

Report on an announced inspection of

HMYOI Warren Hill

4 - 8 March 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-webrps.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

Introduction	5
Fact page	7
Healthy prison summary	9
1 Safety	17
<hr/>	
2 Respect	31
<hr/>	
3 Purposeful activity	43
<hr/>	
4 Resettlement	49
<hr/>	
5 Recommendations, housekeeping points and good practice	57
<hr/>	
Appendices	
<hr/>	
I Inspection team	65
II Establishment population profile	67
III Summary of children and young people questionnaires and interviews	71

Introduction

HMYOI Warren Hill, situated in rural Suffolk, is a facility holding up to 192 young people aged from 15 to 18. At our last inspection we described an institution that was improving following recent disturbances and that was about to open new accommodation and facilities. This inspection found that, overall, improvement had been sustained and that Warren Hill was continuing to operate successfully.

The governor and staff were clearly active in seeking to ensure the safety of young people held. The new reception and first night accommodation were excellent and facilitated very good initial assessment, peer support and induction. Safeguarding and child protection structures were effective and well integrated, with visible leadership by the governor. The security department were working in a measured way to address gang culture and issues related to violence. The perception of young people concerning their personal safety was positive. However, the number of violent incidents was very high and some were serious. Partly as a consequence of this, there had been a rise in the use of formal disciplinary procedures since we last inspected. The segregation unit was a very poor facility holding some young people for extended periods.

All the accommodation had now reopened. The contrast between the run-down older units and the newer facilities was stark. The new Welcome and Waveney units were excellent and provided decent facilities promoting respect. Staff managed and related to young people confidently and work was in place to promote diversity, although the perceptions of black and minority ethnic young people were more negative than their counterparts. Services for young people - including the chaplaincy, health care, legal services, consultation and responses to complaints - provided good outcomes.

Young people had adequate time unlocked and most were engaged with some form of education or training. There were sufficient activity places for all young people, although when we checked about a fifth were still on the units during the working day for various reasons. More needed to be done to monitor attendance and improve behaviour in classrooms. Initial assessments were thorough and the curriculum had improved, providing a good range of programmes in education and vocational training. The standard of most work was good but, although most teaching met requirements, some required improvement. The number of young people achieving accreditation on courses remained high.

Sentence management and resettlement provision was good. Sentence plans were detailed, prepared in consultation with young people and addressed risk and resettlement needs. The Waveney unit provided a constructive environment for those held longer term, and transition arrangements for those needing to move to the young adult estate were generally good. Most young people lived a significant distance from the establishment, and it was essential that efforts to lessen the impact on those who did not receive visits were not only sustained but developed. The provision of offending behaviour and life skills programmes had the potential to be a real strength, but more young people needed to access them.

Overall this is a good report. Warren Hill is very well led by a governor and management team who understand young people and their needs. It is an institution subject to considerable scrutiny and significant risk, and yet those risks were managed in a confident, proportionate and considered way. The high level of violent incidents remains a significant concern and more needs to be done to

reduce it. However, the institution is a respectful place that is equipping young people with skills and working well to prepare them for the future.

Nick Hardwick
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

May 2013

Fact page

Task of the establishment

HMYOI Warren Hill holds convicted and remanded young people aged 15 to 18. The catchment area for courts covers Northampton to London, Norwich, Lewes and Chelmsford.

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

Public, commissioned by Youth Justice Board

Region/Department

East of England

Number held

Warren Hill: 86

Waveney and Welcome unit: 28

Certified normal accommodation

192

Operational capacity

192

Date of last full inspection

9 – 13 May 2011

Brief history

Warren Hill and the Carlford unit became a juvenile establishment in October 2000.

In February 2012, Waveney and Welcome unit opened on the Warren Hill main site and Carlford unit reverted to HMP Hollesley Bay on the same site.

Short description of residential units

Warren Hill consists of six residential units including Butley unit, the care and separation unit. Waveney and Welcome unit is a purpose-built first night, health care and induction unit which can hold 60 young people. Accommodation is single cell with in-cell sanitation and washing facilities including an integrated shower area.

Name of governor/director

Bev Bevan

Escort contractor

Serco Wincanton

Health service commissioner and providers

Care UK

Learning and skills providers

A4E

Independent Monitoring Board chair

Penny Creasy

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:

Safety	children and young people, particularly the most vulnerable, are held safely
Respect	children and young people are treated with respect for their human dignity
Purposeful activity	children and young people are able, and expected, to engage in activity that is likely to benefit them
Resettlement	children and young people are 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.

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 Young people said they often had to remain in court for long periods after their cases had been dealt with. There continued to be late arrivals. The new early days accommodation had helped to transform the experience for young people on admission. Young people subject to ACCT (assessment, care in custody and teamwork) procedures were well cared for and most incidents involved scratching. The safeguarding arrangements were sound and the child protection procedures good. Violent incidents were managed well, but fights and assaults between young people took place frequently and had resulted in serious injuries. Force was used proportionately and de-escalation was routinely employed. The segregation unit did not provide suitable treatment and conditions for young people. Outcomes for young people in relation to this healthy prison test were not sufficiently good.

HP7 Young people consistently reported¹ having to spend long periods at court after their cases had been dealt with. Fewer young people than at the previous inspection said they were treated well or very well by escort providers. Late arrivals were a continuing problem.

¹ **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*.)

Not all young people arrived with background information but appropriate action was taken to manage young people safely on arrival and to obtain missing documentation.

- HP8 The new reception and first night accommodation provided an excellent facility for young people and set the right tone and standard from the outset. Young people were mostly positive about their reception experience and we observed staff treating young people well in reception. Routine strip-searching in reception still took place, which was unnecessary, though young people told us that it was done in a respectful way. The reception process was thorough. Good attention was paid to relevant background documentation and there was an effective process to ensure that any immediate concerns were dealt with quickly.
- HP9 Young people on the first night unit now had access to equalities representatives in the evenings; this provided a very helpful additional source of information and reassurance.
- HP10 Young people were relatively positive about how helpful they found induction which included useful contributions from community agencies. Young people's views on their induction experience were not collected. The information guide produced for young people was excellent.
- HP11 There were very good links between the safeguarding committee and the local authority children's services department. Collection of safeguarding data was generally good but longitudinal patterns or trends were not identified. The involvement of young people representatives at the safeguarding meeting was a constructive initiative.
- HP12 Young people causing the most concern were discussed at the weekly health and wellbeing meeting which provided an effective opportunity for staff from all departments to share information and discuss the management of the young people. However, not all young people who needed it had a plan to ensure that follow-up work was completed.
- HP13 Arrangements to deal with child protection referrals were sound. All allegations involving adults were referred out and the local authority responded well. Senior managers maintained close scrutiny of child protection through the monthly child protection meeting. Strategy meetings were held when necessary and, in some cases where the local authority and police had decided not to pursue the referral, robust internal investigations were carried out.
- HP14 The number of violent incidents was extremely high. Over the previous 12 months, five young people had required hospital treatment for their injuries and a further 10 had received multiple injuries as a result of assaults. Despite this, young people in our discussion groups and most young people in our survey did not report feeling unsafe.
- HP15 Not all perpetrators of violence and antisocial behaviour were identified quickly enough by unit managers and these young people were not managed using the behaviour risk plan. Perpetrators of violence who were identified were appropriately challenged about their behaviour and given good levels of support by their personal mentors. Victim support was also managed well and a range of useful measures were used to keep young people safe.
- HP16 There had been an average of two incidents of self-harm a month over the previous six months, most of which involved scratching. The majority of ACCTs were opened in response to staff concerns, rather than self-harm. Staff demonstrated good knowledge of the young people in their care who were subject to ACCT processes, and these young people were well looked after. ACCT reviews took place on time and the quality of the documents was checked regularly by managers. Not all reviews were fully multidisciplinary

- HP17 Young people in our groups said that it was not worth being on the gold level of the rewards and sanctions scheme and we found that the differentials were not significant enough to encourage better behaviour. Reviews were well documented and showed that young people were actively involved and given the chance to challenge decisions.
- HP18 Security staff had a good grasp of the main issues relating to gangs, assaults and bullying. Security objectives were set systematically and the overall approach was proportionate to the risks posed without restricting young people's access to the regime. Some innovative work was being undertaken with Metropolitan police boroughs to address gang-related matters.
- HP19 Random and suspicion drug testing indicated that there were very few illegal drugs available in the prison.
- HP20 There had been a significant rise in the number of adjudications since our last inspection, which reflected the increasing number of fights and assaults. Adjudications were used appropriately to deal with the more serious infringements of rules, and punishments were fair. The holding rooms for young people awaiting adjudication were poorly furnished and wholly unsuitable.
- HP21 Full use of force was low compared to similar establishments and there was clear evidence that de-escalation was used regularly. Force, and in particular full use of control and restraint, was used only as a last resort. Some use was made of pain compliance techniques, which was inappropriate with this age group. We welcomed the governor's decision to review the use of pain compliance during restraint.
- HP22 The physical environment on Butley unit was very poor and the regime for separated young people was inadequate. An entirely fresh approach was required to look after young people held on Butley. They were locked up for long periods and all the young people we spoke to on the unit complained of boredom. Staff relationships with young people on the unit were mainly respectful and staff knew the young people well. Some antisocial behaviour, such as shouting out of windows, remained unchallenged.
- HP23 Young people had ready access to support from the young people's substance misuse service which provided a good quality casework service.

Respect

- HP24 There was a considerable contrast in the standard of residential accommodation. The new buildings provided a well designed, comfortable living environment, while some of the older accommodation was shabby and run down with a lot of graffiti. Relationships between staff and young people had improved and staff were now friendly but firm. Personal officers were helpful. Considerable progress had been made towards developing diversity but there was evidence of poorer outcomes for young people from a black and minority ethnic background. An effective contribution continued to be made by the chaplaincy. Health care services were very good. The standard of food was adequate. Outcomes for young people in relation to this healthy prison test were reasonably good.

- HP25 The physical environment on the new Waveney and Welcome units was exceptional. In comparison, the other units were poorly decorated, run down and contained graffiti. The condition of the showers on some of the older units was poor.
- HP26 Staff generally mixed well with young people. We saw evidence of staff challenging young people confidently and appropriately. The consultation forums were effective and the newly formed youth council was a very promising initiative. Most mentors met the young people they were responsible for promptly on arrival and the scheme worked well.
- HP27 The diversity policy was detailed and comprehensive. The equality action team committee was chaired by a governor. The committee met regularly and was well attended by staff, but representation from young people was patchy. The trained young person equality representatives had effective, supportive monthly meetings.
- HP28 There was evidence of poorer outcomes for black and minority ethnic young people in some areas of the regime. These discrepancies were discussed, but the agreed action was usually limited to 'explore further'. Disability was assessed on reception and, where necessary, multidisciplinary care plans were put in place. Discrimination incident report forms were investigated promptly and thoroughly, with good responses to complainants. There was no independent specialist legal advice for foreign national young people.
- HP29 There was an active chaplaincy which provided services for all the major faiths, and to which young people had easy access. The multi-faith room was well designed and suitably equipped.
- HP30 Responses to complaints were timely and young people had the opportunity to comment on the responses they received.
- HP31 There was comprehensive coverage of young people's legal rights on induction, including an excellent opportunity to discuss issues with a visiting solicitor. Young people had good access to their legal advisers through free telephone calls and legal visits. There were systems in place to ensure that young people understood their legal status, including those serving long sentences.
- HP32 Health care services were good and young people said they were satisfied with the health care provided. The new health care centre provided an excellent environment for primary care and dental facilities. All areas were spacious, bright and clean and treatment rooms were well equipped. Pharmacy services were satisfactory and dental services were good. Primary and secondary mental health services were also good and young people had access to a child and adolescent mental health service psychiatrist. The small team of professional counsellors liaised closely with the mental health team.
- HP33 There were good arrangements for consulting young people about food. Portion sizes were ample, although some young people said they were hungry at night. Young people ate communally for all meals on most units, which was commendable and helped to create a civilising atmosphere.

Purposeful activity

- HP34 Most young people received adequate time unlocked from their cell. Access to association was good but young people had limited opportunities for exercise in the fresh air.

Punctuality and classroom attendance were satisfactory and the breadth and depth of the curriculum had improved. The standard of teaching was good and most young people made progress. Problems associated with young people being returned from class continued. The library was a useful resource and PE provision was good. Outcomes for young people in relation to this healthy prison test were reasonably good.

- HP35 The time that young people had unlocked was similar to that reported at the last inspection at about nine hours a day for most young people.
- HP36 In our survey, 94% of young people said they had association every day against the comparator of 74%.
- HP37 There were good working relationships between prison and education staff and work with young people not engaging in formal education and training was particularly effective. The self-assessment and quality assurance arrangements were properly established and worked well.
- HP38 Punctuality and attendance were satisfactory although young people continued to be taken out of sessions for appointments or returned to units for poor behaviour, with insufficient monitoring and follow-up work to address their behaviour.
- HP39 Most young people were engaged in some form of education or training during the day. The curriculum had been improved and offered a range of programmes. Young people in the Butley unit had limited opportunity for education, a very narrow choice of subjects and no vocational training.
- HP40 Initial assessments remained thorough and effective and helped to inform sentence planning. Most teaching, learning and assessment was good and classroom assistants worked well with tutors. Standards of written and practical work were impressive. Good use was made of information and learning technology to support learning sessions.
- HP41 There were good physical resources for vocational training and other practical activities such as the raptor programme. There was high retention and achievement on most programmes, including PE. Most young people made good progress towards higher level learning. Achievement on a few ICT and literacy programmes was not good enough and qualifications were not offered in horticulture.
- HP42 The library was a good resource run efficiently by dedicated staff. All young people were given the opportunity to enrol on induction and were encouraged to keep using the service. The library still did not open in the evenings and at weekends.
- HP43 PE continued to provide a good service and most young people spoke positively about it. Young people had good access to PE and there was a wide range of accredited programmes. Facilities in the gym were good but the showers in the fitness suite required refurbishment.

Resettlement

- HP44 Despite weak strategic oversight, the standard of sentence planning and resettlement practice was good. There were good systems to deal with public protection and looked-after children. Resettlement pathway work was effective with particular emphasis on

ensuring that young people were appropriately accommodated on release. Many young people were a long way from home and considerable efforts were made to mitigate this. Good use was made of release on temporary licence. The needs of young people serving long sentences were well met. Transition arrangements for those approaching 18 were good, except for a few challenging young people. Outcomes for young people against this healthy prison test were good.

- HP45 The strategic governance of reducing reoffending and resettlement was weak. There was no coherent link between the reducing re-offending needs analysis, the reducing re-offending strategy and the discussions of the resettlement committee. Despite the lack of overarching governance, coordination between departments delivering resettlement services was good and links were successfully made with community agencies through the local resettlement forum.
- HP46 Young people's risk and resettlement needs were identified on arrival and there was an appropriate focus on preventing re-offending. However, in our survey, fewer young people than in our 2011 local survey said that they knew where to get help with important resettlement pathways such as education, finances and health services.
- HP47 Sentence plans were usually detailed enough and based on young people's needs. Most young people in our survey said that they were involved in the development of their plans and understood their targets. Review meetings were timely and there was good attendance, including from education and residential units. There were good links between case managers and other departments and the role of the case manager was central to the training planning process.
- HP48 Public protection was managed very well. There was good attendance at the monthly public protection meeting and all young people identified as a risk were discussed in detail. There was an appropriate emphasis on finding suitable accommodation on release. Restrictions on contact with children and the monitoring of young people's letters and telephone calls were proportionate. All restrictions were properly assessed and regularly reviewed. Decisions taken were defensible.
- HP49 There were good systems in place to identify young people with looked-after status. The establishment social workers worked hard to get local authorities to meet their obligations to looked-after young people.
- HP50 The Waveney unit provided a safe, constructive environment for young people serving long and indeterminate sentences. Young people were able to engage in a full range of activities, and were supported by an integrated care planning system.
- HP51 The transition arrangements for young people moving to Swinfen Hall were excellent. Young people transferring elsewhere were also helped to understand regimes in the young adult estate by talking to staff visiting from Swinfen Hall. There were continuing problems in transferring a few young people with behavioural problems to the young adult estate, and a coordinated approach was required to move these young people, when it was in their best interests.
- HP52 Accommodation needs were highlighted early in the young person's sentence and we saw robust efforts, including interventions by the governor, to ensure that community agencies provided suitable accommodation for young people who were not returning home. Despite these efforts, some young people did not know their address until just before release.

- HP53 Information and advice was given by education support services on induction and during the sentence, but the careers guidance delivered by 'Moving On' was inadequate. Good use had been made recently of release on temporary licence to provide young people with work experience or to attend college. More work needed to be done to identify employment opportunities. Entry into employment was very low at less than 1%, but entry into education and training was reported as high at 98%.
- HP54 Health care discharge planning for young people was well organised and timely. Young people were given many opportunities to learn how to manage their money and deal with debt. There was a wide range of offending behaviour and life skills programmes. Some young people participated in the JETS (juvenile enhanced thinking skills) programme but few young people benefited from the other short courses available.
- HP55 The number of young people who lived over 100 miles from the establishment had increased in the past year, and in our survey only 22% of young people said that it was easy for their families to visit the establishment against the comparator of 35%. Action had been taken to try to mitigate the effect of the establishment's remote location. Family days continued to be appreciated by young people and their families and were available to all young people.

Main concerns and recommendations

- HP56 Concern: Despite considerable efforts by staff, the number of violent incidents between young people was extremely high and there had been a significant number of serious injuries as a result.

Recommendation: The YJB and NOMS should work with the establishment to develop and implement a strategy to understand and reduce the high levels of violence between young people.

- HP57 Concern: The physical environment in the segregation unit was poor and the regime completely inadequate. Young people were often held there for long periods with limited prospect of being able to change their circumstances.

Recommendation: Young people who need to be separated should be held in a suitable setting for the shortest necessary time, where they can experience a full regime and be given suitable help to address their behaviour.

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 Fewer young people than at the previous inspection said they had been treated well by escort staff. Many young people spent unnecessarily long periods in court and journeys to the prison were often long. Late arrivals remained a problem.
- 1.2 In our survey, 24% of young people said they had travelled with adults or female young people against the comparator of 38%, and 53% said they were treated well by escort staff against 68% at the previous inspection. Many young people told us of delays at court and long journeys, and arrivals after 8pm continued to occur. Person escort records (PERs) showed that young people were experiencing waits at court. In February 2013, one young person had finished his court case at 12.30pm, left the court at 8.42pm and arrived at Warren Hill at 10.46pm. Another arrived at 9.30pm after waiting nearly four hours to leave the court after his placement order had arrived. Lengthy journeys were frequent and most late arrivals had had journeys of over two hours. Not all PERs recorded young people being offered food or drink and monitoring of PERs by the establishment had identified a young person who had arrived at 10pm after finishing at court just after midday with no record of food being offered. The establishment used their monitoring data to raise issues with contract providers at regular meetings.
- 1.3 The establishment had produced a useful information sheet which had been given to courts, but few young people said they had received any information prior to their arrival.

Recommendations

- 1.4 Young people should not be held in court cells for unnecessarily long periods.
- 1.5 Young people who have lengthy journeys or are likely to arrive at Warren Hill after the evening meal has been served should be offered food and drink during the journey.

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 The reception and first night unit were excellent facilities which helped to set the tone for young people's treatment on arrival and during their first days at the establishment. Most young people were positive about their reception experience and more than the comparator said that induction helped them understand what they needed to know.
- 1.7 In our survey, 84% of young people said they had been treated well in reception against the comparator of 67%, and our observations reflected this. All young people were routinely strip-searched on arrival; although this was inappropriate, in our discussion groups young people said this was conducted respectfully.
- 1.8 The excellent new, purpose-built reception facilities comprised private interview rooms, clean holding rooms and a comfortable seating area. Young people were seen individually at the reception desk and then moved to other rooms for interviews, searches and property checks. Health care staff carried out their initial screening in a private room. The holding rooms contained information and magazines for young people to read while waiting.
- 1.9 Staff used electronic data to start completion of the risk assessment and management form in reception before the young person arrived. Documentation was completed during a private interview with the young person before he moved to the first night unit. Forms that we examined were completed properly and an effective electronic information-sharing process ensured that immediate concerns were identified and addressed by relevant staff. Young people were asked about gang affiliations and young people they thought they would have problems with, and this information was used to assign young people to residential units when they had completed induction. A member of reception staff was available to deal with late arrivals. Not all young people arrived with the necessary background information, but there were reliable procedures to follow this up and young people were placed on increased levels of observation until the information was received.
- 1.10 The new first night area, known as Welcome unit, was an impressive facility. The unit was clean and light and all cells had showers and toilets. Young people were given a welcome pack in reception which contained toiletries, refreshments and stamps. The cells were ready for a young person to occupy irrespective of the time he arrived. Frozen meals were available and we saw staff putting meals aside for two young people who arrived in reception just before tea was served. Young people were given a free telephone call on their first night or the following morning if they could not talk to anyone on their first night. They also received £2 pin phone credit.
- 1.11 In our survey, 83% of young people said they felt safe on their first night. Cell-sharing risk assessments were completed, but young people did not share on their first night. Equality representatives from the adjacent Waveney unit attended evening association on Welcome unit to act as peer mentors for new arrivals, and young people were given a very good, age-appropriate guide to Warren Hill. We observed relaxed relationships between staff and young people on the unit.
- 1.12 Induction started on the day after arrival and lasted a week. Young people remained on the Welcome unit until they had completed induction and staff said this gave them the opportunity to identify and reinforce areas of induction that young people had not understood. The induction room was large and suitably equipped and the programme included sessions from a range of internal departments and community agencies. The regular involvement of a local solicitor who explained legal rights and services to young people was particularly beneficial. In our survey, 76% against the national comparator of 62% said induction told them everything they needed to know. There was no opportunity for young people to give feedback on the induction programme.

Recommendation

- 1.13 Young people should not be routinely strip-searched.

Housekeeping point

- 1.14 Young people's views on induction should be sought and used to inform reviews of induction.

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.

- 1.15 The establishment had very good links with the local authority. Collection of safeguarding data was good but more analysis was needed to identify patterns and trends. A useful weekly meeting took place to discuss young people of particular concern.
- 1.16 Links with the local safeguarding children board (LSCB) were very good, and the safeguarding strategy and associated policies were agreed with the LSCB following annual reviews. The LSCB had carried out its annual review of restraint in July 2012 and the safeguarding team had been invited to deliver a presentation on good practice to the LSCB members. New staff received induction into the local safeguarding and child protection arrangements. 'Working with young people' training was being delivered and training had been commissioned for staff who acted as appropriate adults for young people. Safeguarding induction material for young people was good, and we saw evidence of staff acting on concerns raised in a telephone call by the parent of one young person.
- 1.17 The head of safeguarding chaired a monthly safeguarding meeting at which safeguarding data and issues were discussed. Staff from key areas of the establishment attended, and there was regular attendance by the local authority. Although a good range of data was collected by the safeguarding team, it was not analysed well enough to inform discussion and to identify patterns and trends. The involvement of young people safeguarding representatives in this meeting was commendable, and the opportunity for them to nominate staff or other young people for safeguarding awards was a good initiative. One young person was nominated for breaking up a fight and another for his caring attitude towards new arrivals when working on the servery.
- 1.18 The weekly health and wellbeing meeting facilitated by the safeguarding team was well attended by most areas of the establishment, but residential areas were not always represented. It provided a forum to discuss young people of particular concern and determine their management and support. Records of discussions indicated knowledge of the young people but not all had a care plan. All young people on Waveney unit had up-to-date care plans.

Recommendations

- 1.19 The data provided to the safeguarding committee should be used to identify patterns and trends to better inform safeguarding arrangements.
- 1.20 All young people for whom interventions or support are agreed should have a care plan.

Good practice

- 1.21 *The involvement of young people representatives in nominating their peers or staff for a safeguarding award helped to embed a culture of safeguarding.*

Child protection

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.22 The child protection policy was clear and up to date. Referrals were dealt with appropriately by the child protection coordinator, with good support from the local authority and local police. Internal oversight by senior managers was regular and rigorous.
- 1.23 The child protection policy was reviewed annually, most recently in February 2013, and ratified by the LSCB. Establishment staff were able to access LSCB e-learning on child protection.
- 1.24 There had been 16 child protection referrals from different areas of the prison during the six months prior to the inspection. Referrals were managed efficiently: information was held securely with access limited to a few staff involved in managing child protection. All complaints about staff or use of force were referred to the local authority, whose responses were timely. One referral had been subject to police investigation. All child protection referrals were reviewed at a monthly meeting chaired by the governor and attended by the local authority and police and key establishment staff. Young people subject to a child protection referral were told that a formal procedure was taking place and one of the establishment social workers kept them informed of progress.
- 1.25 If the local authority and police took no further action on a referral, an internal investigation was considered in consultation with the governor. The local authority designated officer confirmed that the local authority was kept informed of the outcome. Internal investigations since the previous inspection had led to disciplinary action against members of staff. The governor reviewed and signed off all completed child protection referrals each month. As an additional safeguard, the LSCB was invited to review and sign off completed referrals. Child protection referrals were a standing agenda item at the monthly 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.

1.26 Victim support was managed well and a range of measures were in place to keep victims safe.

1.27 Victims of violence were well supported. A range of measures were used to keep them safe, including risk assessments on arrival, changes of education or work allocation and removal of some young people from free flow to keep victims and perpetrators apart. Behaviour risk plans (see section on behaviour management) for victims showed that personal mentors gave significant support to victims and those we spoke to felt safe and well cared for. Young people most at risk were held in separation in Butley unit (see section on separation/removal from normal location).

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.

1.28 Young people identified as being at risk of self-harm were managed effectively. The care of young people on ACCTs (assessment, care in custody and teamwork) was good.

1.29 Suicide and self-harm prevention was managed by the safeguarding team. They gave advice and support to staff and quality assured the ACCT records. All staff had received training in ACCT procedures and regular refresher training was undertaken. Night staff confirmed that they had received training and showed good knowledge of the requirements of ACCT procedures. Staff had good knowledge of the young people in their care on open ACCTs.

1.30 There was no local policy on the care of young people at risk of self-harm and staff followed the appropriate Prison Service Instruction and a local document setting out the links between safeguarding and self-harm prevention.

1.31 The nature and extent of self-harm was monitored by the safeguarding committee, with data provided by the safeguarding team. There had been 26 incidents of self-harm in the six months before the inspection and 49 ACCTs had been opened. Scratching was the most common form of self-harm. One young person had required stitches after banging his head against his cell door.

1.32 Two gated cells were used for constant observations. In December 2012 one young person had attended activities on his unit until lock-up time, had then been moved to a gated cell for the night and returned to his unit for breakfast. There had been no use of anti-ligature clothing since the previous inspection.

1.33 Most ACCTs were opened by staff in reception or on the first night unit if they were concerned about young people. Custodial managers took the role of case manager, and information about

Housekeeping point

- 1.34 All care maps should be updated following reviews.

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.

- 1.35 The behaviour management strategy was based on the behaviour risk plan which took a balanced approach to tackling antisocial and violent behaviour but was not time bound.

- 1.36 The overall behaviour management strategy was comprehensive. The strategy was based on a comprehensive behaviour risk plan, which involved staff assessing and challenging young people about their behaviour and encouraging them to explore different ways of dealing with difficult situations. Young people were set targets to assist in improving their behaviour and offered appropriate support to help them achieve those targets.

- 1.37 Mediation was included in the strategy but not all staff undertaking mediation had been trained in its use.

- 1.38 The strategy was monitored at the safeguarding and force minimisation meeting but not always in sufficient depth (see section on safeguarding).

Recommendations

- 1.39 All components of the behaviour management strategy should be implemented.
- 1.40 The behaviour risk plan should include time-bound reviews and targets for young people.

Housekeeping point

- 1.41 Staff undertaking mediation should be trained in its use.

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.

- 1.42 Young people said that it was not worth being on the gold level of the rewards and sanctions scheme and we found that the differentials were not distinct enough. Records of reviews showed that young people were involved and given the chance to challenge decisions. Electronic case notes showed a good level of engagement with the scheme by personal mentors, and quality assurance was adequate.
- 1.43 The rewards and sanctions scheme was explained to young people during induction and young people and staff were familiar with the application of the scheme and what was required of them.
- 1.44 Young people in our discussion groups said that it was not worth being on the gold level and we found that the differentials between levels were not sufficient to encourage better behaviour. Many young people we spoke to individually said they were happy to remain on the silver level. Young people transferring in from other establishments on the highest level of the scheme could retain that status and those on silver could apply or be recommended for gold after 21 days of continuous good behaviour.
- 1.45 Warnings were given for poor behaviour and recorded on individual electronic case note files. Reviews were carried out when a young person had received three or more warnings. Young people could attend these reviews and make written submissions. Records showed that reviews were carried out fairly and that young people could challenge decisions made in a safe environment. Reviews were carried out by a custodial manager with the young person's mentor and views were sought from other departments, such as work areas and education. All reviews were checked and countersigned by the residential manager and we saw evidence of a decision being challenged when there was not enough information to warrant a change of level.
- 1.46 In support of the establishment's zero tolerance policy for violence, young people could be demoted to bronze level immediately for any act of violence. Although this happened following a review, demotion had occurred in all the cases that we examined and it was, in effect, automatic and took place before adjudications were completed.
- 1.47 At the time of the inspection, 13 young people were on the bronze level of the scheme. They were managed under the behaviour risk plan and had been set reasonable targets, although many were not time bound. Young people we spoke to felt they had been treated fairly. An individual assessment could lead to a review and a rapid change of level if young people's behaviour improved or deteriorated.
- 1.48 Electronic case notes indicated a good level of engagement with the scheme by personal mentors who made efforts to encourage better behaviour from young people.

Recommendations

- 1.49 Differentials in the rewards and sanctions scheme should be sufficient to encourage better behaviour by young people.

- 1.50 There should not be an automatic reduction to bronze level following an act of violence and all available facts should be considered.

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.

- 1.51 The main security concerns were the influence of gangs, assaults and bullying, and objectives were set for key areas requiring attention. Security was proportionate to risk and did not restrict access to the regime. Security reports were acted on quickly and searching was intelligence led. Drug availability was limited. Closed visits were used appropriately. Some innovative work was being undertaken to address gang-related concerns.
- 1.52 The security department received a significant flow of information from all departments and staff were focused on the main issues of gangs, assaults, fights and bullying.
- 1.53 Physical security was sound and the overall approach to security was proportionate. Free flow movement was allowed, although it presented significant risk, but it was well managed by staff and provided young people with full access to activities.
- 1.54 The security committee met monthly and was reasonably well attended. A significant amount of information was received about gang issues, fights and assaults, and much pre-emptive work was done to keep young people safe and prevent such incidents. Nevertheless, the incidence of violence was high and many unpredictable, spontaneous acts were carried out by young people settling scores with other young people (see section on bullying and violence reduction).
- 1.55 Information was analysed effectively and relevant objectives were set to address key areas. Security information reports on safer custody matters were shared during the morning management briefing.
- 1.56 All searching was intelligence led under a recently revised searching strategy. Searches were carried out swiftly and strip-searching was carried out by risk assessment, apart from in reception. All strip-searches were logged.
- 1.57 Risk assessment was used to allocate young people to residential accommodation and activities because of the high number of gang affiliations and reported issues between individual young people. A database of young people who could not associate together was accessible to all staff. Staff we spoke to used this information to keep young people safe.
- 1.58 The availability of drugs and alcohol was low. Finds were mainly tobacco. The year-to-date random mandatory drug testing (MDT) rate stood at 0% against a target of 5.5%, and only one young person had tested positive under suspicion MDT since April 2012. Reception staff undertook drug testing in a designated suite and did not carry out full searches.

- 1.59 No young people were subject to closed visits at the time of our inspection. The security committee carried out monthly reviews and young people were removed from restrictions at the earliest opportunity.
- 1.60 Some innovative work had been undertaken to deal with problems caused by gang affiliations. Several Metropolitan Police boroughs were involved in an information-sharing initiative relating to gangs, and work on gangs was being undertaken with academics. This improved staff awareness and understanding about the nature of gang behaviour.

Adjudications

- 1.61 The number of adjudications had increased significantly since our last inspection which reflected the increase in violent behaviour and incidents. Before the previous inspection, there had been 321 adjudications in six months. There had been 1,164 adjudications in 2012 and 513 in the six months before our inspection, mainly for fighting, assaults and threatening and abusive behaviour. More serious charges were referred to the independent adjudicator and the police were involved when necessary or when requested by young people.
- 1.62 Adjudication documents were issued the day before the hearing and young people were given adequate time to prepare their case. They were offered the assistance of an advocate when the documentation was issued but there was no system to ensure that all young people could speak to an advocate before their hearings.
- 1.63 The room used for adjudications had been adapted to make it child friendly. Holding rooms were dirty and poorly furnished and wholly unsuitable for young people.
- 1.64 Adjudication documents that we examined gave a full account of events leading up to the disciplinary charge and showed that young people were given the chance to present their case and that full account was taken of mitigating circumstances.
- 1.65 A published tariff of punishments was used: punishments were consistent and appropriate for this age group with no use of removal from unit. The head of the segregation unit conducted a 10% quality check each quarter.
- 1.66 Adjudication review meetings were scheduled quarterly but had not been held between June 2012 and February 2013. SMART (Systematic Monitoring and Analysis of Race Equality Template) data were used but there was no long-term monitoring or identification of trends.

Housekeeping points

- 1.67 The holding rooms in Butley unit for young people awaiting adjudications should be clean and appropriately furnished.
- 1.68 Adjudication review meetings should take place according to the meeting schedule and include monitoring of long-term trends and statistics.

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.

- 1.69 Only 14% of young people said in our survey that they felt unsafe but levels of violence were significantly higher than at comparable establishments. Not all perpetrators of violence and antisocial behaviour had been identified promptly by unit managers. Those who were identified were appropriately challenged about their behaviour and supported well by personal mentors.
- 1.70 The behaviour risk plan was used to manage young people who perpetrated violence or antisocial behaviour or who were victims. The policy had just recently been developed and showed an imaginative approach to challenging young people for poor behaviour, although there were no time scales for reviews or targets for young people. The safeguarding and restraint minimisation committee met weekly to discuss bullying and violence. However, a short-term view was taken of managing violence and the safety of young people, with little focus on longer-term strategy and monitoring.
- 1.71 Most young people in our survey and in our groups did not report feeling unsafe. However, levels of violence were significantly higher than in similar establishments. During the six months before our inspection there had been 137 assaults on young people, 48 assaults on staff and 112 fights between young people. Most injuries were minor, but five young people and one member of staff had required hospital treatment for broken bones, unconsciousness and multiple injuries, including black eyes, stab wounds and grazes. There were also 94 recorded incidents of bullying. Investigations of bullying and violent incidents were carried out by custodial managers on the residential units. Young people we spoke to said they often dealt with matters by fighting and violence as they would outside prison. Not all young people who were perpetrators of violence or antisocial behaviour had been identified promptly by unit managers and in some cases a week had passed before a behaviour risk plan had been opened to address their behaviour. The plans that we examined showed that young people were challenged robustly, with subsequent improvement in their behaviour. Most young people were closely supported by their personal mentors who had made informative entries on electronic case note records.
- 1.72 Measures to prevent bullying included risk assessments of young people on arrival to determine gang affiliations or problems with other young people in the establishment, removal from free flow for perpetrators of violence, and changes to education and work sessions to keep young people apart. Young people could be referred to an anger management course and one-to-one work with psychology.

Recommendations

- 1.73 Designated managers should be accountable for the consistent implementation of a violence reduction strategy. The strategy should include coordinated action by safer custody and security functions informed by consultation with young people, rigorous investigation of actual and potential incidents and analysis of relevant data.
- 1.74 All perpetrators of violence should be identified quickly and appropriately managed.

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.

- 1.75 The use of force was low compared to similar establishments and records showed significant levels of de-escalation. Force, particularly the full use of control and restraint, was used as a last resort. Some pain compliance was reported, which was inappropriate. There was no long-term analysis of data and not all planned incidents were reviewed.
- 1.76 Full use of control and restraint (C&R) was low in comparison with similar establishments. There had been 252 incidents in the previous six months, 85 of which had involved full use of restraint techniques. The majority of force was used spontaneously when staff had intervened in fights or assaults.
- 1.77 Documentation that we reviewed showed that force, particularly full use of C&R, was used as a last resort. Records were completed thoroughly and de-escalation was evident in all the cases we looked at. In most incidents, young people were returned to their cells. There were no formal cool-down areas and no policy to support cooling off or time out. Pain compliance in the form of the mandibular angle technique, a form of restraint which involves pressure being applied at a point below the ear, had been used during 26 incidents in 2012 and three times in 2013 to date, which was inappropriate. The governor told us that she intended to review use of the technique.
- 1.78 Not all planned incidents were video recorded, particularly those occurring at night. We reviewed a sample of recordings which showed that the use of force had been proportionate to the circumstances. There was no procedure to review recordings to learn lessons and to ensure that force had been used appropriately. Health care staff attended all planned incidents and visited the young person as soon as possible after a spontaneous incident. Handcuffs were used only when it was the safest option for the young person being restrained.
- 1.79 The safeguarding and restraint minimisation committee discussed use of force but there was no long-term monitoring of statistics. A newly formed use of force committee held its first meeting during the inspection to address this and other issues that we had raised with managers.
- 1.80 Young people were debriefed by a member of the safeguarding team after use of force and the young person's parent or carer and their youth offending team worker were informed of the circumstances. Child protection issues arising from use of force were dealt with quickly and thoroughly by the safeguarding team.

Recommendation

- 1.81 Pain compliance should not be used during use of force.

Housekeeping points

- 1.82 All planned incidents of use of force should be recorded and reviewed.
- 1.83 The use of force committee should review all recordings of use of force and should monitor statistics relating to the use of force.

Separation/removal from normal location

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.84 The environment and regime on Butley unit were poor. Toilets were dirty, there was graffiti in cells and the unit was poorly lit. Relationships between staff and young people were respectful and staff knew the young people well. Some antisocial behaviour remained unchallenged. Too many young people remained in the unit for long periods. Many young people were not given adequate targets or reintegration plans and reviews were not held frequently enough. The behaviour risk plan had recently been introduced to aid reintegration planning but only one young person on the unit had a plan. All the young people we spoke to complained of boredom.
- 1.85 The regime within Butley unit, which housed young people separated from normal location, lacked focus. The behaviour management policy was based on the behaviour risk plan which had not been fully implemented for all young people in the unit.
- 1.86 The communal areas of the unit were dark and grubby. The cells were dirty and poorly lit and some had graffiti etched on walls, furniture, windows and plastic television screen protectors. Some of the graffiti concerned Gypsies and Travellers and was racially offensive. Toilets were ingrained with dirt.
- 1.87 Eight young people were resident on the unit at the time of our inspection, five of whom had been separated for good order or discipline and three for their own protection. Two of the young people had been on the unit for 50 days for good order or discipline. Of the 191 young people held in Butley during 2012, 51 had stayed for over 30 days with five staying over 65 days. About half had returned to units within the establishment, although formal reintegration planning was not evident. Records showed that young people close to their 18th birthday held on the unit for good order or discipline or for their own protection (25% of those held in 2012) were generally held in the unit until they could transfer to the young adult estate.
- 1.88 All young people on the unit had been appropriately authorised for separation. Records showed that reviews took place after 72 hours and then fortnightly, which was not frequent enough. The behaviour risk plan was intended to be used to manage the young people but only one of the eight young people had a reintegration plan which was poorly thought out and completed and it was difficult to determine if progress was being made. Some interventions were available, such as one-to-one work with psychology, counselling and an anger management course (Starving the anger gremlin), but few young people on the unit had been referred to these resources.
- 1.89 The regime on the unit was poor and all the young people we spoke to complained of boredom, loneliness and being locked up for long periods. One young man asked us to talk to him for as long as possible as he was lonely and bored. Young people said they were well treated by staff and had daily access to telephones and showers, and could see a governor and health care staff each day. Relationships between staff and young people were respectful and staff knew the young people well. However, we observed that antisocial behaviour such as shouting out of windows often went unchallenged. Observations by staff in behaviour risk plans were informative and indicated reasonable engagement between staff and young people.

- 1.90 Education staff attended the unit daily but facilities and subject choices were poor and lessons were carried out in the servery area, which lacked privacy (see section on purposeful activity). Young people did not associate together on the unit. Those separated for their own safety had televisions provided in their cells, depending on their level on the rewards and sanctions scheme.
- 1.91 The segregation and monitoring review group met quarterly to consider a range of information. Documentation was quality checked at this meeting but the minutes did not record discussion on the lack of reintegration plans. The meeting had noted an increase in the use of segregation between October and December 2012, but there was no record of action to investigate this.

Recommendations

- 1.92 Cells and communal areas should be cleaned and well lit and graffiti should be removed.
- 1.93 Reviews of segregation should take place weekly and young people should have a reintegration plan with realistic targets.

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.

- 1.94 No young people had required detoxification since the previous inspection. The young people's substance misuse service (YPSMS) offered a good level of individual support but group work was limited. A new provider was shortly due to begin carrying out this work.
- 1.95 The establishment had not received young people with a need for detoxification since before our last inspection, but screening and clinical management protocols were in place. All nurses had completed level 1 of the Royal College of General Practitioners training, specialist clinical advice was available and the new induction unit provided a safe environment for young people requiring monitoring and observation.
- 1.96 Weekly case reviews took place for young people with complex needs and their care was coordinated at multi-agency health and well-being meetings. Mental health services included counselling support, and there was appropriate liaison between mental health and YPSMS teams. Information sharing was facilitated by access for the YPSMS to SystmOne (electronic clinical records).
- 1.97 Young people could receive nicotine replacement therapy on reception, but take-up was very low and only one young person was using patches at the time of the inspection. All nurses had completed smoking cessation support training.
- 1.98 The local drug and alcohol action team had undertaken a comprehensive independent needs assessment during 2012. A community drug and alcohol service had been commissioned to provide the substance misuse service from April 2013 and the substance misuse strategy needed updating in the light of these developments. The substance misuse strategy committee chaired by the head of reducing reoffending met quarterly, and additional meetings with commissioners and the new service provider had also taken place.

- 1.99 The substance misuse awareness programme was delivered to young people during induction but other group work had been suspended because of staff shortages. The YPSMS assessed young people within five days of arrival, usually in the first two days. A more age-appropriate screening tool was ready to be implemented and the service planned to source more up-to-date material for young people. All young people had been assigned case workers and records showed good quality case work. Young people we spoke to clearly valued the support they received.
- 1.100 The YPSMS was well integrated into the establishment, staff attended multi-agency meetings and contributed to training planning.

Recommendations

- 1.101 The substance misuse strategy should be updated to reflect the recent needs assessment and to set development targets for the new supplier.
- 1.102 The young people's substance misuse service should review and develop the range of interventions in consultation with young people.

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 The two new units, Waveney and Welcome, provided an excellent environment but the older units were run down and dirty. Facilities for association and outside exercise were reasonable, though some equipment was in a poor state of repair. Young people were not allowed to wear their own clothes and they complained that prison clothes did not fit.
- 2.2 The condition of the residential units varied from exemplary in the new units, to run down and grubby in the older accommodation. All cells were single occupancy. Each had a cupboard, chair, table and, in most, curtains. In the older units (Orwell, Alde, Gippen and Deben) each cell had a toilet and wash basin. In the new Welcome and Waveney units, there was an in-cell shower. Many older cells contained graffiti, much of which was gang related. Many toilets were heavily stained, though those in Gippen were in better condition. Alde and Orwell were in need of redecoration. On Deben, we saw young people playing table tennis in an area which was strewn with rubbish and bits of food.
- 2.3 All young people were encouraged to clean their cells. Some said they found it difficult to get cleaning materials and staff told us that toilet cleaner had been withdrawn for security reasons. The state of some of the cells in the older units indicated that daily cell inspections were not rigorous enough.
- 2.4 In all the older units the heat was excessive and staff told us they were unable to adjust it. A programme of shower refurbishment was in progress. Showers that had not yet been refurbished were dirty and one, on Orwell, smelt offensive. In many showers, used underclothes were left lying around.
- 2.5 In sharp contrast, the conditions in the new units were excellent. Cells were clean and well equipped, with almost no graffiti. The communal areas were spacious, comfortably furnished and attractive. The physical conditions contributed to a mutually respectful atmosphere to which young people responded well.
- 2.6 In all the units, staff had prevented the accumulation and display of large stocks of toiletries in the cells.
- 2.7 Young people told us that staff usually responded promptly to their call bells. In our survey, 85% of young people said they could have a shower every day against the comparator of 69%.
- 2.8 All young people had at least one period of association a day, when they could play table tennis and table football, or use the play stations. Dining out of cell at every meal provided opportunities for additional association. On Alde, two of the three play station televisions in the communal areas were out of order.

- 2.9 Floodlights were being installed on the exercise yards so that they could be used after dark. Telephones with privacy hoods could be used during association. Young people on the gold level of the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme could take evening association in the activity centre which had a range of leisure facilities.
- 2.10 Young people were not allowed to wear their own clothes, and most wore track suit tops and bottoms. Some said that the clothes did not fit properly and were uncomfortable. Young people were allowed to keep their own underwear and socks but the only facility for washing them was their cell wash basins and many chose to wear prison-issue underclothes.

Recommendations

- 2.11 A programme of redecoration and regular deep cleaning should be undertaken in the older units.
- 2.12 Heating on the residential units should be regulated.

Housekeeping points

- 2.13 Staff should ensure that cells are kept clean and free of graffiti.
- 2.14 Staff should encourage young people to tidy the communal areas before evening activities start.
- 2.15 Televisions in communal areas should be in a good state of repair.

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.

- 2.16 Staff interacted with young people in a considerate way, taking the trouble to talk and engage with them during association. There was a good mentor (personal officer) scheme, though some young people experienced delays in meeting their mentor for the first time.
- 2.17 In our survey, 81% of young people said they felt staff treated them with respect against 64% at the 2011 inspection, and 55% said that staff had checked in the last week on how they were getting on against the comparator of 41%. Young people in our discussion groups were less positive about the quality of staff contact with them, though some said that the attitudes of staff varied from one unit to another.
- 2.18 We observed good interactions between staff and young people, particularly during association where most staff talked to young people or played table tennis and board games with them. Staff responded positively to young people, in most instances providing explanations when they could not accede to requests.

- 2.19 Personal officers were called mentors and, commendably, a staff buddy scheme had been introduced to take on the mentoring role when staff were on leave. In our discussion groups, some young people said they did not see their mentor or buddy regularly, while others valued the contact they had with their mentor. Electronic case notes showed that most young people had regular contact with their mentors, although gaps of three or four weeks between sessions were not unusual and one record showed the young person waited for a month after arrival for his first mentoring session. Some entries recorded 'no issues'. Management checks were evident, but if a manager noted that a mentoring session was overdue, this was not always rectified.
- 2.20 The establishment had recently employed a youth organisation, Kinetics, to work with young people to develop a youth council.

Recommendation

- 2.21 Mentors or buddies should see young people within 24 hours of their arrival and at least weekly thereafter.

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.

- 2.22 There was an effective and comprehensive equalities policy in place. The equalities action team met regularly, but not all units were represented by a young person. Areas of concern were identified, but effective action was not always taken to address problems. Young people's diversity representatives were well trained and supported. Discrimination incident report forms were thoroughly investigated, but a programme for perpetrators was ineffective.

Strategic management

- 2.23 The strategic management of equality had improved greatly since the previous inspection. An active equalities action team (EAT) had quarterly meetings chaired by a member of the senior management team. Most departments were represented on the EAT, but not all units were represented by a young person. Minutes showed that issues raised were followed up, though it was often agreed that concerns would continue to be investigated and some action points lacked focus. The diversity and equalities policy covered all the relevant protected characteristics in line with the Equalities Act.
- 2.24 A team of young people acting as unit diversity representatives had been trained and met monthly for mutual support. They were issued with distinctive black sweatshirts but few wore them and they were not very visible to staff and other young people: on one unit staff were unsure who the representative was.

- 2.25 Discrimination incident report forms (DIRFs) were readily available on all units. Eighteen had been submitted in the six months before the inspection which had all been investigated thoroughly and promptly; many had been checked by the governor. DIRFs, with names removed, were discussed regularly by the EAT.
- 2.26 A seven-session intervention programme, 'Discrimination by Diversity', was available for young people accused of discriminatory behaviour. The local Commission for Racial Equality group was contracted to run it, but the contract did not allow enough time to deliver the programme in its present format, and no young people had completed it.

Recommendation

- 2.27 The Discrimination by Diversity programme should be adapted so that young people can complete it.

Housekeeping points

- 2.28 Records of EAT meetings should show what actions are to be taken and by whom, in response to each identified problem.
- 2.29 Diversity representatives should be more visible and staff should know who they are.

Diverse needs

- 2.30 At the time of the inspection, 54% of young people were of black and minority ethnic origin. In our survey, 63% of black and minority ethnic young people said that they were treated with respect against the comparator of 93% for white young people. No white young people said that they had been victimised by staff because of their race, while 10% of black and minority ethnic young people said that they had. These negative perceptions were reflected in our focus group of black and minority ethnic young people, who told us that, when they behaved boisterously, staff concluded that violence would follow and immediately imposed sanctions, whereas they believed that white young people were allowed more leeway.
- 2.31 Ethnic monitoring data were regularly discussed at the EAT meetings. On several occasions, SMART (Systematic Monitoring and Analysis of Race Equality Template) data suggested worse outcomes for black and minority ethnic young people than white young people. A particular concern was the disproportionate use of the care and separation unit for black and minority ethnic young people. An investigation had been completed in May 2012 but the report had contained little analysis and had made few relevant recommendations. There was no record of findings being followed up at subsequent EAT meetings, and it was unclear what actions had been taken.
- 2.32 The equalities department had arranged events to celebrate black and minority ethnic cultures, including Black History Month, and a visit by an African drumming group during African History Month. There were plans for the Irish Traveller chaplaincy to deliver a series of workshops on Gypsy and Traveller culture.
- 2.33 Equalities staff maintained contact with the UK Border Agency who attended regularly to see foreign national young people. A foreign national young people's forum met approximately every two months. There was no independent specialist legal advice for foreign nationals, though staff had been trying to arrange this. Details of two telephone interpretation services were displayed in

- 2.34 In our survey, 58% of young people with disabilities said they had felt unsafe against 25% of young people without disabilities. Young people were screened for disabilities during induction. Those who disclosed a disability were interviewed by the equalities senior officer, who coordinated the preparation of a multidisciplinary care plan. Most young people with disabilities had asthma, visual impairments or specific educational needs, and most care plans were drawn up by education and health care staff. At the time of the inspection, only one young person had a physical disability. He was using crutches following a leg injury. Staff had arranged help for him to collect his meals, and a personal emergency and evacuation plan was in place. He told us that he had no other specific needs.
- 2.35 The nature of the site made it impossible for a young person with severe physical limitations to access the regime. Most residential units were approached by steps, and there was no access for young people with disabilities to the library and much of the education department. Staff told us that young people in wheelchairs were not admitted to Warren Hill.
- 2.36 In our survey, 64% of Muslim young people said they were treated with respect against the comparator of 87% for non-Muslim young people. Nearly half the Muslim respondents (48%) said they would have nobody to turn to if they had a problem, compared with 16% of other young people.
- 2.37 Most units had posters portraying positive images of gay culture, including rap artists denouncing homophobia, the Stonewall 'some people are gay. Get over it' poster, and pictures of famous gay or lesbian people. No gay or transgender young people had identified themselves to the equalities department.

Recommendations

- 2.38 The negative perceptions of black and minority ethnic and Muslim young people should be investigated and acted upon.
- 2.39 The services of a specialist immigration legal adviser should be available to foreign national young people.

Housekeeping point

- 2.40 Telephone interpretation services should be readily accessible to staff and used in any confidential discussions with young people who cannot speak English.

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 faith and their religious needs were respected, and there was good provision for religious observance except for Roman Catholics, who lacked the services of a resident Catholic

chaplain. The chaplaincy provided good pastoral care and was developing useful links in the community to aid resettlement.

- 2.42 The chaplaincy comprised a managing chaplain who was also the Muslim chaplain, and ministers from the Free Church and Church of England. There was a weekly service for the principal faiths but there had been no Catholic chaplain for the past 18 months, so a full mass could only be held once a month when a priest visited. Hindu, Sikh, Buddhist and Jehovah's Witness ministers attended when needed. The chaplains were supported by community volunteers who helped with Muslim and Christian classes, and 'Time Out', a twice-weekly evening social and discussion group for vulnerable young people. The chaplaincy had developed useful links with faith groups in the communities to which many young people would be released. The multi-faith room provided a serene environment for religious observance. There were no ablution facilities, but Muslim young people told us they had access to residential unit showers before prayers.
- 2.43 The Muslim and Christian chaplains delivered a session together every Friday during induction, and the chaplaincy and times of the services were widely advertised. Young people had to apply to attend services and the list was scrutinised by security staff on Thursdays: young people arriving after Wednesday had to wait more than a week to attend a service. A chaplain visited the residential units, including the care and separation unit, to hold individual services with young people who could not attend the multi-faith room.
- 2.44 During the inspection, a group of young people had been excluded from Friday prayers for an assault committed during the previous week. The victim of the assault had also been excluded, which was concerning.

Housekeeping points

- 2.45 Young people should not be prevented from attending services on the first weekend after their arrival.
- 2.46 Measures to protect victims of assaults should not prevent them from attending religious services.

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.

- 2.47 Two-thirds of young people said it was easy to make a complaint and, of those who had, just over half said it had been sorted out fairly. Complaint forms were available on all the units, the complaints procedure was managed efficiently and responses to complaints were satisfactory.
- 2.48 In our survey, 66% of young people said it was easy to make a complaint and 55% said that complaints were sorted out fairly against respective comparators of 54% and 37%. In our discussion groups, some young people expressed no confidence in the system, while others mentioned examples of a satisfactory outcome to a complaint. During the six months to March 2013, 242 complaints had been submitted. The reasons for making complaints and the units they

- 2.49 Complaint forms were freely available on the wings. Boxes were emptied daily by an administrator who logged the complaints and allocated them to appropriate managers. The complaints clerk identified child protection or equalities concerns to share with relevant teams, and a member of the safeguarding team checked all complaints to ensure that safeguarding issues had been taken into account in dealing with the complaint. Data on complaints were considered at the safeguarding meetings.
- 2.50 In the sample of complaints that we examined, most responses were polite, focused and timely. Many replies were handwritten and a few were hard to read. Young people were given a receipt with their reply and a feedback form to indicate how they thought their complaint had been dealt with. A minority of young people completed and returned this. The governor quality assured 10% of completed complaints each month.

Housekeeping point

- 2.51 Responses to complaints should always be legible.

Legal rights

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.52 Legal rights were explained to young people during induction and they could consult a solicitor who visited the establishment. Young people could make free, confidential telephone calls to their legal advisers.
- 2.53 Legal rights were explained to young people during induction and officers helped young people to understand their sentence or remand status. Advice was also available from the internal advocacy service. Young people had an excellent opportunity to consult a visiting solicitor, who advised on a number of areas, including managing court fines and appropriate adult arrangements and police interviews while in custody.
- 2.54 Young people were able to make free, confidential telephone calls to their legal advisers and young people on remand could discuss bail applications with their community youth offending team worker and legal adviser.
- 2.55 There were good systems to ensure that young people understood their sentence and the key dates.

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.

2.56 The new health care centre was an excellent facility and health care services had significantly improved. A small team of staff delivered a good quality of care that was valued by young people. The range of clinics was appropriate for the population and waiting times were minimal. Pharmacy services were satisfactory and dental care was good. The mental health team delivered a good level of multidisciplinary care.

Governance arrangements

- 2.57 Health care services were commissioned by Suffolk Primary Care Trust with which the establishment had a very good working relationship. The governor regularly attended the partnership board and was supportive of the provision and development of health care. Most of the health care was provided by Care UK whose regional manager was an active presence on site. The head of health care regularly attended senior management team meetings. Comments we received from young people indicated that they were generally satisfied with access to and the quality of health care.
- 2.58 The health care centre was a new purpose-built building which had been opened a year previously and provided an excellent facility for the care and treatment of patients. All the clinical rooms on the ground floor were easily accessible and there was an open area at the entrance with a reception desk and small waiting area with seating, a television and a variety of health care information and other reading material.
- 2.59 The last health needs assessment in March 2011 had been used to develop services, but the new provider had introduced significant changes and a further review was needed. The head of health care managed a small team of nurses and one administrator. A small bank of nurses was used regularly to cover holiday and sickness absence.
- 2.60 Young people had access to health care 24 hours a day and one nurse was available at night. An appropriate range of primary care and health promotion clinics were delivered. None of the nurses had specialist qualifications for specific clinics but they had attended short courses in some areas. The GPs carried out initial consultations with new patients. Other staff training was well managed and all staff were in date for mandatory training. There were opportunities for clinical supervision at staff meetings or on a one-to-one basis, but we were told that this was not consistent.
- 2.61 Three GPs from a local practice provided a clinic each weekday and were available at other times during the day if required. Out-of-hours cover was provided by the local community service. The pharmacy was nurse led with a technician visiting once a week and a pharmacist once a month. The dentist and dental nurse from the Weymouth Dental Service delivered a weekly clinic and the service provided holiday and sickness cover.
- 2.62 The electronic patient record, SystemOne, was used very effectively to manage patients. Clinical records that we sampled were well written and included care for mental health and dental patients.

- 2.63 A health care forum was convened each month with representatives from each of the residential units, which enabled health care issues to be shared in confidence. A health promotion strategy had been developed and theme days had been used to display information. The health promotion action plan had yet to be completed, including distributing health promotion information more widely on the units. There were policies and procedures for the management and control of communicable diseases. Complaints about health care were rare: there had been three during the six months before our inspection, which had been dealt with sensitively and quickly.

Recommendations

- 2.64 The health needs of the population should be informed by an up-to-date health needs assessment.
- 2.65 Specialist clinics should be delivered by appropriately trained nurses.

Housekeeping points

- 2.66 Dental records should be secured in a locked filing cabinet in the dental suite.
- 2.67 Automated external defibrillators should have their batteries checked each day.
- 2.68 Health promotion information should be more widely available to young people.

Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.69 Young people received an initial health care screen on reception followed by a comprehensive secondary screen within 24 hours. The health care centre was adjacent to reception and the screening room could be reached from either department. The room was large and well equipped. Information about health care services was available in a range of languages and telephone interpretation services were used when required. Young people could request appointments with health care by putting applications in confidential boxes on the units or by speaking to health care staff. GP appointments were arranged within 48 hours or more quickly if required. Patients were not told of their appointments until a member of discipline staff collected them, which seemed unnecessarily restrictive. The range of clinics reflected the age and needs of the population. Attendance rates were good and waiting times for all clinics were short.
- 2.70 Young people in the segregation unit were seen each day by a nurse and three times a week by a GP. Regular health promotion clinics included asthma and sexual health, childhood vaccination and inoculation as required. Condoms were available from the health care centre and were provided when young people were released. An average of 10 patients attended outside hospital appointments each month and the process was well organised. Cancellations were rare and patients could be held at the establishment to keep their appointment when required.

Housekeeping point

- 2.71 Patients should be made aware in advance of their appointments in the health care centre unless a risk assessment indicates otherwise.

Pharmacy

- 2.72 The pharmacy was clean and an appropriate size for the volume of medicines. Medicines were dispensed for named patients by a community pharmacy and there was no dispensing on site. Prescribing was electronic and medicines were administered at appropriate times during the day. A large photocopier obstructed movement around the room. There was an out-of-date copy of the Children's British National Formulary. Patient group directions (PGDs: supply and administration of prescription-only medicine by persons other than a doctor or pharmacist, usually a nurse) were under review at the time of the inspection. One PGD allowed the supply of the antihistamine Chlorphenamine but staff said they were not allowed to stock the product. A tube of permethrin cream for the treatment of scabies was in the stock cupboard but there was no PGD to allow supply without a prescription from a doctor.
- 2.73 Drug stocks were well managed and audited appropriately. Medicines were held securely apart from the emergency medicines box for the dental suite which had recently been moved from a locked cupboard in the pharmacy to the countertop in the dental room where it was left out at night. The controlled drugs cabinet was not bolted to the wall. All supplies had been changed from a same day to a next day delivery and we were told that stock was often mistakenly delivered to the neighbouring prison, leading to delays in young people receiving their medicines.

Recommendations

- 2.74 Further patient group directions appropriate to the population should be available to enable more potent medication to be administered by the nurse. A copy of the original signed patient group directions should be present, read and signed by all relevant staff.
- 2.75 Dental medicines should be stored securely in a locked cabinet in the dental room or in a pharmacy cabinet overnight.
- 2.76 The supply and delivery of medicines should be reviewed with the service provider to ensure patients receive their medication promptly.

Housekeeping points

- 2.77 The photocopier should be moved from the pharmacy to a more appropriate location.
- 2.78 Only the most recent copy of reference books should be kept to ensure that up-to-date information is used.

Dentistry

- 2.79 The dental suite comprised two rooms which enabled the safe decontamination of instruments away from the treatment area. The suite was clean and well equipped. Young people had very good access to the dentist and there were no waiting lists. Young people were prioritised according to the treatment required and were seen within two weeks of applying for an appointment. We

Housekeeping point

- 2.80 The canteen list should include dental hygiene items.

Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.81 Primary and secondary mental health care was provided by Norfolk and Suffolk NHS Trust. A small team of mental health nurses delivered a child and adolescent mental health service (CAMHS) on weekdays. The team included three mental health nurses, one of whom had recently been recruited. There was an open referral system, with 15 to 20 referrals each month. Each nurse carried a caseload of about 10 patients. Young people also had access to a team of three professional counsellors. Mental health nurses attended all ACCT (assessment, care in custody and teamwork) self-harm reviews.
- 2.82 Young people were consulted about their care and there was a multi-agency approach to their management. Mental health nurses attended the weekly health and wellbeing meeting at which the needs of looked-after children and those on ACCTs were discussed, together with safeguarding issues. Clinical management was considered at a weekly CAMHS multidisciplinary meeting which was attended by the psychiatrist and clinical psychologist. The CAMHS psychiatrist attended the establishment fortnightly to see up to four cases when required. Very few young people had enduring mental health problems and there had been no transfers to secure mental health units for many years. Mental health awareness training for discipline staff had been delivered in 2012 but no programme was planned for 2013.

Recommendation

- 2.83 Mental health awareness training should be provided regularly for all discipline 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.

- 2.84 Most young people ate their meals in association. Although extra food had been provided, some young people said they were hungry at night. Portion sizes varied across units. Food consultation arrangements had not yet been implemented effectively. Young people appreciated the food provided for religious festivals.

- 2.85 Most young people could eat their meals in association. Lunch was at midday and dinner at 5pm, though meals were served a little earlier on Butley unit. In our groups, young people said that the size of food portions varied unacceptably, and that sometimes they felt hungry at night. The budget for food had recently been reduced but the governor had provided funds for catering staff to provide

- 2.86 The catering forum met regularly but there were not enough young people representatives; at one forum only one young person was present. There were good efforts to consult, but young people were not always told the outcome of consultations and food surveys.
- 2.87 Special menus were devised to celebrate religious festivals. Young people told us that good arrangements had been made for Christmas, Ramadan and Eid al-Fitr.

Recommendation

- 2.88 Food consultation arrangements should be improved and discrepancies in portion size resolved.

Housekeeping point

- 2.89 Food complaints books should be renamed food comments books, and staff and young people should be encouraged to make balanced observations.

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.

- 2.90 Young people were satisfied with the purchases system and bullying relating to purchases was minimised.
- 2.91 In our focus groups, young people said they were happy with the range of goods and the prices, and the speed with which mistakes were corrected. The canteen list included items to meet the needs of black and minority ethnic young people and items of religious observance. The list was reviewed each quarter and the minutes of the January 2013 young people's forum recorded that the canteen list had been discussed, but young people had requested no changes. Young people opened deliveries in the presence of staff to check that the fulfilment of the order was correct and to minimise bullying.

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.²

- 3.1 Most young people had enough time out of their cell during the week, but they were unlocked less at the weekend. A few young people on Butley unit received very little time unlocked. Time outside was incorporated into association and, although most young people said they had association every day, few had the opportunity to go outside.
- 3.2 The establishment reported an average of just under eight hours a day unlock time. The core day allowed just over nine hours each weekday out of cell; most young people achieved this, with the exception of those who had lost association and dining out and young people on Butley unit. Some young people on Butley spent over 21 hours a day locked up. Time out of cell at weekends was more limited for all young people, with lock-up starting at 5.15pm. There was no obvious slippage in the regime during the inspection. Young people moved to and from activities via free flow which provided some opportunity to be outside.
- 3.3 During our roll checks (excluding Butley unit), a quarter of young people were locked in their cells during a morning check and over a fifth of young people in the afternoon. Young people were in their cells for a variety of reasons: they had not been allocated activity, were awaiting adjudication, had been involved in a fight, excluded or returned from group education, or had refused activity. We were told that young people with no allocated activity for one session would have timetabled activity for the other session that morning or afternoon. Random visits to units during the inspection showed that young people were able to come out of their cells and undertake cleaning, providing it was safe for them to do so. Young people who did not attend group education had one-to-one sessions with education staff on the units. These young people were mainly based on Butley unit and the facilities for education there were poor. The time allocated to a young person for these individual sessions was not enough (see section on provision of activities).
- 3.4 Evening association was timetabled on weekday evenings and during the day at weekends. In our survey, 94% of young people said they had association each day against the comparator of 74%. The association sessions that we observed were relaxed, with some staff joining in activities with young people. Association was intended to include the opportunity for time in the outdoor exercise areas but young people told us this rarely happened because they were not allowed out in the dark and floodlights were still being installed in some outside areas. In our survey, 35% of young people said they usually went outside for exercise each day against the national comparator of 46% and local comparator of 15% at the last inspection.

² 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.

Recommendations

- 3.5 All young people should spend a minimum of 10 hours every day out of their cell.
- 3.6 Provision for young people who receive education on the units should be improved.
- 3.7 All young people should have timetabled access to time in the fresh air.

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 (Ofsted³) 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 A good range and level of learning and skills programmes were delivered which enabled full qualifications to be achieved. Education was severely restricted for young people on Butley unit. The number of young people attending formal learning and skills sessions was extremely low primarily due to young people refusing to attend or engaging in other activities. The quality of teaching and learning was generally good but no outstanding sessions were observed during the inspection. Young people continued to benefit from good initial assessments, and individual support was well planned and effective. The number of young people being returned to units continued to be too high and young people were frequently taken out of learning and skills sessions for other appointments. Young people's achievements and standards of work were good. The library was a good facility which was managed well and well used. Young people had good access to PE.

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:	Good
Quality of learning and skills and work activities (including the quality of teaching, training, learning and assessment):	Good
Effectiveness of leadership and management of learning and skills and work activities:	Good

³ 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>.

Management of education and learning and skills

- 3.10 The management of learning and skills was good. A new curriculum model had been introduced which integrated learning and skills with other activities to ensure a coherent approach to sentence planning. Working relationships between the establishment and the education contractor, A4E, were productive. Few classes were cancelled and short modular programmes provided opportunities for young people with short sentences to gain accredited awards.
- 3.11 Induction for young people was satisfactory. The initial assessment was thorough and provided a clear picture of a young person's previous experience and achievements. Very good use was made of a comprehensive database to record individual details and sentence plans and to measure young people's progress through their sentence. This was well used by staff, but not all learning and skills areas were equipped with computers and the opportunity for young people to review and contribute was restricted. The management of activities and allocation procedures following induction was good. Reviews were constructive, participative and well managed; they were held frequently and involved young people and a wide range of staff, including education and health care and personal mentors.
- 3.12 The careers information, advice and guidance provided by the A4E education support service during induction and throughout the sentence was appropriate. Careers guidance offered by the national careers service provision, 'Moving On', was inadequate and additional staff had recently been recruited to enhance the service. The two providers were not well integrated or linked effectively to the resettlement strategy.
- 3.13 A detailed, effective prison-wide self-assessment process had clear links with quality improvement. A session observation scheme linked to a staff training plan was well established and provided a clear picture of teaching and learning, most of which was good or satisfactory with no outstanding sessions. This was reinforced by our observations during the inspection.

Recommendation

- 3.14 **The information, advice and guidance services should be well coordinated to ensure that young people are given targeted support throughout their sentence.**

Provision of activities

- 3.15 There were sufficient activity places for all young people, including those on remand. Most young people were engaged in activity during the core day and the new curriculum provided a wide choice. The number of young people in the establishment was low and, while most young people participated in learning and skills, in some instances only one or two attended a learning session due to refusing to attend or engaging in other activities. At the time of the inspection, about 20% of young people were on the units, a few of whom had refused to attend activities. The learning and skills provision on the Butley unit was extremely poor with inadequate facilities and, although good learning support was provided on an individual basis, not enough time was allowed to engage young people fully.
- 3.16 Punctuality was good and few classes were cancelled, but sessions were often interrupted for young people to attend other appointments, which disrupted teaching and learning. Too many young people were sent back to units for poor behaviour in class. When incidents occurred, staff did not take time to identify and resolve issues, and reintegrate the young people into the sessions.

- 3.17 The range of education provision was good and included, for example, ICT programmes, English and mathematics, cookery, English for speakers of other languages, sociology, creative media work, and radio production. Most programmes were offered up to level 2; higher level opportunities included GCSE, 'AS' and 'A' level courses and distance learning programmes. The provision was enriched by magazine production supported by the writer in residence and contributions from visiting artists and musicians. The establishment had recently been awarded an Artsmark Gold Award for its high quality arts programme. The raptor programme continued to be used successfully to develop young people's interpersonal, numeracy and employability skills.
- 3.18 Some accredited vocational training was delivered, for example, painting and decorating, brickwork, motor vehicle engineering and industrial cleaning. Horticulture work was provided but a lack of suitably trained staff prevented accredited awards from being offered. The number of young people on vocational training programmes was very low. Some young people did not want to work outside and others refused to engage in particular programmes.

Recommendations

- 3.19 **More young people should attend education and vocational training.**
- 3.20 **The facilities and provision of learning and skills on the Butley unit should be improved to ensure that the needs of all learners are met.**
- 3.21 **Young people should not be removed from learning sessions to attend other activities.**
- 3.22 **A more structured approach should be taken to managing poor behaviour in class to provide better support to young people and to reduce the number of young people being returned to units.**

Quality of provision

- 3.23 Many teaching and learning sessions that we observed were good but some required improvement and none was outstanding. In the best sessions, learning was well planned with a variety of activities. In higher level programmes, good use was made of group discussions, often related to recent news items, and developments in social media. Young people were actively engaged and behaviour was good. In the weaker sessions, poor behaviour was not challenged and progress was inhibited. Effective use was made of learning support practitioners and information and learning technology. We observed collaborative work with teaching staff and learners being supported and making good progress. Low numbers attending classes often impeded progress, particularly when group work formed an essential part of learning activities.
- 3.24 Individual coaching and training, particularly in practical sessions and in supported learning environments, was effective and well managed. Standards of written and practical work were good in most cases and there was evidence that work was marked appropriately, with constructive, evaluative comments. Resources for most vocational programmes were good. There were very good links with the local police who gave the establishment the opportunity to buy modern cars and motor cycles seized by them. Young people clearly enjoyed the chance to work on electric scooters and hybrid vehicles. The raptor programme was well supported with excellent resources.

Recommendation

- 3.25 The quality of teaching sessions should be improved to give young people the best opportunity to develop their learning and skills.

Education and vocational achievements

- 3.26 The number of young people staying on learning and skills programmes and achieving accredited qualifications continued to be high with the majority over 90%.
- 3.27 Many young people progressed by at least one academic level above their starting point at entry to the prison, and several had progressed two levels in a variety of subjects.

Library

- 3.28 The small library remained a good resource. It was well managed by a library manager employed by Suffolk County library service with the support of an operational support grade whose post was scheduled to cease in April 2013. Induction into the establishment included a visit and enrolment into the library. Young people were allowed to take books out immediately. The library manager had access to young people's curriculum plans and was successful in following up non-attendance and encouraging participation.
- 3.29 The book stock was good (3,500) with a wide range of resources for education and vocational training and fiction and non-fiction material. Easy-read books and a range of language books were available and there was easy access to minutes of young people's forum meetings. The library manager controlled the issue of music CDs and play station games. There were effective arrangements for young people who could not attend the library to have books, but the condition of books in some areas was poor. The library continued to be closed in the evenings and at weekends.

Recommendation

- 3.30 The opening hours of the library should include evenings and weekends.

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.

- 3.31 Young people had good access to PE and PE facilities were well managed. PE staff were well qualified and had a good relationship with young people. Accredited courses linked well with education and there was high achievement on most courses. Quality assurance was effective.

- 3.32 Young people had good access to PE which offered a broad, well planned programme delivered by experienced, well-qualified staff. Facilities were good and well managed. They included a

- 3.33 PE staff were well qualified with appropriate teaching qualifications. Young people received a good induction into PE and there was a strong focus on health and safety. Young people had access to PE during the core day, in the evening and at weekends. Team games were encouraged but links with the community to participate in competitive sport were under developed.
- 3.34 Accredited courses ranged from entry level to level 2 and linked well with education courses. Young people on the fitness and physical exercise programme had opportunities to develop their coaching skills in supervised coaching sessions with their peers.
- 3.35 Outcomes were good and there was high achievement on most courses, although achievement on courses such as health and life style management at level 1 required improvement (see section on education and vocational achievements). Effective quality assurance included observations of teaching, learning and assessment. Approximately 80% of young people attended PE.
- 3.36 Young people's views were collected from forums and quarterly questionnaires and used to inform self-assessment and quality improvement. Links with health care were good and remedial PE was available. Many of the accredited courses had a strong focus on healthy living.

Recommendation

- 3.37 **The showers in the fitness suite should be refurbished.**

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 was not linked to the needs analysis and the resettlement committee did not provide oversight. Despite this, there was good coordination between departments and developing links with community agencies. Young people's resettlement needs were identified early and there was an appropriate focus on reducing re-offending, although a significant number of young people did not know where to get help on some important issues. Many young people were able to benefit from release on temporary licence (ROTL).
- 4.2 The reducing re-offending strategy described how the establishment addressed the seven resettlement pathways outlined in the Youth Justice Board resettlement document, 'Youth resettlement: A framework for action'. Some of the pathway leads had changed following restructuring of key staff roles and we found that some managers were unclear about their new responsibilities.
- 4.3 A useful reducing re-offending needs analysis had been carried out recently, based on resettlement data and a survey of young people. The analysis had identified important areas requiring further development, but it was unclear how these were incorporated into the strategy and given appropriate emphasis.
- 4.4 Departments delivering resettlement services were well coordinated, and this was reflected in discussions at the resettlement committee and the case records of young people. We saw evidence of regular email contact and informal discussions between staff involved with young people. One visiting community agency said how good the communication was between departments involved with a young person. The establishment made continuous efforts to liaise with community agencies, including hosting an open day and visits by managers to a range of external meetings aimed at improving services for young people. The senior youth offending team (YOT) worker in the establishment chaired a regional resettlement forum, which aimed to address resettlement issues for young people from the eastern region.
- 4.5 Young people's risk and resettlement needs were identified on arrival and there was an appropriate focus on preventing re-offending, including an accredited enhanced thinking skills programme, and assessment and treatment for young people who had sexually abused others. A range of services helped to prepare young people to return to the community, find accommodation, facilitate family contact, and give advice on finance. However, in our survey, fewer young people than in our 2011 survey said they knew where to get help with a number of important resettlement pathways such as education, help with finances and accessing health services. Despite their best efforts, the establishment had not been able to obtain information from YOTs about the resettlement outcomes of young people who had been released.

- 4.6 There was a good system to assess young people eligible for release on temporary licence (ROTL) and the establishment reported 358 placements in the six months prior to the inspection. Placements included community reparation, visits to confirm college placements and family contact.

Recommendation

- 4.7 The reducing re-offending strategy should reflect the reducing re-offending needs analysis and other sources of information. The strategy should identify clear actions to reduce re-offending and facilitate effective resettlement, and the reducing re-offending committee should monitor their implementation.

Housekeeping point

- 4.8 The establishment should make young people aware of where they can get information on resettlement pathways which will help them on release.

Training planning and remand management

Expected outcomes:

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

- 4.9 Training planning was effective and well coordinated across departments. Remanded young people were able to make bail applications and had access to all the services provided by the establishment. Review meetings were timely and well attended by internal departments, but attendance by community YOTs required improvement. The Waveney unit offered young people on long sentences a good service, but more needed to be done to help young people with behavioural problems to move to the young adult estate. Public protection procedures were very good and looked-after children were given appropriate support by the internal social work team.

- 4.10 All young people were allocated a case worker on arrival who was responsible for the management of individual training plans. Sentenced and remanded young people were contacted quickly by a relevant worker and initial training and remand management plans were developed within appropriate time scales. There was evidence in the plans that we scrutinised of a cycle of assessment, planning and review, with good coordination of services from a number of departments. Plans varied in quality, but they were all of an adequate standard and demonstrated that caseworkers were central to the sentence and resettlement planning process and a whole-establishment approach to reducing re-offending. There were examples of case workers and other staff devoting much time to young people and multidisciplinary meetings being convened to discuss young people with more complex needs. This included one foreign national young person alone in this country, who received good support, including appropriate involvement from the local authority. Sentence plans were drawn up in a collaborative way and, in our survey, 92% of young people said they were involved in the development of their plan and understood the targets they had been set.
- 4.11 Remanded young people were able to make a bail application, and records indicated that offender supervisors helped to facilitate young people's contact with their legal advisers and community YOT

- 4.12 Training planning and remand management meetings were well organised and timely, but attendance by community YOTs was erratic. From October to December 2012 there had been 204 detention and training order and Section 91 planning meetings, only 149 of which had been attended by a community YOT worker and a further 32 had involved a telephone call or video link. This was unsatisfactory. The establishment had made considerable efforts to ensure attendance at planning meetings, with an emphasis on participation by residential officers, which was regularly monitored and enforced. There was evidence of residential officers supporting young people to achieve their sentence planning targets. Attendance by the education department was also good. The planning meeting that we observed was child focused and well attended, including the young person's mother. Those attending brought up-to-date information about the young person's progress and there was appropriate focus on the young person's plans on release.
- 4.13 A significant number of young people serving long or indeterminate sentences for serious offences were placed on the new Waveney unit which provided a safe, constructive environment, based on sound relationships between staff and young people, and a good balance between care and control. The unit operated a care planning system, which provided an opportunity for young people and their personal mentors to meet regularly to set achievable targets and review their progress. Young people were able to engage in a full range of activities, and care planning was appropriately linked with training planning. Documentation required for young people serving life sentences was completed by the unit.
- 4.14 Good transitions had been arranged for young people moving to the young adult secure estate at the age of eighteen. Young people had the opportunity to talk to staff from Swinfen Hall and get detailed information about the regime. This was an excellent initiative. One young person knew what courses he would be attending and had been able to stay at Warren Hill to complete courses before moving on, which was important for his personal development.
- 4.15 The transfer of a few young people with behavioural problems to the young adult estate continued to present difficulties, and some young people were inappropriately held at Warren Hill, when they should have progressed to a more age-appropriate regime. At the time of the inspection, there were two young people in that position. The system should enable young people who reach the age of eighteen to move, when it is in their best interest to do so.

Recommendation

- 4.16 **Warren Hill should be assisted to move 18 year olds with behavioural problems to the young adult estate, when their placement in a young people's establishment is no longer appropriate or in their best interests.**

Public protection

- 4.17 There was a comprehensive public protection policy and a well attended monthly public protection meeting. Minutes of the meetings indicated thorough discussion of young people considered to be a risk and an appropriate emphasis on monitoring release arrangements and the suitability of accommodation on release. External statutory agencies were contacted if concerns were raised.
- 4.18 There were clear criteria for determining who might present a risk to the public and a good system for them to be identified early. Young people considered to be a risk were allocated a case worker, placed on a database and discussed at the earliest public protection meeting. Young people who

- 4.19 There were appropriate procedures for identifying young people who were assessed as being a risk to children in the community, and reasonable restrictions were put in place to ensure that contact was properly risk assessed. Decisions about whom young people had contact with were made by senior managers and case workers and regularly reviewed, and we found that restrictions were proportionate and defensible. 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 and the monitoring was no longer required.

Looked-after children

- 4.20 In our survey, 37% of young people said that they had been in the care of the local authority. At the time of the inspection, 40 young people had looked-after status, four of whom were on full care orders, 26 on voluntary orders and 10 remanded into custody.
- 4.21 The establishment had a seconded senior social worker and social worker, who focused on the needs of young people with looked-after status. There were good systems to identify young people who had been looked after by scrutiny of the documentation accompanying young people into custody and interviews with all young people on induction.
- 4.22 A looked-after young person was allocated to a social worker and case worker and was given written information about contact they could have with the internal and community social workers. The social workers took action to ensure that local authorities met their responsibilities to looked-after young people. The establishment looked-after children policy was sent to the local authority with a proposal for financial support of between £5 and £10 a week. Appropriate support had been secured in some cases, but a number of children who had been on a voluntary care order were not receiving any financial support from their home local authority.
- 4.23 Good efforts were made to ensure that looked-after children were reviewed by their local authority while in custody. However, success in securing a review was patchy and often depended on whether the local authority's independent reviewing officer knew the young person. The establishment was working with local authorities to coordinate looked-after reviews with sentence and remand planning meetings.

Good practice

- 4.24 *The care planning process on the Waveney unit is a good initiative, which should be further developed.*
- 4.25 *The visits by staff from Swinfen Hall and the transition arrangements to that establishment are a great help to young people.*

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.

- 4.26 All young people had a release plan, but some plans lacked detail. Release arrangements were adequate. Accommodation arrangements were rigorously pursued and young people received good help with money matters. Not all young people were referred to the education support service. Young people benefited from community placements while on release on temporary licence (ROTL). Young people received overdose prevention and harm reduction information pre-release, but community links needed to improve. Young people attended a discharge health care clinic prior to release and there were good links with community health care teams. More young people lived a long distance from Warren Hill, but the establishment focused on helping young people to maintain contact with their family and friends. There was a good range of offending behaviour and living skills programmes.
- 4.27 All young people had a release plan prepared by their community YOT worker and most of the plans that we scrutinised were comprehensive and indicated where the young person was going to live and what was expected of him while on supervision. A few plans did not show the dates of early appointments for young people, which staff said was not uncommon and they were trying to address this with the YOTs.
- 4.28 Practical release arrangements were adequate, young people had access to their money and were given a holdall to carry their belongings. Young people could pay for their clothes to be dry cleaned but only young people on Waveney unit were able to launder their clothes free of charge before release or transfer.

Accommodation

In our survey, 32% of young people said they would have a problem with accommodation when they were released. Accommodation needs were assessed early and updated throughout the young person's sentence. Attention was given to young people who were considered a risk to the public. Despite the best efforts of staff, some young people did not know their address until just before release. We did not find any evidence of young people leaving the establishment without a named address, but the establishment did not keep accurate data on the suitability of the accommodation young people were returning to, which was an omission.

- 4.29 Case managers were rigorous in pursuing responsible local authorities and YOTs, when they considered that a young person was not going to suitable accommodation. They escalated the needs of hard-to-place young people, using internal advocates and social workers and legal representation when required. On occasion, the governor made timely, appropriate interventions when external agencies had not planned suitable accommodation.

Housekeeping points

- 4.30 All young people should be able to leave the establishment with freshly laundered clothes.
- 4.31 Data should be kept on the nature and suitability of the accommodation to which young people are released.

Education, training and employment

- 4.32 Young people referred to the education support service (ESS), A4E, received information, advice and guidance during induction, and information was used effectively to inform sentence planning. Details were entered onto a database which was used to ensure that young people's education and

- 4.33 A minority of young people were recorded as entering employment on release but a high proportion was recorded as entering education and training. Many young people attended preparation for work courses in the community for people not in employment, education or training. ROTL had been used well in recent months and young people had benefited. Some had attended college and others had participated in work experience, such as with national animal organisations. Young people had visited schools and other community organisations with the raptor programme, which helped them develop good communication and coping skills.

Recommendation

- 4.34 Information, advice and guidance services should be integrated into the resettlement strategy to ensure that all young people receive a high quality service on entry to the establishment, during their sentence and before release.

Health care

- 4.35 Health care procedures to help prepare young people for release were good. All young people attended a discharge clinic so that continuing medication could be arranged. Information was provided for their GP and they were given a range of health promotion material. The care programme approach was used for young people with enduring mental health problems and there were good links with community mental health teams. Policies and protocols for palliative care had been developed.

Drugs and alcohol

- 4.36 YPSMS staff contributed to and attended review boards, and files that we examined showed that young people consistently received overdose prevention and harm reduction information pre-release. The team had links with several community YOTs, but the quality of through care arrangements varied and staff told us that some YOTs did not consistently refer young people with drug and alcohol issues to their local community service. The YPSMS were developing joint working protocols with a number of YOTs and with community drug and alcohol services. An additional YPSMS worker was due to be appointed to improve through care arrangements.

Recommendation

- 4.37 The YPSMS should improve links with community services to ensure that young people can access appropriate support in the community.

Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.38 In our survey, 46% of young people said they thought they would have a problem with money/finances against 28% in 2011. A further 23% said they would have difficulty in claiming benefits, but only 17% said they knew where they could get help with the problem, against 33% in 2011.

- 4.39 The education department provided opportunities for young people to learn and talk about financial matters. A well attended course on personal budgeting and managing money had just finished and had been followed by an employability course, which gave practical advice on how young people could claim their money on release, managing a typical wage, budgeting, understanding how to use a bank account and how to approach debt problems. Young people had the opportunity to discuss issues that were particularly pertinent to them.
- 4.40 All residential units had a wide range of booklets on money matters, and all young people who were attending an education or training course on release received practical help on how to manage their limited resources while attending the course.

Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.41 Establishment figures showed that in early 2013, 48% of young people lived over 100 miles from Warren Hill, an increase from 38% in 2012. Forty-five per cent lived between 50 and 100 miles and only 7% lived less than 50 miles from Warren Hill, both of which represented slight decreases from 2012. In our survey, only 22% of young people said that it was easy/very easy for their family and friends to visit them, against the national comparator of 35%. Twenty per cent said they did not get visits, but 90% said they were able to use a telephone every day, against the comparator of 67%.
- 4.42 A very useful family guide was given to all families of young people. Before and after visits, visitors were able to use a clean and tidy visitors' centre, with good toilet and washing facilities. A range of helpful material was available about the establishment and how to get help with visits. There was a visitors' complaints box, but it was rarely used. Family visits took place on Wednesday afternoons and Saturdays and Sundays. Staff told us there were few visitors on Wednesdays and there were none during the inspection. The establishment provided a free taxi service from Ipswich station at weekends.
- 4.43 The visits hall was clean and adequately furnished and was able to accommodate 26 family groups. There was a small play area, but it was not supervised by a trained children's worker. There were usually about 15 family/friends groups at the weekends and staff did not recall having to turn anyone away. Some young people in our focus groups complained that visits sometimes finished early. There were facilities for closed visits, which were agreed by the security department and regularly reviewed.
- 4.44 A full-time family liaison officer had undertaken a number of important initiatives to improve links between families and young people. The role had been removed recently under the new staffing structure and, although responsibility had transferred to other departments, concern was expressed that family work might lose its focus. It was too early to assess if this had happened.
- 4.45 Young people who did not receive visits were monitored and a log was kept which was accessible to staff. Until recently, young people were seen by the family liaison worker to discuss ways of overcoming the problem. Young people were able to receive emails from named family and friends and between 40 and 60 emails were received each month. The family liaison worker helped young people to write to their families and in some cases facilitated renewed contact when relationships had broken down. Young men who were fathers were able to record stories for their children. The Time for Families - Building Bridges course, aimed at strengthening relationships between young people and their parent or carer, was soon to be delivered at the establishment.
- 4.46 Five family days had been organised in 2012, which could be attended by all young people irrespective of their level on the rewards and sanctions scheme. Family days were well attended and feedback from young people and their families was very positive.

Housekeeping point

- 4.47 The establishment should sustain the focus on ensuring that essential links between family/friends and young people are maintained or re-established.

Good practice

- 4.48 *The assessment of the circumstances of young people who do not receive visits and the resolution of potential problems is an essential initiative.*

Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.49 A range of appropriate offending behaviour and life skills programmes were delivered, all based on well established evidence of effective practice and on the reducing re-offending needs analysis. Plans were in place to evaluate their effectiveness. However, at the time of the inspection not enough young people had access to these programmes.
- 4.50 The accredited juvenile enhanced thinking skills programme (JETS) was delivered and the required number of young people were attending the programme. Awareness training was given to staff, and programme facilitators helped residential staff to offer appropriate support to young people who needed to change their behaviour.
- 4.51 The Lucy Faithfull Foundation continued to undertake assessments and deliver a programme to young people who had sexually abused others.

Recommendation

- 4.52 **More young people should have access to offending behaviour programmes which meet their needs.**

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 recommendation

To the Youth Justice Board and NOMS

- 5.1 The YJB and NOMS should work with the establishment to develop and implement a strategy to understand and reduce the high levels of violence between young people. (HP56)

Main recommendation

To the governor

- 5.2 Young people who need to be separated should be held in a suitable setting for the shortest necessary time, where they can experience a full regime and be given suitable help to address their behaviour. (HP57)

Recommendation

To NOMS and the Youth Justice Board

Training planning and remand management

- 5.3 Warren Hill should be assisted to move 18 year olds with behavioural problems to the young adult estate, when their placement in a young people's establishment is no longer appropriate or in their best interests. (4.16)

Recommendations

To the escort contractor

Courts, escorts and transfers

- 5.4 Young people should not be held in court cells for unnecessarily long periods. (1.4)
- 5.5 Young people who have lengthy journeys or are likely to arrive at Warren Hill after the evening meal has been served should be offered food and drink during the journey. (1.5)

Recommendations

To the governor

Early days in custody

- 5.6 Young people should not be routinely strip-searched. (1.13)

Care and protection of children and young people

- 5.7 The data provided to the safeguarding committee should be used to identify patterns and trends to better inform safeguarding arrangements. (1.19)
- 5.8 All young people for whom interventions or support are agreed should have a care plan. (1.20)

Behaviour management

- 5.9 All components of the behaviour management strategy should be implemented. (1.39)
- 5.10 The behaviour risk plan should include time-bound reviews and targets for young people. (1.40)
- 5.11 Differentials in the rewards and sanctions scheme should be sufficient to encourage better behaviour by young people. (1.49)
- 5.12 There should not be an automatic reduction to bronze level following an act of violence and all available facts should be considered. (1.50)
- 5.13 Designated managers should be accountable for the consistent implementation of a violence reduction strategy. The strategy should include coordinated action by safer custody and security functions informed by consultation with young people, rigorous investigation of actual and potential incidents and analysis of relevant data. (1.73)
- 5.14 All perpetrators of violence should be identified quickly and appropriately managed. (1.74)
- 5.15 Pain compliance should not be used during use of force. (1.81)
- 5.16 Cells and communal areas should be cleaned and well lit and graffiti should be removed. (1.92)
- 5.17 Reviews of segregation should take place weekly and young people should have a reintegration plan with realistic targets. (1.93)

Substance misuse

- 5.18 The substance misuse strategy should be updated to reflect the recent needs assessment and to set development targets for the new supplier. (1.101)
- 5.19 The young people's substance misuse service should review and develop the range of interventions in consultation with young people. (1.102)

Residential units

- 5.20 A programme of redecoration and regular deep cleaning should be undertaken in the older units. (2.11)
- 5.21 Heating on the residential units should be regulated. (2.12)

Relationships between staff and children and young people

- 5.22 Mentors or buddies should see young people within 24 hours of their arrival and at least weekly thereafter. (2.21)

Equality and diversity

- 5.23 The Discrimination by Diversity programme should be adapted so that young people can complete it. (2.27)
- 5.24 The negative perceptions of black and minority ethnic and Muslim young people should be investigated and acted upon. (2.38)
- 5.25 The services of a specialist immigration legal adviser should be available to foreign national young people. (2.39)

Health services

- 5.26 The health needs of the population should be informed by an up-to-date health needs assessment. (2.64)
- 5.27 Specialist clinics should be delivered by appropriately trained nurses. (2.65)
- 5.28 Further patient group directions appropriate to the population should be available to enable more potent medication to be administered by the nurse. A copy of the original signed patient group directions should be present, read and signed by all relevant staff. (2.74)
- 5.29 Dental medicines should be stored securely in a locked cabinet in the dental room or in a pharmacy cabinet overnight. (2.75)
- 5.30 The supply and delivery of medicines should be reviewed with the service provider to ensure patients receive their medication promptly. (2.76)
- 5.31 Mental health awareness training should be provided regularly for all discipline staff. (2.83)

Catering

- 5.32 Food consultation arrangements should be improved and discrepancies in portion size resolved. (2.88)

Time out of cell

- 5.33 All young people should spend a minimum of 10 hours every day out of their cell. (3.5)
- 5.34 Provision for young people who receive education on the units should be improved. (3.6)
- 5.35 All young people should have timetabled access to time in the fresh air. (3.7)

Education, learning and skills

- 5.36 The information, advice and guidance services should be well coordinated to ensure that young people are given targeted support throughout their sentence. (3.14)
- 5.37 More young people should attend education and vocational training. (3.19)
- 5.38 The facilities and provision of learning and skills on the Butley unit should be improved to ensure that the needs of all learners are met. (3.20)
- 5.39 Young people should not be removed from learning sessions to attend other activities. (3.21)
- 5.40 A more structured approach should be taken to managing poor behaviour in class to provide better support to young people and to reduce the number of young people being returned to units. (3.22)
- 5.41 The quality of teaching sessions should be improved to give young people the best opportunity to develop their learning and skills. (3.25)
- 5.42 The opening hours of the library should include evenings and weekends. (3.30)

Physical education and healthy living

- 5.43 The showers in the fitness suite should be refurbished. (3.37)

Pre-release and resettlement

- 5.44 The reducing re-offending strategy should reflect the reducing re-offending needs analysis and other sources of information. The strategy should identify clear actions to reduce re-offending and facilitate effective resettlement, and the reducing re-offending committee should monitor their implementation. (4.7)

Reintegration planning

- 5.45 Information, advice and guidance services should be integrated into the resettlement strategy to ensure that all young people receive a high quality service on entry to the establishment, during their sentence and before release. (4.34)
- 5.46 The YPSMS should improve links with community services to ensure that young people can access appropriate support in the community. (4.37)
- 5.47 More young people should have access to offending behaviour programmes which meet their needs. (4.52)

Housekeeping points

Early days in custody

- 5.48 Young people's views on induction should be sought and used to inform reviews of induction. (1.14)

Care and protection of children and young people

- 5.49 All care maps should be updated following reviews. (1.34)

Behaviour management

- 5.50 Staff undertaking mediation should be trained in its use. (1.41)
- 5.51 The holding rooms in Butley unit for young people awaiting adjudications should be clean and appropriately furnished. (1.67)
- 5.52 Adjudication review meetings should take place according to the meeting schedule and include monitoring of long-term trends and statistics. (1.68)
- 5.53 All planned incidents of use of force should be recorded and reviewed. (1.82)
- 5.54 The use of force committee should review all recordings of use of force and should monitor statistics relating to the use of force. (1.83)

Residential units

- 5.55 Staff should ensure that cells are kept clean and free of graffiti. (2.13)
- 5.56 Staff should encourage young people to tidy the communal areas before evening activities start. (2.14)
- 5.57 Televisions in communal areas should be in a good state of repair. (2.15)

Equality and diversity

- 5.58 Records of EAT meetings should show what actions are to be taken and by whom, in response to each identified problem. (2.28)
- 5.59 Diversity representatives should be more visible and staff should know who they are. (2.29)
- 5.60 Telephone interpretation services should be readily accessible to staff and used in any confidential discussions with young people who cannot speak English. (2.40)

Faith and religious activity

- 5.61 Young people should not be prevented from attending services on the first weekend after their arrival. (2.45)

- 5.62 Measures to protect victims of assaults should not prevent them from attending religious services. (2.46)

Complaints

- 5.63 Responses to complaints should always be legible. (2.51)

Health services

- 5.64 Dental records should be secured in a locked filing cabinet in the dental suite. (2.66)
- 5.65 Automated external defibrillators should have their batteries checked each day. (2.67)
- 5.66 Health promotion information should be more widely available to young people. (2.68)
- 5.67 Patients should be made aware in advance of their appointments in the health care centre unless a risk assessment indicates otherwise. (2.71)
- 5.68 The photocopier should be moved from the pharmacy to a more appropriate location. (2.77)
- 5.69 Only the most recent copy of reference books should be kept to ensure that up-to-date information is used. (2.78)
- 5.70 The canteen list should include dental hygiene items. (2.80)

Catering

- 5.71 Food complaints books should be renamed food comments books, and staff and young people should be encouraged to make balanced observations. (2.89)

Pre-release and resettlement

- 5.72 The establishment should make young people aware of where they can get information on resettlement pathways which will help them on release. (4.8)

Reintegration planning

- 5.73 All young people should be able to leave the establishment with freshly laundered clothes. (4.30)
- 5.74 Data should be kept on the nature and suitability of the accommodation to which young people are released. (4.31)
- 5.75 The establishment should sustain the focus on ensuring that essential links between family/friends and young people are maintained or re-established. (4.47)

Good practice

Care and protection of children and young people

- 5.76 The involvement of young people representatives in nominating their peers or staff for a safeguarding award helped to embed a culture of safeguarding. (1.21)

Training planning and remand management

- 5.77 The care planning process on the Waveney unit is a good initiative, which should be further developed. (4.24)
- 5.78 The visits by staff from Swinfen Hall and the transition arrangements to that establishment are a great help to young people. (4.25)

Reintegration planning

- 5.79 The assessment of the circumstances of young people who do not receive visits and the resolution of potential problems is an essential initiative. (4.48)

Appendix I: Inspection team

Martin Lomas	Deputy Chief Inspector
Ian Macfadyen	Team leader
Karen Dillon	Inspector
Peter Dunn	Inspector
Angela Johnson	Inspector
Ian Thomson	Inspector
Ewan Kennedy	Researcher
Alissa Redmond	Researcher

Specialist inspectors

Siggi Engelen	Substance misuse inspector
Mick Bowen	Health services inspector
Jan Fookes-Bale	Care Quality Commission
Michelle Fox	Care Quality Commission observer
Peter Gibbs	Pharmacist
Bob Cowdrey	Ofsted inspector
Steve Miller	Ofsted inspector
Julie Ashton	Ofsted observer

Appendix II: Establishment population profile

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

Population breakdown by:

Status	Number of young people	%
Sentenced	102	86.4
Recalls	0	0
Convicted unsentenced	1	0.8
Remand	14	11.9
Detainee	0	0
Other	1	0.8
Total	118	99.9

Age	Number of young people	%
15 years	7	5.9
16 years	23	19.5
17 years	68	57.6
18 years	20	16.9
Total	118	99.9

Nationality	Number of young people	%
British	105	89
Foreign nationals	13	11
Total	118	99.9

Ethnicity	Number of young people	%
White		
British	55	46.6
Irish	2	1.7
Other white	5	4.2
	62	52.5
Mixed		
White and black Caribbean	2	1.7
White and black African	2	1.7
White and Asian	0	0
Other mixed	5	4.2
	9	7.6
Asian or Asian British		
Indian	0	0
Pakistani	3	2.5
Bangladeshi	2	1.7
Other Asian	2	1.7
	7	5.9
Black or black British		
Caribbean	20	16.9
African	14	11.9

Other black	5	4.2
	39	33.1
Chinese or other ethnic group		
Chinese	0	0
Arab	0	0
Other ethnic group	1	0.8
	1	0.8
Not stated		
Total	118	99.9

Religion	Number of young people	%
Baptist	0	0
Church of England	6	5.1
Roman Catholic	11	9.3
Other Christian denominations	29	24.6
Muslim	24	20.3
Sikh	1	0.8
Hindu	0	0
Buddhist	0	0
Jewish	0	0
Other	0	0
No religion	47	39.8
Total	118	99.9

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

Sentenced only – length of stay by age

Length of stay	<1 mth	1–3 mths	3–6 mths	6–12 mths	1–2 yrs	2 yrs +	4 yrs +	Total
Age								
15 years	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	5
16 years	6	4	6	4	0	0	0	20
17 years	7	17	17	14	3	0	0	58
18 years	2	2	6	7	2	0	0	19
Total	16	27	29	25	5	0	0	102

Unsentenced only – length of stay by age

Length of stay	<1 mth	1–3 mths	3–6 mths	6–12 mths	1–2 yrs	2 yrs+	4 yrs +	Total
Age								
15 years	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
16 years	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
17 years	6	2	2	0	0	0	0	10

18 years	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total	9	5	2	0	0	0	0	16

Main offence	Number of young people	%
Violence against the person	31	26.3
Sexual offences	7	5.9
Burglary	11	9.3
Robbery	36	30.5
Theft and handling	4	3.4
Fraud and forgery	1	1.7
Drugs offences	9	7.6
Other offences	8	6.8
Offence not recorded/holding warrant	7	5.9
Total	118	97.4

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

Sentence	4 mths	6 mths	8 mths	10 mths	12 mths	18 mths	24 mths	Recall	Total
Age									
15 years	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
16 years	0	0	2	1	1	5	5	0	14
17 years	3	0	4	3	8	4	8	0	30
18 years	0	0	1	0	3	1	4	0	9
Total	4	0	7	4	13	10	17	0	54

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	0	0	0	0	0	1
16 years	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
17 years	13	0	0	0	0	0	13
18 years	9	0	0	0	0	0	9
Total	25	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
16 years	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
17 years	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
18 years	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	5	0	0	0	0	0	5

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

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

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

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

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

Children and young people survey methodology

A voluntary, confidential and anonymous survey of the population of 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 11 February 2013, the population of young people at HMYOI Warren Hill was 117. Questionnaires were offered to all young people.

Interviews were carried out with any respondents with literacy difficulties or who did not speak or read English. In total, one respondent was interviewed.

Methodology

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

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

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

Respondents were not asked to put their names on their questionnaire, although their responses could be identified back to them in line with child protection requirements.

Response rates

In total, 85 respondents completed and returned their questionnaires. This represented 73% of children and young people in the establishment at the time.

Eight respondents refused to complete a questionnaire, 14 questionnaires were not returned and 10 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 eight male establishments surveyed since April 2012. 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 Warren Hill in 2011. 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:

- 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.
- A comparison within the 2013 survey between the responses of young people who consider themselves to have a disability and those who do not consider themselves to have a disability.

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.

Survey 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

Q1	How old are you?	
	15.....	6 (7%)
	16.....	9 (11%)
	17.....	53 (63%)
	18.....	16 (19%)
Q2	Are you a British citizen?	
	Yes.....	79 (98%)
	No.....	2 (2%)
Q3	Do you understand spoken English?	
	Yes.....	80 (98%)
	No.....	2 (2%)
Q4	Do you understand written English?	
	Yes.....	80 (98%)
	No.....	2 (2%)
Q5	What is your ethnic origin?	
	<i>White - British</i>	41 (50%)
	<i>White - Irish</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>White - Other</i>	4 (5%)
	<i>Black or Black British - Caribbean</i>	13 (16%)
	<i>Black or Black British - African</i>	12 (15%)
	<i>Black or Black British - Other</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Indian</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Pakistani</i>	2 (2%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi</i>	2 (2%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Chinese</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Other</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Mixed race - White and Black Caribbean</i>	2 (2%)
	<i>Mixed race - White and Black African</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Mixed race - White and Asian</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Mixed race - Other</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Arab</i>	2 (2%)
	<i>Other ethnic group</i>	1 (1%)
Q6	What is your religion?	
	<i>None</i>	27 (33%)
	<i>Church of England</i>	13 (16%)
	<i>Catholic</i>	11 (13%)
	<i>Protestant</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Other Christian denomination</i>	12 (15%)
	<i>Buddhist</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Hindu</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Jewish</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Muslim</i>	18 (22%)
	<i>Sikh</i>	0 (0%)

Q7	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	
	Yes.....	10 (12%)
	No	70 (84%)
	Don't know.....	3 (4%)
Q8	Do you have any children?	
	Yes.....	12 (15%)
	No	66 (85%)
Q9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability (i.e. do you need help with any long-term physical, mental or learning needs)?	
	Yes.....	16 (20%)
	No	65 (80%)
Q10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	
	Yes.....	30 (37%)
	No	51 (63%)

SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE

Q1	Are you sentenced?	
	Yes.....	70 (84%)
	No - unsentenced/on remand.....	13 (16%)
Q2	How long is your sentence (the full DTO sentence)?	
	Not sentenced	13 (16%)
	Less than 6 months.....	9 (11%)
	6 to 12 months.....	16 (20%)
	More than 12 months, up to 2 years	16 (20%)
	More than 2 years	23 (28%)
	Indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP).....	5 (6%)
Q3	How long have you been in this establishment?	
	Less than 1 month.....	7 (9%)
	1 to 6 months	45 (56%)
	More than 6 months, but less than 12 months	17 (21%)
	12 months to 2 years	9 (11%)
	More than 2 years	3 (4%)
Q4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	
	Yes.....	48 (57%)
	No	36 (43%)

SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS

Q1	On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?	
	Yes.....	66 (80%)
	No	7 (8%)
	Don't remember.....	10 (12%)
Q2	On your most recent journey here, were there any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females travelling with you?	
	Yes.....	20 (24%)

	No	47 (57%)
	Don't remember	16 (19%)
Q3	On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?	
	Less than 2 hours	16 (19%)
	2 to 4 hours	49 (58%)
	More than 4 hours	11 (13%)
	Don't remember	8 (10%)
Q4	On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?	
	My journey was less than 2 hours	16 (19%)
	Yes	15 (18%)
	No	46 (55%)
	Don't remember	7 (8%)
Q5	On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?	
	My journey was less than 2 hours	16 (19%)
	Yes	26 (31%)
	No	40 (48%)
	Don't remember	2 (2%)
Q6	On your most recent journey here, how did you feel you were treated by the escort staff?	
	Very well	12 (14%)
	Well	33 (39%)
	Neither	26 (31%)
	Badly	4 (5%)
	Very badly	4 (5%)
	Don't remember	5 (6%)
Q7	Before you arrived here, did you receive any information to help you prepare for coming here?	
	Yes - and it was helpful	12 (14%)
	Yes - but it was not helpful	10 (12%)
	No - I received no information	50 (60%)
	Don't remember	11 (13%)

SECTION 4: FIRST DAYS

Q1	How long were you in reception?	
	Less than 2 hours	68 (82%)
	2 hours or longer	4 (5%)
	Don't remember	11 (13%)
Q2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	
	Yes	70 (84%)
	No	5 (6%)
	Don't remember/not applicable	8 (10%)
Q3	How well did you feel you were treated in reception?	
	Very well	20 (24%)
	Well	50 (60%)
	Neither	11 (13%)
	Badly	0 (0%)
	Very badly	1 (1%)

Don't remember..... 2 (2%)

Q4 When you first arrived here, did staff ask if you needed help or support with any of the following things? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

Not being able to smoke	45 (63%)	Money worries	18 (25%)
Loss of property.....	20 (28%)	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to.....	29 (41%)
Feeling scared	22 (31%)	Health problems	35 (49%)
Gang problems	41 (58%)	Getting phone numbers.....	30 (42%)
Contacting family.....	46 (65%)	Staff did not ask me about any of these	5 (7%)

Q5 When you first arrived here, did you have any of the following problems? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

Not being able to smoke	36 (51%)	Money worries	17 (24%)
Loss of property.....	9 (13%)	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to.....	9 (13%)
Feeling scared	5 (7%)	Health problems	7 (10%)
Gang problems	7 (10%)	Getting phone numbers.....	20 (29%)
Contacting family.....	19 (27%)	I did not have any problems	18 (26%)

Q6 When you first arrived here, were you given any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

Toiletries/basic items	70 (88%)
The opportunity to have a shower	61 (76%)
Something to eat	70 (88%)
A free phone call to friends/family	68 (85%)
PIN phone credit.....	51 (64%)
Information about feeling worried/upset	34 (43%)
Don't remember.....	6 (8%)
I was not given any of these	1 (1%)

Q7 Within your first 24 hours here, did you have access to the following people or services? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

Chaplain.....	40 (49%)
Peer mentor	22 (27%)
Childline/Samaritans.....	18 (22%)
The prison shop/canteen.....	19 (23%)
Don't remember.....	23 (28%)
I did not have access to any of these	25 (31%)

Q8 Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?

Yes.....	64 (80%)
No	12 (15%)
Don't remember.....	4 (5%)

Q9 Did you feel safe on your first night here?

Yes.....	65 (82%)
No	8 (10%)
Don't remember.....	6 (8%)

Q10 Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the establishment?

I have not been on an induction course	10 (13%)
Yes.....	51 (66%)
No	11 (14%)

Don't remember..... 5 (6%)

SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT

Q1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	
	Yes.....	68 (85%)
	No	7 (9%)
	Don't know	5 (6%)
Q2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	
	Yes.....	34 (44%)
	No	30 (39%)
	Don't know.....	13 (17%)
Q3	What is the food like here?	
	Very good.....	1 (1%)
	Good.....	11 (14%)
	Neither.....	21 (27%)
	Bad	24 (31%)
	Very bad.....	21 (27%)
Q4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	
	I have not bought anything yet/don't know.....	3 (4%)
	Yes.....	37 (47%)
	No	38 (49%)
Q5	How easy is it for you to attend religious services?	
	I don't want to attend religious services.....	14 (18%)
	Very easy.....	23 (29%)
	Easy.....	25 (32%)
	Neither.....	8 (10%)
	Difficult	1 (1%)
	Very difficult.....	1 (1%)
	Don't know.....	6 (8%)
Q6	Are you religious beliefs respected?	
	Yes.....	46 (60%)
	No	11 (14%)
	Don't know/not applicable.....	20 (26%)
Q7	Can you speak to a chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?	
	Yes.....	60 (76%)
	No	4 (5%)
	Don't know/not applicable.....	15 (19%)
Q8	Can you speak to a peer mentor when you need to?	
	Yes.....	48 (62%)
	No	7 (9%)
	Don't know.....	22 (29%)
Q9	Can you speak to a member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board) when you need to?	
	Yes.....	44 (56%)
	No	8 (10%)

Don't know..... 27 (34%)

Q10 Can you speak to an advocate (an outside person to help you) when you need to?
 Yes..... 33 (41%)
 No 11 (14%)
 Don't know..... 36 (45%)

SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF

Q1 Do most staff treat you with respect?
 Yes..... 63 (81%)
 No 15 (19%)

Q2 If you had a problem, who would you turn to? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

No one.....	17 (24%)	Social worker	6 (8%)
Personal officer.....	28 (39%)	Health services staff	1 (1%)
Wing officer	16 (23%)	Peer mentor	4 (6%)
Teacher/education staff.....	5 (7%)	Another young person here	16 (23%)
Gym staff	4 (6%)	Case worker.....	9 (13%)
Chaplain.....	7 (10%)	Advocate.....	2 (3%)
IMB.....	4 (6%)	Family/friends.....	35 (49%)
YOT worker	14 (20%)	Childline/Samaritans.....	2 (3%)

Q3 Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?
 Yes..... 41 (55%)
 No 34 (45%)

Q4 When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?
I still have not met him/her 4 (5%)
 In your first week 28 (36%)
 After your first week 30 (39%)
 Don't remember..... 15 (19%)

Q5 How often do you see your personal (named) officer?
I still have not met him/her 4 (6%)
 At least once a week..... 44 (64%)
 Less than once a week..... 21 (30%)

Q6 Do you feel your personal (named) officer tries to help you?
I still have not met him/her 4 (6%)
 Yes..... 56 (80%)
 No 10 (14%)

SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS

Q1 Is it easy to make an application?
 Yes..... 68 (87%)
 No 5 (6%)
 Don't know..... 5 (6%)

Q2 Are applications sorted out fairly?
I have not made an application 22 (29%)
 Yes..... 40 (53%)
 No 14 (18%)

Q3	Are applications sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	
	<i>I have not made an application</i>	22 (29%)
	Yes.....	32 (43%)
	No	21 (28%)
Q4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	
	Yes.....	51 (66%)
	No	11 (14%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	15 (19%)
Q5	Are complaints sorted out fairly?	
	<i>I have not made a complaint</i>	37 (48%)
	Yes.....	22 (29%)
	No	18 (23%)
Q6	Are complaints sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	
	<i>I have not made a complaint</i>	37 (47%)
	Yes.....	20 (26%)
	No	21 (27%)
Q7	Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint?	
	Yes.....	7 (9%)
	No	47 (64%)
	<i>Never needed to make a complaint</i>	20 (27%)

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>	2 (3%)
	<i>Enhanced (top)</i>	35 (45%)
	<i>Standard (middle)</i>	29 (37%)
	<i>Basic (bottom)</i>	4 (5%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	8 (10%)
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>	2 (3%)
	Yes.....	45 (59%)
	No	20 (26%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	9 (12%)
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>	2 (3%)
	Yes.....	44 (59%)
	No	22 (29%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	7 (9%)
Q4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	
	Yes.....	45 (58%)
	No	30 (39%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	2 (3%)

Q5	If you have had a minor report, was the process explained clearly to you?	
	<i>I have not had a minor report</i>	32 (42%)
	Yes.....	32 (42%)
	No	13 (17%)
Q6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	
	Yes.....	43 (57%)
	No	32 (42%)
	Don't know.....	1 (1%)
Q7	If you have had an adjudication ('nicking'), was the process explained clearly to you?	
	<i>I have not had an adjudication</i>	33 (42%)
	Yes.....	37 (47%)
	No	8 (10%)
Q8	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	
	Yes.....	25 (32%)
	No	47 (61%)
	Don't know.....	5 (6%)
Q9	If you have spent a night in the care and separation unit (CSU), how were you treated by staff?	
	<i>I have not been to the care and separation unit</i>	52 (66%)
	Very well.....	4 (5%)
	Well.....	9 (11%)
	Neither.....	6 (8%)
	Badly	5 (6%)
	Very badly.....	3 (4%)

SECTION 9: SAFETY

Q1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	
	Yes.....	22 (30%)
	No	51 (70%)
Q2	Do you feel unsafe now?	
	Yes.....	10 (14%)
	No	61 (86%)
Q3	In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Never felt unsafe	51 (72%)
	Everywhere	7 (10%)
	Care and separation unit.....	0 (0%)
	Association areas.....	9 (13%)
	Reception area	2 (3%)
	At the gym	9 (13%)
	In an exercise yard.....	1 (1%)
	At work.....	3 (4%)
	At education	10 (14%)
	At religious services.....	1 (1%)
	At mealtimes	4 (6%)
	At health care.....	0 (0%)
	Visits area.....	0 (0%)
	In wing showers.....	6 (8%)

<i>In gym showers</i>	4 (6%)
<i>In corridors/stairwells</i>	4 (6%)
<i>On your landing/wing</i>	5 (7%)
<i>During movement</i>	6 (8%)
<i>In your cell</i>	1 (1%)

Q4 Have you ever been victimised by another young person/group of young people here (e.g. insulted or assaulted you)?

Yes.....	20 (26%)
No	57 (74%)

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>	7 (9%)
<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	10 (13%)
<i>Sexual abuse</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	5 (6%)
<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i>	3 (4%)
<i>Medication</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Debt</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Drugs</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Your nationality</i>	0 (0%)
<i>You are from a different part of the country to others</i>	2 (3%)
<i>You are from a Traveller community</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Your sexuality</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Your age</i>	1 (1%)
<i>You having a disability</i>	1 (1%)
<i>You were new here</i>	8 (10%)
<i>Your offence/crime</i>	2 (3%)
<i>Gang related issues</i>	3 (4%)

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

Yes.....	16 (22%)
No	58 (78%)

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>	9 (12%)
<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	5 (7%)
<i>Sexual abuse</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	2 (3%)
<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Medication</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Debt</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Drugs</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	3 (4%)
<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Your nationality</i>	1 (1%)
<i>You are from a different part of the country to others</i>	1 (1%)
<i>You are from a Traveller community</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Your sexuality</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Your age</i>	0 (0%)
<i>You having a disability</i>	1 (1%)

You were new here	2 (3%)
Your offence/crime	0 (0%)
Gang related issues	1 (1%)
Because you made a complaint.....	3 (4%)

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

Yes.....	22 (29%)
No	40 (53%)
Don't know.....	13 (17%)

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

Yes.....	30 (40%)
No	28 (37%)
Don't know.....	17 (23%)

Q12 Is shouting through the windows a problem here?

Yes.....	22 (29%)
No	48 (64%)
Don't know.....	5 (7%)

SECTION 10: HEALTH SERVICES

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

	Yes	No	Don't know
The doctor	48 (63%)	18 (24%)	10 (13%)
The nurse	56 (72%)	14 (18%)	8 (10%)
The dentist	42 (55%)	23 (30%)	11 (14%)

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

<i>I have not been</i>	2 (3%)
<i>Very good</i>	11 (14%)
<i>Good</i>	36 (47%)
<i>Neither</i>	20 (26%)
<i>Bad</i>	7 (9%)
<i>Very bad</i>	1 (1%)

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>	43 (57%)
Yes, all of my meds.....	8 (11%)
Yes, some of my meds.....	14 (19%)
No	10 (13%)

Q4 Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?

Yes.....	17 (22%)
No	59 (78%)

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>	59 (77%)
Yes.....	12 (16%)
No	6 (8%)

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

Yes.....	9 (12%)
----------	---------

	No	68 (88%)
Q7	Have you received any help with alcohol problems here?	
	Yes.....	8 (10%)
	No	69 (90%)
Q8	Did you have problems with drugs when you first arrived here?	
	Yes.....	28 (36%)
	No	49 (64%)
Q9	Do you have problems with drugs now?	
	Yes.....	12 (16%)
	No	62 (84%)
Q10	Have you received any help with drugs problems here?	
	Yes.....	25 (35%)
	No	47 (65%)
Q11	How easy or difficult is it to get illegal drugs here?	
	Very easy.....	6 (8%)
	Easy.....	5 (7%)
	Neither.....	7 (9%)
	Difficult.....	3 (4%)
	Very difficult.....	10 (13%)
	Don't know.....	45 (59%)

SECTION 11: ACTIVITIES

Q1	How old were you when you were last at school?	
	14 or under.....	28 (37%)
	15 or over	47 (63%)
Q2	Have you ever been excluded from school?	
	Yes.....	66 (86%)
	No	10 (13%)
	Not applicable	1 (1%)
Q3	Did you ever skip school before you came into custody?	
	Yes.....	62 (82%)
	No	12 (16%)
	Not applicable	2 (3%)
Q4	Do you CURRENTLY take part in any of the following activities? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Education.....	63 (83%)
	A job in this establishment.....	15 (20%)
	Vocational or skills training	9 (12%)
	Offending behaviour programmes.....	15 (20%)
	I am not currently involved in any of these.....	6 (8%)

Q5	If you have been involved in any of the following activities here, do you think they will help you when you leave prison?				
		Not been involved	Yes	No	Don't know
	Education	2 (3%)	54 (78%)	10 (14%)	3 (4%)
	A job in this establishment	10 (20%)	25 (51%)	9 (18%)	5 (10%)
	Vocational or skills training	10 (20%)	26 (53%)	8 (16%)	5 (10%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	8 (19%)	22 (51%)	7 (16%)	6 (14%)
Q6	Do you usually have association every day?				
	Yes.....				68 (94%)
	No.....				4 (6%)
Q7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?				
	Don't want to go				10 (14%)
	Yes.....				25 (34%)
	No.....				38 (52%)
Q8	How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?				
	Don't want to go				5 (7%)
	None.....				7 (9%)
	One to two times.....				24 (32%)
	Three to five times.....				30 (40%)
	More than five times.....				9 (12%)

SECTION 12: FAMILY AND FRIENDS

Q1	Are you able to use the telephone every day if you want to?				
	Yes.....				68 (89%)
	No.....				8 (11%)
	Don't know.....				0 (0%)
Q2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?				
	Yes.....				32 (42%)
	No.....				37 (49%)
	Don't know.....				7 (9%)
Q3	How many visits do you usually have each week, from family or friends?				
	I don't get visits				20 (26%)
	Less than one a week.....				23 (30%)
	About one a week.....				22 (29%)
	More than one a week.....				1 (1%)
	Don't know.....				10 (13%)
Q4	How easy is it for your family and friends to visit you here?				
	I don't get visits				20 (26%)
	Very easy.....				5 (6%)
	Easy.....				12 (16%)
	Neither.....				6 (8%)
	Difficult.....				23 (30%)
	Very difficult.....				8 (10%)
	Don't know.....				3 (4%)

Q5	Do your visits usually start on time?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	20 (26%)
	Yes.....	30 (39%)
	No	18 (24%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	8 (11%)

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>	23 (32%)
	<i>Getting into school or college</i>	26 (36%)
	<i>Getting a job</i>	42 (58%)
	<i>Money/finances</i>	33 (46%)
	<i>Claiming benefits</i>	17 (24%)
	<i>Continuing health services</i>	4 (6%)
	<i>Opening a bank account</i>	10 (14%)
	<i>Avoiding bad relationships</i>	17 (24%)
	<i>I won't have any problems</i>	20 (28%)
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.....	39 (52%)
	No	15 (20%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	21 (28%)
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>	36 (50%)
	Yes.....	33 (46%)
	No	3 (4%)
Q4	Do you understand the targets that have been set in your plan?	
	<i>I don't have a plan/don't know if I have a plan</i>	36 (49%)
	Yes.....	35 (47%)
	No	3 (4%)
Q5	Do you have a caseworker here?	
	Yes.....	59 (79%)
	No	5 (7%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	11 (15%)
Q6	Has your caseworker helped to prepare you for release?	
	<i>I don't have a caseworker</i>	16 (22%)
	Yes.....	26 (35%)
	No	22 (30%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	10 (14%)
Q7	Has your social worker been to visit you since you have been here?	
	<i>I don't have a social worker</i>	27 (38%)
	Yes.....	26 (36%)
	No	19 (26%)
Q8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	
	Yes.....	33 (43%)
	No	28 (37%)

Don't know..... 15 (20%)

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.)

Finding accommodation..... 18 (28%)
 Getting into school or college..... 19 (30%)
 Getting a job..... 22 (34%)
 Help with money/finances 16 (25%)
 Help with claiming benefits 11 (17%)
 Continuing health services 9 (14%)
 Opening a bank account..... 10 (16%)
 Avoiding bad relationships..... 10 (16%)
 I don't know who to contact..... 34 (53%)

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

Not sentenced..... 13 (18%) Having a mentor (someone you can ask for advice)..... 4 (6%)
 Nothing, it is up to me..... 19 (26%) Having a YOT worker or social worker that I get on with..... 8 (11%)
 Making new friends outside..... 4 (6%) Having children..... 12 (17%)
 Going back to live with my family..... 12 (17%) Having something to do that isn't crime..... 19 (26%)
 Getting a place of my own..... 19 (26%) This sentence..... 20 (28%)
 Getting a job..... 35 (49%) Getting into school/college..... 18 (25%)
 Having a partner (girlfriend or boyfriend)..... 18 (25%) Talking about my offending behaviour with staff..... 3 (4%)
 Staying off alcohol/drugs..... 13 (18%) Anything else 5 (7%)

Q11 Do you want to stop offending?

Not sentenced..... 13 (18%)
 Yes..... 56 (76%)
 No 1 (1%)
 Don't know..... 4 (5%)

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?

Not sentenced..... 13 (18%)
 Yes..... 29 (39%)
 No 32 (43%)

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



Survey responses from children and young people: HMYOI Warren Hill 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

		Warren Hill 2013	Young people's comparator	Warren Hill 2013	Warren Hill 2011
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		85	857	85	88
SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU					
1.1	Are you 18 years of age?	19%	15%	19%	13%
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	3%	5%	3%	2%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	97%	99%	97%	
1.4	Do you understand written English?	97%	98%	97%	
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other category)?	45%	45%	45%	44%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	22%	22%	22%	23%
1.7	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	12%	5%	12%	5%
1.8	Do you have any children?	16%	10%	16%	8%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	20%	16%	20%	10%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	37%	32%	37%	28%
SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE					
2.1	Are you sentenced?	84%	81%	84%	71%
2.2	Is your sentence 12 months or less?	31%	35%	31%	36%
2.3	Have you been in this establishment for one month or less?	9%	16%	9%	16%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	57%	56%	57%	49%
SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS					
On your most recent journey here:					
3.1	Did you feel safe?	80%	82%	80%	84%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	24%	38%	24%	23%
3.3	Did you spend more than 4 hours in the van?	13%	9%	13%	10%
For those who spent 2 or more hours in the escort van:					
3.4	Were you offered a toilet break if you needed it?	22%	13%	22%	20%
3.5	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	38%	32%	38%	51%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	53%	52%	53%	68%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	15%	17%	15%	

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

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		Warren Hill 2013	Young people's comparator	Warren Hill 2013	Warren Hill 2011
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse					
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details					
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference					
Number of completed questionnaires returned		85	857	85	88
SECTION 4: YOUR FIRST FEW DAYS HERE					
4.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	82%	82%	82%	84%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	84%	83%	84%	
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	84%	67%	84%	77%
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?	63%	54%	63%	64%
4.4b	Loss of property?	29%	21%	29%	19%
4.4c	Feeling scared?	31%	30%	31%	
4.4d	Gang problems?	58%	50%	58%	
4.4e	Contacting family?	64%	58%	64%	62%
4.4f	Money worries?	26%	20%	26%	20%
4.4g	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	41%	39%	41%	
4.4h	Health problems?	49%	56%	49%	71%
4.4i	Getting phone numbers?	42%	47%	42%	52%
4.5	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	74%	70%	74%	75%
When you first arrived, did you have problems with any of the following:					
4.5a	Not being able to smoke?	52%	46%	52%	41%
4.5b	Loss of property?	13%	11%	13%	16%
4.5c	Feeling scared?	7%	9%	7%	
4.5d	Gang problems?	10%	11%	10%	
4.5e	Contacting family?	27%	23%	27%	35%
4.5f	Money worries?	24%	15%	24%	21%
4.5g	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	13%	11%	13%	
4.5h	Health problems?	10%	10%	10%	9%
4.5i	Getting phone numbers?	29%	25%	29%	40%
When you first arrived, were you given any of the following:					
4.6a	Toiletries/basic items?	87%	83%	87%	
4.6b	The opportunity to have a shower?	76%	53%	76%	30%
4.6c	Something to eat?	87%	86%	87%	82%
4.6d	A free phone call to friends/family?	85%	81%	85%	79%
4.6e	PIN phone credit?	64%	65%	64%	
4.6f	Information about feeling worried/upset?	43%	37%	43%	

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Warren Hill 2013	Young people's comparator	Warren Hill 2013	Warren Hill 2011
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		85	857	85	88
Within your first 24 hours, did you have access to the following people or services:					
4.7a	A chaplain?	49%	48%	49%	52%
4.7b	A peer mentor?	27%	14%	27%	
4.7c	Childline/Samaritans	22%	17%	22%	
4.7d	The prison shop/canteen?	23%	14%	23%	10%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	80%	74%	80%	81%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	83%	82%	83%	82%
4.10	For those who have been on an induction course: did it cover everything you needed to know about the establishment	76%	62%	76%	69%
SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT					
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	85%	69%	85%	90%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	44%	41%	44%	18%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	16%	18%	16%	16%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	47%	51%	47%	45%
5.5	Is it easy/very easy for you to attend religious services?	62%	62%	62%	61%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	59%	59%	59%	59%
Can you speak to:					
5.7	A chaplain of your faith in private?	76%	71%	76%	75%
5.8	A peer mentor?	62%	36%	62%	
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	56%	27%	56%	51%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	41%	47%	41%	42%
SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF					
6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	81%	73%	81%	64%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no one to turn to?	24%	25%	24%	
6.3	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	55%	41%	55%	42%
For those who have met their personal officer:					
6.4	Did you meet your personal (named) officer within the first week?	39%	42%	39%	41%
6.5	Do you see your personal (named) officer at least once a week?	68%	59%	68%	72%
6.6	Do you feel your personal (named) officer tries to help you?	85%	71%	85%	

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Warren Hill 2013	Young people's comparator	Warren Hill 2013	Warren Hill 2011
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		85	857	85	88
SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS					
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	87%	79%	87%	83%
For those who have made an application:					
7.2	Do you feel applications are sorted out fairly?	74%	72%	74%	63%
7.3	Do you feel applications are sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	60%	62%	60%	58%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	66%	54%	66%	77%
For those who have made a complaint:					
7.5	Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	55%	37%	55%	34%
7.6	Do you feel complaints are sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	49%	40%	49%	36%
7.7	Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint?	10%	9%	10%	
SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE					
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	45%	31%	45%	32%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	59%	51%	59%	51%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	59%	53%	59%	52%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	59%	51%	59%	
For those who have had a minor report:					
8.5	Was the process explained clearly to you?	71%	80%	71%	
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	56%	63%	56%	65%
For those who have had an adjudication ('nicking'):					
8.7	Was the process explained clearly to you?	82%	87%	82%	79%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	33%	30%	33%	39%
8.9	For those who had spent a night in the care and separation unit: did the staff treat you well/very well?	49%	48%	49%	56%
SECTION 9: SAFETY					
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	30%	30%	30%	32%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	14%	10%	14%	

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

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		Warren Hill 2013	Young people's comparator	Warren Hill 2013	Warren Hill 2011
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse					
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details					
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference					
Number of completed questionnaires returned		85	857	85	88
9.4	Have you ever been victimised by other young people here?	26%	22%	26%	26%
Since you have been here, have other young people:					
9.5a	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	9%	10%	9%	16%
9.5b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	13%	10%	13%	14%
9.5c	Sexually abused you?	1%	1%	1%	0%
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	7%	8%	7%	
9.5e	Taken your canteen/property?	4%	4%	4%	11%
9.5f	Victimised you because of medication?	1%	1%	1%	
9.5g	Victimised you because of debt?	1%	2%	1%	
9.5h	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	1%	0%	1%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	2%	0%	4%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	2%	0%	3%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	2%	0%	
9.5l	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	3%	2%	3%	4%
9.5m	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%	1%	0%	
9.5n	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	1%	0%	
9.5o	Victimised you because of your age?	1%	1%	1%	
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	1%	2%	1%	1%
9.5q	Victimised you because you were new here?	10%	5%	10%	9%
9.5r	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	3%	2%	3%	1%
9.5s	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	4%	4%	4%	0%

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Warren Hill 2013	Young people's comparator	Warren Hill 2013	Warren Hill 2011
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		85	857	85	88
9.7	Have you ever been victimised by a member of staff here?	22%	22%	22%	23%
Since you have been here, have staff:					
9.8a	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	12%	13%	12%	15%
9.8b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	7%	4%	7%	5%
9.8c	Sexually abused you?	0%	1%	0%	1%
9.8d	Threatened or intimidated you?	3%	7%	3%	
9.8e	Taken your canteen/property?	1%	3%	1%	2%
9.8f	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	1%	0%	
9.8g	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	0%	0%	
9.8h	Victimised you because of drugs?	1%	1%	1%	1%
9.8i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	4%	3%	4%	1%
9.8j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	2%	0%	1%
9.8k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	1%	1%	1%	
9.8k	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	1%	2%	1%	1%
9.8m	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%	1%	0%	
9.8n	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	0%	0%	
9.8o	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	1%	0%	
9.8p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	1%	1%	1%	0%
9.8q	Victimised you because you were new here?	3%	2%	3%	6%
9.8r	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	0%	3%	0%	5%
9.8s	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	1%	1%	1%	2%
9.8t	Victimised you because you made a complaint?	4%	5%	4%	
9.10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	29%	29%	29%	
9.11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	40%	31%	40%	34%
9.12	Is shouting through the windows a problem here?	29%	34%	29%	42%

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

Key to tables

		Warren Hill 2013	Young people's comparator	Warren Hill 2013	Warren Hill 2011
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		85	857	85	88
SECTION 10: HEALTH SERVICES					
10.1a	Is it easy for you to see the doctor?	63%	63%	63%	57%
10.1b	Is it easy for you to see the nurse?	72%	79%	72%	68%
10.1c	Is it easy for you to see the dentist?	55%	42%	55%	35%
10.2	For those who have been to health services: do you think the overall quality is good/very good?	63%	60%	63%	68%
10.3	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/all of it in your cell?	68%	50%	68%	
10.4	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?	22%	19%	22%	21%
10.5	If you have emotional or mental health problems, are you being helped by anyone here?	68%	67%	68%	39%
10.6	Did you have any problems with alcohol when you first arrived?	11%	10%	11%	8%
10.7	Have you received any help with any alcohol problems here?	10%	6%	10%	6%
10.8	Did you have any problems with drugs when you first arrived?	36%	34%	36%	30%
10.9	Do you have a problem with drugs now?	17%	6%	17%	2%
10.10	Have you received any help with any drug problems here?	35%	22%	35%	29%
10.11	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs here?	14%	18%	14%	14%
SECTION 11: ACTIVITIES					
11.1	Were you 14 or younger when you were last at school?	38%	37%	38%	36%
11.2	Have you ever been excluded from school?	86%	86%	86%	85%
11.3	Did you ever skip school before you came into custody?	82%	74%	82%	
Do you currently take part in any of the following:					
11.4a	Education?	83%	78%	83%	79%
11.4b	A job in this establishment?	20%	29%	20%	23%
11.4c	Vocational or skills training?	12%	18%	12%	27%
11.4d	Offending behaviour programmes?	20%	25%	20%	27%
11.4e	Nothing	8%	10%	8%	11%

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

Key to tables

		Warren Hill 2013	Young people's comparator	Warren Hill 2013	Warren Hill 2011
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		85	857	85	88
For those who have taken part in the following activities while in this establishment, do you think that they will help you when you leave prison:					
11.5a	Education?	81%	64%	81%	85%
11.5b	A job in this establishment?	65%	54%	65%	62%
11.5c	Vocational or skills training?	67%	52%	67%	69%
11.5d	Offending behaviour programmes?	63%	51%	63%	67%
11.6	Do you usually have association every day?	94%	74%	94%	95%
11.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	35%	46%	35%	15%
11.8	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	12%	9%	12%	11%
SECTION 12: KEEPING IN TOUCH WITH FAMILY AND FRIENDS					
12.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	90%	67%	90%	95%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	42%	37%	42%	43%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	31%	38%	31%	18%
12.4	Is it easy/very easy for your family and friends to visit you here?	22%	35%	22%	
12.5	Do your visits start on time?	39%	46%	39%	31%
SECTION 13: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE					
Do you think you will have a problem with the following, when you are released:					
13.1a	Finding accommodation?	32%	24%	32%	23%
13.1b	Getting into school or college?	36%	30%	36%	23%
13.1c	Getting a job?	59%	55%	59%	37%
13.1d	Money/finances?	46%	37%	46%	28%
13.1e	Claiming benefits?	23%	22%	23%	24%
13.1f	Continuing health services?	6%	9%	6%	15%
13.1g	Opening a bank account?	14%	16%	14%	20%
13.1h	Avoiding bad relationships?	23%	17%	23%	15%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	52%	53%	52%	
For those with a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan:					
13.3	Were you involved in the development of your plan?	92%	85%	92%	
13.4	Do you understand the targets set in your plan?	92%	96%	92%	
13.5	Do you have a caseworker here?	79%	83%	79%	
13.6	Has your caseworker helped to prepare you for release?	45%	53%	45%	
For those with a social worker:					
13.7	Has your social worker been to visit you since you have been here?	58%	63%	58%	
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	44%	41%	44%	58%

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

Key to tables

		Warren Hill 2013	Young people's comparator	Warren Hill 2013	Warren Hill 2011
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		85	857	85	88
If you have a problem with any of the following, do you know who to ask for help?					
13.9a	Finding accommodation	28%	28%	28%	41%
13.9b	Getting into school or college	30%	27%	30%	62%
13.9c	Getting a job	34%	34%	34%	46%
13.9d	Help with money/finances	25%	23%	25%	38%
13.9e	Help with claiming benefits	17%	20%	17%	33%
13.9f	Continuing health services	14%	15%	14%	30%
13.9g	Opening a bank account	16%	20%	16%	38%
13.9h	Avoiding bad relationships	16%	15%	16%	36%
For those who were sentenced:					
13.11	Do you want to stop offending?	92%	90%	92%	100%
13.12	Have you done anything or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future	48%	51%	48%	55%

Diversity analysis



Key question responses (ethnicity/religion) HMYOI Warren Hill 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				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		37	45	18	64
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	6%	0%	0%	4%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	94%	100%	100%	96%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	94%	100%	96%	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)?			88%	33%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	42%	5%		
1.5	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	2%	19%	4%	14%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	6%	30%	14%	21%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	26%	44%	32%	37%
2.1	Are you sentenced?	88%	81%	88%	83%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	55%	57%	50%	60%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	14%	34%	17%	27%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	45%	58%	48%	55%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	6%	20%	13%	16%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	86%	82%	88%	84%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	80%	87%	88%	84%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	83%	80%	86%	79%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	79%	83%	86%	80%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic young people	White young people	Muslim young people	Non-Muslim young people
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		37	45	18	64
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	83%	87%	96%	84%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	32%	53%	32%	49%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	13%	17%	14%	17%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	30%	61%	36%	51%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	77%	48%	86%	53%
Can you speak to:					
5.7	A chaplain of your faith in private?	87%	68%	86%	73%
5.8	A peer mentor?	50%	70%	42%	67%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	40%	68%	55%	57%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	36%	46%	26%	47%
6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	63%	93%	64%	87%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	29%	15%	48%	16%
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	82%	90%	82%	90%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	49%	79%	32%	74%
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	48%	43%	40%	46%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	48%	69%	48%	63%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	50%	66%	40%	64%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	59%	56%	64%	57%
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	66%	48%	67%	54%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	42%	24%	48%	30%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic young people	White young people	Muslim young people	Non-Muslim young people
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		37	45	18	64
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	29%	32%	21%	32%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	18%	12%	17%	14%
9.4	Have you been victimised by other young people here?	16%	34%	5%	30%
Since you have been here, have other young people:					
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	2%	10%	0%	7%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	0%	0%	0%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	0%	0%	0%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	0%	0%	0%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	2%	0%	0%
9.7	Have you been victimised by staff here?	28%	19%	22%	21%
Since you have been here, have staff:					
9.8d	Threatened or intimidated you?	3%	2%	6%	1%
9.8i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	10%	0%	6%	4%
9.8j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	0%	0%	0%
9.8k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	3%	0%	0%	1%
9.8p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	2%	0%	0%
9.10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	24%	32%	21%	31%
9.11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	30%	46%	33%	43%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic young people	White young people	Muslim young people	Non-Muslim young people
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		37	45	18	64
10.1a	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the doctor?	58%	65%	58%	65%
10.1b	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the nurse?	66%	75%	71%	73%
10.4	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	16%	28%	21%	23%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:					
11.4a	Education?	93%	77%	85%	83%
11.4b	A job in this establishment?	16%	23%	30%	18%
11.4c	Vocational or skills training?	14%	12%	15%	12%
11.4d	Offending behaviour programmes?	23%	19%	21%	21%
11.4e	Nothing?	0%	12%	0%	8%
11.6	Do you usually have association every day?	98%	93%	85%	96%
11.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	37%	33%	22%	37%
11.8	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	17%	10%	0%	15%
12.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	90%	89%	83%	92%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	55%	32%	42%	40%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	18%	38%	21%	34%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	51%	51%	50%	52%
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	42%	44%	30%	48%



Diversity analysis - disability

**Key question responses (disability analysis)
HMYOI Warren Hill 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.

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		16	65
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	0%	4%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	97%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	100%	97%
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?	14%	52%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	14%	22%
1.5	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	32%	8%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	50%	33%
2.1	Are you sentenced?	96%	81%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	64%	58%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	14%	28%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	52%	54%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	14%	14%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	71%	88%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	81%	84%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	60%	86%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	67%	88%
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	67%	88%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	60%	40%

Diversity analysis - disability

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	19%	14%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	33%	48%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	40%	66%
Can you speak to:			
5.7	A chaplain of your faith in private?	60%	80%
5.8	A peer mentor?	52%	64%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	52%	57%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	40%	43%

Diversity analysis - disability

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	94%	79%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no one to turn to?	22%	20%
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	83%	88%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	67%	66%
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	37%	50%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	63%	59%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	67%	59%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	58%	59%
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	58%	57%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	22%	37%
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	58%	25%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	21%	13%
9.4	Have you been victimised by other young people here?	61%	20%
Since you have been here, have other young people:			
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	33%	1%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	0%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	0%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	0%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	6%	0%
9.7	Have you been victimised by staff here?	22%	23%
Since you have been here, have staff:			
9.8d	Threatened or intimidated you?	0%	4%
9.8i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	5%

Diversity analysis - disability

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
9.8j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	0%
9.8k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	1%
9.8p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	6%	0%
9.10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	17%	32%
9.11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	37%	42%

Diversity analysis - disability

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
10.1a	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the doctor?	50%	65%
10.1b	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the nurse?	70%	72%
10.4	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	58%	15%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:			
11.4a	Education?	85%	86%
11.4b	A job in this establishment?	30%	18%
11.4c	Vocational or skills training?	5%	14%
11.4d	Offending behaviour programmes?	5%	24%
11.4e	Nothing?	0%	7%
11.6	Do you usually have association every day?	94%	96%
11.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	42%	33%
11.8	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	6%	14%
12.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	83%	90%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	42%	41%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	21%	35%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	42%	57%
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	30%	49%