



Thematic report by HM Inspectorate of Prisons

Training planning for children and young people

May 2010

Crown copyright 2010

ISBN: 978-1-84099-348-6

Published by:
HM Inspectorate of Prisons
1st Floor Ashley House
2 Monck Street
LONDON
SW1P 2BQ

Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Acknowledgements | 4 |
| Introduction | 5 |
| 1. Summary | 7 |
| 2. Background to the report | 11 |
| 3. Arrival in custody | 15 |
| 4. Training planning | 19 |
| 5. Resettlement | 25 |
| 6. Training plans for young people serving indeterminate and long-term sentences | 31 |
| Appendices | 35 |
| <hr/> | |
| I. Methodology | |
| II. Data analysis by establishment | |
| III. Data analysis – long-term and short-term sentenced comparison | |

Acknowledgements

Adam Altoft
Research officer

Samantha Booth
Senior research officer

Ian Thomson
Inspector

Louise Falshaw
Head of research, development and thematics

Amy Summerfield
Research officer

Introduction

This short thematic review of training planning for children and young people was conducted by HM Inspectorate of Prisons as part of a supplementary programme of independent inspection agreed with, and supported by, the Youth Justice Board (YJB). Training plans should underpin and guide the management of a young person's time in custody and his or her transition back into the community. The review is intended to complement wider work being undertaken by the YJB to produce guidance on effective case management, of which training plans form an important part.

The Inspectorate routinely surveys a sample of young people in all young offender institutions holding juveniles. For this review, an analysis was made of the responses of young people to the most recent surveys conducted between April 2008 and September 2009. In addition, a desktop analysis was conducted of all relevant inspections published between October 2007 and March 2010. Together this provides an insight into the views of young people, along with the relevant judgements of inspectors.

Timely and accurate information is essential to ensuring the safety and well-being of young people arriving in custody, as well as the subsequent adequacy of training plans. Most young people reported experiencing problems when they arrived in custody, so it was disappointing that inspections often found information arriving with them to be incomplete. This left staff to pursue missing data to inform reception interviews and vulnerability assessments, some of which varied in quality.

Training plans are mandatory, so it was surprising that only 60% of sentenced young people surveyed reported having a plan. At the very least, this suggests the need for greater efforts to ensure young people are aware of and engage with the planning process. Of those who were aware of their plans, only half said they were involved in its development. Young people serving longer sentences tended to report much more positively on their experience of the training planning process.

The quality of plans varied. At some establishments, inspectors noted that targets were too generic and did not take the individualised approach to risk and need that the process requires. There were also logistical difficulties with inconsistent frequency of meetings, variable attendance by key contributors – for example families – and even a lack of appropriate locations for the discussions.

For some young people, the achievement of targets was blocked by a lack of offending behaviour programmes and a variation in the resettlement services available to prepare them for release. Nevertheless, young people who said they had plans were much more confident about their prospects on release and knowledgeable about the support they could access. Some custodial staff also made good efforts to attend planning reviews in the community once a young person was released, but this was not consistent across the estate.

This brief thematic offers a useful insight into the strengths and weaknesses of training planning in young offender institutions. A number of areas for improvement are highlighted, together with some examples of good practice. It is to be hoped that this assists the YJB as it seeks to offer establishments some pointers as to how sentence planning and wider case management can be improved.

Anne Owers
Chief Inspector of Prisons

April 2010

1. Summary

- 1.1 The findings in this report come from two main sources: inspection reports published between October 2007 and March 2010, and data from the most recent survey undertaken in each young people's establishment between April 2008 and September 2009.

Arrival in custody

- 1.2 In the majority of instances, young people arrived at establishments with the appropriate accompanying documentation. However, inspections found it was not uncommon for young people to arrive with some of their documentation incomplete, and, while they were isolated cases, some arrived in custody with no supporting documentation at all.
- 1.3 Reception interviews took place with young people in all establishments. Mostly, interviews conducted by staff were both relaxed and thorough, and establishment procedures were explained to the young person in an age-appropriate manner. However, positive engagement with young people was often hindered by a lack of privacy for interviews.
- 1.4 Seventy-five per cent of all young people told us they were experiencing problems when they arrived in custody. This figure was particularly high for young women – 98% told us they had problems upon arrival.
- 1.5 Initial vulnerability assessments were of variable quality across the estate. Inspections noted several factors attributable to failings in this area, including: failure to include significant details from discussion with the young person in reception interviews; failure to consult other documentation, such as Assets (Youth Justice Board assessment documentation), when making assessments – or staff being over-reliant on self-disclosed information from young people; and, a lack of quality assurance processes.

Training planning

- 1.6 In our surveys, only 60% of sentenced young people told us that they had a training plan. This low figure was not supported by inspection findings. Such a low figure may be attributable to the fact that not all young people are aware they have a plan; they may refer to it by a different name; or they may have forgotten they have one, due to their lack of involvement with the planning process or the infrequency with which it is reviewed.
- 1.7 Of those young people who told us they had a training plan, just over half were involved in its development. Two-thirds of young people could not see their training plan when they wanted to.
- 1.8 The targets set in training plans were not always tailored to the individual needs of the young person. At some establishments we found that all the young people were receiving similar, generic targets.
- 1.9 The lack of an appropriate environment in which to hold review meetings was an issue across the estate. In some instances, reviews were held in visits areas, which both inhibited open and

productive discussion and, due to restrictions on availability, prevented reviews from taking place within prescribed timescales.

- 1.10 The attendance of staff at review meetings was inconsistent across the estate, and multidisciplinary staff representation was rare. Although youth offending team (YOT) workers working with the young person attended the majority of reviews, attendance by staff from other departments varied – and not all establishments expected multidisciplinary staff attendance at review meetings.
- 1.11 Forty-six per cent of young people who had met their personal officer did so within their first week of arrival. Inspections found some establishments where personal officers did not attend the review meetings for young people in their care.
- 1.12 Some establishments were failing to afford sufficient resources to reviewing public protection cases. Inspections found instances where case review meetings took place infrequently, and the level of attendance by establishment staff was low.

Resettlement

- 1.13 The extent to which establishments prepared young people effectively for release was variable across the estate. In some establishments holding young men, inspections found a wide range of vocational courses to aid future employment. However, at others, provision for vocational training was insufficient. In addition, not all young people could gain accreditations for the work they had completed.
- 1.14 In establishments holding young women, there was a range of vocational opportunities and most young women were able to complete accredited courses during their time in custody, including some courses accredited at level three.
- 1.15 Young people at some establishments could meet health care staff before release. In addition, young people who were under the care of mental health in-reach teams were referred to services in the community before release. While some young people not previously registered with a GP were advised how to do so, this service was not always provided.
- 1.16 Some establishments provided family days where young people could receive an extended visit from members of their family. However, these were irregular and some establishments had never hosted a family day. A small number of establishments provided parenting courses for young fathers, but this was rare.
- 1.17 The lack of accredited offending behaviour programmes made it difficult for young people to achieve the targets set in their training plan and to address their offending behaviour. Only 22% of all young men surveyed said they were taking part in offending behaviour programmes.
- 1.18 Some establishments did not have any specialist housing advice for young people requiring support in arranging suitable accommodation on release. Units holding young women had difficulties in liaising with housing providers to address accommodation problems, often because the young women came from a different part of the country.
- 1.19 Young people who knew they had a training plan were significantly more positive about their release than those without one. Young people who said they had a plan also had a greater knowledge of who the main resettlement contacts were within the establishment holding them.

- 1.20 Despite the inclusion of release on temporary licence (ROTL) in the resettlement strategy at most establishments, its use was varied across the estate. At some establishments, young people were rarely able to gain ROTL, and work to facilitate its use was underdeveloped.
- 1.21 Attendance by establishment staff at first reviews in the community was usually prioritised according to risk. However, inspectors noted that at some establishments staff needed to attend more first reviews for young people in the community.

Young people serving indeterminate and long-term sentences

- 1.22 A higher proportion of young people serving long or indeterminate sentences said they had a training plan than those serving shorter sentences. A greater proportion also said that they were involved in the development of their training plan, and that they could see it when they wanted to.

2. Background to the report

- 2.1 This thematic report provides an overview of the training planning process across the young people's secure estate and looks at how effectively training plans are being used to address a young person's individual risks and needs during and after custody.

Training plans

- 2.2 It is an expectation¹ of Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons (HMIP) that all young people in custody, whether remanded or sentenced, should have a good quality training plan or a remand management plan, based on their individual risks, needs and aspirations, and that this should be implemented effectively. Planning for the release of the young person starts upon their arrival in custody and, as instructed by Prison Service instruction (PSI) 28/2009,² establishment staff, in partnership with the youth offending team (YOT) manager, should establish procedures to monitor constantly and regularly review the progress of the young person. This process should continue after the young person's release, ensuring a seamless transition for the young person back into the community.
- 2.3 Once the young person has been sentenced to custody, it is the responsibility of the YOT practitioner, as outlined in the *National Standards for Youth Justice Services*,³ to send all relevant information on the young person, including a completed Asset, to the Youth Justice Board (YJB). The Asset is an assessment tool used by YOTs and includes details of the offence committed, previous offence details and vulnerability alerts, and identifies a range of factors that may have contributed to the offending behaviour of the young person.⁴ Once all the core documents are gathered together, the YJB's placements and casework service forward these documents to the receiving establishment through the secure electronic yellow envelope (EYE) information transfer process.⁵
- 2.4 The reports sent with the young person form the evidence base for the initial assessments that follow. If initial assessments are inaccurate, then any planning or intervention that follows will lack an informed evidence base, and 'probably be ineffective because it is based on false information'.⁶ The effective and timely sharing of information, coupled with sound initial assessments, is integral to the training planning process.
- 2.5 The creation of the young person's training plan begins by identifying their individual vulnerabilities, needs and risks. This starts in a reception interview conducted by a member of the establishment staff. As outlined in the YJB guidance, good and thorough early assessments are an important part of ensuring the efficiency and effectiveness of the training planning process, and, therefore, the most purposeful use of time that the young person spends in custody.

¹ Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons (2009), *Expectations for Children and Young People in Prison Custody*, London: HMI Prisons.

² NOMS, *Care and Management of Young People*, PSI 28/2009.

³ Youth Justice Board (2009), *National Standards for Youth Justice Services* (<http://www.yjb.gov.uk/en-gb/practitioners/MonitoringPerformance/NationalStandards/>).

⁴ <http://www.yjb.gov.uk/en-gb/practitioners/Assessment/Asset.htm>

⁵ <http://www.wiringupyouthjustice.info/site/eye/>

⁶ Youth Justice Board. T1:A, T1:P, T1:AR and T1:PR forms, C&YP Consultation, T2, T3, and T4 forms – Guidance for completion (<http://www.yjb.gov.uk/en-gb/practitioners/Custody/Forms/default.htm>).

- 2.6 According to PSI 28/2009, the reception interview should occur within one hour and be completed within two hours of the young person's arrival, and is necessary to assess their immediate needs and level of vulnerability. Information provided by the young person in the reception interview, coupled with the information sent to the establishment by the YJB placement and casework service, is used to complete an initial vulnerability assessment of the young person, in addition to any other necessary risk assessments. As stated in the *National Standards for Youth Justice Services*, where a young person is received without an Asset, they should be treated as 'vulnerable' until it arrives.
- 2.7 The YJB stipulates that an initial planning meeting should be held within '10 working days of the custodial sentence being made, and produce a sentence plan as a result'. It is the responsibility of the YOT worker to attend this, and to invite other relevant staff, in addition to the young person themselves and their family. It is an expectation of the Inspectorate that the young person is 'actively involved' in this first meeting, and that the establishment actively encourages and, where possible, facilitates the attendance of their parents or carers.
- 2.8 In its *Expectations*, the Inspectorate identifies the purpose of the initial training planning meeting as being to agree upon and set targets for the young person during their time in custody. The targets should be: specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and time bound (SMART); based on a comprehensive assessment of the individualised needs of, and risk posed by the young person; and compiled with the active consultation and involvement of the young person.
- 2.9 Both PSI 28/2009 and the *National Standards for Youth Justice* require the young person to be given a copy of their plan and be able to understand its content, and indicate their agreement with the plan by signing it. PSI 28/2009 states that: 'where the young person has refused to sign, the chair of the meeting must sign to say that the sentence plan has been explained to the young person who has refused to sign.'
- 2.10 In accordance with the *National Standards for Youth Justice*, a review meeting should take place within one month of the initial planning meeting. This discussion should be held by the YOT practitioner to review the progress of the young person with establishment staff and the young person. PSI 28/2009 states that the condition in which review meetings are held should 'afford as much privacy as possible'. After the first review, subsequent reviews must then happen within a period not exceeding three months. It is an expectation of the Inspectorate that reviews occur 'regularly' but, as a minimum, monthly.
- 2.11 As stated in PSI 28/2009, planning for the effective resettlement of the young person 'must start' at the first sentence planning meeting. Staff at the establishment, as outlined in the *National Standards for Youth Justice Services*, must hold a resettlement review meeting one month before the discharge date for the young person to confirm the final arrangements for their release. It is an expectation of the Inspectorate that when a young person is released from custody, a post-release meeting occurs within 10 days of their return to the community, and that a member of establishment staff who knows the young person attends.

Scope of the report

- 2.12 Our findings for this report come from two sources (see Appendix I for further details).
- Inspection reports: the most recent inspection report for all young offender institutions (YOIs) holding children and young people was analysed. The specialist Carlford and Oswald units were inspected alongside their parent establishments, Warren Hill and Castington, and are

therefore included within those inspection reports. The Keppel Unit was inspected separately to its parent establishment Wetherby, and therefore has a separate inspection report. In total, 17 inspection reports published between October 2007 and March 2010 were analysed. These included full, full follow-up and short follow-up inspections. Details of all establishments inspected can be found in Appendix I.

- Survey data: data from the most recent survey undertaken in each young people's establishment between April 2008 and September 2009 was used. As part of a service level agreement with the YJB, researchers from HM Inspectorate of Prisons survey a representative sample of young people at each young people's establishment on an annual basis. When timely, surveys also form part of the evidence base for individual establishment inspections. In total, 1,168 responses from young people have been analysed, across the entire young people's estate. The survey was updated in April 2009, and in seven establishments/units the survey had been carried out before this date and so are missing data for some questions (see Appendix II).

2.13 For the purpose of this review, we made the following analyses.

- A best and worst case analysis of survey data from all establishments holding young men.
- A best and worst case analysis of survey data from all establishments holding young women.
- A best and worst case analysis of all survey data received, by establishment, across the young people's estate.
- A comparison between young people who told us they had a training plan and those who said they did not. This was limited to sentenced young people only.
- A comparison between young people serving a long-term sentence (an indeterminate sentence or one that is more than two years in length) and those serving a short-term sentence (one that is two years or less). This was limited to sentenced young people only.
- An analysis of survey data, by establishment, of all young men serving a long-term sentence.

3. Arrival in custody

Key documentation

- 3.1 It is an expectation of the Inspectorate that all essential documentation about a young person is received by the establishment before or at the time of their arrival. When a young person arrives in custody, PSI 28/2009 states that it is the responsibility of staff at the receiving establishment to check that all key documentation has been received. As outlined by the YJB, if the Asset has not arrived by the time the young person has, the establishment must contact the YJB's placement and casework service requesting that it is sent within one working day.
- 3.2 In most of our inspections, we found that the majority of young people arrived at establishments with the appropriate accompanying documentation. However, in some isolated cases, there were occasions when young people arrived at an establishment without any accompanying documentation. During the Wetherby inspection, two young people arrived at the establishment without any supporting documentation at all.
- 3.3 Instances where young people arrived in custody with incomplete documentation were not uncommon. Staff at Wetherby estimated that 30% of new arrivals had incomplete documentation. At the Huntercombe inspection, almost 50% of young men arrived without full Asset documents. This was despite the nationwide use of E-Asset. In our inspections, the Keppel Unit at Wetherby was the only establishment where missing information was rare for new arrivals.
- 3.4 Most inspections reported that establishment staff identified missing information for new arrivals. Once identified, staff usually chased this information through a secure email link or telephone system with the YJB. Where information was missing, it was standard practice for new arrivals to be subject to routine vulnerability checks as a precaution, in line with PSI 28/2009. On the Keppel Unit, one new arrival with missing information was monitored hourly during his first night. We considered this to be a proportionate response.
- 3.5 Despite the best efforts of staff to pursue missing information, our inspections revealed instances where its retrieval from the YJB had not been prompt. During the inspection of the Josephine Butler Unit, two Assets were found that required updating. Staff on the unit had become concerned about one young woman for whom existing information detailed a previous conviction classifying her as a 'risk to children'. She had been admitted to the unit three months earlier, yet the establishment was still waiting for her updated Asset. It was not unusual for young women to arrive on this unit without an up to date Asset.

First days in custody

- 3.6 In accordance with PSI 28/2009, all young people should have a reception interview with a member of staff from the establishment within one hour of arrival, and this should be completed within two hours. The primary purpose of this interview is to assess the needs and level of vulnerability of the young person, and to ensure that details listed in arrival documentation are correct. It is an expectation of the Inspectorate that the reception interview should be conducted sensitively, occur in a suitably private environment, enable the young person to disclose any anxieties, and verify the information disclosed in the Asset document.

- 3.7 Inspections found that reception interviews took place in all establishments inspected and, mostly, these arrangements were good. In the majority of prisons, we found that officers interviewing young people did so in a relaxed, thorough and conscientious manner. Interviews were seldom rushed, and staff explained procedures to the young person in an age-appropriate manner. At Hindley, there was a reception orderly who spoke to and answered questions from new arrivals. During the Toscana Unit inspection, we observed an interview where the officer put the young woman at ease and elicited relevant background information from her that had not been included in her arrival documentation.
- 3.8 At some male establishments, we found that the environment in which the reception interview took place was unsatisfactory or that interviews were not conducted in private. At Brinsford, Warren Hill and Hindley, young people were interviewed over the reception desk – at Brinsford this was sometimes while other young people were in the same room, and, therefore, the interviewee was unlikely to disclose any anxieties. At Werrington, the facilities for reception interviews were unsatisfactory.
- 3.9 The need for effective reception interviews and consequent vulnerability assessments was evident across the young people's estate. In our surveys, 75% of all young people told us that they had problems when they first arrived. Table 1 provides a breakdown of the problems that they told us they were experiencing on arrival in custody. The biggest problem was not being able to smoke. In seven of the nine areas covered, a greater proportion of young women than young men experienced problems on arrival – of particular concern was the proportion of young women who said they had problems with feeling low and contacting family members.

Table 1: The problems experienced by young people when they arrived in custody

| When you first arrived, did you have problems with any of the following: | Overall young men | Overall young women | Overall young people |
|--|-------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| Not being able to smoke? | 48% | 72% | 48% |
| Loss of property? | 10% | 13% | 11% |
| Housing problems? | 12% | 19% | 12% |
| Needing protection from other young people? | 5% | 2% | 5% |
| Letting family know where you are? | 21% | 37% | 21% |
| Money worries? | 15% | 9% | 15% |
| Feeling low/upset/needing someone to talk to? | 19% | 37% | 20% |
| Health problems? | 11% | 15% | 11% |
| Getting phone numbers? | 25% | 45% | 26% |

- 3.10 Table 2 shows the proportion of young people surveyed who said that staff had asked whether they needed any help or support with these problems on arrival. Across all areas, the proportion of young people who said they were asked about these problems was relatively low. All the questions in the table indicate important issues for new arrivals, the understanding of which can enable staff to identify areas that need targeting through the training plan. The proportion of young people who told us they were asked about housing problems (19%) and money worries (18%) – significant resettlement issues – was very low.

Table 2: The problems young people reported that staff had asked them about

| When you first arrived, did staff ask if you needed help or support with any of the following: | Overall young men | Overall young women | Overall young people |
|--|-------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| Not being able to smoke? | 62% | 69% | 62% |
| Loss of property? | 22% | 15% | 22% |
| Housing problems? | 20% | 12% | 19% |
| Needing protection from other young people? | 22% | 15% | 22% |
| Letting family know where you are? | 62% | 65% | 62% |
| Money worries? | 18% | 14% | 18% |
| Feeling low/upset/needing someone to talk to? | 43% | 59% | 44% |
| Health problems? | 55% | 41% | 54% |
| Getting phone numbers? | 43% | 41% | 43% |

- 3.11 Ninety-one per cent of young men surveyed on the Keppel Unit said that they had arrived with problems. This was unsurprising as this unit housed young men struggling to cope in the mainstream prison system. However, many young men on the unit told us that staff did not ask them about some of these problems: only 47% of respondents said they were asked if they had any health problems; 42% if they were feeling low, upset, or needed someone to talk to; 20% if they needed protection from other young people; 13% if they had housing problems; and 20% if they had any problems with the loss of property.
- 3.12 The need for thorough reception interviews was particularly acute for young women: 98% of those surveyed said that they had problems when they first arrived in custody. Furthermore, 37% of young women told us that they were 'feeling low/upset/needing someone to talk to' on arrival in custody. In 2007, 89% of young women in custody had self-harmed, and young women in custody were twice as likely to harm themselves as adult women.⁷ None of the young women on the Mary Carpenter Unit said they had been asked if they needed protection from other prisoners, or if they had any housing problems – although three young women there told us that they had housing problems. In addition, nine of the young women surveyed there told us that not being able to smoke was a problem for them, but only three said that staff had asked them if they needed help or support with this. None of the eight young women surveyed on the Toscana Unit said that they had been asked about housing problems or money worries when they arrived. Although the young women told us that these had not necessarily been issues for them, five worried that they would have problems with accommodation on release, and four felt they would have problems with gaining financial help.

Vulnerability assessments

- 3.13 The quality of initial vulnerability assessments varied across the young people's estate. In some establishments, they failed to reflect adequately the quality and specific details that had arisen in reception interviews. Some inspections, such as those at Stoke Heath and Brinsford,

⁷ HM Inspectorate of Prisons (2008). *HM Chief Inspector of Prisons for England and Wales: Annual Report, 2006/07*, London: The Stationery Office.

found little evidence that relevant documentation, such as the Asset, had even been consulted when assessing young people – even at Stoke Heath, whose safeguarding policy contained useful guidance for staff on the completion of vulnerability and risk assessments. We found that the quality of initial vulnerability assessments there ranged from poor to satisfactory. At the Brinsford inspection, one vulnerability assessment for a young person noted ‘no’ to any history of self-harm, despite other documentation indicating that he had previously tried to kill himself.

- 3.14 At Cookham Wood, staff were over-reliant on self-disclosed information from the young person and failed to pay due attention to vulnerabilities highlighted in other documentation. At Werrington, initial assessments lacked sufficient detail and were not always fully completed.
- 3.15 In contrast, initial assessments at other establishments were good. On the Keppel Unit, staff drew upon arrival documents meticulously when making initial assessments. At Parc, the quality of initial assessments was ‘consistently high’ and we found evidence that staff drew on arrival paperwork when they completed them. At the Toscana Unit, we found that initial assessments were completed to a consistently good standard, and E-Asset was used well to inform vulnerability decisions.
- 3.16 Inspections at Hindley found that while the Asset was not regularly consulted when making vulnerability assessments, such omissions were identified by a thorough quality assurance process. Parc had a robust system of quality assurance. However, the lack of scrupulous quality assurance procedures for vulnerability assessments was a recurrent problem elsewhere in the estate. Five inspections recommended the introduction of a quality assurance process or an improvement to the quality of existing vulnerability assessments.

4. Training planning

- 4.1 Overall, only 60% of sentenced young people surveyed said that they had a training plan. Although some might have referred to their training plan by another name, others could have been unaware of what a training plan was, or whether they even had one. As shown in Table 3, sentenced young men reported poorer experiences of the training planning process than young women.

Table 3: Responses from sentenced young people on the training planning process

| For sentenced young people only: | Overall young men | Overall young women | Overall young people |
|---|-------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| Do you have a training plan? | 59% | 74% | 60% |
| For those with a training plan: | | | |
| Were you involved in the development of your training plan? | 56% | 63% | 56% |
| Do you understand the targets set in your training plan? | 71% | 75% | 71% |
| Can you see your training plan when you want to? | 38% | 53% | 38% |

- 4.2 Experiences of the training planning process across the young male estate varied greatly. At Werrington, only 44% of sentenced young men said that they had a training plan – at Warren Hill this figure was 78%. While a greater proportion of sentenced young women than young men told us that they had a training plan, only four of the eight young women surveyed on the Toscana Unit said that they had a plan.
- 4.3 Only 38% of sentenced young men who said they had a training plan said that they could see their plan when they wanted to. This figure was as low as 28% at Werrington.
- 4.4 All inspections found similar planning procedures for all young people whether they were on remand (awaiting conviction or sentence) or sentenced. At Warren Hill, all remand cases were handled by a specialist YOT worker who, as their initial focus, worked to obtain bail for the young person. While the process was similar to those for sentenced young people, initial meetings had tighter deadlines. At Hindley, a specialist team covered remand work. However, as the number of young people on remand was approaching 25% of the population, the high volume of work had made it difficult for staff to arrange initial reviews within five working days, as specified by the national standards.

Initial planning meetings

- 4.5 We found that the targets set in individual training plans were of a mixed quality across the young people's estate. In six establishments inspected, the targets in existing training plans were adequately representative of the individual needs of the young person. However, in five establishments, training plan targets did not respond appropriately to individual needs. Targets were frequently generic and followed a standard format across an establishment.

- 4.6 At Hindley, staff from specialist departments did not always provide written contributions for reviews; this limited the extent to which targets reflected the specific needs of young people there. At Castington, training plan targets were often formulaic and failed to address individual needs. At Wetherby, targets were generally predictable and the same for all young people – they failed to reflect the individual needs of the young person or the quality of discussion at reviews. However at Ashfield, the plans contained relevant targets, based on individual needs. At Feltham, the targets were also appropriate and individualised. But at Huntercombe, while young people were allocated to appropriate programmes based on their assessed need, some targets were still too general.
- 4.7 On the Toscana Unit, the quality of targets had improved since the last inspection, and this process was now auditable. On the Rivendell Unit, all young women had a clear training plan with targets addressing their individual needs.
- 4.8 Only 56% of the young men who told us they had a training plan had been involved in its development. This ranged from 43% at both Werrington and Ashfield to 72% at Warren Hill, where 83% also said that they understood the targets in their plan.
- 4.9 At Toscana Unit, only two (43%) of the young women who said they had a training plan said that they had been involved in its development. In contrast, on the Rivendell Unit, 92% (11) of young women who had a plan said that they understood their targets.

Review meetings

- 4.10 Our expectation is that training planning review meetings should take place ‘whenever there is a change in circumstances for the young person or a need to revise targets, but as a minimum monthly’, and that meetings should take place in a suitable venue of sufficient size and privacy. PSI 28/2009 states that: ‘it is important for the young person to participate in the review, and there must be an opportunity for their family to do so as well’. Furthermore, ‘the contents of all reviews must be accurately recorded and documented.’
- 4.11 The lack of an appropriate environment in which to hold review meetings has been a recurrent problem across the young people’s estate. At both Brinsford and Huntercombe, meetings were held in the main visits area, with often more than one meeting at the same time. This was unsuitable and inhibited open and productive discussion with the young person. At Cookham Wood, review meetings also took place in the main visits area, which was unavailable two days a week, making it difficult to schedule review meetings. At Parc, while the facilities for interviews were good, they were not always available, and consequently, review meetings often occurred outside the prescribed timescales. At Hindley, there were 80 reviews a week in dedicated rooms in the reception area. However, although these rooms were both private and readily available, some were cramped and poorly ventilated.
- 4.12 Training planning reviews were usually chaired by caseworkers or members of the community YOT team. The quality of reviews observed during inspections was mixed. At Ashfield, not all training plan reviews were chaired effectively. Salient points were often lost in discussion, attendees were not introduced at the beginning, and the main outcomes were not summarised at the end. At Brinsford, caseworkers were sometimes underprepared for review meetings and, consequently, had limited knowledge of the young person’s specific circumstances. By contrast, there was positive practice in reviews held in some establishments – such as ‘consistently high standards’ for reviews at Werrington, and well-conducted reviews at Parc. At the Josephine Butler Unit, review meetings were well chaired and well attended by staff who had worked closely with the young person.

- 4.13 Attendance at training plan reviews was particularly inconsistent across the estate. At most establishments, a YOT worker attended training planning reviews. At Brinsford, Stoke Heath and Wetherby, a community-based YOT worker was always present at reviews. At Cookham Wood, however, the attendance of YOT workers was poor.
- 4.14 Most young men told us that their YOT worker had been in touch with them since their arrival. The figure was 98% on the Keppel Unit, 90% at Ashfield and 85% at Warren Hill, which were larger establishments. In contrast, 73% of young men at Werrington and 78% at Hindley said that their YOT worker had contacted them since they had been in custody.
- 4.15 Young men reported mixed experiences when asked if they knew how to contact their YOT worker. Overall 60% said they did. However, this figure was 48% at Hindley.
- 4.16 There were disparities in the frequency with which education staff attended training planning meetings. At Ashfield, staff from the education department attended around two-thirds of reviews. At Cookham Wood, education staff attended all training plan reviews. At Brinsford, Wetherby and Hindley, attendance by education staff was poor.
- 4.17 Attendance by family members at review meetings was also inconsistent. Family members attended approximately 60% of training planning reviews at Werrington and 60–70% at Wetherby, but only about a third of reviews at Cookham Wood, and at Ashfield only approximately 6% of the 162 reviews that had taken place in July 2008.
- 4.18 The frequency of health care staff attendance was also varied. At Werrington, they only attended the reviews of young people with whom they were already in contact. At Stoke Heath, it was rare for health care staff to attend training planning reviews, and at Brinsford, there was no record that health care staff had ever attended a training planning review.

Personal officers

- 4.19 It is an expectation of the Inspectorate that every young person is allocated a personal officer/key worker within 24 hours of their arrival in custody. As outlined in PSI 28/2009, each young person must know who their assigned officer is, and how the personal officer system works. Crucially, the personal officer/caseworker must make arrangements to ensure 'that each young person understands to whom they can turn to, to discuss all issues of concern, including resettlement', and 'that the personal officer/caseworker attends each sentence plan review during the custodial period'. The Inspectorate *Expectations* state that a young person's personal officer should be a designated officer who acts as a central point of regular contact and support for them. This regular interaction means that they can play an important part in reviews and provide crucial information on the young person's daily progress.
- 4.20 Inspections found that, too often, this opportunity was wasted. At Brinsford, personal officers did not usually attend review meetings. At Hindley, personal officers seldom attended reviews. At Cookham Wood, there was no evidence that personal officers ever attended review meetings, and nor was there anything to suggest that they were expected to. Table 4 shows the survey responses from young people who had met their personal officers. Only 46% told us that they had done so within their first week – the lowest response being at Brinsford where only 31% of young people surveyed told us that they had met their personal officer within the first week.

Table 4: Responses from young people about personal officers

| For those who have met their personal officer: | Overall young men | Overall young women | Overall young people |
|---|-------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| Did you meet your personal officer within the first week? | 46% | 67% | 46% |
| Do you see your personal officer at least once a week? | 67% | 84% | 67% |
| Do you feel your personal officer has helped you? | 60% | 65% | 60% |

- 4.21 There were marked differences across the estate in young men’s interactions with personal officers. On two of the specialist units, Keppel and Carlford, survey respondents were positive about their interaction with personal officers. On both these units, most young men said that they had met their personal officer within their first week of arrival and saw them at least once a week.
- 4.22 Other responses raised concerns. Overall, only 37% of the young men surveyed said that a member of staff had checked on them personally within the last week, and at Huntercombe, this figure was a low 22%. At both Brinsford and Feltham, only 25% of young men felt that a disclosure that they had been victimised would be taken seriously by staff.
- 4.23 The young women surveyed were positive about their interactions with personal officers – 67% had met their personal officer within their first week and 84% said that they saw their personal officer at least once a week. On the Mary Carpenter Unit, young women were particularly positive about their interactions with personal officers. Eight (90%) of the young women surveyed said they saw their personal officers at least once a week, and six (78%) felt their personal officer had helped them. The Mary Carpenter Unit also had the highest proportion of young women who said that they had a training plan.

Good practice – HMYOI Stoke Heath

Personal officer attendance at training plan reviews was given priority. To ensure their release from duties on the unit, a member of the caseworking team came to the unit to replace them. The caseworker attended the review only if the personal officer was not available, and with the benefit of an oral briefing and written submission from the personal officer.

Engagement with young people

- 4.24 Inspections found some examples of young people being effectively engaged in their training planning. At Wetherby, young people were usually interviewed before their review meetings and, therefore, were well prepared to participate in the discussions that took place. On the Keppel Unit, it was clear that staff knew their young people well, and that they had interviewed them before the meeting to ensure they understood its purpose. At both Stoke Heath and Wetherby, staff engaged well with young people during difficult discussions and in cases where they were unwilling to participate. At Ashfield, young people were given plenty of notice before review meetings and could prepare for them properly.

Good practice – HMYOI Ashfield

Ashfield had piloted a scheme where young people on the resettlement unit had chaired their own training planning meetings. Staff said young people had appreciated having more control of the meeting and had felt able to hold staff accountable when tasks assigned to them had not been completed.

- 4.25 However, survey responses showed that young people did not always feel adequately involved. Overall, only 56% of young people who had a training plan said that they had been involved in its development, 71% said that they understood the targets set, and only 38% reported that they could see their training plan when they wanted to.

Public protection

- 4.26 An effective training planning process is integral to working with young people subject to public protection measures to minimise their risk and reduce their likelihood of reoffending. Inspectors found that in most establishments potential public protection cases were identified on their arrival in custody from the documentation that arrived with young people and from the reception interviews. In most establishments, public protection cases were reviewed at monthly risk management meetings.
- 4.27 At Cookham Wood, inspectors found that public protection measures were inadequate. Cases were reviewed infrequently, and relevant information on the young person was not shared effectively with visits and safeguarding staff. At Feltham, there was a shortage of staff, which had affected attendance at public protection meetings. At Stoke Heath, public protection measures for young people who presented a risk to children, or who had been convicted of harassment or hate crimes, were only reviewed every six months, which was inadequate. In contrast, inspections found that public protection arrangements at Hindley were thorough. All cases were reviewed at monthly meetings, and young people subject to public protection arrangements had restrictions on their visits and mail, which were reviewed when circumstances changed.

5. Resettlement

- 5.1 Young people who reported that they had a training plan were significantly more positive about their release. In addition, significantly more young people with training plans than those without knew who the main resettlement contacts were in their establishments.

Table 5: Resettlement: young people who said they had a training plan against those who said they did not

| | Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better than for those without a training plan. | Said they had a training plan | Said they did not have a training plan |
|---|---|-------------------------------|--|
| | Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse than for those without a training plan. | | |
| Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released? | | 58% | 37% |
| Are you going to school or college on release? | | 66% | 58% |
| Do you know who to contact for help with the following, in preparation for your release: | | | |
| Finding accommodation? | | 54% | 32% |
| Getting into school or college? | | 64% | 48% |
| Getting a job? | | 62% | 49% |
| Help with money/finances? | | 47% | 33% |
| Help with claiming benefits? | | 46% | 27% |
| Continuing health services? | | 38% | 21% |
| Opening a bank account? | | 47% | 33% |
| Avoiding bad relationships? | | 37% | 22% |
| Do you think you will have a problem with the following, when you are released: | | | |
| Getting a job? | | 44% | 57% |
| Help with money/finances? | | 31% | 42% |
| Help with claiming benefits? | | 24% | 34% |
| For those who were sentenced: | | | |
| Do you want to stop offending? | | 94% | 88% |
| Have you done anything or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future? | | 56% | 42% |

- 5.2 An up to date resettlement needs analysis is integral to ensuring the provision of appropriate services to enable young people to achieve the targets set in their plans and address their resettlement needs. In about half of our inspections, the establishment had conducted a resettlement needs analysis. At Wetherby, there had been only a partial needs analysis, which failed to provide a comprehensive assessment of resettlement needs. At Cookham Wood, the needs analysis was based on its previous population, young women, and had not been updated since its re-role. However, resettlement policies at both Huntercombe and Werrington were based on up to date needs analyses, and were used to inform service development. At Hindley, the resettlement policy was informed by a previous detailed analysis.

Reintegration services

- 5.3 Inspections identified shortfalls in support for young men finding accommodation on release. Although 90% of young men held at Ashfield between May and June 2008 were recorded as

released to pre-arranged accommodation, there was no record of its suitability. Young men released from Parc did not always have accommodation, and the establishment needed to establish a specialist housing advice service. Both the main Wetherby site and the Keppel Unit had no specialist accommodation advice service, although records on the main Wetherby site showed that no young men had been discharged without accommodation in the six months before the inspection. At Cookham Wood, very few young men were released without accommodation to go to, and work in this area was good.

- 5.4 Few young women were released from custody without pre-arranged accommodation. On the Josephine Butler Unit, the in-house YOT identified new arrivals with accommodation problems, and undertook to work with YOT workers based in the area where they came from. A caseworker on the Mary Carpenter Unit addressed the accommodation needs of young women as a significant part of her role, and the unit's training planning documentation showed that accommodation issues were addressed for every young woman. On the Toscana Unit, efforts were made to ensure that young women were discharged to appropriate accommodation, and inspectors found no occasions where a young woman had been released without accommodation. However, some young women's units faced difficulties in addressing accommodation problems effectively, as a high proportion of the young women they held did not come from the local area. Some units had difficulties in working effectively with community-based YOTs and housing providers due to geographical distance.

Good practice – HMYOI Ashfield

Funding had been secured for a halfway house for young people needing extra support on release.

- 5.5 Money management courses had been introduced at both Ashfield and Castington. Although Wetherby and the Keppel Unit provided a pre-release course, there was no input on money and debt management, and a lack of specialist advice for young people who needed help in this area.

Education, training and employment

- 5.6 The education department at Castington provided good opportunities for young people, with a focus on gaining skills suitable for employment, and the provision of a range of specialist courses. There was a lack of provision at Werrington with a smaller proportion of young men surveyed saying that they were taking part in education than at any other young men's establishment across the entire estate.
- 5.7 At Hindley, a range of courses was provided. In addition to courses targeted at personal development and enhancing life skills, vocational courses included plastering and forklift truck driving. At Huntercombe, vocational attainment places had increased by 28% since the previous inspection. Young people were able to undertake a four-week 'taster course' to sample vocational subjects. The standard of artwork produced by young people at the establishment was particularly high, resulting in the achievement of several Koestler awards. At Werrington, young people were set tasks in the vocational workshops that were both challenging and engaging. However, despite the high standard of work attained by young people there, much of it was either not accredited or accreditation was limited to level one.
- 5.8 Inspections found that at Cookham Wood the number of vocational training places was insufficient; many young people were unable to attend courses of their preference. At Stoke

Heath, while the number of vocational places available had increased, it was still low. At Warren Hill, inspections noted that there were waiting lists for some vocational courses, and that the amount of vocational training was insufficient. Inspections at Wetherby observed 'serious delays' in getting some minor works completed – this prevented the establishment from running some courses for a considerable period, such as computer maintenance. At Keppel, vocational opportunities were limited, few courses were accredited and the opportunities for more able students were insufficient.

- 5.9 All the young women surveyed on the Josephine Butler Unit were taking part in education. Opportunities for vocational training had also improved since the previous inspection. At the time of inspection, 91% of young women left the unit with some form of accreditation. Young women were able to engage in popular subjects, such as cookery, textiles, hairdressing, and beauty therapy, and despite difficulties posed by the inappropriate facilities, young women were able to achieve high standards. A wide range of external partners had also become involved in the curriculum there, enabling young women to develop skills in other areas, including business and enterprise. On the Mary Carpenter Unit, young women were able to participate in vocational courses, such as business administration. However, despite their successes and achievements, young women serving short sentences were not able to complete their courses before leaving custody, which meant that they were not accredited for the work completed. On the Toscana Unit, young women could gain accreditation for vocational courses at both levels two and three. In addition, a small number of young women were able to continue their GCSE studies on the unit. Inspections on the Rivendell Unit found that both education and vocational provisions were of a good standard. The curriculum facilitated a balanced learning programme, including literacy and numeracy, as well as hairdressing and catering. Most young women left the unit equipped with qualifications that would aid their future education, training and employment.
- 5.10 At Wetherby, inspections observed that support from the Connexions service was inadequate. On the Keppel Unit, young people's contact with the Connexions service was limited to a fortnightly clinic. At Parc, the qualifications available to young people were insufficient to prepare them for employment and progression on release. At Warren Hill, records showed that 93% of young men were released with an arranged education placement. On the Josephine Butler Unit, both Connexions and education staff gave good pre-release guidance to the young women on the options available to them. The Connexions staff on the Mary Carpenter Unit worked well with local service providers to help young women access services on release.

Mental and physical health

- 5.11 In our surveys, 39% of young women said that they had a mental health or emotional well-being problem. Of these, 15% said that they were not receiving any help, 62% were being helped by a psychiatrist/psychologist, 32% by a counsellor and 22% by a doctor. A quarter of young men reported a mental health or emotional well-being problem, with 38% of these reporting not receiving any help, 31% receiving help from a psychiatrist or psychologist, 21% from a doctor and only 18% from a counsellor.
- 5.12 At Brinsford, all young men saw a nurse two days before their release and were given a doctor's note that summarised their care in custody. Young people released with identified mental health needs were routinely referred to the community child and adolescent mental health service (CAMHS). At Castington, health care staff met all young people before their release, and at Cookham Wood young people had a pre-discharge clinic.

- 5.13 At Cookham Wood, Castington, and Warren Hill, where appropriate, the establishment contacted service providers in the community to ensure that young people with ongoing mental health problems were able to continue receiving care. At Warren Hill, young people not registered with a GP were given the details of one near their discharge address. However, at Wetherby and Stoke Heath, young people not previously registered with a GP were not given any guidance on how to do so. At Huntercombe, pre-release information was not shared routinely between health care staff and caseworkers, who did not always know if their young people had any health care appointments in the community.
- 5.14 On the Rivendell Unit, all young women met with health care staff before leaving. Assistance was provided for young women to register with a GP and other health care professionals in the community. All young women on the Josephine Butler Unit saw their named nurse before leaving the establishment. A letter was provided for their GP, summarising the care they had received on the unit. Young women with ongoing mental health issues were under the care of CAMHS, which provided them with aftercare arrangements.

Drugs and alcohol

- 5.15 Several establishments ran pre-release sessions on preventing a drug overdose. On the Rivendell Unit, the young people's substance misuse service (YPSMS) had good contact with external YOTs and substance misuse services. This ensured that arrangements were made to support young women with substance misuse problems when they were released into the community. At Warren Hill, the YPSMS was also active in working with community YOTs before pre-release meetings for young men with substance misuse problems to establish plans supporting their reintegration into the community. The YPSMS also provided good services for the young men on the Keppel Unit. At Castington, there was a lack of intensive intervention for young people who had alcohol issues – although a needs analysis had identified this as a gap in service provision.

Children and families

- 5.16 Almost a third (30%) of young women surveyed said they never received visits and a further 19% reported that they had not received one in the previous month. For young men, 14% said they had never received visits and 12% had not had one in the previous month. At Werrington, family days occurred every two months. The length of visit was extended, and families were also provided with a free lunch and a tour of the establishment. At Warren Hill, family days took place every six weeks, although young men on the basic level of the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme were not eligible. At Hindley, young men requiring extra support in maintaining contact with family had been identified, and action plans had been created to address this. At Brinsford, while new arrivals were given information about visits, there was little to promote family contact. Inspections found that sentenced young people were entitled to less than one visit a week, and there were no provisions for evening visits or family days.
- 5.17 On the Toscana Unit, inspections found that though there had been no family days previously, the establishment was preparing for its first, and invitations to families had already been sent out. The Rivendell Unit arranged four family days a year – these were planned and prepared by both staff and the young women. Staff were conscious that young women who were not visited by family could find such days difficult, and, in response, ensured that they were also involved. Young women on the unit indicated that they both enjoyed and valued the family days.

- 5.18 Inspections at Castington found evidence of courses for young fathers addressing the issues of being a parent in prison. The establishment had introduced a pro forma for new arrivals to complete during induction, identifying those who could find the course beneficial. Young fathers at Hindley were able to take a parenting course. At the time of inspection, four courses had taken place, enabling children, fathers, and other family members to engage in a range of practical activities. The establishment also facilitated both a parentcraft course and a six-week storybook course for young fathers. Warren Hill delivered a 10-week 'Dads' course for young men who had children or were about to become a father.

Offending behaviour programmes

- 5.19 Only 22% of all young men surveyed were currently taking part in offending behaviour programmes – and only 13% at both Werrington and Hindley, although 16 young men surveyed at each establishment were serving long-term sentences. On inspection, Cookham Wood held two young people who had been convicted of an offence of a sexual nature, yet there was no specialist input for them. An establishment application to the YJB for resources to provide specialist sex offender treatment had been denied. There were insufficient offending behaviour programmes across the young people's estate.

Release on temporary licence

- 5.20 Release on temporary licence (ROTL) was part of the resettlement strategy in most establishments. However, the actual use of ROTL in training plans varied across the young people's estate. At both Stoke Heath and Cookham Wood, ROTL was seldom used and this area was underdeveloped. At Feltham, use of ROTL had become 'dormant', and no young person had been released on ROTL for nearly a year before the inspection. At Hindley, use of ROTL was sparse and restricted to some one-off community visits, although staff were working to identify other potential opportunities in the community. In contrast, at Castington, ROTL was frequently used to enable young men to achieve the Duke of Edinburgh's Award and become involved in projects leading to personal and social development and the acquisition of skills for employment. At Warren Hill, 30 young people had been released on ROTL in August 2009, and its use was highlighted in the training planning procedures to motivate young people to progress.
- 5.21 Despite the frequency with which ROTL was discussed at training planning meetings on the Josephine Butler Unit, it was seldom used, although some young women were able to attend college interviews or view future accommodation placements. ROTL was used innovatively on the Toscana Unit, and its use was promoted throughout training planning meetings on the unit.

Good practice – HMYOI Parc

Young people had been consulted about the development of the ROTL scheme and parents participated in review boards.

Pre-release planning

- 5.22 It is an expectation of the Inspectorate that a clear post-release plan is agreed for each young person at a pre-release meeting, at least 10 days before their release, that details their needs, as well as the responsibilities of relevant community agencies to ensure that all aspects of their post-release care are provided.

- 5.23 The Road to Resettlement programme at Brinsford encouraged young people to take responsibility for their own resettlement needs. Stoke Heath also ran a practical pre-release course. On the Keppel Unit, however, there was insufficient attention to ensuring that each young person had a reintegration plan, with responsibilities clearly assigned to staff, to guarantee that a suitable level of sustainable support on release had been put in place. There was no pre-release course at Hindley.

First reviews in the community

- 5.24 It is a mandatory requirement of PSI 28/2009 that a 'relevant staff member' attends the first review for a young person following their transfer to the community.
- 5.25 Four inspections recommended that establishment staff attend more first review meetings for young people in the community. Across the estate, staff usually prioritised the first community reviews they attended according to risk. They consistently attended first reviews for high-risk individuals and for young people subject to multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) levels two and three. At Werrington, establishment staff attended almost 75% of all first reviews in the community. Staff from Stoke Heath also attended a high proportion of first reviews, which helped maintain a positive continuation of the service for young people. There was no evidence at the Cookham Wood inspection that staff attended any first reviews in the community.

6. Training plans for young people serving indeterminate and long-term sentences

- 6.1 In *The Accommodation of Young People Serving a Long-term Sentence*,⁸ the YJB defines a long-term sentence to be any of 'the four custodial sentences not covered by the detention and training order (DTO). These are section 90, section 91, section 226, and section 228'. Our survey asks young people to state the length of their sentence but, other than those serving an indeterminate sentence, does not require them to disclose the categorisation of their sentence. For the purpose of analysis, all survey data in this chapter is limited to sentenced young people, and where the term 'long-termers' is used, this refers exclusively to young people who told us they were serving an indeterminate sentence or one that is more than two years in length. The analysis of long-termers by establishment is also limited to those holding young men. Young women are, however, included in the overall comparator of responses between those serving more than two years and those serving two years or less. While a proportion of long-termers surveyed were held in Carlford or Oswald units, long-termers were held in establishments across the young people's estate.
- 6.2 Young people who said they were serving long or indeterminate sentences reported a better experience of the training planning process than young people who said they were serving shorter sentences. As shown in Table 6, young people serving more than two years in custody were more likely to say they had a training plan, and those who said they had a plan were more likely to have been involved in its development, and be able to see it when they wanted to.

Table 6: Experiences of young people sentenced to two or more years against those sentenced to less than two years

| | | Two years or more | Less than two years |
|--|--|-------------------|---------------------|
| | Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better. | | |
| | Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse. | | |
| | Do you have a training plan? | 69% | 55% |
| | For those with a training plan: | | |
| | Were you involved in the development of your training plan? | 61% | 52% |
| | Do you understand the targets set in your training plan? | 75% | 69% |
| | Can you see your training plan when you want to? | 50% | 35% |
| | Has your YOT worker been in touch since you arrived here? | 93% | 82% |
| | Do you know how to get in touch with your YOT worker? | 76% | 55% |

⁸ Youth Justice Board (2008), *The Accommodation of Young People Serving a Long-term Sentence* (<http://www.yjb.gov.uk/en-gb>).

- 6.3 Overall, a significantly larger proportion of long-termers said they were taking part in employment (37%) and offending behaviour programmes (33%) than those sentenced to less than two years (30% and 21%). A significantly higher proportion were also more positive about how they had used their time in custody – 58% said they had done something while in custody that they felt would make them less likely to offend in the future, while only 46% of young people serving a short-term sentence felt the same.
- 6.4 At Ashfield, young people serving life sentences were waiting too long for transfers to first-stage lifer prisons – sometimes for 12 months or more. In one case, a 19-year-old male had been waiting for a transfer from Ashfield for over 18 months. The establishment had only two Section 91 caseworkers, both of whom, at the time of inspection, handled over 45 cases each.
- 6.5 At Hindley, long-termers were subject to the same planning procedures as other young people. The establishment provided no specialist resources to meet the distinct needs of long-termers and had no lifer trained staff.

Carlford Unit and Oswald Unit

- 6.6 The Carlford Unit and the Oswald Unit are a national resource housing young men serving indeterminate and long-term sentences for committing serious offences.
- 6.7 Young people on the Carlford Unit had poor responses to the questions they were asked on arrival into custody. Only 17% (four) said they were asked if they needed help with not being able to smoke, and only 29% (seven) said they were asked whether they needed help or support with 'feeling low/upset/need someone to talk to' – these responses were lower than those from long-termers at any other establishment.
- 6.8 Although 79% of young people on the Carlford Unit who had met their personal officer said that this was within their first week, the inspection found that, in some cases, 'several days' passed before personal officers introduced themselves to young people, despite the good staffing levels on the unit. In addition, only 44% said there was a member of staff that they could turn to for help with a problem, which was lower than the responses from other establishments.
- 6.9 The training planning process was managed well on both units. On the Oswald Unit, meetings were timely and well attended by YOT workers, families and personal officers. There were also significant contributions from the Lucy Faithfull Foundation worker and the psychology department, where appropriate. On the Carlford Unit, 63% of young men said that they could see their training plan – higher than at any other male establishment across the estate. Inspections on the unit noted that the review meeting observed was well attended, and was held in relaxed surroundings and very well chaired. Proceedings were explained well to the young person throughout, and there were good efforts to include his father in discussion, who was provided with an interpreter as he did not speak English. The caseworker chairing reviews told inspectors that meetings were arranged to enable personal officer attendance, 'which they always did'.
- 6.10 Work on addressing offending behaviour was restricted on both units. Although the Oswald Unit undertook specialist work with those convicted of a sex offence and those serving an indeterminate sentence, there were gaps in the services to address the needs or risks of most young men on the unit. Similarly, on the Carlford Unit, while there was specialist one-to-one work with young men convicted of a sex offence, there were insufficient specialist interventions to address the specific needs of other young men on the unit.

- 6.11 There was evidence of some good resettlement work on the Carlford Unit. Between March and September 2009, eight young men had been released on temporary licence. Compared to long-termers at other establishments, a greater proportion of those on the Carlford Unit reported an excellent knowledge of the contacts there to gain help with services in preparation for release.

Appendix I

Methodology

Inspection report analysis

An analysis of inspection reports was conducted. This included findings from 17 inspection reports published between October 2007 and March 2010. The following table details the inspections included in the analysis.

| Establishment | Type of Inspection | Date of inspection (w/c) |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Ashfield | Short follow-up | 26 August 2008 |
| Brinsford | Full announced | 28 July 2008 |
| Castington (and Oswald Unit) | Full announced | 19 January 2009 |
| Cookham Wood | Full announced | 2 February 2009 |
| Downview – Josephine Butler Unit | Short follow-up | 12 May 2008 |
| Eastwood Park – Mary Carpenter Unit | Short follow-up | 1 June 2009 |
| Feltham | Full follow-up | 4 June 2007 |
| Foston Hall – Toscana Unit | Short follow-up | 28 September 2009 |
| Hindley | Full announced | 19 October 2009 |
| Huntercombe | Short follow-up | 9 December 2008 |
| New Hall – Rivendell Unit | Short follow-up | 27 July 2009 |
| Parc | Full announced | 15 June 2009 |
| Stoke Heath | Full announced | 13 October 2008 |
| Warren Hill (and Carlford Unit) | Full announced | 14 September 2009 |
| Werrington | Full announced | 29 June 2009 |
| Wetherby | Full announced | 30 June 2008 |
| Wetherby – Keppel Unit | Full announced | 20 April 2009 |

The most recent inspection report for all young offender institutions (YOIs) holding children and young people was analysed. The specialist Carlford and Oswald units were inspected alongside their parent establishments, Warren Hill and Castington, and are therefore included within those inspection reports. The Keppel Unit was inspected separately to its parent establishment Wetherby, and therefore has a separate inspection report.

Children and young people survey data

As part of a service level agreement with the YJB, researchers from HM Inspectorate of Prisons survey a representative sample of young people at each young people's establishment on an annual basis. When timely, surveys also form part of the evidence base for individual establishment inspections. Findings from young people surveyed at 19 establishments, including the specialist Carlford and Oswald units, between April 2008 and September 2009 were used for this report. In total, 1,168 responses from young people have been analysed.

The survey was updated in April 2009, and in seven establishments the survey had been carried out before this date and so is missing data for some questions. In Appendix II, questions missing data have been shaded grey.

For the purpose of this review, the following analyses were conducted:

- A best and worst case analysis of survey data from all establishments holding young men.
- A best and worst case analysis of survey data from all establishments holding young women.
- A best and worst case analysis of all survey data received, by establishment, across the young people's estate (see Appendix II).
- A comparison between young people who told us they had a training plan and those who said they did not. This was limited to sentenced young people only.
- A comparison between young people serving a long-term sentence (an indeterminate sentence or one that is more than two years in length) and those serving a short-term sentence (one that is two years or less). This was limited to sentenced young people only (see Appendix III). Each establishment had at least one young person serving a long-term sentence.
- An analysis of survey data, by establishment, of all young men serving a long-term sentence.

Appendix II

Data analysis by establishment

Survey responses (missing data has been excluded for each question).

Key to tables

| | Josephine Butler Unit (HM/YOI Downview) 2008 | Mary Carpenter Unit (HM/YOI Eastwood Park) 2009 | Rivendell Unit (HM/YOI New Hall) 2009 | Toscana Unit (HM/YOI Fosson Hall) 2009 | Overall young women | HM/YOI Brinsford 2008 | HM/YOI Feltham 2008 | HM/YOI Castling 2008 | HM/YOI Huntercombe 2008 | HM/YOI Stoke Heath 2008 | HM/YOI Ashfield 2009 | HM/YOI Cookham Wood 2009 | HM/YOI Hindley 2009 | HM/YOI Parc 2009 | HM/YOI Warren Hill 2009 | HM/YOI Werrington 2009 | HM/YOI Wetherby 2008 | Keppel Unit (HM/YOI Wetherby) 2009 | Oswald Unit (HM/YOI Castling) 2008 | Carlford Unit (HM/YOI Warren Hill) 2009 | Overall young men | Overall young people | |
|---|---|---|---------------------------------------|--|---------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|-------------------|----------------------|-----|
| Any percentages highlighted in green show the best score across establishments. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Any percentages highlighted in blue show the worst score across establishments. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of completed questionnaires returned | 14 | 10 | 18 | 8 | 50 | 69 | 92 | 54 | 112 | 84 | 104 | 63 | 97 | 53 | 104 | 75 | 106 | 42 | 36 | 27 | 1118 | 1168 | |
| SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.2 | Are you sentenced? | 67% | 91% | 95% | 73% | 82% | 76% | 6% | 87% | 100% | 80% | 80% | 65% | 74% | 77% | 80% | 100% | 85% | 83% | 100% | 100% | 77% | 77% |
| 2.3 | Is your sentence 12 months or less? | 29% | 73% | 40% | 33% | 42% | 45% | 3% | 40% | 53% | 45% | 32% | 31% | 48% | 43% | 44% | 56% | 36% | 24% | 0% | 0% | 38% | 38% |
| 2.4 | Do you have less than six months to serve? | 25% | 73% | 47% | 11% | 42% | 50% | 1% | 68% | 74% | 54% | 49% | 54% | 52% | 56% | 80% | 53% | 47% | 15% | 22% | 51% | 51% | |
| 2.5 | Have you been in this prison less than a month? | 40% | 22% | 10% | 44% | 28% | 24% | 34% | 10% | 15% | 25% | 18% | 25% | 31% | 19% | 28% | 24% | 18% | 2% | 11% | 23% | 23% | |
| 2.6 | Is this the first time that you have been in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre? | 46% | 40% | 42% | 0% | 42% | 51% | 58% | 32% | 46% | 44% | 31% | 42% | 40% | 30% | 46% | 44% | 29% | 43% | 26% | 44% | 44% | |
| 2.7 | Have you been to any other YOI during this sentence? | 29% | 40% | 11% | 11% | 30% | 24% | 13% | 17% | 39% | 18% | 29% | 13% | 21% | 22% | 49% | 20% | 57% | 62% | 32% | 26% | 26% | |

Key to tables

| | Josephine Butler Unit (HM/YOI Downview) 2008 | Mary Carpenter Unit (HM/YOI Eastwood Park) 2009 | Rivendell Unit (HM/YOI New Hall) 2009 | Toscana Unit (HM/YOI Fosson Hall) 2009 | Overall young women | HM/YOI Brinsford 2008 | HM/YOI Feltham 2008 | HM/YOI Castington 2008 | HM/YOI Huntercombe 2008 | HM/YOI Stoke Heath 2008 | HM/YOI Ashfield 2009 | HM/YOI Cookham Wood 2009 | HM/YOI Hindley 2009 | HM/YOI Parc 2009 | HM/YOI Warren Hill 2009 | HM/YOI Werrington 2009 | HM/YOI Wetherby 2009 | Koppel Unit (HM/YOI Wetherby) 2009 | Oswald Unit (HM/YOI Castington) 2008 | Carifford Unit (HM/YOI Warren Hill) 2009 | Overall young men | Overall young people | | |
|---|---|---|---------------------------------------|--|---------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------|----------------------|-----|-----|
| | Any percentages highlighted in green show the best score across establishments. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Any percentages highlighted in blue show the worst score across establishments. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SECTION 4: YOUR FIRST FEW DAYS HERE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| When you first arrived, did staff ask if you needed help or support with any of the following?: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.5a | Not being able to smoke | | 27% | 78% | 100% | 69% | | | | | | 58% | 78% | 63% | 59% | 57% | 40% | 73% | 69% | | 17% | 62% | 62% | |
| 4.5b | Loss of property | | 9% | 11% | 33% | 15% | | | | | | 21% | 28% | 19% | 22% | 28% | 27% | 21% | 20% | | 13% | 22% | 22% | |
| 4.5c | Housing problems | | 0% | 22% | 0% | 12% | | | | | | 17% | 30% | 19% | 22% | 28% | 23% | 15% | 13% | | 8% | 20% | 19% | |
| 4.5d | Needing protection from other young people | | 0% | 22% | 11% | 15% | | | | | | 28% | 44% | 19% | 22% | 30% | 13% | 20% | 20% | | 8% | 22% | 22% | |
| 4.5e | Letting family know where you are | | 64% | 58% | 89% | 65% | | | | | | 62% | 55% | 71% | 70% | 64% | 63% | 53% | 63% | | 71% | 62% | 62% | |
| 4.5f | Money worries | | 9% | 22% | 0% | 14% | | | | | | 18% | 25% | 18% | 24% | 21% | 14% | 15% | 20% | | 17% | 18% | 18% | |
| 4.5g | Feeling low/upset/needng someone to talk to | | 36% | 63% | 67% | 59% | | | | | | 40% | 65% | 42% | 44% | 41% | 43% | 42% | 42% | | 29% | 43% | 44% | |
| 4.5h | Health problems | | 18% | 53% | 44% | 41% | | | | | | 52% | 67% | 57% | 57% | 56% | 53% | 51% | 47% | | 56% | 55% | 54% | |
| 4.5i | Getting phone numbers | | 36% | 47% | 33% | 41% | | | | | | 39% | 39% | 42% | 61% | 53% | 33% | 41% | 53% | | 48% | 43% | 43% | |
| 4.6 | Did you have any problems when you first arrived? | | 100% | 100% | 100% | 89% | 98% | 70% | 72% | 79% | 74% | 76% | 84% | 84% | 78% | 83% | 68% | 70% | 74% | 91% | 65% | 57% | 75% | 75% |
| When you first arrived, did you have problems with any of the following?: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.6a | Not being able to smoke | | 54% | 91% | 77% | 67% | 72% | 40% | 29% | 63% | 41% | 55% | 64% | 50% | 56% | 60% | 46% | 49% | 52% | 70% | 20% | 10% | 48% | 48% |
| 4.6b | Loss of property | | 0% | 18% | 18% | 11% | 13% | 8% | 3% | 11% | 15% | 6% | 23% | 19% | 9% | 12% | 7% | 18% | 7% | 19% | 10% | 10% | 10% | 11% |
| 4.6c | Housing problems | | 36% | 27% | 6% | 0% | 19% | 13% | 14% | 16% | 15% | 4% | 12% | 25% | 11% | 12% | 15% | 16% | 5% | 16% | 10% | 0% | 12% | 12% |
| 4.6d | Needing protection from other young people | | 0% | 9% | 0% | 0% | 2% | 8% | 5% | 0% | 6% | 9% | 11% | 8% | 5% | 5% | 4% | 0% | 1% | 19% | 7% | 0% | 5% | 5% |
| 4.6e | Letting family know where you are | | 29% | 36% | 33% | 56% | 37% | 24% | 13% | 21% | 8% | 19% | 27% | 37% | 30% | 24% | 17% | 17% | 24% | 40% | 25% | 20% | 21% | 21% |
| 4.6f | Money worries | | 7% | 9% | 11% | 0% | 9% | 20% | 16% | 19% | 17% | 13% | 18% | 25% | 16% | 21% | 8% | 18% | 9% | 16% | 10% | 15% | 15% | 15% |
| 4.6g | Feeling low/upset/needng someone to talk to | | 54% | 18% | 33% | 44% | 37% | 24% | 22% | 15% | 20% | 23% | 26% | 19% | 21% | 17% | 15% | 7% | 17% | 44% | 20% | 5% | 19% | 20% |
| 4.6h | Health problems | | 21% | 18% | 0% | 33% | 15% | 14% | 13% | 15% | 10% | 15% | 12% | 12% | 12% | 19% | 10% | 4% | 7% | 21% | 13% | 5% | 11% | 11% |
| 4.6i | Getting phone numbers | | | 64% | 44% | 33% | 45% | | | | | | 31% | 36% | 26% | 36% | 25% | 10% | 23% | 47% | | 15% | 25% | 26% |
| 4.9 | Did you feel safe on your first night here? | | 64% | 64% | 89% | 67% | 72% | 81% | 85% | 74% | 83% | 79% | 75% | 85% | 81% | 84% | 83% | 90% | 82% | 75% | 92% | 92% | 82% | 82% |

Key to tables

| | | Josephine Butler Unit (HM/YOI Downview) 2008 | Mary Carpenter Unit (HM/YOI Eastwood Park) 2009 | Rivendell Unit (HM/YOI New Hall) 2009 | Toscana Unit (HM/YOI Foston Hall) 2009 | Overall young women | HM/YOI Brinsford 2008 | HM/YOI Feltham 2008 | HM/YOI Castington 2008 | HM/YOI Huntercombe 2008 | HM/YOI Stoke Heath 2008 | HM/YOI Ashfield 2009 | HM/YOI Cookham Wood 2009 | HM/YOI Hindley 2009 | HM/YOI Parc 2009 | HM/YOI Warren Hill 2009 | HM/YOI Werrington 2009 | HM/YOI Wetherby 2009 | Keppel Unit (HM/YOI Wetherby) 2009 | Oswald Unit (HM/YOI Castington) 2008 | Carford Unit (HM/YOI Warren Hill) 2009 | Overall young men | Overall young people | |
|--|--|--|---|---------------------------------------|--|---------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------|----------------------|--|
| Any percentages highlighted in green show the best score across establishments. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Any percentages highlighted in blue show the worst score across establishments. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE HERE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5.7a | Is there a member of staff you can turn to with a problem? | | 73% | 65% | 89% | 72% | | | | | | 64% | 80% | 78% | 86% | 82% | 80% | 65% | 80% | | 44% | 74% | 74% | |
| 5.7b | Do most staff treat you with respect? | 50% | 75% | 80% | 89% | 70% | 78% | 69% | 68% | 58% | 76% | 59% | 69% | 78% | 90% | 79% | 74% | 66% | 92% | 72% | 67% | 71% | 71% | |
| SECTION 6: HEALTH SERVICES | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6.4a | Did you have any problems with alcohol when you first arrived? | 0% | 18% | 20% | 27% | 22% | 13% | 9% | 25% | 9% | 14% | 23% | 16% | 14% | 33% | 19% | 10% | 20% | 28% | 20% | 3% | 15% | 16% | |
| 6.4b | Do you have any problems with alcohol now? | | 0% | 15% | 10% | 11% | | | | | | 4% | 3% | 2% | 8% | 4% | 4% | 6% | 9% | | 0% | 4% | 4% | |
| 6.4c | Have you received any help with any alcohol problems here? | N/A | 9% | 32% | 27% | 17% | 19% | 10% | 25% | 17% | 24% | 15% | 12% | 10% | 24% | 25% | 7% | 17% | 19% | 17% | 7% | 16% | 16% | |
| 6.5a | Did you have any problems with drugs when you first arrived? | 15% | 36% | 40% | 27% | 36% | 17% | 8% | 33% | 17% | 23% | 46% | 37% | 36% | 44% | 42% | 29% | 34% | 44% | 13% | 7% | 28% | 29% | |
| 6.5b | Do you have any problems with drugs now? | | 9% | 20% | 0% | 14% | | | | | | 16% | 6% | 4% | 10% | 6% | 8% | 9% | 16% | | 0% | 8% | 8% | |
| 6.5c | Have you received any help with any drug problems here? | 13% | 27% | 32% | 27% | 25% | 36% | 17% | 36% | 35% | 32% | 28% | 34% | 23% | 38% | 41% | 29% | 27% | 46% | 22% | 7% | 29% | 29% | |
| 6.7 | Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems? | | 27% | 39% | 50% | 39% | | | | | | 32% | 35% | 20% | 31% | 17% | 18% | 28% | 57% | | 0% | 25% | 25% | |
| If you feel you have emotional or mental health problems, are you being helped by any of the following?: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6.8a | Not getting any help | | 33% | 14% | 0% | 15% | | | | | | 49% | 40% | 47% | 38% | 54% | 36% | 31% | 8% | | N/A | 38% | 37% | |
| 6.8b | Doctor | | 33% | 33% | 0% | 22% | | | | | | 17% | 25% | 12% | 25% | 8% | 10% | 35% | 27% | | N/A | 21% | 21% | |
| 6.8c | Nurse | | 0% | 33% | 20% | 23% | | | | | | 20% | 35% | 12% | 31% | 8% | 55% | 27% | 23% | | N/A | 23% | 23% | |
| 6.8d | Psychiatrist/psychologist | | 33% | 67% | 80% | 62% | | | | | | 29% | 35% | 36% | 19% | 31% | 36% | 19% | 60% | | N/A | 31% | 32% | |
| 6.8e | Counsellor | | 0% | 33% | 50% | 32% | | | | | | 6% | 19% | 24% | 13% | 31% | 10% | 19% | 16% | | N/A | 18% | 19% | |
| SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8.1 | Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme? | 33% | 18% | 40% | 10% | 30% | 30% | 11% | 23% | 18% | 24% | 19% | 19% | 26% | 38% | 35% | 32% | 30% | 33% | 45% | 79% | 26% | 26% | |
| 8.2 | Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme? | 46% | 36% | 65% | 90% | 60% | 52% | 51% | 54% | 43% | 59% | 42% | 66% | 55% | 64% | 63% | 69% | 61% | 62% | 63% | 83% | 56% | 56% | |
| 8.3 | Do the different levels make you change your behaviour? | 40% | 40% | 55% | 60% | 51% | 57% | 57% | 43% | 53% | 72% | 68% | 74% | 59% | 62% | 58% | 81% | 52% | 53% | 63% | 66% | 60% | 60% | |
| SECTION 9: SAFETY | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9.1 | Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison? | 40% | 27% | 20% | 40% | 32% | 38% | 32% | 27% | 30% | 42% | 43% | 32% | 31% | 16% | 34% | 17% | 26% | 38% | 26% | 10% | 31% | 31% | |
| 9.9 | If you were being victimised by another young person or a member of staff would you be able to tell anyone about it? | 55% | 70% | 81% | 60% | 67% | 63% | 65% | 46% | 58% | 61% | 56% | 71% | 76% | 76% | 60% | 75% | 60% | 64% | 44% | 50% | 63% | 63% | |
| 9.10 | If you did tell a member of staff that you were being victimised do you think it would be taken seriously? | 15% | 36% | 50% | 73% | 44% | 25% | 25% | 34% | 31% | 38% | 32% | 61% | 42% | 57% | 46% | 52% | 37% | 50% | 53% | 46% | 38% | 38% | |
| 9.12 | Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on? | 58% | 70% | 56% | 73% | 63% | 33% | 36% | 29% | 22% | 32% | 30% | 60% | 43% | 66% | 42% | 34% | 36% | 74% | 44% | 46% | 37% | 37% | |

Key to tables

| | | Josephine Butler Unit (HM/YOI Downview) 2008 | Mary Carpenter Unit (HM/YOI Eastwood Park) 2009 | Rivendell Unit (HM/YOI New Hall) 2009 | Toscana Unit (HM/YOI Foston Hall) 2009 | Overall young women | HM/YOI Brinsford 2008 | HM/YOI Feltham 2008 | HM/YOI Casington 2008 | HM/YOI Huntercombe 2008 | HM/YOI Stoke Heath 2008 | HM/YOI Ashfield 2009 | HM/YOI Cookham Wood 2009 | HM/YOI Hindley 2009 | HM/YOI Parc 2009 | HM/YOI Warren Hill 2009 | HM/YOI Werrington 2009 | HM/YOI Wetherby 2008 | Keppel Unit (HM/YOI Wetherby) 2009 | Oswald Unit (HM/YOI Casington) 2008 | Carlford Unit (HM/YOI Warren Hill) 2009 | Overall young men | Overall young people | |
|---|---|--|---|---------------------------------------|--|---------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|-------------------|----------------------|--|
| Any percentages highlighted in green show the best score across establishments. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Any percentages highlighted in blue show the worst score across establishments. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SECTION 10: ACTIVITIES | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Do you currently take part in any of the following?: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10.3a | Education | 100% | 91% | 95% | 60% | 89% | 74% | 57% | 92% | 85% | 90% | 87% | 79% | 75% | 81% | 84% | 40% | 59% | 95% | 94% | 100% | 75% | 75% | |
| 10.3b | A job in this establishment | 15% | 50% | 11% | 10% | 21% | 4% | 15% | 23% | 21% | 13% | 22% | 32% | 41% | 10% | 19% | 22% | 59% | 33% | 17% | 38% | 28% | 28% | |
| 10.3c | Vocational or skills training | 42% | 36% | 11% | 40% | 30% | 42% | 34% | 73% | 52% | 49% | 32% | 26% | 32% | 10% | 35% | 17% | 22% | 28% | 49% | 21% | 35% | 35% | |
| 10.3d | Offending behaviour programmes | | 36% | 47% | 50% | 46% | | | | | | 36% | 22% | 13% | 42% | 18% | 13% | 24% | 48% | | 55% | 22% | 23% | |
| For those who have taken part in the following activities, while in this prison: Do you think that they will help you when you leave prison? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10.4a | Education | | 91% | 75% | 86% | 81% | | | | | | 75% | 88% | 66% | 67% | 78% | 84% | 67% | 72% | | 76% | 72% | 73% | |
| 10.4b | A job in this establishment | | 75% | 100% | 50% | 69% | | | | | | 56% | 78% | 61% | 43% | 56% | 80% | 68% | 92% | | 53% | 64% | 65% | |
| 10.4c | Vocational or skills training | | 88% | 100% | 63% | 79% | | | | | | 65% | 79% | 56% | 53% | 70% | 62% | 79% | 90% | | 78% | 65% | 66% | |
| 10.4d | Offending behaviour programmes | | 78% | 75% | 57% | 70% | | | | | | 54% | 71% | 47% | 54% | 54% | 54% | 71% | 88% | | 63% | 57% | 57% | |
| SECTION 12: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| For those who have met their personal officer: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12.1 | Did you meet your personal officer within the first week? | 42% | 80% | 59% | 100% | 67% | 31% | 56% | 52% | 41% | 73% | 48% | 43% | 34% | 74% | 55% | 35% | 56% | 78% | 61% | 79% | 46% | 46% | |
| 12.2 | Do you see your personal officer at least once a week? | | 90% | 87% | 73% | 84% | | | | | | 65% | 67% | 64% | 76% | 83% | 54% | 58% | 95% | | 83% | 67% | 67% | |
| 12.3 | Do you feel your personal officer has helped you? | 46% | 78% | 65% | 73% | 65% | 62% | 57% | 72% | 49% | 75% | 47% | 71% | 63% | 70% | 77% | 57% | 45% | 80% | 71% | 67% | 60% | 60% | |
| For sentenced young people only | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12.4 | Do you have a training plan? | | 80% | 77% | 63% | 74% | | | | | | 57% | 54% | 55% | 58% | 78% | 44% | 62% | 63% | | 83% | 59% | 60% | |
| For those with a training plan (sentenced only): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12.5a | Were you involved in the development of your training plan? | | 57% | 77% | 43% | 63% | | | | | | 43% | 46% | 47% | 58% | 72% | 43% | 67% | 50% | | 62% | 56% | 56% | |
| 12.5b | Do you understand the targets set in your training plan? | | 75% | 92% | 43% | 75% | | | | | | 68% | 64% | 59% | 81% | 83% | 70% | 78% | 68% | | 76% | 71% | 71% | |
| 12.5c | Can you see your training plan when you want to? | 30% | 25% | 69% | 83% | 53% | 33% | 29% | 46% | 36% | 42% | 38% | 36% | 35% | 50% | 46% | 28% | 43% | 34% | 43% | 63% | 38% | 38% | |
| 12.6 | Has your YOT worker been in touch since you arrived here? | | 90% | 81% | 60% | 77% | | | | | | 90% | 92% | 78% | 89% | 85% | 73% | 81% | 98% | | 93% | 82% | 82% | |
| 12.7 | Do you know how to get in touch with your YOT worker? | | 90% | 75% | 90% | 84% | | | | | | 59% | 64% | 48% | 80% | 76% | 55% | 58% | 75% | | 89% | 60% | 61% | |

Key to tables

| Any percentages highlighted in green show the best score across establishments. | | Josephine Butler Unit (HMYOI Downview) 2008 | Many Carpenter Unit (HMYOI Eastwood Park) 2008 | Rivendell Unit (HMYOI New Hall) 2009 | Toscana Unit (HMYOI Foston Hall) 2009 | Overall young women | HMYOI Brinsford 2008 | HMYOI Feltham 2008 | HMYOI Casington 2008 | HMYOI Huntercombe 2008 | HMYOI Stoke Heath 2008 | HMYOI Ashfield 2009 | HMYOI Cookham Wood 2009 | HMYOI Hindley 2009 | HMYOI Parc 2009 | HMYOI Warren Hill 2009 | HMYOI Werrington 2009 | HMYOI Wetherby 2008 | Koppel Unit (HMYOI Wetherby) 2009 | Oswald Unit (HMYOI Casington) 2008 | Cariford Unit (HMYOI Warren Hill) 2009 | Overall young men | Overall young people |
|---|---|---|--|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|--------------------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|-------------------|----------------------|
| | | Any percentages highlighted in blue show the worst score across establishments. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SECTION 12: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE cont. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Please answer the following questions about your preparation for release: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12.8a | Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released? | 14% | 60% | 56% | 27% | 39% | 36% | 20% | 48% | 50% | 38% | 38% | 52% | 33% | 56% | 51% | 49% | 45% | 49% | 50% | 52% | 42% | 42% |
| 12.8b | Are you going to school or college on release? | 79% | 80% | 61% | 50% | 67% | 58% | 54% | 27% | 44% | 39% | 60% | 84% | 59% | 50% | 69% | 74% | 54% | 73% | 37% | 46% | 55% | 55% |
| 12.8c | Do you have a job to go to on release? | 17% | 10% | 6% | 0% | 9% | 31% | 26% | 27% | 23% | 28% | 22% | 27% | 25% | 26% | 16% | 25% | 21% | 32% | 28% | 23% | 24% | 24% |
| Do you know who to contact for help with the following, in preparation for your release?: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12.9a | Finding accommodation | | 78% | 53% | 67% | 64% | | | | | | 43% | 53% | 35% | 45% | 52% | 38% | 48% | 33% | | 68% | 43% | 44% |
| 12.9b | Getting into school or college | | 67% | 59% | 67% | 64% | | | | | | 54% | 65% | 47% | 55% | 69% | 68% | 49% | 58% | | 68% | 56% | 56% |
| 12.9c | Getting a job | | 89% | 65% | 44% | 66% | | | | | | 53% | 59% | 51% | 55% | 54% | 62% | 54% | 36% | | 68% | 54% | 54% |
| 12.9d | Help with money/finances | | 67% | 47% | 67% | 57% | | | | | | 38% | 51% | 35% | 41% | 38% | 44% | 40% | 50% | | 73% | 41% | 41% |
| 12.9e | Help with claiming benefits | | 67% | 53% | 44% | 53% | | | | | | 34% | 45% | 31% | 48% | 40% | 39% | 37% | 39% | | 57% | 37% | 38% |
| 12.9f | Continuing health services | | 67% | 47% | 56% | 53% | | | | | | 32% | 43% | 26% | 24% | 30% | 29% | 31% | 33% | | 52% | 30% | 31% |
| 12.9g | Opening a bank account | | 50% | 47% | 56% | 50% | | | | | | 35% | 43% | 35% | 36% | 46% | 52% | 38% | 28% | | 73% | 40% | 41% |
| 12.9h | Avoiding bad relationships | | 50% | 53% | 33% | 46% | | | | | | 27% | 45% | 30% | 29% | 29% | 29% | 29% | 30% | | 44% | 30% | 31% |
| Do you think you will have a problem with the following, when you are released?: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12.10a | Finding accommodation | | 30% | 40% | 60% | 44% | | | | | | 39% | 29% | 22% | 22% | 32% | 16% | 20% | 24% | | 18% | 24% | 25% |
| 12.10b | Getting into school or college | | 20% | 21% | 27% | 23% | | | | | | 33% | 24% | 23% | 22% | 27% | 16% | 26% | 46% | | 14% | 25% | 25% |
| 12.10c | Getting a job | | 40% | 47% | 60% | 50% | | | | | | 55% | 59% | 48% | 51% | 50% | 40% | 47% | 51% | | 32% | 48% | 48% |
| 12.10d | Help with money/finances | | 70% | 53% | 50% | 56% | | | | | | 53% | 43% | 38% | 39% | 32% | 21% | 28% | 51% | | 27% | 34% | 35% |
| 12.10e | Help with claiming benefits | | 30% | 21% | 60% | 38% | | | | | | 42% | 26% | 34% | 29% | 24% | 18% | 19% | 33% | | 5% | 26% | 27% |
| 12.10f | Continuing health services | | 20% | 21% | 50% | 31% | | | | | | 21% | 10% | 12% | 12% | 9% | 6% | 10% | 16% | | 0% | 11% | 11% |
| 12.10g | Opening a bank account | | 20% | 14% | 40% | 24% | | | | | | 23% | 21% | 13% | 17% | 5% | 9% | 12% | 16% | | 5% | 13% | 13% |
| 12.10h | Avoiding bad relationships | | 20% | 29% | 40% | 30% | | | | | | 24% | 21% | 19% | 15% | 22% | 12% | 19% | 36% | | 0% | 19% | 19% |
| 12.11 | Is there anything you would still like help with before you are released? | 64% | 33% | 24% | 50% | 42% | 33% | 40% | 34% | 39% | 36% | 34% | 46% | 30% | 35% | 31% | 37% | 35% | 61% | 37% | 27% | 36% | 36% |
| For those who were sentenced: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12.13 | Do you want to stop offending? | 75% | 100% | 94% | 100% | 92% | 91% | 100% | 82% | 92% | 92% | 91% | 97% | 93% | 83% | 88% | 88% | 91% | 94% | 93% | 100% | 91% | 91% |
| 12.14 | Have you done anything or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future? | 43% | 43% | 50% | 38% | 44% | 52% | 20% | 29% | 48% | 57% | 49% | 66% | 40% | 49% | 54% | 53% | 50% | 69% | 58% | 64% | 50% | 49% |

Appendix III

Data analysis - long-term and short-term sentenced comparison

Survey responses (missing data has 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

| | | Long-term sentenced (more than two years) | Short-term sentenced (two years or less) |
|---|--|---|--|
| | 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 demographic details. | | |
| | Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference. | | |
| Number of completed questionnaires returned | | 253 | 618 |
| SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE | | | |
| 2.4 | Do you have less than six months to serve? | 23% | 84% |
| 2.5 | Have you been in this prison less than a month? | 6% | 23% |
| 2.6 | Is this the first time that you have been in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre ? | 44% | 42% |
| 2.7 | Have you been to any other YOI during this sentence? | 45% | 24% |
| When you first arrived, did staff ask if you needed help or support with any of the following?: | | | |
| 4.5a | Not being able to smoke | 57% | 60% |
| 4.5b | Loss of property | 21% | 22% |
| 4.5c | Housing problems | 16% | 19% |
| 4.5d | Needing protection from other young people | 14% | 21% |
| 4.5e | Letting family know where you are | 64% | 59% |
| 4.5f | Money worries | 17% | 16% |
| 4.5g | Feeling low/upset/needing someone to talk to | 37% | 42% |
| 4.5h | Health problems | 54% | 53% |
| 4.5i | Getting phone numbers | 45% | 41% |
| 4.6 | Did you have any problems when you first arrived? | 74% | 77% |
| When you first arrived, did you have problems with any of the following?: | | | |
| 4.6a | Not being able to smoke | 37% | 55% |
| 4.6b | Loss of property | 14% | 11% |
| 4.6c | Housing problems | 6% | 14% |
| 4.6d | Needing protection from other young people | 3% | 5% |
| 4.6e | Letting family know where you are | 26% | 21% |
| 4.6f | Money worries | 10% | 15% |
| 4.6g | Feeling low/upset/needing someone to talk to | 17% | 20% |
| 4.6h | Health problems | 13% | 11% |
| 4.6i | Getting phone numbers | 31% | 23% |
| 4.9 | Did you feel safe on your first night here? | 80% | 83% |

Key to tables

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | | |
| | Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better. | Long-term sentenced (more than two years) | Short-term sentenced (two years or less) |
| | Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse. | | |
| | Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in demographic details. | | |
| | Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference. | | |
| | Number of completed questionnaires returned | 253 | 618 |
| SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE HERE | | | |
| 5.7a | Is there a member of staff you can turn to with a problem? | 72% | 73% |
| 5.7b | Do most staff treat you with respect? | 63% | 72% |
| SECTION 6: HEALTH SERVICES | | | |
| 6.4a | Did you have any problems with alcohol when you first arrived? | 12% | 19% |
| 6.4b | Do you have any problems with alcohol now? | 1% | 6% |
| 6.4c | Have you received any help with any alcohol problems here? | 14% | 20% |
| 6.5a | Did you have any problems with drugs when you first arrived? | 26% | 33% |
| 6.5b | Do you have any problems with drugs now? | 4% | 10% |
| 6.5c | Have you received any help with any drug problems here? | 28% | 33% |
| 6.7 | Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems? | 25% | 25% |
| If you feel you have emotional or mental health problems, are you being helped by any of the following?: | | | |
| 6.8a | Not getting any help | 31% | 42% |
| 6.8b | Doctor | 21% | 21% |
| 6.8c | Nurse | 28% | 26% |
| 6.8d | Psychiatrist/psychologist | 43% | 25% |
| 6.8e | Counsellor | 18% | 16% |
| SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE | | | |
| 8.1 | Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme? | 43% | 24% |
| 8.2 | Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme? | 51% | 58% |
| 8.3 | Do the different levels make you change your behaviour? | 61% | 60% |
| SECTION 9: SAFETY | | | |
| 9.1 | Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison? | 23% | 33% |
| 9.9 | If you were being victimised by another young person or a member of staff would you be able to tell anyone about it? | 56% | 66% |
| 9.10 | If you did tell a member of staff that you were being victimised do you think it would be taken seriously? | 38% | 40% |
| 9.12 | Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on? | 37% | 33% |
| SECTION 10: ACTIVITIES | | | |
| Do you currently take part in any of the following?: | | | |
| 10.3a | Education | 78% | 76% |
| 10.3b | A job in this establishment | 37% | 30% |
| 10.3c | Vocational or skills training | 41% | 36% |
| 10.3d | Offending behaviour programmes | 33% | 21% |
| For those who have taken part in the following activities, while in this prison: Do you think that they will help you when you leave prison? | | | |
| 10.4a | Education | 79% | 72% |
| 10.4b | A job in this establishment | 70% | 64% |
| 10.4c | Vocational or skills training | 73% | 66% |
| 10.4d | Offending behaviour programmes | 58% | 60% |
| SECTION 12: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE | | | |
| For those who have met their personal officer: | | | |
| 12.1 | Did you meet your personal officer within the first week? | 46% | 47% |
| 12.2 | Do you see your personal officer at least once a week? | 71% | 66% |
| 12.3 | Do you feel your personal officer has helped you? | 53% | 61% |
| 12.4 | Do you have a training plan? | 69% | 55% |
| For those with a training plan: | | | |
| 12.5a | Were you involved in the development of your training plan? | 61% | 52% |

Key to tables

| | | | |
|---|---|---|--|
| | Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better. | Long-term sentenced (more than two years) | Short-term sentenced (two years or less) |
| | Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse. | | |
| | Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in demographic details. | | |
| | Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference. | | |
| Number of completed questionnaires returned | | 253 | 618 |
| SECTION 12: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE cont. | | | |
| 12.5b | Do you understand the targets set in your training plan? | 75% | 69% |
| 12.5c | Can you see your training plan when you want to? | 50% | 35% |
| 12.6 | Has your YOT worker been in touch since you arrived here? | 93% | 82% |
| 12.7 | Do you know how to get in touch with your YOT worker? | 76% | 55% |
| Please answer the following about your preparation for release: | | | |
| 12.8a | Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released? | 43% | 51% |
| 12.8b | Are you going to school or college on release? | 58% | 54% |
| 12.8c | Do you have a job to go to on release? | 27% | 23% |
| Do you know who to contact for help with the following, in preparation for your release?: | | | |
| 12.9a | Finding accommodation | 48% | 44% |
| 12.9b | Getting into school or college | 57% | 57% |
| 12.9c | Getting a job | 55% | 57% |
| 12.9d | Help with money/finances | 45% | 40% |
| 12.9e | Help with claiming benefits | 36% | 39% |
| 12.9f | Continuing health services | 34% | 29% |
| 12.9g | Opening a bank account | 45% | 40% |
| 12.9h | Avoiding bad relationships | 32% | 30% |
| Do you think you will have a problem with the following, when you are released?: | | | |
| 12.10a | Finding accommodation | 24% | 25% |
| 12.10b | Getting into school or college | 25% | 24% |
| 12.10c | Getting a job | 50% | 49% |
| 12.10d | Help with money/finances | 35% | 35% |
| 12.10e | Help with claiming benefits | 23% | 30% |
| 12.10f | Continuing health services | 12% | 10% |
| 12.10g | Opening a bank account | 13% | 12% |
| 12.10h | Avoiding bad relationships | 18% | 19% |
| 12.11 | Is there anything you would still like help with before you are released? | 42% | 37% |
| For those who were sentenced: | | | |
| 12.13 | Do you want to stop offending? | 92% | 92% |
| 12.14 | Have you done anything or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future? | 58% | 46% |

