



Inspections of secure training centres

A report on the responses to consultation

This is a report on the outcomes of the consultation about the proposals to revise the framework for the inspection of secure training centres.

If you would like a version of this document in a different format, such as large print or Braille, please telephone 0300 123 1231 or email enquiries@ofsted.gov.uk.

Age group: 12–17

Published: July 2015

Reference no: 150101



Corporate member of
Plain English Campaign
Committed to clearer communication

361

The Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills (Ofsted) regulates and inspects to achieve excellence in the care of children and young people, and in education and skills for learners of all ages. It regulates and inspects childcare and children's social care, and inspects the Children and Family Court Advisory and Support Service (Cafcass), schools, colleges, initial teacher training, further education and skills, adult and community learning, and education and training in prisons and other secure establishments. It assesses council children's services, and inspects services for looked after children, safeguarding and child protection.

If you would like a copy of this document in a different format, such as large print or Braille, please telephone 0300 123 1231, or email enquiries@ofsted.gov.uk.

You may reuse this information (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, visit www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence, write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

This publication is available at www.gov.uk/government/organisations/ofsted.

Interested in our work? You can subscribe to our monthly newsletter for more information and updates: <http://eepurl.com/iTrDn>.

Piccadilly Gate
Store Street
Manchester
M1 2WD

T: 0300 123 1231
Textphone: 0161 618 8524
E: enquiries@ofsted.gov.uk
W: www.gov.uk/government/organisations/ofsted

No. 150101

© Crown copyright 2015



Contents

Introduction	4
The proposals in the consultation	4
Summary of responses	5
Findings in full	6
Proposal 1: the evaluation criteria	6
Proposal 2: the judgement structure	9
Proposal 3: limiting judgements	9
Proposal 4: weekend visits	10
Young people’s survey	10
Next steps	11
Annex A. Responses received – data	12
Annex B: Respondents to the consultation	15

Introduction

1. This report summarises the responses to a formal consultation process conducted by Ofsted, Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons (HMIP) and the Care Quality Commission (CQC) on proposals for revisions to the framework for inspecting secure training centres.
2. Secure training centres are purpose-built centres for young offenders aged from 12 to 17 years. There are three secure training centres in England, established under the terms of the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994.¹ They are currently jointly inspected by Ofsted, HMIP and CQC under arrangements made with the Youth Justice Board, in accordance with rule 43(1) of The Secure Training Centre Rules 1998² and section 146 of the Education and Inspections Act 2006.³
3. The consultation covered four key proposals about the joint inspection of secure training centres. The consultation ran between 12 May 2015 and 23 June 2015. We received 23 responses to our main consultation, plus two written submissions, and we held two consultation events.
4. We also received 125 responses to a questionnaire for young people currently detained at the three secure training centres.
5. We are very grateful to all the young people, organisations and individuals who took the time to respond to the consultation.

The proposals in the consultation

6. We sought views on four specific proposals.
7. The first proposal concerned the evaluation criteria for the judgements of outstanding and good in each of the judgement areas. We asked if the evaluation criteria accurately describe the characteristics of good and outstanding in overall effectiveness, taking into account:
 - the safety of young people
 - promoting positive behaviour
 - the care of young people
 - the achievement of young people
 - the health of young people
 - the resettlement of young people

¹ Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994; www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1994/33/contents.

² The Secure Training Centre Rules 1998; www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/1998/472/contents/made.

³ Education and Inspections Act 2006; www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2006/40/contents.

- the effectiveness of leaders and managers.
- 8. The second proposal was that the judgement structure be revised to include separate judgements on the health of young people and the effectiveness of leaders and managers.
- 9. The third proposal concerned limiting judgements:
 - that a judgement of inadequate for the safety of young people would always limit the overall effectiveness judgement to inadequate
 - that a judgement of inadequate for other judgement areas would be likely to lead to a judgement of inadequate for the overall effectiveness and in all instances would be limited to requires improvement.
- 10. The fourth proposal was about the inspection framework including the scope to visit at weekends, as necessary, to ensure a secure evidence base of young people's experiences throughout the week.

Summary of responses

- 11. The large majority of respondents supported our proposals and said that they agreed or strongly agreed with each of the questions asked. This is summarised below.
 - Nearly all respondents (91%) who replied to the question either agreed or strongly agreed that the evaluation criteria for the overall effectiveness judgement accurately describe what good should look like.
 - An average of 87% of respondents agreed, or strongly agreed, that the evaluation descriptors for all other judgement areas accurately describe what good should look like.
 - Nearly all respondents (91%) either agreed or strongly agreed with the proposed inspection judgement structure.
 - Nearly all (87%) respondents either strongly agreed or agreed that a judgement of inadequate for the safety of young people should always limit the judgement for the overall effectiveness to inadequate.
 - Most respondents (70%) either agreed or strongly agreed that a judgement of inadequate for any of the graded judgements should be likely to lead to a judgement of inadequate for the overall effectiveness and in all instances, the judgement should be limited to requires improvement.
 - Nearly all respondents (87%) either agreed or strongly agreed that the framework should make it clear that inspectors may visit at weekends, if necessary, to enable a full understanding of young people's experience.

12. We received several comments asking us to clarify or amend some of the evaluation criteria. Respondents' comments most commonly sought clarity or amendments to criteria that addressed:
- the views, wishes and feelings of young people, particularly about whether they feel safe at the centre or whether they have the confidence in their right to complain
 - partnership working and information sharing
 - young people's rights and equality issues
 - the use of restraint and single separation
 - sentence planning, resettlement and rehabilitation
 - the continuity of healthcare between custody and the community.
13. As a result, we have made several changes to the proposed evaluation criteria and will provide additional guidance in the *Handbook for inspections of secure training centres* to accompany the inspection framework. Further detail on the additional changes to the proposed evaluation criteria are provided in paragraphs 16–32.
14. Several respondents expressed the general view that it was unfair to judge secure training centres on aspects of practice that they may have limited or no influence on, such as the attendance of external organisations at planning meetings or the performance of health services commissioned by NHS England.
15. We understand these concerns. Inspection reports will make it clear where accountabilities lie. However, we feel it is important that inspection reports retain a focus on the experiences of young people, regardless of the model of service delivery. Furthermore, the capacity of leaders and managers to engage with partners and to identify and address shortfalls in the care of young people is a key measure of the effectiveness of the centre.

Findings in full

Proposal 1: the evaluation criteria

Overall effectiveness

16. Several respondents supported the emphasis on safeguarding, including the effective use of restraint. We have made several amendments as a result of requests for further clarification. Changes include the following.
- We accept that the centres have limited scope to provide evidence of a reduced likelihood of offending as a result of their resettlement practice. We have amended the relevant descriptor accordingly. Inspectors will be looking for evidence that resettlement work is clearly focused on reducing the likelihood of offending.

- We have strengthened the descriptor on the health of young people to emphasise the broad scope of healthcare and that the healthcare that young people receive should be at least equal to that which they might reasonably expect within the community.

The safety of young people

17. Several amendments have been made to address specific comments, including changes in relation to ensuring that potential risks to young people include:
 - a reference to the risk of radicalisation
 - young people's confidence in policies and procedures relating to complaints.
18. A small number of respondents suggested that the use of restraint and single separation may be better located within this judgement rather than in the judgement about promoting positive behaviour. We agree that a centre's use of restraint and single separation will have a strong influence on young people's safety, and their feelings of safety. On balance, however, we have decided to retain the position as proposed, given the fundamental role of effective behaviour management in minimising the use of physical restraint and in implementing sanctions such as single separation.

Promoting positive behaviour

19. Nearly all respondents (86%) who answered the question agreed or strongly agreed with the descriptors of good for this judgement.
20. Several changes have been made that clarify and strengthen the descriptors on the use of physical restraint, including amendments that address:
 - the quality of debriefing for staff and young people involved in restraint incidents
 - the capturing of young people's views
 - the effectiveness of health professionals' liaison with young people and other professionals during, and after, restraint incidents.
21. A small number of responses received disagreed with the inclusion of the following criterion within this judgement:
 - restraint techniques involving the intentional use of pain are not used.
22. It was argued that this criterion does not take into account current government policy and legislation that allows the use of pain-inducing restraint techniques, albeit in very limited circumstances.
23. Inspectors will be looking for evidence of good or better practice, not simply compliance with regulations and/or guidance. Inspectors will apply their

professional judgement when considering the weight of evidence and will apply what is known as 'best fit' when making judgements.

24. A centre's failure to achieve all criteria for good will not necessarily lead to a judgement of requires improvement. The criteria set out what is expected but they do not limit judgements where there is proper account of the progress children are making and the quality of care and support that is available to them. Therefore, the use of pain-inducing holds in rare and exceptional circumstances, undertaken in line with the legislative framework, will not **automatically** result in a less than good judgement.
25. We have made it more explicit that the reintegration of young people who have been subject to single separation must be managed effectively and as promptly as possible.

The care of young people

26. We have made minor changes to the wording of several descriptors. We have reinforced the importance of effective relationships between young people and their key workers and of meeting the needs of young people who may also be parents.

The achievement of young people

27. Minor changes have been made that clarify the descriptors relating to disabled young people and those who have, or may have, special educational needs.

The health of young people

28. We have made several amendments to stress the importance of meeting the emotional and mental health needs of young people as part of good healthcare provision.

The resettlement of young people

29. Several respondents expressed the view that this judgement should include reference to the level of understanding and engagement that young people have in relation to plans for their resettlement. We agree and a descriptor has been added to ensure that young people's views and involvement are more central to this judgement.
30. We have also added a further descriptor that makes explicit reference to the specific needs and vulnerabilities of young people subject to remand.

The effectiveness of leaders and managers

31. No substantial changes have been made to the proposed descriptors.

Evaluation criteria for outstanding

32. Nearly all respondents who answered this question either agreed, or strongly agreed, that the evaluation criteria accurately describe outstanding in each of the judgement areas.
33. A small number of respondents suggested changes, particularly around the descriptor on agencies working in partnership to support the resettlement of young people. Other respondents made requests for greater clarity on promoting positive behaviour in relation to discrimination, and an increase in the emphasis on the voice of young people.
34. We have reinforced expectations in relation to partnership working to describe outstanding resettlement practice. Several comments received about the proposed characteristics of outstanding are addressed by amendments or additions to descriptors of good, including changes that amplify the voice of young people and make more explicit reference to anti-discriminatory practice.

Proposal 2: the judgement structure

35. Nearly all respondents (91%) either agreed or strongly agreed with the proposed inspection judgement structure. One respondent wrote:

‘We strongly agree that the judgement structure is revised to include separate judgements on the health of young people and the effectiveness of leaders and managers as it reflects the NHS commissioning structures, takes account of the inter-collegiate standards and provides a greater potential for improved integration of healthcare between custody and the community.’

36. Given the positive responses to the proposed judgement structure, we will be implementing this proposal.

Proposal 3: limiting judgements

37. Overall, there was very strong agreement that a limiting judgement should apply and respondents welcomed the specific focus on safeguarding young people.
38. Given the overall support for the limiting judgement, we will be implementing this proposal.
39. Most respondents (70%) either agreed or strongly agreed that a judgement of inadequate for any of the graded judgements should be likely to lead to a judgement of inadequate for the overall effectiveness and in all instances, the judgement should be limited to requires improvement.
40. A small number of respondents felt that an inadequate judgement for the effectiveness of leaders and managers should always lead to an overall

inadequate judgement as they were ultimately responsible for the young people while in the care of the centre. If any of the other judgements, however, are inadequate, most respondents agreed that there should be flexibility. For example, poor resettlement practice may be largely due to a lack of cooperation from partner agencies in the community, despite the best attempts of the centre. In such circumstances, an automatic inadequate judgement for overall effectiveness may be disproportionate and unfair.

41. Similarly, inadequate leadership and management may be largely historical.
42. We believe that, on balance, it is important to retain such flexibility for all judgements except the judgement of the safety of young people which, as several respondents commented, is of paramount importance and fundamental to the overall effectiveness of a centre. We stress, however, the **likelihood** of inadequate judgements leading to an overall judgement of inadequate.
43. Given the overall support, we will be implementing this proposal.

Proposal 4: weekend visits

44. Respondents gave strong support to this proposal. They felt that young people had a different regime at weekends, were cared for by different practitioners, and generally had a very different experience.
45. One respondent also suggested it would be useful to specify a minimum number of inspections that would include a weekend visit during the inspection cycle. We agree that it is important that we reflect the strong consensus to inspect at weekends by giving it serious consideration but, on balance, we will not be specifying a minimum number of such visits. It is important that decisions about the deployment of inspectors is based on the needs and circumstances of each inspection.
46. Given the strong overall support, we will be implementing the proposal that inspectors may visit centres at weekends during inspections. Framework guidance will clarify that such visits may be the start of inspectors' on-site activity, to protect the integrity of the no-notice nature of the inspections.

Young people's survey

47. We received 125 responses to our questionnaire for young people currently detained at the three secure training centres.
48. We asked young people what they would look at if they were inspecting a secure training centre. Young people said they would look at:
 - how young people were treated and looked after and their behaviour – if they were coping and okay, if they were safe, if they were happy, or if they had any problems

- the environment young people lived in, especially the cleanliness of the rooms and units
 - how staff behaved with the young people/children, and their attitude
 - the education provided to young people
 - the food provided for young people
 - the activities provided.
49. Young people also said that, as an inspector, they would make sure they talked to the staff and young people during the inspection and some would talk to young people alone so they could be honest, or have a relaxed chat with them. A number of young people would want to tour the whole centre to see how everything worked.
50. We have reviewed the evaluation criteria in light of young people's comments to ensure that it addresses the issues that are most important to them.
51. As a result, we have made several amendments to the proposed criteria. Specifically, the criteria now reflect more explicitly the importance that young people placed on the physical environment, especially the state of cleanliness and tidiness of the centre, and on a healthy, balanced diet.
52. The methodology for inspection is consistent with young people's particular concerns that inspectors take time to speak to them during inspections. Inspections will focus on the experiences of young people in the secure training centre. Listening to the views of young people is a core activity for inspectors.
53. Almost all young people said that it was important for inspectors to see how different life is at weekends. They wanted inspectors to see the sorts of activities they do and how staff relate to young people.

Next steps

54. We will implement the revised inspection framework from July 2015. The revised framework incorporates the changes that we have identified in this report. You can view the framework on our website at: www.gov.uk/government/publications/inspecting-secure-training-centres-framework.
55. We will carry out a review of the revised inspection framework within 18 months of its implementation.

Annex A. Responses received – data

Q1. Do you agree that the characteristics of good accurately describe the level of overall effectiveness that should be expected?

Response	Number of respondents
Strongly Agree	7
Agree	14
Disagree	2
Total number of respondents who answered the question	23

Q2. Do you agree that the characteristics of good accurately describe what should be expected in the each of the judgement areas?

Judgement	Number of respondents who strongly agreed or agreed	Total number of respondents who answered the question
The safety of young people	20	23
Promoting positive behaviour	18	21
The care of young people	18	22
The achievement of young people	19	22
The health of young people	18	21
The resettlement of young people	20	22
The effectiveness of leaders and managers	20	22

Q3. Do you agree that the characteristics of outstanding accurately describe what should be expected in the each of the judgement areas?

Judgement	Number of respondents who strongly agreed or agreed	Total number of respondents who answered the question
The safety of young people	20	23
Promoting positive behaviour	19	22
The care of young people	20	22
The achievement of young people	19	21
The health of young people	20	22
The resettlement of young people	20	22
The effectiveness of leaders and managers	21	22

Q4. Do you agree with the proposals for the judgement structure for inspections of secure training centres?

Response	Number of respondents
Strongly Agree	10
Agree	10
Neither agree nor disagree	2
Total number of respondents who answered the question	22

Q5. Do you agree that a judgement of inadequate for the safety of young people will always limit the judgement for the overall effectiveness to inadequate?

Response	Number of respondents
Strongly Agree	11
Agree	9
Neither agree nor disagree	1
Don't know	2
Total number of respondents who answered the question	23

Q6. Do you agree that a judgement of inadequate for any of the graded judgements is likely to lead to a judgement of inadequate for overall effectiveness and in all instances, the judgement will be limited to requires improvement?

Response	Number of respondents
Strongly Agree	5
Agree	11
Neither agree nor disagree	1
Disagree	4
Don't know	2
Total number of respondents who answered the question	23

Q7. Do you agree that the inspection framework should make it clear that inspectors may visit at weekends, if necessary, to enable a full understanding of young people's experiences at the centre?

Response	Number of respondents
Strongly Agree	14
Agree	6
Neither agree nor disagree	1
Disagree	1
Don't know	1
Total number of respondents who answered the question	23

Annex B: Respondents to the consultation

Type of respondent	Number of responses
A young person held at, or previously held at, a secure training centre	1
A representative member of a national or regional group involved with a secure training centre	2
A provider of a secure training centre	1
An employee of a secure training centre	1
A professional working with young people at a secure training centre	7
Local safeguarding children board representative	4
Skipped question	7
Total	23

The responses included submissions from the following organisations:

- Adolescent Forensic Special Interest Group of the Royal College of Psychiatrists
- Association of Youth Offending Team Managers
- Bedfordshire Youth Offending Service
- Coram Voice
- G4S
- HM Crown Prosecution Service Inspectorate
- Hillindon Youth Offending Service
- The National Association for Youth Justice (NAYJ)
- Office of the Children’s Commissioner for England
- Prisons and Probation Ombudsman
- South Tyneside Youth Justice Service
- Southampton Youth Offending Service
- Southwark Youth Offending Service
- Stoke-on-Trent Youth Offending Service
- Staffordshire Youth Offending Service
- Youth Justice Board.

Questionnaire for young people

125 young people held at secure training centres responded to the consultation.