



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

Investigating Officer: Richard Stedman

Version No:	V1.5	Document Type:	Standard
Version Date:	09 th March 2018	Document ID	RS/CI 0080318
Version Expiry:	NA	Document classification:	SENSITIVE
Version Status:	NA	Uncontrolled if printed or downloaded	

Index

1. Background

2. Methodology

3. Sequence of events / Interviews

4. Conclusions

5. Recommendations

6. Appendices

I	Terms of Reference
II	Course attendance data (05 th Feb 2018)
III	Course attendance data (22 nd Feb 2018)
IV	Kerry Smith, Hibiscus Initiatives - Interview notes
V	Tesni Woodfall, Hibiscus Initiatives - Interview notes
VI	Name Irrelevant Hibiscus Initiatives - Interview notes
VII	Maria-Claire Llaudes, G4S Healthcare – interview notes
VIII	Stanislava Fedorcova, G4S Healthcare (held via conference call)
IX	Joanne Cockrell – Interview notes
X	Emma Bradshaw – Interview notes
XI	Laura McGonagall – Interview notes
XII	Mark Demian– Interview notes
XIII	Shaun Phillipott – Interview notes
XIV	Lynn Harthill – Interview notes
XV	Sarah Newland – Interview notes
XVI	Observations from Personal Protection Training

Version No:	V1.5	Document Type:	Standard
Version Date:	09 th March 2018	Document ID	RS/CI 0080318
Version Expiry:	NA	Document classification:	SENSITIVE
Version Status:	NA	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 Jason Riggs (a trained C&R Instructor and G4S employee on secondment from HMP/YOI Parc) and DCO David Webb (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 Sarah Newland (Head of Tinsley House, Borders and PDA at Gatwick IRC). The email had been sent by Donna John (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.

On the 09th of February 2018 Emma Bradshaw (Welfare Team Leader) had emailed her line Manager Joanne Cockrell (Welfare Services Manager) to express her concern at the use of swearing towards detainees taught on the Personal protection Training on the 5th of February 2018. Emma had found the use of swearing disturbing and requested that this be feedback to Lynn Harthill or Sarah Newland.

Following the submission of Version 1.2 of the Investigation to the commissioning authority on the 28th of February, the Investigating Officer completed further interviews with relevant parties on the 6th and 7th of March, resulting in the additional content for Version 1.3

Version No:	V1.5	Document Type:	Standard
Version Date:	09 th March 2018	Document ID	RS/CI 0080318
Version Expiry:	NA	Document classification:	SENSITIVE
Version Status:	NA	Uncontrolled if printed or downloaded	

Section 2 – Methodology

Terms of Reference were issued by Paul Kempster (G4S C&DS Chief Operating Officer) to Richard Stedman (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 PCO Jason Riggs and DCO Dave Webb, during a personal protection training course, held on the 22nd of February 2018.

- Inappropriate behaviour, language and conduct of C&R Instructors DCO Dave Webb and PCO Luke Rual 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:

Interview Two: Tesni Woodfall (Hibiscus Initiatives) accompanied by Sister Margaret Baxter (Hibiscus Initiatives). Appendix V.

Interview Three: Name Irrelevant (Hibiscus Initiatives) accompanied by Sister Margaret Baxter (Hibiscus Initiatives). Appendix VI.

Interview Four: Maria-Claire Llaudes (Healthcare Assistant-G4S Health) accompanied by Sandra Calver (G4S Health). Appendix VII.

Interview Five: (held via tele conference due to shift timings of interviewee) Stanislava Fedorcova (Healthcare assistant-G4S Health) accompanied by Sandra Calver (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

Version No:	V1.5	Document Type:	Standard
Version Date:	09 th March 2018	Document ID	RS/CI 0080318
Version Expiry:	NA	Document classification:	SENSITIVE
Version Status:	NA	Uncontrolled if printed or downloaded	

Section 3 - Sequence of events

Interviews

Interview One:	Kerry Smith (Hibiscus Initiatives) accompanied by Sister Margaret Baxter (Hibiscus Initiatives).
Interview Two:	Tesni Woodfall (Hibiscus Initiatives) accompanied by Sister Margaret Baxter (Hibiscus Initiatives).
Interview Three:	Name Irrelevant (Hibiscus Initiatives) accompanied by Sister Margaret Baxter (Hibiscus Initiatives).
Interview Four:	Maria-Claire Llaudes (Healthcare Assistant-G4S Health) accompanied by Sandra Calver (G4S Health)
Interview Five:	(held via tele conference due to shift timings of interviewee) Stanislava Fedorcova (Healthcare assistant-G4S Health) accompanied by Sandra Calver (G4S Health)
Interview five:	Mark Demian (Head of Safeguarding Gatwick IRC)
Interview six:	Shaun Philpott (Healthcare Assistant G4S Health) accompanied by Sandra Calver (G4S Health)
Interview seven:	Joanne Cockrell (Welfare Services Manager-Gatwick IRC)
Interview eight:	Emma Bradshaw (Welfare Services Manager-Gatwick IRC)
Interview nine:	Laurel McGonagall (Senior Nurse, RGN-Gatwick IRC)
Interview ten:	Lynn Harthill (PDA and Borders Manager-Tinsley House IRC)
Interview eleven:	Sarah Newland (Head of Tinsley House)

Version No:	V1.5	Document Type:	Standard
Version Date:	09 th March 2018	Document ID	RS/CI 0080318
Version Expiry:	NA	Document classification:	SENSITIVE
Version Status:	NA	Uncontrolled if printed or downloaded	

Allegation 1:

"I'm going to fucking destroy you" (said multiple times by David and Jason). Jason also said at one point during the practical training when referring to reacting to a detainee attacking you "To use Dave's 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. Their account was supported by the interview with Shaun Philpott and 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" (PCO Jason Riggs)

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 account of the hibiscus staff was supported by evidence from Shaun Philpott of G4S Health. 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. Dave 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:

Dave and Jason 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 (Dave and Jason).

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" (Dave).

All of the Hibiscus staff interviewed were consistent that DCO Dave Webb had used this phrase when describing our duty of care in the classroom component of the training. In describing our legal duty of care as "fluffing it up" this minimizes and belittles a critical part of our responsibility to use appropriate force only where is necessary and to a degree that is reasonable. It seemingly further evidenced to Hibiscus staff that our (G4S) view of detainees was that they are not deserving of the

Version No:	V1.5	Document Type:	Standard
Version Date:	09 th March 2018	Document ID	RS/CI 0080318
Version Expiry:	NA	Document classification:	SENSITIVE
Version Status:	NA	Uncontrolled if printed or downloaded	

protection provided to them in law, which is both inaccurate and inconsistent to our company values. (Substantiated: Yes)

Allegation 6:

In reference to a story told by Dave about a female officer swearing at a detainee when he put his hand on her shoulder, Kerry asked whether she couldn't just ask politely first without swearing. Dave said no because they are prisoners. Maria from Healthcare said they were murderers, paedophiles etc. and couldn't be communicated with normally. Encouragement given by Laurel and the others in the room.

All three Hibiscus staff were clear that this conversation happened as described in the above text and were unambiguous and consistent in their description of what was said. When interviewed Healthcare Assistant Maria Llaudes stated that she had spoken about the serious nature of some of the index offences for those in detention at Brook House however Maria remained adamant that she had not then gone on to say that as a result detainees could not be communicated with normally. When interviewed Maria's G4S Health colleague Stanislava could not recall the conversation and believed that she might have been out of the room at this time. Shaun Philpott from G4S Health was also unsure as to whether Maria had made any such comment. As such there is a clear discrepancy in the account given by the G4S Health staff to that given by the Hibiscus staff. It is possible that in describing the serious nature of the offences committed by a proportion of those held at Brook (which in the context of the course would have been entirely legitimate) this has been misinterpreted or misconstrued by those in attendance. However the view of the Investigating Officer is that this seems to have been a further example whereby the two trainers have not re-inforced with the staff on the course that detainees are human beings who should expect to be spoken to with decency and as adults at all times. (Substantiated: No)

Allegation 7:

The presentation was geared towards prison staff. Jason said that the training is in the process of being changed.

Given the fact that Jason Riggs is a PCO with a long history of working in an adult prison environment it is understandable that this is where he would draw on for examples and context. The environment at Tinsley is significantly different to that at either Brook House or an adult prison environment however a risk of violence exists at Tinsley. The concern from Hibiscus staff was that there was very little focus on the de-escalation techniques which could be even more relevant in a context such as Tinsley and the brushing over of this content by the trainers continued to promote the wrong message of an overly aggressive approach to those in attendance. (Substantiated: N/A)

Allegation 8:

Frequently referring to them as prisoners rather than detainees and calling the centre a prison. As described in allegation 7 it is understandable that for PCO Riggs 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. DCO Webb 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).

Version No:	V1.5	Document Type:	Standard
Version Date:	09 th March 2018	Document ID	RS/CI 0080318
Version Expiry:	NA	Document classification:	SENSITIVE
Version Status:	NA	Uncontrolled if printed or downloaded	

Allegation 9:

Dave 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 DCO Webb, although Maria Llaudes from G4S Health could not remember it is being said. Concerningly there was a further allegation raised during interview that DCO Webb stated that as a result he now hates the BBC. Any reference by DCO Webb 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 DCO Webb is dismissive of the incredibly serious and concerning issues raised by the Panorama documentary. To seemingly brag 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 Dave 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 DCO Webb 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 DCO Webb 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:

Jason was 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, Dave 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.

In addition to the accounts given by the three staff from Hibiscus during interview Maria Llaudes 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).

Version No:	V1.5	Document Type:	Standard
Version Date:	09 th March 2018	Document ID	RS/CI 0080318
Version Expiry:	NA	Document classification:	SENSITIVE
Version Status:	NA	Uncontrolled if printed or downloaded	

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 behaviour 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:

Dave said 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 Jason and Dave to any inappropriate contact by a detainee was immediately to be aggressive as opposed to clear, calm and assertive. The perspective of the Hibiscus staff was supported by the Laurel McGonagall and Shaun Philpott from G4S Health both of whom found the use of swearing without reference to any other forms of strong, assertive language to be at odds with their experience and instinct to be professional. 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 PCO Riggs and DCO Webb's 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)

Allegation 15:

Regarding the Right to Life article in the Human Rights Act, Dave alluded to our lives being worth more than a detainee's life. He gave a hypothetical example about smashing a fax machine over a detainees head if they were attacking him or the other staff. He said "it's me. Myself and I".

A personal safety course will quite appropriately focus on how those in attendance on the course are able to reasonably and legally protect themselves from harm by a detainee. In describing how any individual is able to use a level of force that they judge to be proportionate DCO Webb uses an extreme example. Whilst not technically incorrect, clearly the manner of his explanation and the language used to illustrate the point appears to move away from calm rational explanation based on what is proportionate to an emotive example that does not contain the appropriate degree of balance. (Substantiated: Yes)

Version No:	V1.5	Document Type:	Standard
Version Date:	09 th March 2018	Document ID	RS/CI 0080318
Version Expiry:	NA	Document classification:	SENSITIVE
Version Status:	NA	Uncontrolled if printed or downloaded	

Allegation 16:

In the presentation slideshow there was a line about how to deescalate a situation by using a clam/soft voice and Dave said that we could ignore that as it doesn't work.

All three of the Hibiscus staff were clear and consistent in their account that this was the approach taken by DCO Webb when discussing de-escalation. For a trainer to discount such an important part of the course content seems a significant misjudgement in failing to equip those attending the course with the skills required to manage a difficult situation holistically. On a more basic level it sends a message to any staff member that our first instinct should not be to speak to a detainee but to use force at the first opportunity, this is not reasonable and is contrary to the C&R manual.

(Substantiated: Yes)

Allegation 17:

After a discussion about the Jimmy Mubenga case where he dies after being restrained on a plane during his removal, Laurel said that sometimes mistakes have to be made in order for you to learn from them.

The Investigating Officer put to the three Hibiscus staff the notion that it surely important that after any tragic death such as that of Jimmy Mubenga every possible attempt is made to learn from such an event to ensure that any mistakes are not to be repeated. All three of the Hibiscus staff agreed with this sentiment, however they all stated that it was not what Laurel said that concerned it was the manner in which Laurel made the point that seemed flippant and without sufficient regard to the death of Mr Mubenga. This was further supported by the interview with Healthcare assistant Shaun Philpott who agreed with the hibiscus staff that Laurels wording around the death of Mr Mubenga appeared without compassion which appeared at odds with such a tragic death.

Did the Control and restraint Instructors act in accordance with our expected standard of conduct and behaviour and in line with company values?

From the information ascertained from interviews with five of the members of staff present on the 22nd of February, it can be considered reasonable to conclude that the high standards of professionalism expected of staff in a training and development capacity were not seen to be upheld by PCO Riggs and DCO Webb. Frequent and unnecessary use of bad language in the context of a training environment is inappropriate at best, however when it is used in the context of demonstrating how we speak about and to those in our care it can be considered highly inappropriate. Use of language that is derogatory and belittling falls a long way short of how all of those in our employment are expected to treat and refer to those in our care with dignity and respect. Use of language when describing to new staff how we carefully consider and manage challenging behaviour is a critical part of demonstrating that care. The apparent promotion of the phrase "I am going to fucking destroy you" as acceptable terminology suggests that both PCO Riggs and DCO Webb felt that using clear, calm and assertive language to describe how to best engage with a detainee using force that is both reasonable and proportionate, was better replaced with their own more aggressive and bullying language. As such the message delivered to both G4S staff, partner agency staff as well as a representative of the customer was that we are overly aggressive in our use and application of force.

Further to the concerns raised by our Hibiscus colleagues the concern raised by [Name Irrelevant] over the language used by PCO Riggs when asking Healthcare Assistant Maria Llaudes to straddle him for the purposes of a demonstration whilst asking her "do you not want to get 'jiggy' with a Welshman?" had the consequence of harassing a colleague in a very public forum.

Was the training delivered in line with the C&R training manual and guidance?

Version No:	V1.5	Document Type:	Standard
Version Date:	09 th March 2018	Document ID	RS/CI 0080318
Version Expiry:	NA	Document classification:	SENSITIVE
Version Status:	NA	Uncontrolled if printed or downloaded	

Whilst the Investigating Officer is not a C&R specialist or a trained facilitator, he is C&R trained and has a basic working knowledge of the C&R manual. In the view of the Investigating Officer there is significant deviation from the C&R manual in the sense that insufficient time and exploration is given to the importance of de-escalation in managing any potentially violent situation. This fails to adequately equip those on the course and it could lead to force being used prematurely and therefore that force would be unnecessary and or illegal. This poses a significant risk to our legitimacy in operating a safe, decent and caring environment.

The second element of the Terms of Reference issued are as follows:

- Inappropriate behaviour, language and conduct of C&R Instructors DCO Dave Webb and PCO Luke Rual, during a Personal Protection Training course, held on the 5th February 2018.

When interviewed on the 7th of March Emma Bradshaw was clear with the Investigating Officer that she found the use of swear words such as “fuck off” in the Personal Protection Training on the 5th of February to be unnecessary and overly aggressive. Emma stated that during her years as an operational member of staff at the Gatwick IRC cluster, she had not previously been taught such an approach and was deeply uncomfortable with the use of such language. Emma was clear with the Investigating Officer that the use of swear words was limited to scenario specific situations and did not extend to more general conversation. Emma stated that she had spoken with one of the two instructors on the day (PCO Luke Rual from HMP Parc) to express her concern over the use of swear words such as ‘fuck off’ however she found that PCO Rual was not receptive to the feedback or viewpoint. When interviewed on the 6th of March 2018 PCO Luke Rual stated that he could not recall a specific challenge from Emma Bradshaw in relation to his use of swear words, however he vaguely recalled a passing comment from a manager on the course with dark hair and glasses (this physical description does not describe Emma Bradshaw).

Emma confirmed that she had emailed her line manager Joanne Cockrell about the issue, since she was keen that both Lynn Harthill and Sarah Newland were aware of her concerns.

The Investigating officer spoke at length during interview with Mark Demian (Head of Safeguarding) and Joanne Cockrell (Welfare Services Manager) who were both in attendance at the training on the 5th (DCO Ummar Zeb was also spoken to on the phone as part of the investigation, although no transcript for this conversation is available). Mark Demian was very clear that he believed that the use of swear words in the training scenarios was appropriate and necessary and in his view was not inappropriate, as such at no point did Mark feel uncomfortable with the content of the training. Welfare services Manager Joanne Cockrell stated during interview that initially she was alarmed by the use of swearing since it was her first time in such training. Joanne stated that following conversations with colleagues on the course (including Emma Bradshaw) that she became more comfortable with the use of swearing within the scenarios and felt no need to raise her concerns formally either during or after the course. Joanne stated that she was surprised by the email from Emma Bradshaw on the 9th of February since Emma was one of the colleagues who had reassured her over the use of swear words during the course on the 5th. DCO Ummar Zeb also stated during his telephone interview that he was not concerned by the use of swear words during scenarios and felt it was an appropriate use of language.

During both of their interviews Lynn Harthill and Sarah Newland stated that when they met with Joanne Cockrell to discuss the email sent by Emma Bradshaw on the 9th of February, they instructed Joanne to go back to Emma to request further clarity on the exact use and context of the swear words. Whilst Joanne was not clear during her interview that she felt she had been tasked to do this,

Version No:	V1.5	Document Type:	Standard
Version Date:	09 th March 2018	Document ID	RS/CI 0080318
Version Expiry:	NA	Document classification:	SENSITIVE
Version Status:	NA	Uncontrolled if printed or downloaded	

a further conversation did take place between Emma and Joanne though it took nearly ten days for this to happen due to Emma having rest days after nights and a period of sickness absence.

On the 8th of March 2018 the Investigating Officer spoke with PCO Steve Fisher at HMP Oakwood, Steve is an experienced C&R Instructor and is currently involved in a review of Use of Force Training across C&DS. Steve was clear that the use and promotion of swear words by trainers when facilitating either a full C&R course or a Personal safety course is entirely unnecessary and is not supported by the HMPPS C&R manual. In Steve's view as an experienced trainer, the use of swear words can undermine a member of staffs ability to deescalate a confrontational situation with a prisoner or detainee since it makes the member of staff appear to be meeting aggression with more aggression. Rather than using swear words staff should make assertive use of phrases such as move away, back away, get away to indicate to a prisoner or detainee their expectation. Steve was clear that as an experienced instructor the use of the phrase "fuck off" was not appropriate, helpful or necessary.

Was the training delivered on the 5th of February in line with the C&R training manual and guidance?

The use of swear words such as "fuck off" by the two instructors on the 5th of February was confirmed by all of those interviewed for the Investigation. Following consultation with an experienced C&R Instructor from a sister G4S establishment (Steve Fisher HMP Oakwood) the Investigating officer is clear that the use of swear words is not consistent with the training manual and was not appropriate in its context or use during the course being facilitated on the 5th of February. The acceptance by a number of those interviewed as part of the investigation that swearing was an acceptable part of the training could suggest a wider cultural concern about the use of language.

Was the complaint raised by an employee on the 5th of February course dealt with and investigated properly?

The Investigating Officer was assured that as soon as the email of concern was sent by Emma Bradshaw on the 9th of February, both Lynn Harthill and Sarah Newland met with Joanne Cockrell (Emma's line manager) to task her with speaking to Emma to gain further clarity about the details of her concern. During this meeting Lynn and Sarah both received an assurance from Joanne that as a fellow course attendee on the 5th of February with Emma, Joanne did not share Emma's concerns. Given Joanne's experience as a manager and as a social worker, Sarah and Lynn took understandable assurance from this. The delay in Joanne having this follow up conversation with Emma due to rest days after nights and sick absence was however unfortunate.

Section 4 - Conclusions

- The content of the Personal Safety training course delivered on the 22nd of February was concerning in both its content and manner of delivery. There was significant departure from approved training methods and the standard of professionalism displayed by the two instructors fell a long way short of what G4S expects of staff acting in such a capacity in order to uphold our values. Furthermore, it is of significant concern that it was representatives of a partner agency who formally raised concerns about the content of the course, none of the G4S staff attending on the day raised a formal concern despite their apparent discomfort with what they saw and heard. The fact that a Senior nurse from G4S Health Care was so concerned by what she saw on

Version No:	V1.5	Document Type:	Standard
Version Date:	09 th March 2018	Document ID	RS/CI 0080318
Version Expiry:	NA	Document classification:	SENSITIVE
Version Status:	NA	Uncontrolled if printed or downloaded	

the day that she vowed never to work with either trainer again in the future but took no action either during or after the course is a significant worry.

- The complaint raised by Emma Bradshaw on the Personal Safety training delivered on the 5th of February has been more complex to understand. Emma's concerns appear reasonable and legitimate and are supported by the view of C&R Instructor Steve Fisher. Given Emma's certainty that she spoke with PCO Luke Rual during the training, it is unclear as to why PCO Rual would deny or be vague about whether such a conversation took place. That so many of Emma's colleagues in attendance on the day (even at a Senior Management level) did not share those concerns suggests an acceptance of unprofessional and aggressive language by staff at the centre, which must be addressed.

Section 5 - Recommendations

- Consideration as to whether DCO Webb should face disciplinary action is a matter for the Chief Operating Officer as Commissioning Authority.
- Consideration as to whether PCO Riggs should face disciplinary action is a matter for the Chief Operating Officer as Commissioning Authority.
- Consideration as to whether Senior Nurse McGonigal should face disciplinary action is a matter for the Chief Operating Officer as Commissioning Authority.
- Consideration by the Commissioning Authority as to the suitability of PCO Luke Rual as a Use of Force trainer in conjunction with the Director of HMP and YOI Parc.
- Consideration should be given to the commissioning of a Culture review (with specific reference to the use of language) at Gatwick IRC and identified C&DS establishments.
- A formal review of the language used within all forms of Use of Force training at Gatwick IRC and other identified C&DS establishments.
- A formal review to be completed which seeks to understand the need for differentiation of context and the content of training such as Personal Protection training, for staff who work in centres such as Tinsley House who care for a group of detainees with a significantly different 'profile' to detainees at Brook House.
- Consideration to be given to the introduction of either a supervision model and or system of compliance checks whereby quality checks of all forms of training delivery are completed by staff from sister G4S establishments, in order to provide a greater degree of impartial assurance to the standard of training across C&DS .
- Consideration given to the allocation of two D2 managers across C&DS establishments to maintain regular and formal contact with C&R National Trainers to ensure that that all grades of Senior Managers within G4S are kept appropriately sighted on changes to training methods and content.
- For all C&DS establishments to revisit the methods for the promotion of all forms of 'whistleblowing' within the organisation, specifically to include staff from internal providers such as G4S Healthcare and Facilities Management as well as other partner agencies who operate within our business and are included in any component of staff training.

Version No:	V1.5	Document Type:	Standard
Version Date:	09 th March 2018	Document ID	RS/CI 0080318
Version Expiry:	NA	Document classification:	SENSITIVE
Version Status:	NA	Uncontrolled if printed or downloaded	

Section 6

APPENDICES

Version No:	V1.5	Document Type:	Standard
Version Date:	09 th March 2018	Document ID	RS/CI 0080318
Version Expiry:	NA	Document classification:	SENSITIVE
Version Status:	NA	Uncontrolled if printed or downloaded	

Appendix I – Terms of Reference

[C:\Users\InmanC\Desktop\GATWICK INVESTIGATION \(FEB-MARCH 2018\)\Appendix I - Terms of Reference.docx](C:\Users\InmanC\Desktop\GATWICK INVESTIGATION (FEB-MARCH 2018)\Appendix I - Terms of Reference.docx)

Appendix II – Course attendance data (05th Feb 2018)

[C:\Users\InmanC\Desktop\GATWICK INVESTIGATION \(FEB-MARCH 2018\)\Appendix II 05th Feb 2018.pdf](C:\Users\InmanC\Desktop\GATWICK INVESTIGATION (FEB-MARCH 2018)\Appendix II 05th Feb 2018.pdf)

Appendix III – Course attendance data (22nd Feb 2018)

[C:\Users\InmanC\Desktop\GATWICK INVESTIGATION \(FEB-MARCH 2018\)\Appendix III 22nd Feb 2018.pdf](C:\Users\InmanC\Desktop\GATWICK INVESTIGATION (FEB-MARCH 2018)\Appendix III 22nd Feb 2018.pdf)

Appendix IV – Kerry Smith, Hibiscus Initiatives - Interview notes

[C:\Users\InmanC\Desktop\GATWICK INVESTIGATION \(FEB-MARCH 2018\)\Appendix IV Kerry Smith.doc](C:\Users\InmanC\Desktop\GATWICK INVESTIGATION (FEB-MARCH 2018)\Appendix IV Kerry Smith.doc)

Appendix V - Tesni Woodfall, Hibiscus Initiatives - Interview notes

[C:\Users\InmanC\Desktop\GATWICK INVESTIGATION \(FEB-MARCH 2018\)\Appendix V Tesni Woodfall.doc](C:\Users\InmanC\Desktop\GATWICK INVESTIGATION (FEB-MARCH 2018)\Appendix V Tesni Woodfall.doc)

Appendix VI - [Name Irrelevant] Hibiscus Initiatives - Interview notes

[C:\Users\InmanC\Desktop\GATWICK INVESTIGATION \(FEB-MARCH 2018\)\Appendix VI Ella Wooster.doc](C:\Users\InmanC\Desktop\GATWICK INVESTIGATION (FEB-MARCH 2018)\Appendix VI Ella Wooster.doc)

Appendix VII - Maria-Claire Llaudes, G4S Healthcare – interview notes

[C:\Users\InmanC\Desktop\GATWICK INVESTIGATION \(FEB-MARCH 2018\)\Appendix VII Maria Clare Llaudes.doc](C:\Users\InmanC\Desktop\GATWICK INVESTIGATION (FEB-MARCH 2018)\Appendix VII Maria Clare Llaudes.doc)

Appendix VIII - Stanislava Fedorcova, G4S Healthcare (held via conference call)

[C:\Users\InmanC\Desktop\GATWICK INVESTIGATION \(FEB-MARCH 2018\)\Appendix VIII Stanislava Fedorcova.doc](C:\Users\InmanC\Desktop\GATWICK INVESTIGATION (FEB-MARCH 2018)\Appendix VIII Stanislava Fedorcova.doc)

Appendix IX–Joanne Cockrell – Interview notes

[C:\Users\InmanC\Desktop\GATWICK INVESTIGATION \(FEB-MARCH 2018\)\Appendix IX JoAnne Cockrell.doc](C:\Users\InmanC\Desktop\GATWICK INVESTIGATION (FEB-MARCH 2018)\Appendix IX JoAnne Cockrell.doc)

Appendix X –Emma Bradshaw – Interview notes

[C:\Users\InmanC\Desktop\GATWICK INVESTIGATION \(FEB-MARCH 2018\)\Appendix X Emma Bradshaw.doc](C:\Users\InmanC\Desktop\GATWICK INVESTIGATION (FEB-MARCH 2018)\Appendix X Emma Bradshaw.doc)

Appendix XI– Laura McGonagall – Interview notes

[C:\Users\InmanC\Desktop\GATWICK INVESTIGATION \(FEB-MARCH 2018\)\Appendix XI Laurel McGonagall.doc](C:\Users\InmanC\Desktop\GATWICK INVESTIGATION (FEB-MARCH 2018)\Appendix XI Laurel McGonagall.doc)

Appendix XII – Mark Demian– Interview notes

[C:\Users\InmanC\Desktop\GATWICK INVESTIGATION \(FEB-MARCH 2018\)\Appendix XII Mark Demian.doc](C:\Users\InmanC\Desktop\GATWICK INVESTIGATION (FEB-MARCH 2018)\Appendix XII Mark Demian.doc)

Appendix XIII– Shaun Phillipott – Interview notes

Version No:	V1.5	Document Type:	Standard
Version Date:	09 th March 2018	Document ID	RS/CI 0080318
Version Expiry:	NA	Document classification:	SENSITIVE
Version Status:	NA	Uncontrolled if printed or downloaded	

[C:\Users\InmanC\Desktop\GATWICK INVESTIGATION \(FEB-MARCH 2018\)\Appendix XIII Shaun Phillpott.doc](C:\Users\InmanC\Desktop\GATWICK INVESTIGATION (FEB-MARCH 2018)\Appendix XIII Shaun Phillpott.doc)

Appendix XIV – Lynn Harthill – Interview notes

[C:\Users\InmanC\Desktop\GATWICK INVESTIGATION \(FEB-MARCH 2018\)\Appendix XIV Lynn Harthill.doc](C:\Users\InmanC\Desktop\GATWICK INVESTIGATION (FEB-MARCH 2018)\Appendix XIV Lynn Harthill.doc)

Appendix XV – Sarah Newland – Interview notes

[C:\Users\InmanC\Desktop\GATWICK INVESTIGATION \(FEB-MARCH 2018\)\Appendix XV Sarah Newland.doc](C:\Users\InmanC\Desktop\GATWICK INVESTIGATION (FEB-MARCH 2018)\Appendix XV Sarah Newland.doc)

Appendix XVI – Observations from Personal Protection Training

[C:\Users\InmanC\Desktop\GATWICK INVESTIGATION \(FEB-MARCH 2018\)\Appendix XVI Observations from Personal Protection Training.docx](C:\Users\InmanC\Desktop\GATWICK INVESTIGATION (FEB-MARCH 2018)\Appendix XVI Observations from Personal Protection Training.docx)

Version No:	V1.5	Document Type:	Standard
Version Date:	09 th March 2018	Document ID	RS/CI 0080318
Version Expiry:	NA	Document classification:	SENSITIVE
Version Status:	NA	Uncontrolled if printed or downloaded	