

Report on an unannounced inspection of

HMYOI Cookham Wood

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

12–23 September 2016

This inspection was carried out with assistance from colleagues at the General Pharmaceutical Council and in partnership with the following bodies:



Crown copyright 2017

You may re-use this information (excluding logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, visit <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/> or email: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk

Where we have identified any third party copyright material you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

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

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

Printed and published by:
Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons
Victory House
6th floor
30–34 Kingsway
London
WC2B 6EX
England

Contents

Introduction	5
Fact page	7
About this inspection and report	9
Summary	11
Section 1. Safety	17
Section 2. Respect	27
Section 3. Purposeful activity	39
Section 4. Resettlement	45
Section 5. Summary of recommendations and good practice	51
Section 6. Appendices	57
Appendix I: Inspection team	57
Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report	59
Appendix III: Establishment population profile	67
Appendix IV: Summary of children and young people questionnaires and interviews	71

Glossary of terms

We try to make our reports as clear as possible, but if you find terms that you do not know, please see the glossary in our 'Guide for writing inspection reports' on our website at: <http://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/about-our-inspections/>

Introduction

Cookham Wood, near Rochester in Kent, is a young offender institution holding boys aged 15 to 18. One of only a few such facilities nationally, the institution serves a substantial catchment area across much of southern England, with boys held for many reasons. They range from those recently remanded to those beginning lengthy, sometimes indeterminate, sentences. In recognition of the risks, challenges and vulnerabilities presented by the profile of the boys held, such institutions are inspected annually. When we visited Cookham Wood in May 2015 we were encouraged by the progress the institution had made. This progress had been maintained over the last year with improvement evident in two of our healthy prison tests – respect and purposeful activity – although some concerns in the area of safety remained.

Cookham Wood's huge catchment area continued to contribute to the often late arrival of boys on their initial transfer to the institution, undermining the early risk assessment and settling in processes. The attentiveness of staff and some good reception and induction arrangements mitigated some of this risk. We found safeguarding and child protection arrangements to be well-developed, showing better scrutiny and improved relationships with the local authority. The care offered to boys who were at risk of self-harm was also good.

The prison's greatest challenge remained the levels of violence – much of it quite serious and concerted and including assaults upon staff. We recognised some significant and innovative work to try to improve matters. This included a new behaviour management strategy, some robust procedural security arrangements and the development of the new BI unit, a facility intended to support progression amongst some hard-to-reach boys. Much of this work, however, was still to fully embed and prove its effectiveness. This report contains a main recommendation which we hope will support the continuation of these strategies.

Most of the residential units at Cookham Wood were new, with much of the prison having been rebuilt in recent years. Accommodation standards were high, although some areas were disappointingly grubby and access to kit was not good enough. The staff, in contrast, were knowledgeable and caring and working patiently with some very difficult young people. The promotion of equality and diversity was improving although much more needed to be done.

Access to time out of cell was better than at the last inspection, although we still found over a quarter of boys locked in cell during the working day. There was sufficient activity for all boys to have some access daily, with a balanced range of education options provided, although vocational training opportunities were more limited. The quality of teaching was good, as was the achievement of qualifications for those who completed courses. Our colleagues from Ofsted scored the provision as 'good' across the full range of their assessments, and arguably it could have been better still but for disruptions to routines and weak coordination that hampered attendance and punctuality. One of our main recommendations asks that the institution prioritises improvements in this area.

Work to support resettlement remained reasonably good with better use of temporary release to aid reintegration and excellent support from the institution's casework team. Some sentence plans, however, were too generic and paid insufficient attention to risk of harm and risk of reoffending. Visits provision had improved but work to promote family ties and parenting remained weak. Several new offending behaviour interventions had been usefully introduced over the preceding year.

This is a very positive report concerning an institution that continues to improve. Difficulties, risks and weaknesses were being attended to in effective and often creative and innovative ways right across the prison, and it was clear to us that even more improvement was very achievable quite quickly. The prison was led with confidence; the management team seemed cohesive and attentive and an evident strength was the quite impressive culture that was developing amongst the staff as they grew in both experience and confidence.

Peter Clarke CVO OBE QPM
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

November 2016

Fact page

Task of the establishment

Young offender institution for boys aged 15 to 18 years.

Establishment status

Public

Department

Young people's estate

Number held

156

Certified normal accommodation

196

Operational capacity

196

Date of last full inspection

May 2015

Brief history

HMYOI Cookham Wood was built in the 1970s, originally for young men, but its use was changed to meet the growing need for secure female accommodation at the time. In 2007-8, it changed its function to accommodate 15-17-year-old young men to reduce capacity pressures in London and the South East for this age group.

In January 2014, a new purpose-built residential unit was opened incorporating integrated facilities, and designed to meet the needs of the young people and improve safety.

Short description of residential units

179 single cells with integral telephone and showers, spread over six self-contained landings.

One room to accommodate a disabled young person.

Phoenix unit – seven-bed separation unit.

Cedar unit – 17-bed enhanced support unit.

Name of governor

Jonathan French

Escort contractor

GEOAmey

Health service providers

Oxleas NHS Foundation Trust – primary care

Central and North West London NHS Trust – child and adolescent mental health services

Learning and skills provider

Novus

Independent Monitoring Board chair

Anne Finlayson

About this inspection and report

A1 Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons is an independent, statutory organisation which reports on the treatment and conditions of those detained in prisons, young offender institutions, immigration detention facilities and police custody.

A2 All inspections carried out by HM Inspectorate of Prisons contribute to the UK's response to its international obligations under the Optional Protocol to the UN Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (OPCAT). OPCAT requires that all places of detention are visited regularly by independent bodies – known as the National Preventive Mechanism (NPM) – which monitor the treatment of and conditions for detainees. HM Inspectorate of Prisons is one of several bodies making up the NPM in the UK.

A3 All Inspectorate of Prisons reports include a summary of an establishment's performance against the model of a healthy prison. The four tests of a healthy prison are:

Safety children and young people, particularly the most vulnerable, are held safely

Respect children and young people are treated with respect for their human dignity

Purposeful activity children and young people are able, and expected, to engage in activity that is likely to benefit them

Resettlement children and young people are prepared for their release into the community and helped to reduce the likelihood of reoffending.

A4 Under each test, we make an assessment of outcomes for children and young people and therefore of the establishment's overall performance against the test. In some cases, this performance will be affected by matters outside the establishment's direct control, which need to be addressed nationally.

- **outcomes for children and young people are good against this healthy prison test.**
There is no evidence that outcomes for children and young people are being adversely affected in any significant areas.
- **outcomes for children and young people are reasonably good against this healthy prison test.**
There is evidence of adverse outcomes for children and young people in only a small number of areas. For the majority, there are no significant concerns. Procedures to safeguard outcomes are in place.
- **outcomes for children and young people are not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.**
There is evidence that outcomes for children and young people are being adversely affected in many areas or particularly in those areas of greatest importance to their well-being. Problems/concerns, if left unattended, are likely to become areas of serious concern.

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

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

A5 Our assessments might result in one of the following:

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

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

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

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

This report

A9 This explanation of our approach is followed by a summary of our inspection findings against the four healthy prison tests. There then follow four sections each containing a detailed account of our findings against our *Expectations. Criteria for assessing the treatment of children and young people and conditions in prisons*. The reference numbers at the end of some recommendations indicate that they are repeated, and provide the paragraph location of the previous recommendation in the last report. Section 5 collates all recommendations, housekeeping points and examples of good practice arising from the inspection. Appendix II lists the recommendations from the previous inspection, and our assessment of whether they have been achieved.

A10 Details of the inspection team and the establishment population profile can be found in Appendices I and III respectively.

A11 Findings from the survey of children and young people and a detailed description of the survey methodology can be found in Appendix IV of this report. Please note that we only refer to comparisons with other comparable establishments or previous inspections when these are statistically significant.¹

¹ The significance level is set at 0.01, which means that there is only a 1% chance that the difference in results is due to chance.

Summary

Safety

- S1 *Too many boys continued to arrive late at Cookham Wood, but good early days work offset some of the risks this posed. Safeguarding and child protection procedures were sound. Levels of self-harm were low and case management for boys in crisis was good. Levels of violence were high and assaults on staff were common. A promising strategy to manage and reduce violence was very much in its early stages. The introduction of the PACT ('positive attitudes created together') scheme as a response to violence and bullying was beginning to be effective, and support for victims was good. Rewards and sanctions were well integrated into the overarching behaviour management strategy. Security was controlled but broadly proportionate. Use of force was very high although the cases we reviewed were proportionate. The segregation unit was a poor facility but case management was good. **Outcomes for children and young people were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.***
- S2 *At the last inspection in May 2015 we found that outcomes for children and young people in Cookham Wood were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test. We made 24 recommendations about safety. At this follow-up inspection we found that 13 of the recommendations had been achieved, five had been partially achieved and six had not been achieved.*
- S3 Boys arriving at Cookham Wood sometimes experienced long waits on cellular vehicles before they were brought into reception. However, reception staff were welcoming and first night procedures were thorough, even when boys arrived late. Too many were located in their cells late at night, some of which were ill-equipped, although staff did carry out regular checks throughout the night. The multidisciplinary induction programme was good.
- S4 Safeguarding procedures were well developed and there were good links with the local safeguarding children board. The identification of and support for boys most at risk or with complex needs was reasonable, but too many arrived without the necessary paperwork to identify potential vulnerabilities or risk. Child protection referrals had increased significantly and were high for the type of establishment, but there was evidence that this was a result of closer scrutiny following use of force interventions. Child protection procedures were sound, and the relationship with the local authority designated officer (LADO) had improved.
- S5 There had been one death from natural causes since the last inspection, and recommendations from the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman (PPO) report had been taken on board. Levels of self-harm were much lower than in similar establishments. Boys at risk and on assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management were mostly positive about their care, and the quality of ACCT documentation was reasonably good.
- S6 The new behaviour management strategy to deal with the most violent and complex individuals (PACT) was innovative. The creation of special units, although not yet fully developed, was an appropriate response to an important safety challenge. However, although the management of violent behaviour had improved, case management (particularly of boys with complex and difficult behaviour on the progression unit) had not developed sufficiently. The incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme was reasonably well managed and better integrated into the overarching behaviour management strategy than at the previous

inspection. However, the yellow card sanctions scheme was undermanaged, and we were not assured that punishments were always just or proportionate.

- S7 Procedural security was proportionate to prevailing risks. Links between security and other departments, particularly safeguarding, were good. There were effective systems to identify and help deal with extensive gang activity, which included the necessary use of a 'keep apart' list for boys who had to be separated from one another. Drug use remained low, and there were appropriate supply reduction measures. The number of adjudications was very high, although most charges were appropriate and hearings were fair and child-focused.
- S8 Despite a recent reduction, the number of fights and assaults on young people remained too high. Too many incidents were serious and involved multiple assailants, and the severity of attacks on staff remained concerning. PACT processes (individual plans to address violent behaviour and support victims) and the new progression landing on BI were not yet fully developed but there were positive early signs. Support for victims of bullying had improved and was generally good.
- S9 Use of force had increased and was very high. In most cases it was used to restrain and protect boys in fights and assaults, and once again we saw examples of staff behaving bravely in these situations. Supervision and governance had improved in important areas, but there were delays and gaps in recording. Living conditions in the segregation unit were poor and the regime was inadequate. Governance of segregation had improved with comprehensive reviews and effective reintegration planning. The average length of stay had reduced, although there were notable exceptions.
- S10 Outcomes for boys with substance misuse problems had deteriorated since the last inspection. About 41% of appointments for boys to see the Addaction support service were not attended, with evidence that this was often due to poor administration, and there were limited interventions to help boys in need. Although very few boys had required a clinical drug treatment service, the commissioner indicated concerns about the adequacy of night-time monitoring and observation arrangements.

Respect

*S11 The environment was generally clean, although some areas were poorly maintained. All cells were single and included showers and telephones. Prison-issue clothes were often ill-fitting, and there had been shortages of basic items. The professionalism and commitment of staff in general was a real strength. Strategic management of equality and diversity work remained weak in some areas but this was offset by some impressive work by the equality officer to support boys with protected characteristics. Complaints were managed well. Health services were good. **Outcomes for children and young people were good against this healthy prison test.***

S12 At the last inspection in May 2015 we found that outcomes for children and young people in Cookham Wood were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 27 recommendations about respect. At this follow-up inspection we found that eight of the recommendations had been achieved, seven had been partially achieved and 12 had not been achieved.

- S13 Residential units were generally clean and well decorated. Some communal areas were grubby and there was still a problem with graffiti. Standards in some cells required improvement, but all cells were single and the provision of in-cell showers and telephones was excellent. Boys could not wear their own clothes and prison-issue clothing was often ill-

fitting and damaged. A shortage of basic items at times caused great frustration for boys and staff. Long delays in getting telephone numbers on to the PIN (personal identification number) system meant that new arrivals could not call home for up to three weeks. Calls, including those to support organisations such as Childline and the Samaritans, were restricted to three 10-minute periods a day. The application process was inadequate, and there was no effective system to track responses.

- S14 Most of the staff we spoke to were knowledgeable about the boys in their care. They displayed commitment and patience, even in extremely challenging situations. Most boys we spoke to were positive about the staff at Cookham Wood.
- S15 Work on equality and diversity had improved but some weaknesses remained. The equality committee only met quarterly, and one meeting in 2016 had been cancelled. Attendance at these meetings was poor. However, an enthusiastic equality officer ensured that boys with protected characteristics were seen monthly, either as a group or individually, and management of discrimination complaints was good. In our survey, only 35% of boys said it was easy to attend religious service, against the comparator of 50%; this was predominantly due to the 'keep apart' strategy.
- S16 The establishment needed to address why, in our survey, only 41% of boys from black and minority ethnic backgrounds said that it was easy to make a complaint. We found that complaints were generally answered promptly and appropriately.
- S17 Boys were supported by the casework team to exercise their legal rights, including making bail applications, and legal visits now took place with sufficient privacy.
- S18 Working relationships and integrated governance between health providers and the prison were good. Boys had good access to nurses and GP, although there was a long waiting list for the dentist. Medicines management was good, as was health promotion. Young people had good access to various therapeutic mental health interventions. There had been clear improvement in getting boys to group interventions, but approximately a third of those allocated did not attend groups. There had been some significant delays to transfers to secure hospitals in the last year. The Care Quality Commission (CQC)² found no breaches of the relevant regulations.
- S19 The quality and quantity of lunch and evening meals were adequate but breakfast was insufficient. The lunch meal was sometimes placed on the floor outside cells, which was unacceptable. New arrivals received a free and generous reception pack and telephone credit. However, they had to wait up to 10 days to place a shop order.

² CQC is the independent regulator of health and adult social care in England. It monitors, inspects and regulates services to make sure they meet fundamental standards of quality and safety. For information on CQC's standards of care and the action it takes to improve services, please visit: <http://www.cqc.org.uk>.

Purposeful activity

S20 *Time out of cell had improved for most boys but one in four were still locked up for too long during the core day. The management of learning and skills was good and there was sufficient training for all boys. Although there was a broad provision of education up to level 1, there were limited opportunities in vocational training and peer mentoring. Punctuality was poor but behaviour in class was generally good. The quality of teaching was good, and English and mathematics were very well integrated into sessions. Too many outreach sessions were cancelled due to regime restrictions, and one in five learners left before completing their courses. Access to the library was good. PE provision was limited to recreational sessions. **Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***

S21 *At the last inspection in May 2015 we found that outcomes for children and young people in Cookham Wood were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test. We made 15 recommendations about purposeful activity. At this follow-up inspection we found that four of the recommendations had been achieved, two had been partially achieved and nine had not been achieved.*

S22 Time out of cell had improved since the last inspection for most boys. In our survey, only 34% of boys said they could have association every day, against the comparator of 67%. During our roll checks we found 26% of boys locked in their cells.

S23 The education provision was well led and there was purposeful strategic planning to provide a programme rich in personal development and creativity. Staff were very well supported to manage and challenge poor behaviour, and improve teaching and learning. An inclusive quality improvement group shared good practice well. There had been an increased use of data to monitor the provision, but senior prison managers were not involved in monitoring the quality or progress of learning.

S24 There was sufficient training for all boys to participate in activities daily. The new 'activities hub' effectively coordinated the movements of individuals, and non-attendance was well monitored and managed. Learning plans were informed by an effective induction with appropriate assessments. There was a broad and balanced range of education provision to level 1 but the range of vocational activities was still too narrow. There were too few opportunities for boys to work as qualified peer mentors. Punctuality was poor and too many sessions did not start or finish on time.

S25 Teaching and coaching in most taught sessions was good and enabled learners to make good progress. Learning needs were identified at induction and were well supported. Boys who received one-to-one outreach support could progress well, but too often this work was disrupted by regime problems. English and mathematics were very well integrated into most sessions. Classroom and workshop resources were good, but inadequate in horticulture.

S26 Most learners who completed their courses successfully gained qualifications but around 20% of starters left without completing them. Achievement of functional skills qualifications in English and mathematics was good, but mathematics at level 2 required improvement. Behaviour in training sessions was generally good, and poor behaviour was challenged appropriately.

S27 The library had improved since the last inspection, and access was good. Books were delivered to boys who did not attend classes, and staff promoted activities to encourage interest in the library.

- S28 Induction to the gym was minimal and lacked sufficient focus on healthy living and well-being. Most boys had adequate access to recreational gym, but there were no accredited courses or sessions for boys with health issues.

Resettlement

S29 *Strategic management of resettlement was reasonably good, and work on transition of boys to other establishments and release on temporary licence (ROTL) had improved. Boys were positive about the excellent support they received from their caseworker. Remand and training planning meetings were affected by delays in attendance by boys and non-attendance by some staff. Some sentence plan objectives were too generic and not clearly linked to risk factors, and some boys did not know they had a plan. Public protection arrangements were in place. The provision for looked-after boys had improved. Reintegration planning was good, with clear efforts to resettle boys back into their communities. The visits provision had improved but there were still some weaknesses in the family pathway. The establishment had recently introduced accredited interventions, which was a positive development. **Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***

S30 *At the last inspection in May 2015 we found that outcomes for children and young people in Cookham Wood were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 13 recommendations about resettlement. At this follow-up inspection we found that five of the recommendations had been achieved, one had been partially achieved and seven had not been achieved.*

S31 Strategic management of resettlement was based on a comprehensive needs analysis and covered the key issues relevant to case management and planning for release. Use of ROTL was improving, and early release arrangements were used appropriately. Transition arrangements for boys moving to new establishments were developing well.

S32 Boys received excellent support from the casework team, and in our survey more than the comparator said their caseworker had helped them to prepare for release. More complex and high risk cases were allocated appropriately within the team. However, there was no prison-wide approach to preventing reoffending. Remand and training planning meetings were organised well but were compromised by delays in getting boys to the reviews; attendance by other departments was also patchy. Some sentence plans were too generic and it was not always clear how objectives contributed to reducing risk and reoffending. Too few boys knew that they had a sentence plan.

S33 Multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPAs) were appropriately managed through the inter-departmental risk management board. Support for looked-after boys had been strengthened. Screening was thorough and there was good follow-up to ensure that boys received appropriate support from their local authority.

S34 Practical arrangements for boys' release were well organised, and caseworkers ensured they were met by a responsible adult. Release accommodation was discussed at initial planning reviews but there were still difficulties in identifying an address for some boys before their release. None had been released without an address in the last six months but two had been released to bed and breakfast or hostel accommodation, which were unsuitable placements for the age group.

S35 A pre-release life skills course, run by the education provider, prepared a small number of boys for ROTL and release. The prison did not effectively monitor or record boys'

destinations on release to assess the effectiveness of the interventions provided in custody. Despite some efforts by the Cookham Wood team, provision for managing boys' finance and debt needs remained underdeveloped.

- S36 Health care discharge arrangements were sound with good links to local youth offending teams (YOTs) and child and adolescent mental health services (CAMHS). The substance misuse service contributed to training plans and prioritised attendance at final review meetings. Substance misuse workers followed up boys' progress two weeks after release and, where possible, attended their first community review.
- S37 The quality of the visits area had improved. There were still no parenting or relationship courses for boys who were also parents. Although there were regular family days, these were not available to all boys.
- S38 Several accredited interventions had been introduced since the previous inspection, although lengthy waiting lists limited the numbers who could attend before their release. A range of other non-accredited interventions were available. These included the 'Most Valuable Player' (MVP) programme, group work which focused on reducing violence, and individual work addressing harmful sexual behaviours.

Main concerns and recommendations

- S39 Concern: The number of violent incidents against boys and staff remained too high and were serious. Although the management of violent behaviour had improved, case management (particularly of boys with complex and difficult behaviour on the progression unit) had not developed sufficiently. We were not assured that systems for reporting incidents were accurate.

Recommendation: Systems for reporting and managing violent behaviour should be accurate and used to reduce levels of violence. Case management for all boys on PACT, particularly those on the progression unit, should be multidisciplinary, and include a positive and decent regime.

- S40 Concern: Boys were too often prevented from attending activities or appointments on time, and in some cases at all, because of regime issues, a lack of staff to escort them or incidents elsewhere in the establishment. This had a negative impact on their education, health care, substance misuse treatment, health and well-being, programmes and casework.

Recommendation: Cookham Wood should ensure that boys are able to attend on time the activities and specialist appointments necessary for their management and care.

- S41 Concern: There was insufficient focus on risk and reoffending in some of the boys' training plans. Some targets were generic and not clearly focused on individual need. There was no prison-wide approach to preventing reoffending. Attendance at training planning meetings was not sufficiently multidisciplinary, and written contributions to inform discussion and planning were insufficient.

Recommendation: Individual training and remand planning targets should be specific and address identified risks of reoffending and harm. Staff from all relevant departments should be represented at training planning or remand management reviews, or submit a detailed report if they cannot attend.

Section 1. Safety

Courts, escorts and transfers

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.1 Boys said they felt safe on their journey to Cookham Wood, and the cellular escort vehicles were clean and suitably equipped. Boys still often waited too long in court cells before they were transferred to the establishment, and most arrived too late to be settled on to the unit by a reasonable time. During our inspection, boys also experienced long waits on the vehicles before they were brought into reception – including one new arrival who waited an hour and 20 minutes on the van.
- I.2 The court video link had been used an average of only 17 times during the previous three months and remained an underused resource.
- I.3 We continued to have concerns that some boys placed at Cookham Wood were not suitable for the establishment. These included those who would usually have been sent to a secure training centre (STC), where there was a shortage of places.

Recommendations

- I.4 **Young people should be transported from court to the establishment as soon as possible after their hearing ends to reduce waiting and journey times, and assist early settlement on their first night.**
- I.5 **Waits on cellular vehicles should be kept to a minimum, especially for new arrivals.**
- I.6 **Boys should only be allocated to Cookham Wood when it is clear that the establishment can meet their needs. (Repeated recommendation I.8)**

Early days in custody

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.7 Reception staff were friendly and reassuring to new arrivals, and the area was clean and bright. Staff checked whether arrivals were new to custody and if they understood why they were there. Waits in reception were kept to a minimum. All boys had an initial assessment by a nurse, whatever time they arrived. They were given a hot meal and drink, and then a comprehensive risk assessment in private. Staff gave new arrivals clear information about what was going to happen to them on reception, during their first night and the next day.

- I.8** In the three months to June 2016, 42 boys had arrived without their Asset (Youth Justice Board assessment documentation). Missing data limited the quality and accuracy of the assessment of risk or identification of vulnerability on arrival. As a result, boys experienced delays in the allocation of their telephone numbers, preventing contact with family, and had delayed access to education and time out of cell.
- I.9** New arrivals were taken to a designated induction landing where they were settled into their cells and could make a free telephone call home. Staff made hourly checks on them throughout their first night. Cells were not always fully equipped and some lacked key items, such as a kettle. Although the induction wing was quiet on the night we observed it, other wings were noisy with boys shouting out unchallenged, which could be worrying for those new to custody (see paragraph 1.24). There was no reliable system for staff to hand over information about new arrivals to those coming on duty in the morning.
- I.10** An individual five-day induction programme usually began the day following arrival. Boys were given a clear information booklet and a DVD about Cookham Wood. The multidisciplinary induction programme was comprehensive, with progress tracked through an individual 'induction passport' signed by each contributor. Boys spent too long locked in their cells during the induction week.
- I.11** A new peer mentoring scheme provided support to boys on the induction wing during evening association.

Recommendations

- I.12** **Cells on the first night unit should be fully equipped and ready for use before boys are accommodated in them.** (Repeated recommendation 1.19)
- I.13** **Boys should arrive at the establishment with their Asset paperwork so that comprehensive risk assessments can be completed.**
- I.14** **Staff on the induction wing should hand over all relevant information about new boys to staff on the following shift.**

Care and protection of children and young people

Safeguarding

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.15** The safeguarding policy was in depth and up to date. It included clear guidance for staff on how to identify boys at risk of harm from others and how to make a safeguarding referral. The safeguarding team had expanded and now included additional uniformed staff and administrative support. The strategic and operational oversight of safeguarding was good. A monthly safeguarding meeting was chaired by the head of safeguarding and had an operational focus. The quarterly safeguarding meeting was more strategic, and discussed segregation monitoring and review group (SMARG) data. Both meetings were well attended. Eighty-seven per cent of staff had received training in child protection and safeguarding.

- I.16** Cookham Wood had good links with the Medway safeguarding children board, and the governor attended these meetings. The safeguarding team was well represented at two safeguarding subgroups in the community - a quality assurance group and a learning lessons group. The latter audited case files and reviewed recommendations from Prisons and Probation Ombudsman (PPO) deaths in custody reports.
- I.17** In the previous six months, there had been 508 safeguarding information reports (STIRs) submitted by staff who had identified concerns about a boy – an increase from 316 at the 2015 inspection. The new administrator monitored STIR investigations through a tracking system, and investigations were timely and thorough.
- I.18** New arrivals with complex needs were identified on reception through a private interview using the risk assessment management tool. All new arrivals were allocated a caseworker, who provided consistent individual support and supported their welfare while they were in custody. The 17-bed Cedar residential unit provided a range of interventions for young people who could not access a full regime elsewhere (see paragraph I.50). A weekly safer regimes meeting reviewed and monitored boys in most need of support and/or with complex needs.

Child protection

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.19** In the previous six months, there had been 47 child protection referrals, including 39 to the local authority designated officer (LADO), which was a considerable increase since the last inspection and higher than similar establishments. Twenty-six of these referrals included allegations of excessive force by staff against a boy during a physical restraint. A few boys had made more than one allegation, with four referrals on behalf of one boy. The introduction of the minimising and managing physical restraint (MMPR) debrief after the use of force had increased awareness among boys about how to raise concerns. We were confident that they also had access to independent advocates and members of the casework team who provided support and advice.
- I.20** The child protection policy had been updated in February 2016. The monitoring of referrals and investigations had improved since the last inspection with the introduction of a tracking system. Referrals to the LADO were made promptly and most investigations began without significant delay, although incomplete use of force documentation had led to delays in a few cases. The location of three social workers inside the establishment had helped to improve the relationship with the LADO, and YOI staff now attended all child protection strategy meetings in the community with the police and the LADO. The LADO continued to attend the quarterly safeguarding meeting.

Recommendation

- I.21** **Documentation supporting child protection referrals should be submitted to the local authority designated officer without delay.**

Victims of bullying and intimidation

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.22** The identification of bullying and its victims was effective, and information-sharing arrangements in the main residential units were very good. There was a 24-hour hotline for families to report concerns about bullying. The supervision of boys when they were unlocked was also very good, and CCTV coverage across most areas provided further support. Residential staff remained alert to the signs of bullying and regularly identified emerging issues, which they recorded in wing observation books and boys' electronic history files. We also saw officers taking appropriate action to deal with potential incidents before they developed.
- I.23** Formal support for victims of bullying had improved. There were individual support plans, and the weekly multidisciplinary safer regimes meeting provided further support for the most vulnerable.
- I.24** Although opportunities for bullying remained evident, staff challenged intimidating behaviour more consistently than at the last inspection. Abusive and threatening shouting out of windows and cell doors had reduced significantly but remained a problem, especially at night.
- I.25** In our survey, 21% of respondents said that they had been victimised by other boys, which was below the comparator of 37%. Only 10% of respondents said that they felt unsafe, compared with 21% at the last inspection

Suicide and self-harm prevention

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.26** There had been one death in custody by natural causes since the last inspection, and the three recommendations by the PPO had been achieved. An action plan had been put in place and was reviewed regularly at the monthly internal and external safeguarding meetings.
- I.27** As at the last inspection, levels of self-harm were low. There had been 15 incidents in the last six months, similar to the 14 incidents at the last inspection and substantially fewer than at similar establishments. There had been no serious self-harm incidents in the last six months and only one boy placed on constant observation in the same period.
- I.28** Forty-six assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management documents for boys at risk of suicide or self-harm had been opened in the previous six months, which was low for the type of establishment. The boys subject to ACCT who we spoke to were positive about their care and said they appreciated the regular contact with staff and support from them. The quality of ACCT documentation was generally good. They identified personal factors and significant events that might have been a trigger to self-harm. Reviews were multidisciplinary and sufficiently detailed care maps were completed. Some observational entries did not record the boy's mood or interaction with staff, but most included examples of positive engagement and regular contact. Some post-closure reviews

were late, which was unsatisfactory. A quality assurance system monitored the completion of ACCT documentation, and included daily checks by unit managers and weekly checks by the duty governor. A monthly quality assurance measure introduced in April 2016 was yet to fully embed.

- I.29** All boys subject to ACCT case management were discussed at the weekly safer regimes meeting and self-harm incidents were reviewed at the monthly safeguarding meeting.

Behaviour management

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.30** Behaviour management had improved since the last inspection. A single system, 'positive attitudes created together' (PACT), had been introduced to deal with violent and other antisocial behaviour (see paragraph I.47). It also linked other relevant policies, such as violence reduction, self-harm prevention, adjudication, segregation, and the rewards and sanctions scheme.
- I.31** Relationships between staff and young people had significantly improved since the last inspection, and poor behaviour was consistently challenged in residential units and in education. Low-level disruption was dealt with quickly, and boys were made aware of appropriate boundaries. Incentives for boys who demonstrated good behaviour had also improved, and staff handed out instant rewards for good behaviour more frequently (see paragraph I.36). Mediation was better integrated into the routine management of conflict, and some staff had been trained in restorative justice techniques.
- I.32** The establishment was developing a strategy to deal with the most violent and complex boys through the creation of special units. The new progression unit on B1 was an appropriate response to the main challenges. However, it lacked direction, and there was no distinct strategy that set expected working practices or its specific aims. The regime on B1 for the most challenging boys was insufficient, and case management through a multidisciplinary staff team had not yet been developed properly (see also paragraph I.49 and main recommendation S39).

Recommendation

- I.33** The role, working practices and aims of the progression unit on B1 should be specified and published.

Rewards and sanctions

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.34** The incentives and earned privileges (IEP) policy document had been revised. It described how the system worked, how young people could progress through the levels and the standards of expected behaviour. All boys had signed compacts. The scheme offered the

usual differentials in access to private cash, computer games and time out of cell, which were reasonable. There was also an enhanced unit on A3 landing. At the time of inspection, most young people, about 58%, were on the standard level, 23% were on enhanced and 19% on basic – which was more than we usually see at similar YOIs.

- I.35** The regime for boys on basic was austere and they were deprived of a kettle, which should be viewed as a basic amenity rather than a privilege. They were also subject to the usual sanctions, such as loss of TV, association and a gym session. However, they could attend education, and could shower and exercise every day. The time spent on basic was comparatively short and boys were nearly always promoted to standard within a week. There was good help to return them to the standard regime, and we saw officers encourage boys to deal with the issues that had caused demotion to basic.
- I.36** Alongside the IEP scheme was a separate system of instant awards and sanctions. Staff could give green cards to boys to reward specific good behaviour, which could attract a financial award of up to £5. By contrast, yellow cards were issued to punish poor behaviour and resulted in instant punishment of up to three days' loss of privileges (including association). Governance of this system was poor and it was undermanaged and inherently unfair. We found many examples where punishments were issued without any investigation of the facts, and inconsistencies where the same poor behaviour did not always result in the same sanction.

Recommendations

- I.37** **The removal of basic amenities, such as kettles, should not form part of the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme.**
- I.38** **Young people should not be punished without a full investigation of the facts.**

Security and disciplinary procedures

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.39** Procedural security, including searching and supervision of movements, although controlling, was proportionate to the risks of violence. Cell searching was intelligence led and strip searching was not routine.
- I.40** Management and use of intelligence had improved since the previous inspection and was very good. The security department received an average of 220 information reports a month, over 80% of which related to violence. They were processed quickly by trained staff, and intelligence was communicated to appropriate areas.
- I.41** The interactions we observed throughout the prison clearly showed that staff knew about the personal circumstances of young people, and supervision was effective, which helped support a dynamic prison-wide approach to managing security. The security department, alongside the activities department, compiled and managed a 'keep apart' list of boys who had to be kept separated due to various issues about violence, usually gang related (see paragraph 3.3).

- I.42** Security-led meetings were well attended and links with other key prison departments, particularly safeguarding, had improved since the last inspection and were very good. Security objectives were now agreed and reviewed through the appropriate consideration of intelligence. Reports from other areas of the prison, such as residential units, were also discussed, and used to identify particular risks and inform specific strategies. Security fed into most decision making by informing rather than determining final outcomes. There were strong links with the local police, particularly on operations to deal with issues related to gangs and staff corruption. The establishment had an appropriate focus on extremism and the risks of radicalisation, and this was managed well
- I.43** Drug use remained low. Finds consisted of small amounts of cannabis, tobacco and occasionally small quantities of alcohol. Mandatory drug testing (MDT) on suspicion had been used three times in the previous six months, with two positives for cannabis. The MDT testing area was clean and tidy, but the waiting room, which was also the dentist's waiting room, contained some offensive graffiti.
- I.44** Information sharing between the security department and substance misuse services had improved and there were appropriate supply reduction measures, including intelligence-led searching and the use of area drug-detection dogs. Although there was still no written supply reduction strategy or action plan, drugs supply was discussed at the security meeting, which was attended by the team manager from Addaction, the drug and alcohol treatment charity working at the prison (see paragraph I.64).
- I.45** The number of adjudications was high but governance was reasonably good and the charges we viewed seemed proportionate. Statistics on the number and nature of adjudications were presented to the safeguarding team and used to identify and address trends. Standardisation meetings were well attended, and minutes indicated good discussion of relevant issues.

Bullying and violence reduction

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.46** Although there had been a reduction in the overall incidence of fights and assaults on young people in the last few months, numbers remained high. There had been 127 violent incidents in the previous six months, based on proven adjudications. Of these, 33 were recorded as assaults on young people, 30 as assaults on staff and 58 fights. Some incidents were very serious and involved gangs of boys attacking a single young person. Assaults on staff had increased by nearly a third since the last inspection and some were very serious. However, we were not assured that these figures accurately reflected the level of violence, and we found data on the establishment's incident reporting system indicating that actual numbers could have been higher (see main recommendation S39).
- I.47** There was a clear violence reduction strategy and a behaviour management policy document that described protocols to deal with specific aspects of antisocial behaviour. The previous formal measures to manage violent and antisocial behaviour had been replaced by the single-stage PACT scheme (see paragraph I.30). This was based on individual plans, raised and managed by residential officers, to set and monitor targets to improve behaviour and support vulnerable young people. The rewards and sanctions scheme was often used in conjunction with PACT plans, and there was evidence that positive changes in behaviour were rewarded quickly (see paragraph I.36). But the quality of plans we looked at varied: some were very good and addressed the issues while others were superficial.

- I.48** In April 2016, a landing on BI had been designated as a progression unit for young people whose behaviour was persistently disruptive or violent. We were told that the aim of the unit, an alternative to segregation, was to deliver a four-week programme of interventions and education and help return young people to the mainstream population. Boys initially received a tightly restricted regime, which included little more than daily exercise, a shower and about 30 minutes of individual education on the unit. As their behaviour improved, they could gradually progress to a more open regime, including an incremental return to full-time education and association.
- I.49** There were early signs that this approach had been successful in some cases, helping to reduce the number of violent incidents and use of segregation. However, we were concerned that in too many of the more complex cases, young people were unable to progress due to their poor behaviour. The quality of many of the PACT plans for these boys was poor, targets were often superficial, and there was little to assure us that changes in behaviour or circumstances were monitored well enough or acted on. Reviews were often superficial and not well attended by staff from all departments who knew the boy. As a result, too many remained locked alone in their cells nearly all day with little purposeful activity. At the time of inspection, there were 19 boys on the unit. We were told that the average stay was about six weeks, but we found at least four cases where boys had stayed for over three months. (See main recommendation S39.)
- I.50** The Cedar unit also continued to be used well to support and reintegrate boys with complex needs, and case management here was generally very good. However, there were also examples where difficult-to-manage boys were locked in their cells for too long.

The use of force

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.51** There was a very high level of use of force, with 480 cases in the previous six months. This was significantly higher than we usually see at similar establishments and higher than the 400 cases found during a similar period before the last inspection.
- I.52** The new Prison Service policy for use of force in the young people's estate had been fully implemented since the last inspection, and all frontline staff, including managers, had been trained in minimising and managing physical restraint (MMPR).
- I.53** Most incidents involving use of force were spontaneous in response to fights or assaults. Many began very quickly, with little warning, and involved groups of boys attacking each other or single victims (see paragraph I.46). This resulted in several recordings of force used during a single violent incident. For example, we saw an assault on one boy involving six assailants that was, correctly, recorded as six separate use of force incidents.
- I.54** Governance of use of force had improved but there were still some gaps. The safeguarding and restraint minimisation committees discussed all aspects of use of force at monthly meetings and monitored the statistics. Trends were identified and helped inform reduction strategies.
- I.55** Full-time MMPR coordinators scrutinised CCTV recordings of nearly all spontaneous incidents and all planned incidents, usually on the day they occurred. They reported their findings to the head of safeguarding at a weekly meeting. However, we found that some

important use of force paperwork had not been processed, some of it was incomplete and important parts - such as written accounts from officers and accident reports from health care staff - were missing in about 100 cases. Nonetheless, the completed documentation and video recordings we examined were reasonably good and gave some assurance that incidents were managed appropriately with minimum force used for short periods of time. There were examples where de-escalation techniques had been used effectively, and we saw video recordings where officers had risked harm to themselves to protect boys from attack.

- I.56** Two injuries to young people due to use of force had been recorded in the previous six months - one was a suspected broken arm. Both were fully investigated and referred to the safeguarding committee. However, the number of complaints from young people about excessive use of force was very high, with 26 referrals to the local authority (see paragraph I.19).

Recommendation

- I.57** Use of force documents should be completed fully, quickly and kept together.

Separation/removal from normal location

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.58** Use of segregation had increased since the last inspection but there was evidence that it was now reducing. There had been 112 young people segregated in the previous six months, which was nearly double the number found in 2015. However, since April 2016, there had been a significant month-by-month reduction of about 50%, and the average length of stay had reduced from 14 to 12 days (with some notable exceptions). Managers said that this coincided with the opening of the reintegration unit on BI (see paragraphs I.33 and I.49).
- I.59** At the time of this inspection, five young people were in segregation, all for reasons of good order or discipline. Living conditions in the segregation unit were poor. Communal corridors were dark and narrow and the exercise yard was stark. Cells were small and poorly ventilated, and many were dirty. There was graffiti on walls and windows, and many toilets were dirty and stained.
- I.60** Day-to-day relationships between staff and prisoners on the unit were good but the regime was insufficient. Although young people could have a daily shower and telephone call, exercise was often limited to 30 minutes. Their daily education classes were often cancelled due to staff shortages, and as a result boys were too often locked in their cells for nearly all day with little to do.
- I.61** Planning to return boys to the residential mainstream was very good. Individual cases were reviewed weekly by an effective multidisciplinary staff group at well-attended meetings. These organised individual interventions to deal with the issues that had caused the initial segregation

Recommendations

- I.62 Living conditions in the segregation unit should be improved, and cells and communal areas should be kept clean, graffiti-free and well maintained.**
- I.63 The regime for young people in the segregation unit should be improved and include time out of cell activities that are consistently available.**

Substance misuse

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.64** Clinical and psychosocial services were delivered by the Addaction drug and alcohol treatment charity. All new arrivals were screened by a health care nurse and any substance use needs were identified (see paragraph I.7). An Addaction worker saw each boy within three days for a further assessment, and gave them basic awareness and harm reduction information. Boys with more complex needs were given an individual care plan involving further one-to-one contact with their allocated substance misuse worker.
- I.65** Too few boys with higher level needs received regular substance misuse-based interventions. In our survey, only 12% of boys, against the 24% comparator, said they had received help for a drug problem. No groupwork was available, partly due to increased requirements for education time. We were also told it was because the increase in violence had led to 'keep apart' processes that hampered opportunities for groupwork. However, we observed that other departments operated their groups effectively in the education department.
- I.66** Provision of one-to-one work had also been difficult. Since April 2016, 294 appointments for substance misuse interventions had been offered to boys on the Addaction caseload but 121 (41%) were not attended. Reasons cited for this included boys refusing appointments, double-booked rooms, wing lock-downs and late arrivals for appointments. These issues remained unresolved at the time of the inspection. (See main recommendation S40.)
- I.67** The establishment offered a clinical drug treatment service but only one boy had arrived requiring a benzodiazepine detoxification, and none had required opiate substitution. All the appropriate written protocols were in place, but there was still no 24-hour nursing cover. As such, we continued to share the concerns of the substance misuse services commissioner over the adequacy of out-of-hours monitoring and observation if alcohol or opiate detoxification were ever needed.

Recommendation

- I.68 There should be robust and reliable provision of monitoring and observation services should any boy need clinical substance misuse services.**

Section 2. Respect

Residential units

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.1 Residential units were generally clean and freshly decorated. Some communal areas were grubby and there was still graffiti. There was a painting programme and boys could sometimes paint their own cells.
- 2.2 All cells were for single occupancy and had their own showers, toilets and telephone. In our survey, 98% of boys said they were able to shower every day. Some cells were not clean.
- 2.3 Boys, including those on remand, could not wear their own clothes or underwear. The prison-issue clothing was largely ill-fitting, and sometimes damaged. Boys told us that because of recent problems with the laundry service they had to wear the same trousers for up to three weeks, although we were told the problem had been resolved. Bedding was usually replaced weekly and was generally clean, although some blankets were stained and frayed. There was sometimes a shortage of basic items, such as toilet rolls, which was frustrating for boys and staff, who had to track these items down.
- 2.4 Boys had access to telephones 24 hours a day, which was good. There were still too many delays in them getting clearance for their telephone PIN (personal identification number) numbers, and new arrivals were sometimes unable to make calls for up to three weeks after their first night call. All calls, including those to organisations such as Childline and the Samaritans, were restricted to three 10-minute periods a day, which was unreasonable.
- 2.5 Cell bells were rung too frequently and often left unanswered for long periods. Boys and staff acknowledged that because bells were mainly used to get staff attention, rather than for an emergency, staff did not rush to answer them. There was a risk that a real emergency could be missed.
- 2.6 In our survey, boys said it was easy to make an application (77% against the comparator of 54%), but they still lacked confidence that their requests would be dealt with fairly or within seven days. There was no effective system to track or quality assure responses to applications.

Recommendations

- 2.7 **Boys on remand should not have to wear prison clothes.** (Repeated recommendation 2.9)
- 2.8 **All prison-issue clothing should fit and be in good repair.**
- 2.9 **Boys' telephone numbers should be cleared quickly to enable them to call close family and friends soon after their arrival. They should have longer time to make telephone calls, and be able to call support organisations such as Samaritans and Childline without restrictions.**
- 2.10 **Applications should be tracked and subject to regular management checks.**

Relationships between staff and children and young people

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.11** Most staff were knowledgeable about the boys in their care, and displayed exemplary commitment and patience in frequently challenging situations. This understanding was reflected in staff entries about the boys in wing files, although less so in the computer records. The professionalism and positive behaviour of staff across all disciplines was a real strength at Cookham Wood.
- 2.12** Staff introduced themselves to new arrivals but because they still did not wear name badges, it was difficult for boys to remember who they were. The personal officer scheme continued to be ineffective. Boys were often unaware of who their personal officer was, and meetings between boys and their personal officers were not frequent enough or recorded. However, most boys said they did have members of staff they could go to for information and help, and they were very positive about staff and the support they provided.
- 2.13** A youth council met once or twice a month consisting of representatives of the boys and various staff members, as well as the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB). The boys had raised issues such as food, education, health care and use of telephones, but the minutes of meetings did not record whether actions agreed by staff were followed through.

Recommendations

- 2.14** **All staff should wear their names on their uniform.** (Repeated recommendation 2.20)
- 2.15** **An effective personal officer scheme should be in place, ensuring that all boys have an identified officer with whom they meet regularly to discuss concerns and needs.** (Repeated recommendation 2.19)

Equality and diversity

Expected outcomes:

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

Strategic management

- 2.16** Equality and diversity work was important to the establishment, although strategic management was not strong enough. The equality policy was reviewed annually and covered protected characteristics, training and local governance. The equality action team (EAT) meeting was chaired by the governor or deputy governor. It had been reduced to quarterly

meetings to coincide with the publication of equality monitoring tool performance data. However, one of the first three EAT meetings of 2016 had been cancelled and not rescheduled, and attendance overall was poor.

- 2.17** The EAT was overseen by a senior manager who also had responsibility for safeguarding. The senior lead was supported by a small but enthusiastic team, made up of an officer and administrative support. Although previously there had been eight young people's equality representatives, there were only two at the time of the inspection. Their role was not fully understood and they did not attend the EAT meeting. In place of an annual survey, the equality officer sent out questionnaires to around 25% of the population before each meeting, but the returns were only around 10%.
- 2.18** The EAT discussed data from the equality monitoring tool, and out-of-range data could often be attributed as due to a small number of individuals causing concern. The equality officer presented the data in a clear report analysed for each protected characteristic, but this was only available to staff and not the boys. There was an annual programme of equality impact assessments, based on emerging issues. The equality action plan had few actions, although it was reviewed regularly and updated.
- 2.19** Equality was well promoted with clear displays on residential notice boards, but lacked information on current issues or statistics. An annual programme of diversity events was supported by the education department within personal social and health education (see below). Events had included Gypsy, Romany and Traveller groups, an Anne Frank exhibition and planned autism awareness training. Some planned diversity events did not take place due to time constraints on the equality officer, which undermined the programme.
- 2.20** Twenty-two discrimination incident reporting forms (DIRFs) had been submitted in the previous six months. Most concerned race and inappropriate language. The management of DIRFs had improved since our previous inspection, and all were logged centrally and investigated by an appropriate manager. The governor quality assured all completed DIRFs, with some independent scrutiny from a member of the IMB. The complainant was updated on progress as required, and all were seen individually to receive feedback following completion of the investigation. The complainant was also given a satisfaction form to complete, which allowed them to comment on how the process was managed and whether they felt the outcome was appropriate.

Recommendations

- 2.21** **Representatives from key departments, and equality representatives, should attend the equality action team meetings.**
- 2.22** **The number of equality peer support representatives should be expanded.**

Good practice

- 2.23** *Boys who submitted discrimination incident reporting forms (DIRFs) were given a satisfaction form enabling their feedback on how they thought their complaint was handled.*

Diverse needs

- 2.24** As at our previous inspection, about 60% of boys were of black or Asian minority ethnic origin but only 4% of staff were. Cultural awareness training for staff was still limited to the

online Civil Service programme, and the additional training identified in the equality action plan had not yet been implemented.

- 2.25** All new arrivals had a comprehensive equality screening, which provided the safeguarding team with data on the diverse needs and protected characteristics of the population. Tutors in personal, social and health education (PSHE) used an after-school club to discuss protected characteristics to raise awareness with the boys. This was provided in a safe learning environment that led to positive and open discussion. However, not all boys with protected characteristics could attend structured support forums to raise issues and support each other, and links with external organisations were limited.
- 2.26** The equality officer attempted to see all boys from a black or minority ethnic origin in small groups or individually each month, and the resulting focus group documentation covered all key aspects of life at Cookham Wood. However, the concerns raised were not regularly sent to relevant departments or managers for follow up, which created frustration for some boys, who felt that issues were not addressed. In our surveys, boys from a black or minority ethnic background held similar perceptions to white boys, except on complaints (see paragraph 2.38).
- 2.27** In our survey 10% of boys identified themselves as from a Gypsy, Romany or Traveller background. The equality officer met this group, and had done some one-to-one work with an individual who had made inappropriate comments against boys from this background. There had been Traveller awareness events, and a special meal prepared by the catering department.
- 2.28** Twenty-nine boys (18.4%) were identified as foreign national at the time of inspection. A caseworker oversaw processes, and the Home Office immigration enforcement officer attended forums and regularly saw individual boys. External support was provided by the Migrant Help charity. Boys who did not receive visits could make a free five-minute overseas telephone call each month.
- 2.29** In our survey, 19% of boys said they had a disability. There was no specific forum for boys with disabilities, although the education department supported boys with learning difficulties, and an autism awareness training day was planned. Personal emergency evacuation plans were available in hard copy and through the prison intranet system. An IT screen for staff on A and B units quickly identified any boys who needed assistance in an emergency.
- 2.30** In the previous 12 months, only two boys had identified themselves as bisexual, one of whom had been a victim of bullying. Discussion on gay, bisexual and transgender issues were integrated into PSHE, but there was still no formal individual support to provide assurance that such boys would be kept safe.

Recommendations

- 2.31** **Consultation for boys with protected characteristics should be formalised to monitor progress on supportive actions identified.**
- 2.32** **Gay and bisexual boys should be reassured that support and advice was available for them and that homophobic behaviour would be robustly addressed.** (Repeated recommendation 2.37)

Faith and religious activity

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.33** A member of the chaplaincy saw all new arrivals within 24 hours, and also had a more detailed discussion during induction. Members of the chaplaincy were visible around the establishment and were regularly involved in the care of boys who needed additional support, such as those on a constant watch or who had been bereaved. A range of appropriate faith classes included the Alpha Christian course, Bible study and Arabic study.
- 2.34** In our survey, only 35% of boys said it was easy to attend a religious service, against the comparator of 50%. Boys did not have to apply to attend a service, but there was a stringent 'keep apart' system where conflicts had been identified (see paragraph 1.40). Where boys could not attend due to 'keep apart' concerns, a chaplain visited them. Some services took place during key association times, which added to low attendance. An average of 15 boys attended Muslim Friday prayer. On several occasions no boys attended the Catholic mass.
- 2.35** The primary multi-faith room had improved in appearance but was small, not particularly welcoming and had little storage for religious articles. The washing facilities for Muslim boys were very good.

Recommendation

- 2.36** **Subject to security concerns, all boys should be able to see a chaplain and attend corporate worship.** (Repeated recommendation 2.42)

Complaints

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.37** There had been an average of 42 complaints a month in the previous six months. Ten per cent were quality assured by the deputy governor, and the safeguarding team screened all complaints for possible referrals to the local safeguarding board. A detailed analysis of complaints data was presented to the establishment's performance meeting, covering location, subject matter, ethnicity and scrutiny of those that were upheld or rejected.
- 2.38** In our survey, only 41% of boys from a black or minority ethnic background thought it was easy to make a complaint, compared with 64% of white boys, which warranted further exploration. The responses we reviewed were prompt, polite and addressed the issues. Complaints boxes were accessible, well stocked, and were emptied daily by a member of the business hub. Boys wishing to make a complaint could also approach Barnardo's advocates for independent support and advice.

Recommendation

- 2.39** The establishment should investigate and address why boys from a black or minority ethnic background have worse perceptions than white boys about making a complaint.

Legal rights

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.40** Caseworkers continued to support new arrivals to understand their sentence and legal status and to support them in accessing their solicitor. They sought a bail application for boys on remand and liaised with the relevant agencies to resolve any issues preventing bail. Eighteen per cent of the population were on remand at the time of the inspection, and 46 boys had been released on bail between March and August in 2016.
- 2.41** Boys recalled to custody after release were identified promptly by the casework team and given documentation explaining their status. For consistency, returning boys were allocated to their original caseworker.
- 2.42** Since the last inspection five new legal booths had been installed so legal visits now took place with sufficient privacy.

Health services

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.43** The inspection of health services was jointly undertaken by the Care Quality Commission (CQC)³ and HM Inspectorate of Prisons under a memorandum of understanding agreement between the agencies. The CQC found no breaches of the relevant regulations and did not issue any 'requirement to improve' notices.

Governance arrangements

- 2.44** Partnership board arrangements were effective with suitable representation from the commissioner, establishment and main health care providers, and separate quarterly contract meetings with individual main providers. Governance was sound with effective integrated management and monitoring of clinical risk and complaints by the quarterly quality board shared by all the main service providers. There was an up-to-date health needs assessment, but it lacked detailed analysis to inform all services.

³ CQC is the independent regulator of health and adult social care in England. It monitors, inspects and regulates services to make sure they meet fundamental standards of quality and safety. For information on CQC's standards of care and the action it takes to improve services, please visit: <http://www.cqc.org.uk>.

- 2.45** Health staff were professional and caring, and engaged with young people. There were reasonable arrangements for management and clinical supervision for staff. Induction and structured support for newly qualified nurses was being developed, and there was now less reliance on agency staff. All health staff were trained in safeguarding of children and adults, and providers had effective links with local authority safeguarding bodies and the safer regimes department. Clinical records detailed care and treatment appropriately, but entries by substance misuse worker were limited. Care plans and templates were used effectively, and there was evidence of consent from young people to share information.
- 2.46** Arrangements for communicable diseases were reasonable, and levels of immunisation for childhood diseases and blood-borne viruses had improved.
- 2.47** Young people with potentially life-threatening medical conditions were offered and encouraged to wear a medical alert wrist band to aid prison staff in ensuring their safety. An easy-to-read pocket guide for prison staff on a range of health conditions was due to be introduced.
- 2.48** Primary care (except dental services) was delivered from treatment rooms between A and B wings and the Cedar unit. A small reception health room was poorly configured and not a safe environment to assess young people. It had no easily accessible emergency bell and exit for health staff, and offered poor visibility for prison staff. Treatment rooms were generally clinically appropriate and cleaned daily, but there were no separate hand basins with elbow taps. A recent infection control audit had achieved 85%.
- 2.49** Emergency equipment, including automated external defibrillators, was strategically sited and regularly checked, but we noted a few gaps in recording. All health staff had received annual resuscitation skills training. Approximately 33% of prison staff had completed basic life support training within the last three years.
- 2.50** Health promotion was led by trained 'support to recovery' workers and included a session on the induction programme. There was limited health literature to support health education. There was individual work with young people about their sexual health, and barrier protection was offered on release.
- 2.51** Management of complaints had improved and boys could now make a complaint through a separate confidential health system; almost all complaints in the previous months related to dental services.
- 2.52** Health staff attended the establishment's youth council (see paragraph 2.13), but there was no separate health forum. Health and well-being (mental health) services gathered user feedback through an exit survey. The mental health services provider had done various useful service audits incorporating boys' views on mental health support.

Recommendation

- 2.53** **The reception health treatment room should provide a safe environment for health staff and better visibility for prison staff.**

Good practice

- 2.54** *Medical alert wristbands and the planned pocket guide for prison staff on potentially life-threatening health conditions supported the safety and care of young people.*

Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.55** All new arrivals had a comprehensive health screening, including physical and mental health, substance misuse and neuro-disability, with efforts to ensure continuity of care through contact with community GPs. All the boys received a school health-equivalent sight and hearing screening and oral health assessment. Those with long-term conditions were suitably monitored by the GP, with plans for nurses to provide some of this care.
- 2.56** All boys, including those on the segregation, Cedar and BI units, had good access to nurses and GPs. Urgent needs were prioritised well. Registered nurses were available between 7.30am and 9pm Monday to Friday, with reduced hours at the weekend. Boys had reasonable access to a range of primary care services, including an optician and physiotherapist; podiatry was available externally.
- 2.57** Difficulties in getting boys to their primary care appointments had improved recently for most services, but were still a problem for dental services (see below). In the seven months to June 2016, there had been 506 non attendances, with just over a quarter (133) due to a lack of officers to escort boys. (See main recommendation S40.) There was a sound risk-based approach to boys who arrived with existing hospital referrals/appointments.
- 2.58** Arrangements for emergency medical care were equivalent to the community, and out-of-hours cover included GP visits where required. There was no evidence of ambulance delays.

Good practice

- 2.59** *The provision of school health-equivalent hearing and sight tests and an oral health assessment soon after boys arrived maximised the opportunity for early specialist support where needed.*

Pharmacy

- 2.60** Medicines were supplied from HMP Rochester. There was good pharmaceutical oversight with visits by a pharmacist or pharmacy technician on alternate weeks. Boys could see the pharmacist for advice by request or referral from health care staff.
- 2.61** Prescribing was age-appropriate with most medicines administered on a supervised basis. Boys could keep medicines, such as antibiotics and acne medicines, inhalers and ointments, in their cells.
- 2.62** Arrangements for the administration and collection of medicines had improved and were now well organised, confidential and safe. Nurses could administer simple 'over-the-counter' medicines and this was appropriately recorded on SystemOne (the clinical IT system), but without suitable policy or patient group direction (PGD) authority. Medicines such as insulin pens (for diabetes) and epipens (to counteract allergic reactions) were kept by nursing or prison staff and given to boys as required. Young people experiencing pain at night could request simple pain relief from wing staff, with appropriate recording by officers and monitoring by nurses.
- 2.63** Controlled drugs were well managed and all boys on methylphenidate (given for attention deficit hyperactivity disorder) received this on a named-patient basis. There was safe storage of these drugs and a clear audit trail for access by staff. Arrangements for the receipt of controlled drugs were generally reasonable, but the transporting box was not always escorted by two people as required.

Recommendation

2.64 Two people should accompany all controlled drugs transported in the prison.

Good practice

2.65 *Young people experiencing pain at night could request simple pain relief medicines from prison staff, and this was managed safely.*

Dentistry

2.66 Young people waited too long for dental treatment. The non-attendance rate was 35% for the first quarter of 2016, which while an improvement was still unacceptably high.

2.67 The dental clinic appointments schedule was managed by the dental nurse and based on clinical need, time spent on the waiting list and the 'keep apart' list (see paragraph 1.40). The waiting list remained too long and had increased to 87, with 51 boys waiting an excessive time - 30 had been waiting for between eight and 13 weeks and a further 21 for over 13 weeks. The dentist now provided 'see and treat' appointments – rather than recalling them for a future appointment - to minimise the need for follow-up appointments.

2.68 The dental surgery was large and well equipped, but was now isolated from the main primary care treatment rooms. There was no separate decontamination facility. Dental equipment was suitably maintained and certificated, and dental waste disposed of appropriately.

Recommendation

2.69 Boys should not have excessively long waits for dental services. Best practice guidance for instrument decontamination should be followed.

Delivery of care (mental health)

2.70 Young people had access to a wide range of therapeutic interventions, including child and adolescent mental health (CAMHS) specialist psychiatrist sessions, CAMHS nurses, art therapy, clinical psychology, and speech and language therapy. There were 57 young people on the team caseload with a range of complex mental health problems; cases were prioritised and triaged through a weekly multidisciplinary referral meeting.

2.71 Individual casework was complemented by a range of focused group sessions. There had been some improvement in enabling young people to attend the groups, but there was still a significant problem in getting them to the group sessions and promptly; in a two-month period between July and September 2016, approximately a third of appointments were lost due mainly to lack of rooms, but also a lack of escort officers (see main recommendation S40).

2.72 The team had excellent links with the wider establishment through formal meetings. Constructive working relationships between clinicians and specific units and individual prison staff were complemented by prison staff who had received mental health awareness training and additional work, such as joint meetings with officers on BI unit and psychology staff contributing to minimising and managing physical restraint (MMPR) training (see paragraph 1.52).

- 2.73** Between November 2015 and September 2016, there had been eight mental health assessments for suitability for a secure mental health bed. Three young people had waited more than two weeks for transfer, and one had waited three and a half months for transfer while unwell - this case had been the subject of scrutiny and action by commissioners.

Recommendations

- 2.74** **The regime should support young people's sustained attendance at therapeutic group sessions.**
- 2.75** **Boys who need a secure mental health bed should be transferred as soon as possible.**

Catering

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.76** The establishment had recently moved to the young people's estate standardised menu and operated a four-week cycle with five options at both lunch and evening meal. Lunch consisted of a cold sandwich with some snacks and a hot meal was provided in the evening. The reverse applied at weekends. The menu catered for a range of diets, fresh fruit was available daily and fresh milk cartons were offered on weekends. The evening meal portions and sandwich lunches were adequate, but the breakfast pack provision was poor in quality and quantity.
- 2.77** Boys could eat their evening meal and breakfast in association but the lunch was left in their cell. On several occasions we saw the meal pack left on the floor outside cells before it was lifted and placed inside the cell, which was not acceptable. Supervision at meal times was good.
- 2.78** Boys were employed on residential serveries and trained to level 1 food and hygiene but no boys worked in the main kitchen, which was a missed opportunity for them to gain qualifications. The kitchen was small and clean, but there was mess and leftover food in the residential serving points. The catering manager regularly attended the youth council meeting (see paragraph 2.13) and conducted twice yearly surveys. There were food comments books at each point of service but they were rarely used.

Recommendations

- 2.79** **All meals should be issued at the servery and eaten in association.** (Repeated recommendation 2.100)
- 2.80** **Boys should be employed to prepare food so that they can achieve related qualifications.** (Repeated recommendation 2.101)

Purchases

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.81** New arrivals were offered a generous free grocery pack in addition to £2.50 credit for telephone calls. Following reception, boys could wait up to 10 days for their first shop order, although they could buy additional reception grocery packs and get advances of pay if they had no funds.
- 2.82** In our survey, only 45% of boys said the shop sold a wide enough variety of goods, compared with 61% at our last inspection. We found that the shop order form had over 300 items and was appropriate for the population. Shop issues could be raised at the youth council meeting and there was evidence of action taken. Boys could order newspapers and shop from several catalogues, and it was positive that no administration fee was charged on catalogue orders.

Recommendation

- 2.83** **Boys should be able to place a canteen order within 24 hours of their arrival.**
(Repeated recommendation 2.105)

Section 3. Purposeful activity

Time out of cell

Expected outcomes:

Children and young people spend most of their time out of their cell, engaged in activities such as education, leisure and cultural pursuits, seven days a week.⁴

- 3.1** Despite a high number of staff vacancies, time out of cell had improved for most boys since our previous inspection. In our survey, 34% of boys said that they could go on association every day compared with 14% in 2015. However, this figure was still significantly worse than the comparator of 67%.
- 3.2** An amendment to the core day during the inspection meant that boys returned from educational activities at 4pm, which allowed more time for association and to dine out for the evening meal. The published core day for a boy attending all his scheduled activities enabled approximately 10.5 hours a day out of cell. Boys with no activity or residing on B1 (see paragraph 1.48) had as little as two hours a day out of cell, depending on their individual care plan. The establishment had reported figures of as low as 1.6 hours out of cell on a weekend and 6.7 hours on a weekday in the previous two months.
- 3.3** At roll checks during the core day we found an average of 26% of boys locked in their cells, which was an improvement since our previous inspection. The numbers were predominantly due to the 'keep apart' list (see paragraph 2.13) and boys located on B1, as well as staff having to react to any emerging issues between boys during the day. Exercise was limited to 30 minutes a day, and although the exercise yards had seats they were otherwise stark.

Recommendations

- 3.4 All boys should spend at least 10 hours every day out of their cell and have the opportunity to spend at least one hour in the open air every day.**
- 3.5 More activities should be available during outside exercise.** (Repeated recommendation, 3.7)

⁴ Time out of cell, in addition to formal 'purposeful activity', includes any time children and young people are out of their cells to associate or use communal facilities to take showers or make telephone calls.

Education, learning and skills

Expected outcomes:

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

3.6 Ofsted⁵ made the following assessments about the learning and skills and work provision:

Overall effectiveness of learning and skills and work: Good

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

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

Personal development and behaviour: Good

Effectiveness of leadership and management of learning and skills and work activities: Good

Management of education and learning and skills

3.7 The education and vocational training provision from Novus was good. It was well led and well managed, and had improved considerably since the last inspection. Caseworkers and tutors worked closely with Novus tutors to support boys unable to attend education. Strong management ensured that boys on the progressive, segregation and Cedar units received visits from tutors to continue their training.

3.8 Staff were very well supported and had received useful training to help them manage and challenge poor behaviour and improve teaching and learning. Teachers used lunchtime sessions effectively to share information and ideas with each other. Observations of teachers were regular and used well to identify and support improvement activities. An ambitious strategy to improve the application of information and communications technology (ICT) to support teaching and learning was progressing slowly. The delay in establishing the 'virtual campus' – giving boys internet access to community education, training and employment opportunities - had inhibited progress and had affected young people conducting independent research or seeking information about job or training opportunities (see recommendation 4.26).

⁵ Inspection of the provision of education and educational standards, as well as vocational training in YOIs for young people, is undertaken by the Office for Standards in Education Children's Services and Skills (Ofsted) working under the general direction of HM Inspectorate of Prisons. It reports directly to the UK Parliament and is independent and impartial. It (inter alia) inspects and regulates services that provide education and skills for all ages, including those in custody. For information on Ofsted's inspection framework, please visit: <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk>.

- 3.9** Teachers and education managers used data more effectively to monitor the provision and identify the impact of change. However, senior prison staff did not know how well learners or tutors performed and were not involved in any quality monitoring. Monitoring by Youth Justice Board (YJB) managers was perfunctory and looked at performance indicators rather than the quality of the provision.
- 3.10** The new 'activities hub', run jointly by the prison and Novus, effectively coordinated the movement of boys into activities. However, the increasing numbers of boys on the 'keep apart' list placed significant pressure on the allocation process and the availability of sufficient suitable pathways appropriate for each boy.
- 3.11** The quality improvement group was well managed; it monitored learner and staff performance and the impact of actions to improve the provision. However, while the group involved prison staff it was chaired by Novus staff and did not include senior prison managers. The self-assessment report was accurate and evaluative, providing clear judgements on improvements.

Recommendations

- 3.12 Senior prison staff should ensure that the allocation process enables boys to attend the education and training activities that meet their identified needs.**
- 3.13 Senior prison managers should frequently monitor the performance and quality of all learning delivered by subcontractors to ensure that all learners make progress and that staff are suitably supported.**

Provision of activities

- 3.14** There were sufficient education opportunities to engage all boys not otherwise restricted actively. Non-attendance was well monitored and managed, but the reasons individuals were returned to their wings were not always correctly recorded. Shortages of prison wing staff and disruptions to the regime meant that boys too frequently arrived late for sessions and were often collected late at their end. (See main recommendation S40.) When regime disruptions meant sessions could not take place, teaching staff supported learners on wings with individual coaching and support.
- 3.15** Induction and the appropriate assessments were used effectively in planning each boy's training pathway. They were each allocated a caseworker who supported them well in managing their sentence and encouraging them to complete their training. Allocation to training depended on the boy's identified English and mathematics support needs and skills preference. Options included academic subjects (such as business), dedicated functional skills, prison radio, art, pre-apprenticeship vocational training in painting and decorating and engineering, interpersonal and social skills development in horticulture, healthy living and catering.
- 3.16** The training and education programme was purposefully structured to enhance personal development and creativity. More vocational training had been introduced since the last inspection, but was still limited. The broad and balanced curriculum enabled individuals to follow one of 21 pathways in vocational training or classroom learning. Activity clubs provided alternative activities, such as those taking place in the last hour of long sessions. Although provision covered a broad range of subjects, it was very limited up to and above level 1. There was still no training for boys to become peer mentors.

Quality of provision

- 3.17** The quality of teaching and coaching was good. Experienced and capable teachers were adept in the classroom and workshop, and adjusted lessons according to the situation. They challenged poor behaviour appropriately and set clear boundaries that learners were well aware of. Lessons were well paced and teachers incorporated a mix of activities to maintain learner interests. Functional skills were embedded well in most sessions. A minority of teaching staff struggled to make effective use of the interactive whiteboards to enhance and stimulate learning. Managers and fellow teachers supported new and less experienced colleagues very well, and helped them to develop their classroom practice with challenging learners.
- 3.18** Initial assessment during induction was used to identify boys' learning needs well, and helped many settle in the establishment and follow their individual learning plans. Staff were diligent in acquiring information about previous educational achievement and used it well to inform planning. Engagement and resettlement staff reviewed and updated individual learning plans regularly, providing useful records on each learner's progress and the difficulties they were experiencing. Around 36% of the population were identified with an additional learning need. Support for such needs was agreed at induction, and learning support assistants were very responsive to individual needs.
- 3.19** Work in classrooms and vocational training was to a good standard. Most learners made good progress in improving their mathematical understanding, some used complex digital software in music technology and many participated enthusiastically in drama. Learners enjoyed discussing topical issues in English, expressing diverse opinions and respectful to opposing views. Learners in art produced particularly high quality work. A prison radio session enabled young people to record interviews with specialist staff focusing on mental health and well-being. A small minority of learners could have achieved qualifications at a higher level, especially in vocational training.
- 3.20** There was good support for learners unable to attend education. Outreach tutors visited the wings to provide individual support and coaching. Many boys took work back to their rooms to make progress to complete qualifications.
- 3.21** Classroom and workshop resources were generally good. However, the horticulture classroom was insufficiently equipped and inappropriate to teach this practical subject, even at entry level.

Recommendation

- 3.22** **There should be sufficient resources to support the practical teaching of vocational training, especially horticulture, and to extend learning to higher levels.**

Personal development and behaviour

- 3.23** The curriculum gave considerable attention to boys' personal and social development. Boys gained confidence and developed personal and social skills during their learning, which also helped many to understand their behaviour and how they could reduce their risk of reoffending. Many had learned to relate appropriately to others, express their own views maturely and value the opinions of others. In the later stages of their sentence, many began to develop a sense of purpose and achievement necessary to learn and gain qualifications.

Most learners were enthusiastic and well motivated to gain a qualification and complete their courses.

- 3.24** Boys' behaviour in sessions was generally good, and most were respectful of each other and staff. However, the failure of prison staff to get boys to and from lessons punctually hampered the development of the skills they needed for resettlement. (See main recommendation S40.)

Education and vocational achievements

- 3.25** Achievements in education and vocational training were good. Almost all learners who completed their courses gained qualifications and made improvements on their starting points. Achievement of functional skills qualifications or parts of qualifications in English and mathematics were very good, although mathematics at level 2 required improving. Learners produced good work, and a considerable amount had been presented for Koestler Trust awards – the awards scheme for art by offenders. Many learners who had previously been excluded from school or left with no qualifications completed their courses and gained qualifications. Around 20% of starters left the establishment before completing their pathway, and not all gained a qualification for their work.
- 3.26** There were no significant gaps in the achievement of skills or qualifications by different groups of learners, but there had been no analysis to investigate other factors that impacted on achievements.

Library

- 3.27** The library provided space for independent and group study, and was well used by the boys. There had been progress to integrate the library into the education programme, and weekly visits linked well with the topics followed in the classroom. These library visits were used well to research information, gather data and provide all boys with the opportunity to acquire books for personal reading. Only learners on education courses had access to the library. Self-excluders or those on the Cedar, segregation or progressive wings could request books from a library catalogue.
- 3.28** Young people responded well to reading projects, such as 'reading ahead', and themed weeks involving festivals, topics or a focus on a specific author. The library also hosted interesting external speakers. Boys also had appropriate access to newspapers and periodicals.

Physical education and healthy living

Expected outcomes:

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

- 3.29** The facilities for physical training and activities were adequate. Most, but not all, boys attended an induction to the gym, which was minimal and lacked sufficient focus on healthy living and well-being. The induction included perfunctory training in lifting techniques and aspects of the Heartstart basic life support course. Induction sessions were too often curtailed due to incidents elsewhere in the establishment and regime staffing problems.

- 3.30** All boys on learning programmes had access to the gym and could choose to attend additional session in the evenings and at weekends. Qualified staff managed the facility but there were too few to offer the accredited courses previously offered. Sessions were limited to recreational sports, games and individual training. The previous recommendation to introduce competitive community based sports had been accepted but had not happened.
- 3.31** Too many boys did not go to the gym, either because they were not interested or there were no appropriate sessions. There were no specific sessions for those needing to lose weight, recovering from injury or with health care concerns. Boys with injuries known to health care were restricted from all physical activities and locked in their rooms while others attended the gym.
- 3.32** Although the sports hall roof had been repaired, the all-weather pitches, which were heavily used, required maintenance and repair. Changing and showering facilities were satisfactory but most boys preferred to shower back on their wing.

Recommendations

- 3.33** The gym should reintroduce appropriate accredited training courses.
- 3.34** There should be urgent maintenance and repair work to the all-weather sports facilities.

Section 4. Resettlement

Pre-release and resettlement

Expected outcomes:

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

- 4.1 The reducing reoffending strategy was informed by a needs analysis from 2015. The strategy covered the role of the casework team as well as the needs of specific groups of boys, including those transitioning to the adult estate and boys with looked-after status.
- 4.2 Monthly resettlement meetings reviewed boys coming up to release and the work of each resettlement pathway. Attendance at the meetings was reasonable, and sometimes included the South London and North East London resettlement consortiums and other external agencies providing resettlement support – with whom there were effective links. Work on some pathways had slowed, but this was being addressed. There was insufficient strategic oversight of resettlement actions in the establishment's consolidated action plan.
- 4.3 The casework team managed cases efficiently. In our survey, 56% of boys said their caseworker had helped them prepare for release, against the comparator of 41%. The team combined officer, social work and youth offending team (YOT) staff, each with a caseload of about 20 boys. The team also included two looked-after apprentices who provided administrative support. They each had personal experience of the care system, which provided a user perspective to the casework team and other professionals caring for the boys with looked-after status. Boys assessed as being high risk to others and those deemed to be a risk to themselves were assigned to the more experienced caseworkers. Duty caseworkers were available each day to cover for absent caseworker.
- 4.4 Support for boys who moved to an adult prison after their 18th birthday was progressing well, although relationships with the adult establishments varied. Staff at Cookham Wood attempted to manage the expectations of all concerned, including the boy and his family.
- 4.5 Release on temporary licence (ROTL) was now used more than at the previous inspection, and was organised well. There had been 439 such releases in the previous six months, averaging about six boys a month. ROTL was offered for a variety of reasons, including apprenticeships, work experience, interviews, family work and visits in the visitors' centre (see paragraph 4.34). The community engagement manager was working to increase the opportunities available but found that some organisations were wary of the age group. Boys were given information about ROTL as part of their induction, and for some it was motivation to do well at Cookham Wood.
- 4.6 Early release arrangements were used appropriately and 22 boys had achieved early release in 2016 to date. Four boys had been released on home detention curfew (HDC) in the previous six months.
- 4.7 Follow-up data on boys' progress after their release was limited, which prevented managers assessing the long-term effectiveness of the work with boys.

Recommendation

- 4.8** There should be a young people's estate-wide approach to enable young offender institutions to collect data systematically to determine the resettlement and reoffending outcomes for boys released into the community.

Good practice

- 4.9** *Young people with experience of the care system were employed as apprentices in the administrative support team.*

Training planning and remand management

Expected outcomes:

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

- 4.10** There were regular remand and training planning meetings, which were well attended by YOT workers and, for about half of boys, by family members. Attendance by other departments was limited and written contributions were not always submitted. (See main recommendation S41.) Some reviews were curtailed or cancelled due to incidents of poor behaviour by some boys that temporarily stopped other boys moving around the site. One review that we observed was delayed by over 25 minutes due to on-site incidents. In the previous six months, between 10 and 17 hours a month had been lost waiting for boys to get to reviews.
- 4.11** All the cases we looked at had a plan, but in our survey less than half of respondents knew they had one. The quality was variable and some targets were too generic - for example, 'learn how to comply with rules' and 'avoid fights and assaults'. It was not clear how some targets addressed identified risk factors or contributed to reducing reoffending, or how the boy's behaviour would be assessed to measure progress in reducing risk. The lack of involvement by other departments in remand and training planning meetings affected the achievement of an establishment-wide approach to reducing reoffending. (See main recommendation S41.)

Public protection

- 4.12** Reception screening identified boys for whom there might be public protection concerns. The monthly interdepartmental risk management board (IRMB) reviewed new arrivals and made decisions about their subsequent monitoring or restrictions on contact. The IRMB also reviewed all boys due to be released in the coming month to check that there were plans for identified risks in release arrangements. Attendance at the IRMB was generally reasonable, although it rarely included the full range of identified participants.
- 4.13** YOTs were contacted to find out if new arrivals were subject to multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) and, if so, at what level. Initial screening included identification of boys convicted of a MAPPA offence, with the implications of this included in their induction casework interview. Decisions on MAPPA levels were made by external YOT workers. Nine boys were subject to level 1 arrangements (the lowest risk management level)

and two to level 2 during the inspection. Boys subject to MAPPA were reviewed each month by the IRMT. Arrangements for the preparation of MAPPA F reports (assessments for community meetings) were managed well, and those we reviewed had been completed appropriately.

Indeterminate sentence young people

- 4.14** No boys were serving indeterminate sentences at the time of the inspection; 14 boys were serving sentences of over five years. Although there was no additional provision or services for those with long or indeterminate sentences, there was sufficient expertise in the casework team to manage and support appropriately boys on such a sentence or who might potentially receive one.

Looked-after children

- 4.15** Support for looked-after boys had been strengthened since the previous inspection. They were identified soon after their arrival and each boy had an interview with one of the three social workers seconded to the establishment (an additional social worker had been appointed since the previous inspection). This interview obtained the necessary background information, and the relevant local authorities were contacted about their responsibilities to the boy while he was at Cookham Wood. A social worker held a fortnightly surgery that enabled looked-after boys to ask questions and raise concerns outside their formal reviews.
- 4.16** Despite the efforts of the social work team, the support provided by local authorities was variable. Pocket money was not always sent consistently or promptly. Statutory care reviews generally took place within the required timescales, but the provision of accommodation on release remained a concern for some looked-after boys.
- 4.17** In our survey, only 18% of looked-after boys said they received a weekly visit from family or friends, compared with 51% of other boys. Social workers said that adoption or special guardianship orders had broken down for some of the looked-after group.

Reintegration planning

Expected outcomes:

Children and young people's resettlement needs are addressed prior to release.

An effective multi-agency response is used to meet the specific needs of each individual young person in order to maximise the likelihood of successful reintegration into the community.

- 4.18** Release planning was discussed from an early stage in a boy's stay at Cookham Wood to prepare for all aspects of his care after release. Caseworkers arranged for all released boys to be met at the gate by a suitable adult to take them to their destination. Practical arrangements on the day of release were organised efficiently, and included a final check that boys knew the conditions on which they were being released. There was a supply of clothing for boys who had nothing suitable to wear on release, or new clothes could be handed in. Boys were given unmarked holdalls for their personal belongings.

Accommodation

- 4.19** In our survey, more boys than the comparator thought they would have difficulty finding accommodation on release. Many boys returned to live with their family on release. Potential difficulties with housing were identified early in the training planning process. For boys on remand, consideration was given to where they would live if released from court. Boys who were looked after or turned 18 while in custody had the most uncertainty about their release accommodation. Caseworkers and social workers assisted such boys, and the independent Barnardo's advocacy service provided extra support - if necessary, instigating legal action on boys' behalf. The London resettlement consortiums provided boys in their areas with an address two weeks before release, but boys from elsewhere were not offered such a service and some were uncertain where they would be living until close to their release date. This affected other aspects of release planning, such as arranging education or training placements or community support.
- 4.20** In the previous six months, no boys had been released without a confirmed address to go to. However, two boys had been released to bed and breakfast or hostel accommodation, which were inappropriate placements for children; four 18-year-olds had been released to similar accommodation.

Recommendation

- 4.21** **The Youth Justice Board should work with relevant government departments to ensure that boys are not released from custody into bed and breakfast or hostel accommodation.**

Education, training and employment

- 4.22** The contract for careers information, advice and guidance had moved to Novus shortly before the inspection, and was delivered by the in-house engagement and resettlement caseworkers. Staff were gaining specialist qualifications. A few boys leaving the establishment went on a pre-release life skills course, which helped them develop the skills required to cope with resettlement. The certificated course included cooking, domestic chores and budgeting, and was well received by most participants.
- 4.23** The team covered initial assessment and ongoing casework, and took into account young people's offending behaviour history. The collation and use of data were insufficient, and managers were planning to set benchmark data to track young people's progression into education, training or employment.
- 4.24** The 'virtual campus' – giving boys internet access to community education, training and employment opportunities – was still not available to support learning or provide access to careers advice or employment opportunities.

Recommendations

- 4.25** **The establishment should maintain effective records to monitor the destinations and sustained employment or training of the young people who leave.**
- 4.26** **The virtual campus should be used to enable boys to access up-to-date employment, education and training opportunities.** (Repeated recommendation 4.37)

Health care

- 4.27** Boys were given a pre-discharge health questionnaire, which informed a pre-discharge GP appointment, the issue of any take-home prescribed medicines and external follow-up hospital care. A summary of the clinical record was forwarded to the young person's registered GP and a copy given to them. Prescribed medicines were given to responsible adults supporting the release. Health staff attended resettlement pre-release meetings to support young people with complex needs. Those with continuing mental health needs were linked with their local child and adolescent mental health service (CAMHS) team and/or adult services.

Drugs and alcohol

- 4.28** The substance misuse service contributed to training plans and prioritised attendance at final detention and training order (DTO) reviews. There were good links with community YOTs, especially in Lewisham. Substance misuse workers followed up boys' progress two weeks after their release and, where possible, attended their first community review.

Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.29** Work in this area was underdeveloped. The life skills course included some work on money management. Plans for boys to open bank accounts had not worked out, but further work had developed this option and the first application for an account was made shortly before the inspection.
- 4.30** Caseworkers helped boys to obtain National Insurance numbers if needed, but there was no advice about welfare benefits or links with Jobcentre Plus. There was no support for boys who had problems with debt, other than that provided by caseworkers individually. Despite the establishment's efforts, there was no specialist advice for boys who gambled.

Recommendation

- 4.31** **Boys should receive comprehensive advice and guidance on finance, benefit and debt.**

Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.32** Work to identify young men who were also fathers remained underdeveloped, and there were still no parenting or relationship courses or any other provision for young fathers.
- 4.33** Bimonthly family days continued and had good feedback from the boys and families able to attend. However, this opportunity was still unavailable to boys who were not on or nearing the enhanced level of the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme. This was a missed opportunity to work with the more challenging boys and their families.
- 4.34** The visitors' centre was open for families half an hour before visits, and staff were welcoming and helpful. The visits area had improved substantially, and there were now toilets accessible for both visitors and boys. However, there was no play area or toys for younger children visiting, and boys still had to wear yellow bibs to identify them during the visits.

- 4.35** Boys assessed as suitable for ROTL could have visits outside the gates in an area next to the visitors' centre.

Recommendations

- 4.36** **Children and families services should be developed further to meet the needs of boys who are fathers, such as parenting and relationship courses and Storybook Dads.** (See recommendation 4.45 in Appendix II)
- 4.37** **Family days should be available to boys on all levels of the IEP scheme.** (Repeated recommendation 4.46)
- 4.38** **There should be a suitably equipped play area for younger children in the visits area.**

Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.39** Since the last inspection, the YOI had introduced some accredited and approved programmes used across the juvenile estate, which was a positive step. There was also some locally approved groupwork, which included the 'Most Valuable Player' (MVP), which was being assessed for accreditation (see paragraph 4.42).
- 4.40** The roll-out of accredited programmes had been hampered by delays in central training for facilitators and the 'keep apart' list restricting the boys who could be placed in groups together. The second Juvenile Estate Thinking Skills Programme (JETS) group of the year was running during the inspection with four participants, with three more groups scheduled for the year. Only up to 30 boys a year could take part, while the waiting list had over 60 boys identified as likely to benefit from the programme. A few boys had taken part in the approved programmes STAG (starve the anger gremlin) and A-Z, which focused on motivation to change. These were run as both group and one-to-one interventions. However, learning from interventions was not reinforced on residential units, which was a missed opportunity to support boys in changing their behaviour.
- 4.41** We were told that boys who presented the highest risk were prioritised for interventions, and boys in the segregation unit and on the BI progression programme were targeted for individual work.
- 4.42** The MVP groupwork course focused on reducing violence, gang issues and emotional literacy. Two groups of 10 were running during the inspection, and another three boys were completing the programme individually. One of the casework team provided an intervention on knife crime. The health and well-being team provided groupwork for boys with emotional control or self-esteem issues, and also offered appropriate assessment and focused individual work with boys with sexually harmful behaviour and victims of sexual abuse. The team continued to be integrated into meetings when the care of boys was discussed.

Recommendations

- 4.43** **Staff who deliver interventions should be trained promptly to maximise the number of boys who can benefit from the programmes offered. [NOMS]**
- 4.44** **Learning from programmes should be reinforced by staff across the establishment.** (Repeated recommendation 4.53)

Section 5. Summary of recommendations and good practice

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

Main recommendations

To the governor

- 5.1 Systems for reporting and managing violent behaviour should be accurate and used to reduce levels of violence. Case management for all boys on PACT, particularly those on the progression unit, should be multidisciplinary, and include a positive and decent regime. (S39)
- 5.2 Cookham Wood should ensure that boys are able to attend on time the activities and specialist appointments necessary for their management and care. (S40)
- 5.3 Individual training and remand planning targets should be specific and address identified risks of reoffending and harm. Staff from all relevant departments should be represented at training planning or remand management reviews, or submit a detailed report if they cannot attend. (S41)

Recommendation

To NOMS

- 5.4 Staff who deliver interventions should be trained promptly to maximise the number of boys who can benefit from the programmes offered. (4.43)

Recommendation

To the Youth Justice Board and NOMS

- 5.5 There should be a young people's estate-wide approach to enable young offender institutions to collect data systematically to determine the resettlement and reoffending outcomes for boys released into the community. (4.8)

Recommendation To the Youth Justice Board, NOMS and escort provider

- 5.6 Young people should be transported from court to the establishment as soon as possible after their hearing ends to reduce waiting and journey times, and assist early settlement on their first night. (1.4)

Recommendations

To the Youth Justice Board

- 5.7 Boys should only be allocated to Cookham Wood when it is clear that the establishment can meet their needs. (1.6, repeated recommendation 1.8)
- 5.8 Boys should arrive at the establishment with their Asset paperwork so that comprehensive risk assessments can be completed. (1.13)

- 5.9** The Youth Justice Board should work with relevant government departments to ensure that boys are not released from custody into bed and breakfast or hostel accommodation. (4.21)

Recommendations

To the governor

Courts, escort and transfers

- 5.10** Waits on cellular vehicles should be kept to a minimum, especially for new arrivals. (1.5)

Early days in custody

- 5.11** Cells on the first night unit should be fully equipped and ready for use before boys are accommodated in them. (1.12, repeated recommendation 1.19)
- 5.12** Staff on the induction wing should hand over all relevant information about new boys to staff on the following shift. (1.14)

Child protection

- 5.13** Documentation supporting child protection referrals should be submitted to the local authority designated officer without delay. (1.21)

Behaviour management

- 5.14** The role, working practices and aims of the progression unit on B1 should be specified and published. (1.33)

Rewards and sanctions

- 5.15** The removal of basic amenities, such as kettles, should not form part of the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme. (1.37)
- 5.16** Young people should not be punished without a full investigation of the facts. (1.38)

The use of force

- 5.17** Use of force documents should be completed fully, quickly and kept together. (1.57)

Separation/removal from normal location

- 5.18** Living conditions in the segregation unit should be improved, and cells and communal areas should be kept clean, graffiti-free and well maintained. (1.62)
- 5.19** The regime for young people in the segregation unit should be improved and include time out of cell activities that are consistently available. (1.63)

Substance misuse

- 5.20** There should be robust and reliable provision of monitoring and observation services should any boy need clinical substance misuse services. (1.68)

Residential units

- 5.21** Boys on remand should not have to wear prison clothes. (2.7, repeated recommendation 2.9)
- 5.22** All prison-issue clothing should fit and be in good repair. (2.8)
- 5.23** Boys' telephone numbers should be cleared quickly to enable them to call close family and friends soon after their arrival. They should have longer time to make telephone calls, and be able to call support organisations such as Samaritans and Childline without restrictions. (2.9)
- 5.24** Applications should be tracked and subject to regular management checks. (2.10)

Relationships between staff and children and young people

- 5.25** All staff should wear their names on their uniform. (2.14, repeated recommendation 2.20)
- 5.26** An effective personal officer scheme should be in place, ensuring that all boys have an identified officer with whom they meet regularly to discuss concerns and needs. (2.15, repeated recommendation 2.19)

Equality and diversity

- 5.27** Representatives from key departments, and equality representatives, should attend the equality action team meetings. (2.21)
- 5.28** The number of equality peer support representatives should be expanded. (2.22)
- 5.29** Consultation for boys with protected characteristics should be formalised to monitor progress on supportive actions identified. (2.31)
- 5.30** Gay and bisexual boys should be reassured that support and advice was available for them and that homophobic behaviour would be robustly addressed. (2.32, repeated recommendation 2.37)

Faith and religious activity

- 5.31** Subject to security concerns, all boys should be able to see a chaplain and attend corporate worship. (2.36, repeated recommendation 2.42)

Complaints

- 5.32** The establishment should investigate and address why boys from a black or minority ethnic background have worse perceptions than white boys about making a complaint. (2.39)

Health services

- 5.33** The reception health treatment room should provide a safe environment for health staff and better visibility for prison staff. (2.53)
- 5.34** Two people should accompany all controlled drugs transported in the prison. (2.64)

- 5.35** Boys should not have excessively long waits for dental services. Best practice guidance for instrument decontamination should be followed. (2.69)
- 5.36** The regime should support young people's sustained attendance at therapeutic group sessions. (2.74)
- 5.37** Boys who need a secure mental health bed should be transferred as soon as possible. (2.75)

Catering

- 5.38** All meals should be issued at the servery and eaten in association. (2.79, repeated recommendation 2.100)
- 5.39** Boys should be employed to prepare food so that they can achieve related qualifications. (2.80, repeated recommendation 2.101)

Purchases

- 5.40** Boys should be able to place a canteen order within 24 hours of their arrival. (2.83, repeated recommendation 2.105)

Time out of cell

- 5.41** All boys should spend at least 10 hours every day out of their cell and have the opportunity to spend at least one hour in the open air every day. (3.4)
- 5.42** More activities should be available during outside exercise. (3.5, repeated recommendation, 3.7)

Education, learning and skills

- 5.43** Senior prison staff should ensure that the allocation process enables boys to attend the education and training activities that meet their identified needs. (3.12)
- 5.44** Senior prison managers should frequently monitor the performance and quality of all learning delivered by subcontractors to ensure that all learners make progress and that staff are suitably supported. (3.13)
- 5.45** There should be sufficient resources to support the practical teaching of vocational training, especially horticulture, and to extend learning to higher levels. (3.22)

Physical education and healthy living

- 5.46** The gym should reintroduce appropriate accredited training courses. (3.33)
- 5.47** There should be urgent maintenance and repair work to the all-weather sports facilities. (3.34)

Reintegration planning

- 5.48** The establishment should maintain effective records to monitor the destinations and sustained employment or training of the young people who leave. (4.25)

- 5.49** The virtual campus should be used to enable boys to access up-to-date employment, education and training opportunities. (4.26, repeated recommendation 4.37)
- 5.50** Boys should receive comprehensive advice and guidance on finance, benefit and debt. (4.31)
- 5.51** Children and families services should be developed further to meet the needs of boys who are fathers, such as parenting and relationship courses and Storybook Dads. (4.36, see recommendation 4.45 in Appendix II)
- 5.52** Family days should be available to boys on all levels of the IEP scheme. (4.37, repeated recommendation 4.46)
- 5.53** There should be a suitably equipped play area for younger children in the visits area. (4.38)
- 5.54** Learning from programmes should be reinforced by staff across the establishment. (4.44, repeated recommendation 4.53)

Examples of good practice

- 5.55** Boys who submitted discrimination incident reporting forms (DIRFs) were given a satisfaction form enabling their feedback on how they thought their complaint was handled. (2.23)
- 5.56** Medical alert wristbands and the planned pocket guide for prison staff on potentially life-threatening health conditions supported the safety and care of young people. (2.54)
- 5.57** The provision of school health-equivalent hearing and sight tests and an oral health assessment soon after boys arrived maximised the opportunity for early specialist support where needed. (2.59)
- 5.58** Young people experiencing pain at night could request simple pain relief medicines from prison staff, and this was managed safely. (2.65)
- 5.59** Young people with experience of the care system were employed as apprentices in the administrative support team. (4.9)

Section 6. Appendices

Appendix I: Inspection team

Martin Lomas	Deputy chief inspector
Deborah Butler	Team leader
Ian Dickens	Inspector
Fionn Gordon	Inspector
Angela Johnson	Inspector
Gordon Riach	Inspector
Fran Russell	Inspector
Tim McSweeney	Researcher
Helen Ranns	Researcher
Alissa Redmond	Researcher
Paul Roberts	Substance misuse inspector
Nicola Rabjohns	Health services inspector
Malcolm Irons	Care Quality Commission inspector
Martin Hughes	Ofsted inspector
Tony Gallagher	Ofsted inspector

Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report

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

Safety

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

At the last inspection, in 2015, too many boys arrived late at the establishment and there were still long waits in court cells. The reception environment was good and boys were well cared for. First night cells were not always adequately prepared and the behaviour of other residents was intimidating. Induction was reasonably good. Child protection procedures required further improvement. Suicide and self-harm prevention measures were mostly good. Behaviour management was not sufficiently effective in response to significant challenges. Procedural security was mostly appropriate but dynamic security required greater emphasis. Adjudications were in disarray. Levels of violence remained high and measures to reduce violent behaviour were poorly applied. The Cedar unit was a good intervention. Use of force was high and records were not complete. Segregation had improved and boys were well cared for there. Substance misuse services were good. Outcomes for children and young people were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendations

Systems for reporting, analysing and managing violent behaviour should be used effectively to reduce levels of violence, support victims and to make boys feel safe. (S66)

Partially achieved

There should be high expectations of boys and a good range of opportunities to demonstrate good behaviour in all areas of the establishment. The behaviour management policy should be underpinned by the promotion of constructive relationships and its application should ensure that poor behaviour is consistently challenged and good behaviour rewarded. (S67)

Achieved

Recommendations

Boys should only be allocated to Cookham Wood when it is clear that the establishment can meet their needs. (I.8)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, I.6)

Key staff at the establishment, NOMS, the YJB and the escort providers should meet regularly to monitor and resolve problems relating to escort arrangements and ensure that children arrive at the establishment in good time to be assessed and settled on their first night. (I.6)

Not achieved

More use should be made of video links with courts. (I.7)

Not achieved

Cells on the first night unit should be fully equipped and ready for use before boys are accommodated in them. (I.19)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, I.12)

Induction sessions should be designed and delivered in an engaging way. (I.20)

Achieved

There should be a formal peer mentor scheme to provide support to all boys new to the establishment. (I.21)

Achieved

Safeguarding team information reports (STIRs) should be submitted on every appropriate occasion. (I.28)

Achieved

The work of the safeguarding team should be undertaken thoroughly and consistently. (I.29)

Partially achieved

Child protection investigations should be carried out without delay and should be systematically recorded, including actions taken internally. (I.35)

Partially achieved

Children should not be strip-searched under restraint unless all other options have been exhausted, there is a risk to the safety of the child or others, and it has been authorised at a senior level and recorded accordingly. (I.65)

Achieved

Security should be effectively managed with a regular, well attended security meeting which analyses current information about incidents and sets clear objectives to improve safety and security in the establishment. Information reports should be analysed immediately and intelligence-led searches carried out promptly. (I.66)

Achieved

Adjudications should not be used for trivial matters and all adjudications should be heard. (I.67)

Achieved

Pain inducement techniques should not be used during use of force. (I.85)

Not achieved

Force should only be used as a last resort and not to gain compliance. (I.86)

Achieved

Use of force documentation should be completed and use of force recordings should be reviewed swiftly after each incident. (I.87)

Not achieved

Boys should be separated for the shortest time possible. (I.95)

Achieved

All targets set at GOOD reviews should be explained to boys clearly and their understanding checked. (I.96)

Achieved

Safety algorithms should be completed accurately for all boys. (I.97)

Achieved

The establishment should record and monitor the number of boys segregated pending adjudication. (1.98)

Achieved

GOOD documentation should only be signed by those present at reviews. (1.99)

Achieved

Boys with a high level of clinical need should not be placed at the establishment in the absence of 24-hour health care cover and finalised treatment protocols. (1.110)

Partially achieved

A supply reduction strategy should be developed and integrated with the substance misuse strategy so that trends can be identified quickly and remedial action taken. (1.111)

Partially achieved

Respect

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

At the last inspection, in 2015, residential accommodation was reasonable. Access to telephones was delayed for many boys. Relationships between staff and boys varied and the personal officer scheme was not effective. Equality work was improving but more needed to be done to address disadvantage and to improve the management of discrimination complaints. Complaints were managed reasonably well. Health services were mostly good but compromised by poor access to some services. There was impressive mental health provision. Food was reasonable but not enough meals were eaten in association. Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

Recommendations

All accommodation, including landings, should be kept clean and free of graffiti. (2.7)

Partially achieved

Boys should be responsible for cleaning communal areas under the direction of staff. (2.8)

Achieved

Boys on remand should not have to wear prison clothes. (2.9)

Not achieved (repeated recommendation, 2.7)

All applications should be answered promptly. (2.10)

Not achieved

PIN numbers should be added to phones promptly to ensure that boys can communicate with friends and family. (2.11)

Not achieved

Mail and parcels should be delivered to boys promptly. (2.12)

Not achieved

An effective personal officer scheme should be in place, ensuring that all boys have an identified officer with whom they meet regularly to discuss concerns and needs. (2.19)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 2.15)

All staff should wear their names on their uniform. (2.20)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 2.14)

Inequality identified through monitoring data should be investigated and addressed. (2.27)

Achieved

The quality of investigations into discrimination incident reports should be improved and should include effective quality assurance. (2.28)

Achieved

Cultural awareness should be promoted and staff should receive refresher training in equality. (2.35)

Partially achieved

Regular meaningful consultation should be held with all minority groups. (2.36)

Partially achieved

Gay and bisexual boys should be reassured that support and advice was available for them and that homophobic behaviour would be robustly addressed. (2.37)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 2.32)

Subject to security concerns, all boys should be able to see a chaplain and attend corporate worship. (2.42)

Partially achieved (recommendation repeated, 2.36)

Complaints should be quality assured and data and analysis discussed at senior management team meetings. (2.47)

Achieved

The responses to complaints should adequately address the issues raised. (2.48)

Achieved

The health needs assessment should assess the boys' need for dentistry and immunisation and vaccination. (2.67)

Not achieved

Health complaints should be separate from the main complaints system and receipt of complaints should not be recorded in boys' clinical notes. (2.68)

Achieved

Staff members should receive regular documented clinical supervision. (2.69)

Achieved

Children should be able to attend their health appointments on time and did-not-attend rates should be minimised. (2.78)

Partially achieved

Medicine queues should be regulated to ensure that crowding at the hatches does not occur. (2.82)

Achieved

Access to dental services should be improved to reduce the non-attendance rate to acceptable levels and best practice guidance for decontamination should be followed. (2.86)

Not achieved

Boys should be able to access mental health consultations and treatment as clinically indicated. (2.92)

Partially achieved

Health care professionals should not be hampered from seeing their patients. (2.93)

Partially achieved

All meals should be issued at the servery and eaten in association. (2.100)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 2.79)

Boys should be employed to prepare food so that they can achieve related qualifications. (2.101)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 2.80)

Boys should be able to place a canteen order within 24 hours of their arrival. (2.105)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 2.83)

Purposeful activity

Children and young people are able, and expected, to engage in activity that is likely to benefit them.

At the last inspection, in 2015, there was significant slippage in the published core day and we found 36% of boys locked in their cells during the working day. The management of learning and skills had improved and there was some good partnership working, although there were missed opportunities to provide meaningful work. There was a broad education curriculum but vocational training had reduced and delays in movement to activities restricted activity hours. The quality of practical and academic teaching and learning was good but disrupted by some poor behaviour in education. Achievements were also good. Library provision was reasonable but a few boys had no access. PE provision was inadequate. Outcomes for children and young people were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendation

All boys should attend activities during the working day and sessions should start and finish on time. (S68)

Not achieved

Recommendations

All children should spend a minimum of 10 hours every day out of their cell. (3.5)

Not achieved

Boys should be given the opportunity to spend at least one hour in the open air every day. (3.6)

Not achieved

More activities should be available during outside exercise. (3.7)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated 3.5)

Vocational training provision should be increased to provide more opportunities to meet boys' resettlement needs and aspirations. (3.16)

Partially achieved

All boys should be able to attend activities regularly and punctually. (3.17)

Not achieved

The number and range of work activities around the establishment should be increased so that all boys are engaged fully in purposeful activity which meets their resettlement needs. (3.22)

Achieved

Security arrangements should be reviewed to ensure that vocational training programmes above level 1 are offered where appropriate. (3.23)

Not achieved

Teachers should ensure that disruptive behaviour during learning sessions is challenged. (3.27)

Achieved

Staff should set specific targets to develop and record the boys' personal and social skills. (3.28)

Achieved

The library should improve the promotion of literacy across the establishment. (3.33)

Achieved

Maintenance work should be carried out on the all-weather facilities and the sports hall should be repaired as a matter of urgency. (3.39)

Not achieved

Opportunities should be provided for children to engage in community based competitive sports. (3.40)

Not achieved

More accredited programmes should be offered to support boys' resettlement needs. (3.41)

Not achieved

Formal links between the gym and health care staff should be strengthened to ensure that information is shared about boys deemed unfit to participate in activities. (3.42)

Partially achieved

Resettlement

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

At the last inspection, in 2015, a comprehensive needs analysis was being undertaken. Temporary release opportunities were no longer available but plans to reinstate them were progressing. All boys had training plans and review meetings were appropriately focused. Public protection arrangements were sound. We were not confident that the needs of boys with or facing indeterminate sentences were being met. Looked-after children were identified but there was not enough support for them from social workers in the establishment. Reintegration planning was well organised and delivered. Pathway provision was generally good but the children and families pathway was underdeveloped. Some valuable group work programmes and individual work were provided and new interventions were being developed. Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendation

The children and families pathway should be improved by development of relationships programmes and support for boys with parental responsibilities. (S69)

Not achieved

Recommendations

Resettlement and reoffending outcomes for boys released into the community should be systematically collected and used to inform future provision. (4.10)

Not achieved

ROTL opportunities should be made available and all eligible children should be considered for ROTL suitability in good time. (4.11)

Achieved

Training planning and remand management meetings should include staff from all areas who work with the children. (4.18)

Not achieved

Appropriate measures should be developed to ensure that boys with, or facing, indeterminate sentences have the services and support that they need. (4.25)

Partially achieved

The establishment should be clear whether boys with looked-after status receive the support they are entitled to from their local authority. They should make robust efforts on behalf of boys who are not receiving support and check that they are receiving the help they need following release. (4.28)

Achieved

A pre-release course on education, training and employment and resettlement issues should be offered. (4.36)

Achieved

The virtual campus should be used better to enable boys to access up-to-date employment and education and training opportunities. (4.37)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 4.26)

Children and families services should be established to meet the identified needs of boys, such as parenting and relationship courses and Storybook Dads. (4.45)

Not achieved (see recommendation 4.36)

Family days should be available to boys on all levels of the IEP scheme. (4.46)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 4.37)

Toilets should be available near the visits hall for children to use. (4.47)

Achieved

All visits sessions should start on time and be properly organised in a safe manner. (4.48)

Achieved

Learning from programmes should be reinforced by staff across the establishment. (4.53)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 4.44)

Appendix III: Establishment population profile

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

Population breakdown by:

Status	Number of young people	%
Sentenced	120	75.9
Recall	2	1.3
Convicted unsentenced	7	4.4
Remand	29	18.4
Total	158	100

Age	Number of young people	%
15 years	10	6.3
16 years	29	18.4
17 years	102	64.6
18 years	17	10.7
Total	158	100

Nationality	Number of young people	%
British	129	81.6
Foreign nationals	29	18.4
Total	158	100

Ethnicity	Number of young people	%
White		
British	51	32.3
Irish	1	0.6
Gypsy/Irish Traveller	5	3.2
Other white	8	5.1
Mixed		
White and black Caribbean	9	5.7
White and black African	4	2.5
Other mixed	4	2.5
Asian or Asian British		
Indian	2	1.3
Pakistani	4	2.5
Bangladeshi	3	1.9
Other Asian	5	3.2
Black or black British		
Caribbean	25	15.8
African	17	10.8
Other black	19	12.0
Other ethnic group	1	0.6
Total	158	100

Religion	Number of young people	%
Church of England	4	2.5
Roman Catholic	13	8.2
Other Christian denominations	51	32.3
Muslim	39	24.7
No religion	51	32.3
Total	158	100

Sentenced only – length of stay by age

Length of stay	<1 mth	1–3 mths	3–6 mths	6–12 mths	1–2 yrs	Total
Age						
15 years	3	3	1	0	0	7
16 years	2	10	4	3	0	19
17 years	16	26	10	20	7	79
18 years	0	2	3	9	2	16
Total	21	41	18	32	9	121

Unsentenced only – length of stay by age

Length of stay	<1 mth	1–3 mths	3–6 mths	6–12 mths	Total
Age					
15 years	5	1	3	1	10
16 years	10	1	9	3	23
17 years	0	0	1	0	1
18 years	0	0	0	0	0
Total	17	3	13	4	37

Main offence	Number of young people	%
Violence against the person	56	35.4
Sexual offences	8	5.1
Burglary	7	4.4
Robbery	33	20.9
Theft and handling	10	6.3
Drugs offences	27	17.1
Other offences	17	10.8
Total	158	100

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

Sentence	4 mths	6 mths	8 mths	10 mths	12 mths	18 mths	24 mths	Recall	Total
Age									
15 years	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	3
16 years	4	0	0	2	1	3	4	1	15
17 years	8	0	1	3	4	3	17	1	37
18 years	0	0	0	1	0	0	10	0	11
Total	13	0	1	6	6	7	31	2	66

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

Sentence	Under 2 yrs	2–3 yrs	3–4 yrs	4–5 yrs	5 yrs +	Recall	Total
Age							
15 years	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
16 years	1	0	1	2	2	1	7
17 years	2	0	9	10	3	2	26
18 years	1	0	0	1	1	0	3
Total	4	0	10	14	7	3	38

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

Sentence	Under 2 yrs	2–3 yrs	3–4 yrs	4–5 yrs	5 yrs +	Recall	Total
Age							
15 years	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16 years	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
17 years	0	0	0	0	4	0	4
18 years	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Total	0	0	0	0	7	0	7

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

Children and young people survey methodology

Sampling

Questionnaires were offered to all young people.

Distributing and collecting questionnaires

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

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

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

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

Survey response

At the time of the survey on 12 September 2016, the young people's population at HMYOI Cookham Wood was 159. Questionnaires were distributed to 156 young people.⁶

We received a total of 141 completed questionnaires, a response rate of 90%. This included two questionnaires completed via interview. Three respondents refused to complete a questionnaire and 12 questionnaires were not returned.

Wing/Unit	Number of completed survey returns
A	78
B	49
Cedar	10
Phoenix (segregation)	4

Presentation of survey results and analyses

Over the following pages we present the survey results for HMYOI Cookham Wood.

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

⁶ Surveys were not distributed to three young people. One was at court for the day, another was attending hospital and the remaining child was away from the establishment having been released on temporary licence (ROTL).

We also present a number of comparative analyses. In all the comparative analyses that follow, statistically significant⁷ differences are indicated by shading. Results that are significantly better are indicated by green shading, results that are significantly worse are indicated by blue shading. If the difference is not statistically significant there is no shading. Orange shading has been used to show a statistically significant difference in young people's background details.

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

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

The following comparative analyses are presented:

- The current survey responses from HMYOI Cookham Wood in 2016 compared with responses from young people surveyed in all other young offender institutions. This comparator is based on all responses from young people surveys carried out in five YOIs since April 2015.
- The current survey responses from HMYOI Cookham Wood in 2016 compared with the responses of young people surveyed at HMYOI Cookham Wood in 2015.
- A comparison within the 2016 survey between the responses of white young people and those from a black and minority ethnic group.
- A comparison within the 2016 survey between those who are British and those who are foreign nationals.
- A comparison within the 2016 survey between the responses of Muslim young people and non-Muslim young people.
- A comparison within the 2016 survey between the responses of young people who consider themselves to have a disability and those who do not consider themselves to have a disability.

⁷ A statistically significant difference between the two samples is one that is unlikely to have arisen by chance alone, and can therefore be assumed to represent a real difference between the two populations. In order to appropriately adjust p-values in light of multiple testing, $p < 0.01$ was considered statistically significant for all comparisons undertaken. This means there is only a 1% likelihood that the difference is due to chance.

Survey summary

SECTION I: ABOUT YOU

Q1	How old are you?	
	15	10 (7%)
	16	22 (16%)
	17	86 (61%)
	18	22 (16%)
Q2	Are you a British citizen?	
	Yes	122 (87%)
	No	18 (13%)
Q3	Do you understand spoken English?	
	Yes	138 (99%)
	No	1 (1%)
Q4	Do you understand written English?	
	Yes	133 (99%)
	No	2 (1%)
Q5	What is your ethnic origin?	
	White - British	49 (35%)
	White - Irish	4 (3%)
	White - other	3 (2%)
	Black or Black British - Caribbean	18 (13%)
	Black or Black British - African	24 (17%)
	Black or Black British - other	4 (3%)
	Asian or Asian British - Indian	0 (0%)
	Asian or Asian British - Pakistani	4 (3%)
	Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi	3 (2%)
	Asian or Asian British - Chinese	0 (0%)
	Asian or Asian British - other	3 (2%)
	Mixed race - White and Black Caribbean	13 (9%)
	Mixed race - White and Black African	2 (1%)
	Mixed race - White and Asian	1 (1%)
	Mixed race - other	2 (1%)
	Arab	5 (4%)
	Other ethnic group	4 (3%)
Q6	What is your religion?	
	None	40 (29%)
	Church of England	21 (15%)
	Catholic	19 (14%)
	Protestant	0 (0%)
	Other Christian denomination	23 (17%)
	Buddhist	0 (0%)
	Hindu	0 (0%)
	Jewish	0 (0%)
	Muslim	36 (26%)
	Sikh	0 (0%)

Q7	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	
	Yes	14 (10%)
	No	116 (85%)
	Don't know	6 (4%)
Q8	Do you have any children?	
	Yes	11 (8%)
	No	127 (92%)
Q9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability (i.e. do you need help with any long-term physical, mental or learning needs)?	
	Yes	26 (19%)
	No	112 (81%)
Q10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	
	Yes	55 (40%)
	No	83 (60%)

SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE

Q1	Are you sentenced?	
	Yes	108 (78%)
	No - unsentenced/on remand	30 (22%)
Q2	How long is your sentence (the full DTO sentence)?	
	Not sentenced	30 (22%)
	Less than 6 months	21 (15%)
	6 to 12 months	26 (19%)
	More than 12 months, up to 2 years	25 (18%)
	More than 2 years	34 (25%)
	Indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP)	1 (1%)
Q3	How long have you been in this establishment?	
	Less than 1 month	28 (20%)
	1 to 6 months	66 (48%)
	More than 6 months, but less than 12 months	32 (23%)
	12 months to 2 years	11 (8%)
	More than 2 years	1 (1%)
Q4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	
	Yes	86 (62%)
	No	52 (38%)

SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS

Q1	On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?	
	Yes	109 (78%)
	No	11 (8%)
	Don't remember	19 (14%)

Q2	On your most recent journey here, were there any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females travelling with you?	
	Yes	48 (34%)
	No	69 (49%)
	Don't remember	23 (16%)
Q3	On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?	
	Less than 2 hours	67 (48%)
	2 to 4 hours	56 (40%)
	More than 4 hours	12 (9%)
	Don't remember	5 (4%)
Q4	On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?	
	My journey was less than 2 hours	67 (48%)
	Yes	7 (5%)
	No	59 (42%)
	Don't remember	7 (5%)
Q5	On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?	
	My journey was less than 2 hours	67 (49%)
	Yes	28 (20%)
	No	36 (26%)
	Don't remember	7 (5%)
Q6	On your most recent journey here, how did you feel you were treated by the escort staff?	
	Very well	15 (11%)
	Well	57 (42%)
	Neither	43 (31%)
	Badly	4 (3%)
	Very badly	5 (4%)
	Don't remember	13 (9%)
Q7	Before you arrived here, did you receive any information to help you prepare for coming here?	
	Yes - and it was helpful	12 (9%)
	Yes - but it was not helpful	26 (19%)
	No - I received no information	76 (54%)
	Don't remember	26 (19%)

SECTION 4: FIRST DAYS

Q1	How long were you in reception?	
	Less than 2 hours	113 (81%)
	2 hours or longer	12 (9%)
	Don't remember	14 (10%)
Q2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	
	Yes	109 (78%)
	No	17 (12%)
	Don't remember/Not applicable	14 (10%)

Q3	How well did you feel you were treated in reception?			
	Very well		21 (15%)	
	Well		68 (49%)	
	Neither		35 (25%)	
	Badly		5 (4%)	
	Very badly		3 (2%)	
	Don't remember		6 (4%)	
Q4	When you first arrived here, did staff ask if you needed help or support with any of the following things? (Please tick all that apply to you.)			
	Not being able to smoke	65 (49%)	Money worries	24 (18%)
	Loss of property	22 (16%)	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to	44 (33%)
	Feeling scared	40 (30%)	Health problems	87 (65%)
	Gang problems	82 (61%)	Getting phone numbers	72 (54%)
	Contacting family	89 (66%)	Staff did not ask me about any of these	11 (8%)
Q5	When you first arrived here, did you have any of the following problems? (Please tick all that apply to you.)			
	Not being able to smoke	51 (39%)	Money worries	20 (15%)
	Loss of property	18 (14%)	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to	18 (14%)
	Feeling scared	13 (10%)	Health problems	15 (11%)
	Gang problems	20 (15%)	Getting phone numbers	65 (49%)
	Contacting family	53 (40%)	I did not have any problems	28 (21%)
Q6	When you first arrived here, were you given any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)			
	Toiletries/basic items		125 (91%)	
	The opportunity to have a shower		111 (80%)	
	Something to eat		115 (83%)	
	A free phone call to friends/family		98 (71%)	
	PIN phone credit		72 (52%)	
	Information about feeling worried/upset		51 (37%)	
	Don't remember		2 (1%)	
	I was not given any of these		2 (1%)	
Q7	Within your first 24 hours here, did you have access to the following people or services? (Please tick all that apply to you.)			
	Chaplain		71 (54%)	
	Peer mentor		16 (12%)	
	Childline/Samaritans		26 (20%)	
	The prison shop/canteen		11 (8%)	
	Don't remember		29 (22%)	
	I did not have access to any of these		35 (27%)	
Q8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?			
	Yes		106 (76%)	
	No		24 (17%)	
	Don't remember		10 (7%)	

Q9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	
	Yes	103 (74%)
	No	19 (14%)
	Don't remember	17 (12%)
Q10	Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the establishment?	
	<i>I have not been on an induction course</i>	10 (7%)
	Yes	66 (48%)
	No	46 (33%)
	Don't remember	16 (12%)

SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT

Q1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	
	Yes	135 (98%)
	No	3 (2%)
	Don't know	0 (0%)
Q2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	
	Yes	27 (20%)
	No	103 (75%)
	Don't know	7 (5%)
Q3	What is the food like here?	
	Very good	2 (1%)
	Good	18 (13%)
	Neither	45 (33%)
	Bad	40 (29%)
	Very bad	32 (23%)
Q4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	
	<i>I have not bought anything yet/Don't know</i>	7 (5%)
	Yes	62 (45%)
	No	69 (50%)
Q5	How easy is it for you to attend religious services?	
	<i>I don't want to attend religious services</i>	23 (17%)
	Very easy	24 (17%)
	Easy	24 (17%)
	Neither	20 (14%)
	Difficult	12 (9%)
	Very difficult	9 (7%)
	Don't know	26 (19%)
Q6	Are your religious beliefs respected?	
	Yes	72 (52%)
	No	20 (14%)
	Don't know/Not applicable	47 (34%)
Q7	Can you speak to a chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?	
	Yes	78 (56%)
	No	11 (8%)
	Don't know/Not applicable	50 (36%)

Q8	Can you speak to a peer mentor when you need to?	
	Yes	42 (30%)
	No	26 (18%)
	Don't know	73 (52%)
Q9	Can you speak to a member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board) when you need to?	
	Yes	26 (18%)
	No	29 (21%)
	Don't know	86 (61%)
Q10	Can you speak to an advocate (an outside person to help you) when you need to?	
	Yes	44 (31%)
	No	26 (18%)
	Don't know	71 (50%)

SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF

Q1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	
	Yes	84 (62%)
	No	52 (38%)
Q2	If you had a problem, who would you turn to? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	No-one	26 (20%)
	Personal officer	23 (17%)
	Wing Officer	31 (23%)
	Teacher/education staff	11 (8%)
	Gym staff	8 (6%)
	Chaplain	11 (8%)
	Independent Monitoring Board (IMB)	7 (5%)
	YOT worker	41 (31%)
	Other (please specify)	55 (100%)
	Social worker	13 (10%)
	Health services staff	7 (5%)
	Peer mentor	2 (2%)
	Another young person here	19 (14%)
	Case worker	62 (47%)
	Advocate	5 (4%)
	Family/friends	76 (57%)
	Childline/Samaritans	2 (2%)
Q3	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	
	Yes	43 (31%)
	No	95 (69%)
Q4	When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?	
	I still have not met him/her	52 (38%)
	In your first week	21 (15%)
	After your first week	43 (31%)
	Don't remember	21 (15%)
Q5	How often do you see your personal (named) officer?	
	I still have not met him/her	52 (40%)
	At least once a week	27 (21%)
	Less than once a week	50 (39%)
Q6	Do you feel your personal (named) officer tries to help you?	
	I still have not met him/her	52 (40%)
	Yes	44 (34%)
	No	34 (26%)

SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS

Q1	Is it easy to make an application?	
	Yes	105 (77%)
	No	19 (14%)
	Don't know	12 (9%)
Q2	Are applications sorted out fairly?	
	<i>I have not made an application</i>	10 (8%)
	Yes	48 (40%)
	No	62 (52%)
Q3	Are applications sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	
	<i>I have not made an application</i>	10 (8%)
	Yes	34 (28%)
	No	78 (64%)
Q4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	
	Yes	69 (49%)
	No	28 (20%)
	Don't know	43 (31%)
Q5	Are complaints sorted out fairly?	
	<i>I have not made a complaint</i>	43 (39%)
	Yes	17 (16%)
	No	49 (45%)
Q6	Are complaints sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	
	<i>I have not made a complaint</i>	43 (39%)
	Yes	13 (12%)
	No	53 (49%)
Q7	Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint?	
	Yes	14 (10%)
	No	77 (57%)
	Never needed to make a complaint	43 (32%)

SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE

Q1	What level of the rewards and sanctions scheme are you on?	
	<i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i>	5 (4%)
	<i>Enhanced (top)</i>	37 (26%)
	<i>Standard (middle)</i>	67 (48%)
	<i>Basic (bottom)</i>	25 (18%)
	Don't know	7 (5%)
Q2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the rewards and sanctions scheme?	
	<i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i>	5 (4%)
	Yes	46 (35%)
	No	64 (48%)
	Don't know	18 (14%)

Q3	Do the different levels of the rewards and sanctions scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	
	<i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i>	5 (4%)
	Yes	55 (43%)
	No	52 (40%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	17 (13%)
Q4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	
	Yes	51 (37%)
	No	34 (25%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	53 (38%)
Q5	If you have had a minor report, was the process explained clearly to you?	
	<i>I have not had a minor report</i>	87 (64%)
	Yes	29 (21%)
	No	20 (15%)
Q6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	
	Yes	103 (74%)
	No	31 (22%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	5 (4%)
Q7	If you have had an adjudication ('nicking'), was the process explained clearly to you?	
	<i>I have not had an adjudication</i>	36 (26%)
	Yes	86 (62%)
	No	17 (12%)
Q8	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	
	Yes	69 (50%)
	No	59 (43%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	10 (7%)
Q9	If you have spent a night in the care and separation unit (CSU), how were you treated by staff?	
	<i>I have not been to the care and separation unit</i>	108 (81%)
	Very well	4 (3%)
	Well	4 (3%)
	Neither	3 (2%)
	Badly	9 (7%)
	Very badly	5 (4%)

SECTION 9: SAFETY

Q1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	
	Yes	50 (36%)
	No	88 (64%)
Q2	Do you feel unsafe now?	
	Yes	13 (10%)
	No	122 (90%)

Q3	In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Never felt unsafe	88 (67%)
	Everywhere	15 (11%)
	Care and separation unit	3 (2%)
	Association areas	10 (8%)
	Reception area	2 (2%)
	At the gym	5 (4%)
	In an exercise yard	10 (8%)
	At work	2 (2%)
	At education	12 (9%)
	At religious services	4 (3%)
	At meal times	4 (3%)
	At healthcare	2 (2%)
	Visits area	14 (11%)
	In wing showers	1 (1%)
	In gym showers	2 (2%)
	In corridors/stairwells	5 (4%)
	On your landing/wing	7 (5%)
	During movement	9 (7%)
	In your cell	11 (8%)
Q4	Have you ever been victimised by another young person/group of young people here (e.g. insulted or assaulted you)?	
	Yes	28 (20%)
	No	109 (80%)
Q5	If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply.)	
	Insulting remarks (about you, your family or friends)	16 (12%)
	Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)	15 (11%)
	Sexual abuse	2 (1%)
	Feeling threatened or intimidated	11 (8%)
	Having your canteen/property taken	1 (1%)
	Medication	0 (0%)
	Debt	3 (2%)
	Drugs	1 (1%)
	Your race or ethnic origin	5 (4%)
	Your religion/religious beliefs	2 (1%)
	Your nationality	4 (3%)
	You are from a different part of the country to others	1 (1%)
	You are from a Traveller community	1 (1%)
	Your sexuality	0 (0%)
	Your age	1 (1%)
	You having a disability	2 (1%)
	You were new here	8 (6%)
	Your offence/crime	4 (3%)
	Gang related issues	10 (7%)
Q7	Have you ever been victimised by staff here (e.g. insulted or assaulted you)?	
	Yes	34 (25%)
	No	104 (75%)

Q8	If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you, your family or friends)</i>	20 (14%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	17 (12%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	13 (9%)
	<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i>	8 (6%)
	<i>Medication</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>Debt</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Drugs</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	7 (5%)
	<i>Your nationality</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>You are from a different part of the country to others</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>You are from a Traveller community</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Your sexuality</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Your age</i>	5 (4%)
	<i>You having a disability</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>You were new here</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>Your offence/crime</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Gang related issues</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>Because you made a complaint</i>	9 (7%)

Q10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	
	Yes	32 (27%)
	No	58 (49%)
	Don't know	29 (24%)

Q11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	
	Yes	28 (21%)
	No	47 (35%)
	Don't know	59 (44%)

Q12	Is shouting through the windows a problem here?	
	Yes	58 (43%)
	No	62 (46%)
	Don't know	14 (10%)

SECTION 10: HEALTH SERVICES

Q1	Is it easy to see the following people if you need to?			
		Yes	No	Don't know
	The doctor	69 (51%)	43 (32%)	23 (17%)
	The nurse	93 (68%)	23 (17%)	20 (15%)
	The dentist	32 (24%)	77 (57%)	26 (19%)

Q2	What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?	
	<i>I have not been</i>	11 (8%)
	<i>Very good</i>	12 (9%)
	<i>Good</i>	59 (44%)
	<i>Neither</i>	24 (18%)
	<i>Bad</i>	16 (12%)
	<i>Very bad</i>	13 (10%)

Q3	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/all of it in your room?	
	<i>I am not taking any medication</i>	66 (49%)
	<i>Yes, all of my meds</i>	11 (8%)
	<i>Yes, some of my meds</i>	20 (15%)
	<i>No</i>	39 (29%)
Q4	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?	
	<i>Yes</i>	33 (25%)
	<i>No</i>	97 (75%)
Q5	Are you being helped by anyone here with your emotional or mental health problems (e.g. a psychologist, doctor, counsellor, personal officer or another member of staff)?	
	<i>I do not have any emotional or mental health problems</i>	97 (73%)
	<i>Yes</i>	21 (16%)
	<i>No</i>	14 (11%)
Q6	Did you have problems with alcohol when you first arrived here?	
	<i>Yes</i>	9 (7%)
	<i>No</i>	126 (93%)
Q7	Have you received any help with alcohol problems here?	
	<i>Yes</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>No</i>	131 (97%)
Q8	Did you have problems with drugs when you first arrived here?	
	<i>Yes</i>	33 (24%)
	<i>No</i>	102 (76%)
Q9	Do you have problems with drugs now?	
	<i>Yes</i>	8 (6%)
	<i>No</i>	127 (94%)
Q10	Have you received any help with drugs problems here?	
	<i>Yes</i>	16 (12%)
	<i>No</i>	120 (88%)
Q11	How easy or difficult is it to get illegal drugs here?	
	<i>Very easy</i>	11 (8%)
	<i>Easy</i>	10 (8%)
	<i>Neither</i>	9 (7%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	22 (17%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	77 (58%)

SECTION II: ACTIVITIES

Q1	How old were you when you were last at school?	
	<i>14 or under</i>	52 (38%)
	<i>15 or over</i>	84 (62%)
Q2	Have you ever been excluded from school?	
	<i>Yes</i>	121 (88%)
	<i>No</i>	11 (8%)
	<i>Not applicable</i>	5 (4%)

Q3	Did you ever skip school before you came into custody?				
	Yes				99 (73%)
	No				31 (23%)
	Not applicable				6 (4%)
Q4	Do you CURRENTLY take part in any of the following activities? (Please tick all that apply to you.)				
	Education				111 (80%)
	A job in this establishment				15 (11%)
	Vocational or skills training				10 (7%)
	Offending behaviour programmes				28 (20%)
	I am not currently involved in any of these				23 (17%)
Q5	If you have been involved in any of the following activities here, do you think they will help you when you leave prison?				
		Not been involved	Yes	No	Don't know
	Education	9 (7%)	79 (60%)	26 (20%)	18 (14%)
	A job in this establishment	36 (41%)	19 (22%)	18 (20%)	15 (17%)
	Vocational or skills training	31 (37%)	16 (19%)	16 (19%)	21 (25%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	23 (24%)	39 (41%)	17 (18%)	16 (17%)
Q6	Do you usually have association every day?				
	Yes				46 (34%)
	No				90 (66%)
Q7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?				
	Don't want to go				7 (5%)
	Yes				106 (78%)
	No				23 (17%)
Q8	How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?				
	Don't want to go				3 (2%)
	None				19 (14%)
	One to two times				57 (43%)
	Three to five times				53 (40%)
	More than five times				2 (1%)

SECTION 12: FAMILY AND FRIENDS

Q1	Are you able to use the telephone every day, if you want to?			
	Yes			121 (88%)
	No			16 (12%)
	Don't know			0 (0%)
Q2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?			
	Yes			73 (53%)
	No			52 (38%)
	Don't know			13 (9%)

Q3	How many visits do you usually have each week, from family or friends?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	28 (22%)
	<i>Less than one a week</i>	41 (32%)
	<i>About one a week</i>	41 (32%)
	<i>More than one a week</i>	7 (5%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	11 (9%)
Q4	How easy is it for your family and friends to visit you here?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	28 (21%)
	<i>Very easy</i>	7 (5%)
	<i>Easy</i>	34 (25%)
	<i>Neither</i>	20 (15%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	26 (19%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	10 (7%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	9 (7%)
Q5	Do your visits usually start on time?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	28 (21%)
	<i>Yes</i>	62 (46%)
	<i>No</i>	33 (24%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	12 (9%)

SECTION 13: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE

Q1	Do you think you will have a problem with any of the following things, when you are released? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Finding accommodation</i>	50 (38%)
	<i>Getting into school or college</i>	55 (41%)
	<i>Getting a job</i>	70 (53%)
	<i>Money/finances</i>	42 (32%)
	<i>Claiming benefits</i>	14 (11%)
	<i>Continuing health services</i>	15 (11%)
	<i>Opening a bank account</i>	17 (13%)
	<i>Avoiding bad relationships</i>	18 (14%)
	<i>I won't have any problems</i>	42 (32%)
Q2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan? (i.e. a plan that is discussed in your DTO/planning meetings, which sets out your targets)	
	<i>Yes</i>	58 (43%)
	<i>No</i>	45 (33%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	32 (24%)
Q3	Were you involved in the development of your plan?	
	<i>I don't have a plan/don't know if I have a plan</i>	77 (58%)
	<i>Yes</i>	47 (35%)
	<i>No</i>	9 (7%)
Q4	Do you understand the targets that have been set in your plan?	
	<i>I don't have a plan/don't know if I have a plan</i>	77 (57%)
	<i>Yes</i>	52 (39%)
	<i>No</i>	5 (4%)

Q5	Do you have a caseworker here?		
	Yes		128 (93%)
	No		3 (2%)
	Don't know		6 (4%)
Q6	Has your caseworker helped to prepare you for release?		
	<i>I don't have a caseworker</i>		9 (7%)
	Yes		70 (53%)
	No		37 (28%)
	Don't know		17 (13%)
Q7	Has your social worker been to visit you since you have been here?		
	<i>I don't have a social worker</i>		39 (29%)
	Yes		67 (50%)
	No		29 (21%)
Q8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?		
	Yes		57 (42%)
	No		50 (37%)
	Don't know		29 (21%)
Q9	Do you know who to contact for help with any of the following problems, before your release? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	<i>Finding accommodation</i>		36 (31%)
	<i>Getting into school or college</i>		41 (36%)
	<i>Getting a job</i>		38 (33%)
	<i>Help with money/finances</i>		27 (23%)
	<i>Help with claiming benefits</i>		21 (18%)
	<i>Continuing health services</i>		21 (18%)
	<i>Opening a bank account</i>		25 (22%)
	<i>Avoiding bad relationships</i>		17 (15%)
	<i>I don't know who to contact</i>		62 (54%)
Q10	What is most likely to stop you offending in the future? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	30 (22%)	<i>Having a mentor (someone you can ask for advice)</i> 10 (7%)
	<i>Nothing, it is up to me</i>	44 (32%)	<i>Having a YOT worker or social worker that I get on with</i> 20 (15%)
	<i>Making new friends outside</i>	21 (15%)	<i>Having children</i> 23 (17%)
	<i>Going back to live with my family</i>	26 (19%)	<i>Having something to do that isn't crime</i> 27 (20%)
	<i>Getting a place of my own</i>	39 (29%)	<i>This sentence</i> 31 (23%)
	<i>Getting a job</i>	51 (38%)	<i>Getting into school/college</i> 30 (22%)
	<i>Having a partner (girlfriend or boyfriend)</i>	29 (21%)	<i>Talking about my offending behaviour with staff</i> 1 (1%)
	<i>Staying off alcohol/drugs</i>	18 (13%)	<i>Anything else</i> 5 (4%)
Q11	Do you want to stop offending?		
	<i>Not sentenced</i>		30 (23%)
	Yes		87 (65%)
	No		5 (4%)
	Don't know		11 (8%)

Q12	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here, that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	30 (23%)
	Yes	57 (43%)
	No	46 (35%)

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



Survey responses from children and young people: HMYOI Cookham Wood 2016

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

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

Key to tables

		HMYOI Cookham Wood 2016	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Cookham Wood 2016	HMYOI Cookham Wood 2015
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		141	493	141	139
SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU					
1.1	Are you 18 years of age?	16%	13%	16%	10%
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	13%	5%	13%	8%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	99%	100%	99%	99%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	99%	99%	99%	95%
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other category.	60%	43%	60%	60%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	26%	21%	26%	25%
1.7	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	10%	6%	10%	9%
1.8	Do you have any children?	8%	8%	8%	16%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	19%	20%	19%	17%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	40%	36%	40%	41%
SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE					
2.1	Are you sentenced?	78%	79%	78%	67%
2.2	Is your sentence 12 months or less?	34%	31%	34%	27%
2.3	Have you been in this establishment for one month or less?	21%	15%	21%	16%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	62%	61%	62%	55%
SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS					
On your most recent journey here:					
3.1	Did you feel safe?	78%	75%	78%	80%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	34%	36%	34%	25%
3.3	Did you spend more than 4 hours in the van?	9%	8%	9%	6%
For those who spent 2 or more hours in the escort van:					
3.4	Were you offered a toilet break if you needed it?	10%	13%	10%	6%
3.5	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	40%	42%	40%	40%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	53%	53%	53%	52%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	9%	12%	9%	14%

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

Key to tables

		HMYOI Cookham Wood 2016	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Cookham Wood 2016	HMYOI Cookham Wood 2015
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		141	493	141	139
SECTION 4: YOUR FIRST FEW DAYS HERE					
4.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	82%	76%	82%	81%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	78%	79%	78%	86%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	65%	64%	65%	67%
When you first arrived, did staff ask if you needed help or support with any of the following:					
4.4a	Not being able to smoke?	48%	42%	48%	46%
4.4b	Loss of property?	16%	18%	16%	16%
4.4c	Feeling scared?	30%	25%	30%	23%
4.4d	Gang problems?	61%	38%	61%	55%
4.4e	Contacting family?	66%	48%	66%	58%
4.4f	Money worries?	18%	15%	18%	15%
4.4g	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	33%	30%	33%	31%
4.4h	Health problems?	65%	50%	65%	61%
4.4i	Getting phone numbers?	54%	33%	54%	44%
4.5	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	79%	78%	79%	81%
When you first arrived, did you have problems with any of the following:					
4.5a	Not being able to smoke?	39%	50%	39%	43%
4.5b	Loss of property?	13%	12%	13%	11%
4.5c	Feeling scared?	10%	15%	10%	9%
4.5d	Gang problems?	15%	18%	15%	16%
4.5e	Contacting family?	40%	29%	40%	42%
4.5f	Money worries?	15%	15%	15%	23%
4.5g	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	13%	17%	13%	10%
4.5h	Health problems?	11%	15%	11%	19%
4.5i	Getting phone numbers?	49%	29%	49%	42%
When you first arrived, were you given any of the following:					
4.6a	Toiletries/basic items?	90%	81%	90%	74%
4.6b	The opportunity to have a shower?	80%	36%	80%	79%
4.6c	Something to eat?	83%	75%	83%	90%
4.6d	A free phone call to friends/family?	71%	73%	71%	82%
4.6e	PIN phone credit?	52%	53%	52%	67%
4.6f	Information about feeling worried/upset?	37%	25%	37%	36%

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

Key to tables

		HMYOI Cookham Wood 2016	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Cookham Wood 2016	HMYOI Cookham Wood 2015
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		141	493	141	139
Within your first 24 hours, did you have access to the following people or services:					
4.7a	A chaplain?	54%	39%	54%	42%
4.7b	A peer mentor?	12%	9%	12%	9%
4.7c	Childline/Samaritans	20%	13%	20%	19%
4.7d	The prison shop/canteen?	8%	8%	8%	8%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	76%	67%	76%	74%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	74%	75%	74%	79%
4.10	For those who have been on an induction course: did it cover everything you needed to know about the establishment	52%	50%	52%	63%
SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT					
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	98%	86%	98%	95%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	20%	23%	20%	17%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	15%	16%	15%	11%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	45%	47%	45%	61%
5.5	Is it easy/very easy for you to attend religious services?	35%	50%	35%	46%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	52%	59%	52%	62%
Can you speak to:					
5.7	A chaplain of your faith in private?	56%	66%	56%	63%
5.8	A peer mentor?	30%	27%	30%	23%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	18%	17%	18%	11%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	31%	31%	31%	44%
SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF					
6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	62%	63%	62%	62%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	19%	23%	19%	21%
6.3	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	31%	32%	31%	20%
For those who have met their personal officer:					
6.4	Did you meet your personal (named) officer within the first week?	25%	35%	25%	20%
6.5	Do you see your personal (named) officer at least once a week?	35%	50%	35%	22%
6.6	Do you feel your personal (named) officer tries to help you?	57%	63%	57%	48%

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

Key to tables

		HMYOI Cookham Wood 2016	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Cookham Wood 2016	HMYOI Cookham Wood 2015
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		141	493	141	139
SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS					
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	77%	54%	77%	75%
For those who have made an application:					
7.2	Do you feel applications are sorted out fairly?	44%	54%	44%	56%
7.3	Do you feel applications are sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	30%	39%	30%	25%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	49%	41%	49%	54%
For those who have made a complaint:					
7.5	Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	26%	30%	26%	38%
7.6	Do you feel complaints are sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	20%	23%	20%	25%
7.7	Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint?	11%	17%	11%	9%
SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE					
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	26%	25%	26%	22%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	35%	40%	35%	41%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	43%	44%	43%	37%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	37%	52%	37%	38%
For those who have had a minor report:					
8.5	Was the process explained clearly to you?	59%	61%	59%	67%
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	74%	66%	74%	74%
For those who have had an adjudication ('nicking'):					
8.7	Was the process explained clearly to you?	84%	77%	84%	84%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (Cand R) since you have been here?	50%	45%	50%	44%
8.9	For those who had spent a night in the care and separation unit: did the staff treat you well/very well?	32%	33%	32%	54%
SECTION 9: SAFETY					
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	37%	48%	37%	41%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	10%	17%	10%	21%

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

Key to tables

		HMYOI Cookham Wood 2016	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Cookham Wood 2016	HMYOI Cookham Wood 2015
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		141	493	141	139
9.4	Have you ever been victimised by other young people here?	21%	37%	21%	27%
Since you have been here, have other young people:					
9.5a	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	12%	22%	12%	16%
9.5b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	11%	17%	11%	11%
9.5c	Sexually abused you?	1%	1%	1%	0%
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	8%	16%	8%	13%
9.5e	Taken your canteen/property?	1%	9%	1%	3%
9.5f	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	2%	0%	0%
9.5g	Victimised you because of debt?	2%	2%	2%	1%
9.5h	Victimised you because of drugs?	1%	2%	1%	1%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	4%	7%	4%	3%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	1%	4%	1%	0%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	3%	4%	3%	1%
9.5l	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	1%	6%	1%	3%
9.5m	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	1%	3%	1%	3%
9.5n	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	1%	0%	0%
9.5o	Victimised you because of your age?	1%	1%	1%	1%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	1%	2%	1%	1%
9.5q	Victimised you because you were new here?	6%	12%	6%	3%
9.5r	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	3%	5%	3%	4%
9.5s	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	7%	10%	7%	8%

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

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		HMYOI Cookham Wood 2016	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Cookham Wood 2016	HMYOI Cookham Wood 2015
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse					
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details					
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference					
Number of completed questionnaires returned		141	493	141	139
9.7	Have you ever been victimised by a member of staff here?	24%	34%	24%	26%
Since you have been here, have staff:					
9.8a	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	15%	17%	15%	15%
9.8b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	12%	10%	12%	8%
9.8c	Sexually abused you?	3%	1%	3%	1%
9.8d	Threatened or intimidated you?	10%	9%	10%	3%
9.8e	Taken your canteen/property?	6%	5%	6%	4%
9.8f	Victimised you because of medication?	1%	1%	1%	1%
9.8g	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	0%	0%	1%
9.8h	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	2%	0%	0%
9.8i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	5%	4%	5%	4%
9.8j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	5%	3%	5%	1%
9.8k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	2%	2%	2%	4%
9.8k	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	0%	2%	0%	3%
9.8m	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	1%	1%	1%	1%
9.8n	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	1%	0%	1%	1%
9.8o	Victimised you because of your age?	4%	2%	4%	1%
9.8p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	1%	0%	1%
9.8q	Victimised you because you were new here?	1%	4%	1%	1%
9.8r	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	2%	2%	2%	1%
9.8s	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	1%	2%	1%	1%
9.8t	Victimised you because you made a complaint?	6%	5%	6%	3%
9.10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	27%	29%	27%	25%
9.11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	21%	24%	21%	22%
9.12	Is shouting through the windows a problem here?	43%	44%	43%	41%

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMYOI Cookham Wood 2016	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Cookham Wood 2016	HMYOI Cookham Wood 2015
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		141	493	141	139
SECTION 10: HEALTH SERVICES					
10.1a	Is it easy for you to see the doctor?	51%	49%	51%	41%
10.1b	Is it easy for you to see the nurse?	68%	62%	68%	55%
10.1c	Is it easy for you to see the dentist?	24%	27%	24%	18%
10.2	For those who have been to health services: Do you think the overall quality is good/very good?	57%	46%	57%	51%
10.3	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/all of it in your cell?	44%	53%	44%	41%
10.4	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?	25%	24%	25%	27%
10.5	If you have emotional or mental health problems, are you being helped by anyone here?	60%	51%	60%	64%
10.6	Did you have any problems with alcohol when you first arrived?	7%	8%	7%	4%
10.7	Have you received any help with any alcohol problems here?	3%	5%	3%	3%
10.8	Did you have any problems with drugs when you first arrived?	24%	35%	24%	29%
10.9	Do you have a problem with drugs now?	6%	8%	6%	3%
10.10	Have you received any help with any drug problems here?	12%	24%	12%	15%
10.11	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs here?	16%	26%	16%	14%
SECTION 11: ACTIVITIES					
11.1	Were you 14 or younger when you were last at school?	38%	36%	38%	42%
11.2	Have you ever been excluded from school?	88%	86%	88%	88%
11.3	Did you ever skip school before you came into custody?	73%	71%	73%	72%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:					
11.4a	Education?	80%	74%	80%	82%
11.4b	A job in this establishment?	11%	18%	11%	12%
11.4c	Vocational or skills training?	7%	10%	7%	14%
11.4d	Offending behaviour programmes?	21%	18%	21%	11%
11.4e	Nothing	17%	16%	17%	16%

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

Key to tables

		HMYOI Cookham Wood 2016	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Cookham Wood 2016	HMYOI Cookham Wood 2015
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		141	493	141	139
For those who have taken part in the following activities while in this establishment, do you think that they will help you when you leave prison:					
11.5a	Education?	64%	57%	64%	66%
11.5b	A job in this establishment?	36%	38%	36%	29%
11.5c	Vocational or skills training?	30%	39%	30%	35%
11.5d	Offending behaviour programmes?	54%	42%	54%	32%
11.6	Do you usually have association every day?	34%	67%	34%	14%
11.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	78%	63%	78%	63%
11.8	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	1%	5%	1%	15%
SECTION 12: KEEPING IN TOUCH WITH FAMILY AND FRIENDS					
12.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	88%	79%	88%	85%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	53%	53%	53%	49%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	38%	33%	38%	33%
12.4	Is it easy/very easy for your family and friends to visit you here?	31%	29%	31%	31%
12.5	Do your visits start on time?	46%	34%	46%	41%
SECTION 13: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE					
Do you think you will have a problem with the following, when you are released:					
13.1a	Finding accommodation?	38%	26%	38%	27%
13.1b	Getting into school or college?	41%	34%	41%	30%
13.1c	Getting a job?	53%	51%	53%	51%
13.1d	Money/finances?	31%	36%	31%	35%
13.1e	Claiming benefits?	11%	16%	11%	11%
13.1f	Continuing health services?	11%	10%	11%	8%
13.1g	Opening a bank account?	13%	17%	13%	18%
13.1h	Avoiding bad relationships?	13%	18%	13%	15%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	43%	48%	43%	46%
For those with a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan:					
13.3	Were you involved in the development of your plan?	84%	86%	84%	90%
13.4	Do you understand the targets set in your plan?	91%	89%	91%	97%
13.5	Do you have a caseworker here?	94%	91%	94%	93%
13.6	Has your caseworker helped to prepare you for release?	56%	41%	56%	38%
For those with a social worker:					
13.7	Has your social worker been to visit you since you have been here?	70%	75%	70%	78%
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	42%	38%	42%	44%

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMYOI Cookham Wood 2016	Young people's comparator	HMYOI Cookham Wood 2016	HMYOI Cookham Wood 2015
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		141	493	141	139
Do you know who to contact for help with the following problems?					
13.9a	Finding accommodation	32%	24%	32%	29%
13.9b	Getting into school or college	35%	27%	35%	31%
13.9c	Getting a job	33%	29%	33%	27%
13.9d	Help with money/finances	24%	23%	24%	22%
13.9e	Help with claiming benefits	19%	17%	19%	9%
13.9f	Continuing health services	19%	15%	19%	14%
13.9g	Opening a bank account	22%	20%	22%	18%
13.9h	Avoiding bad relationships	15%	14%	15%	16%
For those who were sentenced:					
13.11	Do you want to stop offending?	85%	90%	85%	95%
13.12	Have you done anything or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future	55%	52%	55%	51%

Diversity analysis



Key question responses (ethnicity, nationality and religion) HMYOI Cookham Wood 2016

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

Key to tables

		Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		Black and minority ethnic young people	White young people	Foreign national young people	British young people	Muslim young people	Non-Muslim young people
Number of completed questionnaires returned						83	56	18	122		36	103
1.2	Are you a foreign national?					16%	9%				12%	14%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?					99%	100%	95%	100%		100%	99%
1.4	Do you understand written English?					98%	100%	95%	99%		100%	98%
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)							71%	58%		93%	48%
1.6	Are you Muslim?					40%	5%	24%	27%			
1.5	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?					1%	24%	24%	8%		0%	13%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?					12%	29%	10%	20%		3%	23%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?					38%	40%	15%	43%		40%	39%
2.1	Are you sentenced?					78%	81%	85%	78%		88%	75%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?					65%	58%	63%	63%		61%	64%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?					36%	31%	29%	36%		30%	37%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?					48%	60%	30%	56%		43%	56%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?					11%	5%	15%	7%		12%	8%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?					73%	84%	60%	80%		78%	77%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?					68%	59%	55%	66%		62%	65%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?					80%	71%	76%	75%		73%	77%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?					73%	77%	71%	75%		81%	71%
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?					98%	98%	100%	98%		95%	99%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?					13%	30%	5%	22%		13%	23%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?					11%	18%	5%	16%		8%	17%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?					38%	57%	45%	46%		40%	47%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?					59%	41%	55%	52%		78%	43%
Can you speak to:												
5.7	A chaplain of your faith in private?					61%	51%	53%	57%		80%	47%
5.8	A peer mentor?					30%	30%	40%	29%		30%	29%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?					16%	23%	15%	19%		17%	20%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?					34%	29%	29%	32%		30%	32%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

		Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		Black and minority ethnic young people	White young people	Foreign national young people	British young people	Muslim young people	Non-Muslim young people
Number of completed questionnaires returned							83	56	18	122	36	103
6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	55%	72%						71%	61%	49%	67%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	23%	15%						11%	21%	35%	14%
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	80%	73%						67%	80%	80%	77%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	41%	64%						29%	53%	48%	51%
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	22%	33%						45%	24%	30%	25%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	26%	48%						40%	34%	35%	35%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	40%	49%						47%	42%	40%	44%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	41%	32%						29%	39%	36%	37%
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	75%	73%						55%	77%	83%	70%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	55%	44%						29%	54%	58%	48%
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	36%	34%						42%	35%	38%	37%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	11%	8%						11%	9%	8%	10%
9.4	Have you been victimised by other young people here?	22%	15%						30%	19%	21%	21%
Since you have been here, have other young people:												
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	11%	3%						16%	7%	8%	8%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	5%	0%						0%	4%	8%	2%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	2%	0%						0%	2%	3%	1%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	5%	0%						5%	2%	8%	1%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	1%	2%						0%	2%	0%	2%
9.7	Have you been victimised by staff here?	26%	23%						16%	26%	31%	23%
Since you have been here, have staff:												
9.8d	Threatened or intimidated you?	9%	10%						0%	11%	13%	9%
9.8i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	5%	3%						5%	4%	8%	3%
9.8j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	9%	0%						0%	6%	13%	3%
9.8k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	1%	3%						5%	2%	3%	2%
9.8p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	0%						0%	0%	0%	0%
9.10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	26%	30%						50%	24%	29%	27%
9.11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	17%	28%						6%	23%	21%	22%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic young people	White young people	Foreign national young people	British young people	Muslim young people	Non-Muslim young people
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse						
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details						
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference						
Number of completed questionnaires returned		83	56	18	122	36	103
10.1a	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the doctor?	49%	56%	47%	52%	55%	48%
10.1b	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the nurse?	65%	75%	75%	68%	64%	69%
10.4	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	27%	25%	11%	28%	20%	28%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:							
11.4a	Education?	82%	80%	70%	82%	85%	80%
11.4b	A job in this establishment?	9%	15%	11%	11%	15%	10%
11.4c	Vocational or skills training?	3%	13%	0%	8%	5%	8%
11.4d	Offending behaviour programmes?	21%	20%	16%	21%	20%	21%
11.4e	Nothing?	16%	16%	30%	14%	15%	16%
11.6	Do you usually have association every day?	28%	44%	44%	33%	20%	39%
11.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	83%	72%	63%	81%	82%	76%
11.8	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	1%	2%	5%	1%	0%	2%
12.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	90%	88%	95%	88%	83%	90%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	59%	43%	37%	56%	66%	49%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	40%	34%	61%	34%	39%	39%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	44%	43%	33%	45%	28%	49%
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	45%	40%	37%	43%	42%	43%

Diversity analysis - disability



Key question responses (disability)
HMYOI Cookham Wood 2016

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		26	112
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	7%	14%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	100%	99%
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	38%	64%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	4%	30%
1.5	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	22%	8%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	64%	35%
2.1	Are you sentenced?	77%	79%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	57%	64%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	32%	35%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	70%	50%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	0%	11%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	93%	75%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	82%	61%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	83%	73%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	71%	74%
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	100%	98%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	11%	22%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	19%	14%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	50%	45%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	39%	55%
Can you speak to:			
5.7	A chaplain of your faith in private?	52%	58%
5.8	A peer mentor?	38%	29%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	31%	15%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	28%	33%

Diversity analysis - disability

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	70%	61%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	11%	20%
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	70%	78%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	57%	47%
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	38%	23%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	39%	34%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	42%	44%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	25%	40%
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	89%	70%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	44%	50%
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	22%	40%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	4%	10%
9.4	Have you been victimised by other young people here?	18%	21%
Since you have been here, have other young people:			
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	7%	8%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	5%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	2%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	4%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	4%	1%
9.7	Have you been victimised by staff here?	22%	26%
Since you have been here, have staff:			
9.8d	Threatened or intimidated you?	7%	10%
9.8i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	6%
9.8j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	4%	6%
9.8k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	2%
9.8p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	0%
9.10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	33%	25%
9.11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	18%	22%

Diversity analysis - disability

Key to tables

		Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
10.1a	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the doctor?	69%	48%
10.1b	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the nurse?	77%	67%
10.4	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	48%	22%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:			
11.4a	Education?	67%	83%
11.4b	A job in this establishment?	11%	11%
11.4c	Vocational or skills training?	18%	6%
11.4d	Offending behaviour programmes?	33%	18%
11.4e	Nothing?	22%	16%
11.6	Do you usually have association every day?	46%	32%
11.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	67%	80%
11.8	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	4%	1%
12.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	96%	86%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	46%	54%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	29%	39%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	54%	42%
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	44%	41%

Wing comparator



Survey responses from children and young people: HMYOI Cookham Wood 2016

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	A wing	B wing
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		78	49
SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU			
1.1	Are you 18 years of age?	16%	13%
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	16%	11%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	99%	100%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	99%	100%
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other category.)	59%	65%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	31%	19%
1.7	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	9%	10%
1.8	Do you have any children?	8%	6%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	16%	21%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	44%	33%
SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE			
2.1	Are you sentenced?	86%	66%
2.2	Is your sentence 12 months or less?	36%	32%
2.3	Have you been in this establishment for one month or less?	14%	30%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	62%	65%
SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS			
On your most recent journey here:			
3.1	Did you feel safe?	78%	80%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	28%	36%
3.3	Did you spend more than 4 hours in the van?	13%	2%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	51%	55%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	7%	11%

Wing comparator

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	A wing	B wing
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		78	49
SECTION 4: YOUR FIRST FEW DAYS HERE			
4.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	81%	82%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	76%	80%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	66%	61%
When you first arrived, did staff ask if you needed help or support with any of the following:			
4.4a	Not being able to smoke?	48%	52%
4.4b	Loss of property?	12%	23%
4.4c	Feeling scared?	25%	37%
4.4d	Gang problems?	62%	60%
4.4e	Contacting family?	69%	62%
4.4f	Money worries?	17%	23%
4.4g	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	32%	35%
4.4h	Health problems?	62%	69%
4.4i	Getting phone numbers?	53%	60%
4.5	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	86%	65%
When you first arrived, did you have problems with any of the following:			
4.5a	Not being able to smoke?	35%	39%
4.5b	Loss of property?	18%	6%
4.5c	Feeling Scared?	7%	14%
4.5d	Gang Problems?	12%	17%
4.5e	Contacting Family?	43%	33%
4.5f	Money worries?	17%	14%
4.5g	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	15%	12%
4.5h	Health problems?	11%	6%
4.5i	Getting phone numbers?	60%	35%
When you first arrived, were you given any of the following:			
4.6a	Toiletries/basic items?	86%	98%
4.6b	The opportunity to have a shower?	78%	83%
4.6c	Something to eat?	87%	78%
4.6d	A free phone call to friends/family?	74%	69%
4.6e	PIN phone credit?	48%	61%
4.6f	Information about feeling worried/upset?	32%	44%

Wing comparator

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	A wing	B wing
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		78	49
Within your first 24 hours, did you have access to the following people or services:			
4.7a	A chaplain?	57%	46%
4.7b	A peer mentor?	12%	14%
4.7c	Childline/Samaritans	22%	16%
4.7d	The prison shop/canteen?	8%	12%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	73%	84%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	76%	69%
SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT			
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	98%	98%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	18%	17%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	17%	13%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	47%	41%
5.5	Is it easy/very easy for you to attend religious services?	36%	35%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	59%	43%
Can you speak to:			
5.7	A Chaplain of your faith in private?	59%	49%
5.8	A peer mentor?	26%	36%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	17%	11%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	30%	31%
SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF			
6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	66%	58%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	20%	22%
6.3	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	29%	27%
SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS			
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	78%	78%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	47%	49%
7.7	Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint?	4%	15%

Wing comparator

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	A wing	B wing
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		78	49
SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE			
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	35%	15%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	38%	27%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	48%	33%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	36%	38%
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	71%	75%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (Cand R) since you have been here?	49%	47%
SECTION 9: SAFETY			
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	35%	36%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	8%	12%
9.4	Have you ever been victimised by other young people here?	17%	20%
Since you have been here, have other young people:			
9.5a	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	11%	13%
9.5b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	9%	11%
9.5c	Sexually abused you?	0%	4%
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	8%	6%
9.5e	Taken your canteen/property?	0%	0%
9.5f	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	0%
9.5g	Victimised you because of debt?	1%	2%
9.5h	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	0%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	2%	4%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	1%	2%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	1%	4%
9.5l	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	1%	0%
9.5m	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%	2%
9.5n	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	0%
9.5o	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	2%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	4%
9.5q	Victimised you because you were new here?	2%	11%
9.5r	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	1%	6%
9.5s	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	7%	4%

Wing comparator

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	A wing	B wing
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		78	49
9.7	Have you ever been victimised by a member of staff here?	21%	29%
Since you have been here, have staff:			
9.8a	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	13%	15%
9.8b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	9%	13%
9.8c	Sexually abused you?	1%	4%
9.8d	Threatened or intimidated you?	10%	9%
9.8e	Taken your canteen/property?	6%	6%
9.8f	Victimised you because of medication?	1%	2%
9.8g	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	0%
9.8h	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	0%
9.8i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	3%	4%
9.8j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	6%	4%
9.8k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	1%	2%
9.8k	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	0%	0%
9.8m	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	1%	0%
9.8n	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	0%
9.8o	Victimised you because of your age?	2%	4%
9.8p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	0%
9.8q	Victimised you because you were new here?	2%	0%
9.8r	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	1%	2%
9.8s	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	1%	2%
9.8t	Victimised you because you made a complaint?	3%	11%
9.10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	32%	21%
9.11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	22%	18%
9.12	Is shouting through the windows a problem here?	44%	40%
SECTION 10: HEALTH SERVICES			
10.1a	Is it easy for you to see the doctor?	47%	60%
10.1b	Is it easy for you to see the nurse?	65%	73%
10.1c	Is it easy for you to see the dentist?	19%	33%
10.4	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?	24%	17%
10.6	Did you have any problems with alcohol when you first arrived?	7%	2%
10.7	Have you received any help with any alcohol problems here?	0%	2%
10.8	Did you have any problems with drugs when you first arrived?	22%	26%
10.9	Do you have a problem with drugs now?	4%	9%
10.10	Have you received any help with any drug problems here?	9%	11%
10.11	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs here?	13%	19%

Wing comparator

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	A wing	B wing
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		78	49
SECTION 11: ACTIVITIES			
11.1	Were you 14 or younger when you were last at school?	34%	44%
11.2	Have you ever been excluded from school?	87%	96%
11.3	Did you ever skip school before you came into custody?	72%	70%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:			
11.4a	Education?	94%	62%
11.4b	A job in this establishment?	14%	4%
11.4c	Vocational or skills training?	8%	4%
11.4d	Offending behaviour programmes?	22%	18%
11.4e	Nothing	3%	35%
11.6	Do you usually have association every day?	37%	30%
11.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	76%	78%
11.8	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	1%	2%
SECTION 12: KEEPING IN TOUCH WITH FAMILY AND FRIENDS			
12.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	87%	88%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	55%	49%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	41%	36%
12.4	Is it easy/very easy for your family and friends to visit you here?	33%	26%
12.5	Do your visits start on time?	47%	44%
SECTION 13: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE			
Do you think you will have a problem with the following, when you are released:			
13.1a	Finding accommodation?	33%	42%
13.1b	Getting into school or college?	39%	42%
13.1c	Getting a job?	55%	54%
13.1d	Money/finances?	29%	33%
13.1e	Claiming benefits?	8%	15%
13.1f	Continuing health services?	13%	9%
13.1g	Opening a bank account?	11%	13%
13.1h	Avoiding bad relationships?	11%	17%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	44%	43%
13.5	Do you have a caseworker here?	97%	87%
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	40%	44%



Key question responses (first time in custody analysis) HMYOI Cookham Wood 2016

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Young people in custody for the first time	Young people not in custody for the first time
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		86	52
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	12%	12%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	99%	100%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	99%	98%
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	63%	55%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	26%	28%
1.5	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	9%	12%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	26%	64%
2.1	Are you sentenced?	74%	88%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	39%	29%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	47%	59%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	12%	0%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	74%	83%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	65%	61%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	76%	76%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	70%	81%
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	97%	100%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	22%	16%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	18%	10%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	44%	44%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	48%	56%
Can you speak to:			
5.7	A chaplain of your faith in private?	52%	64%
5.8	A peer mentor?	30%	27%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	18%	17%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	26%	39%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Young people in custody for the first time	Young people not in custody for the first time
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	65%	54%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	16%	27%
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	76%	80%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	43%	58%
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	26%	27%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	32%	35%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	40%	45%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	38%	35%
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	71%	81%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	47%	55%
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	39%	31%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	9%	10%
9.4	Have you been victimised by other young people here?	20%	20%
Since you have been here, have other young people:			
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	8%	5%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	5%	2%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	1%	2%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	5%	0%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	2%	0%
9.7	Have you been victimised by staff here?	24%	28%
Since you have been here, have staff:			
9.8d	Threatened or intimidated you?	8%	12%
9.8i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	5%	4%
9.8j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	6%	4%
9.8k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	2%	2%
9.8p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	0%
9.10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	29%	22%
9.11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	26%	12%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Young people in custody for the first time	Young people not in custody for the first time
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
10.1a	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the doctor?	47%	58%
10.1b	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the nurse?	69%	69%
10.4	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	27%	25%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:			
11.4a	Education?	85%	72%
11.4b	A job in this establishment?	10%	12%
11.4c	Vocational or skills training?	5%	12%
11.4d	Offending behaviour programmes?	20%	21%
11.4e	Nothing?	9%	28%
11.6	Do you usually have association every day?	29%	43%
11.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	77%	81%
11.8	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	1%	2%
12.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	91%	85%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	62%	41%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	45%	27%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	39%	47%
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	38%	46%

Diversity analysis



Key question responses (local authority care analysis) HMYOI Cookham Wood 2016

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Young people who have been in local authority care	Young people who have not been in local authority care
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		55	83
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	5%	18%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	100%	99%
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	58%	61%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	27%	26%
1.5	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	5%	12%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	29%	11%
2.1	Are you sentenced?	80%	77%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	41%	78%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	32%	35%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	62%	47%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	5%	11%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	89%	73%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	69%	63%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	74%	77%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	76%	73%
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	98%	98%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	13%	25%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	13%	16%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	46%	45%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	57%	48%
Can you speak to:			
5.7	A chaplain of your faith in private?	57%	55%
5.8	A peer mentor?	32%	29%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	18%	18%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	37%	29%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Young people who have been in local authority care	Young people who have not been in local authority care
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	59%	66%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	29%	12%
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	87%	72%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	53%	47%
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	24%	28%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	32%	37%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	46%	41%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	42%	34%
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	84%	67%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	58%	44%
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	34%	37%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	13%	7%
9.4	Have you been victimised by other young people here?	22%	19%
Since you have been here, have other young people:			
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	10%	8%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	5%	2%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	2%	1%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	2%	3%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	2%	1%
9.7	Have you been victimised by staff here?	27%	23%
Since you have been here, have staff:			
9.8d	Threatened or intimidated you?	11%	9%
9.8i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	3%	5%
9.8j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	8%	3%
9.8k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	2%	2%
9.8p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	0%
9.10	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	26%	29%
9.11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	15%	26%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Young people who have been in local authority care	Young people who have not been in local authority care
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
10.1a	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the doctor?	56%	49%
10.1b	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the nurse?	71%	68%
10.4	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	31%	22%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:			
11.4a	Education?	78%	82%
11.4b	A job in this establishment?	10%	12%
11.4c	Vocational or skills training?	10%	7%
11.4d	Offending behaviour programmes?	22%	19%
11.4e	Nothing?	19%	15%
11.6	Do you usually have association every day?	29%	37%
11.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	74%	80%
11.8	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	2%	1%
12.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	85%	90%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	47%	57%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	18%	51%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	42%	43%
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	44%	39%