	27 (18%)
Don't know .....	77 (52%)

## SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Do most staff treat you with respect?</b>	
	Yes.....	86 (59%)
	No.....	59 (41%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>If you had a problem, who would you turn to? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	No one.....	42 (30%)
	Personal officer.....	31 (22%)
	Wing officer.....	24 (17%)
	Teacher/education staff.....	7 (5%)
	Gym staff.....	5 (4%)
	Chaplain.....	14 (10%)
	IMB.....	9 (6%)
	YOT worker.....	40 (29%)
	Social worker.....	17 (12%)
	Health services staff.....	2 (1%)
	Peer mentor.....	2 (1%)
	Another young person here.....	20 (14%)
	Case worker.....	26 (19%)
	Advocate.....	4 (3%)
	Family/friends.....	56 (40%)
	Childline/Samaritans.....	2 (1%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?</b>	
	Yes.....	36 (26%)
	No.....	104 (74%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?</b>	
	<i>I still have not met him/her</i> .....	25 (17%)
	<i>In your first week</i> .....	40 (28%)
	<i>After your first week</i> .....	42 (29%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	37 (26%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>How often do you see your personal (named) officer?</b>	
	<i>I still have not met him/her</i> .....	25 (19%)
	<i>At least once a week</i> .....	61 (46%)
	<i>Less than once a week</i> .....	46 (35%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>Do you feel your personal (named) officer tries to help you?</b>	
	<i>I still have not met him/her</i> .....	25 (20%)
	Yes.....	67 (53%)
	No.....	35 (28%)

## SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Is it easy to make an application?</b>	
	Yes.....	84 (59%)
	No.....	28 (20%)
	Don't know .....	31 (22%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Are applications sorted out fairly?</b>	
	<i>I have not made an application</i> .....	52 (36%)
	Yes.....	56 (39%)
	No.....	35 (24%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>Are applications sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?</b>	
	<i>I have not made an application</i> .....	52 (37%)
	Yes.....	31 (22%)
	No.....	56 (40%)

Q4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	
	Yes.....	61 (42%)
	No.....	32 (22%)
	Don't know .....	51 (35%)
Q5	Are complaints sorted out fairly?	
	<i>I have not made a complaint</i> .....	78 (54%)
	Yes.....	14 (10%)
	No.....	52 (36%)
Q6	Are complaints sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	
	<i>I have not made a complaint</i> .....	78 (55%)
	Yes.....	14 (10%)
	No.....	51 (36%)
Q7	Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint?	
	Yes.....	15 (11%)
	No.....	78 (57%)
	Never needed to make a complaint.....	43 (32%)

## SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE

Q1	What level of the rewards and sanctions scheme are you on?	
	<i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i> .....	5 (4%)
	<i>Enhanced (top)</i> .....	22 (16%)
	<i>Standard (middle)</i> .....	81 (57%)
	<i>Basic (bottom)</i> .....	26 (18%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	7 (5%)
Q2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the rewards and sanctions scheme?	
	<i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i> .....	5 (4%)
	Yes.....	56 (41%)
	No.....	61 (45%)
	Don't know .....	15 (11%)
Q3	Do the different levels of the rewards and sanctions scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	
	<i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i> .....	5 (4%)
	Yes.....	63 (45%)
	No.....	58 (42%)
	Don't know .....	13 (9%)
Q4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	
	Yes.....	40 (28%)
	No.....	48 (34%)
	Don't know .....	54 (38%)
Q5	If you have had a minor report, was the process explained clearly to you?	
	<i>I have not had a minor report</i> .....	102 (73%)
	Yes.....	28 (20%)
	No.....	10 (7%)
Q6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	
	Yes.....	82 (59%)
	No.....	51 (37%)



	<i>Don't know</i> .....	5 (4%)
Q7	If you have had an adjudication ('nicking'), was the process explained clearly to you?	
	<i>I have not had an adjudication</i> .....	56 (42%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	61 (46%)
	<i>No</i> .....	15 (11%)
Q8	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	53 (38%)
	<i>No</i> .....	79 (57%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	7 (5%)
Q9	If you have spent a night in the care and separation unit (CSU), how were you treated by staff?	
	<i>I have not been to the care and separation unit</i> .....	89 (66%)
	<i>Very well</i> .....	4 (3%)
	<i>Well</i> .....	12 (9%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....	8 (6%)
	<i>Badly</i> .....	7 (5%)
	<i>Very badly</i> .....	14 (10%)

## SECTION 9: SAFETY

Q1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	52 (37%)
	<i>No</i> .....	89 (63%)
Q2	Do you feel unsafe now?	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	24 (18%)
	<i>No</i> .....	113 (82%)
Q3	In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Never felt unsafe</i> .....	89 (64%)
	<i>Everywhere</i> .....	19 (14%)
	<i>Care and separation unit</i> .....	5 (4%)
	<i>Association areas</i> .....	8 (6%)
	<i>Reception area</i> .....	6 (4%)
	<i>At the gym</i> .....	6 (4%)
	<i>In an exercise yard</i> .....	4 (3%)
	<i>At work</i> .....	7 (5%)
	<i>At education</i> .....	12 (9%)
	<i>At religious services</i> .....	9 (6%)
	<i>At meal times</i> .....	4 (3%)
	<i>At healthcare</i> .....	8 (6%)
	<i>Visits area</i> .....	15 (11%)
	<i>In wing showers</i> .....	7 (5%)
	<i>In gym showers</i> .....	7 (5%)
	<i>In corridors/stairwells</i> .....	18 (13%)
	<i>On your landing/wing</i> .....	7 (5%)
	<i>During movement</i> .....	17 (12%)
	<i>In your cell</i> .....	8 (6%)
Q4	Have you ever been victimised by another young person/group of young people here (e.g. insulted or assaulted you)?	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	30 (21%)
	<i>No</i> .....	111 (79%)

**Q5 If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**

<i>Insulting remarks (about you, your family or friends)</i> .....	10 (7%)
<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i> .....	14 (10%)
<i>Sexual abuse</i> .....	1 (1%)
<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i> .....	7 (5%)
<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i> .....	5 (4%)
<i>Medication</i> .....	2 (1%)
<i>Debt</i> .....	2 (1%)
<i>Drugs</i> .....	2 (1%)
<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i> .....	2 (1%)
<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i> .....	3 (2%)
<i>Your nationality</i> .....	2 (1%)
<i>You are from a different part of the country to others</i> .....	0 (0%)
<i>You are from a Traveller community</i> .....	2 (1%)
<i>Your sexuality</i> .....	0 (0%)
<i>Your age</i> .....	1 (1%)
<i>You having a disability</i> .....	3 (2%)
<i>You were new here</i> .....	7 (5%)
<i>Your offence/crime</i> .....	3 (2%)
<i>Gang related issues</i> .....	10 (7%)

**Q7 Have you ever been victimised by staff here (e.g. insulted or assaulted you)?**

<i>Yes</i> .....	42 (30%)
<i>No</i> .....	97 (70%)

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

<i>Insulting remarks (about you, your family or friends)</i> .....	27 (19%)
<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i> .....	6 (4%)
<i>Sexual abuse</i> .....	2 (1%)
<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i> .....	16 (12%)
<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i> .....	4 (3%)
<i>Medication</i> .....	3 (2%)
<i>Debt</i> .....	1 (1%)
<i>Drugs</i> .....	2 (1%)
<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i> .....	7 (5%)
<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i> .....	10 (7%)
<i>Your nationality</i> .....	6 (4%)
<i>You are from a different part of the country to others</i> .....	4 (3%)
<i>You are from a Traveller community</i> .....	1 (1%)
<i>Your sexuality</i> .....	1 (1%)
<i>Your age</i> .....	3 (2%)
<i>You having a disability</i> .....	2 (1%)
<i>You were new here</i> .....	5 (4%)
<i>Your offence/crime</i> .....	6 (4%)
<i>Gang related issues</i> .....	4 (3%)
<i>Because you made a complaint</i> .....	10 (7%)

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

<i>Yes</i> .....	25 (20%)
<i>No</i> .....	75 (60%)
<i>Don't know</i> .....	26 (21%)

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

<i>Yes</i> .....	28 (20%)
------------------	----------

No..... 59 (42%)  
 Don't know ..... 54 (38%)

Q12 Is shouting through the windows a problem here?  
 Yes..... 33 (23%)  
 No..... 96 (68%)  
 Don't know ..... 12 (9%)

## SECTION 10: HEALTH SERVICES

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

	Yes	No	Don't know
The doctor .....	56 (40%)	64 (45%)	21 (15%)
The nurse .....	81 (58%)	38 (27%)	20 (14%)
The dentist .....	23 (17%)	73 (53%)	41 (30%)

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

<i>I have not been</i> .....	22 (15%)
<i>Very good</i> .....	6 (4%)
<i>Good</i> .....	33 (23%)
<i>Neither</i> .....	25 (17%)
<i>Bad</i> .....	27 (19%)
<i>Very bad</i> .....	31 (22%)

Q3 If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/all of it in your room?

<i>I am not taking any medication</i> .....	83 (59%)
<i>Yes, all of my meds</i> .....	12 (9%)
<i>Yes, some of my meds</i> .....	13 (9%)
<i>No</i> .....	33 (23%)

Q4 Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?

Yes.....	23 (16%)
No.....	117 (84%)

Q5 Are you being helped by anyone here with your emotional or mental health problems (e.g. a psychologist, doctor, counsellor, personal officer or another member of staff)?

<i>I do not have any emotional or mental health problems</i> .....	117 (83%)
Yes.....	10 (7%)
No.....	14 (10%)

Q6 Did you have problems with alcohol when you first arrived here?

Yes.....	7 (5%)
No.....	134 (95%)

Q7 Have you received any help with alcohol problems here?

Yes.....	0 (0%)
No.....	140 (100%)

Q8 Did you have problems with drugs when you first arrived here?

Yes.....	25 (18%)
No.....	117 (82%)

Q9 Do you have problems with drugs now?

Yes.....	9 (6%)
No.....	130 (94%)

Q10	Have you received any help with drugs problems here?	
	Yes.....	4 (3%)
	No.....	136 (97%)
Q11	How easy or difficult is it to get illegal drugs here?	
	Very easy.....	10 (7%)
	Easy.....	8 (6%)
	Neither.....	6 (4%)
	Difficult.....	3 (2%)
	Very difficult.....	18 (13%)
	Don't know.....	96 (68%)

## SECTION 11: ACTIVITIES

Q1	How old were you when you were last at school?				
	14 or under.....	35 (25%)			
	15 or over.....	104 (75%)			
Q2	Have you ever been excluded from school?				
	Yes.....	116 (83%)			
	No.....	17 (12%)			
	Not applicable.....	7 (5%)			
Q3	Did you ever skip school before you came into custody?				
	Yes.....	82 (60%)			
	No.....	49 (36%)			
	Not applicable.....	6 (4%)			
Q4	Do you CURRENTLY take part in any of the following activities? (Please tick all that apply to you.)				
	Education.....	95 (68%)			
	A job in this establishment.....	19 (14%)			
	Vocational or skills training.....	12 (9%)			
	Offending behaviour programmes.....	11 (8%)			
	I am not currently involved in any of these.....	26 (19%)			
Q5	If you have been involved in any of the following activities here, do you think they will help you when you leave prison?				
		<i>Not been involved</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
	Education	4 (3%)	42 (34%)	64 (51%)	15 (12%)
	A job in this establishment	17 (17%)	36 (35%)	30 (29%)	19 (19%)
	Vocational or skills training	25 (25%)	30 (30%)	23 (23%)	21 (21%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	26 (27%)	18 (19%)	29 (30%)	24 (25%)
Q6	Do you usually have association every day?				
	Yes.....	116 (84%)			
	No.....	22 (16%)			
Q7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?				
	Don't want to go.....	7 (5%)			
	Yes.....	58 (42%)			
	No.....	72 (53%)			

Q8	How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?	
	<i>Don't want to go</i> .....	9 (7%)
	<i>None</i> .....	20 (15%)
	<i>One to two times</i> .....	40 (30%)
	<i>Three to five times</i> .....	57 (43%)
	<i>More than five times</i> .....	6 (5%)

## SECTION 12: FAMILY AND FRIENDS

Q1	Are you able to use the telephone every day if you want to?	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	104 (75%)
	<i>No</i> .....	29 (21%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	6 (4%)
Q2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	57 (42%)
	<i>No</i> .....	67 (49%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	13 (9%)
Q3	How many visits do you usually have each week, from family or friends?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i> .....	28 (19%)
	<i>Less than one a week</i> .....	41 (28%)
	<i>About one a week</i> .....	41 (28%)
	<i>More than one a week</i> .....	13 (9%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	21 (15%)
Q4	How easy is it for your family and friends to visit you here?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i> .....	28 (21%)
	<i>Very easy</i> .....	18 (13%)
	<i>Easy</i> .....	32 (24%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....	20 (15%)
	<i>Difficult</i> .....	22 (16%)
	<i>Very difficult</i> .....	7 (5%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	9 (7%)
Q5	Do your visits usually start on time?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i> .....	28 (20%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	35 (26%)
	<i>No</i> .....	56 (41%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	18 (13%)

## SECTION 13: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE

Q1	Do you think you will have a problem with any of the following things, when you are released? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Finding accommodation</i> .....	36 (27%)
	<i>Getting into school or college</i> .....	61 (46%)
	<i>Getting a job</i> .....	81 (61%)
	<i>Money/finances</i> .....	56 (42%)
	<i>Claiming benefits</i> .....	33 (25%)
	<i>Continuing health services</i> .....	17 (13%)
	<i>Opening a bank account</i> .....	24 (18%)
	<i>Avoiding bad relationships</i> .....	27 (20%)
	<i>I won't have any problems</i> .....	33 (25%)

Q2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan (i.e. a plan that is discussed in your DTO/planning meetings, which sets out your targets)?		
	Yes.....	41 (30%)	
	No.....	53 (39%)	
	Don't know .....	43 (31%)	
Q3	Were you involved in the development of your plan?		
	<i>I don't have a plan/don't know if I have a plan.....</i>	96 (72%)	
	Yes.....	31 (23%)	
	No.....	7 (5%)	
Q4	Do you understand the targets that have been set in your plan?		
	<i>I don't have a plan/don't know if I have a plan.....</i>	96 (72%)	
	Yes.....	32 (24%)	
	No.....	5 (4%)	
Q5	Do you have a caseworker here?		
	Yes.....	109 (78%)	
	No.....	8 (6%)	
	Don't know .....	23 (16%)	
Q6	Has your caseworker helped to prepare you for release?		
	<i>I don't have a caseworker.....</i>	31 (23%)	
	Yes.....	37 (27%)	
	No.....	51 (38%)	
	Don't know .....	16 (12%)	
Q7	Has your social worker been to visit you since you have been here?		
	<i>I don't have a social worker .....</i>	67 (48%)	
	Yes.....	45 (32%)	
	No.....	27 (19%)	
Q8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?		
	Yes.....	42 (31%)	
	No.....	61 (45%)	
	Don't know .....	34 (25%)	
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>	9 (9%)	
	<i>Getting into school or college.....</i>	18 (17%)	
	<i>Getting a job.....</i>	18 (17%)	
	<i>Help with money/finances .....</i>	9 (9%)	
	<i>Help with claiming benefits.....</i>	6 (6%)	
	<i>Continuing health services .....</i>	3 (3%)	
	<i>Opening a bank account.....</i>	4 (4%)	
	<i>Avoiding bad relationships .....</i>	3 (3%)	
	<i>I don't know who to contact.....</i>	73 (70%)	
Q10	What is most likely to stop you offending in the future? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	<i>Not sentenced .....</i>	50 (36%)	<i>Having a mentor (someone you can ask for advice).....</i> 12 (9%)
	<i>Nothing, it is up to me .....</i>	23 (16%)	<i>Having a YOT worker or social worker that I get on with.....</i> 23 (16%)

<i>Making new friends outside</i> .....	16 (11%)	<i>Having children</i> .....	16 (11%)
<i>Going back to live with my family</i> .....	26 (19%)	<i>Having something to do that isn't crime..</i>	29 (21%)
<i>Getting a place of my own</i> .....	26 (19%)	<i>This sentence</i> .....	21 (15%)
<i>Getting a job</i> .....	55 (39%)	<i>Getting into school/college</i> .....	41 (29%)
<i>Having a partner (girlfriend or boyfriend)</i>	23 (16%)	<i>Talking about my offending behaviour</i>	1 (1%)
		<i>with staff</i> .....	
<i>Staying off alcohol/drugs</i> .....	20 (14%)	<i>Anything else</i> .....	4 (3%)

Q11 Do you want to stop offending?

<i>Not sentenced</i> .....	50 (36%)
<i>Yes</i> .....	75 (54%)
<i>No</i> .....	7 (5%)
<i>Don't know</i> .....	8 (6%)

Q12 Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here, that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?

<i>Not sentenced</i> .....	50 (36%)
<i>Yes</i> .....	39 (28%)
<i>No</i> .....	50 (36%)

## Survey responses from children and young people: HMYOI Feltham 2013

**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

		2013 Feltham (including Heron Unit)	Young people comparator	2013 Feltham (including Heron Unit)	2011 Feltham (excluding Heron Unit)
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		155	838	155	109
<b>SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU</b>					
1.1	Are you 18 years of age?	11%	14%	11%	5%
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	7%	4%	7%	7%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	99%	99%	99%	
1.4	Do you understand written English?	99%	98%	99%	
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other category)?	82%	37%	82%	83%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	44%	17%	44%	39%
1.7	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	3%	5%	3%	3%
1.8	Do you have any children?	11%	9%	11%	12%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	7%	16%	7%	10%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	27%	31%	27%	17%
<b>SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE</b>					
2.1	Are you sentenced?	67%	82%	67%	35%
2.2	Is your sentence 12 months or less?	35%	36%	35%	17%
2.3	Have you been in this establishment for one month or less?	13%	17%	13%	18%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	55%	55%	55%	61%
<b>SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS</b>					
On your most recent journey here:					
3.1	Did you feel safe?	76%	83%	76%	77%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	51%	34%	51%	26%
3.3	Did you spend more than 4 hours in the van?	7%	7%	7%	0%
For those who spent 2 or more hours in the escort van:					
3.4	Were you offered a toilet break if you needed it?	6%	13%	6%	14%
3.5	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	21%	38%	21%	17%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	49%	53%	49%	49%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	12%	16%	12%	



## Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	2013 Feltham (including Heron Unit)	Young people comparator	2013 Feltham (including Heron Unit)	2011 Feltham (excluding Heron Unit)
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>155</b>	<b>838</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>109</b>
<b>SECTION 4: YOUR FIRST FEW DAYS HERE</b>					
4.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	82%	81%	82%	85%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	75%	84%	75%	
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	58%	68%	58%	58%
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?	33%	58%	33%	45%
4.4b	Loss of property?	19%	24%	19%	15%
4.4c	Feeling scared?	24%	30%	24%	
4.4d	Gang problems?	62%	53%	62%	
4.4e	Contacting family?	46%	60%	46%	59%
4.4f	Money worries?	15%	21%	15%	11%
4.4g	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	30%	38%	30%	
4.4h	Health problems?	51%	57%	51%	50%
4.4i	Getting phone numbers?	41%	47%	41%	31%
4.5	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	63%	72%	63%	79%
When you first arrived, did you have problems with any of the following:					
4.5a	Not being able to smoke?	38%	47%	38%	45%
4.5b	Loss of property?	8%	13%	8%	18%
4.5c	Feeling scared?	4%	9%	4%	
4.5d	Gang problems?	15%	12%	15%	
4.5e	Contacting family?	21%	24%	21%	18%
4.5f	Money worries?	17%	16%	17%	28%
4.5g	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	3%	12%	3%	
4.5h	Health problems?	4%	11%	4%	9%
4.5i	Getting phone numbers?	24%	28%	24%	42%
When you first arrived, were you given any of the following:					
4.6a	Toiletries/basic items?	75%	84%	75%	
4.6b	The opportunity to have a shower?	34%	48%	34%	11%
4.6c	Something to eat?	88%	83%	88%	83%
4.6d	A free phone call to friends/family?	81%	79%	81%	73%
4.6e	PIN phone credit?	57%	67%	57%	
4.6f	Information about feeling worried/upset?	25%	40%	25%	

## Key to tables

		2013 Feltham (including Heron Unit)	Young people comparator	2013 Feltham (including Heron Unit)	2011 Feltham (excluding Heron Unit)
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>155</b>	<b>838</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>109</b>
Within your first 24 hours, did you have access to the following people or services:					
<b>4.7a</b>	A chaplain?	34%	50%	34%	37%
<b>4.7b</b>	A peer mentor?	10%	15%	10%	
<b>4.7c</b>	Childline/Samaritans	11%	19%	11%	
<b>4.7d</b>	The prison shop/canteen?	11%	14%	11%	16%
<b>4.8</b>	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	46%	78%	46%	51%
<b>4.9</b>	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	76%	82%	76%	59%
<b>4.10</b>	For those who have been on an induction course: did it cover everything you needed to know about the establishment?	55%	65%	55%	45%
<b>SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT</b>					
<b>5.1</b>	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	74%	68%	74%	82%
<b>5.2</b>	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	47%	37%	47%	46%
<b>5.3</b>	Do you find the food here good/very good?	16%	18%	16%	15%
<b>5.4</b>	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	40%	50%	40%	32%
<b>5.5</b>	Is it easy/very easy for you to attend religious services?	63%	61%	63%	58%
<b>5.6</b>	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	69%	56%	69%	72%
Can you speak to:					
<b>5.7</b>	A chaplain of your faith in private?	70%	70%	70%	75%
<b>5.8</b>	A peer mentor?	27%	38%	27%	
<b>5.9</b>	A member of the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB)?	24%	31%	24%	18%
<b>5.10</b>	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	29%	47%	29%	15%
<b>SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF</b>					
<b>6.1</b>	Do most staff treat you with respect?	59%	70%	59%	71%
<b>6.2</b>	If you had a problem, would you have no one to turn to?	31%	23%	31%	
<b>6.3</b>	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	26%	42%	26%	25%
For those who have met their personal officer:					
<b>6.4</b>	Did you meet your personal (named) officer within the first week?	34%	46%	34%	48%
<b>6.5</b>	Do you see your personal (named) officer at least once a week?	57%	61%	57%	55%
<b>6.6</b>	Do you feel your personal (named) officer tries to help you?	66%	72%	66%	
<b>SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS</b>					
<b>7.1</b>	Is it easy to make an application?	59%	82%	59%	55%
For those who have made an application:					
<b>7.2</b>	Do you feel applications are sorted out fairly?	62%	74%	62%	55%

## Key to tables

		2013 Feltham (including Heron Unit)	Young people comparator	2013 Feltham (including Heron Unit)	2011 Feltham (excluding Heron Unit)
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>155</b>	<b>838</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>109</b>
<b>7.3</b>	Do you feel applications are sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	<b>36%</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>31%</b>
<b>7.4</b>	Is it easy to make a complaint?	<b>42%</b>	<b>59%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>53%</b>
For those who have made a complaint:					
<b>7.5</b>	Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	<b>22%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>30%</b>
<b>7.6</b>	Do you feel complaints are sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	<b>22%</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>33%</b>
<b>7.7</b>	Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint?	<b>11%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>11%</b>	
<b>SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE</b>					
<b>8.1</b>	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	<b>16%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>17%</b>
<b>8.2</b>	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	<b>41%</b>	<b>51%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>46%</b>
<b>8.3</b>	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	<b>45%</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>45%</b>
<b>8.4</b>	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	<b>28%</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>28%</b>	
For those who have had a minor report:					
<b>8.5</b>	Was the process explained clearly to you?	<b>73%</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>73%</b>	
<b>8.6</b>	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	<b>60%</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>65%</b>
For those who have had an adjudication ('nicking'):					
<b>8.7</b>	Was the process explained clearly to you?	<b>80%</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>91%</b>
<b>8.8</b>	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	<b>38%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>43%</b>
<b>8.9</b>	For those who had spent a night in the care and separation unit: did the staff treat you well/very well?	<b>36%</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>19%</b>
<b>SECTION 9: SAFETY</b>					
<b>9.1</b>	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	<b>37%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>46%</b>
<b>9.2</b>	Do you feel unsafe now?	<b>17%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>17%</b>	
<b>9.4</b>	Have you ever been victimised by other young people here?	<b>21%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>22%</b>
Since you have been here, have other young people:					
<b>9.5a</b>	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	<b>7%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>14%</b>
<b>9.5b</b>	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	<b>10%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>8%</b>
<b>9.5c</b>	Sexually abused you?	<b>1%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.5d</b>	Threatened or intimidated you?	<b>5%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>5%</b>	
<b>9.5e</b>	Taken your canteen/property?	<b>4%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>8%</b>
<b>9.5f</b>	Victimised you because of medication?	<b>1%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>1%</b>	
<b>9.5g</b>	Victimised you because of debt?	<b>1%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>1%</b>	
<b>9.5h</b>	Victimised you because of drugs?	<b>1%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>1%</b>

**Key to tables**

		2013 Feltham (including Heron Unit)	Young people comparator	2013 Feltham (including Heron Unit)	2011 Feltham (excluding Heron Unit)
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>155</b>	<b>838</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>109</b>
<b>9.5i</b>	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	1%	3%	1%	5%
<b>9.5j</b>	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	2%	2%	2%	4%
<b>9.5k</b>	Victimised you because of your nationality?	1%	2%	1%	
<b>9.5l</b>	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	0%	4%	0%	3%
<b>9.5m</b>	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	1%	1%	1%	
<b>9.5n</b>	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	1%	0%	
<b>9.5o</b>	Victimised you because of your age?	1%	1%	1%	
<b>9.5p</b>	Victimised you because you have a disability?	2%	2%	2%	1%
<b>9.5q</b>	Victimised you because you were new here?	5%	8%	5%	6%
<b>9.5r</b>	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	2%	2%	2%	2%
<b>9.5s</b>	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	7%	3%	7%	11%
<b>9.7</b>	Have you ever been victimised by a member of staff here?	31%	22%	31%	17%
Since you have been here, have staff:					
<b>9.8a</b>	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	20%	11%	20%	11%
<b>9.8b</b>	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	4%	4%	4%	2%
<b>9.8c</b>	Sexually abused you?	1%	1%	1%	0%
<b>9.8d</b>	Threatened or intimidated you?	12%	7%	12%	
<b>9.8e</b>	Taken your canteen/property?	3%	4%	3%	1%
<b>9.8f</b>	Victimised you because of medication?	2%	1%	2%	
<b>9.8g</b>	Victimised you because of debt?	1%	0%	1%	
<b>9.8h</b>	Victimised you because of drugs?	1%	1%	1%	2%
<b>9.8i</b>	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	5%	4%	5%	6%
<b>9.8j</b>	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	7%	2%	7%	2%
<b>9.8k</b>	Victimised you because of your nationality?	4%	1%	4%	
<b>9.8k</b>	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	3%	2%	3%	2%
<b>9.8m</b>	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	1%	1%	1%	
<b>9.8n</b>	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	1%	0%	1%	
<b>9.8o</b>	Victimised you because of your age?	2%	1%	2%	
<b>9.8p</b>	Victimised you because you have a disability?	1%	1%	1%	2%
<b>9.8q</b>	Victimised you because you were new here?	4%	3%	4%	5%
<b>9.8r</b>	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	4%	2%	4%	1%
<b>9.8s</b>	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	3%	2%	3%	0%
<b>9.8t</b>	Victimised you because you made a complaint?	7%	6%	7%	

## Key to tables

		2013 Feltham (including Heron Unit)	Young people comparator	2013 Feltham (including Heron Unit)	2011 Feltham (excluding Heron Unit)
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>155</b>	<b>838</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>109</b>
<b>9.10</b>	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	20%	31%	20%	
<b>9.11</b>	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	20%	32%	20%	21%
<b>9.12</b>	Is shouting through the windows a problem here?	24%	38%	24%	34%
<b>SECTION 10: HEALTH SERVICES</b>					
<b>10.1a</b>	Is it easy for you to see the doctor?	40%	65%	40%	29%
<b>10.1b</b>	Is it easy for you to see the nurse?	59%	79%	59%	65%
<b>10.1c</b>	Is it easy for you to see the dentist?	17%	43%	17%	13%
<b>10.2</b>	For those who have been to health services: do you think the overall quality is good/very good?	32%	66%	32%	37%
<b>10.3</b>	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/all of it in your cell?	44%	49%	44%	
<b>10.4</b>	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?	16%	21%	16%	23%
<b>10.5</b>	If you have emotional or mental health problems, are you being helped by anyone here?	41%	60%	41%	36%
<b>10.6</b>	Did you have any problems with alcohol when you first arrived?	5%	12%	5%	7%
<b>10.7</b>	Have you received any help with any alcohol problems here?	0%	8%	0%	
<b>10.8</b>	Did you have any problems with drugs when you first arrived?	18%	38%	18%	18%
<b>10.9</b>	Do you have a problem with drugs now?	7%	7%	7%	6%
<b>10.10</b>	Have you received any help with any drug problems here?	3%	26%	3%	6%
<b>10.11</b>	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs here?	13%	20%	13%	12%
<b>SECTION 11: ACTIVITIES</b>					
<b>11.1</b>	Were you 14 or younger when you were last at school?	25%	39%	25%	24%
<b>11.2</b>	Have you ever been excluded from school?	83%	87%	83%	86%
<b>11.3</b>	Did you ever skip school before you came into custody?	60%	74%	60%	
Do you currently take part in any of the following:					
<b>11.4a</b>	Education?	68%	80%	68%	65%
<b>11.4b</b>	A job in this establishment?	13%	31%	13%	24%
<b>11.4c</b>	Vocational or skills training?	9%	21%	9%	12%
<b>11.4d</b>	Offending behaviour programmes?	8%	25%	8%	16%
<b>11.4e</b>	Nothing	19%	9%	19%	20%
For those who have taken part in the following activities while in this establishment, do you think that they will help you when you leave prison:					
<b>11.5a</b>	Education?	35%	69%	35%	44%
<b>11.5b</b>	A job in this establishment?	42%	57%	42%	46%
<b>11.5c</b>	Vocational or skills training?	40%	56%	40%	42%

## Key to tables

		2013 Feltham (including Heron Unit)	Young people comparator	2013 Feltham (including Heron Unit)	2011 Feltham (excluding Heron Unit)
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>155</b>	<b>838</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>109</b>
<b>11.5d</b>	Offending behaviour programmes?	25%	56%	25%	32%
<b>11.6</b>	Do you usually have association every day?	84%	69%	84%	88%
<b>11.7</b>	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	42%	44%	42%	53%
<b>11.8</b>	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	5%	9%	5%	3%
<b>SECTION 12: KEEPING IN TOUCH WITH FAMILY AND FRIENDS</b>					
<b>12.1</b>	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	75%	62%	75%	73%
<b>12.2</b>	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	42%	40%	42%	42%
<b>12.3</b>	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	38%	35%	38%	42%
<b>12.4</b>	Is it easy/very easy for your family and friends to visit you here?	37%	35%	37%	
<b>12.5</b>	Do your visits start on time?	26%	49%	26%	29%
<b>SECTION 13: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE</b>					
Do you think you will have a problem with the following, when you are released:					
<b>13.1a</b>	Finding accommodation?	27%	23%	27%	38%
<b>13.1b</b>	Getting into school or college?	46%	27%	46%	43%
<b>13.1c</b>	Getting a job?	61%	51%	61%	53%
<b>13.1d</b>	Money/finances?	42%	37%	42%	39%
<b>13.1e</b>	Claiming benefits?	25%	22%	25%	30%
<b>13.1f</b>	Continuing health services?	13%	10%	13%	12%
<b>13.1g</b>	Opening a bank account?	18%	14%	18%	18%
<b>13.1h</b>	Avoiding bad relationships?	20%	16%	20%	20%
<b>13.2</b>	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	30%	54%	30%	
For those with a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan:					
<b>13.3</b>	Were you involved in the development of your plan?	82%	83%	82%	
<b>13.4</b>	Do you understand the targets set in your plan?	86%	96%	86%	
<b>13.5</b>	Do you have a caseworker here?	78%	80%	78%	
<b>13.6</b>	Has your caseworker helped to prepare you for release?	36%	56%	36%	
For those with a social worker:					
<b>13.7</b>	Has your social worker been to visit you since you have been here?	62%	63%	62%	
<b>13.8</b>	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	31%	42%	31%	21%
If you have a problem with any of the following, do you know who to ask for help?					
<b>13.9a</b>	Finding accommodation	9%	36%	9%	34%
<b>13.9b</b>	Getting into school or college	17%	38%	17%	43%

**Key to tables**

		2013 Feltham (including Heron Unit)	Young people comparator	2013 Feltham (including Heron Unit)	2011 Feltham (excluding Heron Unit)
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>155</b>	<b>838</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>109</b>
<b>13.9c</b>	Getting a job	17%	41%	17%	34%
<b>13.9d</b>	Help with money/finances	9%	32%	9%	32%
<b>13.9e</b>	Help with claiming benefits	6%	28%	6%	21%
<b>13.9f</b>	Continuing health services	3%	23%	3%	16%
<b>13.9g</b>	Opening a bank account	4%	29%	4%	21%
<b>13.9h</b>	Avoiding bad relationships	3%	24%	3%	13%
For those who were sentenced:					
<b>13.11</b>	Do you want to stop offending?	83%	91%	83%	74%
<b>13.12</b>	Have you done anything or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?	44%	52%	44%	20%

## Key question responses (ethnicity and religion) HMYOI Feltham 2013

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

### Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic young people	White young people	Muslim young people	Non-Muslim young people
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>125</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>86</b>
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	6%	6%	5%	8%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	99%	100%	99%	99%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	99%	100%	99%	99%
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?			94%	74%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	50%	16%		
1.5	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	0%	16%	0%	5%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	6%	7%	5%	8%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	23%	43%	23%	30%
2.1	Are you sentenced?	65%	77%	68%	66%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	58%	39%	49%	59%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	54%	44%	56%	49%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	43%	80%	45%	53%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	10%	20%	9%	14%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	72%	93%	72%	78%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	56%	71%	56%	60%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	44%	58%	46%	46%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	73%	93%	72%	79%
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	70%	93%	67%	79%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	45%	60%	39%	55%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	13%	30%	12%	19%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	40%	45%	39%	43%



**Key to tables**

		Black and minority ethnic young people	White young people	Muslim young people	Non-Muslim young people
Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better					
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse					
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details					
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference					
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>125</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>86</b>
<b>5.6</b>	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	<b>70%</b>	<b>73%</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>75%</b>
Can you speak to:					
<b>5.7</b>	A chaplain of your faith in private?	<b>70%</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>63%</b>	<b>77%</b>
<b>5.8</b>	A peer mentor?	<b>23%</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>37%</b>
<b>5.9</b>	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	<b>23%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>29%</b>
<b>5.10</b>	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	<b>26%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>37%</b>
<b>6.1</b>	Do most staff treat you with respect?	<b>53%</b>	<b>93%</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>71%</b>
<b>6.2</b>	If you had a problem, would you have no one to turn to?	<b>31%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>30%</b>
<b>7.1</b>	Is it easy to make an application?	<b>53%</b>	<b>93%</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>61%</b>
<b>7.4</b>	Is it easy to make a complaint?	<b>40%</b>	<b>57%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>54%</b>
<b>8.1</b>	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	<b>15%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>16%</b>
<b>8.2</b>	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	<b>35%</b>	<b>69%</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>43%</b>
<b>8.3</b>	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	<b>40%</b>	<b>69%</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>46%</b>
<b>8.4</b>	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	<b>27%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>30%</b>
<b>8.6</b>	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	<b>59%</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>64%</b>
<b>8.8</b>	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	<b>41%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>44%</b>
<b>9.1</b>	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	<b>43%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>34%</b>
<b>9.2</b>	Do you feel unsafe now?	<b>21%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>14%</b>
<b>9.4</b>	Have you been victimised by other young people here?	<b>24%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>25%</b>
Since you have been here, have other young people:					
<b>9.5d</b>	Threatened or intimidated you?	<b>6%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>8%</b>
<b>9.5i</b>	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	<b>2%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>2%</b>
<b>9.5j</b>	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	<b>3%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>4%</b>
<b>9.5k</b>	Victimised you because of your nationality?	<b>2%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>2%</b>

**Key to tables**

		Black and minority ethnic young people	White young people	Muslim young people	Non-Muslim young people
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>125</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>86</b>
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	3%	0%	0%	4%
9.7	Have you been victimised by staff here?	34%	13%	37%	23%
Since you have been here, have staff:					
9.8d	Threatened or intimidated you?	14%	3%	16%	9%
9.8i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	6%	0%	7%	4%
9.8j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	9%	0%	13%	2%
9.8k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	5%	0%	6%	4%
9.8p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	1%	0%	0%	1%
9.10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	16%	31%	13%	24%
9.11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	19%	28%	18%	22%
10.1a	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the doctor?	37%	54%	42%	39%
10.1b	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the nurse?	57%	69%	58%	59%
10.4	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	14%	29%	15%	19%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:					
11.4a	Education?	68%	69%	63%	73%
11.4b	A job in this establishment?	13%	20%	12%	15%
11.4c	Vocational or skills training?	8%	13%	9%	9%
11.4d	Offending behaviour programmes?	9%	3%	10%	7%
11.4e	Nothing?	18%	24%	20%	17%
11.6	Do you usually have association every day?	82%	97%	81%	87%
11.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	36%	72%	40%	44%
11.8	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	5%	3%	2%	7%
12.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	72%	93%	68%	81%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	45%	24%	39%	43%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	38%	40%	33%	43%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	26%	50%	22%	36%
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	26%	57%	26%	35%

## Survey responses from children and young people: HMYOI Feltham: Heron Unit 2013 vs Heron Unit 2012

**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

		Heron Unit 2013	Heron Unit 2012
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>24</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU</b>			
1.1	Are you 18 years of age?	21%	0%
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	4%	7%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	
1.4	Do you understand written English?	100%	
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other category)?	68%	67%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	41%	41%
1.7	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	4%	0%
1.8	Do you have any children?	7%	10%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	7%	7%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	39%	14%
<b>SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE</b>			
2.1	Are you sentenced?	96%	100%
2.2	Is your sentence 12 months or less?	62%	76%
2.3	Have you been in this establishment for one month or less?	14%	10%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	59%	43%
<b>SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS</b>			
On your most recent journey here:			
3.1	Did you feel safe?	93%	87%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	50%	20%
3.3	Did you spend more than 4 hours in the van?	7%	0%
For those who spent 2 or more hours in the escort van:			
3.4	Were you offered a toilet break if you needed it?	8%	0%
3.5	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	39%	33%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	38%	47%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	4%	

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Heron Unit 2013	Heron Unit 2012
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>24</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>SECTION 4: YOUR FIRST FEW DAYS HERE</b>			
<b>4.1</b>	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	<b>93%</b>	<b>87%</b>
<b>4.2</b>	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	<b>79%</b>	
<b>4.3</b>	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	<b>62%</b>	<b>43%</b>
When you first arrived, did staff ask if you needed help or support with any of the following:			
<b>4.4a</b>	Not being able to smoke?	<b>39%</b>	<b>55%</b>
<b>4.4b</b>	Loss of property?	<b>26%</b>	<b>17%</b>
<b>4.4c</b>	Feeling scared?	<b>14%</b>	
<b>4.4d</b>	Gang problems?	<b>82%</b>	
<b>4.4e</b>	Contacting family?	<b>52%</b>	<b>48%</b>
<b>4.4f</b>	Money worries?	<b>19%</b>	<b>10%</b>
<b>4.4g</b>	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	<b>19%</b>	
<b>4.4h</b>	Health problems?	<b>61%</b>	<b>48%</b>
<b>4.4i</b>	Getting phone numbers?	<b>48%</b>	<b>52%</b>
<b>4.5</b>	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	<b>76%</b>	<b>73%</b>
When you first arrived, did you have problems with any of the following:			
<b>4.5a</b>	Not being able to smoke?	<b>52%</b>	<b>48%</b>
<b>4.5b</b>	Loss of property?	<b>8%</b>	<b>4%</b>
<b>4.5c</b>	Feeling scared?	<b>0%</b>	
<b>4.5d</b>	Gang problems?	<b>24%</b>	
<b>4.5e</b>	Contacting family?	<b>28%</b>	<b>11%</b>
<b>4.5f</b>	Money worries?	<b>24%</b>	<b>15%</b>
<b>4.5g</b>	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	<b>4%</b>	
<b>4.5h</b>	Health problems?	<b>4%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>4.5i</b>	Getting phone numbers?	<b>32%</b>	<b>33%</b>
When you first arrived, were you given any of the following:			
<b>4.6a</b>	Toiletries/basic items?	<b>78%</b>	
<b>4.6b</b>	The opportunity to have a shower?	<b>48%</b>	<b>17%</b>
<b>4.6c</b>	Something to eat?	<b>93%</b>	<b>79%</b>
<b>4.6d</b>	A free phone call to friends/family?	<b>93%</b>	<b>83%</b>
<b>4.6e</b>	PIN phone credit?	<b>56%</b>	
<b>4.6f</b>	Information about feeling worried/upset?	<b>30%</b>	

## Key to tables

		Heron Unit 2013	Heron Unit 2012
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>24</b>	<b>28</b>
Within your first 24 hours, did you have access to the following people or services:			
<b>4.7a</b>	A chaplain?	<b>35%</b>	<b>48%</b>
<b>4.7b</b>	A peer mentor?	<b>15%</b>	
<b>4.7c</b>	Childline/Samaritans	<b>4%</b>	
<b>4.7d</b>	The prison shop/canteen?	<b>4%</b>	<b>7%</b>
<b>4.8</b>	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	<b>61%</b>	<b>59%</b>
<b>4.9</b>	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	<b>82%</b>	<b>90%</b>
<b>4.10</b>	For those who have been on an induction course: did it cover everything you needed to know about the establishment?	<b>63%</b>	<b>56%</b>
<b>SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT</b>			
<b>5.1</b>	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	<b>93%</b>	<b>93%</b>
<b>5.2</b>	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	<b>52%</b>	<b>60%</b>
<b>5.3</b>	Do you find the food here good/very good?	<b>19%</b>	<b>20%</b>
<b>5.4</b>	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	<b>62%</b>	<b>21%</b>
<b>5.5</b>	Is it easy/very easy for you to attend religious services?	<b>71%</b>	<b>63%</b>
<b>5.6</b>	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	<b>70%</b>	<b>79%</b>
Can you speak to:			
<b>5.7</b>	A chaplain of your faith in private?	<b>68%</b>	<b>66%</b>
<b>5.8</b>	A peer mentor?	<b>38%</b>	
<b>5.9</b>	A member of the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB)?	<b>17%</b>	<b>17%</b>
<b>5.10</b>	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	<b>46%</b>	<b>13%</b>
<b>SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF</b>			
<b>6.1</b>	Do most staff treat you with respect?	<b>78%</b>	<b>63%</b>
<b>6.2</b>	If you had a problem, would you have no one to turn to?	<b>19%</b>	
<b>6.3</b>	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	<b>27%</b>	<b>31%</b>
For those who have met their personal officer:			
<b>6.4</b>	Did you meet your personal (named) officer within the first week?	<b>46%</b>	<b>69%</b>
<b>6.5</b>	Do you see your personal (named) officer at least once a week?	<b>67%</b>	<b>69%</b>
<b>6.6</b>	Do you feel your personal (named) officer tries to help you?	<b>71%</b>	
<b>SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS</b>			
<b>7.1</b>	Is it easy to make an application?	<b>79%</b>	<b>60%</b>
For those who have made an application:			
<b>7.2</b>	Do you feel applications are sorted out fairly?	<b>77%</b>	<b>76%</b>

## Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Heron Unit 2013	Heron Unit 2012
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>24</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>7.3</b>	Do you feel applications are sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	<b>43%</b>	<b>33%</b>
<b>7.4</b>	Is it easy to make a complaint?	<b>46%</b>	<b>55%</b>
For those who have made a complaint:			
<b>7.5</b>	Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	<b>44%</b>	<b>44%</b>
<b>7.6</b>	Do you feel complaints are sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	<b>75%</b>	<b>50%</b>
<b>7.7</b>	Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint?	<b>4%</b>	
<b>SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE</b>			
<b>8.1</b>	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	<b>32%</b>	<b>47%</b>
<b>8.2</b>	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	<b>67%</b>	<b>43%</b>
<b>8.3</b>	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	<b>67%</b>	<b>43%</b>
<b>8.4</b>	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	<b>21%</b>	
For those who have had a minor report:			
<b>8.5</b>	Was the process explained clearly to you?	<b>83%</b>	
<b>8.6</b>	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	<b>41%</b>	<b>33%</b>
For those who have had an adjudication ('nicking'):			
<b>8.7</b>	Was the process explained clearly to you?	<b>82%</b>	<b>67%</b>
<b>8.8</b>	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	<b>14%</b>	<b>21%</b>
<b>8.9</b>	For those who had spent a night in the care and separation unit: did the staff treat you well/very well?	<b>71%</b>	<b>50%</b>
<b>SECTION 9: SAFETY</b>			
<b>9.1</b>	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	<b>7%</b>	<b>20%</b>
<b>9.2</b>	Do you feel unsafe now?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.4</b>	Have you ever been victimised by other young people here?	<b>21%</b>	<b>11%</b>
Since you have been here, have other young people:			
<b>9.5a</b>	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	<b>7%</b>	<b>7%</b>
<b>9.5b</b>	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	<b>4%</b>	<b>7%</b>
<b>9.5c</b>	Sexually abused you?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.5d</b>	Threatened or intimidated you?	<b>4%</b>	
<b>9.5e</b>	Taken your canteen/property?	<b>4%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.5f</b>	Victimised you because of medication?	<b>4%</b>	
<b>9.5g</b>	Victimised you because of debt?	<b>0%</b>	
<b>9.5h</b>	Victimised you because of drugs?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.5i</b>	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>

**Key to tables**

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Heron Unit 2013	Heron Unit 2012
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>24</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>9.5j</b>	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.5k</b>	Victimised you because of your nationality?	<b>0%</b>	
<b>9.5l</b>	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	<b>0%</b>	<b>4%</b>
<b>9.5m</b>	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	<b>4%</b>	
<b>9.5n</b>	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	<b>0%</b>	
<b>9.5o</b>	Victimised you because of your age?	<b>0%</b>	
<b>9.5p</b>	Victimised you because you have a disability?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.5q</b>	Victimised you because you were new here?	<b>4%</b>	<b>7%</b>
<b>9.5r</b>	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	<b>4%</b>	<b>4%</b>
<b>9.5s</b>	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	<b>4%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.7</b>	Have you ever been victimised by a member of staff here?	<b>7%</b>	<b>19%</b>
Since you have been here, have staff:			
<b>9.8a</b>	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	<b>4%</b>	<b>14%</b>
<b>9.8b</b>	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	<b>0%</b>	<b>4%</b>
<b>9.8c</b>	Sexually abused you?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.8d</b>	Threatened or intimidated you?	<b>0%</b>	
<b>9.8e</b>	Taken your canteen/property?	<b>0%</b>	<b>4%</b>
<b>9.8f</b>	Victimised you because of medication?	<b>4%</b>	
<b>9.8g</b>	Victimised you because of debt?	<b>0%</b>	
<b>9.8h</b>	Victimised you because of drugs?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.8i</b>	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	<b>0%</b>	<b>4%</b>
<b>9.8j</b>	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.8k</b>	Victimised you because of your nationality?	<b>0%</b>	
<b>9.8k</b>	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.8m</b>	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	<b>0%</b>	
<b>9.8n</b>	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	<b>0%</b>	
<b>9.8o</b>	Victimised you because of your age?	<b>0%</b>	
<b>9.8p</b>	Victimised you because you have a disability?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.8q</b>	Victimised you because you were new here?	<b>0%</b>	<b>4%</b>
<b>9.8r</b>	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	<b>0%</b>	<b>7%</b>
<b>9.8s</b>	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	<b>0%</b>	<b>4%</b>
<b>9.8t</b>	Victimised you because you made a complaint?	<b>0%</b>	
<b>9.10</b>	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	<b>21%</b>	

**Key to tables**

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Heron Unit 2013	Heron Unit 2012
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>24</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>9.11</b>	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	<b>38%</b>	<b>47%</b>
<b>9.12</b>	Is shouting through the windows a problem here?	<b>32%</b>	<b>30%</b>
<b>SECTION 10: HEALTH SERVICES</b>			
<b>10.1a</b>	Is it easy for you to see the doctor?	<b>38%</b>	<b>35%</b>
<b>10.1b</b>	Is it easy for you to see the nurse?	<b>68%</b>	<b>66%</b>
<b>10.1c</b>	Is it easy for you to see the dentist?	<b>21%</b>	<b>14%</b>
<b>10.2</b>	For those who have been to health services: do you think the overall quality is good/very good?	<b>29%</b>	<b>46%</b>
<b>10.3</b>	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/all of it in your cell?	<b>55%</b>	
<b>10.4</b>	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?	<b>7%</b>	<b>17%</b>
<b>10.5</b>	If you have emotional or mental health problems, are you being helped by anyone here?	<b>50%</b>	<b>60%</b>
<b>10.6</b>	Did you have any problems with alcohol when you first arrived?	<b>7%</b>	<b>3%</b>
<b>10.7</b>	Have you received any help with any alcohol problems here?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>10.8</b>	Did you have any problems with drugs when you first arrived?	<b>17%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>10.9</b>	Do you have a problem with drugs now?	<b>4%</b>	<b>3%</b>
<b>10.10</b>	Have you received any help with any drug problems here?	<b>7%</b>	<b>3%</b>
<b>10.11</b>	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs here?	<b>14%</b>	<b>25%</b>
<b>SECTION 11: ACTIVITIES</b>			
<b>11.1</b>	Were you 14 or younger when you were last at school?	<b>14%</b>	<b>17%</b>
<b>11.2</b>	Have you ever been excluded from school?	<b>93%</b>	<b>90%</b>
<b>11.3</b>	Did you ever skip school before you came into custody?	<b>71%</b>	
Do you currently take part in any of the following:			
<b>11.4a</b>	Education?	<b>61%</b>	<b>83%</b>
<b>11.4b</b>	A job in this establishment?	<b>26%</b>	<b>33%</b>
<b>11.4c</b>	Vocational or skills training?	<b>26%</b>	<b>13%</b>
<b>11.4d</b>	Offending behaviour programmes?	<b>22%</b>	<b>17%</b>
<b>11.4e</b>	Nothing	<b>4%</b>	<b>0%</b>
For those who have taken part in the following activities while in this establishment, do you think that they will help you when you leave prison:			
<b>11.5a</b>	Education?	<b>23%</b>	<b>56%</b>
<b>11.5b</b>	A job in this establishment?	<b>58%</b>	<b>50%</b>
<b>11.5c</b>	Vocational or skills training?	<b>53%</b>	<b>63%</b>
<b>11.5d</b>	Offending behaviour programmes?	<b>50%</b>	<b>47%</b>
<b>11.6</b>	Do you usually have association every day?	<b>100%</b>	<b>93%</b>



**Key to tables**

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Heron Unit 2013	Heron Unit 2012
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>24</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>11.7</b>	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	<b>44%</b>	<b>48%</b>
<b>11.8</b>	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	<b>14%</b>	<b>7%</b>
<b>SECTION 12: KEEPING IN TOUCH WITH FAMILY AND FRIENDS</b>			
<b>12.1</b>	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	<b>100%</b>	<b>93%</b>
<b>12.2</b>	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	<b>46%</b>	<b>50%</b>
<b>12.3</b>	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	<b>38%</b>	<b>38%</b>
<b>12.4</b>	Is it easy/very easy for your family and friends to visit you here?	<b>41%</b>	
<b>12.5</b>	Do your visits start on time?	<b>39%</b>	<b>38%</b>
<b>SECTION 13: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE</b>			
Do you think you will have a problem with the following, when you are released:			
<b>13.1a</b>	Finding accommodation?	<b>15%</b>	<b>17%</b>
<b>13.1b</b>	Getting into school or college?	<b>27%</b>	<b>21%</b>
<b>13.1c</b>	Getting a job?	<b>58%</b>	<b>48%</b>
<b>13.1d</b>	Money/finances?	<b>46%</b>	<b>41%</b>
<b>13.1e</b>	Claiming benefits?	<b>31%</b>	<b>38%</b>
<b>13.1f</b>	Continuing health services?	<b>23%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>13.1g</b>	Opening a bank account?	<b>23%</b>	<b>17%</b>
<b>13.1h</b>	Avoiding bad relationships?	<b>23%</b>	<b>14%</b>
<b>13.2</b>	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	<b>46%</b>	
For those with a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan:			
<b>13.3</b>	Were you involved in the development of your plan?	<b>100%</b>	
<b>13.4</b>	Do you understand the targets set in your plan?	<b>92%</b>	
<b>13.5</b>	Do you have a caseworker here?	<b>86%</b>	
<b>13.6</b>	Has your caseworker helped to prepare you for release?	<b>56%</b>	
For those with a social worker:			
<b>13.7</b>	Has your social worker been to visit you since you have been here?	<b>86%</b>	
<b>13.8</b>	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	<b>50%</b>	<b>57%</b>
If you have a problem with any of the following, do you know who to ask for help?			
<b>13.9a</b>	Finding accommodation	<b>21%</b>	<b>56%</b>
<b>13.9b</b>	Getting into school or college	<b>11%</b>	<b>59%</b>
<b>13.9c</b>	Getting a job	<b>32%</b>	<b>52%</b>
<b>13.9d</b>	Help with money/finances	<b>11%</b>	<b>41%</b>
<b>13.9e</b>	Help with claiming benefits	<b>21%</b>	<b>37%</b>

**Key to tables**

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Heron Unit 2013	Heron Unit 2012
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>24</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>13.9f</b>	Continuing health services	<b>5%</b>	<b>15%</b>
<b>13.9g</b>	Opening a bank account	<b>5%</b>	<b>27%</b>
<b>13.9h</b>	Avoiding bad relationships	<b>11%</b>	<b>19%</b>
For those who were sentenced:			
<b>13.11</b>	Do you want to stop offending?	<b>96%</b>	<b>90%</b>
<b>13.12</b>	Have you done anything or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?	<b>39%</b>	<b>43%</b>