
From: Nick Ross [DPA]
Sent: 10 May 2018 13:51
To: Lee Hanford; 'Wortley, Richard'
Subject: RE: Brook House

Dear Lee

Thank you, and please thank Michelle and your colleagues, for showing us round Brook House on Tuesday. It made a lot more sense of what we have been discussing since the Panorama programme.

In general both Richard and I were impressed by what you have achieved. As you know, we did not have time to speak at length to staff or inmates but we found the physical layout harsh and very much like a prison while the staff we saw, the relationships with detainees, and the care shown to detainees was of a much high calibre than we had expected.

The JDI is not an inspectorate but has considerable relevant experience and may be able to advise on several aspects of Brook House management. The challenges you face are well-known to you, among them:

- A very high churn-rate of inmates, a third of whom change each week, with a few staying hours and some staying only a few days. This conspires against staff forming positive relationships with detainees and thus impairs job satisfaction. There is thus an inevitable risk of impersonal behaviour and dehumanising the detainees.
- Some detainees stay for many months in defiance of the normal pattern, and it is hard for you to cater for the needs of long-term inmates.
- Unlike conventional prisoners in the UK, almost all of whom have determinate sentences, many of your detainees have no release to look forward to, merely a worsening of their situation through deportation. This adds a further destabilising layer.
- Unlike conventional prisoners, almost all of whom have committed offences, many of your detainees have no criminal record or antisocial leanings, but are nonetheless mixed with foreign national criminals.
- You are charged with detaining people in high security conditions and yet have the overriding need to acknowledge that some of those detained may prove the right to remain in the UK like any other citizen.
- Friction is inevitable and yet, almost uniquely, there are no penalties for bad, or even very violent, behaviour. Your overriding policy directive is to do nothing which could delay deportation. This lack of sanctions leaves staff in a vulnerable position, and can contribute to poor morale.
- There is a mismatch between harsh political rhetoric about creating a hostile environment for illegal immigrants and the Home Office's real-world political obligation to provide safe, humane and dignified conditions.
- This disparity between political tone and material requirements is heightened by the fact that some detainees face frightening, disheartening and life-changing deportation, which can lead to depression, self-harm and risk of suicide. There is a need for considerable sensitivity.
- In addition, as with any custodial unit, you are easily caught between two irreconcilable demands of public opinion, with the risk of media exposure as being 'too soft' or of being too harsh.

- Your staff also encounter cases where they feel procedures are unfair or even unethical, such as the 'transportation for life' of people who have lived in the UK since early childhood and in some cases have no knowledge of the country to which they are being sent, no understanding of the language and no family or support network. However rare these cases, they do not make for good staff morale.
- You face tight budgetary constraints which lead to understaffing, and which in the past have led to what you regard as unsafe understaffing.
- Understaffing contributes to low morale, as well as long hours, antisocial shift-work patterns and, in turn, to high staff turnover.
- You operate in a full-employment area within commuting distance to London and other centres competing for staff.

It is only fair to judge your performance against these very challenging circumstances.

On the other hand there are many issues over which you have direct control or a lot of leverage. In particular, given the importance of addressing high staff turnover, we propose some relatively minor changes:

1. Recruitment campaigns should be crystal clear about what candidates will face if appointed: what they discover inside must be exactly what it said on the tin.
2. Induction processes should also spell out the difficulties, repeatedly asking recruits if they have second-thoughts and so weeding out early those who are unlikely to stay the course.
3. Half way through induction recruits should be asked to agree in writing that in exchange for completion of training they will stay for at least 12 months. (Even if there is no way to prevent staff from leaving earlier, there is some evidence that making a clear commitment leads to greater compliance.)
4. Staff should expect that detainees will face sanctions for bad behaviour and non-compliance. Such sanctions could include loss of the standard £5 allowance or access to the shop, the gym or IT rooms. These may be minor, and may have no deterrence effect, but should be designed to give staff assurance that at least some amends have been made.
5. While it is hard for staff to establish relationships with short-term detainees, each staff member should be allocated detainees for whom he/she has personal responsibility. Staff may have little direct contact with those assigned to them but should act as an advocate for those inmates for all aspects of life within Brook House, including access to lawyers. However, the role must not compromise the review or deportation processes and staff should specifically be prohibited from acting as paralegals or advising on appeals. This guardian relationship is intended at least as much for the benefit of staff as for detainees and so it is essential that it should be popular with staff. It would be wise to pilot and adjust the process in close consultation with staff.
6. It is important to have routine 360 degree assessments with staff so that you learn more about what encourages them and can design out what discourages them. Some hierarchical process is inevitable in a custodial institution but it should not be a bar to criticising managers under controlled conditions.
7. You should give some thought to the nomenclature, as well as to softening the appearance of the physical estate. Since some 50% of detainees are released into the community, the term 'removal centre' is inappropriate. If possible, there should be more use of sound-absorbent materials and more use of art, especially art created by inmates themselves. You might also consider an 'I was here' wall of signatures, photographs and (moderated) comments to reduce the sense of depersonalisation.

8. As for physical violence, we discussed how the three dynamics are distinct even if they overlap: aggression between detainees, aggression against staff, and staff aggression towards detainees. It is impressive that you keep a wide range of detailed statistics and it may be that we can help you analyse the data both in order to recommend better ways of data collection and in the hope of finding useful patterns to guide remedial interventions.

Finally, we ought to formalise our relationship. We have been happy to provide informal advice over the last few months but, as discussed, we should agree a commercial rate to UCL for future work.

Of course it is always possible for G4S to make a donation to the Jill Dando Fund, the charitable account which underwrote the establishment of the Institute, but we regard any input so far as pro bono.

Once again thank you for your hospitality. As we say, given the taxing conditions in which you operate, there are many impressive features you and your colleagues can be proud of.

With good wishes.
Nick

Nick Ross | 3 Orme Square, London W2 4RS | [redacted] DPA [redacted]

From: Lee Hanford <[redacted] DPA [redacted]>
Sent: 09 May 2018 09:44
To: Nick Ross <[redacted] DPA [redacted]>; 'Wortley, Richard' <[redacted] DPA [redacted]>
Subject: RE: Brook House

Hi Nick, Richard
Thank you both for your time yesterday. I hope that the visit was beneficial from your perspective.

The team really appreciated your time and approach, which has generated some creative thinking on providing differential regimes to reward those detainees who demonstrate positive and pro-social behaviour.

I look forward to catching up with you both in the very near future to discuss next steps

Best wishes
Lee

Lee Hanford
Director Gatwick IRCs
Custodial & Detention Services
G4S Care & Justice Services (UK) Limited

Tel: [redacted] DPA [redacted]
[redacted] DPA [redacted]

From: Nick Ross [redacted] DPA [redacted]
Sent: 04 May 2018 17:02
To: Lee Hanford <[redacted] DPA [redacted]>; 'Wortley, Richard' <[redacted] DPA [redacted]>

Cc: Corrigan, Peter <[REDACTED]>
Subject: RE: Brook House

Lee
Richard and I look forward to seeing you at about 10am. Is it walking distance from the railway station?
Best wishes.
Nick

Nick Ross | 3 Orme Square, London W2 4RS | [REDACTED]

From: Lee Hanford <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 02 April 2018 09:40
To: Nick Ross <[REDACTED]>; 'Wortley, Richard' <[REDACTED]>
Cc: Corrigan, Peter <[REDACTED]>
Subject: RE: Brook House

Morning Both
Yes, just to confirm 8th May at Brook House
Kind Regards
Lee

Lee Hanford
Director Gatwick IRCs
Custodial & Detention Services
G4S Care & Justice Services (UK) Limited

Tel: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: Nick Ross [REDACTED]
Sent: 01 April 2018 17:31
To: 'Wortley, Richard' [REDACTED]; Lee Hanford [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Brook House

Great.
Nick

Nick Ross | 3 Orme Square, London W2 4RS | [REDACTED]

From: Wortley, Richard <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 01 April 2018 17:28
To: Nick Ross <[REDACTED]>; 'Lee Hanford' <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Re: Brook House

That's what I have got in my diary. Richard

Sadly I can't do 3 May. Do you want to suggest alternatives?
Best wishes.
Nick

Sent from my iPhone

On 19 Mar 2018, at 16:43, Lee Hanford <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Dear Nick, Richard
Apologies for the delay in responding following our recent meeting – although I did spend a few days in work last week it's only now I seem to be fully functioning.

Thank you for the meeting – it was very beneficial and I look forward to the next meeting at Brook House.

I met with Michelle Smith (Assistant Director with the Home Office – also copied into this e mail) last week who is keen to meet you both and be involved in this project to explore the staff and detainee culture at Brook House and potentially the wider Immigration Estate.

I am aware that we are unable to meet until early May but I am keen to agree the date prior to us all going on our journey's – so, does Thursday 3rd May at 10.00 work for us all?

Kind Regards
Lee

Lee Hanford
Director Gatwick IRCs
Custodial & Detention Services
G4S Care & Justice Services (UK) Limited

Tel: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: Nick Ross <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 15 February 2018 17:34
To: 'Gudge, Peter' <[REDACTED]>; Lee Hanford <[REDACTED]>
Subject: RE: Brook House

Dear both,
2.15pm Thursday 1 March it is.
Best wishes.
Nick

Nick Ross | 3 Orme Square, London W2 4RS <[REDACTED]>

From: Lee Hanford [DPA]
Sent: 14 February 2018 17:33
To: Nick Ross [DPA]
Cc: 'Wortley, Richard' [DPA]
Subject: RE: Brook House

Dear Nick
Hope you are well – would it be possible to arrange a meeting in the very near future to take this project forward
I look forward to catching up with you
Kind Regards
Lee

Lee Hanford
Director Gatwick IRCs
Custodial & Detention Services
G4S Care & Justice Services (UK) Limited

DPA

From: Nick Ross [DPA]
Sent: 05 January 2018 08:48
To: Lee Hanford [DPA]
Cc: 'Wortley, Richard' [DPA]
Subject: RE: Brook House

Dear Lee,

I'm sorry I can't give you a proper steer on this until I come back from the US and Prof Richard Wortley returns from Australia w/c 15 January, but I'm sure we can arrange some sort of tie-up between G4S and the JDI as you propose. Just to recap the issues we've discussed:

- ? An induction process which makes new staff aware of the risks of Milgram-type compliance or Stanford Prison/Abu Ghraib cruelty
- ? A duty of candour which requires staff to disclose anything which could harm inmates, staff or the company's integrity
- ? A speak up guardian process which encourages candour
- ? Routine candour reviews with individual staff
- ? Occasional top-up sessions with all staff, building on the induction sessions
- ? Materials for staff for voluntary reading such as books and websites
- ? Routine feedback to the Board to ensure consistent candour buy-in by directors
- ? Potential use of the JDI or 3rd parties to raise sensitive issues, eg pricing and staffing levels, in public affairs
- ? Possible internship of JDI students at G4S
- ? Possible G4S courses at the JDI
- ? The need for a JDI coordinator with G4S.

In addition I gather you are already extending the use of CCTV and body-worn cameras.