

Harris Review Meeting 15

12:00 – 13:30, 15 January 2015

Room 8.29B, 102 Petty France

Present: Lord Toby Harris (TH), Dinesh Maganty (DM), Deborah Coles (DC) (from 12:00), Stephen Cragg (SC), Philip Leach (PL), Meng Aw Yong (MAY), Matilda MacAttram (MM), Richard Shepherd (RS) Deborah Browne (DB), Robyn Malan de Merindol (RM), Graham MacKenzie (GM)

Apologies: Graham Towl, Dinesh Maganty

For Item 1: MoJ analysts, Sarah Morton (SM) and Rachel Tsang (RT) and for RAND/University of Cambridge, Chris Giacomantonio (CG)

(Secretary's note: This meeting was short as the rest of the day was given to official Stakeholder Hearings)

Item 1: Presentation by MoJ analysts and RAND on final report of the qualitative study

1. The report by RAND Europe and University of Cambridge on the qualitative study on staff perceptions is now complete. RT talked through the summary of key findings MoJ analysts had prepared from the Report.
2. When asked how staff felt about the Personal Officer Scheme, CG said that it was not running in the prisons he had visited as part of the research, but he didn't know about all of the prisons in the study. *[Sentence redacted as it relates to interim findings identified at the time and may not reflect the final conclusions presented to the Panel.]*
3. CG was asked if he thought that from discussions with staff they felt that they had enough opportunity to learn from the post death and inquest process. CG said that there was a range of responses on this. *[Sentence redacted as it relates to interim findings identified at the time and may not reflect the final conclusions presented to the Panel.]*
4. The panel wanted to flag up that they are unsighted on what happens at a 'hot debrief' following a death and that they were looking to understand more about this process. They were interested in attitudes, whether a note is made and how any outcomes from this are used and how any learning is shared.
5. *[Paragraph redacted as it relates to interim findings identified at the time and may not reflect the final conclusions presented to the Panel.]*
6. *[Paragraph redacted as it relates to interim findings identified at the time and may not reflect the final conclusions presented to the Panel.]*
7. The chair clarified that that while the Review will welcome dissemination of this research appropriately, the research will not be cleared to go into the public domain until after the Report is published, which, it is hoped, will be before the autumn.
8. The panel agreed that the research was very good and a valuable piece of work.

Action 113: Secretariat and analysts will agree the queries that the panel would like to take forward with RAND to include the following:

- **Be clear in the report whether OSGs were included in staff interviewed;**
- **Reflections of staff on post death care for staff and prisoners;**
- **What staff thought about staffing levels at night?**

AOB

9. TH told the meeting that he had received a reply from NOMS to his letter that raised concerns about their submission. TH said that he would respond and accept that there may have been a misunderstanding, but that he is now expecting a considered overview and specific questions to be answered.

10. The panel would like information from NOMS about 'Hot debriefs' and may have further questions that would need to be turned around quickly. However, they did not want to interrupt the work NOMS will now be doing to supplement the submission, because this was considered important.