

Harris Review Meeting 8
10:30 – 13:00, 25 September 2014, Room 8.29B
102 Petty France, London SW1H 9AJ

Present:

Chair: Lord Toby Harris (TH)

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

The Harris Review Secretariat: Deborah Browne (DB), Robyn Malan de Merindol (RM)

For Item 3: Darrick Joliffe (DJ), Zubaida Haque (ZH), Michael Fiddler (MF), Joel Harvey (JH), Jorgen Lovbakke (JL) and Rachel Tsang (RT).

Apologies:

None

Item 1: Minutes of the meeting 04.09.2014

1. The minutes were accepted as a true record.

Item 2: Action Log

2. Actions were updated.

Action 62: The panel will let the secretariat know of any organisations, particularly those representing BAME offenders who should be invited to the Community Group Stakeholder Seminar

Item 3: Update on Literature Review (interim findings)

3. DJ introduced the paper and said that they had found an overlap between studies where both suicide and self-harm were looked at together, which made it difficult to separate these, so they were incorporating them both. They would continue to add to the 125 studies that they had reviewed and would be happy to assess any primary research that was made available to them.

4. DM said that it would be wrong to conflate studies on suicide and self-harm and researchers should not do so in their paper. DM was concerned about the

researchers making an evaluation of whether a study was 'good' or not and the weighting of individual studies, as this would take particular expertise. DM felt that the researchers would need to have advice about weighting studies in terms of what is 'good' for the Review and explained an interrogative approach particularly to studies about the American prison population.

Action 65: University of Greenwich to provide the Review with the list of the 125 studies that they had analysed and on which their presentation was based.

4. TH asked for the researchers to focus on: 1. The extent to which people in prison should be in prison, particularly looking at earlier interventions. 2. The point at which offenders enter prison, if they have risk factors are these taken on board properly? 3. The processes in prison, what is and is not working effectively to protect offenders.

5. The panel asked researchers to look at and take on board the following:
- Look at the impact of failure to provide purposeful activity, this should include studies on isolation;
 - Court dates and the impact that these have on self-harm and self-inflicted death;
 - Be creative with how researchers look at risk factors and how they accumulate and link into a rubric of communication;
 - Because all prisoners will show up as being at some level of risk, do not use a risk/no risk approach;
 - Identify any work regarding Institutional Resignation to suicide;

Action 66: University of Greenwich to provide 20 – 30 top line findings for the Review meeting on 30 October.

6. TH requested that University of Greenwich and the panel have an ongoing dialogue to support, refine and steer their work.

7. TH said that it is yet to be decided what the status of the Literature Review will be in the final report; it may be used as a submission only.

Item 4: Discussion on submissions received

8. The panel drew attention to the absence of any submissions that looked specifically at BAME issues and said that the Review should consider filling this gap.

9. The panel were pleased with the way that the submissions summary had been presented by the trainee barristers and were content for this format to be used.

10. It was noted that the law / guidance on care leavers for 18 – 24 year olds in prison and on release from prison was missing from the submissions.

11. The meeting agreed that the panel can identify questions to put to various bodies and identify organisations and subject areas where the Review needs to have a view.

Action 67: ALL, to provide the secretariat with questions they would like to ask and to whom they should be directed. In addition, the panel will highlight any organisations and subject areas that they feel are missing from the Review.

Action 68: Secretariat to find out the status of the Transitions PSI.

Action 69: Secretariat to schedule detailed discussion of submissions on future Agenda.

Action 70: Secretariat to provide updated forward look to panel.

Action 71: Secretariat to ask NOMS, where staff numbers are being supplement with detached duty staff, what percentage of staff this represents at the respective establishments.

Item 5: Pre Brief on Public Hearing

12. Nothing to note.