| | W 1 447 1 2010 | | |
|----|---|----|---|
| 1 | Monday, 16 July 2018 | 1 | I have just mentioned, he describes over the first few |
| 2 | (10.30 am) | 2 | paragraphs the responsibilities of the Chief Inspector |
| 3 | Welcome and opening remarks by THE CHAIR | 3 | in respect of child custody, so I don't need to ask you |
| 4 | THE CHAIR: Good morning, everyone. I am Alexis Jay and | 4 | about the detail of that, but could you just give |
| 5 | I am the chair of the Independent Inquiry into Child | 5 | a brief overview, please, of the responsibilities? |
| 6 | Sexual Abuse and sitting this week with the other panel | 6 | A. So Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons has |
| 7 | members of the Inquiry: Ivor Frank, Professor Sir | 7 | a responsibility to inspect the treatment of prisoners, |
| 8 | Malcolm Evans and Drusilla Sharpling. | 8 | including children and the conditions and facilities |
| 9 | Welcome to the sixth of the first substantive | 9 | that are available to them, broadly speaking. Our remit |
| 10 | hearing of Children in Custodial Institutions | 10 | with regards to children is only in two of the three |
| 11 | investigation. Today the Inquiry will hear from some of | 11 | sectors that currently exist. We have no role in secure |
| 12 | the institutions, local authorities and further evidence | 12 | children's home inspections. |
| 13 | from the investigations expert witness. | 13 | Q. Turning, first then, to the issue of safety generally, |
| 14 | Ms Hill, if there are no matters to deal with prior | 14 | please. Could we have a look at the annual reports at |
| 15 | to hearing the witnesses, I will now invite you, as | 15 | 2016 to 2017 published on 18 July 2017 which is at |
| 16 | counsel to the inquiry, to call the first witness. | 16 | INQ001442, if that could be pulled up on the screen, |
| 17 | MS HILL: Thank you, chair. There is just a couple of | 17 | please, and within that, page 9. Could you zoom in on |
| 18 | matters by way of housekeeping if I may. Chair, you and | 18 | the bottom half of the page, please? I'd just like to |
| 19 | the core participants have been made aware of the | 19 | read out a couple of sections of this and then ask you |
| 20 | witnesses we propose to hear from today and tomorrow. | 20 | a question about it. |
| 21 | You will see that we have quite a lot of evidence to get | 21 | The inspector here describes the custodial estate |
| 22 | through, so I am grateful, chair, for your indication | 22 | for children and young people and noted that the outcome |
| 23 | that you are willing to sit until 4 .30 today, but no | 23 | of the inspections had been very troubling. In early |
| 24 | later. | 24 | 2017 he, "felt compelled to bring to the attention of |
| 25 | As far as tomorrow is concerned, I think the CPs | 25 | ministers my serious concerns about our findings", he |
| | Page 1 | | Page 3 |
| 1 | have been made aware that we propose to sit at 10.00 am | 1 | says: |
| 2 | and conclude at 4.00 pm in order to get through the | 2 | "By February of this year, we had reached the |
| 3 | evidence. I have circulated a very broad timetable for | 3 | conclusion that there was not a single establishment |
| 4 | today, chair, that I believe you and the core | 4 | that we inspected in England and Wales in which it was |
| 5 | participants have that we will endeavour to stick to as | 5 | safe to hold children and young people. The background |
| 6 | best we can. | 6 | to this dire situation is significant." |
| 7 | Mr Straw will question the first witness. | 7 | Then he goes on to read out a number of statistics. |
| 8 | MR STRAW: I'd like to call Mr Mulready-Jones. | 8 | A new annual report has been produced more recently |
| 9 | MR ANGUS MULREADY-JONES (affirmed) | 9 | than that, just on 11 July last year. Could you please |
| 10 | Examination by MR STRAW | 10 | describe how the situation has changed, if at all, since |
| 11 | MR STRAW: Mr Mulready-Jones, could you describe your | 11 | then? |
| 12 | current role, please? | 12 | A. The situation is better. The situation in early 2017, |
| 13 | A. My role is as lead inspector for children in detention | 13 | there was a point in time that none of the institutions |
| 14 | for Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons, so I am | 14 | were judged "reasonably good" or "good" on our healthy |
| 15 | responsible for leading on policy, I lead many of the | 15 | prison test of safety or the Ofsted test of behaviour |
| 16 | inspections of YOIs holding children and I contribute or | 16 | and safety in the Secure Training Centre framework. The |
| 17 | I lead our contribution to the multi-agency inspections | 17 | judgments are slightly different in that framework, so |
| 18 | of Secure Training Centres. | 18 | it will be none of those institutions would have been |
| 19 | Q. Chair, with your permission, I'd like to adduce two | 19 | "good" or "outstanding". |
| 20 | witness statements produced by Mr Mulready-Jones, which | 20 | Since that time, there has been some improvement in |
| 21 | are HIP000018 and 21 and then a statement by the | 21 | this area and we have seen several of the institutions |
| 22 | Chief Inspector himself, Peter Clarke, which is | 22 | be awarded our grade of "reasonably" "reasonably |
| 23 | HIP000012 and the Deputy Chief inspector Martin Lomas | 23 | good". However, this has been to reflect some of the |
| 24 | HIP000017. | 24 | activity that's gone on in terms of behaviour management |
| 25 | Mr Mulready-Jones, in Peter Clarke's statement which | 25 | more broadly and not specifically their response to |
| | D 2 | | D 4 |
| | Page 2 | | Page 4 |

| 1 allegations of abuse, particularly sexual abuse. 2 Q. So in the realm of salety, low are SIUS, for example, doing? 3 A. STCs, there are problems across the estate. So I don't believe, as it stands today, I think the justice – the most recent judgments are "requires improvements" and/or "landequarle", which are in the set of safety which includes child protection and behaviour management, which obviously includes what we would call in sort of common, everyday speak "safety", because that would include things like violence and restraint and that sort of thing. 13 There is – what I would say is, while we have seen demonstrable improvement in some of those area and we have seen demonstrable improvement in some of those area and we have seen demonstrable improvement in some of those increasing wholence, increasing wholence, increasing wholence, increasing wholence, increasing wholence, increasing wholence in cuttody and the set of safety more broadly so violence in cuttody and the ear of safety more broadly so violence in cuttody and the ear of safety more broadly so violence in cuttody and the ear of safety more broadly so violence in cuttody and the ear of safety more broadly so violence in cuttody and the ear of safety more broadly so violence in cuttody and the ear of safety more broadly so violence in cuttody and the ear of safety more broadly so violence in cuttody and the ear of safety more broadly so violence in cuttody and the ear of safety more broadly so violence in cuttody and the ear of safety more broadly so violence in cuttody and the ear of safety more broadly so violence in cuttody and the ear of safety more broadly so violence in cuttody and the ear of safety more broadly so violence in cuttody and the ear of safety more broadly so violence in cuttody and the ear of safety more broadly so violence in cuttody and the ear of safety more broadly so violence in cuttody and the ear of safety more broadly so violence in cuttody and the ear of safety more broadly so violence in cuttody and the ear of sa | | | | |
|--|----|---|----|--|
| doing? 4 A. STCs, there are problems across the estate. So I don't 5 believe, as it stands today, I think the justice — the 6 most recent judgments are "requires improvements" and/or "inadequate", which are on the test of safety which 8 includes child protection and behaviour management, 9 which obviously includes what we would call its ort of 10 common, everyday speak, "safety", because that would 11 include things like violence and restraint and that sort 12 of thing. 13 There is — what I would say is, while we have seen 14 improvement in processing in some of these areas and we 15 have seen demonstrable improvement in some of those 16 outcomes, some of those trends we have seen in 17 increasing violence, increasing use of force in these 18 establishments has continued this year, from last year 19 so it's a mixed picture beta is a link between the issue 20 q. Du you consider that there is a link between the issue 21 cy. Du you consider that there is a link between the issue 22 of safety more broadly so violence in custody and the 23 risk olidien being subject to sexual abuse? 24 hough, I think that there is — the reason we have 25 healthy prison tests is we believe there is something 26 more than process that protects children, so actually 27 healthy prison tests is we believe there is something 28 healthy prison tests is we believe there is something 29 the plant protects children, as a citally 20 being viclinised in terms of violence and victimised 21 you see an institution with sorres that are lower across 23 all of the tests, you would see a more risky institution 24 with regards sexual abuse than one that had higher 25 sexually, so—and so the—so I would say that when 26 year the provider children are in reporting some of 27 the bigger things that go on in those institutions like 28 being vicinised in terms of violence and victimised 39 being vicinity and the control of the bigger things that go on in those institutions like 30 being vicinity and the obtile provider where that 31 with regards sexual abus | | , , | | |
| so the first respect is, as I'm sure that other believe, as it stands today, I think the justice – the most recent judgments are "requires improvements" and/or "landequate", which are on the test of safety which sincluses child protection and behaviour management, which obviously includes what we would call in sort of common, everyday speak "safety", because that would in include finings like violence and restraint and that sort of thing. There is – what I would say is, while we have seen improvement in processing in some of those improvement in processing in some of these improvement in processing in some of these controlled, include things like violence and restraint and that sort outcomes, some of those trends we have seen in increasing violence, increasing use of force in these seathlishments has continued this year, room bust year so it's a mixed picture but there has been some improvement since last year. Q. Do you consider that there is a link between the issue of safety more broadly so violence in custody and the of highly proportion of children in custody and the object of think there is a link in the risk, yes. I think the – how you get to there is more — is not direct, Page 5 so the children heing shed further away from home and the mix of children hein ghed further away from home and the mix of children hein ghed further away from home and the mix of children hein ghed further away from home and the mix of children hein ghed further away from home and the mix of children hein ghed further away from home and the mix of children hein ghed further away from home and the mix of children hein ghed further away from home and the mix of children hein ghed further away from home and the mix of children hein ghed further away from home and the mix of children hein ghed further away from home and the mix of children hein ghed further away from home and the mix of children hein ghed further away from home and the mix of children hein ghed further away from home and the and the authors of the surface and th | | • | | |
| believe, as it stands today, I think the justice – the most recent judgments are "requires improvements" and/or "inadequate", which are on the test of safety which includes child protection and hehaviour management, which do viously includes what we would call in sort of common, everyday speak "safety", because that would include things like violence and restraint and that sort of thing. There is — what I would say is, while we have seen in include things like violence and restraint and that sort in the seen demonstrable improvement in some of those outcomes, some of those trends we have seen in increasing violence, increasing use of force in these establishments has continued this year, from last year so improvement since last year. Description of children in custody that are — that have previously committed a violence in custody and the exist of children being subject to sexual abuses? Description of this common individual that there is a link the individual that is a link there is a li | | | | - |
| most recent judgments are "requires improvements" and/or "inadequate", which are on the test of safety which as includes child protection and behaviour management, which obviously includes what we would call in sort of common, everyday special windows what we would call in sort of thing. There is - what I would say is, while we have seen in increasing violence, increasing in some of those outcomes, some of those rends we have seen in increasing violence, increasing use of force in these outcomes, some of those rends we have seen in increasing violence, increasing use of force in these outcomes, some of those trends we have seen in increasing violence, increasing use of force in these outcomes, some of those trends we have seen in increasing violence, increasing use of force in these outcomes, some of those trends we have seen in increasing violence, increasing use of force in these outcomes, some of those trends we have seen in increasing violence, increasing use of force in these outcomes, some of those trends we have seen in increasing violence, increasing use of force in these outcomes, some of those trends we have seen in increasing violence, increasing use of force in these outcomes, some of those trends we have seen in or fastly more broadly so violence in custody and the outcomes, some of those trends we have seen in ordinary to increase outcomes, one of those trends we have seen outcomes, one of those trends we have seen in ordinary to increase outcomes, one of those trends we have seen in ordinary to increase outcomes, one of those trends we have seen in ordinary to increase outcomes, one of those trends we have seen in ordinary to increase outcomes, one of those trends we have seen in ordinary to increase outcomes, one of those trends we have seen in ordinary to increase outcomes, one of those trends we have seen in ordinary to increase outcomes, one of those trends we have seen in ordinary to increase outcomes, one of the language of the ordinary to increase outcomes, one of the language of the ordi | | • | | • |
| 8 includes child protection and behaviour management, 9 which obviously includes what we would call in sort of 10 common, everyday speak "safety", because that would 11 include things like violence and restraint and that sort 12 of thing. 13 There is — what I would say is, while we have seen 14 improvement in processing in some of these areas and we have seen demonstrable improvement in some of those obtained share seen demonstrable improvement in some of those obtained share seen demonstrable improvement in some of those obtained share seen demonstrable improvement in some of those obtained share seen demonstrable improvement in some of these areas and we have seen in increasing violence, increasing use of force in these establishments has continued this year, from last year so improvement since last year. 19 so it's a mixed picture but there has been some improvement since last year. 20 (D. Do you consider that ther is a link between the issue of safety more broadly so violence in custody and the risk of children being subject to sexual abuse? 21 A. I think there is a link the risk year. I think 25 the — how you get to there is more — is not direct, 22 of safety more broadly so violence in custody and the healthy prison tests is we believe there is something and healthy prison tests is we believe there is something more than process that protects children, so actually how children are treated by staff, how they're cared for by staff. How staff respond to everyday requests for things like toiler roil, and so on, has an impact on how safe and how conflident children are in reporting some of the bigger things that go on in those institutions like being victimised in terms of violence and victimised some of the bigger things that go on in those institutions like object the everyday nature of violence and victimised some of the bigger things that go on in those institutions like object the certain process that are lower across all of the tests, you would see a more risky institution to make the provider attempted | 5 | ** | | • • |
| she includes child protection and behaviour management, which obviously includes what we would call in sort of common, everyday spack. "safer," because that would include things like violence and restraint and that sort of thing. There is — what I would say is, while we have seen improvement in processing in some of these areas and we have seen demonstrable improvement in some of those outcomes, some of those trends we have seen in increasing violence, increasing use of force in these as this have seen demonstrable improvement in some of those outcomes, some of those trends we have seen in increasing violence, increasing use of force in these as the state of the seed of the seed of the seed outcomes, some of those trends we have seen in improvement since last year. 10. Do you consider that there is a link between the issue of safety more broadly so violence in custody and the control of children in control of the seed of children being subject to sexual abuse? 22. Though, I think that there is — the reason we have bealthy prison tests are around — that we call them a healthy prison tests is we believe there is something more than process that protects children, so actually how safe and how conflident children are in reporting some of the bigger things that go on in those institutions tilke being victimised in terms of violence and victimised in terms of violence and victimised with regards sexual abuse than one that had higher socores altowed the control of the sex of t | - | | | |
| which obviously includes what we would call in sort of common, everyday speak "safety", because that would in include things like violence and restraint and that sort of thing. There is — what I would say is, while we have seen in improvement in processing in some of these areas and we have seen demonstrable improvement in some of these areas and we have seen demonstrable improvement in some of these areas and we have seen demonstrable improvement in some of these areas and we have seen demonstrable improvement in some of these areas and we have seen demonstrable improvement in some of these areas and we have seen demonstrable improvement in some of these areas and we have seen increasing violence, increasing use of force in these establishments has continued this year, from last year so improvement since last year. O Do you consider that there is a link between the issue of minor of the staff was more than been some improvement since last year. It was a minor that we call them in the risk of things that there is a link in the risk, yes. I think there is a link in the risk, yes. I think there is a link in the risk, yes. I think there is a link in the risk, yes. I think there is a link in the risk of things that there is more in bottletch, and the provider are treated by staff, how they're cared for by staff. How staff respond to everyday requests for things like toiler roll, and so on, has an impact on how as afe and how confident children are in reporting some of the bigger things that go on in those institutions like being victimised in terms of violence and victimised in the rest of the provider are the provider where that provider stempted to sell the institution, which has caused instability of their days-to-adjusted that there is a link in the risk of the demonstrable that the provider are the provider where that provider are treated by staff, how they're cared for by staff. How staff respond to everyday requests for things like toiler roll, and so on, has an impact on how as a staff and how confident | | | 1 | <u> </u> |
| common, everyday speak "safety", because that would include things like violence and restraint and that sort of thing. There is — what I would say is, while we have seen improvement in processing in some of these areas and we have seen outcomes, some of those trends we have seen in forceasing violence, increasing sivel force in these establishments has continued this year, from last year so it's a mixed picture but there has been some is of safety more broadly so violence in custody and the said of safety more broadly so violence in custody and the 22 of safety more broadly so violence in custody and the 23 risk of children being subject to sexual abuse? Though, I think that there is — the reason we have believe there is a link in the risk, yes. I think the — how yon get to there is more — is not direct, Though, I think that there is—the reason we have believe there is one healthy prison tests are around—that we call them a healthy prison tests are around—that we call them being victimised in terms of violence and victimised in the respond to everyday requests for things like toilet roll, and so on, has an impact on how safe and how confident children are in reporting some of the bigger things that go on in those institutions like being victimised in terms of violence and victimised in terms of violence and intimidation impacts on the likelihood of children to this way. We have bade a — not just instability of staffing at the lower levels, but all the way up right to the director responsible for children's elevels, but all the way up right to the director responsible for third with regards sexual abuse from owld sea a more resity institution to the sort of band 3 prison office grade or their sare of custody what I would say is the content of the staff who are working with children or tank. The content of the certain of the content of the provider of the private sector providers and we have seen uncertainty, massive uncertainty, around the one institution, which has caused institution that hasn't changed pr | _ | includes child protection and behaviour management, | | that closure programme was led to children being held |
| include things like violence and restraint and that sort of thing. There is — what I would say is, while we have seen improvement in processing in some of these areas and we have seen demonstrable improvement in some of those of have seen demonstrable improvement in some of those of have seen demonstrable improvement in some of those of have seen demonstrable improvement in some of those of have seen demonstrable improvement in some of those of have seen demonstrable improvement in some of those of have seen demonstrable improvement in some of those of said increasing violence, increasing use of force in these establishments has continued this year, from last year increasing violence, increasing use of force in these establishments has continued this year, from last year increasing violence, increasing use of force in these establishments has continued this year, from last year increasing violence, increasing use of force in these establishments has continued this year, from last year increasing violence, increasing use of force in these establishments has continued this year, from last year increasing violence, increasing use of force in these establishments has continued this year, from last year increasing violence, increasi | - | • | | • |
| 12 of thing. 13 There is — what I would say is, while we have seen in this processing in some of these areas and we have seen demonstrable improvement in rome of those outcomes, some of those trends we have seen in 17 increasing violence, increasing use of force in these establishments has continued this year, from last year so it's a mixed picture but there has been some 19 so it's a mixed picture but there has been some 20 improvement since last year. 20 O. Do you consider that there is a link between the issue 22 of safety more broadly so violence in custody and the 23 risk of children being subject to sexual abuse? 21 O. Do you consider that there is a link between the issue 23 risk of children being subject to sexual abuse? 22 A. I think there is a link in the risk, yes. I think 24 sector, where we have healthy prison tests is we believe there is something 4 more than process that protects children, so actually 5 how children are treated by staff, how they're cared for by staff. How staff respond to everyday requests for 6 things like toilet roll, and so on, has an impact on how 8 safe and how confident children are in reporting some of 6 the bigger things that yoo in those institutions like 9 being victimised in terms of violence and victimised sexual abuse than one that had higher scores although it's not a direct link. 10 Me have had — up until very recently, we have had a — not just instability of the director responsible for this area of custody. I have been in this way: 11 though, I think that there is a link that when with regards sexual abuse than one that had higher scores although it's not a direct link. 12 you see an institution with scores that are lower across all of the tests, you would see a more risky institution with regards sexual abuse than one that had higher scores although it's not a direct link. 13 | | | | |
| There is — what I would say is, while we have seen improvement in processing in some of these areas and we outcomes, some of those trends we have seen in increasing violence, increasing use of force in these establishments has continued this year, from last year so it's a mixed picture but there has been some improvement since last year. 10 Do you consider that there is a link between the issue of safety more broadly so violence in custody and the risk of children being subject to sexual abuse? 21 A. I think there is a link in the risk, yes. I think there is a link in the risk, yes. I think there is a link in the risk, yes. I think there is a link in the risk, yes. I think there is a link in the risk yes the leaves the leastly prison tests are around — that we call them healthy prison tests are around — that we call them healthy prison tests is we believe there is something how children are treated by staff, how they're cared for by staff. How staff respond to everyday requests for the beigger things that go on in those institutions. But do to a custodial sentence to non-custodial options has led to a custodial sentence to non-custodial options has det on a custodial sentence to non-custodial options has det on a lighter proportion children in custody that are — that have previously committed a violent or sexual offece in terms of proportion, although i'm of sure of that's true overall numbers, set if our form of the that's true of overall numbers, set if our form of the staff that have be in proson for on top also probably goes down as well. 20 Do you consider that there is a link between the issue of safety more breadly so violence in ususdy and the many control of the series of the secul series. I was a set of the secul series of the prison of the secul short of the prison of the secul short of the provider attempted to sell the institution then didn't sell the institution that hasn't changed provider where that provider attempted to sell the institution then didn't sell the institution that hasn't change | | | | diversion schemes in the community both from the |
| improvement in processing in some of these areas and we have seen demonstrable improvement in some of those have seen demonstrable improvement in some of those of that have perviously committed a violent or secual offence in terms of proportion, although I'm not sure that have perviously committed a violent or secual offence in terms of proportion, although I'm not sure that have perviously committed a violent or secual offence in terms of proportion, although I'm not sure that have perviously committed a violent or secual offence in terms of proportion, although I'm not sure that have perviously committed a violent or secual offence in terms of proportion, although I'm not sure that have not overland by one of overland unabout the structure of overland unabouts, because if you go from 15,000 to 900 as the denominator, then the numerator on top also probably goes down as well. 20 Do you consider that there is a link between the issue of risk of children being subject to sexual abuse? 21 A. I think there is a link in the risk, yes. I think there has no there is nore—is not direct, there has near a round—that we call them 2 healthy prison tests is we believe there is something 4 more than process that protects children, so actually how children are treated by staff, how they're cared for by staff. How staff respond to everyday requests for things like foilet roll, and so on, has an impact on how safe and how confident children are in reporting some of the bigger things that go on in those institutions like being victimised in terms of violence and victimised sexually, so — and so the — so I would say that when 12 you see an institution with scores that are lower across all of the tests, you would see a more risky institution with regards sexual abuse fran on that had higher scores although it's not a direct link. 22 Me baleve the everyday nature of violence and intumidation impacts on the likelihood of children to trust the institution to protect them if they report 2 sexual abuse from other children or staff. | | of thing. | | criminal justice system totally and within the criminal |
| have seen demonstrable improvement in some of those outcomes, some of those trends we have seen in increasing violence, increasing use of force in these establishments has continued this year, from last year so it's a mixed picture but there has been some improvement since last year. 21 Q. Do you consider that there is a link between the issue of safety more broadly so violence in custody and the risk of children being subject to sexual abuse? 22 A. I think there is a link in the risk, yes. I think 24 serious crime. We have also had some instability of management in some institutions, particularly in the STC sector, where we have had lots of changes of provider, either from the private sector back into HMPPS or though, I think that there is — the reason we have healthy prison tests are around — that we call them a healthy prison tests are around — that we call them a healthy prison tests are around — that we call them as healthy prison tests are around — that we call them as healthy prison tests are around — that we call them as healthy prison tests are around — that we call them as healthy prison tests are around — that we call them as healthy prison tests are around — that we call them as healthy prison tests are around — that we call them as healthy prison tests are around — that we call them as healthy prison tests are around — that we call them as healthy prison tests are around — that we call them as healthy prison tests are around — that we call them as healthy prison tests are around — that we call them as healthy prison tests is we believe there is something and the provider are treated by staff, how they're cared for things like toilet roil, and so on, has an impact on how as afe and how confident children are in reporting some of the bigger things that go on in those institutions like being victimised in terms of violence and victimised and you see an institution with scores that are lower across all of the tests, you would see a more risky institution in this post for three years and I have known | 13 | There is what I would say is, while we have seen | | justice system from disposals that would lead to |
| outcomes, some of those trends we have seen in increasing violence, increasing use of force in these establishments has continued this year, from last year improvement since last year. Q. Do you consider that there is a link between the issue 21 of safety more broadly so violence in custody and the 22 of safety more broadly so violence in custody and the 23 of safety more broadly so violence in custody and the 24 of risk of children being subject to sexual abuse? A. I think there is a link in the risk, yes. I think 24 the – how you get to there is more – is not direct, 25 the healthy prison tests are around – that we call them 3 healthy prison tests are around – that we call them 3 healthy prison tests are around – that we call them 3 healthy prison tests are around – that we call them 4 more than process that protects children, so actually 5 how children are treated by staff. how they're cared for 5 things like toilet roll, and so on, has an impact on how 8 safe and how confident children are in reporting more of the bigger things that go on in those institutions like being victimised in terms of violence and victimised 10 terms of violence and victimised 11 sexually, so – and so the – so I would say that when 12 you see an institution with scores that are lower across all of the tests, you would see a more risky institution with regards sexual abuse than one that had higher 15 scores although it's not a direct link. 19 this way: 18 We believe the everyday nature of violence and intimidation impacts on the likelihood of children to 20 trust the institution to protect them if they report 20 trust the institution to protect them if they report 21 sexual abuse than one that had higher 22 sexual abuse than one that had higher 23 sexual abuse than one that had higher 24 sexual abuse than one that had higher 25 sexual abuse than one that had higher 26 sexual abuse than one that had higher 27 sexual abuse than one that had higher 28 sexual abuse than one that had higher 29 sexual abuse than one that had higher 29 s | | | | a custodial sentence to non-custodial options has led to |
| increasing violence, increasing use of force in these establishments has continued this year, from last year so it's a mixed picture but there has been some improvement since last year. Q. Do you consider that there is a link between the issue of safety more broadly so violence in custody and the risk, yes. I think there is a link between the issue of safety more broadly so violence in custody and the radiation of safety more broadly so violence in custody and the radiation of safety more broadly so violence in custody and the radiation of safety more broadly so violence in custody and the radiation of safety more broadly so violence in custody and the radiation of safety more broadly so violence in custody and the radiation of safety more broadly so violence in custody and the radiation of safety more broadly so violence in custody and the radiation of safety more broadly so violence in custody and the radiation of safety more broadly so violence in custody and the radiation of safety more broadly so violence in custody and the radiation of safety more broadly so violence in custody and the radiation of safety more broadly so violence in custody and the radiation of safety more broadly so violence in custody and the radiation of safety more broadly so violence in custody and the radiation of safety more broadly so violence and victimised in terms of violence and victimised being victimised in terms of violence and victimised with regards sexual abuse than one that had higher secured states and institution with regards sexual abuse than one that had higher secured states and institution with regards sexual abuse than one that had higher secured states and institution in macts on the likelihood of children to the proper sexual abuse than one that had higher secores although it's not a direct link. Q. Mr Lomas put it, in paragraph 9 of his statement, in this way: "We believe the everyday nature of violence and intimidation impacts on the likelihood of children to terms of their preparation and the reality of t | 15 | have seen demonstrable improvement in some of those | | a higher proportion of children in custody that are |
| so it's a mixed picture but there has been some improvement since last year. 20 | 16 | outcomes, some of those trends we have seen in | | that have previously committed a violent or sexual |
| so it's a mixed picture but there has been some improvement since last year. Q. Do you consider that there is a link between the issue of safety more broadly so violence in custody and the risk of children being subject to sexual abuse? A. I think there is a link in the risk, yes. I think the how you get to there is more — is not direct, Page 5 Though, I think that there is — the reason we have healthy prison tests are around — that we call them a healthy prison tests is we believe there is something more than process that protects children, so actually how children are rreated by staff, how they're cared for things like toilet roil, and so on, has an impact on how safe and how confident children are in reporting some of the bigger things that go on in those institutions like being victimised in terms of violence and victimised with regards sexual abuse than one that had higher scores although it's not a direct link. Q. Mr Lomas put it, in paragraph 9 of his statement, in this way: Would you agree with that? A. Ves. Q. Are you able to help the panel on the causes of the | 17 | increasing violence, increasing use of force in these | 17 | offence in terms of proportion, although I'm not sure |
| top also probably goes down as well. 2 top also probably goes down as well. 2 top also probably goes down as well. 2 top a serious crime. We have also had some instability of instability of instability of instability of the instability of | 18 | establishments has continued this year, from last year | 1 | that's true of overall numbers, because if you go from |
| 21 Q. Do you consider that there is a link between the issue 22 of safety more broadly so violence in custody and the 23 risk of children being subject to sexual abuse? 24 A. I think there is a link in the risk, yes. I think 25 the – how you get to there is more — is not direct, 26 Page 5 1 though, I think that there is — the reason we have 2 healthy prison tests are around — that we call them 3 healthy prison tests are around — that we call them 4 more than process that protects children, so actually 5 how children are treated by staff, how they're cared for 6 by staff. How staff respond to everyday requests for 7 things like toilet roll, and so on, has an impact on how 8 safe and how confident children are in reporting some of 9 the bigger things that go on in those institutions like 10 being victimised in terms of violence and victimised 11 sexually, so — and so the — so I would say that when 12 you see an institution with scores that are lower across 13 all of the tests, you would see a more risky institution 14 with regards sexual abuse than one that had higher 15 scores although it's not a direct link. 16 Q. Mr Lomas put it, in paragraph 9 of his statement, in 17 this way: 18 "We believe the everyday nature of violence and intimidation impacts on the likelhood of children to trust the institution to protect them if they report 20 sexual abuse from other children or staff." 21 Sexual abuse from other children or staff." 22 Would you agree with that? 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. Are you able to help the panel on the causes of the | 19 | so it's a mixed picture but there has been some | 1 | 3,000 to 900 as the denominator, then the numerator on |
| of safety more broadly so violence in custody and the risk of children being subject to excual abuse? A. I think there is a link in the risk, yes. I think the – how you get to there is more — is not direct, Page 5 Page 7 though, I think that there is — the reason we have healthy prison tests are around — that we call them a healthy prison tests is we believe there is something more than process that protects children, so actually how children are treated by staff, how they're cared for by staff. How staff respond to everyday requests for things like toilet roll, and so on, has an impact on how a safe and how confident children are in reporting some of the bigger things that go on in those institutions like being victimised in terms of violence and violence and violence and violence and intimidation impacts on the likelihood of children to trust the institution to protect them if they report sexual abuse from other children or staff." Description of safety more broadly so violence and intimidation impacts on the likelihood of children to trust the institution to protect them if they report secured as serious crime. We have also had some instability of management in some institutions, particularly in the STC sector, where we have had lots of changes of provider, cither from the private sector pack into the MPPS or Page 7 Detween private sector providers and we have seen uncertainty, massive uncertainty, around the one institution that hasn't changed provider where that provider where that provider attempted to sell the institution that hasn't changed provider where that provider attempted to sell the institution, which has caused instability of there. We have had — up until very recently, we have had a — not just instability of staffing at the lower levels, but all the way up right to the director responsible for this provider attempted to sell the institution, which has caused instability of their specific provider attempted to sell the institution, which has caused instability of theres. We have had — u | 20 | improvement since last year. | 1 | top also probably goes down as well. |
| risk of children being subject to sexual abuse? A. I think there is a link in the risk, yes. I think the – how you get to there is more – is not direct, Page 5 Page 7 1 though, I think that there is – the reason we have healthy prison tests are around – that we call them healthy prison tests are around – that we call them healthy prison tests is we believe there is something more than process that protects children, so actually how children are treated by staff, how they're cared for by staff. How staff respond to everyday requests for things like toilet roll, and so on, has an impact on how safe and how confident children are in reporting some of the bigger things that go on in those institutions like being victimised in terms of violence and victimised with regards sexual abuse than one that had higher scores although it's not a direct link. Q. Mr Lomas put it, in paragraph 9 of his statement, in this way: "We believe the everyday nature of violence and intimidation impacts on the likelihood of children to trust the institution to protect them if they report sexual abuse from other children or staff." 23 A. Yes. 24 A. I think ther is a link in the risk, yes. I think that his higher show a link in the risk, yes. I think that his higher are in some divertions, cither from the private sector pack into HMPPS or cither from the private sector pack into HMPPS or cither from the private sector pack into HMPPS or cither from the private sector providers, cither from the private sector providers and we have seen uncertainty, massive uncertainty, around the one institution that hasn't changed provider where that provider attempted to sell the institution, the noe institution that hasn't changed provider where that provider attempted to sell the institution, which has caused instability of the one institution, which has caused instability of staffing at the lower there. 4 between private sector poviders and we have seen uncertainty, massive uncertainty, massive uncertainty, massive uncertainty, massive uncerta | 21 | Q. Do you consider that there is a link between the issue | 21 | So the children are more likely to be in prison for |
| A. I think there is a link in the risk, yes. I think 24 sector, where we have had lots of changes of provider, 25 either from the private sector back into HMPPS or Page 5 Page 7 1 though, I think that there is — the reason we have 2 healthy prison tests are around — that we call them 3 healthy prison tests is we believe there is something 4 more than process that protects children, so actually 5 how children are treated by staff, how they're cared for 6 by staff. How staff respond to everyday requests for 7 things like toilet roll, and so on, has an impact on how 8 safe and how confident children are in reporting some of 9 the bigger things that go on in those institutions like 10 being victimised in terms of violence and victimised 11 sexually, so — and so the — so I would say that when 12 you see an institution with scores that are lower across 13 all of the tests, you would see a more risky institution 14 with regards sexual abuse than one that had higher 15 scores although it's not a direct link. 16 Q. Mr Lomas put it, in paragraph 9 of his statement, in 17 this way: 18 "We believe the everyday nature of violence and intimidation impacts on the likelihood of children to 20 trust the institution to protect them if they report 21 sexual abuse from other children or staff." 22 Would you agree with that? 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. Are you able to help the panel on the causes of the | 22 | of safety more broadly so violence in custody and the | 22 | a serious crime. We have also had some instability of |
| the – how you get to there is more – is not direct, Page 5 Page 7 though, I think that there is – the reason we have healthy prison tests are around – that we call them a healthy prison tests is we believe there is something more than process that protects children, so actually how children are treated by staff, how they're cared for by staff. How staff respond to everyday requests for things like toilet roll, and so on, has an impact on how safe and how confident children are in reporting some of the bigger things that go on in those institutions like being victimised in terms of violence and victimised saturably you see an institution with scores that are lower across all of the tests, you would sea a more risky institution with regards sexual abuse than one that had higher scores although it's not a direct link. Q. Mr Lomas put it, in paragraph 9 of his statement, in this way: "We believe the everyday nature of violence and intimidation impacts on the likelihood of children to trust the institution to protect them if they report sexual abuse from other children or staff." 25 either from the private sector providers and we have seen uncertainty, massive uncertainty, around the one institution that hasn't changed provider where that provider attempted to sell the institution, which has caused institution that hasn't changed provider where that provider attempted to sell the institution, which has caused institution that hasn't changed provider where that provider attempted to sell the institution, which has caused institution that hasn't changed provider where that provider attempted to sell the institution, which has caused institution that hasn't changed provider where that provider attempted to sell the institution, which has caused institution that hasn't changed provider where that provider attempted to sell the institution that hasn't changed provider where that institution that hasn't changed provider where that provider attempted to sell the institution that hasn't changed provider where that pro | 23 | risk of children being subject to sexual abuse? | 23 | management in some institutions, particularly in the STC |
| though, I think that there is — the reason we have healthy prison tests are around — that we call them healthy prison tests is we believe there is something more than process that protects children, so actually how children are treated by staff, how they're cared for things like toilet roll, and so on, has an impact on how safe and how confident children are in reporting some of the bigger things that go on in those institutions like being victimised in terms of violence and victimised sexually, so — and so the — so I would say that when you see an institution with scores that are lower across all of the tests, you would see a more risky institution with regards sexual abuse than one that had higher scores although it's not a direct link. Q. Mr. Lomas put it, in paragraph 9 of his statement, in this way: "We believe the everyday nature of violence and intimidation impacts on the likelihood of children to trust the institution or the course of the instability of their perception and the reality of their safety in terms of their perception and the reality of their safety in terms of their perception and the reality of their safety in terms of their perception and the reality of their safety in terms of their perception and the reality of their safety in terms of their day-to-day experience. So there are many, many things that have happened in this way, so the last six, seven, eight years. Q. Ar eyou able to help the panel on the causes of the | 24 | A. I think there is a link in the risk, yes. I think | 24 | sector, where we have had lots of changes of provider, |
| though, I think that there is — the reason we have healthy prison tests are around — that we call them healthy prison tests are around — that we call them healthy prison tests is we believe there is something more than process that protects children, so actually how children are treated by staff, how they're cared for by staff. How staff respond to everyday requests for things like toilet roll, and so on, has an impact on how safe and how confident children are in reporting some of the bigger things that go on in those institutions like being victimised in terms of violence and victimised sexually, so — and so the — so I would say that when you see an institution with scores that are lower across all of the tests, you would see a more risky institution with regards sexual abuse than one that had higher scores although it's not a direct link. Q. Mr Lomas put it, in paragraph 9 of his statement, in this way: "We believe the everyday nature of violence and intimidation impacts on the likelihood of children to trust the institution to protect them if they report sexual abuse from other children or staff." A. Yes. 1 between private sector providers and we have seen uncertainty, around the one institution that hasn't changed provider where that uncertainty, around the one institution that hasn't changed provider where that provider attempted to sell the institution that hasn't changed provider where that provider attempted to sell the institution, which has caused instability of there that well the sell the institution, which has caused instability of there. We have had — up until very recently, we have had a — not just instability of staffing at the lower levels, but all the way up right to the director responsible for this are not just instability of staffing at the lower responsible for this are not just instability of the fires. 10 this post for three years and I have known several directors that have been responsible for children's custody. So there has been an instability of leadership from the top right | 25 | the how you get to there is more is not direct, | 25 | either from the private sector back into HMPPS or |
| healthy prison tests are around — that we call them healthy prison tests is we believe there is something more than process that protects children, so actually how children are treated by staff, how they're cared for by staff. How staff respond to everyday requests for things like toilet roll, and so on, has an impact on how safe and how confident children are in reporting some of the bigger things that go on in those institutions like being victimised in terms of violence and victimised sexually, so — and so the — so I would say that when you see an institution with scores that are lower across all of the tests, you would see a more risky institution with regards sexual abuse than one that had higher scores although it's not a direct link. Q. Mr Lomas put it, in paragraph 9 of his statement, in this way: "We believe the everyday nature of violence and intimidation impacts on the likelihood of children to trust the institution to protect them if they report sexual abuse from other children or staff." A. Yes. Q. Are you able to help the panel on the causes of the uncertainty, massive uncertainty, around the one institution that hasn't changed provider where that provider attempted to sell the institution then thasn't changed provider where that provider attempted to sell the institution then dind't sell the institution, which has caused instability sell the institution then dind't sell the institution, whic | | Page 5 | | Page 7 |
| healthy prison tests are around — that we call them healthy prison tests is we believe there is something more than process that protects children, so actually how children are treated by staff, how they're cared for by staff. How staff respond to everyday requests for things like toilet roll, and so on, has an impact on how safe and how confident children are in reporting some of the bigger things that go on in those institutions like being victimised in terms of violence and victimised sexually, so — and so the — so I would say that when you see an institution with scores that are lower across all of the tests, you would see a more risky institution with regards sexual abuse than one that had higher scores although it's not a direct link. Q. Mr Lomas put it, in paragraph 9 of his statement, in this way: "We believe the everyday nature of violence and intimidation impacts on the likelihood of children to trust the institution to protect them if they report sexual abuse from other children or staff." A. Yes. Q. Are you able to help the panel on the causes of the uncertainty, massive uncertainty, around the one institution that hasn't changed provider where that provider attempted to sell the institution then thasn't changed provider where that provider attempted to sell the institution then dind't sell the institution, which has caused instability sell the institution then dind't sell the institution, whic | , | | , | |
| healthy prison tests is we believe there is something more than process that protects children, so actually how children are treated by staff, how they're cared for by staff. How staff respond to everyday requests for things like toilet roll, and so on, has an impact on how safe and how confident children are in reporting some of the bigger things that go on in those institutions like being victimised in terms of violence and victimised sexually, so—and so the—so I would say that when you see an institution with scores that are lower across all of the tests, you would see a more risky institution with regards sexual abuse than one that had higher scores although it's not a direct link. Q. Mr Lomas put it, in paragraph 9 of his statement, in with sway: "We believe the everyday nature of violence and intimidation impacts on the likelihood of children to trust the institution to protect them if they report would you agree with that? A. Yes. Q. Are you able to help the panel on the causes of the | | | | |
| more than process that protects children, so actually how children are treated by staff, how they're cared for by staff. How staff respond to everyday requests for things like toilet roll, and so on, has an impact on how safe and how confident children are in reporting some of the bigger things that go on in those institutions like being victimised in terms of violence and victimised sexually, so – and so the – so I would say that when law you see an institution with scores that are lower across all of the tests, you would see a more risky institution with regards sexual abuse than one that had higher scores although it's not a direct link. Q. Mr Lomas put it, in paragraph 9 of his statement, in this way: "We believe the everyday nature of violence and intimidation impacts on the likelihood of children to trust the institution then didn't sell the institution, which has caused instability there. We have had – up until very recently, we have had a – not just instability of staffing at the lower levels, but all the way up right to the director responsible for this area of custody. I have been in this post for three years and I have known several directors that have been responsible for children's custody. So there has been an instability of leadership from the top right the way down to the bottom, in terms of those frontline staff who are working with children on an everyday basis, although what I would say is the instability at the bottom of the sort of band 3 prison officer grade or the private sector equivalent has a huge impact on children's feelings of safety both in trust the institution to protect them if they report sexual abuse from other children or staff." Would you agree with that? A. Yes. Q. Are you able to help the panel on the causes of the 24 Q. Why has it had a huge impact, you mention the staff at | | * * | | |
| bow children are treated by staff, how they're cared for by staff. How staff respond to everyday requests for things like toilet roll, and so on, has an impact on how safe and how confident children are in reporting some of the bigger things that go on in those institutions like being victimised in terms of violence and victimised sall of the tests, you would see a more risky institution with scores that are lower across all of the tests, you would see a more risky institution with regards seall abuse than one that had higher scores although it's not a direct link. Q. Mr Lomas put it, in paragraph 9 of his statement, in this way: "We have had — up until very recently, we have had a — not just instability of staffing at the lower levels, but all the way up right to the director responsible for this area of custody. I have been in this post for three years and I have known several directors that have been responsible for children's custody. So there has been an instability of leadership from the top right the way down to the bottom, in terms of those frontline staff who are working with children on an everyday basis, although what I would say is the instability at the bottom of the sort of band 3 prison officer grade or the private sector equivalent has a huge impact on children's feelings of safety both in terms of their day-to-day experience. So there are many, many things that have happened in this way, on the last six, seven, eight years. A. Yes. Q. Are you able to help the panel on the causes of the | | • • | 1 | |
| by staff. How staff respond to everyday requests for things like toilet roll, and so on, has an impact on how safe and how confident children are in reporting some of the bigger things that go on in those institutions like being victimised in terms of violence and victimised to being victimised in terms of violence and victimised to being victimised in terms of violence and victimised to being victimised in terms of violence and victimised to being victimised in terms of violence and victimised to being victimised in terms of violence and victimised to being victimised in terms of violence and victimised to being victimised in terms of violence and victimised to being victimised in terms of the exts, you would say that when you see an institution with scores that are lower across all of the tests, you would see a more risky institution to scores although it's not a direct link. 13 all of the tests, you would see a more risky institution to go the being victimised than one that had higher to scores although it's not a direct link. 15 of those frontline staff who are working with children on an everyday basis, although what I would say is the instability at the bottom of the sort of band 3 prison officer grade or the private sector equivalent has intimidation impacts on the likelihood of children to trust the institution to protect them if they report to terms of their perception and the reality of their safety in terms of their day-to-day experience. So there are many, many things that have happened in this way, so the last six, seven, eight years. 14 We have had — up until very recently, we have had a — not just instability of staffing at the lower responsible for children's feelings of their directors that have happened in this a — not just instability of staffing at the lower levels, but all the way up right to the director responsible for this are not just instability of their serves and I have known several directors that have been responsible for children's ferom the top right the way down to the bottom | _ | | | • |
| things like toilet roll, and so on, has an impact on how safe and how confident children are in reporting some of the bigger things that go on in those institutions like being victimised in terms of violence and victimised to being victimised in terms of violence and victimised pour sexually, so — and so the — so I would say that when this post for three years and I have known several directors that have been responsible for children's all of the tests, you would see a more risky institution with regards sexual abuse than one that had higher scores although it's not a direct link. The paragraph 9 of his statement, in this way: The believe the everyday nature of violence and intimidation impacts on the likelihood of children to trust the institution to protect them if they report sexual abuse from other children or staff." The post for three years and I have known several directors that have been responsible for children's custody. So there has been an instability of leadership from the top right the way down to the bottom, in terms of those frontline staff who are working with children on an everyday basis, although what I would say is the instability at the bottom of the sort of band 3 prison officer grade or the private sector equivalent has a huge impact on children's feelings of safety both in trust the institution to protect them if they report terms of their perception and the reality of their safety in terms of their day-to-day experience. So there are many, many things that have happened in this way, so the last six, seven, eight years. A. Yes. A. Yes. Q. Are you able to help the panel on the causes of the Q. Why has it had a huge impact, you mention the staff at | | • | | • |
| safe and how confident children are in reporting some of the bigger things that go on in those institutions like being victimised in terms of violence and victimised sexually, so — and so the — so I would say that when lyou see an institution with scores that are lower across all of the tests, you would see a more risky institution with regards sexual abuse than one that had higher scores although it's not a direct link. Q. Mr Lomas put it, in paragraph 9 of his statement, in this way: "We believe the everyday nature of violence and intimidation impacts on the likelihood of children to trust the institution to protect them if they report sexual abuse from other children or staff." Would you agree with that? A. Yes. Q. Are you able to help the panel on the causes of the | _ | | | |
| the bigger things that go on in those institutions like being victimised in terms of violence and victimised sexually, so — and so the — so I would say that when lace you see an institution with scores that are lower across all of the tests, you would see a more risky institution with regards sexual abuse than one that had higher scores although it's not a direct link. Q. Mr Lomas put it, in paragraph 9 of his statement, in this way: "We believe the everyday nature of violence and intimidation impacts on the likelihood of children to trust the institution to protect them if they report sexual abuse from other children or staff." Would you agree with that? Q. Are you able to help the panel on the causes of the you see an institution to protect them if they report to the sexual abuse in institution to the director responsible for this area of custody. I have been in this post for three years and I have known several directors that have been responsible for children's custody. So there has been an instability of leadership from the top right the way down to the bottom, in terms of those frontline staff who are working with children from the top right the way down to the bottom, in terms of those frontline staff who are working with children to an everyday basis, although what I would say is the instability at the bottom of the sort of band 3 prison officer grade or the private sector equivalent has a huge impact on children's feelings of safety both in terms of their perception and the reality of their safety in terms of their day-to-day experience. So there are many, many things that have happened in this way, so the last six, seven, eight years. | | | | |
| being victimised in terms of violence and victimised 10 responsible for this area of custody. I have been in 11 sexually, so — and so the — so I would say that when 12 you see an institution with scores that are lower across 13 all of the tests, you would see a more risky institution 14 with regards sexual abuse than one that had higher 15 scores although it's not a direct link. 16 Q. Mr Lomas put it, in paragraph 9 of his statement, in 17 this way: 18 "We believe the everyday nature of violence and 19 intimidation impacts on the likelihood of children to 20 trust the institution to protect them if they report 21 sexual abuse from other children or staff." 22 Would you agree with that? 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. Are you able to help the panel on the causes of the 20 with an the way ap right to the directors 10 responsible for this area of custody. I have been in 11 this post for three years and I have known several 12 directors that have been responsible for children's 13 custody. So there has been an instability of leadership 14 from the top right the way down to the bottom, in terms 15 of those frontline staff who are working with children 16 on an everyday basis, although what I would say is the 17 instability at the bottom of the sort of band 3 prison 18 officer grade or the private sector equivalent has 19 intimidation impacts on the likelihood of children to 20 terms of their perception and the reality of their 21 safety in terms of their day-to-day experience. So 22 there are many, many things that have happened in this 23 way, so the last six, seven, eight years. 24 Q. Why has it had a huge impact, you mention the staff at | | | 1 | · |
| sexually, so — and so the — so I would say that when you see an institution with scores that are lower across all of the tests, you would see a more risky institution with regards sexual abuse than one that had higher scores although it's not a direct link. Q. Mr Lomas put it, in paragraph 9 of his statement, in this way: "We believe the everyday nature of violence and intimidation impacts on the likelihood of children to trust the institution to protect them if they report sexual abuse from other children or staff." Would you agree with that? A. Yes. Q. Are you able to help the panel on the causes of the this post for three years and I have known several directors that have been responsible for children's custody. So there has been an instability of leadership from the top right the way down to the bottom, in terms of those frontline staff who are working with children on an everyday basis, although what I would say is the instability at the bottom of the sort of band 3 prison officer grade or the private sector equivalent has a huge impact on children's feelings of safety both in terms of their perception and the reality of their safety in terms of their day-to-day experience. So Would you agree with that? 21 safety in terms of their day-to-day experience. So 22 there are many, many things that have happened in this 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. Are you able to help the panel on the causes of the 25 Q. Why has it had a huge impact, you mention the staff at | | | 1 | |
| you see an institution with scores that are lower across all of the tests, you would see a more risky institution with regards sexual abuse than one that had higher scores although it's not a direct link. Q. Mr Lomas put it, in paragraph 9 of his statement, in this way: "We believe the everyday nature of violence and intimidation impacts on the likelihood of children to trust the institution to protect them if they report sexual abuse from other children or staff." Would you agree with that? A. Yes. Q. Wr you see an institution with scores that are lower across all directors that have been responsible for children's custody. So there has been an instability of leadership from the top right the way down to the bottom, in terms of those frontline staff who are working with children on an everyday basis, although what I would say is the instability at the bottom of the sort of band 3 prison officer grade or the private sector equivalent has a huge impact on children's feelings of safety both in terms of their perception and the reality of their safety in terms of their day-to-day experience. So there are many, many things that have happened in this A. Yes. Q. Are you able to help the panel on the causes of the Q. Why has it had a huge impact, you mention the staff at | | 9 | 1 | • |
| all of the tests, you would see a more risky institution with regards sexual abuse than one that had higher scores although it's not a direct link. Q. Mr Lomas put it, in paragraph 9 of his statement, in this way: "We believe the everyday nature of violence and intimidation impacts on the likelihood of children to trust the institution to protect them if they report sexual abuse from other children or staff." Would you agree with that? A. Yes. Q. Mre you able to help the panel on the causes of the custody. So there has been an instability of leadership from the top right the way down to the bottom, in terms of those frontline staff who are working with children on an everyday basis, although what I would say is the instability at the bottom of the sort of band 3 prison officer grade or the private sector equivalent has a huge impact on children's feelings of safety both in terms of their perception and the reality of their safety in terms of their day-to-day experience. So there are many, many things that have happened in this way, so the last six, seven, eight years. | | • | 1 | |
| with regards sexual abuse than one that had higher scores although it's not a direct link. Q. Mr Lomas put it, in paragraph 9 of his statement, in this way: "We believe the everyday nature of violence and intimidation impacts on the likelihood of children to trust the institution to protect them if they report sexual abuse from other children or staff." Would you agree with that? A. Yes. With regards sexual abuse than one that had higher from the top right the way down to the bottom, in terms of those frontline staff who are working with children on an everyday basis, although what I would say is the instability at the bottom of the sort of band 3 prison officer grade or the private sector equivalent has a huge impact on children's feelings of safety both in trust the institution to protect them if they report sexual abuse from other children or staff." 21 safety in terms of their day-to-day experience. So there are many, many things that have happened in this way. A. Yes. 22 way, so the last six, seven, eight years. 23 Why has it had a huge impact, you mention the staff at | | • | 1 | |
| scores although it's not a direct link. 15 of those frontline staff who are working with children 16 Q. Mr Lomas put it, in paragraph 9 of his statement, in 17 this way: 18 "We believe the everyday nature of violence and 19 intimidation impacts on the likelihood of children to 20 trust the institution to protect them if they report 21 sexual abuse from other children or staff." 22 Would you agree with that? 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. Are you able to help the panel on the causes of the | | | 1 | |
| Q. Mr Lomas put it, in paragraph 9 of his statement, in this way: 17 this way: 18 "We believe the everyday nature of violence and intimidation impacts on the likelihood of children to trust the institution to protect them if they report sexual abuse from other children or staff." 19 Example 10 to the institution of protect them if they report sexual abuse from other children or staff." 20 Example 21 the institution of protect them if they report sexual abuse from other children or staff." 21 Safety in terms of their day-to-day experience. So there are many, many things that have happened in this way: 22 A. Yes. 23 Way, so the last six, seven, eight years. 24 Q. Are you able to help the panel on the causes of the sort of band 3 prison instability at the bottom of the sort of band 3 prison officer grade or the private sector equivalent has a huge impact on children's feelings of safety both in terms of their perception and the reality of their safety in terms of their day-to-day experience. So there are many, many things that have happened in this way. 25 A. Yes. 26 Q. Why has it had a huge impact, you mention the staff at | | | 1 | • • |
| this way: 17 instability at the bottom of the sort of band 3 prison 18 "We believe the everyday nature of violence and 19 intimidation impacts on the likelihood of children to 20 trust the institution to protect them if they report 21 sexual abuse from other children or staff." 22 Would you agree with that? 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. Are you able to help the panel on the causes of the 17 instability at the bottom of the sort of band 3 prison 18 officer grade or the private sector equivalent has 19 a huge impact on children's feelings of safety both in 20 terms of their perception and the reality of their 21 safety in terms of their day-to-day experience. So 22 there are many, many things that have happened in this 23 way, so the last six, seven, eight years. 24 Q. Why has it had a huge impact, you mention the staff at | | | 1 | 5 |
| 18 "We believe the everyday nature of violence and 19 intimidation impacts on the likelihood of children to 20 trust the institution to protect them if they report 21 sexual abuse from other children or staff." 22 Would you agree with that? 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. Are you able to help the panel on the causes of the 18 officer grade or the private sector equivalent has 19 a huge impact on children's feelings of safety both in 20 terms of their perception and the reality of their 21 safety in terms of their day-to-day experience. So 22 there are many, many things that have happened in this 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. Why has it had a huge impact, you mention the staff at | | | | |
| intimidation impacts on the likelihood of children to trust the institution to protect them if they report sexual abuse from other children or staff." 20 terms of their perception and the reality of their sexual abuse from other children or staff." 21 safety in terms of their day-to-day experience. So Would you agree with that? 22 there are many, many things that have happened in this 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. Are you able to help the panel on the causes of the 29 way, so the last six, seven, eight years. 29 Q. Why has it had a huge impact, you mention the staff at | | • | 1 | • |
| trust the institution to protect them if they report trust the institution to protect them if they report trust the institution to protect them if they report trust the institution to protect them if they report trust the institution to protect them if they report trust the institution to protect them if they report trust the institution to protect them if they report trust the institution to protect them if they report trust the institution to protect them if they report trust the institution to protect them if they report trust the institution to protect them if they report 20 terms of their perception and the reality of their 21 safety in terms of their day-to-day experience. So there are many, many things that have happened in this 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. Are you able to help the panel on the causes of the 26 Using the protection and the reality of their 27 Safety in terms of their day-to-day experience. So 28 Using the protection and the reality of their 29 Safety in terms of their day-to-day experience. So 20 Using the protection and the reality of their 21 Safety in terms of their day-to-day experience. So 22 Using the protection and the reality of their 21 Safety in terms of their day-to-day experience. So 22 Using the protection and the reality of their 23 Safety in terms of their day-to-day experience. So 24 Using the protection and the reality of their 25 Safety in terms of their day-to-day experience. So 26 Using the protection and the reality of their 27 Safety in terms of their day-to-day experience. So 28 Using the protection and the reality of their 29 Safety in terms of their day-to-day experience. So 20 Using the protection and the reality of their 20 Using the protection and the reality of their 21 Safety in terms of their day-to-day experience. So 22 Using the protection and the reality of their 24 Using the protection and the reality of their day-to-day experience. So 28 Using the protection and the protection and the protection and the protection and the prote | | | 1 | |
| sexual abuse from other children or staff." 21 safety in terms of their day-to-day experience. So 22 Would you agree with that? 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. Are you able to help the panel on the causes of the 25 safety in terms of their day-to-day experience. So 26 there are many, many things that have happened in this 27 way, so the last six, seven, eight years. 28 Q. Why has it had a huge impact, you mention the staff at | | • | 1 | |
| 22 Would you agree with that? 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. Are you able to help the panel on the causes of the 25 there are many, many things that have happened in this way, so the last six, seven, eight years. 26 Q. Why has it had a huge impact, you mention the staff at | | | 1 | |
| 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. Are you able to help the panel on the causes of the 23 way, so the last six, seven, eight years. 24 Q. Why has it had a huge impact, you mention the staff at | | | 1 | |
| Q. Are you able to help the panel on the causes of the 24 Q. Why has it had a huge impact, you mention the staff at | | | 1 | |
| | | | 1 | |
| 25 decline in safety and the mixed picture which you 25 the bottom and the turnover of staff at the bottom being | | | 1 | |
| | 25 | decline in safety and the mixed picture which you | 25 | the bottom and the turnover of staff at the bottom being |
| Page 6 Page 8 | L | Page 6 | | Page 8 |

| 1 | particularly problematic. Why is that? | 1 | this is it uses staff from other establishments to come |
|----|--|----|--|
| 2 | A. Because if you take what we know about children and how | 2 | into that establishment, which, again, has the same |
| 3 | they form their relationships and what makes children | 3 | impact as what I talked about before of inconsistent |
| 4 | flourish, these children are not different children to | 4 | responses to everyday requests. So you have a member of |
| 5 | children in the community, so if we talk my children or | 5 | staff from HMP wherever who is coming to Feltham or |
| 6 | anyone else's children in this room, we would hope that | 6 | Cookham Wood to bolster the service, so whilst you might |
| 7 | they would be raised by a consistent care giver and that | 7 | be able to do the basics, well, there is sort of, the |
| 8 | that would make them more resilient when they faced | 8 | underlying care isn't improved through that sort of |
| 9 | problems as they grew older. And if you live on a unit | 9 | approach. |
| 10 | for a number of months with members of staff that come | 10 | Q. In your report which is at INQ001453, we don't need to |
| 11 | and go, that you don't know their names of who's | 11 | turn this up but it's the most recent Children in |
| 12 | unlocking you in the morning and who is locking you back | 12 | Custody report, you mentioned the simple example of |
| 13 | up at night, you don't know who is eating lunch with you | 13 | staffing issues being able to have detrimental impact on |
| 14 | in the middle of the day, that has a huge impact in the | 14 | something as simple as the child's ability to use the |
| 15 | same way that, if we changed a placement six or seven | 15 | telephone. |
| 16 | times in the community, we would say that would be | 16 | A. Yes. To use a telephone, have a shower, specifically |
| 17 | a poor outcome for that child. | 17 | this is in YOIs, in STCs the design of the buildings |
| 18 | Q. I think in the reports, this is noted as a concern, for | 18 | means, and the provision of telephones means, that they |
| 19 | example, just for the purpose of the note in the | 19 | would have access to those things. |
| 20 | Rainsbrook report which is at HMP000193 at paragraph 19, | 20 | Q. I will come back to that a bit later. A difficult |
| 21 | the staff turnover issue was noted to be to pose | 20 | question, but what can be done about it; the high |
| 22 | major challenges. Is it right that turnover has been, | 22 | current levels of staff turnover and the problems with |
| 23 | at least in 2016, up to 67 per cent annually? | 23 | • |
| 24 | A. Yes and those numbers, I mean, I would those numbers | 24 | staffing levels? A. I think that there are several things that can be done |
| 25 | | 25 | |
| 23 | at that point were particularly high because that was at | 23 | about it. The first thing is to say that this isn't |
| | Page 9 | | Page 11 |
| 1 | a point of changing of providers, I think that was | 1 | a problem that can be solved tomorrow, which is but |
| 2 | an inspection although I'd have to check for clarity, | 2 | there are a number of things that we, in terms of our |
| 3 | but that was an inspection that had an "inadequate" | 3 | own witness statement, have suggested that might |
| 4 | judgment attached to it, that report, or certainly a | 4 | increase stability in the sector. The first is around |
| 5 | "requires improvement" judgment. | 5 | minimum entry standards and training and experience for |
| 6 | But while that was the highest staff turnover we | 6 | staff working with this age group and the second is |
| 7 | saw, or we have seen over recent years, we have seen, | 7 | around what the job entails. So if you have a custodial |
| 8 | similarly, high or too high turnovers at both public | 8 | sector that is struggling, those new staff that come in |
| 9 | sector and private sector sites and not just in the STC | 9 | straight from the entry level training course, the POELT |
| 10 | sector. | 10 | course or the initial training course in the private |
| 11 | Q. Have there also been staffing levels which are lower | 11 | sector, they're coming into a very, very difficult often |
| 12 | than they should be? | 12 | chaotic environment where the person that's — that |
| 13 | A. There have been staffing levels at times that have been | 13 | might be mentoring them or the person that's in charge |
| 14 | too low, so and that impacts, again, both in STCs | 14 | of them might be temporarily promoted. They might not |
| 15 | that has an impact generally in STCs, the impact has | 15 | have huge amounts of experience as well. The person |
| | | 16 | |
| 16 | been around the sort of closure of units and the capping | 17 | above them may also be temporarily promoted as well, so I think the issue is around getting the recruitment |
| 17 | of places. In YOIs, the impact has been on the regime, | 18 | 8 8 |
| 18 | so what has happened in the YOI sector is either the | 19 | right, making sure that the people that you are recruiting are able to do the job, but then also |
| 19 | prison has been unable to deliver a regime that involves | 1 | • • |
| 20 | all of the activity that a child should and deserves to | 20 | improving what their initial induction to the |
| 21 | get and the child is locked up for longer or the | 21 | establishment is, to ensure that you keep them. I mean, |
| 22 | response to requests and issues that go on in that | 22 | what we have seen is some attrition from new entrants, |
| 23 | establishment are not as swift or as good as they should | 23 | particularly, I think, in the STC sector. |
| 24 | be. | 24 | In terms of that recruitment, I think the – that's |
| 25 | Another impact of how the prison service manages | 25 | not an overnight solution. You have to go from today |
| | Page 10 | | Page 12 |
| | | | |

| | | l . | |
|--|--|--|---|
| 1 | until, you know, this will be ongoing, certainly at some | 1 | the top there, which include these. The first one: |
| 2 | sites. There is something about terms and conditions, | 2 | "There is a concern due to the self-reporting nature |
| 3 | but I think some work has gone into that. What I would | 3 | of the current STC contracts with a significant reliance |
| 4 | say is that there are now entry level salaries that are | 4 | on contracts to provide data without a robust |
| 5 | comparable to other professions, and I think, if we are | 5 | independent assurance mechanism. Under-reporting of |
| 6 | paying professional salaries, we should be expecting | 6 | incidents and issues therefore cannot be successfully |
| 7 | professional qualifications. | 7 | detected or challenged. The assessment of contracts |
| 8 | Q. I will come back to qualifications a bit later, if | 8 | tends to focus on processes and not necessarily the |
| 9 | I may, but first wanted to cover the issues of | 9 | quality of the service delivered." |
| 10 | privatisation. We have heard serious concerns being | 10 | Then the final bullet point: |
| 11 | raised about Medway and Rainsbrook when they were in G4S | 11 | "There is a critical need for triangulating data |
| 12 | control. Is this a fair summary of the other two | 12 | from different sources to form a holistic overarching |
| 13 | institutions which G4S continues to control: Parc, the | 13 | picture." |
| 14 | most recent survey and inspection judged its safety as | 14 | Do you have any recommendations as to how contracts |
| 15 | "reasonably good", whereas Oakhill STC, which is G4S's | 15 | of private contractors can be better managed? |
| 16 | second and final current child institution, is doing | 16 | A. I think it's probably outside of the remit of the |
| 17 | poorly in terms of safety and, indeed, concerns were | 17 | Inspectorate to do so. What I would say is, when we |
| 18 | raised with the ministers, is that correct, by the | 18 | inspect an institution, we look for outcomes of the |
| 19 | inspector, because of how poorly it was doing? | 19 | people that are living there and what I have noticed, as |
| 20 | A. Yes, we raised a we raised concerns at the last | 20 | I go around inspecting institutions of all types, is |
| 21 | inspection. We have just been to Oakhill recently so | 21 | that often a lot of the things that are measured are |
| 22 | not that inspection, the inspection before, regarding | 22 | process. So there are lots of KPIs, but around process |
| 23 | | 23 | rather than outcome, and we would do some of that |
| 24 | levels of violence and a general lack of control of the institution. | 24 | · |
| 25 | | 25 | triangulating on inspection to come up with those |
| 23 | In terms of, I think was there a broader question | 23 | outcomes that are delivered. But in terms of |
| | Page 13 | | Page 15 |
| | 1 486 13 | l . | 1 486 13 |
| | | | |
| 1 | about privatisation? | 1 | recommendations, I'm not sure I could give you any clear |
| 1 2 | about privatisation? Q. Yes, do you have a view whether private companies | 1 2 | recommendations, I'm not sure I could give you any clear ones around contract management. |
| | • | | |
| 2 | Q. Yes, do you have a view whether private companies | 2 | ones around contract management. |
| 2 3 | Q. Yes, do you have a view whether private companies running custodial institutions for children makes it | 2 3 | ones around contract management. Q. Okay. The next issue, then, is CCTV. Could we turn up, |
| 2 3 4 | Q. Yes, do you have a view whether private companies running custodial institutions for children makes it more difficult to care for them? | 2 3 4 | ones around contract management. Q. Okay. The next issue, then, is CCTV. Could we turn up, please, INQ001480. This is the 2017 report of Medway |
| 2 3 4 5 | Q. Yes, do you have a view whether private companies running custodial institutions for children makes it more difficult to care for them? A. In terms of the evidence for inspection, there is no | 2 3 4 5 | ones around contract management. Q. Okay. The next issue, then, is CCTV. Could we turn up, please, INQ001480. This is the 2017 report of Medway and have a look, please, at page 10 of that. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | Q. Yes, do you have a view whether private companies running custodial institutions for children makes it more difficult to care for them? A. In terms of the evidence for inspection, there is no evidence regarding the type of provider and the outcomes | 2 3 4 5 6 | ones around contract management. Q. Okay. The next issue, then, is CCTV. Could we turn up, please, INQ001480. This is the 2017 report of Medway and have a look, please, at page 10 of that. Paragraph 29 it says: |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Q. Yes, do you have a view whether private companies running custodial institutions for children makes it more difficult to care for them? A. In terms of the evidence for inspection, there is no evidence regarding the type of provider and the outcomes we see. We see very poor outcomes in some public provision, we see poor outcomes in some private | 2 3 4 5 6 7 | ones around contract management. Q. Okay. The next issue, then, is CCTV. Could we turn up, please, INQ001480. This is the 2017 report of Medway and have a look, please, at page 10 of that. Paragraph 29 it says: "The centre still lacks CCTV coverage in areas where |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | Q. Yes, do you have a view whether private companies running custodial institutions for children makes it more difficult to care for them? A. In terms of the evidence for inspection, there is no evidence regarding the type of provider and the outcomes we see. We see very poor outcomes in some public | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | ones around contract management. Q. Okay. The next issue, then, is CCTV. Could we turn up, please, INQ001480. This is the 2017 report of Medway and have a look, please, at page 10 of that. Paragraph 29 it says: "The centre still lacks CCTV coverage in areas where young people have consistently reported feeling unsafe, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | Q. Yes, do you have a view whether private companies running custodial institutions for children makes it more difficult to care for them? A. In terms of the evidence for inspection, there is no evidence regarding the type of provider and the outcomes we see. We see very poor outcomes in some public provision, we see poor outcomes in some private provision and, equally, we see some relatively good | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | ones around contract management. Q. Okay. The next issue, then, is CCTV. Could we turn up, please, INQ001480. This is the 2017 report of Medway and have a look, please, at page 10 of that. Paragraph 29 it says: "The centre still lacks CCTV coverage in areas where young people have consistently reported feeling unsafe, such as stairwells and education block. However, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | Q. Yes, do you have a view whether private companies running custodial institutions for children makes it more difficult to care for them? A. In terms of the evidence for inspection, there is no evidence regarding the type of provider and the outcomes we see. We see very poor outcomes in some public provision, we see poor outcomes in some private provision and, equally, we see some relatively good provision in both sectors. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | ones around contract management. Q. Okay. The next issue, then, is CCTV. Could we turn up, please, INQ001480. This is the 2017 report of Medway and have a look, please, at page 10 of that. Paragraph 29 it says: "The centre still lacks CCTV coverage in areas where young people have consistently reported feeling unsafe, such as stairwells and education block. However, inspectors were assured that CCTV coverage is shortly to |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | Q. Yes, do you have a view whether private companies running custodial institutions for children makes it more difficult to care for them? A. In terms of the evidence for inspection, there is no evidence regarding the type of provider and the outcomes we see. We see very poor outcomes in some public provision, we see poor outcomes in some private provision and, equally, we see some relatively good provision in both sectors. We don't see — we see some very reactive managers in some — in some private sector institutions, we see | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | ones around contract management. Q. Okay. The next issue, then, is CCTV. Could we turn up, please, INQ001480. This is the 2017 report of Medway and have a look, please, at page 10 of that. Paragraph 29 it says: "The centre still lacks CCTV coverage in areas where young people have consistently reported feeling unsafe, such as stairwells and education block. However, inspectors were assured that CCTV coverage is shortly to be extended across the centre and included in the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | Q. Yes, do you have a view whether private companies running custodial institutions for children makes it more difficult to care for them? A. In terms of the evidence for inspection, there is no evidence regarding the type of provider and the outcomes we see. We see very poor outcomes in some public provision, we see poor outcomes in some private provision and, equally, we see some relatively good provision in both sectors. We don't see — we see some very reactive managers | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | ones around contract management. Q. Okay. The next issue, then, is CCTV. Could we turn up, please, INQ001480. This is the 2017 report of Medway and have a look, please, at page 10 of that. Paragraph 29 it says: "The centre still lacks CCTV coverage in areas where young people have consistently reported feeling unsafe, such as stairwells and education block. However, inspectors were assured that CCTV coverage is shortly to be extended across the centre and included in the improvement plan." |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | Q. Yes, do you have a view whether private companies running custodial institutions for children makes it more difficult to care for them? A. In terms of the evidence for inspection, there is no evidence regarding the type of provider and the outcomes we see. We see very poor outcomes in some public provision, we see poor outcomes in some private provision and, equally, we see some relatively good provision in both sectors. We don't see — we see some very reactive managers in some — in some private sector institutions, we see some poor managers. What I would say is, where we find good outcomes, we often find good leadership at that | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | ones around contract management. Q. Okay. The next issue, then, is CCTV. Could we turn up, please, INQ001480. This is the 2017 report of Medway and have a look, please, at page 10 of that. Paragraph 29 it says: "The centre still lacks CCTV coverage in areas where young people have consistently reported feeling unsafe, such as stairwells and education block. However, inspectors were assured that CCTV coverage is shortly to be extended across the centre and included in the improvement plan." First question, do you consider CCTV as important for safety? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | Q. Yes, do you have a view whether private companies running custodial institutions for children makes it more difficult to care for them? A. In terms of the evidence for inspection, there is no evidence regarding the type of provider and the outcomes we see. We see very poor outcomes in some public provision, we see poor outcomes in some private provision and, equally, we see some relatively good provision in both sectors. We don't see — we see some very reactive managers in some — in some private sector institutions, we see some poor managers. What I would say is, where we find good outcomes, we often find good leadership at that same institution and that's the thing that matters, | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | ones around contract management. Q. Okay. The next issue, then, is CCTV. Could we turn up, please, INQ001480. This is the 2017 report of Medway and have a look, please, at page 10 of that. Paragraph 29 it says: "The centre still lacks CCTV coverage in areas where young people have consistently reported feeling unsafe, such as stairwells and education block. However, inspectors were assured that CCTV coverage is shortly to be extended across the centre and included in the improvement plan." First question, do you consider CCTV as important for safety? A. I think it is important but I don't think it's the most |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | Q. Yes, do you have a view whether private companies running custodial institutions for children makes it more difficult to care for them? A. In terms of the evidence for inspection, there is no evidence regarding the type of provider and the outcomes we see. We see very poor outcomes in some public provision, we see poor outcomes in some private provision and, equally, we see some relatively good provision in both sectors. We don't see we see some very reactive managers in some in some private sector institutions, we see some poor managers. What I would say is, where we find good outcomes, we often find good leadership at that same institution and that's the thing that matters, rather than the provider, and absolutely we have found | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | ones around contract management. Q. Okay. The next issue, then, is CCTV. Could we turn up, please, INQ001480. This is the 2017 report of Medway and have a look, please, at page 10 of that. Paragraph 29 it says: "The centre still lacks CCTV coverage in areas where young people have consistently reported feeling unsafe, such as stairwells and education block. However, inspectors were assured that CCTV coverage is shortly to be extended across the centre and included in the improvement plan." First question, do you consider CCTV as important for safety? A. I think it is important but I don't think it's the most important thing. I don't think that we can monitor |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | Q. Yes, do you have a view whether private companies running custodial institutions for children makes it more difficult to care for them? A. In terms of the evidence for inspection, there is no evidence regarding the type of provider and the outcomes we see. We see very poor outcomes in some public provision, we see poor outcomes in some private provision and, equally, we see some relatively good provision in both sectors. We don't see — we see some very reactive managers in some — in some private sector institutions, we see some poor managers. What I would say is, where we find good outcomes, we often find good leadership at that same institution and that's the thing that matters, rather than the provider, and absolutely we have found the sorts of poor practice that have been national news | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | ones around contract management. Q. Okay. The next issue, then, is CCTV. Could we turn up, please, INQ001480. This is the 2017 report of Medway and have a look, please, at page 10 of that. Paragraph 29 it says: "The centre still lacks CCTV coverage in areas where young people have consistently reported feeling unsafe, such as stairwells and education block. However, inspectors were assured that CCTV coverage is shortly to be extended across the centre and included in the improvement plan." First question, do you consider CCTV as important for safety? A. I think it is important but I don't think it's the most important thing. I don't think that we can monitor these places safe. The focus is on staff and |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | Q. Yes, do you have a view whether private companies running custodial institutions for children makes it more difficult to care for them? A. In terms of the evidence for inspection, there is no evidence regarding the type of provider and the outcomes we see. We see very poor outcomes in some public provision, we see poor outcomes in some private provision and, equally, we see some relatively good provision in both sectors. We don't see — we see some very reactive managers in some — in some private sector institutions, we see some poor managers. What I would say is, where we find good outcomes, we often find good leadership at that same institution and that's the thing that matters, rather than the provider, and absolutely we have found the sorts of poor practice that have been national news at other institutions. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | ones around contract management. Q. Okay. The next issue, then, is CCTV. Could we turn up, please, INQ001480. This is the 2017 report of Medway and have a look, please, at page 10 of that. Paragraph 29 it says: "The centre still lacks CCTV coverage in areas where young people have consistently reported feeling unsafe, such as stairwells and education block. However, inspectors were assured that CCTV coverage is shortly to be extended across the centre and included in the improvement plan." First question, do you consider CCTV as important for safety? A. I think it is important but I don't think it's the most important thing. I don't think that we can monitor these places safe. The focus is on staff and relationships, absolutely and that will be — if I was |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | Q. Yes, do you have a view whether private companies running custodial institutions for children makes it more difficult to care for them? A. In terms of the evidence for inspection, there is no evidence regarding the type of provider and the outcomes we see. We see very poor outcomes in some public provision, we see poor outcomes in some private provision and, equally, we see some relatively good provision in both sectors. We don't see — we see some very reactive managers in some — in some private sector institutions, we see some poor managers. What I would say is, where we find good outcomes, we often find good leadership at that same institution and that's the thing that matters, rather than the provider, and absolutely we have found the sorts of poor practice that have been national news at other institutions. Q. A slightly different question which is about contract | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | ones around contract management. Q. Okay. The next issue, then, is CCTV. Could we turn up, please, INQ001480. This is the 2017 report of Medway and have a look, please, at page 10 of that. Paragraph 29 it says: "The centre still lacks CCTV coverage in areas where young people have consistently reported feeling unsafe, such as stairwells and education block. However, inspectors were assured that CCTV coverage is shortly to be extended across the centre and included in the improvement plan." First question, do you consider CCTV as important for safety? A. I think it is important but I don't think it's the most important thing. I don't think that we can monitor these places safe. The focus is on staff and relationships, absolutely and that will be — if I was going to give one message, I think that that's the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | Q. Yes, do you have a view whether private companies running custodial institutions for children makes it more difficult to care for them? A. In terms of the evidence for inspection, there is no evidence regarding the type of provider and the outcomes we see. We see very poor outcomes in some public provision, we see poor outcomes in some private provision and, equally, we see some relatively good provision in both sectors. We don't see we see some very reactive managers in some in some private sector institutions, we see some poor managers. What I would say is, where we find good outcomes, we often find good leadership at that same institution and that's the thing that matters, rather than the provider, and absolutely we have found the sorts of poor practice that have been national news at other institutions. Q. A slightly different question which is about contract management of private companies. Could we turn up, | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | ones around contract management. Q. Okay. The next issue, then, is CCTV. Could we turn up, please, INQ001480. This is the 2017 report of Medway and have a look, please, at page 10 of that. Paragraph 29 it says: "The centre still lacks CCTV coverage in areas where young people have consistently reported feeling unsafe, such as stairwells and education block. However, inspectors were assured that CCTV coverage is shortly to be extended across the centre and included in the improvement plan." First question, do you consider CCTV as important for safety? A. I think it is important but I don't think it's the most important thing. I don't think that we can monitor these places safe. The focus is on staff and relationships, absolutely and that will be — if I was going to give one message, I think that that's the issue. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Q. Yes, do you have a view whether private companies running custodial institutions for children makes it more difficult to care for them? A. In terms of the evidence for inspection, there is no evidence regarding the type of provider and the outcomes we see. We see very poor outcomes in some public provision, we see poor outcomes in some private provision and, equally, we see some relatively good provision in both sectors. We don't see — we see some very reactive managers in some — in some private sector institutions, we see some poor managers. What I would say is, where we find good outcomes, we often find good leadership at that same institution and that's the thing that matters, rather than the provider, and absolutely we have found the sorts of poor practice that have been national news at other institutions. Q. A slightly different question which is about contract management of private companies. Could we turn up, please, HMP000187. This is something that was provided | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | ones around contract management. Q. Okay. The next issue, then, is CCTV. Could we turn up, please, INQ001480. This is the 2017 report of Medway and have a look, please, at page 10 of that. Paragraph 29 it says: "The centre still lacks CCTV coverage in areas where young people have consistently reported feeling unsafe, such as stairwells and education block. However, inspectors were assured that CCTV coverage is shortly to be extended across the centre and included in the improvement plan." First question, do you consider CCTV as important for safety? A. I think it is important but I don't think it's the most important thing. I don't think that we can monitor these places safe. The focus is on staff and relationships, absolutely and that will be — if I was going to give one message, I think that that's the issue. The process is important and the fact that children |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | Q. Yes, do you have a view whether private companies running custodial institutions for children makes it more difficult to care for them? A. In terms of the evidence for inspection, there is no evidence regarding the type of provider and the outcomes we see. We see very poor outcomes in some public provision, we see poor outcomes in some private provision and, equally, we see some relatively good provision in both sectors. We don't see we see some very reactive managers in some in some private sector institutions, we see some poor managers. What I would say is, where we find good outcomes, we often find good leadership at that same institution and that's the thing that matters, rather than the provider, and absolutely we have found the sorts of poor practice that have been national news at other institutions. Q. A slightly different question which is about contract management of private companies. Could we turn up, please, HMP000187. This is something that was provided by HMPPS. It comes up. It's an internal analysis of | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | ones around contract management. Q. Okay. The next issue, then, is CCTV. Could we turn up, please, INQ001480. This is the 2017 report of Medway and have a look, please, at page 10 of that. Paragraph 29 it says: "The centre still lacks CCTV coverage in areas where young people have consistently reported feeling unsafe, such as stairwells and education block. However, inspectors were assured that CCTV coverage is shortly to be extended across the centre and included in the improvement plan." First question, do you consider CCTV as important for safety? A. I think it is important but I don't think it's the most important thing. I don't think that we can monitor these places safe. The focus is on staff and relationships, absolutely and that will be — if I was going to give one message, I think that that's the issue. The process is important and the fact that children feel unsafe in those areas is important and needs to be |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | Q. Yes, do you have a view whether private companies running custodial institutions for children makes it more difficult to care for them? A. In terms of the evidence for inspection, there is no evidence regarding the type of provider and the outcomes we see. We see very poor outcomes in some public provision, we see poor outcomes in some private provision and, equally, we see some relatively good provision in both sectors. We don't see we see some very reactive managers in some in some private sector institutions, we see some poor managers. What I would say is, where we find good outcomes, we often find good leadership at that same institution and that's the thing that matters, rather than the provider, and absolutely we have found the sorts of poor practice that have been national news at other institutions. Q. A slightly different question which is about contract management of private companies. Could we turn up, please, HMP000187. This is something that was provided by HMPPS. It comes up. It's an internal analysis of Secure Training Centre contracts and can you turn, | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | ones around contract management. Q. Okay. The next issue, then, is CCTV. Could we turn up, please, INQ001480. This is the 2017 report of Medway and have a look, please, at page 10 of that. Paragraph 29 it says: "The centre still lacks CCTV coverage in areas where young people have consistently reported feeling unsafe, such as stairwells and education block. However, inspectors were assured that CCTV coverage is shortly to be extended across the centre and included in the improvement plan." First question, do you consider CCTV as important for safety? A. I think it is important but I don't think it's the most important thing. I don't think that we can monitor these places safe. The focus is on staff and relationships, absolutely and that will be — if I was going to give one message, I think that that's the issue. The process is important and the fact that children feel unsafe in those areas is important and needs to be addressed, which is why it's referenced in that report, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | Q. Yes, do you have a view whether private companies running custodial institutions for children makes it more difficult to care for them? A. In terms of the evidence for inspection, there is no evidence regarding the type of provider and the outcomes we see. We see very poor outcomes in some public provision, we see poor outcomes in some private provision and, equally, we see some relatively good provision in both sectors. We don't see we see some very reactive managers in some in some private sector institutions, we see some poor managers. What I would say is, where we find good outcomes, we often find good leadership at that same institution and that's the thing that matters, rather than the provider, and absolutely we have found the sorts of poor practice that have been national news at other institutions. Q. A slightly different question which is about contract management of private companies. Could we turn up, please, HMP000187. This is something that was provided by HMPPS. It comes up. It's an internal analysis of | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | ones around contract management. Q. Okay. The next issue, then, is CCTV. Could we turn up, please, INQ001480. This is the 2017 report of Medway and have a look, please, at page 10 of that. Paragraph 29 it says: "The centre still lacks CCTV coverage in areas where young people have consistently reported feeling unsafe, such as stairwells and education block. However, inspectors were assured that CCTV coverage is shortly to be extended across the centre and included in the improvement plan." First question, do you consider CCTV as important for safety? A. I think it is important but I don't think it's the most important thing. I don't think that we can monitor these places safe. The focus is on staff and relationships, absolutely and that will be — if I was going to give one message, I think that that's the issue. The process is important and the fact that children feel unsafe in those areas is important and needs to be |

Page 14

| 1 public areas in youth custodial institutions that you 2 inspect or are there still gaps? 3 A. There will definitely be gaps across the estate, yes. 4 I couldn't tell you how many gaps sat here now, but 5 there will be gaps and there will also be gaps, in terms 6 of maintenance gaps, as well across the estate, of CCTV 7 cameras out of action at certain points. 8 Q. Page 25, please, at the bottom of the page, 9 paragraph 116 says: 10 "Some urgent remedial training" 11 This is still the report about Medway: 11 Some urgent remedial training has been rolled out 12 "Some urgent remedial training has been rolled out 13 across the staff group, including the safeguarding 14 module of the NOMS training course to ensure that 15 a minimum level of awareness is universal. This is 16 valuable training, but it is only a day in length and 17 cannot be regarded as enough to ensure that the 18 workforce is sufficiently aware of the safeguarding 18 and information between those two, and I think that the 2 way they're recruited and retained is part of that issue. 2 What about training, leaving the initial qualification to one side, do you think the mandatory training for residential ordinary staff that they receive about safeguarding at the moment is sufficient or should be improved? A. I think that the — that if all of them get the mandatory training, then the training is sufficient, but you would need to talk about starting points of all training, so if you had, in the same way that you would talk about the outcome is, in terms of, rather than the training programme, the outcome should be that all staff have a current and good understanding of safeguarding and how the process works. Some staff may come in with that knowledge and other staff may not come in with that knowledge, and what training each individual needs, in |
|--|
| A. There will definitely be gaps across the estate, yes. I couldn't tell you how many gaps sat here now, but there will be gaps and there will also be gaps, in terms of maintenance gaps, as well across the estate, of CCTV cameras out of action at certain points. Q. Page 25, please, at the bottom of the page, paragraph 116 says: "Some urgent remedial training" This is still the report about Medway: "Some urgent remedial training has been rolled out "Some urgent remedial training has been rolled out across the staff group, including the safeguarding module of the NOMS training course to ensure that module of the NOMS training, but it is only a day in length and cannot be regarded as enough to ensure that the That is a minimum level of awareness is universal. This is cannot be regarded as enough to ensure that the Touldn't tell you how many gaps sat here now, but 4 Q. What about training, leaving the initial qualification to one side, do you think the mandatory training for residential ordinary staff that they receive about safeguarding at the moment is sufficient or should be improved? A. I think that the — that if all of them get the mandatory training, then the training is sufficient, but you would need to talk about starting points of all training, so if you had, in the same way that you would talk about the outcome is, in terms of, rather than the training programme, the outcome should be that all staff have a current and good understanding of safeguarding and how the process works. Some staff may come in with that |
| I couldn't tell you how many gaps sat here now, but there will be gaps and there will also be gaps, in terms of maintenance gaps, as well across the estate, of CCTV cameras out of action at certain points. Q. Page 25, please, at the bottom of the page, paragraph 116 says: "Some urgent remedial training" This is still the report about Medway: "Some urgent remedial training has been rolled out across the staff group, including the safeguarding module of the NOMS training course to ensure that a minimum level of awareness is universal. This is valuable training, but it is only a day in length and valuable training, but it is only a day in length and cannot be regarded as enough to ensure that the valuable training, said you think the mandatory training, leaving the initial qualification to one side, do you think the mandatory training, leaving the initial qualification to one side, do you think the mandatory training for residential ordinary staff that they receive about safeguarding at the moment is sufficient or should be improved? A. I think that the that if all of them get the mandatory training, then the training is sufficient, but you would need to talk about starting points of all training, so if you had, in the same way that you would talk about the outcome is, in terms of, rather than the training programme, the outcome should be that all staff have a current and good understanding of safeguarding and how the process works. Some staff may come in with that |
| there will be gaps and there will also be gaps, in terms of maintenance gaps, as well across the estate, of CCTV cameras out of action at certain points. Q. Page 25, please, at the bottom of the page, paragraph 116 says: "Some urgent remedial training" This is still the report about Medway: "Some urgent remedial training has been rolled out "Some urgent remedial training has been rolled out across the staff group, including the safeguarding talk about the outcome is, in terms of, rather than the module of the NOMS training course to ensure that a minimum level of awareness is universal. This is valuable training, but it is only a day in length and cannot be regarded as enough to ensure that that to one side, do you think the mandatory training for residential ordinary staff that they receive about safeguarding at the moment is sufficient or should be improved? A. I think that the — that if all of them get the mandatory training, then the training is sufficient, but you would need to talk about starting points of all training, so if you had, in the same way that you would talk about the outcome is, in terms of, rather than the training programme, the outcome should be that all staff have a current and good understanding of safeguarding and how the process works. Some staff may come in with that knowledge and other staff may not come in with that |
| of maintenance gaps, as well across the estate, of CCTV cameras out of action at certain points. Q. Page 25, please, at the bottom of the page, paragraph 116 says: "Some urgent remedial training" This is still the report about Medway: "Some urgent remedial training has been rolled out across the staff group, including the safeguarding module of the NOMS training course to ensure that a minimum level of awareness is universal. This is valuable training, but it is only a day in length and cannot be regarded as enough to ensure that the residential ordinary staff that they receive about residential ordinary staff that they receive about safeguarding at the moment is sufficient or should be improved? A. I think that the that if all of them get the mandatory training, then the training is sufficient, but you would need to talk about starting points of all training, so if you had, in the same way that you would talk about the outcome is, in terms of, rather than the training programme, the outcome should be that all staff have a current and good understanding of safeguarding and how the process works. Some staff may come in with that knowledge and other staff may not come in with that |
| 7 cameras out of action at certain points. 8 Q. Page 25, please, at the bottom of the page, 9 paragraph 116 says: 9 (Some urgent remedial training" 11 This is still the report about Medway: 12 "Some urgent remedial training has been rolled out 13 across the staff group, including the safeguarding 14 module of the NOMS training course to ensure that 15 a minimum level of awareness is universal. This is 16 valuable training, but it is only a day in length and 17 cannot be regarded as enough to ensure that the 7 safeguarding at the moment is sufficient or should be improved? 9 A. I think that the that if all of them get the mandatory training, then the training is sufficient, but you would need to talk about starting points of all training, so if you had, in the same way that you would talk about the outcome is, in terms of, rather than the training programme, the outcome should be that all staff have a current and good understanding of safeguarding and how the process works. Some staff may come in with that knowledge and other staff may not come in with that |
| 8 Q. Page 25, please, at the bottom of the page, 9 paragraph 116 says: 9 A. I think that the that if all of them get the 10 "Some urgent remedial training" 11 This is still the report about Medway: 12 "Some urgent remedial training has been rolled out 13 across the staff group, including the safeguarding 14 module of the NOMS training course to ensure that 15 a minimum level of awareness is universal. This is 16 valuable training, but it is only a day in length and 17 cannot be regarded as enough to ensure that the |
| paragraph 116 says: 10 "Some urgent remedial training" 11 This is still the report about Medway: 12 "Some urgent remedial training has been rolled out 13 across the staff group, including the safeguarding 14 module of the NOMS training course to ensure that 15 a minimum level of awareness is universal. This is 16 valuable training, but it is only a day in length and 17 cannot be regarded as enough to ensure that the 18 M. I think that the — that if all of them get the mandatory training, then the training is sufficient, but you would need to talk about starting points of all training, so if you had, in the same way that you would talk about the outcome is, in terms of, rather than the training programme, the outcome should be that all staff have a current and good understanding of safeguarding and how the process works. Some staff may come in with that knowledge and other staff may not come in with that |
| "Some urgent remedial training" 10 mandatory training, then the training is sufficient, but 11 This is still the report about Medway: 12 "Some urgent remedial training has been rolled out 13 across the staff group, including the safeguarding 14 module of the NOMS training course to ensure that 15 a minimum level of awareness is universal. This is 16 valuable training, but it is only a day in length and 17 cannot be regarded as enough to ensure that the |
| This is still the report about Medway: 11 you would need to talk about starting points of all 12 "Some urgent remedial training has been rolled out 13 across the staff group, including the safeguarding 14 module of the NOMS training course to ensure that 15 a minimum level of awareness is universal. This is 16 valuable training, but it is only a day in length and 17 cannot be regarded as enough to ensure that the |
| 12 "Some urgent remedial training has been rolled out 13 across the staff group, including the safeguarding 14 module of the NOMS training course to ensure that 15 a minimum level of awareness is universal. This is 16 valuable training, but it is only a day in length and 17 cannot be regarded as enough to ensure that the 18 training, so if you had, in the same way that you would 19 talk about the outcome is, in terms of, rather than the 10 training programme, the outcome should be that all staff 11 have a current and good understanding of safeguarding 12 training, so if you had, in the same way that you would 13 talk about the outcome is, in terms of, rather than the 14 training programme, the outcome should be that all staff 15 have a current and good understanding of safeguarding 16 and how the process works. Some staff may come in with 17 that knowledge and other staff may not come in with that |
| across the staff group, including the safeguarding module of the NOMS training course to ensure that a minimum level of awareness is universal. This is valuable training, but it is only a day in length and cannot be regarded as enough to ensure that the 13 talk about the outcome is, in terms of, rather than the training programme, the outcome should be that all staff have a current and good understanding of safeguarding and how the process works. Some staff may come in with that knowledge and other staff may not come in with that |
| module of the NOMS training course to ensure that a minimum level of awareness is universal. This is a minimum level of awareness is universal. This is valuable training, but it is only a day in length and cannot be regarded as enough to ensure that the training programme, the outcome should be that all staff have a current and good understanding of safeguarding and how the process works. Some staff may come in with that knowledge and other staff may not come in with that |
| 15 a minimum level of awareness is universal. This is 16 valuable training, but it is only a day in length and 17 cannot be regarded as enough to ensure that the 18 have a current and good understanding of safeguarding 19 and how the process works. Some staff may come in with 10 that knowledge and other staff may not come in with that |
| valuable training, but it is only a day in length and 16 and how the process works. Some staff may come in with cannot be regarded as enough to ensure that the 17 that knowledge and other staff may not come in with that |
| cannot be regarded as enough to ensure that the 17 that knowledge and other staff may not come in with that |
| |
| 18 workforce is sufficiently aware of the safeguarding 18 knowledge, and what training each individual needs, in |
| |
| 19 issues. A range of appropriate further training is 19 the same way that you wouldn't expect two children, one |
| 20 planned and the volume of expression of interest from 20 that's come in with GCSEs and the other with entry |
| 21 the staff group is a good sign. However, the impact of 21 level 3 qualifications, you wouldn't expect the same |
| 22 this training is some distance in the future." 22 provision to be provided for them children, you wouldn't |
| 23 Are you aware of what the current position is in 23 expect the same provision to be provided for staff |
| 24 YOIs and STCs in terms of training; is this amount of 24 coming in. |
| 25 training referred to in this paragraph given in terms of 25 Some people come in with degrees from the Prison |
| Page 17 Page 19 |
| |
| 1 safeguarding or is more? 1 Service College, some staff don't and I think we need to |
| 2 A. There is safeguarding training available for staff in 2 have a more nuanced approach to this. So I think that |
| 3 YOIs and STCs. I think the in terms of the equipping 3 the approach requires improvement to take account of |
| 4 staff for the role, I think there are two things in 4 that. |
| 5 terms of what qualifications and experience staff come 5 Q. Next paragraph, please, on the same page, you go on to |
| 6 into the role with and what training is provided to 6 discuss, 117, supervision in Medway: |
| 7 those staff once they get there, and I would again, 7 "There is no expectation that unit staff and |
| 8 while it is important that staff have a current and 8 managers will engage in a supervisory relationship." |
| 9 up-to-date knowledge of safeguarding, they will also 9 One sentence later: |
| 10 need other things as well to be able to work in this 10 "Supervision is an important tool to promote good |
| 11 sector appropriately. 11 quality childcare practice in other residential |
| 12 Q. Focusing on ordinary staff, so residential staff that 12 provision for under 18s, such as secure and open |
| have day-to-day contact with children, do you think 13 children's homes. It is difficult to see how custodial |
| there should be a minimum qualification level for those 14 officers will be helped to continually improve their |
| staff coming into working with children? 15 performance and maintain a child-centred focus without |
| 16 A. I think we should start to expect qualification levels 16 this, given that most staff have no childcare- or youth |
| 17 in terms of people coming into this environment in a way 17 work-related qualifications. It is also currently |
| 18 that you would in other similar environments holding 18 unclear how poor performance by staff is dealt with." |
| 19 children elsewhere, not just in the custodial sector and 19 Looking at YOIs and STCs generally, do you have |
| 20 that may well have two impacts, not just on the children 20 similar concerns; do you think that supervision in those |
| 21 that are involved here, but on the expertise that you 21 establishments is sufficient or it needs to be improved? |
| would then draw on, because, at the minute, we seem to 22 A. I think we have similar concerns across the estate. |
| have two children's workforces in the criminal justice 23 There are particular issues around supervisory |
| 24 system. We have a community workforce and a custodial 24 relationships, so how many direct reports some staff |
| 25 workforce and there is very little sharing of expertise 25 have, particularly in the public sector where custodial |
| |
| Page 18 Page 20 |

2

3

4

5

11

12

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 1 managers in some institutions have a large number of 2 direct reports that cannot be supervised in a way that 3 you or I would be supervised in our job roles, in terms 4 of touching base with your manager every so often, and 5 it simply wouldn't be possible with some of these residential managers. The reason that is, is that the 7 supervisory officer that sits between the custodial 8 manager and the band 3 officer has no line management 9 responsibility. 10
 - Q. A slightly different question about staffing. In Mr Lomas' statement at paragraph 20, he indicates that, in his view, the role of residential staff should be primarily one of care. Do you agree with that?
- 13 14 A. Yes, I think that that underpins any model of 15 safeguarding that the staff should know the people that 16 they're looking after. They should have some regard for 17 those people and there should be a relationship of trust 18 that develops, so that if -- that prevents any type of 19 abuse happening in the first place, but if it does, it 20 means that children are confident that if they tell 21 their unit officer, who they spend most of their time 22 with, that that's what -- they have confidence that 23 something will be done about it and, while that

- restraint process, which at paragraph 5.68 noted that,
- for children who have been victims of abuse in the past,
 - restraint can be a highly traumatic experience.
- Updating the position to now, do you consider that the MMPR process has been successful or can more be done
- 6 to reduce the incidence of unnecessary restraints?
- 7 A. I think, well, yes, more can be done to reduce the 8 incidence of unnecessary restraint, but, focusing on the
- 9 system of restraint, again, in the same way, is a little
- 10 bit of a red herring here. The -- it's the behaviour
- management that reduces the need for restraint in 11
- 12 many -- in children's institutions, the overwhelming
- 13 majority of restraints are in response to violent
- 14 incidents or incidents of self-harm, and what you need
- 15 to achieve in terms -- in order to minimise unnecessary restraint, is to have staff that are able and capable to 16
- 17 defuse situations before they get to the point where
- 18 restraint needs to be used and that's how you minimise
- 19

25

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 20 Then you can get into a discussion about whether 21 this technique or that technique is suitable, but,
- 22 actually, the bigger and more meaningful discussion is
- 23 about what happens before restraint when you're managing 24 a dispute on a residential unit.
 - Q. Strip or full searching so removing the clothes of

Page 21

something is being done about it, they're protected from

Q. And that primary role of care, is that currently the case in YOIs or STCs or should changes be made?

further harm by that very same officer.

- A. I think there should be changes made to focus on that, but that's not to say there are not officers that see that as their role, that's not to say that there aren't managers that see that as an aspiration. I think there are structural difficulties, one of them being the high number of -- the high amount of churn we have seen recently in the workforce in these institutions and the other is the very difficult environment. It's easy for me to sit here in this room and say that prison officers and their private sector equivalents should be caring for children, but actually, if you come on to shift and you're -- and you are having to challenge some very difficult behaviour straight from the start, all week, I think you would need some support and some real guidance to explain what care means in that setting and
- Q. Moving on to the use of force and restraint on children. The Chief Inspector of Prisons produced a report in November 2015 which is at INQ001441 -- we don't need to turn this up -- reviewing the early implementation of the MMPR, the minimising the management and physical

I think that that's missing and that's where the

management of those staff and that supervisory

relationship comes in.

Page 22

Page 23

- 1 a child and then searching him or her, we understand 2 that there is a process whereby a form should be
- 3 completed which describes the reason for the search and
- 4 that the appropriate authorisation has been achieved for
 - it. Firstly, is there evidence that those forms are
- 6 always properly completed or in some cases are those not 7
 - properly completed?
 - A. In some cases they will not be properly completed. Again, I couldn't give you a magnitude at this time.
 - Q. Just a couple of references. I have noted that in a recent Medway report in 2018 at paragraph 10 and also in the Rainsbrook 2016 report, which is INQ001571, at paragraph 94, there was some comments that the forms weren't being completed properly.

A second question about strip searching: we heard that it was hoped that if there were safeguarding concerns about the child -- for example, had been abused in the past -- then those would come in through the ASSETPlus assessment and would be filtered into the decision as to whether strip searching would occur in an individual case.

Do you have any comments on whether that aspiration works in practice?

A. I think that that is an aspiration that in many of these institutions is unrealistic. I think that the -- that

Page 24

6 (Pages 21 to 24)

| 1 | that information will filter into the institution, but, | 1 | A. Yes. |
|---|--|---|--|
| 2 | in their current format, those searches will be | 2 | Q. In 2017, overall in STCs, are these the figures: no one, |
| 3 | authorised on a fairly dynamic basis. So it's not | 3 | 21 per cent; staff on the unit, 41 per cent; family, |
| 4 | people don't meet up in a room before the decision is | 4 | 43 per cent. |
| 5 | made to authorise a strip search; it's often at the end | 5 | Just pausing there, were family the individuals who |
| 6 | of a restraint. It's often because there is | 6 | children were most likely to want to turn to if they had |
| 7 | an intelligence around a weapon or some other | 7 | a problem? |
| 8 | unauthorised article and that then the risk | 8 | A. In 2016/17, family is the most yes. |
| 9 | assessment is done and authorised on that basis. | 9 | Q. Okay, with staff second? |
| 10 | I think if you think of an institution just | 10 | A. Yes. |
| 11 | picking one like Cookham Wood, where you've got 160 or | 11 | Q. Then you list a number of others, teachers, key worker, |
| 12 | 170 children, many of whom would have had prior | 12 | case worker and, at the bottom, advocates, is that |
| 13 | experience of abuse, for that individual member of staff | 13 | right, at 9 per cent? |
| 14 | to know that individual child at that point, when they | 14 | A. Yes. |
| 15 | have got hold of them in many respects and to and to | 15 | Q. The remainder of the position about you ask a number |
| 16 | write that down and note that or consider that in a risk | 16 | of questions there, for example, "Are complaints dealt |
| 17 | assessment I think is a difficult position to put in. | 17 | with fairly?", which is over the page, 54 per cent of |
| 18 | There are other searches that are authorised where | 18 | respondents said yes. Over the page again: |
| 19 | you would expect that to be completed and that all to | 19 | "Have you ever felt unsafe here?" |
| 20 | fit, but I don't I'm not sure if that is, as I say, | 20 | 22 per cent of respondents said yes. And then over |
| 21 | a in the current form of these institutions, I'm not | 21 | the page, 8.10: |
| 22 | sure how you would always guarantee that that would | 22 | "If you were being bullied or picked on would you |
| 23 | happen. | 23 | tell a member of staff?" |
| 24 | Q. Thank you. Moving on to the question of whether there | 24 | 61 per cent. |
| 25 | are barriers to disclosure of sexual abuse, so factors | 25 | A. Yes. |
| | , | | |
| | Page 25 | | Page 27 |
| | | | |
| 1 | that might discourage a child from disclosing abuse, | 1 | Q. Because of the time, I will just skip over to the |
| 2 | Mr Lomas says at paragraph 12 of his statement: | 2 | picture in the YOIs before asking you the question, |
| 3 | "In order for children to have confidence in | 3 | please. In YOIs, I'd like to look at the survey |
| 4 | reporting something as significant as sexual abuse, they | | 1 7707 1 11 1 701 |
| 5 | 1. 1 61 1 | 4 | responses by YOI and overall, please. There, to |
| _ | need to have confidence that staff will take their | 5 | respondents in YOIs, you ask a slightly different |
| 6 | allegations seriously." | 5 6 | respondents in YOIs, you ask a slightly different question. You ask: |
| 7 | allegations seriously." I would like you to help the panel, please, with | 5 6 7 | respondents in YOIs, you ask a slightly different question. You ask: "Can you speak to a chaplain of your faith in |
| 7 8 | allegations seriously." I would like you to help the panel, please, with just looking through the recent statistics as to whether | 5 6 7 8 | respondents in YOIs, you ask a slightly different question. You ask: "Can you speak to a chaplain of your faith in private, a peer mentor, a member of the IMB or |
| 7 8 9 | allegations seriously." I would like you to help the panel, please, with just looking through the recent statistics as to whether children do have confidence in that. | 5 6 7 8 9 | respondents in YOIs, you ask a slightly different question. You ask: "Can you speak to a chaplain of your faith in private, a peer mentor, a member of the IMB or an advocate?" |
| 7 8 9 10 | allegations seriously." I would like you to help the panel, please, with just looking through the recent statistics as to whether children do have confidence in that. Could we turn up, please, INQ001200. | 5 6 7 8 9 10 | respondents in YOIs, you ask a slightly different question. You ask: "Can you speak to a chaplain of your faith in private, a peer mentor, a member of the IMB or an advocate?" Just pausing there, is there a reason why that |
| 7 8 9 10 11 | allegations seriously." I would like you to help the panel, please, with just looking through the recent statistics as to whether children do have confidence in that. Could we turn up, please, INQ001200. The computers seem to have stopped working. | 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | respondents in YOIs, you ask a slightly different question. You ask: "Can you speak to a chaplain of your faith in private, a peer mentor, a member of the IMB or an advocate?" Just pausing there, is there a reason why that question in STCs which lists a number of different staff |
| 7 8 9 10 11 12 | allegations seriously." I would like you to help the panel, please, with just looking through the recent statistics as to whether children do have confidence in that. Could we turn up, please, INQ001200. The computers seem to have stopped working. The file is not in there, okay. 1200. Can we try | 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | respondents in YOIs, you ask a slightly different question. You ask: "Can you speak to a chaplain of your faith in private, a peer mentor, a member of the IMB or an advocate?" Just pausing there, is there a reason why that question in STCs which lists a number of different staff is asked for STCs but not in YOIs? |
| 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | allegations seriously." I would like you to help the panel, please, with just looking through the recent statistics as to whether children do have confidence in that. Could we turn up, please, INQ001200. The computers seem to have stopped working. The file is not in there, okay. 1200. Can we try the number again just in case, it's INQ001200. | 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | respondents in YOIs, you ask a slightly different question. You ask: "Can you speak to a chaplain of your faith in private, a peer mentor, a member of the IMB or an advocate?" Just pausing there, is there a reason why that question in STCs which lists a number of different staff is asked for STCs but not in YOIs? A. Yes, although not a particularly good one. The two |
| 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | allegations seriously." I would like you to help the panel, please, with just looking through the recent statistics as to whether children do have confidence in that. Could we turn up, please, INQ001200. The computers seem to have stopped working. The file is not in there, okay. 1200. Can we try the number again just in case, it's INQ001200. No, okay. We will try and resolve that and come | 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | respondents in YOIs, you ask a slightly different question. You ask: "Can you speak to a chaplain of your faith in private, a peer mentor, a member of the IMB or an advocate?" Just pausing there, is there a reason why that question in STCs which lists a number of different staff is asked for STCs but not in YOIs? A. Yes, although not a particularly good one. The two surveys were designed at different times and for |
| 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | allegations seriously." I would like you to help the panel, please, with just looking through the recent statistics as to whether children do have confidence in that. Could we turn up, please, INQ001200. The computers seem to have stopped working. The file is not in there, okay. 1200. Can we try the number again just in case, it's INQ001200. No, okay. We will try and resolve that and come back to that issue later. | 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | respondents in YOIs, you ask a slightly different question. You ask: "Can you speak to a chaplain of your faith in private, a peer mentor, a member of the IMB or an advocate?" Just pausing there, is there a reason why that question in STCs which lists a number of different staff is asked for STCs but not in YOIs? A. Yes, although not a particularly good one. The two surveys were designed at different times and for different settings at the current moment, we will |
| 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | allegations seriously." I would like you to help the panel, please, with just looking through the recent statistics as to whether children do have confidence in that. Could we turn up, please, INQ001200. The computers seem to have stopped working. The file is not in there, okay. 1200. Can we try the number again just in case, it's INQ001200. No, okay. We will try and resolve that and come back to that issue later. A. If it's helpful, I have the data in front of me. | 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | respondents in YOIs, you ask a slightly different question. You ask: "Can you speak to a chaplain of your faith in private, a peer mentor, a member of the IMB or an advocate?" Just pausing there, is there a reason why that question in STCs which lists a number of different staff is asked for STCs but not in YOIs? A. Yes, although not a particularly good one. The two surveys were designed at different times and for different settings — at the current moment, we will have a new survey combining both settings. We will be |
| 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | allegations seriously." I would like you to help the panel, please, with just looking through the recent statistics as to whether children do have confidence in that. Could we turn up, please, INQ001200. The computers seem to have stopped working. The file is not in there, okay. 1200. Can we try the number again just in case, it's INQ001200. No, okay. We will try and resolve that and come back to that issue later. A. If it's helpful, I have the data in front of me. Q. You do? Excellent. That will help. In that case | 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | respondents in YOIs, you ask a slightly different question. You ask: "Can you speak to a chaplain of your faith in private, a peer mentor, a member of the IMB or an advocate?" Just pausing there, is there a reason why that question in STCs which lists a number of different staff is asked for STCs but not in YOIs? A. Yes, although not a particularly good one. The two surveys were designed at different times and for different settings at the current moment, we will have a new survey combining both settings. We will be able to compare the responses from children in STCs and |
| 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | allegations seriously." I would like you to help the panel, please, with just looking through the recent statistics as to whether children do have confidence in that. Could we turn up, please, INQ001200. The computers seem to have stopped working. The file is not in there, okay. 1200. Can we try the number again just in case, it's INQ001200. No, okay. We will try and resolve that and come back to that issue later. A. If it's helpful, I have the data in front of me. Q. You do? Excellent. That will help. In that case I will go through with you, then. This is the | 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | respondents in YOIs, you ask a slightly different question. You ask: "Can you speak to a chaplain of your faith in private, a peer mentor, a member of the IMB or an advocate?" Just pausing there, is there a reason why that question in STCs which lists a number of different staff is asked for STCs but not in YOIs? A. Yes, although not a particularly good one. The two surveys were designed at different times and for different settings at the current moment, we will have a new survey combining both settings. We will be able to compare the responses from children in STCs and children in YOIs. Also, when we became involved in |
| 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | allegations seriously." I would like you to help the panel, please, with just looking through the recent statistics as to whether children do have confidence in that. Could we turn up, please, INQ001200. The computers seem to have stopped working. The file is not in there, okay. 1200. Can we try the number again just in case, it's INQ001200. No, okay. We will try and resolve that and come back to that issue later. A. If it's helpful, I have the data in front of me. Q. You do? Excellent. That will help. In that case I will go through with you, then. This is the appendices to the Children in Custody, 2016 to 2017, | 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | respondents in YOIs, you ask a slightly different question. You ask: "Can you speak to a chaplain of your faith in private, a peer mentor, a member of the IMB or an advocate?" Just pausing there, is there a reason why that question in STCs which lists a number of different staff is asked for STCs but not in YOIs? A. Yes, although not a particularly good one. The two surveys were designed at different times and for different settings — at the current moment, we will have a new survey combining both settings. We will be able to compare the responses from children in STCs and children in YOIs. Also, when we became involved in STCs, their population was significantly — I mean, it |
| 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | allegations seriously." I would like you to help the panel, please, with just looking through the recent statistics as to whether children do have confidence in that. Could we turn up, please, INQ001200. The computers seem to have stopped working. The file is not in there, okay. 1200. Can we try the number again just in case, it's INQ001200. No, okay. We will try and resolve that and come back to that issue later. A. If it's helpful, I have the data in front of me. Q. You do? Excellent. That will help. In that case I will go through with you, then. This is the appendices to the Children in Custody, 2016 to 2017, report, so the most recent one. Could we have a look, | 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | respondents in YOIs, you ask a slightly different question. You ask: "Can you speak to a chaplain of your faith in private, a peer mentor, a member of the IMB or an advocate?" Just pausing there, is there a reason why that question in STCs which lists a number of different staff is asked for STCs but not in YOIs? A. Yes, although not a particularly good one. The two surveys were designed at different times and for different settings — at the current moment, we will have a new survey combining both settings. We will be able to compare the responses from children in STCs and children in YOIs. Also, when we became involved in STCs, their population was significantly — I mean, it is still significantly different but less so than those |
| 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | allegations seriously." I would like you to help the panel, please, with just looking through the recent statistics as to whether children do have confidence in that. Could we turn up, please, INQ001200. The computers seem to have stopped working. The file is not in there, okay. 1200. Can we try the number again just in case, it's INQ001200. No, okay. We will try and resolve that and come back to that issue later. A. If it's helpful, I have the data in front of me. Q. You do? Excellent. That will help. In that case I will go through with you, then. This is the appendices to the Children in Custody, 2016 to 2017, report, so the most recent one. Could we have a look, please it's not sequentially page numbered, but could | 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | respondents in YOIs, you ask a slightly different question. You ask: "Can you speak to a chaplain of your faith in private, a peer mentor, a member of the IMB or an advocate?" Just pausing there, is there a reason why that question in STCs which lists a number of different staff is asked for STCs but not in YOIs? A. Yes, although not a particularly good one. The two surveys were designed at different times and for different settings at the current moment, we will have a new survey combining both settings. We will be able to compare the responses from children in STCs and children in YOIs. Also, when we became involved in STCs, their population was significantly I mean, it is still significantly different but less so than those held in YOIs and so we took out a lot of the detail, so |
| 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | allegations seriously." I would like you to help the panel, please, with just looking through the recent statistics as to whether children do have confidence in that. Could we turn up, please, INQ001200. The computers seem to have stopped working. The file is not in there, okay. 1200. Can we try the number again just in case, it's INQ001200. No, okay. We will try and resolve that and come back to that issue later. A. If it's helpful, I have the data in front of me. Q. You do? Excellent. That will help. In that case I will go through with you, then. This is the appendices to the Children in Custody, 2016 to 2017, report, so the most recent one. Could we have a look, please it's not sequentially page numbered, but could we have a look at appendix A2, so, "Survey responses | 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | respondents in YOIs, you ask a slightly different question. You ask: "Can you speak to a chaplain of your faith in private, a peer mentor, a member of the IMB or an advocate?" Just pausing there, is there a reason why that question in STCs which lists a number of different staff is asked for STCs but not in YOIs? A. Yes, although not a particularly good one. The two surveys were designed at different times and for different settings at the current moment, we will have a new survey combining both settings. We will be able to compare the responses from children in STCs and children in YOIs. Also, when we became involved in STCs, their population was significantly I mean, it is still significantly different but less so than those held in YOIs and so we took out a lot of the detail, so while that's there is more detail in that question, |
| 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | allegations seriously." I would like you to help the panel, please, with just looking through the recent statistics as to whether children do have confidence in that. Could we turn up, please, INQ001200. The computers seem to have stopped working. The file is not in there, okay. 1200. Can we try the number again just in case, it's INQ001200. No, okay. We will try and resolve that and come back to that issue later. A. If it's helpful, I have the data in front of me. Q. You do? Excellent. That will help. In that case I will go through with you, then. This is the appendices to the Children in Custody, 2016 to 2017, report, so the most recent one. Could we have a look, please it's not sequentially page numbered, but could we have a look at appendix A2, so, "Survey responses from children and young people in STCs". Do you ask the | 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | respondents in YOIs, you ask a slightly different question. You ask: "Can you speak to a chaplain of your faith in private, a peer mentor, a member of the IMB or an advocate?" Just pausing there, is there a reason why that question in STCs which lists a number of different staff is asked for STCs but not in YOIs? A. Yes, although not a particularly good one. The two surveys were designed at different times and for different settings at the current moment, we will have a new survey combining both settings. We will be able to compare the responses from children in STCs and children in YOIs. Also, when we became involved in STCs, their population was significantly I mean, it is still significantly different but less so than those held in YOIs and so we took out a lot of the detail, so while that's there is more detail in that question, as a whole, the survey is much shorter and simpler in |
| 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | allegations seriously." I would like you to help the panel, please, with just looking through the recent statistics as to whether children do have confidence in that. Could we turn up, please, INQ001200. The computers seem to have stopped working. The file is not in there, okay. 1200. Can we try the number again just in case, it's INQ001200. No, okay. We will try and resolve that and come back to that issue later. A. If it's helpful, I have the data in front of me. Q. You do? Excellent. That will help. In that case I will go through with you, then. This is the appendices to the Children in Custody, 2016 to 2017, report, so the most recent one. Could we have a look, please it's not sequentially page numbered, but could we have a look at appendix A2, so, "Survey responses from children and young people in STCs". Do you ask the question, in STCs: | 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | respondents in YOIs, you ask a slightly different question. You ask: "Can you speak to a chaplain of your faith in private, a peer mentor, a member of the IMB or an advocate?" Just pausing there, is there a reason why that question in STCs which lists a number of different staff is asked for STCs but not in YOIs? A. Yes, although not a particularly good one. The two surveys were designed at different times and for different settings at the current moment, we will have a new survey combining both settings. We will be able to compare the responses from children in STCs and children in YOIs. Also, when we became involved in STCs, their population was significantly I mean, it is still significantly different but less so than those held in YOIs and so we took out a lot of the detail, so while that's there is more detail in that question, as a whole, the survey is much shorter and simpler in STCs than it is in YOIs. |
| 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | allegations seriously." I would like you to help the panel, please, with just looking through the recent statistics as to whether children do have confidence in that. Could we turn up, please, INQ001200. The computers seem to have stopped working. The file is not in there, okay. 1200. Can we try the number again just in case, it's INQ001200. No, okay. We will try and resolve that and come back to that issue later. A. If it's helpful, I have the data in front of me. Q. You do? Excellent. That will help. In that case I will go through with you, then. This is the appendices to the Children in Custody, 2016 to 2017, report, so the most recent one. Could we have a look, please it's not sequentially page numbered, but could we have a look at appendix A2, so, "Survey responses from children and young people in STCs". Do you ask the | 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | respondents in YOIs, you ask a slightly different question. You ask: "Can you speak to a chaplain of your faith in private, a peer mentor, a member of the IMB or an advocate?" Just pausing there, is there a reason why that question in STCs which lists a number of different staff is asked for STCs but not in YOIs? A. Yes, although not a particularly good one. The two surveys were designed at different times and for different settings at the current moment, we will have a new survey combining both settings. We will be able to compare the responses from children in STCs and children in YOIs. Also, when we became involved in STCs, their population was significantly I mean, it is still significantly different but less so than those held in YOIs and so we took out a lot of the detail, so while that's there is more detail in that question, as a whole, the survey is much shorter and simpler in |
| 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | allegations seriously." I would like you to help the panel, please, with just looking through the recent statistics as to whether children do have confidence in that. Could we turn up, please, INQ001200. The computers seem to have stopped working. The file is not in there, okay. 1200. Can we try the number again just in case, it's INQ001200. No, okay. We will try and resolve that and come back to that issue later. A. If it's helpful, I have the data in front of me. Q. You do? Excellent. That will help. In that case I will go through with you, then. This is the appendices to the Children in Custody, 2016 to 2017, report, so the most recent one. Could we have a look, please it's not sequentially page numbered, but could we have a look at appendix A2, so, "Survey responses from children and young people in STCs". Do you ask the question, in STCs: | 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | respondents in YOIs, you ask a slightly different question. You ask: "Can you speak to a chaplain of your faith in private, a peer mentor, a member of the IMB or an advocate?" Just pausing there, is there a reason why that question in STCs which lists a number of different staff is asked for STCs but not in YOIs? A. Yes, although not a particularly good one. The two surveys were designed at different times and for different settings at the current moment, we will have a new survey combining both settings. We will be able to compare the responses from children in STCs and children in YOIs. Also, when we became involved in STCs, their population was significantly I mean, it is still significantly different but less so than those held in YOIs and so we took out a lot of the detail, so while that's there is more detail in that question, as a whole, the survey is much shorter and simpler in STCs than it is in YOIs. |

| 1 | be somewhere in between the two. | 1 | survey. The system works differently in STCs. The |
|----|--|----|---|
| 2 | Q. Okay, but you're reviewing and rationalising? | 2 | you know, people get on their emergency cell bell for |
| 3 | A. Basically, yes. | 3 | a number of different reasons, but, you know, often |
| 4 | Q. Okay, so moving on: | 4 | they're asking for things like toilet rolls or minor |
| 5 | "If you had a problem, would you have no one to turn | 5 | things. It's an emergency cell bell; they're not really |
| 6 | to?" | 6 | meant to be asking for toilet rolls when they're |
| 7 | 23 per cent said yes. Then you go on: | 7 | pressing it. But, as I say, if you're living in |
| 8 | "Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?" | 8 | an institution that cannot guarantee those basics of |
| 9 | 26 per cent said yes: | 9 | everyday life, I'm not sure you would have the |
| 10 | "Do you feel complaints are sorted out quickly?" | 10 | confidence to do something. |
| 11 | Only 21 per cent said yes: | 11 | If I say that you have assaulted me in a YOI, I'm |
| 12 | "Have you ever felt unsafe here?" | 12 | putting myself at risk and someone else has to protect |
| 13 | 39 per cent said yes. Then over at 9.10: | 13 | me. And I need to trust that they're going to protect |
| 14 | "If you were victimised, would you tell a member of | 14 | me and they're going to be able to keep you away from |
| 15 | staff?" | 15 | me. |
| 16 | 28 per cent said yes: | 16 | Q. Mr Lomas, in his witness statement at paragraph 14, |
| 17 | "Do you think staff would take it seriously if you | 17 | indicates family or friends positive relationships |
| 18 | told them you had been victimised?" | 18 | with family or friends is a protective factor. |
| 19 | Only 27 per cent said yes. | 19 | Over the page in your survey, you ask some questions |
| 20 | Can you help broadly in that, why is the picture in | 20 | about family and friends, 12.1: |
| 21 | YOIs so bad? | 21 | "Are you able to use the telephone every day?", and |
| 22 | A. The picture in YOIs is so bad for those reasons that | 22 | 68 per cent of respondents said yes. |
| 23 | I have told you earlier on. I mean, these are | 23 | 12.3: |
| 24 | institutions where they there are well, until very | 24 | "Do you usually have one or more visits per week |
| 25 | recently, there has been an inconsistent staffing | 25 | with family and friends?" |
| | Ų. | | |
| | Page 29 | | Page 31 |
| 1 | picture. There has been an inconsistent regime in many | 1 | And only 34 per cent of respondents in YOIs said |
| 2 | of these institutions, so you don't know what is | 2 | yes. |
| 3 | happening from day to day, and the approach to behaviour | 3 | 12.4: |
| 4 | management hasn't been sophisticated enough to | 4 | "Is it easy, or very easy, for your family and |
| 5 | incentivise people to behave. So when children come | 5 | friends to visit you here?" |
| 6 | out, they're coming out to fairly chaotic environments | 6 | And, again, only 32 per cent of children said yes. |
| 7 | where I mean, I don't want the violence is | 7 | In terms of telephones, are telephones always in |
| 8 | an everyday feature. It's unusual in an YOI to not have | 8 | private or in some YOIs are they in positions where |
| 9 | an alarm bell going at that day or on a particular day, | 9 | they the child may be overheard when talking to their |
| 10 | requiring a staff response. | 10 | family and friends? |
| 11 | Now, if you see all of that going on, the | 11 | A. Yes, sorry, to answer the question, they're not always |
| 12 | institution is meant to prevent all of that happening to | 12 | in private in YOIs and they are sometimes in places that |
| 13 | you, it's meant to prevent it's meant to ensure that | 13 | they could be overheard. It just depends on how close |
| 14 | you get up at a time, that you go to school at a time, | 14 | people are standing to you whilst you're on the |
| 15 | that you have your lunch at a time, that you are out of | 15 | telephone. |
| 16 | your cell consistently for this amount of time and that | 16 | Q. In the Feltham report in 2017, INQ001205, you I think |
| 17 | you don't experience violence. | 17 | the inspector notes that the telephones are held in |
| 18 | Now, if you see, every day, those things happening, | 18 | corridors; is that right? So there may be children |
| 19 | you're not going to trust the institution to respond | 19 | walking past or members of staff as they're talking to |
| 20 | very well to your problem, when you see it. If you see | 20 | their family. And is it also correct that telephone |
| 21 | that the institution is responsible for stopping this | 21 | calls with family are not necessarily confidential, so |
| 22 | stuff and can't stop this stuff, then you are going to | 22 | a member of staff might be listening |
| 23 | have a lack of faith when you raise the issue yourself. | 23 | A. Yes. |
| 24 | The other thing to say is you will also notice there | 24 | Q to that? And visits also, is it right family visits |
| 25 | is a question about cell bell response times in the YOI | 25 | tend to be in a big hall so not confidential? |
| | , | " | |
| | Page 30 | | Page 32 |
| | | | |

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

| Day 6 | IICSA Inquiry Children in Cus | stodial | Institutions Investigation 16 Jul |
|-------|---|---------|---|
| 1 | A. Mm-hmm. | 1 | from their perspective, that makes little difference to |
| 2 | Q. And may or if a child wants to write a letter to | 2 | them, whether it's a the establishment is much |
| 3 | their family, again, it may be read by a member of | 3 | larger. |
| 4 | staff? | 4 | Q. Whistleblowing, Mr Lomas says at paragraph 15 there is |
| 5 | A. Just to put some context on that figure of 32 per cent | 5 | evidence to suggest that staff in custodial institutions |
| 6 | family visits, or approximately 32 per cent find it | 6 | holding children rarely blow the whistle on poor |
| 7 | easy, you have to put this into context. Many of these | 7 | practice and abuse carried out by colleagues. |
| 8 | children have come in with prior care experience, and so | 8 | Is that your understanding of the position? |
| 9 | there will be very good reasons why their family find it | 9 | A. Yes, I think we do see examples where staff do blow |
| 10 | very difficult to visit them while they're in custody | 10 | whistle on poor practice, but we they are they're |
| 11 | and, if you look at the annex, you will find | 11 | not as many as you would like. Again, I don't think |
| 12 | a looked-after children comparator and you will see | 12 | this is a problem limited to the custodial estate. |
| 13 | a real stark difference between those questions on | 13 | I think we have seen similar in across all |
| 14 | family between those people who have a prior care | 14 | professions, I think people are reluctant in the same |
| 15 | experience and those people that were, for want of | 15 | way as we ask that question, "Would you tell a memb |
| 16 | a better word, living at home before they came into | 16 | staff?" or "Would you think your complaint would be |
| 17 | custody. | 17 | taken seriously?", I would suggest that many people |
| 18 | Q. And Mr Lomas in his statement makes a recommendation | 18 | working for a range of different settings would say, |
| 19 | that children should be held closer to the communities | 19 | "I'm not quite sure I trust that whistleblowing hotline |
| 20 | in which they live to facilitate those relationships? | 20 | or the ability of this institution to protect me if |
| 21 | A. Yes. | 21 | I put my head above the parapet". |
| 22 | Q. And a similar one, custodial institutions holding | 22 | Q. Okay, I'm sorry, we're rather rushing through all the |
| 23 | children should be smaller to facilitate positive | 23 | issues because we have very limited time. So I will |
| 24 | relationships between staff and children. | 24 | move on to the response. In the Medway in one of the |
| 25 | A. Yes. | 25 | Medway reports, which is, let me just get the year, the |
| | Page 33 | | Page 35 |
| 1 | Q. What do you think do you support that? | 1 | 2016 report, there were concerns and the reference is |
| 2 | A. Yes. I think the two things are linked, so you hold | 2 | INQ001479, but no need to turn it up and concerns |
| 3 | well, we hold 900 children in custody, give or take, and | 3 | were raised that child protection matters were not |
| 4 | we did a thematic inspection on the impact of distance | 4 | managed effectively and young people were not |
| 5 | from home and we found that you received broadly | 5 | sufficiently safeguarded and it drew attention to |
| 6 | speaking, one view is that for every 25 miles you were | 6 | a number of specific concerns about the responses to |
| 7 | held further from home, and that was visits by both | 7 | child protection referrals. |
| 8 | family members and professionals, so in terms of that | 8 | Is that only Medway or are there concerns in some |
| 9 | external relationship and your ability to maintain it | 9 | other places? |
| 10 | and your ability to have contact if you did want to make | 10 | A. There are concerns in some other places at differen |
| 11 | a complaint or tell someone that something had happened | 11 | points in time, so that's a relatively dated assessmen |
| 12 | to you, the distance absolutely matters and if you | 12 | of Medway, as we stand today. I think there have b |
| 13 | simply do the the maths on how you construct | 13 | two subsequent inspections of Medway and I think |
| 14 | an estate with 900 children in it, you would have to | 14 | safeguarding has been assessed as marginally impro |
| | | | |

ther it's a -- the establishment is much owing, Mr Lomas says at paragraph 15 there is suggest that staff in custodial institutions ldren rarely blow the whistle on poor d abuse carried out by colleagues. our understanding of the position? nk we do see examples where staff do blow the poor practice, but we -- they are -- they're y as you would like. Again, I don't think oblem limited to the custodial estate. have seen similar in -- across all s, I think people are reluctant -- in the same ask that question, "Would you tell a member of "Would you think your complaint would be ously?", I would suggest that many people or a range of different settings would say, uite sure I trust that whistleblowing hotline ity of this institution to protect me if ead above the parapet". sorry, we're rather rushing through all the use we have very limited time. So I will the response. In the Medway -- in one of the ports, which is, let me just get the year, the Page 35 t, there were concerns -- and the reference is 9, but no need to turn it up -- and concerns d that child protection matters were not ffectively and young people were not y safeguarded and it drew attention to of specific concerns about the responses to ction referrals. nly Medway or are there concerns in some e concerns in some other places at different ime, so that's a relatively dated assessment y, as we stand today. I think there have been quent inspections of Medway and I think their ding has been assessed as marginally improved from that report. However, those sorts -- I think that report says that there were five delayed referrals and one of which the local authority didn't have a record of. The one about the local authority not having a report of is unusual. We rarely find that. We do find delays, so the general problem with referrals to local authorities is the timeliness, making sure all of the information goes with the referral and, to be frank, then chasing up the local authority to make sure that the local authority is investigating in a timely

9 (Pages 33 to 36)

have those -- to enable them -- people to be held

to have a greater number of smaller institutions.

The smaller institutions is more about smaller

so in theory, you could have a very large institution

living units and personal relationships on those units,

that was broken up into lots of small living units, that

sort of mimics a smaller unit, but that's a point that

a size from the perspective of the child, so if they are

Page 34

living on a smaller part of an establishment, I suppose,

we're driving at there in terms of the size. It's

anywhere near where they're coming from, you would need

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

| 1 | fashion. But that's not an unusual those sort of | 1 | February 2016. There is a guide for inspectors as well |
|--|--|--|---|
| 2 | five that were out of time, and all there were delays | 2 | from January 2018, a safeguarding policy. The |
| 3 | with, it's not unusual for us to find that in other | 3 | references are HIP00008, then 9, 10 and 11. Does the |
| 4 | institutions. | 4 | inspection regime apply equally to STCs and YOIs? |
| 5 | Q. Moving on to the inspector's powers, in the 2018 annual | 5 | A. The inspection regime? |
| 6 | report, which is HIP000022 at page 63, it records, so | 6 | Q. Yes. |
| 7 | far as safety is concerned, 34 per cent of previous | 7 | A. The inspection regime is different in all three sectors, |
| 8 | recommendations were achieved, 15 per cent partially | 8 | so the STC inspection regime happens annually, as does |
| 9 | achieved but more than half, 51 per cent, were not | 9 | the YOI inspection, but the frameworks are different, so |
| 10 | achieved. | 10 | the YOI inspection framework has four tests: safety; |
| 11 | Has a similar picture been in place over the last | 11 | respect; purposeful activity; and resettlement. The STC |
| 12 | few years? | 12 | inspection regime has more tests which include safety, |
| 13 | A. I think there has been a decline in the system. Those | 13 | behaviour management, care, healthcare, resettlement |
| 14 | figures are a response to all inspections across all | 14 | achievement, leadership and management and overall |
| 15 | sectors. The there has been a decline in the number | 15 | effectiveness, so there are significant differences in |
| 16 | of recommendations that have been achieved from the | 16 | the structure of the report. In reality, we looked at |
| 17 | previous inspection in general, so it's been getting | 17 | very, very similar things, particularly in regard to |
| 18 | worse. | 18 | safety, but the make-up of teams is different. While we |
| 19 | Q. Okay. And at INQ001580 there was a press release from | 19 | have Ofsted, CQC and ourselves on both inspections, we |
| 20 | Peter Clarke, the Chief Inspector of Prisons, dated | 20 | lead in YOIs, Ofsted lead in STCs, Ofsted have the bulk |
| 21 | 16 February 2018, in which he was discussing concerns | 21 | of the inspection team in STCs, whereas the reverse is |
| 22 | about Liverpool Prison, an adult prison, and the | 22 | true in YOIs, and the as I say, we don't some of |
| 23 | Justice Select Committee's response to it, but in that | 23 | those tests you will notice are completely absent from |
| 24 | context, he made this comment, that he would welcome the | 24 | YOIs while they're involved in the other one, and we |
| 25 | Select Committee's recommendation that independent | 25 | certainly don't have that overarching judgment in the |
| 23 | Select Committee's recommendation that independent | 23 | certainly don't have that over arching judgment in the |
| | Page 37 | | Page 39 |
| | | | |
| 1 | scrutiny needs to be injected into monitoring the | 1 | VOI sector |
| 1 2 | scrutiny needs to be injected into monitoring the | 1 2 | YOI sector. So in regards to frequency was it's the same but |
| 2 | implementation of inspection reports, and he said: | 2 | So in regards to frequency, yes, it's the same, but |
| 2 3 | implementation of inspection reports, and he said: "It is crucial that progress in implementing HMP | 2 3 | So in regards to frequency, yes, it's the same, but in terms of what that looks like on the ground, there |
| 2 3 4 | implementation of inspection reports, and he said: "It is crucial that progress in implementing HMP recommendations is transparent and independently | 2 3 4 | So in regards to frequency, yes, it's the same, but in terms of what that looks like on the ground, there are real differences. |
| 2 3 4 5 | implementation of inspection reports, and he said: "It is crucial that progress in implementing HMP recommendations is transparent and independently verifiable. The abject failure of too many prisons to | 2 3 4 5 | So in regards to frequency, yes, it's the same, but in terms of what that looks like on the ground, there are real differences. Q. Mr Lomas, at paragraph 26, said: |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | implementation of inspection reports, and he said: "It is crucial that progress in implementing HMP recommendations is transparent and independently verifiable. The abject failure of too many prisons to take inspection reports seriously must stop." | 2 3 4 5 6 | So in regards to frequency, yes, it's the same, but in terms of what that looks like on the ground, there are real differences. Q. Mr Lomas, at paragraph 26, said: "There should be one inspection regime for the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | implementation of inspection reports, and he said: "It is crucial that progress in implementing HMP recommendations is transparent and independently verifiable. The abject failure of too many prisons to take inspection reports seriously must stop." Do you support a sort of mechanism of that form | 2 3 4 5 6 7 | So in regards to frequency, yes, it's the same, but in terms of what that looks like on the ground, there are real differences. Q. Mr Lomas, at paragraph 26, said: "There should be one inspection regime for the sector, YOIs, STCs and SCHs, that continues to give |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | implementation of inspection reports, and he said: "It is crucial that progress in implementing HMP recommendations is transparent and independently verifiable. The abject failure of too many prisons to take inspection reports seriously must stop." Do you support a sort of mechanism of that form where there is some form of independent scrutiny of | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | So in regards to frequency, yes, it's the same, but in terms of what that looks like on the ground, there are real differences. Q. Mr Lomas, at paragraph 26, said: "There should be one inspection regime for the sector, YOIs, STCs and SCHs, that continues to give significant weight to safeguarding and child |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | implementation of inspection reports, and he said: "It is crucial that progress in implementing HMP recommendations is transparent and independently verifiable. The abject failure of too many prisons to take inspection reports seriously must stop." Do you support a sort of mechanism of that form where there is some form of independent scrutiny of recommendations? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | So in regards to frequency, yes, it's the same, but in terms of what that looks like on the ground, there are real differences. Q. Mr Lomas, at paragraph 26, said: "There should be one inspection regime for the sector, YOIs, STCs and SCHs, that continues to give significant weight to safeguarding and child protection." |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | implementation of inspection reports, and he said: "It is crucial that progress in implementing HMP recommendations is transparent and independently verifiable. The abject failure of too many prisons to take inspection reports seriously must stop." Do you support a sort of mechanism of that form where there is some form of independent scrutiny of recommendations? A. Yes, absolutely. We regularly find that the | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | So in regards to frequency, yes, it's the same, but in terms of what that looks like on the ground, there are real differences. Q. Mr Lomas, at paragraph 26, said: "There should be one inspection regime for the sector, YOIs, STCs and SCHs, that continues to give significant weight to safeguarding and child protection." Would you support that? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | implementation of inspection reports, and he said: "It is crucial that progress in implementing HMP recommendations is transparent and independently verifiable. The abject failure of too many prisons to take inspection reports seriously must stop." Do you support a sort of mechanism of that form where there is some form of independent scrutiny of recommendations? A. Yes, absolutely. We regularly find that the institution's own assessment of where they are and how | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | So in regards to frequency, yes, it's the same, but in terms of what that looks like on the ground, there are real differences. Q. Mr Lomas, at paragraph 26, said: "There should be one inspection regime for the sector, YOIs, STCs and SCHs, that continues to give significant weight to safeguarding and child protection." Would you support that? A. Yes, I don't think there is any good reason why we |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | implementation of inspection reports, and he said: "It is crucial that progress in implementing HMP recommendations is transparent and independently verifiable. The abject failure of too many prisons to take inspection reports seriously must stop." Do you support a sort of mechanism of that form where there is some form of independent scrutiny of recommendations? A. Yes, absolutely. We regularly find that the institution's own assessment of where they are and how many recommendations they have achieved is optimistic | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | So in regards to frequency, yes, it's the same, but in terms of what that looks like on the ground, there are real differences. Q. Mr Lomas, at paragraph 26, said: "There should be one inspection regime for the sector, YOIs, STCs and SCHs, that continues to give significant weight to safeguarding and child protection." Would you support that? A. Yes, I don't think there is any good reason why we inspect these three sectors differently. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | implementation of inspection reports, and he said: "It is crucial that progress in implementing HMP recommendations is transparent and independently verifiable. The abject failure of too many prisons to take inspection reports seriously must stop." Do you support a sort of mechanism of that form where there is some form of independent scrutiny of recommendations? A. Yes, absolutely. We regularly find that the institution's own assessment of where they are and how many recommendations they have achieved is optimistic and of a different order to what we — they make the | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | So in regards to frequency, yes, it's the same, but in terms of what that looks like on the ground, there are real differences. Q. Mr Lomas, at paragraph 26, said: "There should be one inspection regime for the sector, YOIs, STCs and SCHs, that continues to give significant weight to safeguarding and child protection." Would you support that? A. Yes, I don't think there is any good reason why we inspect these three sectors differently. Q. The Chief Inspector has also said in public that, in |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | implementation of inspection reports, and he said: "It is crucial that progress in implementing HMP recommendations is transparent and independently verifiable. The abject failure of too many prisons to take inspection reports seriously must stop." Do you support a sort of mechanism of that form where there is some form of independent scrutiny of recommendations? A. Yes, absolutely. We regularly find that the institution's own assessment of where they are and how many recommendations they have achieved is optimistic and of a different order to what we — they make the assessment of when we follow up those recommendations. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | So in regards to frequency, yes, it's the same, but in terms of what that looks like on the ground, there are real differences. Q. Mr Lomas, at paragraph 26, said: "There should be one inspection regime for the sector, YOIs, STCs and SCHs, that continues to give significant weight to safeguarding and child protection." Would you support that? A. Yes, I don't think there is any good reason why we inspect these three sectors differently. Q. The Chief Inspector has also said in public that, in fact, in his most recent annual report that the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | implementation of inspection reports, and he said: "It is crucial that progress in implementing HMP recommendations is transparent and independently verifiable. The abject failure of too many prisons to take inspection reports seriously must stop." Do you support a sort of mechanism of that form where there is some form of independent scrutiny of recommendations? A. Yes, absolutely. We regularly find that the institution's own assessment of where they are and how many recommendations they have achieved is optimistic and of a different order to what we — they make the assessment of when we follow up those recommendations. So it would make sense that if we are making these | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | So in regards to frequency, yes, it's the same, but in terms of what that looks like on the ground, there are real differences. Q. Mr Lomas, at paragraph 26, said: "There should be one inspection regime for the sector, YOIs, STCs and SCHs, that continues to give significant weight to safeguarding and child protection." Would you support that? A. Yes, I don't think there is any good reason why we inspect these three sectors differently. Q. The Chief Inspector has also said in public that, in fact, in his most recent annual report that the inspection regime ought to be have a statutory |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | implementation of inspection reports, and he said: "It is crucial that progress in implementing HMP recommendations is transparent and independently verifiable. The abject failure of too many prisons to take inspection reports seriously must stop." Do you support a sort of mechanism of that form where there is some form of independent scrutiny of recommendations? A. Yes, absolutely. We regularly find that the institution's own assessment of where they are and how many recommendations they have achieved is optimistic and of a different order to what we — they make the assessment of when we follow up those recommendations. So it would make sense that if we are making these recommendations, then, in those establishments that are | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | So in regards to frequency, yes, it's the same, but in terms of what that looks like on the ground, there are real differences. Q. Mr Lomas, at paragraph 26, said: "There should be one inspection regime for the sector, YOIs, STCs and SCHs, that continues to give significant weight to safeguarding and child protection." Would you support that? A. Yes, I don't think there is any good reason why we inspect these three sectors differently. Q. The Chief Inspector has also said in public that, in fact, in his most recent annual report that the inspection regime ought to be — have a statutory footing. Do you support that and, if so, why is that |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | implementation of inspection reports, and he said: "It is crucial that progress in implementing HMP recommendations is transparent and independently verifiable. The abject failure of too many prisons to take inspection reports seriously must stop." Do you support a sort of mechanism of that form where there is some form of independent scrutiny of recommendations? A. Yes, absolutely. We regularly find that the institution's own assessment of where they are and how many recommendations they have achieved is optimistic and of a different order to what we — they make the assessment of when we follow up those recommendations. So it would make sense that if we are making these recommendations, then, in those establishments that are struggling, that we — there is some mechanism where we | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | So in regards to frequency, yes, it's the same, but in terms of what that looks like on the ground, there are real differences. Q. Mr Lomas, at paragraph 26, said: "There should be one inspection regime for the sector, YOIs, STCs and SCHs, that continues to give significant weight to safeguarding and child protection." Would you support that? A. Yes, I don't think there is any good reason why we inspect these three sectors differently. Q. The Chief Inspector has also said in public that, in fact, in his most recent annual report that the inspection regime ought to be — have a statutory footing. Do you support that and, if so, why is that important? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | implementation of inspection reports, and he said: "It is crucial that progress in implementing HMP recommendations is transparent and independently verifiable. The abject failure of too many prisons to take inspection reports seriously must stop." Do you support a sort of mechanism of that form where there is some form of independent scrutiny of recommendations? A. Yes, absolutely. We regularly find that the institution's own assessment of where they are and how many recommendations they have achieved is optimistic and of a different order to what we — they make the assessment of when we follow up those recommendations. So it would make sense that if we are making these recommendations, then, in those establishments that are struggling, that we — there is some mechanism where we would be able to go and check that those recommendations | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | So in regards to frequency, yes, it's the same, but in terms of what that looks like on the ground, there are real differences. Q. Mr Lomas, at paragraph 26, said: "There should be one inspection regime for the sector, YOIs, STCs and SCHs, that continues to give significant weight to safeguarding and child protection." Would you support that? A. Yes, I don't think there is any good reason why we inspect these three sectors differently. Q. The Chief Inspector has also said in public that, in fact, in his most recent annual report that the inspection regime ought to be have a statutory footing. Do you support that and, if so, why is that important? A. Yes, I do support that. I think there was a Prisons and |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | implementation of inspection reports, and he said: "It is crucial that progress in implementing HMP recommendations is transparent and independently verifiable. The abject failure of too many prisons to take inspection reports seriously must stop." Do you support a sort of mechanism of that form where there is some form of independent scrutiny of recommendations? A. Yes, absolutely. We regularly find that the institution's own assessment of where they are and how many recommendations they have achieved is optimistic and of a different order to what we — they make the assessment of when we follow up those recommendations. So it would make sense that if we are making these recommendations, then, in those establishments that are struggling, that we — there is some mechanism where we would be able to go and check that those recommendations are being implemented appropriately, both in terms of | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | So in regards to frequency, yes, it's the same, but in terms of what that looks like on the ground, there are real differences. Q. Mr Lomas, at paragraph 26, said: "There should be one inspection regime for the sector, YOIs, STCs and SCHs, that continues to give significant weight to safeguarding and child protection." Would you support that? A. Yes, I don't think there is any good reason why we inspect these three sectors differently. Q. The Chief Inspector has also said in public that, in fact, in his most recent annual report that the inspection regime ought to be — have a statutory footing. Do you support that and, if so, why is that important? A. Yes, I do support that. I think there was a Prisons and Courts Bill that got lost in the mists of time that |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | implementation of inspection reports, and he said: "It is crucial that progress in implementing HMP recommendations is transparent and independently verifiable. The abject failure of too many prisons to take inspection reports seriously must stop." Do you support a sort of mechanism of that form where there is some form of independent scrutiny of recommendations? A. Yes, absolutely. We regularly find that the institution's own assessment of where they are and how many recommendations they have achieved is optimistic and of a different order to what we — they make the assessment of when we follow up those recommendations. So it would make sense that if we are making these recommendations, then, in those establishments that are struggling, that we — there is some mechanism where we would be able to go and check that those recommendations are being implemented appropriately, both in terms of making sure that the establishment understands the | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | So in regards to frequency, yes, it's the same, but in terms of what that looks like on the ground, there are real differences. Q. Mr Lomas, at paragraph 26, said: "There should be one inspection regime for the sector, YOIs, STCs and SCHs, that continues to give significant weight to safeguarding and child protection." Would you support that? A. Yes, I don't think there is any good reason why we inspect these three sectors differently. Q. The Chief Inspector has also said in public that, in fact, in his most recent annual report that the inspection regime ought to be have a statutory footing. Do you support that and, if so, why is that important? A. Yes, I do support that. I think there was a Prisons and Courts Bill that got lost in the mists of time that would have assisted HMIP and put some of our powers on |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | implementation of inspection reports, and he said: "It is crucial that progress in implementing HMP recommendations is transparent and independently verifiable. The abject failure of too many prisons to take inspection reports seriously must stop." Do you support a sort of mechanism of that form where there is some form of independent scrutiny of recommendations? A. Yes, absolutely. We regularly find that the institution's own assessment of where they are and how many recommendations they have achieved is optimistic and of a different order to what we — they make the assessment of when we follow up those recommendations. So it would make sense that if we are making these recommendations, then, in those establishments that are struggling, that we — there is some mechanism where we would be able to go and check that those recommendations are being implemented appropriately, both in terms of making sure that the establishment understands the purpose of that recommendation but also in some — you | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | So in regards to frequency, yes, it's the same, but in terms of what that looks like on the ground, there are real differences. Q. Mr Lomas, at paragraph 26, said: "There should be one inspection regime for the sector, YOIs, STCs and SCHs, that continues to give significant weight to safeguarding and child protection." Would you support that? A. Yes, I don't think there is any good reason why we inspect these three sectors differently. Q. The Chief Inspector has also said in public that, in fact, in his most recent annual report that the inspection regime ought to be have a statutory footing. Do you support that and, if so, why is that important? A. Yes, I do support that. I think there was a Prisons and Courts Bill that got lost in the mists of time that would have assisted HMIP and put some of our powers on a more formal footing. Some of that has happened |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | implementation of inspection reports, and he said: "It is crucial that progress in implementing HMP recommendations is transparent and independently verifiable. The abject failure of too many prisons to take inspection reports seriously must stop." Do you support a sort of mechanism of that form where there is some form of independent scrutiny of recommendations? A. Yes, absolutely. We regularly find that the institution's own assessment of where they are and how many recommendations they have achieved is optimistic and of a different order to what we — they make the assessment of when we follow up those recommendations. So it would make sense that if we are making these recommendations, then, in those establishments that are struggling, that we — there is some mechanism where we would be able to go and check that those recommendations are being implemented appropriately, both in terms of making sure that the establishment understands the purpose of that recommendation but also in some — you know, as well as sort of from a sort of audity | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | So in regards to frequency, yes, it's the same, but in terms of what that looks like on the ground, there are real differences. Q. Mr Lomas, at paragraph 26, said: "There should be one inspection regime for the sector, YOIs, STCs and SCHs, that continues to give significant weight to safeguarding and child protection." Would you support that? A. Yes, I don't think there is any good reason why we inspect these three sectors differently. Q. The Chief Inspector has also said in public that, in fact, in his most recent annual report that the inspection regime ought to be have a statutory footing. Do you support that and, if so, why is that important? A. Yes, I do support that. I think there was a Prisons and Courts Bill that got lost in the mists of time that would have assisted HMIP and put some of our powers on a more formal footing. Some of that has happened already in terms of the urgent notification process and |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | implementation of inspection reports, and he said: "It is crucial that progress in implementing HMP recommendations is transparent and independently verifiable. The abject failure of too many prisons to take inspection reports seriously must stop." Do you support a sort of mechanism of that form where there is some form of independent scrutiny of recommendations? A. Yes, absolutely. We regularly find that the institution's own assessment of where they are and how many recommendations they have achieved is optimistic and of a different order to what we — they make the assessment of when we follow up those recommendations. So it would make sense that if we are making these recommendations, then, in those establishments that are struggling, that we — there is some mechanism where we would be able to go and check that those recommendations are being implemented appropriately, both in terms of making sure that the establishment understands the purpose of that recommendation but also in some — you know, as well as sort of from a sort of audity perspective, as well. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | So in regards to frequency, yes, it's the same, but in terms of what that looks like on the ground, there are real differences. Q. Mr Lomas, at paragraph 26, said: "There should be one inspection regime for the sector, YOIs, STCs and SCHs, that continues to give significant weight to safeguarding and child protection." Would you support that? A. Yes, I don't think there is any good reason why we inspect these three sectors differently. Q. The Chief Inspector has also said in public that, in fact, in his most recent annual report that the inspection regime ought to be have a statutory footing. Do you support that and, if so, why is that important? A. Yes, I do support that. I think there was a Prisons and Courts Bill that got lost in the mists of time that would have assisted HMIP and put some of our powers on a more formal footing. Some of that has happened already in terms of the urgent notification process and there is there are developments happening in terms of |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | implementation of inspection reports, and he said: "It is crucial that progress in implementing HMP recommendations is transparent and independently verifiable. The abject failure of too many prisons to take inspection reports seriously must stop." Do you support a sort of mechanism of that form where there is some form of independent scrutiny of recommendations? A. Yes, absolutely. We regularly find that the institution's own assessment of where they are and how many recommendations they have achieved is optimistic and of a different order to what we — they make the assessment of when we follow up those recommendations. So it would make sense that if we are making these recommendations, then, in those establishments that are struggling, that we — there is some mechanism where we would be able to go and check that those recommendations are being implemented appropriately, both in terms of making sure that the establishment understands the purpose of that recommendation but also in some — you know, as well as sort of from a sort of audity perspective, as well. Q. The inspection regime, we have a number of documents on | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | So in regards to frequency, yes, it's the same, but in terms of what that looks like on the ground, there are real differences. Q. Mr Lomas, at paragraph 26, said: "There should be one inspection regime for the sector, YOIs, STCs and SCHs, that continues to give significant weight to safeguarding and child protection." Would you support that? A. Yes, I don't think there is any good reason why we inspect these three sectors differently. Q. The Chief Inspector has also said in public that, in fact, in his most recent annual report that the inspection regime ought to be have a statutory footing. Do you support that and, if so, why is that important? A. Yes, I do support that. I think there was a Prisons and Courts Bill that got lost in the mists of time that would have assisted HMIP and put some of our powers on a more formal footing. Some of that has happened already in terms of the urgent notification process and there is there are developments happening in terms of following up from inspections, as well. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | implementation of inspection reports, and he said: "It is crucial that progress in implementing HMP recommendations is transparent and independently verifiable. The abject failure of too many prisons to take inspection reports seriously must stop." Do you support a sort of mechanism of that form where there is some form of independent scrutiny of recommendations? A. Yes, absolutely. We regularly find that the institution's own assessment of where they are and how many recommendations they have achieved is optimistic and of a different order to what we — they make the assessment of when we follow up those recommendations. So it would make sense that if we are making these recommendations, then, in those establishments that are struggling, that we — there is some mechanism where we would be able to go and check that those recommendations are being implemented appropriately, both in terms of making sure that the establishment understands the purpose of that recommendation but also in some — you know, as well as sort of from a sort of audity perspective, as well. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | So in regards to frequency, yes, it's the same, but in terms of what that looks like on the ground, there are real differences. Q. Mr Lomas, at paragraph 26, said: "There should be one inspection regime for the sector, YOIs, STCs and SCHs, that continues to give significant weight to safeguarding and child protection." Would you support that? A. Yes, I don't think there is any good reason why we inspect these three sectors differently. Q. The Chief Inspector has also said in public that, in fact, in his most recent annual report that the inspection regime ought to be have a statutory footing. Do you support that and, if so, why is that important? A. Yes, I do support that. I think there was a Prisons and Courts Bill that got lost in the mists of time that would have assisted HMIP and put some of our powers on a more formal footing. Some of that has happened already in terms of the urgent notification process and there is there are developments happening in terms of |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | implementation of inspection reports, and he said: "It is crucial that progress in implementing HMP recommendations is transparent and independently verifiable. The abject failure of too many prisons to take inspection reports seriously must stop." Do you support a sort of mechanism of that form where there is some form of independent scrutiny of recommendations? A. Yes, absolutely. We regularly find that the institution's own assessment of where they are and how many recommendations they have achieved is optimistic and of a different order to what we — they make the assessment of when we follow up those recommendations. So it would make sense that if we are making these recommendations, then, in those establishments that are struggling, that we — there is some mechanism where we would be able to go and check that those recommendations are being implemented appropriately, both in terms of making sure that the establishment understands the purpose of that recommendation but also in some — you know, as well as sort of from a sort of audity perspective, as well. Q. The inspection regime, we have a number of documents on | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | So in regards to frequency, yes, it's the same, but in terms of what that looks like on the ground, there are real differences. Q. Mr Lomas, at paragraph 26, said: "There should be one inspection regime for the sector, YOIs, STCs and SCHs, that continues to give significant weight to safeguarding and child protection." Would you support that? A. Yes, I don't think there is any good reason why we inspect these three sectors differently. Q. The Chief Inspector has also said in public that, in fact, in his most recent annual report that the inspection regime ought to be have a statutory footing. Do you support that and, if so, why is that important? A. Yes, I do support that. I think there was a Prisons and Courts Bill that got lost in the mists of time that would have assisted HMIP and put some of our powers on a more formal footing. Some of that has happened already in terms of the urgent notification process and there is there are developments happening in terms of following up from inspections, as well. |

Q

a statutory footing, while our actions are independent
as we are now, in reality the organisation is an arm's
length body of the Ministry of Justice and we have -and the organisation itself still is not referred to in
any sort of legislation. We are just a Chief Inspector.

Q. Should there be a greater investigation during the
HMIP's inspections of safeguarding issues? Thave two

Q. Should there be a greater investigation during the HMIP's inspections of safeguarding issues? I have two suggestions here, but please do tell me if these are already part of your inspections.

So, for example, analysing the proportion of staff which have received mandatory safeguarding training or to test staff's understanding of key areas in respect of safeguarding. Do you think what's asked at the moment or what is inspected at the moment is sufficient or more can be done?

A. We ask as part of inspection of our inspection methodology for training figures for a large range of things, including safeguarding training and inspectors, I would expect them to be, as they were going round — particularly residential staff — to be asking how they would make referrals in terms of safeguarding.

A point, though, about safeguarding and our framework, there is a section called "Safeguarding and child protection", but there are also sections around suicide and self-harm prevention, violence reduction and the survey findings alone. We then triangulate that with evidence we have collected during inspection.

What the survey does do is give an accurate picture of the perceptions of a very large number of children that are detained at a point in time, so we have about a return rate about 84, 85 per cent, which is very, very high and we have been doing this for a number of years, so you can monitor sort of trends and things getting better or worse, but the survey is absolutely not designed to get an accurate picture of child sexual abuse in custody over a period of time. It can only do what it's designed to do, which is to take the perceptions of the children at the time that the survey is conducted.

- Q. Howe & Co who represent a number of core participants have put forward a question or suggestion of statutory agency, perhaps similar so the US Bureau of Justice statistics whose role is to collect, monitor and perhaps audit allegations of sexual abuse. So to carry out a wider and more detailed survey. Do you have any comments on that?
- A. I think that there is nothing wrong with having a statutory agency with responsibility for making sure that these statistics are accurate and that they are all reported. I see the recommendations, such as

Page 41

so on, which are obviously also safeguarding too.

Q. Surveys. In the witness statement by
Peter Clarke, May 2016, he noted that since
1 January 2002 until the date of his witness statement,
so it's a slightly different period to what the inquiry
has been looking at, HMIP had records of 221 reports of
alleged sexual abuse against a child in a custodial
institution. Now, have you heard that the inquiry has
asked all relevant bodies to produce information about
allegations that they had received and in the period
between 1 January 2009 and 31 December 2017, a slightly
different period, there were 1,070 allegations as
a whole.

Do you have any comment on that? Is the Inspectorate supposed to be there to get a complete picture of abuse or is it just a snapshot at the time of the surveys?

A. We are there to inspect, as I said before, the treatment

of prisoners and the conditions in which they were held.

Now, that is much wider than the prevention of abuse, so the survey itself is designed as a tool to inform inspection. So what the survey does is gives inspectors looking at that area — whether it be victimisation, in this case — whether it looks like there is a particular issue at this institution. What we never do is rely on

Page 42

Page 43

HMI Prisons to collect the data. I think, if there was a duty, that would have to come with resource.

A point about the methodology in the United States is that their survey methodology is a sample survey, the it's not — they don't survey, as we do, every single child. They survey roughly about 15 per cent of the children and they don't do it as frequently as we do. They rely, also, on report data from the institution and from the institutions in terms of allegations of abuse which is probably a very similar route to some of those other route — allegations that make up your total number that you've described.

I think it makes sense for them to be together in one place, but I think I would be cautious of saying, "This seems to look good over here and so we would implement it there". I think there are things that probably are better, but there are some things that maybe are not as robust as what is happening here at this minute in time.

- Q. I think you have seen the Howe & Co proposals for reform. Another question they have asked is whether you support a child safeguarding authority. Do you have any comments on that or any of the other proposals for reform that Howe & Co have put forward?
- A. I think the creation of a child custodial safeguarding

Page 44

11 (Pages 41 to 44)

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

21

22

23

24

25

authority, while I can see the sentiment behind that, I think there are risks involved, what the Inspectorate would like to see is a competent safeguarding authority that applied the same thresholds to children in custody as children in the community and ensure that they were protected.

I think in the current system we have local authorities with that duty and some of them, obviously, are -- some of them operate more effectively than others and that, I suppose, is a danger, but one of the risks of having a child custodial safeguarding authority is that that becomes separate from children in other settings in a way that, when I talk about workforce, it's perhaps not as -- you know, it has risks as well as benefits. So you could -- you know, you could look at that one organisation and say, "Well, we will make sure that this operates well", but actually the risk is it becomes a slightly siloed service from other safeguarding agencies.

And the other thing that I think, again, to go back to my original point, which is around that I'm not sure that process and structure is the whole story here about, you know, changing this structure or that structure in terms of external oversight. I think that there is something about the fundamentals of how the

1 institutions is an illusion of oversight because lots of 2 people are looking at something quite briefly, so there

are links of oversight to a local authority LADO who may

3 4 or may not have experience specifically of what the

5 issues are in custody. There are obviously some

6 oversight arrangements through local partnerships or

7 Safeguarding Boards, but, actually, they are stretched, 8

and their ability to dedicate resource to this. Then we

9 have ourselves who are coming in once a year. And then

10 you have the management line, which, while it has been rationalised some way in terms of the children's --11

12 children in custody sector -- in terms of children in

13 custody we still have three agencies at the centre that

14 have some oversight of this space in terms of the

15 management, some policy input from the YJB and some 16 policy -- some oversight from the YJB and the policy

17 team in NOMS.

18

19

20

21

22

23

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So, yes, I think that that could be rationalised and, if it was, or at least some of those processes were aligned, managers could ensure or could focus more of their time on improving outcomes in their institutions rather than oversight and governance.

Q. The last issue is just going back to the inquiry's 24 prevalence analysis. In 2016, the inquiry's prevalence 25 analysis found 32 allegations of sexual abuse in Medway.

Page 47

day-to-day stuff operates in these institutions that safeguard children.

Page 45

In terms of one other recommendation that is made around a recommendation that we have previously made around Feltham, obviously what we would like to see is that all of our recommendations are implemented by HMPPS. I don't know whether you wanted me to comment on any of the other things in this document?

Q. I am very tight for time, so I'd better on move on, but thank you. I just have two final questions, then, two final issues. The first one is about regulation, oversight and governance. I think in Mr Lomas' statement he notes at paragraph 16 that external regulation, oversight and governance arrangements are complex and lead to institutions being held to account by several external agencies for different aspects of

At 25, he recommends they should be rationalised.

19 Do you support those concerns? 20

A. Yes, I think what we find is managers doing several things for several different masters, ourselves and the inspection regime being one of them, and I think one of the dangers of recommending solutions is that it's always easy to recommend another process for managers to

implement and I think that what we have in some of these

Page 46

1 As I understand it, in the 2016 survey of Medway, which 2 is INQ001479 001, it was noted that at the time of the

3 survey there were 36 people in Medway -- 36 children in

4 Medway and 33 questionnaires were responded to. None of

them said that they had been sexually abused on the survey and, similarly, the next snapshot,

6 7 28 February 2017, which is the next survey, the

8 population of Medway was 29 children and, again, none of 9 them said that they had been sexually abused.

> Can you help us understand what's happening there as to why it may be that the -- there was a zero per cent response rate to the snapshot survey that you took but a number of allegations appear to have been made

elsewhere?

A. I think that people respond differently to different methods of reporting child sexual abuse. I think that that -- and actually you need several different safeguards operating at the same time, so I imagine that what you have got there is people have reported to the institution or staff have reported separately in terms or there may possibly be historical allegations that involve people that have left the institution. I don't know what the nature of those allegations are. I would

suggest that some of that is a churn of the population

but in reality there will be -- there's no perfect

Page 48

12 (Pages 45 to 48)

| | | Τ | |
|----|---|----------|---|
| 1 | methodology in making sure that everyone reports all of | 1 | seem odd that you would inspect those outcomes there in |
| 2 | the time every time they're asked. | 2 | different ways and, again, a third way different in |
| 3 | Q. Thank you. Chair, with your permission, I'll just | 3 | secure children's homes. So I think and it hides |
| 4 | adduce formally a few other documents that I haven't | 4 | some comparability of outcomes across sectors. |
| 5 | mentioned yet. One of those is INQ001457, a report | 5 | MS SHARPLING: Which brings me on to my next question: is it |
| 6 | about Rainsbrook and then INQ001569, another such report | 6 | possible to fix that? |
| 7 | and, finally, chair, just to draw your attention to two | 7 | A. The legislation appoints the inspectorates but it is |
| 8 | of the witness statements, which describe the number of | 8 | possible, it would be possible to fix it, yes, it's not |
| 9 | different establishments to which HMIP had received | 9 | beyond with inspectorates drafting new legislation |
| 10 | allegations of sexual abuse from and then the statement | 10 | new frameworks that changed the current frameworks and |
| 11 | by Mr Mulready-Jones dated February 2018, he actually | 11 | I think given the reform in the sector, I think that |
| 12 | gives details of a number of the allegations that have | 12 | that will be necessary when we have a fourth model of |
| 13 | been made, so quotes there, quotes from the children | 13 | custody, but at the minute, I think the frameworks |
| 14 | themselves who have left comments on the surveys. | 14 | the inspection regime reflects a rather fragmented |
| 15 | Does the panel have any questions? | 15 | sector rather than a sort of taking a more strategic |
| 16 | Questions by THE PANEL | 16 | approach across all three types of custody. |
| 17 | THE CHAIR: Thank you, I have one, Mr Mulready-Jones. | 17 | MS SHARPLING: I see, thank you. |
| 18 | You have referred quite frequently to the | 18 | THE CHAIR: Sir Malcolm? |
| 19 | relationship between the quality of leadership and | 19 | PROFESSOR SIR MALCOLM EVANS: Thank you, just one very small |
| 20 | better outcomes, so do you think that the quality of | 20 | question: I couldn't help but notice that when we were |
| 21 | leadership across the estate is good enough to address | 21 | looking at paragraph 117 of the 2017 inspection report |
| 22 | the many and complex issues that we have been hearing | 22 | on Medway a little while back, it mentioned that one of |
| 23 | about? | 23 | the difficulties was that whilst minutes were saying |
| 24 | A. I think we would have to say no because we have assessed | 24 | that individual staff would be spoken to or receive |
| 25 | the leadership and management to be not good enough in | 25 | letters about their conduct, "as no staff files are |
| | | | |
| | Page 49 | <u> </u> | Page 51 |
| 1 | some of the institutions, with in the STC estate and | 1 | maintained, it is not possible to see whether there is |
| 2 | demonstrably it's not good enough yet to deal with some | 2 | any follow through here". |
| 3 | of the issues that are in the YOI estate. There has | 3 | A. That was without having the report to my to hand, |
| 4 | been a lot of change over the recent time and have been | 4 | I think that was a particular problem with Medway at |
| 5 | some improvements, which is why I've given a sort of | 5 | that inspection at that time. There was an issue about |
| 6 | mealy-mouthed outcome, but to answer the question | 6 | records across the site, not just records of the staff |
| 7 | directly, I don't think currently we could say yes to | 7 | and what's happened with the staff, but records of the |
| 8 | that question. | 8 | children and what's happened with the children in terms |
| 9 | THE CHAIR: Thank you. Ms Sharpling? | 9 | of their ongoing care. |
| 10 | MS SHARPLING: Thank you, Mr Mulready-Jones. Just | 10 | PROFESSOR SIR MALCOLM EVANS: So that would be specific to |
| 11 | a question of clarification for me, I'm not sure whether | 11 | Medway at that time |
| 12 | you said it or not, that's why I am asking. Can you | 12 | A. At that time. |
| 13 | tell me the underlying reasons why the framework for | 13 | PROFESSOR SIR MALCOLM EVANS: rather than generic |
| 14 | YOIs are different from STCs? | 14 | practice? |
| 15 | A. They are designed by two different organisations, so | 15 | A. Yes. |
| 16 | while the STC framework is a joint framework with | 16 | THE CHAIR: Thank you very much. We have no further |
| 17 | ourselves and the CQC and Ofsted, the lead inspectorate | 17 | MR STEIN: Chair, sorry to interrupt and I don't want to |
| 18 | is Ofsted and so their policy team draft the framework | 18 | delay progress of the day. We note that |
| 19 | and they commend and so on. It's not — and also it's | 19 | Mr Mulready-Jones has read the Howe & Co recommendations |
| 20 | a hangover from a system that was larger in parts and so | 20 | and proposals. He hasn't, I don't think, had the time |
| 21 | it made a lot more sense when there were more children | 21 | today to go through those and provide his own opinion. |
| 22 | in custody. It was hidden that we had sort of these | 22 | What we would ask, if he's prepared to, and as long |
| 23 | different approaches in different sectors, but actually, | 23 | as counsel to the inquiry has no objection, would be if |
| 24 | when you get down to it now and you've only got about | 24 | he could provide an answer to those proposals in |
| 25 | 600 in YOIs and another 120, 130, 140 in STCs, it does | 25 | correspondence? |
| | | | - |
| | Page 50 | | Page 52 |
| | | - | |

| 1 | THE CHAIR: Are you willing to do this? | 1 | in the material that you saw? |
|--|---|--|---|
| 2 | A. Yes. | 2 | A. That's right, yes. |
| 3 | MR STEIN: We're very grateful. | 3 | Q. Over the page, 8.1.2, one theme was an apparent |
| 4 | MR STRAW: Mr Mulready-Jones, would you be willing to | 4 | perception by members of staff about the young people |
| 5 | produce something in writing in response to those | 5 | and that seemed to frame how they responded to the |
| 6 | questions? | 6 | allegations? |
| 7 | A. Yes. | 7 | A. That's right. |
| 8 | MR STRAW: Perhaps we can deal with it that way. | 8 | Q. 8.1.3, you've made observations about how well |
| 9 | MR STEIN: Thank you. | 9 | understood the previous trauma and abuse of the children |
| 10 | THE CHAIR: Thank you very much. We will now take a break | 10 | was by the staff? |
| 11 | and return at 5 past noon. | 11 | A. That's right. |
| 12 | (11.48 am) | 12 | Q. 8.1.4, you raised questions about how well staff were |
| 13 | (A short break) | 13 | trained and supported in dealing with those issues? |
| 14 | (12.05 pm) | 14 | A. That's correct. |
| 15 | MR ALAN WOOD (recalled) | 15 | Q. 8.1.5, again, a question about the role of the child |
| 16 | Examination by MS HILL | 16 | having had a previous experience of authority and what |
| 17 | MS HILL: Thank you, chair. | 17 | that meant in terms of engaging with the complaint and |
| 18 | Mr Wood, you're already under oath. Thank you very | 18 | investigative processes? |
| 19 | much for returning to give some further evidence. Just | 19 | A. That's right. |
| 20 | to orientate, you, Mr Wood, and the rest of the | 20 | Q. 8.1.6 was a broad theme about perhaps process rather |
| 21 | participants in the proceedings, I had hoped to ask you | 21 | than content? |
| 22 | some very brief questions about some of the generic | 22 | A. That's right. |
| 23 | themes you had elicited from some the case studies | 23 | Q. 8.1.7 was a sense that some of the staff seemed to |
| 24 | material, but it may be that we should just press on to | 24 | regard the children as "other" and that that perhaps |
| 25 | deal with the Feltham matters. | 25 | formed their response to the children's allegations? |
| | | | |
| | Page 53 | | Page 55 |
| | | | <u> </u> |
| 1 | | 1 | |
| 1 2 | But just by way of broad introduction, is this | 1 2 | A. That's right, yes. |
| 2 | But just by way of broad introduction, is this right: that you were instructed by the inquiry to review | 2 | A. That's right, yes. Q. And then, finally, a broad theme where there seemed to |
| 2 3 | But just by way of broad introduction, is this right: that you were instructed by the inquiry to review a series of allegations of sexual abuse that were made | 2 3 | A. That's right, yes. Q. And then, finally, a broad theme where there seemed to be a disparity in the support given to a staff member |
| 2 3 4 | But just by way of broad introduction, is this right: that you were instructed by the inquiry to review a series of allegations of sexual abuse that were made at six institutions? | 2 3 4 | A. That's right, yes. Q. And then, finally, a broad theme where there seemed to be a disparity in the support given to a staff member against whom an allegation was made compared to the |
| 2 3 4 5 | But just by way of broad introduction, is this right: that you were instructed by the inquiry to review a series of allegations of sexual abuse that were made at six institutions? A. That's right. | 2 3 4 5 | A. That's right, yes. Q. And then, finally, a broad theme where there seemed to be a disparity in the support given to a staff member against whom an allegation was made compared to the child? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | But just by way of broad introduction, is this right: that you were instructed by the inquiry to review a series of allegations of sexual abuse that were made at six institutions? A. That's right. Q. And I think the total number you were asked to review | 2 3 4 5 6 | A. That's right, yes. Q. And then, finally, a broad theme where there seemed to be a disparity in the support given to a staff member against whom an allegation was made compared to the child? A. That's right. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | But just by way of broad introduction, is this right: that you were instructed by the inquiry to review a series of allegations of sexual abuse that were made at six institutions? A. That's right. Q. And I think the total number you were asked to review was around 70 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 | A. That's right, yes. Q. And then, finally, a broad theme where there seemed to be a disparity in the support given to a staff member against whom an allegation was made compared to the child? A. That's right. Q. All right. Just so the panel can understand your broad |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | But just by way of broad introduction, is this right: that you were instructed by the inquiry to review a series of allegations of sexual abuse that were made at six institutions? A. That's right. Q. And I think the total number you were asked to review was around 70 A. That's right, yes. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | A. That's right, yes. Q. And then, finally, a broad theme where there seemed to be a disparity in the support given to a staff member against whom an allegation was made compared to the child? A. That's right. Q. All right. Just so the panel can understand your broad conclusions and we will return, as I say, to this on |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | But just by way of broad introduction, is this right: that you were instructed by the inquiry to review a series of allegations of sexual abuse that were made at six institutions? A. That's right. Q. And I think the total number you were asked to review was around 70 A. That's right, yes. Q spread across different institutions, and what you're | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | A. That's right, yes. Q. And then, finally, a broad theme where there seemed to be a disparity in the support given to a staff member against whom an allegation was made compared to the child? A. That's right. Q. All right. Just so the panel can understand your broad conclusions and we will return, as I say, to this on Wednesday the following page, please, 8.1.9, you had |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | But just by way of broad introduction, is this right: that you were instructed by the inquiry to review a series of allegations of sexual abuse that were made at six institutions? A. That's right. Q. And I think the total number you were asked to review was around 70 A. That's right, yes. Q spread across different institutions, and what you're hoping to give evidence about today in particular are | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | A. That's right, yes. Q. And then, finally, a broad theme where there seemed to be a disparity in the support given to a staff member against whom an allegation was made compared to the child? A. That's right. Q. All right. Just so the panel can understand your broad conclusions and we will return, as I say, to this on Wednesday the following page, please, 8.1.9, you had made the point that because the children in custody are |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | But just by way of broad introduction, is this right: that you were instructed by the inquiry to review a series of allegations of sexual abuse that were made at six institutions? A. That's right. Q. And I think the total number you were asked to review was around 70 A. That's right, yes. Q spread across different institutions, and what you're hoping to give evidence about today in particular are the themes that emerge from your analysis of both | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | A. That's right, yes. Q. And then, finally, a broad theme where there seemed to be a disparity in the support given to a staff member against whom an allegation was made compared to the child? A. That's right. Q. All right. Just so the panel can understand your broad conclusions and we will return, as I say, to this on Wednesday the following page, please, 8.1.9, you had made the point that because the children in custody are so vulnerable under B on this page you had said |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | But just by way of broad introduction, is this right: that you were instructed by the inquiry to review a series of allegations of sexual abuse that were made at six institutions? A. That's right. Q. And I think the total number you were asked to review was around 70 A. That's right, yes. Q spread across different institutions, and what you're hoping to give evidence about today in particular are the themes that emerge from your analysis of both Feltham and Werrington? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | A. That's right, yes. Q. And then, finally, a broad theme where there seemed to be a disparity in the support given to a staff member against whom an allegation was made compared to the child? A. That's right. Q. All right. Just so the panel can understand your broad conclusions and we will return, as I say, to this on Wednesday the following page, please, 8.1.9, you had made the point that because the children in custody are so vulnerable under B on this page you had said that the highest levels of safeguarding practice should |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | But just by way of broad introduction, is this right: that you were instructed by the inquiry to review a series of allegations of sexual abuse that were made at six institutions? A. That's right. Q. And I think the total number you were asked to review was around 70 A. That's right, yes. Q spread across different institutions, and what you're hoping to give evidence about today in particular are the themes that emerge from your analysis of both Feltham and Werrington? A. That's right. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | A. That's right, yes. Q. And then, finally, a broad theme where there seemed to be a disparity in the support given to a staff member against whom an allegation was made compared to the child? A. That's right. Q. All right. Just so the panel can understand your broad conclusions and we will return, as I say, to this on Wednesday the following page, please, 8.1.9, you had made the point that because the children in custody are so vulnerable under B on this page you had said that the highest levels of safeguarding practice should be expected of the members of staff working in these |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | But just by way of broad introduction, is this right: that you were instructed by the inquiry to review a series of allegations of sexual abuse that were made at six institutions? A. That's right. Q. And I think the total number you were asked to review was around 70 A. That's right, yes. Q spread across different institutions, and what you're hoping to give evidence about today in particular are the themes that emerge from your analysis of both Feltham and Werrington? A. That's right. Q. Just to orientate the panel very briefly, and I don't | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | A. That's right, yes. Q. And then, finally, a broad theme where there seemed to be a disparity in the support given to a staff member against whom an allegation was made compared to the child? A. That's right. Q. All right. Just so the panel can understand your broad conclusions and we will return, as I say, to this on Wednesday the following page, please, 8.1.9, you had made the point that because the children in custody are so vulnerable under B on this page you had said that the highest levels of safeguarding practice should be expected of the members of staff working in these institutions and appropriate and clear responses should |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | But just by way of broad introduction, is this right: that you were instructed by the inquiry to review a series of allegations of sexual abuse that were made at six institutions? A. That's right. Q. And I think the total number you were asked to review was around 70 A. That's right, yes. Q spread across different institutions, and what you're hoping to give evidence about today in particular are the themes that emerge from your analysis of both Feltham and Werrington? A. That's right. Q. Just to orientate the panel very briefly, and I don't want to spend very long on this at all, but could I ask | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | A. That's right, yes. Q. And then, finally, a broad theme where there seemed to be a disparity in the support given to a staff member against whom an allegation was made compared to the child? A. That's right. Q. All right. Just so the panel can understand your broad conclusions and we will return, as I say, to this on Wednesday the following page, please, 8.1.9, you had made the point that because the children in custody are so vulnerable under B on this page you had said that the highest levels of safeguarding practice should be expected of the members of staff working in these institutions and appropriate and clear responses should be expected. But under C, your broad conclusion was |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | But just by way of broad introduction, is this right: that you were instructed by the inquiry to review a series of allegations of sexual abuse that were made at six institutions? A. That's right. Q. And I think the total number you were asked to review was around 70 A. That's right, yes. Q spread across different institutions, and what you're hoping to give evidence about today in particular are the themes that emerge from your analysis of both Feltham and Werrington? A. That's right. Q. Just to orientate the panel very briefly, and I don't want to spend very long on this at all, but could I ask you just to pull up your generic topics that you | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | A. That's right, yes. Q. And then, finally, a broad theme where there seemed to be a disparity in the support given to a staff member against whom an allegation was made compared to the child? A. That's right. Q. All right. Just so the panel can understand your broad conclusions and we will return, as I say, to this on Wednesday the following page, please, 8.1.9, you had made the point that because the children in custody are so vulnerable under B on this page you had said that the highest levels of safeguarding practice should be expected of the members of staff working in these institutions and appropriate and clear responses should be expected. But under C, your broad conclusion was that that high level of safeguarding practice had not |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | But just by way of broad introduction, is this right: that you were instructed by the inquiry to review a series of allegations of sexual abuse that were made at six institutions? A. That's right. Q. And I think the total number you were asked to review was around 70 A. That's right, yes. Q spread across different institutions, and what you're hoping to give evidence about today in particular are the themes that emerge from your analysis of both Feltham and Werrington? A. That's right. Q. Just to orientate the panel very briefly, and I don't want to spend very long on this at all, but could I ask you just to pull up your generic topics that you identified? It's INQ001210_025, I hope. Under the | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | A. That's right, yes. Q. And then, finally, a broad theme where there seemed to be a disparity in the support given to a staff member against whom an allegation was made compared to the child? A. That's right. Q. All right. Just so the panel can understand your broad conclusions and we will return, as I say, to this on Wednesday the following page, please, 8.1.9, you had made the point that because the children in custody are so vulnerable under B on this page you had said that the highest levels of safeguarding practice should be expected of the members of staff working in these institutions and appropriate and clear responses should be expected. But under C, your broad conclusion was that that high level of safeguarding practice had not been routinely experienced by the children across all |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | But just by way of broad introduction, is this right: that you were instructed by the inquiry to review a series of allegations of sexual abuse that were made at six institutions? A. That's right. Q. And I think the total number you were asked to review was around 70 A. That's right, yes. Q spread across different institutions, and what you're hoping to give evidence about today in particular are the themes that emerge from your analysis of both Feltham and Werrington? A. That's right. Q. Just to orientate the panel very briefly, and I don't want to spend very long on this at all, but could I ask you just to pull up your generic topics that you identified? It's INQ001210_025, I hope. Under the heading "8.0" at the end of your report on the | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | A. That's right, yes. Q. And then, finally, a broad theme where there seemed to be a disparity in the support given to a staff member against whom an allegation was made compared to the child? A. That's right. Q. All right. Just so the panel can understand your broad conclusions and we will return, as I say, to this on Wednesday the following page, please, 8.1.9, you had made the point that because the children in custody are so vulnerable under B on this page you had said that the highest levels of safeguarding practice should be expected of the members of staff working in these institutions and appropriate and clear responses should be expected. But under C, your broad conclusion was that that high level of safeguarding practice had not been routinely experienced by the children across all six institutions. Is that right? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | But just by way of broad introduction, is this right: that you were instructed by the inquiry to review a series of allegations of sexual abuse that were made at six institutions? A. That's right. Q. And I think the total number you were asked to review was around 70 A. That's right, yes. Q spread across different institutions, and what you're hoping to give evidence about today in particular are the themes that emerge from your analysis of both Feltham and Werrington? A. That's right. Q. Just to orientate the panel very briefly, and I don't want to spend very long on this at all, but could I ask you just to pull up your generic topics that you identified? It's INQ001210_025, I hope. Under the heading "8.0" at the end of your report on the institutional responses, I think you pull together just | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | A. That's right, yes. Q. And then, finally, a broad theme where there seemed to be a disparity in the support given to a staff member against whom an allegation was made compared to the child? A. That's right. Q. All right. Just so the panel can understand your broad conclusions and we will return, as I say, to this on Wednesday the following page, please, 8.1.9, you had made the point that because the children in custody are so vulnerable under B on this page you had said that the highest levels of safeguarding practice should be expected of the members of staff working in these institutions and appropriate and clear responses should be expected. But under C, your broad conclusion was that that high level of safeguarding practice had not been routinely experienced by the children across all six institutions. Is that right? A. That's correct, yes. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | But just by way of broad introduction, is this right: that you were instructed by the inquiry to review a series of allegations of sexual abuse that were made at six institutions? A. That's right. Q. And I think the total number you were asked to review was around 70 A. That's right, yes. Q spread across different institutions, and what you're hoping to give evidence about today in particular are the themes that emerge from your analysis of both Feltham and Werrington? A. That's right. Q. Just to orientate the panel very briefly, and I don't want to spend very long on this at all, but could I ask you just to pull up your generic topics that you identified? It's INQ001210_025, I hope. Under the heading "8.0" at the end of your report on the institutional responses, I think you pull together just a series of broad themes that the panel might have | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | A. That's right, yes. Q. And then, finally, a broad theme where there seemed to be a disparity in the support given to a staff member against whom an allegation was made compared to the child? A. That's right. Q. All right. Just so the panel can understand your broad conclusions and we will return, as I say, to this on Wednesday the following page, please, 8.1.9, you had made the point that because the children in custody are so vulnerable under B on this page you had said that the highest levels of safeguarding practice should be expected of the members of staff working in these institutions and appropriate and clear responses should be expected. But under C, your broad conclusion was that that high level of safeguarding practice had not been routinely experienced by the children across all six institutions. Is that right? A. That's correct, yes. Q. I think you had said that if one scrolls further down to |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | But just by way of broad introduction, is this right: that you were instructed by the inquiry to review a series of allegations of sexual abuse that were made at six institutions? A. That's right. Q. And I think the total number you were asked to review was around 70 A. That's right, yes. Q spread across different institutions, and what you're hoping to give evidence about today in particular are the themes that emerge from your analysis of both Feltham and Werrington? A. That's right. Q. Just to orientate the panel very briefly, and I don't want to spend very long on this at all, but could I ask you just to pull up your generic topics that you identified? It's INQ001210_025, I hope. Under the heading "8.0" at the end of your report on the institutional responses, I think you pull together just a series of broad themes that the panel might have regard to and I will just literally take you through the | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | A. That's right, yes. Q. And then, finally, a broad theme where there seemed to be a disparity in the support given to a staff member against whom an allegation was made compared to the child? A. That's right. Q. All right. Just so the panel can understand your broad conclusions and we will return, as I say, to this on Wednesday the following page, please, 8.1.9, you had made the point that because the children in custody are so vulnerable under B on this page you had said that the highest levels of safeguarding practice should be expected of the members of staff working in these institutions and appropriate and clear responses should be expected. But under C, your broad conclusion was that that high level of safeguarding practice had not been routinely experienced by the children across all six institutions. Is that right? A. That's correct, yes. Q. I think you had said that if one scrolls further down to the very end of your conclusions at M, that when looking |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | But just by way of broad introduction, is this right: that you were instructed by the inquiry to review a series of allegations of sexual abuse that were made at six institutions? A. That's right. Q. And I think the total number you were asked to review was around 70 A. That's right, yes. Q spread across different institutions, and what you're hoping to give evidence about today in particular are the themes that emerge from your analysis of both Feltham and Werrington? A. That's right. Q. Just to orientate the panel very briefly, and I don't want to spend very long on this at all, but could I ask you just to pull up your generic topics that you identified? It's INQ001210_025, I hope. Under the heading "8.0" at the end of your report on the institutional responses, I think you pull together just a series of broad themes that the panel might have regard to and I will just literally take you through the headings. As I say, I won't spend long on it today. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | A. That's right, yes. Q. And then, finally, a broad theme where there seemed to be a disparity in the support given to a staff member against whom an allegation was made compared to the child? A. That's right. Q. All right. Just so the panel can understand your broad conclusions and we will return, as I say, to this on Wednesday the following page, please, 8.1.9, you had made the point that because the children in custody are so vulnerable under B on this page you had said that the highest levels of safeguarding practice should be expected of the members of staff working in these institutions and appropriate and clear responses should be expected. But under C, your broad conclusion was that that high level of safeguarding practice had not been routinely experienced by the children across all six institutions. Is that right? A. That's correct, yes. Q. I think you had said that if one scrolls further down to the very end of your conclusions at M, that when looking at the key elements of the Working Together guidance |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | But just by way of broad introduction, is this right: that you were instructed by the inquiry to review a series of allegations of sexual abuse that were made at six institutions? A. That's right. Q. And I think the total number you were asked to review was around 70 A. That's right, yes. Q spread across different institutions, and what you're hoping to give evidence about today in particular are the themes that emerge from your analysis of both Feltham and Werrington? A. That's right. Q. Just to orientate the panel very briefly, and I don't want to spend very long on this at all, but could I ask you just to pull up your generic topics that you identified? It's INQ001210_025, I hope. Under the heading "8.0" at the end of your report on the institutional responses, I think you pull together just a series of broad themes that the panel might have regard to and I will just literally take you through the headings. As I say, I won't spend long on it today. Can we scroll down then, please, through 8.1.1, your | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | A. That's right, yes. Q. And then, finally, a broad theme where there seemed to be a disparity in the support given to a staff member against whom an allegation was made compared to the child? A. That's right. Q. All right. Just so the panel can understand your broad conclusions and we will return, as I say, to this on Wednesday the following page, please, 8.1.9, you had made the point that because the children in custody are so vulnerable under B on this page you had said that the highest levels of safeguarding practice should be expected of the members of staff working in these institutions and appropriate and clear responses should be expected. But under C, your broad conclusion was that that high level of safeguarding practice had not been routinely experienced by the children across all six institutions. Is that right? A. That's correct, yes. Q. I think you had said that if one scrolls further down to the very end of your conclusions at M, that when looking at the key elements of the Working Together guidance that we looked at last week, you broadly said that they |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | But just by way of broad introduction, is this right: that you were instructed by the inquiry to review a series of allegations of sexual abuse that were made at six institutions? A. That's right. Q. And I think the total number you were asked to review was around 70 A. That's right, yes. Q spread across different institutions, and what you're hoping to give evidence about today in particular are the themes that emerge from your analysis of both Feltham and Werrington? A. That's right. Q. Just to orientate the panel very briefly, and I don't want to spend very long on this at all, but could I ask you just to pull up your generic topics that you identified? It's INQ001210_025, I hope. Under the heading "8.0" at the end of your report on the institutional responses, I think you pull together just a series of broad themes that the panel might have regard to and I will just literally take you through the headings. As I say, I won't spend long on it today. Can we scroll down then, please, through 8.1.1, your heading was this: that children were very isolated in | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | A. That's right, yes. Q. And then, finally, a broad theme where there seemed to be a disparity in the support given to a staff member against whom an allegation was made compared to the child? A. That's right. Q. All right. Just so the panel can understand your broad conclusions and we will return, as I say, to this on Wednesday the following page, please, 8.1.9, you had made the point that because the children in custody are so vulnerable under B on this page you had said that the highest levels of safeguarding practice should be expected of the members of staff working in these institutions and appropriate and clear responses should be expected. But under C, your broad conclusion was that that high level of safeguarding practice had not been routinely experienced by the children across all six institutions. Is that right? A. That's correct, yes. Q. I think you had said that if one scrolls further down to the very end of your conclusions at M, that when looking at the key elements of the Working Together guidance that we looked at last week, you broadly said that they were all consistently absent from within the records you |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | But just by way of broad introduction, is this right: that you were instructed by the inquiry to review a series of allegations of sexual abuse that were made at six institutions? A. That's right. Q. And I think the total number you were asked to review was around 70 A. That's right, yes. Q spread across different institutions, and what you're hoping to give evidence about today in particular are the themes that emerge from your analysis of both Feltham and Werrington? A. That's right. Q. Just to orientate the panel very briefly, and I don't want to spend very long on this at all, but could I ask you just to pull up your generic topics that you identified? It's INQ001210_025, I hope. Under the heading "8.0" at the end of your report on the institutional responses, I think you pull together just a series of broad themes that the panel might have regard to and I will just literally take you through the headings. As I say, I won't spend long on it today. Can we scroll down then, please, through 8.1.1, your | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | A. That's right, yes. Q. And then, finally, a broad theme where there seemed to be a disparity in the support given to a staff member against whom an allegation was made compared to the child? A. That's right. Q. All right. Just so the panel can understand your broad conclusions and we will return, as I say, to this on Wednesday the following page, please, 8.1.9, you had made the point that because the children in custody are so vulnerable under B on this page you had said that the highest levels of safeguarding practice should be expected of the members of staff working in these institutions and appropriate and clear responses should be expected. But under C, your broad conclusion was that that high level of safeguarding practice had not been routinely experienced by the children across all six institutions. Is that right? A. That's correct, yes. Q. I think you had said that if one scrolls further down to the very end of your conclusions at M, that when looking at the key elements of the Working Together guidance that we looked at last week, you broadly said that they |

A. That's right. 1 health worker had sexually assaulted a child. Is that 1 2 2 Q. All right, thank you. Can I try and drill down a little right? 3 3 bit now, please, then, to some of the institutional A. That's correct, yes. 4 issues that arose around the Feltham analysis that you 4 Q. I think that was the 28 November 2012 incident and 5 did and can I begin, please, by orientating the panel by 5 that's HOU000003. bringing up, please, INQ001228 002, which, Mr Wood, is 6 Turning then, if I may, to the themes that you 6 7 7 just the letter of instruction you were sent in relation elicited, can I look up, please, your second and third 8 8 to Feltham, and perhaps just scroll in on that list of report. It's INQ001210 and it's internal page 8. You 9 incidents underneath the heading "A", because that shows 9 dealt with your views on Feltham under three headings. 10 the panel the number of incidents and the broad date of 10 Firstly, you applied the general principles of good 11 the incidents that you were invited to look at. 11 practice to Feltham. Then you dealt with some more 12 12 points of detail around allegations against members of A. That's right, yes. 13 Q. So the panel can see here that you were asked to look at 13 staff. In fact, forgive me, it's two headings in 14 15 different allegations from Feltham. They range 14 relation to Feltham. 15 from October 2008 and I think you were asked, 15 Is this right, Mr Wood: that as far as the initial 16 ultimately, to not look at that one because it's before 16 recording of an allegation is concerned and the initial 17 our 2009 start date but you then focused on a series of 17 response, we can perhaps scroll in on 3.1.1 on this 18 allegations from September 2009 through 18 page, you felt there was a wide variation in terms of 19 to September 2015. 19 the approach and standard in terms of the recordings. 20 20 And I think the two themes you brought out later around A. That's correct. 21 Q. Just putting that document to one side, and I won't 21 this were that the record seemed to reflect a lack of 22 22 bring these documents up, but just to give the panel understanding about the complication caused by the child 23 a broad flavour of it, the underlying material that you 23 being in custody, about them being scared to report. 24 were asked to look at -- the panel won't see this in 24 Just tell us a little bit more about that, would you? 25 your report, but I am just, hopefully, trying to give 25 A. That's right, yes. I think one of the major themes to Page 57 Page 59 a bit of detail here -- is that, for example, the 1 me was the fact that -- mentioned last time, some of the 1 2 allegation from 9 September 2009 was an allegation by 2 child's responses to custody in terms of externalising 3 3 a young person, a 17-year old who submitted a complaint behaviours may elicit a response from members of staff 4 in which this was written: he had been searched by 4 in terms of trying to restrain them, so these are --5 a female prison officer: 5 6 6 "She sexually assaulted me by squeezing my penis 7 a couple of times. I have several witnesses who saw the 7 8 8 assault." q 9 We don't need to bring that up but that's HOU000003 10 internal page 29. And several of the other incidents 10 11 that you were asked to look at had arisen because 11 12 12 a child had disclosed the allegation in one of the 13 survey responses? 13 14 14 A. That's right. 15 Q. Some of the other allegations, just by way of example, 15 16 that you were asked to look at involved one suggestion, 16

I think this is 19 March 2012. An incident that you

were asked to look at involved an officer coming into

shorts. The officer, it was said, had grabbed the child

by the genitals. That's the sort of thing you were

Q. And then just one, I think, perhaps final example.

Page 58

There was one example of a suggestion that a mental

the cell to hand out lunch. The child was wearing boxer

there is a gap there in terms of understanding the connection between those two things: previous experiences; and the current behaviour. In terms of the form actually to record any allegations against staff, Feltham did stand out in lots of ways in terms of the inconsistent approach, so we have mentioned before, I think, that, actually, a large range of forms are available to use and routes in to making an allegation against a member of staff. There was inconsistency in terms of the method, inconsistency in terms of the written response. One of the themes which did stand out was that there was consistency in terms of records in terms of members of staff, so one of the concerns I had was that there were clear pathways in terms of -- from an HR perspective, in terms of members of staff, those weren't replicated from a child or young person's experience.

There seems to me a lack of impetus to examine the whole picture, linked to the withdrawal or denial of allegations being made, as well. And there was some examples of that.

Page 60

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

15 (Pages 57 to 60)

looking at?

A. That's right, yes.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

3

4

5

6

7

8

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

page 4.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Now, I think using different methods to collate information, written by different people at different times, the tracking of those things in terms of being able to learn or to improve from those examples was absent, as well, so it was quite hard actually to track what had actually happened across the range of documents.
- O. So I think you're suggesting that the documentation suggested a better insight into the impact and allegation on the staff member than the child. Is that right?
- 12 A. That's right, yes.
- 13 Q. And that there was a perhaps inconsistent approach to 14 the support given to the child or, indeed, no apparent 15 support from the documentation being given to the child. 16 Is that right?
- 17 A. That's right. I think one of the things for me, as 18 I mentioned several times in several reports I've done, 19 that based on information I've actually seen, that's the 20 picture. That information may be recorded elsewhere, 21 but there was no cross-referencing to those other 22 records which may exist from Children's Service 23 departments from the police records, so it's very hard 24 to see how those things actually joined up. 25
 - I could only comment on the records I have seen, so

Q. I think another broad issue that you brought out was that there was, on occasion, a need for the child to report the allegation to more than one person to sort of repeat it and I think you felt that this was a rather difficult process. Can I ask you, please, to bring up your fifth report and, in particular, what you say about

this at 1.15 and 16, so it's INQ001764 and it's internal

- 9 If you scroll in, please, on 1.15 and 16. You seem 10 to be concerned across several of the institutions, but 11 including Feltham, about the number of members of staff 12 who became aware of allegations and this overexposure, 13 you call it of the allegations. Is that something you 14 can comment a little bit further on, please?
 - A. I think -- I think elsewhere in the report, and other reports, I mention the fact that just by the very nature of a custodial institution, it is actually quite hard to keep things completely confidential due to the fact of handovers of staff, risk assessments are being completed all the time on children and young people, so I think, in terms of when a child discloses sexual abuse, it is hard to keep that contained. The risks around that are that members of staff who may or may not be involved may become aware of those allegations. Other children and young people may become aware because the child may talk

Page 61

I did mention several points. It may be elsewhere, but it's not actually explicit.

- Q. Just to be clear, that is a point that's been raised in several of the institutional responses, that there may be evidence of support elsewhere. I think what you're saying is that on the core documents you were sent, on the child protection logs and things of that nature, it wasn't obvious what that support was?
- A. That's right. I think, from my perspective, it would have been really helpful if a log of other potential evidence sources which are linked in terms of the major records are examined, so it's about multi-agency approaches, as well. So no one agency is responsible in its entirety for safeguarding children; all agencies are responsible. I think it is hard, though, when agencies don't actually tie in to other records, so this may be available elsewhere. It would be quite helpful to see written down, but it wasn't written down anywhere.
 - Q. Would that sort of joined-up approach be consistent with the Working Together approach?
- A. It is completely consistent with this. I think the additional complexities of custody add a different aspect to that as well. However, all agencies are responsible for safeguarding children and young people, so it needs to be reflected across all agencies.

Page 62

Page 63

- 1 to other children and young people around those 2 confidential issues, as well, so it is very difficult 3 to -- to actually to work through that.
 - I think in terms of an absence of a record of that, it would be helpful, I think, for agencies to record the difficulties they may have in keeping things confidential, and then to put in some management around that. But overall, it is actually quite hard to do
 - There were some examples in terms of institutions, talking about Feltham in particular, where children and young people were concerned that other members of staff may become aware of allegations, as well.
 - Q. Perhaps I can take you to an area where you deal with that in your first consideration of these issues, please, it's INQ001210 010 and scroll in, please, on 3.1.16 where I think you had raised a particular observation about a child being concerned that their complaint had not been kept confidential but seemed to be known about by the partner of the member of staff who was then treating the child differently. Is that a summary of one example?
 - A. That's correct, yes. I think there, again, the added complication is that the member of staff who those allegations were made against may well have spoken to

Page 64

16 (Pages 61 to 64)

| 1 | his or her partner about the allegation. Again, I think | 1 | harm and with the most amount of care. |
|----|--|-----|---|
| 2 | it would have been helpful to see a record from the | 2 | I think, however I think in terms of how a child |
| 3 | child protection logs or some sort of record written | 3 | can actually perceive that loss of power, loss of |
| 4 | down about this issue and say what they were going to do | 4 | control, it's quite clear that there's a number of |
| 5 | in terms of trying to deal with that risk factor. | 5 | allegations across the entire range I've looked at |
| 6 | Certainly from the records I saw, the young person's | 6 | whereby restraint is a starting point, so children would |
| 7 | perspective was that they were being treated in | 7 | perceive that restraint in a certain way. It's also |
| 8 | a different way, and the allegation had actually been | 8 | aligned to searches, as well, so if children have made |
| 9 | made. | 9 | comments around that, as well. And the view was, this |
| 10 | Q. Thank you. You have already highlighted, I think, if | 10 | is a thorough search, this is a complete completely |
| 11 | you go to the top of that page, please, a theme of the | 11 | within the rules of restraint. However, the child's |
| 12 | disparity in the apparent understanding of the impact on | 12 | experience of that wasn't really recognised or picked |
| 13 | staff compared to the impact on children. Is there | 13 | out from that. |
| 14 | anything more that you would like to say about that, how | 14 | Now, I do understand working in an environment |
| 15 | that reflected itself in the Feltham records? | 15 | whereby high levels of conflict and stress are around |
| 16 | A. I think for me the one of the core issues for me is | 16 | all the time. However, that child's individual |
| 17 | in terms of whose record it actually is. I think from | 17 | experience of that episode should be reflected, I think, |
| 18 | a member of staff point of view, it is important | 18 | in terms of the records. |
| 19 | obviously to record allegations or concerns or | 19 | Q. I think we have seen in the response by the |
| 20 | complaints and to log those and to follow a correct | 20 | Ministry of Justice and indeed some of the witness |
| 21 | process associated with the contract they're actually | 21 | evidence that we will hear today that the allegations |
| 22 | having to work to. | 22 | that you looked at, as we have seen, ended in 2015 but |
| 23 | One of the concerns I suppose I had really was | 23 | there is, now, a different process in place |
| 24 | it's quite clear, you can see the pathways whereby | 24 | A. There is, yes. |
| 25 | members of staff were invited to meetings. It's all | 25 | Q as far as restraint is concerned? |
| | Page 65 | | Page 67 |
| 1 | written down in a clean way. The results of these | , | A. Yes. |
| 1 | written down in a clear way. The results of those | 1 2 | Q. And our understanding is that there will be some debrief |
| 2 | meetings are very clearly written down. You could | 3 | of the child after restraint? |
| 3 | easily pick out what the processes were, what the issues | 4 | |
| 4 | were, what the next steps were and that wasn't always so | | A. Yes, I was very pleased to see that. |
| 5 | obvious when the child actually made an issue, so there | 5 | Q. What sort of thing would you hope to see that that |
| 6 | is two different ways of thinking about it. | 6 | debrief includes, Mr Wood? |
| 7 | Now, it may be and I think agencies, I have | 7 | A. I think in terms of from a behavioural response, |
| 8 | already said in another response to the report, that | 8 | I suppose, in terms of what was leading up to the |
| 9 | those records, in terms of the response in terms of | 1 1 | restraint, why the staff actually identify the need to |
| 10 | support for the child, may be lodged somewhere else, | 10 | restrain or put hands on a child, enabling the child to |
| 11 | that may be the case, but there was no cross-referencing | 11 | understand what the rules were and why restraint was |
| 12 | to the records I saw, so that's one issue I think in | 12 | important under some limited circumstances. |
| 13 | terms of evidence based work. | 13 | I think for me it's aligned also to there would be |
| 14 | The issue about restraints - | 14 | a large amount of information which would be known about |
| 15 | Q. Let's come to that, if we scroll in, please, on 3.1.13. | 15 | the child if they've got history of involvement prior to |
| 16 | I think what you had mentioned here sorry, it's 12 | 16 | coming into custody. So all information about their |
| 17 | and 13, forgive me is that there was a concern here | 17 | past lives, experiences, their past trauma, their past |
| 18 | about the way in which a restraint issue had been dealt | 18 | child protection status, past involvement with social |
| 19 | with. Tell us what your findings were there. | 19 | care or other agencies, all that should be known, so it |
| 20 | A. I think for me, I mentioned several points, I suppose, | 20 | may not come as a surprise to staff, then, if children |
| 21 | that a child's pre-existing experience of trauma or | 21 | respond in certain ways. |
| 22 | abuse may configure their internal working view of the | 22 | So actually, it's about the staff and the agency |
| 23 | world, so they may be expecting conflict, aggression and | 23 | taking responsibility to understand the child as much as |
| 24 | I understand that workers are trained specifically to | 24 | possible what triggers may emerge from their past |
| 25 | restrain in certain ways to cause the least amount of | 25 | experiences and also enabling the child to understand |
| | Page 66 | | Page 68 |

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 what the rules are and how the rules are different 2 within custody to outside of custody and what the 3 consequences of some of their behaviour might be. 4 So I think a debrief is in two elements. It's the 5 child's understanding and the member of staff's 6 understanding. I did see the response in terms of --7 from the recent attempts to improve practice in Feltham 8 in terms of creating a log to make sure that if certain 9 members of staff are more prone to restraining children 10 and others weren't that could be now identified, which 11 is very helpful, I think, in terms of understanding the 12 staff issue as well as the young person's issue, because 13 my experience would say that some members of staff are 14 more skilled and more able to deescalate prior to 15 restraint, others members of staff may move to restraint 16 in a quicker way, so you can understand that from 17 a debriefing as well. 18 Q. Just following on from that, one of the points that you 19 have made in your report, I think at 3.1.13, was that 20 where there was a concern that the restraint of a child 21 had not followed expected training you were suggesting 22 that there wasn't evidence of any follow-up with the 23 member of staff concerned? 24 A. That's right. 25 Q. But is it your understanding that that would now occur Page 69

made, reactions can be interpreted in a certain way which may actually escalate the issue, the conflict

And I think understanding children's point of view in terms of what relationships adults mean to them, past experiences would be useful. I think from a confidentiality point of view, that would be done in a careful way because you wouldn't want to expose the entire history of a child across the entire range of adults.

But with a key worker approach, they could hold information. The members of staff can go to that key worker and say, "Actually, I saw this today. Does this make sense in terms of the past experiences?", and a discussion could happen then.

I think in terms of the resource implication, and it's the care and control relationship which we spoke about last time, if you think about safeguarding is at the heart of all activity with children and young people, then workers have got a responsibility to make sure their actions are understood and interpreted by a child within that perspective.

Q. So I think, is this fair, that what you're saying is that, albeit fully recognising that restraint may be necessary on occasion?

Page 71

1 as part of some formal debrief?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A. What I've recently read in terms of the papers presented to me, I think the response now seems very robust now. It's quite a recent change and I think also for me it would be about understanding compliance, not only in terms of the correct forms being filled out, but understanding the child's experience of that, as well. So inspection could bring that out.

Q. Just a final question on this topic, please, to what extent would it be your expectation that that pool of knowledge about a child would be available to the staff member who has to make that decision in the moment about whether to restrain that child?

A. I would think that, I mean, the essence of a care planning process would be that key people would have to know what the presenting issues were for the child. I think that could be done in a way whereby the child doesn't feel their entire past history is exposed to a series of adults or members of staff whom they may have very limited contact with. However, I think there are key themes which could be drawn out from that, so my view would be that the pre-existing knowledge which agencies have about children in terms of experiences should be used in a child centred way, in an appropriate

A. Yes.

Q. That in deciding whether to restrain a child, the fact, if so exists, that that child has been already physically or sexually abused should be part of that

4 5

decision-making framework?

6 A. I think -- I think, you know, sitting here, it's easy to 7 say that in terms of a --

Q. I appreciate that.

A. - detached view, I think, in terms of the harsh fact of having to deal with the child's escalating behaviour in front of you as an adult, and I've certainly been in situations whereby that's happening. I think the skill is understanding what's behind that behaviour and also enabling the child to feel that is another option. It does take some skill to do that and some support and some supervision and some elements around that to do that, but I think in terms of, if you don't want a child to have a repeated experience of trauma and abuse, which then adds to their sense of isolation and no control and no power, then I would say that understanding where the child's perception comes from is important. In practical ways, it's difficult to do that. I think staff would have to be trained to understand what may be lying behind some of the behaviours.

Page 72

Q. Or, indeed, even if the behaviour is entirely unrelated

Page 70

way, but it's essential, otherwise decisions can be

18 (Pages 69 to 72)

1 to past abuse --1 Ministry of Justice has outlined a range of options in 2 2 A. Yes. terms of the pathways to making an allegation against 3 3 Q. - the fact of restraint potentially retraumatising a member of staff or a child, the form is one of them, 4 a child. Is that right? 4 and I suppose, for me, it would have been helpful to 5 A. My experience of seeing restraints happen, being 5 understand a little more about whether this is 6 involved in some restraints as a member of staff is that 6 a surprise to staff, this came as a common factor. 7 7 it can be a very traumatising experience for the child. To me, it was left in that stage whereby the child 8 My approach would be to talk to the child throughout the 8 was saying, "It wasn't me", and it is difficult. If 9 9 entire restraint, remain some contact. I think once the a child is denying an allegation, then there is an end 10 emotions and the heightened emotions of restraint are 10 to that. You can't keep on trying to fish information. 11 happening, it's very difficult for children to hear what 11 There is an end to it, but I felt that it would have 12 adults are saying to them. The damage can be done 12 been helpful to have a written explanation about what 13 13 between that period, so when the brains are effectively happened next, if anything. 14 switched off from what's gone on, and factually, it's 14 Q. Because it could have been a retraction of 15 somebody responding from a emotional point of view, it's 15 an allegation, couldn't it --16 a survival technique, it's very hard to communicate at 16 A. Absolutely. 17 that point, but I think maintaining that drip, drip, 17 Q. -- rather than a mistake? 18 drip of positive contact is important in that restraint 18 A. Absolutely right, yes. I think for me it would have 19 and I think it is difficult, I think I've certainly been 19 been helpful to show how these things were actually sort 20 20 involved, you know, seen events happen whereby the of worked out. So making a decision to do nothing is 2.1 behaviour escalates, restraint happens, the child gets 21 still making a choice, and that's what happens, I think. 22 22 worn out, effectively gives up, is then moved to So it would have been useful to show how the thought 23 23 somewhere that's a safe space and the same pattern patterns are worked out, why the end result was that 24 repeats itself over and over again and for some children 24 way, instead of just recording "Retraction allegation, 25 that's their way of communicating and understanding, 25 denial", that was the end. Page 75 Page 73 1 having contact with adults, which is totally harmful in 1 Q. And I think is this fair, if you go on to 3.1.5 in your 2 the short and long-term. That's a factual thing. 2 report, you saw a similar pattern where complaints had 3 3 Q. It's a further complicating factor of it? actually been withdrawn, so withdrawal of complaints 4 4 appear not to have been followed up in terms of A. Absolutely, yes. 5 Q. Moving on from restraint issues, Mr Wood, if I may, can 5 analysing and evidencing the meaning of the allegation 6 I deal now with some points about the nuts and bolts, if 6 to the child, given the context of it being made and the 7 I can call it that, of how allegations were 7 reasoning why it was later withdrawn? 8 investigated --8 A. That's right. 9 9 Q. That's a similar sort of theme, is it the? 10 Q. - and pull up, please, 3.1.3, which is the same report 10 A. That's right. 11 but at internal page 8, where you refer here to two 11 Q. While we're dealing with this, you do say at 3.1.4 12 incidents where complaints forms have been completed, 12 a perhaps general observation that I think perhaps 13 had highlighted sexual abuse but where both of the 13 permeates the YOI analysis about the use of complaint 14 14 children denied completing the form. All right? So can forms and the practitioner point, I think, that you pull 15 you comment on what you drew from that and how that was 15 out of this is that there is, as we heard from your 16 evidence last week a difference between concerns, 16 17 A. Again, from examination of the records which were there, 17 complaints and allegations that have a significance for 18 these two separate children made two separate 18 your practitioner head --19 complaints, both denied filling them out and I think for 19 A. That's right, yes. 20 me, there is a lack of evidence, I suppose, in terms of 20 Q. -- if you like, that perhaps doesn't carry over to 21 what was going to happen next, then, so the form was 21 a complaints form in custody. So please help us with 22 filled out by someone and people -- I think the staff 22 what you have drawn out under that topic. 23 member seemed satisfied with the explanation that it 23 A. I think for me, it goes back to the Howe & Co 24 wasn't me. Now, I suppose in terms of looking at the 24 recommendation, I suppose -- I think it was 25 range of options children would have and I know the 25 recommendation 9 -- in terms of having a way to manage Page 74 Page 76

2.1

or a way to record in a clearly transparent, trackable way. And what I found really and what I experienced, looking at the entirety of this and the record, it's very difficult to track those things, understand what actually happened, so -- and I think for me also, from a complaints point of view, a complaint to me has a different outcome, a complaint under stage 1, stage 2 and stage 3 could be investigated, it may be deemed not to be substantiated at any point in stage 1 or stage 2 or stage 3, but I think for me the use of the word "complaints" when we're talking about allegations of sexual abuse, there is a gap there, to me. A complaint may be against a member of staff who

A complaint may be against a member of staff who understands it would have to be recorded in a certain way, but there were examples — may not have been in Feltham, but other institutions, I can't recall at the moment, but there were definitely examples whereby children actually spoke to a member of staff about an allegation and then he told them to fill out a complaints form.

Well, to me, it's that adult's responsibility to take forward that allegation and not — it isn't very helpful to say to a child, "Stop where you are, fill out a complaints form", which may — they may not be able to do anyway, but also may be worried about writing things

what the results were, that's the fundamental keystone.

- Q. Moving, then, to some issues you had raised about the actual quality of the investigation when a disclosure had been made, 3.1.14, please, it's internal page 10 of that same document. I think there are several different points you made under this heading, and at 3.1.14 you pulled out that there had been two, I think historical allegations of sexual abuse made by adults in regards to staff at Feltham which had not been pursued. Tell us what your concern was about the way those had been investigated.
 - A. One of them was really about one route was that they advised some mental health professionals that it wasn't the correct thing to do to follow up that allegation due to the mental health state of the adult. I wasn't clear from the record in terms of what explanation was around that or what support could be put in for that for the mental health issues, so there's a gap there.

Now, it may be that's very standard advice and it may be the correct advice, but it would have been really helpful to understand how the institution responded to that, to say, "Well, that's the case, what we're going to do about this allegation".

The issue, the other issue, was that there was an issue in terms of a decision was made not to -- not

Page 77

down and then -- it then goes somewhere else.

- Q. Is that one of the examples of a sort of focus on substance not form that -- forgive me, form not substance, that you identified that there was quite an adherence to process that you seem to have nulled or
- an adherence to process that you seem to have pulled out
- 6 as a key theme. Is that fair?
 - A. That's fair, yes and I think for me it's the it's the experience of the child is the most important thing, it's actually quite hard to spot that. I mean, forms can be filled out to whatever extent they're going to be filled out to and you may gain information from those forms, but I think in terms of the number of substantiated allegations which ended up whichever route was taken, was very low across all institutions anyway, so the outcome for children was hard to spot, I think.

So I think for me, the procedures are complex anyway. The inspection frameworks are complex and may not actually complement each other across the entirety of the span, so that's into the mix as we stand now and for a child to try to navigate their way through that actually is quite hard. So I think for me, there are advantages and disadvantages, but I think, for me, to have a system or a process whereby we can track exactly how many allegations were made against whom and when and

Page 78

Page 79

- to pursue one of the allegations of historical background issue. I think for me, again, a rational
 - explanation about why that decision was made and to work
- 4 backwards from that was actually absent from the record.
- 5 I think it may say, sort of later on in the report why
- 6 that was.
 - Q. Then I think a second theme that you pulled out from the Feltham analysis was certain examples of records being missing or not being as clear as you would have liked and I think to understand this, please, if we go to 2.1.12 in that report, that's page 7, you made a comment about some missing records in relation to Werrington at 2.1.12. That's internal page 7, as I say. Just scrolling down to 2.1.12, you said:

"It is unclear from the records examined why a record of entry into a child's cell was absent was a particular concern, given that the child in question was perceived as being of high risk in regards to a propensity to make allegations against staff."

There were further points about an absence of recording, and then you're asked to look at that issue in the context of Feltham. If we go, then, to your fifth report, please, which INQ001764 and it's internal page 2 and scroll in, please, on paragraph 1.3 and thereafter. I think you pulled out a similar theme in

Page 80

20 (Pages 77 to 80)

- 1 respect of two of the incidents at Feltham 1 2 2 from December 2012 and June 2015. Can you help us with 3 3 what your concern was about the lack of evidence here? 4 A. Yes, certainly. I think the issue in terms of a clearly 4 5 defined pathway in terms of why decisions were made, 5 6 which links into 1.5 in terms of the training and 6 7 7 support given to individuals who worked directly with 8 8 children and young people, I think for me -- it says, 9 9 "I can further confirm the evidence of records 10 examined" -- there were difficulties in terms of 10 11 11 disclosure and allegations of sexual abuse and I think 12 12 in terms of, for me, unless you get a very clear record 13 13 in terms of what the response was, when a child actually 14 14 alleged any form of abuse, but particularly sexual abuse 15 15 in this instance, in terms of what processes were 16 16 followed, what support was given, what advice was 17 17 sought, external working together, those sort of things 18 18 as well, it's very hard to spot where those things are. 19 And there were issues across some of the agencies, 19 20 20 there are examples there. Feltham, I think, from my 21 reading of the paperwork provided to me quite recently 21 22 22 in terms of the standards there and the recent 23 23 inspection there, seems to be doing one of those things, 24 24 but obviously the period of time I was looking at is if 25 the concerns were actually there, and there were 25 Page 81 1 absences of records and this goes back to this issue in 1 2 terms of the pre-existing awareness which members of 2 3 3 staff have about children and young people and the risks 4 they may or may not present. It wasn't actually 4 5 utilised in a positive way. 5 6 Q. I think you have made a second point towards the end of 6 7 1.3 that there were some issues about an absence of CCTV 7 8 coverage in relation to some of the incidents. Can you 8 q g help us with what that was? 10 A. Yes, there were issues in terms of some of the instances 10 11 of where I had CCTV, some of the decisions were made in 11 12
 - terms of deciding not to put -- not to pursue allegations against members of staff. There was no CCTV coverage actually in the child's cell and that -- but one of the reasons to decide not to progress is that that wasn't there anyway. So it's quite hard to understand why a decision was made on the basis of it not being there. Q. I think we heard some -- we adduced some evidence from the REA that a theme that had been identified by the research team here was whether or not there is, on occasion, an undue reliance on CCTV and I think what you're saying on that example is that the absence of CCTV was used as a reason not to pursue an allegation --A. That's right. Page 82
- Q. -- when it was in an area where there was never going to be any CCTV? A. That's right. Q. Is that your concern? A. That's correct and I find that quite difficult to comprehend those two things together, really. So if there is an absence anyway, but there is no CCTV coverage there, then those two things are separate issues. O. I think Ms Willow's evidence last week was that her perception was that if there's not a CCTV recording or a member of staff corroborating a child's account, a child would find it very hard to be believed. Does that sort of fit a little bit with what you saw on this allegation? A. I think so. I think in terms of the reliance upon CCTV coverage, these other examples in terms of it being quite hard to see the alleged incident on CCTV, because of the number of children around at the same time or the members of staff around, so there is a reliance on that, I think. I think -- and with the absence of that -- and I think one of the recommendations against for Howe & Co was the sort of cameras being issued to members of staff and I do understand the implications in terms of a child's right to having a private space and the Page 83 cameras may impact on that, but I think in terms of providing evidence and providing good evidence which is not one person's word against the other, that's probably the only way to do that. So I think in terms of the very fact that there's certain areas within the institution whereby there's no CCTV, it would have been useful to see and the records -- which may not have been the records I have seen, it may be elsewhere in some other documents -about how the institution actually managed the risks associated with those areas that weren't being covered 12 by CCTV. 13 One example we looked at earlier in terms of the 14 fact that a member of staff going into a child's cell 15 where it was known that was a high-risk issue and no 16 record being made, that adds another complicated factor 17 to it. I mean, I would suggest that if there is no CCTV 18

coverage in the cell, then records should be very accurate in terms of who went in, what for, how long for, who was there as a witness.

21 Q. To add to the objective pool of evidence about what 22 happened?

23

19

20

24 Q. Just finally on this topic, please, 1.52 of your fifth 25 report, it's INQ001764, just bear with me a second. No,

Page 84

21 (Pages 81 to 84)

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

| 1 | sorry, yes, it's INQ001764_010, please. I think you | 1 | make this choice? How did we communicate to that young |
|----------|---|----------|---|
| 2 | return to the issue of CCTV at Feltham at 1.52 at the | 2 | person about the allegation isn't going to go any |
| 3 | bottom of this page and over the next page, and I think | 3 | further? Well, the record didn't actually sort of show |
| 4 | a specific example you pulled out was the | 4 | that. |
| 5 | 9 September 2009 allegation where you said here that the | 5 | Q. I think another example of a lack of documentation, |
| 6 | decision not to pursue the allegation was made as the | 6 | albeit in a slightly different context, was brought out |
| 7 | CCTV evidence did not support the allegation made, so | 7 | by you at 3.1.17 of your first report, please. It's |
| 8 | there was CCTV for this incident. | 8 | INQ001210, individual page 10, please, and it's |
| 9 | But then you say: | 9 | paragraph 3.1.17. |
| 10 | "This is despite the fact that the record indicated | 10 | Now, this is a serious allegation of rape that had |
| 11 | that the footage was very unclear, given the distance | 11 | been made against a member of staff. You make the point |
| 12 | and the large number of other children and young people | 12 | here there was a very brief record of it. A section 47 |
| 13 | in the area. The records do not indicate that the | 13 | strategy meeting was held within which the decision was |
| 14 | witnesses to the allegation were spoken to. In stating | 14 | taken that there was insufficient evidence to contact |
| 15 | to the child or young person the seriousness of the | 15 | the local authority where the alleged perpetrator lived |
| 16 | allegation and the lack of evidence to support it, it | 16 | and I think your concern was not only that this wasn't |
| 17 | can be argued that the message given to the child was | 17 | followed up further, but that there wasn't a clear |
| 18 | one based upon a warning." | 18 | reason for why that was. Is that a fair summary? |
| 19 | A. Yes. | 19 | A. It is a fair summary, yes, and, again, I think for me, |
| 20 | Q. So is your concern about that, that CCTV was very | 20 | if those records about decisions and processes were held |
| 21 | unclear but was used as a reason not to pursue the | 21 | elsewhere then that should be cross-referenced here, |
| 22 | allegation? | 22 | otherwise it looks as if on the face, looking at what's |
| 23 | A. That's what the record indicated, yes, that it was very | 23 | actually happened, a serious allegation was actually |
| 24 | unclear and that was the reason why they didn't take it | 24 | made, a strategy meeting was held in this circumstance |
| 25 | any further. | 25 | and decision was made at that point there wasn't |
| | Page 85 | | Page 87 |
| | | | |
| 1 | Q. And it didn't seem, from your perspective, that | 1 | sufficient evidence at that point, which, again, goes to |
| 2 | witnesses had been spoken to? | 2 | the definition of what an investigation actually is, so |
| 3 | A. That's right. | 3 | is it internal, is it a LADO investigation, is it |
| 4 | Q. And I think you felt that the child might have seen this | 4 | a social care investigation, is it a joint |
| 5 | as a warning. Help us with what you mean by that? | 5 | investigation, is it a police investigation, is it |
| 6 | A. I think for me, if a child alleged an incident and | 6 | an investigation under section 47 of the Children Act? |
| 7 | adults respond to that in terms of saying: well, we've | 7 | So it's unclear in terms of why that choice actually was |
| 8 | got no evidence for that, and I think the words of the | 8 | made. |
| 9 | child were this is a serious thing you've said, it | 9 | I suppose coming from a point of view whereby |
| 10 | seemed to me from the record that in the absence of | 10 | I would record things expecting the child to view the |
| 11 | clear CCTV evidence, the fact that witnesses weren't | 11 | record at some point in the future, I'd want |
| 12 | actually approached or asked from what they had actually | 12 | an explanation about why the decision was made. |
| 13 | seen, the information was shared with the child, it was | 13 | Q. You have made the point in your fifth report, please, |
| 14 15 | a serious issue to make an allegation against a member | 14 15 | paragraph 1.19, it's INQ001764_004 that there were |
| 16 | of staff and we've got no evidence to say this is true. So I think from a child's point of view I didn't | 16 | several similarly serious allegations among the paperwork that you saw. I think you have said at 1.19 |
| 17 | feel like it's important that you're given the scope to | 17 | that the record did indicate a serious allegation being |
| 18 | make allegations and we take allegations in a serious | 18 | made by a child or young person ringing Childline in |
| 19 | way and we're going to investigate them to the best of | 19 | respect of witnessing another child being raped by other |
| 20 | our possible resources. It did feel to me this is | 20 | children or young people in the shower. |
| 21 | an issue to say whether the child was actually told this | 21 | And you summarise there the other serious |
| 22 | is not a good thing to do without evidence. | 22 | allegations, particularly serious allegations that you |
| 23 | I think, for me, the impetus on the child really was | 23 | had looked at, including a nursing member of staff |
| 24 | the wrong way to handle that. The institution should | 24 | sexually abusing a child during an examination, |
| 25 | have looked at we there is a gap here, why did we | 25 | a custody member of staff during a search, a custody |
| | 0 I 1/11 V 1 1 1 1 1 | 1 | , |
| I | Page 86 | | Page 88 |

1 1 member of staff raping a child or young person in the LADO. You said at 3 that a generic theme was the use of 2 2 internal investigations. Where allegations were made cell and those are, I think, a summary, is this right, 3 of the more serious of the allegations that you looked 3 against members of staff the LADO was contacted although 4 at? 4 not present on one occasion at Werrington. 5 5 Investigations under section 47 were a rarity across all A. That's right, yes. 6 Q. You make the point that there were, I think, you say 6 the institutions, but in comparison to Medway, Feltham 7 7 there, no substantiated allegations, albeit I think in appeared to have a low rate of substantive involvement 8 fairness earlier you suggest that one --8 from the LADO. 9 9 So that was one particular Feltham-related theme. A. One. 10 O. -- of them was. 10 Is that right? 11 11 A. That's correct, yes. A. That's correct, yes. Q. And then finally, please, help us with your evidence. 12 Q. On 9 September 2009. 12 13 If we can go back to 1.41 in the report, it's internal 13 A. Yes. 14 Q. And you go on within this report, then, to deal with the 14 page 8, where you were asked some questions about the 15 Social Services involvement. Can I ask you to look at, 15 police investigation. 16 please, 1.39 in your report. It's internal page 8 and 16 A. Yes. 17 I think you broadly said that just above 1.39, forgive 17 Q. You have said here in Feltham none of the allegations 18 me, in around 50 per cent of the cases from Feltham the 18 were substantiated, none have substantive police 19 Social Services or LADO had some involvement. Is that 19 investigations, none were subjected to section 47 20 20 right? investigations. 21 A. That's correct, yes. 21 A. Yes. 22 22 Q. But then you go on to indicate concerns, I think, Q. Help us with what you mean, please, by "substantive 23 23 overall about the section 47 threshold and about the police investigations"? 24 substantive involvement of the LADO service so help us, 24 A. Certainly, yes, I'm happy to do that. My perception of 25 please, with your themes about that? 25 substantive police involvement was actually a section 47 Page 89 Page 91 1 1 approach, so I know one example's been given in terms of A. I think for me it's the issue is linked to when the 2 decision is made to refer to LADO or straight to social 2 the police interviewing a young person, looking at CCTV 3 3 coverage, analysing rotas, those sort of things, as care, the process around from a LADO point of view in 4 4 terms of the threshold they may want to apply to the 5 information they have, from a social care point of view 5 I think for me it is, from the records it actually 6 is quite hard to see what actually happened to reach in terms of ensuring that section 47, the requirements 6 7 7 allegation which was made. I do take the point in terms are actually met. 8 I'll go on further to, I suppose, a bit later on the 8 of substantive police investigations may be the fact 9 9 that they took their own investigation. To me, this report, to say that given the additional risk factors 10 and the exposure to risk and the past history of some 10 again comes back to the difficulties in terms of trying 11 children and young people, it's my view, I suppose, that 11 to separate out what people mean by allegations, 12 12 section 47 should start as a default position and then investigations. 13 work backwards from that with instances against 13 Q. Who is doing what. 14 14 A. Who is doing what, and when and why. So I think in allegations against a member of staff. 15 So I think, for me, it comes back to, again, in 15 terms of the example given, I suppose, my view about 16 substantive involvements isn't just attending a strategy 16 terms of this diverse range of responses and I suppose 17 17 meeting. That isn't substantive involvement from any what was of concern to me was it may be the situation 18 18 agency; that's their statutory responsibilities to do that in response to an allegation a child has made may 19 take a particular route depending on who that allegation 19 that. So substantial involvement would mean to me in 20 is actually made to, so the consistency of approach is 20 terms of undertaking a very clear process under 21 21 section 47 of the Children Act. And, again, it's hard hard to see. That's my overarching view, I suppose. 22 22 Q. I think if I can go, please, to the last but one page of to see where that actually is tracked across all the 23 that report, it's internal page 12, please, under 23 24 heading 3. You pull together, I think, a generic theme 24 Q. So is there a difference in the language that you're 25 was around the involvement of Social Services and the 25 using, then, between substantive police investigation

Page 92

| 1 | and no police investigation? | 1 | You have heard evidence, I think, about the review |
|-------|--|-------|---|
| 2 | A. There is, yes, and I think, for me, the investigating | 2 | of the pain-inducing techniques that has been carried |
| 3 | sort of process needs to be analysed under one view, so | 3 | out by the Youth Justice Board. Can you give a view |
| 4 | section 47 is the most convenient way to do that in | 4 | from your own perspective of what you consider the |
| 5 | terms of cross from agencies' point of view. | 5 | effect may have been of pain-inducing restraint on |
| 6 | It links into, into me in terms of agencies | 6 | children's willingness to disclose abuse and perhaps, |
| 7 | undertaking their own internal investigations as well, | 7 | more generally, from what you have seen in these case |
| 8 | so it is quite hard on each individual allegation being | 8 | studies? |
| 9 | made to see who was involved when and why and what | 9 | A. Yes, I'd be very surprised if a child responded in |
| 10 | involvement what actually meant, but I do agree with | 10 | a positive way to understand that the reason why |
| 11 | the MPS's view that the example which they gave is | 11 | restraint happened, no matter how much you explain to |
| 12 | example of police becoming extremely involved in a case. | 12 | a child the reason why, a positive response is actually |
| 13 | My understanding was that may not have been under | 13 | quite hard to see afterwards. So therefore that would |
| 14 | section 47 of the Children Act. | 14 | sort of show to me that a child's previous experience is |
| 15 | Q. I think, in terms of your background, do you yourself | 15 | based upon adults harming them, abusing them, trying to |
| 16 | have experience of conducting police investigations in | 16 | control them, which may be pre-existing, their |
| 17 | custody? | 17 | experience from wherever they are, Feltham or Werrington |
| 18 | A. I do. In terms of from my angle on that, yes, I would | 18 | or anywhere, it's going to add to their sense of adults |
| 19 | do, yes, so I have undertaken those. I mean, I have | 19 | can impose their power in a certain way. |
| 20 | conducted joint investigations with police myself and | 20 | It's not going to assist a child feeling comfortable |
| 21 | police and joint investigations and that includes | 21 | or confident in talking to that member of staff about |
| 22 | allegations against members of staff and also | 22 | an allegation of sexual abuse. That's my perception. |
| 23 | allegations whereby there's an organised view from abuse | 23 | I mean, it is a very difficult role to do to restrain |
| 24 | so wide a wide ranging group of adults, as well, | 24 | a child. No matter how careful you are, it does |
| 25 | within particular areas, as well. | 25 | actually mean that adults imposing their power and |
| | The second second with the second sec | - | accuracy mean time accuracy imposing their power and |
| | Page 93 | | Page 95 |
| 1 | I've also had to remove children from various | 1 | control over that child. |
| 2 | situations with police involved, undertaken Achieving | 2 | Q. Thank you. And just finally for completeness I should |
| 3 | Best Evidence interviews and I've supplied to courts for | 3 | just read in the reference for the MPS material. It's |
| 4 | a wide range of orders, which is normally is | 4 | OHY003322, and that's the example you were given of |
| 5 | a consequence of the police exercising their powers to | 5 | various steps the Met Police had taken on a |
| 6 | remove a child under extreme circumstances, so I have | 6 | particular |
| 7 | done those things, yes. | 7 | A. That's right, yes. |
| 8 | Q. So just trying to distill it, then, you remain of the | 8 | MS HILL: Thank you, chair. Those are my questions for the |
| 9 | view that there were questions, if I can put it | 9 | witness. |
| 10 | neutrally, about the substantive police involvement in | 10 | THE CHAIR: Thank you. We will take a lunch break now and |
| 11 | some of these allegations. Is that right? | 11 | return at 2.00. |
| 12 | A. I think, for me, the example which is given is a clear | 12 | (1.05 pm) |
| 13 | example of what they actually did. For me, without | 13 | (The luncheon adjournment) |
| 14 | examining the entirety of records across police records, | 14 | (2.00 pm) |
| 15 | which may add additional factors, with the information | 15 | MS HILL: Thank you, chair. I will call, please, |
| 16 | I have seen, which I would expect, since a child's | 16 | Glenn Knight. |
| 17 | actually "resident", in inverted commas, there, that | 17 | MR GLENN KNIGHT (sworn) |
| 18 | should be the core element of where all the records are | 18 | Examination by MS HILL |
| 19 | actually cross sort of referenced from my | 19 | MS HILL: Thank you very much. You're Glenn Knight; is that |
| 20 | • | 20 | right? |
| 20 | perspective, anyway. | 20 | |
| 21 22 | It is quite hard to see the level of involvement | 21 22 | A. Yes, that is correct. Q. You're here to give evidence because, is this correct, |
| 22 | across a range of issues, not just from the police but | 22 23 | until May of this year you were the governing governor |
| 23 | from social care, from LADO, all agencies involved. | 24 | at Feltham? |
| 25 | Q. Just one final question, chair, if I may, from | 25 | |
| 23 | Howe & Co, please. | 23 | A. Yes, I was. |
| | Page 94 | | Page 96 |

| 1 | Q. You're hoping to assist the panel, I think, with some | 1 | sexualised behaviour or self-harm. Is that right? |
|----------|---|-----|--|
| 2 | general background to the systems in place for | 2 | A. Yes, that is correct, yes, there will be a complete |
| 3 | safeguarding children at Feltham and also to try and | 3 | multidisciplinary assessment on both of those young |
| 4 | assist with the response to some of the issues that | 4 | people. |
| 5 | Mr Wood has identified. Is that right? A. That is correct. | 5 | Q. You were asked some questions, Mr Knight, about the |
| 6 7 | Q. You have provided a statement dated 13 July which I will | 6 7 | inspector's report of Feltham in 2017. If I could bring |
| 8 | adduce, please, with your permission, chair, HMP000407, | 8 | that up, please, it's INQ000125? |
| 9 | which sets out a bit of the background in relation to | 9 | MR FRANK: Ms Hill, I wonder if I could ask you I am |
| 10 | Feltham. Mr Knight, can you tell us a little bit about | 10 | having difficulty finding this in my bundle. MS HILL: Just bear with me a second. I understand that you |
| 11 | the two different parts of Feltham and what they are and | 11 | have the statement for Mr Knight in your bundle. |
| 12 | things like that? | 12 | I don't think you have his exhibits or the supporting |
| 13 | A. So Feltham has two sides, so it has Feltham A, which is | 13 | documentation. Just bear with me a second, please, |
| 14 | where we care for up to 180 young people and that will | 14 | I think you have his statement should be, it's |
| 15 | be from the age of 15 to 18, and then it would have | 15 | section 33, tab D, the index may not have yet caught it |
| 16 | Feltham B, in which we'd care for, fully operational, | 16 | up, I'm sorry. |
| 17 | 522 young adults and that would be the age from 18 to | 17 | MR FRANK: Thank you very much. |
| 18 | 21. | 18 | MS HILL: But I think the inspectors report I am about to go |
| 19 | Q. Feltham A has young people who are both sentenced and on | 19 | to is at tab C. |
| 20 | remand. Is that right? | 20 | Thank you, if I could pull up the 2017 report. As |
| 21 | A. Yes, it does. | 21 | I say it's INQ000125 and just to take this relatively |
| 22 | Q. Then tell us a little bit, please, about the different | 22 | briefly, Mr Knight, because I know this isn't the most |
| 23 | units within Feltham A? | 23 | recent report, could I pull up, please, internal page 5 |
| 24 | A. So on Feltham A you have an induction unit where all the | 24 | which sets out a broad introduction to the report. |
| 25 | children and young people would come initially. You | 25 | This was a report with Peter Clarke, HM |
| | | | |
| | Page 97 | | Page 99 |
| 1 | also have the living units where we would care for up to | 1 | Chief Inspector of Prisons and, is this right, there |
| 2 | 30 young people on those units and just recently we have | 2 | were a range of concerns raised in the report about |
| 3 | introduced an enhanced support unit, which is a small | 3 | levels of violence and the use of force having |
| 4 | unit that would care for the young people, the most | 4 | increased, for example? |
| 5 | challenged and challenging needs. | 5 | A. Yes, there was. |
| 6 | Q. Help us, please, with whether children share a room or | 6 | Q. Some of the violence was very serious. There was |
| 7 | whether or not there are double rooms? | 7 | a concern about the restrictions on the regime and |
| 8 | A. So the majority of the rooms are single. We do have | 8 | I think, by way of trying to pull the different threads |
| 9 | some rooms that can be shared, but that would be on | 9 | together towards the end of this page, "There was |
| 10 | a risk assessment basis or a cell share risk assessment | 10 | an extent", it says, under the penultimate paragraph, |
| 11 | would take place, and that would normally be only with | 11 | "to which Feltham A was a place of contrast. There was |
| 12 | boys that have reached an enhanced level or if they're | 12 | no doubt staff working in very challenging circumstances |
| 13 | an insider and we felt like some additional young person | 13 | yet most of the interactions we observed between staff |
| 14 | would need additional support. But there are only one | 14 | and the boys were polite. Inevitably, relationships |
| 15 | of those on each of the units and they're used very | 15 | were hindered by the lack of time for meaningful contact |
| 16 | infrequently. And if they would be used, as I said, it | 16 | because of the amount of time the boys were locked up. |
| 17 | would be documented and risk assessments would be taking | 17 | Healthcare was good. The work of the mental health team |
| 18 | place. | 18 | was good." |
| 19 | Q. I think, Mr Knight, you give a specific example of one | 19 | It goes on to say it would be wrong not to recognise |
| 20 | of the double rooms being shared by two young people who | 20 | the challenges faced by staff at Feltham A, but overall |
| 21 | had been at Feltham for a long time and developed | 21 | it said that violence was a serious problem: |
| 22 | a friendship and their sharing arrangement was agreed | 22 | "The current approach is failing to deliver that |
| 23 | after careful consideration of their offences and their | 23 | reasonable expectation and from the evidence available |
| 24 25 | conduct in custody. You suggest that the process of doing that ensures that there were no risk indicators of | 24 | to us is actually making it worse." |
| 23 | doing that changes that there were no fisk indicators of | 25 | And concluded over the page by observing at the top |
| | Page 98 | | Page 100 |

| 1 | of internal page 6: | 1 | a number of reasons, really. We completely relooked at |
|----|--|----|---|
| 2 | "One should not be surprised at the failure to | 2 | our behaviour management strategy. One of the issues |
| 3 | improve when a mere 11 of the 55 recommendations made at | 3 | and concerns we had was around staffing. We did |
| 4 | the time of the last inspection had been fully achieved. | 4 | actually invest in some staff training but, more |
| 5 | 34 were not achieved. Nine were partially achieved. | 5 | importantly, our own localised recruitment process, so |
| 6 | I would urge the leadership at both Feltham A, HMPPS and | 6 | that helped and there is a midpoint pay rise as well. |
| 7 | the Youth Justice Board to study this report carefully | 7 | So, in effect, prison officers get paid more to work on |
| 8 | and on this occasion to take its recommendations | 8 | Feltham than they were in other establishments. |
| 9 | seriously." | 9 | Q. Let's just perhaps deal with this as we can in your |
| 10 | Just going further through the report if I may, | 10 | statement, please, it's HMP000407 and internal page 3, |
| 11 | please, section 1 of the report, we can see summarised | 11 | please. |
| 12 | on internal page 13. That deals with safety overall and | 12 | Just to try to put a bit of flesh on this, |
| 13 | it's right, isn't it, that in the box at the top, | 13 | Mr Knight, you have explained here in your witness |
| 14 | "Safety overall", the outcomes for children and young | 14 | statement that you designed an action plan that's |
| 15 | people were poor against this healthy prison test. That | 15 | exhibit GK1 to respond to the report. |
| 16 | was the result in 2017? | 16 | A. Yes, he did. |
| 17 | A. Yes, that is correct. | 17 | Q. You have provided the most recent report at your |
| 18 | Q. Then, if one looks at internal paragraph 1.17 on | 18 | exhibit GK2 and, in fact, I think you extract part of |
| 19 | internal page 23, please, the heading "Child | 19 | the report at paragraph 10. Perhaps we can just scroll |
| 20 | protection": | 20 | in over the page on that. This report noted that work |
| 21 | "The findings of this report were that the | 21 | to support the boys was reasonably good. Safeguarding |
| 22 | establishment protects children and young people from | 22 | and child protection systems were sound. Instances of |
| 23 | maltreatment by adults or other children and young | 23 | self-harm were lower than comparators. A clear focus on |
| 24 | people", was the expected outcome, but against that | 24 | reducing violence led to an impressive reduction in |
| 25 | measure 19 child protection referrals had been made. | 25 | assaults on boys and staff. Levels of violence were |
| | P 404 | | 70.404 |
| | Page 101 | | Page 103 |
| 1 | The majority continued to relate to the use of force | 1 | still too high. Systems to challenge bullying and |
| 2 | by staff. Evidence that investigations were delayed | 2 | support victims required greater management oversight at |
| 3 | unnecessarily because some staff were confused about the | 3 | unit level. A promising new behaviour management |
| 4 | procedure for notifying the establishment safeguarding | 4 | strategy was showing some early results. Use of force |
| 5 | team. The potential for delaying timely action to | 5 | was proportionate, governance was good. |
| 6 | prevent further harm was concerning. The safeguarding | 6 | Then some other observations. So the outcome |
| 7 | team referred allegations to the LADO within 24 hours." | 7 | overall was that children and young people, it was |
| 8 | And there was evidence about the subgroup remaining | 8 | a reasonably good grade on safety. Is that right? |
| 9 | useful but there was obviously a concern being expressed | 9 | A. That's correct, yes. |
| 10 | there that not all staff were aware of the child | 10 | Q. You have indicated that in announcing the results of |
| 11 | protection procedures. Is that right? | 11 | that further inspection, the Chief Inspector welcomed |
| 12 | A. Yes, that's correct. | 12 | the work that had been done by Feltham. Is that |
| 13 | Q. There were various other parts of the report that dealt | 13 | correct? |
| 14 | with issues such as the level of violence, support for | 14 | A. Yes, he did. |
| 15 | victims and things of that nature, that I perhaps don't | 15 | Q. You have provided, at GK3, the press release to that |
| 16 | need to come to. But is this right, that Feltham has | 16 | effect. So just to help us understand a little bit, |
| 17 | taken steps to try and address those findings and | 17 | you've mentioned some of the recruitment issues and the |
| 18 | accepted the concerns that were expressed? | 18 | pay issues, but help us understand a little bit more |
| 19 | A. Yes, we did. Yes, we took all of the recommendations | 19 | about the nuts and bolts of the action plan and what you |
| 20 | very seriously from memory out of the 47 that was | 20 | have implemented. |
| 21 | connected to safety, 22 of them we achieved in the | 21 | A. So all the recommendations would actually be linked to |
| 22 | recent inspection and 15 we partially achieved and | 22 | an action plan, so we would look at those individually, |
| 23 | I think you can see from my statement that the "poor" | 23 | but if I talk about the whole focus and the strategy, |
| 24 | score was actually improved to "reasonably good", so | 24 | yes, we had two priorities. One was award safety and |
| 25 | from a 1 to a 3, and that's pretty much because we | 25 | ensuring that all of the young people that we care for, |
| | D 402 | | D 404 |
| | Page 102 | | Page 104 |
| | | | 26 (Danas 101 to 104) |

| | | Т | |
|--|--|--|--|
| 1 | the staff and all visitors are kept as safe as possible | 1 | Q. You've endeavoured, I think, to have the prison staff |
| 2 | and how we improved safety was we had a complete review | 2 | engage more proactively with partner agencies such as |
| 3 | of our behaviour management strategy. We also | 3 | healthcare, psychology, the local authority and youth |
| 4 | introduced a restraint minimisation plan. | 4 | support services in a range of ways, is that fair? |
| 5 | We also need to actually get a sense of community | 5 | A. Yes, it has to be a whole-establishment approach, |
| 6 | because somebody actually said to me once, "You don't | 6 | multidisciplinary, completely. |
| 7 | have an issue with violence at Feltham. You actually | 7 | Q. Then help us, please, a little bit with the safeguarding |
| 8 | have an issue with conflict", and what we found is the | 8 | training that staff are given and the extent to which |
| 9 | children and young people did at times, understandably, | 9 | that is compulsory and fully complied with or the |
| 10 | given their age, struggle to deal with conflict, so we | 10 | training is done, at least. |
| 11 | introduced the restorative justice and we got conflict | 11 | A. So we call it POELT, so prison officers who are new to |
| 12 | practitioners that help then deal with conflict. | 12 | the role now, we do our own POELT training for all those |
| 13 | We also tried to get a sense of community, as well | 13 | staff that work with young people. Safeguarding is |
| 14 | and anybody that has worked with young people would know | 14 | a key part of that initial training, but of course we |
| 15 | that actually awarding sanctions, sanctions don't work, | 15 | have existing staff, so we would look to do our own |
| 16 | you have to have clear boundaries, but what we have | 16 | local training and raising awareness. As I have said in |
| 17 | realised is, actually, reward works more, so you have to | 17 | my statement, of course, would I want every single |
| 18 | reward somebody seven times sorry, sanction somebody | 18 | member of staff to ensure they have carried out that |
| 19 | seven times unless you give a reward. So what I would | 19 | out? Yes, definitely. Are there some staff that it may |
| 20 | say is we have completely reversed our policy. So young | 20 | not have happened because of sickness when we have put |
| 21 | people were rewarded if they behaved and kept | 21 | the training on? Yes, so should I say that 100 per cent |
| 22 | boundaries, they were given the tools to deal with their | 22 | of the staff have been trained in no but we do put |
| 23 | conflicts and, on the whole, there was a sense of | 23 | an emphasis on that. |
| 24 | community. Our enhanced, sort of, earned privileges | 24 | But also just raising awareness, so we have had the |
| 25 | scheme, we introduced three levels, bronze, silver and | 25 | LADO come in and we have introduced themed briefings |
| | | | |
| | Page 105 | | Page 107 |
| | | | |
| 1 | gold, but also a platinum level which meant the children | 1 | once a week. So they actually give a briefing to |
| 1 2 | gold, but also a platinum level which meant the children and young people that would work as a community could | | once a week. So they actually give a briefing to managers and to staff. |
| _ | and young people that would work as a community could | 1 2 3 | managers and to staff. |
| 2 | and young people that would work as a community could actually do additional tasks like Duke of Edinburgh. So | 2 | managers and to staff. Q. And you think that's led to positive outcomes? |
| 2 3 | and young people that would work as a community could | 3 | managers and to staff. Q. And you think that's led to positive outcomes? A. Definitely, yes, I think raising awareness and raising |
| 2 3 4 | and young people that would work as a community could actually do additional tasks like Duke of Edinburgh. So there was a complete change and refocus, and I must say | 2 3 4 | managers and to staff. Q. And you think that's led to positive outcomes? |
| 2 3 4 5 | and young people that would work as a community could actually do additional tasks like Duke of Edinburgh. So there was a complete change and refocus, and I must say the reason we would be able to do that, to be honest, | 2 3 4 5 | managers and to staff. Q. And you think that's led to positive outcomes? A. Definitely, yes, I think raising awareness and raising training, because it's not about individuals, as I have |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | and young people that would work as a community could actually do additional tasks like Duke of Edinburgh. So there was a complete change and refocus, and I must say the reason we would be able to do that, to be honest, because the second priority has always been resource and | 2 3 4 5 6 | managers and to staff. Q. And you think that's led to positive outcomes? A. Definitely, yes, I think raising awareness and raising training, because it's not about individuals, as I have said, it's a whole-establishment approach. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | and young people that would work as a community could actually do additional tasks like Duke of Edinburgh. So there was a complete change and refocus, and I must say the reason we would be able to do that, to be honest, because the second priority has always been resource and our biggest resource of anybody that works in | 2 3 4 5 6 7 | managers and to staff. Q. And you think that's led to positive outcomes? A. Definitely, yes, I think raising awareness and raising training, because it's not about individuals, as I have said, it's a whole-establishment approach. Q. I think you've indicated that the current child |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | and young people that would work as a community could actually do additional tasks like Duke of Edinburgh. So there was a complete change and refocus, and I must say the reason we would be able to do that, to be honest, because the second priority has always been resource and our biggest resource of anybody that works in an institution like Feltham is the staff and, without | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | managers and to staff. Q. And you think that's led to positive outcomes? A. Definitely, yes, I think raising awareness and raising training, because it's not about individuals, as I have said, it's a whole-establishment approach. Q. I think you've indicated that the current child protection policy for Feltham which I think we have |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | and young people that would work as a community could actually do additional tasks like Duke of Edinburgh. So there was a complete change and refocus, and I must say the reason we would be able to do that, to be honest, because the second priority has always been resource and our biggest resource of anybody that works in an institution like Feltham is the staff and, without the staff given the correct tools to do their job, the | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | managers and to staff. Q. And you think that's led to positive outcomes? A. Definitely, yes, I think raising awareness and raising training, because it's not about individuals, as I have said, it's a whole-establishment approach. Q. I think you've indicated that the current child protection policy for Feltham which I think we have just bear a second, LOM000004_001, perhaps you could |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | and young people that would work as a community could actually do additional tasks like Duke of Edinburgh. So there was a complete change and refocus, and I must say the reason we would be able to do that, to be honest, because the second priority has always been resource and our biggest resource of anybody that works in an institution like Feltham is the staff and, without the staff given the correct tools to do their job, the right amount of staff that we had and motivated and | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | managers and to staff. Q. And you think that's led to positive outcomes? A. Definitely, yes, I think raising awareness and raising training, because it's not about individuals, as I have said, it's a whole-establishment approach. Q. I think you've indicated that the current child protection policy for Feltham which I think we have just bear a second, LOM000004_001, perhaps you could bring that up briefly. That's June 2015 but I think you |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | and young people that would work as a community could actually do additional tasks like Duke of Edinburgh. So there was a complete change and refocus, and I must say the reason we would be able to do that, to be honest, because the second priority has always been resource and our biggest resource of anybody that works in an institution like Feltham is the staff and, without the staff given the correct tools to do their job, the right amount of staff that we had and motivated and trained, it's very difficult to achieve anything at all. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | managers and to staff. Q. And you think that's led to positive outcomes? A. Definitely, yes, I think raising awareness and raising training, because it's not about individuals, as I have said, it's a whole-establishment approach. Q. I think you've indicated that the current child protection policy for Feltham which I think we have just bear a second, LOM000004_001, perhaps you could bring that up briefly. That's June 2015 but I think you have indicated that that is going to be updated in light |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | and young people that would work as a community could actually do additional tasks like Duke of Edinburgh. So there was a complete change and refocus, and I must say the reason we would be able to do that, to be honest, because the second priority has always been resource and our biggest resource of anybody that works in an institution like Feltham is the staff and, without the staff given the correct tools to do their job, the right amount of staff that we had and motivated and trained, it's very difficult to achieve anything at all. So those were the two priorities that I set, it | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | managers and to staff. Q. And you think that's led to positive outcomes? A. Definitely, yes, I think raising awareness and raising training, because it's not about individuals, as I have said, it's a whole-establishment approach. Q. I think you've indicated that the current child protection policy for Feltham which I think we have just bear a second, LOM000004_001, perhaps you could bring that up briefly. That's June 2015 but I think you have indicated that that is going to be updated in light of Working Together 2018, which you now have. Is that |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | and young people that would work as a community could actually do additional tasks like Duke of Edinburgh. So there was a complete change and refocus, and I must say the reason we would be able to do that, to be honest, because the second priority has always been resource and our biggest resource of anybody that works in an institution like Feltham is the staff and, without the staff given the correct tools to do their job, the right amount of staff that we had and motivated and trained, it's very difficult to achieve anything at all. So those were the two priorities that I set, it directs the travel and I'm pleased to say the | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | managers and to staff. Q. And you think that's led to positive outcomes? A. Definitely, yes, I think raising awareness and raising training, because it's not about individuals, as I have said, it's a whole-establishment approach. Q. I think you've indicated that the current child protection policy for Feltham which I think we have just bear a second, LOM000004_001, perhaps you could bring that up briefly. That's June 2015 but I think you have indicated that that is going to be updated in light of Working Together 2018, which you now have. Is that right? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | and young people that would work as a community could actually do additional tasks like Duke of Edinburgh. So there was a complete change and refocus, and I must say the reason we would be able to do that, to be honest, because the second priority has always been resource and our biggest resource of anybody that works in an institution like Feltham is the staff and, without the staff given the correct tools to do their job, the right amount of staff that we had and motivated and trained, it's very difficult to achieve anything at all. So those were the two priorities that I set, it directs the travel and I'm pleased to say the inspectorate recognised us. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | managers and to staff. Q. And you think that's led to positive outcomes? A. Definitely, yes, I think raising awareness and raising training, because it's not about individuals, as I have said, it's a whole-establishment approach. Q. I think you've indicated that the current child protection policy for Feltham which I think we have just bear a second, LOM000004_001, perhaps you could bring that up briefly. That's June 2015 but I think you have indicated that that is going to be updated in light of Working Together 2018, which you now have. Is that right? A. There are more modern versions than the 2015, but the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | and young people that would work as a community could actually do additional tasks like Duke of Edinburgh. So there was a complete change and refocus, and I must say the reason we would be able to do that, to be honest, because the second priority has always been resource and our biggest resource of anybody that works in an institution like Feltham is the staff and, without the staff given the correct tools to do their job, the right amount of staff that we had and motivated and trained, it's very difficult to achieve anything at all. So those were the two priorities that I set, it directs the travel and I'm pleased to say the inspectorate recognised us. Q. A few points of detail, you make the point in your | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | managers and to staff. Q. And you think that's led to positive outcomes? A. Definitely, yes, I think raising awareness and raising training, because it's not about individuals, as I have said, it's a whole-establishment approach. Q. I think you've indicated that the current child protection policy for Feltham which I think we have — just bear a second, LOM000004_001, perhaps you could bring that up briefly. That's June 2015 but I think you have indicated that that is going to be updated in light of Working Together 2018, which you now have. Is that right? A. There are more modern versions than the 2015, but the current one which gets reviewed annually, we have just |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | and young people that would work as a community could actually do additional tasks like Duke of Edinburgh. So there was a complete change and refocus, and I must say the reason we would be able to do that, to be honest, because the second priority has always been resource and our biggest resource of anybody that works in an institution like Feltham is the staff and, without the staff given the correct tools to do their job, the right amount of staff that we had and motivated and trained, it's very difficult to achieve anything at all. So those were the two priorities that I set, it directs the travel and I'm pleased to say the inspectorate recognised us. Q. A few points of detail, you make the point in your witness statement at paragraph 12 that as at the end | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | managers and to staff. Q. And you think that's led to positive outcomes? A. Definitely, yes, I think raising awareness and raising training, because it's not about individuals, as I have said, it's a whole-establishment approach. Q. I think you've indicated that the current child protection policy for Feltham which I think we have just bear a second, LOM000004_001, perhaps you could bring that up briefly. That's June 2015 but I think you have indicated that that is going to be updated in light of Working Together 2018, which you now have. Is that right? A. There are more modern versions than the 2015, but the current one which gets reviewed annually, we have just been given the Working Together practice guide, so it's |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | and young people that would work as a community could actually do additional tasks like Duke of Edinburgh. So there was a complete change and refocus, and I must say the reason we would be able to do that, to be honest, because the second priority has always been resource and our biggest resource of anybody that works in an institution like Feltham is the staff and, without the staff given the correct tools to do their job, the right amount of staff that we had and motivated and trained, it's very difficult to achieve anything at all. So those were the two priorities that I set, it directs the travel and I'm pleased to say the inspectorate recognised us. Q. A few points of detail, you make the point in your witness statement at paragraph 12 that as at the end of June this year Feltham A was fully staffed. Is that | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | managers and to staff. Q. And you think that's led to positive outcomes? A. Definitely, yes, I think raising awareness and raising training, because it's not about individuals, as I have said, it's a whole-establishment approach. Q. I think you've indicated that the current child protection policy for Feltham which I think we have just bear a second, LOM000004_001, perhaps you could bring that up briefly. That's June 2015 but I think you have indicated that that is going to be updated in light of Working Together 2018, which you now have. Is that right? A. There are more modern versions than the 2015, but the current one which gets reviewed annually, we have just been given the Working Together practice guide, so it's due to review in July and that's happening as we speak, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | and young people that would work as a community could actually do additional tasks like Duke of Edinburgh. So there was a complete change and refocus, and I must say the reason we would be able to do that, to be honest, because the second priority has always been resource and our biggest resource of anybody that works in an institution like Feltham is the staff and, without the staff given the correct tools to do their job, the right amount of staff that we had and motivated and trained, it's very difficult to achieve anything at all. So those were the two priorities that I set, it directs the travel and I'm pleased to say the inspectorate recognised us. Q. A few points of detail, you make the point in your witness statement at paragraph 12 that as at the end of June this year Feltham A was fully staffed. Is that right? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | managers and to staff. Q. And you think that's led to positive outcomes? A. Definitely, yes, I think raising awareness and raising training, because it's not about individuals, as I have said, it's a whole-establishment approach. Q. I think you've indicated that the current child protection policy for Feltham which I think we have just bear a second, LOM000004_001, perhaps you could bring that up briefly. That's June 2015 but I think you have indicated that that is going to be updated in light of Working Together 2018, which you now have. Is that right? A. There are more modern versions than the 2015, but the current one which gets reviewed annually, we have just been given the Working Together practice guide, so it's due to review in July and that's happening as we speak, yes. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | and young people that would work as a community could actually do additional tasks like Duke of Edinburgh. So there was a complete change and refocus, and I must say the reason we would be able to do that, to be honest, because the second priority has always been resource and our biggest resource of anybody that works in an institution like Feltham is the staff and, without the staff given the correct tools to do their job, the right amount of staff that we had and motivated and trained, it's very difficult to achieve anything at all. So those were the two priorities that I set, it directs the travel and I'm pleased to say the inspectorate recognised us. Q. A few points of detail, you make the point in your witness statement at paragraph 12 that as at the end of June this year Feltham A was fully staffed. Is that right? A. Yes, it was, yes, it's probably the first time I've ever | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | managers and to staff. Q. And you think that's led to positive outcomes? A. Definitely, yes, I think raising awareness and raising training, because it's not about individuals, as I have said, it's a whole-establishment approach. Q. I think you've indicated that the current child protection policy for Feltham which I think we have — just bear a second, LOM000004_001, perhaps you could bring that up briefly. That's June 2015 but I think you have indicated that that is going to be updated in light of Working Together 2018, which you now have. Is that right? A. There are more modern versions than the 2015, but the current one which gets reviewed annually, we have just been given the Working Together practice guide, so it's due to review in July and that's happening as we speak, yes. Q. I see. Just for completeness, please, can I formally adduce, and just perhaps bring it up briefly, the action plan that you referred to, your exhibit GK1 is |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | and young people that would work as a community could actually do additional tasks like Duke of Edinburgh. So there was a complete change and refocus, and I must say the reason we would be able to do that, to be honest, because the second priority has always been resource and our biggest resource of anybody that works in an institution like Feltham is the staff and, without the staff given the correct tools to do their job, the right amount of staff that we had and motivated and trained, it's very difficult to achieve anything at all. So those were the two priorities that I set, it directs the travel and I'm pleased to say the inspectorate recognised us. Q. A few points of detail, you make the point in your witness statement at paragraph 12 that as at the end of June this year Feltham A was fully staffed. Is that right? A. Yes, it was, yes, it's probably the first time I've ever known Feltham to be fully staffed yes. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | managers and to staff. Q. And you think that's led to positive outcomes? A. Definitely, yes, I think raising awareness and raising training, because it's not about individuals, as I have said, it's a whole-establishment approach. Q. I think you've indicated that the current child protection policy for Feltham which I think we have just bear a second, LOM000004_001, perhaps you could bring that up briefly. That's June 2015 but I think you have indicated that that is going to be updated in light of Working Together 2018, which you now have. Is that right? A. There are more modern versions than the 2015, but the current one which gets reviewed annually, we have just been given the Working Together practice guide, so it's due to review in July and that's happening as we speak, yes. Q. I see. Just for completeness, please, can I formally adduce, and just perhaps bring it up briefly, the action plan that you referred to, your exhibit GK1 is HMP000408. Let's see if we can bring that up, briefly. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | and young people that would work as a community could actually do additional tasks like Duke of Edinburgh. So there was a complete change and refocus, and I must say the reason we would be able to do that, to be honest, because the second priority has always been resource and our biggest resource of anybody that works in an institution like Feltham is the staff and, without the staff given the correct tools to do their job, the right amount of staff that we had and motivated and trained, it's very difficult to achieve anything at all. So those were the two priorities that I set, it directs the travel and I'm pleased to say the inspectorate recognised us. Q. A few points of detail, you make the point in your witness statement at paragraph 12 that as at the end of June this year Feltham A was fully staffed. Is that right? A. Yes, it was, yes, it's probably the first time I've ever known Feltham to be fully staffed yes. Q. And you've indicated that around 40 staff members have taken up place on the foundation degree about which we have heard. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | managers and to staff. Q. And you think that's led to positive outcomes? A. Definitely, yes, I think raising awareness and raising training, because it's not about individuals, as I have said, it's a whole-establishment approach. Q. I think you've indicated that the current child protection policy for Feltham which I think we have just bear a second, LOM000004_001, perhaps you could bring that up briefly. That's June 2015 but I think you have indicated that that is going to be updated in light of Working Together 2018, which you now have. Is that right? A. There are more modern versions than the 2015, but the current one which gets reviewed annually, we have just been given the Working Together practice guide, so it's due to review in July and that's happening as we speak, yes. Q. I see. Just for completeness, please, can I formally adduce, and just perhaps bring it up briefly, the action plan that you referred to, your exhibit GK1 is HMP000408. Let's see if we can bring that up, briefly. I think if you go to the next page, please, and the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | and young people that would work as a community could actually do additional tasks like Duke of Edinburgh. So there was a complete change and refocus, and I must say the reason we would be able to do that, to be honest, because the second priority has always been resource and our biggest resource of anybody that works in an institution like Feltham is the staff and, without the staff given the correct tools to do their job, the right amount of staff that we had and motivated and trained, it's very difficult to achieve anything at all. So those were the two priorities that I set, it directs the travel and I'm pleased to say the inspectorate recognised us. Q. A few points of detail, you make the point in your witness statement at paragraph 12 that as at the end of June this year Feltham A was fully staffed. Is that right? A. Yes, it was, yes, it's probably the first time I've ever known Feltham to be fully staffed yes. Q. And you've indicated that around 40 staff members have taken up place on the foundation degree about which we have heard. A. Yes, they have, so people have volunteered and are | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | managers and to staff. Q. And you think that's led to positive outcomes? A. Definitely, yes, I think raising awareness and raising training, because it's not about individuals, as I have said, it's a whole-establishment approach. Q. I think you've indicated that the current child protection policy for Feltham which I think we have just bear a second, LOM000004_001, perhaps you could bring that up briefly. That's June 2015 but I think you have indicated that that is going to be updated in light of Working Together 2018, which you now have. Is that right? A. There are more modern versions than the 2015, but the current one which gets reviewed annually, we have just been given the Working Together practice guide, so it's due to review in July and that's happening as we speak, yes. Q. I see. Just for completeness, please, can I formally adduce, and just perhaps bring it up briefly, the action plan that you referred to, your exhibit GK1 is HMP000408. Let's see if we can bring that up, briefly. I think if you go to the next page, please, and the panel can look through that in due course, but just for |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | and young people that would work as a community could actually do additional tasks like Duke of Edinburgh. So there was a complete change and refocus, and I must say the reason we would be able to do that, to be honest, because the second priority has always been resource and our biggest resource of anybody that works in an institution like Feltham is the staff and, without the staff given the correct tools to do their job, the right amount of staff that we had and motivated and trained, it's very difficult to achieve anything at all. So those were the two priorities that I set, it directs the travel and I'm pleased to say the inspectorate recognised us. Q. A few points of detail, you make the point in your witness statement at paragraph 12 that as at the end of June this year Feltham A was fully staffed. Is that right? A. Yes, it was, yes, it's probably the first time I've ever known Feltham to be fully staffed yes. Q. And you've indicated that around 40 staff members have taken up place on the foundation degree about which we have heard. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | managers and to staff. Q. And you think that's led to positive outcomes? A. Definitely, yes, I think raising awareness and raising training, because it's not about individuals, as I have said, it's a whole-establishment approach. Q. I think you've indicated that the current child protection policy for Feltham which I think we have just bear a second, LOM000004_001, perhaps you could bring that up briefly. That's June 2015 but I think you have indicated that that is going to be updated in light of Working Together 2018, which you now have. Is that right? A. There are more modern versions than the 2015, but the current one which gets reviewed annually, we have just been given the Working Together practice guide, so it's due to review in July and that's happening as we speak, yes. Q. I see. Just for completeness, please, can I formally adduce, and just perhaps bring it up briefly, the action plan that you referred to, your exhibit GK1 is HMP000408. Let's see if we can bring that up, briefly. I think if you go to the next page, please, and the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | and young people that would work as a community could actually do additional tasks like Duke of Edinburgh. So there was a complete change and refocus, and I must say the reason we would be able to do that, to be honest, because the second priority has always been resource and our biggest resource of anybody that works in an institution like Feltham is the staff and, without the staff given the correct tools to do their job, the right amount of staff that we had and motivated and trained, it's very difficult to achieve anything at all. So those were the two priorities that I set, it directs the travel and I'm pleased to say the inspectorate recognised us. Q. A few points of detail, you make the point in your witness statement at paragraph 12 that as at the end of June this year Feltham A was fully staffed. Is that right? A. Yes, it was, yes, it's probably the first time I've ever known Feltham to be fully staffed yes. Q. And you've indicated that around 40 staff members have taken up place on the foundation degree about which we have heard. A. Yes, they have, so people have volunteered and are | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | managers and to staff. Q. And you think that's led to positive outcomes? A. Definitely, yes, I think raising awareness and raising training, because it's not about individuals, as I have said, it's a whole-establishment approach. Q. I think you've indicated that the current child protection policy for Feltham which I think we have just bear a second, LOM000004_001, perhaps you could bring that up briefly. That's June 2015 but I think you have indicated that that is going to be updated in light of Working Together 2018, which you now have. Is that right? A. There are more modern versions than the 2015, but the current one which gets reviewed annually, we have just been given the Working Together practice guide, so it's due to review in July and that's happening as we speak, yes. Q. I see. Just for completeness, please, can I formally adduce, and just perhaps bring it up briefly, the action plan that you referred to, your exhibit GK1 is HMP000408. Let's see if we can bring that up, briefly. I think if you go to the next page, please, and the panel can look through that in due course, but just for |

| 1 | actions numbered in the left-hand column, and it runs | 1 | levels of responsibility, who's responsible, Working |
|--|---|--|---|
| 2 | through to some 81 different action points. Is that | 2 | Together across local authorities and internally, as |
| 3 | right? | 3 | well. |
| 4 | A. That's correct, yes. | 4 | Q. I think you have dealt with this in your witness |
| 5 | Q. We can see on it the target dates, who is responsible | 5 | statement at paragraph 37 but this process applies, is |
| 6 | and things of that nature. The panel can look at that | 6 | this right, when a member of staff is the recipient |
| 7 | in their own time, perhaps. | 7 | of an allegation of sexual abuse and other things? |
| 8 | A. Yes, they can. | 8 | A. Yes, yes, it is, yes. |
| 9 | Q. Your exhibit 2, HMP000409, perhaps the second page, that | 9 | Q. The intention is that this will be reviewed in |
| 10 | is the most recent HMCIP his inspection report from | 10 | accordance with the most recent Working Together |
| 11 | earlier this year, HMCIP, and we can see, if the panel | 11 | document, but its intention is to set out a clearer |
| 12 | look into that, internal page 5, please, gives the more | 12 | process for how to respond to allegations against |
| 13 | positive overall response than the previous report. Is | 13 | members of staff? |
| 14 | that right? | 14 | A. That's correct, yes. |
| 15 | A. Yes, it does. It's actually showing the glossary of | 15 | Q. And then, finally, your GK7, which is HMP000414 and it |
| 16 | terms, I think it's the next page, actually. | 16 | will be the second internal page in that. This is |
| 17 | Q. It's my internal page 5. That's it. Forgive me. The | 17 | a risk assessment matrix, I think, an RAM that's been |
| 18 | panel can, again, read that, but this is the report that | 18 | designed in early 2018, which was, again, referenced in |
| 19 | you were no doubt pleased to see. | 19 | the most recent Chief Inspector's report. What is your |
| 20 | You have referred just to formally exhibit it, we | 20 | understanding of what this document does? |
| 21 | don't need to bring it up, I think to the press | 21 | A. So this is a local document we introduced, just, again, |
| 22 | release from the Chief Inspector. That's at your | 22 | for clarity really, so this is around setting it's |
| 23 | exhibit GK3, HMP000410. The headline is: | 23 | looking at risk around individuals as well, so the risk |
| 24 | "HM YOI Feltham A. 'Children and young people | 24 | assessment process could be if it's if there is |
| 25 | significantly safer', says chief Inspector." | 25 | a concern or an issue, but it's around training, that |
| | | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| | Page 109 | | Page 111 |
| | | | |
| 1 | You've also referred to the safeguarding strategy | 1 | could be highlighted, to the most serious concern where |
| 1 2 | You've also referred to the safeguarding strategy. I will bring that up because the panel may wish to look | 1 2 | could be highlighted, to the most serious concern where |
| 2 | I will bring that up because the panel may wish to look | 2 | a member of staff may have to be suspended or obviously |
| 2 3 | I will bring that up because the panel may wish to look at that. That's HMP000411. That's a September 2017, | 2 3 | a member of staff may have to be suspended or obviously from police involved. |
| 2 3 4 | I will bring that up because the panel may wish to look at that. That's HMP000411. That's a September 2017, next page, please, sorry is the internal page 2. That's | 2 3 4 | a member of staff may have to be suspended or obviously from police involved. So it's just a framework in a document where we can |
| 2 3 4 5 | I will bring that up because the panel may wish to look at that. That's HMP000411. That's a September 2017, next page, please, sorry is the internal page 2. That's a September 2017 strategy for safeguarding. So it | 2 3 4 5 | a member of staff may have to be suspended or obviously from police involved. So it's just a framework in a document where we can actually manage risk and it can be documented almost |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | I will bring that up because the panel may wish to look at that. That's HMP000411. That's a September 2017, next page, please, sorry is the internal page 2. That's a September 2017 strategy for safeguarding. So it postdates, does it, all of the allegations that Mr Wood | 2 3 4 5 6 | a member of staff may have to be suspended or obviously from police involved. So it's just a framework in a document where we can actually manage risk and it can be documented almost like a decision log, really, around how we have come to |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | I will bring that up because the panel may wish to look at that. That's HMP000411. That's a September 2017, next page, please, sorry is the internal page 2. That's a September 2017 strategy for safeguarding. So it postdates, does it, all of the allegations that Mr Wood looked at? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 | a member of staff may have to be suspended or obviously from police involved. So it's just a framework in a document where we can actually manage risk and it can be documented almost like a decision log, really, around how we have come to the process of making those decisions around that |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | I will bring that up because the panel may wish to look at that. That's HMP000411. That's a September 2017, next page, please, sorry is the internal page 2. That's a September 2017 strategy for safeguarding. So it postdates, does it, all of the allegations that Mr Wood looked at? A. Yes, it does, yes. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | a member of staff may have to be suspended or obviously from police involved. So it's just a framework in a document where we can actually manage risk and it can be documented almost like a decision log, really, around how we have come to the process of making those decisions around that individual case and member of staff. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | I will bring that up because the panel may wish to look at that. That's HMP000411. That's a September 2017, next page, please, sorry is the internal page 2. That's a September 2017 strategy for safeguarding. So it postdates, does it, all of the allegations that Mr Wood looked at? A. Yes, it does, yes. Q. Then, for completeness, please, HMP000413 and it will be | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | a member of staff may have to be suspended or obviously from police involved. So it's just a framework in a document where we can actually manage risk and it can be documented almost like a decision log, really, around how we have come to the process of making those decisions around that individual case and member of staff. Q. Is the hope that the risk assessment process here looks |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | I will bring that up because the panel may wish to look at that. That's HMP000411. That's a September 2017, next page, please, sorry is the internal page 2. That's a September 2017 strategy for safeguarding. So it postdates, does it, all of the allegations that Mr Wood looked at? A. Yes, it does, yes. Q. Then, for completeness, please, HMP000413 and it will be the second page. This is a perhaps no, forgive me, | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | a member of staff may have to be suspended or obviously from police involved. So it's just a framework in a document where we can actually manage risk and it can be documented almost like a decision log, really, around how we have come to the process of making those decisions around that individual case and member of staff. Q. Is the hope that the risk assessment process here looks at both the needs and vulnerabilities of the child, but |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | I will bring that up because the panel may wish to look at that. That's HMP000411. That's a September 2017, next page, please, sorry is the internal page 2. That's a September 2017 strategy for safeguarding. So it postdates, does it, all of the allegations that Mr Wood looked at? A. Yes, it does, yes. Q. Then, for completeness, please, HMP000413 and it will be the second page. This is a perhaps no, forgive me, sorry, it's 412, I think. This is GK yes, that is | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | a member of staff may have to be suspended or obviously from police involved. So it's just a framework in a document where we can actually manage risk and it can be documented almost like a decision log, really, around how we have come to the process of making those decisions around that individual case and member of staff. Q. Is the hope that the risk assessment process here looks at both the needs and vulnerabilities of the child, but also part of this process is to consider whether or not |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | I will bring that up because the panel may wish to look at that. That's HMP000411. That's a September 2017, next page, please, sorry is the internal page 2. That's a September 2017 strategy for safeguarding. So it postdates, does it, all of the allegations that Mr Wood looked at? A. Yes, it does, yes. Q. Then, for completeness, please, HMP000413 and it will be the second page. This is a perhaps no, forgive me, sorry, it's 412, I think. This is GK yes, that is right, this is the perhaps allied strategy which is | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | a member of staff may have to be suspended or obviously from police involved. So it's just a framework in a document where we can actually manage risk and it can be documented almost like a decision log, really, around how we have come to the process of making those decisions around that individual case and member of staff. Q. Is the hope that the risk assessment process here looks at both the needs and vulnerabilities of the child, but also part of this process is to consider whether or not someone should be suspended, it's to help make decisions |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | I will bring that up because the panel may wish to look at that. That's HMP000411. That's a September 2017, next page, please, sorry is the internal page 2. That's a September 2017 strategy for safeguarding. So it postdates, does it, all of the allegations that Mr Wood looked at? A. Yes, it does, yes. Q. Then, for completeness, please, HMP000413 and it will be the second page. This is a perhaps no, forgive me, sorry, it's 412, I think. This is GK yes, that is right, this is the perhaps allied strategy which is around restraint minimisation? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | a member of staff may have to be suspended or obviously from police involved. So it's just a framework in a document where we can actually manage risk and it can be documented almost like a decision log, really, around how we have come to the process of making those decisions around that individual case and member of staff. Q. Is the hope that the risk assessment process here looks at both the needs and vulnerabilities of the child, but also part of this process is to consider whether or not someone should be suspended, it's to help make decisions of that nature? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | I will bring that up because the panel may wish to look at that. That's HMP000411. That's a September 2017, next page, please, sorry is the internal page 2. That's a September 2017 strategy for safeguarding. So it postdates, does it, all of the allegations that Mr Wood looked at? A. Yes, it does, yes. Q. Then, for completeness, please, HMP000413 and it will be the second page. This is a perhaps no, forgive me, sorry, it's 412, I think. This is GK yes, that is right, this is the perhaps allied strategy which is around restraint minimisation? A. That's correct, yes. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | a member of staff may have to be suspended or obviously from police involved. So it's just a framework in a document where we can actually manage risk and it can be documented almost like a decision log, really, around how we have come to the process of making those decisions around that individual case and member of staff. Q. Is the hope that the risk assessment process here looks at both the needs and vulnerabilities of the child, but also part of this process is to consider whether or not someone should be suspended, it's to help make decisions of that nature? A. Yes, I mean, the child has to be the centre of all of |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | I will bring that up because the panel may wish to look at that. That's HMP000411. That's a September 2017, next page, please, sorry is the internal page 2. That's a September 2017 strategy for safeguarding. So it postdates, does it, all of the allegations that Mr Wood looked at? A. Yes, it does, yes. Q. Then, for completeness, please, HMP000413 and it will be the second page. This is a perhaps no, forgive me, sorry, it's 412, I think. This is GK yes, that is right, this is the perhaps allied strategy which is around restraint minimisation? A. That's correct, yes. Q. Then help us, please, with these last two documents. So | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | a member of staff may have to be suspended or obviously from police involved. So it's just a framework in a document where we can actually manage risk and it can be documented almost like a decision log, really, around how we have come to the process of making those decisions around that individual case and member of staff. Q. Is the hope that the risk assessment process here looks at both the needs and vulnerabilities of the child, but also part of this process is to consider whether or not someone should be suspended, it's to help make decisions of that nature? A. Yes, I mean, the child has to be the centre of all of these processes. So, yes, it's a way of that being |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | I will bring that up because the panel may wish to look at that. That's HMP000411. That's a September 2017, next page, please, sorry is the internal page 2. That's a September 2017 strategy for safeguarding. So it postdates, does it, all of the allegations that Mr Wood looked at? A. Yes, it does, yes. Q. Then, for completeness, please, HMP000413 and it will be the second page. This is a perhaps no, forgive me, sorry, it's 412, I think. This is GK yes, that is right, this is the perhaps allied strategy which is around restraint minimisation? A. That's correct, yes. Q. Then help us, please, with these last two documents. So GK6, which is 413, this is a new document agreed, | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | a member of staff may have to be suspended or obviously from police involved. So it's just a framework in a document where we can actually manage risk and it can be documented almost like a decision log, really, around how we have come to the process of making those decisions around that individual case and member of staff. Q. Is the hope that the risk assessment process here looks at both the needs and vulnerabilities of the child, but also part of this process is to consider whether or not someone should be suspended, it's to help make decisions of that nature? A. Yes, I mean, the child has to be the centre of all of these processes. So, yes, it's a way of that being documented as well and, more importantly, evidence. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | I will bring that up because the panel may wish to look at that. That's HMP000411. That's a September 2017, next page, please, sorry is the internal page 2. That's a September 2017 strategy for safeguarding. So it postdates, does it, all of the allegations that Mr Wood looked at? A. Yes, it does, yes. Q. Then, for completeness, please, HMP000413 and it will be the second page. This is a perhaps no, forgive me, sorry, it's 412, I think. This is GK yes, that is right, this is the perhaps allied strategy which is around restraint minimisation? A. That's correct, yes. Q. Then help us, please, with these last two documents. So GK6, which is 413, this is a new document agreed, I think, with the London Borough of Hounslow. So help | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | a member of staff may have to be suspended or obviously from police involved. So it's just a framework in a document where we can actually manage risk and it can be documented almost like a decision log, really, around how we have come to the process of making those decisions around that individual case and member of staff. Q. Is the hope that the risk assessment process here looks at both the needs and vulnerabilities of the child, but also part of this process is to consider whether or not someone should be suspended, it's to help make decisions of that nature? A. Yes, I mean, the child has to be the centre of all of these processes. So, yes, it's a way of that being documented as well and, more importantly, evidence. Q. If I have understood it correctly, if one looks at the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | I will bring that up because the panel may wish to look at that. That's HMP000411. That's a September 2017, next page, please, sorry is the internal page 2. That's a September 2017 strategy for safeguarding. So it postdates, does it, all of the allegations that Mr Wood looked at? A. Yes, it does, yes. Q. Then, for completeness, please, HMP000413 and it will be the second page. This is a perhaps no, forgive me, sorry, it's 412, I think. This is GK yes, that is right, this is the perhaps allied strategy which is around restraint minimisation? A. That's correct, yes. Q. Then help us, please, with these last two documents. So GK6, which is 413, this is a new document agreed, I think, with the London Borough of Hounslow. So help us a little bit, please, with that? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | a member of staff may have to be suspended or obviously from police involved. So it's just a framework in a document where we can actually manage risk and it can be documented almost like a decision log, really, around how we have come to the process of making those decisions around that individual case and member of staff. Q. Is the hope that the risk assessment process here looks at both the needs and vulnerabilities of the child, but also part of this process is to consider whether or not someone should be suspended, it's to help make decisions of that nature? A. Yes, I mean, the child has to be the centre of all of these processes. So, yes, it's a way of that being documented as well and, more importantly, evidence. Q. If I have understood it correctly, if one looks at the document, this is a document that is filled in about |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | I will bring that up because the panel may wish to look at that. That's HMP000411. That's a September 2017, next page, please, sorry is the internal page 2. That's a September 2017 strategy for safeguarding. So it postdates, does it, all of the allegations that Mr Wood looked at? A. Yes, it does, yes. Q. Then, for completeness, please, HMP000413 and it will be the second page. This is a perhaps no, forgive me, sorry, it's 412, I think. This is GK yes, that is right, this is the perhaps allied strategy which is around restraint minimisation? A. That's correct, yes. Q. Then help us, please, with these last two documents. So GK6, which is 413, this is a new document agreed, I think, with the London Borough of Hounslow. So help us a little bit, please, with that? A. I mean, so this is our local protocol that we have | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | a member of staff may have to be suspended or obviously from police involved. So it's just a framework in a document where we can actually manage risk and it can be documented almost like a decision log, really, around how we have come to the process of making those decisions around that individual case and member of staff. Q. Is the hope that the risk assessment process here looks at both the needs and vulnerabilities of the child, but also part of this process is to consider whether or not someone should be suspended, it's to help make decisions of that nature? A. Yes, I mean, the child has to be the centre of all of these processes. So, yes, it's a way of that being documented as well and, more importantly, evidence. Q. If I have understood it correctly, if one looks at the document, this is a document that is filled in about a member of staff. Is that right? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | I will bring that up because the panel may wish to look at that. That's HMP000411. That's a September 2017, next page, please, sorry is the internal page 2. That's a September 2017 strategy for safeguarding. So it postdates, does it, all of the allegations that Mr Wood looked at? A. Yes, it does, yes. Q. Then, for completeness, please, HMP000413 and it will be the second page. This is a perhaps no, forgive me, sorry, it's 412, I think. This is GK yes, that is right, this is the perhaps allied strategy which is around restraint minimisation? A. That's correct, yes. Q. Then help us, please, with these last two documents. So GK6, which is 413, this is a new document agreed, I think, with the London Borough of Hounslow. So help us a little bit, please, with that? A. I mean, so this is our local protocol that we have agreed jointly with the local Borough of Hounslow. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | a member of staff may have to be suspended or obviously from police involved. So it's just a framework in a document where we can actually manage risk and it can be documented almost like a decision log, really, around how we have come to the process of making those decisions around that individual case and member of staff. Q. Is the hope that the risk assessment process here looks at both the needs and vulnerabilities of the child, but also part of this process is to consider whether or not someone should be suspended, it's to help make decisions of that nature? A. Yes, I mean, the child has to be the centre of all of these processes. So, yes, it's a way of that being documented as well and, more importantly, evidence. Q. If I have understood it correctly, if one looks at the document, this is a document that is filled in about a member of staff. Is that right? A. That's correct, yes. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | I will bring that up because the panel may wish to look at that. That's HMP000411. That's a September 2017, next page, please, sorry is the internal page 2. That's a September 2017 strategy for safeguarding. So it postdates, does it, all of the allegations that Mr Wood looked at? A. Yes, it does, yes. Q. Then, for completeness, please, HMP000413 and it will be the second page. This is a perhaps no, forgive me, sorry, it's 412, I think. This is GK yes, that is right, this is the perhaps allied strategy which is around restraint minimisation? A. That's correct, yes. Q. Then help us, please, with these last two documents. So GK6, which is 413, this is a new document agreed, I think, with the London Borough of Hounslow. So help us a little bit, please, with that? A. I mean, so this is our local protocol that we have agreed jointly with the local Borough of Hounslow. Q. What does this assist in the panel the panel in | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | a member of staff may have to be suspended or obviously from police involved. So it's just a framework in a document where we can actually manage risk and it can be documented almost like a decision log, really, around how we have come to the process of making those decisions around that individual case and member of staff. Q. Is the hope that the risk assessment process here looks at both the needs and vulnerabilities of the child, but also part of this process is to consider whether or not someone should be suspended, it's to help make decisions of that nature? A. Yes, I mean, the child has to be the centre of all of these processes. So, yes, it's a way of that being documented as well and, more importantly, evidence. Q. If I have understood it correctly, if one looks at the document, this is a document that is filled in about a member of staff. Is that right? A. That's correct, yes. Q. And so it is a way of tracking how many safeguarding |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | I will bring that up because the panel may wish to look at that. That's HMP000411. That's a September 2017, next page, please, sorry is the internal page 2. That's a September 2017 strategy for safeguarding. So it postdates, does it, all of the allegations that Mr Wood looked at? A. Yes, it does, yes. Q. Then, for completeness, please, HMP000413 and it will be the second page. This is a perhaps no, forgive me, sorry, it's 412, I think. This is GK yes, that is right, this is the perhaps allied strategy which is around restraint minimisation? A. That's correct, yes. Q. Then help us, please, with these last two documents. So GK6, which is 413, this is a new document agreed, I think, with the London Borough of Hounslow. So help us a little bit, please, with that? A. I mean, so this is our local protocol that we have agreed jointly with the local Borough of Hounslow. Q. What does this assist in the panel the panel in understanding, what does this apply to, how does it work | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | a member of staff may have to be suspended or obviously from police involved. So it's just a framework in a document where we can actually manage risk and it can be documented almost like a decision log, really, around how we have come to the process of making those decisions around that individual case and member of staff. Q. Is the hope that the risk assessment process here looks at both the needs and vulnerabilities of the child, but also part of this process is to consider whether or not someone should be suspended, it's to help make decisions of that nature? A. Yes, I mean, the child has to be the centre of all of these processes. So, yes, it's a way of that being documented as well and, more importantly, evidence. Q. If I have understood it correctly, if one looks at the document, this is a document that is filled in about a member of staff. Is that right? A. That's correct, yes. Q. And so it is a way of tracking how many safeguarding referrals have been made in relation to a particular |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | I will bring that up because the panel may wish to look at that. That's HMP000411. That's a September 2017, next page, please, sorry is the internal page 2. That's a September 2017 strategy for safeguarding. So it postdates, does it, all of the allegations that Mr Wood looked at? A. Yes, it does, yes. Q. Then, for completeness, please, HMP000413 and it will be the second page. This is a perhaps no, forgive me, sorry, it's 412, I think. This is GK yes, that is right, this is the perhaps allied strategy which is around restraint minimisation? A. That's correct, yes. Q. Then help us, please, with these last two documents. So GK6, which is 413, this is a new document agreed, I think, with the London Borough of Hounslow. So help us a little bit, please, with that? A. I mean, so this is our local protocol that we have agreed jointly with the local Borough of Hounslow. Q. What does this assist in the panel the panel in understanding, what does this apply to, how does it work in practice or how is it anticipated it will work in | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | a member of staff may have to be suspended or obviously from police involved. So it's just a framework in a document where we can actually manage risk and it can be documented almost like a decision log, really, around how we have come to the process of making those decisions around that individual case and member of staff. Q. Is the hope that the risk assessment process here looks at both the needs and vulnerabilities of the child, but also part of this process is to consider whether or not someone should be suspended, it's to help make decisions of that nature? A. Yes, I mean, the child has to be the centre of all of these processes. So, yes, it's a way of that being documented as well and, more importantly, evidence. Q. If I have understood it correctly, if one looks at the document, this is a document that is filled in about a member of staff. Is that right? A. That's correct, yes. Q. And so it is a way of tracking how many safeguarding referrals have been made in relation to a particular member of staff. Is that right? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | I will bring that up because the panel may wish to look at that. That's HMP000411. That's a September 2017, next page, please, sorry is the internal page 2. That's a September 2017 strategy for safeguarding. So it postdates, does it, all of the allegations that Mr Wood looked at? A. Yes, it does, yes. Q. Then, for completeness, please, HMP000413 and it will be the second page. This is a perhaps no, forgive me, sorry, it's 412, I think. This is GK yes, that is right, this is the perhaps allied strategy which is around restraint minimisation? A. That's correct, yes. Q. Then help us, please, with these last two documents. So GK6, which is 413, this is a new document agreed, I think, with the London Borough of Hounslow. So help us a little bit, please, with that? A. I mean, so this is our local protocol that we have agreed jointly with the local Borough of Hounslow. Q. What does this assist in the panel the panel in understanding, what does this apply to, how does it work in practice or how is it anticipated it will work in practice? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | a member of staff may have to be suspended or obviously from police involved. So it's just a framework in a document where we can actually manage risk and it can be documented almost like a decision log, really, around how we have come to the process of making those decisions around that individual case and member of staff. Q. Is the hope that the risk assessment process here looks at both the needs and vulnerabilities of the child, but also part of this process is to consider whether or not someone should be suspended, it's to help make decisions of that nature? A. Yes, I mean, the child has to be the centre of all of these processes. So, yes, it's a way of that being documented as well and, more importantly, evidence. Q. If I have understood it correctly, if one looks at the document, this is a document that is filled in about a member of staff. Is that right? A. That's correct, yes. Q. And so it is a way of tracking how many safeguarding referrals have been made in relation to a particular member of staff. Is that right? A. It can be used in that way as well, yes, so it will |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | I will bring that up because the panel may wish to look at that. That's HMP000411. That's a September 2017, next page, please, sorry is the internal page 2. That's a September 2017 strategy for safeguarding. So it postdates, does it, all of the allegations that Mr Wood looked at? A. Yes, it does, yes. Q. Then, for completeness, please, HMP000413 and it will be the second page. This is a perhaps no, forgive me, sorry, it's 412, I think. This is GK yes, that is right, this is the perhaps allied strategy which is around restraint minimisation? A. That's correct, yes. Q. Then help us, please, with these last two documents. So GK6, which is 413, this is a new document agreed, I think, with the London Borough of Hounslow. So help us a little bit, please, with that? A. I mean, so this is our local protocol that we have agreed jointly with the local Borough of Hounslow. Q. What does this assist in the panel the panel in understanding, what does this apply to, how does it work in practice or how is it anticipated it will work in | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | a member of staff may have to be suspended or obviously from police involved. So it's just a framework in a document where we can actually manage risk and it can be documented almost like a decision log, really, around how we have come to the process of making those decisions around that individual case and member of staff. Q. Is the hope that the risk assessment process here looks at both the needs and vulnerabilities of the child, but also part of this process is to consider whether or not someone should be suspended, it's to help make decisions of that nature? A. Yes, I mean, the child has to be the centre of all of these processes. So, yes, it's a way of that being documented as well and, more importantly, evidence. Q. If I have understood it correctly, if one looks at the document, this is a document that is filled in about a member of staff. Is that right? A. That's correct, yes. Q. And so it is a way of tracking how many safeguarding referrals have been made in relation to a particular member of staff. Is that right? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | I will bring that up because the panel may wish to look at that. That's HMP000411. That's a September 2017, next page, please, sorry is the internal page 2. That's a September 2017 strategy for safeguarding. So it postdates, does it, all of the allegations that Mr Wood looked at? A. Yes, it does, yes. Q. Then, for completeness, please, HMP000413 and it will be the second page. This is a perhaps no, forgive me, sorry, it's 412, I think. This is GK yes, that is right, this is the perhaps allied strategy which is around restraint minimisation? A. That's correct, yes. Q. Then help us, please, with these last two documents. So GK6, which is 413, this is a new document agreed, I think, with the London Borough of Hounslow. So help us a little bit, please, with that? A. I mean, so this is our local protocol that we have agreed jointly with the local Borough of Hounslow. Q. What does this assist in the panel the panel in understanding, what does this apply to, how does it work in practice or how is it anticipated it will work in practice? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | a member of staff may have to be suspended or obviously from police involved. So it's just a framework in a document where we can actually manage risk and it can be documented almost like a decision log, really, around how we have come to the process of making those decisions around that individual case and member of staff. Q. Is the hope that the risk assessment process here looks at both the needs and vulnerabilities of the child, but also part of this process is to consider whether or not someone should be suspended, it's to help make decisions of that nature? A. Yes, I mean, the child has to be the centre of all of these processes. So, yes, it's a way of that being documented as well and, more importantly, evidence. Q. If I have understood it correctly, if one looks at the document, this is a document that is filled in about a member of staff. Is that right? A. That's correct, yes. Q. And so it is a way of tracking how many safeguarding referrals have been made in relation to a particular member of staff. Is that right? A. It can be used in that way as well, yes, so it will |

| 1 | Q. I am just looking at the form. It has "Staff name" at | 1 | Q. Can I just move now to some other of the points of |
|--|---|--|--|
| 2 | the top? | 2 | detail that Mr Wood has raised. As you have heard, he's |
| 3 | A. Yes, it would. | 3 | given various views about the use of the complaints form |
| 4 | Q. But this is about a member of staff, so it's to try to | 4 | and I think he's accepted that complaints are but one |
| 5 | track, is it, the risk that they pose or are perceived | 5 | way in which children might disclose child sexual abuse. |
| 6 | to pose? | 6 | Can you offer your perspective on this issue, please? |
| 7 | A. Yes. | 7 | A. Yes, the complaints is just one source and, again, |
| 8 | Q. So if an allegation is made by different children | 8 | I think we have listed it in my statement but the |
| 9 | allegations are made by different children against the | 9 | children that we care for at Feltham have a number of |
| 10 | same member of staff, this form should help capture | 10 | avenues as well from their CuSP officers or personal |
| 11 | that. Is that right? | 11 | officers, from education, from our social workers, |
| 12 | A. Yes, it would, yes and obviously we would have that | 12 | healthcare, the IMB, our advocacy service from |
| 13 | information and we could look back and track back and | 13 | Barnardos, the list is endless. We've got youth |
| 14 | see how many times are there things that need to be done | 14 | workers, Connected Youth come in, Road Light, so we have |
| 15 | around training or is it repeat occurrences or are there | 15 | lots and lots of individuals and lots of agencies and |
| 16 | serious concerns? | 16 | organisations that they actually could raise a concern |
| 17 | Q. And things such as their last MMPR refresher and actions | 17 | to. |
| 18 | that are taken about them are noted on this form. Is | 18 | Q. I think you have considered whether or not the complaint |
| 19 | that right? | 19 | form which is, in fairness I'm sure the panel |
| 20 | A. Any action that will be taken but that could be one | 20 | understand a generic form that children can use to |
| 21 | example, yes. | 21 | complain about anything, whether or not there should be |
| 22 | Q. Your final exhibit, please, I think is your GK8 that's | 22 | a specific section about sexual abuse on the form, and |
| 23 | HMP000415 and that is a, I think in fairness, still | 23 | what is the view that you have given about that? |
| 24 | draft service level agreement, next page, please, | 24 | A. So if I'm being honest, my view is I don't think that |
| 25 | a service level agreement between the Met Police, | 25 | would be appropriate, would work, so these are generic |
| | | | |
| | Page 113 | | Page 115 |
| | | | |
| 1 | MHS England. The Havens and HMDDS about if one looks in | 1 | forms that young poople can use and those are in view |
| 1 | NHS England, The Havens and HMPPS about, if one looks in | 1 2 | forms that young people can use and these are in view |
| 2 | the middle of the page, responding to serious sexual | 2 | for everybody to take, so they can have free access to |
| 2 3 | the middle of the page, responding to serious sexual offences within prison establishments in London. You | 2 3 | for everybody to take, so they can have free access to them and I just think having a box on there, I'm not so |
| 2 3 4 | the middle of the page, responding to serious sexual offences within prison establishments in London. You can see the purpose is "to standardise the interagency | 2 3 4 | for everybody to take, so they can have free access to them and I just think having a box on there, I'm not so sure a child would actually tick that box or feel |
| 2 3 4 5 | the middle of the page, responding to serious sexual offences within prison establishments in London. You can see the purpose is "to standardise the interagency responses to sexual offences within prison | 2 3 4 5 | for everybody to take, so they can have free access to them and I just think having a box on there, I'm not so sure a child would actually tick that box or feel comfortable about it, so I just think we understand that |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | the middle of the page, responding to serious sexual offences within prison establishments in London. You can see the purpose is "to standardise the interagency responses to sexual offences within prison establishments in London." | 2 3 4 5 6 | for everybody to take, so they can have free access to them and I just think having a box on there, I'm not so sure a child would actually tick that box or feel comfortable about it, so I just think we understand that it's a generic form, but there is another option, there |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | the middle of the page, responding to serious sexual offences within prison establishments in London. You can see the purpose is "to standardise the interagency responses to sexual offences within prison establishments in London." So it applies to the adult estate as well, I think. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 | for everybody to take, so they can have free access to them and I just think having a box on there, I'm not so sure a child would actually tick that box or feel comfortable about it, so I just think we understand that it's a generic form, but there is another option, there is a stage 2, so confidential access. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | the middle of the page, responding to serious sexual offences within prison establishments in London. You can see the purpose is "to standardise the interagency responses to sexual offences within prison establishments in London." So it applies to the adult estate as well, I think. Is that right? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | for everybody to take, so they can have free access to them and I just think having a box on there, I'm not so sure a child would actually tick that box or feel comfortable about it, so I just think we understand that it's a generic form, but there is another option, there is a stage 2, so confidential access. Q. That's a COMP 2 not a COMP 1, is that right? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | the middle of the page, responding to serious sexual offences within prison establishments in London. You can see the purpose is "to standardise the interagency responses to sexual offences within prison establishments in London." So it applies to the adult estate as well, I think. Is that right? A. It does, yes, that's correct. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | for everybody to take, so they can have free access to them and I just think having a box on there, I'm not so sure a child would actually tick that box or feel comfortable about it, so I just think we understand that it's a generic form, but there is another option, there is a stage 2, so confidential access. Q. That's a COMP 2 not a COMP 1, is that right? A. So there is a COMP 2, which is a confidential access |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | the middle of the page, responding to serious sexual offences within prison establishments in London. You can see the purpose is "to standardise the interagency responses to sexual offences within prison establishments in London." So it applies to the adult estate as well, I think. Is that right? A. It does, yes, that's correct. Q. Do you have a sense of when this SLA will be finalised | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | for everybody to take, so they can have free access to them and I just think having a box on there, I'm not so sure a child would actually tick that box or feel comfortable about it, so I just think we understand that it's a generic form, but there is another option, there is a stage 2, so confidential access. Q. That's a COMP 2 not a COMP 1, is that right? A. So there is a COMP 2, which is a confidential access form and we would provide envelopes next to those |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | the middle of the page, responding to serious sexual offences within prison establishments in London. You can see the purpose is "to standardise the interagency responses to sexual offences within prison establishments in London." So it applies to the adult estate as well, I think. Is that right? A. It does, yes, that's correct. Q. Do you have a sense of when this SLA will be finalised and operational? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | for everybody to take, so they can have free access to them and I just think having a box on there, I'm not so sure a child would actually tick that box or feel comfortable about it, so I just think we understand that it's a generic form, but there is another option, there is a stage 2, so confidential access. Q. That's a COMP 2 not a COMP 1, is that right? A. So there is a COMP 2, which is a confidential access form and we would provide envelopes next to those complaints, so actually they get sealed in an envelope |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | the middle of the page, responding to serious sexual offences within prison establishments in London. You can see the purpose is "to standardise the interagency responses to sexual offences within prison establishments in London." So it applies to the adult estate as well, I think. Is that right? A. It does, yes, that's correct. Q. Do you have a sense of when this SLA will be finalised and operational? A. To be honest, I don't, because I'm my new job now, | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | for everybody to take, so they can have free access to them and I just think having a box on there, I'm not so sure a child would actually tick that box or feel comfortable about it, so I just think we understand that it's a generic form, but there is another option, there is a stage 2, so confidential access. Q. That's a COMP 2 not a COMP 1, is that right? A. So there is a COMP 2, which is a confidential access form and we would provide envelopes next to those complaints, so actually they get sealed in an envelope and they can either be opened by the governor or they |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | the middle of the page, responding to serious sexual offences within prison establishments in London. You can see the purpose is "to standardise the interagency responses to sexual offences within prison establishments in London." So it applies to the adult estate as well, I think. Is that right? A. It does, yes, that's correct. Q. Do you have a sense of when this SLA will be finalised and operational? A. To be honest, I don't, because I'm — my new job now, I'm a sort of interim prison group director for the IRC, | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | for everybody to take, so they can have free access to them and I just think having a box on there, I'm not so sure a child would actually tick that box or feel comfortable about it, so I just think we understand that it's a generic form, but there is another option, there is a stage 2, so confidential access. Q. That's a COMP 2 not a COMP 1, is that right? A. So there is a COMP 2, which is a confidential access form and we would provide envelopes next to those complaints, so actually they get sealed in an envelope and they can either be opened by the governor or they can also be to my boss, the deputy director of custody. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | the middle of the page, responding to serious sexual offences within prison establishments in London. You can see the purpose is "to standardise the interagency responses to sexual offences within prison establishments in London." So it applies to the adult estate as well, I think. Is that right? A. It does, yes, that's correct. Q. Do you have a sense of when this SLA will be finalised and operational? A. To be honest, I don't, because I'm my new job now, I'm a sort of interim prison group director for the IRC, so I've left Feltham since May. I was just speaking to | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | for everybody to take, so they can have free access to them and I just think having a box on there, I'm not so sure a child would actually tick that box or feel comfortable about it, so I just think we understand that it's a generic form, but there is another option, there is a stage 2, so confidential access. Q. That's a COMP 2 not a COMP 1, is that right? A. So there is a COMP 2, which is a confidential access form and we would provide envelopes next to those complaints, so actually they get sealed in an envelope and they can either be opened by the governor or they can also be to my boss, the deputy director of custody. So that's a form that no one has access to apart from |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | the middle of the page, responding to serious sexual offences within prison establishments in London. You can see the purpose is "to standardise the interagency responses to sexual offences within prison establishments in London." So it applies to the adult estate as well, I think. Is that right? A. It does, yes, that's correct. Q. Do you have a sense of when this SLA will be finalised and operational? A. To be honest, I don't, because I'm — my new job now, I'm a sort of interim prison group director for the IRC, so I've left Feltham since May. I was just speaking to my colleague earlier and it is still being discussed, | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | for everybody to take, so they can have free access to them and I just think having a box on there, I'm not so sure a child would actually tick that box or feel comfortable about it, so I just think we understand that it's a generic form, but there is another option, there is a stage 2, so confidential access. Q. That's a COMP 2 not a COMP 1, is that right? A. So there is a COMP 2, which is a confidential access form and we would provide envelopes next to those complaints, so actually they get sealed in an envelope and they can either be opened by the governor or they can also be to my boss, the deputy director of custody. So that's a form that no one has access to apart from very senior people. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | the middle of the page, responding to serious sexual offences within prison establishments in London. You can see the purpose is "to standardise the interagency responses to sexual offences within prison establishments in London." So it applies to the adult estate as well, I think. Is that right? A. It does, yes, that's correct. Q. Do you have a sense of when this SLA will be finalised and operational? A. To be honest, I don't, because I'm — my new job now, I'm a sort of interim prison group director for the IRC, so I've left Feltham since May. I was just speaking to my colleague earlier and it is still being discussed, but it would be wrong of me to put an exact date of when | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | for everybody to take, so they can have free access to them and I just think having a box on there, I'm not so sure a child would actually tick that box or feel comfortable about it, so I just think we understand that it's a generic form, but there is another option, there is a stage 2, so confidential access. Q. That's a COMP 2 not a COMP 1, is that right? A. So there is a COMP 2, which is a confidential access form and we would provide envelopes next to those complaints, so actually they get sealed in an envelope and they can either be opened by the governor or they can also be to my boss, the deputy director of custody. So that's a form that no one has access to apart from very senior people. Q. I think you make the point — is this right? — that if |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | the middle of the page, responding to serious sexual offences within prison establishments in London. You can see the purpose is "to standardise the interagency responses to sexual offences within prison establishments in London." So it applies to the adult estate as well, I think. Is that right? A. It does, yes, that's correct. Q. Do you have a sense of when this SLA will be finalised and operational? A. To be honest, I don't, because I'm my new job now, I'm a sort of interim prison group director for the IRC, so I've left Feltham since May. I was just speaking to my colleague earlier and it is still being discussed, but it would be wrong of me to put an exact date of when it's going to be finalised, and I wouldn't be signing | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | for everybody to take, so they can have free access to them and I just think having a box on there, I'm not so sure a child would actually tick that box or feel comfortable about it, so I just think we understand that it's a generic form, but there is another option, there is a stage 2, so confidential access. Q. That's a COMP 2 not a COMP 1, is that right? A. So there is a COMP 2, which is a confidential access form and we would provide envelopes next to those complaints, so actually they get sealed in an envelope and they can either be opened by the governor or they can also be to my boss, the deputy director of custody. So that's a form that no one has access to apart from very senior people. Q. I think you make the point — is this right? — that if a COMP 1 is filled in, that the complaints clerk who |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | the middle of the page, responding to serious sexual offences within prison establishments in London. You can see the purpose is "to standardise the interagency responses to sexual offences within prison establishments in London." So it applies to the adult estate as well, I think. Is that right? A. It does, yes, that's correct. Q. Do you have a sense of when this SLA will be finalised and operational? A. To be honest, I don't, because I'm my new job now, I'm a sort of interim prison group director for the IRC, so I've left Feltham since May. I was just speaking to my colleague earlier and it is still being discussed, but it would be wrong of me to put an exact date of when it's going to be finalised, and I wouldn't be signing it, so it would be obviously the new governor of Feltham | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | for everybody to take, so they can have free access to them and I just think having a box on there, I'm not so sure a child would actually tick that box or feel comfortable about it, so I just think we understand that it's a generic form, but there is another option, there is a stage 2, so confidential access. Q. That's a COMP 2 not a COMP 1, is that right? A. So there is a COMP 2, which is a confidential access form and we would provide envelopes next to those complaints, so actually they get sealed in an envelope and they can either be opened by the governor or they can also be to my boss, the deputy director of custody. So that's a form that no one has access to apart from very senior people. Q. I think you make the point — is this right? — that if a COMP 1 is filled in, that the complaints clerk who receives those complaints does have child protection |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | the middle of the page, responding to serious sexual offences within prison establishments in London. You can see the purpose is "to standardise the interagency responses to sexual offences within prison establishments in London." So it applies to the adult estate as well, I think. Is that right? A. It does, yes, that's correct. Q. Do you have a sense of when this SLA will be finalised and operational? A. To be honest, I don't, because I'm my new job now, I'm a sort of interim prison group director for the IRC, so I've left Feltham since May. I was just speaking to my colleague earlier and it is still being discussed, but it would be wrong of me to put an exact date of when it's going to be finalised, and I wouldn't be signing it, so it would be obviously the new governor of Feltham but I think we're talking we're talking weeks rather | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | for everybody to take, so they can have free access to them and I just think having a box on there, I'm not so sure a child would actually tick that box or feel comfortable about it, so I just think we understand that it's a generic form, but there is another option, there is a stage 2, so confidential access. Q. That's a COMP 2 not a COMP 1, is that right? A. So there is a COMP 2, which is a confidential access form and we would provide envelopes next to those complaints, so actually they get sealed in an envelope and they can either be opened by the governor or they can also be to my boss, the deputy director of custody. So that's a form that no one has access to apart from very senior people. Q. I think you make the point — is this right? — that if a COMP 1 is filled in, that the complaints clerk who receives those complaints does have child protection training and so should know to direct that sort of |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | the middle of the page, responding to serious sexual offences within prison establishments in London. You can see the purpose is "to standardise the interagency responses to sexual offences within prison establishments in London." So it applies to the adult estate as well, I think. Is that right? A. It does, yes, that's correct. Q. Do you have a sense of when this SLA will be finalised and operational? A. To be honest, I don't, because I'm — my new job now, I'm a sort of interim prison group director for the IRC, so I've left Feltham since May. I was just speaking to my colleague earlier and it is still being discussed, but it would be wrong of me to put an exact date of when it's going to be finalised, and I wouldn't be signing it, so it would be obviously the new governor of Feltham but I think we're talking — we're talking weeks rather than months or years, so | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | for everybody to take, so they can have free access to them and I just think having a box on there, I'm not so sure a child would actually tick that box or feel comfortable about it, so I just think we understand that it's a generic form, but there is another option, there is a stage 2, so confidential access. Q. That's a COMP 2 not a COMP 1, is that right? A. So there is a COMP 2, which is a confidential access form and we would provide envelopes next to those complaints, so actually they get sealed in an envelope and they can either be opened by the governor or they can also be to my boss, the deputy director of custody. So that's a form that no one has access to apart from very senior people. Q. I think you make the point — is this right? — that if a COMP 1 is filled in, that the complaints clerk who receives those complaints does have child protection training and so should know to direct that sort of allegation of abuse if that's what's made in the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | the middle of the page, responding to serious sexual offences within prison establishments in London. You can see the purpose is "to standardise the interagency responses to sexual offences within prison establishments in London." So it applies to the adult estate as well, I think. Is that right? A. It does, yes, that's correct. Q. Do you have a sense of when this SLA will be finalised and operational? A. To be honest, I don't, because I'm — my new job now, I'm a sort of interim prison group director for the IRC, so I've left Feltham since May. I was just speaking to my colleague earlier and it is still being discussed, but it would be wrong of me to put an exact date of when it's going to be finalised, and I wouldn't be signing it, so it would be obviously the new governor of Feltham but I think we're talking — we're talking weeks rather than months or years, so Q. Is it your understanding that part of the rationale for | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | for everybody to take, so they can have free access to them and I just think having a box on there, I'm not so sure a child would actually tick that box or feel comfortable about it, so I just think we understand that it's a generic form, but there is another option, there is a stage 2, so confidential access. Q. That's a COMP 2 not a COMP 1, is that right? A. So there is a COMP 2, which is a confidential access form and we would provide envelopes next to those complaints, so actually they get sealed in an envelope and they can either be opened by the governor or they can also be to my boss, the deputy director of custody. So that's a form that no one has access to apart from very senior people. Q. I think you make the point — is this right? — that if a COMP 1 is filled in, that the complaints clerk who receives those complaints does have child protection training and so should know to direct that sort of allegation of abuse if that's what's made in the complaint to the safeguarding team? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | the middle of the page, responding to serious sexual offences within prison establishments in London. You can see the purpose is "to standardise the interagency responses to sexual offences within prison establishments in London." So it applies to the adult estate as well, I think. Is that right? A. It does, yes, that's correct. Q. Do you have a sense of when this SLA will be finalised and operational? A. To be honest, I don't, because I'm my new job now, I'm a sort of interim prison group director for the IRC, so I've left Feltham since May. I was just speaking to my colleague earlier and it is still being discussed, but it would be wrong of me to put an exact date of when it's going to be finalised, and I wouldn't be signing it, so it would be obviously the new governor of Feltham but I think we're talking we're talking weeks rather than months or years, so Q. Is it your understanding that part of the rationale for that document is to give a clearer understanding of the | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | for everybody to take, so they can have free access to them and I just think having a box on there, I'm not so sure a child would actually tick that box or feel comfortable about it, so I just think we understand that it's a generic form, but there is another option, there is a stage 2, so confidential access. Q. That's a COMP 2 not a COMP 1, is that right? A. So there is a COMP 2, which is a confidential access form and we would provide envelopes next to those complaints, so actually they get sealed in an envelope and they can either be opened by the governor or they can also be to my boss, the deputy director of custody. So that's a form that no one has access to apart from very senior people. Q. I think you make the point — is this right? — that if a COMP 1 is filled in, that the complaints clerk who receives those complaints does have child protection training and so should know to direct that sort of allegation of abuse if that's what's made in the complaint to the safeguarding team? A. Yes, they would know to the safeguarding team child |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | the middle of the page, responding to serious sexual offences within prison establishments in London. You can see the purpose is "to standardise the interagency responses to sexual offences within prison establishments in London." So it applies to the adult estate as well, I think. Is that right? A. It does, yes, that's correct. Q. Do you have a sense of when this SLA will be finalised and operational? A. To be honest, I don't, because I'm — my new job now, I'm a sort of interim prison group director for the IRC, so I've left Feltham since May. I was just speaking to my colleague earlier and it is still being discussed, but it would be wrong of me to put an exact date of when it's going to be finalised, and I wouldn't be signing it, so it would be obviously the new governor of Feltham but I think we're talking — we're talking weeks rather than months or years, so Q. Is it your understanding that part of the rationale for that document is to give a clearer understanding of the roles of the various agencies involved when a serious | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | for everybody to take, so they can have free access to them and I just think having a box on there, I'm not so sure a child would actually tick that box or feel comfortable about it, so I just think we understand that it's a generic form, but there is another option, there is a stage 2, so confidential access. Q. That's a COMP 2 not a COMP 1, is that right? A. So there is a COMP 2, which is a confidential access form and we would provide envelopes next to those complaints, so actually they get sealed in an envelope and they can either be opened by the governor or they can also be to my boss, the deputy director of custody. So that's a form that no one has access to apart from very senior people. Q. I think you make the point is this right? that if a COMP 1 is filled in, that the complaints clerk who receives those complaints does have child protection training and so should know to direct that sort of allegation of abuse if that's what's made in the complaint to the safeguarding team? A. Yes, they would know to the safeguarding team child protection officer or, if a complaint was dealt with at |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | the middle of the page, responding to serious sexual offences within prison establishments in London. You can see the purpose is "to standardise the interagency responses to sexual offences within prison establishments in London." So it applies to the adult estate as well, I think. Is that right? A. It does, yes, that's correct. Q. Do you have a sense of when this SLA will be finalised and operational? A. To be honest, I don't, because I'm my new job now, I'm a sort of interim prison group director for the IRC, so I've left Feltham since May. I was just speaking to my colleague earlier and it is still being discussed, but it would be wrong of me to put an exact date of when it's going to be finalised, and I wouldn't be signing it, so it would be obviously the new governor of Feltham but I think we're talking we're talking weeks rather than months or years, so Q. Is it your understanding that part of the rationale for that document is to give a clearer understanding of the roles of the various agencies involved when a serious sexual assault allegation is made in custody? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | for everybody to take, so they can have free access to them and I just think having a box on there, I'm not so sure a child would actually tick that box or feel comfortable about it, so I just think we understand that it's a generic form, but there is another option, there is a stage 2, so confidential access. Q. That's a COMP 2 not a COMP 1, is that right? A. So there is a COMP 2, which is a confidential access form and we would provide envelopes next to those complaints, so actually they get sealed in an envelope and they can either be opened by the governor or they can also be to my boss, the deputy director of custody. So that's a form that no one has access to apart from very senior people. Q. I think you make the point — is this right? — that if a COMP 1 is filled in, that the complaints clerk who receives those complaints does have child protection training and so should know to direct that sort of allegation of abuse if that's what's made in the complaint to the safeguarding team? A. Yes, they would know to the safeguarding team child protection officer or, if a complaint was dealt with at a weekend, it would be the duty governor, because |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | the middle of the page, responding to serious sexual offences within prison establishments in London. You can see the purpose is "to standardise the interagency responses to sexual offences within prison establishments in London." So it applies to the adult estate as well, I think. Is that right? A. It does, yes, that's correct. Q. Do you have a sense of when this SLA will be finalised and operational? A. To be honest, I don't, because I'm — my new job now, I'm a sort of interim prison group director for the IRC, so I've left Feltham since May. I was just speaking to my colleague earlier and it is still being discussed, but it would be wrong of me to put an exact date of when it's going to be finalised, and I wouldn't be signing it, so it would be obviously the new governor of Feltham but I think we're talking — we're talking weeks rather than months or years, so Q. Is it your understanding that part of the rationale for that document is to give a clearer understanding of the roles of the various agencies involved when a serious | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | for everybody to take, so they can have free access to them and I just think having a box on there, I'm not so sure a child would actually tick that box or feel comfortable about it, so I just think we understand that it's a generic form, but there is another option, there is a stage 2, so confidential access. Q. That's a COMP 2 not a COMP 1, is that right? A. So there is a COMP 2, which is a confidential access form and we would provide envelopes next to those complaints, so actually they get sealed in an envelope and they can either be opened by the governor or they can also be to my boss, the deputy director of custody. So that's a form that no one has access to apart from very senior people. Q. I think you make the point is this right? that if a COMP 1 is filled in, that the complaints clerk who receives those complaints does have child protection training and so should know to direct that sort of allegation of abuse if that's what's made in the complaint to the safeguarding team? A. Yes, they would know to the safeguarding team child protection officer or, if a complaint was dealt with at |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | the middle of the page, responding to serious sexual offences within prison establishments in London. You can see the purpose is "to standardise the interagency responses to sexual offences within prison establishments in London." So it applies to the adult estate as well, I think. Is that right? A. It does, yes, that's correct. Q. Do you have a sense of when this SLA will be finalised and operational? A. To be honest, I don't, because I'm my new job now, I'm a sort of interim prison group director for the IRC, so I've left Feltham since May. I was just speaking to my colleague earlier and it is still being discussed, but it would be wrong of me to put an exact date of when it's going to be finalised, and I wouldn't be signing it, so it would be obviously the new governor of Feltham but I think we're talking we're talking weeks rather than months or years, so Q. Is it your understanding that part of the rationale for that document is to give a clearer understanding of the roles of the various agencies involved when a serious sexual assault allegation is made in custody? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | for everybody to take, so they can have free access to them and I just think having a box on there, I'm not so sure a child would actually tick that box or feel comfortable about it, so I just think we understand that it's a generic form, but there is another option, there is a stage 2, so confidential access. Q. That's a COMP 2 not a COMP 1, is that right? A. So there is a COMP 2, which is a confidential access form and we would provide envelopes next to those complaints, so actually they get sealed in an envelope and they can either be opened by the governor or they can also be to my boss, the deputy director of custody. So that's a form that no one has access to apart from very senior people. Q. I think you make the point — is this right? — that if a COMP 1 is filled in, that the complaints clerk who receives those complaints does have child protection training and so should know to direct that sort of allegation of abuse if that's what's made in the complaint to the safeguarding team? A. Yes, they would know to the safeguarding team child protection officer or, if a complaint was dealt with at a weekend, it would be the duty governor, because |

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- with any safeguarding issue.
 Q. But do you feel now that the process in place at Feltham
 is that if sexual abuse is disclosed via the complaint
- is that if sexual abuse is disclosed via the complaint route, that the person who opens that will know how to
- 5 direct that to the safeguarding team?
- 6 A. Yes, confident about that.
- Q. Mr Wood has made some observations about the retraction
 of complaints. Can you help with that, Mr Knight?
- 8 9 A. The individual cases, some of them are historic, so 10 I wasn't at Feltham at the time, but I can talk in more 11 general terms. So what I would say is, if anybody has 12 to sort of -- doesn't want to go forward with their 13 complaint, we just wouldn't take that at face value. So 14 now they would be spoken to by either their unit staff, 15 certainly safeguarding officer, also could be social 16 worker as well, but more importantly, I think Mr Wood's 17 actually said it, we would look and ask other people 18 around, as well, that actually care for and work with 19 that young person. So we wouldn't routinely just say 20 "Well, you want to withdraw that complaint? Sign here 2.1 and it will be taken back". That certainly wouldn't
 - Q. Do you feel the approach is more robust now than it was at the time of the allegations Mr Wood was looking at?

Page 117

25 A. I can't comment.

happen now.

22

23

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

support to a child who does disclose abuse?

- A. Yes, they are one of the key people that could offer
 support and do offer support.
 - Q. If a disclosure of sexual abuse was made by a child at Feltham now, or at least relatively recently, how do you think that would be responded to in terms of the support given to the child?
 - A. So the support given, obviously, the complaint, the allegation would be made. That would be done, obviously given to whoever it's dealt with. The immediate concerns would be about keeping that young person or child safe, so how would we do that? So a risk assessment would be -- a process would be put in place but, more importantly, about what impact that child having to make that complaint would be, so you would look at how you could support them and it may be that they have already got close links with our healthcare, maybe our psychologist team. It could be they're already linked in with our embedded social work team, so you would look to see who could possibly support them and what I would say is the general staff, as well, so everybody would be looking to support that young person, that child.
 - Q. You say at paragraph 27 of your witness statement that in terms of the more substantive response to the

Page 119

Q. More nuanced perhaps rather than robust?

- A. In general terms, yes, yes, I would. What I can say is, am I confident about the way that we would approach complaints now? Yes. I can't comment on 2009. But what I would say is, yes, I think our systems are more robust now, in my opinion.
- Q. Help the chair and panel, please, with understanding the role of the dedicated social workers at Feltham?
- A. So they are dedicated social workers at Feltham, they come from our local authority. We have currently got three in post now. I was one of their responsibilities is obviously is to look after those that are looked-after children, but also to deal with any safeguarding issue or complaints. They would have a case load and they would speak to the individual children and also speak to staff as well and just there for general advice, as well as have case loads.
- Q. Has the provision of dedicated social workers changed in
 the last couple of years or has that always been in
 place?
- A. It's always been in place but, like everything really, sometimes there have been gaps around recruitment, but I'm pleased to say that, yes, there are now three at Feltham.

Page 118

25 Q. Do they provide support as part of the options for

allegation:

"I am confident now that Feltham would respond robustly if an allegation was made." Just help the panel with why you say that.

A. I would say that just because we have had independent scrutiny from the inspectorate, I mean, they have actually said it in their processes. Also, as well, we have a -- our local authority, our LADO as well as people that work in the local authority have access to keys to Feltham, so we have a number of times that they come in and do internal audits and they have free access, so assurance processes I believe are there. I mean, I think from our policies and procedures now, they are robust, they are reviewed and they do get reviewed.

Q. Part of the changes that you have described has been the different approach to restraint as we have seen and I think you have made the point that there is quite a different process in terms of responding to a restraint incident than there was in place in 2015. Is that fair?

A. Yes, there is. I mean, you've heard a lot about MMPR and introduction of that which we know obviously has a focus around the child. Staff get refreshed on that every six months not every 12 months, but if there is

Page 120

Pag

30 (Pages 117 to 120)

| 1 | an issue, and if there is a restraint, immediately now, | 1 | Q. Is there anything else that you believe is necessary for |
|----|--|----|---|
| 2 | depending what would happen, they will already be seen | 2 | Feltham to improve its systems for responding to |
| 3 | by a nurse and the duty governor. Then there would be | 3 | allegations of sexual abuse? |
| 4 | very quickly a follow-up debrief from a member of the | 4 | A. I think we could always improve. I do think actually |
| 5 | safeguarding team and from that, you know, I also chair, | 5 | the new 2018 Working Together, I think our policies do |
| 6 | as the governor, or the deputy governor in my absence, | 6 | have to be reviewed and refreshed around that. I think |
| 7 | a weekly governance meeting where we would look at all | 7 | we can only ever keep doing what we're doing to actually |
| 8 | the incidents that happen on Feltham A and one of the | 8 | ensure that every member of staff, every young person |
| 9 | key questions would always be, what support mechanisms | 9 | and child and visitor has an understanding about this |
| 10 | are in place for this child? Is there issues to support | 10 | policy and, more important to me, certainly know how to |
| 11 | the staff, as well, is it a training issue? Is it | 11 | signpost or flag it up. Again, our support mechanisms, |
| 12 | a serious concern? Is it a CP? Have we referred it | 12 | would I like more social workers? Of course I would. |
| 13 | out? | 13 | Would I like more staff so we could interact with young |
| 14 | So that is minuted | 14 | people? Of course. You have heard about reform. |
| 15 | Q. That means it is a child protection case? | 15 | Resources coming more to YOIs now and we're starting to |
| 16 | A. Sorry, child protection case. So all of that would be | 16 | see that. So I wouldn't say, yes, we have got there and |
| 17 | minuted and all of that would be documented in that | 17 | we can't improve, because I don't think you could ever |
| 18 | weekly meeting, but prior to that, all of the MMPR | 18 | improve, certainly around this subject enough, sorry, |
| 19 | coordinators and safeguarding officers would have | 19 | improve enough. |
| 20 | already spoken to that young person and, again, it could | 20 | MS HILL: Chair, those are all my questions. |
| 21 | be that if that young person has had a number of times | 21 | Questions by THE PANEL |
| 22 | and there has been a restraint, so we would look at | 22 | THE CHAIR: Thank you. Mr Knight, could you help us with |
| 23 | we would look at the situation around that. It could | 23 | something you mentioned: pay levels and the fact you |
| 24 | | 24 | were able to raise them in order to attract staff at one |
| 25 | be, if they do have an issue with anger or dealing with conflict, we have a whole suite of interventions that we | 25 | stage. For our information, could you say something |
| 23 | connect, we have a whole suite of interventions that we | 23 | stage. For our information, could you say something |
| | Page 121 | | Page 123 |
| | | | O . |
| 1 | could try and help that child to deal with that, or if | 1 | about, is there parity between the pay scales and |
| 2 | it's a specific concern around a unit, individual | 2 | conditions in the public sector and the private |
| 3 | members of staff, of course we would look at that as | 3 | providers in this area? |
| 4 | well. | 4 | A. So I I can't comment on the exact salaries in the |
| 5 | What I would say is there is a government structure | 5 | private sector, but I can comment about Feltham, so if |
| 6 | that's highlighting inspection now, where we robustly | 6 | you looked at the local labour market, yes, there are |
| 7 | monitor all of these complaints, and the child is centre | 7 | a number of private sector establishments, Bronzefield |
| 8 | in all of that. | 8 | amongst others, that were paying more, but probably one |
| 9 | Q. I think you make the point, at page 12 of the most | 9 | of the biggest issues that we had at Heathrow Airport, |
| 10 | recent inspectors report, that Feltham processes for | 10 | so of course it was the labour market around that, so |
| 11 | governance around restraint were commended? | 11 | our attrition rates were fairly high, we couldn't |
| 12 | A. Yes, they were. Yes. | 12 | attract and retain staff, so we have now realised that |
| 13 | Q. You have made the point in your witness statement that | 13 | and there has been a process and an increment and |
| 14 | staff do receive training on the complex needs and | 14 | a midpoint pay range to ensure that we do get the right |
| 15 | vulnerabilities of children and are trained to use | 15 | people and that's in line with the local labour market |
| 16 | physical restraint as the last resort in this context. | 16 | and specifically around Feltham and working with young |
| 17 | Is that right? | 17 | people. |
| 18 | A. Yes, it would always be the last resort. | 18 | THE CHAIR: And you have no idea what private providers pay? |
| 19 | Q. And you've made the point that if, as governor, on | 19 | A. It would be wrong of me. I would be guessing if I said |
| 20 | reviewing any restraint incident, you were concerned | 20 | it. |
| 21 | about the use of force, you would convene a strategy | 21 | THE CHAIR: Is there interchangeability across the sectors, |
| 22 | meeting and follow the child protection process. | 22 | in terms of people moving through from one to the other? |
| 23 | I think that when you said, "Is it a CP?", that's what | 23 | A. So, yes, not so you would have to resign from the |
| 24 | you meant. Is that right? | 24 | private sector and then come to the public sector, you |
| 25 | A. Yes, we would. Or, yes, I would. | 25 | couldn't be seconded or just moved across. |

Page 124

| 1 | THE CHAIR: No, no, but is there movement of staff? | 1 | are most likely to suffer from that shortage. What can |
|----|---|----|---|
| 2 | A. Yes, yes, I have seen just locally, I do know of | 2 | be done to increase the number? |
| 3 | staff that have come to Feltham from private sector | 3 | A. What, in Feltham, or in general? |
| 4 | establishments, yes. | 4 | MR FRANK: So let's deal with Feltham, which is |
| 5 | THE CHAIR: Thank you very much. | 5 | A. Well, I guess this is probably somewhere above my pay |
| 6 | Ms Sharpling? | 6 | grade as the governor, as the governor then, so this is |
| 7 | MS SHARPLING: Thank you. Just a question from me. The | 7 | a policy decision that people just need to consider |
| 8 | complaint forms that you have mentioned whilst giving | 8 | about where are resources best placed, so I think it |
| 9 | your evidence, are they actually retained on personnel | 9 | would be wrong of me to be able to say how it could be |
| 10 | files for a certain period of time? I'm just thinking | 10 | done, but I think certainly there's a legal analysis as |
| 11 | of those circumstances where, for example, the complaint | 11 | well but, corporately, I understand, as you say, if we |
| 12 | has not been substantiated or not upheld or dismissed or | 12 | get additional social workers in Feltham and the overall |
| 13 | whatever the action is, are they then retained on the | 13 | budget isn't increased, then somebody else has less. |
| 14 | personnel files for a period of time? | 14 | MR FRANK: I won't press you on what you can't answer. |
| 15 | A. So the complaint form is one that a young person/child | 15 | Thank you very much. |
| 16 | | 16 | |
| | would complete. They wouldn't be retained in personnel | 17 | THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr Knight. MS HILL: Thank you, Mr Knight. Thank you. |
| 17 | files. Our personnel files now are all done | | 3 , 6 |
| 18 | electronically. What would happen is, let's just say | 18 | Chair, just before Mr Wood returns I should indicate |
| 19 | there was a local investigation or the police are | 19 | that there is a written response that's been provided to |
| 20 | involved, there would be a note of that if an award was | 20 | the inquiry on behalf of Hounslow who are the |
| 21 | given on individual records but there wouldn't be around | 21 | appropriate local authority for Feltham. I don't think |
| 22 | on personnel files to say | 22 | time today is going to permit reading in that evidence, |
| 23 | MS SHARPLING: What happens to the form in the end? | 23 | but please can I just formally adduce in particular the |
| 24 | A. So the form will be kept by our complaints clerk and | 24 | witness statement from Lara Wood, head of safeguarding |
| 25 | will be filed and then it will be kept for the period of | 25 | and quality assurance for the |
| | Page 125 | | Page 127 |
| | | | |
| 1 | time we have to keep it, and eventually it would be | 1 | London Borough of Hounslow, dated 2 July. |
| 2 | destroyed and put on our sort of destruction log to say | 2 | It's HOU000018 because that is Hounslow's detailed |
| 3 | that this information's been destroyed, but that would | 3 | response to the points Mr Wood has made and in due |
| 4 | be in five, ten years' time, it certainly wouldn't be in | 4 | course I'd ask you, chair, to read that. |
| 5 | the next short term. | 5 | For completeness, can I also formally adduce some |
| 6 | MS SHARPLING: All right, thank you. | 6 | earlier statements from Hounslow with the following |
| 7 | THE CHAIR: Mr Frank? | 7 | references: HOU000002, 000004, 000001, 000017 and then |
| 8 | MR FRANK: Just a question about the social workers that you | 8 | in fact Hounslow had also provided the draft protocol |
| 9 | mentioned. You say you have three, I think? | 9 | about which we heard at 000020. In particular as I say, |
| 10 | A. Yes. | 10 | chair, it's the response of 2 July that I'd ask you and |
| 11 | MR FRANK: What's optimum? | 11 | your colleagues to read in full. |
| 12 | A. So, I mean, if there is optimum for me, I think we | 12 | So I will recall, please, now Mr Wood to move on to |
| 13 | could always we could use double that, treble that | 13 | deal with some issues around Werrington and, chair, what |
| 14 | but, again, I appreciate it's difficult in the | 14 | I propose to do is ask Mr Wood some questions about the |
| 15 | community, as well. So if you was if you were | 15 | themes he identified in relation to Werrington. Then |
| 16 | talking about me, I would say, yes, actually, my view, | 16 | perhaps that might be the time for our break and then we |
| 17 | five or six would be really, really useful, but I do | 17 | will hear from Mr Gormley about Werrington. |
| 18 | recognise the scene around, sort of, public funds and | 18 | Thank you, chair. |
| 19 | the community as well. | 19 | MR ALAN WOOD (continued) |
| 20 | MR FRANK: One of the things you mentioned was that, | 20 | Examination by MS HILL (continued) |
| 21 | I think, they tend to have a direct involvement with | 21 | MS HILL: Mr Wood, help us, then, with some of the themes |
| 22 | those who have already been in care, as it were. | 22 | that you identified from your review of the allegations |
| 23 | A. Yes. | 23 | at Werrington. First of all, if I can ask you to look, |
| 24 | MR FRANK: And so, if there is a shortage of social workers, | 24 | please, at paragraph 2.1.7 of your second/third report. |
| 25 | it's the ones who have come from the care background who | 25 | In fact, forgive me, before we get there, can I ask you |
| | | | _ |
| | Page 126 | | Page 128 |
| - | | | |

| | | 1 | |
|--|---|---|---|
| 1 | to turn up the list of allegations in relation to | 1 | help us with that, please. |
| 2 | Feltham. It's at Werrington. It's INQ001210 and | 2 | A. Yes, a couple of examples, I suppose. In terms of |
| 3 | it's internal page 5, please: if we scroll in on that, | 3 | a child's past use of the complaints procedure so |
| 4 | top of the page, please. | 4 | there were some examples in terms of whereby the view |
| 5 | We will see there that you were invited to look at | 5 | I had was, was that sometimes the response may have been |
| 6 | ten issues, is this right, in relation to Werrington? | 6 | framed by the view that there is a suspicion regarding |
| 7 | A. That's correct, yes. | 7 | the purpose of why the child has wanted to make |
| 8 | Q. I will just wait for that to come up. INQ001210, it's | 8 | a statement. |
| 9 | the report we had earlier. | 9 | I think one example I drew out says there is |
| 10 | Second and third report. Sorry if I gave you a bad | 10 | a significant potential for a disclosure not to be |
| 11 | reference. It's internal page 5, please, and just | 11 | a genuine one and that statement was made prior to any |
| 12 | scroll in on section 2.0 at the top. That is the list | 12 | investigative or any breakdown of what had |
| 13 | of dates of allegations that you looked at, so it spans | 13 | actually the allegation actually was. |
| 14 | here a period from January 2011 to March 2016. Is that | 14 | So in its sole context without any meaning behind |
| 15 | right? | 15 | that, that's quite a stark statement to make in terms of |
| 16 | A. That's correct, yes. | 16 | being significantly potential for the disclosure not to |
| 17 | Q. If we scroll in, please, on 2.1.1, go down there. | 17 | be a genuine one. |
| 18 | Generally, is this right? At 2.1.1, you said: | 18 | Now, that may have been reflective of the person |
| 19 | "With the exception of one allegation, Werrington | 19 | filling out that particular record of his or her |
| 20 | responded to allegations in a timely and structurally | 20 | experience, but, without the additional context, |
| 21 | appropriate way. There was good evidence of the | 21 | actually quite hard to grasp the reason why that |
| 22 | allegations being recorded in an appropriate manner | 22 | statement was actually made. |
| 23 | using the correct form. Generally, the recording was | 23 | Q. Just for completeness, if we can turn up, please, |
| 24 | clear and concise, but there were some issues, perhaps, | 24 | INQ001764, internal page 2. That's where you gave some |
| 25 | about the quality and appropriateness of the language | 25 | specific examples, I think, of this theme in operation. |
| | | | |
| | Page 129 | _ | Page 131 |
| 1 | used." | 1 | It's the first two paragraphs on this page, please, 1.1 |
| 2 | So just help us with what you meant by that? | 2 | and 1.2. You were asked specifically about certain |
| 3 | A. Yes, certainly. I think in terms of an overarching | 3 | allegations there, those referred to on the notes |
| 4 | point of view, the records within this young offenders' | 1 | |
| | | 1 4 | SFC000007 and NOM000009 and I think you indicated that |
| 5 | • | 4 5 | SFC000007 and NOM000009, and I think you indicated that they were examples of this sort of suspicion in |
| 5 6 | institution were of a high standard. They did show what | 5 | they were examples of this sort of suspicion in |
| 6 | institution were of a high standard. They did show what actions were looked at and what the next steps were. | 5 6 | they were examples of this sort of suspicion in operation. Is that right? |
| 6 7 | institution were of a high standard. They did show what actions were looked at and what the next steps were. I think for me, again, it reflects on other comments | 5 6 7 | they were examples of this sort of suspicion in operation. Is that right? A. That's correct, yes. |
| 6 7 8 | institution were of a high standard. They did show what actions were looked at and what the next steps were. I think for me, again, it reflects on other comments I made earlier that the consistency in terms of the good | 5 6 7 8 | they were examples of this sort of suspicion in operation. Is that right? A. That's correct, yes. Q. I think, just for completeness, we can pull up some |
| 6 7 8 9 | institution were of a high standard. They did show what actions were looked at and what the next steps were. I think for me, again, it reflects on other comments I made earlier that the consistency in terms of the good recording practice wasn't always matched in terms of the | 5 6 7 8 9 | they were examples of this sort of suspicion in operation. Is that right? A. That's correct, yes. Q. I think, just for completeness, we can pull up some examples of that from the letter of instruction where |
| 6 7 8 9 10 | institution were of a high standard. They did show what actions were looked at and what the next steps were. I think for me, again, it reflects on other comments I made earlier that the consistency in terms of the good recording practice wasn't always matched in terms of the analysis, understanding of children's needs following on | 5 6 7 8 9 10 | they were examples of this sort of suspicion in operation. Is that right? A. That's correct, yes. Q. I think, just for completeness, we can pull up some examples of that from the letter of instruction where the documents were quoted. It's INQ001733_001, please |
| 6 7 8 9 10 11 | institution were of a high standard. They did show what actions were looked at and what the next steps were. I think for me, again, it reflects on other comments I made earlier that the consistency in terms of the good recording practice wasn't always matched in terms of the analysis, understanding of children's needs following on from that. | 5 6 7 8 9 10 | they were examples of this sort of suspicion in operation. Is that right? A. That's correct, yes. Q. I think, just for completeness, we can pull up some examples of that from the letter of instruction where the documents were quoted. It's INQ001733_001, please and you can see, if you scroll in on the bottom |
| 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | institution were of a high standard. They did show what actions were looked at and what the next steps were. I think for me, again, it reflects on other comments I made earlier that the consistency in terms of the good recording practice wasn't always matched in terms of the analysis, understanding of children's needs following on from that. Q. So there was a better process here, is that right? | 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | they were examples of this sort of suspicion in operation. Is that right? A. That's correct, yes. Q. I think, just for completeness, we can pull up some examples of that from the letter of instruction where the documents were quoted. It's INQ001733_001, please and you can see, if you scroll in on the bottom paragraph on that page, please, the extract from one of |
| 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | institution were of a high standard. They did show what actions were looked at and what the next steps were. I think for me, again, it reflects on other comments I made earlier that the consistency in terms of the good recording practice wasn't always matched in terms of the analysis, understanding of children's needs following on from that. Q. So there was a better process here, is that right? A. That's correct, yes. | 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | they were examples of this sort of suspicion in operation. Is that right? A. That's correct, yes. Q. I think, just for completeness, we can pull up some examples of that from the letter of instruction where the documents were quoted. It's INQ001733_001, please and you can see, if you scroll in on the bottom paragraph on that page, please, the extract from one of the documents here, (i), I think, where there is |
| 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | institution were of a high standard. They did show what actions were looked at and what the next steps were. I think for me, again, it reflects on other comments I made earlier that the consistency in terms of the good recording practice wasn't always matched in terms of the analysis, understanding of children's needs following on from that. Q. So there was a better process here, is that right? A. That's correct, yes. Q. But there were still some concerns about the nuanced | 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | they were examples of this sort of suspicion in operation. Is that right? A. That's correct, yes. Q. I think, just for completeness, we can pull up some examples of that from the letter of instruction where the documents were quoted. It's INQ001733_001, please and you can see, if you scroll in on the bottom paragraph on that page, please, the extract from one of the documents here, (i), I think, where there is reference to what the allegation was, that "A female |
| 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | institution were of a high standard. They did show what actions were looked at and what the next steps were. I think for me, again, it reflects on other comments I made earlier that the consistency in terms of the good recording practice wasn't always matched in terms of the analysis, understanding of children's needs following on from that. Q. So there was a better process here, is that right? A. That's correct, yes. Q. But there were still some concerns about the nuanced understanding of the children's needs? | 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | they were examples of this sort of suspicion in operation. Is that right? A. That's correct, yes. Q. I think, just for completeness, we can pull up some examples of that from the letter of instruction where the documents were quoted. It's INQ001733_001, please and you can see, if you scroll in on the bottom paragraph on that page, please, the extract from one of the documents here, (i), I think, where there is reference to what the allegation was, that "A female officer touches my burn and my dick and grabs me during |
| 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | institution were of a high standard. They did show what actions were looked at and what the next steps were. I think for me, again, it reflects on other comments I made earlier that the consistency in terms of the good recording practice wasn't always matched in terms of the analysis, understanding of children's needs following on from that. Q. So there was a better process here, is that right? A. That's correct, yes. Q. But there were still some concerns about the nuanced understanding of the children's needs? A. That is correct, yes. I think this institution tended | 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | they were examples of this sort of suspicion in operation. Is that right? A. That's correct, yes. Q. I think, just for completeness, we can pull up some examples of that from the letter of instruction where the documents were quoted. It's INQ001733_001, please and you can see, if you scroll in on the bottom paragraph on that page, please, the extract from one of the documents here, (i), I think, where there is reference to what the allegation was, that "A female officer touches my bum and my dick and grabs me during searches on visits". The initial note from the head of |
| 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | institution were of a high standard. They did show what actions were looked at and what the next steps were. I think for me, again, it reflects on other comments I made earlier that the consistency in terms of the good recording practice wasn't always matched in terms of the analysis, understanding of children's needs following on from that. Q. So there was a better process here, is that right? A. That's correct, yes. Q. But there were still some concerns about the nuanced understanding of the children's needs? A. That is correct, yes. I think this institution tended to follow one set way, so it was easier to match up | 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | they were examples of this sort of suspicion in operation. Is that right? A. That's correct, yes. Q. I think, just for completeness, we can pull up some examples of that from the letter of instruction where the documents were quoted. It's INQ001733_001, please and you can see, if you scroll in on the bottom paragraph on that page, please, the extract from one of the documents here, (i), I think, where there is reference to what the allegation was, that "A female officer touches my bum and my dick and grabs me during searches on visits". The initial note from the head of safeguarding said, "I have some doubts as to the |
| 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | institution were of a high standard. They did show what actions were looked at and what the next steps were. I think for me, again, it reflects on other comments I made earlier that the consistency in terms of the good recording practice wasn't always matched in terms of the analysis, understanding of children's needs following on from that. Q. So there was a better process here, is that right? A. That's correct, yes. Q. But there were still some concerns about the nuanced understanding of the children's needs? A. That is correct, yes. I think this institution tended to follow one set way, so it was easier to match up those initial views, as well. So I think for me, still, | 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | they were examples of this sort of suspicion in operation. Is that right? A. That's correct, yes. Q. I think, just for completeness, we can pull up some examples of that from the letter of instruction where the documents were quoted. It's INQ001733_001, please and you can see, if you scroll in on the bottom paragraph on that page, please, the extract from one of the documents here, (i), I think, where there is reference to what the allegation was, that "A female officer touches my bum and my dick and grabs me during searches on visits". The initial note from the head of safeguarding said, "I have some doubts as to the credibility of the complaints, as both boys chose to |
| 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | institution were of a high standard. They did show what actions were looked at and what the next steps were. I think for me, again, it reflects on other comments I made earlier that the consistency in terms of the good recording practice wasn't always matched in terms of the analysis, understanding of children's needs following on from that. Q. So there was a better process here, is that right? A. That's correct, yes. Q. But there were still some concerns about the nuanced understanding of the children's needs? A. That is correct, yes. I think this institution tended to follow one set way, so it was easier to match up those initial views, as well. So I think for me, still, the common theme really was that, even though the | 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | they were examples of this sort of suspicion in operation. Is that right? A. That's correct, yes. Q. I think, just for completeness, we can pull up some examples of that from the letter of instruction where the documents were quoted. It's INQ001733_001, please and you can see, if you scroll in on the bottom paragraph on that page, please, the extract from one of the documents here, (i), I think, where there is reference to what the allegation was, that "A female officer touches my bum and my dick and grabs me during searches on visits". The initial note from the head of safeguarding said, "I have some doubts as to the credibility of the complaints, as both boys chose to submit them on the same day", and there are various |
| 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | institution were of a high standard. They did show what actions were looked at and what the next steps were. I think for me, again, it reflects on other comments I made earlier that the consistency in terms of the good recording practice wasn't always matched in terms of the analysis, understanding of children's needs following on from that. Q. So there was a better process here, is that right? A. That's correct, yes. Q. But there were still some concerns about the nuanced understanding of the children's needs? A. That is correct, yes. I think this institution tended to follow one set way, so it was easier to match up those initial views, as well. So I think for me, still, the common theme really was that, even though the recordings were there, there is still some issues in | 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | they were examples of this sort of suspicion in operation. Is that right? A. That's correct, yes. Q. I think, just for completeness, we can pull up some examples of that from the letter of instruction where the documents were quoted. It's INQ001733_001, please and you can see, if you scroll in on the bottom paragraph on that page, please, the extract from one of the documents here, (i), I think, where there is reference to what the allegation was, that "A female officer touches my bum and my dick and grabs me during searches on visits". The initial note from the head of safeguarding said, "I have some doubts as to the credibility of the complaints, as both boys chose to submit them on the same day", and there are various other reasons why it was thought to be lacking in |
| 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | institution were of a high standard. They did show what actions were looked at and what the next steps were. I think for me, again, it reflects on other comments I made earlier that the consistency in terms of the good recording practice wasn't always matched in terms of the analysis, understanding of children's needs following on from that. Q. So there was a better process here, is that right? A. That's correct, yes. Q. But there were still some concerns about the nuanced understanding of the children's needs? A. That is correct, yes. I think this institution tended to follow one set way, so it was easier to match up those initial views, as well. So I think for me, still, the common theme really was that, even though the recordings were there, there is still some issues in terms of what it meant. | 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | they were examples of this sort of suspicion in operation. Is that right? A. That's correct, yes. Q. I think, just for completeness, we can pull up some examples of that from the letter of instruction where the documents were quoted. It's INQ001733_001, please and you can see, if you scroll in on the bottom paragraph on that page, please, the extract from one of the documents here, (i), I think, where there is reference to what the allegation was, that "A female officer touches my bum and my dick and grabs me during searches on visits". The initial note from the head of safeguarding said, "I have some doubts as to the credibility of the complaints, as both boys chose to submit them on the same day", and there are various other reasons why it was thought to be lacking in credibility. |
| 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | institution were of a high standard. They did show what actions were looked at and what the next steps were. I think for me, again, it reflects on other comments I made earlier that the consistency in terms of the good recording practice wasn't always matched in terms of the analysis, understanding of children's needs following on from that. Q. So there was a better process here, is that right? A. That's correct, yes. Q. But there were still some concerns about the nuanced understanding of the children's needs? A. That is correct, yes. I think this institution tended to follow one set way, so it was easier to match up those initial views, as well. So I think for me, still, the common theme really was that, even though the recordings were there, there is still some issues in terms of what it meant. Q. One of the themes you pulled out, if we can go to the | 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | they were examples of this sort of suspicion in operation. Is that right? A. That's correct, yes. Q. I think, just for completeness, we can pull up some examples of that from the letter of instruction where the documents were quoted. It's INQ001733_001, please and you can see, if you scroll in on the bottom paragraph on that page, please, the extract from one of the documents here, (i), I think, where there is reference to what the allegation was, that "A female officer touches my bum and my dick and grabs me during searches on visits". The initial note from the head of safeguarding said, "I have some doubts as to the credibility of the complaints, as both boys chose to submit them on the same day", and there are various other reasons why it was thought to be lacking in credibility. The LADO has said: |
| 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | institution were of a high standard. They did show what actions were looked at and what the next steps were. I think for me, again, it reflects on other comments I made earlier that the consistency in terms of the good recording practice wasn't always matched in terms of the analysis, understanding of children's needs following on from that. Q. So there was a better process here, is that right? A. That's correct, yes. Q. But there were still some concerns about the nuanced understanding of the children's needs? A. That is correct, yes. I think this institution tended to follow one set way, so it was easier to match up those initial views, as well. So I think for me, still, the common theme really was that, even though the recordings were there, there is still some issues in terms of what it meant. Q. One of the themes you pulled out, if we can go to the next page, please, internal page 6 and scroll in on | 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | they were examples of this sort of suspicion in operation. Is that right? A. That's correct, yes. Q. I think, just for completeness, we can pull up some examples of that from the letter of instruction where the documents were quoted. It's INQ001733_001, please and you can see, if you scroll in on the bottom paragraph on that page, please, the extract from one of the documents here, (i), I think, where there is reference to what the allegation was, that "A female officer touches my bum and my dick and grabs me during searches on visits". The initial note from the head of safeguarding said, "I have some doubts as to the credibility of the complaints, as both boys chose to submit them on the same day", and there are various other reasons why it was thought to be lacking in credibility. The LADO has said: "I agree this invites some suspicion about the |
| 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | institution were of a high standard. They did show what actions were looked at and what the next steps were. I think for me, again, it reflects on other comments I made earlier that the consistency in terms of the good recording practice wasn't always matched in terms of the analysis, understanding of children's needs following on from that. Q. So there was a better process here, is that right? A. That's correct, yes. Q. But there were still some concerns about the nuanced understanding of the children's needs? A. That is correct, yes. I think this institution tended to follow one set way, so it was easier to match up those initial views, as well. So I think for me, still, the common theme really was that, even though the recordings were there, there is still some issues in terms of what it meant. Q. One of the themes you pulled out, if we can go to the next page, please, internal page 6 and scroll in on 2.1.7 and 8, one theme you elicited was a suggestion of | 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | they were examples of this sort of suspicion in operation. Is that right? A. That's correct, yes. Q. I think, just for completeness, we can pull up some examples of that from the letter of instruction where the documents were quoted. It's INQ001733_001, please and you can see, if you scroll in on the bottom paragraph on that page, please, the extract from one of the documents here, (i), I think, where there is reference to what the allegation was, that "A female officer touches my bum and my dick and grabs me during searches on visits". The initial note from the head of safeguarding said, "I have some doubts as to the credibility of the complaints, as both boys chose to submit them on the same day", and there are various other reasons why it was thought to be lacking in credibility. The LADO has said: "I agree this invites some suspicion about the genuineness of the allegation." |
| 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | institution were of a high standard. They did show what actions were looked at and what the next steps were. I think for me, again, it reflects on other comments I made earlier that the consistency in terms of the good recording practice wasn't always matched in terms of the analysis, understanding of children's needs following on from that. Q. So there was a better process here, is that right? A. That's correct, yes. Q. But there were still some concerns about the nuanced understanding of the children's needs? A. That is correct, yes. I think this institution tended to follow one set way, so it was easier to match up those initial views, as well. So I think for me, still, the common theme really was that, even though the recordings were there, there is still some issues in terms of what it meant. Q. One of the themes you pulled out, if we can go to the next page, please, internal page 6 and scroll in on | 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | they were examples of this sort of suspicion in operation. Is that right? A. That's correct, yes. Q. I think, just for completeness, we can pull up some examples of that from the letter of instruction where the documents were quoted. It's INQ001733_001, please and you can see, if you scroll in on the bottom paragraph on that page, please, the extract from one of the documents here, (i), I think, where there is reference to what the allegation was, that "A female officer touches my bum and my dick and grabs me during searches on visits". The initial note from the head of safeguarding said, "I have some doubts as to the credibility of the complaints, as both boys chose to submit them on the same day", and there are various other reasons why it was thought to be lacking in credibility. The LADO has said: "I agree this invites some suspicion about the |
| 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | institution were of a high standard. They did show what actions were looked at and what the next steps were. I think for me, again, it reflects on other comments I made earlier that the consistency in terms of the good recording practice wasn't always matched in terms of the analysis, understanding of children's needs following on from that. Q. So there was a better process here, is that right? A. That's correct, yes. Q. But there were still some concerns about the nuanced understanding of the children's needs? A. That is correct, yes. I think this institution tended to follow one set way, so it was easier to match up those initial views, as well. So I think for me, still, the common theme really was that, even though the recordings were there, there is still some issues in terms of what it meant. Q. One of the themes you pulled out, if we can go to the next page, please, internal page 6 and scroll in on 2.1.7 and 8, one theme you elicited was a suggestion of | 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | they were examples of this sort of suspicion in operation. Is that right? A. That's correct, yes. Q. I think, just for completeness, we can pull up some examples of that from the letter of instruction where the documents were quoted. It's INQ001733_001, please and you can see, if you scroll in on the bottom paragraph on that page, please, the extract from one of the documents here, (i), I think, where there is reference to what the allegation was, that "A female officer touches my bum and my dick and grabs me during searches on visits". The initial note from the head of safeguarding said, "I have some doubts as to the credibility of the complaints, as both boys chose to submit them on the same day", and there are various other reasons why it was thought to be lacking in credibility. The LADO has said: "I agree this invites some suspicion about the genuineness of the allegation." |

| 1 | "An unidentified person had told Childline that he | 1 | Q. And if we wish to see that, that's in your fifth report |
|----|---|----|---|
| 2 | had been informed by a person recently released from | 2 | at paragraph 1.21, so that's INQ001764, internal page 5, |
| 3 | Werrington that a 16-year-old had been raped while | 3 | please. Forgive me that's a bad reference, sorry, just |
| 4 | detained at Werrington by another inmate who was from | 4 | bear with me a second. |
| 5 | a rival gang because of the young person's gang | 5 | Forgive me, I will go back to the Werrington section |
| 6 | affiliation. The referral said inmates from other gangs | 6 | at internal page 2, please. |
| 7 | and the young person's own gang were planning to target | 7 | I think in this section you were asked to pick up |
| 8 | and assault the young person for informing on them." | 8 | several themes, perhaps deal with it in this way: 1.6 on |
| 9 | And an observation was made: | 9 | this page, please, you raise some points about the |
| 10 | "It is quite possible this is a malicious referral | 10 | nature of the investigation of some of the allegations |
| 11 | that needs putting to bed one way or another." | 11 | at Werrington. What were the themes that you pulled out |
| 12 | A. That's correct. | 12 | there, Mr Wood? |
| 13 | Q. That's the sort of thing that you felt exemplified this | 13 | A. I think this is where the definition of what you mean by |
| 14 | theme? | 14 | "internal investigation" comes in, as well, so there |
| 15 | A. That's right, yes. | 15 | were examples whereby decisions were made for |
| 16 | Q. Going back, please, to your report, the first report you | 16 | an internal investigation to happen and I think, for me, |
| 17 | produced on Werrington. You had also raised concerns, | 17 | it would have been really helpful if it was explained |
| 18 | I think, about the lack of records in some areas. This | 18 | about why that choice was made, what that meant, who |
| 19 | is 2.1.12, so it's INQ001210, internal page 7, please. | 19 | would actually speak to the child, what the outcome of |
| 20 | Scroll in on 2.12, please, I think it's a paragraph we | 20 | the investigation was, what the issues were, what the |
| 21 | have looked at before. | 21 | potential was as well, and what would also happen if the |
| 22 | A. That's right, yes. | 22 | internal investigation highlighted that it was needed to |
| 23 | Q. Just help us a little bit with the detail on that, | 23 | be externally examined as well. Those things weren't |
| 24 | Mr Wood. | 24 | there, so I think in terms of the choice made in terms |
| 25 | A. Again, this is the one where there was some issue | 25 | of which route to go down, I think sometimes, for me |
| | - | | |
| | Page 133 | | Page 135 |
| 1 | regarding why a record wasn't made about the entry into | 1 | the LADO perspective as well, there is an issue into, if |
| 2 | a child's cell, and there were some prior experiences of | 2 | the LADO says there is no need or there's no requirement |
| 3 | this young person being at high risk in particular | 3 | for investigation to go through that route, then it's |
| 4 | areas. So I would have expected, if there was some | 4 | pushed back then in terms of the institution to complete |
| 5 | pre-existing awareness of this child, that a very clear | 5 | their own internal investigation at that point. |
| 6 | record of why the entry was made, who was there, what | 6 | I suppose, for me, the loop then has slightly got |
| 7 | happened and what happened afterwards would have been | 7 | a gap in it, really, in terms of what happens then as |
| 8 | there for me to look at, which wasn't there. | 8 | investigation highlights any other issues? |
| 9 | There's no context round that either, so there's no | 9 | Q. Perhaps we can go, please, to internal page 9 in that |
| 10 | reason why that record wasn't made. It just says it's | 10 | report so it's INQ001764, internal page 9. At the foot |
| 11 | not clear why it was missing. | 11 | of the page, you were asked about some specific |
| 12 | Q. I think if we can pull up, please, INQ001764 002 and | 12 | allegations and how they're investigated. Perhaps the |
| 13 | scroll in, please, on paragraph 1.3, you confirmed again | 13 | panel can just scroll in on 1.45 and the following page. |
| 14 | certain other examples of this lack of records in | 14 | I think for each of these and there are, I think, |
| 15 | operation. Scroll in on 1.3, please, from NOM000009 | 15 | five or six different dates, so it's 1.45 through to |
| 16 | relating to those dates, 18 November 2011, | 16 | 1.51, perhaps the panel can just scroll in on that |
| 17 | 18 March 2015, 24 February 2016, and 20 March 2016 were | 17 | you fleshed out why you felt there had been a lack of |
| 18 | the Werrington examples, I think, of an absence of | 18 | full investigation for some of these issues. Is that |
| 19 | records | 19 | right? |
| 20 | A. That's right. | 20 | A. That's right, yes. |
| 21 | Q that you'd have hoped to see? | 21 | Q. So you picked out, for example, themes where 1.46 by |
| 22 | A. Yes. | 22 | way of example: |
| 23 | Q. You, I think, have made observations about the delay in | 23 | "8 April 2013, CCTV was used in the area where |
| 24 | responding to some allegations. Is that right? | 24 | searches took place. Two members of staff were present. |
| 25 | A. That's correct, yes. | 25 | There is no record of the CCTV being checked and that |
| - | • | | |
| | Page 134 | | Page 136 |

| 1 | anyone else present during the search was questioned. | 1 | denying the attack actually happened, I think the way in |
|----|--|----|---|
| 2 | The boys appeared to withdraw the allegation once | 2 | which he responded to the information being shared with |
| 3 | an explanation was given to them in regard to the | 3 | him did raise some concern for me. |
| 4 | thorough manner the member of staff concerned undertook | 4 | I think also it would have been helpful, I think, if |
| 5 | the searches. There is a relationship here between the | 5 | the record indicated an awareness of the fact that there |
| 6 | experience of a child in relation to how any allegations | 6 | could be a relationship between the state of the young |
| 7 | are received and managed and communicated about and the | 7 | person, the risks he was experiencing, the control and |
| 8 | likelihood of retraction, given a lack of trust and | 8 | also the shame element and the power of gangs in terms |
| 9 | confidence." | 9 | of controlling children and young people. |
| 10 | There are various other points of detail that you | 10 | I suppose, for me, the other issue was that, I mean, |
| 11 | take the panel to in relation to other allegations but | 11 | I appreciate completely if a young person is saying, |
| 12 | of a similar sort of concern. Is that right? | 12 | "No, it didn't happen and the allegation is completely |
| 13 | A. That's right. | 13 | untrue", and it's not appropriate to go back over and |
| 14 | Q. Just bear with me a second, to see whether I need to | 14 | over again the same issue. What would have been |
| 15 | bring this one up. I think a related point, perhaps, is | 15 | helpful, I think, is, given the context of the gang |
| 16 | at 2.1.11 of your first report. That's INQ0001216_007 | 16 | and the information's quite detailed from the outside in |
| 17 | at 2.1.11, I think as well as a concern about | 17 | terms of this issue it would have been quite helpful |
| 18 | qualitative investigative steps, if you like. There was | 18 | to record at least that young the person's given the |
| 19 | a concern at 2.1.11 about contact with members of staff | 19 | opportunity to come back to the issue if he wanted to or |
| 20 | once allegations had been made against them. Is that | 20 | if there is some information to be shared with him about |
| 21 | right? | 21 | the impact of gangs upon people and how to recognise the |
| 22 | A. Yes, that is right, yes. | 22 | signs of control and that. |
| 23 | Q. Just help us a bit with what you said about that, | 23 | So I accept that the young person said it didn't |
| 24 | please sorry, it's INQ0001216 is it? Or is it my | 24 | happen. However, I think it would have been helpful, |
| 25 | handwriting? Is it 1210? That's why you can't find it, | 25 | given the context and the height and risk around these |
| | | | 8····································· |
| | Page 137 | | Page 139 |
| 1 | sorry. 1210_007. It's 2.1.11, please: what was the | 1 | issues, that the door would have been kept for him to |
| 2 | issue that you identified there about contact with | 2 | push it and to then talk to a member of staff after the |
| 3 | children and the staff member in question? | 3 | incident. |
| 4 | A. That was the issue really, I suppose. When a child's | 4 | Q. I think more generally, if I can take you, please, to |
| 5 | made an allegation against a particular member of staff, | 5 | INQ0001764, internal page 2, please, and scroll it on to |
| 6 | to be clear about what would happen and how they're | 6 | paragraphs 1.5 and 6. I think you have made the point |
| 7 | going to try to manage the issue, that member of staff | 7 | that there is a need for staff to be trained in how to |
| 8 | may come into contact with that child, where the member | 8 | work directly with children in terms of responding to |
| 9 | of staff has moved to a different unit or whatever, but | 9 | their allegations in a way that doesn't then impact upon |
| 10 | I think for me there wasn't much evidence on this one in | 10 | any potential criminal or civil proceedings, so what's |
| 11 | particular in terms of how they're going to try to work | 11 | your point there about that, Mr Wood? |
| 12 | with that risk. So from a child's point of view | 12 | A. I think in terms of the likely range of experience, |
| 13 | I mean, the member of staff could obviously be told not | 13 | skills and attitude of staff members working in any |
| 14 | to discuss anything about the allegation which has been | 14 | institution, it's important to think that people are |
| 15 | made, but from the child's experience, to see that same | 15 | given tips and techniques about how to respond when |
| 16 | member of staff would be difficult. | 16 | |
| 17 | Q. Then if we just scroll down on that page, please, to | 17 | a child does actually explicitly say something's going wrong in terms of an allegation or the more tricky one, |
| 18 | 2.1.16, I think we deal here with this particular | 18 | I suppose, is in terms of children starting to drop |
| 19 | allegation which I think is an allegation that a 16-year | 19 | hints around issues, behaviour starting to change, their |
| 20 | old boy had been raped by another detainee in the | 20 | relationship with other people starting to change. So |
| 21 | context of a gang | 21 | it's being open to the idea of things, which is |
| 22 | A. That's right, yes. | 22 | a difficult one for institutions to accept that sexual |
| 23 | Q situation. What was your concern about that | 23 | abuse can happen here and sex abusers look like |
| 24 | particular allegation and its response? | 24 | everybody here. So I suppose, for me, there's quite |
| 25 | A. Whilst I accept that the young person was completely | 25 | a big leap in terms of institutions accepting the fact |
| | | 23 | a signeap in terms of institutions accepting the fact |
| | Page 138 | | Page 140 |

| 1 | that there is an inherent risk, when you get adults and | 1 | the LADO did not attend. The outcome was |
|--|---|--|--|
| 2 | children together, that some people are purposely trying | 2 | unsubstantiated. There was no explanation as to the |
| 3 | to gain access to children and young people. So how you | 3 | reason for the LADO's absence or if the LADO's views had |
| 4 | respond to that is important and how you respond to | 4 | been sought in relation to the outcome. In my opinion |
| 5 | children and young people in the absence of allegations | 5 | the absence of the LADO was grounds for the meeting to |
| 6 | is important as well because that sets the context for | 6 | be suspended until the LADO was available." |
| 7 | your relationship with them. | 7 | And then the third example you give: |
| 8 | And I think the recent developments from other young | 8 | "An alleged sexual assault by a member of staff |
| 9 | offender institutions whereby the relationship practice | 9 | during restraint within a cell was not referred to the |
| 10 | angle is starting to be built up, that's really good to | 10 | LADO or Social Services. The key driver appears to be |
| 11 | hear because that's the basis of children feeling | 11 | the deputy governor was present during the restraint and |
| 12 | confident that allegations will be taken in a serious | 12 | the young person had said he was naked, whereas he was |
| 13 | way. | 13 | wearing boxer shorts. In my opinion, there were grounds |
| 14 | It also creates I think from a staff training | 14 | to refer this alleged sexual assault to the LADO." |
| 15 | point of view, it creates the atmosphere and the | 15 | A. That's right, yes. |
| 16 | approach in the unit whereby allegations are less likely | 16 | Q. You've, I think, repeated here in this part of your |
| 17 | to happen because abuse is less likely to happen. So | 17 | report the evidence you gave earlier today about how you |
| 18 | there's a relationship between those two things. | 18 | consider the default position should be that |
| 19 | Q. Then finally a few points, please, about the role of the | 19 | a section 47 inquiry is undertaken in relation to |
| 20 | local authority here, 1.38, please, of your fifth | 20 | a child in custody. Is there anything further in the |
| 21 | report, so if we can go, please, to INQ001764, internal | 21 | context of Werrington you want to say about that? |
| 22 | page 7, to your fifth report and scroll in, please, on | 22 | A. I suppose, as a generic comment, that I think it would |
| 23 | 1.38 at the bottom. | 23 | be helpful, given the additional needs of children and |
| 24 | Just to anchor this, Mr Wood you were asked here | 24 | young people who are in custody, that we talked about |
| 25 | about the procedures as set out in the London Child | 25 | earlier last week and also earlier today, that the |
| | | | |
| | Page 141 | | Page 143 |
| | | | |
| 1 | Protection Procedures and so on for responding to | 1 | starting point should be that and then a clear |
| 1 2 | Protection Procedures and so on for responding to allegations and you say at 1.38 that these are some | 1 2 | starting point should be that and then a clear explanation about why that is not the right route to be |
| 2 | allegations and you say at 1.38 that these are some | 2 | explanation about why that is not the right route to be |
| | allegations and you say at 1.38 that these are some examples where you feel the fact that the victim was in | 2 3 | explanation about why that is not the right route to be written down. |
| 2 3 4 | allegations and you say at 1.38 that these are some examples where you feel the fact that the victim was in custody may have influenced how that allegation was | 2 3 4 | explanation about why that is not the right route to be written down. Q. Then, just for completeness, over the page, please, |
| 2 3 4 5 | allegations and you say at 1.38 that these are some examples where you feel the fact that the victim was in custody may have influenced how that allegation was responded to compared to had they been in the community. | 2 3 4 5 | explanation about why that is not the right route to be written down. Q. Then, just for completeness, over the page, please, internal page 9 at the top of that page, you have |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | allegations and you say at 1.38 that these are some examples where you feel the fact that the victim was in custody may have influenced how that allegation was responded to compared to had they been in the community. Is that right? | 2 3 4 5 6 | explanation about why that is not the right route to be written down. Q. Then, just for completeness, over the page, please, internal page 9 at the top of that page, you have confirmed from your analysis of the Werrington material |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | allegations and you say at 1.38 that these are some examples where you feel the fact that the victim was in custody may have influenced how that allegation was responded to compared to had they been in the community. Is that right? A. That's right, yes. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 | explanation about why that is not the right route to be written down. Q. Then, just for completeness, over the page, please, internal page 9 at the top of that page, you have confirmed from your analysis of the Werrington material that none of the allegations were substantiated. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | allegations and you say at 1.38 that these are some examples where you feel the fact that the victim was in custody may have influenced how that allegation was responded to compared to had they been in the community. Is that right? A. That's right, yes. Q. We can take the panel through here, under (a) in | 2 3 4 5 6 | explanation about why that is not the right route to be written down. Q. Then, just for completeness, over the page, please, internal page 9 at the top of that page, you have confirmed from your analysis of the Werrington material that none of the allegations were substantiated. A small minority had substantive police investigations |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | allegations and you say at 1.38 that these are some examples where you feel the fact that the victim was in custody may have influenced how that allegation was responded to compared to had they been in the community. Is that right? A. That's right, yes. Q. We can take the panel through here, under (a) in relation to Werrington: | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | explanation about why that is not the right route to be written down. Q. Then, just for completeness, over the page, please, internal page 9 at the top of that page, you have confirmed from your analysis of the Werrington material that none of the allegations were substantiated. A small minority had substantive police investigations but none were subjected to section 47 investigations. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | allegations and you say at 1.38 that these are some examples where you feel the fact that the victim was in custody may have influenced how that allegation was responded to compared to had they been in the community. Is that right? A. That's right, yes. Q. We can take the panel through here, under (a) in relation to Werrington: "An alleged physical and sexual assault and | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | explanation about why that is not the right route to be written down. Q. Then, just for completeness, over the page, please, internal page 9 at the top of that page, you have confirmed from your analysis of the Werrington material that none of the allegations were substantiated. A small minority had substantive police investigations but none were subjected to section 47 investigations. Is that right? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | allegations and you say at 1.38 that these are some examples where you feel the fact that the victim was in custody may have influenced how that allegation was responded to compared to had they been in the community. Is that right? A. That's right, yes. Q. We can take the panel through here, under (a) in relation to Werrington: "An alleged physical and sexual assault and associated threats of violence were reported to | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | explanation about why that is not the right route to be written down. Q. Then, just for completeness, over the page, please, internal page 9 at the top of that page, you have confirmed from your analysis of the Werrington material that none of the allegations were substantiated. A small minority had substantive police investigations but none were subjected to section 47 investigations. Is that right? A. That's what I understand from the record, yes. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | allegations and you say at 1.38 that these are some examples where you feel the fact that the victim was in custody may have influenced how that allegation was responded to compared to had they been in the community. Is that right? A. That's right, yes. Q. We can take the panel through here, under (a) in relation to Werrington: "An alleged physical and sexual assault and associated threats of violence were reported to Social Services but were then deemed not seriously | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | explanation about why that is not the right route to be written down. Q. Then, just for completeness, over the page, please, internal page 9 at the top of that page, you have confirmed from your analysis of the Werrington material that none of the allegations were substantiated. A small minority had substantive police investigations but none were subjected to section 47 investigations. Is that right? A. That's what I understand from the record, yes. Q. Is there anything else about the Werrington material |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | allegations and you say at 1.38 that these are some examples where you feel the fact that the victim was in custody may have influenced how that allegation was responded to compared to had they been in the community. Is that right? A. That's right, yes. Q. We can take the panel through here, under (a) in relation to Werrington: "An alleged physical and sexual assault and associated threats of violence were reported to Social Services but were then deemed not seriously enough to reach the threshold for investigation." | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | explanation about why that is not the right route to be written down. Q. Then, just for completeness, over the page, please, internal page 9 at the top of that page, you have confirmed from your analysis of the Werrington material that none of the allegations were substantiated. A small minority had substantive police investigations but none were subjected to section 47 investigations. Is that right? A. That's what I understand from the record, yes. Q. Is there anything else about the Werrington material that you feel I need to pull out to assist the chair and |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | allegations and you say at 1.38 that these are some examples where you feel the fact that the victim was in custody may have influenced how that allegation was responded to compared to had they been in the community. Is that right? A. That's right, yes. Q. We can take the panel through here, under (a) in relation to Werrington: "An alleged physical and sexual assault and associated threats of violence were reported to Social Services but were then deemed not seriously enough to reach the threshold for investigation." It appears that the separation into two single cells | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | explanation about why that is not the right route to be written down. Q. Then, just for completeness, over the page, please, internal page 9 at the top of that page, you have confirmed from your analysis of the Werrington material that none of the allegations were substantiated. A small minority had substantive police investigations but none were subjected to section 47 investigations. Is that right? A. That's what I understand from the record, yes. Q. Is there anything else about the Werrington material that you feel I need to pull out to assist the chair and panel, Mr Wood? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | allegations and you say at 1.38 that these are some examples where you feel the fact that the victim was in custody may have influenced how that allegation was responded to compared to had they been in the community. Is that right? A. That's right, yes. Q. We can take the panel through here, under (a) in relation to Werrington: "An alleged physical and sexual assault and associated threats of violence were reported to Social Services but were then deemed not seriously enough to reach the threshold for investigation." It appears that the separation into two single cells of the two boys concerned was perceived as a sufficient | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | explanation about why that is not the right route to be written down. Q. Then, just for completeness, over the page, please, internal page 9 at the top of that page, you have confirmed from your analysis of the Werrington material that none of the allegations were substantiated. A small minority had substantive police investigations but none were subjected to section 47 investigations. Is that right? A. That's what I understand from the record, yes. Q. Is there anything else about the Werrington material that you feel I need to pull out to assist the chair and panel, Mr Wood? A. Just a generic view. I think, also, just in terms of |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | allegations and you say at 1.38 that these are some examples where you feel the fact that the victim was in custody may have influenced how that allegation was responded to compared to had they been in the community. Is that right? A. That's right, yes. Q. We can take the panel through here, under (a) in relation to Werrington: "An alleged physical and sexual assault and associated threats of violence were reported to Social Services but were then deemed not seriously enough to reach the threshold for investigation." It appears that the separation into two single cells of the two boys concerned was perceived as a sufficient response and reminding the victim of his right to | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | explanation about why that is not the right route to be written down. Q. Then, just for completeness, over the page, please, internal page 9 at the top of that page, you have confirmed from your analysis of the Werrington material that none of the allegations were substantiated. A small minority had substantive police investigations but none were subjected to section 47 investigations. Is that right? A. That's what I understand from the record, yes. Q. Is there anything else about the Werrington material that you feel I need to pull out to assist the chair and panel, Mr Wood? A. Just a generic view. I think, also, just in terms of the London Child Protection Procedures, I think it's |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | allegations and you say at 1.38 that these are some examples where you feel the fact that the victim was in custody may have influenced how that allegation was responded to compared to had they been in the community. Is that right? A. That's right, yes. Q. We can take the panel through here, under (a) in relation to Werrington: "An alleged physical and sexual assault and associated threats of violence were reported to Social Services but were then deemed not seriously enough to reach the threshold for investigation." It appears that the separation into two single cells of the two boys concerned was perceived as a sufficient response and reminding the victim of his right to contact the police: | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | explanation about why that is not the right route to be written down. Q. Then, just for completeness, over the page, please, internal page 9 at the top of that page, you have confirmed from your analysis of the Werrington material that none of the allegations were substantiated. A small minority had substantive police investigations but none were subjected to section 47 investigations. Is that right? A. That's what I understand from the record, yes. Q. Is there anything else about the Werrington material that you feel I need to pull out to assist the chair and panel, Mr Wood? A. Just a generic view. I think, also, just in terms of the London Child Protection Procedures, I think it's 3.3.2 in those, it does give a very clear definition of |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | allegations and you say at 1.38 that these are some examples where you feel the fact that the victim was in custody may have influenced how that allegation was responded to compared to had they been in the community. Is that right? A. That's right, yes. Q. We can take the panel through here, under (a) in relation to Werrington: "An alleged physical and sexual assault and associated threats of violence were reported to Social Services but were then deemed not seriously enough to reach the threshold for investigation." It appears that the separation into two single cells of the two boys concerned was perceived as a sufficient response and reminding the victim of his right to contact the police: "In my opinion, the behaviour of the alleged | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | explanation about why that is not the right route to be written down. Q. Then, just for completeness, over the page, please, internal page 9 at the top of that page, you have confirmed from your analysis of the Werrington material that none of the allegations were substantiated. A small minority had substantive police investigations but none were subjected to section 47 investigations. Is that right? A. That's what I understand from the record, yes. Q. Is there anything else about the Werrington material that you feel I need to pull out to assist the chair and panel, Mr Wood? A. Just a generic view. I think, also, just in terms of the London Child Protection Procedures, I think it's 3.3.2 in those, it does give a very clear definition of when section 47 should actually happen and which then |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | allegations and you say at 1.38 that these are some examples where you feel the fact that the victim was in custody may have influenced how that allegation was responded to compared to had they been in the community. Is that right? A. That's right, yes. Q. We can take the panel through here, under (a) in relation to Werrington: "An alleged physical and sexual assault and associated threats of violence were reported to Social Services but were then deemed not seriously enough to reach the threshold for investigation." It appears that the separation into two single cells of the two boys concerned was perceived as a sufficient response and reminding the victim of his right to contact the police: "In my opinion, the behaviour of the alleged perpetrator would have warranted action linked to the | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | explanation about why that is not the right route to be written down. Q. Then, just for completeness, over the page, please, internal page 9 at the top of that page, you have confirmed from your analysis of the Werrington material that none of the allegations were substantiated. A small minority had substantive police investigations but none were subjected to section 47 investigations. Is that right? A. That's what I understand from the record, yes. Q. Is there anything else about the Werrington material that you feel I need to pull out to assist the chair and panel, Mr Wood? A. Just a generic view. I think, also, just in terms of the London Child Protection Procedures, I think it's 3.3.2 in those, it does give a very clear definition of when section 47 should actually happen and which then aligns to my earlier point in terms of that being the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | allegations and you say at 1.38 that these are some examples where you feel the fact that the victim was in custody may have influenced how that allegation was responded to compared to had they been in the community. Is that right? A. That's right, yes. Q. We can take the panel through here, under (a) in relation to Werrington: "An alleged physical and sexual assault and associated threats of violence were reported to Social Services but were then deemed not seriously enough to reach the threshold for investigation." It appears that the separation into two single cells of the two boys concerned was perceived as a sufficient response and reminding the victim of his right to contact the police: "In my opinion, the behaviour of the alleged perpetrator would have warranted action linked to the need to assess sexually harmful behaviour and, as such, | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | explanation about why that is not the right route to be written down. Q. Then, just for completeness, over the page, please, internal page 9 at the top of that page, you have confirmed from your analysis of the Werrington material that none of the allegations were substantiated. A small minority had substantive police investigations but none were subjected to section 47 investigations. Is that right? A. That's what I understand from the record, yes. Q. Is there anything else about the Werrington material that you feel I need to pull out to assist the chair and panel, Mr Wood? A. Just a generic view. I think, also, just in terms of the London Child Protection Procedures, I think it's 3.3.2 in those, it does give a very clear definition of when section 47 should actually happen and which then aligns to my earlier point in terms of that being the default position and working backwards from that, so |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | allegations and you say at 1.38 that these are some examples where you feel the fact that the victim was in custody may have influenced how that allegation was responded to compared to had they been in the community. Is that right? A. That's right, yes. Q. We can take the panel through here, under (a) in relation to Werrington: "An alleged physical and sexual assault and associated threats of violence were reported to Social Services but were then deemed not seriously enough to reach the threshold for investigation." It appears that the separation into two single cells of the two boys concerned was perceived as a sufficient response and reminding the victim of his right to contact the police: "In my opinion, the behaviour of the alleged perpetrator would have warranted action linked to the need to assess sexually harmful behaviour and, as such, the needs of the victim and perpetrator should have been | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | explanation about why that is not the right route to be written down. Q. Then, just for completeness, over the page, please, internal page 9 at the top of that page, you have confirmed from your analysis of the Werrington material that none of the allegations were substantiated. A small minority had substantive police investigations but none were subjected to section 47 investigations. Is that right? A. That's what I understand from the record, yes. Q. Is there anything else about the Werrington material that you feel I need to pull out to assist the chair and panel, Mr Wood? A. Just a generic view. I think, also, just in terms of the London Child Protection Procedures, I think it's 3.3.2 in those, it does give a very clear definition of when section 47 should actually happen and which then aligns to my earlier point in terms of that being the default position and working backwards from that, so it's useful, I think, just to remind yourselves of that, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | allegations and you say at 1.38 that these are some examples where you feel the fact that the victim was in custody may have influenced how that allegation was responded to compared to had they been in the community. Is that right? A. That's right, yes. Q. We can take the panel through here, under (a) in relation to Werrington: "An alleged physical and sexual assault and associated threats of violence were reported to Social Services but were then deemed not seriously enough to reach the threshold for investigation." It appears that the separation into two single cells of the two boys concerned was perceived as a sufficient response and reminding the victim of his right to contact the police: "In my opinion, the behaviour of the alleged perpetrator would have warranted action linked to the need to assess sexually harmful behaviour and, as such, the needs of the victim and perpetrator should have been assessed as part of a multi-agency plan." | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | explanation about why that is not the right route to be written down. Q. Then, just for completeness, over the page, please, internal page 9 at the top of that page, you have confirmed from your analysis of the Werrington material that none of the allegations were substantiated. A small minority had substantive police investigations but none were subjected to section 47 investigations. Is that right? A. That's what I understand from the record, yes. Q. Is there anything else about the Werrington material that you feel I need to pull out to assist the chair and panel, Mr Wood? A. Just a generic view. I think, also, just in terms of the London Child Protection Procedures, I think it's 3.3.2 in those, it does give a very clear definition of when section 47 should actually happen and which then aligns to my earlier point in terms of that being the default position and working backwards from that, so it's useful, I think, just to remind yourselves of that, actually. It is quite clearly defined in terms of |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | allegations and you say at 1.38 that these are some examples where you feel the fact that the victim was in custody may have influenced how that allegation was responded to compared to had they been in the community. Is that right? A. That's right, yes. Q. We can take the panel through here, under (a) in relation to Werrington: "An alleged physical and sexual assault and associated threats of violence were reported to Social Services but were then deemed not seriously enough to reach the threshold for investigation." It appears that the separation into two single cells of the two boys concerned was perceived as a sufficient response and reminding the victim of his right to contact the police: "In my opinion, the behaviour of the alleged perpetrator would have warranted action linked to the need to assess sexually harmful behaviour and, as such, the needs of the victim and perpetrator should have been assessed as part of a multi-agency plan." Under (b): | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | explanation about why that is not the right route to be written down. Q. Then, just for completeness, over the page, please, internal page 9 at the top of that page, you have confirmed from your analysis of the Werrington material that none of the allegations were substantiated. A small minority had substantive police investigations but none were subjected to section 47 investigations. Is that right? A. That's what I understand from the record, yes. Q. Is there anything else about the Werrington material that you feel I need to pull out to assist the chair and panel, Mr Wood? A. Just a generic view. I think, also, just in terms of the London Child Protection Procedures, I think it's 3.3.2 in those, it does give a very clear definition of when section 47 should actually happen and which then aligns to my earlier point in terms of that being the default position and working backwards from that, so it's useful, I think, just to remind yourselves of that, actually. It is quite clearly defined in terms of a suspicion or allegation against an adult, so that's — |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | allegations and you say at 1.38 that these are some examples where you feel the fact that the victim was in custody may have influenced how that allegation was responded to compared to had they been in the community. Is that right? A. That's right, yes. Q. We can take the panel through here, under (a) in relation to Werrington: "An alleged physical and sexual assault and associated threats of violence were reported to Social Services but were then deemed not seriously enough to reach the threshold for investigation." It appears that the separation into two single cells of the two boys concerned was perceived as a sufficient response and reminding the victim of his right to contact the police: "In my opinion, the behaviour of the alleged perpetrator would have warranted action linked to the need to assess sexually harmful behaviour and, as such, the needs of the victim and perpetrator should have been assessed as part of a multi-agency plan." Under (b): "An alleged sexual assault by a member of staff | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | explanation about why that is not the right route to be written down. Q. Then, just for completeness, over the page, please, internal page 9 at the top of that page, you have confirmed from your analysis of the Werrington material that none of the allegations were substantiated. A small minority had substantive police investigations but none were subjected to section 47 investigations. Is that right? A. That's what I understand from the record, yes. Q. Is there anything else about the Werrington material that you feel I need to pull out to assist the chair and panel, Mr Wood? A. Just a generic view. I think, also, just in terms of the London Child Protection Procedures, I think it's 3.3.2 in those, it does give a very clear definition of when section 47 should actually happen and which then aligns to my earlier point in terms of that being the default position and working backwards from that, so it's useful, I think, just to remind yourselves of that, actually. It is quite clearly defined in terms of a suspicion or allegation against an adult, so that's — Q. I think the theme that you have identified is that they |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | allegations and you say at 1.38 that these are some examples where you feel the fact that the victim was in custody may have influenced how that allegation was responded to compared to had they been in the community. Is that right? A. That's right, yes. Q. We can take the panel through here, under (a) in relation to Werrington: "An alleged physical and sexual assault and associated threats of violence were reported to Social Services but were then deemed not seriously enough to reach the threshold for investigation." It appears that the separation into two single cells of the two boys concerned was perceived as a sufficient response and reminding the victim of his right to contact the police: "In my opinion, the behaviour of the alleged perpetrator would have warranted action linked to the need to assess sexually harmful behaviour and, as such, the needs of the victim and perpetrator should have been assessed as part of a multi-agency plan." Under (b): | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | explanation about why that is not the right route to be written down. Q. Then, just for completeness, over the page, please, internal page 9 at the top of that page, you have confirmed from your analysis of the Werrington material that none of the allegations were substantiated. A small minority had substantive police investigations but none were subjected to section 47 investigations. Is that right? A. That's what I understand from the record, yes. Q. Is there anything else about the Werrington material that you feel I need to pull out to assist the chair and panel, Mr Wood? A. Just a generic view. I think, also, just in terms of the London Child Protection Procedures, I think it's 3.3.2 in those, it does give a very clear definition of when section 47 should actually happen and which then aligns to my earlier point in terms of that being the default position and working backwards from that, so it's useful, I think, just to remind yourselves of that, actually. It is quite clearly defined in terms of a suspicion or allegation against an adult, so that's — |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | allegations and you say at 1.38 that these are some examples where you feel the fact that the victim was in custody may have influenced how that allegation was responded to compared to had they been in the community. Is that right? A. That's right, yes. Q. We can take the panel through here, under (a) in relation to Werrington: "An alleged physical and sexual assault and associated threats of violence were reported to Social Services but were then deemed not seriously enough to reach the threshold for investigation." It appears that the separation into two single cells of the two boys concerned was perceived as a sufficient response and reminding the victim of his right to contact the police: "In my opinion, the behaviour of the alleged perpetrator would have warranted action linked to the need to assess sexually harmful behaviour and, as such, the needs of the victim and perpetrator should have been assessed as part of a multi-agency plan." Under (b): "An alleged sexual assault by a member of staff | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | explanation about why that is not the right route to be written down. Q. Then, just for completeness, over the page, please, internal page 9 at the top of that page, you have confirmed from your analysis of the Werrington material that none of the allegations were substantiated. A small minority had substantive police investigations but none were subjected to section 47 investigations. Is that right? A. That's what I understand from the record, yes. Q. Is there anything else about the Werrington material that you feel I need to pull out to assist the chair and panel, Mr Wood? A. Just a generic view. I think, also, just in terms of the London Child Protection Procedures, I think it's 3.3.2 in those, it does give a very clear definition of when section 47 should actually happen and which then aligns to my earlier point in terms of that being the default position and working backwards from that, so it's useful, I think, just to remind yourselves of that, actually. It is quite clearly defined in terms of a suspicion or allegation against an adult, so that's — Q. I think the theme that you have identified is that they |

| 1 | institutions at least. Is that right? | 1 | A. They are, yes. |
|--|---|--|--|
| 2 | A. Yes, that is right. I think one of the other issues, as | 2 | Q. You have a dedicated social worker and a dedicated |
| 3 | I said before earlier today, is that explanations, | 3 | senior social worker employed through the |
| 4 | records, connections, cross-referencing may be evident | 4 | local authority, and you say this at paragraph 7 of your |
| 5 | elsewhere, but it wasn't that clear in the records | 5 | statement: |
| 6 | I looked at. | 6 | "They are in place to provide external scrutiny to |
| 7 | MS HILL: Chair, I'm not sure if you have any questions for | 7 | the Child Protection Procedures and ensure that all |
| 8 | Mr Wood on the Werrington paperwork? | 8 | looked after children are supported throughout their |
| 9 | THE CHAIR: No, thank you. Thank you very much. | 9 | time in custody. All young people arriving into |
| 10 | MS HILL: Chair, that might be a moment to take our break | 10 | Werrington meet with their dedicated social worker |
| 11 | and we have one more witness after the break. | 11 | on-site." |
| 12 | THE CHAIR: Yes, we will return at 3.20. | 12 | A. That's correct. |
| 13 | (3.07 pm) | 13 | Q. Looked-after children are obviously children who are |
| 14 | (A short break) | 14 | coming into care in that category. That's not all the |
| 15 | (3.20 pm) | 15 | children in care, is it? |
| 16 | MS HILL: Thank you, chair. I will call, please, | 16 | A. No, it's not, but children that come in on remand are |
| 17 | Peter Gormley. | 17 | considered to take on looked-after status, so a fairly |
| 18 | MR PETER GORMLEY (sworn) | 18 | large proportion are. |
| 19 | Examination by MS HILL | 19 | Q. So those children will automatically meet a social |
| 20 | MS HILL: Thank you very much. You're Peter Gormley; is | 20 | worker, but children who are sentenced won't |
| 21 | that right? | 21 | automatically be seen as looked after. Is that correct? |
| 22 | A. That's correct. | 22 | A. That's correct. They will the social workers form |
| 23 | Q. You were governor at Werrington again, is this | 23 | part of our induction, so the child's induction into the |
| 24 | right? until April of 2018? | 24 | establishment, so the social workers will form part of |
| 25 | A. Yes, that is correct. | 25 | that. So they will meet them. |
| 23 | A. 168, that is correct. | 23 | that. So they will meet them. |
| | Page 145 | | Page 147 |
| | | | |
| 1 | O. So again, rather like your colleague. Mr Gormley, you're | 1 | O. So all abildran will be made aware of the presence of |
| 1 | Q. So again, rather like your colleague, Mr Gormley, you're | 1 | Q. So all children will be made aware of the presence of |
| 2 | here to give the panel some broad evidence about the | 2 | the social workers; is that correct? |
| 2 3 | here to give the panel some broad evidence about the systems in place at Werrington in terms of child | 2 3 | the social workers; is that correct? A. Yes. |
| 2 3 4 | here to give the panel some broad evidence about the systems in place at Werrington in terms of child protection and sexual abuse issues, but also to provide | 2 3 4 | the social workers; is that correct? A. Yes. Q. Forgive me, Mr Gormley I should have formally adduced |
| 2 3 4 5 | here to give the panel some broad evidence about the systems in place at Werrington in terms of child protection and sexual abuse issues, but also to provide some response to Mr Wood's evidence. Is that correct? | 2 3 4 5 | the social workers; is that correct? A. Yes. Q. Forgive me, Mr Gormley I should have formally adduced your witness statement of 13 July HMP000405, with your |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | here to give the panel some broad evidence about the systems in place at Werrington in terms of child protection and sexual abuse issues, but also to provide some response to Mr Wood's evidence. Is that correct? A. Yes. | 2 3 4 5 6 | the social workers; is that correct? A. Yes. Q. Forgive me, Mr Gormley I should have formally adduced your witness statement of 13 July HMP000405, with your permission, chair. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | here to give the panel some broad evidence about the systems in place at Werrington in terms of child protection and sexual abuse issues, but also to provide some response to Mr Wood's evidence. Is that correct? A. Yes. Q. Help us a little bit, please, with some background then | 2 3 4 5 6 7 | the social workers; is that correct? A. Yes. Q. Forgive me, Mr Gormley I should have formally adduced your witness statement of 13 July HMP000405, with your permission, chair. You were asked some questions about |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | here to give the panel some broad evidence about the systems in place at Werrington in terms of child protection and sexual abuse issues, but also to provide some response to Mr Wood's evidence. Is that correct? A. Yes. Q. Help us a little bit, please, with some background then about Werrington? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | the social workers; is that correct? A. Yes. Q. Forgive me, Mr Gormley I should have formally adduced your witness statement of 13 July HMP000405, with your permission, chair. You were asked some questions about the February 2017 report on Werrington, especially |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | here to give the panel some broad evidence about the systems in place at Werrington in terms of child protection and sexual abuse issues, but also to provide some response to Mr Wood's evidence. Is that correct? A. Yes. Q. Help us a little bit, please, with some background then about Werrington? A. So Werrington is one of the public sector young | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | the social workers; is that correct? A. Yes. Q. Forgive me, Mr Gormley I should have formally adduced your witness statement of 13 July HMP000405, with your permission, chair. You were asked some questions about the February 2017 report on Werrington, especially around the safety and safeguarding findings, and you, I |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | here to give the panel some broad evidence about the systems in place at Werrington in terms of child protection and sexual abuse issues, but also to provide some response to Mr Wood's evidence. Is that correct? A. Yes. Q. Help us a little bit, please, with some background then about Werrington? A. So Werrington is one of the public sector young offenders' institutes. It's one of the smaller ones. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | the social workers; is that correct? A. Yes. Q. Forgive me, Mr Gormley I should have formally adduced your witness statement of 13 July HMP000405, with your permission, chair. You were asked some questions about the February 2017 report on Werrington, especially around the safety and safeguarding findings, and you, I think, have, rather similarly to your colleague, pointed |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | here to give the panel some broad evidence about the systems in place at Werrington in terms of child protection and sexual abuse issues, but also to provide some response to Mr Wood's evidence. Is that correct? A. Yes. Q. Help us a little bit, please, with some background then about Werrington? A. So Werrington is one of the public sector young offenders' institutes. It's one of the smaller ones. We lock up 118 or we care for 118 children, maximum. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | the social workers; is that correct? A. Yes. Q. Forgive me, Mr Gormley I should have formally adduced your witness statement of 13 July HMP000405, with your permission, chair. You were asked some questions about the February 2017 report on Werrington, especially around the safety and safeguarding findings, and you, I think, have, rather similarly to your colleague, pointed out that there is a more recent report from earlier this |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | here to give the panel some broad evidence about the systems in place at Werrington in terms of child protection and sexual abuse issues, but also to provide some response to Mr Wood's evidence. Is that correct? A. Yes. Q. Help us a little bit, please, with some background then about Werrington? A. So Werrington is one of the public sector young offenders' institutes. It's one of the smaller ones. We lock up 118 or we care for 118 children, maximum. Q. I think I have read about 110. Is that right? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | the social workers; is that correct? A. Yes. Q. Forgive me, Mr Gormley I should have formally adduced your witness statement of 13 July HMP000405, with your permission, chair. You were asked some questions about the February 2017 report on Werrington, especially around the safety and safeguarding findings, and you, I think, have, rather similarly to your colleague, pointed out that there is a more recent report from earlier this year that is more favourable. Is that right? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | here to give the panel some broad evidence about the systems in place at Werrington in terms of child protection and sexual abuse issues, but also to provide some response to Mr Wood's evidence. Is that correct? A. Yes. Q. Help us a little bit, please, with some background then about Werrington? A. So Werrington is one of the public sector young offenders' institutes. It's one of the smaller ones. We lock up 118 or we care for 118 children, maximum. Q. I think I have read about 110. Is that right? A. On average 110, we can go up to 118. There are three | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | the social workers; is that correct? A. Yes. Q. Forgive me, Mr Gormley I should have formally adduced your witness statement of 13 July HMP000405, with your permission, chair. You were asked some questions about the February 2017 report on Werrington, especially around the safety and safeguarding findings, and you, I think, have, rather similarly to your colleague, pointed out that there is a more recent report from earlier this year that is more favourable. Is that right? A. In terms of safety, it's a similar score, it's the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | here to give the panel some broad evidence about the systems in place at Werrington in terms of child protection and sexual abuse issues, but also to provide some response to Mr Wood's evidence. Is that correct? A. Yes. Q. Help us a little bit, please, with some background then about Werrington? A. So Werrington is one of the public sector young offenders' institutes. It's one of the smaller ones. We lock up 118 or we care for 118 children, maximum. Q. I think I have read about 110. Is that right? A. On average 110, we can go up to 118. There are three main units, which is residential units in the | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | the social workers; is that correct? A. Yes. Q. Forgive me, Mr Gormley I should have formally adduced your witness statement of 13 July HMP000405, with your permission, chair. You were asked some questions about the February 2017 report on Werrington, especially around the safety and safeguarding findings, and you, I think, have, rather similarly to your colleague, pointed out that there is a more recent report from earlier this year that is more favourable. Is that right? A. In terms of safety, it's a similar score, it's the same it hasn't gone up or down. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | here to give the panel some broad evidence about the systems in place at Werrington in terms of child protection and sexual abuse issues, but also to provide some response to Mr Wood's evidence. Is that correct? A. Yes. Q. Help us a little bit, please, with some background then about Werrington? A. So Werrington is one of the public sector young offenders' institutes. It's one of the smaller ones. We lock up 118 or we care for 118 children, maximum. Q. I think I have read about 110. Is that right? A. On average 110, we can go up to 118. There are three main units, which is residential units in the establishment, two of which, A and B wing we call normal | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | the social workers; is that correct? A. Yes. Q. Forgive me, Mr Gormley I should have formally adduced your witness statement of 13 July HMP000405, with your permission, chair. You were asked some questions about the February 2017 report on Werrington, especially around the safety and safeguarding findings, and you, I think, have, rather similarly to your colleague, pointed out that there is a more recent report from earlier this year that is more favourable. Is that right? A. In terms of safety, it's a similar score, it's the same it hasn't gone up or down. Q. Let's perhaps just bring up the details, if we may. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | here to give the panel some broad evidence about the systems in place at Werrington in terms of child protection and sexual abuse issues, but also to provide some response to Mr Wood's evidence. Is that correct? A. Yes. Q. Help us a little bit, please, with some background then about Werrington? A. So Werrington is one of the public sector young offenders' institutes. It's one of the smaller ones. We lock up 118 or we care for 118 children, maximum. Q. I think I have read about 110. Is that right? A. On average 110, we can go up to 118. There are three main units, which is residential units in the establishment, two of which, A and B wing we call normal units and the third one, C wing, which is our care and | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | the social workers; is that correct? A. Yes. Q. Forgive me, Mr Gormley I should have formally adduced your witness statement of 13 July HMP000405, with your permission, chair. You were asked some questions about the February 2017 report on Werrington, especially around the safety and safeguarding findings, and you, I think, have, rather similarly to your colleague, pointed out that there is a more recent report from earlier this year that is more favourable. Is that right? A. In terms of safety, it's a similar score, it's the same — it hasn't gone up or down. Q. Let's perhaps just bring up the details, if we may. Let's go first to the 2017 report at INQ001457_001. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | here to give the panel some broad evidence about the systems in place at Werrington in terms of child protection and sexual abuse issues, but also to provide some response to Mr Wood's evidence. Is that correct? A. Yes. Q. Help us a little bit, please, with some background then about Werrington? A. So Werrington is one of the public sector young offenders' institutes. It's one of the smaller ones. We lock up 118 or we care for 118 children, maximum. Q. I think I have read about 110. Is that right? A. On average 110, we can go up to 118. There are three main units, which is residential units in the establishment, two of which, A and B wing we call normal units and the third one, C wing, which is our care and separation unit and also offers an induction with | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | the social workers; is that correct? A. Yes. Q. Forgive me, Mr Gormley I should have formally adduced your witness statement of 13 July HMP000405, with your permission, chair. You were asked some questions about the February 2017 report on Werrington, especially around the safety and safeguarding findings, and you, I think, have, rather similarly to your colleague, pointed out that there is a more recent report from earlier this year that is more favourable. Is that right? A. In terms of safety, it's a similar score, it's the same it hasn't gone up or down. Q. Let's perhaps just bring up the details, if we may. Let's go first to the 2017 report at INQ001457_001. Perhaps let's go within that to the introductory |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | here to give the panel some broad evidence about the systems in place at Werrington in terms of child protection and sexual abuse issues, but also to provide some response to Mr Wood's evidence. Is that correct? A. Yes. Q. Help us a little bit, please, with some background then about Werrington? A. So Werrington is one of the public sector young offenders' institutes. It's one of the smaller ones. We lock up 118 or we care for 118 children, maximum. Q. I think I have read about 110. Is that right? A. On average 110, we can go up to 118. There are three main units, which is residential units in the establishment, two of which, A and B wing we call normal units and the third one, C wing, which is our care and separation unit and also offers an induction with an element of enhanced provision for children that are | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | the social workers; is that correct? A. Yes. Q. Forgive me, Mr Gormley I should have formally adduced your witness statement of 13 July HMP000405, with your permission, chair. You were asked some questions about the February 2017 report on Werrington, especially around the safety and safeguarding findings, and you, I think, have, rather similarly to your colleague, pointed out that there is a more recent report from earlier this year that is more favourable. Is that right? A. In terms of safety, it's a similar score, it's the same it hasn't gone up or down. Q. Let's perhaps just bring up the details, if we may. Let's go first to the 2017 report at INQ001457_001. Perhaps let's go within that to the introductory narrative, please, on internal page 5. This is |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | here to give the panel some broad evidence about the systems in place at Werrington in terms of child protection and sexual abuse issues, but also to provide some response to Mr Wood's evidence. Is that correct? A. Yes. Q. Help us a little bit, please, with some background then about Werrington? A. So Werrington is one of the public sector young offenders' institutes. It's one of the smaller ones. We lock up 118 or we care for 118 children, maximum. Q. I think I have read about 110. Is that right? A. On average 110, we can go up to 118. There are three main units, which is residential units in the establishment, two of which, A and B wing we call normal units and the third one, C wing, which is our care and separation unit and also offers an induction with an element of enhanced provision for children that are on gold regimes. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | the social workers; is that correct? A. Yes. Q. Forgive me, Mr Gormley I should have formally adduced your witness statement of 13 July HMP000405, with your permission, chair. You were asked some questions about the February 2017 report on Werrington, especially around the safety and safeguarding findings, and you, I think, have, rather similarly to your colleague, pointed out that there is a more recent report from earlier this year that is more favourable. Is that right? A. In terms of safety, it's a similar score, it's the same it hasn't gone up or down. Q. Let's perhaps just bring up the details, if we may. Let's go first to the 2017 report at INQ001457_001. Perhaps let's go within that to the introductory narrative, please, on internal page 5. This is your May 2017 report, we will just perhaps scroll |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | here to give the panel some broad evidence about the systems in place at Werrington in terms of child protection and sexual abuse issues, but also to provide some response to Mr Wood's evidence. Is that correct? A. Yes. Q. Help us a little bit, please, with some background then about Werrington? A. So Werrington is one of the public sector young offenders' institutes. It's one of the smaller ones. We lock up 118 or we care for 118 children, maximum. Q. I think I have read about 110. Is that right? A. On average 110, we can go up to 118. There are three main units, which is residential units in the establishment, two of which, A and B wing we call normal units and the third one, C wing, which is our care and separation unit and also offers an induction with an element of enhanced provision for children that are on gold regimes. Q. A care and support unit in C wing has eight cells for | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | the social workers; is that correct? A. Yes. Q. Forgive me, Mr Gormley I should have formally adduced your witness statement of 13 July HMP000405, with your permission, chair. You were asked some questions about the February 2017 report on Werrington, especially around the safety and safeguarding findings, and you, I think, have, rather similarly to your colleague, pointed out that there is a more recent report from earlier this year that is more favourable. Is that right? A. In terms of safety, it's a similar score, it's the same it hasn't gone up or down. Q. Let's perhaps just bring up the details, if we may. Let's go first to the 2017 report at INQ001457_001. Perhaps let's go within that to the introductory narrative, please, on internal page 5. This is your May 2017 report, we will just perhaps scroll through it. It makes the point that there was by this |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | here to give the panel some broad evidence about the systems in place at Werrington in terms of child protection and sexual abuse issues, but also to provide some response to Mr Wood's evidence. Is that correct? A. Yes. Q. Help us a little bit, please, with some background then about Werrington? A. So Werrington is one of the public sector young offenders' institutes. It's one of the smaller ones. We lock up 118 or we care for 118 children, maximum. Q. I think I have read about 110. Is that right? A. On average 110, we can go up to 118. There are three main units, which is residential units in the establishment, two of which, A and B wing we call normal units and the third one, C wing, which is our care and separation unit and also offers an induction with an element of enhanced provision for children that are on gold regimes. Q. A care and support unit in C wing has eight cells for segregation for people away from the main wings; is that | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | the social workers; is that correct? A. Yes. Q. Forgive me, Mr Gormley I should have formally adduced your witness statement of 13 July HMP000405, with your permission, chair. You were asked some questions about the February 2017 report on Werrington, especially around the safety and safeguarding findings, and you, I think, have, rather similarly to your colleague, pointed out that there is a more recent report from earlier this year that is more favourable. Is that right? A. In terms of safety, it's a similar score, it's the same — it hasn't gone up or down. Q. Let's perhaps just bring up the details, if we may. Let's go first to the 2017 report at INQ001457_001. Perhaps let's go within that to the introductory narrative, please, on internal page 5. This is your May 2017 report, we will just perhaps scroll through it. It makes the point that there was by this point in the third paragraph — well, in fact, let's go |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | here to give the panel some broad evidence about the systems in place at Werrington in terms of child protection and sexual abuse issues, but also to provide some response to Mr Wood's evidence. Is that correct? A. Yes. Q. Help us a little bit, please, with some background then about Werrington? A. So Werrington is one of the public sector young offenders' institutes. It's one of the smaller ones. We lock up 118 or we care for 118 children, maximum. Q. I think I have read about 110. Is that right? A. On average 110, we can go up to 118. There are three main units, which is residential units in the establishment, two of which, A and B wing we call normal units and the third one, C wing, which is our care and separation unit and also offers an induction with an element of enhanced provision for children that are on gold regimes. Q. A care and support unit in C wing has eight cells for segregation for people away from the main wings; is that right? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | the social workers; is that correct? A. Yes. Q. Forgive me, Mr Gormley I should have formally adduced your witness statement of 13 July HMP000405, with your permission, chair. You were asked some questions about the February 2017 report on Werrington, especially around the safety and safeguarding findings, and you, I think, have, rather similarly to your colleague, pointed out that there is a more recent report from earlier this year that is more favourable. Is that right? A. In terms of safety, it's a similar score, it's the same — it hasn't gone up or down. Q. Let's perhaps just bring up the details, if we may. Let's go first to the 2017 report at INQ001457_001. Perhaps let's go within that to the introductory narrative, please, on internal page 5. This is your May 2017 report, we will just perhaps scroll through it. It makes the point that there was by this point in the third paragraph — well, in fact, let's go to the first paragraph — that at the previous report |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | here to give the panel some broad evidence about the systems in place at Werrington in terms of child protection and sexual abuse issues, but also to provide some response to Mr Wood's evidence. Is that correct? A. Yes. Q. Help us a little bit, please, with some background then about Werrington? A. So Werrington is one of the public sector young offenders' institutes. It's one of the smaller ones. We lock up 118 or we care for 118 children, maximum. Q. I think I have read about 110. Is that right? A. On average 110, we can go up to 118. There are three main units, which is residential units in the establishment, two of which, A and B wing we call normal units and the third one, C wing, which is our care and separation unit and also offers an induction with an element of enhanced provision for children that are on gold regimes. Q. A care and support unit in C wing has eight cells for segregation for people away from the main wings; is that right? A. Yes, it does. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | the social workers; is that correct? A. Yes. Q. Forgive me, Mr Gormley I should have formally adduced your witness statement of 13 July HMP000405, with your permission, chair. You were asked some questions about the February 2017 report on Werrington, especially around the safety and safeguarding findings, and you, I think, have, rather similarly to your colleague, pointed out that there is a more recent report from earlier this year that is more favourable. Is that right? A. In terms of safety, it's a similar score, it's the same it hasn't gone up or down. Q. Let's perhaps just bring up the details, if we may. Let's go first to the 2017 report at INQ001457_001. Perhaps let's go within that to the introductory narrative, please, on internal page 5. This is your May 2017 report, we will just perhaps scroll through it. It makes the point that there was by this point in the third paragraph well, in fact, let's go to the first paragraph that at the previous report in October 2015 there were concerns about the safety at |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | here to give the panel some broad evidence about the systems in place at Werrington in terms of child protection and sexual abuse issues, but also to provide some response to Mr Wood's evidence. Is that correct? A. Yes. Q. Help us a little bit, please, with some background then about Werrington? A. So Werrington is one of the public sector young offenders' institutes. It's one of the smaller ones. We lock up 118 or we care for 118 children, maximum. Q. I think I have read about 110. Is that right? A. On average 110, we can go up to 118. There are three main units, which is residential units in the establishment, two of which, A and B wing we call normal units and the third one, C wing, which is our care and separation unit and also offers an induction with an element of enhanced provision for children that are on gold regimes. Q. A care and support unit in C wing has eight cells for segregation for people away from the main wings; is that right? A. Yes, it does. Q. All of the young people are housed in single cells | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | the social workers; is that correct? A. Yes. Q. Forgive me, Mr Gormley I should have formally adduced your witness statement of 13 July HMP000405, with your permission, chair. You were asked some questions about the February 2017 report on Werrington, especially around the safety and safeguarding findings, and you, I think, have, rather similarly to your colleague, pointed out that there is a more recent report from earlier this year that is more favourable. Is that right? A. In terms of safety, it's a similar score, it's the same it hasn't gone up or down. Q. Let's perhaps just bring up the details, if we may. Let's go first to the 2017 report at INQ001457_001. Perhaps let's go within that to the introductory narrative, please, on internal page 5. This is your May 2017 report, we will just perhaps scroll through it. It makes the point that there was by this point in the third paragraph well, in fact, let's go to the first paragraph that at the previous report in October 2015 there were concerns about the safety at Werrington, although in all other respects outcomes were |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | here to give the panel some broad evidence about the systems in place at Werrington in terms of child protection and sexual abuse issues, but also to provide some response to Mr Wood's evidence. Is that correct? A. Yes. Q. Help us a little bit, please, with some background then about Werrington? A. So Werrington is one of the public sector young offenders' institutes. It's one of the smaller ones. We lock up 118 or we care for 118 children, maximum. Q. I think I have read about 110. Is that right? A. On average 110, we can go up to 118. There are three main units, which is residential units in the establishment, two of which, A and B wing we call normal units and the third one, C wing, which is our care and separation unit and also offers an induction with an element of enhanced provision for children that are on gold regimes. Q. A care and support unit in C wing has eight cells for segregation for people away from the main wings; is that right? A. Yes, it does. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | the social workers; is that correct? A. Yes. Q. Forgive me, Mr Gormley I should have formally adduced your witness statement of 13 July HMP000405, with your permission, chair. You were asked some questions about the February 2017 report on Werrington, especially around the safety and safeguarding findings, and you, I think, have, rather similarly to your colleague, pointed out that there is a more recent report from earlier this year that is more favourable. Is that right? A. In terms of safety, it's a similar score, it's the same it hasn't gone up or down. Q. Let's perhaps just bring up the details, if we may. Let's go first to the 2017 report at INQ001457_001. Perhaps let's go within that to the introductory narrative, please, on internal page 5. This is your May 2017 report, we will just perhaps scroll through it. It makes the point that there was by this point in the third paragraph well, in fact, let's go to the first paragraph that at the previous report in October 2015 there were concerns about the safety at |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | here to give the panel some broad evidence about the systems in place at Werrington in terms of child protection and sexual abuse issues, but also to provide some response to Mr Wood's evidence. Is that correct? A. Yes. Q. Help us a little bit, please, with some background then about Werrington? A. So Werrington is one of the public sector young offenders' institutes. It's one of the smaller ones. We lock up 118 or we care for 118 children, maximum. Q. I think I have read about 110. Is that right? A. On average 110, we can go up to 118. There are three main units, which is residential units in the establishment, two of which, A and B wing we call normal units and the third one, C wing, which is our care and separation unit and also offers an induction with an element of enhanced provision for children that are on gold regimes. Q. A care and support unit in C wing has eight cells for segregation for people away from the main wings; is that right? A. Yes, it does. Q. All of the young people are housed in single cells | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | the social workers; is that correct? A. Yes. Q. Forgive me, Mr Gormley I should have formally adduced your witness statement of 13 July HMP000405, with your permission, chair. You were asked some questions about the February 2017 report on Werrington, especially around the safety and safeguarding findings, and you, I think, have, rather similarly to your colleague, pointed out that there is a more recent report from earlier this year that is more favourable. Is that right? A. In terms of safety, it's a similar score, it's the same it hasn't gone up or down. Q. Let's perhaps just bring up the details, if we may. Let's go first to the 2017 report at INQ001457_001. Perhaps let's go within that to the introductory narrative, please, on internal page 5. This is your May 2017 report, we will just perhaps scroll through it. It makes the point that there was by this point in the third paragraph well, in fact, let's go to the first paragraph that at the previous report in October 2015 there were concerns about the safety at Werrington, although in all other respects outcomes were |

1 "We indicated our confidence then that the 1 tackle the violence and early indications were that they 2 2 management team would improve outcomes in safety." 3 And the third paragraph makes clear that by this 3 4 point there had been an improvement in the children's 4 5 perception of safety. It was clear that managers and 5 6 staff were working hard to reduce violence which was 6 7 7 evidencing some success. 8 8 And there were various other observations made. 9 Some points, for example, about access to telephones 9 10 being limited and that causing some friction. Time out 10 11 of cells for boys was reasonable. Ofsted assessed the 11 12 overall provision as good. I think the conclusion on 12 13 13 this page was that, "Werrington, like other young 14 offenders' institutions, faces some tough challenges and 14 15 works with boys who can be very difficult, but it 15 16 continues to do well. It was well-led with coherent 16 17 innovative plans and initiatives helping to create 17 18 18 a much more positive ethos in the institution than we 19 see elsewhere. The priorities for Werrington include 19 20 20 further reductions in violence and work to sustain the 21 resilience of the staff group so that they can build 21 22 22 upon the progress they have made." 23 Just bear with me a second. 23 24 I think if we can go then to your exhibit PG1 which 24 better. 25 is at HMP000406 and go to the second internal page of 25 Page 149 1 1 that, please, we will see that this is the much more --2 well, a more recent report from earlier this year, and 2 3 if we go, please, to the March 2018 introduction on 3 4 page 5 internally, and one can see -- just go to the 4 5 last paragraph, please, on that page: 5 6 "In conclusion, it is pleasing to be able to publish 6 7 a very positive report about a YOI. The inspectorate 7 8 always welcomes good practice being identified and 8 9 9 promulgated, which is why we have gone to particular 10 lengths in this report to do so. It is clear that if 10 11 progress that has been made at Werrington is to be 11

were having a positive effect. The ambition was to make the YOI safer but not at the expense of the regime. These efforts are detailed in this report." If we go to the very top of that page, in January 2018 it says: "We found not only that standards had been maintained. In the area of respect they had improved and now merited our highest assessment of 'good'. By any standards, this was a good inspection." So although that was there ongoing concern about safety and in fact that element having got worse or levels of violence having risen and use of force being high, overall this was a positive inspection. Is there anything else that you would like to add on that, Mr Gormley? You have given some evidence at paragraphs 8 to 12 of your witness statement. Is there anything else that you would like to say? A. Only that I think it's proven that if you take the inspection and the recommendation serious and the resources are put towards what can be achieved in a young offenders' institution, then clearly the outcomes for the children that are being cared for are Q. Let's scroll in, in fact, on your report, please, at Page 151 your statement, please, HMP000405 internal page 3, paragraph 10, please -- 10 and 11, sorry, 10 and 11. You quote part of the report here and you say, I think, that this is the particular part that you think the panel might want to look at, that boys were positive about their early days at Werrington. Safeguarding and child protection arrangements were good. Support for boys at risk of self-harm was also good, although there was that concern about the use of violence. The outcome at the end of this paragraph: "Outcomes of children and young people were 12 reasonably good against this healthy prison test." 13 And that's the safety test, I think, isn't it? 14 A. That's correct. 15 Q. All right. You accept, I think, at paragraph 12 that 16 efforts are required to reduce the level of violence in 17 the establishment but that overall that was a positive 18 inspection.

A. Yes, that is correct.

Q. Now, you've provided some observations in response to Mr Wood's evidence. Help us with what broad themes you want to draw out from the examination that he carried out. I think, obviously, he's looked at ten incidents over a 7-year period, so what's the broad point that you make about that?

Page 152

Page 150

consolidated and maintained, there needs to be

a continued and unwavering focus on reducing the

If we go further up in that narrative to the third

"Our major concerns were around the levels of

violence which had risen since the last inspection and

were too high. There had been a significant increase

from 142 to 206 incidents in the period leading up to

this inspection. There had been an increase in the use

of force and, in light of this, it was disappointing

Nevertheless, there were good initiatives in place to

that body-worn video cameras were underused.

violence that is the major threat to its continuing

paragraph, there was a concern, it says:

stability and success."

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 A. Just the fact that is a very small sample size, I think. 1 weren't discouraged by the form being structured in 2 And particularly the issue around the complaint forms 2 a certain, perhaps more complicated, way. 3 3 not being specifically for complaining or disclosing Help us, then, with what other routes are available 4 sexual abuse. 4 at Werrington for the children to make disclosures if 5 Q. Taking those in two parts, if I may. You make the 5 they wish 6 point, I think, at paragraph 14 of your witness 6 A. So simply by talking to a member of staff, any member of 7 7 statement that seven years is a long time in the life of staff. There are lots of independent people who work at 8 an establishment. 8 Werrington. So, for example, there are youth workers, 9 9 A. Yes. Kinetic Youth workers. 10 Q. And I think the latest HMIP report that we have gone to 10 Q. That's Kinetic Youth workers, isn't it? 11 you say is perhaps more helpful for the panel to look at 11 A. Kinetic, yes. There is advocacy service, which is 12 in a broad sense. Is that right? 12 Barnardo's. There is the independent monitoring board, 13 13 A. Yes, yes. then there is the social workers who are local authority 14 Q. But you note that he has observed that Werrington 14 social workers, so there is a whole range of staff they 15 generally had responded in a timely and structurally 15 can talk to, or independent people. 16 appropriate way, which you welcome. 16 Q. And you have CuSP officers I think already in place, is 17 A. Yes. 17 that right, at Werrington? 18 18 Q. What's your view on the issue of the complaint forms A. We do, yes. So that's like a personal officer to - so 19 that Mr Wood has raised, Mr Gormley? Help us with that. 19 the -- they will be identified for a number of children 20 A. I can completely understand Mr Wood's thoughts around 20 that they personally take, look after and meet with them 21 the complaint procedure, but it is a generic complaint 21 once a week. They can certainly disclose anything to 22 22 form for a number of reasons. It is, as I've pointed those members of staff and then there is the phone 23 23 out in my statement, out of the ten sample size, only lines, ChildLine, the ... 24 two of them, of the incidents, were actually reported by 24 Q. NSPCC line --25 the complaints form, so it demonstrates to me that there 25 A. NSPCC, sorry, yes. Page 153 Page 155 1 Q. -- and as with other institutions there is always 1 are a number of ways that a child can disclose 2 information, not just using this complaints form. 2 availability of COMP 2, which is a confidential 3 3 complaint to the governor. Is that right? I do have concerns that if we make a specific form 4 4 A. Yes, that's a standard form, the confidential complaints for declaring abuse that may not be used, because I do 5 5 think that some children don't understand what they're form. 6 Q. There's a chaplain, I think, as well? 6 declaring. 7 I think the system that we've got at the moment with A. Yes. 8 Q. And is this right: you've also explained that third 8 safeguarding trained staff who will look at a complaint 9 parties who have observed changes in behaviour on the 9 and if there is an allegation of or a potential abuse 10 10 element within that complaint then we process it well, part of a child, or who have witnessed conduct which 11 11 because ultimately all those complaints then go to the they consider to be inappropriate, or that's been 12 12 reported by a family member could also come into the safeguarding department where social workers and 13 safeguarding staff will look at that complaint. 13 safeguarding route? 14 14 Q. So in fact you share the concerns expressed by the A. Yes, they can, the important thing for me is that 15 Feltham governor, is that right, that if there was 15 whichever method of disclosure or potential disclosure 16 16 a special box on the form for sexual abuse you would be takes place, it always goes to the safeguarding for 17 17 concerned that that might miss some allegations because a child protection referral where staff there, 18 18 children might not know how to define it to put it in multi-disciplined staff will -- I call it triaging, 19 19 that box; is that one of the issues that you're talking where they would look at what the evidence or the 20 about? 20 submission states and then they'll take appropriate 21 21 A. That is a potential, yes. Yes. 22 Q. Dealing with the issue of the support that's given to 22 Q. And I think you say that you don't want the form to 23 23 children after disclosure of abuse is made, have you become too complex, you try and keep it as simple and 24 straightforward as possible, because it's a generic 24 made the point, as others have, that perhaps Mr Wood has 25 25 looked at the core documentation but there may be form. You would be anxious to ensure that children

Page 156

Page 154

| 1 | evidence in other material of support being provided to | 1 | local authority to have some dialogue to say whether |
|--|---|--|--|
| 2 | the children? | 2 | they think it meets the threshold for a strategy |
| 3 | A. Yes, so for example at Werrington, one of the main | 3 | meeting, section 47, and then they will task appropriate |
| | • • | 4 | |
| 4 | support mechanisms is that any child who makes | 5 | action from that dialogue. |
| 5 | an allegation will be seen by the embedded social | | Q. Is there anything else about the work with the |
| 6 | workers. That social worker will stay with that child | 6 | local authority that you wish to draw to the panel's |
| 7 | in terms of support until such time that the | 7 | attention? |
| 8 | investigation or whatever the outcome is concluded. | 8 | A. Yes, the local authority independently scrutinise |
| 9 | Q. I think you go on, in fact, at paragraph 24 of your | 9 | incidents at Werrington. So, for example, under use of |
| 10 | witness statement and say that in addition to the | 10 | force, they will sit on a quarterly board meeting where |
| 11 | involvement of the dedicated social worker, every child | 11 | they actually chair the meeting and they have access to |
| 12 | making an allegation is seen by the duty governor and/or | 12 | view all incidents and/or paperwork and will review it |
| 13 | the orderly officer depending on the time of day you | 13 | and make recommendations to us about what we can do to |
| 14 | will conduct an initial assessment of the needs of the | 14 | improve, or if there are any concerns about a particular |
| 15 | child, including any vulnerability that may arise from | 15 | incident. They also do that for the child protection |
| 16 | the making of the allegation and the need for immediate | 16 | logs, as well, at the monthly safeguarding meeting. |
| 17 | steps are to be taken, such as enhanced observations or | 17 | Q. And what would happen if you had concerns about the |
| 18 | a move to a different part of the establishment. | 18 | LADO's assessment? So let's just say the LADO said that |
| 19 | Have we understood that correctly, then, that what | 19 | the case did not meet the threshold for a strategy |
| 20 | you're saying is that every child who discloses sexual | 20 | meeting. What would happen then? |
| 21 | abuse will be seen by the duty governor; is that what | 21 | A. You mean if I have concerns that I thought it did? |
| 22 | you are saying at 24 of your statement? | 22 | Q. No, if you disagreed with the LADO's assessment. |
| 23 | A. Yes, so if a serious allegation is made then the duty | 23 | A. Ultimately it's the LADO's decision but we will |
| 24 | governor or the orderly officer, which is another one of | 24 | certainly have that conversation and, you know, they are |
| 25 | the managers in the establishment, will go to see that | 25 | quite challenging meetings where what I would call |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | Page 157 | | Page 159 |
| | | | |
| 1 | child because the overriding concern is obviously | 1 | professional tension is for me, actually, it's |
| 1 2 | child because the overriding concern is obviously safeguarding and to see if there is anything that needs | 2 | professional tension is for me, actually, it's a necessity because that gives me the reassurance that |
| | child because the overriding concern is obviously safeguarding and to see if there is anything that needs to be done immediately. | | professional tension is — for me, actually, it's a necessity because that gives me the reassurance that actually staff are challenging and accepting — not just |
| 2 | child because the overriding concern is obviously safeguarding and to see if there is anything that needs to be done immediately. Q. Do you think there is any risk that that process, which | 2 | professional tension is — for me, actually, it's a necessity because that gives me the reassurance that actually staff are challenging and accepting — not just accepting what, you know, one of the agencies say. They |
| 2 3 | child because the overriding concern is obviously safeguarding and to see if there is anything that needs to be done immediately. Q. Do you think there is any risk that that process, which involves the child being seen by a very senior figure in | 2 3 | professional tension is — for me, actually, it's a necessity because that gives me the reassurance that actually staff are challenging and accepting — not just |
| 2 3 4 | child because the overriding concern is obviously safeguarding and to see if there is anything that needs to be done immediately. Q. Do you think there is any risk that that process, which | 2 3 4 | professional tension is — for me, actually, it's a necessity because that gives me the reassurance that actually staff are challenging and accepting — not just accepting what, you know, one of the agencies say. They |
| 2 3 4 5 | child because the overriding concern is obviously safeguarding and to see if there is anything that needs to be done immediately. Q. Do you think there is any risk that that process, which involves the child being seen by a very senior figure in the prison, might make the child concerned about reprisals or might make it obvious that something | 2 3 4 5 | professional tension is for me, actually, it's a necessity because that gives me the reassurance that actually staff are challenging and accepting not just accepting what, you know, one of the agencies say. They are multi-agencies so there are lots of opinion that |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | child because the overriding concern is obviously safeguarding and to see if there is anything that needs to be done immediately. Q. Do you think there is any risk that that process, which involves the child being seen by a very senior figure in the prison, might make the child concerned about reprisals or might make it obvious that something serious has happened? | 2 3 4 5 6 | professional tension is — for me, actually, it's a necessity because that gives me the reassurance that actually staff are challenging and accepting — not just accepting what, you know, one of the agencies say. They are multi-agencies so there are lots of opinion that make that decision — lots of people, sorry, that make that decision. Q. You say you have attempted to establish an environment |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | child because the overriding concern is obviously safeguarding and to see if there is anything that needs to be done immediately. Q. Do you think there is any risk that that process, which involves the child being seen by a very senior figure in the prison, might make the child concerned about reprisals or might make it obvious that something | 2 3 4 5 6 7 | professional tension is — for me, actually, it's a necessity because that gives me the reassurance that actually staff are challenging and accepting — not just accepting what, you know, one of the agencies say. They are multi-agencies so there are lots of opinion that make that decision — lots of people, sorry, that make that decision. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | child because the overriding concern is obviously safeguarding and to see if there is anything that needs to be done immediately. Q. Do you think there is any risk that that process, which involves the child being seen by a very senior figure in the prison, might make the child concerned about reprisals or might make it obvious that something serious has happened? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | professional tension is — for me, actually, it's a necessity because that gives me the reassurance that actually staff are challenging and accepting — not just accepting what, you know, one of the agencies say. They are multi-agencies so there are lots of opinion that make that decision — lots of people, sorry, that make that decision. Q. You say you have attempted to establish an environment |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | child because the overriding concern is obviously safeguarding and to see if there is anything that needs to be done immediately. Q. Do you think there is any risk that that process, which involves the child being seen by a very senior figure in the prison, might make the child concerned about reprisals or might make it obvious that something serious has happened? A. There is always a risk, of course, of that, but one | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | professional tension is — for me, actually, it's a necessity because that gives me the reassurance that actually staff are challenging and accepting — not just accepting what, you know, one of the agencies say. They are multi-agencies so there are lots of opinion that make that decision — lots of people, sorry, that make that decision. Q. You say you have attempted to establish an environment which encourages a frank exchange of views between the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | child because the overriding concern is obviously safeguarding and to see if there is anything that needs to be done immediately. Q. Do you think there is any risk that that process, which involves the child being seen by a very senior figure in the prison, might make the child concerned about reprisals or might make it obvious that something serious has happened? A. There is always a risk, of course, of that, but one thing that it demonstrates, I believe, to the child, is | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | professional tension is for me, actually, it's a necessity because that gives me the reassurance that actually staff are challenging and accepting not just accepting what, you know, one of the agencies say. They are multi-agencies so there are lots of opinion that make that decision lots of people, sorry, that make that decision. Q. You say you have attempted to establish an environment which encourages a frank exchange of views between the professionals involved: |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | child because the overriding concern is obviously safeguarding and to see if there is anything that needs to be done immediately. Q. Do you think there is any risk that that process, which involves the child being seen by a very senior figure in the prison, might make the child concerned about reprisals or might make it obvious that something serious has happened? A. There is always a risk, of course, of that, but one thing that it demonstrates, I believe, to the child, is that it would take is seriously. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | professional tension is — for me, actually, it's a necessity because that gives me the reassurance that actually staff are challenging and accepting — not just accepting what, you know, one of the agencies say. They are multi-agencies so there are lots of opinion that make that decision — lots of people, sorry, that make that decision. Q. You say you have attempted to establish an environment which encourages a frank exchange of views between the professionals involved: "It's not uncommon for there to be debate about the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | child because the overriding concern is obviously safeguarding and to see if there is anything that needs to be done immediately. Q. Do you think there is any risk that that process, which involves the child being seen by a very senior figure in the prison, might make the child concerned about reprisals or might make it obvious that something serious has happened? A. There is always a risk, of course, of that, but one thing that it demonstrates, I believe, to the child, is that it would take is seriously. Q. I see, so you balance the two | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | professional tension is — for me, actually, it's a necessity because that gives me the reassurance that actually staff are challenging and accepting — not just accepting what, you know, one of the agencies say. They are multi-agencies so there are lots of opinion that make that decision — lots of people, sorry, that make that decision. Q. You say you have attempted to establish an environment which encourages a frank exchange of views between the professionals involved: "It's not uncommon for there to be debate about the correct course of action, but as governor I find this to |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | child because the overriding concern is obviously safeguarding and to see if there is anything that needs to be done immediately. Q. Do you think there is any risk that that process, which involves the child being seen by a very senior figure in the prison, might make the child concerned about reprisals or might make it obvious that something serious has happened? A. There is always a risk, of course, of that, but one thing that it demonstrates, I believe, to the child, is that it would take is seriously. Q. I see, so you balance the two A. Yes. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | professional tension is — for me, actually, it's a necessity because that gives me the reassurance that actually staff are challenging and accepting — not just accepting what, you know, one of the agencies say. They are multi-agencies so there are lots of opinion that make that decision — lots of people, sorry, that make that decision. Q. You say you have attempted to establish an environment which encourages a frank exchange of views between the professionals involved: "It's not uncommon for there to be debate about the correct course of action, but as governor I find this to be reassuring, gives me confidence that we end up with |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | child because the overriding concern is obviously safeguarding and to see if there is anything that needs to be done immediately. Q. Do you think there is any risk that that process, which involves the child being seen by a very senior figure in the prison, might make the child concerned about reprisals or might make it obvious that something serious has happened? A. There is always a risk, of course, of that, but one thing that it demonstrates, I believe, to the child, is that it would take is seriously. Q. I see, so you balance the two A. Yes. Q and you think in balance it's struck the other way? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | professional tension is — for me, actually, it's a necessity because that gives me the reassurance that actually staff are challenging and accepting — not just accepting what, you know, one of the agencies say. They are multi-agencies so there are lots of opinion that make that decision — lots of people, sorry, that make that decision. Q. You say you have attempted to establish an environment which encourages a frank exchange of views between the professionals involved: "It's not uncommon for there to be debate about the correct course of action, but as governor I find this to be reassuring, gives me confidence that we end up with the right course of action in each case." |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | child because the overriding concern is obviously safeguarding and to see if there is anything that needs to be done immediately. Q. Do you think there is any risk that that process, which involves the child being seen by a very senior figure in the prison, might make the child concerned about reprisals or might make it obvious that something serious has happened? A. There is always a risk, of course, of that, but one thing that it demonstrates, I believe, to the child, is that it would take is seriously. Q. I see, so you balance the two A. Yes. Q and you think in balance it's struck the other way? A. Yes. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | professional tension is — for me, actually, it's a necessity because that gives me the reassurance that actually staff are challenging and accepting — not just accepting what, you know, one of the agencies say. They are multi-agencies so there are lots of opinion that make that decision — lots of people, sorry, that make that decision. Q. You say you have attempted to establish an environment which encourages a frank exchange of views between the professionals involved: "It's not uncommon for there to be debate about the correct course of action, but as governor I find this to be reassuring, gives me confidence that we end up with the right course of action in each case." Is that what you have said here? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | child because the overriding concern is obviously safeguarding and to see if there is anything that needs to be done immediately. Q. Do you think there is any risk that that process, which involves the child being seen by a very senior figure in the prison, might make the child concerned about reprisals or might make it obvious that something serious has happened? A. There is always a risk, of course, of that, but one thing that it demonstrates, I believe, to the child, is that it would take is seriously. Q. I see, so you balance the two A. Yes. Q and you think in balance it's struck the other way? A. Yes. Q. The dialogue with the local authority that is now in | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | professional tension is — for me, actually, it's a necessity because that gives me the reassurance that actually staff are challenging and accepting — not just accepting what, you know, one of the agencies say. They are multi-agencies so there are lots of opinion that make that decision — lots of people, sorry, that make that decision. Q. You say you have attempted to establish an environment which encourages a frank exchange of views between the professionals involved: "It's not uncommon for there to be debate about the correct course of action, but as governor I find this to be reassuring, gives me confidence that we end up with the right course of action in each case." Is that what you have said here? A. Yes. Q. As you know, one of the themes has been that Mr Wood has |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | child because the overriding concern is obviously safeguarding and to see if there is anything that needs to be done immediately. Q. Do you think there is any risk that that process, which involves the child being seen by a very senior figure in the prison, might make the child concerned about reprisals or might make it obvious that something serious has happened? A. There is always a risk, of course, of that, but one thing that it demonstrates, I believe, to the child, is that it would take is seriously. Q. I see, so you balance the two A. Yes. Q and you think in balance it's struck the other way? A. Yes. Q. The dialogue with the local authority that is now in place at Werrington, please help the panel with that topic. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | professional tension is — for me, actually, it's a necessity because that gives me the reassurance that actually staff are challenging and accepting — not just accepting what, you know, one of the agencies say. They are multi-agencies so there are lots of opinion that make that decision — lots of people, sorry, that make that decision. Q. You say you have attempted to establish an environment which encourages a frank exchange of views between the professionals involved: "It's not uncommon for there to be debate about the correct course of action, but as governor I find this to be reassuring, gives me confidence that we end up with the right course of action in each case." Is that what you have said here? A. Yes. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | child because the overriding concern is obviously safeguarding and to see if there is anything that needs to be done immediately. Q. Do you think there is any risk that that process, which involves the child being seen by a very senior figure in the prison, might make the child concerned about reprisals or might make it obvious that something serious has happened? A. There is always a risk, of course, of that, but one thing that it demonstrates, I believe, to the child, is that it would take is seriously. Q. I see, so you balance the two A. Yes. Q and you think in balance it's struck the other way? A. Yes. Q. The dialogue with the local authority that is now in place at Werrington, please help the panel with that topic. A. So if an allegation is brought to the attention of the | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | professional tension is — for me, actually, it's a necessity because that gives me the reassurance that actually staff are challenging and accepting — not just accepting what, you know, one of the agencies say. They are multi-agencies so there are lots of opinion that make that decision — lots of people, sorry, that make that decision. Q. You say you have attempted to establish an environment which encourages a frank exchange of views between the professionals involved: "It's not uncommon for there to be debate about the correct course of action, but as governor I find this to be reassuring, gives me confidence that we end up with the right course of action in each case." Is that what you have said here? A. Yes. Q. As you know, one of the themes has been that Mr Wood has drawn out this concern about suspicion as opposed to validity. What do you wish to say about that, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | child because the overriding concern is obviously safeguarding and to see if there is anything that needs to be done immediately. Q. Do you think there is any risk that that process, which involves the child being seen by a very senior figure in the prison, might make the child concerned about reprisals or might make it obvious that something serious has happened? A. There is always a risk, of course, of that, but one thing that it demonstrates, I believe, to the child, is that it would take is seriously. Q. I see, so you balance the two A. Yes. Q and you think in balance it's struck the other way? A. Yes. Q. The dialogue with the local authority that is now in place at Werrington, please help the panel with that topic. A. So if an allegation is brought to the attention of the safeguarding department then, as I said, triage will | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | professional tension is — for me, actually, it's a necessity because that gives me the reassurance that actually staff are challenging and accepting — not just accepting what, you know, one of the agencies say. They are multi-agencies so there are lots of opinion that make that decision — lots of people, sorry, that make that decision. Q. You say you have attempted to establish an environment which encourages a frank exchange of views between the professionals involved: "It's not uncommon for there to be debate about the correct course of action, but as governor I find this to be reassuring, gives me confidence that we end up with the right course of action in each case." Is that what you have said here? A. Yes. Q. As you know, one of the themes has been that Mr Wood has drawn out this concern about suspicion as opposed to validity. What do you wish to say about that, Mr Gormley? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | child because the overriding concern is obviously safeguarding and to see if there is anything that needs to be done immediately. Q. Do you think there is any risk that that process, which involves the child being seen by a very senior figure in the prison, might make the child concerned about reprisals or might make it obvious that something serious has happened? A. There is always a risk, of course, of that, but one thing that it demonstrates, I believe, to the child, is that it would take is seriously. Q. I see, so you balance the two A. Yes. Q and you think in balance it's struck the other way? A. Yes. Q. The dialogue with the local authority that is now in place at Werrington, please help the panel with that topic. A. So if an allegation is brought to the attention of the safeguarding department then, as I said, triage will take place through one of the social workers or maybe | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | professional tension is — for me, actually, it's a necessity because that gives me the reassurance that actually staff are challenging and accepting — not just accepting what, you know, one of the agencies say. They are multi-agencies so there are lots of opinion that make that decision — lots of people, sorry, that make that decision. Q. You say you have attempted to establish an environment which encourages a frank exchange of views between the professionals involved: "It's not uncommon for there to be debate about the correct course of action, but as governor I find this to be reassuring, gives me confidence that we end up with the right course of action in each case." Is that what you have said here? A. Yes. Q. As you know, one of the themes has been that Mr Wood has drawn out this concern about suspicion as opposed to validity. What do you wish to say about that, Mr Gormley? A. I mean, the one incident that Mr Wood has pointed out is |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | child because the overriding concern is obviously safeguarding and to see if there is anything that needs to be done immediately. Q. Do you think there is any risk that that process, which involves the child being seen by a very senior figure in the prison, might make the child concerned about reprisals or might make it obvious that something serious has happened? A. There is always a risk, of course, of that, but one thing that it demonstrates, I believe, to the child, is that it would take is seriously. Q. I see, so you balance the two A. Yes. Q and you think in balance it's struck the other way? A. Yes. Q. The dialogue with the local authority that is now in place at Werrington, please help the panel with that topic. A. So if an allegation is brought to the attention of the safeguarding department then, as I said, triage will take place through one of the social workers or maybe even both if they're available, a senior member of the | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | professional tension is — for me, actually, it's a necessity because that gives me the reassurance that actually staff are challenging and accepting — not just accepting what, you know, one of the agencies say. They are multi-agencies so there are lots of opinion that make that decision — lots of people, sorry, that make that decision. Q. You say you have attempted to establish an environment which encourages a frank exchange of views between the professionals involved: "It's not uncommon for there to be debate about the correct course of action, but as governor I find this to be reassuring, gives me confidence that we end up with the right course of action in each case." Is that what you have said here? A. Yes. Q. As you know, one of the themes has been that Mr Wood has drawn out this concern about suspicion as opposed to validity. What do you wish to say about that, Mr Gormley? A. I mean, the one incident that Mr Wood has pointed out is clearly that is an interpretation of that. What I would |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | child because the overriding concern is obviously safeguarding and to see if there is anything that needs to be done immediately. Q. Do you think there is any risk that that process, which involves the child being seen by a very senior figure in the prison, might make the child concerned about reprisals or might make it obvious that something serious has happened? A. There is always a risk, of course, of that, but one thing that it demonstrates, I believe, to the child, is that it would take is seriously. Q. I see, so you balance the two A. Yes. Q and you think in balance it's struck the other way? A. Yes. Q. The dialogue with the local authority that is now in place at Werrington, please help the panel with that topic. A. So if an allegation is brought to the attention of the safeguarding department then, as I said, triage will take place through one of the social workers or maybe even both if they're available, a senior member of the management team and some of the safeguarding team, to | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | professional tension is — for me, actually, it's a necessity because that gives me the reassurance that actually staff are challenging and accepting — not just accepting what, you know, one of the agencies say. They are multi-agencies so there are lots of opinion that make that decision — lots of people, sorry, that make that decision. Q. You say you have attempted to establish an environment which encourages a frank exchange of views between the professionals involved: "It's not uncommon for there to be debate about the correct course of action, but as governor I find this to be reassuring, gives me confidence that we end up with the right course of action in each case." Is that what you have said here? A. Yes. Q. As you know, one of the themes has been that Mr Wood has drawn out this concern about suspicion as opposed to validity. What do you wish to say about that, Mr Gormley? A. I mean, the one incident that Mr Wood has pointed out is clearly that is an interpretation of that. What I would say in terms of reassurance is the fact that whatever |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | child because the overriding concern is obviously safeguarding and to see if there is anything that needs to be done immediately. Q. Do you think there is any risk that that process, which involves the child being seen by a very senior figure in the prison, might make the child concerned about reprisals or might make it obvious that something serious has happened? A. There is always a risk, of course, of that, but one thing that it demonstrates, I believe, to the child, is that it would take is seriously. Q. I see, so you balance the two A. Yes. Q and you think in balance it's struck the other way? A. Yes. Q. The dialogue with the local authority that is now in place at Werrington, please help the panel with that topic. A. So if an allegation is brought to the attention of the safeguarding department then, as I said, triage will take place through one of the social workers or maybe even both if they're available, a senior member of the | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | professional tension is — for me, actually, it's a necessity because that gives me the reassurance that actually staff are challenging and accepting — not just accepting what, you know, one of the agencies say. They are multi-agencies so there are lots of opinion that make that decision — lots of people, sorry, that make that decision. Q. You say you have attempted to establish an environment which encourages a frank exchange of views between the professionals involved: "It's not uncommon for there to be debate about the correct course of action, but as governor I find this to be reassuring, gives me confidence that we end up with the right course of action in each case." Is that what you have said here? A. Yes. Q. As you know, one of the themes has been that Mr Wood has drawn out this concern about suspicion as opposed to validity. What do you wish to say about that, Mr Gormley? A. I mean, the one incident that Mr Wood has pointed out is clearly that is an interpretation of that. What I would |

Page 160

Page 158

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

9

11

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 1 investigated with and they are always done via 2 a multi-disciplinary meeting, so whilst the words there, 3 I can accept that that is the case on that one example. 4 Q. I think you say this: that there may well have been 5 variability of practice in the observation in the period 6 of time that Mr Wood was looking at. You're conscious 7
- of the need to keep staff aware of the importance of 8 approaching complaints with an open mind and recording them in a neutral and objective way. And I think two 10 further points you say you're not aware of any widespread deficiency in this regard at the moment, 12 never flagged in the HMIP inspection and safeguarding 13 department or the IMB haven't raised it either, so 14 you're hopeful that that's not part of a wider problem 15 now. Is that right?

A. That's correct, yes.

Q. The safeguarding department you say will consider every allegation in a rigorous and objective manner without any pre-judgment. Inevitably you do need to look at the complaints history of the child to some degree but you say:

"I assure the inquiry that the safeguarding department considers each allegation on its merits and without any pre-conception as to its validity." Is that fair?

Page 161

A. That's correct.

- Q. And what is your response to the observations he has made about the concerns regarding aggression and violence on the part of the children appear to have framed the focus. What do you say about that?
- A. The -- the one incident that was given, obviously it's concerning and staff should be able to respond in a manner which is appropriate to the child. Clearly, this one case I would have thought would have given rise for concern that if a child was responding in an aggressive manner more generally.
 - Q. I think you said that if staff are unduly distracted by the child's behaviour rather than subsequent complaint then that is a concern, but you have not had this wider concern brought to your attention by the safeguarding department or the local authority. Is that right?

A. That's correct.

Q. And in relation to the absence of records, help us with what you say about that. I think paragraph 36 of your witness statement, if it helps you, you say that I think you would accept that there clearly has been a record keeping failure in relation to some of the areas Mr Wood identifies. You go on to say you're not clear why in a particular case records have not been kept. You accept that they should have been and what do you say

Page 162

about the position now?

- A. Clearly records are -- have gone missing. That is a fault, as is the response in terms of the tone is a training issue. I believe that records are far more rigorous now. They are quality assured on a monthly basis and they are signed off by the governor of the establishment at the end of it, so I would say now we're in a much stronger position in terms of record keeping.
 - Q. How would you respond to the points he has made about the allegation in relation to gangs? So that was an allegation about sexual abuse in the context of gang membership and I think the suggestion was there appeared to be a lack of understanding of that context at Werrington. What do you say about that?
 - A. I don't think there is a lack of understanding of gangs. You know, we work with a lot of gang issues at Werrington, as well as all other establishments.
- 18 Q. I think you go on to say that gang membership may just 19 be one of many reasons why a child might be reluctant to 20 disclose.

A. Indeed, yes.

Q. And a difficult case involving rival gangs may well involve a range of strategies. We would hope that over time and with encouragement a child would be prepared to voice his concerns, but ultimately if a child is adamant

Page 163

- in his denial that he's been abused then you're simply unable to take the matter forward. Is that right?
- 3 A. That's correct, but the important thing for me is that 4 we make sure we keep the door open for that child and at 5 some point if they feel safe enough they will disclose 6 something further.
 - Q. Having reflected as you have, Mr Gormley, on the issues that we have been through with you, is there anything else that you think Werrington can do to improve its systems to protect children from sexual abuse or to respond better when it happens?
 - A. Certainly in terms of resources, staffing resource, we now, as a youth custody service, attract and recruit specifically to members of staff who are going to work with children, which is important. The training element is also equally important. We do safeguarding initial training and follow-up safeguarding training and we are just introducing through reform and in part in response to the Taylor Report, we are introducing a youth justice foundation degree, which has elements of safeguarding in it and the good thing for that for me is that we are also in a position where we can refine and amend that delivery or that foundation degree, and our ambition is to have 100 per cent frontline staff trained in that. So --

Page 164

1 Q. Within the next how many years? 1 it's paragraph 37 of your statement, where you mention 2 2 that if there is a complaint made against a member of A. Well, it's a five year roll-out so it's 2023, I think. So it's an ambitious -- but it's something that we have 3 3 staff a risk assessment is immediately undertaken on 4 started already. There are some 250 members of staff 4 receipt of the allegation for the purposes of 5 already signed up and --5 identifying the steps that may be required to separate 6 the alleged victim and the alleged perpetrator. Who 6 Q. I think that's nationally, though, isn't it? 7 7 would undertake that assessment? A. That's not Werrington, that's nationally, sorry, yes. 8 A. Well, that's part of the work who -- of the safeguarding 8 So at Werrington there is, I think we got -- at last 9 department. However sometimes, you know, it needs to be 9 count there was about 34 on it, so we're getting to --10 we've looked into using the word "professionalise", 10 done quicker than that, so it would be a duty governor or an orderly officer, who the report will be given to 11 improve the standards and upskill the staff in terms of 11 12 their knowledge about child -- and the way children 12 and they would have to do a dynamic risk assessment to 13 13 respond, so that's really important for me. say, you know, the overarching thing is to safeguard 14 Something that we have done at Werrington in terms 14 that child so if it's an allegation against a member of 15 of making things better was we have tried to make it 15 staff do we need to remove that member of staff from 16 16 that unit, do we need to remove that member of staff a reward culture and not a punitive one, and that's 17 17 from operations, so we put them what we call non-child taken a long time to change people's mindset, that 18 contact, or do we have to actually suspend that member 18 actually if you reward children in terms of punishing 19 them, outcomes generally tend to be a lot better. 19 of staff, or if it's a child versus a child then what 20 can we do with that child as the perceived victim and 20 Certainly having read the paperwork for this inquiry 21 there is certainly, from my opinion, there is a need to 21 what do we need to do for that child as the perceived 22 perpetrator. 22 improve on record keeping and responses, the way we 23 23 respond to children. So it's a dynamic risk assessment just to safeguard 24 Q. I think just in fairness to you, in relation to your 24 things until it can actually be investigated properly. 25 point there about the incentive rather than punishment 25 PROFESSOR SIR MALCOLM EVANS: Thank you very much. Page 165 Page 167 1 culture, HMP000406, internal page 5, that was something 1 THE CHAIR: Mr Frank. 2 specifically commended by the most recent inspection, 2 MR FRANK: I think in fairness to you, in your witness 3 was it not? 3 statement, which is dated 13 July, so, what, last 4 A. It was and it has made a big difference. It has made 4 Friday, was it? You indicate that you have not 5 a big difference. 5 yourself, you say, had an opportunity to investigate the 6 MS HILL: Thank you. 6 alleged incidents that have been referred to by 7 Chair, those are all my questions for Mr Gormley. 7 Mr Wood's report in detail. I think that's the way you 8 THE CHAIR: Thank you. 8 put it. 9 Ms Sharpling. 9 A. That's right. 10 Questions by THE PANEL 10 MR FRANK: But you're familiar with the contents of the 11 MS SHARPLING: Thank you, just one question from me. Would 11 report and the broad thrust of the incidents that he 12 you accept that -- we have heard a lot this afternoon 12 brought to our attention. 13 about children and young people making or not making 13 A. Yes, I am. 14 reports of sexual abuse. Would you accept that where 14 MR FRANK: You see, it may be right that you say that there 15 violence is common or at unsafe levels in an institution 15 were only ten alleged incidents over a period of 16 that would actively discourage children from reporting 16 five years and you say they may not be representative, 17 sexual abuse? 17 but from the point of view of the child who makes the 18 A. I think it's linked. I'm not sure it's -- there's 18 complaint, if they feel it has not been fairly 19 a direct cause and effect there, but I think it's 19 investigated it's the only incident they need to know 20 definitely linked and for some children it probably 20 about to put them off making any further complaints in 21 would, yes. 21 future if they have not been fairly dealt with. 22 MS SHARPLING: Thank you. 22 So what I want to ask you is this: in respect of --23 THE CHAIR: Malcolm. 23 and we can put this up on the screen, please --24 PROFESSOR SIR MALCOLM EVANS: Thank you. 24 INQ001764 009, which refers to an incident on 25 A short question, if I may, relating to -- I think 25 24 February 2016, so not that long ago, we see there is Page 166 Page 168

| | 1 7 | | |
|----------------|--|----------|---|
| 1 | an incident where a written statement from the deputy | 1 | I'm afraid, have time to read in, because it is, |
| 2 | governor who witnessed the alleged assault was not | 2 | perhaps, pertinent for you to be aware of this and have |
| 3 | actually present on the file, it would appear. Can you | 3 | this in mind. |
| 4 | help about that? | 4 | So, chair, we had hoped to read in some evidence |
| 5 | A. I can't, unfortunately, no. I have no knowledge of | 5 | from the independent monitoring board from Saffron |
| 6 | that. | 6 | Clackson in statements dated 20 May 2016 and Rachel |
| 7 | MR FRANK: No evidence of a questioning of the deputy | 7 | Stuart, 3 July 2018, in IMB000001 and IMB000008, where |
| 8 | governor or of any other members who were present at the | 8 | they set out the role of the independent monitoring |
| 9 | time of that assault; any idea about that? | 9 | board in terms of visiting institutions and where they |
| 10 | A. I haven't. | 10 | set out the number of complaints that had been made to |
| 11 | MR FRANK: Do you think that's good practice? | 11 | that institution of sexual abuse. |
| 12 | A. No, it's not. | 12 | Similarly, chair, we have also asked you to have |
| 13 | MR FRANK: Again, when we look at 1.47, in relation to there | 13 | regard, please, to evidence from the Prison and |
| 14 | being no CCTV evidence, whereas the allegation took | 14 | Probations Ombudsman. That's a statement, or a letter |
| 15 | place in the child's cell where there would be no CCTV. | 15 | from Nigel Newcomen, dated 9 September 2016 at PPO000001 |
| 16 | Was that a proper reason for not furthering the | 16 | and information also from Elizabeth Moody, dated |
| 17 | investigation, the fact that there wasn't a CCTV record | 17 | 10 April PPO000003, which again sets out the role they |
| 18 | where you wouldn't expect one? | 18 | perform and the number of allegations they had had |
| 19 | A. No. | 19 | reported to them. |
| 20 | MR FRANK: No and, again, if we look further down, 1.51, | 20 | Finally in this group, please, there is a statement |
| 21 | linked allegation, the fact that CCTV does not cover the | 21 | from the Children's Commissioner, Anne Longfield, dated |
| 22 | young person's cell appears not to have been taken into | 22 | 12 April 2018, INQ001175, and, again, confirming the |
| 23 | account. Does that appear to you to be a proper | 23 | role performed by the Children's Commissioner and |
| 24 | response to that investigation? | 24 | confirming that they had received no disclosures of |
| 25 | A. No, it doesn't. | 25 | sexual abuse. |
| | | | |
| | Page 169 | | Page 171 |
| 1 | MR FRANK: No. | 1 | And then finally, please, we would ask you to have |
| 2 | Yes, thank you, that's all I ask. | 2 | regard to material from Rosamund Roughton of |
| 3 | THE CHAIR: Thank you very much, Mr Gormley. | 3 | NHS England, who has given a lengthy statement dated |
| 4 | MS HILL: Thank you, Mr Gormley. | 4 | 28 November 2016, NHS000027, which sets out an overview |
| 5 | Chair, just in the remaining few minutes | 5 | of the role of the NHS as far as children in custody are |
| 6 | Mr Gormley can leave the witness box, thank you very | 6 | concerned, includes information, for example, about the |
| 7 | much we have a short statement from Yvonne Gordon | 7 | CHAT assessment tool, the comprehensive health |
| 8 | just to adduce this formally, please. Just by way of | 8 | assessment tool, about which you have heard, and |
| 9 | clarification, as I'm sure you've appreciated, chair, | 9 | includes further detail that we would ask you to |
| 10 | for each of the institutions there is a local authority | 10 | consider. |
| 11 | that sits alongside that. | 11 | And there is finally evidence from Nadine Good, |
| 12 | In relation to this particular local authority, | 12 | assistant director at Barnardo's, dated 5 June 2018 in |
| 13 | Staffordshire County Council, Mr Wood confirmed in | 13 | BRD000238, the pertinence, perhaps, of that material, |
| 14 | a report of 13 June at INQ001255 that there was no | 14 | chair, is that it goes to give you an understanding of |
| 15 | criticism of Staffordshire County Council in relation to | 15 | the advocacy services Barnardo's provided, the |
| 16 | their conduct on those allegations, so I will formally | 16 | information given to the children about those services. |
| 17 | adduce, if I may please, just simply a statement from | 17 | We have copied for you in the bundle that you have, |
| 18 | Yvonne Gordon that sets out the general systems in place | 18 | chair, a range of exhibits that show the sort of |
| 19 | as far as Staffordshire are concerned, and Werrington. | 19 | material that children are given about the Barnardo's |
| 20 | That's a statement dated 16 February 2018, SFC000023 and | 20 | services, if you like, and also Barnardo's own policies. |
| | the whole of that statement, chair, sets out their | 21 | There is also material exhibited to Ms Good's |
| 21 | the whole of that statement, chair, sets out then | 1 | |
| 21 22 | | 22 | statement dealing with the number of allegations of |
| 22 | safeguarding processes in outline. | 22 23 | |
| 22 23 | safeguarding processes in outline. Chair, I wonder if I might just take the last | | statement dealing with the number of allegations of sexual abuse that Barnardo's had received and that's in both BRD000238 and BRD000270. You may in particular |
| 22 | safeguarding processes in outline. Chair, I wonder if I might just take the last few minutes just formally to adduce some material that | 23 | sexual abuse that Barnardo's had received and that's in |
| 22 23 24 | safeguarding processes in outline. Chair, I wonder if I might just take the last | 23 24 | sexual abuse that Barnardo's had received and that's in both BRD000238 and BRD000270. You may in particular |

```
is the material given to the children about that service
 2
          and the statistics that are provided therein.
 3
            There is finally a very short statement dated
 4
          28 June at BRD000274, which brings up-to-date, I think,
 5
          the prevalent information and provides further detail
 6
          about the dates and hours of service of the advocacy
          services that are provided and some information about
 8
          Barnardo's safeguarding referral processes, which you
 9
          may remember have changed rather since the Medway
10
          Improvement Board's findings.
            So, chair, I hope that brings us up-to-date with the
11
12
          read material and that concludes the evidence for today.
13
        THE CHAIR: Thank you very much, Ms Hill.
14
        (4.00 pm)
15
          (The hearing adjourned until 10.00 am on Tuesday,
16
                     17 July 2018)
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
                           Page 173
 3
4
      Welcome and opening remarks by THE ......1
          CHAIR
 5
     MR ANGUS MULREADY-JONES (affirmed) ......2
 6
        Examination by MR STRAW .....2
 7
        Questions by THE PANEL ......49
 8
     MR ALAN WOOD (recalled) .....53
 9
        Examination by MS HILL .....53
10
     MR GLENN KNIGHT (sworn) ......96
11
        Examination by MS HILL .....96
12
        Questions by THE PANEL .....123
13
     MR ALAN WOOD (continued) ......128
14
        Examination by MS HILL (continued) ......128
15
     MR PETER GORMLEY (sworn) .....145
16
        Examination by MS HILL .....145
17
        Questions by THE PANEL ......166
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
                           Page 174
```

| | | | | Page 175 |
|---------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|
| | abusans 140:22 | 151.15 | 16.16 17.12 62.11 | 120:12 140:17 |
| A | abusers 140:23 | 151:15 | 46:16 47:13 62:14 | 139:12 140:17 |
| A2 26:22 | abusing 88:24 | added 64:23 | 62:15,23,25 64:5 | 142:4 144:23 |
| ability 11:14 34:9 | 95:15 | addition 157:10 | 66:7 68:19 70:23 | 154:9 157:5,12,16 |
| 34:10 35:20 47:8 | accept 138:25 | additional 62:22 | 81:19 93:6 94:23 | 157:23 158:19,24 |
| abject 38:5 | 139:23 140:22 | 90:9 94:15 98:13 | 107:2 114:23,25 | 161:18,23 163:10 |
| able 6:24 11:7,13 | 152:15 161:3 | 98:14 106:3 | 115:15 160:4 | 163:11 167:4,14 |
| 12:19 18:10 23:16 | 162:21,25 166:12 | 127:12 131:20 | agencies' 93:5 | 169:14,21 |
| 28:17 31:14,21 | 166:14 | 143:23 | agency 43:17,23 | allegations 5:1 26:6 |
| 38:18 61:4 69:14 | accepted 102:18 | address 49:21 | 62:13 68:22 92:18 | 42:10,12 43:19 |
| 77:24 106:5 | 115:4 | 102:17 | aggression 66:23 | 44:9,11 47:25 |
| 123:24 127:9 | accepting 140:25 | addressed 16:23 | 162:3 | 48:13,21,23 49:10 |
| 150:6 162:7 | 160:3,4 | adds 72:19 84:16 | aggressive 162:11 | 49:12 54:3 55:6 |
| absence 64:4 80:20 | access 11:19 116:2 | adduce 2:19 49:4 | ago 168:25 | 55:25 57:14,18 |
| 82:7,23 83:7,21 | 116:7,9,14 120:9 | 97:8 108:20 | agree 6:22 21:13 | 58:15 59:12 60:9 |
| 86:10 121:6 | 120:12 141:3 | 127:23 128:5 | 93:10 132:23 | 60:24 63:12,13,24 |
| 134:18 141:5 | 149:9 159:11 | 170:8,17,24 | agreed 98:22 | 64:13,25 65:19 |
| 143:3,5 162:18 | account 20:3 46:15 | adduced 82:19 | 110:16,20 | 67:5,21 74:7 |
| absences 82:1 | 83:12 169:23 | 148:4 | agreement 113:24 | 76:17 77:11 78:13 |
| absent 39:23 56:24 | accurate 43:3,10,24 | adherence 78:5 | 113:25 | 78:25 79:8 80:1 |
| 61:5 80:4,16 | 84:19 | adjourned 173:15 | Airport 124:9 | 80:19 81:11 82:13 |
| absolutely 14:16 | achieve 23:15 | adjournment 96:13 | ALAN 53:15 | 86:18,18 88:15,22 |
| 16:18 34:12 38:10 | 106:11 | adult 37:22 72:11 | 128:19 174:8,13 | 88:22 89:3,7 |
| 43:9 74:4 75:16 | achieved 24:4 37:8 | 79:15 114:7 | alarm 30:9 | 90:14 91:2,17 |
| 75:18 | 37:9,10,16 38:12 | 144:23 | albeit 71:24 87:6 | 92:11 93:22,23 |
| abuse 1:6 5:1,1,23 | 101:4,5,5 102:21 | adult's 77:21 | 89:7 | 94:11 102:7 110:6 |
| 6:14,21 21:19 | 102:22 151:21 | adults 70:19 71:5 | Alexis 1:4 | 111:12 113:9 |
| 23:2 25:13,25 | achievement 39:14 | 71:10 73:12 74:1 | aligned 47:20 67:8 | 117:24 123:3 |
| 26:1,4 35:7 42:7 | Achieving 94:2 | 79:8 86:7 93:24 | 68:13 | 128:22 129:1,13 |
| 42:16,20 43:11,19 | Act 88:6 92:21 | 95:15,18,25 97:17 | aligns 144:19 | 129:20,22 130:25 |
| 44:9 47:25 48:16 | 93:14 | 101:23 141:1 | allegation 56:4 | 132:3 134:24 |
| 49:10 54:3 55:9 | action 17:7 102:5 | advantages 78:23 | 58:2,2,12 59:16 | 135:10 136:12 |
| 63:21 66:22 72:18 | 103:14 104:19,22 | advice 79:19,20 | 60:13 61:10 63:3 | 137:6,11,20 140:9 |
| 73:1 74:13 77:12 | 108:20 109:2 | 81:16 118:17 | 65:1,8 75:2,9,15 | 141:5,12,16 142:2 |
| 79:8 81:11,14,14 | 113:20 125:13 | advised 79:13 | 75:24 76:5 77:19 | 144:7 154:17 |
| 93:23 95:6,22 | 142:19 156:21 | advocacy 115:12 | 77:22 79:14,23 | 170:16 171:18 |
| 111:7 115:5,22 | 159:4 160:12,14 | 155:11 172:15 | 82:24 83:15 85:5 | 172:22 |
| 116:20 117:3 | actions 41:1 71:21 | 173:6 | 85:6,7,14,16,22 | alleged 42:7 81:14 |
| 119:1,4 123:3 | 109:1 113:17 | advocate 28:9 | 86:14 87:2,10,23 | 83:18 86:6 87:15 |
| 140:23 141:17 | 130:6 | advocates 27:12 | 88:17 90:18,19 | 142:10,18,24 |
| 146:4 153:4 154:4 | actively 166:16 | affiliation 133:6 | 92:7 93:8 95:22 | 143:8,14 167:6,6 |
| 154:9,16 156:23 | activity 4:24 10:20 | affirmed 2:9 174:5 | 111:7 113:8 | 168:6,15 169:2 |
| 157:21 163:11 | 39:11 71:19 | afraid 171:1 | 114:24 116:20 | allied 110:12 |
| 164:10 166:14,17 | actual 79:3 | afternoon 166:12 | 119:9 120:1,3 | alongside 170:11 |
| 171:11,25 172:23 | adamant 163:25 | age 12:6 97:15,17 | 129:19 131:13 | ambition 151:2 |
| abused 24:17 48:5 | add 62:22 84:21 | 105:10 | 132:14,24 137:2 | 164:23 |
| 48:9 72:4 164:1 | 94:15 95:18 | agencies 45:19 | 138:5,14,19,19,24 | ambitious 165:3 |
| TU.) 12.T 1UT.1 | - | | | |
| | | | | |

| | | | | Page 176 |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|--------------------------|
| amend 164:22 | appendix 26:22 | arisen 58:11 | assistant 172:12 | available 3:9 18:2 |
| amount 17:24 22:8 | applied 45:4 59:10 | arm's 41:2 | assisted 40:20 | 60:12 62:17 70:11 |
| 30:16 66:25 67:1 | applies 111:5 114:7 | arose 57:4 | associated 65:21 | 100:23 143:6 |
| 68:14 100:16 | apply 39:4 90:4 | arrangement 98:22 | 84:11 142:11 | 155:3 158:22 |
| 106:10 | 110:22 | arrangements | assurance 15:5 | avenues 115:10 |
| amounts 12:15 | appoints 51:7 | 46:14 47:6 152:7 | 120:12 127:25 | average 146:13 |
| analysed 93:3 | appreciate 72:8 | arriving 147:9 | assure 161:22 | award 104:24 |
| analysing 41:10 | 126:14 139:11 | article 25:8 | assured 16:10 | 125:20 |
| 76:5 92:3 | appreciated 170:9 | asked 28:12 41:13 | 163:5 | awarded 4:22 |
| analysis 14:22 | approach 11:9 20:2 | 42:9 44:21 49:2 | atmosphere 141:15 | awarding 105:15 |
| 47:24,25 54:11 | 20:3 30:3 51:16 | 54:6 57:13,15,24 | attached 10:4 | aware 1:19 2:1 |
| 57:4 76:13 80:8 | 59:19 60:10 61:13 | 58:11,16,18 80:21 | attack 139:1 | 16:25 17:18,23 |
| 127:10 130:10 | 62:19,20 71:11 | 86:12 91:14 99:5 | attempted 8:4 | 63:12,24,25 64:13 |
| 144:6 | 73:8 90:20 92:1 | 132:2 135:7 | 160:8 | 102:10 148:1 |
| anchor 141:24 | 100:22 107:5 | 136:11 141:24 | attempts 69:7 | 161:7,10 171:2 |
| and/or 5:6 157:12 | 108:6 117:23 | 148:7 171:12 | attempts 07.7 | awareness 17:15 |
| 159:12 | 118:3 120:17 | asking 28:2 31:4,6 | attend 143.1 attending 92:16 | 82:2 107:16,24 |
| anger 121:24 | 141:16 | 41:20 50:12 | attention 3:24 36:5 | 108:4 134:5 139:5 |
| angle 93:18 141:10 | approached 86:12 | aspect 62:23 | 49:7 158:19 159:7 | 100.4 134.3 139.3 |
| ANGUS 2:9 174:5 | approaches 50:23 | aspects 46:16 | 162:15 168:12 | В |
| Anne 171:21 | 62:13 | aspiration 22:6 | attitude 140:13 | b 56:11 97:16 |
| annex 33:11 | approaching 161:8 | 24:22,24 | attract 123:24 | 142:23 146:15 |
| announcing 104:10 | appropriate 17:19 | assault 58:8 114:24 | 124:12 164:13 | back 7:25 9:12 |
| annual 3:14 4:8 | 24:4 56:14 70:24 | 133:8 142:10,24 | attrition 12:22 | 11:20 13:8 26:15 |
| 37:5 40:14 | 115:25 127:21 | 143:8,14 169:2,9 | 124:11 | 45:20 47:23 51:22 |
| annually 9:23 39:8 | 129:21,22 139:13 | assaulted 31:11 | audit 43:19 | 76:23 82:1 90:15 |
| 108:15 | 153:16 156:20 | 58:6 59:1 | audits 120:11 | 91:13 92:10 |
| answer 32:11 50:6 | 159:3 162:8 | assaults 103:25 | audity 38:22 | 113:13,13 117:21 |
| 52:24 127:14 | | assautts 103.23 assess 142:20 | authorisation 24:4 | 133:16 135:5 |
| | appropriately 18:11 38:19 | assess 142.20 assessed 36:14 | authorise 25:5 | 136:4 139:13,19 |
| anticipated 110:23 anxious 154:25 | | 49:24 142:22 | authorised 25:3,9 | background 4:5 |
| | appropriateness | 149:11 | 25:18 | 80:2 93:15 97:2,9 |
| anybody 105:14 106:7 117:11 | 129:25 | | | 126:25 146:7 |
| | approximately | assessment 15:7 | authorities 1:12 | backwards 80:4 |
| anyway 77:25 | 33:6 Appl 136:22 | 24:19 25:9,17 | 36:22 45:8 111:2 authority 36:18,19 | 90:13 144:20 |
| 78:15,18 82:16 83:7 94:20 | April 136:23 | 36:11 38:11,14 | , | bad 29:21,22 |
| | 145:24 171:17,22 | 98:10,10 99:3 | 36:24,25 44:22 | 129:10 135:3 |
| apart 116:14 | area 4:21 8:10 | 111:17,24 112:9 | 45:1,3,11 47:3 | balance 158:12,14 |
| apparent 55:3 61:14 65:12 | 42:23 64:14 83:1 | 119:13 151:9 157:14 159:18,22 | 55:16 87:15 107:3 | band 8:17 21:8 |
| | 85:13 124:3 136:23 151:8 | , | 118:10 120:8,9 | Barnardo's 155:12 |
| appear 48:13 76:4 | | 167:3,7,12,23 | 127:21 141:20 | 172:12,15,19,20 |
| 162:4 169:3,23 | areas 5:14 16:7,22 | 172:7,8 | 147:4 155:13 | 172:12,13,13,20 |
| appeared 91:7 | 17:1 41:12 84:6 | assessments 63:19 | 158:16 159:1,6,8 | Barnardos 115:13 |
| 137:2 163:12 | 84:11 93:25 | 98:17 | 162:16 170:10,12 | barriers 25:25 |
| appears 142:14 | 133:18 134:4 | ASSETPlus 24:19 | automatically | base 21:4 |
| 143:10 169:22 | 162:22 | assist 95:20 97:1,4 | 147:19,21 | based 61:19 66:13 |
| appendices 26:19 | argued 85:17 | 110:21 144:13 | availability 156:2 | NASCA 01.17 00.13 |
| | • | • | • | • |

| | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 85:18 95:15 | 23:10 57:3 58:1 | brief 3:5 53:22 | 146:16,20 | causes 6:24 |
| Basically 29:3 | 59:24 63:14 83:14 | 87:12 | call 1:16 2:8 5:9 6:2 | causing 149:10 |
| basics 11:7 31:8 | 90:8 97:9,10,22 | briefing 108:1 | 63:13 74:7 96:15 | cautious 44:14 |
| basis 8:16 25:3,9 | 103:12 104:16,18 | briefings 107:25 | 107:11 145:16 | CCTV 16:3,7,10,13 |
| 82:17 98:10 | 107:7 110:18 | briefly 47:2 54:14 | 146:15 156:18 | 16:25 17:6 82:7 |
| 141:11 163:6 | 133:23 137:23 | 99:22 108:10,20 | 159:25 167:17 | 82:11,13,22,24 |
| bear 84:25 99:10 | 146:7 | 108:22 | called 41:23 | 83:2,7,11,16,18 |
| 99:13 108:9 135:4 | block 16:9 | bring 3:24 57:22 | calls 32:21 | 84:7,12,17 85:2,7 |
| 137:14 149:23 | blow 35:6,9 | 58:9 63:5 70:8 | cameras 17:7 83:23 | 85:8,20 86:11 |
| becoming 93:12 | board 95:3 101:7 | 99:6 108:10,20,22 | 84:1 150:24 | 92:2 136:23,25 |
| bed 133:11 | 155:12 159:10 | 109:21 110:2 | capable 23:16 | 169:14,15,17,21 |
| behalf 127:20 | 171:5,9 | 137:15 148:15 | capping 10:16 | cell 30:16,25 31:2,5 |
| behave 30:5 | Board's 173:10 | bringing 57:6 | capture 113:10 | 58:19 80:16 82:14 |
| behaved 105:21 | Boards 47:7 | brings 51:5 173:4 | care 9:7 11:8 14:4 | 84:14,18 89:2 |
| behaviour 4:15,24 | bodies 42:9 | 173:11 | 21:13 22:1,17 | 98:10 134:2 143:9 |
| 5:8 22:15 23:10 | body 41:3 | broad 2:3 54:1,20 | 33:8,14 39:13 | 169:15,22 |
| 30:3 39:13 60:7 | body-worn 150:24 | 55:20 56:2,7,15 | 52:9 67:1 68:19 | cells 142:14 146:20 |
| 69:3 72:10,13,25 | bolster 11:6 | 57:10,23 63:1 | 70:14 71:17 88:4 | 146:24 149:11 |
| 73:21 99:1 103:2 | bolts 74:6 104:19 | 99:24 146:2 | 90:3,5 94:23 | cent 7:6 9:23 27:3,3 |
| 104:3 105:3 | Borough 110:17,20 | 152:21,24 153:12 | 97:14,16 98:1,4 | 27:4,13,17,20,24 |
| 140:19 142:18,20 | 128:1 | 168:11 | 104:25 115:9 | 29:7,9,11,13,16 |
| 156:9 162:13 | boss 116:13 | broader 13:25 | 117:18 126:22,25 | 29:19 31:22 32:1 |
| behavioural 68:7 | bottom 3:18 8:14 | broadly 3:9 4:25 | 146:11,16,20 | 32:6 33:5,6 37:7,8 |
| behaviours 60:3 | 8:17,25,25 17:8 | 5:22 29:20 34:5 | 147:14,15 | 37:9 43:6 44:6 |
| 72:24 | 27:12 85:3 132:11 | 56:23 89:17 | cared 6:5 151:23 | 48:11 89:18 |
| believe 2:4 5:5 6:3 | 141:23 | broken 34:21 | careful 71:8 95:24 | 107:21 164:24 |
| 6:18 120:12 123:1 | boundaries 105:16 | bronze 105:25 | 98:23 | centre 4:16 14:23 |
| 158:10 163:4 | 105:22 | Bronzefield 124:7 | carefully 101:7 | 16:7,11 47:13 |
| believed 83:13 | box 101:13 116:3,4 | brought 59:20 63:1 | caring 22:12 | 112:14 122:7 |
| bell 30:9,25 31:2,5 | 154:16,19 170:6 | 87:6 158:19 | carried 35:7 95:2 | centred 70:24 |
| benefits 45:15 | boxer 58:19 143:13 | 162:15 168:12 | 107:18 152:22 | Centres 2:18 |
| best 2:6 86:19 94:3 | boy 138:20 | budget 127:13 | carry 43:19 76:20 | certain 17:7 66:25 |
| 127:8 | boys 98:12 100:14 | build 149:21 | case 22:2 24:21 | 67:7 68:21 69:8 |
| better 4:12 15:15 | 100:16 103:21,25 | buildings 11:17 | 26:13,17 27:12 | 71:1 77:14 80:8 |
| 33:16 43:9 44:17 | 132:18 137:2 | built 141:10 | 42:24 53:23 66:11 | 84:6 95:19 125:10 |
| 46:9 49:20 61:9 | 142:15 149:11,15 | bulk 39:20 | 79:22 93:12 95:7 | 132:2 134:14 |
| 130:12 148:25 | 152:5,8 | bullet 15:10 | 112:8 118:15,17 | 155:2 |
| 151:24 164:11 | brains 73:13 | bullied 27:22 | 121:15,16 159:19 | certainly 10:4 13:1 |
| 165:15,19 | BRD000238 172:13 | bullying 104:1 | 160:14 161:3 | 39:25 65:6 72:11 |
| beyond 51:9 | 172:24 | bum 132:15 | 162:9,24 163:22 | 73:19 81:4 91:24 |
| big 32:25 140:25 | BRD000270 172:24 | bundle 99:9,11 | cases 24:6,8 89:18 | 112:25 117:15,21 |
| 166:4,5 | BRD000274 173:4 | 172:17 | 117:9 | 123:10,18 126:4 |
| bigger 6:9 23:22 | break 53:10,13 | Bureau 43:17 | category 147:14 | 127:10 130:3 |
| biggest 106:7 124:9 | 96:10 128:16 | $\overline{\mathbf{C}}$ | caught 99:15 | 155:21 159:24 |
| Bill 40:19 | 145:10,11,14 | C 56:15 99:19 | cause 66:25 166:19 | 164:12 165:20,21 |
| bit 11:20 13:8 | breakdown 131:12 | C 30.13 33.13 | caused 8:5 59:22 | chair 1:3,4,5,17,18 |
| | ı | <u>I</u> | ı | I |

| | | | | Page 176 |
|---------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1:22 2:4,19 49:3,7 | 41:5 100:1 104:11 | 162:8,10 163:19 | 82:3 83:19 85:12 | 42:3 99:25 |
| 49:17 50:9 51:18 | 109:22,25 111:19 | 163:24,25 164:4 | 88:6,20 90:11 | Clarke's 2:25 |
| 52:16,17 53:1,10 | child 1:5 3:3 5:8 | 165:12 167:14,19 | 92:21 93:14 94:1 | clear 16:1 56:14 |
| 53:17 94:24 96:8 | 9:17 10:20,21 | 167:19,20,21 | 97:3,25 98:6 | 60:18 62:3 65:24 |
| 96:10,15 97:8 | 13:16 24:1,17 | 168:17 | 101:14,22,23 | 66:1 67:4 79:15 |
| 118:7 121:5 | 25:14 26:1 32:9 | child's 11:14 60:2 | 104:7 105:9 106:1 | 80:9 81:12 86:11 |
| 123:20,22 124:18 | 33:2 34:24 36:3,7 | 66:21 67:11,16 | 109:24 113:8,9 | 87:17 92:20 94:12 |
| 124:21 125:1,5 | 40:8 41:24 42:7 | 69:5 70:7 72:10 | 115:5,9,20 118:13 | 103:23 105:16 |
| 124.21 123.1,3 | 43:10 44:6,22,25 | 72:21 80:16 82:14 | 118:16 122:15 | 110:25 129:24 |
| 128:4,10,13,18 | 45:11 48:16 55:15 | 83:12,25 84:14 | 138:3 139:9 140:8 | 134:5,11 138:6 |
| 144:13 145:7,9,10 | 56:5 58:12,19,20 | 86:16 94:16 95:14 | 140:18 141:2,3,5 | 144:1,17 145:5 |
| 145:12,16 148:6 | 59:1,22 60:20 | 131:3 134:2 138:4 | 141:11 143:23 | 149:3,5 150:10 |
| 159:11 166:7,8,23 | 61:10,14,15 62:7 | 138:12,15 147:23 | 146:11,18 147:8 | 162:23 |
| 168:1 170:3,5,9 | 63:2,21,25 64:18 | 162:13 169:15 | 147:13,13,15,16 | clearer 111:11 |
| 170:21,23 171:4 | 64:21 65:3 66:5 | child-centred | 147:19,20 148:1 | 114:22 |
| 171:12 172:14,18 | 66:10 67:2 68:3 | 20:15 | 151:23 152:11 | clearly 66:2 77:1 |
| 173:11,13 174:4 | 68:10,10,15,18,23 | childcare 20:11 | 154:5,18,25 155:4 | 81:4 144:22 |
| challenge 22:14 | 68:25 69:20 70:11 | childcare- 20:16 | 155:19 156:23 | 151:22 158:25 |
| 104:1 | 70:13,16,17,24 | Childline 88:18 | 157:2 162:4 | 160:22 162:8,21 |
| challenged 15:7 | 71:9,22 72:2,3,14 | 133:1 155:23 | 164:10,15 165:12 | 163:2 |
| 98:5 | 72:17 73:4,7,8,21 | children 1:10 2:13 | 165:18,23 166:13 | clerk 116:17 |
| challenges 9:22 | 75:3,7,9 76:6 | 2:16 3:8,10,22 4:5 | 166:16,20 172:5 | 125:24 |
| 100:20 149:14 | 77:23 78:8,21 | 5:23 6:4,5,8,19,21 | 172:16,19 173:1 | close 32:13 119:17 |
| challenging 98:5 | 80:17 81:13 83:13 | 7:5,8,9,15,21 8:15 | children's 3:12 7:2 | closer 33:19 |
| 100:12 159:25 | 85:15,17 86:4,6,9 | 9:2,3,4,4,5,5,6 | 8:12,19 18:23 | closing 7:7 |
| 160:3 | 86:13,21,23 88:10 | 11:11 14:3 16:21 | 20:13 23:12 47:11 | closure 7:8 10:16 |
| change 50:4 70:4 | 88:18,19,24 89:1 | 18:13,15,19,20 | 51:3 55:25 61:22 | clothes 23:25 |
| 106:4 140:19,20 | 90:18 94:6 95:9 | 19:19,22 21:20 | 71:4 95:6 130:10 | coherent 149:16 |
| 165:17 | 95:12,20,24 96:1 | 22:13,21 23:2 | 130:15 149:4 | collate 61:1 |
| changed 4:10 7:10 | 101:19,25 102:10 | 25:12 26:3,9,19 | 171:21,23 | colleague 114:15 |
| 8:3 9:15 51:10 | 103:22 108:7 | 26:23 27:6 28:17 | choice 75:21 87:1 | 146:1 148:10 |
| 118:18 173:9 | 112:10,14 115:5 | 28:18 30:5 32:6 | 88:7 135:18,24 | colleagues 35:7 |
| changes 7:24 22:2 | 116:4,18,22 119:1 | 32:18 33:8,12,19 | chose 132:18 | 128:11 |
| 22:3 120:16 156:9 | 119:4,7,12,14,23 | 33:23,24 34:3,14 | churn 22:8 48:24 | collect 43:18 44:1 |
| changing 10:1 | 120:24 121:10,15 | 35:6 43:4,13 44:7 | circulated 2:3 | collected 43:2 |
| 45:23 | 121:16 122:1,7,22 | 45:4,5,12 46:2 | circumstance 87:24 | College 20:1 |
| chaotic 12:12 30:6 | 123:9 131:7 134:5 | 47:12,12 48:3,8 | circumstances | column 109:1 |
| chaplain 28:7 | 135:19 137:6 | 49:13 50:21 52:8 | 68:12 94:6 100:12 | combined 28:25 |
| 156:6 | 138:8 140:16 | 52:8 54:24 55:9 | 125:11 | combining 28:16 |
| charge 12:13 | 141:25 143:20 | 55:24 56:10,17 | civil 140:10 | come 9:10 11:1,20 |
| chasing 36:24 | 144:16 146:3 | 62:14,24 63:20,24 | Clackson 171:6 | 12:8 13:8 15:24 |
| CHAT 172:7 | 147:7 152:7 154:1 | 64:1,11 65:13 | clarification 50:11 | 18:5 19:16,17,20 |
| check 10:2 38:18 | 156:10,17 157:4,6 | 67:6,8 68:20 69:9 | 170:9 | 19:25 22:13 24:18 |
| checked 136:25 | 157:11,15,20 | 70:23 71:19 73:11 | clarity 10:2 111:22 | 26:14 30:5 33:8 |
| chief 2:22,23 3:2 | 158:1,5,6,10 | 73:24 74:14,18,25 | 114:25 | 44:2 66:15 68:20 |
| 22:22 37:20 40:13 | 159:15 161:20 | 77:18 78:15 81:8 | Clarke 2:22 37:20 | 97:25 102:16 |
| | | | <u> </u> | l |

| 107:25 112:6 | |
|--|----------|
| | 16.79 |
| | 10.7,7 |
| 120:11 124:24 | ality |
| 125:3 126:25 companies 14:2,20 63:19 74:12 170:19 172:6 71:7 | inty |
| 129:8 138:8 comparability 51:4 completely 39:23 concerning 102:6 configure 6 | 56-22 |
| 139:19 147:16 comparable 13:5 62:21 63:18 67:10 162:7 confirm 81 | |
| 156:12 comparator 33:12 103:1 105:20 concerns 3:25 confirmed | |
| comes 14:22 22:20 comparators 107:6 138:25 13:10,17,20 20:20 144:6 170 | |
| 72:21 90:15 92:10 103:23 139:11,12 153:20 20:22 24:17 36:1 confirming | |
| 135:14 compare 28:17 completeness 96:2 36:2,6,8,10 37:21 171:24 | ; 1/1.22 |
| comfortable 95:20 compared 56:4 108:19,25 110:9 46:19 60:18 65:19 conflict 66: | . 2 2 |
| 116:5 65:13 142:5 128:5 131:23 65:23 76:16 81:25 67:15 71: | |
| | |
| 0 1 / | 1,12 |
| 18:15,17 19:24 | 15.22 |
| 30:6 34:16 47:9 | |
| 58:18 68:16 88:9 complain 115:21 49:22 78:17,18 130:14 133:17 confused 1 | |
| 123:15 147:14 complaining 153:3 122:14 154:23 148:23 150:18 connected | 102:21 |
| commas 94:17 complaint 34:11 complexities 62:22 154:3,14 159:14 115:14 | (0.6 |
| commend 50:19 35:16 55:17 58:3 compliance 70:5 159:17,21 162:3 connection | |
| commended 122:11 64:19 76:13 77:6 complicated 84:16 163:25 connection | |
| 166:2 77:7,13 115:18 155:2 concise 129:24 conscious 1 | |
| comment 37:24 116:21,23 117:3 complicating 74:3 conclude 2:2 consequence | |
| 42:14 46:7 61:25 117:13,20 119:8 complication 59:22 concluded 100:25 consequence | |
| 63:14 74:15 80:11 | |
| 117:25 118:4 | |
| 124:4,5 143:22 | |
| comments 24:13,22 154:10,13 156:3 comprehensive 56:15 149:12 143:18 15 | |
| 43:21 44:23 49:14 162:13 167:2 172:7 150:6 161:17 17 | |
| 67:9 130:7 168:18 compulsory 107:9 conclusions 56:8,21 considerations 56:8,21 consider | |
| Commissionercomplaints 27:16computers 26:11conditions 3:8 13:264:15 98: | _ |
| 171:21,23 29:8,10 65:20 concern 9:18 15:2 42:19 124:2 considered | 115:18 |
| committed 7:16 74:12,19 76:2,3 66:17 69:20 79:10 conduct 51:25 147:17 | |
| Committee's 37:23 76:17,21 77:6,11 80:17 81:3 83:4 98:24 156:10 considers 1 | |
| 37:25 77:20,24 115:3,4 85:20 87:16 90:17 157:14 170:16 consistency | , |
| common 5:10 75:6 115:7 116:11,17 100:7 102:9 conducted 43:14 90:20 130 | |
| 130:19 166:15 | 9:7 |
| communicate 118:4,14 122:7 115:16 121:12 conducting 93:16 62:19,21 | |
| 73:16 87:1 125:24 131:3 122:2 137:12,17 confidence 21:22 consistently | • |
| communicated 132:18 153:25 137:19 138:23 26:3,5,9 31:10 30:16 56: | |
| 137:7 154:2,11 156:4 139:3 150:17 137:9 149:1 consolidate | ed |
| communicating 161:8,20 168:20 151:11 152:9 160:13 150:12 | |
| 73:25 171:10 158:1 160:18 confident 6:8 21:20 construct 3 | 4:13 |
| communities 33:19 complement 78:19 162:10,14,15 95:21 117:6 118:3 contact 18: | 13 34:10 |
| community 7:11 | 9,18 |
| 9:5,16 18:24 45:5 67:10 99:2 105:2 37:7 59:16 63:10 confidential 32:21 74:1 87:1 | 4 100:15 |
| 105:5,13,24 106:2 106:4 125:16 64:12,18 67:25 32:25 63:18 64:2 137:19 13 | 38:2,8 |
| | |

| 142:17 167:18 | 55:14 56:19 57:20 | CPs 1:25 | 60:2 62:22 68:16 | 74:16 102:13 |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|
| contacted 91:3 | 59:3 64:23 65:20 | CQC 39:19 50:17 | 69:2,2 76:21 | 111:4 116:23 |
| contained 63:22 | 70:6 79:14,20 | create 149:17 | 88:25,25 93:17 | 119:10 168:21 |
| content 55:21 | 83:5 89:11,21 | creates 141:14,15 | 98:24 114:24 | debate 160:11 |
| contents 168:10 | 91:11 96:21,22 | creating 69:8 | 116:13 142:4 | debrief 68:2,6 69:4 |
| context 33:5,7 | 97:6 99:2 101:17 | creation 44:25 | 143:20,24 147:9 | 70:1 121:4 |
| 37:24 76:6 80:22 | 102:12 104:9,13 | credibility 132:18 | 164:13 172:5 | debriefing 69:17 |
| 87:6 122:16 | 106:9 109:4 | 132:21 | | December 42:11 |
| 131:14,20 134:9 | 110:14 111:14 | crime 7:22 | D | 81:2 |
| 138:21 139:15,25 | 112:20 114:9 | criminal 7:12,12 | D 99:15 174:3 | decide 82:15 |
| 141:6 143:21 | 129:7,16,23 | 18:23 140:10 | damage 73:12 | 158:24 |
| 163:11,13 | 130:13,16 132:7 | critical 15:11 | danger 45:10 | deciding 72:2 82:12 |
| continually 20:14 | 133:12 134:25 | criticism 170:15 | dangers 46:23 | decision 24:20 25:4 |
| continued 5:18 | 145:22,25 146:5 | cross 93:5 94:19 | data 15:4,11 26:16 | 70:12 75:20 79:25 |
| 102:1 128:19,20 | 147:12,21,22 | cross-referenced | 44:1,8 | 80:3 82:17 85:6 |
| 150:13 174:13,14 | 148:2 152:14,19 | 87:21 | date 42:4 57:10,17 | 87:13,25 88:12 |
| continues 13:13 | 160:12 161:16 | cross-referencing | 114:16 | 90:2 112:6 127:7 |
| 40:7 149:16 | 162:1,17 164:3 | 61:21 66:11 145:4 | dated 36:11 37:20 | 159:23 160:6,7 |
| continuing 150:14 | correctly 112:17 | crucial 38:3 | 49:11 97:7 128:1 | decision-making |
| contract 14:19 16:2 | 157:19 | culture 165:16 | 168:3 170:20 | 72:5 |
| 65:21 | correspondence | 166:1 | 171:6,15,16,21 | decisions 70:25 |
| contractors 15:15 | 52:25 | current 2:12 11:22 | 172:3,12 173:3 | 81:5 82:11 87:20 |
| contracts 14:23 | corridors 32:18 | 13:16 15:3 17:23 | dates 109:5 129:13 | 112:7,12 135:15 |
| 15:3,4,7,14 | corroborating | 18:8 19:15 25:2 | 134:16 136:15 | declaring 154:4,6 |
| contrast 100:11 | 83:12 | 25:21 28:15 45:7 | 173:6 | decline 6:25 37:13 |
| contribute 2:16 | Council 170:13,15 | 51:10 60:7 100:22 | day 9:14 17:16 30:3 | 37:15 |
| contribution 2:17 | counsel 1:16 52:23 | 108:7,15 | 30:3,9,9,18 31:21 | dedicate 47:8 |
| control 13:12,13,23 | count 165:9 | currently 3:11 | 52:18 132:19 | dedicated 118:8,9 |
| 67:4 71:17 72:19 | County 170:13,15 | 16:25 20:17 22:1 | 157:13 | 118:18 147:2,2,10 |
| 95:16 96:1 139:7 | couple 1:17 3:19 | 28:25 50:7 118:10 | day-to-day 8:21 | 157:11 |
| 139:22 | 24:10 58:7 118:19 | CuSP 115:10 | 18:13 46:1 | deemed 77:8 |
| controlling 139:9 | 131:2 | 155:16 | days 152:6 | 142:12 |
| convene 122:21 | course 12:9,10,10 | custodial 1:10 3:21 | deal 1:14 50:2 53:8 | deescalate 69:14 |
| convenient 93:4 | 17:14 107:14,17 | 7:3,14 12:7 14:3 | 53:25 64:14 65:5 | default 90:12 |
| conversation | 108:24 122:3 | 17:1 18:19,24 | 72:10 74:6 89:14 | 143:18 144:20 |
| 159:24 | 123:12,14 124:10 | 20:13,25 21:7 | 103:9 105:10,12 | deficiency 161:11 |
| Cookham 11:6 | 128:4 158:9 | 33:22 35:5,12 | 105:22 116:25 | define 154:18 |
| 25:11 | 160:12,14 | 42:7 44:25 45:11 | 118:13 122:1 | defined 81:5 |
| coordinators | courts 40:19 94:3 | 63:17 | 127:4 128:13 | 144:22 |
| 121:19 | cover 13:9 16:25 | custody 3:3 5:22 | 135:8 138:18 | definitely 17:3 |
| copied 172:17 | 169:21 | 7:10,15 8:10,13 | dealing 55:13 76:11 | 77:17 107:19 |
| core 1:19 2:4 43:15 | coverage 16:7,10 | 11:12 26:19 33:10 | 121:24 156:22 | 108:4 166:20 |
| 62:6 65:16 94:18 | 82:8,14 83:8,17 | 33:17 34:3 43:11 | 172:22 | definition 88:2 |
| 156:25 | 84:18 92:3 | 45:4 47:5,12,13 | deals 101:12 | 135:13 144:17 |
| corporately 127:11 | covered 84:11 | 50:22 51:13,16 | dealt 20:18 27:16 | defuse 23:17 |
| correct 13:18 32:20 | CP 121:12 122:23 | 54:25 56:10 59:23 | 59:9,11 66:18 | degree 106:22 |
| | I | | <u> </u> | I |

| | | | 1 | |
|----------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|
| 161:20 164:20,23 | detached 72:9 | differently 31:1 | disclosures 155:4 | 128:8 |
| degrees 19:25 | detail 3:4 28:21,22 | 40:12 48:15 64:21 | 171:24 | drafting 51:9 |
| delay 52:18 134:23 | 58:1 59:12 106:15 | difficult 11:20 | discourage 26:1 | draw 18:22 49:7 |
| delayed 36:17 | 115:2 133:23 | 12:11 14:4 20:13 | 166:16 | 152:22 159:6 |
| 102:2 | 137:10 168:7 | 22:10,15 25:17 | discouraged 155:1 | drawn 70:21 76:22 |
| delaying 102:5 | 172:9 173:5 | 33:10 63:5 64:2 | discuss 20:6 138:14 | 160:18 |
| delays 36:21 37:2 | detailed 43:20 | 72:22 73:11,19 | discussed 114:15 | drew 36:5 74:15 |
| deliver 10:19 | 128:2 139:16 | 75:8 77:4 83:5 | discussing 37:21 | 131:9 |
| 100:22 | 151:4 | 95:23 106:11 | discussion 23:20,22 | drill 57:2 |
| delivered 15:9,25 | details 49:12 | 126:14 138:16 | 71:15 | drip 73:17,17,18 |
| delivery 164:23 | 148:15 | 140:22 149:15 | dismissed 125:12 | driver 143:10 |
| demonstrable 5:15 | detained 43:5 | 163:22 | disparity 56:3 | driving 34:23 |
| demonstrably 50:2 | 133:4 | difficulties 22:7 | 65:12 | drop 140:18 |
| demonstrates | detainee 138:20 | 51:23 64:6 81:10 | disposals 7:13 | Drusilla 1:8 |
| 153:25 158:10 | detected 15:7 | 92:10 | dispute 23:24 | due 15:2 63:18 |
| denial 60:23 75:25 | detention 2:13 | difficulty 99:9 | distance 17:22 34:4 | 79:14 108:17,24 |
| 164:1 | detrimental 11:13 | dire 4:6 | 34:12 85:11 | 128:3 |
| denied 74:14,19 | developed 98:21 | direct 5:25 6:15 | distill 94:8 | Duke 106:3 |
| denominator 7:19 | developments | 20:24 21:2 116:19 | distracted 162:12 | duty 44:2 45:8 |
| denying 75:9 139:1 | 40:23 141:8 | 117:5 126:21 | diverse 90:16 | 116:24 121:3 |
| department 154:12 | develops 21:18 | 166:19 | diversion 7:11 | 157:12,21,23 |
| 158:20 161:13,17 | dialogue 158:16 | directly 50:7 81:7 | document 46:8 | 167:10 |
| 161:23 162:16 | 159:1,4 | 140:8 | 57:21 79:5 110:16 | dynamic 25:3 |
| 167:9 | dick 132:15 | director 8:9 114:13 | 111:11,20,21 | 167:12,23 |
| departments 61:23 | difference 33:13 | 116:13 172:12 | 112:4,18,18 | · |
| depending 90:19 | 35:1 76:16 92:24 | directors 8:12 | 114:22 | E |
| 121:2 157:13 | 166:4,5 | directs 106:13 | documentation | E 174:3 |
| depends 32:13 | differences 39:15 | disadvantages | 61:8,15 87:5 | earlier 7:1 29:23 |
| deputy 2:23 116:13 | 40:4 | 78:23 | 99:13 156:25 | 84:13 89:8 109:11 |
| 121:6 143:11 | different 4:17 9:4 | disagreed 159:22 | documented 98:17 | 114:15 128:6 |
| 169:1,7 | 14:19 15:12 21:10 | disappointing | 112:5,16 121:17 | 129:9 130:8 |
| describe 2:11 4:10 | 28:5,11,14,15,20 | 150:23 | documents 38:24 | 143:17,25,25 |
| 49:8 | 31:3 35:18 36:10 | disclose 95:6 115:5 | 49:4 57:22 61:7 | 144:19 145:3 |
| described 7:1 44:12 | 38:13 39:7,9,18 | 119:1 154:1 | 62:6 84:9 92:23 | 148:11 150:2 |
| 120:16 | 42:5,12 46:16,21 | 155:21 163:20 | 110:15 132:10,13 | early 3:23 4:12 |
| describes 3:1,21 | 48:15,17 49:9 | 164:5 | doing 5:3 13:16,19 | 22:24 104:4 |
| 24:3 | 50:14,15,23,23 | disclosed 58:12 | 28:25 43:7 46:20 | 111:18 151:1 |
| deserves 10:20 | 51:2,2 54:9 57:14 | 117:3 | 81:23 92:13,14 | 152:6 |
| design 11:17 | 61:1,2,2 62:22 | discloses 63:21 | 98:25 123:7,7 | earned 105:24 |
| designed 28:14 | 65:8 66:6 67:23 | 157:20 | door 140:1 164:4 | easier 130:17 |
| 42:21 43:10,12 | 69:1 77:7 79:5 | disclosing 26:1 | double 98:7,20 | easily 66:3 |
| 50:15 103:14 | 87:6 97:11,22 | 153:3 | 126:13 | easy 22:10 32:4,4 |
| 111:18 | 100:8 109:2 113:8 | disclosure 25:25 | doubt 100:12 | 33:7 46:24 72:6 |
| despite 85:10 | 113:9 120:17,19 | 79:3 81:11 119:4 | 109:19 | eating 9:13 |
| destroyed 126:2,3 | 136:15 138:9 | 131:10,16 156:15 | doubts 132:17 | Edinburgh 106:3 |
| destruction 126:2 | 157:18 | 156:15,23 | draft 50:18 113:24 | education 16:9 |
| | l | | | |

| | | | | Tage 102 |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| 115:11 | England 4:4 114:1 | 101:22 102:4 | evident 145:4 | exist 3:11 61:22 |
| effect 95:5 103:7 | 172:3 | 146:15 147:24 | exact 114:16 124:4 | existing 107:15 |
| 104:16 151:2 | enhanced 98:3,12 | 152:17 153:8 | exactly 78:24 | exists 72:3 |
| 166:19 | 105:24 146:18 | 157:18,25 163:7 | examination 2:10 | expect 18:16 19:19 |
| effectively 36:4 | 157:17 | establishments | 53:16 74:17 88:24 | 19:21,23 25:19 |
| 45:9 73:13,22 | ensure 12:21 17:14 | 5:18 11:1 20:21 | 96:18 128:20 | 41:19 94:16 |
| effectiveness 39:15 | 17:17 30:13 45:5 | 38:16 49:9 103:8 | 145:19 152:22 | 169:18 |
| efforts 151:4 | 47:20 107:18 | 114:3,6 124:7 | 174:6,9,11,14,16 | expectation 20:7 |
| 152:16 | 123:8 124:14 | 125:4 163:17 | examine 60:22 | 70:10 100:23 |
| eight 8:23 146:20 | 147:7 154:25 | estate 3:21 5:4 7:3 | examined 62:12 | expected 56:13,15 |
| either 7:25 10:18 | ensures 98:25 | 17:3,6 20:22 | 80:15 81:10 | 69:21 101:24 |
| 116:12 117:14 | ensuring 90:6 | 34:14 35:12 49:21 | 135:23 | 134:4 |
| 134:9 161:13 | 104:25 | 50:1,3 114:7 | examining 94:14 | expecting 13:6 |
| electronically | entails 12:7 | ethos 149:18 | example 5:2 9:19 | 66:23 88:10 |
| 125:18 | entire 67:5 70:18 | Evans 1:8 51:19 | 11:12 24:17 27:16 | expense 151:3 |
| element 94:18 | 71:9,9 73:9 | 52:10,13 166:24 | 41:10 58:1,15,24 | experience 8:21 |
| 139:8 146:18 | entirely 72:25 | 167:25 | 58:25 64:22 82:23 | 12:5,15 18:5 23:3 |
| 151:12 154:10 | entirety 62:14 77:3 | events 73:20 | 84:13 85:4 87:5 | 25:13 30:17 33:8 |
| 164:15 | 78:19 94:14 | eventually 126:1 | 92:15 93:11,12 | 33:15 47:4 55:16 |
| elements 56:22 | entrants 12:22 | everybody 116:2 | 94:12,13 96:4 | 60:21 66:21 67:12 |
| 69:4 72:16 164:20 | entry 12:5,9 13:4 | 119:22 140:24 | 98:19 100:4 | 67:17 69:13 70:7 |
| elicit 60:3 | 19:20 80:16 134:1 | everyday 5:10 6:6 | 113:21 125:11 | 72:18 73:5,7 78:8 |
| elicited 53:23 59:7 | 134:6 | 6:18 8:16 11:4 | 131:9 136:21,22 | 93:16 95:14,17 |
| 130:24 | envelope 116:11 | 30:8 31:9 | 143:7 149:9 155:8 | 131:20 137:6 |
| Elizabeth 171:16 | envelopes 116:10 | evidence 1:12,21 | 157:3 159:9 161:3 | 138:15 140:12 |
| else's 9:6 | environment 12:12 | 2:3 14:5,6 24:5 | 172:6 | experienced 56:17 |
| embedded 119:19 | 18:17 22:10 67:14 | 35:5 43:2 53:19 | example's 92:1 | 77:2 |
| 157:5 | 160:8 | 54:10 62:5,11 | examples 35:9 | experiences 60:7 |
| emerge 54:11 68:24 | environments | 66:13 67:21 69:22 | 60:25 61:4 64:10 | 68:17,25 70:23 |
| emergency 31:2,5 | 18:18 30:6 | 74:20 76:16 81:3 | 77:15,17 78:2 | 71:6,14 134:2 |
| emotional 73:15 | episode 67:17 | 81:9 82:19 83:10 | 80:8 81:20 83:17 | experiencing 139:7 |
| emotions 73:10,10 | equally 14:9 39:4 | 84:2,2,21 85:7,16 | 131:2,4,25 132:5 | expert 1:13 |
| emphasis 107:23 | 164:16 | 86:8,11,15,22 | 132:9 134:14,18 | expertise 18:21,25 |
| employed 147:3 | equipping 18:3 | 87:14 88:1 91:12 | 135:15 142:3 | explain 22:17 95:11 |
| enable 34:15 | equivalent 8:18 | 94:3 95:1 96:22 | Excellent 26:17 | explained 103:13 |
| enabling 68:10,25 | equivalents 22:12 | 100:23 102:2,8 | exception 129:19 | 135:17 156:8 |
| 72:14 | escalate 71:2 | 112:16 125:9 | exchange 160:9 | explanation 74:23 |
| encouragement | escalates 73:21 | 127:22 129:21 | exemplified 133:13 | 75:12 79:16 80:3 |
| 163:24 | escalating 72:10 | 138:10 143:17 | exercising 94:5 | 88:12 137:3 143:2 |
| encourages 160:9 | especially 148:8 | 146:2,5 151:16 | exhibit 103:15,18 | 144:2 |
| endeavour 2:5 | essence 70:14 | 152:21 156:19 | 108:21 109:9,20 | explanations 145:3 |
| endeavoured 107:1 | essential 70:25 | 157:1 169:7,14 | 109:23 113:22 | explicit 62:2 |
| ended 67:22 78:13 | establish 160:8 | 171:4,13 172:11 | 149:24 172:25 | explicitly 140:16 |
| endless 115:13 | establishment 4:3 | 173:12 | exhibited 172:21 | expose 71:8 |
| engage 20:8 107:2 | 10:23 11:2 12:21 | evidencing 76:5 | exhibits 99:12 | exposed 70:18 |
| engaging 55:17 | 34:25 35:2 38:20 | 149:7 | 172:18 | exposure 90:10 |
| | l | l | l | l |

| | 161.25 | 01.17.05.17.06.24 | 22.0 11 27 20 21 | 56.0 (0.10 120 6 |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| expressed 102:9,18 | 161:25 | 91:17 95:17 96:24 | 33:9,11 36:20,21 | 56:9 69:18 128:6 |
| 154:14 | fairly 25:3 27:17 | 97:3,10,11,13,13 | 37:3 38:10 46:20 | 130:10 136:13 |
| expression 17:20 | 29:8 30:6 124:11 | 97:16,19,23,24 | 83:5,13 137:25 | foot 136:10 |
| extended 16:11 | 147:17 168:18,21 | 98:21 99:6 100:11 | 160:12 | footage 85:11 |
| extent 70:10 78:10 | fairness 89:8 | 100:20 101:6 | finding 99:9 | footing 40:16,21 |
| 100:10 107:8 | 113:23 115:19 | 102:16 103:8 | findings 3:25 43:1 | 41:1 |
| external 34:9 45:24 | 165:24 168:2 | 104:12 105:7 | 66:19 101:21 | force 5:17 22:21 |
| 46:13,16 81:17 | faith 28:7 30:23 | 106:8,17,20 108:8 | 102:17 148:9 | 100:3 102:1 104:4 |
| 147:6 | familiar 168:10 | 109:24 114:14,18 | 173:10 | 122:21 150:23 |
| externalising 60:2 | family 27:3,5,8 | 115:9 117:2,10 | first 1:9,16 2:7 3:1 | 151:13 159:10 |
| externally 135:23 | 31:17,18,20,25 | 118:8,9,24 119:5 | 3:13 7:4 11:25 | forgive 59:13 66:17 |
| extract 103:18 | 32:4,10,20,21,24 | 120:2,10 121:8 | 12:4 13:9 15:1 | 78:3 89:17 109:17 |
| 132:12 | 33:3,6,9,14 34:8 | 122:10 123:2 | 16:13 21:19 46:11 | 110:10 128:25 |
| extreme 94:6 | 156:12 | 124:5,16 125:3 | 64:15 87:7 106:19 | 135:3,5 148:4 |
| extremely 93:12 | far 1:25 16:25 37:7 | 127:3,4,12,21 | 128:23 132:1 | form 9:3 15:12 |
| F | 59:15 67:25 163:4 | 129:2 154:15 | 133:16 137:16 | 24:2 25:21 38:7,8 |
| - | 170:19 172:5 | Feltham-related | 148:16,22 | 60:8 74:14,21 |
| face 87:22 117:13 faced 9:8 100:20 | fashion 37:1 | 91:9 | Firstly 24:5 59:10 | 75:3 76:21 77:20 |
| | fault 163:3 | female 58:5 132:14 | fish 75:10 | 77:24 78:3,3 |
| faces 149:14 | favourable 148:12 | fifth 63:6 80:23 | fit 25:20 83:14 | 81:14 113:1,10,18 |
| facilitate 33:20,23 | feature 30:8 | 84:24 88:13 135:1 | five 36:17 37:2 | 115:3,19,20,22 |
| facilities 3:8 | February 4:2 37:21 | 141:20,22 | 126:4,17 136:15 | 116:6,10,14 |
| fact 16:21 40:14 | 39:1 48:7 49:11 | figure 33:5 158:5 | 165:2 168:16 | 125:15,23,24 |
| 59:13 60:1 63:16 | 134:17 148:8 | figures 27:2 37:14 | fix 51:6,8 | 129:23 147:22,24 |
| 63:18 72:2,9 73:3 | 168:25 170:20 | 41:17 | flag 123:11 | 153:22,25 154:2,3 |
| 84:5,14 85:10 | feel 16:22 29:8,10 | file 26:12 169:3 | flagged 161:12 | 154:16,22,25 |
| 86:11 92:8 103:18 | 70:18 72:14 86:17 | filed 125:25 | flavour 57:23 | 155:1 156:4,5 |
| 123:23 128:8,25 | 86:20 116:4 117:2 | files 51:25 125:10 | flesh 103:12 | formal 40:21 70:1 |
| 139:5 140:25 | 117:23 142:3 | 125:14,17,17,22 | fleshed 136:17 | formally 49:4 |
| 142:3 148:21 | 144:13 164:5 | fill 77:19,23 | flourish 9:4 | 108:19 109:20 |
| 151:12,25 153:1 | 168:18 | filled 70:6 74:22 | focus 15:8 16:17 | 127:23 128:5 |
| 154:14 157:9 | feeling 16:8 95:20 | 78:10,11 112:18 | 20:15 22:3 47:20 | 148:4 170:8,16,24 |
| 160:23 169:17,21 | 141:11 | 116:17 | 78:2 103:23 | format 25:2 |
| factor 31:18 65:5 | feelings 8:19 | filling 74:19 131:19 | 104:23 120:24 | formed 55:25 |
| 74:3 75:6 84:16 | felt 3:24 27:19 | filter 25:1 | 150:13 162:5 | forms 24:5,13 |
| factors 25:25 90:9 | 29:12 59:18 63:4 | filtered 24:19 | focused 57:17 | 60:12 70:6 74:12 |
| 94:15 | 75:11 86:4 98:13 | final 13:16 15:10 | focusing 18:12 23:8 | 76:14 78:9,12 |
| factual 74:2 | 133:13 136:17 | 46:10,11 58:24 | follow 38:14 52:2 | 116:1 125:8 153:2 |
| factually 73:14 | Feltham 11:5 32:16 | 70:9 94:24 113:22 | 65:20 79:14 | 153:18 |
| failing 100:22 | 46:5 53:25 54:12 | finalised 114:10,17 | 122:22 130:17 | forward 43:16 |
| failure 38:5 101:2 | 57:4,8,14 59:9,11 | finally 49:7 56:2 | follow-up 69:22 | 44:24 77:22 |
| 162:22 | 59:14 60:9 63:11 | 84:24 91:12 96:2 | 121:4 164:17 | 117:12 164:2 |
| fair 13:12 71:23 | 64:11 65:15 69:7 | 111:15 141:19 | followed 69:21 | found 14:16 34:5 |
| 76:1 78:6,7 87:18 | 77:16 79:9 80:8 | 171:20 172:1,11 | 76:4 81:16 87:17 | 47:25 77:2 105:8 |
| 87:19 107:4 | 80:22 81:1,20 | 173:3 | 160:24 | 151:7 |
| 108:25 120:21 | 85:2 89:18 91:6 | find 14:13,14 33:6 | following 40:24 | foundation 106:22 |
| | <u> </u> | | l | |

| 164 20 22 | 102 (104 11 | 24 0 24 2 40 7 | 07.2.00.14.22 | 145 17 10 20 |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| 164:20,23 | 102:6 104:11 | 24:9 34:3 40:7 | 87:2 89:14,22 | 145:17,18,20 |
| four 14:25 39:10 | 143:20 149:20 | 43:3 53:19 54:10 | 90:8,22 91:13 | 146:1 148:4 |
| fourth 51:12 | 150:16 161:10 | 57:22,25 95:3 | 99:18 108:23 | 151:16 153:19 |
| fragmented 51:14 | 164:6 168:20 | 96:22 98:19 | 117:12 129:17 | 160:20 164:7 |
| frame 55:5 | 169:20 172:9 | 105:19 108:1 | 130:22 135:5,25 | 166:7 170:3,4,6 |
| framed 131:6 162:5 | 173:5 | 114:22 143:7 | 136:3,9 139:13 | 174:15 |
| framework 4:16,17 | furthering 169:16 | 144:17 146:2 | 141:21 146:13 | governance 46:12 |
| 38:25 39:10 41:23 | future 17:22 88:11 | 172:14 | 148:16,17,21 | 46:14 47:22 104:5 |
| 50:13,16,16,18 | 168:21 | given 17:25 20:16 | 149:24,25 150:3,4 | 121:7 122:11 |
| 72:5 112:4 | | 50:5 51:11 56:3 | 150:16 151:5 | governing 96:23 |
| frameworks 39:9 | $\frac{\mathbf{G}}{\mathbf{G}_{10}}$ | 61:14,15 76:6 | 154:11 157:9,25 | government 122:5 |
| 51:10,10,13 78:18 | G4S 13:11,13 | 80:17 81:7,16 | 162:23 163:18 | governor 96:23 |
| frank 1:7 36:23 | G4S's 13:15 | 85:11,17 86:17 | goes 4:7 7:20 36:23 | 114:18 116:12,24 |
| 99:8,17 126:7,8 | gain 78:11 141:3 | 90:9 92:1,15 | 76:23 78:1 82:1 | 121:3,6,6 122:19 |
| 126:11,20,24 | gang 133:5,5,7 | 94:12 96:4 105:10 | 88:1 100:19 | 127:6,6 143:11 |
| 127:4,14 160:9 | 138:21 139:15 | 105:22 106:9 | 156:16 172:14 | 145:23 154:15 |
| 168:1,2,10,14 | 163:11,16,18 | 107:8 108:16 | going 16:19 30:9,11 | 156:3 157:12,21 |
| 169:7,11,13,20 | gangs 133:6 139:8 | 115:3,23 119:7,8 | 30:19,22 31:13,14 | 157:24 160:12 |
| 170:1 | 139:21 163:10,15 | 119:10 125:21 | 41:19 47:23 65:4 | 163:6 167:10 |
| free 116:2 120:11 | 163:22 | 137:3,8 139:15,18 | 74:21 78:10 79:22 | 169:2,8 |
| frequency 40:2 | gap 60:5 77:12 | 139:25 140:15 | 83:1 84:14 86:19 | grabbed 58:20 |
| frequently 44:7 | 79:18 86:25 136:7 | 143:23 151:16 | 87:2 95:18,20 | grabs 132:15 |
| 49:18 | gaps 17:2,3,4,5,5,6 | 156:22 162:6,9 | 101:10 108:11 | grade 4:22 8:18 |
| friction 149:10 | 118:22 | 167:11 172:3,16 | 114:17 127:22 | 104:8 127:6 |
| Friday 168:4 | GCSEs 19:20 | 172:19 173:1 | 133:16 138:7,11 | grasp 131:21 |
| friends 31:17,18,20 | general 13:23 | giver 9:7 | 140:16 164:14 | grateful 1:22 53:3 |
| 31:25 32:5,10 | 36:21 37:17 59:10 | gives 42:22 49:12 | gold 106:1 146:19 | greater 34:17 41:6 |
| friendship 98:22 | 76:12 97:2 117:11 | 73:22 109:12 | good 1:4 4:14,14,19 | 104:2 |
| front 26:16 72:11 | 118:2,17 119:21 | 160:2,13 | 4:23 10:23 13:15 | grew 9:9 |
| frontline 8:15 | 127:3 170:18 | giving 125:8 | 14:9,14,14 17:21 | ground 40:3 |
| 164:24 | generally 3:13 | GK 110:11 | 19:15 20:10 28:13 | grounds 143:5,13 |
| full 23:25 128:11 | 10:15 20:19 95:7 | GK1 103:15 108:21 | 33:9 40:11 44:15 | group 12:6 17:13 |
| 136:18 | 129:18,23 140:4 | GK2 103:18 | 49:21,25 50:2 | 17:21 93:24 |
| fully 71:24 97:16 | 153:15 162:11 | GK3 104:15 109:23 | 59:10 84:2 86:22 | 114:13 149:21 |
| 101:4 106:17,20 | 165:19 | GK6 110:16 | 100:17,18 102:24 | 171:20 |
| 107:9 | generic 52:13 53:22 | GK7 111:15 | 103:21 104:5,8 | guarantee 25:22 |
| fundamental 79:1 | 54:16 90:24 91:1 | GK8 113:22 | 129:21 130:8 | 31:8 |
| fundamentals | 115:20,25 116:6 | Glenn 96:16,17,19 | 141:10 148:25 | guess 127:5 |
| 45:25 | 143:22 144:15 | 174:10 | 149:12 150:8,25 | guessing 124:19 |
| funds 126:18 | 153:21 154:24 | glossary 109:15 | 151:10 152:7,8,12 | guidance 22:17 |
| further 1:12 7:9 | genitals 58:21 | go 6:9 7:18 9:11 | 164:21 169:11 | 56:22 |
| 17:19 21:25 34:7 | genuine 131:11,17 | 10:22 12:25 15:20 | 172:11 | guide 39:1 108:16 |
| 52:16 53:19 56:20 | genuineness 132:24 | 20:5 26:18 29:7 | good' 151:9 | |
| 63:14 74:3 80:20 | getting 12:17 37:17 | 30:14 38:18 45:20 | Good's 172:21 | Н |
| 81:9 85:25 87:3 | 43:8 165:9 | 52:21 65:11 71:12 | Gordon 170:7,18 | half 3:18 37:9 |
| 87:17 90:8 101:10 | give 3:4 16:1,19 | 76:1 80:10,22 | Gormley 128:17 | hall 32:25 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

| hand 52:3 58:19 | Havens 114:1 | 128:21 130:2 | HIP000012 2:23 | homes 20:13 51:3 |
|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|
| handle 86:24 | head 35:21 76:18 | 131:1 133:23 | HIP000017 2:24 | honest 106:5 |
| handovers 63:19 | 127:24 132:16 | 137:23 146:7 | HIP000018 2:21 | 114:12 115:24 |
| hands 68:10 | heading 54:18,24 | 152:21 153:19 | HIP000022 37:6 | hope 9:6 54:17 68:5 |
| handwriting | 57:9 79:6 90:24 | 155:3 158:17 | HIP00008 39:3 | 112:9 163:23 |
| 137:25 | 101:19 | 162:18 169:4 | historic 117:9 | 173:11 |
| hangover 50:20 | headings 54:22 | helped 20:14 103:6 | historical 48:21 | hoped 24:16 53:21 |
| happen 25:23 | 59:9,13 | helpful 26:16 62:10 | 79:7 80:1 | 134:21 170:25 |
| 71:15 73:5,20 | headline 109:23 | 62:17 64:5 65:2 | history 68:15 70:18 | 171:4 |
| 74:21 117:22 | health 59:1 79:13 | 69:11 75:4,12,19 | 71:9 90:10 161:20 | hopeful 161:14 |
| 121:2,8 125:18 | 79:15,18 100:17 | 77:23 79:21 | HM 99:25 109:24 | hopefully 57:25 |
| 135:16,21 138:6 | 172:7 | 135:17 139:4,15 | HMCIP 109:10,11 | hoping 54:10 97:1 |
| 139:12,24 140:23 | healthcare 39:13 | 139:17,24 143:23 | HMI 44:1 | hotline 35:19 |
| 141:17,17 144:18 | 100:17 107:3 | 153:11 | HMIP 38:25 40:20 | HOU000002 128:7 |
| 159:17,20 | 115:12 119:17 | helping 149:17 | 42:6 49:9 153:10 | HOU000003 58:9 |
| happened 8:22 | healthy 4:14 6:2,3 | helps 162:20 | 161:12 | 59:5 |
| 10:18 34:11 40:21 | 101:15 152:12 | herring 23:10 | HMIP's 41:7 | HOU000018 128:2 |
| 52:7,8 61:6 75:13 | hear 1:11,20 67:21 | hidden 50:22 | HMP 11:5 38:3 | Hounslow 110:17 |
| 77:5 84:22 87:23 | 73:11 128:17 | hides 51:3 | HMP000187 14:21 | 110:20 127:20 |
| 92:6 95:11 107:20 | 141:11 | high 9:25 10:8,8 | HMP000193 9:20 | 128:1,6,8 |
| 134:7,7 139:1 | heard 13:10 24:15 | 11:21 22:7,8 43:7 | HMP000405 148:5 | Hounslow's 128:2 |
| 158:8 | 42:8 76:15 82:19 | 56:16 67:15 80:18 | 152:1 | hours 102:7 173:6 |
| happening 21:19 | 95:1 106:23 115:2 | 104:1 124:11 | HMP000406 | housed 146:24 |
| 30:3,12,18 40:23 | 120:22 123:14 | 130:5 134:3 | 149:25 166:1 | housekeeping 1:18 |
| 44:18 48:10 72:12 | 128:9 166:12 | 150:20 151:14 | HMP000407 97:8 | Howe 43:15 44:20 |
| 73:11 108:17 | 172:8 | high-risk 84:15 | 103:10 | 44:24 52:19 76:23 |
| 144:25 | hearing 1:10,15 | higher 6:14 7:15 | HMP000408 | 83:22 94:25 |
| happens 23:23 39:8 | 49:22 173:15 | highest 10:6 56:12 | 108:22 | HR 60:19 |
| 73:21 75:21 | heart 71:19 | 151:9 | HMP000409 109:9 | huge 8:19,24 9:14 |
| 125:23 136:7 | Heathrow 124:9 | highlighted 65:10 | HMP000410 | 12:15 |
| 164:11 | height 139:25 | 74:13 112:1 | 109:23 | |
| happy 91:24 | heightened 73:10 | 135:22 | HMP000411 110:3 | <u> </u> |
| hard 61:5,23 62:15 | held 7:5,8 28:21 | highlighting 122:6 | HMP000413 110:9 | idea 124:18 140:21 |
| 63:17,22 64:8 | 32:17 33:19 34:7 | highlights 136:8 | HMP000414 | 169:9 |
| 73:16 78:9,15,22 | 34:15 42:19 46:15 | highly 23:3 | 111:15 | identified 54:17 |
| 81:18 82:16 83:13 | 87:13,20,24 | Hill 1:14,17 53:16 | HMP000415 | 69:10 78:4 82:20 |
| 83:18 90:21 92:6 | help 6:24 26:7,17 | 53:17 96:8,15,18 | 113:23 | 97:5 128:15,22 |
| 92:21 93:8 94:21 | 29:20 48:10 51:20 | 96:19 99:8,10,18 | HMPPS 7:25 14:22 | 138:2 144:24 |
| 95:13 131:21 | 76:21 81:2 82:9 | 123:20 127:17 | 46:7 101:6 114:1 | 150:8 155:19 |
| 149:6 | 86:5 89:24 91:12 | 128:20,21 145:7 | hold 4:5 25:15 34:2 | identifies 162:23 |
| harm 21:25 67:1 | 91:22 98:6 104:16 | 145:10,16,19,20 | 34:3 71:11 | identify 68:9 |
| 102:6 | 104:18 105:12 | 166:6 170:4 | holding 2:16 18:18 | identifying 167:5 |
| harmful 74:1 | 107:7 110:15,17 | 173:13 174:9,11 | 33:22 35:6 | illusion 47:1 |
| 142:20 | 112:12 113:10 | 174:14,16 | holistic 15:12 | imagine 48:18 |
| harming 95:15 | 117:8 118:7 120:4 | hindered 100:15 | home 3:12 7:9 | IMB 28:8 115:12 |
| harsh 72:9 | 122:1 123:22 | hints 140:19 | 33:16 34:5,7 | 161:13 |
| | | | l | |

| | | | | rage 100 |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| IMB000001 171:7 | improved 11:8 19:8 | 150:20,22 | 68:16 71:12 75:10 | INQ001442 3:16 |
| IMB000008 171:7 | 20:21 36:14 | increased 100:4 | 78:11 86:13 90:5 | INQ001442 5:10 INQ001453 11:10 |
| immediate 119:10 | 102:24 105:2 | 127:13 | 94:15 113:13 | INQ001457 49:5 |
| 157:16 | 151:8 | increasing 5:17,17 | 123:25 139:2,20 | INQ001457 001 |
| immediately 121:1 | improvement 4:20 | increment 124:13 | 154:2 171:16 | 148:16 |
| 158:3 167:3 | 5:14,15,20 10:5 | independent 1:5 | 172:6,16 173:5,7 | INQ001479 36:2 |
| impact 6:7 8:19,24 | 16:12 20:3 149:4 | 15:5 37:25 38:8 | information's | INQ001479 001 |
| 9:14 10:15,15,17 | 173:10 | 41:1 120:5 155:7 | 126:3 139:16 | 48:2 |
| 10:25 11:3,13 | improvements 5:6 | 155:12,15 160:25 | informed 133:2 | INQ001480 16:4 |
| 17:21 34:4 61:9 | 50:5 | 171:5,8 | informing 133:8 | INQ001569 49:6 |
| 65:12,13 84:1 | improving 12:20 | independently 38:4 | infrequently 98:16 | INQ001571 24:12 |
| 119:14 139:21 | 47:21 | 159:8 | inherent 141:1 | INQ001580 37:19 |
| 140:9 | inadequate 5:7 | index 99:15 | initial 12:10,20 | INQ001733 001 |
| impacts 6:19 10:14 | 10:3 | indicate 85:13 | 19:4 59:15,16 | 132:10 |
| 18:20 | inappropriate | 88:17 89:22 | 107:14 130:18 | INQ001764 63:7 |
| impetus 60:22 | 156:11 | 127:18 168:4 | 132:16 157:14 | 80:23 84:25 |
| 86:23 | incentive 165:25 | indicated 85:10,23 | 160:24 164:16 | 131:24 135:2 |
| implement 44:16 | incentivise 30:5 | 104:10 106:21 | initially 97:25 | 136:10 141:21 |
| 46:25 | incidence 23:6,8 | 108:7,11 132:4 | initiatives 149:17 | INQ001764 002 |
| implementation | incident 58:17 59:4 | 139:5 149:1 | 150:25 | 134:12 |
| 22:24 38:2 | 83:18 85:8 86:6 | 172:25 | injected 38:1 | INQ001764_004 |
| implemented 38:19 | 120:20 122:20 | indicates 21:11 | inmate 133:4 | 88:14 |
| 46:6 104:20 | 140:3 159:15 | 31:17 | inmates 133:6 | INQ001764_009 |
| implementing 38:3 | 160:21 162:6 | indication 1:22 | innovative 149:17 | 168:24 |
| implication 71:16 | 168:19,24 169:1 | indications 151:1 | input 47:15 | INQ001764_010 |
| implications 83:24 | incidents 15:6 | indicators 98:25 | INQ0001216 | 85:1 |
| importance 161:7 | 23:14,14 57:9,10 | individual 19:18 | 137:24 | inquiry 1:5,7,11,16 |
| important 16:13,15 | 57:11 58:10 74:12 | 24:21 25:13,14 | INQ0001216_007 | 42:5,8 52:23 54:2 |
| 16:16,21,22 18:8 | 81:1 82:8 121:8 | 51:24 67:16 87:8 | 137:16 | 127:20 143:19 |
| 20:10 40:17 65:18 | 150:21 152:23 | 93:8 112:8 117:9 | INQ000125 99:7,21 | 161:22 165:20 |
| 68:12 72:21 73:18 | 153:24 159:9,12 | 118:15 122:2 | INQ0001764 140:5 | inquiry's 47:23,24 |
| 78:8 86:17 123:10 | 168:6,11,15 | 125:21 | INQ001175 171:22 | insider 98:13 |
| 140:14 141:4,6 | include 5:11 15:1 | individually 104:22 | INQ001200 26:10 | insight 61:9 |
| 156:14 164:3,15 | 39:12 149:19 | individuals 27:5 | 26:13 | inspect 3:7 15:18 |
| 164:16 165:13 | included 16:11 | 81:7 108:5 111:23 | INQ001205 32:16 | 17:2 40:12 42:18 |
| importantly 103:5 | includes 5:8,9 68:6 | 115:15 | INQ001210 59:8 | 51:1 |
| 112:16 117:16 | 93:21 172:6,9 | induction 12:20 | 87:8 129:2,8 | inspected 4:4 41:14 |
| 119:14 | including 3:8 17:13 | 97:24 146:17 | 133:19 | inspecting 15:20 |
| impose 95:19 | 38:25 41:18 63:11 | 147:23,23 | INQ001210_010 | inspection 10:2,3 |
| imposing 95:25 | 88:23 157:15 | Inevitably 100:14 | 64:16 | 13:14,21,22,22 |
| impressive 103:24 | inconsistency | 161:19 | INQ001210_025 | 14:5 15:24 34:4 |
| improve 20:14 61:4 | 60:14,14 | influenced 142:4 | 54:17 | 37:17 38:2,6,24 |
| 69:7 101:3 123:2 | inconsistent 11:3 | inform 42:21 | INQ001228_002 | 38:25 39:4,5,7,8,9 |
| 123:4,17,18,19 | 29:25 30:1 60:10 | information 19:1 | 57:6 | 39:10,12,21 40:6 |
| 149:2 159:14 | 61:13 | 25:1 36:23 42:9 | INQ001255 170:14 | 40:15,25 41:16,16 |
| 164:9 165:11,22 | increase 12:4 127:2 | 61:2,19,20 68:14 | INQ001441 22:23 | 42:22 43:2 46:22 |
| | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

| | | | | Tage 107 |
|---|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 51:14,21 52:5 | 171:11 | 135:16,22 136:5,9 | 91:2,5,19,20,23 | 133:25 136:1 |
| 70:8 78:18 81:23 | institution's 38:11 | 136:10 140:5 | 92:8,12 93:7,16 | 138:2,4,7 139:10 |
| 101:4 102:22 | institutional 54:19 | 141:21 144:5 | 93:20,21 102:2 | 139:14,17,19 |
| 104:11 109:10 | 57:3 62:4 | 148:18 149:25 | 144:8,9 | 153:2,18 156:22 |
| 122:6 150:19,22 | institutions 1:10,12 | 152:1 166:1 | investigative 55:18 | 163:4 |
| 151:10,14,20 | 4:13,18,21 6:9 7:7 | internally 111:2 | 131:12 137:18 | issued 83:23 |
| 152:18 161:12 | 7:23 13:13 14:3 | 150:4 | invite 1:15 | issues 10:22 11:13 |
| 166:2 | 14:12,18 15:20 | interpretation | invited 57:11 65:25 | 13:9 15:6 17:19 |
| inspections 2:16,17 | 17:1 21:1 22:9 | 160:22 | 129:5 | 20:23 35:23 41:7 |
| 3:12,23 36:13 | 23:12 24:25 25:21 | interpreted 71:1,21 | invites 132:23 | 46:11 47:5 49:22 |
| 37:14 39:19 40:24 | 29:24 30:2 33:22 | interrupt 52:17 | involve 48:22 | 50:3 55:13 57:4 |
| 41:7,9 | 34:17,18 35:5 | interventions | 163:23 | 64:2,15 65:16 |
| inspector 2:13,22 | 37:4 44:9 46:1,15 | 121:25 | involved 18:21 | 66:3 70:16 74:5 |
| 2:23 3:2,21 13:19 | 47:1,21 50:1 54:4 | interviewing 92:2 | 28:18 39:24 45:2 | 79:2,18 81:19 |
| 22:22 32:17 37:20 | 54:9 56:14,18 | interviews 94:3 | 58:16,18 63:23 | 82:7,10 83:9 |
| 40:13 41:5 100:1 | 63:10 64:10 77:16 | intimidation 6:19 | 73:6,20 93:9,12 | 94:22 97:4 102:14 |
| 104:11 109:22,25 | 78:14 91:6 140:22 | introduced 98:3 | 94:2,23 112:3 | 103:2 104:17,18 |
| inspector's 37:5 | 140:25 141:9 | 105:4,11,25 | 114:23 125:20 | 121:10 124:9 |
| 99:6 111:19 | 145:1 149:14 | 107:25 111:21 | 160:10 | 128:13 129:6,24 |
| inspectorate 2:14 | 156:1 170:10 | introducing 164:18 | involvement 68:15 | 130:20 135:20 |
| 3:6 15:17 42:15 | 171:9 | 164:19 | 68:18 89:15,19,24 | 136:8,18 140:1,19 |
| 45:2 50:17 106:14 | instructed 54:2 | introduction 54:1 | 90:25 91:7,25 | 145:2 146:4 |
| 120:6 150:7 | instruction 57:7 | 99:24 120:23 | 92:17,19 93:10 | 154:19 163:16 |
| inspectorates 51:7 | 132:9 | 150:3 | 94:10,21 126:21 | 164:7 |
| 51:9 | insufficient 87:14 | introductory | 157:11 | Ivor 1:7 |
| inspectors 16:10 | intelligence 25:7 | 148:17 | involvements 92:16 | - J |
| 39:1 41:18 42:22 | intention 111:9,11 | inverted 94:17 | involves 10:19 | |
| 99:18 122:10 | interact 123:13 | invest 103:4 | 158:5 | January 39:2 42:4 42:11 129:14 |
| instability 7:22 8:5 | interactions 100:13 | investigate 86:19 | involving 163:22 | 151:6 |
| 8:8,13,17 | interagency 114:4 | 168:5 | IRC 114:13 | |
| instance 81:15 | interchangeability | investigated 74:8 | isolated 54:24 | Jay 1:4 |
| instances 82:10 | 124:21 | 77:8 79:11 136:12 | isolation 72:19 | job 12:7,19 21:3 106:9 114:12 |
| 90:13 103:22 | interest 17:20 | 161:1 167:24 | issue 3:13 5:21 9:21 | joined 61:24 |
| institutes 146:10 | interim 114:13 | 168:19 | 12:17 16:3,20 | joined-up 62:19 |
| institution 6:12,13 | internal 14:22 | investigating 36:25 | 19:3 26:15 30:23 | joint 50:16 88:4 |
| 6:20 8:3,4,5 13:16 13:24 14:15 15:18 | 58:10 59:8 63:7 | 93:2 | 42:25 47:23 52:5 | 93:20,21 |
| | 66:22 74:11 79:4 | investigation 1:11 | 63:1 65:4 66:5,12 | jointly 110:20 |
| 25:1,10 30:12,19 30:21 31:8 34:20 | 80:13,23 88:3 89:16 90:23 91:2 | 41:6 79:3 88:2,3,4 | 66:14,18 69:12,12 | judged 4:14 13:14 |
| 35:20 42:8,25 | 91:13 93:7 99:23 | 88:5,5,6 91:15 92:9,25 93:1 | 71:2,3 79:24,24 79:25 80:2,21 | judgment 10:4,5 |
| 44:8 48:20,22 | 101:1,12,18,19 | 125:19 135:10,14 | 81:4 82:1 84:15 | 39:25 |
| 63:17 79:21 84:6 | 101:1,12,18,19 | 135:16,20,22 | 85:2 86:14,21 | judgments 4:17 5:6 |
| 84:10 86:24 106:8 | 110:4 111:16 | 136:3,5,8,18 | 90:1 105:7,8 | July 1:1 3:15 4:9 |
| 130:5,16 136:4 | 120:11 129:3,11 | 142:13 157:8 | 111:25 115:6 | 97:7 108:17 128:1 |
| 140:14 149:18 | 130:23 131:24 | 169:17,24 | 117:1 118:14 | 128:10 148:5 |
| 151:22 166:15 | 133:19 135:2,6,14 | investigations 1:13 | 121:1,11,24 | 168:3 171:7 |
| 131.22 100.13 | 133.17 133.2,0,14 | investigations 1.13 | 121.1,11,27 | |
| L | | | | |

| 173:16 | 160:4,17 163:16 | leap 140:25 | 124:15 155:24 | 100:16 |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| June 81:2 106:17 | 167:9,13 168:19 | learn 61:4 | lines 155:23 | locking 9:12 |
| 108:10 170:14 | knowledge 18:9 | leave 170:6 | link 5:21,24 6:15 | lodged 66:10 |
| 172:12 173:4 | 19:17,18 70:11,22 | leaving 19:4 | linked 34:2 60:23 | log 62:10 65:20 |
| justice 5:5 7:12,13 | 165:12 169:5 | led 7:7,8,14 103:24 | 62:11 90:1 104:21 | 69:8 112:6 126:2 |
| 18:23 37:23 41:3 | known 8:11 64:20 | 108:3 | 119:19 142:19 | logs 62:7 65:3 |
| 43:17 67:20 75:1 | 68:14,19 84:15 | left 48:22 49:14 | 166:18,20 169:21 | 159:16 |
| 95:3 101:7 105:11 | 106:20 | 75:7 114:14 | links 47:3 81:6 93:6 | LOM000004_001 |
| 164:19 | KPIs 15:22 | left-hand 109:1 | 119:17 | 108:9 |
| | | legal 127:10 | list 27:11 57:8 | Lomas 2:23 6:16 |
| <u>K</u> | <u>L</u> | legislation 41:5 | 115:13 129:1,12 | 26:2 31:16 33:18 |
| keep 12:21 31:14 | labour 124:6,10,15 | 51:7,9 | listed 115:8 | 35:4 40:5 |
| 63:18,22 75:10 | lack 13:23 30:23 | length 17:16 41:3 | listening 32:22 | Lomas' 21:11 |
| 123:7 126:1 | 59:21 60:22 74:20 | lengths 150:10 | lists 28:11 | 46:12 |
| 154:23 161:7 | 81:3 85:16 87:5 | lengthy 172:3 | literally 54:21 | London 110:17 |
| 164:4 | 100:15 133:18 | let's 66:15 103:9 | little 18:25 23:9 | 114:3,6 128:1 |
| keeping 64:6 | 134:14 136:17 | 108:22 125:18 | 35:1 51:22 57:2 | 141:25 144:16 |
| 119:11 162:22 | 137:8 163:13,15 | 127:4 148:15,16 | 59:24 63:14 75:5 | long 52:22 54:15,22 |
| 163:8 165:22 | lacking 132:20 | 148:17,21 151:25 | 83:14 97:10,22 | 84:19 98:21 153:7 |
| kept 64:19 105:1 | lacks 16:7 | 159:18 | 104:16,18 107:7 | 165:17 168:25 |
| 105:21 125:24,25 | LADO 47:3 88:3 | letter 33:2 57:7 | 110:18 133:23 | long-term 74:2 |
| 140:1 162:24 | 89:19,24 90:2,3 | 132:9 171:14 | 146:7 | longer 10:21 |
| key 27:11 41:12 | 91:1,3,8 94:23 102:7 107:25 | letters 51:25 | live 9:9 33:20 | Longfield 171:21 |
| 56:22 70:15,21 | 102.7 107.23 | level 12:9 13:4 | lived 87:15 | look 3:14 15:18 |
| 71:11,12 78:6 107:14 119:2 | 136:1,2 143:1,5,6 | 17:15 18:14 19:21 | Liverpool 37:22 | 16:5 26:20,22 |
| 121:9 143:10 | 143:10,14 159:18 | 56:16 94:21 98:12 | lives 68:17 | 28:3 33:11 44:15 |
| keys 120:10 | LADO's 143:3,3 | 102:14 104:3 | living 15:19 31:7 | 45:15 57:11,13,16 |
| keystone 79:1 | 159:18,22,23 | 106:1 113:24,25 | 33:16 34:19,21,25 | 57:24 58:11,16,18 |
| Kinetic 155:9,10,11 | language 92:24 | 152:16 | 98:1 | 59:7 80:21 89:15 |
| Knight 96:16,17,19 | 129:25 | levels 8:9 10:11,13 | load 118:15 | 104:22 107:15 |
| 97:10 98:19 99:5 | Lara 127:24 | 11:22,23 13:23 | loads 118:17 | 108:24 109:6,12 |
| 99:11,22 103:13 | large 21:1 34:20 | 18:16 56:12 67:15 | local 1:12 36:18,19 | 110:2 113:13 117:17 118:12 |
| 117:8 123:22 | 41:17 43:4 60:11 | 100:3 103:25 105:25 111:1 | 36:22,24,25 45:7 47:3,6 87:15 | 117.17 118.12 |
| 127:16,17 174:10 | 68:14 85:12 | 103.23 111.1 | 107:3,16 110:19 | 119.10,20 121.7 |
| know 9:2,11,13 | 147:18 | 151:13 166:15 | 110:20 111:2,21 | 121.22,23 122.3 |
| 13:1 21:15 25:14 | larger 35:3 50:20 | life 31:9 153:7 | 118:10 120:8,9 | 134:8 140:23 |
| 30:2 31:2,3 38:22 | latest 153:10 | light 108:11 115:14 | 124:6,15 125:19 | 154.8 140.23 |
| 45:14,15,23 46:7 | lead 2:13,15,17 | 150:23 | 127:21 141:20 | 154:8,13 155:20 |
| 48:23 70:16 72:6 | 7:13 39:20,20 | liked 80:9 | 147:4 155:13 | 156:19 161:19 |
| 73:20 74:25 92:1 | 46:15 50:17 | likelihood 6:19 | 158:16 159:1,6,8 | 169:13,20 172:25 |
| 99:22 105:14 | leadership 8:13 | 137:8 | 162:16 170:10,12 | looked 39:16 56:23 |
| 116:19,22 117:4 | 14:14 39:14 49:19 | limited 35:12,23 | localised 103:5 | 56:25 67:5,22 |
| 120:23 121:5 | 49:21,25 101:6 | 68:12 70:20 | locally 125:2 | 84:13 86:25 88:23 |
| 123:10 125:2 | leading 2:15 68:8 | 149:10 | lock 146:11 | 89:3 110:7 124:6 |
| 154:18 159:24 | 150:21 | line 21:8 47:10 | locked 10:21 | 129:13 130:6 |
| | <u> </u> | | <u> </u> | |

| 133:21 145:6 | maintenance 17:6 | 129:14 134:17,17 | 130:2,21 135:18 | 32:19 34:8 55:4 |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| 147:8,21 152:23 | Majesty's 2:14 3:6 | 150:3 | measure 101:25 | 56:13 59:12 60:3 |
| 156:25 165:10 | major 9:22 59:25 | marginally 36:14 | measured 15:21 | 60:17,19 63:11,23 |
| looked-after 33:12 | 62:11 150:14,18 | market 124:6,10,15 | mechanism 15:5 | 64:12 65:25 69:9 |
| 118:13 147:13,17 | majority 23:13 | Martin 2:23 | 38:7,17 | 69:13,15 70:19 |
| looking 20:19 | 98:8 102:1 | massive 8:2 | mechanisms 121:9 | 71:12 82:2,13 |
| 21:16 26:8 42:6 | make-up 39:18 | masters 46:21 | 123:11 157:4 | 83:20,23 91:3 |
| 42:23 47:2 51:21 | making 12:18 | match 130:17 | Medway 13:11 | 93:22 106:21 |
| 56:21 58:22 74:24 | 36:22 38:15,20 | matched 130:9 | 16:4 17:11 20:6 | 111:13 122:3 |
| 77:3 81:24 87:22 | 43:23 49:1 60:13 | material 53:24 55:1 | 24:11 35:24,25 | 136:24 137:19 |
| 92:2 111:23 113:1 | 75:2,20,21 100:24 | 57:23 96:3 144:6 | 36:8,12,13 47:25 | 140:13 155:22 |
| 117:24 119:22 | 112:7 157:12,16 | 144:12 157:1 | 48:1,3,4,8 51:22 | 164:14 165:4 |
| 161:6 | 165:15 166:13,13 | 170:24 172:2,13 | 52:4,11 91:6 | 169:8 |
| looks 40:3 42:24 | 168:20 | 172:19,21 173:1 | 173:9 | membership |
| 87:22 101:18 | Malcolm 1:8 51:18 | 173:12 | meet 25:4 147:10 | 163:12,18 |
| 112:9,17 114:1 | 51:19 52:10,13 | maths 34:13 | 147:19,25 155:20 | memory 102:20 |
| loop 136:6 | 166:23,24 167:25 | matrix 111:17 | 159:19 | mental 58:25 79:13 |
| loss 67:3,3 | malicious 133:10 | matter 95:11,24 | meeting 87:13,24 | 79:15,18 100:17 |
| lost 40:19 | maltreatment | 164:2 | 92:17 121:7,18 | mention 8:24 62:1 |
| lot 1:21 15:21 | 101:23 | matters 1:14,18 | 122:22 142:25 | 63:16 167:1 |
| 28:21 50:4,21 | manage 76:25 | 14:15 34:12 36:3 | 143:5 159:3,10,11 | mentioned 3:1 |
| 120:22 163:16 | 112:5 138:7 | 53:25 | 159:16,20 161:2 | 11:12 49:5 51:22 |
| 165:19 166:12 | managed 15:15 | maximum 146:11 | meetings 65:25 | 60:1,11 61:18 |
| lots 7:24 15:22 | 36:4 84:10 137:7 | mealy-mouthed | 66:2 159:25 | 66:16,20 104:17 |
| 34:21 47:1 60:9 | management 4:24 | 50:6 | meets 159:2 | 123:23 125:8 |
| 115:15,15,15 | 5:8 7:23 14:20 | mean 9:24 12:21 | member 11:4 25:13 | 126:9,20 |
| 155:7 160:5,6 | 16:2 21:8 22:19 | 28:19 29:23 30:7 | 27:23 28:8 29:14 | mentor 28:8 |
| low 10:14 78:14 | 22:25 23:11 30:4 | 70:14 71:5 78:9 | 32:22 33:3 35:15 | mentoring 12:13 |
| 91:7 | 39:13,14 47:10,15 | 84:17 86:5 91:22 | 56:3 60:13 61:10 | mere 101:3 |
| lower 6:12 8:8 | 49:25 64:7 103:2 | 92:11,19 93:19 | 64:20,24 65:18 | merited 151:9 |
| 10:11 103:23 | 104:2,3 105:3 | 95:23,25 110:19 | 69:5,23 70:12 | merits 161:23 |
| lunch 9:13 30:15 | 149:2 158:23 | 112:14 120:6,13 | 73:6 74:23 75:3 | message 16:19 |
| 58:19 96:10 | manager 21:4,8 | 120:22 126:12 | 77:13,18 83:12 | 85:17 |
| luncheon 96:13 | managers 14:11,13 | 135:13 138:13 | 84:14 86:14 87:11 | met 90:7 96:5 |
| lying 72:24 | 20:8 21:1,6 22:6 | 139:10 159:21 | 88:23,25 89:1 | 113:25 |
| <u> </u> | 46:20,24 47:20 | 160:21 | 90:14 95:21 | method 60:14 |
| $\frac{1}{M}$ 56:21 | 108:2 149:5 | meaning 76:5 | 107:18 111:6 | 156:15 |
| | 157:25 | 131:14 | 112:2,8,19,23 | methodology 41:17 |
| magnitude 24:9 main 146:14,21 | manages 10:25 | meaningful 23:22 | 113:4,10 121:4 | 44:3,4 49:1 |
| 157:3 | managing 23:23 | 100:15 | 123:8 137:4 138:3 | methods 48:16 61:1 |
| maintain 20:15 | mandatory 19:5,10 | means 11:18,18 | 138:5,7,8,13,16 | middle 9:14 114:2 |
| 34:9 | 41:11 | 21:20 22:17 | 140:2 142:24 | midpoint 103:6 |
| maintained 52:1 | manner 129:22 | 121:15 | 143:8 155:6,6 | 124:14 |
| 150:12 151:8 | 137:4 161:18 | meant 30:12,13,13 | 156:12 158:22 | miles 34:6 |
| maintaining 73:17 | 162:8,11 | 31:6 55:17 93:10 | 167:2,14,15,16,18 | mimics 34:22 |
| maintaining / J.1 / | March 14:25 58:17 | 106:1 122:24 | members 1:7 9:10 | mind 161:8 171:3 |
| | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> |

| | | 1 | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| mindset 165:17 | morning 1:4 9:12 | necessary 51:12 | NOM000009 132:4 | 9:24 |
| minimisation 105:4 | motivated 106:10 | 71:25 123:1 | 134:15 | numerator 7:19 |
| 110:13 | move 35:24 46:9 | necessity 160:2 | NOMS 17:14 47:17 | nurse 121:3 |
| minimise 23:15,18 | 69:15 115:1 | need 3:3 11:10 | non-child 167:17 | nursing 88:23 |
| minimising 22:25 | 128:12 157:18 | 15:11 18:10 19:11 | non-custodial 7:14 | nuts 74:6 104:19 |
| minimum 12:5 | moved 73:22 | 20:1 22:16,23 | noon 53:11 | |
| 17:15 18:14 | 124:25 138:9 | 23:11,14 26:5 | normal 146:15 | 0 |
| ministers 3:25 | movement 125:1 | 31:13 34:16 36:2 | normally 94:4 | Oakhill 13:15,21 |
| 13:18 | moving 22:21 | 48:17 58:9 63:2 | 98:11 | oath 53:18 |
| Ministry 41:3 | 25:24 29:4 37:5 | 68:9 98:14 102:16 | note 9:19 25:16 | objection 52:23 |
| 67:20 75:1 | 74:5 79:2 124:22 | 105:5 109:21 | 52:18 125:20 | objective 84:21 |
| minor 31:4 | MPS 96:3 | 113:14 127:7 | 132:16 153:14 | 161:9,18 |
| minority 144:8 | MPS's 93:11 | 136:2 137:14 | noted 3:22 9:18,21 | observation 64:18 |
| minute 18:22 44:19 | Mulready-Jones | 140:7 142:20 | 23:1 24:10 42:3 | 76:12 133:9 161:5 |
| 51:13 | 2:8,9,11,20,25 | 144:13 157:16 | 48:2 103:20 | observations 55:8 |
| minuted 121:14,17 | 49:11,17 50:10 | 161:7,19 165:21 | 113:18 | 104:6 117:7 |
| minutes 51:23 | 52:19 53:4 174:5 | 167:15,16,21 | notes 32:17 46:13 | 134:23 149:8 |
| 170:5,24 | multi-agencies | 168:19 | 132:3 | 152:20 157:17 |
| missing 22:18 80:9 | 160:5 | needed 135:22 | notice 30:24 39:23 | 162:2 |
| 80:12 134:11 | multi-agency 2:17 | needs 16:22 19:18 | 51:20 | observed 100:13 |
| 163:2 | 62:12 142:22 | 20:21 23:18 38:1 | noticed 15:19 | 153:14 156:9 |
| mistake 75:17 | multi-disciplinary | 62:25 93:3 98:5 | notification 40:22 | observing 100:25 |
| mists 40:19 | 161:2 | 112:10 114:25 | notifying 102:4 | obvious 62:8 66:5 |
| mix 7:9 78:20 | multi-disciplined | 122:14 130:10,15 | November 22:23 | 158:7 |
| mixed 5:19 6:25 | 156:18 | 133:11 142:21 | 59:4 134:16 172:4 | obviously 5:9 42:1 |
| Mm-hmm 33:1 | multidisciplinary | 143:23 150:12 | NSPCC 155:24,25 | 45:8 46:5 47:5 |
| MMPR 22:25 23:5 | 99:3 107:6 | 157:14 158:2 | nuanced 20:2 118:1 | 65:19 81:24 102:9 |
| 113:17 120:22 | | 167:9 | 130:14 | 112:2 113:12 |
| 121:18 | <u>N</u> | neutral 161:9 | number 4:7 7:3,5,7 | 114:18 116:25 |
| model 21:14 51:12 | N 174:3 | neutrally 94:10 | 9:10 12:2 21:1 | 118:12 119:8,9 |
| modern 108:14 | Nadine 172:11 | never 42:25 83:1 | 22:8 26:13 27:11 | 120:23 138:13 |
| module 17:14 | naked 143:12 | 161:12 | 27:15 28:11 31:3 | 147:13 152:23 |
| moment 19:7 28:15 | name 113:1 | Nevertheless | 34:17 36:6 37:15 | 158:1 162:6 |
| 41:13,14 70:12 | names 9:11 | 150:25 | 38:24 43:4,7,15 | occasion 63:2 71:25 |
| 77:17 145:10 | narrative 148:18 | new 4:8 12:8,22 | 44:12 48:13 49:8 | 82:22 91:4 101:8 |
| 154:7 161:11 | 150:16 | 28:16 51:9,10 | 49:12 54:6 57:10 | occur 24:20 69:25 |
| Monday 1:1 | national 14:17 | 104:3 107:11 | 63:11 67:4 78:12 | occurrences 113:15 |
| monitor 16:16 43:8 | nationally 165:6,7 | 110:16 114:12,18 | 83:19 85:12 103:1 | October 57:15 |
| 43:18 122:7 | nature 6:18 15:2 | 123:5 | 115:9 120:10 | 148:23 |
| monitoring 38:1 | 48:23 62:7 63:16 | Newcomen 171:15 | 121:21 124:7 | odd 51:1 |
| 155:12 171:5,8 | 102:15 109:6 | news 14:17 | 127:2 153:22 | offence 7:17 |
| monthly 159:16 | 112:13 135:10 | NHS 114:1 172:3,5 | 154:1 155:19 | offences 98:23 |
| 163:5 | navigate 78:21 | NHS000027 172:4 | 171:10,18 172:22 | 114:3,5 |
| months 9:10 | near 34:16 | Nigel 171:15 | numbered 26:21 | offender 141:9 |
| 114:20 120:25,25 | necessarily 15:8 | night 9:13 | 109:1 | offenders' 130:4 |
| Moody 171:16 | 32:21 | Nine 101:5 | numbers 7:18 9:24 | 146:10 149:14 |
| | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> |
| | | | | |

| 151 22 | 110 6 1 12 10 | W 7 10 07 0 | 140 10 140 13 33 | B 12.12 |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|
| 151:22 | 118:6 142:18 | overall 7:18 27:2 | 148:18 149:13,25 | Parc 13:13 |
| offer 115:6 119:2,3 | 143:4,13 160:5 | 28:4 39:14 64:8 | 150:4,5 151:5 | parity 124:1 |
| offers 146:17 | 165:21 | 89:23 100:20 | 152:1 166:1 | part 16:24 19:2 |
| officer 8:18 21:7,8 | opportunity 139:19 | 101:12,14 104:7 | paid 103:7 | 34:25 41:9,16 |
| 21:21,25 58:5,18 | 168:5 | 109:13 127:12 | pain-inducing 95:2 | 70:1 72:4 103:18 |
| 58:20 116:23 | opposed 160:18 | 149:12 151:14 | 95:5 | 107:14 112:11 |
| 117:15 132:15 | optimistic 38:12 | 152:17 | panel 1:6 6:24 26:7 | 114:21 118:25 |
| 155:18 157:13,24 | optimum 126:11,12 | overarching 15:12 | 49:15,16 54:14,20 | 120:16 142:22 |
| 167:11 | option 72:14 116:6 | 39:25 90:21 130:3 | 56:7 57:5,10,13 | 143:16 147:23,24 |
| officers 20:14 22:4 | options 7:14 74:25 | 167:13 | 57:22,24 97:1 | 152:3,4 156:10 |
| 22:11 103:7 | 75:1 118:25 | overexposure | 108:24 109:6,11 | 157:18 161:14 |
| 107:11 115:10,11 | order 2:2 23:15 | 63:12 | 109:18 110:2,21 | 162:4 164:18 |
| 121:19 155:16 | 26:3 38:13 123:24 | overheard 32:9,13 | 110:21 115:19 | 167:8 |
| Ofsted 4:15 39:19 | orderly 157:13,24 | overnight 12:25 | 118:7 120:4 | partially 37:8 |
| 39:20,20 50:17,18 | 167:11 | overriding 158:1 | 123:21 136:13,16 | 101:5 102:22 |
| 149:11 | orders 94:4 | oversight 45:24 | 137:11 142:8 | participants 1:19 |
| OHY003322 96:4 | ordinary 18:12 | 46:12,14 47:1,3,6 | 144:14 146:2 | 2:5 43:15 53:21 |
| okay 7:2 16:3 26:12 | 19:6 | 47:14,16,22 104:2 | 152:5 153:11 | particular 20:23 |
| 26:14 27:9 29:2,4 | organisation 40:25 | overview 3:5 172:4 | 158:17 166:10 | 30:9 42:24 52:4 |
| 35:22 37:19 | 41:2,4 45:16 | overwhelming | 174:7,12,17 | 54:10 63:6 64:11 |
| old 58:3 138:20 | organisations | 23:12 | panel's 159:6 | 64:17 80:17 90:19 |
| older 9:9 | 50:15 115:16 | | papers 70:2 | 91:9 93:25 96:6 |
| Ombudsman | organised 93:23 | <u>P</u> | paperwork 81:21 | 112:22 127:23 |
| 171:14 | orientate 53:20 | page 3:17,18 14:24 | 88:16 145:8 | 128:9 131:19 |
| on-site 147:11 | 54:14 | 16:5 17:8,8 20:5 | 159:12 165:20 | 134:3 138:5,11,18 |
| once 18:7 47:9 73:9 | orientating 57:5 | 26:21 27:17,18,21 | paragraph 6:16 | 138:24 150:9 |
| 105:6 108:1 137:2 | original 45:21 | 31:19 37:6 55:3 | 9:20 16:6 17:9,25 | 152:4 159:14 |
| 137:20 155:21 | ought 40:15 | 56:9,11 58:10 | 20:5 21:11 23:1 | 162:24 170:12 |
| ones 16:2 126:25 | outcome 3:22 9:17 | 59:8,18 63:8 | 24:11,13 26:2 | 172:24 |
| 146:10 | 15:23 19:13,14 | 65:11 74:11 79:4 | 31:16 35:4 40:5 | particularly 5:1 |
| ongoing 13:1 52:9 | 50:6 77:7 78:15 | 80:11,13,24 85:3 | 46:13 51:21 80:24 | 7:23 9:1,25 12:23 |
| 151:11 | 101:24 104:6 | 85:3 87:8 89:16 | 87:9 88:14 100:10 | 20:25 28:13 39:17 |
| open 20:12 140:21 | 135:19 143:1,4 | 90:22,23 91:14 | 101:18 103:19 | 41:20 81:14 88:22 |
| 161:8 164:4 | 152:9 157:8 | 99:23 100:9,25 | 106:16 111:5 | 153:2 |
| opened 116:12 | outcomes 5:16 14:6 | 101:1,12,19 | 119:24 128:24 | parties 156:9 |
| opening 1:3 174:4 | 14:7,8,14 15:18 | 103:10,20 108:23 | 132:12 133:20 | partner 64:20 65:1 |
| opens 117:4 | 15:25 47:21 49:20 | 109:9,12,16,17 | 134:13 135:2 | 107:2 |
| operate 45:9 | 51:1,4 101:14 | 110:4,4,10 111:16 | 147:4 148:21,22 | partnerships 47:6 |
| operates 45:17 46:1 | 108:3 148:24 | 113:24 114:2 | 149:3 150:5,17 | parts 50:20 97:11 |
| operating 48:18 | 149:2 151:23 | 122:9 129:3,4,11 | 152:2,10,15 153:6 | 102:13 153:5 |
| operation 131:25 | 152:11 165:19 | 130:23,23 131:24 | 157:9 162:19 | pathway 81:5 |
| 132:6 134:15 | outline 170:22 | 132:1,12,25 | 167:1 | pathways 60:18 |
| operational 97:16 | outlined 75:1 | 133:19 135:2,6,9 | paragraphs 3:2 | 65:24 75:2 |
| 114:11 | outside 15:16 69:2 | 136:9,10,11,13 | 132:1 140:6 | pattern 73:23 76:2 |
| operations 167:17 | 139:16 | 138:17 140:5 | 151:17 | patterns 75:23 |
| opinion 52:21 | outstanding 4:19 | 141:22 144:4,5,5 | parapet 35:21 | pausing 27:5 28:10 |
| | | | l | I |

| | | | | l |
|--------------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| pay 103:6 104:18 | 43:13 | pertinent 171:2 | 20:5 26:7,10,21 | 43:5 44:3 45:21 |
| 123:23 124:1,14 | perfect 48:25 | Peter 2:22,25 37:20 | 28:3,4 41:8 54:23 | 56:10 62:3 65:18 |
| 124:18 127:5 | perform 171:18 | 42:3 99:25 145:17 | 56:9 57:3,5,6 59:7 | 67:6 71:4,7 73:15 |
| paying 13:6 124:8 | performance 20:15 | 145:18,20 174:15 | 63:5,9,14 64:16 | 73:17 76:14 77:6 |
| peer 28:8 | 20:18 | PG1 149:24 | 64:16 65:11 66:15 | 77:9 82:6 86:16 |
| penis 58:6 | performed 171:23 | phone 155:22 | 70:9 74:10 76:21 | 87:11,25 88:1,9 |
| penultimate 100:10 | period 42:5,10,12 | physical 22:25 | 79:4 80:10,23,24 | 88:11,13 89:6 |
| people 3:22 4:5 | 43:11 73:13 81:24 | 122:16 142:10 | 84:24 85:1 87:7,8 | 90:3,5 92:7 93:5 |
| 12:18 15:19 16:8 | 125:10,14,25 | physically 72:4 | 88:13 89:16,25 | 106:15 116:16 |
| 18:17 19:25 21:15 | 129:14 150:21 | pick 66:3 135:7 | 90:22,23 91:12,22 | 120:18 122:9,13 |
| 21:17 25:4 26:23 | 152:24 161:5 | picked 27:22 67:12 | 94:25 96:15 97:8 | 122:19 130:4 |
| 30:5 31:2 32:14 | 168:15 | 136:21 | 97:22 98:6 99:7 | 136:5 137:15 |
| 33:14,15 34:15 | permeates 76:13 | picking 25:11 | 99:13,23 101:11 | 138:12 140:6,11 |
| 35:14,17 36:4 | permission 2:19 | picture 5:19 6:25 | 101:19 103:10,11 | 141:15 144:1,19 |
| 47:2 48:3,15,19 | 49:3 97:8 148:6 | 15:13 16:24 28:2 | 107:7 108:19,23 | 148:20,21 149:4 |
| 48:22 55:4 61:2 | permit 127:22 | 29:20,22 30:1 | 109:12 110:4,9,15 | 152:24 153:6 |
| 62:24 63:20,25 | perpetrator 87:15 | 37:11 42:16 43:3 | 110:18 113:22,24 | 156:24 164:5 |
| 64:1,12 70:15 | 142:19,21 167:6 | 43:10 60:23 61:20 | 115:6 118:7 | 165:25 168:17 |
| 71:20 74:22 81:8 | 167:22 | place 21:19 37:11 | 127:23 128:12,24 | pointed 148:10 |
| 82:3 85:12 88:20 | person 12:12,13,15 | 44:14 67:23 97:2 | 129:3,4,11,17 | 153:22 160:21 |
| 90:11 92:11 97:14 | 58:3 63:3 85:15 | 98:11,18 100:11 | 130:23 131:1,23 | points 14:25 17:7 |
| 97:19,25 98:2,4 | 87:2 88:18 89:1 | 106:22 117:2 | 132:1,10,12,25 | 19:11 36:11 59:12 |
| 98:20 99:4 101:15 | 92:2 98:13 116:25 | 118:20,21 119:13 | 133:16,19,20 | 62:1 66:20 69:18 |
| 101:22,24 104:7 | 117:4,19 119:11 | 120:20 121:10 | 134:12,13,15 | 74:6 79:6 80:20 |
| 104:25 105:9,14 | 119:22 121:20,21 | 136:24 146:3 | 135:3,6,9 136:9 | 106:15 109:2 |
| 105:21 106:2,24 | 123:8 131:18 | 147:6 150:25 | 137:24 138:1,17 | 115:1 128:3 135:9 |
| 107:13 109:24 | 133:1,2,8 134:3 | 155:16 156:16 | 140:4,5 141:19,20 | 137:10 141:19 |
| 116:1,15 117:17 | 138:25 139:7,11 | 158:17,21 169:15 | 141:21,22 144:4 | 149:9 161:10 |
| 119:2 120:9 | 139:23 143:12 | 170:18 | 145:16 146:7 | 163:9 |
| 123:14 124:15,17 124:22 127:7 | person's 60:21 65:6 69:12 84:3 133:5 | placed 127:8 placement 9:15 | 148:18 150:1,3,5 | police 61:23 88:5 |
| 139:9,21 140:14 | 133:7 139:18 | places 10:17 16:17 | 151:25 152:1,2 158:17 168:23 | 91:15,18,23,25 92:2,8,25 93:1,12 |
| , | 169:22 | 1 | | , , , , , , |
| 140:20 141:2,3,5 143:24 146:21,24 | person/child | 32:12 36:9,10 106:25 | 170:8,17 171:13 171:20 172:1 | 93:16,20,21 94:2 94:5,10,14,22 |
| 147:9 152:11 | 125:15 | plan 16:12 103:14 | pleased 68:4 | 96:5 112:3 113:25 |
| 155:7,15 160:6 | personal 34:19 | 104:19,22 105:4 | 106:13 109:19 | 125:19 142:17 |
| 166:13 | 115:10 155:18 | 104.19,22 103.4 | 118:23 | 144:8 |
| people's 165:17 | personally 155:20 | planned 17:20 | pleasing 150:6 | policies 120:13 |
| perceive 67:3,7 | personnel 125:9,14 | planning 70:15 | pm 2:2 53:14 96:12 | 123:5 172:20 |
| perceived 80:18 | 125:16,17,22 | 133:7 | 96:14 145:13,15 | policy 2:15 39:2 |
| 113:5 142:15 | perspective 34:24 | plans 149:17 | 173:14 | 47:15,16,16 50:18 |
| 167:20,21 | 35:1 38:23 60:19 | platinum 106:1 | POELT 12:9 | 105:20 108:8 |
| perception 8:20 | 62:9 65:7 71:22 | play 16:24 | 107:11,12 | 123:10 127:7 |
| 55:4 72:21 83:11 | 86:1 94:20 95:4 | please 2:12 3:5,14 | point 4:13 9:25 | polite 100:14 |
| 91:24 95:22 149:5 | 115:6 136:1 | 3:17,18 4:9 14:21 | 10:1 15:10 23:17 | pool 70:10 84:21 |
| perceptions 43:4 | pertinence 172:13 | 14:24 16:4,5 17:8 | 25:14 34:22 41:22 | poor 9:17 14:7,8,13 |
| r F | r | | | F |
| | | | | |

| 14:17 20:18 35:6 | practitioner 76:14 | 106:12 149:19 | 15:22 16:21 19:16 | properly 24:6,7,8 |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| 35:10 101:15 | 76:18 | priority 106:6 | 23:1,5 24:2 40:22 | 24:14 167:24 |
| 102:23 | practitioners | prison 4:15 6:2,3 | 45:22 46:24 55:20 | proportion 7:15,17 |
| poorly 13:17,19 | 105:12 | 7:21 8:17 10:19 | 63:5 65:21 67:23 | 41:10 147:18 |
| population 28:19 | pre-conception | 10:25 19:25 22:11 | 70:15 78:5,24 | proportionate |
| 48:8,24 | 161:24 | 37:22,22 58:5 | 90:3 92:20 93:3 | 104:5 |
| pose 9:21 113:5,6 | pre-existing 66:21 | 101:15 103:7 | 98:24 103:5 111:5 | proposals 44:20,23 |
| position 17:23 23:4 | 70:22 82:2 95:16 | 107:1,11 114:3,5 | 111:12,24 112:7,9 | 52:20,24 |
| 25:17 27:15 35:8 | 134:5 | 114:13 152:12 | 112:11 117:2 | propose 1:20 2:1 |
| 90:12 143:18 | pre-judgment | 158:6 171:13 | 119:13 120:19 | 128:14 |
| 144:20 163:1,8 | 161:19 | prisoners 3:7 42:19 | 122:22 124:13 | protect 6:20 31:12 |
| 164:22 | prepared 52:22 | prisons 2:14 3:6 | 130:12 154:10 | 31:13 35:20 |
| positions 32:8 | 163:24 | 22:22 37:20 38:5 | 158:4 160:24 | 164:10 |
| positive 31:17 | presence 148:1 | 40:18 44:1 100:1 | processes 15:8 | protected 21:24 |
| 33:23 73:18 82:5 | present 82:4 91:4 | private 7:25 8:1,18 | 47:19 55:18 66:3 | 45:6 |
| 95:10,12 108:3 | 136:24 137:1 | 10:9 12:10 14:2,8 | 81:15 87:20 | protection 5:8 36:3 |
| 109:13 149:18 | 143:11 169:3,8 | 14:12,20 15:15 | 112:15 120:7,12 | 36:7 40:9 41:24 |
| 150:7 151:2,14 | presented 70:2 | 22:12 28:8 32:8 | 122:10 170:22 | 62:7 65:3 68:18 |
| 152:5,17 | presenting 70:16 | 32:12 83:25 124:2 | 173:8 | 101:20,25 102:11 |
| possible 21:5 51:6 | press 37:19 53:24 | 124:5,7,18,24 | processing 5:14 | 103:22 108:8 |
| 51:8,8 52:1 68:24 | 104:15 109:21 | 125:3 | produce 42:9 53:5 | 116:18,23 121:15 |
| 86:20 105:1 | 127:14 | privatisation 13:10 | produced 2:20 4:8 | 121:16 122:22 |
| 133:10 154:24 | pressing 31:7 | 14:1 | 22:22 133:17 | 142:1 144:16 |
| possibly 48:21 | pretty 102:25 | privileges 105:24 | professional 13:6,7 | 146:4 147:7 152:7 |
| 119:20 | prevalence 47:24 | proactively 107:2 | 160:1 | 156:17 159:15 |
| post 8:11 118:11 | 47:24 | probably 7:20 | professionalise | protective 31:18 |
| postdates 110:6 | prevalent 173:5 | 15:16 44:10,17 | 165:10 | protects 6:4 101:22 |
| potential 62:10 | prevent 30:12,13 | 84:3 106:19 124:8 | professionals 34:8 | protocol 110:19 |
| 102:5 131:10,16 | 102:6 | 127:5 166:20 | 79:13 160:10 | 128:8 |
| 135:21 140:10 | prevention 41:25 | Probations 171:14 | professions 13:5 | proven 151:19 |
| 154:9,21 156:15 | 42:20 | problem 12:1 26:25 | 35:14 | provide 15:4 52:21 |
| potentially 73:3 | prevents 21:18 | 27:7 29:5 30:20 | Professor 1:7 51:19 | 52:24 116:10 |
| power 67:3 72:20 | previous 7:2 37:7 | 35:12 36:21 52:4 | 52:10,13 166:24 | 118:25 146:4 |
| 95:19,25 139:8 | 37:17 55:9,16 | 100:21 161:14 | 167:25 | 147:6 |
| powers 37:5 40:20 | 60:6 95:14 109:13 | problematic 9:1 | programme 7:8 | provided 14:21 |
| 94:5 | 148:22 | problems 5:4 9:9 | 19:14 | 18:6 19:22,23 |
| PPO000001 171:15 | previously 7:16 | 11:22 | progress 38:3 | 81:21 97:7 103:17 |
| PPO000003 171:17 | 46:4 | procedure 102:4 | 52:18 82:15 | 104:15 127:19 |
| practical 72:22 | primarily 21:13 | 131:3 153:21 | 149:22 150:11 | 128:8 152:20 |
| practice 14:17 | primary 22:1 | procedures 78:17 | promising 104:3 | 157:1 172:15 |
| 20:11 24:23 35:7 | principles 59:10 | 102:11 120:13 | promote 20:10 | 173:2,7 |
| 35:10 52:14 56:12 | prior 1:14 25:12 | 141:25 142:1 | promoted 12:14,16 | provider 7:24 8:3,4 |
| 56:16 59:11 69:7 | 33:8,14 68:15 | 144:16 147:7 | promulgated 150:9 | 14:6,16 |
| 108:16 110:23,24 | 69:14 121:18 | proceedings 53:21 | prone 69:9 | providers 8:1 10:1 |
| 130:9 141:9 150:8 | 131:11 134:2 | 140:10 | propensity 80:19 | 124:3,18 |
| 161:5 169:11 | priorities 104:24 | process 6:4 15:22 | proper 169:16,23 | provides 173:5 |
| | l | | l | |

| providing 84:2.2 provision 11:18 | | 1 | | | |
|--|----------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------|
| Provision 11:18 14:8,9,10 19:22 19:23 20:12 118:18 146:18 149:12 49:12 19:4 13:15,21 133:10 13:15,21 133:10 13:15,21 133:10 13:15,21 133:10 13:15,21 133:10 13:15,21 133:10 13:15,21 133:10 13:15,21 133:10 13:15,21 133:10 13:15,21 133:10 13:15,21 133:10 13:15,21 133:10 13:15,21 13:15,21 13:15,21 13:15,21 13:15 13:15,21 13:15 13:15,21 13:10 13:1 | providing 84:2,2 | 57:21 133:11 | 78:4,9,22 81:21 | rationale 114:21 | reasoning 76:7 |
| 14.8,9,10 19.22 19.23 20:12 19.18 1846:18 18:16 19.4 18:16 19.4 19.18 19 | | | | | |
| 19:23 20:12 18:16 19:4 18:16 19:4 18:16 19:4 13:15; 19:21 13:10; 113:20 13:15; 21:13:21 13:10 13:10; 19:18 | l - | Q | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | |
| 118:18 146:18 18:16 19:4 qualifications 13:7 13:18 12:19 139:16;17 140:24 139:16;17 140:24 139:16;17 140:24 139:16;17 140:24 139:16;17 140:24 139:16;17 140:24 139:16;17 140:24 139:16;17 140:24 139:16;17 140:24 139:16;17 140:24 139:16;17 140:24 139:16;17 140:24 139:16;17 140:24 139:18 128:19 139:18;18:19 139:18 | | qualification 18:14 | | | |
| 149:12 138 18:5 19:11 120:17 13:8 18:5 19:12 14:22 159:25 14:42 159:25 16:13 149:19 20:17 140:24 149:19 20:17 140:24 149:19 20:17 140:24 144:22 159:25 144:22 159:25 16:13 129:29 16:13 129:29 139:29 16:13 129:29 139:29 16:13 129:29 139:29 139:29 139:29 139:29 139:29 139:39 | | 18:16 19:4 | | | |
| 13:8 18:5 19:21 20:17 quote 15:23 quote 15:23 quote 15:23 quote 13:21 reactions 71:1 reactions | | qualifications 13:7 | - | | |
| Tip:18 | psychologist | 13:8 18:5 19:21 | , | | |
| psychology 107:3 public 10:8 147: publish 150:6 publish 150:6 publish 150:6 publish 23:15 pull 34:16,19 74:10 76:14 90:24 99:20 99:23 100:8 132:8 134:12 144:13 punishing 165:18 punishing 165:16 purpose 9:19 38:21 punishing 165:16 purpose 9:19 38:21 purposely 141:2 purposely 141:4 put 61:6 25:17 33:5 33:7 35:21 40:20 48:3 48:4 166:11,25 7 16:6 13:2 | | 20:17 | | | reassuring 160:13 |
| valide 10/8 14:7 valide 17:9 20:11 valide 17:12 0:25 40:13 valide 17:6 20:15 1 valide 17:6 20:15 20:15 20:15 20:25 | psychology 107:3 | qualitative 137:18 | _ - | | _ |
| 17:1 20:25 40:13 249:19.20 79:3 127:25 129:25 Rachel 171:6 Rachel 171:6 163:5 quarterly 159:10 question 2:7 3:20 152:14:19 16:13 21:10 24:15 25:24 26:24 28:2 28:24 135:19 25:24 26:24 28:2 28:6,11,22 30:25 32:11 35:15 43:16 44:21 50:6,8,11 51:5,20 55:15 punishing 165:18 punished 3:15 48:44 15:7 purpose 9:19 38:21 114:4 131:7 purpose 9:19 38:21 purposes 167:4 pursue 80:1 82:12 82:24 85:6,21 pursued 79:9 push 140:2 pursue 80:1 82:12 pursued 79:9 55:12 91:14 94:9 96:8 99:5 121:9 pushed 136:4 put 6:16 25:17 33:5 33:7 35:5 12 0:20 174:17 166:10 174:7,12 pursued 79:9 55:12 91:14 94:9 96:8 99:5 121:9 pushed 136:4 put 6:16 25:17 33:5 33:7 35:6 44:24 64:7 68:10 79:17 82:12 pushed 136:4 put 6:16 25:17 33:5 36:610 79:17 82:12 pushed 136:4 put 6:16 25:17 136:4 14:21 135:19 pushed 136:4 put 6:16 25:17 33:5 36:02 pushed 136:4 put 6:16 25:17 33:7 35:04:20 pushed 136:4 put 6:16 25:17 33:5 36:02 pushed 1 | 1 0 | quality 15:9 20:11 | _ | | |
| 124:2,24 126:18 | 1 - | 49:19,20 79:3 | | | |
| 146:9 163:5 quarterly 159:10 question 2:7 3:20 13:11 24:12 49:6 13:11 24:12 49:6 13:12 144:13 13:12 144:13 13:12 144:13 13:12 144:13 13:12 144:13 13:12 144:13 13:12 144:13 13:12 144:13 13:12 144:13 13:12 144:13 13:12 144:13 13:12 144:13 13:12 144:13 13:12 144:13 14:13 1 1 | | 127:25 129:25 | R | | receipt 167:4 |
| publish 150:6 published 3:15 quarterly 159:10 question 2:7 3:20 Rainsbrook 9:20 duestion 2:7 3:20 13:11 24:12 49:6 fracise 30:23 115:16 170:25 171:1,4 fracise 30:23 115:16 122:14 received 34:5 41:11 122:14 received 34:5 41:11 173:12 | • | 163:5 | Rachel 171:6 | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | _ |
| published 3:15 question 2:7 3:20 13:11 24:12 49:6 173:12 received 34:5 41:11 publ 54:16,19 74:10 76:14 90:24 99:20 11:21 13:25 14:19 received 34:5 41:11 76:14 90:24 99:20 99:23 100:8 132:8 25:24 26:24 28:2 25:24 26:24 28:2 22:524 26:24 28:2 22:524 26:24 28:2 28:6,11,22 30:25 32:11 35:15 43:16 32:11 35:15 43:16 32:11 35:15 43:16 32:13 55:15 43:16 32:13 55:15 43:16 44:21 50:6,8,11 55:12 62:3 64:17 79:2 100:2 115:2 79:2 100:2 115:2 79:2 100:2 115:2 13:17 153:19 16:13 21:12 recived 34:5 41:11 received 34:5 41:11 42:10 49:9 137:7 171:24 172:23 receives 116:18 recei | publish 150:6 | | Rainsbrook 9:20 | | |
| Triangle Part Par | _ | question 2:7 3:20 | 13:11 24:12 49:6 | · / | received 34:5 41:11 |
| 76:14 90:24 99:20 99:23 100:8 132:8 134:12 144:13 pulled 3:16 78:5 79:7 80:7,25 85:4 130:22 135:11 punishing 165:18 punishing 165:16 purpose 9:19 38:21 114:4 131:7 purposety 141:2 purpose 139:11 purposely 141:2 purpose 167:4 pursue 80:1 82:12 82:24 85:6,21 pursued 79:9 push 40:2 pursued 79:9 push 40:2 pursued 79:9 push 40:2 pushed 136:4 put 6:16 25:17 33:5 33:7 35:21 40:20 43:16 44:24 64:7 68:10 79:17 82:12 94:9 103:12 107:20,22 114:16 119:13 126:2 119:13 126:2 119:13 126:2 166:23 166:17 63:17 64:8 171:24 172:23 receives 116:18 recipient 111:6 recognise 100:19 126:18 39:21 reality 8:20 39:16 41:2 48:25 reality 8:20 39:16 41:2 106:14 recognise 100:19 126:18 139:21 126:18 139:21 recognise 100:19 126:18 139:13 13:10 12:24 recognise 100:19 126:18 139:10 127:22 reality 8:20 | 1 - | 11:21 13:25 14:19 | raise 30:23 115:16 | reading 81:21 | |
| 99:23 100:8 132:8 134:12 144:13 pulled 3:16 78:5 79:7 80:7,25 85:4 130:22 135:11 punishing 165:18 punishment 165:25 punitive 165:16 purpose 9:19 38:21 144:4 131:7 purposely 141:2 purposes 167:4 purposes 167:4 purpose 80:1 82:12 82:24 85:6,21 pursued 79:9 push 140:2 pushed 136:4 put 6:16 25:17 33:5 33:7 35:21 40:20 43:16 44:24 64:7 68:10 79:17 82:12 94:9 103:12 107:20,22 114:16 119:13 126:2 115:21 154:18 139:3 139:3 raised 9:7 13:11,18 13:20,20 36:3 raising 107:16,24 raising 107:16,24 raising 107:16,24 raising 107:16,24 raising 105:17 raising 107:16,24 raising 105:16 raising 107:16,24 raising 105:17 raising 107:16,24 raising 105:17 raising 107:16,24 raising 105:16 raising 107:16,24 raising 105:17 raising 107:16,24 raising 105:16 raising 107:16,24 raising 105:16 raising 107:16,24 raising 105:17 raising 107:16,24 raising 105:16 raising 107:16,24 raising 105:16 raising 107:16,24 raising 105:16 raising 107:16,24 raising 105:16 raising 107:16,24 raising | 1 = | 16:13 21:10 24:15 | 123:24 135:9 | | 171:24 172:23 |
| pulled 3:16 78:5 32:11 35:15 43:16 13:20,20 36:3 realised 105:17 recognise 100:19 79:7 80:7,25 85:4 44:21 50:6,8,11 51:5,20 55:15 79:2 100:2 115:2 124:12 realised 105:17 recognise 100:19 punishing 165:18 punishment 165:25 punitive 165:16 purpose 9:19 38:21 14:4 131:7 166:11,25 133:17 153:19 133:17 153:19 realised 105:17 126:18 139:21 recognise 100:19 126:18 139:21 recognise 67:12 106:14 recognise 7:12 recognise 67:12 106:14 recognise 67:12 106:14 recognise 100:19 124:12 recognise 100:19 126:18 139:21 recognise 100:19 126:18 139:21 126:18 139:21 126:18 139:21 recognise 100:19 126:18 139:21 126:18 139:21 126:18 139:21 126:18 139:21 126:18 139:21 126:18 13 | | 25:24 26:24 28:2 | 139:3 | real 22:16 33:13 | receives 116:18 |
| pulled 3:16 78:5 32:11 35:15 43:16 13:20,20 36:3 realised 105:17 recognise 100:19 79:7 80:7,25 85:4 44:21 50:6,8,11 55:12 62:3 64:17 79:2 100:2 115:2 realised 105:17 126:18 139:21 recognise 100:19 punishing 165:18 punishment 165:25 puniftive 165:16 purpose 9:19 38:21 114:4 131:7 125:7 126:8 138:3 166:11,25 133:17 153:19 166:11,25 realised 105:17 124:18 recognise 100:19 126:18 139:21 recognise 10:19 126:11 | 134:12 144:13 | 28:6,11,22 30:25 | raised 9:7 13:11,18 | 40:4 | recipient 111:6 |
| 79:7 80:7,25 85:4 130:22 135:11 punishing 165:18 punishment 165:25 punitive 165:16 purpose 9:19 38:21 114:4 131:7 purposeful 39:11 purpose 180:1 82:12 82:24 85:6,21 pursued 79:9 push 140:2 pushed 136:4 put 6:16 25:17 33:5 33:7 35:21 40:20 43:16 44:24 64:7 68:10 79:17 82:12 94:9 103:12 107:20 22 114:16 119:13 126:2 182:12 15:18 139:21 124:12 126:18 139:21 126:18 13 | pulled 3:16 78:5 | 32:11 35:15 43:16 | 13:20,20 36:3 | realised 105:17 | |
| punishing 165:18 punishment 165:25 punitive 165:16 purpose 9:19 38:21 114:4 131:7 purposeful 39:11 purposeful 39:11 purposes 167:4 pursue 80:1 82:12 82:24 85:6,21 pursued 79:9 push 140:2 purbosed 136:4 purbosed 136:4 purbosed 136:4 purbosed 136:4 purbose 136:16 25:17 33:5 33:7 35:21 40:20 43:16 44:24 46:7 68:10 79:17 82:12 94:9 103:22 119:13 126:2 107:20,22 114:16 119:13 126:2 166:23 47:2 49:18 61:5 166:17 176:88,20 166:23 47:2 49:18 61:5 166:10 174:7,12 151:21 154:18 167:17 168:8,20 168:23 70:9 80:17 94:24 1133:17 153:19 161:13 raising 107:16,24 108:4,4 recognising 71:24 recommend 46:24 rec | 79:7 80:7,25 85:4 | 44:21 50:6,8,11 | | 124:12 | <u> </u> |
| punishing 165:18 70:9 80:17 94:24 133:17 153:19 41:2 48:25 106:14 recognising 71:24 recommend 46:24 | * | 51:5,20 55:15 | 79:2 100:2 115:2 | reality 8:20 39:16 | recognised 67:12 |
| punishment 165:25 125:7 126:8 138:3 166:11,25 raising 107:16,24 really 31:5 62:10 recognising 71:24 recommend 46:24 rec | punishing 165:18 | | 133:17 153:19 | | _ |
| punitive 165:16 Interpose 9:19 38:21 166:11,25 raising 107:16,24 65:23 67:12 77:2 recommend 46:24 purpose 9:19 38:21 questioned 137:1 questioning 169:7 RAM 111:17 79:12,20 83:6 86:23 103:1 recommend 46:24 purposely 141:2 questionnaires 48:4 RAM 111:17 range 17:19 35:18 41:17 57:14 60:12 66:23 103:1 111:22 112:6 46:3,4 76:24,25 151:20 purposely 141:2 questions 27:16 31:19 33:13 46:10 49:15,16 53:6,22 49:15,16 53:6,22 49:15,16 53:6,22 74:25 75:1 90:16 136:7 138:4 15:14 16:1 37:8 15:14 16:1 37:8 push 140:2 96:8 99:5 121:9 123:20,21 128:14 166:10 174:7,12 166:10 174:7,12 166:10 174:7,12 166:10 174:7,12 174:17 46:33 172:18 24:3 28:10 40:11 38:14 9:12 107:3,8 102:19 106:5 131:21 101:3,8 102:19 106:5 131:21 101:3,8 102:19 106:5 131:21 106:5 131:21 104:6 23 104:10 165:13 106:5 131:21 104:6 24 recommend 46:24 103:21 104:8 104:6 23 104:11 10 165:13 106:5 131:21 101:3,8 102:19 101:3,8 102:19 104:6 23 | | 125:7 126:8 138:3 | 161:13 | really 31:5 62:10 | recognising 71:24 |
| purpose 9:19 38:21 114:4 131:7 questioned 137:1 questioning 169:7 questionnaires RAM 111:17 range 17:19 35:18 41:17 57:14 60:12 48:4 79:12,20 83:6 86:23 103:1 111:22 112:6 111:22 112:6 118:21 126:17,17 130:19 135:17 111:22 112:6 118:21 126:17,17 130:19 135:17 130: | punitive 165:16 | * | raising 107:16,24 | 65:23 67:12 77:2 | |
| purposeful 39:11 purposely 141:2 purposes 167:4 purposes 167:4 pursue 80:1 82:12 82:24 85:6,21 pursued 79:9 push 140:2 pushed 136:4 put 6:16 25:17 33:5 33:7 35:21 40:20 43:16 44:24 64:7 68:10 79:17 82:12 94:9 103:12 107:20,22 114:16 119:13 126:2 151:21 154:18 167:17 168:8,20 168:23 questionnaires 48:4 questions 27:16 48:4 41:17 57:14 60:12 16:6 67:5 71:9 61:6 67:5 71:9 74:25 75:1 90:16 94:4,22 100:2 107:4 124:14 160:12 155:14 163:23 172:18 realm 5:2 realm 5:2 reason 6:1 21:6 24:3 28:10 40:11 101:3,8 102:19 107:4 124:14 rape 87:10 raped 88:19 133:3 138:20 raped 88:19 133:3 138:20 raped 88:19 133:3 138:20 raped 88:19 133:3 169:16 reasonable 100:23 138:20 rarity 91:5 rate 43:6 48:12 91:7 4:22 13:15 102:24 4:22 13:15 102:24 103:21 104:8 46:3,4 76:24,25 151:20 recommendations 151:4 16:1 37:8 151:20 recommendations 15:14 16:1 37:8 15:14 16:1 37:8 16:67:13:84 141:10 165:13 realm 5:2 realm 5:2 raping 93:24 rape 87:10 raping 89:1 raped 88:19 133:3 138:20 raping 89:1 rarely 35:6 36:20 rarity 91:5 rate 43:6 48:12 91:7 rates 124:11 reasonably 4:14,22 4:22 13:15 102:24 13:15 102:24 13:15 102:24 13:15 102:24 13:15 102:24 13:15 102:24 13:15 102:24 13:15 102:24 13:15 102:24 13:15 102:24 13:15 102:24 13:15 102:24 13:15 102:24 13:15 102:24 13:15 104:8 | purpose 9:19 38:21 | | • | 79:12,20 83:6 | recommendation |
| purposely 141:2 48:4 41:17 57:14 60:12 118:21 126:17,17 151:20 recommendations purposes 167:4 questions 27:16 31:19 33:13 46:10 49:15,16 53:6,22 49:15,16 53:6,22 49:15,16 53:6,22 74:25 75:1 90:16 130:19 135:17 151:20 recommendations pursued 79:9 55:12 91:14 94:9 96:8 99:5 121:9 107:4 124:14 realm 5:2 37:16 38:4,9,12 37:16 38:4,9,12 37:16 38:4,9,12 38:14,16,18 43:25 46:6 52:19 83:22 70:4 124:14 <t< th=""><td>114:4 131:7</td><td></td><td></td><td>86:23 103:1</td><td>33:18 37:25 38:21</td></t<> | 114:4 131:7 | | | 86:23 103:1 | 33:18 37:25 38:21 |
| purposes 167:4 questions 27:16 61:6 67:5 71:9 130:19 135:17 130:19 135:17 recommendations pursue 80:1 82:12 82:24 85:6,21 49:15,16 53:6,22 94:4,22 100:2 136:7 138:4 15:14 16:1 37:8 pursued 79:9 96:8 99:5 121:9 107:4 124:14 141:10 165:13 37:16 38:4,9,12 pushed 136:4 96:8 99:5 121:9 140:12 155:14 163:23 172:18 realm 5:2 46:6 52:19 83:22 pushed 136:4 145:7 148:7 166:7 ranging 93:24 ranging 93:24 76:10 174:7,12 174:17 raped 88:19 133:3 87:18 95:10,12 104:21 159:13 104:21 159:13 104:21 159:13 104:21 159:13 104:21 159:13 104:21 159:13 104:21 159:13 104:21 159:13 101:3,8 102:19 104:21 159:13 101:3,8 102:19 104:21 159:13 101:3,8 102:19 104:21 159:13 101:3,8 102:19 104:21 159:13 101:3,8 102:19 104:21 159:13 104:21 159:13 104:21 159:13 104:21 159:13 104:21 159:13 104:21 159:13 104:21 159:13 104:21 159:13 104:21 159:13 104:21 159:13 104:21 159:13 105:21 150:12 106:13 10:41 </th <th>purposeful 39:11</th> <th>-</th> <th>O</th> <th>111:22 112:6</th> <th>46:3,4 76:24,25</th> | purposeful 39:11 | - | O | 111:22 112:6 | 46:3,4 76:24,25 |
| purposes 167:4 questions 27:16 61:6 67:5 71:9 130:19 135:17 recommendations pursue 80:1 82:12 31:19 33:13 46:10 49:15,16 53:6,22 94:4,22 100:2 136:7 138:4 15:14 16:1 37:8 pursued 79:9 55:12 91:14 94:9 96:8 99:5 121:9 107:4 124:14 realm 5:2 38:14,16,18 43:25 pushed 136:4 123:20,21 128:14 145:7 148:7 166:7 ranging 93:24 24:3 28:10 40:11 101:3,8 102:19 put 6:16 25:17 33:5 166:10 174:7,12 ranging 93:24 82:24 85:21,24 104:21 159:13 104:21 159:13 33:7 35:21 40:20 174:17 raped 88:19 133:3 138:20 138:20 106:5 131:21 104:21 159:13 94:9 103:12 107:20,22 114:16 167:10 raping 89:1 rarely 35:6 36:20 rasing 89:1 recommends 46:18 recomdends 46:18 15:121 154:18 167:17 168:8,20 121:4 quite 1:21 35:19 47:2 49:18 61:5 91:7 4:22 13:15 102:24 85:23 86:10 87:3 168:23 47:2 49:18 61:5 74:25 75:1 90:16 74:25 75:1 74:25 75:1 74:25 75:1 74:25 75:1 74:25 75:1 74:25 7 | purposely 141:2 | | | 118:21 126:17,17 | 151:20 |
| 82:24 85:6,21 49:15,16 53:6,22 94:4,22 100:2 141:10 165:13 37:16 38:4,9,12 pursued 79:9 96:8 99:5 121:9 140:12 155:14 141:10 165:13 38:14,16,18 43:25 pushed 136:4 123:20,21 128:14 140:12 155:14 143:23 172:18 166:52:19 83:22 pushed 136:4 145:7 148:7 166:7 166:10 174:7,12 166:10 174:7,12 166:10 174:7,12 174:17 | | _ | | 130:19 135:17 | recommendations |
| pursued 79:9 55:12 91:14 94:9 107:4 124:14 realm 5:2 38:14,16,18 43:25 pushed 136:4 96:8 99:5 121:9 123:20,21 128:14 140:12 155:14 reason 6:1 21:6 46:6 52:19 83:22 put 6:16 25:17 33:5 145:7 148:7 166:7 166:10 174:7,12 ranging 93:24 rape 87:10 87:18 95:10,12 104:21 159:13 recommending 43:16 44:24 64:7 quicker 69:16 167:10 raping 89:1 138:20 134:10 143:3 recommends 46:18 94:9 103:12 quickly 29:10 rarity 91:5 rarity 91:5 reasonable 100:23 65:17,19 77:1,3 65:17,19 77:1,3 65:17,19 77:1,3 79:16 80:4,16 167:17 168:8,20 47:2 49:18 61:5 91:7 4:22 13:15 102:24 85:23 86:10 87:3 168:23 47:2 49:18 61:5 72:17 64:8 72:17 64:8 72:17 64:8 72:10 62:17 63:17 64:8 72:10 62:17 63:17 64:8 72:10 62:17 63:17 64:8 72:10 62:17 63:17 64:8 72:10 62:17 63:17 64:8 85:23 86:10 87:3 | pursue 80:1 82:12 | | | 136:7 138:4 | 15:14 16:1 37:8 |
| push 140:2 96:8 99:5 121:9 140:12 155:14 reason 6:1 21:6 46:6 52:19 83:22 pushed 136:4 123:20,21 128:14 163:23 172:18 reason 6:1 21:6 46:6 52:19 83:22 put 6:16 25:17 33:5 145:7 148:7 166:7 ranging 93:24 82:24 85:21,24 46:23 172:13 33:7 35:21 40:20 166:10 174:7,12 rape 87:10 87:18 95:10,12 recommending 43:16 44:24 64:7 quicker 69:16 138:20 raped 88:19 133:3 166:5 131:21 recommends 46:18 94:9 103:12 107:20,22 114:16 167:10 raping 89:1 rarely 35:6 36:20 reasonable 100:23 60:8 64:4,5 65:2,3 19:13 126:2 121:4 quite 1:21 35:19 rate 43:6 48:12 reasonably 4:14,22 79:16 80:4,16 167:17 168:8,20 47:2 49:18 61:5 91:7 4:22 13:15 102:24 81:12 84:16 85:10 168:23 62:17 63:17 64:8 rates 124:11 103:21 104:8 85:23 86:10 87:3 | 82:24 85:6,21 | | | 141:10 165:13 | 37:16 38:4,9,12 |
| pushed 136:4 123:20,21 128:14 163:23 172:18 24:3 28:10 40:11 101:3,8 102:19 pushed 136:4 145:7 148:7 166:7 ranging 93:24 24:3 28:10 40:11 101:3,8 102:19 33:7 35:21 40:20 43:16 44:24 64:7 166:10 174:7,12 rape 87:10 87:18 95:10,12 recommending 43:10 44:24 64:7 quicker 69:16 138:20 134:10 143:3 recommends 46:18 94:9 103:12 107:20,22 114:16 quickly 29:10 raping 89:1 raely 35:6 36:20 reasonable 100:23 65:17,19 77:1,3 151:21 154:18 quite 1:21 35:19 47:2 49:18 61:5 place 43:6 48:12 page 43:10 page 43:24 pa | pursued 79:9 | | | realm 5:2 | 38:14,16,18 43:25 |
| put 6:16 25:17 33:5 145:7 148:7 166:7 ranging 93:24 82:24 85:21,24 104:21 159:13 33:7 35:21 40:20 43:16 44:24 64:7 166:10 174:7,12 174:17 43:16 44:24 64:7 174:17 43:10:5 131:21 46:23 46:23 94:9 103:12 107:20,22 114:16 167:10 raping 89:1 169:16 recommends 46:18 19:13 126:2 121:4 rarity 91:5 rate 43:6 48:12 149:11 65:17,19 77:1,3 167:17 168:8,20 47:2 49:18 61:5 91:7 4:22 13:15 102:24 81:12 84:16 85:10 168:23 62:17 63:17 64:8 rates 124:11 103:21 104:8 85:23 86:10 87:3 | push 140:2 | | | reason 6:1 21:6 | 46:6 52:19 83:22 |
| 33:7 35:21 40:20 166:10 174:7,12 rape 87:10 87:18 95:10,12 recommending 43:16 44:24 64:7 quicker 69:16 138:20 138:20 134:10 143:3 recommends 46:18 94:9 103:12 107:20,22 114:16 167:10 rapel 87:10 raped 88:19 133:3 169:16 recommends 46:18 119:13 126:2 121:4 rarity 91:5 rate 43:6 48:12 149:11 65:17,19 77:1,3 151:21 154:18 47:2 49:18 61:5 91:7 rate 43:6 48:12 4:22 13:15 102:24 81:12 84:16 85:10 168:23 62:17 63:17 64:8 rates 124:11 103:21 104:8 85:23 86:10 87:3 | pushed 136:4 | - | | 24:3 28:10 40:11 | 101:3,8 102:19 |
| 43:16 44:24 64:7 174:17 raped 88:19 133:3 106:5 131:21 46:23 68:10 79:17 82:12 quicker 69:16 138:20 134:10 143:3 recommends 46:18 94:9 103:12 107:20,22 114:16 quickly 29:10 raping 89:1 169:16 record 36:18 59:21 19:13 126:2 121:4 rarity 91:5 rate 43:6 48:12 149:11 65:17,19 77:1,3 167:17 168:8,20 47:2 49:18 61:5 91:7 4:22 13:15 102:24 81:12 84:16 85:10 168:23 62:17 63:17 64:8 rates 124:11 103:21 104:8 85:23 86:10 87:3 | put 6:16 25:17 33:5 | | | 82:24 85:21,24 | 104:21 159:13 |
| 68:10 79:17 82:12 94:9 103:12 quicker 69:16 167:10 raping 89:1 107:20,22 114:16 119:13 126:2 151:21 154:18 167:17 168:8,20 168:23 138:20 raping 89:1 134:10 143:3 169:16 record 36:18 59:21 169:16 reasonable 100:23 149:11 rate 43:6 48:12 91:7 rate 43:6 48:12 91:7 rates 124:11 103:21 104:8 138:20 raping 89:1 169:16 reasonable 100:23 169:16 reasonable 100:23 149:11 reasonably 4:14,22 4:22 13:15 102:24 103:21 104:8 60:8 64:4,5 65:2,3 149:11 reasonably 4:14,22 4:22 13:15 102:24 103:21 104:8 | 33:7 35:21 40:20 | | <u> </u> | 87:18 95:10,12 | recommending |
| 94:9 103:12 | 43:16 44:24 64:7 | | - | 106:5 131:21 | 46:23 |
| 107:20,22 114:16 quickly 29:10 rarely 35:6 36:20 reasonable 100:23 60:8 64:4,5 65:2,3 119:13 126:2 121:4 quite 1:21 35:19 rate 43:6 48:12 reasonably 4:14,22 65:17,19 77:1,3 167:17 168:8,20 47:2 49:18 61:5 91:7 4:22 13:15 102:24 81:12 84:16 85:10 168:23 62:17 63:17 64:8 rates 124:11 103:21 104:8 85:23 86:10 87:3 | 68:10 79:17 82:12 | - | | 134:10 143:3 | recommends 46:18 |
| 119:13 126:2 151:21 154:18 167:17 168:8,20 168:23 121:4 quite 1:21 35:19 47:2 49:18 61:5 62:17 63:17 64:8 rate 43:6 48:12 91:7 rate 43:6 48:12 91:7 rates 124:11 149:11 reasonably 4:14,22 4:22 13:15 102:24 81:12 84:16 85:10 103:21 104:8 85:23 86:10 87:3 | 94:9 103:12 | | 1 0 | 169:16 | record 36:18 59:21 |
| 151:21 154:18 167:17 168:8,20 168:23 | 107:20,22 114:16 | | • | reasonable 100:23 | 60:8 64:4,5 65:2,3 |
| 167:17 168:8,20 | | | • | 149:11 | |
| 168:23 62:17 63:17 64:8 rates 124:11 103:21 104:8 85:23 86:10 87:3 | 151:21 154:18 | | | reasonably 4:14,22 | |
| 100.25 | | | | | |
| putting 31:12 40:25 65:24 67:4 70:4 rational 80:2 148:25 152:12 87:12 88:10,11,17 | | | | | |
| | putting 31:12 40:25 | 65:24 67:470:4 | rational 80:2 | 148:25 152:12 | 87:12 88:10,11,17 |
| | | l | | l | <u> </u> |

| 112:25 131:19 referenced 16:23 regimes 146:19 reminding 142:16 48:16 | |
|---|--------------------|
| | 166:16 |
| | 3:14 9:18 |
| | 21:2 35:25 |
| | 5 42:6 49:1 |
| | 63:16 |
| | |
| | |
| 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | ent 43:15 |
| | |
| | |
| 129:23 130:9 101:25 112:22 112:22 128:15 replicated 60:20 reprisal | |
| | ts 6:6 10:22 |
| recordings 59:19 49:18 102:7 142:9 143:4,19 9:20 10:4 11:10 11:4 | J 104.2 |
| 130:20 108:21 109:20 162:18,22 163:10 11:12 16:4,23 require | |
| | 6 167:5 |
| | ement 136:2 |
| | ements 90:6 |
| | es 5:6 10:5 |
| 66:9,12 67:18 | 20.10 |
| | ng 30:10 |
| 81:9 82:1 84:8,8 reflected 62:25 141:7,9,18 59:8,23 63:3,6,15 research | |
| | ement 39:11 |
| 92:5 94:14,14,18 reflective 131:18 16:18 20:24 31:17 76:2 80:5,11,23 39:13 | |
| 125:21 130:4 reflects 51:14 130:7 33:20,24 34:19 84:25 87:7 88:13 residen | |
| | tial 18:12 |
| | 20:11 21:6 |
| | 23:24 41:20 |
| recruit 164:13 164:18 release 37:19 101:7,10,11,21 146:14 | |
| recruited 19:2 refreshed 120:24 104:15 109:22 102:13 103:15,17 resign 1 | |
| | ce 149:21 |
| recruitment 12:17 refresher 113:17 relevant 42:9 109:13,18 111:19 resilien | |
| 12:24 103:5 regard 21:16 39:17 reliance 15:3 82:22 122:10 128:24 resolve | |
| | 22:16,18 |
| | ce 44:2 47:8 |
| | 106:6,7 |
| 149:6 152:16 regarded 17:17 163:19 141:21,22 143:17 164:12 | |
| | es 86:20 |
| | 5 127:8 |
| | 1 164:12 |
| reduction 41:25 162:3 remaining 102:8 153:10 164:19 respect | |
| 1 0 1 | 41:12 81:1 |
| reductions 149:20 40:2 79:8 80:18 remand 97:20 170:14 88:19 | |
| refer 74:11 90:2 regime 10:17,19 147:16 reported 16:8 168:22 | |
| ' · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | s 7:3 25:15 |
| reference 36:1 96:3 39:7,8,12 40:6,15 remedial 17:10,12 142:11 153:24 148:24 | |
| | d 6:6 30:19 |
| 135:3 | 68:21 86:7 |
| | |

| , | | | | Page 196 |
|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|
| 102.15 111.12 | 0.10 12 20.21 | 111.0 120.14 15 | -i 160.25 | 79.14.70.12.00.10 |
| 103:15 111:12 | 8:10,12 30:21 | 111:9 120:14,15 | rigour 160:25 | 78:14 79:12 90:19 |
| 120:2 140:15 | 62:13,15,24 109:5 | 123:6 | ringing 88:18 | 117:4 135:25 |
| 141:4,4 162:7 | | reviewing 22:24 | rise 103:6 162:9 | 136:3 144:2 |
| 163:9 164:11 | rest 53:20 | 29:2 122:20 | risen 150:19 151:13 | 156:13 |
| 165:13,23 | restorative 105:11 | reward 105:17,18 | risk 5:23,24 25:8 | routes 60:12 155:3 |
| responded 48:4 | restrain 60:4 66:25 | 105:19 165:16,18 | 25:16 31:12 45:17 | routinely 56:17 |
| 55:5 79:21 95:9 | 68:10 70:13 72:2 | rewarded 105:21 | 63:19 65:5 80:18 | 117:19 |
| 119:6 129:20 | 95:23 | right 8:9,14 9:22 | 90:9,10 98:10,10 | rules 67:11 68:11 |
| 139:2 142:5 | restraining 69:9 | 12:18 27:13 32:18 | 98:17,25 111:17 | 69:1,1 |
| 153:15 | restraint 5:11 | 32:24 54:2,5,8,13 | 111:23,23 112:5,9 | running 14:3 |
| respondents 27:18 | 22:21 23:1,3,8,9 | 55:2,7,11,19,22 | 113:5 119:12 | runs 109:1 |
| 27:20 28:5 31:22 | 23:11,16,18,19,23 | 56:1,6,7,18 57:1,2 | 134:3 138:12 | rushing 35:22 |
| 32:1 | 25:6 66:18 67:6,7 | 57:12 58:14,23 | 139:25 141:1 | <u> </u> |
| responding 73:15 | 67:11,25 68:3,9 | 59:2,15,25 61:11 | 152:8 158:4,9 | safe 4:5 6:8 16:17 |
| 114:2 120:19 | 68:11 69:15,15,20 | 61:12,16,17 62:9 | 167:3,12,23 | |
| 123:2 134:24 | 71:24 73:3,9,10 | 69:24 73:4 74:14 | risks 45:2,10,14 | 73:23 105:1 |
| 140:8 142:1 | 73:18,21 74:5 | 75:18 76:8,10,19 | 63:22 82:3 84:10 | 119:12 164:5 |
| 162:10 | 95:5,11 105:4 | 82:25 83:3,25 | 139:7 | safeguard 46:2 |
| response 4:25 | 110:13 120:17,20 | 86:3 89:2,5,20 | risky 6:13 | 167:13,23 |
| 10:22 23:13 30:10 | 121:1,22 122:11 | 91:10 94:11 96:7 | rival 133:5 163:22 | safeguarded 36:5 |
| 30:25 35:24 37:14 | 122:16,20 143:9 | 96:20 97:5,20 | Road 115:14 | safeguarding 17:13 |
| 37:23 48:12 53:5 | 143:11 | 99:1 100:1 101:13 | robust 15:4 44:18 | 17:18 18:1,2,9 |
| 55:25 59:17 60:3 | restraints 23:6,13 | 102:11,16 104:8 | 70:3 117:23 118:1 | 19:7,15 21:15 |
| 60:15 66:8,9 | 66:14 73:5,6 | 106:10,18 108:13 | 118:6 120:14 | 24:16 36:14 39:2 |
| 67:19 68:7 69:6 | restrictions 100:7 | 109:3,14 110:12 | robustly 120:3 | 40:8 41:7,11,13 |
| 70:3 81:13 90:18 | result 75:23 101:16 | 111:6 112:19,23 | 122:6 | 41:18,21,22,23 |
| 95:12 97:4 109:13 | results 66:1 79:1 | 113:11,19 114:8 | role 2:12,13 3:11 | 42:1 44:22,25 |
| 119:25 127:19 | 104:4,10 | 116:8,16 122:17 | 18:4,6 21:12 22:1 | 45:3,11,19 47:7 |
| 128:3,10 131:5 | retain 124:12 | 122:24 124:14 | 22:5 43:18 55:15 | 56:12,16 62:14,24 |
| 138:24 142:16 | retained 19:2 125:9 | 126:6 129:6,15,18 | 95:23 107:12 | 71:18 97:3 102:4 |
| 146:5 152:20 | 125:13,16 | 130:12 132:6 | 118:8 141:19 | 102:6 103:21 |
| 160:24 162:2 | retraction 75:14,24 | 133:15,22 134:20 | 171:8,17,23 172:5 | 107:7,13 110:1,5 |
| 163:3 164:18 | 117:7 137:8 | 134:24 136:19,20 | roles 21:3 114:23 | 112:21 116:21,22 |
| 169:24 | retraumatising | 137:12,13,21,22 | roll 6:7 | 117:1,5,15 118:14 |
| responses 11:4 | 73:3 | 138:22 142:6,7,16 | roll-out 165:2 | 121:5,19 127:24 |
| 26:22 28:4,17 | return 43:6 53:11 | 143:15 144:2,10 | rolled 17:12 | 132:17 148:9 |
| 36:6 54:19 56:14 | 56:8 85:2 96:11 | 145:1,2,21,24 | rolls 31:4,6 | 152:6 154:8,12,13 |
| 58:13 60:2 62:4 | 145:12 | 146:12,22,25 | room 9:6 22:11 | 156:13,16 158:2 |
| 90:16 114:5 | returning 53:19 | 148:12 152:15 | 25:4 98:6 | 158:20,23 159:16 |
| 165:22 | returns 127:18 | 153:12 154:15 | rooms 98:7,8,9,20 | 161:12,17,22 |
| responsibilities 3:2 | reverse 39:21 | 155:17 156:3,8 | Rosamund 172:2 | 162:15 164:16,17 |
| 3:5 92:18 118:12 | reversed 105:20 | 160:14 161:15 | rotas 92:3 | 164:20 167:8 |
| responsibility 3:7 | review 54:2,6 95:1 | 162:16 164:2 | roughly 44:6 | 170:22 173:8 |
| 21:9 43:23 68:23 | 105:2 108:17 | 168:9,14 | Roughton 172:2 | safeguards 48:18 |
| 71:20 77:21 111:1 | 128:22 159:12 | rigorous 161:18 | round 41:19 134:9 | safer 151:3 |
| responsible 2:15 | reviewed 108:15 | 163:5 | route 44:10,11 | safer' 109:25 |
| | | | <u> </u> | |
| | | | | |

| , | | | | Page 19/ |
|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------|
| safety 3:13 4:15,16 | 59:17 63:9 64:16 | 12.4 9 11 22 | 157:21 158:5 | 142:12 158:11 |
| 5:2,7,10,22 6:25 | 66:15 80:24 | 12:4,8,11,23 14:12 18:11,19 | segregation 146:21 | seriousness 85:15 |
| 8:19,21 13:14,17 | 103:19 129:3,12 | 20:25 22:12 40:1 | Select 37:23,25 | service 10:25 11:6 |
| 16:14 37:7 39:10 | 129:17 130:23 | 40:7 47:12 51:11 | self-harm 23:14 | 15:9 20:1 45:18 |
| 39:12,18 101:12 | 132:11 133:20 | 51:15 124:2,5,7 | 41:25 99:1 103:23 | 61:22 89:24 |
| 101:14 102:21 | 134:13,15 136:13 | 124:24,24 125:3 | 152:8 | 113:24,25 115:12 |
| 104:8,24 105:2 | 134.13,13 130.13 | 146:9 | self-reporting 15:2 | 155:11 164:13 |
| 148:9,13,23 149:2 | 140:5 141:22 | sectors 3:11 14:10 | sell 8:4,5 | 173:1,6 |
| 149:5 151:12 | 148:19 151:25 | 37:15 39:7 40:12 | senior 116:15,25 | services 89:15,19 |
| 152:13 | scrolling 80:14 | 50:23 51:4 124:21 | 147:3 158:5,22 | 90:25 107:4 |
| Saffron 171:5 | scrolls 56:20 | secure 2:18 3:11 | sense 38:15 44:13 | 142:12 143:10 |
| salaries 13:4,6 | scrutinise 159:8 | 4:16 14:23 20:12 | 50:21 55:23 71:14 | 172:15,16,20 |
| 124:4 | scrutiny 38:1,8 | 51:3 | 72:19 95:18 105:5 | 172.13,10,20 |
| sample 44:4 153:1 | 120:6 147:6 | see 1:21 6:12,13 | 105:13,23 114:10 | set 106:12 111:11 |
| 153:23 | sealed 116:11 | 14:7,7,8,9,11,11 | 153:12 | 130:17 141:25 |
| sanction 105:18 | search 24:3 25:5 | 14:12,24 20:13 | sent 57:7 62:6 | 171:8,10 |
| sanction 105.18 | 67:10 88:25 137:1 | 22:4,6 30:11,18 | sent 37.7 62.6 sentence 7:14 20:9 | sets 97:9 99:24 |
| 105:15 | 142:25 | 30:20,20 33:12 | sentenced 97:19 | 110:25 141:6 |
| sat 17:4 | searched 58:4 | 35:9 43:25 45:1,3 | 147:20 | 170:18,21 171:17 |
| satisfied 74:23 | searches 25:2,18 | 46:5 51:17 52:1 | sentiment 45:1 | 170:16,21 171:17 |
| saw 10:7 55:1 58:7 | 67:8 132:16 | 57:13,24 61:24 | separate 45:12 | setting 22:17 |
| 65:6 66:12 71:13 | 136:24 137:5 | 62:17 65:2,24 | 74:18,18 83:8 | 111:22 |
| 76:2 83:14 88:16 | searching 23:25 | 68:4,5 69:6 83:18 | 92:11 167:5 | settings 28:15,16 |
| saying 44:14 51:23 | 24:1,15,20 | 84:7 90:21 92:6 | separately 48:20 | 35:18 45:13 |
| 62:6 71:23 73:12 | second 12:6 13:16 | 92:22 93:9 94:21 | separation 142:14 | seven 8:23 9:15 |
| 75:8 82:23 86:7 | 24:15 27:9 59:7 | 95:13 101:11 | 146:17 | 105:18,19 153:7 |
| 139:11 157:20,22 | 80:7 82:6 84:25 | 102:23 108:19,22 | September 57:18 | sex 140:23 |
| says 4:1 16:6 17:9 | 99:10,13 106:6 | 109:5,11,19 | 57:19 58:2 85:5 | sexual 1:6 5:1,23 |
| 26:2 35:4 36:16 | 108:9 109:9 | 113:14 114:4 | 89:12 110:3,5 | 6:14,21 7:16 |
| 81:8 100:10 | 110:10 111:16 | 119:20 123:16 | 171:15 | 25:25 26:4 42:7 |
| 109:25 131:9 | 129:10 135:4 | 129:5 132:11 | sequentially 26:21 | 43:10,19 47:25 |
| 134:10 136:2 | 137:14 149:23,25 | 134:21 135:1 | series 54:3,20 | 48:16 49:10 54:3 |
| 150:17 151:6 | second/third | 137:14 138:15 | 57:17 70:19 | 63:21 74:13 77:12 |
| scales 124:1 | 128:24 | 149:19 150:1,4 | 108:25 | 79:8 81:11,14 |
| scared 59:23 | seconded 124:25 | 157:25 158:2,12 | serious 3:25 7:22 | 95:22 111:7 114:2 |
| scene 126:18 | section 41:23 87:12 | 168:14,25 | 13:10 86:9,14,18 | 114:5,24 115:5,22 |
| scheme 105:25 | 88:6 89:23 90:6 | seeing 73:5 | 87:10,23 88:15,17 | 117:3 119:4 123:3 |
| schemes 7:11 | 90:12 91:5,19,25 | seen 4:21 5:13,15 | 88:21,22 89:3 | 140:22 142:10,24 |
| school 30:14 | 92:21 93:4,14 | 5:16 8:1 10:7,7 | 100:6,21 112:1 | 143:8,14 146:4 |
| SCHs 40:7 | 99:15 101:11 | 12:22 22:8 35:13 | 113:16 114:2,23 | 153:4 154:16 |
| scope 86:17 | 115:22 129:12 | 44:20 61:19,25 | 121:12 141:12 | 157:20 163:11 |
| score 102:24 | 135:5,7 143:19 | 67:19,22 73:20 | 151:20 157:23 | 164:10 166:14,17 |
| 148:13 | 144:9,18 159:3 | 84:9 86:4,13 | 158:8 | 171:11,25 172:23 |
| scores 6:12,15 | sections 3:19 41:24 | 94:16 95:7 120:17 | seriously 26:6 | sexualised 99:1 |
| screen 3:16 168:23 | sector 7:24,25 8:1 | 121:2 125:2 | 29:17 35:17 38:6 | sexually 6:11 48:5 |
| scroll 54:23 57:8 | 8:18 10:9,9,10,18 | 147:21 157:5,12 | 101:9 102:20 | 48:9 58:6 59:1 |
| | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> |
| | | | | |

| | | | | Page 196 |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|
| 72:4 88:24 142:20 | siloed 45:18 | 21:10 28:5 42:5 | 63:3 65:3 68:5 | 150:15 |
| SFC000007 132:4 | silver 105:25 | 42:11 45:18 87:6 | 75:19 76:9 78:2 | staff 6:5,6,6,21 |
| SFC000007 132.4 SFC000023 170:20 | similar 18:18 20:20 | 136:6 | 80:5 81:17 83:14 | 8:15,24,25 9:10 |
| shame 139:8 | 20:22 33:22 35:13 | small 34:21 51:19 | 83:23 87:3 92:3 | 9:21 10:6 11:1,5 |
| share 98:6,10 | 37:11 39:17 43:17 | 98:3 144:8 153:1 | 93:3 94:19 95:14 | 11:22 12:6,8 |
| 154:14 | 44:10 76:2,9 | smaller 33:23 | 105:24 114:13 | 16:17 17:13,21 |
| shared 86:13 98:9 | 80:25 137:12 | 34:17,18,18,22,25 | 116:19 117:12 | 18:2,4,5,7,8,12,12 |
| 98:20 139:2,20 | 148:13 | 146:10 | 126:2,18 132:5 | 18:15 19:6,14,16 |
| sharing 18:25 | similarly 10:8 48:6 | snapshot 42:16 | 133:13 137:12 | 19:17,23 20:1,7 |
| 98:22 | 88:15 148:10 | 48:6,12 | 172:18 | 20:16,18,24 21:12 |
| Sharpling 1:8 50:9 | 171:12 | social 68:18 88:4 | sorted 29:8,10 | 21:15 22:19 23:16 |
| 50:10 51:5,17 | simple 11:12,14 | 89:15,19 90:2,5 | sorts 14:17 36:16 | 25:13 26:5 27:3,9 |
| 125:6,7,23 126:6 | 154:23 | 90:25 94:23 | sought 81:17 143:4 | 27:23 28:11 29:15 |
| 166:9,11,22 | simpler 28:23 | 115:11 117:15 | sound 103:22 | 29:17 30:10 32:19 |
| shift 22:13 | simpler 28.23 simply 21:5 34:13 | 118:8,9,18 119:19 | source 115:7 | 32:22 33:4,24 |
| shirt 22.13 short 53:13 74:2 | 155:6 164:1 | 123:12 126:8,24 | source 113.7 sources 15:12 | 35:5,9,16 41:10 |
| 126:5 145:14 | 170:17 | 127:12 142:12 | 62:11 | 41:20 48:20 51:24 |
| 166:25 170:7 | single 4:3 44:5 98:8 | 143:10 147:2,3,10 | space 47:14 73:23 | 51:25 52:6,7 55:4 |
| 173:3 | 107:17 142:14 | 147:19,22,24 | 83:25 | 55:10,12,23 56:3 |
| shortage 126:24 | 146:24 | 147:19,22,24 | span 78:20 | 56:13 59:13 60:3 |
| 127:1 | Sir 1:7 51:18,19 | 155:13,14 157:5,6 | spans 129:13 | 60:9,13,17,20 |
| shorter 28:23 | 52:10,13 166:24 | 157:11 158:21 | speak 5:10 28:7 | 61:10 63:11,19,23 |
| shortly 16:10 | 167:25 | sole 131:14 | 108:17 118:15,16 | 64:12,20,24 65:13 |
| shorts 58:20 143:13 | sit 1:23 2:1 22:11 | solution 12:25 | 135:19 | 65:18,25 68:9,20 |
| show 75:19,22 87:3 | 159:10 | solutions 46:23 | speaking 3:9 34:6 | 68:22 69:9,12,13 |
| 95:14 130:5 | site 52:6 | solved 12:1 | 114:14 | 69:15,23 70:11,19 |
| 172:18 | sites 10:9 13:2 | somebody 73:15 | special 154:16 | 71:12 72:23 73:6 |
| shower 11:16 88:20 | sits 21:7 170:11 | 105:6,18,18 | specific 36:6 52:10 | 74:22 75:3,6 |
| showing 104:4 | sitting 1:6 72:6 | 127:13 | 85:4 98:19 115:22 | 77:13,18 79:9 |
| 109:15 | situation 4:6,10,12 | something's 140:16 | 122:2 131:25 | 80:19 82:3,13 |
| shows 57:9 | 4:12 90:17 121:23 | sophisticated 30:4 | 136:11 154:3 | 83:12,20,23 84:14 |
| sickness 107:20 | 138:23 | sorry 32:11 35:22 | specifically 4:25 | 86:15 87:11 88:23 |
| side 19:5 57:21 | situations 23:17 | 52:17 66:16 85:1 | 11:16 47:4 66:24 | 88:25 89:1 90:14 |
| sides 97:13 | 72:12 94:2 | 99:16 105:18 | 124:16 132:2 | 91:3 93:22 95:21 |
| sign 17:21 117:20 | six 8:23 9:15 54:4 | 110:4,11 121:16 | 153:3 164:14 | 100:12,13,20 |
| signed 163:6 165:5 | 56:18 120:25 | 123:18 129:10 | 166:2 | 102:2,3,10 103:4 |
| significance 76:17 | 126:17 136:15 | 135:3 137:24 | spend 21:21 54:15 | 103:25 105:1 |
| significant 4:6 15:3 | sixth 1:9 | 138:1 152:2 | 54:22 | 106:8,9,10,21 |
| 26:4 39:15 40:8 | size 34:23,24 153:1 | 155:25 160:6 | spoke 71:17 77:18 | 107:1,8,13,15,18 |
| 131:10 150:20 | 153:23 | 165:7 | spoken 51:24 64:25 | 107:19,22 108:2 |
| significantly 28:19 | skill 72:12,15 | sort 5:9,11 8:17 | 85:14 86:2 117:14 | 111:6,13 112:2,8 |
| 28:20 109:25 | skilled 69:14 | 10:16 11:7,8 | 121:20 | 112:19,23 113:1,4 |
| 131:16 | skills 140:13 | 34:22 37:1 38:7 | spot 78:9,15 81:18 | 113:10 117:14 |
| signing 114:17 | skip 28:1 | 38:22,22 41:5 | spread 54:9 | 118:16 119:21 |
| signpost 123:11 | SLA 114:10 | 43:8 50:5,22 | squeezing 58:6 | 120:24 121:11 |
| signs 139:22 | slightly 4:17 14:19 | 51:15 58:21 62:19 | stability 12:4 | 122:3,14 123:8,13 |
| | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | |
| | | | | |

| | | | | Page 199 |
|----------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 123:24 124:12 | 26:2 31:16 33:18 | 77:23 | substantial 92:19 | 44:22 46:19 56:3 |
| 125:1,3 136:24 | 42:2,4 46:13 | stopped 26:11 | substantiated 77:9 | 61:14,15 62:5,8 |
| 137:4,19 138:3,5 | 49:10 97:7 99:11 | stopped 20.11 stopping 30:21 | 78:13 89:7 91:18 | 66:10 72:15 79:17 |
| 137.4,19 138.3,3 | 99:14 102:23 | 11 0 | 125:12 144:7 | |
| 2 2 2 | | story 45:22 | | 81:7,16 85:7,16 |
| 140:2,7,13 141:14 | 103:10,14 106:16 107:17 111:5 | straight 12:9 22:15 90:2 | substantive 1:9 | 98:3,14 102:14 103:21 104:2 |
| 142:24 143:8 | | | 89:24 91:7,18,22 | |
| 149:6,21 154:8,13 | 115:8 119:24 | straightforward | 91:25 92:8,16,17 | 107:4 118:25 |
| 155:6,7,14,22 | 122:13 127:24 | 154:24 | 92:25 94:10 | 119:1,3,3,6,8,16 |
| 156:17,18 160:3 | 131:8,11,15,22 | strategic 51:15 | 119:25 144:8 | 119:20,22 121:9 |
| 161:7 162:7,12 | 147:5 148:5 | strategies 163:23 | success 7:10 149:7 | 121:10 123:11 |
| 164:14,24 165:4 | 151:17 152:1 | strategy 87:13,24 | 150:15 | 146:20 152:7 |
| 165:11 167:3,15 | 153:7,23 157:10 | 92:16 103:2 104:4 | successful 23:5 | 156:22 157:1,4,7 |
| 167:15,16,19 | 157:22 162:20 | 104:23 105:3 | successfully 15:6 | supported 55:13 |
| staff's 41:12 69:5 | 167:1 168:3 169:1 | 110:1,5,12 122:21 | suffer 127:1 | 147:8 |
| staffed 106:17,20 | 170:7,17,20,21 | 142:25 159:2,19 | sufficient 19:7,10 | supporting 99:12 |
| staffing 8:8 10:11 | 171:14,20 172:3 | Straw 2:7,8,10,11 | 20:21 41:14 88:1 | suppose 34:25 |
| 10:13 11:13,23 | 172:22 173:3 | 53:4,8 174:6 | 142:15 | 45:10 65:23 66:20 |
| 21:10 29:25 103:3 | statements 2:20 | stress 67:15 | sufficiently 17:18 | 68:8 74:20,24 |
| 164:12 | 49:8 128:6 171:6 | stretched 47:7 | 36:5 | 75:4 76:24 88:9 |
| Staffordshire | states 44:3 156:20 | strip 23:25 24:15 | suggest 35:5,17 | 90:8,11,16,21 |
| 170:13,15,19 | stating 85:14 | 24:20 25:5 | 48:24 84:17 89:8 | 92:15 131:2 136:6 |
| stage 75:7 77:7,7,8 | statistics 4:7 26:8 | stronger 163:8 | 98:24 | 138:4 139:10 |
| 77:9,9,10 116:7 | 43:18,24 173:2 | struck 158:14 | suggested 12:3 61:9 | 140:18,24 143:22 |
| 123:25 | status 68:18 147:17 | structural 22:7 | suggesting 61:8 | supposed 42:15 |
| stairwells 16:9 | statutory 40:15 | structurally 129:20 | 69:21 | sure 7:4,17 12:18 |
| stand 36:12 60:9,16 | 41:1 43:16,23 | 153:15 | suggestion 43:16 | 16:1 25:20,22 |
| 78:20 | 92:18 | structure 39:16 | 58:16,25 130:24 | 31:9 35:19 36:22 |
| standard 59:19 | stay 157:6 | 45:22,23,24 122:5 | 163:12 | 36:24 38:20 43:23 |
| 79:19 130:5 156:4 | STC 7:23 10:9 | structured 155:1 | suggestions 41:8 | 45:16,21 49:1 |
| standardise 114:4 | 12:23 13:15 15:3 | struggle 105:10 | suicide 41:25 | 50:11 69:8 71:21 |
| standards 12:5 | 39:8,11 50:1,16 | struggling 12:8 | suitable 23:21 | 115:19 116:4 |
| 81:22 151:7,10 | STCs 5:2,4 10:14 | 38:17 | suite 121:25 | 145:7 164:4 |
| 165:11 | 10:15 11:17 17:24 | Stuart 171:7 | summarise 88:21 | 166:18 170:9 |
| standing 32:14 | 18:3 20:19 22:2 | studies 53:23 95:8 | summarised | surprise 68:20 75:6 |
| stands 5:5 | 26:23,24 27:2 | study 101:7 | 101:11 | surprised 95:9 |
| stark 33:13 131:15 | 28:11,12,17,19,24 | stuff 30:22,22 46:1 | summary 13:12 | 101:2 |
| start 18:16 22:15 | 31:1 39:4,20,21 | subgroup 102:8 | 64:22 87:18,19 | survey 13:14 26:22 |
| 57:17 90:12 | 40:7 50:14,25 | subject 5:23 123:18 | 89:2 | 28:3,16,23,25 |
| started 165:4 | STEIN 52:17 53:3 | subjected 91:19 | supervised 21:2,3 | 31:1,19 42:21,22 |
| starting 19:11 67:6 | 53:9 | 144:9 | supervision 20:6,10 | 43:1,3,9,13,20 |
| 123:15 140:18,19 | steps 66:4 96:5 | submission 156:20 | 20:20 72:16 | 44:4,4,5,6 48:1,3 |
| 140:20 141:10 | 102:17 130:6 | submit 132:19 | supervisory 20:8 | 48:6,7,12 58:13 |
| 144:1 | 137:18 157:17 | submitted 58:3 | 20:23 21:7 22:19 | surveys 28:14 42:2 |
| state 79:15 139:6 | 167:5 | subsequent 36:13 | supplied 94:3 | 42:17 49:14 |
| statement 2:21,25 | stick 2:5 | 162:13 | support 22:16 34:1 | survival 73:16 |
| 6:16 12:3 21:11 | stop 30:22 38:6 | substance 78:3,4 | 38:7 40:10,16,18 | suspend 167:18 |
| | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | l | <u> </u> |

| | | | ı | |
|--------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| suspended 112:2 | talked 11:3 143:24 | 18:17 19:13 21:3 | 46:10 49:3,17 | 83:8 88:10 92:3 |
| 112:12 143:6 | talking 32:9,19 | 23:15 32:7 34:8 | 50:9,10 51:17,19 | 94:7 97:12 102:15 |
| suspicion 130:25 | 64:11 77:11 95:21 | 34:23 38:19 40:3 | 52:16 53:9,10,17 | 109:6 111:7 |
| 131:6 132:5,23 | 114:19,19 126:16 | 40:22,23 41:21 | 53:18 57:2 65:10 | 113:14,17 126:20 |
| 144:23 160:18 | 154:19 155:6 | 44:9 45:24 46:3 | 96:2,8,10,15,19 | 135:23 140:21 |
| sustain 149:20 | target 109:5 133:7 | 47:11,12,14 48:20 | 99:17,20 123:22 | 141:18 165:15 |
| swift 10:23 | task 159:3 | 52:8 55:17 59:18 | 125:5,7 126:6 | 167:24 |
| switched 73:14 | tasks 106:3 | 59:19 60:2,4,5,8 | 127:15,16,17,17 | think 1:25 5:5,24 |
| sworn 96:17 145:18 | Taylor 164:19 | 60:10,14,15,17,17 | 128:18 145:9,9,16 | 5:24 6:1 9:18 |
| 174:10,15 | teachers 27:11 | 60:19,19 61:3 | 145:20 166:6,8,11 | 10:1 11:24 12:17 |
| system 7:12,13 | team 39:21 47:17 | 62:11 63:21 64:4 | 166:22,24 167:25 | 12:23,24 13:3,5 |
| 18:24 23:9 31:1 | 50:18 82:21 | 64:10 65:5,17 | 170:2,3,4,6 | 13:25 15:16 16:15 |
| 37:13 38:25 45:7 | 100:17 102:5,7 | 66:9,9,13 67:2,18 | 173:13 | 16:15,16,19 18:3 |
| 50:20 78:24 154:7 | 116:21,22 117:5 | 68:7,8 69:6,8,11 | thematic 34:4 | 18:4,13,16 19:1,5 |
| systems 97:2 | 119:18,19 121:5 | 70:2,6,23 71:5,14 | theme 55:3,20 56:2 | 19:9 20:1,2,20,22 |
| 103:22 104:1 | 149:2 158:23,23 | 71:16 72:7,9,17 | 65:11 76:9 78:6 | 21:14 22:3,6,16 |
| 118:5 123:2 146:3 | teams 39:18 | 74:20,24 75:2 | 80:7,25 82:20 | 22:18 23:7 24:24 |
| 164:10 170:18 | technique 23:21,21 | 76:4,25 78:12 | 90:24 91:1,9 | 24:25 25:10,10,17 |
| | 73:16 | 79:16,25 81:4,5,6 | 130:19,24 131:25 | 29:17 32:16 34:1 |
| T | techniques 95:2 | 81:10,12,13,15,22 | 133:14 144:24 | 34:2 35:9,11,13 |
| tab 99:15,19 | 140:15 | 82:2,10,12 83:16 | themed 107:25 | 35:14,16 36:12,13 |
| tackle 151:1 | telephone 11:15,16 | 83:17,24 84:1,5 | themes 53:23 54:11 | 36:16 37:13 40:11 |
| take 9:2 20:3 26:5 | 31:21 32:15,20 | 84:13,19 86:7 | 54:20 59:6,20,25 | 40:18 41:13 43:22 |
| 29:17 34:3 38:6 | telephones 11:18 | 88:7 90:4,6,16 | 60:15 70:21 89:25 | 44:1,13,14,16,20 |
| 43:12 53:10 54:21 | 32:7,7,17 149:9 | 92:1,7,10,15,20 | 128:15,21 130:22 | 44:25 45:2,7,20 |
| 64:14 72:15 77:22 | tell 17:4 21:20 | 93:5,6,15,18 | 135:8,11 136:21 | 45:24 46:12,20,22 |
| 85:24 86:18 90:19 | 27:23 29:14 34:11 | 109:16 117:11 | 152:21 160:17 | 46:25 47:18 48:15 |
| 92:7 96:10 98:11 | 35:15 41:8 50:13 | 118:2 119:6,25 | theory 34:20 | 48:16 49:20,24 |
| 99:21 101:8 116:2 | 59:24 66:19 79:9 | 120:19 124:22 | thing 5:12 11:25 | 50:7 51:3,11,11 |
| 117:13 137:11 | 97:10,22 | 130:3,8,9,21 | 14:15 16:16 30:24 | 51:13 52:4,20 |
| 140:4 142:8 | temporarily 12:14 | 131:2,4,15 135:24 | 45:20 58:21 68:5 | 54:6,19 56:20 |
| 145:10 147:17 | 12:16 | 135:24 136:4,7 | 74:2 78:8 79:14 | 57:15 58:17,24 |
| 151:19 155:20 | ten 126:4 129:6 | 138:11 139:8,17 | 86:9,22 133:13 | 59:4,20,25 60:11 |
| 156:20 158:11,21 | 152:23 153:23 | 140:8,12,17,18,25 | 156:14 158:10 | 61:1,8,17 62:5,9 |
| 164:2 170:23 | 168:15 | 144:15,19,22 | 164:3,21 167:13 | 62:15,21 63:1,4 |
| taken 35:17 78:14 | tend 32:25 126:21 | 146:3 148:13 | things 5:11 6:7,9 | 63:15,15,20 64:4 |
| 87:14 96:5 102:17 | 165:19 | 157:7 160:23,25 | 8:22 11:19,24 | 64:5,17,23 65:1 |
| 106:22 113:18,20 | tended 130:16 | 163:3,8 164:12 | 12:2 15:21 18:4 | 65:10,16,17 66:7 |
| 117:21 141:12 | tends 15:8 | 165:11,14,18 | 18:10 30:18 31:4 | 66:12,16,20 67:2 |
| 157:17 165:17 | tension 160:1 | 171:9 | 31:5 34:2 39:17 | 67:2,17,19 68:7 |
| 169:22 | term 126:5 | test 4:15,15 5:7 | 41:18 43:8 44:16 | 68:13 69:4,11,19 |
| takes 156:16 | terms 4:24 6:10 | 41:12 101:15 | 44:17 46:8,21 | 70:3,4,14,17,20 |
| talk 9:5 19:11,13 | 7:17 8:14,20,21 | 152:12,13 | 60:6 61:3,17,24 | 71:4,6,16,18,23 |
| 45:13 63:25 73:8 | 12:2,24 13:2,17 | tests 6:2,3,13 39:10 | 62:7 63:18 64:6 | 72:6,6,9,12,17,22 |
| 104:23 117:10 | 13:25 14:5 15:25 | 39:12,23 | 75:19 77:4,25 | 73:9,17,19,19 |
| 140:2 155:15 | 17:5,24,25 18:3,5 | thank 1:17 25:24 | 81:17,18,23 83:6 | 74:19,22 75:18,21 |
| | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> |
| | | | | |

| | | | | 1age 201 |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 76:1,12,14,23,24 | 153:10 154:5,7,22 | 50:4 52:5,11,12 | 84:24 158:18 | treble 126:13 |
| 77:5,10 78:7,12 | 155:16 156:6 | 52:20 60:1 63:20 | topics 54:16 | trends 5:16 43:8 |
| 78:16,17,22,23 | 157:9 158:4,14 | 67:16 71:18 81:24 | total 44:11 54:6 | triage 158:20 |
| 79:5,7 80:2,5,7,10 | 159:2 161:4,9 | 83:19 98:21 | totally 7:12 74:1 | triaging 156:18 |
| 80:25 81:4,8,11 | 162:12,19,20 | 100:15,16 101:4 | touch 158:25 | triangulate 43:1 |
| 81:20 82:6,19,22 | 163:12,15,18 | 106:19 109:7 | touches 132:15 | triangulating 15:11 |
| 83:10,16,16,21,21 | 164:9 165:2,6,8 | 117:10,24 125:10 | touching 21:4 | 15:24 |
| 83:22 84:1,5 85:1 | 165:24 166:18,19 | 125:14 126:1,4 | tough 149:14 | tricky 140:17 |
| 85:3 86:4,6,8,16 | 166:25 168:2,7 | 127:22 128:16 | track 61:5 77:4 | tried 105:13 165:15 |
| 86:23 87:5,16,19 | 169:11 173:4 | 147:9 149:10 | 78:24 113:5,13 | triggers 68:24 |
| 88:16 89:2,6,7,17 | thinking 66:6 | 153:7 157:7,13 | trackable 77:1 | troubling 3:23 |
| 89:22 90:1,15,22 | 125:10 | 161:6 163:24 | tracked 92:22 | true 7:18 39:22 |
| 90:24 92:5,14 | third 14:24 51:2 | 165:17 169:9 | tracking 61:3 | 86:15 |
| 93:2,15 94:12 | 59:7 129:10 143:7 | 171:1 | 112:21 | trust 6:20 21:17 |
| 95:1 97:1 98:19 | 146:16 148:21 | timeliness 36:22 | trained 55:13 66:24 | 30:19 31:13 35:19 |
| 99:12,14,18 100:8 | 149:3 150:16 | timely 36:25 102:5 | 72:23 106:11 | 137:8 |
| 102:23 103:18 | 156:8 | 129:20 153:15 | 107:22 122:15 | try 26:12,14 57:2 |
| 107:1 108:3,4,7,8 | thorough 67:10 | times 9:16 10:13 | 140:7 154:8 | 78:21 97:3 102:17 |
| 108:10,23 109:16 | 137:4 | 28:14 30:25 58:7 | 164:24 | 103:12 113:4 |
| 109:21 110:11,17 | thought 75:22 | 61:3,18 105:9,18 | training 2:18 4:16 | 122:1 138:7,11 |
| 111:4,17 113:22 | 132:20 159:21 | 105:19 113:14 | 12:5,9,10 14:23 | 154:23 |
| 113:23 114:7,19 | 162:9 | 120:10 121:21 | 17:10,12,14,16,19 | trying 57:25 60:4 |
| 115:4,8,18,24 | thoughts 153:20 | timetable 2:3 | 17:22,24,25 18:2 | 65:5 75:10 92:10 |
| 116:3,5,16 117:16 | threads 100:8 | tips 140:15 | 18:6 19:4,5,10,10 | 94:8 95:15 100:8 |
| 118:5 119:6 | threat 150:14 | today 1:11,20,23 | 19:12,14,18 41:11 | 141:2 |
| 120:13,18 122:9 | threats 142:11 | 2:4 5:5 12:25 | 41:17,18 69:21 | Tuesday 173:15 |
| 122:23 123:4,4,5 | three 3:10 8:11 | 36:12 52:21 54:10 | 81:6 103:4 107:8 | turn 11:11 14:20 |
| 123:6,17 126:9,12 | 39:7 40:12 47:13 | 54:22 67:21 71:13 | 107:10,12,14,16 | 14:23 16:3 22:24 |
| 126:21 127:8,10 | 51:16 59:9 105:25 | 127:22 143:17,25 | 107:21 108:5 | 26:10,25 27:6 |
| 127:21 130:3,7,16 | 118:11,23 126:9 | 145:3 173:12 | 111:25 113:15 | 29:5 36:2 129:1 |
| 130:18 131:9,25 | 146:13 | toilet 6:7 31:4,6 | 116:19 121:11 | 131:23 |
| 132:4,8,13 133:18 | 90:4 142:13 159:2 | told 7:5 29:18,23 | 122:14 141:14 163:4 164:15,17 | Turning 3:13 59:6 |
| 133:20 134:12,18 134:23 135:7,13 | 159:19 | 77:19 86:21 133:1 138:13 | 164:17 | turnover 8:25 9:21 9:22 10:6 11:22 |
| 135:16,24,25 | thresholds 45:4 | tomorrow 1:20,25 | transformed 7:3 | turnovers 10:8 |
| 136:14,14 137:15 | thrust 168:11 | 12:1 | transparent 38:4 | two 2:19 3:10 13:12 |
| 137:17 138:10,18 | tick 116:4 | tone 163:3 | 77:1 | 18:4,20,23 19:1 |
| 138:19 139:1,4,4 | tie 62:16 | tool 20:10 42:21 | trauma 55:9 66:21 | 19:19 28:13 29:1 |
| 139:15,24 140:4,6 | tight 46:9 | 172:7,8 | 68:17 72:18 | 34:2 36:13 41:7 |
| 140:12,14 141:8 | time 4:13,20 21:21 | tools 105:22 106:9 | traumatic 23:3 | 46:10,10 49:7 |
| 141:14 143:16,22 | 24:9 28:1 30:14 | top 7:20 8:14 15:1 | traumatising 73:7 | 50:15 59:13,20 |
| 144:15,16,21,24 | 30:14,15,16 35:23 | 65:11 100:25 | travel 106:13 | 60:6 66:6 69:4 |
| 145:2 146:12 | 36:11 37:2 40:19 | 101:13 113:2 | treated 6:5 65:7 | 74:11,18,18 79:7 |
| 148:10 149:12,24 | 42:16 43:5,11,13 | 129:4,12 144:5 | treating 64:21 | 81:1 83:6,8 97:11 |
| 151:19 152:3,4,13 | 44:19 46:9 47:21 | 151:5 | treatment 3:7 | 97:13 98:20 |
| 152:15,23 153:1,6 | 48:2,18 49:2,2 | topic 70:9 76:22 | 42:18 | 104:24 106:12 |
| | | ļ - | <u> </u> | |
| | | | | |

| | _ | _ | _ | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|
| 110:15 132:1 | 123:9 130:10,15 | 37:1,3 | victims 23:2 102:15 | |
| 136:24 141:18 | 163:13,15 172:14 | unwavering 150:13 | 104:2 | wait 129:8 |
| 142:14,15 144:25 | understands 38:20 | up-to-date 18:9 | video 150:24 | Wales 4:4 |
| 146:15 153:5,24 | 77:14 | 173:4,11 | view 14:2 21:12 | walking 32:19 |
| 158:12 161:9 | understood 55:9 | updated 108:11 | 34:6 65:18 66:22 | want 27:6 30:7 |
| type 14:6 21:18 | 71:21 112:17 | Updating 23:4 | 67:9 70:22 71:4,7 | 33:15 34:10 52:17 |
| types 15:20 51:16 | 157:19 | upheld 125:12 | 72:9 73:15 77:6 | 54:15 71:8 72:17 |
| | undertake 167:7 | upskill 165:11 | 86:16 88:9,10 | 88:11 90:4 107:17 |
| U | undertaken 93:19 | urge 101:6 | 90:3,5,11,21 | 117:12,20 143:21 |
| ultimately 57:16 | 94:2 143:19 167:3 | urgent 17:10,12 | 92:15 93:3,5,11 | 152:5,22 154:22 |
| 154:11 159:23 | undertaking 92:20 | 40:22 | 93:23 94:9 95:3 | 168:22 |
| 163:25 | 93:7 | use 5:17 11:14,16 | 115:23,24 116:1 | wanted 13:9 46:7 |
| unable 10:19 164:2 | undertook 137:4 | 22:21 31:21 60:12 | 126:16 130:4 | 131:7 139:19 |
| unauthorised 25:8 | underused 150:24 | 76:13 77:10 91:1 | 131:4,6 138:12 | wants 33:2 |
| uncertainty 8:2,2 | undue 82:22 | 100:3 102:1 104:4 | 141:15 144:15 | warning 85:18 86:5 |
| unclear 20:18 | unduly 162:12 | 115:3,20 116:1 | 153:18 159:12 | warranted 142:19 |
| 80:15 85:11,21,24 | unfortunately | 122:15,21 126:13 | 168:17 | wasn't 62:8,18 66:4 |
| 88:7 | 169:5 | 131:3 150:22 | views 59:9 115:3 | 67:12 69:22 74:24 |
| uncommon 160:11 | unidentified 133:1 | 151:13 152:9 | 130:18 143:3 | 75:8 79:13,15 |
| Under-reporting | unit 9:9 20:7 21:21 | 159:9 | 160:9 | 82:4,16 87:16,17 |
| 15:5 | 23:24 27:3 34:22 | useful 71:6 75:22 | violence 5:11,17,22 | 87:25 117:10 |
| underlying 11:8 | 97:24 98:3,4 | 84:7 102:9 126:17 | 6:10,18 13:23 | 130:9 134:1,8,10 |
| 50:13 57:23 | 104:3 117:14 | 144:21 | 30:7,17 41:25 | 138:10 145:5 |
| underneath 57:9 | 122:2 138:9 | uses 11:1 | 100:3,6,21 102:14 | 169:17 |
| underpins 21:14 | 141:16 146:17,20 | usually 31:24 | 103:24,25 105:7 | way 1:18 6:17 8:9 |
| understand 24:1 | 167:16 | utilised 82:5 | 142:11 149:6,20 | 8:14,23 9:15 |
| 48:1,10 56:7 | United 44:3 | | 150:14,19 151:1 | 18:17 19:2,12,19 |
| 66:24 67:14 68:11 | units 10:16 34:19 | V | 151:13 152:9,16 | 21:2 23:9 35:15 |
| 68:23,25 69:16 | 34:19,21 97:23 | validity 160:19 | 162:4 166:15 | 45:13 47:11 51:2 |
| 72:23 75:5 77:4 | 98:1,2,15 146:14 | 161:24 | violent 7:16 23:13 | 53:8 54:1 58:15 |
| 79:21 80:10 82:17 | 146:14,16 | valuable 17:16 | visit 32:5 33:10 | 65:8 66:1,18 67:7 |
| 83:24 95:10 99:10 | universal 17:15 | value 117:13 | visiting 171:9 | 69:16 70:17,24,25 |
| 104:16,18 115:20 | unlocking 9:12 | variability 161:5 | visitor 123:9 | 71:1,8 73:25 |
| 116:5 127:11 | unnecessarily | variation 59:18 | visitors 105:1 | 75:24 76:25 77:1 |
| 144:11 153:20 | 102:3 | various 94:1 96:5 | visits 31:24 32:24 | 77:2,15 78:21 |
| 154:5 | unnecessary 23:6,8 | 102:13 114:23 | 32:24 33:6 34:7 | 79:10 82:5 84:4 |
| understandably | 23:15 | 115:3 132:19 | 132:16 | 86:19,24 93:4 |
| 105:9 | unrealistic 24:25 | 137:10 149:8 | voice 163:25 | 95:10,19 100:8 |
| understanding | unrelated 72:25 | verifiable 38:5 | volume 17:20 | 112:15,21,24 |
| 19:15 35:8 41:12 | unsafe 16:8,22 | versions 108:14 | volunteered 106:24 | 115:5 118:3 |
| 59:22 60:5 65:12 | 27:19 29:12 | versus 167:19 | vulnerabilities | 129:21 130:17 |
| 68:2 69:5,6,11,25 | 166:15 | victim 142:3,16,21 | 112:10 122:15 | 133:11 135:8 |
| 70:5,7 71:4 72:13 | unsubstantiated | 167:6,20 | vulnerability | 136:22 139:1 |
| 72:20 73:25 93:13 | 143:2 | victimisation 42:23 | 157:15 | 140:9 141:13 |
| 110:22 111:20 | untrue 139:13 | victimised 6:10,10 | vulnerable 56:11 | 153:16 155:2 |
| 114:21,22 118:7 | unusual 30:8 36:20 | 29:14,18 | | 158:14 161:9 |
| | | | | 1 |

| | | | | rage 203 |
|-----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|
| 165:12,22 168:7 | 146:9 147:10 | 170:6 | 59:1 71:11,13 | 124:19 127:9 |
| 170:8 | 148:8,24 149:13 | witnessed 156:10 | 117:16 147:2,3,10 | 140:17 |
| ways 51:2 60:10 | 149:19 150:11 | 169:2 | 147:20 157:6,11 | |
| 66:6,25 68:21 | 152:6 153:14 | witnesses 1:15,20 | workers 66:24 | X |
| 72:22 107:4 154:1 | 155:4,8,17 157:3 | 7:5 58:7 85:14 | 71:20 115:11,14 | X 174:3 |
| we're 28:25 34:23 | 158:17 159:9 | 86:2,11 | 118:8,9,18 123:12 | T 7 |
| 35:22 53:3 76:11 | 163:14,17 164:9 | witnessing 88:19 | 126:8,24 127:12 | <u>Y</u> |
| 77:11 79:22 86:19 | 165:7,8,14 170:19 | wonder 99:8 | 147:22,24 148:2 | year 4:2,9 5:18,18 |
| 114:19,19 123:7 | whichever 78:13 | 170:23 | 154:12 155:8,9,10 | 5:20 35:25 47:9 |
| 123:15 163:7 | 156:15 | Wood 11:6 25:11 | 155:13,14 157:6 | 96:23 106:17 |
| 165:9 | whilst 11:6 32:14 | 53:15,18,20 57:6 | 158:21 | 109:11 148:12 |
| we've 86:7,15 | 51:23 125:8 | 59:15 68:6 74:5 | workforce 17:18 | 150:2 165:2 |
| 115:13 154:7 | 138:25 161:2 | 97:5 110:6 115:2 | 18:24,25 22:9 | years 7:2 8:11,23 |
| 165:10 | whistle 35:6,10 | 117:7,24 127:18 | 45:13 | 10:7 37:12 43:7 |
| weapon 25:7 | whistleblowing | 127:24 128:3,12 | workforces 18:23 | 114:20 118:19 |
| wearing 58:19 | 35:4,19 | 128:14,19,21 | working 8:15 12:6 | 153:7 165:1 |
| 143:13 | whole-establish | 133:24 135:12 | 18:15 26:11 35:18 | 168:16 vears' 126:4 |
| Wednesday 56:9 | 107:5 108:6 | 140:11 141:24 | 56:13,22 62:20 | YJB 47:15,16 |
| week 1:6 22:15 | wide 59:18 93:24 | 144:14 145:8 | 66:22 67:14 81:17 | YOI 10:18 28:4 |
| 31:24 56:23 76:16 | 93:24 94:4 | 153:19 156:24 | 100:12 108:12,16 | 30:8,25 31:11 |
| 83:10 108:1 | wider 42:20 43:20 | 160:17,21 161:6 | 111:1,10 123:5 | 39:9,10 40:1 50:3 |
| 143:25 155:21 | 161:14 162:14 | 162:22 170:13 | 124:16 140:13 | 76:13 109:24 |
| 170:25 | widespread 161:11 | 174:8,13 | 144:20 149:6 | 150:7 151:3 |
| weekend 116:24 | willing 1:23 53:1,4 | Wood's 117:16 | works 19:16 24:23 | YOIs 2:16 10:17 |
| weekly 121:7,18 | willingness 95:6 | 146:5 152:21 | 31:1 105:17 106:7 | 11:17 17:24 18:3 |
| weeks 114:19 | Willow's 83:10 | 153:20 168:7 | 149:15 | 20:19 22:2 28:2,3 |
| weight 40:8 | wing 146:15,16,20 | word 33:16 77:10 | world 66:23 | 28:5,12,18,21,24 |
| welcome 1:3,9 | wings 146:21,25 | 84:3 165:10 | worn 73:22 | 29:21,22 32:1,8 |
| 37:24 153:16 | wish 110:2 135:1 | words 86:8 161:2 | worried 77:25 | 32:12 39:4,20,22 |
| 174:4 | 155:5 159:6 | work 13:3 18:10 | worse 37:18 43:9 | 39:24 40:7 50:14 |
| welcomed 104:11 | 160:19 172:25 | 46:17 64:3 65:22 | 100:24 151:12 | 50:25 123:15 |
| welcomes 150:8 | withdraw 117:20 | 66:13 80:3 90:13 | wouldn't 19:19,21 | young 3:22 4:5 |
| well-led 149:16 | 137:2 | 100:17 103:7,20 | 19:22 21:5 71:8 | 16:8 26:23 36:4 |
| went 84:19 | withdrawal 60:23 | 104:12 105:15 | 114:17 117:13,19 | 55:4 58:3 60:20 |
| weren't 24:14 | 76:3 | 106:2 107:13 | 117:21 123:16 | 62:24 63:20,25 |
| 60:20 69:10 84:11 86:11 135:23 | withdrawn 76:3,7 | 110:22,23 115:25 117:18 119:19 | 125:16,21 126:4 169:18 | 64:1,12 65:6 |
| 155:1 | witness 1:13,16 2:7 2:20 12:3 31:16 | 120:9 138:11 | write 25:16 33:2 | 69:12 71:19 81:8 |
| Werrington 54:12 | 42:2,4 49:8 67:20 | 140:8 149:20 | writing 53:5 77:25 | 82:3 85:12,15 |
| 80:12 91:4 95:17 | 84:20 96:9 103:13 | 155:7 159:5 | written 14:25 58:4 | 87:1 88:18,20 |
| 128:13,15,17,23 | 106:16 111:4 | 163:16 164:14 | 60:15 61:2 62:18 | 89:1 90:11 92:2 |
| 128.13,13,17,23 | 119:24 122:13 | 167:8 | 62:18 65:3 66:1,2 | 97:14,17,19,25 |
| 133:4,17 134:18 | 127:24 145:11 | work-related 20:17 | 75:12 127:19 | 98:2,4,13,20 99:3 |
| 135:5,11 142:9 | 148:5 151:17 | worked 75:20,23 | 144:3 169:1 | 101:14,22,23 |
| 143:21 144:6,12 | 153:6 157:10 | 81:7 105:14 | wrong 43:22 86:24 | 104:7,25 105:9,14 |
| 145:8,23 146:3,8 | 162:20 168:2 | worker 27:11,12 | 100:19 114:16 | 105:20 106:2 |
| 113.0,23 170.3,0 | 102.20 100.2 | ,, or wer 27.11,12 | 100,17 117,10 | |
| | | | | |

| | | | | _ |
|--|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| 107:13 109:24 | 1.41 91:13 | 16 1:1 37:21 46:13 | 108:14 120:20 | 3,000 7:19 |
| 116:1 117:19 | 1.45 136:13,15 | 63:7,9 170:20 | 134:17 148:23 | 3.07 145:13 |
| 119:11,22 121:20 | 1.46 136:21 | 16-year 138:19 | 2016 3:15 9:23 | 3.1.1 59:17 |
| 121:21 123:8,13 | 1.47 169:13 | 16-year-old 133:3 | 14:25 24:12 26:19 | 3.1.13 66:15 69:19 |
| 124:16 125:15 | 1.5 81:6 140:6 | 160 25:11 | 36:1 39:1 42:3 | 3.1.14 79:4,6 |
| 130:4 133:5,7,8 | 1.51 136:16 169:20 | 166 174:17 | 47:24 48:1 129:14 | 3.1.16 64:17 |
| 134:3 138:25 | 1.52 84:24 85:2 | 17 173:16 | 134:17,17 168:25 | 3.1.17 87:7,9 |
| 139:6,9,11,18,23 | 1.6 135:8 | 17-year 58:3 | 171:6,15 172:4 | 3.1.3 74:10 |
| 141:3,5,8 143:12 | 10 16:5 24:11 39:3 | 170 25:12 | 2016/17 27:8 | 3.1.4 76:11 |
| 143:24 146:9,24 | 79:4 87:8 103:19 | 18 3:15 97:15,17 | 2017 3:15,15,24 | 3.1.5 76:1 |
| 147:9 149:13 | 152:2,2,2 171:17 | 134:16,17 | 4:12 16:4 26:19 | 3.20 145:12,15 |
| 151:22 152:11 | 10.00 2:1 173:15 | 180 97:14 | 27:2 32:16 42:11 | 3.3.2 144:17 |
| 166:13 169:22 | 10.30 1:2 | 18s 20:12 | 48:7 51:21 99:6 | 30 1:23 98:2 |
| youth 17:1 20:16 | 100 107:21 164:24 | 19 9:20 58:17 | 99:20 101:16 | 31 42:11 |
| 95:3 101:7 107:3 | 11 4:9 39:3 101:3 | 101:25 | 110:3,5 148:8,16 | 32 32:6 33:5,6 |
| 115:13,14 155:8,9 | 152:2,2 | | 148:19 | 47:25 |
| 155:10 164:13,19 | 11.48 53:12 | 2 | 2018 1:1 24:11 37:5 | 33 48:4 99:15 |
| Yvonne 170:7,18 | 110 146:12,13 | 2 77:7,9 80:24 | 37:21 39:2 49:11 | 34 32:1 37:7 101:5 |
| | 116 17:9 | 109:9 110:4 116:7 | 108:12 111:18 | 165:9 |
| Z | 117 20:6 51:21 | 116:8,9 128:1,10 | 123:5 145:24 | 36 48:3,3 162:19 |
| zero 48:11 | 118 146:11,11,13 | 131:24 135:6 | 150:3 151:6 | 37 111:5 167:1 |
| zoom 3:17 | 12 26:2 66:16 90:23 | 140:5 156:2 | 170:20 171:7,22 | 39 29:13 |
| | 106:16 120:25 | 172:25 174:5,6 | 172:12 173:16 | |
| 0 | 122:9 151:17 | 2.0 129:12 | 2023 165:2 | 4 |
| 000001 128:7 | 152:15 171:22 | 2.00 96:11,14 | 206 150:21 | 4 1:23 63:8 |
| 000004 128:7 | 12.05 53:14 | 2.1.1 129:17,18 | 21 2:21 14:25 27:3 | 4.00 2:2 173:14 |
| 000017 128:7 | 12.1 31:20 | 2.1.11 137:16,17,19 | 29:11 97:18 | 40 106:21 |
| 000020 128:9 | 12.3 31:23 | 138:1 | 22 27:20 102:21 | 41 27:3 |
| 1 | 12.4 32:3 | 2.1.12 80:11,13,14 | 221 42:6 | 412 110:11 |
| 1 42:4,11 77:7,9 | 120 50:25 | 133:19 | 23 29:7 101:19 | 413 110:16 |
| 101:11 102:25 | 1200 26:12 | 2.1.16 138:18 | 24 102:7 134:17 | 43 27:4 |
| 116:8,17 174:4 | 1210 137:25 | 2.1.7 128:24 130:24 | 157:9,22 168:25 | 47 87:12 88:6 89:23 |
| 1,070 42:12 | 1210_007 138:1 | 2.12 133:20 | 25 17:8 34:6 46:18 | 90:6,12 91:5,19 |
| 1.05 96:12 | 123 174:12 | 20 21:11 134:17 | 250 165:4 | 91:25 92:21 93:4 |
| 1.0 3 90.12 1.1 132:1 | 128 174:13,14 | 171:6 | 26 29:9 40:5 | 93:14 102:20 |
| 1.1 132.1 1.15 63:7,9 | 13 66:17 97:7 | 2002 42:4 | 27 29:19 119:24 | 143:19 144:9,18 |
| 1.17 101:18 | 101:12 148:5 | 2008 57:15 | 28 29:16 48:7 59:4 | 159:3 |
| 1.19 88:14,16 | 168:3 170:14 | 2009 42:11 57:17 | 172:4 173:4 | 49 174:7 |
| 1.2 132:2 | 130 50:25 | 57:18 58:2 85:5 | 29 16:6 48:8 58:10 | 5 |
| 1.21 132.2 1.21 135:2 | 14 31:16 153:6 | 89:12 118:4 | | |
| 1.3 80:24 82:7 | 140 50:25 | 2011 129:14 134:16 | 3 | 5 53:11 99:23 |
| 134:13,15 | 142 150:21 | 2012 58:17 59:4 | 3 8:17 19:21 21:8 | 109:12,17 129:3 |
| 1.38 141:20,23 | 145 174:15,16 | 81:2 | 77:8,10 90:24 | 129:11 135:2 |
| 142:2 | 15 35:4 37:8 44:6 | 2013 136:23 | 91:1 102:25 | 148:18 150:4 |
| 1.39 89:16,17 | 57:14 97:15 | 2015 22:23 57:19 | 103:10 152:1 | 166:1 172:12 |
| 1.07 07.10,17 | 102:22 | 67:22 81:2 108:10 | 171:7 | 5.68 23:1 |
| | | | | |

| | | | rage 200 |
|---------------------------|---------------------|---|----------|
| 50 89:18 | 9.10 29:13 | 1 | |
| | | | |
| 51 37:9 | 900 7:19 34:3,14 | | |
| 522 97:17 | 94 24:13 | | |
| 53 174:8,9 | 96 174:10,11 | | |
| 54 27:17 | | | |
| 55 101:3 | | | |
| 6 | | | |
| 6 101:1 130:23 | | | |
| 140:6 | | | |
| 60 7:6 | | | |
| 600 50:25 | | | |
| 61 27:24 | | | |
| 63 37:6 | | | |
| 67 9:23 | | | |
| | | | |
| 68 31:22 | | | |
| 7 | | | |
| 7 80:11,13 133:19 | | | |
| 141:22 147:4 | | | |
| 7-year 152:24 | | | |
| 70 7:6 54:7 | | | |
| 70 7.0 54.7 | | | |
| 8 | | | |
| 8 59:8 74:11 89:16 | | | |
| 91:14 130:24 | | | |
| 136:23 151:17 | | | |
| 8.0 54:18 | | | |
| 8.1.1 54:23 | | | |
| 8.1.2 55:3 | | | |
| 8.1.3 55:8 | | | |
| | | | |
| 8.1.4 55:12 | | | |
| 8.1.5 55:15 | | | |
| 8.1.6 55:20 | | | |
| 8.1.7 55:23 | | | |
| 8.1.9 56:9 | | | |
| 8.10 27:21 | | | |
| 81 109:2 | | | |
| 84 43:6 | | | |
| 85 43:6 | | | |
| 9 | | | |
| 93:17 6:16 27:13 | | | |
| 39:3 58:2 76:25 | | | |
| 85:5 89:12 136:9 | | | |
| 136:10 144:5 | | | |
| | | | |
| 171:15 | | | |