

Report on an unannounced inspection of

# **Young Persons' Unit**

**at**

# **HMP & YOI Parc**

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

**16–26 October 2017**

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



Arolygiaeth Ei Mawrhydi dros Addysg a Hyfforddiant yng Nghymru  
Her Majesty's Inspectorate for Education and Training in Wales

Crown copyright 2018

This publication, excluding logos, is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. To view this licence, visit [nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3](http://nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3) or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email: [psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk).

Where we have identified any third party copyright information 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](mailto: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  
Clive House  
5th floor  
70 Petty France  
London  
SW1H 9EX  
England

# Contents

Introduction	5
Fact page	7
About this inspection and report	9
Summary	11
Section 1. Safety	17
Section 2. Respect	29
Section 3. Purposeful activity	39
Section 4. Resettlement	45
Section 5. Summary of recommendations and good practice	51
Section 6. Appendices	55
Appendix I: Inspection team	55
Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report	57
Appendix III: Establishment population profile	63
Appendix IV: Summary of children and young people questionnaires and interviews	65

### **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

A separate facility within the larger Parc prison in Bridgend, South Wales, the small young persons' unit at Parc is managed by the private company G4S and holds up to 60 boys under the age of 18. In keeping with all custodial institutions holding young people, the young persons' unit is inspected annually.

In the past, we have often reported very positively concerning the young persons' unit at Parc, although at our last visit we were disappointed to see some deterioration, with the institution becoming less safe and less respectful. At this inspection, however, it was clear to us that, with good leadership and a re-energised staff group, deterioration had been arrested and indeed quite significant improvement was evident.

Safety in institutions holding young people is always a key challenge. Recorded violence, although falling, remained too high. In our survey, boys' poor perceptions of victimisation and their own safety still needed to be addressed, but the evidence clearly indicated improvement in most aspects of safety. Boys were well received and correctly inducted, safeguarding and child protection procedures were more rigorous and the care for those at risk of self-harm was much better. The units were now well ordered and staff were supervising boys with much greater confidence. Behaviour management arrangements had been properly reviewed and now had a greater emphasis on motivation than sanctions. Security was proportionate and use of force was better managed and applied in accordance with revised and more appropriate techniques.

Cleanliness on the units was improved and access to amenities and facilities was good. Staff and managers were much more visible and the interactions we observed were good. Importantly, poor behaviour was challenged correctly and consistently. Consultation with boys was getting better but more needed to be done to promote equality, which remained weak. Boys could eat communally in an ordered atmosphere, although the food itself was not popular. Boys indicated to us that they had confidence in applications and complaints procedures.

Boys had a good amount of time out of cell and the provision of education and activity had also clearly improved. Most boys evidenced progress in education and were developing useful and transferable skills. The prison had given less priority to improving resettlement provision, but this was understandable in terms of the order of priorities, and overall outcomes remained reasonably good.

To conclude, this is a good report. It was encouraging to see many of our previous recommendations attended to, which was to the great credit of the director and her staff, who had clearly worked very hard. Some very creative and caring approaches were seen in the work we inspected and we cited several examples of good practice. Staff were well trained, committed and confident, and it was clear to us that a firm platform for yet further progress was in place.

**Peter Clarke CVO OBE QPM**  
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

December 2017



# Fact page

**Task of the establishment**

Young persons' unit within category B training prison for male prisoners aged 18 plus.

**Establishment status**

Private - G4S Central Government Services

**Region**

Wales and the South West

**Number held**

43

**Certified normal accommodation**

64

**Operational capacity**

60

**Date of last full inspection**

5–16 December 2016

**Brief history**

The young persons' unit in HMP & YOI Parc opened in March 2002 as a 28-room facility for remand young people only aged 15 to 18. In October 2004, it expanded to house 36 young people aged 15 to 18, both remand and sentenced, with a further expansion in February 2007 to 64 young people. In March 2013, the court catchment area for the unit extended from Wales to include South West England from Devon and Cornwall to the Dorset border. In April 2014, the court catchment area expanded further to include Bristol, Swindon and Wiltshire.

**Short description of residential units**

G1 unit houses up to 36 young people and E1 up to 24 young people, both with a mix of sentenced and remand young people.

**Name of director**

Janet Wallsgrove

**Escort contractor**

GEOAmey

**Health service provider**

G4S Health Services UK Ltd

**Learning and skills providers**

G4S

**Independent Monitoring Board chair**

Jean Davies





# 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:
- |                            |   |
|----------------------------|---|
| <b>Safety</b>              | children and young people, particularly the most vulnerable, are held safely  |
| <b>Respect</b>             | children and young people are treated with respect for their human dignity  |
| <b>Purposeful activity</b> | children and young people are able, and expected, to engage in activity that is likely to benefit them                          |
| <b>Resettlement</b>        | children and young people are 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 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 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.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> 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** *Leaders and managers had worked to improve safety and the number of violent incidents and fights had started to reduce. However, too many boys reported being victimised by others or feeling unsafe, and levels of violence were still high. Boys' early days experiences remained good. Safeguarding and child protection arrangements had improved, and support for children at risk of self-harm was generally good. A range of initiatives to promote positive behaviour had been introduced and were beginning to be effective. Governance of use of force had improved. Use of segregation remained commendably low, and there were no boys self-isolating during the inspection. Security was proportionate, and substance misuse services remained good. **Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***
- S2** *At the last inspection in December 2016 we found that outcomes for children and young people in Parc were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test. We made 16 recommendations about safety. At this follow-up inspection we found that nine of the recommendations had been achieved, three had been partially achieved and four had not been achieved.*
- S3** Many boys continued to arrive at Parc late in the evening after excessive delays at court and long journeys. The reception process was completed promptly on the unit, with good consideration of risk, and was generally good. The induction remained impressive and was good practice.
- S4** A review of safeguarding and child protection since the last inspection had resulted in clearer processes, more referrals and the start of external scrutiny of some areas of practice. Oversight of child protection referrals had improved, but we found some delays in investigations from external agencies. Boys did not always understand the reasons for these delays, and in one case a boy had lost confidence in the process as a result. The quality of written referrals was too variable, and in some, key information about the child's status was omitted.
- S5** Nearly two-thirds of boys who responded to our survey said that they had been victimised by others, which was too many. A range of initiatives had been introduced since the previous inspection to combat bullying and intimidation. The number of boys self-isolating had reduced, and management of individuals now ensured reasonable access to the regime.
- S6** The number of reported self-harm incidents remained comparatively high, but most were of a low level that related to acts of frustration. Care for boys at risk of suicide or self-harm on assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management had improved and was generally good, and they could access the regime. However, recorded observations were too predictable.
- S7** The units were well ordered. Behaviour management processes had been reviewed and now motivated boys better and encouraged positive behaviour. We observed staff demonstrate a sensible balance of patience and challenge when dealing with inappropriate behaviour, and managers were often visible to provide additional support during key times in the regime. The incentives scheme was well managed, and boys on all levels had good access to regime and enrichment sessions. The number of adjudications had notably reduced during 2017, with few adjourned hearings.

- S8 Security procedures remained proportionate to the risks posed; intelligence reports were acted on promptly. The use of illicit substances remained low, and supply reduction measures for the unit remained effective.
- S9 There had been a small reduction in assaults and fights, which was encouraging, but violence remained high. Most incidents were, however, low level, and staff intervened promptly to prevent escalation. Systems for recording violent incidents had recently been revised, and an action plan to address concerns highlighted had been introduced, but further development was required.
- S10 Use of force had reduced but remained high for the type of unit. Minimising and managing physical restraint (MMPR, a system of restraint used in all young offender institutions and secure training centres holding children) had been introduced and the unit now benefited from the introduction of full-time MMPR coordinators. In many cases, MMPR was used to restrain and protect boys involved in fights and assaults. Incidents that we observed showed force applied appropriately, often with the use of low-level guiding holds. Oversight and monitoring arrangements had improved since the introduction of MMPR, and external scrutiny was being embedded.
- S11 The use of segregation remained commendably low and its oversight was appropriate. Supervision of boys separated following an award from disciplinary procedures was well managed, and limitations to the individual's regime were minimal.
- S12 Despite staff shortage, psychosocial support for boys with substance misuse needs was good and remained well integrated with all other departments. Boys could access a range of interventions, including harm minimisation and brief interventions based on individual need and some group activity.

## Respect

**S13** *Cells and communal areas were clean and well equipped but double cells remained cramped and toilets were heavily stained. Staff relationships with boys had improved in all areas, and most interaction we saw was respectful, caring and effective. Consultation arrangements were reasonably good. Despite recent improvements, there remained significant weaknesses in the management of equality work. Management of complaints had improved, and health care provision was generally good. The food was unappetising but children could eat communally for all meals. **Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***

**S14** *At the last inspection in December 2016, we found that outcomes for children and young people in Parc were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test. We made 15 recommendations about respect. At this follow-up inspection we found that six of the recommendations had been achieved, five had been partially achieved and four had not been achieved.*

**S15** Improved cleanliness and newly installed flooring had improved the appearance of cells and communal areas. Most cells were stark but adequate, but double cells were too cramped and many toilets remained stained. Cell call bells were answered promptly, and boys had good access to clean clothes, towels and bedding, as well as much improved association equipment. Applications were generally managed promptly through the electronic information kiosks, and in-cell telephones remained highly valued.

**S16** Since our last inspection, several initiatives - including increased staffing, more visible leadership and staff training - had improved relationships between wing staff and boys and,

with few exceptions, the interactions we observed were good. We saw staff challenge poor behaviour and reinforce positive behaviour more consistently than on our last inspection, and this was echoed in key worker and case note records. Consultation with boys was reasonably good, although some actions continued to take too long to be resolved.

- S17 There had been little progress to promote and understand equality and diversity issues in the unit, despite access to good resources in the main prison. The unit did not have a robust approach to the identification of and response to equality and diversity issues and potential disproportionally. As a consequence, managers were unable to understand or address perceptions of poor treatment among some groups. Only eight discrimination complaints had been submitted in the previous six months; investigations were superficial and responses did not always provide a full explanation that boys could understand. Despite this, some new work was beginning to address some of these concerns and included, for example, consultation groups. The chaplaincy continued to provide good faith services and pastoral support for the minority of children who followed a religion.
- S18 Quality assurance of complaints had improved and boys told us they had more confidence in using the complaints system. The casework team continued to provide appropriate support to boys to exercise their legal rights.
- S19 Health services were mostly good, and there were now two dedicated unit nurses. Boys were positive about the quality of health care particularly. Reception and subsequent health screening was comprehensive, and now completed within recommended timescales. There was an appropriate range of primary care services with prompt access, although there were some delays with immunisations. Medicines management was effective, and the clinic room on the unit was now appropriate. Dental provision was good, with short waiting times and good oral health promotion. The mental health nurse provided a responsive and caring service. Although the range of interventions had increased, more access was needed to the multidisciplinary mental health in-reach team.
- S20 Meal times were well ordered and, unlike units elsewhere, it was positive that boys could eat all meals communally. Only 8% of boys said the food was good, and we found that some was unappetising. Boys could easily buy a wide range of reasonably priced goods from the shop.

## Purposeful activity

**S21** *Time out of cell exceeded our expectations for most boys at Parc. The prison was focused on ensuring boys attended education consistently. Management of learning and skills was good and had led to improvements in provision. Officers and teachers worked well together, and in most sessions the behaviour of boys was good. Achievement levels had improved and most boys made good progress in education. PE provision was very good. **Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***

**S22** *At the last inspection in December 2016, we found that outcomes for children and young people in Parc were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made six recommendations about purposeful activity. At this follow-up inspection we found that five of the recommendations had been achieved and one was no longer relevant.*

**S23** Senior managers had a commitment to ensure that boys received a decent regime, including education, exercise and evening association. Time out of cell was better than elsewhere and exceeded our expectations for most boys. We found only a small number of boys locked up

during the school day. This was much better than similar establishments, and a significant achievement reflecting a sensible management of risk.

- S24 There had been sustained commitment to the resourcing and management of education, and there were effective measures to monitor provision to ensure that education met its targets. There were clear plans to secure funding to extend provision. Leaders and managers used labour market information effectively to inform the planning of the curriculum. There were helpful regular team meetings that ensured that all staff worked cooperatively to agree the planning of support that individual boys required to progress.
- S25 Boys were allocated promptly to education and made the most of useful opportunities to sample learning before making their final choice. Teachers in education shared information about the boys' literacy and numeracy skills needs effectively, and used this well in their planning. Officers and teachers worked well together to support the boys in their education. Most boys behaved well in education and where disruption occurred it was addressed proactively and speedily. The prison had developed useful partnerships with local organisations to provide boys with meaningful work experiences, with opportunities in one company for boys to pursue apprenticeships on release. However, release on temporary licence (ROTL) opportunities were underused.
- S26 Most boys received high quality teaching, which engaged them well in purposeful and challenging learning activities. The facilities and resources met the needs of boys well and provided a safe and stimulating environment for learning. Most boys had useful individual education plans that were used effectively to record and review their progress and achievement. Nearly all boys were involved effectively in monthly setting, reviewing and monitoring of their progress towards achieving goals across all aspects of their learning. Boys who refused to attend education were supported well to enable them to access the curriculum and participate in classes and activities.
- S27 Most boys were developing useful skills and knowledge that they could transfer to further education or employment. They achieved their learning goals and gained relevant qualifications and certificates of learning. Nearly all boys improved their literacy and numeracy skills and developed these well in vocational contexts. Most boys had good attendance records and many participated well in class. Achievement success rates had improved.
- S28 All boys had good access to a well-resourced library that contained a sufficient range of age-appropriate books, including Welsh language books, accessible materials and other resources.
- S29 The boys had very good access to a well-equipped gym and had improved their understanding of the importance of healthy living choices.

## Resettlement

**S30** *The management of resettlement was largely unchanged since the previous inspection. Caseworkers had a good knowledge of the offending behaviour needs of boys, but this was not always reflected in review meetings or training plan targets. Despite efforts by the prison-based social workers, looked-after children did not always receive the support from local authorities that they were entitled to. Public protection work was good. Release planning was generally appropriate, and the recent introduction of the trauma recovery model was an interesting initiative. There were still no interventions to address sexually harmful behaviours, which was a significant concern. Family work was good. **Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***

**S31** *At the last inspection in December 2016, we found that outcomes for children and young people in Parc were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 10 recommendations about resettlement. At this follow-up inspection we found that one recommendation had been achieved, four had been partially achieved and five had not been achieved.*

**S32** Management of resettlement was largely unchanged since the last inspection. Work to move the provision forward was still at an early stage and had not yet delivered the outcomes aimed for. Relationships with key external partners were reasonable at both strategic and operational levels. Transition of boys to adult prisons was planned for in good time, and this work was more comprehensive for those who moved to Parc main site. No boys had been granted ROTL since the previous inspection, but the unit had secured some ROTL placements and boys were due to be identified to take these up.

**S33** Boys had regular reviews and access to their caseworkers between reviews. Caseworkers attended a range of meetings at which the boys they managed were discussed. However, and as at the last inspection, only just over half of boys knew they had a sentence or remand plan even though they were now given a copy of their sentence plan targets. The electronic case management system was not used to record meetings, which hindered the full sharing of information with external partners. The records of training planning meetings did not fully reflect the depth of caseworker knowledge about boys, the risks they posed, their offending behaviour and discussions about these. Residential unit staff attendance at review meetings was better than we often see, but attendance from other staff was not as good.

**S34** Boys who were likely to be subject to multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) on release were identified by caseworkers and risk levels determined in sufficient time before their release.

**S35** Local authorities had a statutory responsibility for over 70% of the boys at Parc. The support they provided was inconsistent, but better for the boys on full care orders. Support from the unit was good, especially in contacting social workers on behalf of children.

**S36** Practical arrangements for the day of release were appropriate. Efforts to improve accommodation outcomes for boys had led to some good results, although some boys did not have suitable accommodation identified at the time of their final review. Boys could access basic budgeting and financial management training in education, and were supported to get National Insurance numbers and open bank accounts.

**S37** Boys did not have good and early access to independent careers advice to ensure that they could plan how to make constructive use of their time in prison. Good partnerships were emerging with local providers such as colleges.

- S38 Pre-release and transfer arrangements for boys with health care and substance misuse needs were good.
- S39 Support for boys to maintain family ties remained good, and the family worker provided an effective point of contact for families. Regular family days were thoughtfully planned and supported by staff from all areas of the unit.
- S40 There were still no interventions for boys with sexually harmful behaviours, even though such boys continued to be placed at Parc. Nearly all other interventions work took place on a one-to-one basis, and was in transition following introduction of the trauma recovery model.<sup>2</sup>

## Main concerns and recommendations

- S41 Concern:** In our survey, 63% of boys at Parc reported victimisation by other children. Although levels of violence at Parc had decreased since the previous inspection, they remained too high.

**Recommendation:** Senior managers should work to identify and provide the support needed to help Parc address and reduce the consistently high levels of violence, while continuing to deliver a full, constructive regime to the boys in its care.

- S42 Concern:** The strategic management of equality and diversity work remained weak, with insufficient focus on the boys in the unit. Senior managers were not focused on the concerns and negative perceptions of boys from minority backgrounds.

**Recommendation:** There should be a regular equality management meeting to ensure that policy, planning and consultation are effective, boys' perceptions and needs are addressed, and comprehensive monitoring data are considered.

- S43 Concern:** A small number of boys at the unit had sexually harmful behaviour as part or all of their offending and there was no targeted intervention or support available to them.

**Recommendation:** The Youth Custody Service and Welsh Government should work with G4S as a matter of urgency to determine how suitable interventions will be put in place for boys who have shown sexually harmful behaviour in their offending history.

---

<sup>2</sup> The trauma recovery model (TRM) (Skuse and Matthew, 2015) is a composite model drawing on theories of child development and current understanding of neurobiological development. It helps practitioners understand the psychological needs that underpin behaviours and suggests the types of interventions that best address those needs, allowing staff to tailor and sequence interventions according to the individual. The TRM focuses on the need to undertake relational therapy to help young people mediate the impact of trauma before cognitive interventions can be fully effective.



# 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** Many arrivals continued to have long journeys in the same transport as adults. They also still arrived late due to the unit's extensive catchment area and/or delays in court after their case was completed. While recently most boys had arrived between 6pm and 8pm, some had arrived after 10pm. In our survey, 66% of boys said they had been treated well by escort staff.

### Recommendation

- I.2** Boys should be transported to custody as soon as their case has finished. They should be transported separately from adults and arrive into custody before 7pm. (Repeated recommendation I.4)

## 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.3** New arrivals were sometimes delayed on the transport while the main admissions area was cleared of adult prisoners, but they generally spent minimal time in reception before they moved to a dedicated admissions room on the unit. In our survey, 50% of boys said they were treated well in reception, and those we spoke to were generally positive about their first night experience.
- I.4** In our survey, 77% of boys said they had problems on arrival. New arrivals had prompt first night interviews and risk assessments, and were given comprehensive age-appropriate information about life on the unit, rules and services. In the admissions we observed, staff interacted well with the boys and promptly addressed their risks and needs, including offering telephone calls. However, boys were not routinely offered drinks.
- I.5** Most new arrivals were initially allocated to a cell covered by a camera, to enable less intrusive half-hourly overnight observations. Although stark, first night cells were prepared, adequately equipped and clean. In our survey, 70% of boys said they felt safe on the first night.
- I.6** The induction process remained impressive. The five-day rolling programme was individualised to each boy and included repetition of key activities to ensure they were understood. The sessions we observed included significant individual engagement and support from staff. All induction elements were tracked to ensure they were completed. A manager met each boy at the end to confirm he had understood everything, and identified

any concerns. However, the course still did not keep boys fully occupied, and they spent less time out of cell during this week than their counterparts.

## Good practice

- 1.7** *New arrivals received age-appropriate and comprehensive literature about the unit, and an induction programme that recognised their individual needs and supported them effectively to adjust to life on the unit.*

## Care and protection of children and young people

### Safeguarding

#### Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.8** There had been a review of safeguarding and child protection since the last inspection, which had resulted in more external scrutiny. The unit had done considerable work to address several of the shortfalls we previously highlighted. It now followed a clear action plan, and was due to take some joint quality assurance work with local children services.
- 1.9** The unit manager had established links with the local children's safeguarding board and a senior social worker, which had improved understanding of each other's roles and responsibilities, and created more openness about how both contributed to keeping children safe. The head of the young persons' unit could now contact the senior social worker for advice and guidance, leading to consideration of a wider range of concerns.
- 1.10** Some basic and key information was missing on referral forms, and the quality was too variable. In some cases, the child's legal status and the contact details of any social workers were often missing. The G4S combined referral and tracking form also gave more prominence to the tracking element of than guidance on referrals.
- 1.11** The monthly safeguarding meetings were well attended but were a forum for a range of areas, which diluted core discussion, and it was difficult to track key actions from the minutes. Daily briefings continued to be used to inform all staff of any safeguarding issues, so that they could provide support to boys when needed.
- 1.12** The staff we spoke to were aware of safeguarding processes. Several commented that recent minimising and managing physical restraint (MMPR) training had highlighted a range of safeguarding issues, and that they felt confident in reporting any concerns.

### Recommendation

- 1.13** **The monthly safeguarding meeting should accurately record follow-up actions to be taken and evidence of outcomes.**

## Child protection

### Expected outcomes:

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

- I.14** Boys continued to be given clear information about child protection procedures in the induction booklet, as well as contact details for the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB), Barnardo's advocate and the prison social worker. Notices with current contact details were prominently displayed on each unit. Boys could use contact forms to request a visit from the Barnardo's worker, and this could be done discretely.
- I.15** All referrals to the local authority were now tracked and monitored. There had been 17 child protection referrals in the previous six months. In each case, boys had been spoken to and the prison was aware of the progress of each referral. The unit manager attended strategy meetings and ensured that follow-up actions were taken quickly. However, in a few cases there had been some delay in the police speaking to the young person. In one case, it had taken seven weeks from an allegation to a police interview, which had resulted in the young person not having confidence in the system; despite good support from the social worker, he would not talk to the police.
- I.16** The prison had provided CCTV footage to Bridgend children's social care, which had enabled decisions and actions to be identified quickly. In one case, the court had requested some CCTV footage of an adult held in the reception area, and the judge noticed an incident with a boy also held in reception. The details of the incident were passed to the boy's youth offending team, which then made a referral to the local authority children's social care department. As a result of this case, the prison had taken action to further safeguard children in reception.

## 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.17** In our survey, nearly two-thirds of boys, 63%, said they had been victimised by others which was much worse than the comparator of 31%, and 37%, against 12%, said that they had been hit, kicked or assaulted. In addition, 44% of boys said that they had been victimised by staff. The unit had introduced some initiatives to address these concerns – such as the use of reintegration pathways in education (see paragraph 3.19) and increased staffing on the residential units (see paragraph 2.6) – and more boys now had confidence in reporting victimisation to staff. There were no boys self-isolating at the time of inspection.
- I.18** Residential staff were alert to the signs of bullying, and used wing observation books and the IT system to record them. Individuals of concern were discussed at a daily multidisciplinary meeting, which was well attended and chaired by a senior manager. The use of mediation had improved and was an integral tool to ensure that all boys retained good access to the regime.
- I.19** There had been no survey of boys, families, carers or visitors about bullying. New arrivals were given an age-appropriate presentation during induction on the impact of negative behaviour. A new family officer for the unit also provided a valued point of contact and reassurance to families and carers (see paragraph 4.37).

## Recommendation

- I.20 The unit should survey boys at Parc, their families, carers and visitors about bullying concerns to inform future strategy to reduce the number of incidents.**

## 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.21** The number of reported self-harm incidents and opened assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management documents for prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm) remained high for the type of establishment, although most were low level. In the six months to September 2017, 23 boys had carried out 35 acts of self-harm, and 34 ACCT documents had been opened. There was a formal recorded quality assurance check after the first review only, which missed opportunities to learn lessons.
- I.22** Three boys were on open ACCTs during the inspection, and two were on post-closure support. Boys were positive about the support they had received, including access to activities and time out of cell.
- I.23** The quality of ACCT documentation remained reasonably good, but triggers for future self-harm were often not identified clearly. Care maps were mostly good, but were not always specific and measurable - for example, they cited support from a caseworker as required rather than a specified frequency of input. Most observational entries were comprehensive but the timing remained too predictable, particularly at night.
- I.24** Case reviews took place in private and were consistently multidisciplinary; those we observed involved the boy well in planning his support needs.
- I.25** Boys on ACCT were often placed in a camera-observation cell, but there was no log of their use and the rationale for the decision was not always clear, and the monitoring screens remained visible to boys on the unit. However, camera observations no longer replaced meaningful interactions by staff.
- I.26** There were insufficient anti-ligature knives for all staff and those available were in sealed pouches, which could slow response times in an emergency.
- I.27** The strategic approach to suicide and self-harm reduction had improved, and was generally satisfactory and improving.

## Recommendations

- I.28** The recorded frequency of observations of boys on assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) documents should be less predictable.
- I.29** The use of camera-observation cells to monitor boys at heightened risk should always be logged, with clear rationale for their use, and the screen should not be easily visible to other boys on the unit.
- I.30** All staff, including night staff, should carry anti-ligature knives.

## 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.31** The local strategy for behaviour management had been reviewed since the previous inspection and there was now greater focus on encouraging positive behaviour. Staff used several elements from the strategy to motivate boys and encourage positive behaviour. The various strands of behaviour management were discussed at the monthly safeguarding meeting.
- I.32** There was discussion with boys about acceptable behaviour from the point of induction and included all aspects of local processes, such as violence reduction, rewards, sanctions and disciplinary procedures. Residential rules were displayed in several areas, in an age-appropriate format. We observed staff deal with some difficult situations. Even though there were relatively new staff, many showed tolerance to young people, with a sensible balance of patience and challenge when dealing with inappropriate behaviour. Managers were visible at key times, such as movement to activities, to provide assurance and support staff.
- I.33** Boys who displayed poor behaviour were managed on the residential units. There were individual plans to manage poor behaviour and, despite some minor restrictions for recreational association, all boys continued to attend education. Reviews of those managed through behaviour management processes were regular and consistent.

## Good practice

- I.34** *The visible presence of managers during key times in the regime provided appropriate confidence and support to staff when dealing with challenging behaviour.*

## 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.35** The rewards and sanctions scheme had been reviewed since the previous inspection and was now used appropriately and with increased effectiveness. The scheme operated on four levels - bronze, silver, gold and platinum. Very few boys were on the bronze (basic) level, which reflected the shift in focus to a more motivational regime. Boys on the bronze regime could still have around nine hours a day out of cell, and all boys were expected to continue to engage in education regardless of any reduction in incentive level.
- I.36** Following induction, boys were allocated to the gold (enhanced) level of privileges. Boys who continued on gold or attained platinum (enhanced plus) status had additional time out of their room and access to the gold room, which had additional association equipment. Although this equipment was predominantly for boys who had maintained the higher level of privileges, managers held some enrichment competitions in various parts of the unit that were open to boys on all levels to further motivate engagement with positive behaviour.
- I.37** Managers held weekly reviews of boys on bronze, which had improved. Although key workers did not attend review boards, they provided updates on boys and encouraged their engagement in achieving targets. Where boys failed to show progression from bronze, a multidisciplinary review was held to provide further support and guidance to help them progress to silver, although such reviews had not been required for some time.

### Good practice

- I.38** *The policy of placing new arrivals on to the gold regime encouraged an ethos of positive behaviour among the boys.*

## 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** The approach to security remained proportionate. There had been improvements to the supervision and control of movements for the short distance to activities, assisted by increased staffing.
- I.40** Intelligence was managed by the security department, which also covered the adult site. There had been 366 intelligence reports related to the young people's unit during the previous six months, which is lower than we see at similar units. The unit manager also collated data weekly to inform a stability report, and attended the monthly security meeting.
- I.41** All cell searching was intelligence-led and strip searching required the authority of a senior manager. The number of strip searches had increased since the previous inspection, with 36

in the six months to October 2017. These were a proportionate response to intelligence about illicit items, such as weapons or mobile phones.

- I.42 There were increasing concerns about gang cultures in the unit. Evidence indicated that there were 'postcode' gangs where boys from particular areas formed allegiances. While not an immediate risk, it was sensible for the establishment to focus on these concerns to avoid escalation.
- I.43 The availability of drugs remained negligible. Boys tested under the random mandatory drug testing (MDT) programme were selected as part of the wider establishment list. There had been no positive MDT tests during 2017. Suspicion drug testing took place promptly; four of the 17 suspicion tests requested in the previous six months had been positive - all for cannabis.
- I.44 Intelligence, data from finds and reports from boys indicated that most illicit substances entered via new arrivals. The location of the unit and its regime operated separately from the adult site, which continued to provide an effective supply reduction measure.
- I.45 Substance misuse workers from the young persons' unit attended the establishment's quarterly drug strategy committee; the actions arising from meetings were not always evidenced as being completed. A revised establishment-wide drug strategy and supply reduction action plan made appropriate reference to the unit.
- I.46 The number of adjudications had halved since the previous inspection and was now similar to comparable units. Processes were fair and clear explanations were given, which was reflected in our survey, from speaking with boys and examination of previous hearings. However, we identified a few cases that did not provide a detailed explanation of the rules that had been broken, and some hearings could have been dealt with by less formal means.
- I.47 Governance of disciplinary procedures was discussed at the monthly safeguarding meeting, but while this identified trends, there was not always detailed analysis by protected characteristics (see paragraph 2.10 and main recommendation S42).
- I.48 There had been just 17 minor reports during 2017, but most had not been completed due to the unavailability of trained staff. In nearly all cases, it was not clear why the charge had not resulted in a full adjudication. Managers had taken steps to stop the use of minor reports, and encouraged staff to use more appropriate and better managed behaviour management techniques (see section on behaviour management).

## Recommendation

- I.49 **The outcomes of all disciplinary procedures (adjudications and minor reports) should be scrutinised. There should be more focus on analysing trends and protected characteristics with monitored actions to address concerns.** (Repeated recommendation I.55)

## 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.50** There had been 112 violent incidents in the previous six months, compared with 135 for the same period in 2016. Although this slight reduction was encouraging, the number of violent incidents remained too high. (See main recommendation S41.)
- I.51** Most incidents involved boys striking another from behind, and staff intervened promptly to prevent the incident escalating further. There was evidence that some confrontation was due to a few boys intimidating others to conduct an assault. Many incidents resulted in relatively minor injuries, although there had been eight serious assaults and one boy had been involved in four of these.
- I.52** There had been several initiatives to reduce violence and address safety concerns. A modest reduction in population and the introduction of managing and minimising physical restraint (MMPR) had increased staff numbers to improve supervision and control. CCTV coverage had been improved, and the use of body-worn video cameras had increased. The cameras enabled automatic download of data, which could be retained for up to three months to assist with any allegations or child protection concerns; this practice was better than we see elsewhere.
- I.53** Following a violent incident, actions taken were discussed at a daily multidisciplinary meeting (see paragraph I.18) and a range of strategies considered, including mediation, a review of learning pathways and the opening of a supervision log (see paragraph I.66). While these logs provided some assurance, they were mostly used to monitor adjudication awards, and support plans for victims or challenge of perpetrators were underdeveloped (see recommendation I.67). Although the monthly safeguards meeting discussed violence and data, not all actions taken were recorded.
- I.54** Violence reduction monitoring forms were still used as a follow up to investigate acts of violence or unexplained injuries. There had been 57 forms completed during 2017, most of which showed a reasonable quality of investigation, although quality had deteriorated mid-year.
- I.55** A recently appointed safeguards manager had responsibility for violence reduction measures, and a full-time officer to provide additional support for investigations and strategic oversight had also been appointed. Systems to record violence had been revised, and an evidence-based action plan was being developed, but more was required to reduce the levels of violence.

### Good practice

- I.56** *The automatic download and retention of images from body-worn video cameras in case of further investigation was in line with statutory data retention policy.*



## 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.57** Use of force had reduced since the previous inspection but still remained higher than similar establishments. Force had been used on 184 occasions between April and September 2017. Minimising and managing physical restraint (MMPR) techniques had been fully implemented three months previously, and control and restraint was no longer used. Improved staffing in the unit meant that officers from the adult site who were not trained in MMPR did not routinely attend incidents.
- I.58** Since the introduction of MMPR, use of force had been slightly higher but most incidents were a reaction to protect boys following an assault or fight. Force was mostly low level and often involved the use of guiding holds to usher individual boys back to their cell following an incident. Pain-infliction techniques had been used twice since the introduction of MMPR.
- I.59** Governance of force had improved since the introduction of MMPR. The number of body-worn video cameras had been increased and CCTV improved (see also paragraph I.52). There were two full-time coordinators, and any incidents were reviewed the same day; staff were required to complete use of force documents on the same day, as far as practical, which had resulted in no backlog.
- I.60** There was more detailed analysis at a weekly use of force minimisation meeting, which was chaired by a senior manager and MMPR coordinators. While still new, there was external scrutiny from members of the Youth Justice Board, with plans to extend this further. Concerns or good practice were disseminated appropriately. There was further oversight of trends at the monthly safeguarding meeting.
- I.61** All boys were now debriefed after an incident of use of force; these interviews were now prompt but the records were not always completed in full. The local restraint minimisation strategy did not reflect the introduction of MMPR.

### Recommendations

- I.62** External scrutiny of the use of force should be further extended to provide continued assurance of the legality and proportionality of all incidents.
- I.63** Restraint minimisation strategies should reflect the introduction of minimising and managing physical restraint (MMPR).
- I.64** Pain-inducing techniques should not be used on children.

## 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.65** The use of segregation remained commendably low. Two cells were available in a separate unit in the adult prison if required, but they had only been used twice between April and October 2017 - on both occasions following a serious incident of violence and for short periods only. The regime on the unit was decent, with efforts to reintegrate boys at an early stage.
- I.66** Boys who received periods of separation following a proven adjudication were now monitored through supervision logs. This was always done on the main units, and boys were reviewed regularly and continued to attend activities. Supervision logs contained relevant information, such as safety algorithms when considering separation, a record of the award post-adjudication, and daily interactions and observations. However, some aspects of managerial oversight were weak, and several logs we examined did not indicate if reviews had been completed or the support in place.

### Recommendation

- I.67** **Documentation for boys on separation should indicate clearly the reason for the separation, the support in place and the actions required.**

### Good practice

- I.68** *The continued low use of segregation and the management of challenging behaviour on the unit were commendable.*

## 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.69** A full review of the young people's substance misuse operational policy and procedure in January 2017 had resulted in an updated action plan that informed service delivery. The young persons' unit was now more consistently represented on the wider prison regular drug and alcohol strategy meetings, which was positive.
- I.70** All new arrivals were screened by a nurse and any substance misuse needs were identified. The substance misuse section of the comprehensive health assessment tool was also completed within the recommended timescale. No boy had required clinical detoxification from drugs or alcohol since the last inspection, although services by competent staff were available if required.
- I.71** Two caseworkers provided psychosocial substance misuse support for the boys and completed some casework. Despite staff shortage, psychosocial support remained good. Every boy was seen promptly during induction to assess the support needed and to provide

basic drug education. Depending on the need identified, a full assessment was completed within 10 days and an individual treatment plan created. If a boy declined involvement after the initial assessment, he was offered further opportunities to engage with the substance misuse worker.

- I.72** Most interventions were delivered one to one, although some small groups were run. Individual sessions were tailored to meet the needs of each boy and used an appropriate range of workbooks, including those tackling drug supply, cannabis and relapse prevention. Record keeping was good.



## Section 2. Respect

### Residential units

#### Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.1 The cleanliness of communal areas and cells had improved significantly and was good, helped by new flooring. Staff photo boards were up to date, and wing notices and art displays were in good condition. The much improved range and quality of association equipment was valued by the boys. Yard areas were very small and stark, despite decorated walls.
- 2.2 Cells were stark but were mostly graffiti-free. Double cells remained too cramped with only space for one chair, but the reduced occupancy meant that few boys shared cells. Most cells lacked a lockable cabinet. Toilets remained partly screened and badly stained - the unit was addressing toilet screening and in-cell lockable storage. Access to showers remained good. Although the ventilation had not been improved, boys did not raise this and we did not observe any problems. Boys could easily launder their own clothes, and bedding was replaced regularly. Access to property was satisfactory. Only boys on gold level or above could have a flask for hot water, which meant the others could not make a hot drink during the long overnight lock up. Staff responded to call bells promptly
- 2.3 Boys valued the in-cell telephones and could also access wing telephones. Post was delivered daily. Applications were managed promptly through the electronic information kiosks

#### Recommendation

- 2.4 **Cells should have fully screened toilets and a functioning lockable cupboard, and boys should have access to hot water overnight.**

## 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.**

- 2.5 More boys we spoke to than on our last inspection were positive about staff, and all said they had someone they could turn to. In our survey, 66% of boys said most staff treated them with respect.
- 2.6 Several initiatives since our last inspection had improved relationships between wing staff and the boys. These included increased staffing, more visible leadership, enhanced staff training and greater access for boys to purposeful activity. All officers had been interviewed for the role, and effective mentoring supported new staff to develop the required skills. Most staff-young people interactions we observed were respectful, caring and effective. We observed staff being more consistent in challenging negative behaviour and reinforcing positive behaviour, which was reflected in key work and electronic case notes. The units also had a calmer and more controlled atmosphere than on our last inspection.

- 2.7** Staff knew the boys in their care well. Most boys had recorded fortnightly reviews with their key worker, and pool keyworkers were allocated to cover absences.
- 2.8** Consultation with the boys through a community participation forum had improved. Attendance by forum members and staff had improved recently, and points raised were taken to the monthly safeguarding meeting. The forum drove some changes, but some issues continued to be carried over for several meetings.

## 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

- 2.9** The strategic management and leadership of equality and diversity work remained weak. The prison-wide equality and diversity action plan included arrangements for the young persons' unit, but there had been little action to implement actions to date. There was no policy or action plan to ensure equal outcomes across the unit. The equality and diversity meetings paid too little attention to the young persons' unit, and boys did not benefit from some good work in the main prison.
- 2.10** We found very little evidence of detailed analysis of the experience and treatment of boys. Identification of protected characteristics remained underdeveloped. Data on aspects of life on the units were not broken down by protected characteristics, so it was not possible to analyse any disproportionate effects - for example, if black and minority ethnic boys were overrepresented in adjudications. (See main recommendation S42.)
- 2.11** There had been eight discrimination incident reports (DIRFs) in the last six months, which all involved racial discrimination: one was upheld and the rest dismissed. Investigations were not robust enough and sometimes failed to appreciate the boy's perspective. Boys we spoke to had little confidence in the DIRF system. There were very few opportunities, such as written responses to DIRFs and formal consultation, for boys to understand if the discrimination they felt was real or perceived.
- 2.12** The unit had recently started to hold consultation with black and minority ethnic boys, using black history month as a focus, to understand boys' perceptions of their treatment. The equality officer for the unit had undertaken a lot of work in the 10 weeks since she had been appointed, and had begun to develop relationships with boys.
- 2.13** There had been no progress on our previous recommendation that boys in the young persons' unit should have access to a similar range of external diversity groups as adult prisoners.

## Recommendation

- 2.14 Engagement by the young persons' unit with community diversity groups should be improved to the level achieved by the adult prison.** (Repeated recommendation 2.17)

## Diverse needs

- 2.15** Over a third of boys, 35%, were from a black and minority ethnic background. In our survey, while more boys from black and minority ethnic backgrounds than white backgrounds felt safe in the prison and had spoken to a peer mentor, fewer felt that they were treated with respect by staff, searches were respectful or that they were treated well in reception. Some boys told us that they thought the prison was racist. However, they could not give specific reasons for this other than their perception was that black and minority ethnic boys were not treated the same as their white counterparts. The prison had no detailed analysis of data to demonstrate that it treated all boys equally. (See main recommendation S42.)
- 2.16** Two foreign national boys were held at the time of the inspection. The prison-wide foreign national policy did not deal adequately with the needs of these boys – it only referred to the adult male population in the main prison – although they received additional support from a dedicated member of staff, as well as help to keep in contact with families and in appealing decisions. The prison was having difficulties in sourcing legal representation for these boys.
- 2.17** We found two boys with disabilities. Each had their day-to-day care managed through a supported living plan, which detailed any additional support they might need. Staff caring for these boys were knowledgeable about their needs.
- 2.18** No transgender boys were held at the time of our inspection and no boy had declared that they were gay or bisexual. Support was available from the main equality team if a boy did disclose.

## 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.**

- 2.19** The chaplaincy continued to provide good faith services and pastoral support. A member of the chaplaincy visited the unit each day, and shared relevant information with staff and through the daily briefing. A new Muslim chaplain was due to start work, which meant that the Muslim boys would be able to attend a Friday service and see the Muslim chaplain in person. Under the current arrangement, which separated boys from the adult prisoners, the Muslim chaplain led the service in the prison's world faith room and this was relayed by microphone to boys in the chapel. Boys could access corporate worship and a range of weekly discussion groups.

## 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.**

- 2.20 The number of complaints had increased since the last inspection from 18 to 64. Most were domestic - including damage to clothes, poor quality bed sheets, quantity of food and the custodial management system (CMS) (electronic kiosks) breaking down. There were responses to these, and in most cases it was clear that the boys had been spoken to.
- 2.21 Complaint forms were freely available on both units, but there were still no appeal forms. The complaint forms were not age-appropriate, and contained information about processes rather than seeking to assure boys that their concerns would be taken seriously. Complaints were recorded on a prison-wide spreadsheet, and those from young people could be easily extracted.
- 2.22 Quality assurance had improved, and the director reviewed 10 complaints a month. Between June and August 2017, the quality of responses continued to be mixed, and we agreed with the director's assessments that some responses had been thorough and detailed while others were poorly investigated and minimised the young person's concerns,
- 2.23 Some boys used the prison complaints form to complain that they were being treated differently as they were from a minority ethnic background. One boy was asked to submit his concern on a DIRF, which he did not do. His complaint should have been treated as a discrimination complaint, regardless of the form he used.

## Legal rights

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.24 The boy's caseworker explained his legal status to him soon after arrival, including key dates for release or court appearances. Boys on remand received appropriate support to pursue bail applications and had regular remand planning reviews. Caseworkers facilitated telephone calls for boys to contact legal advisers or other external professionals.
- 2.25 Legal visits took place in private rooms. Caseworkers were alert to the need for boys to have appropriate adults for formal interviews with police and other agencies, but highlighted the lack of support or guidance for boys with immigration issues to resolve (see also paragraph 2.16).



## 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.**

### Governance arrangements

- 2.26** G4S Health Services UK Ltd continued to provide health services. Working relationships between the establishment, health services, substance misuse service and the Youth Justice Board remained good. Strategic governance was embedded with well-attended partnership board and governance meetings, which addressed most areas. However, the health and well-being needs assessment was out of date.
- 2.27** The unit now had an additional nurse, which meant that two nurses now worked there each weekday from 7am to 4.30pm; nurses from the main prison were available outside of these hours, 24 hours a day. The unit nurses complemented each other - one was a registered mental health nurse and the other a registered general nurse. They could focus on each area but also effectively shared each other's work. A nurse attended every incident and the weekly minimising and managing physical restraint (MMPR) meeting to review incidents, which was positive (see paragraph 1.60).
- 2.28** The nurse interactions with boys that we observed were caring, and both nurses provided responsive and child-focused care. Boys were positive about the service they received.
- 2.29** Both nurses had good awareness of their safeguarding responsibilities and were appropriately trained in child safeguarding to level 3. Other mandatory training was mostly in date, including intermediate life support, and professional development opportunities were available. Staff felt supported and were due to have formal supervision with a new supervisor.
- 2.30** The electronic clinical records that we sampled, held on the SystmOne clinical IT system, were generally good. There was an appropriate range of policies, although the infection control policy needed to be updated. There were effective systems for the management of communicable diseases. Consent to share medical information and the capacity to consent to treatment was routinely sought.
- 2.31** The new medicine administration room was fully operational so all medication could now be administered on the unit, and some clinics took place there. There were monthly infection control audits, and a few minor areas needing attention were being addressed.
- 2.32** Identified nurses or paramedics from the main prison attended any medical emergency with appropriate emergency equipment. The emergency grab bag on the unit was under review to ensure it was age-appropriate. The automated external defibrillator was in good order, regularly checked and available to all staff. All officers were trained in first aid and understood the emergency medical code system. Ambulances were called promptly in an emergency.
- 2.33** There were long waiting times for the meningitis vaccination and some delays with hepatitis B vaccinations. However, some vaccinations had been received and were being prioritised to reduce both waiting lists. Sexual health screening was comprehensive with established links

with specialist community services. Barrier protection was discussed and available from nurses.

- 2.34** There were now mechanisms to differentiate health incidents between the young persons' unit and the adult prison. However, there was no separate analysis of potential trends, which reduced the opportunity to apply any specific potential learning. Data on health complaints from the unit were still merged with those from the adult prison and were difficult to find. The prison's health complaints system was used and confidential health care envelopes provided. However, this was not clearly advertised and many of the envelopes were difficult to open. One complaint had been received since the last inspection. The response was prompt but lacked an acknowledgement of the how the boy was feeling, and did not fully address the issues raised.
- 2.35** A young people's health care forum had commenced in May 2017; this positive initiative had started to address issues highlighted by the boys.
- 2.36** There had been a recent focus on health promotion, linking with education and the interventions team, which was very promising. Joint work was developing, with nurses joining existing sessions on sexual health and healthy eating, adding a further health dimension. Health promotion happened during individual health appointments, and smoking cessation support was available.

## Recommendations

- 2.37** **There should be an up-to-date health and well-being needs assessment to identify the current and future needs of the population and inform the provision of services.**
- 2.38** **Monitoring and analysis of the unit's health complaints and incidents should be thorough. The confidential health complaints system should be advertised and easily accessible to all boys, and responses should fully address the issues highlighted.**
- 2.39** **Boys should receive vaccinations in a timely manner.**

## Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.40** A registered nurse assessed new arrivals (including late arrivals) for their immediate health needs. The additional nurse meant that subsequent required health screening - including physical health, substance misuse, mental health and neuro-disability - were now completed within the recommended timescales. Appropriate referrals were made.
- 2.41** Boys had prompt access to an appropriate range of primary care services, including physiotherapy, podiatry and the optician. An hour each weekday was allocated in the main health care department exclusively for the boys, escorted by officers, to attend services, including GP and dental services.
- 2.42** Boys could make health care appointments through the CMS. Non-attendance rates were high but were followed up, and boys were encouraged to attend and appointments rebooked when necessary. Marnell Medical Services provided daytime and out-of-hours GP services, which gave a consistent approach to care. Routine GP appointments were within two days, and urgent on-the-day appointments were available and prioritised based on clinical need.

- 2.43** Boys with long-term conditions and complex needs were well known to the team and regularly reviewed by nurses and overseen by the GP. There were evidence-based care plans for those with long-term conditions, and were being developed for boys with complex needs.
- 2.44** Access to external health appointments was good and they were rarely cancelled.

## Pharmacy

- 2.45** Medicines were supplied promptly by the in-house pharmacy, mostly on a named-patient basis in pre-packed doses, and were transported safely in a locked trolley to the unit. All medicines, including controlled drugs were now administered from the unit's medicine administration room, which was a much improved environment since the last inspection.
- 2.46** Prescribing was age-appropriate with most medicines administered supervised at regular intervals in a confidential, safe and helpful manner. Officers supervised medicine administration effectively. Boys could keep medicines, such as inhalers and ointments, and in-possession medicine risk assessments were completed as necessary. Controlled drugs were prescribed mainly for attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) and on a named-patient basis.
- 2.47** Nurses could administer a small range of medicines without a GP prescription, and these were appropriately recorded on SystemOne. Some medicine protocols were under review to ensure they were age-appropriate. Relevant emergency stock was accessible if required. The pharmacist completed medicine use reviews and was available to see boys for advice by request or referral from health staff.
- 2.48** Storage and administration were appropriate. The medicine cabinets were clean and tidy, with clear differentiation of in-possession and supervised medicines. There were appropriate steps to ensure medicines were stored within the correct temperature range.

## Dentistry

- 2.49** Time for Teeth provided a full range of NHS-equivalent services, including good oral health promotion. In our survey, 65% of boys, against the comparator of 34%, said it was easy to see the dentist. The average wait for routine appointments was approximately two weeks and urgent dental care was prioritised, which was positive. Boys were referred to external orthodontic treatment. The dental suite remained an excellent facility, met infection control standards and had a separate decontamination room. Dental equipment was suitably maintained and dental waste disposed of appropriately. Record keeping was good

## Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.50** Boys with mental health needs were identified promptly through a comprehensive health screening on reception, with subsequent mental health and neuro-disability screenings assessments. There was also effective joint working between officers, health staff and caseworkers. The unit mental health nurse provided a responsive and caring service. The nurse now had more time to spend on implementing some primary mental health interventions for boys with mild to moderate mental health problems, including relaxation, mindfulness activities and age-appropriate self-help material. She had six boys on her caseload, and also attended all assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) reviews, which was positive.

- 2.51** The multidisciplinary Forensic Adolescent Consultation and Treatment Service (FACTS) from Cwm Taf University Health Board provided specialist mental health services. A clinical nurse specialist usually provided one session a week and was supporting 11 boys. Waiting times were short and boys were seen regularly, although there was still limited access to interventions for boys with more complex needs.
- 2.52** A psychiatrist had been attending fortnightly, although there had been a gap in provision for a few months. A clinical psychologist attended specifically for time-limited psychological assessment for two boys. A psychologist had been recruited for the in-reach team to provide ongoing sessions and develop a more comprehensive service.
- 2.53** Staff had been trained on the trauma recovery model, and 37% of custody staff had completed mental health awareness training. The clinical nurse specialist had completed a training needs analysis to assess and deliver further custody staff training.
- 2.54** One boy had been transferred to a secure mental health unit under the Mental Health Act since the last inspection. The 14-day transfer guideline was slightly exceeded, but this was not clearly logged in the unit's data to provide the accurate information needed for the service to assess the impact of this.

## Recommendation

- 2.55** **Boys should have access to a full range of mental health interventions, including those provided by the Forensic Adolescent Consultation and Treatment Service.**

## 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.**

- 2.56** The food remained unpopular; in our survey, only 8% of boys said it was good. Most meals continued to be prepared off site and then heated up in the prison kitchen. Sandwiches and wraps were assembled on site, and soups were made from powder and supplemented with frozen vegetables.
- 2.57** The menu was repeated every four weeks. A range of religious, medical and ethical diets were catered for. Lunch consisted of five choices of sandwich, soup and fruit. The hot evening meal offered six choices, and there was fruit and a snack in the evening. At weekends, boys were given three hot meals. Portions were adequate. It remained positive that boys were given fresh milk and toast at breakfast. Boys could eat all meals communally, which was an opportunity for staff to model good social behaviour. The meals we observed were calm and well managed by residential staff. Food service areas were clean, but some food safety check and temperature control booklets were incomplete.
- 2.58** Boys could use the information kiosks on the units to comment on the food. Food consultation arrangements were reasonable.

## Recommendation

- 2.59** Food temperatures should be taken and recorded at the point of service, completion of servery checks should be monitored, and servery supervisors should accurately record the findings after each check.

## 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.**

- 2.60** Boys used the information kiosks to place shop orders. A wide range of appropriately priced goods was available. All new arrivals were given a reception pack. Boys could buy items such as clothing and electrical goods from a range of catalogues. There were no delays in the system, but boys were charged a 50p administration fee to place an order.

## Recommendation

- 2.61** Boys should not be charged administration fees for catalogue orders.



## Section 3. Purposeful activity

### Time out of cell

#### Expected outcomes:

**Children and young people spend most of their time out of their cell, engaged in activities such as education, leisure and cultural pursuits, seven days a week.<sup>3</sup>**

- 3.1** Boys had more time out of cell than in many comparable establishments, and this had improved since our last inspection. Those on the highest reward level could spend 11 hours a day out of their cells, with up to nine hours a day for boys on the lowest level. All boys received regular time in the gym, and could go outside to the exercise yards at least three times a day. In our roll checks, we found only 8% of boys locked in their cells during the day. Staff made significant efforts to get boys out of their cells, including finding time to unlock boys who were scared.
- 3.2** There were more activities available on the wings and association time was well managed. The association rooms for boys on the highest reward level had improved, and provided a real incentive.

### 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.**

**3.3** *Estyn<sup>4</sup> made the following assessments about the learning and skills and work provision:*

<i>Standards:</i>	<i>Good</i>
<i>Well-being and attitudes to learning:</i>	<i>Good</i>
<i>Teaching and learning experiences:</i>	<i>Good</i>
<i>Care, support and guidance:</i>	<i>Excellent</i>
<i>Leadership and management:</i>	<i>Good</i>

<sup>3</sup> Time out of cell, in addition to formal 'purposeful activity', includes any time children and young people are out of their cells to associate or use communal facilities to take showers or make telephone calls.

<sup>4</sup> Inspection of the provision of education and educational standards, as well as vocational training in YOIs for young people, is undertaken by Estyn, the office of Her Majesty's Inspectorate for Education and Training in Wales, working under the general direction of HM Inspectorate of Prisons. Estyn is independent of, but funded by, the National Assembly for Wales. The purpose of Estyn is to inspect quality and standards in education and training in Wales.

## Management of education and learning and skills

- 3.4** The prison was committed to the role and importance of education and skills, and had further developed the learning and skills provision. Resources had been allocated to improve the physical education facilities, and to enable eight prison officers to be trained as learning support workers.
- 3.5** There was effective monitoring of quality improvement, and appropriate systems to monitor the provision to ensure that it met key performance indicators. The new learning and skills team for day-to-day management had only been in place for the previous 12 months, and it was too early to see the full impact on outcomes.
- 3.6** The prison used labour market information effectively to review and extend its curriculum. It had worked well in partnership with an upholstery company to develop a potential progression route for a few boys to access release on temporary licence (ROTL), with the possibility of apprenticeships at the end of their sentence, with relevant vocational training to prepare boys for this opportunity. Further partnerships included the Construction Youth Trust Ltd, which delivered a pilot projects to help ex-offenders into construction apprenticeships.
- 3.7** The prison's senior management team had secured funding to develop the unit's vocational training provision, with plans to convert premises to accommodate this. The prison had bought equipment to be able to offer opportunities for boys to participate in the Duke of Edinburgh's Award scheme, and the scheme was to assess its premises to introduce this provision.
- 3.8** The learning and skills team held weekly staff meetings, which included reviews of individual boys' progress, behaviour and achievement. These meetings were well informed by useful updates of the boys' behaviour and additional learning needs to ensure that staff shared understanding of how to support boys make further progress.

## Recommendation

- 3.9** **The day-to-day management of learning and skills and team development should be fully consolidated through careful monitoring by unit senior managers.**

## Provision of activities

- 3.10** Teachers allocated all boys to education within a few days of their arrival. The boys made the most of this opportunity and sampled the full range of learning pathways offered during their induction. The boys had access to appropriate and relevant learning that allowed them to study a range of vocational subjects, develop their social skills and improve their understanding of healthy lifestyles.
- 3.11** Education staff identified the individual education and support needs of the boys promptly through a wide range of assessments. They used the outcomes of these, together with any prior learning information, to develop detailed individual education plans (IEPs). These plans were shared very effectively with all staff, and were used well by teachers to inform their planning.
- 3.12** Since the previous inspection, the range of vocational choices had been revised to include subjects more relevant to employment opportunities, including cycle mechanics and upholstery. The prison had further strengthened its high priority on boys developing their



literacy and numeracy skills. The curriculum allowed boys to learn and improve their essential skills, and to practise and apply these in all areas of their learning.

- 3.13** Too few boys took part in work experience, and opportunities for ROTL remained underused.

### Quality of provision

- 3.14** The overall standard of teaching was good, and in a few cases excellent. In the best classes, teachers created a very positive atmosphere for learning, managed behaviour well and supported boys to produce high standards of work. All teachers set clear objectives for learning and used an appropriate variety of teaching methods to sustain boys' interest throughout lessons.
- 3.15** Most facilities and resources met the needs of boys well and provided a safe and stimulating environment for learning. Many teaching rooms contained attractive wall displays and useful learning resources, which were used well to support teaching and learning. A few resources were bilingual, and in a few classes boys were encouraged to identify and use relevant Welsh words.
- 3.16** Officers and teachers worked very well together to support boys with their learning and to maximise their individual progress. The management of boys' behaviour in classes was very good due to this team approach. When bad behaviour became a problem, teachers revised their teaching strategies and activities quickly through using methods to re-engage boys in learning promptly. Most boys behaved well in education for most of the time. However, during the inspection, a few did not behave well and disrupted the learning in these classes.
- 3.17** Teachers and officers used informal feedback well to encourage and guide boys' learning. Teachers provided clear and appropriate written feedback on boys' work, including relevant comments on progress in their literacy and numeracy. All teachers provided useful feedback on boys' behaviour as well as their progress in learning.
- 3.18** Nearly all boys were involved effectively in monthly setting, reviewing and monitoring of their progress towards achieving agreed learning goals across all aspects of their learning.
- 3.19** The prison had improved its approach to supporting boys who refused to participate in education. The very few who remained in cells received work that enabled them to follow the curriculum. The improved integration of officers and education staff enabled the boys to receive learning support promptly and effectively. There had been very good and successful progress in developing facilities to encourage these boys into classes and follow a full timetable of activities. Boys' participation in activities and education had improved considerably, enabling them to progress in developing their social, educational and work skills.

### Education and vocational achievements

- 3.20** The majority of boys enjoyed their learning and most participated well in lessons. Nearly all remained on task for most of the time, and a majority engaged in activities with enthusiasm and interest.
- 3.21** Most boys made good progress in their work. They developed their skills systematically and took a pride in their achievements. In vocational classes, particularly in carpentry, they

worked hard to accomplish a high standard. In cookery, they developed useful skills that they could use in their own homes or transfer to commercial kitchens.

- 3.22** In 2016-17, most boys gained qualifications or certificates of credit that reflected their learning achievements well. In vocational classes, 96.5% of boys achieved their learning aims, as did 78% in employability classes. Seven boys achieved GCSEs. Achievements in literacy and numeracy skills remained high, and nearly all boys developed these skills well in vocational classes. All boys who remained at the unit for six months or more improved aspects of their literacy and numeracy by at least one level.
- 3.23** Many boys were developing study skills well and learning how to engage with education. They were starting to understand how the skills they were gaining could be transferred to further education or to future employment.
- 3.24** In vocational workshops, most boys gave good attention to housekeeping to ensure they used tools and equipment safely. Most took the initiative to keep work areas orderly. Nearly all demonstrated a good understanding of when to use personal protective equipment appropriately.

## Library

- 3.25** All boys had good access to a well-resourced library in the unit. Library staff encouraged and supported boys to use the library, and had a good rapport with them. There was a sufficient range of age-appropriate books and other resources, including accessible materials such as easy-read titles, for boys with limited reading skills. A few boys benefited from sessions with a resident reader. There was a useful selection of books in Welsh and other languages, as well a range of audio books. There was a good range of materials for current learning, as well as leisure-interest periodicals. There was a broad range of age-appropriate fiction and non-fiction, including several complete book series, which encouraged the boys to develop and sustain their reading habits. Arrangements to borrow books from other libraries within the prison were effective, and boys were encouraged to request additional books to match their study needs and interests.

## 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.**

- 3.26** All boys had very good access to physical education provision. They could access sport or gym during their learning timetable and also use the facilities during evenings and weekends. They could access the well-equipped gym frequently, and had good opportunities to participate in outdoor sport.
- 3.27** The gym contained a range of high quality, up-to-date facilities that enabled boys to participate in a broad range of activities. Gym staff ensured that boys developed a clear understanding of how these activities improved their health and fitness. They also gave good attention to developing boys' awareness of how hydration, different food groups and toxic substances affected their health and lifestyle.

**3.28** Boys with a particular interest in sport had good opportunities to gain relevant accreditation at an appropriate range of levels.



## 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 management of resettlement had not changed substantially since the last inspection, with greater priority given to other areas of the unit's performance. Despite this, there had been some focus on sustaining and moving provision forward, although this was still at an early stage. Resettlement work was underpinned by an action plan developed from a needs analysis in 2016. The unit's policy was to complete a needs analysis every two years, which did not always meet changes in the population.
- 4.2 The resettlement committee had met once in 2017 with reasonable attendance, except there had been no external representatives. A meeting due in July 2017 had been cancelled. The meetings were too infrequent to drive improvements.
- 4.3 The unit continued to maintain useful strategic and operational links with external partners. Members of the casework team attended resettlement panels in Wales, and the team was also represented at the South West resettlement consortium in England.
- 4.4 The casework team during the inspection included two full-time caseworkers, two dual-role substance misuse workers, a seconded youth offending service worker who managed boys on remand, a seconded social worker who supported boys in the care of their local authority, two interventions officers, a family liaison officer and an administration officer. The team also had two vacant posts.
- 4.5 There had been no use of release on temporary licence (ROTL) since the previous inspection, although the unit was clear about its importance in motivating boys and encouraging engagement and good behaviour. Managers had been active in approaching local organisations and had secured offers of ROTL placements from two sources (see also paragraph 3.6). The first placement was available as soon as boys were identified to take it up, and a ROTL board due shortly after the inspection was to consider eight boys identified as suitable.
- 4.6 Early release provisions for boys with detention and training orders (DTOs) were managed appropriately. Only six boys had been eligible for early release in the previous six months, and one was granted it (one had his early release refused before transfer to the unit). There had been no boys eligible for home detention curfew during the same period.
- 4.7 The length of sentence that some boys received meant that two or three a month, on average, transferred to an adult prison after they turned 18. Planning for this started several months in advance. Transition arrangements for boys who moved on to the Parc main site were more comprehensive than for those who moved elsewhere, as preparatory work depended on the level of engagement from the receiving prison.

- 4.8** A process to gather post-release data on boys released from the unit had been put in place a few months previously. It was too early to assess the effectiveness of this in shaping provision.

## Recommendations

- 4.9** **The resettlement committee should drive improvements to pre-release and resettlement provision based on up-to-date understanding of the needs of the population.**
- 4.10** **The unit should make more use of release on temporary licence to support release planning and maintenance of family ties.** (Repeated recommendation 4.10)

## 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.**

- 4.11** Boys had a training (sentence) plan or a remand plan, but in our survey only just over half knew that they had a plan, even though they were given a copy of their targets. Boys also had plans in education, or agreed targets with their key workers or in assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) reviews, and it was not always clear how these were brought together. Caseworkers attended a range of meetings that discussed the boys they managed, which gave them a broad knowledge of the boy's progress at the unit. The daily multidisciplinary meeting worked well to share all relevant information about boys, and contributed to a better understanding of boys' needs by all staff who worked with them.
- 4.12** Caseworkers had caseloads of up to 14 boys, organised regular review meetings and were accessible to boys between meetings. A range of professionals and family members were invited to attend review meetings. Attendance by youth offending services (YOS) and independent review officers was generally good, although the distances that some had to travel to the unit meant that visits to see boys between formal reviews were less common. Community-based professionals were offered a private discussion with the boy they were responsible for before review meetings. Managers monitored attendance by residential staff, and this was better than we often see, but it was less good from some other areas. There was work to improve the attendance from education staff following an improvement in the written feedback they provided to the meetings.
- 4.13** Records of review meetings did not reflect caseworker knowledge about the boys they managed, the risks they posed, their offending behaviour and how this manifested in custody. Discussions about these areas were not recorded fully enough, and some targets were generic. Documented quality assurance had been introduced and was beginning to address this. The e-Asset (electronic case management) tool was not used to record meetings, pending access to an upgraded system. Although caseworkers prioritised ongoing contact with YOS workers, and maintained logs of information shared via email, telephone or in meetings, the lack of a case management system hindered the sharing of full information about boys' progress, risks and needs with external partners.

## Recommendations

- 4.14** All departments that work with a boy regularly should be represented at his training or remand planning meeting to provide consistent feedback and reinforcement to help him achieve his individual targets.
- 4.15** Records of review meetings should fully reflect the discussion, and how agreed targets are linked to risk and offending.
- 4.16** There should be a case management system to record a boy's progress in custody and facilitate information sharing with community agencies.

## Public protection

- 4.17** Public protection concerns for new arrivals were identified during admissions screening and followed up by caseworkers, who also checked with external youth offending teams (YOTs) about multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA), harassment or restraining orders or the risk they could potentially pose to other boys or staff. There were clear processes for restrictions on or monitoring of contacts, and included regular reviews of decisions made.
- 4.18** Seven boys were subject to MAPPA level one (the lowest level) and two were subject to MAPPA level two (the middle level). External YOTs took the lead in screening boys for MAPPA levels, and these were confirmed with caseworkers as part of the planning for release process. When possible, caseworkers attended community MAPPA reviews for boys on level two or three.

## Indeterminate sentence young people

- 4.19** Few boys with indeterminate sentences were placed at the unit, and there were none during the inspection. Boys with indeterminate sentences were managed in the same way as other boys, with regular review and planning meetings. There was sufficient expertise in the casework team to manage the sentence, but no specific support or provision for them. Eight boys had sentences of over five years. The unit was not resourced as a long-term unit, and there was not enough analysis of the needs of boys who might spend several years on the unit while their peers were released.

## Looked-after children

- 4.20** There were 16 boys who were looked after at the time of the inspection, but there was a total of 31 boys (72%) for whom a local authority had statutory responsibility. Twenty of the boys were over 50 miles away from home, of whom eight were more than 100 miles from home. Local records showed that local authorities from England and Wales had had boys placed at Parc.
- 4.21** Boys entitled to support from their local authority were quickly identified on reception. A seconded social worker took the lead in informing local authorities and reminding them of their obligations when a boy they had responsibility for was admitted. The support provided by local authorities remained variable. The seconded social worker had developed good relationships with the Welsh local authorities, but this was proving more difficult with the English local authorities due to their number.

- 4.22** Statutory reviews for looked-after boys usually took place within the required timescales, but some still had delays. There as a new escalation process and data were being collated to be able to challenge local authorities and notify local safeguarding children's board (LSCB) chairs of issues.

## Recommendation

- 4.23 All boys with looked-after status should receive consistent and adequate levels of support from their local authority.** (Repeated recommendation 4.25)

## 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.**

## Release

- 4.24** Releases took place through the adult admissions area, with boys kept separate from adults also being released, transferred or who worked there. Caseworkers ensured that most boys were met by a responsible adult on release, and were not taken to the admissions area until the adult was known to be in the visitors' centre. In cases where boys were not being met by an adult, they were taken to the local station and staff ensured they got on the right train. Plain bags were provided to carry personal items, and discharge processes were efficient.

## Accommodation

- 4.25** The unit had had some good results in improving accommodation outcomes for boys on release. Outcomes were monitored by the team manager. We were told it could be particularly difficult to find accommodation for boys who did not have family to return to and had their 18th birthday while in custody. Caseworkers and managers escalated cases with external partners when a boy's accommodation needs were not addressed sufficiently. Boys also had good support from independent advocates from Barnardo's and the Howard League. Within Wales, resettlement panels could be used for multiagency discussion about individual boys for whom it was harder to find suitable accommodation. There was no similar facility for English boys.
- 4.26** No boys had been released without an address or to unsuitable accommodation in the previous six months, but in some cases accommodation was not identified until too close to the boy's release date and after his final planning review had taken place. This made comprehensive release planning impossible.

## Recommendation

- 4.27 The Youth Custody Service should work with relevant government departments to ensure that all boys are provided with appropriate accommodation in good time for their release.**



## Education, training and employment

- 4.28** Parc had strengthened its relationships with a few local colleges, and this had enabled a few boys to receive interviews for progression opportunities while they were still in the unit. The development of partnerships with employment and training providers had improved the opportunities for boys to progress into education, training and employment at the end of their sentences. However, it was too early to evaluate the full impact of these links.
- 4.29** Teachers offered boys helpful guidance on progression opportunities. However, most boys were poorly informed about the range of opportunities available to them on their release. They did not have early access to independent careers advice to ensure that they could plan how to make constructive use of their time in the unit, and improve their employment or progression prospects.

## Recommendation

- 4.30** **New arrivals should have sufficient access to independent advice and guidance so that they can plan the best use of the learning opportunities available in the unit.**

## Health care

- 4.31** All boys were seen on transfer or release to identify any outstanding health needs and offered health promotion advice, including barrier protection. They were given a discharge summary for their GP with relevant health information. Boys on medication were given a week's supply, and those in receipt of controlled medication received it from pharmacy staff outside the prison to prevent any diversion. Boys with continuing mental health needs were linked with their local child and adolescent mental health service (CAMHS) team and/or adult services, and there was good liaison with YOTs.

## Drugs and alcohol

- 4.32** Substance misuse workers delivered a pre-release harm reduction session with all boys. There was good liaison with caseworkers, and planning for release and transition to adult services. Links with community services and YOTs were good.

## Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.33** Finance, benefit and debt advice provision had improved slightly but was still underdeveloped. The education team provided basic budgeting and financial management information, and boys were supported to get National Insurance numbers and open bank accounts, although this did not include savings accounts. There was no focused advice on debt avoidance and management, gambling or accessing benefits.

## Recommendation

- 4.34** **Boys should receive comprehensive advice and guidance on finance, benefit and debt before their release.**

## Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.35** There was still good work to support boys to have quality contact with families and friends. The separate visits area for boys remained in good repair, was comfortable and child friendly. The visitors' centre continued to be a valuable resource for parents and families.
- 4.36** Boys could book visits using the electronic kiosk on the wings, and could keep in contact using their in-cell telephones. Parents welcomed this contact and felt that their child was able to report issues to them quickly. Skype had been used for two boys in the last six months, with arrangements for another boy to use this facility.
- 4.37** A family worker dedicated to the unit had recently been appointed, and made sure that parents were informed of any incidents as soon as possible. She also operated the parents telephone line, and had recently extended its hours to accommodate working parents. Parents who we spoke to confirmed that there were quick responses to their calls.
- 4.38** During the inspection, the unit held a family day, which we partly attended. This was held in the education area of the unit, and enabled parents, friends and families to see where the boys lived and the conditions. The family day was well attended, and had a calm and social atmosphere. Staff provided a range of activities for boys and their families. Boys not having a visit that day could still take part in the event, as they had been involved in food preparation and serving drinks and refreshments to visitors. We spoke to several parents following the family day, who all appreciated the efforts the unit had made. One parent told us that when her child went to prison she felt that she had lost all her ability to be his parent, and although she spoke to him on the telephone that she was losing him. She said that the family day had been the closest she had felt to her child, and that she was grateful for this.

## Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.39** Since the previous inspection, the unit had changed its approach to interventions to address offending behaviour and had adopted the trauma recovery model (TRM) (see footnote 2). The previous non-accredited interventions were no longer available, and instead each boy was assessed for individual work with the two interventions officers using a TRM-informed approach. The change was relatively recent and an interesting response to meeting the often complex needs of boys at the unit. It was too early to judge the effectiveness of the model, but the success of the approach needed to be evaluated formally.
- 4.40** As at the previous inspection, there were still no interventions for boys with sexually harmful behaviour. Some boys had sufficiently long sentences to access such interventions when they moved into the adult estate. However, boys with sexual offences had no opportunity while at Parc to reflect on and address the behaviour that had led to custody or to reduce the likelihood of reoffending. We had raised this in previous inspections and yet a small number of boys with these offences continued to be held at Parc, even though there had been no progress in sourcing suitable support for them. (See main recommendation S43.)

## Recommendation

- 4.41** **Evaluation of interventions should be put in place.** (Repeated recommendation 4.47)

## 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 recommendation

To the Youth Custody Service  
and Welsh Government

- 5.1** The Youth Custody Service and Welsh Government should work with G4S as a matter of urgency to determine how suitable interventions will be put in place for boys who have shown sexually harmful behaviour in their offending history. (S43)

### Main recommendations

To the director

- 5.2** Senior managers work to identify and provide the support needed to help Parc address and reduce the consistently high levels of violence, while continuing to deliver a full, constructive regime to the boys in its care. (S41)
- 5.3** There should be a regular equality management meeting to ensure that policy, planning and consultation are effective, boys' perceptions and needs are addressed, and comprehensive monitoring data are considered. (S42)

### Recommendation

To the Youth Custody Service

- 5.4** The Youth Custody Service should work with relevant government departments to ensure that all boys are provided with appropriate accommodation in good time for their release. (4.27)

### Recommendation

To the Youth Custody Service and PECS

- 5.5** Boys should be transported to custody as soon as their case has finished. They should be transported separately from adults and arrive into custody before 7pm. (1.2, repeated recommendation 1.4)

## Recommendations

To the director

### Safeguarding

- 5.6** The monthly safeguarding meeting should accurately record follow-up actions to be taken and evidence of outcomes. (1.13)

### Victims of bullying and intimidation

- 5.7** The unit should survey boys at Parc, their families, carers and visitors about bullying concerns to inform future strategy to reduce the number of incidents. (1.20)

### Suicide and self-harm prevention

- 5.8** The recorded frequency of observations of boys on assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) documents should be less predictable. (1.28)
- 5.9** The use of camera-observation cells to monitor boys at heightened risk should always be logged, with clear rationale for their use, and the screen should not be easily visible to other boys on the unit. (1.29)
- 5.10** All staff, including night staff, should carry anti-ligature knives. (1.30)

### Security and disciplinary procedures

- 5.11** The outcomes of all disciplinary procedures (adjudications and minor reports) should be scrutinised. There should be more focus on analysing trends and protected characteristics with monitored actions to address concerns. (1.49, repeated recommendation 1.55)

### The use of force

- 5.12** External scrutiny of the use of force should be further extended to provide continued assurance of the legality and proportionality of all incidents. (1.62)
- 5.13** Restraint minimisation strategies should reflect the introduction of minimising and managing physical restraint (MMPR). (1.63)
- 5.14** Pain-inducing techniques should not be used on children. (1.64)

### Separation/removal from normal location

- 5.15** Documentation for boys on separation should indicate clearly the reason for the separation, the support in place and the actions required. (1.67)

### Residential units

- 5.16** Cells should have fully screened toilets and a functioning lockable cupboard, and boys should have access to hot water overnight. (2.4)

## Equality and diversity

- 5.17** Engagement by the young persons' unit with community diversity groups should be improved to the level achieved by the adult prison. (2.14, repeated recommendation 2.17)

## Health services

- 5.18** There should be an up-to-date health and well-being needs assessment to identify the current and future needs of the population and inform the provision of services. (2.37)
- 5.19** Monitoring and analysis of the unit's health complaints and incidents should be thorough. The confidential health complaints system should be advertised and easily accessible to all boys, and responses should fully address the issues highlighted. (2.38)
- 5.20** Boys should receive vaccinations in a timely manner. (2.39)
- 5.21** Boys should have access to a full range of mental health interventions, including those provided by the Forensic Adolescent Consultation and Treatment Service. (2.55)

## Catering

- 5.22** Food temperatures should be taken and recorded at the point of service, completion of servery checks should be monitored, and servery supervisors should accurately record the findings after each check. (2.59)

## Purchases

- 5.23** Boys should not be charged administration fees for catalogue orders. (2.61)

## Education, learning and skills

- 5.24** The day-to-day management of learning and skills and team development should be fully consolidated through careful monitoring by unit senior managers. (3.9)

## Pre-release and resettlement

- 5.25** The resettlement committee should drive improvements to pre-release and resettlement provision based on up-to-date understanding of the needs of the population. (4.9)
- 5.26** The unit should make more use of release on temporary licence to support release planning and maintenance of family ties. (4.10, repeated recommendation 4.10)

## Training planning and remand management

- 5.27** All departments that work with a boy regularly should be represented at his training or remand planning meeting to provide consistent feedback and reinforcement to help him achieve his individual targets. (4.14)
- 5.28** Records of review meetings should fully reflect the discussion, and how agreed targets are linked to risk and offending. (4.15)
- 5.29** There should be a case management system to record a boy's progress in custody and facilitate information sharing with community agencies. (4.16)

- 5.30** All boys with looked-after status should receive consistent and adequate levels of support from their local authority. (4.23, repeated recommendation 4.25)

### **Reintegration planning**

- 5.31** New arrivals should have sufficient access to independent advice and guidance so that they can plan the best use of the learning opportunities available in the unit. (4.30)
- 5.32** Boys should receive comprehensive advice and guidance on finance, benefit and debt before their release. (4.34)
- 5.33** Evaluation of interventions should be put in place. (4.41, repeated recommendation 4.47)

### **Examples of good practice**

- 5.34** New arrivals received age-appropriate and comprehensive literature about the unit, and an induction programme that recognised their individual needs and supported them effectively to adjust to life on the unit. (1.7)
- 5.35** The visible presence of managers during key times in the regime provided appropriate confidence and support to staff when dealing with challenging behaviour. (1.34)
- 5.36** The policy of placing new arrivals on to the gold regime encouraged an ethos of positive behaviour among the boys. (1.38)
- 5.37** The automatic download and retention of images from body-worn video cameras in case of further investigation was in line with statutory data retention policy. (1.56)
- 5.38** The continued low use of segregation and the management of challenging behaviour on the unit were commendable. (1.68)

## Section 6. Appendices

### Appendix I: Inspection team

Martin Lomas	Deputy chief inspector
Angus Mulready-Jones	Team leader
Ian Dickens	Inspector
Angela Johnson	Inspector
Yvonne McGuckian	Inspector
Majella Pearce	Inspector
Helen Ranns	Researcher
Anna Fenton	Researcher
Maureen Jamieson	Health services inspector
Tom Stephenson	Health Inspectorate Wales (shadowing)
Gill Sims	Estyn inspector
Alun Connick	Estyn inspector
Ian Dickson	Estyn 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 December 2016, a third of boys at Parc felt unsafe. Boys were inducted well, but spent too long locked up during their early days. There was a lack of operational grip on safety. Levels of violence had increased, safeguarding practice had deteriorated, and the high number of boys on ACCTs2 spent long periods locked in their cells. Half the population were on the lowest level of the rewards and sanctions scheme, but this was not effective in stopping some of the unruly behaviour. Some poor behaviour went unchallenged. Security measures were proportionate but the use of force had increased again and governance was less robust. Substance misuse services remained good. Outcomes for children and young people were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.*

#### Main recommendations

The juvenile unit management team should review current strategy to ensure that perpetrators of violence are appropriately identified and managed and their behaviour challenged. All data on violence should be collated and analysed to inform a relevant action plan to improve the safety of boys on the unit. (S40)

**Partially achieved**

There should be sufficient staff to supervise boys safely. Staff should be trained and supported to challenge poor behaviour consistently and appropriately. Managers at all levels should be visible to staff and boys to model the behaviours expected of them. (S41)

**Achieved**

Managers should investigate the reasons for the poor perceptions of boys about safety. Safeguarding and child protection systems should be consistently applied. Strategic meetings should be well attended and take action to provide boys with a safe and secure environment. All allegations of mistreatment by staff and other boys should be subject to swift, well documented external investigations. (S39)

**Achieved**

#### Recommendations

Boys should be transported to custody as soon as their case has finished. They should be transported separately from adults and arrive into custody before 7pm. (1.4)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 1.2)

Boys should spend more time out of their cells during their first week at Parc. (1.10)

**Not achieved**

Boys in crisis should be provided with activities and opportunities for engagement with staff. Routine use of CCTV for monitoring boys at heightened risk should cease. (I.35)

**Partially achieved**

Case reviews should take place in an appropriate environment and should involve the boy. Boys should leave reviews with an understanding of any changes to their plan. (I.36)

**Achieved**

All poor conduct should be appropriately challenged to encourage good behaviour through positive role modelling. (I.41)

**Achieved**

The rewards and sanctions scheme should be reviewed to ensure it is applied consistently with a focus on motivating good behaviour. (I.46)

**Achieved**

Rewards and sanctions reviews for boys on basic level should be tailored to the needs of the individual and provide opportunity to progress. Boys should be given the opportunity to be involved in reviews and be made aware of the outcome. (I.47)

**Achieved**

The outcomes of all disciplinary procedures (adjudications and minor reports) should be scrutinised. There should be more focus on analysing trends and protected characteristics with monitored actions to address concerns. (I.55)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, I.49)

Pain-inducing techniques should not be used on boys. (I.66)

**Not achieved**

Oversight of use of force should be improved: use of force reports and post-incident debriefs should be completed swiftly; body-worn cameras should be routinely used and reviewed; and a robust system of external oversight should be put in place. (I.67)

**Partially achieved**

Staff from the adult prison should not be routinely used to respond to incidents in the children's unit. (I.68, repeated recommendation I.69)

**Achieved**

Boys should feel confident to report bullying without fear of further intimidation. (I.27, repeated recommendation I.31)

**Achieved**

Appropriate actions should be taken to understand the perceptions of boys in relation to victimisation by staff and measures introduced to address these concerns. (I.28)

**Achieved**

## Respect

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

*At the last inspection, in December 2016, residential areas were shabby and too many cells were dirty. Access to information kiosks and in-cell telephones remained a strength. Units were noisy and unruly at times. Relationships on residential units had deteriorated further and poor behaviour was not challenged consistently. The strategic management of equality and diversity was weak and lacked focus on the needs of boys. Faith services remained good. Complaints were managed well. Health services, particularly access, remained good. Food was not popular, although breakfast was better than we see elsewhere. Outcomes for children and young people were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.*

### Recommendations

Cells should have effective ventilation. (2.5, repeated recommendation 2.12)

#### **Partially achieved**

All cells and communal areas should be kept clean. (2.6)

#### **Achieved**

Toilets should be fully screened. (2.7, repeated recommendation 2.13)

#### **Not achieved**

Boys should have access to a lockable cupboard. (2.8, repeated recommendation 2.14)

#### **Not achieved**

Managers should investigate and address boys' negative perceptions of staff. (2.12, repeated recommendation 2.19)

#### **Achieved**

A regular equality management meeting should take place to ensure that policy, planning and consultation are effective, boys' perceptions and needs are addressed, and comprehensive monitoring data are considered. (2.16, repeated recommendation 2.28)

#### **Not achieved**

Engagement by the young people's unit with community diversity groups should be improved to the level achieved by the adult prison. (2.17, repeated recommendation 2.29)

#### **Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.14)

Access to appropriate faith services should be equitable for boys and adults at Parc. (2.26)

#### **Achieved**

All complaints should be thoroughly investigated and quality assurance procedures should ensure that sufficient replies to boys' complaints are included. (2.28)

#### **Partially achieved**

Health services should be informed by an up-to-date health, well-being and social care assessment and by regular feedback from the boys. (2.38)

#### **Partially achieved**

All clinical areas should be safe and fully compliant with infection control guidelines. (2.39, repeated recommendation 2.74)

#### **Achieved**

There should be systematic health promotion activity linked to relevant national and local health campaigns. (2.40)

**Partially achieved**

All comprehensive health assessment tool assessments should be completed within the required time frame. (2.44)

**Achieved**

Nicotine replacement products should be provided promptly, including on the day of arrival if required. (2.50)

**Achieved**

Boys should have access to an appropriate range of mental health interventions. (2.57)

**Partially achieved**

## 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 December 2016, time out of cell was worse than at the previous inspection. Management of learning and skills was beginning to improve with the introduction of a new manager and curriculum. More effort was needed to ensure that all boys attended education and had an opportunity to progress. There was sufficient provision and a good range of activities for all boys. Punctuality was poor. Educational and vocational achievements were good, as was the quality of teaching. Boys behaved well in most classes and took pride in their work. The library operated well and provided a good service. Boys reported having less time at the gym than at the last inspection. Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.*

## Recommendations

Team meetings should be introduced to review boys' progress and to develop team-wide strategies to support individual boys to achieve their learning targets. (3.15)

**Achieved**

Attainment rates should be benchmarked against those of other institutions. (3.16)

**No longer relevant**

Prison officers should take an active role in helping boys to progress in education. (3.17)

**Achieved**

A common approach should be established for staff to support the development of writing and numeracy skills. This should include procedures for monitoring the progress of individual boys in achieving simple, short-term targets. (3.25)

**Achieved**

All tutors should embed literacy and numeracy into their lessons consistently and effectively to maximise development of these skills. (3.26)

**Achieved**

The PE and classroom facilities should be improved to ensure that boys have the opportunity to engage in a wider range of activities during core PE lessons. (3.50, repeated recommendation 3.51)

**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 December 2016, the strategic management of resettlement had improved since the last inspection and was informed by an up-to-date needs analysis. All boys had a training plan but had not been given a copy. Some plans did not identify risk of harm factors adequately. Review meetings were managed well with contributions from key workers and boys. Public protection was well organised. Support from local authorities for the high number of looked-after boys was inconsistent. Release planning and pathways work were generally good. Accommodation work had improved but there remained a need for further offending behaviour interventions. Work with families was excellent. Outcomes for children and young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.*

### Recommendations

The unit should make more use of release on temporary licence to support release planning and maintenance of family ties. (4.10)

**Not achieved** (Repeated recommendation 4.10)

All departments which work with a boy regularly should be represented at his training or remand planning meeting to provide consistent feedback and reinforcement to help boys achieve their agreed targets. (4.15)

**Not achieved**

Boys should be issued with a copy of their targets and encouraged to achieve them between reviews. (4.16)

**Partially achieved**

Quality assurance of planning documentation should be introduced. (4.17, repeated recommendation 4.18)

**Achieved**

Boys with indeterminate sentences should be placed in custodial settings that are equipped to meet the specific needs presented by their sentence. (4.21)

**Not achieved**

All boys with looked-after status should receive consistent and adequate levels of support from their local authority. (4.25)

**Partially achieved** (recommendation repeated, 4.23)

Work with other government departments should be undertaken to ensure that all boys leaving custody are provided with appropriate accommodation in good time for their release. (4.29, repeated recommendation 4.32)

**Partially achieved**

Boys should have access to information and guidance to enable them to develop the financial awareness and skills they need when released. (4.37, repeated recommendation 4.40)

**Partially achieved**

Evaluation of interventions should be put in place. (4.47, repeated recommendation 4.52)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 4.41)

Interventions should be put in place for boys to address sexually harmful behaviour. (4.48, repeated recommendation 4.53)

**Not achieved**

## 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	36	85%
Remand	4	9%
Detainees	4	9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>100%</b>

Age	Number of young people	%
15 years	1	2%
16 years	11	25%
17 years	31	71%
18 years	1	2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>100%</b>

Nationality	Number of young people	%
British	42	96%
Foreign nationals	2	4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>100%</b>

Ethnicity	Number of young people	%
White		
British	28	65%
Other white	1	2%
Mixed		
White and black Caribbean	2	4%
Asian or Asian British		
Pakistani	2	4%
Black or black British		
Caribbean	2	4%
African	2	4%
Other black	7	17%
<b>Total</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>100%</b>

Religion	Number of young people	%
Other Christian denominations	8	18%
Muslim	7	17%
No religion	29	65%
<b>Total</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Sentenced only – length of stay by age

Length of stay	<1 mth	1–3 mths	3–6 mths	6–12 mths	1–2 yrs	Total
<b>Age</b>						
15 years	1	0	0	0	0	1
16 years	0	0	4	3	1	8
17 years	4	5	8	8	1	26
18 years	0	1	0	0	0	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>36</b>

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

<b>Length of stay</b>	<1 mth	1–3 mths	3–6 mths	6–12 mths	<b>Total</b>
<b>Age</b>					
16 years	0	1	2	0	3
17 years	1	1	2	1	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>8</b>

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

<b>Sentence</b>	4 mths	6 mths	8 mths	10 mths	12 mths	18 mths	24 mths	<b>Total</b>
<b>Age</b>								
15 years	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16 years	0	1	0	1	0	1	2	5
17 years	3	0	3	0	3	5	3	17
18 years	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>22</b>

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

<b>Sentence</b>	2–3 yrs	3–4 yrs	4–5 yrs	5 yrs +	<b>Total</b>
<b>Age</b>					
15 years	0	0	0	0	0
16 years	1	0	0	2	3
17 years	0	2	2	4	8
18 years	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>11</b>

**Number of indeterminate sentences under Section 226b (extended determinate sentence) by age and length of tariff**

<b>Sentence</b>	5–10 yrs	10–15 yrs	<b>Total</b>
<b>Age</b>			
17 years	1	1	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>



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

### Children and young people survey methodology

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

#### 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 16 October 2017, the young person population at HMP & YOI Parc young persons' unit was 43. Using the method described above, questionnaires were distributed to all 43 young people.

We received a total of 39 completed questionnaires, a response rate of 91%. This included one questionnaire completed via interview. One respondent refused to complete a questionnaire and three questionnaires were not returned.

Wing/unit	Number of completed survey returns
E	19
G	20
Total	39

#### Presentation of survey results and analyses

Over the following pages we present the survey results for the young persons' unit at HMP & YOI Parc.

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%.

We also present a number of comparative analyses. In all the comparative analyses that follow, statistically significant<sup>5</sup> 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 peoples' 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. Due to modifications to our analysis processes, the presentation of some data may differ to those previously presented for HMP & YOI Parc young persons' unit in 2016.

The following comparative analyses are presented:

- The current survey responses from HMP & YOI Parc young persons' unit in 2017 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 2016.
- The current survey responses from HMP & YOI Parc young persons' unit in 2017 compared with the responses of young people surveyed at HMP & YOI Parc young persons' unit in December 2016.
- A comparison within the 2017 survey between the responses of white young people and those from a black and minority ethnic group.
- A comparison within the 2017 survey between responses of young people who have been in local authority care and those who have not been in local authority care.
- A comparison within the 2017 survey between the responses of young people on E wing and the responses of young people on G wing.

---

<sup>5</sup> 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

<b>Q1</b>	<b>How old are you?</b>	
	15 .....	0 (0%)
	16 .....	12 (32%)
	17 .....	22 (59%)
	18 .....	3 (8%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Are you a British citizen?</b>	
	Yes .....	36 (97%)
	No.....	1 (3%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>Do you understand spoken English?</b>	
	Yes .....	37 (100%)
	No.....	0 (0%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Do you understand written English?</b>	
	Yes .....	37 (100%)
	No.....	0 (0%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>What is your ethnic origin?</b>	
	White - British .....	23 (62%)
	White - Irish.....	0 (0%)
	White - Other.....	1 (3%)
	Black or Black British - Caribbean.....	1 (3%)
	Black or Black British - African .....	3 (8%)
	Black or Black British - Other .....	1 (3%)
	Asian or Asian British - Indian.....	0 (0%)
	Asian or Asian British - Pakistani.....	3 (8%)
	Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi.....	0 (0%)
	Asian or Asian British - Chinese.....	0 (0%)
	Asian or Asian British - Other .....	0 (0%)
	Mixed race - White and Black Caribbean .....	4 (11%)
	Mixed race - White and Black African .....	0 (0%)
	Mixed race - White and Asian .....	0 (0%)
	Mixed race - Other .....	1 (3%)
	Arab.....	0 (0%)
	Other ethnic group.....	0 (0%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>What is your religion?</b>	
	None.....	22 (59%)
	Church of England .....	6 (16%)
	Catholic .....	3 (8%)
	Protestant.....	0 (0%)
	Other Christian denomination .....	0 (0%)
	Buddhist .....	0 (0%)
	Hindu .....	0 (0%)
	Jewish .....	0 (0%)
	Muslim .....	6 (16%)
	Sikh.....	0 (0%)

<b>Q7</b>	<b>Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?</b>	
	Yes .....	3 (8%)
	No.....	29 (78%)
	Don't know .....	5 (14%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>Do you have any children?</b>	
	Yes .....	1 (3%)
	No.....	37 (97%)
<b>Q9</b>	<b>Do you consider yourself to have a disability?</b>	
	Yes .....	9 (24%)
	No.....	29 (76%)
<b>Q10</b>	<b>Have you ever been in local authority care?</b>	
	Yes .....	10 (31%)
	No.....	22 (69%)

### SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Are you sentenced?</b>	
	Yes .....	30 (81%)
	No - unsentenced/on remand .....	7 (19%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>How long is your sentence (the full DTO sentence)?</b>	
	Not sentenced.....	7 (19%)
	Less than 6 months.....	6 (16%)
	6 to 12 months.....	5 (14%)
	More than 12 months, up to 2 years.....	9 (24%)
	More than 2 years.....	9 (24%)
	Indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP).....	1 (3%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>How long have you been in this establishment?</b>	
	Less than 1 month.....	7 (18%)
	1 to 6 months .....	19 (50%)
	More than 6 months, but less than 12 months.....	8 (21%)
	12 months to 2 years.....	4 (11%)
	More than 2 years.....	0 (0%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?</b>	
	Yes .....	27 (71%)
	No.....	11 (29%)

### SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS

<b>Q1</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?</b>	
	Yes .....	26 (68%)
	No.....	6 (16%)
	Don't remember .....	6 (16%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, were there any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females travelling with you?</b>	
	Yes .....	17 (46%)
	No.....	14 (38%)
	Don't remember .....	6 (16%)

<b>Q3</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?</b>	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i> .....	14 (37%)
	<i>2 to 4 hours</i> .....	17 (45%)
	<i>More than 4 hours</i> .....	5 (13%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	2 (5%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?</b>	
	<i>My journey was less than 2 hours</i> .....	14 (37%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	4 (11%)
	<i>No</i> .....	19 (50%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	1 (3%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?</b>	
	<i>My journey was less than 2 hours</i> .....	14 (37%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	13 (34%)
	<i>No</i> .....	10 (26%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	1 (3%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, how did you feel you were treated by the escort staff?</b>	
	<i>Very well</i> .....	11 (29%)
	<i>Well</i> .....	14 (37%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....	5 (13%)
	<i>Badly</i> .....	4 (11%)
	<i>Very badly</i> .....	1 (3%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	3 (8%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>Before you arrived here, did you receive any information to help you prepare for coming here?</b>	
	<i>Yes - and it was helpful</i> .....	5 (13%)
	<i>Yes - but it was not helpful</i> .....	3 (8%)
	<i>No - I received no information</i> .....	26 (68%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	4 (11%)

#### SECTION 4: FIRST DAYS

<b>Q1</b>	<b>How long were you in reception?</b>	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i> .....	27 (71%)
	<i>2 hours or longer</i> .....	5 (13%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	6 (16%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	23 (62%)
	<i>No</i> .....	7 (19%)
	<i>Don't remember/Not applicable</i> .....	7 (19%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>How well did you feel you were treated in reception?</b>	
	<i>Very well</i> .....	5 (13%)
	<i>Well</i> .....	14 (37%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....	10 (26%)
	<i>Badly</i> .....	5 (13%)
	<i>Very badly</i> .....	1 (3%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	3 (8%)

- 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..... | 25 (69%) | Money worries.....                               | 7 (19%)  |
| Loss of property.....        | 7 (19%)  | Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to | 13 (36%) |
| Feeling scared.....          | 12 (33%) | Health problems.....                             | 22 (61%) |
| Gang problems.....           | 6 (17%)  | Getting phone numbers.....                       | 17 (47%) |
| Contacting family.....       | 17 (47%) | Staff did not ask me about any of these          | 5 (14%)  |
- 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..... | 18 (51%) | Money worries.....                               | 4 (11%) |
| Loss of property.....        | 5 (14%)  | Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to | 6 (17%) |
| Feeling scared.....          | 6 (17%)  | Health problems.....                             | 3 (9%)  |
| Gang problems.....           | 2 (6%)   | Getting phone numbers.....                       | 6 (17%) |
| Contacting family.....       | 12 (34%) | I did not have any problems.....                 | 8 (23%) |
- Q6 When you first arrived here, were you given any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**
- |  |          |
|--|----------|
| Toiletries/basic items.....                  | 31 (86%) |
| The opportunity to have a shower.....        | 19 (53%) |
| Something to eat.....                        | 22 (61%) |
| A free phone call to friends/family.....     | 19 (53%) |
| PIN phone credit.....                        | 9 (25%)  |
| Information about feeling worried/upset..... | 11 (31%) |
| Don't remember.....                          | 0 (0%)   |
| I was not given any of these.....            | 1 (3%)   |
- 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.....                              | 18 (51%) |
| Peer mentor.....                           | 1 (3%)   |
| Childline/Samaritans.....                  | 4 (11%)  |
| The prison shop/canteen.....               | 6 (17%)  |
| Don't remember.....                        | 9 (26%)  |
| I did not have access to any of these..... | 7 (20%)  |
- Q8 Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?**
- |                     |          |
|---------------------|----------|
| Yes.....            | 27 (71%) |
| No.....             | 7 (18%)  |
| Don't remember..... | 4 (11%)  |
- Q9 Did you feel safe on your first night here?**
- |                     |          |
|---------------------|----------|
| Yes.....            | 26 (70%) |
| No.....             | 10 (27%) |
| Don't remember..... | 1 (3%)   |
- Q10 Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the establishment?**
- |   |          |
|---|----------|
| I have not been on an induction course..... | 2 (6%)   |
| Yes.....                                    | 23 (66%) |
| No.....                                     | 8 (23%)  |
| Don't remember.....                         | 2 (6%)   |

## SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?</b>	
	Yes .....	31 (84%)
	No .....	6 (16%)
	Don't know .....	0 (0%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?</b>	
	Yes .....	17 (49%)
	No.....	16 (46%)
	Don't know .....	2 (6%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>What is the food like here?</b>	
	Very good.....	1 (3%)
	Good.....	2 (5%)
	Neither .....	8 (21%)
	Bad .....	12 (32%)
	Very bad.....	15 (39%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?</b>	
	<i>I have not bought anything yet/Don't know</i> .....	2 (6%)
	Yes .....	15 (43%)
	No.....	18 (51%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>How easy is it for you to attend religious services?</b>	
	<i>I don't want to attend religious services</i> .....	6 (17%)
	Very easy.....	7 (20%)
	Easy .....	5 (14%)
	Neither .....	3 (9%)
	Difficult.....	2 (6%)
	Very difficult.....	1 (3%)
	Don't know .....	11 (31%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>Are your religious beliefs respected?</b>	
	Yes .....	10 (29%)
	No.....	4 (12%)
	Don't know/Not applicable.....	20 (59%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>Can you speak to a chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?</b>	
	Yes .....	20 (56%)
	No.....	2 (6%)
	Don't know/Not applicable.....	14 (39%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>Can you speak to a peer mentor when you need to?</b>	
	Yes .....	9 (26%)
	No.....	7 (20%)
	Don't know .....	19 (54%)
<b>Q9</b>	<b>Can you speak to a member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board) when you need to?</b>	
	Yes .....	7 (21%)
	No .....	9 (27%)
	Don't know .....	17 (52%)

<b>Q10</b>	<b>Can you speak to an advocate (an outside person to help you) when you need to?</b>	
	Yes .....	12 (36%)
	No.....	6 (18%)
	Don't know .....	15 (45%)

### SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Do most staff treat you with respect?</b>	
	Yes .....	23 (66%)
	No.....	12 (34%)

<b>Q2</b>	<b>If you had a problem, who would you turn to? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	No-one .....	9 (26%)
	Personal officer.....	8 (23%)
	Wing Officer.....	11 (31%)
	Teacher/education staff .....	3 (9%)
	Gym staff.....	4 (11%)
	Chaplain.....	1 (3%)
	Independent Monitoring Board (IMB) ..	1 (3%)
	YOT worker .....	7 (20%)
	Social worker.....	5 (14%)
	Health services staff.....	2 (6%)
	Peer mentor.....	0 (0%)
	Another young person here .....	8 (23%)
	Case worker .....	11 (31%)
	Advocate .....	0 (0%)
	Family/friends .....	21 (60%)
	Childline/Samaritans.....	0 (0%)

<b>Q3</b>	<b>Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?</b>	
	Yes .....	17 (50%)
	No.....	17 (50%)

<b>Q4</b>	<b>When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?</b>	
	I still have not met him/her .....	6 (17%)
	In your first week.....	16 (46%)
	After your first week.....	7 (20%)
	Don't remember .....	6 (17%)

<b>Q5</b>	<b>How often do you see your personal (named) officer?</b>	
	I still have not met him/her .....	6 (18%)
	At least once a week .....	19 (58%)
	Less than once a week.....	8 (24%)

<b>Q6</b>	<b>Do you feel your personal (named) officer tries to help you?</b>	
	I still have not met him/her .....	6 (18%)
	Yes .....	19 (56%)
	No.....	9 (26%)

### SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Is it easy to make an application?</b>	
	Yes .....	22 (65%)
	No.....	5 (15%)
	Don't know .....	7 (21%)

<b>Q2</b>	<b>Are applications sorted out fairly?</b>	
	I have not made an application .....	7 (23%)
	Yes .....	17 (55%)
	No.....	7 (23%)



<b>Q3</b>	<b>Are applications sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?</b>	
	<i>I have not made an application</i> .....	7 (23%)
	Yes .....	15 (50%)
	No.....	8 (27%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Is it easy to make a complaint?</b>	
	Yes .....	22 (63%)
	No.....	5 (14%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	8 (23%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>Are complaints sorted out fairly?</b>	
	<i>I have not made a complaint</i> .....	8 (31%)
	Yes .....	5 (19%)
	No.....	13 (50%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>Are complaints sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?</b>	
	<i>I have not made a complaint</i> .....	8 (31%)
	Yes .....	4 (15%)
	No.....	14 (54%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint?</b>	
	Yes .....	6 (18%)
	No.....	17 (52%)
	<i>Never needed to make a complaint</i> .....	10 (30%)

## SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE

<b>Q1</b>	<b>What level of the rewards and sanctions scheme are you on?</b>	
	<i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i> .....	2 (6%)
	<i>Enhanced (top)</i> .....	13 (38%)
	<i>Standard (middle)</i> .....	11 (32%)
	<i>Basic (bottom)</i> .....	8 (24%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	0 (0%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the rewards and sanctions scheme?</b>	
	<i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i> .....	2 (6%)
	Yes .....	14 (42%)
	No.....	14 (42%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	3 (9%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>Do the different levels of the rewards and sanctions scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?</b>	
	<i>Don't know what the rewards and sanctions scheme is</i> .....	2 (6%)
	Yes .....	14 (41%)
	No.....	13 (38%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	5 (15%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Have you had a minor report since you have been here?</b>	
	Yes .....	14 (41%)
	No.....	19 (56%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	1 (3%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>If you have had a minor report, was the process explained clearly to you?</b>	
	<i>I have not had a minor report</i> .....	20 (61%)
	Yes .....	9 (27%)
	No.....	4 (12%)

<b>Q6</b>	<b>Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?</b>	
	Yes .....	22 (63%)
	No.....	12 (34%)
	Don't know .....	1 (3%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>If you have had an adjudication ('nicking'), was the process explained clearly to you?</b>	
	<i>I have not had an adjudication.....</i>	13 (41%)
	Yes .....	16 (50%)
	No.....	3 (9%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?</b>	
	Yes .....	19 (56%)
	No.....	11 (32%)
	Don't know .....	4 (12%)
<b>Q9</b>	<b>If you have spent a night in the care and separation unit (CSU), how were you treated by staff?</b>	
	<i>I have not been to the care and separation unit .....</i>	23 (70%)
	Very well.....	2 (6%)
	Well.....	1 (3%)
	Neither .....	3 (9%)
	Badly.....	1 (3%)
	Very badly .....	3 (9%)

### SECTION 9: SAFETY

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Have you ever felt unsafe here?</b>	
	Yes .....	19 (54%)
	No.....	16 (46%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Do you feel unsafe now?</b>	
	Yes .....	7 (21%)
	No.....	26 (79%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	Never felt unsafe .....	16 (48%)
	Everywhere .....	6 (18%)
	Care and separation unit .....	0 (0%)
	Association areas .....	8 (24%)
	Reception area .....	1 (3%)
	At the gym .....	2 (6%)
	In an exercise yard .....	5 (15%)
	At work.....	0 (0%)
	At education .....	3 (9%)
	At religious services.....	0 (0%)
	At meal times .....	6 (18%)
	At healthcare .....	0 (0%)
	Visits area .....	0 (0%)
	In wing showers.....	6 (18%)
	In gym showers .....	0 (0%)
	In corridors/stairwells.....	0 (0%)
	On your landing/wing .....	4 (12%)
	During movement .....	5 (15%)
	In your cell .....	2 (6%)

<b>Q4</b>	<b>Have you ever been victimised by another young person/group of young people here (e.g. insulted or assaulted you)?</b>	
	Yes .....	22 (63%)
	No .....	13 (37%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you, your family or friends)</i> .....	10 (29%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i> .....	13 (37%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i> .....	1 (3%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i> .....	7 (20%)
	<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i> .....	4 (11%)
	<i>Medication</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Debt</i> .....	1 (3%)
	<i>Drugs</i> .....	1 (3%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i> .....	3 (9%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i> .....	1 (3%)
	<i>Your nationality</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>You are from a different part of the country to others</i> .....	3 (9%)
	<i>You are from a Traveller community</i> .....	1 (3%)
	<i>Your sexuality</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Your age</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>You having a disability</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>You were new here</i> .....	6 (17%)
	<i>Your offence/crime</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Gang related issues</i> .....	1 (3%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>Have you ever been victimised by staff here (e.g. insulted or assaulted you)?</b>	
	Yes .....	15 (44%)
	No .....	19 (56%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you, your family or friends)</i> .....	9 (26%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i> .....	3 (9%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i> .....	2 (6%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i> .....	5 (15%)
	<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i> .....	1 (3%)
	<i>Medication</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Debt</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Drugs</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i> .....	3 (9%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i> .....	2 (6%)
	<i>Your nationality</i> .....	1 (3%)
	<i>You are from a different part of the country to others</i> .....	3 (9%)
	<i>You are from a Traveller community</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Your sexuality</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Your age</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>You having a disability</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>You were new here</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Your offence/crime</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Gang related issues</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Because you made a complaint</i> .....	1 (3%)

<b>Q10</b>	<b>If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?</b>		
	Yes .....	11	(41%)
	No.....	11	(41%)
	Don't know .....	5	(19%)
<b>Q11</b>	<b>Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?</b>		
	Yes .....	13	(42%)
	No.....	13	(42%)
	Don't know .....	5	(16%)
<b>Q12</b>	<b>Is shouting through the windows a problem here?</b>		
	Yes .....	12	(36%)
	No.....	18	(55%)
	Don't know .....	3	(9%)

### SECTION 10: HEALTH SERVICES

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Is it easy to see the following people if you need to?</b>			
		Yes	No	Don't know
	The doctor .....	23 (68%)	6 (18%)	5 (15%)
	The nurse .....	30 (88%)	3 (9%)	1 (3%)
	The dentist .....	22 (65%)	8 (24%)	4 (12%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?</b>			
	<i>I have not been</i> .....			2 (5%)
	<i>Very good</i> .....			5 (14%)
	<i>Good</i> .....			15 (41%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....			4 (11%)
	<i>Bad</i> .....			11 (30%)
	<i>Very bad</i> .....			0 (0%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/all of it in your room?</b>			
	<i>I am not taking any medication</i> .....			13 (41%)
	<i>Yes, all of my meds</i> .....			0 (0%)
	<i>Yes, some of my meds</i> .....			2 (6%)
	<i>No</i> .....			17 (53%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?</b>			
	Yes .....			10 (29%)
	No.....			24 (71%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>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)?</b>			
	<i>I do not have any emotional or mental health problems</i> .....			24 (75%)
	Yes .....			6 (19%)
	No.....			2 (6%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>Did you have problems with alcohol when you first arrived here?</b>			
	Yes .....			8 (24%)
	No.....			25 (76%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>Have you received any help with alcohol problems here?</b>			
	Yes .....			5 (15%)
	No.....			28 (85%)

<b>Q8</b>	<b>Did you have problems with drugs when you first arrived here?</b>	
	Yes .....	16 (52%)
	No.....	15 (48%)
<b>Q9</b>	<b>Do you have problems with drugs now?</b>	
	Yes .....	3 (9%)
	No.....	29 (91%)
<b>Q10</b>	<b>Have you received any help with drugs problems here?</b>	
	Yes .....	12 (38%)
	No.....	20 (63%)
<b>Q11</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it to get illegal drugs here?</b>	
	Very easy.....	6 (20%)
	Easy .....	1 (3%)
	Neither .....	0 (0%)
	Difficult.....	2 (7%)
	Very difficult.....	4 (13%)
	Don't know .....	17 (57%)

### SECTION II: ACTIVITIES

<b>Q1</b>	<b>How old were you when you were last at school?</b>				
	14 or under .....	15 (48%)			
	15 or over.....	16 (52%)			
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Have you ever been excluded from school?</b>				
	Yes .....	29 (94%)			
	No.....	2 (6%)			
	Not applicable.....	0 (0%)			
<b>Q3</b>	<b>Did you ever skip school before you came into custody?</b>				
	Yes .....	26 (76%)			
	No.....	7 (21%)			
	Not applicable.....	1 (3%)			
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Do you CURRENTLY take part in any of the following activities? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>				
	Education .....	30 (88%)			
	A job in this establishment.....	1 (3%)			
	Vocational or skills training .....	2 (6%)			
	Offending behaviour programmes .....	7 (21%)			
	I am not currently involved in any of these.....	3 (9%)			
<b>Q5</b>	<b>If you have been involved in any of the following activities here, do you think they will help you when you leave prison?</b>				
		Not been involved	Yes	No	Don't know
	Education	1 (3%)	23 (70%)	4 (12%)	5 (15%)
	A job in this establishment	9 (47%)	3 (16%)	2 (11%)	5 (26%)
	Vocational or skills training	7 (35%)	5 (25%)	2 (10%)	6 (30%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	5 (24%)	6 (29%)	4 (19%)	6 (29%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>Do you usually have association every day?</b>				
	Yes .....	27 (87%)			
	No.....	4 (13%)			

<b>Q7</b>	<b>Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?</b>	
	<i>Don't want to go</i> .....	7 (21%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	20 (61%)
	<i>No</i> .....	6 (18%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?</b>	
	<i>Don't want to go</i> .....	5 (15%)
	<i>None</i> .....	1 (3%)
	<i>One to two times</i> .....	18 (53%)
	<i>Three to five times</i> .....	9 (26%)
	<i>More than five times</i> .....	1 (3%)

## SECTION 12: FAMILY AND FRIENDS

<b>Q1</b>	<b>Are you able to use the telephone every day, if you want to?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	29 (91%)
	<i>No</i> .....	3 (9%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	0 (0%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	15 (47%)
	<i>No</i> .....	15 (47%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	2 (6%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>How many visits do you usually have each week, from family or friends?</b>	
	<i>I don't get visits</i> .....	9 (28%)
	<i>Less than one a week</i> .....	8 (25%)
	<i>About one a week</i> .....	9 (28%)
	<i>More than one a week</i> .....	4 (13%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	2 (6%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>How easy is it for your family and friends to visit you here?</b>	
	<i>I don't get visits</i> .....	9 (29%)
	<i>Very easy</i> .....	4 (13%)
	<i>Easy</i> .....	6 (19%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....	2 (6%)
	<i>Difficult</i> .....	7 (23%)
	<i>Very difficult</i> .....	3 (10%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	0 (0%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>Do your visits usually start on time?</b>	
	<i>I don't get visits</i> .....	9 (28%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	9 (28%)
	<i>No</i> .....	14 (44%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	0 (0%)

## SECTION 13: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE

<b>Q1</b>	<b>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.)</b>	
	<i>Finding accommodation</i> .....	9 (28%)
	<i>Getting into school or college</i> .....	8 (25%)
	<i>Getting a job</i> .....	16 (50%)
	<i>Money/finances</i> .....	11 (34%)
	<i>Claiming benefits</i> .....	5 (16%)
	<i>Continuing health services</i> .....	3 (9%)
	<i>Opening a bank account</i> .....	5 (16%)
	<i>Avoiding bad relationships</i> .....	5 (16%)
	<i>I won't have any problems</i> .....	12 (38%)
<b>Q2</b>	<b>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)?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	18 (56%)
	<i>No</i> .....	3 (9%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	11 (34%)
<b>Q3</b>	<b>Were you involved in the development of your plan?</b>	
	<i>I don't have a plan/don't know if I have a plan</i> .....	14 (44%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	18 (56%)
	<i>No</i> .....	0 (0%)
<b>Q4</b>	<b>Do you understand the targets that have been set in your plan?</b>	
	<i>I don't have a plan/don't know if I have a plan</i> .....	14 (44%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	17 (53%)
	<i>No</i> .....	1 (3%)
<b>Q5</b>	<b>Do you have a caseworker here?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	30 (91%)
	<i>No</i> .....	2 (6%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	1 (3%)
<b>Q6</b>	<b>Has your caseworker helped to prepare you for release?</b>	
	<i>I don't have a caseworker</i> .....	3 (10%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	14 (47%)
	<i>No</i> .....	6 (20%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	7 (23%)
<b>Q7</b>	<b>Has your social worker been to visit you since you have been here?</b>	
	<i>I don't have a social worker</i> .....	10 (30%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	19 (58%)
	<i>No</i> .....	4 (12%)
<b>Q8</b>	<b>Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	16 (50%)
	<i>No</i> .....	8 (25%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	8 (25%)

**Q9 Do you know who to contact for help with any of the following problems, before your release? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**

<i>Finding accommodation</i> .....	10 (36%)
<i>Getting into school or college</i> .....	12 (43%)
<i>Getting a job</i> .....	16 (57%)
<i>Help with money/finances</i> .....	10 (36%)
<i>Help with claiming benefits</i> .....	3 (11%)
<i>Continuing health services</i> .....	6 (21%)
<i>Opening a bank account</i> .....	9 (32%)
<i>Avoiding bad relationships</i> .....	5 (18%)
<i>I don't know who to contact</i> .....	9 (32%)

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

<i>Not sentenced</i> .....	7 (21%)	<i>Having a mentor (someone you can ask for advice)</i> .....	2 (6%)
<i>Nothing, it is up to me</i> .....	7 (21%)	<i>Having a YOT worker or social worker that I get on with</i> .....	8 (24%)
<i>Making new friends outside</i> .....	6 (18%)	<i>Having children</i> .....	1 (3%)
<i>Going back to live with my family</i> .....	9 (26%)	<i>Having something to do that isn't crime</i> .....	12 (35%)
<i>Getting a place of my own</i> .....	6 (18%)	<i>This sentence</i> .....	5 (15%)
<i>Getting a job</i> .....	13 (38%)	<i>Getting into school/college</i> .....	8 (24%)
<i>Having a partner (girlfriend or boyfriend)</i> .....	6 (18%)	<i>Talking about my offending behaviour with staff</i> .....	2 (6%)
<i>Staying off alcohol/drugs</i> .....	8 (24%)	<i>Anything else</i> .....	0 (0%)

**Q11 Do you want to stop offending?**

<i>Not sentenced</i> .....	7 (21%)
<i>Yes</i> .....	20 (61%)
<i>No</i> .....	0 (0%)
<i>Don't know</i> .....	6 (18%)

**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> .....	7 (22%)
<i>Yes</i> .....	12 (38%)
<i>No</i> .....	13 (41%)



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



### Survey responses from children and young people: HMYOI Parc Young Persons' Unit 2017

**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 Parc Young Persons' Unit 2017	All other young offender institutions	HMYOI Parc Young Persons' Unit 2017	HMYOI Parc Young Persons' Unit 2016
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>39</b>	<b>563</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU</b>					
1.1	Are you 18 years of age?	8%	14%	8%	7%
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	3%	8%	3%	4%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%	100%	96%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	100%	99%	100%	97%
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other category.)	35%	48%	35%	41%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	16%	23%	16%	17%
1.7	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	8%	8%	8%	3%
1.8	Do you have any children?	3%	10%	3%	0%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	24%	19%	24%	11%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	31%	44%	31%	30%
<b>SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE</b>					
2.1	Are you sentenced?	81%	78%	81%	79%
2.2	Is your sentence 12 months or less?	30%	30%	30%	38%
2.3	Have you been in this establishment for one month or less?	18%	15%	18%	24%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	71%	56%	71%	62%
<b>SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS</b>					
On your most recent journey here:					
3.1	Did you feel safe?	68%	78%	68%	83%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	46%	32%	46%	31%
3.3	Did you spend more than 4 hours in the van?	13%	7%	13%	14%
For those who spent 2 or more hours in the escort van:					
3.4	Were you offered a toilet break if you needed it?	17%	13%	17%	12%
3.5	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	54%	51%	54%	44%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	66%	55%	66%	39%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	13%	13%	13%	7%

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

### Key to tables

		HMYOI Parc Young Persons' Unit 2017	All other young offender institutions	HMYOI Parc Young Persons' Unit 2017	HMYOI Parc Young Persons' Unit 2016
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>39</b>	<b>563</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>SECTION 4: YOUR FIRST FEW DAYS HERE</b>					
<b>4.1</b>	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	<b>71%</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>68%</b>
<b>4.2</b>	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	<b>62%</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>50%</b>
<b>4.3</b>	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	<b>50%</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>36%</b>
When you first arrived, did staff ask if you needed help or support with any of the following:					
<b>4.4a</b>	Not being able to smoke?	<b>69%</b>	<b>52%</b>	<b>69%</b>	<b>60%</b>
<b>4.4b</b>	Loss of property?	<b>19%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>8%</b>
<b>4.4c</b>	Feeling scared?	<b>33%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>20%</b>
<b>4.4d</b>	Gang problems?	<b>17%</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>16%</b>
<b>4.4e</b>	Contacting family?	<b>47%</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>36%</b>
<b>4.4f</b>	Money worries?	<b>19%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>8%</b>
<b>4.4g</b>	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	<b>36%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>16%</b>
<b>4.4h</b>	Health problems?	<b>61%</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>61%</b>	<b>36%</b>
<b>4.4i</b>	Getting phone numbers?	<b>47%</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>24%</b>
<b>4.5</b>	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	<b>77%</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>88%</b>
When you first arrived, did you have problems with any of the following:					
<b>4.5a</b>	Not being able to smoke?	<b>51%</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>51%</b>	<b>42%</b>
<b>4.5b</b>	Loss of property?	<b>14%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>29%</b>
<b>4.5c</b>	Feeling scared?	<b>17%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>21%</b>
<b>4.5d</b>	Gang problems?	<b>6%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>13%</b>
<b>4.5e</b>	Contacting family?	<b>34%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>50%</b>
<b>4.5f</b>	Money worries?	<b>11%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>25%</b>
<b>4.5g</b>	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	<b>17%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>29%</b>
<b>4.5h</b>	Health problems?	<b>9%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>21%</b>
<b>4.5i</b>	Getting phone numbers?	<b>17%</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>25%</b>
When you first arrived, were you given any of the following:					
<b>4.6a</b>	Toiletries/basic items?	<b>86%</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>82%</b>
<b>4.6b</b>	The opportunity to have a shower?	<b>53%</b>	<b>52%</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>33%</b>
<b>4.6c</b>	Something to eat?	<b>61%</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>61%</b>	<b>67%</b>
<b>4.6d</b>	A free phone call to friends/family?	<b>53%</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>33%</b>
<b>4.6e</b>	PIN phone credit?	<b>25%</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>15%</b>
<b>4.6f</b>	Information about feeling worried/upset?	<b>31%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>15%</b>

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

### Key to tables

		HMYOI Parc Young Persons' Unit 2017	All other young offender institutions	HMYOI Parc Young Persons' Unit 2017	HMYOI Parc Young Persons' Unit 2016
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>39</b>	<b>563</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>31</b>
Within your first 24 hours, did you have access to the following people or services:					
<b>4.7a</b>	A chaplain?	<b>51%</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>51%</b>	<b>50%</b>
<b>4.7b</b>	A peer mentor?	<b>3%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>13%</b>
<b>4.7c</b>	Childline/Samaritans	<b>11%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>21%</b>
<b>4.7d</b>	The prison shop/canteen?	<b>17%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>25%</b>
<b>4.8</b>	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	<b>71%</b>	<b>73%</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>65%</b>
<b>4.9</b>	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	<b>70%</b>	<b>74%</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>77%</b>
<b>4.10</b>	For those who have been on an induction course: did it cover everything you needed to know about the establishment?	<b>70%</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>75%</b>
<b>SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT</b>					
<b>5.1</b>	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	<b>84%</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>77%</b>
<b>5.2</b>	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	<b>49%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>39%</b>
<b>5.3</b>	Do you find the food here good/very good?	<b>8%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>19%</b>
<b>5.4</b>	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	<b>43%</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>50%</b>
<b>5.5</b>	Is it easy/very easy for you to attend religious services?	<b>34%</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>30%</b>
<b>5.6</b>	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	<b>29%</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>22%</b>
Can you speak to:					
<b>5.7</b>	A chaplain of your faith in private?	<b>56%</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>50%</b>
<b>5.8</b>	A peer mentor?	<b>26%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>5.9</b>	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	<b>21%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>4%</b>
<b>5.10</b>	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	<b>36%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>41%</b>
<b>SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF</b>					
<b>6.1</b>	Do most staff treat you with respect?	<b>66%</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>40%</b>
<b>6.2</b>	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	<b>26%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>32%</b>
<b>6.3</b>	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	<b>50%</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>30%</b>
For those who have met their personal officer:					
<b>6.4</b>	Did you meet your personal (named) officer within the first week?	<b>55%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>46%</b>
<b>6.5</b>	Do you see your personal (named) officer at least once a week?	<b>70%</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>46%</b>
<b>6.6</b>	Do you feel your personal (named) officer tries to help you?	<b>68%</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>52%</b>

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

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMYOI Parc Young Persons' Unit 2017	All other young offender institutions	HMYOI Parc Young Persons' Unit 2017	HMYOI Parc Young Persons' Unit 2016
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>39</b>	<b>563</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS</b>					
<b>7.1</b>	Is it easy to make an application?	<b>65%</b>	<b>63%</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>85%</b>
For those who have made an application:					
<b>7.2</b>	Do you feel applications are sorted out fairly?	<b>71%</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>56%</b>
<b>7.3</b>	Do you feel applications are sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	<b>65%</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>39%</b>
<b>7.4</b>	Is it easy to make a complaint?	<b>63%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>63%</b>	<b>37%</b>
For those who have made a complaint:					
<b>7.5</b>	Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	<b>28%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>33%</b>
<b>7.6</b>	Do you feel complaints are sorted out quickly (within 7 days)?	<b>22%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>18%</b>
<b>7.7</b>	Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint?	<b>18%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>15%</b>
<b>SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE</b>					
<b>8.1</b>	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	<b>38%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>16%</b>
<b>8.2</b>	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	<b>42%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>39%</b>
<b>8.3</b>	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	<b>41%</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>46%</b>
<b>8.4</b>	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	<b>41%</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>58%</b>
For those who have had a minor report:					
<b>8.5</b>	Was the process explained clearly to you?	<b>69%</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>69%</b>	<b>53%</b>
<b>8.6</b>	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	<b>63%</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>63%</b>	<b>63%</b>
For those who have had an adjudication ('nicking'):					
<b>8.7</b>	Was the process explained clearly to you?	<b>84%</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>71%</b>
<b>8.8</b>	Have you been physically restrained (Cand R) since you have been here?	<b>56%</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>54%</b>
<b>8.9</b>	For those who had spent a night in the care and separation unit: did the staff treat you well/very well?	<b>30%</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>50%</b>
<b>SECTION 9: SAFETY</b>					
<b>9.1</b>	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	<b>54%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>42%</b>
<b>9.2</b>	Do you feel unsafe now?	<b>21%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>32%</b>

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

**Key to tables**

		HMYOI Parc Young Persons' Unit 2017	All other young offender institutions	HMYOI Parc Young Persons' Unit 2017	HMYOI Parc Young Persons' Unit 2016
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>39</b>	<b>563</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>9.4</b>	Have you ever been victimised by other young people here?	<b>63%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>63%</b>	<b>42%</b>
Since you have been here, have other young people:					
<b>9.5a</b>	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	<b>29%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>27%</b>
<b>9.5b</b>	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	<b>37%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>12%</b>
<b>9.5c</b>	Sexually abused you?	<b>3%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>4%</b>
<b>9.5d</b>	Threatened or intimidated you?	<b>20%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>12%</b>
<b>9.5e</b>	Taken your canteen/property?	<b>11%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.5f</b>	Victimised you because of medication?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.5g</b>	Victimised you because of debt?	<b>3%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.5h</b>	Victimised you because of drugs?	<b>3%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>4%</b>
<b>9.5i</b>	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	<b>9%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>4%</b>
<b>9.5j</b>	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	<b>3%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.5k</b>	Victimised you because of your nationality?	<b>0%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.5l</b>	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	<b>9%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>4%</b>
<b>9.5m</b>	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	<b>3%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>4%</b>
<b>9.5n</b>	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>4%</b>
<b>9.5o</b>	Victimised you because of your age?	<b>0%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.5p</b>	Victimised you because you have a disability?	<b>0%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>4%</b>
<b>9.5q</b>	Victimised you because you were new here?	<b>17%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>12%</b>
<b>9.5r</b>	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	<b>0%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.5s</b>	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	<b>3%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>0%</b>

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

### Key to tables

		HMYOI Parc Young Persons' Unit 2017	All other young offender institutions	HMYOI Parc Young Persons' Unit 2017	HMYOI Parc Young Persons' Unit 2016
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>39</b>	<b>563</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>9.7</b>	Have you ever been victimised by a member of staff here?	<b>44%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>60%</b>
Since you have been here, have staff:					
<b>9.8a</b>	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	<b>27%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>32%</b>
<b>9.8b</b>	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	<b>9%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>8%</b>
<b>9.8c</b>	Sexually abused you?	<b>6%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.8d</b>	Threatened or intimidated you?	<b>15%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>12%</b>
<b>9.8e</b>	Taken your canteen/property?	<b>3%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>12%</b>
<b>9.8f</b>	Victimised you because of medication?	<b>0%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>8%</b>
<b>9.8g</b>	Victimised you because of debt?	<b>0%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>4%</b>
<b>9.8h</b>	Victimised you because of drugs?	<b>0%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.8i</b>	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	<b>9%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>24%</b>
<b>9.8j</b>	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	<b>6%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>8%</b>
<b>9.8k</b>	Victimised you because of your nationality?	<b>3%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.8k</b>	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	<b>9%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.8m</b>	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.8n</b>	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>4%</b>
<b>9.8o</b>	Victimised you because of your age?	<b>0%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>8%</b>
<b>9.8p</b>	Victimised you because you have a disability?	<b>0%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.8q</b>	Victimised you because you were new here?	<b>0%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.8r</b>	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	<b>0%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>8%</b>
<b>9.8s</b>	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	<b>0%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>4%</b>
<b>9.8t</b>	Victimised you because you made a complaint?	<b>3%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>16%</b>
<b>9.10</b>	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	<b>41%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>16%</b>
<b>9.11</b>	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	<b>42%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>21%</b>
<b>9.12</b>	Is shouting through the windows a problem here?	<b>36%</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>32%</b>

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

### Key to tables

		HMYOI Parc Young Persons' Unit 2017	All other young offender institutions	HMYOI Parc Young Persons' Unit 2017	HMYOI Parc Young Persons' Unit 2016
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>39</b>	<b>563</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>SECTION 10: HEALTH SERVICES</b>					
<b>10.1a</b>	Is it easy for you to see the doctor?	<b>68%</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>58%</b>
<b>10.1b</b>	Is it easy for you to see the nurse?	<b>88%</b>	<b>69%</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>71%</b>
<b>10.1c</b>	Is it easy for you to see the dentist?	<b>65%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>52%</b>
<b>10.2</b>	For those who have been to health services: Do you think the overall quality is good/very good?	<b>57%</b>	<b>52%</b>	<b>57%</b>	<b>52%</b>
<b>10.3</b>	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/all of it in your cell?	<b>11%</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>31%</b>
<b>10.4</b>	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?	<b>29%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>35%</b>
<b>10.5</b>	If you have emotional or mental health problems, are you being helped by anyone here?	<b>75%</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>10%</b>
<b>10.6</b>	Did you have any problems with alcohol when you first arrived?	<b>24%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>4%</b>
<b>10.7</b>	Have you received any help with any alcohol problems here?	<b>15%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>10.8</b>	Did you have any problems with drugs when you first arrived?	<b>52%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>52%</b>	<b>35%</b>
<b>10.9</b>	Do you have a problem with drugs now?	<b>9%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>15%</b>
<b>10.10</b>	Have you received any help with any drug problems here?	<b>38%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>15%</b>
<b>10.11</b>	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs here?	<b>23%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>15%</b>
<b>SECTION 11: ACTIVITIES</b>					
<b>11.1</b>	Were you 14 or younger when you were last at school?	<b>48%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>50%</b>
<b>11.2</b>	Have you ever been excluded from school?	<b>94%</b>	<b>89%</b>	<b>94%</b>	<b>81%</b>
<b>11.3</b>	Did you ever skip school before you came into custody?	<b>77%</b>	<b>74%</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>78%</b>
Do you currently take part in any of the following:					
<b>11.4a</b>	Education?	<b>88%</b>	<b>73%</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>62%</b>
<b>11.4b</b>	A job in this establishment?	<b>3%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>4%</b>
<b>11.4c</b>	Vocational or skills training?	<b>6%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>11.4d</b>	Offending behaviour programmes?	<b>21%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>12%</b>
<b>11.4e</b>	Nothing	<b>9%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>35%</b>

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

### Key to tables

		HMYOI Parc Young Persons' Unit 2017	All other young offender institutions	HMYOI Parc Young Persons' Unit 2017	HMYOI Parc Young Persons' Unit 2016
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>39</b>	<b>563</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>31</b>
For those who have taken part in the following activities while in this establishment, do you think that they will help you when you leave prison:					
<b>11.5a</b>	Education?	<b>72%</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>52%</b>
<b>11.5b</b>	A job in this establishment?	<b>30%</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>11%</b>
<b>11.5c</b>	Vocational or skills training?	<b>39%</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>22%</b>
<b>11.5d</b>	Offending behaviour programmes?	<b>38%</b>	<b>51%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>20%</b>
<b>11.6</b>	Do you usually have association every day?	<b>87%</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>87%</b>	<b>75%</b>
<b>11.7</b>	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	<b>61%</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>61%</b>	<b>59%</b>
<b>11.8</b>	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	<b>3%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>12%</b>
<b>SECTION 12: KEEPING IN TOUCH WITH FAMILY AND FRIENDS</b>					
<b>12.1</b>	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	<b>91%</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>91%</b>	<b>82%</b>
<b>12.2</b>	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	<b>47%</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>42%</b>
<b>12.3</b>	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	<b>41%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>44%</b>
<b>12.4</b>	Is it easy/very easy for your family and friends to visit you here?	<b>32%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>39%</b>
<b>12.5</b>	Do your visits start on time?	<b>28%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>52%</b>
<b>SECTION 13: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE</b>					
Do you think you will have a problem with the following, when you are released:					
<b>13.1a</b>	Finding accommodation?	<b>28%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>30%</b>
<b>13.1b</b>	Getting into school or college?	<b>25%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>26%</b>
<b>13.1c</b>	Getting a job?	<b>50%</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>52%</b>
<b>13.1d</b>	Money/finances?	<b>34%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>35%</b>
<b>13.1e</b>	Claiming benefits?	<b>16%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>22%</b>
<b>13.1f</b>	Continuing health services?	<b>9%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>4%</b>
<b>13.1g</b>	Opening a bank account?	<b>16%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>9%</b>
<b>13.1h</b>	Avoiding bad relationships?	<b>16%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>9%</b>
<b>13.2</b>	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	<b>56%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>52%</b>
For those with a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan:					
<b>13.3</b>	Were you involved in the development of your plan?	<b>100%</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>75%</b>
<b>13.4</b>	Do you understand the targets set in your plan?	<b>94%</b>	<b>94%</b>	<b>94%</b>	<b>83%</b>
<b>13.5</b>	Do you have a caseworker here?	<b>91%</b>	<b>96%</b>	<b>91%</b>	<b>89%</b>
<b>13.6</b>	Has your caseworker helped to prepare you for release?	<b>52%</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>52%</b>	<b>41%</b>
For those with a social worker:					
<b>13.7</b>	Has your social worker been to visit you since you have been here?	<b>83%</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>74%</b>
<b>13.8</b>	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	<b>50%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>42%</b>



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

**Key to tables**

		HMYOI Parc Young Persons' Unit 2017	All other young offender institutions	HMYOI Parc Young Persons' Unit 2017	HMYOI Parc Young Persons' Unit 2016
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>39</b>	<b>563</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>31</b>
Do you know who to contact for help with the following problems?					
<b>13.9a</b>	Finding accommodation	<b>36%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>24%</b>
<b>13.9b</b>	Getting into school or college	<b>43%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>43%</b>
<b>13.9c</b>	Getting a job	<b>57%</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>57%</b>	<b>43%</b>
<b>13.9d</b>	Help with money/finances	<b>36%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>19%</b>
<b>13.9e</b>	Help with claiming benefits	<b>11%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>14%</b>
<b>13.9f</b>	Continuing health services	<b>21%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>19%</b>
<b>13.9g</b>	Opening a bank account	<b>32%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>19%</b>
<b>13.9h</b>	Avoiding bad relationships	<b>18%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>14%</b>
For those who were sentenced:					
<b>13.11</b>	Do you want to stop offending?	<b>77%</b>	<b>89%</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>95%</b>
<b>13.12</b>	Have you done anything or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?	<b>48%</b>	<b>51%</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>63%</b>

## Diversity analysis



### Key question responses (ethnicity) HMYOI Parc Young Persons' Unit 2017

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

#### Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic young people	White young people
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>13</b>	<b>24</b>
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	0%	4%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	100%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	100%	100%
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)		
1.6	Are you Muslim?	42%	4%
1.5	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	0%	14%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	8%	35%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	18%	37%
2.1	Are you sentenced?	92%	78%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	62%	75%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	31%	57%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	50%	75%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	15%	13%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	25%	78%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	23%	65%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	54%	83%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	62%	73%
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	62%	96%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	27%	59%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	0%	9%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	33%	43%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	31%	30%
Can you speak to:			
5.7	A chaplain of your faith in private?	54%	55%
5.8	A peer mentor?	8%	38%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	0%	37%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	8%	58%

## Diversity analysis

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	<b>Black and minority ethnic young people</b>	<b>White young people</b>
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in young people's background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>13</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>6.1</b>	Do most staff treat you with respect?	42%	77%
<b>6.2</b>	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	25%	29%
<b>7.1</b>	Is it easy to make an application?	42%	75%
<b>7.4</b>	Is it easy to make a complaint?	46%	71%
<b>8.1</b>	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	17%	48%
<b>8.2</b>	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	17%	60%
<b>8.3</b>	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	25%	45%
<b>8.4</b>	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	42%	40%
<b>8.6</b>	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	58%	62%
<b>8.8</b>	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	58%	50%
<b>9.1</b>	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	33%	68%
<b>9.2</b>	Do you feel unsafe now?	17%	25%
<b>9.4</b>	Have you been victimised by other young people here?	42%	76%
Since you have been here, have other young people:			
<b>9.5d</b>	Threatened or intimidated you?	8%	29%
<b>9.5i</b>	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	8%	10%
<b>9.5j</b>	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	5%
<b>9.5k</b>	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	0%
<b>9.5p</b>	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	0%
<b>9.7</b>	Have you been victimised by staff here?	58%	33%
Since you have been here, have staff:			
<b>9.8d</b>	Threatened or intimidated you?	25%	10%
<b>9.8i</b>	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	17%	5%
<b>9.8j</b>	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	8%	5%
<b>9.8k</b>	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	5%
<b>9.8p</b>	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	0%
<b>9.10</b>	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	33%	47%
<b>9.11</b>	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	33%	50%

## Diversity analysis

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic young people	White 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		
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>13</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>10.1a</b>	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the doctor?	58%	76%
<b>10.1b</b>	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the nurse?	83%	91%
<b>10.4</b>	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	17%	38%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:			
<b>11.4a</b>	Education?	92%	85%
<b>11.4b</b>	A job in this establishment?	0%	5%
<b>11.4c</b>	Vocational or skills training?	0%	10%
<b>11.4d</b>	Offending behaviour programmes?	8%	25%
<b>11.4e</b>	Nothing?	8%	10%
<b>11.6</b>	Do you usually have association every day?	83%	88%
<b>11.7</b>	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	50%	68%
<b>11.8</b>	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	0%	5%
<b>12.1</b>	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	83%	94%
<b>12.2</b>	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	50%	47%
<b>12.3</b>	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	50%	32%
<b>13.2</b>	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	42%	67%
<b>13.8</b>	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	33%	56%

## Diversity analysis



### Key question responses (local authority care analysis) HMYOI Parc Young Persons' Unit 2017

**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		
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>10</b>	<b>22</b>
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	11%	0%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	100%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	100%	100%
1.5	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	22%	43%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	0%	23%
1.5	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	0%	9%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	10%	27%
2.1	Are you sentenced?	90%	81%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	44%	86%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	25%	46%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	100%	55%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	11%	14%
4.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	89%	50%
4.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	60%	50%
4.8	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	67%	64%
4.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	78%	67%
5.1	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	89%	76%
5.2	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	67%	35%
5.3	Do you find the food here good/very good?	22%	0%
5.4	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	44%	45%
5.6	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	0%	30%
Can you speak to:			
5.7	A chaplain of your faith in private?	63%	48%
5.8	A peer mentor?	25%	25%
5.9	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	0%	26%
5.10	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	43%	35%

## 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?	57%	62%
6.2	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	25%	29%
7.1	Is it easy to make an application?	57%	65%
7.4	Is it easy to make a complaint?	57%	62%
8.1	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	43%	35%
8.2	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	67%	40%
8.3	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	57%	40%
8.4	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	43%	40%
8.6	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	75%	65%
8.8	Have you been physically restrained (C and R) since you have been here?	57%	60%
9.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	43%	52%
9.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	17%	25%
9.4	Have you been victimised by other young people here?	50%	65%
Since you have been here, have other young people:			
9.5d	Threatened or intimidated you?	13%	15%
9.5i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	25%	5%
9.5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	5%
9.5k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	0%
9.5p	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	0%
9.7	Have you been victimised by staff here?	50%	43%
Since you have been here, have staff:			
9.8d	Threatened or intimidated you?	0%	14%
9.8i	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	33%	5%
9.8j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	17%	5%
9.8k	Victimised you because of your nationality?	17%	0%
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?	40%	29%
9.11	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	20%	42%

## 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		
<b>10.1a</b>	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the doctor?	<b>83%</b>	<b>62%</b>
<b>10.1b</b>	Is it easy/very easy for you to see the nurse?	<b>100%</b>	<b>86%</b>
<b>10.4</b>	Do you feel you have any emotional or mental health problems?	<b>33%</b>	<b>29%</b>
Do you currently take part in any of the following:			
<b>11.4a</b>	Education?	<b>86%</b>	<b>86%</b>
<b>11.4b</b>	A job in this establishment?	<b>14%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>11.4c</b>	Vocational or skills training?	<b>0%</b>	<b>10%</b>
<b>11.4d</b>	Offending behaviour programmes?	<b>43%</b>	<b>14%</b>
<b>11.4e</b>	Nothing?	<b>0%</b>	<b>14%</b>
<b>11.6</b>	Do you usually have association every day?	<b>80%</b>	<b>85%</b>
<b>11.7</b>	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	<b>100%</b>	<b>57%</b>
<b>11.8</b>	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	<b>0%</b>	<b>5%</b>
<b>12.1</b>	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	<b>100%</b>	<b>85%</b>
<b>12.2</b>	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	<b>17%</b>	<b>55%</b>
<b>12.3</b>	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	<b>33%</b>	<b>40%</b>
<b>13.2</b>	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	<b>43%</b>	<b>60%</b>
<b>13.8</b>	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	<b>33%</b>	<b>50%</b>

## Wing comparator



### Survey responses from children and young people: HMYOI Parc Young Persons' Unit 2017

**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	E wing	G 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		
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>19</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU</b>			
1.1	Are you 18 years of age?	0%	17%
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	5%	0%
1.3	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	100%
1.4	Do you understand written English?	100%	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.)	26%	44%
1.6	Are you Muslim?	11%	22%
1.7	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	17%	0%
1.8	Do you have any children?	0%	5%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	37%	11%
1.10	Have you ever been in local authority care?	31%	31%
<b>SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE</b>			
2.1	Are you sentenced?	79%	83%
2.2	Is your sentence 12 months or less?	33%	26%
2.3	Have you been in this establishment for one month or less?	21%	16%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	74%	68%
<b>SECTION 3: COURTS, TRANSFERS AND ESCORTS</b>			
On your most recent journey here:			
3.1	Did you feel safe?	63%	74%
3.2	Did you travel with any adults (over 18) or a mix of males and females?	44%	47%
3.3	Did you spend more than 4 hours in the van?	16%	11%
3.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	63%	68%
3.7	Before you arrived, did you receive any helpful information to help you prepare for coming here?	11%	15%



## Wing comparator

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	E wing	G 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		
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>19</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>SECTION 4: YOUR FIRST FEW DAYS HERE</b>			
<b>4.1</b>	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	<b>78%</b>	<b>65%</b>
<b>4.2</b>	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	<b>67%</b>	<b>58%</b>
<b>4.3</b>	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	<b>63%</b>	<b>37%</b>
When you first arrived, did staff ask if you needed help or support with any of the following:			
<b>4.4a</b>	Not being able to smoke?	<b>78%</b>	<b>61%</b>
<b>4.4b</b>	Loss of property?	<b>28%</b>	<b>11%</b>
<b>4.4c</b>	Feeling scared?	<b>39%</b>	<b>28%</b>
<b>4.4d</b>	Gang problems?	<b>17%</b>	<b>17%</b>
<b>4.4e</b>	Contacting family?	<b>50%</b>	<b>44%</b>
<b>4.4f</b>	Money worries?	<b>22%</b>	<b>17%</b>
<b>4.4g</b>	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	<b>56%</b>	<b>17%</b>
<b>4.4h</b>	Health problems?	<b>56%</b>	<b>67%</b>
<b>4.4i</b>	Getting phone numbers?	<b>50%</b>	<b>44%</b>
<b>4.5</b>	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	<b>77%</b>	<b>78%</b>
When you first arrived, did you have problems with any of the following:			
<b>4.5a</b>	Not being able to smoke?	<b>41%</b>	<b>61%</b>
<b>4.5b</b>	Loss of property?	<b>6%</b>	<b>22%</b>
<b>4.5c</b>	Feeling Scared?	<b>18%</b>	<b>17%</b>
<b>4.5d</b>	Gang Problems?	<b>6%</b>	<b>6%</b>
<b>4.5e</b>	Contacting Family?	<b>35%</b>	<b>33%</b>
<b>4.5f</b>	Money worries?	<b>0%</b>	<b>22%</b>
<b>4.5g</b>	Feeling worried/upset/needing someone to talk to?	<b>24%</b>	<b>11%</b>
<b>4.5h</b>	Health problems?	<b>0%</b>	<b>17%</b>
<b>4.5i</b>	Getting phone numbers?	<b>24%</b>	<b>11%</b>
When you first arrived, were you given any of the following:			
<b>4.6a</b>	Toiletries/basic items?	<b>88%</b>	<b>84%</b>
<b>4.6b</b>	The opportunity to have a shower?	<b>71%</b>	<b>37%</b>
<b>4.6c</b>	Something to eat?	<b>65%</b>	<b>58%</b>
<b>4.6d</b>	A free phone call to friends/family?	<b>59%</b>	<b>47%</b>
<b>4.6e</b>	PIN phone credit?	<b>29%</b>	<b>21%</b>
<b>4.6f</b>	Information about feeling worried/upset?	<b>35%</b>	<b>26%</b>

## Wing comparator

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	E wing	G 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		
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>19</b>	<b>20</b>
Within your first 24 hours, did you have access to the following people or services:			
<b>4.7a</b>	A chaplain?	<b>47%</b>	<b>56%</b>
<b>4.7b</b>	A peer mentor?	<b>6%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>4.7c</b>	Childline/Samaritans	<b>12%</b>	<b>11%</b>
<b>4.7d</b>	The prison shop/canteen?	<b>18%</b>	<b>17%</b>
<b>4.8</b>	Before you were locked up on your first night, were you seen by a doctor or nurse?	<b>72%</b>	<b>70%</b>
<b>4.9</b>	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	<b>59%</b>	<b>80%</b>
<b>SECTION 5: DAILY LIFE AND RESPECT</b>			
<b>5.1</b>	Can you normally have a shower every day if you want to?	<b>82%</b>	<b>85%</b>
<b>5.2</b>	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	<b>53%</b>	<b>45%</b>
<b>5.3</b>	Do you find the food here good/very good?	<b>0%</b>	<b>15%</b>
<b>5.4</b>	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough variety of products?	<b>44%</b>	<b>42%</b>
<b>5.5</b>	Is it easy/very easy for you to attend religious services?	<b>44%</b>	<b>26%</b>
<b>5.6</b>	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	<b>44%</b>	<b>17%</b>
Can you speak to:			
<b>5.7</b>	A Chaplain of your faith in private?	<b>47%</b>	<b>63%</b>
<b>5.8</b>	A peer mentor?	<b>44%</b>	<b>11%</b>
<b>5.9</b>	A member of the IMB (Independent Monitoring Board)?	<b>21%</b>	<b>21%</b>
<b>5.10</b>	An advocate (an outside person to help you)?	<b>47%</b>	<b>28%</b>
<b>SECTION 6: RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF</b>			
<b>6.1</b>	Do most staff treat you with respect?	<b>77%</b>	<b>56%</b>
<b>6.2</b>	If you had a problem, would you have no-one to turn to?	<b>25%</b>	<b>26%</b>
<b>6.3</b>	Have staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	<b>60%</b>	<b>42%</b>
<b>SECTION 7: APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS</b>			
<b>7.1</b>	Is it easy to make an application?	<b>73%</b>	<b>58%</b>
<b>7.4</b>	Is it easy to make a complaint?	<b>59%</b>	<b>67%</b>
<b>7.7</b>	Have you ever felt too scared or intimidated to make a complaint?	<b>20%</b>	<b>17%</b>

## Wing comparator

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	E wing	G 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		
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>19</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>SECTION 8: REWARDS AND SANCTIONS, AND DISCIPLINE</b>			
<b>8.1</b>	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the reward scheme?	<b>31%</b>	<b>44%</b>
<b>8.2</b>	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the reward scheme?	<b>53%</b>	<b>33%</b>
<b>8.3</b>	Do the different levels make you change your behaviour?	<b>47%</b>	<b>37%</b>
<b>8.4</b>	Have you had a minor report since you have been here?	<b>47%</b>	<b>37%</b>
<b>8.6</b>	Have you had an adjudication ('nicking') since you have been here?	<b>75%</b>	<b>53%</b>
<b>8.8</b>	Have you been physically restrained (Cand R) since you have been here?	<b>60%</b>	<b>53%</b>
<b>SECTION 9: SAFETY</b>			
<b>9.1</b>	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	<b>71%</b>	<b>39%</b>
<b>9.2</b>	Do you feel unsafe now?	<b>31%</b>	<b>12%</b>
<b>9.4</b>	Have you ever been victimised by other young people here?	<b>69%</b>	<b>58%</b>
Since you have been here, have other young people:			
<b>9.5a</b>	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	<b>31%</b>	<b>26%</b>
<b>9.5b</b>	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	<b>44%</b>	<b>32%</b>
<b>9.5c</b>	Sexually abused you?	<b>0%</b>	<b>5%</b>
<b>9.5d</b>	Threatened or intimidated you?	<b>31%</b>	<b>11%</b>
<b>9.5e</b>	Taken your canteen/property?	<b>19%</b>	<b>5%</b>
<b>9.5f</b>	Victimised you because of medication?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.5g</b>	Victimised you because of debt?	<b>6%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.5h</b>	Victimised you because of drugs?	<b>0%</b>	<b>5%</b>
<b>9.5i</b>	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	<b>13%</b>	<b>5%</b>
<b>9.5j</b>	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	<b>6%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.5k</b>	Victimised you because of your nationality?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.5l</b>	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	<b>13%</b>	<b>5%</b>
<b>9.5m</b>	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	<b>6%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.5n</b>	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.5o</b>	Victimised you because of your age?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.5p</b>	Victimised you because you have a disability?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.5q</b>	Victimised you because you were new here?	<b>25%</b>	<b>11%</b>
<b>9.5r</b>	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.5s</b>	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	<b>6%</b>	<b>0%</b>

## Wing comparator

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	E wing	G 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		
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>19</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>9.7</b>	Have you ever been victimised by a member of staff here?	<b>35%</b>	<b>53%</b>
Since you have been here, have staff:			
<b>9.8a</b>	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	<b>24%</b>	<b>29%</b>
<b>9.8b</b>	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	<b>0%</b>	<b>18%</b>
<b>9.8c</b>	Sexually abused you?	<b>6%</b>	<b>6%</b>
<b>9.8d</b>	Threatened or intimidated you?	<b>12%</b>	<b>18%</b>
<b>9.8e</b>	Taken your canteen/property?	<b>0%</b>	<b>6%</b>
<b>9.8f</b>	Victimised you because of medication?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.8g</b>	Victimised you because of debt?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.8h</b>	Victimised you because of drugs?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.8i</b>	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	<b>12%</b>	<b>6%</b>
<b>9.8j</b>	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	<b>0%</b>	<b>12%</b>
<b>9.8k</b>	Victimised you because of your nationality?	<b>0%</b>	<b>6%</b>
<b>9.8k</b>	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	<b>12%</b>	<b>6%</b>
<b>9.8m</b>	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.8n</b>	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.8o</b>	Victimised you because of your age?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.8p</b>	Victimised you because you have a disability?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.8q</b>	Victimised you because you were new here?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.8r</b>	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.8s</b>	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>9.8t</b>	Victimised you because you made a complaint?	<b>0%</b>	<b>6%</b>
<b>9.10</b>	If you were being victimised, would you tell a member of staff?	<b>53%</b>	<b>25%</b>
<b>9.11</b>	Do you think staff would take it seriously if you told them you had been victimised?	<b>33%</b>	<b>50%</b>
<b>9.12</b>	Is shouting through the windows a problem here?	<b>56%</b>	<b>18%</b>
<b>SECTION 10: HEALTH SERVICES</b>			
<b>10.1a</b>	Is it easy for you to see the doctor?	<b>88%</b>	<b>47%</b>
<b>10.1b</b>	Is it easy for you to see the nurse?	<b>82%</b>	<b>94%</b>
<b>10.1c</b>	Is it easy for you to see the dentist?	<b>82%</b>	<b>47%</b>
<b>10.4</b>	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?	<b>35%</b>	<b>24%</b>
<b>10.6</b>	Did you have any problems with alcohol when you first arrived?	<b>31%</b>	<b>18%</b>
<b>10.7</b>	Have you received any help with any alcohol problems here?	<b>13%</b>	<b>18%</b>
<b>10.8</b>	Did you have any problems with drugs when you first arrived?	<b>47%</b>	<b>56%</b>
<b>10.9</b>	Do you have a problem with drugs now?	<b>13%</b>	<b>6%</b>
<b>10.10</b>	Have you received any help with any drug problems here?	<b>31%</b>	<b>44%</b>
<b>10.11</b>	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs here?	<b>19%</b>	<b>29%</b>

## Wing comparator

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	E wing	G 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		
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>19</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>SECTION 11: ACTIVITIES</b>			
11.1	Were you 14 or younger when you were last at school?	44%	53%
11.2	Have you ever been excluded from school?	100%	88%
11.3	Did you ever skip school before you came into custody?	82%	71%
Do you currently take part in any of the following:			
11.4a	Education?	77%	100%
11.4b	A job in this establishment?	6%	0%
11.4c	Vocational or skills training?	0%	12%
11.4d	Offending behaviour programmes?	18%	24%
11.4e	Nothing	18%	0%
11.6	Do you usually have association every day?	73%	100%
11.7	Can you usually go outside for exercise every day?	69%	53%
11.8	Do you go to the gym more than five times each week?	6%	0%
<b>SECTION 12: KEEPING IN TOUCH WITH FAMILY AND FRIENDS</b>			
12.1	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	94%	88%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving letters or parcels?	38%	56%
12.3	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	38%	44%
12.4	Is it easy/very easy for your family and friends to visit you here?	44%	20%
12.5	Do your visits start on time?	38%	19%
<b>SECTION 13: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE</b>			
Do you think you will have a problem with the following, when you are released:			
13.1a	Finding accommodation?	31%	25%
13.1b	Getting into school or college?	25%	25%
13.1c	Getting a job?	44%	56%
13.1d	Money/finances?	38%	31%
13.1e	Claiming benefits?	25%	6%
13.1f	Continuing health services?	6%	13%
13.1g	Opening a bank account?	25%	6%
13.1h	Avoiding bad relationships?	19%	13%
13.2	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	67%	47%
13.5	Do you have a caseworker here?	94%	88%
13.8	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	50%	50%