



Investigation into the inappropriate behaviour and language used by C&R Instructors during ITC training at Brook House IRC

Version number	1.2	Document type	Standard
Version date	28.02.2018	Document ID number	
Version expiry		Document classification	Official-Sensitive
Version status		Uncontrolled if printed or downloaded	



Section 1 – Background

On the 22nd of February 2018, a Personal Safety course was held at Tinsley House (Gatwick IRC) for eight members of staff at the centre. Three of those staff in attendance were employed by Hibiscus Initiatives (a partner agency working with G4S at Gatwick IRC), a further three members of staff in attendance were employed by G4S Health (the healthcare provider for Gatwick IRC), whilst the final attendee was a representative of the customer (Home Office). The Personal Safety course is aimed at non-operational staff and provides those in attendance with Home Office approved training in the appropriate use of force around issues of personal safety and breakaway techniques. The personal safety course is split between a classroom environment for theory and group discussion alongside use of the Tinsley house DOJO for training in the practical application of the different techniques being taught. The course was approximately 8hrs in length and was facilitated by PCO [REDACTED] (a trained C&R Instructor and G4S employee on secondment from HMP/YOI Parc) and [REDACTED] (a trained C&R Instructor and a permanent employee of G4S at the Gatwick IRC cluster).

On the 26th of February 2018 at 08.26hrs an email was received by [REDACTED] (Head of Tinsley House, Borders and PDA at Gatwick IRC). The email had been sent by [REDACTED] (Project Manager International Resettlement-Hibiscus Initiatives) and was entitled 'Serious Concerns-Personal Protection Training. The email made reference to concerns raised by the three Hibiscus employees in attendance on the 22nd to "the language used and general attitude towards detainees displayed by the trainers and other participants. An attachment to the original email contained seventeen specific points of concern.

Section 2 – Methodology

Terms of Reference were issued by [REDACTED] (G4S C&DS Chief Operating Officer) to [REDACTED] (Director of Oakhill STC) (with agreement between G4S C&DS and G4S Health that the Investigating Officer was to investigate on behalf of both G4S C&DS and G4S Health) with direction to investigate the following allegations;

- Inappropriate behaviour, language and conduct of C&R Instructors [REDACTED] and DCO [REDACTED], during a personal protection training course, held on the 22nd of February 2018.
- Inappropriate behaviour, language and conduct of C&R Instructors DCO [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] during a personal protection training course held on the 5th of February 2018.

The deadline for the report was stated as Friday the 2nd of March, however during a telephone conversation on the afternoon of the 27th of February between the Commissioning Authority and the Investigating Officer an initial report was requested for the 28th of February 2018.

On the 27th of February 2018 the Investigating Officer attended Gatwick IRC to conduct a series of interviews as detailed below:

Version number	1.2	Document type	Standard
Version date	28.02.2018	Document ID number	
Version expiry		Document classification	Official-Sensitive
Version status		Uncontrolled if printed or downloaded	



Interview One: [REDACTED] (Hibiscus Initiatives) accompanied by [REDACTED] (Hibiscus Initiatives). *Appendix IV.*

Interview Two: [REDACTED] (Hibiscus Initiatives) accompanied by [REDACTED] (Hibiscus Initiatives). *Appendix V.*

Interview Three: [REDACTED] (Hibiscus Initiatives) accompanied by [REDACTED] (Hibiscus Initiatives). *Appendix VI.*

Interview Four: [REDACTED] (Healthcare Assistant-G4S Health) accompanied by [REDACTED] (G4S Health). *Appendix VII.*

Interview Five (held via tele conference due to shift timings of interviewee) [REDACTED] (Healthcare assistant-G4S Health) accompanied by [REDACTED] (G4S Health). *Appendix VIII.*

NB*-No further interviews have been completed at the time of report submission, so my conclusions are based on the interviews as of 17.00hrs 27/02/18

Section 3 - Sequence of events

Interviews

Interview One: [REDACTED] (Hibiscus Initiatives) accompanied by [REDACTED] (Hibiscus Initiatives).

Interview Two: [REDACTED] (Hibiscus Initiatives) accompanied by [REDACTED] (Hibiscus Initiatives).

Interview Three: [REDACTED] (Hibiscus Initiatives) accompanied by [REDACTED] (Hibiscus Initiatives).

Interview Four: [REDACTED] (Healthcare Assistant-G4S Health) accompanied by [REDACTED] (G4S Health)

Interview Five (held via tele conference due to shift timings of interviewee) [REDACTED] (Healthcare assistant-G4S Health) accompanied by [REDACTED] (G4S Health)

Section 4 – Conclusions

Allegations contained in Hibiscus letter (Substantiated Yes/No).

Version number	1.2	Document type	Standard
Version date	28.02.2018	Document ID number	
Version expiry		Document classification	Official-Sensitive
Version status		Uncontrolled if printed or downloaded	



Allegation 1: "I'm going to fucking destroy you" (said multiple times by [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] Jason also said at one point during the practical training when referring to reacting to a detainee attacking you "To use [REDACTED] favourite line, "I'll fucking destroy you".

All three of the Hibiscus staff interviewed were entirely clear and consistent in their description of the use of this phrase, which is overly aggressive in content and unacceptable in the use of inappropriate language. It does not send a message that the two instructors were promoting the use of considered and reasonable force and appears thuggish. (Substantiated: Yes)

Allegation 2: "If it was down to me, give them one more punch for luck" [REDACTED]

All three of the Hibiscus staff when interviewed were clear and consistent in their account that PCO Riggs had articulated this view when describing how to move out of an area where the member of staff has had to inflict punches (as trained in the C&R manual) to deal with a violent or aggressive prisoner. The C&R manual is clear in equipping staff to use reasonable and appropriate force which they feel is necessary for the risk posed. However to suggest to staff in a training environment that any use of force over and above what is reasonable is to promote the use of excessive and unnecessary force, which is both inappropriate and potentially criminal. (Substantiated: Yes).

Allegation 3: In reference to an incident on Monday night where an officer had punched a detainee in the face (several detainees had barricaded themselves in their room and had weapons and had made the floor wet and soapy. An officer was apparently the last one standing and punched one of them, Vanessa from the Home Office said he deserved it and "had it coming. [REDACTED] then said "we don't say that Vanessa".

All of the Hibiscus employees interviewed on the 27th were clear and consistent that this conversation had taken place as described. Since this allegation relates to a Home Office employee the Investigating Officer is due to meet with Home Office representative on the 1st of March 2018 to discuss. (Substantiated: Yes)

Allegation 4: [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] said that the punches taught in the syllabus are never used because they don't do anything. They said they would just punch in the face ([REDACTED])

All of the Hibiscus staff interviewed were clear that this approach had been articulated at a number of points during the training by both trainers. Whilst it is entirely appropriate for trainers to reinforce with learners on the course that they are able to do what they feel is reasonable and necessary in the circumstances to protect themselves, if approved methods from the manual are dismissed or minimized by the trainers it does not give a clear message about force needing to be reasonable and proportionate. If force is not used in this way our legitimacy to those in our care will be significantly reduced. (Substantiated: Yes)

Allegation 5: The duty of care part of the legislation was just added in to "fluff it up" ([REDACTED])

Version number	1.2	Document type	Standard
Version date	28.02.2018	Document ID number	
Version expiry		Document classification	Official-Sensitive
Version status		Uncontrolled if printed or downloaded	



As described in allegation 7 it is understandable that for [REDACTED] occasionally he might lapse into calling the IRC a prison (due to his length of service working in an adult prison environment) and using the term prisoner rather than detainee. [REDACTED] does not have that excuse. However language and terminology is important in setting the tone for how we speak about those in our care and it is regrettable that the terminology used did not support the approach or context which was required. (Substantiated: Yes).

Allegation 9: [REDACTED] mentioned that due to his great report writing skills he was the only suspended staff member that was allowed back to work after the Panorama documentary. He also said that "he got a cruise out of it" during his time being suspended.

The Hibiscus staff all confirmed that this exact phrase had been used by [REDACTED], although [REDACTED] from G4S Health could not remember it is being said. Concerningly there was a further allegation raised during interview that [REDACTED] stated that as a result he now hates the BBC. Any reference by [REDACTED] that "he got a cruise out of it" is entirely misjudged and inappropriate in the context of the training environment, since it suggests to those who did hear it that [REDACTED] is dismissive of the incredibly serious and concerning issues raised by the Panorama documentary. To seemingly bragg to those in attendance about being able to enjoy a cruise whilst suspended as part of such a serious and significant investigation sends a message that the matter was not a serious one to him despite the documentary containing evidence of serious harm and inappropriate conduct towards those in our care. Whether this was mere bravado or a more determined stance to minimize the issues contained in the programme it portrayed both himself and G4S in a wholly-unacceptable fashion. (Substantiated: Yes)

Allegation 10: All members of staff joined in with [REDACTED] commenting on how Tinsley staff can't deal with working at Brook and alluded to them being weaker than Brook staff.

All of the Hibiscus staff were clear during interview that [REDACTED] had offered this view at multiple points during the course of the training. There are significant differences between the nature of the operation and the circumstances of those held in detention at Tinsley by comparison to Brook House. The suggestion by [REDACTED] that those working at Tinsley can't deal with working at Brook House is unhelpful, unnecessary and disrespectful to his own colleagues at Tinsley who do a complex and challenging role. This falls far short of the expectation for a member of staff in a training role and the standards of professionalism they should be exhibiting. (Substantiated: Yes).

Allegation 11: [REDACTED] teaching the basic phrase of "Fuck off" from the beginning of the training as a way of defending yourself. There was swearing used throughout the training which was in our view unnecessary, however, [REDACTED] did say at the beginning of the training that there would be swearing and that we should speak to him if we don't like the use of swearing. Nobody raised concerns with him about the swearing but we felt that the level of swearing was unnecessary and we don't feel it added to the effectiveness of the training.

Version number	1.2	Document type	Standard
Version date	28.02.2018	Document ID number	
Version expiry		Document classification	Official-Sensitive
Version status		Uncontrolled if printed or downloaded	



In addition to the accounts given by the three staff from Hibiscus during interview [REDACTED] from G4S Health also confirmed a large amount of swearing. It is important to note that when in a training environment there is a need for realism and as such when describing and demonstrating when force can be used it is not unreasonable for some swearing to show realism. However when that swearing becomes a consistent component of the language all through the day and is part of regular conversation it is unprofessional and lazy. By the trainers speaking in such a way to their own colleagues as well as customer representatives and partner agencies, they both lost sight of the need to demonstrate the highest standards when training on the company's behalf. Given that the classroom component of the course describes the cyclical relationship between the use of aggressive behaviour and language and an escalation in violence and frustration, the two trainers were not demonstrating the content of their own subject matter. (Substantiated: Yes).

Allegation 12: *Vanessa from the Home Office, seemed to have a very negative attitude towards detainees. This was shown through laughter at comments made, comments she made herself and her general attitude to violence e.g. "I'd go to town on them"*

All three of the Hibiscus staff reported a significant level of concern around the behavior of Vanessa which will be raised by the Investigating Officer with her immediate line management at the Home Office on the 1st of March 2018. (Substantiated: Yes)

Allegation 13: [REDACTED] *aid that the reason they respond aggressively with swearing, when a detainee touches them in a friendly manner, is because other staff members are lenient and this leads to detainees thinking that they can touch staff e.g. putting their hand on their shoulder. However as Dave and Jason are training new staff to say "fuck off" they are adding the negative approach.*

The three Hibiscus staff were clear and consistent during interview that the stance promoted by [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] to any inappropriate contact by a detainee was immediately to be aggressive as opposed to clear, calm and assertive. By promoting such an approach it creates the potential for an escalation in the level of conflict rather than an opportunity to de-escalate and manage the situation through the use of good interpersonal skills. In an environment such as Tinsley this is missing out on early opportunities to limit and restrict the requirement for force to be used and places both detainee and staff member at greater not reduced risk. C&R Instructors should always structure expectations as to how force can be minimized rather than escalated, this is poor practice in both [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] capacity as trainers. (Substantiated: Yes)

Allegation 14: *A lot of the training was geared towards working in Brook. There should probably be a different version geared to those in the PDA/Tinsley.*

Whilst as an observation there is some merit to this due to the contrasting circumstances between the two centres that make up Gatwick IRC, the course can only be delivered using approved techniques as per the prescribed manual. As such the Investigating Officer has no further view on the matter. (Substantiated; N/A)

Version number	1.2	Document type	Standard
Version date	28.02.2018	Document ID number	
Version expiry		Document classification	Official-Sensitive
Version status		Uncontrolled if printed or downloaded	