



HM YOI Cookham Wood

Annual Report of the Independent Monitoring Board

1st AUGUST 2015 – 31st JULY 2016



SECTION 1

1.1 STATUTORY ROLE OF THE IMB

1.1.1 The Prison Act 1952 and the Immigration and Asylum Act 1999 require every prison and IRC to be monitored by an independent Board appointed by the Secretary of State from members of the community in which the prison or centre is situated.

1.1.2 The Board is specifically charged to:

- Satisfy itself as to the humane and just treatment of those held in custody within its prison and the range and adequacy of the programmes preparing them for release.
- Inform promptly the Secretary of State, or any official to whom he has delegated authority as it judges appropriate, any concern it has.
- Report annually to the Secretary of State on how well the prison has met the standards and requirements placed on it and what impact these have on those in its custody.
- To enable the Board to carry out these duties effectively its members have right of access to every prisoner and every part of the prison and also to the prison's records.

SECTION 2

CONTENTS

		Page
SECTION 1	Statutory Role of the IMB	2
SECTION 2	Contents	3
SECTION 3	Introduction	
3.1	Introduction	4
3.2	Agencies within the Establishment	5
3.3	Findings of Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons	5
SECTION 4	Executive Summary	
4.1	Executive Summary	6
4.2	Particular Issues Requiring a Response	7
4.3	Previous Year's Concerns	7
SECTION 5		
5.1	Equality & Inclusion	9
5.2	Education, Learning & Skills	10
5.3	Healthcare & Mental Health	11
5.4	Purposeful Activity	12
5.5	Resettlement	13
5.6	Safer Custody	14
5.7	Segregation, Care & Separation	16
5.8	Residential Services	17
SECTION 6		
6.1	Adjudications, Incentives and Earned Privileges	17
6.2	Youth Council	18
6.3	Reception, First Night & Induction	19
SECTION 7	Work of the Independent Monitoring Board	
7.1	Work of the Independent Monitoring Board	19
7.2	Recruitment, Training & Development	19
7.3	Applications	20
SECTION 8	Glossary	22

SECTION 3

3.1 INTRODUCTION

- 3.1.1 This report of the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB) for Her Majesty's Young Offenders' Institution (HM YOI) Cookham Wood covers the period from 1st August 2015 to 31st July 2016.
- 3.1.2 Cookham Wood, in Rochester, Kent, is a juvenile custodial institution for up to 178 young men aged 15-18 years. The majority of its young people are aged 16 or 17 years. It is one of four juvenile YOIs in England and Wales.
- 3.1.3 It accommodates both remand and convicted prisoners, and serves the courts from London, the South East, the South West, Central South, and East Anglia.
- 3.1.4 For most of this year, around 30% of its young people were remand prisoners. Their average length of stay was 4 – 12 weeks, though a small number were on remand for up to 24 weeks. The average length of stay for sentenced prisoners was 1 – 6 months; some had sentences of 1 or 2 years, and a small number had, or were facing, indeterminate sentences for capital offences.
- 3.1.5 Cookham Wood was built in the 1970s, but has excellent new residential accommodation and a new education block, both opened in 2014.
- 3.1.6 The new residential unit accommodates young people in single cells on three floors and two wings (A and B). The cells on either side of each landing are separated by a wide association area. Each cell has a shower unit and telephone.
- 3.1.7 Newly admitted young people are housed together on B3 landing for their induction programme.
- 3.1.8 Since April 2016, B1 landing has been set aside for young people who are persistently disruptive and violent. As an alternative to segregation, they have a tightly restricted regime and receive a 4-week "Progressive Programme" of interventions and education to challenge, support and reintegrate them. The aim is to return them to a main landing and normal regime in 4 weeks.
- 3.1.9 Up to 7 young people requiring full GOOD (Good Order and Discipline) segregation are housed in the Phoenix Unit, which is in the old part of Cookham Wood and has a narrow corridor, little natural light and no in-cell telephones or showers.
- 3.1.9 Cedar House is an old-fashioned but comfortable complex needs unit for up to 17 vulnerable young people, separate from the main residential block.
- 3.1.10 The education block comprises classrooms, library and workshops, housed on two floors. The rooms are spacious, light and well equipped.
- 3.1.12 The vision of the NOMS Young People's Estate, of which Cookham Wood is a part, is "To give young people the best chance to turn their lives around by providing them with safe, decent and secure environments that focus on education and personal development and empower them to make positive change, successfully return to the community and lead law-abiding lives."

3.2 AGENCIES WITHIN THE ESTABLISHMENT

- 3.2.1 Healthcare is provided and funded by the NHS. Primary Healthcare nursing services are delivered by Oxleas NHS Foundation Trust. Central and North West London NHS Foundation Trust is responsible for the delivery of Mental Health Services (Health and Wellbeing). GP services are delivered by the Maidstone Medical Centre.
- 3.2.2 Addaction provide Cookham Wood's substance misuse service, working closely with young people who have drug-related problems and delivering training across the institution.
- 3.2.3 The education provider is Novus (formerly The Manchester College). Youth work and some educational support is provided by Kinetic Youth Work Services.
- 3.2.4 The Resettlement Team includes case workers from the Medway Youth Offending Team (YOT) as well as prison staff. A Social Work Team provides child protection and looked after children (LAC) services.
- 3.2.5 Barnados provide independent advocacy support for the young people.
- 3.2.6 Like other YOIs, Cookham Wood established a new, cross-agency Interventions Team this year (January 2016). This is an important development. The team works to the Head of Reducing Re-offending, but its treatment managers and clinical lead are forensic psychologists. Its 5 trainers/facilitators offer 4 new intervention programmes to support and guide young people referred to them. The programmes, which can be delivered one-to-one or to groups of up to 6, address thinking skills, motivation, anger management and emotional awareness.
- 3.2.7 "Most Valued Player" – two expert trainers/consultants from outside Cookham Wood – provide additional training and mediation to address gang-related violence.
- 3.2.8 The new intervention programmes – and the consistency provided by the new Team – are central to Cookham Wood's (January 2016) Behaviour Management Policy. They inform and are informed by the interventions of other agencies at Cookham Wood – Health and Wellbeing, Education and the Casework team. The new Positive Attitudes Created Together (PACT) framework for planning individual care is intended to join up the interventions of all the agencies.

3.3 FINDINGS OF HER MAJESTY'S INSPECTORATE OF PRISONS (HMIP)

- 3.3.1 HMIP's last inspection of Cookham Wood was in May 2015. However, the findings of that inspection provide an important backdrop to developments this year.
- 3.3.2 In his introduction to his May 2015 Inspection Report, HM Chief Inspector noted "important improvements", particularly in "arrangements for boys with the highest level of need". But he also found that the number of violent incidents remained high, and that "boys had much too little time out of their cells".
- 3.3.3 He found that "behaviour management processes were weak": "low level poor behaviour was not promptly, consistently and decisively challenged... good behaviour was not effectively rewarded or publicly recognized ..."
- 3.3.4 He concluded: "Cookham Wood reflects the systemic problems we have identified across the YOI estate. The welcome fall in the number of children in custody means that those who remain represent a more concentrated mix of very challenging young people, held in a smaller number of establishments ... and cared for by a staff group beset by shortages and lack of training for their complex and demanding role".

SECTION 4

4.1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 4.1.1 Cookham Wood is an institution which treats its young people with respect and humanity. During the year continued improvements in Safeguarding, Equality and Diversity, Violence Reduction and Education support offered to the young people built on the progress made in the previous year.
- 4.1.2 Staffing in the Safeguarding Team was increased and the work of these staff was co-ordinated with other teams in the establishment (5.1.3, 5.6.3, 5.6.5, 5.6.7). Equality work was integrated into the Safeguarding Team and aligned with the work of Education, Kinetic (Youth Work) and Behavioural Intervention workers.
- 4.1.3 One young person with severe mental health and behavioural problems remained in segregation for six months (5.7.13). He was assessed by specialist external mental health services but was refused transfer to a mental health establishment. The IMB expressed serious, ongoing concerns at the lack of specialist, humane and appropriate support for the small but very vulnerable group of young people in the youth estate whose needs cannot be met within the available resources.
- 4.1.4 High levels of violence continued into 2016; a new Violence Reduction Strategy was developed to address the ongoing challenges. In April 2016 a Progressive Programme was introduced to identify and work with the small number of young people responsible for a large number of violent incidents (5.6.8, 5.7.10-12). This had a marked impact on the numbers of violent incidents, Use of Force and the disruption of the daily routine of the prison. The IMB were supportive of the Progressive Programme but expressed ongoing concerns about the planning and delivery of the programme, the experience of young people on the first week of the programme which appeared little different from segregation, the input of other departments to the young people, management oversight and involvement in the running of the programme, and the process and level of decision making regarding the young people.
- 4.1.5 Time out of cell improved as staffing levels increased, however the IMB expressed concerns about the experience of young people on the Progressive Programme (4.3.4, 5.4.4).
- 4.1.6 Young people held in the Phoenix (segregation) unit experienced some improvement in the regime offered but remained in their cells for much of the day.
- 4.1.7 Following a period of severe staff shortages in the education department, which resulted in a significant loss of opportunity for young people who remained in their cells for extended periods, the department staffing improved. The introduction of the Progressive Programme saw a marked decrease in interruptions in education, improved attendance and behaviour (5.2.13). The conversion of a former workshop area into interview rooms enabled young people to attend education classes and move to other appointments (legal, health, casework) with little disruption to the delivery of the regime (5.2.9, 5.3.11).
- 4.1.8 Uniformed staffing levels improved in January 2016. The establishment of Band 3 officers is 117; however the number permanently employed in Cookham Wood was averagely 83, supplemented by 18 detached duty officers and 10 officers from Dover IRC, which is currently closed (4.3.2).

- 4.1.9 Opportunities for Release on Temporary License (ROTL) were developed during the year, an improvement on the situation in 2014/15 when no young people were granted ROTL (5.5.2).
- 4.1.10 Of the young people in Cookham Wood approximately 1/3 are Looked After Children. Local Authorities did not secure a placement more than 10 days prior to young people's release date. One young person who attained the age of 18 was released and advised to present as homeless to the local authority. (5.5.6)

4.2 PARTICULAR ISSUES REQUIRING A RESPONSE

4.2.1 Progressive Programme

- * **What will be done to improve time out of cell for the young people on the programme, particularly those on week 1?**
- * **How will the planning, delivery and recording of rehabilitative elements of the programme be improved?**
- * **What will be done to ensure consistency in the level and processes of decision making about young people on the programme?**
- * **What are the plans for reintegration of young people on completion of the programme?**

4.2.2 Time out of cell

**How will this be improved for all young people in the coming year?
How will individual time out of cell be recorded and progress monitored, particularly on the Progressive Landing?**

4.2.3 What will be done about the lack of provision nationally to meet the needs of the small number of young people with severe mental health/behavioural problems?

4.2.4 Number of officers

What will be done to ensure improved recruitment and retention of officers employed at Cookham Wood?

4.2.5 Education staff

What will be done to ensure recruitment and retention of appropriately qualified and experienced teaching staff at Cookham Wood?

4.2.6 What plans are being developed for the improvement of the outdated facilities in Cookham Wood, in particular the Phoenix (segregation) unit and the poorly maintained kitchen drainage? (5.8.3)

4.3 PREVIOUS YEAR'S CONCERNS

4.3.1 The IMB highlighted 5 areas of concern in its 2014-15 Annual Report. The following paragraphs describe developments in these areas during the 2015-16 reporting year.

4.3.2 Number of officers

Some progress (5.6.6).

Shortages of uniformed staff continued up to December. Since January, officer numbers, though tight, have been sufficient, in normal circumstances, to deliver a full regime. This has been helped by the fact that the average monthly population of young people has not exceeded 153.

The authorized number of Band 3 prison officers is 117: the actual number has been around 83 Cookham Wood officers, plus 18 "detached duty" officers from other YOIs and up to 10 officers from Dover IRC (currently closed). Overtime working has been available and encouraged.

As things stand, withdrawal of the detached duty officers would mean that Cookham Wood could not deliver a full regime to its young people.

4.3.3 Violence Reduction

Some progress and lots of fresh thinking (3.1.8, 3.2.6-8, 5.4.5-6, 5.6.2-3, 5.6.8-11, 5.7.10-13, 6.1.5).

There was a high level of violence throughout the year, but a significant (20%) reduction in the number of assaults and fights in the 3 months May - July. This followed the introduction of the Progressive Landing for persistently violent and disruptive young people in April.

The IMB believes that violence will continue to reduce in the coming year. It is confident that the Progressive Programme will mature and that delivery of its educational pathway and behavioural interventions programmes will strengthen. It notes that there is increased use of PACT individual development planning for violent young people – for all the young people on the Progressive Programme, but also for some young people on other landings. It applauds Cookham Wood's planned recruitment of three Band 4 officers to form a new Restorative Justice / Conflict resolution team and lead on mediation.

All these initiatives are linked and balanced in Cookham Wood's comprehensive new Behaviour Management Policy, published in January.

4.3.4 Time out of cell

Little improvement (5.2.7-10, 5.4.1-7).

There has been more time out of cell for young people in the Phoenix unit, and much more in Cedar House (which now has good educational and PE provision). Time out of cell at weekends has improved for everyone because of better staff numbers. In particular, provision of PE has improved.

However, across the institution, average core day (Monday-Friday, 9-5) activity hours per young person have only been 18-23 hours per week (the target is 30 hours). In January, when there were severe staff shortages in the Education Department, this dropped to 16.2 hours.

The IMB is sure that time out of cell will increase for young people on the main landings in the coming year – because the Progressive Programme will lessen disruption, and because use of the new interview rooms in the education block will reduce time out from education. It asks, however, whether this will be at the expense of the young people on the Progressive Landing.

The Progressive Landing was opened in April before the specialist resources were available to deliver the full programme of activities it promised. As a result, in the IMB's opinion, young people on the Programme spent far too much time in their cells, particularly during their first week. Resources have been made available, and the programme of activities has become richer, but slowly. The IMB has monitored time out of cell on the Progressive Landing very closely and repeatedly raised concerns. It will continue to do so.

4.3.5 Information sharing

Improved (5.3.7, 5.3.12).

NHS Commissioners delivered a workshop on (medical) information sharing and the co-ordination of all healthcare services is now good. Addaction staff were given improved access to System 1 (healthcare IT system).

4.3.6 Release on Temporary Licence (ROTL)

Much improved (5.5.2).

A new action plan (October 2015) clarified the application process and both the number of young people granted ROTL and the range of placements available increased steadily. In May 2016, there were 88 ROTL episodes for 9 young people.

SECTION 5

5.1 EQUALITY & INCLUSION

- 5.1.1 Cookham Wood has a very diverse population. Its young people differ from each other in age, ethnicity, religious faith and nationality. They also differ widely in their communication and learning skills. 20% have registered emotional and behavioural difficulties. Establishing a culture of understanding, respect and equal opportunity for everyone is challenging but essential to the wellbeing and rehabilitation of the young people.
- 5.1.2 Cookham Wood has made steady progress this year in recognizing and challenging discrimination. In May 2015, HMIP found support for minority groups (of all types) to be “reasonable”: the Board now considers it to be good.
- 5.1.3 There have been 3 driving forces behind the improvements. First, management oversight of equalities issues has become much tighter: monitoring and review has been professionalised and planning has become proactive. Second, the focus of the equality programme has been widened to address discrimination in relation to all “protected characteristics” – not just race and faith but, crucially, mental health and learning difficulties. Third, equality work has been mainstreamed in the Safeguarding department, and is aligned with and supported by the work of other departments, particularly Education but also Kinetic and the new Behavioural Intervention trainers.
- 5.1.4 Data collection is better and more timely than last year. The First Night Officer completes an Equalities Questionnaire with every new young person, and young people are also encouraged to self-report, in confidence, to the safeguarding team. Healthcare and Education upload information on disabilities onto the NOMIS computer system. A full suite of incident monitoring data is prepared for each quarterly Equality meeting.
- 5.1.5 The Equalities meeting, chaired by the Head of Safeguarding and attended by the Deputy Governor, has developed teeth. It directs research into discrepancies revealed by the monitoring data – notably the persistent over-representation of black young people in use of force incidents, adjudication and on basic regime. It also audits systems for discrimination, through its “Equality Impact Assessment” (EIA) programme. Last year, the Board considered the EIA programme half-hearted: that is no longer the case. Current Impact Assessments, each owned by a responsible governor, address use of force, segregation, release on temporary licence (ROTL) and adjudications.
- 5.1.6 The Equality Officer arranges and chairs regular focus groups of young people representing minorities, to seek their views and advice; the results are published and brought to the Equality meeting. The chaplains also consult (e.g. Muslim) Young People. There is a regular Foreign Nationals workshop. It is encouraging that officers have offered to form their own focus group to discuss equality issues.
- 5.1.7 Because of the turnover of young people, it has been difficult to maintain a full complement of Young People’s Equality Representatives – their number has varied from 10 to 2. The Board would like to see the number of Representatives stabilise; it thinks they are an important point of contact and encouragement for vulnerable Young People.
- 5.1.8 Novus (Education) has given strong support to events raising awareness of equality issues (for instance, last year’s Ann Frank exhibition was supported by a week-long education programme).
- 5.1.9 Young people and staff raise concerns about discrimination and abuse by submitting Discrimination Incident Referral Forms (DIRFs). There are few DIRFs – around 3 a month, mostly submitted by officers and about name-calling between young people. But they are treated seriously – investigated by Custodial Managers, reviewed by both the Head of Safeguarding and

the Governing Governor. Very appropriately, they lead to counselling and support rather than to disciplinary action.

5.1.10 There have been few complaints alleging racial discrimination at Cookham Wood – 3 in the 6 months, January to June 2016 – and there were only two race-related IMB applications in this reporting year (both concerning racist abuse by young people).

5.1.11 The Board has seen no intentional discrimination because of “protected characteristics” at Cookham Wood, and is satisfied that mechanisms are now in place to identify unintentional, “institutional” discrimination.

5.2 EDUCATION, LEARNING & SKILLS

5.2.1 Management of the education contract changed from The Manchester College to NOVUS – a not-for-profit social enterprise within the LTE group.

5.2.2 The purpose built education block has continued to support good learning. Success rates in education continue to be good, in both academic and vocational subjects. Overall effectiveness of the PE department was good.

5.2.3 The reflective glass used on the corridor windows to classrooms means that it is difficult to gain visibility into rooms from the corridor; equally for staff inside classrooms to check corridors before exiting classrooms. This appears to present a security risk.

5.2.4 Windows to classrooms have been broken a number of times by young people banging on them. Classrooms have been left with cracked windows for long periods while waiting for repairs.

5.2.5 The gym roof continued to leak which removed the facility from use in wet weather. Having been patched a number of times – the faults appear to have been finally addressed (January 2016).

5.2.6 There are still no opportunities for young people to compete with teams from outside the prison.

5.2.7 Attendance and punctuality to classes has been a continuing concern. Delays in movements of young people to / from education have led to a loss of learning time. Young people have been held in their cells for a half or full day when they have an appointment (e.g. legal visit – which may have lasted only a short length of time).

5.2.8 Attendance at classes is now reviewed daily by Senior Managers at their Morning Briefing.

5.2.9 Time out of classes should be significantly improved with the recent conversion of the Bricks workshop in the education block into 7 meeting rooms – allowing young people to be temporarily removed from their class to attend an appointment; and then returned to the class immediately afterwards.

5.2.10 Learning hours delivered were under the entitlement for most young people; especially so for those young people in Phoenix (on segregation); on Week 1 of the Progression Landing programme (on B1); to a lesser extent Cedar (vulnerable young people); and for some needing to be kept apart from other young people.

5.2.11 The Library is located within the education block. This meant that access was restricted to weekdays when young people were allocated to education. Weekend access was not possible. Only a limited outreach service was provided to those young people not attending standard education classes – i.e. those in segregation (on Phoenix); those on the Progression Pathway (on B1); and those vulnerable young people not able to leave Cedar for normal classes. Steps were taken at the end of the year to improve this outreach service.

5.2.12 Security risks have limited the vocational courses on offer to Level 1 programmes, or delayed their implementation.

5.2.13 Young people’s behaviour in education classes has been variable throughout the year. There have been some periods where significant violence - to other young people and/or staff - has been experienced. The implementation of the Progressive landing has seen a marked improvement in behaviour in classes within the education block.

- 5.2.14 A horticulture course has started with plans approved to install a polytunnel within the prison grounds between the education and residential blocks.
- 5.2.15 The education team has been approved to start Duke of Edinburgh programmes with young people – with part completion being transferrable where they are unable to attain a full award during their stay in prison.
- 5.2.16 Virtual Campus has remained a largely unused resource to young people due to technical problems with its implementation including a lack of networking. Education staff have worked around the problems by making use of stand-alone laptop computers.
- 5.2.17 The Quality Improvement Group (QIG) has been well led and received good representation from most areas of the prison at meetings, enabling issues to be discussed and addressed. There has been increasing use of data to monitor effectiveness and evaluate improvements against an action plan.

5.3 HEALTHCARE AND MENTAL HEALTHCARE

- 5.3.1 The IMB continued to regard the provision and delivery of Healthcare within Cookham Wood as good.
- 5.3.2 Primary Healthcare Services were delivered by Oxleas NHS Foundation Trust. Recruitment to ongoing vacancies in the nursing team improved, with fewer agency staff required.
- 5.3.3 The dental contract was awarded to a new provider during the year. Clinics were delivered on Monday instead of Friday, as was previously the case. This improved attendance as the clinic did not coincide with Friday prayers with the difficulties of escorting young people to both events. Catch up clinics were held on Saturdays, which resulted in a reduction in waiting lists and waiting times.
- 5.3.4 The dental chair was out of service for several months during the reporting year. Young people's dental health could be reviewed but no treatment delivered as the chair was inoperable. Several boys raised concerns about this and IMB applications were received on this subject. The IMB expressed concerns to the Governor and health managers when the repairs were delayed, as several young people had severe dental pain and were managed by the long term administration of paracetamol. The IMB regarded this as unacceptable.
- 5.3.5 Mental Health Services (Health and Wellbeing: H and WB) were delivered by Central and North West London NHS Foundation Trust. Staffing of the team includes a consultant forensic child psychiatrist, associate specialist, mental health nurses and other workers, art therapist, speech and language therapist, sexual health and psychology staff.
- 5.3.6 Addaction delivered the substance misuse service at Cookham Wood, working with young people arriving in the prison with a range of substance misuse problems. The team were proactive and effective in delivering training and information to all staff and young people when New Psychoactive Substances (NPS) were discovered in the prison.
- 5.3.7 Addaction staff were given better access to System1 (healthcare IT system) during the year: this improved information sharing across healthcare teams.
- 5.3.8 GP services were provided by Maidstone Medical Centre. Good support was given to young people in the prison.
- 5.3.9 Improvements in the co-ordination of all healthcare services at Cookham Wood continued during the year.
- 5.3.10 Lack of clinical rooms had a serious impact on the delivery of healthcare appointments during the year, resulting in a large number of missed appointments for H and WB and Addaction. These

expensive resources were wasted when appointments were missed, putting some young people at increased risk.

- 5.3.11 The conversion of the former Bricks workshop in the education block in July 2016 improved the situation greatly: interview rooms were set aside for use by healthcare services in the new facility and there was no longer the need to delay or reschedule appointments.
- 5.3.12 NHS Commissioners delivered a workshop on (medical) Information Sharing during the year to address concerns raised by some staff groups.
- 5.3.13 The kitchen was fully staffed when the Dover IRC closed and staff transferred to Cookham Wood. The new staff and their proactive manager were experienced in cooking a wide range of foods for the multi-national detainees at Dover. As a result the food offered to the young people improved in quality and variety. A new menu was introduced for all young people in July 2016: it was nutritionally balanced, varied and appetising. Consultation about the menu changes with the boys was encouraged; feedback informed some alterations in food offered.

5.4 PURPOSEFUL ACTIVITY

- 5.4.1 The Board raised concerns during the first half of the year that young people were locked in their cells because of staff shortages, particularly in education. The number of 'young people held in cells', and the reasons, are now reviewed daily at the Governor's morning briefing meeting.
- 5.4.2 Until the end of the reporting year, when the Bricks suite in the education block was converted into meeting rooms, many young people due an appointment (such as a sentence planning meeting or health appointment) could spend most of a half day locked in their cell without activity.
- 5.4.3 Access to vocational education is not as good as it was, with reduced opportunity for young people who would benefit from these activities. There was a lack of prison cleaning and gardening activities for young people for much of the year.
- 5.4.4 At the end of the reporting year, two distinct prison sub-populations could be identified with respect to Purposeful Activity. Young people on the main wings in the residential block had access to a broad range of education opportunities and activities (including library visits scheduled during their weekday slots in the education block). Young people on segregation in Phoenix and those following the Progressive Programme (on B1), spent a great deal of their time locked in their cells.
- 5.4.5 The regime offered to young people on the Progressive Programme developed slowly from May to July. Initially, the IMB considered it very poor, with young people spending most of their time in their cells (particularly during week 1, which appeared to differ little from a regime of 'segregation'). The Board monitored the development of the programme closely, raising significant concerns about the extent of multi-agency support for the young people, the degree of management oversight, and recording of time out of cell.
- 5.4.6 Agencies within the prison have worked together to develop the programme and to increase the provision of purposeful activity for its young people. There is now a Progressive Programme educational pathway. The enrichment of the programme remains work in progress.
- 5.4.7 The Progressive programme has undoubtedly had a positive impact on the provision of purposeful activity elsewhere in Cookham Wood.
- 5.4.8 No library service has been available to young people on Phoenix for most of the year. Recently (July 2016) a 'book catalogue' service has started in Phoenix and Cedar – book covers and outline texts are highlighted in a catalogue to encourage and enable young people to choose a book.

- 5.4.9 The prison's exercise yards are uninspiring and provide little beyond access to fresh air. There is an absence of resources designed to engage young people while out on exercise. Damaged outdoor table tennis tables have not been replaced; they were only ever provided to the main residential block exercise areas (A and B block). The Cedar exercise 'area' is stark with nothing apart from a 'picnic' table. The Phoenix yard is brutal – with nothing at all to engage young people. It is small and lined with steel sheeting – which in hot weather turns the yard effectively into an 'oven'.
- 5.4.10 From the end of July young people from the enhanced wing (A3) have taken their association on the sports field. The IMB welcomes this recognition of their enhanced status.
- 5.4.11 There was a lack of working equipment available to young people while on association on their wings. Time was often wasted during association, searching for cables to enable TVs to work or making improvised 'nets' for table tennis tables. Where items have been lost or broken they have not been replaced.
- 5.4.12 Kinetic youth workers provided good quality support to the young people, including facilitating youth clubs and the Youth Council. They engaged very well with young people during their association time. Cedar Prison Officers also engaged very actively with their young people – both outdoors on exercise and indoors while on association. The engagement of officers on the main landings with young people during association was variable, and the start time for association was often delayed.

5.5 RESETTLEMENT

- 5.5.1 Within 72 hours of entering custody, every young person is allocated a Caseworker and an initial planning meeting for remanded and sentenced young men should take place within 10 days of reception. This is an important meeting to agree a sentence plan for the young person when the resettlement pathways are considered. This target is carefully monitored but not always met.
- 5.5.2 Following the appointment of the new Release on Temporary Licence (ROTL) officer in May 2015, a ROTL action plan was drafted which set up the process of requesting applications for ROTL 3 months in advance to ensure eligibility for ROTL is considered in good time. Consequently, both the number of young people eligible for ROTL and the catalogue of ROTL placements is steadily increasing. For example, in May 2016, 9 young people were on ROTL and the number of ROTL episodes was noted to be 88. ROTL placements include programmes, apprenticeships and family visits. This is a very positive improvement on the previous year and is a good incentive for young people to achieve enhanced status.
- 5.5.3 An employment broker was arranged to attend the establishment in June 2016 to assist in ROTL opportunities and job prospects for young people. In addition, difficulties have now been overcome to enable young people to be offered the opportunity to complete their CSCS (Construction Skills Certification Scheme) qualification online, an important step in potentially securing work in the construction industry.
- 5.5.4 The ability of young people to open bank accounts has been promoted and encouraged throughout the reporting year, only to be met with difficulties at the stage when the paperwork was sent to the bank to set up the accounts. Barclays attended the resettlement pathway to discuss life skills.
- 5.5.5 Of the young people in the custodial estate, approximately 1/3 of those are looked after children in care. This presents a significant challenge to the Safeguarding Team to ensure suitable accommodation placements are secured for those young people upon release and they work hard to ensure that suitable placements are found. This is not always easy however as Local Authorities will not secure a placement more than 10 days prior to a young person's release date,

possibly due to the financial cost in maintaining the placement. This often presents a level of uncertainty for the young person as to where they will be living upon release but also difficulties in ensuring that young people are registered with a GP and other appropriate agencies. Locating a suitable placement address in a timely manner in advance of release is not just an issue for looked after children, but for many other young people, and is a vital part of successful resettlement.

- 5.5.6 It is the aim to ensure that all released young people are registered with a GP but this is not always possible. At least 1 young person who had attained the age of 18 in the reporting year was released and advised to present as homeless to the local authority.

5.6 SAFER CUSTODY

- 5.6.1 During the previous reporting year (2014/15) the IMB expressed serious concerns about high levels of violence and the vulnerability of many of the young people in the establishment.
- 5.6.2 In 2015/16 high levels of violence continued, some incidents involved several assailants; staff were injured in a number of assaults, some of which were targeted. The on-going levels of violence have been challenging for the prison staff. Since the opening of the Progressive Landing in late April 2016, levels of violence in the establishment have reduced significantly.
- 5.6.3 Staffing in the Safer Custody team was increased during the reporting year. The team was led by a governor, who is the Head of Safeguarding. The team consisted of a custodial manager, 4 supervising officers (Managing and Minimising Physical Restraint (MMPR) co-ordinators), 2 officers, 3 administrators, one Equalities officer. During the year the officers' roles were hybridised to ensure cover for annual leave, sickness and training. In addition to the prison team, staff were supported by a Medway Local Authority Social Work team consisting of 3 social workers, one of whose responsibilities was Looked After Children. In May 2016 approval was gained to recruit 3 band 4 specialist officers to lead on Restorative Justice. These staff were recruited during July 2016.
- 5.6.4 Managing and Minimising Physical Restraint (MMPR) training and regular updates were delivered to all relevant staff. MMPR training team staff continued to use body worn cameras when attending incidents. However the use of the cameras by other officers reduced significantly as the pilot scheme continued; the IMB found this very disappointing. Staff attending planned relocations recorded the actions on hand-held cameras.
- 5.6.5 The MMPR co-ordinator team reviewed and quality assured all incidents of violence and restraint. Any cases which met the following criteria were taken forward to the weekly Restraint Minimisation meeting: where there is an injury / serious injury warning sign, where there has been use of a pain-inducing technique, planned interventions, passive non-compliance where force is used, where there is prolonged (over 6 minutes) use of force, where there is a complaint by the young person involved, where there is use of force following an assault on a staff member, and where anything of concern has been raised by an MMPR co-ordinator. A randomly selected 10% of cases which did not meet these criteria were also taken forward to the meeting. IMB members attended Safer Regimes meetings to ensure understanding of the process of scrutiny of incidents.
- 5.6.6 Shortages of uniformed staff continued up to Christmas 2015. This had an impact on young people, who had reduced time out of cell and opportunity for association. The use of detached duty staff from other, largely youth, establishments, continued throughout the year. Many of the detached duty staff had worked at Cookham Wood for extended periods and were valued and experienced members of staff. A severe shortage of teachers during part of the year resulted in many boys being held in their cells as classes were not in operation. This caused frustration and an increase in violent incidents when they were allowed out of their cells.

- 5.6.7 The weekly Safer Regimes meeting continued to identify and address issues relating to the young people with very complex needs. Co-ordination of the work of the various meetings (risk minimisation, safer regimes, safer custody) improved during the year.
- 5.6.8 The prison responded to the on-going high levels of violence by developing an integrated Violence Reduction Strategy, led by the Deputy Governor. A central element of this was the development of the Progressive Programme, to be delivered to young people who were identified as being those responsible for the majority of violent incidents in Cookham Wood. The programme was introduced in April 2016. Young people who had been involved in several violent episodes signed a contract to record their agreement to be included in the programme, delivered on B1 landing. The duration of the programme was 4 weeks with young people receiving assessment, input and more opportunities as they progressed through the programme. The IMB were supportive of the Progressive Programme but expressed concerns about its planning and delivery from the beginning. The Board raised concerns about management oversight and involvement in the day to day delivery of the programme, the process and level of decision making regarding young people and their progress or return to week 1 of the programme. Specific concerns were raised about the difference between week 1 of the programme and segregation, and also the forensic psychology team over-promising on their elements of the process. The officers delivering the Progressive Programme were enthusiastic and committed, despite variable support.
- 5.6.9 The Progressive Programme had a positive impact across the rest of the prison, with young people on the residential wings and Cedar (vulnerable prisoners) unit exposed to fewer violent episodes. Staff in the education team reported a significant decrease in violent incidents in the building and classes, increased attendance and fewer young people returned to their cells.
- 5.6.10 The Cedar unit for vulnerable young people operated well throughout 2015/16. The officers supporting the young people on the unit delivered sensitive and supportive care to this group of boys.
- 5.6.11 The use of Positive Attitudes Created Together (PACT) documents increased across the prison, in place of the previous Team around the Child (TAC) document. All young people participating in the Progressive Programme and others identified with specific needs are subject to this multi-disciplinary process. Quality assurance of PACT and Assessment, Care in Custody and Teamwork (ACCT) documentation has improved during the reporting period. Training in the use of PACT and ACCT continued throughout the year.
- 5.6.12 Incidents of self-harm remained low during the reporting period, despite high levels of violence.
- 5.6.13 Attendance at the monthly safeguarding meetings was better in 2015/16 than in the previous year.
- 5.6.14 Attendance at the quarterly safeguarding meeting was good.
- 5.6.15 There was effective use of the Safeguarding Team Information Reporting (STIR) process during the year. IMB members were encouraged to complete STIR documentation if concerns were raised to them by a young person.

5.7 SEGREGATION, CARE & SEPARATION

- 5.7.1 The physical environment for young people in the Phoenix (segregation) unit is very poor – narrow corridors, little natural light, a cramped, box-like exercise yard, and no in-cell telephone or showers.
- 5.7.2 However, the Phoenix prison officers, part of a team which also serves the Cedar complex needs unit, have outstanding professional skills and empathy. The IMB found, throughout the year, that

they were liked and respected by the young people. There is a high staff ratio (3 officers for up to 7 young people during the core day).

- 5.7.3 Weekly GOOD reviews were painstaking and multi-agency. There was a strong commitment to keeping segregation to the shortest time possible.
- 5.7.4 The average stay of a young person in Phoenix segregation this year was 2 weeks (but with one stay of six months). Each young person had a programme of meetings with prison agencies and, if he wished, educational support. He also had a great deal of one-to-one conversation and support from the Phoenix officers.
- 5.7.5 The limited capacity of Phoenix (7 cells) became a significant problem as the level of violence (and the number of young people needing GOOD segregation for safety reasons) rose during the year. At one point, in December, there were 25 young people on GOOD segregation in the residential block, as well as 7 in the Phoenix unit.
- 5.7.8 The IMB did not, and does not, support keeping segregated young people on the main residential landings: its experience is that they receive less frequent contact with staff there.
- 5.7.9 Easing the transition of segregated young people from Phoenix back to the main landings also became more difficult. The use of Cedar House as a staging post became unacceptable – particularly after it was commissioned as an Enhanced Support Unit in early 2016. This could have increased the time young people spent in segregation.
- 5.7.10 The new (April 2016) Progressive Programme, on B1 landing of the residential block, provided an alternative to full segregation for persistently violent young people, and offered planned interventions and activity to help them change their behaviour. It also eased the transition of segregated young people back to the other landings. Young people in Phoenix could now be taken off full segregation and moved onto week 2 or 3 of the new Programme.
- 5.7.11 As will be seen elsewhere in this Report, the IMB expressed concern that the Progressive Programme has not delivered the level of activity and support it promised. Members have been wary that it might become “segregation – lite”.
- 5.7.12 It is therefore important to record that IMB members have been impressed by the enthusiasm, commitment and work-rate of the prison officers on B1 landing. Although they have a lower staff ratio (typically, 3 officers to 15 young people during the core day), they have taken the good practice in Phoenix and Cedar as their model and seize every opportunity to engage young people in supportive one-to-one conversations.
- 5.7.13 Since May, the typical occupancy of Phoenix has been 5 young people. Often they have moved to the Progressive Programme after a week. Over the year, however, a small number of young people have remained in Phoenix for much longer – one, who could not be placed in a mental health facility outside the prison service, for 6 months. This is a matter of extreme concern to the IMB, which has found that such young people often combine extreme violence and volatility with clear mental health difficulties and on-going distress. The Board strongly believes that there should be a specialist therapeutic facility within the Youth Estate for this small but desperately needy group of young people.

5.8 RESIDENTIAL SERVICES

5.8.1 Residential Wings and the Main Education block

These two buildings are relatively new having been brought into use in 2014. Nevertheless the general appearance is now sometimes scruffy. This is largely due to the standard of maintenance and to a lesser extent cleaning. As to be expected in any large building things go wrong: showers don't work, telephones disconnect, lighting fails, windows get broken, fire sensors fail, etc. Staff are excellent at finding temporary ad hoc 'work-arounds' for these failings so that young people

are content and the prison can continue to function. Proper permanent repairs are eventually carried out by the works contractor Carrilion but often only after weeks of delay.

5.8.2 **Kitchen, gym, offices and other areas**

These functions are carried out in separate individual buildings and porta-cabins scattered around the large estate. The buildings are older, cluttered with obsolete equipment and provide a poor working environment for staff. Much time is spent by staff moving supplies or themselves, and escorting young people between functions.

5.8.3 The kitchen remained dated and in need of a complete refresh. IMB members regularly reported standing water on the floor due to poor drainage, and broken equipment which took months to repair. Despite these failings the kitchen staff (supplemented by relocated Dover IRC staff) do a remarkable job in feeding hungry young people with a wholesome food on a meagre budget.

5.8.4 **Specific young people issues**

Every occupied cell should have its young person's photo and name displayed on the outside. This provides crucial information for staff, especially those on night duty who may be less familiar with the young people. IMB members often noted that this information was missing. In addition, cell observation panels were often found to be blocked by young people placing paper across the window: this is clearly dangerous.

SECTION 6

6.1 ADJUDICATIONS, and INCENTIVES AND EARNED PRIVILEGES

6.1.1 The number of adjudications (formal hearings of disciplinary charges against young people by a governor) was very high throughout the year. It peaked in October (328), December (381) and April (292), in response to a high number of violent incidents, but reduced a little from May to June (237). A number of young people had repeated adjudications.

6.1.2 The most common charges at adjudications were assaults, fights, threatening and abusive behaviour, possession of an unauthorized article (e.g. an improvised weapon) and disobedience to a lawful order. The IMB did not find that adjudication was used inappropriately, for minor matters.

6.1.3 IMB members found that adjudication hearings were fair, and that punishments were appropriate and consistent. Young people were given plenty of opportunity to express their views at the hearings, and were well supported by Barnados advocates. Mitigation was taken into account.

6.1.4 Cookham Wood's policy emphasises that its main method of keeping good order and encouraging good behaviour is by use of Rewards and Sanctions and Incentives and Earned Privileges (rather than by full disciplinary proceedings).

6.1.5 The Rewards and Sanctions and Incentives and Earned Privileges schemes were combined in December in a single Incentives and Earned Privileges (IEP) policy: this simplified and clarified their operation. The scheme is administered by Supervisory Officers and tightly monitored by Custodial Managers.

6.1.6 A young person who behaves badly may be issued with a "yellow card", which carries a sanction (restriction of privileges for one or two days). Conversely, a young person who behaves particularly well can be issued with a "green card", which carries a value of £1 and can be redeemed for rewards, such as chocolate bars and telephone PIN credit.

6.1.7 There are 3 regime levels for young people at Cookham Wood: basic, standard and enhanced. Young People on basic only receive the statutory minimum of privileges (e.g. no TV); standard regime young people have more privileges, and enhanced young people have more still and their own landing (A3).

- 6.1.8 Young people move between the levels according to their behaviour. They are automatically downgraded for violent behaviour. Their regime level is also reviewed if they receive 3 yellow cards within 3 weeks. Changes of level can only be made by an IEP review board, which the young person attends.
- 6.1.9 There is extensive use of downgrading to basic regime as a sanction for violence or threats. Typically this year, 15 – 20% of young people were on basic regime. But young people do not generally spend a long time on basic. They are given an action/support plan and their status is reviewed weekly.
- 6.1.10 The IMB has found that the IEP system is well understood and accepted by young people. The Board is no longer concerned (as it was last year) that low level misbehaviour is tolerated.
- 6.1.11 Green cards for good behaviour are issued frequently, particularly in education. There have also been helpful moves to encourage the enhanced young people on A3 landing (e.g. allowing exercise on the sports field, increased consultation with the Youth Council) – though, in the Board’s opinion, there should be more (e.g. ensuring they receive their full enhanced association time).

6.2 YOUTH COUNCIL

- 6.2.1 For most of the year, the Youth Council, Cookham Wood’s representative body for young people, had little influence or recognition. Its members, all from A3 “enhanced” landing, met fortnightly with a Kinetic youth leader to raise concerns and make representations on behalf of the young people. They gave up their evening association time to do this. The Head of Young People and Services attended alternate meetings but otherwise no prison managers or officers or agency representatives attended. The minutes of the meetings were not widely circulated or, apparently, widely considered. Kinetic deserve a great deal of credit for keeping the Youth Council alive during this period.
- 6.2.2 In June and July all this changed. The Youth Council suddenly came alive and there was a surge of support for it from all Cookham Wood’s agencies. Representatives from the education, healthcare, catering, safeguarding and chaplaincy teams attended its meetings (in their own time). The Head of Education, the chaplains and the catering manager asked Council members to consult young people about the quality of their services and suggest improvements. The members organized a rota to “drop down” to other landings to talk to the young people there and began consultation to draw up a Young People’s List of Cookham Wood Values (friendliness features strongly).
- 6.2.3 The IMB is delighted and impressed by the recent development of the work of the Youth Council (as it is by the increased use of focus groups on equalities issues, section 5 above). It urges Cookham Wood to press on with extending consultation with its young people.

6.3. RECEPTION, FIRST NIGHT AND INDUCTION

- 6.3.1 Young people new to Cookham Wood are placed on a separate landing whilst they carry out their induction programme over several days. During this period a large number of staff from the prison and agencies are introduced and their function explained - for example Barnados, Health, Casework, etc. Besides meetings, young people receive a considerable amount of paperwork.

- 6.2.3 Throughout this reporting year, IMB members have endeavoured to meet new young people and explain the role of IMB. This has become a priority and IMB very much hopes that the general awareness to the IMB's role and function is now much better understood by young people.
- 6.2.4 The reception function deals with all young people arriving and departing Cookham Wood for whatever reason. Searches are carried out, property is recorded and stored, health checks are done and so on. Although young people can arrive at Cookham Wood late in the day, staff do an excellent job in carrying out the necessary functions including providing hot food.

SECTION 7

7.1 WORK OF THE INDEPENDENT MONITORING BOARD

- 7.1.1 Board members made 2 rota visits to Cookham Wood each week; the days and times of visits varied. The first visit followed the standard IMB schedule, but the second was more flexible: its purpose was to follow up issues raised by the first visit, to dig deeper into priority areas, and to engage directly with the young people.
- 7.1.2 Each IMB Board Meeting identified 3 priority issues for monitoring on rota visits throughout the next month.
- 7.1.3 Weekly rota reports were circulated to the Governor, Deputy Governor and Head of Safeguarding, and also to the Youth Justice Board (YJB) Monitor and Contract Manager for Cookham Wood.
- 7.1.4 Board members attended weekly GOOD reviews. It was not always possible to attend the first (72 hour) review, but all segregated young people were seen within 72 hours. Members attended 211 GOOD reviews this year.
- 7.1.5 Each IMB member has special Areas of Responsibility (broadly corresponding to the headings in sections 5 and 6 of this Report), on which s/he leads for the Board. Members attend Cookham Wood to carry out research and attend meetings relating to their Areas of Responsibility.
- 7.1.6 In total, Board members made 271 visits to Cookham Wood in this reporting year. This was 50 fewer visits than last year.

7.2 RECRUITMENT, TRAINING & DEVELOPMENT

- 7.2.1 There were 7 IMB members from August to March. A new member joined in March. Two more new members were recruited, and joined the Board in August 2016, just after the end of the reporting year. Two members were granted 3-month sabbaticals during the year, for health reasons and to meet professional commitments.
- 7.2.2 The substantial turnover in membership in the last 2 years has led to a very helpful mix of ages and backgrounds amongst IMB members.
- 7.2.3 The Board's Annual Team Performance Review was held in July: discussion focused on "buddying" support between members (learning from each other) and on improving training and support for new members.
- 7.2.4 In addition to national IMB training, there was a local IMB training programme, with briefings preceding monthly Board meetings. Members also attended Cookham Wood Staff training sessions – for instance on MMPR and child protection. There is an open invitation to IMB members to attend any staff training they wish.

7.2.5

BOARD STATISTICS	
Recommended Complement of Board members	10
Number of Board members at the start of the reporting period	8
Number of Board members at the end of the reporting period	8
Number of new members joining within the reporting period	1
Number of members leaving within the reporting period	1
Total number of Board meetings during the reporting period	12
Total number of visits to the Establishment	271
Total number of segregation reviews held	N/K
Total number of segregation reviews attended	211
Date of Annual Team Performance Review	13 July 2016

7.3 APPLICATIONS

- 7.3.1 Boxes and forms for written applications to speak to the IMB were displayed in all residential areas. Members also accepted verbal applications in the course of their rota visits, and made a point of visiting young people each week during their association time, to chat informally and encourage them to raise concerns.
- 7.3.2 The concerns raised by applications were examined in a timely way and an explanation of the outcome given personally to the young person.
- 7.3.3 Young people at Cookham Wood make few applications, written or verbal, to speak to the IMB. This suggests to the Board both that the young people are comfortable with Cookham Wood's internal complaints and applications procedures, and that they have high regard for Barnados advocates, who are on site daily and can be contacted at any time for help and advice.

7.3.4

Code	Subject	13-14	14-15	15-16
A	Accommodation	0	0	0
B	Adjudications	1	0	0
C	Equality & Diversity (inc religion)	3	1	2
2D	Education, Employment, Training inc IEP	2	1	4
E1	Family, Visits inc mail & phone	2	4	2
E2	Finance, Pay	0	0	0
F	Food/Kitchen related	0	0	4
G	Health related	0	1	3
H1	Property (within current establishment)	0	1	2
H2	Property (during transfer/in another establishment	0	1	0
H3	Canteen, Facilities, Catalogue, Shopping, Argos	1	0	0
I	Sentence related (inc. HDC, ROTL, parole, release dates, re-cat etc)	0	0	0
J	Staff/Prisoner/Detainee concerns inc bullying	2	1	4
K	Transfers	0	0	0
L	Miscellaneous	1	1	3
	Total number of IMB applications	12	11	24
	Of total: number of IMB confidential access was:	0	1	1

SECTION 8

GLOSSARY

ACCT	Assessment, Care in Custody and Teamwork (young people at risk of self-harm)
ATPR	Annual Team Performance Review
CHAT	Child Health Assessment Tool
DIRF	Discrimination Incident Report Form
EIA	Equality Impact Assessment
GOOD	Good Order or Discipline
H + WB	Health and Well-being (mental health)
IEP	Incentives and Earned Privileges
HMIP	Her Majesty's Inspector of Prisons
IMB	Independent Monitoring Board
IRC	Immigration Removal Centre
LAC	Looked After Child
MMPR	Minimising and Managing Physical Restraint programme
MoJ	Ministry of Justice
NHS	National Health Service
NOMS	National Offender Management Service
NOMIS	National Offender Management Information System
OFSTED	Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills
PACT	Positive Attitudes Created Together (anti-social behaviour management policy)
QIG	Quality Improvement Group
ROTL	Release on Temporary Licence
STIR	Safeguarding Team Information Report
YJB	Youth Justice Board
YOI	Young Offenders' Institution
YOT	Youth Offending Team