

Harris Review Meeting 3
12:30 – 16:30, 15 May 2014, Room 6.09A
102 Petty France, London SW1H 9AJ

Present

Chair: Lord Toby Harris (TH)

Panel Members: Stephen Cragg (SC), Graham Towl (GT), Philip Leach (PL), Dinesh Maganty (DM) (by telephone), Richard Shepherd (RS) (by telephone), Deborah Coles (DC), Matilda MacAttram (MM), Meng Aw Yong (MAY),

The Harris Review Secretariat:

Deborah Browne (DB), Tom Shaw (TS), Robyn Malan de Merindol (RM)

By Telephone: Dinesh Maganty (DM), Richard Shepherd (RS)

For item 3: Kate Davies (KD) and Christine Kelly (CK) from NHS England

For item 7: Sarah Morton (SM) from Offender Management and Sentencing Analytical Services (OMSAS)

Item 1: Minutes of Previous Meeting

1. Revise the wording in Action 12 to reflect the discussion to take place between DM and DC around the arrangements for the Specialist Registrars.

Action 22: Secretariat revise wording for action 12.

Item 2: Action Log update

2. An update on outstanding actions was provided and the action list updated appropriately.

Action 23: Panel to advise the secretariat of any preferences / priorities for prison visits over the next week.

3. Following this update, the panel discussed what further work might be done to improve accessibility to the call for submissions on the IAP website.

Action 24: Secretariat to make improvements to the website to make the call for submissions more accessible.

Action 25: Panel to consider further options to encourage submissions to the Review.

4. The panel noted that there had been no publicity for the Harris Review on the MoJ website to date. While discussions about this are ongoing with MoJ, there was discussion that the review may need to use other means to manage communications and publicity.

Action 26: Secretariat to follow up with the MoJ press and communications teams what support will be provided to enable the Review to conduct its ToR.

Item 3: Stakeholder meeting 1: NHS England

5. In advance to the stakeholders from NHS England giving evidence, DM and MAY declared an interest; they both sit on the Health and Justice Clinical Reference Group.

6. Preliminary discussion concerned whether Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) are available in YOIs and whether the police are included in any information sharing requirements.

Action 27: Secretariat to follow up on what information sharing agreements there are between the police, NHS England and NOMS with regard to vulnerability.

(Secretary's note Kate Davies and Christine Kelly joined the meeting.)

7. TH welcomed KD and CK and read through the Review protocol for using and publishing evidence.

8. During the discussion, KD and CK agreed to provide the Secretariat with:

- Specification of ideal practice for Children and Young People, against which performance is measured;
- Details of a partnership agreement between NHSE and YJB to ensure delivery of services and drive up their quality (particularly in relation to identifying CAMHS and mental health gaps);
- An indication where mental health and health provision is good and not so good, to help identify which establishments the panel should visit;
- The assessment tool available in prison reception to identify mental health problems.

9. KD and CK agreed that NHSE would provide a formal response to the Call for Submissions.

10. A summary of the discussion is available at Annex A (not provided here because still in draft form).

11. TH thanked KD and CK for their full responses.

(Secretary's note KD and CK left the meeting.)

Action 28: Secretariat to add questions that the panel could not get around to asking to the Official Questions List and will ensure they are sent on to NHSE appropriately.

Action 29: Secretariat to send relevant NOMS policies concerning safer custody to the panel.

Action 30: Secretariat to talk to DM about Personality Disorder versus Mental Health questions for NHSE.

Item 5: Prison Visits Protocol

12. The relative merits of having focus groups with prisoners or staff during the prison visits was discussed. It was agreed that this went beyond the scope of general visits, but it might be possible to look into doing something specific within prisons at a later date.

13. Visits should be arranged to take account of panel members' previous experience of visiting prisons.

14. Preparation for each visit should include information about the action plans and responses following any relevant death in custody when appropriate.

Action 31: Secretariat to add Offender Behaviour Programmes to visit protocol.

Action 32: Secretariat to provide any actions plans and responses following a death in custody relevant to the establishment.

Action 33: secretariat to circulate blank ACCT document to panel.

Item 6: Official Questions List

15. This will expand as panel members and the secretariat add to it.

Action 34: Panel to suggest further questions, and who they should be directed to, as soon as possible to allow time to commission the responses.

(Secretary's note Sarah Morton joined the meeting.)

Item 7: Research update

16. SM updated the panel on the research plan. A report on the findings and key recommendations of key relevant reports is being prepared and should be

available by the meeting of the 5th of June. The other options for research were set out.

17. Option 1 is a literature review of the area. It was agreed that this was a necessary undertaking. The relative merits of using the existing research contract with the University of Greenwich were discussed and it was decided that this option was the most appropriate and cost effective.

Action 35: SM to send to the panel the list of all the key databases that OMSAS has access to.

18. Option 2 involved a qualitative study that would take into account the views of staff working in prisons. There was some concern about the costs of this, particularly in relation to the time frame and the numbers of staff interviewed. Overall, however, the panel saw the merit in being able to thoroughly assess the views of experienced staff, many of whom will have years of relevant experience.

19. Option 3, involved a similar study, but as well as the views of staff, the views of young adults was also included. The costs and time frame for this meant that it may be beyond the scope of the review. SM's advice was that this might not be an effective way of getting the views of young adults because of the numbers that would need to be interviewed to find those that had relevant experience. It was felt that there might be other ways of targeting the views young adults.

(Secretary's note SM left the meeting.)

Item 8: Panel discussion of potential research commission

20. Regarding options 2 and 3, there was discussion that maybe NOMS analysts could undertake some research for the Review with oversight from a suitable independent professional. The benefits of this are their existing professional profiles and their experience of working in the prison environment.

Action 36: Secretariat to explore other options for targeting the views of young adults.

21. GT suggested an in depth review of a number of ACCT documents including following through with the prisoner and staff who had contributed to it.

Action 37: SM, GT and DB to look at the in depth review of a number of ACCT documents as an option.

Action 38: TH to speak to HMCIP and ask if they would consider doing some work on the ACCT procedure (in light of them not taking forward their thematic review on ACCT.)

Action 39: DB and SM to meet to take forward ideas on a qualitative study on questions to ask staff using NOMS analysts and to explore the scope of the literature review.

Item 9: AOB

22. The secretariat tabled a list of deaths in scope detailing the date of death, the age at which the person died and the establishment, to help the panel decide their priorities for establishment visits.

23. The meeting reflected on the stakeholder evidence and the list of deaths and it was agreed that the health provider for Wales should be contacted.

Action 40: Secretariat to look into approaching the health provider for Wales to enable the most appropriate means for them to give evidence to the Review.