

Confidential

Independent Investigation into Brook House

Friday, 2 February 2018

**Second interview with
Michelle Brown**

This transcript has been prepared from a recording taken during the interview. Whilst it will not be attached in full to the final report, extracts from it may be included in the report. It forms part of the evidence to the Investigation and as such, will be relied on during the writing of the report and its conclusions. When you receive the transcript, please read it through, add or amend it as necessary, then sign it to signify you agree to its accuracy and return it to Verita. If the signed and agreed transcript is not returned within two weeks, we will assume that you accept its contents as accurate.

Independent Investigation into Brook House

Friday, 2 February 2018

Second interview with Michelle Brown

Investigators: Mr Ed Marsden (Verita)
Ms Kate Lampard (Verita)

1. **Mr Marsden:** This is a further discussion with Michelle Brown. It is part of the independent investigation at Brook House. This is 2 February 2018.
[Introductions]
2. **Ms Lampard:** Michelle, a number of questions have come to the fore as we have been going around, interviewing people and looking at things for ourselves. I am grateful to you for giving some more of your time. Let's start with something which is very germane to this whole piece we are doing, which is about staff raising matters of concern about the behaviours of their colleagues, particularly towards detainees. Do such things ever come through the SIRs?
3. **A.** No, more staff on staff – misconduct, or they feel offended by their colleagues. In terms of against detainees, rarely.
4. **Q.** Have you ever seen one like that through the SIR process?
5. **A.** No, not that I can recall.
6. **Q.** Why do staff do it through SIRs, if they are critical of their colleagues' behaviours towards them, and not go through the HR process?
7. **A.** I think some of it is about education, in that they don't know the correct channels in which to escalate it. Some of it is about – we offer a confidential service and so we have a general SIR reporting process and then a confidential SIR reporting process, which is around corruption prevention. You don't necessarily have to put your name to it, but you can still submit and we would flag that up through to HR, and then it is allocated an investigation with work that the CP team undertake.
8. **Q.** CP?
9. **A.** Crime Prevention.
10. **Q.** But presumably some people put confidential and anonymous ones in the ordinary SIR?
11. **A.** They do, yes.
12. **Q.** Presumably, all SIRs have to be treated in confidence?
13. **A.** Absolutely, yes. The fundamental is that you protect the source on all occasions. We have two different ways of recording it. A general SIR goes in and we log it with the actions. It goes through an audit trail and then CP, if it goes through the normal channels, it automatically is passed to me, Caz, Dan or Kelly – we're the CPT. We look at it completely separately and no-one else has access to that. We hold it in a safe and if there are actions that come out of it, we work it through in terms of what is called a challenge support meeting. It is a fairly new initiative. When I took the post in June, we

started doing them from July, where we will challenge a member of staff in a confidential forum, minuted. It is more of a kind of guidance, to avoid any kind of future occurrences. If it is an allegation about something that has happened, then we direct that to HR and say that this has come through this channel here – it is misconduct. It is then filtered out to the functional head to investigate.

14. Q. So you are taking a view on whether or not that is serious misconduct which needs to go to HR, or whether it is something that is challenge on someone at a lower level.
15. A. If we think a member of staff has been conditioned, for example, or if there is a kind of conflict of interest – if we think a member of staff knows a detainee, or knows a detainee's family – we will conduct what is called a challenge support meeting. We will talk to them about being friendly but not friends, and 'what does conditioning look like to you? Do you understand what this looks like? You could open yourself up to all kinds of allegations. Have you considered that the detainee could say this about you, or you could say this about the detainee?' It is more a kind of steer for staff.
16. Q. So it is preventative?
17. A. Yes.
18. Q. And you call it a CP - ?
19. A. It's called a challenge support meeting, which is under local corruption prevention management, which is a strategy that I implemented or created in August.
20. **Mr Marsden:** And the purpose of that is to cut things off –
21. A. To prevent.
22. Q. It's a good idea.
23. A. For me, I don't want to catch people bringing drugs in or having inappropriate relationships, because it has gone too far by that point. I want to prevent. This is a really tricky issue, because you have to challenge, but you need to have substantial information to be able to do so. If you think there is something untoward, you almost don't want to blow your cover and show your hand as well, if you think there is something. So at what point do you draw the line and say, 'We need to stop this now', or do you need to build on it and find a little more context towards it? We had our first successful outcome in January from a piece of work that we had, involving a member of staff whom we were really concerned about.
24. **Ms Lampard:** Could you tell us all about that.
25. A. There was a DCO who came off an ITC and her name was Lauren Morris. Staff had been flagging up concerns about her being over-familiar with detainees. Some of it was about her going into rooms. One of the LCPM team and I sat her down and said, 'We are really concerned. It has been noted that you have been going into detainees' room for a length of time. Why are you going in there? Do you understand the impact of that? What do you think you could open yourself up to in terms of allegations? From my point of view, you could be having an inappropriate relationship but, equally, it might be naivety on your part.'

26. She initially said that she was helping a detainee with some paperwork and so I asked, why did she pull the door? There was no reason for her to pull the door if she was just doing paperwork. If something went missing in that room, she would be open to allegation. If something happened to her, she would have left herself in a room in a vulnerable position. She then said, 'Actually, no, I was smoking in the room.' I said, 'Okay, thank you for your honesty, but there are blurred lines there around professionalism and what we would expect. I want you to be friendly but not friends and it is about relationships. Think about what that looks like to your colleagues and think about what you could leave yourself open to.' We did the challenge support meeting and we wrote it all up and put it on her record as guidance that we had done so.
27. **Mr Marsden:** When was that?
28. **A.** The first one was –
29. **Q.** That was last year?
30. **A.** Probably September. I can give you a copy. Obviously it is confidential but I am happy for you to look at what we discussed. I hoped to see an immediate and sustained improvement.
31. **Ms Lampard:** That was adopted –
32. **Mr Marsden:** Did you finish that? You had the first conversation in September, and that was what you have just narrated to us.
33. **A.** Yes.
34. **Q.** And then in January it had turned into something else?
35. **A.** We then had an incident that occurred on the D Wing courtyard in round about November time. It was a bit of a free-for-all with the nationalities on there, so we went back and started to go through what had happened. We observed the same DCO smoking in the courtyard with detainees.
36. **Ms Lampard:** Had there been a fight or a fracas, and she was there.
37. **A.** Yes, observed smoking. There were a number of reports that had come in and, when we broke it all down, we produced a timeline about sources and where the information was coming from. We had detainees saying to us that she behaved as though she works in a nightclub. We had someone –
38. **Q.** Where would they have said that?
39. **A.** It was reported to DCMs. We had some security information reports that she doesn't check ID cards, but that is a task for a DCM to manage, about saying 'You should be checking ID cards', as opposed to whether there is a corruption or conditioning issue. It is a really fine line. There was a lot of pressure on Security to say, 'You need to take her off the wing'. We were monitoring her on the wing, in terms of what could be substantiated and what could not, on the balance of probabilities. We had this whole timeline of staff telling us stuff which could not be proved. However, there was a report that said she didn't check an ID card and so we followed that through and looked at it. She was talking to a chap for half an hour on a separate wing. There were ongoing conduct issues as well.
40. I met her in November and had a disciplinary for her. We have what we call 'Our Way of Working' policy. We put the Security bulletins up about what is a conflict of interest, and what does conditioning look like. We put that on her

wing and we raised it in the morning briefings. Again, we reaffirmed expectations but she still failed to adhere to that. I therefore met with her in November and said, 'We have met with you once and we are really concerned about this ongoing behaviour, with the risk to yourself and the risk to colleagues. You are not adhering to the rules.' I gave her disciplinary warning, which is really rare for me. In my career, I think I have given four, and I have been SMT for five years.

41. I was hoping to see a change in her behaviour but it continued through to January. I had done the first two initial meetings and I handed it to Sarah Newland, who terminated her probation, based on the concerns over her conduct. The piece of work that Security produced was around all our nominals that were involved in drugs culture. She couldn't explain why she was talking to them for such a significant amount of time: on some occasions, she was handing them a house roll of the names of other detainees. There was almost some play-fighting that was observed.

42. Q. Do you think she knew that before she came here?

43. A. We have done that check. She worked in Reigate, in a Pizza Hut, and her probation was terminated there. She worked at Gatwick, and her probation was terminated there. She had a conviction for theft, which was in Primark – sorry, no, forgive me, it wasn't a conviction: she was stopped, but it wasn't pursued by the police. We tried various interventions. The smoking was investigated and I then met with her. We had the challenge support meeting, with as much guidance as you can, before you don't see that change in behaviour.

44. In my opinion, she posed a significant risk and, had I allowed that to continue, the likelihood that you are going to catch someone – without being too coarse about it – in a full embrace with a detainee, with a great big bag of weed and a mobile phone in their hand, is really low level. My role is to prevent and to say, 'Actually, I am doing everything I can to stop people going down this route', before we got to that. That was our first one, which we had in January. The Security team did a little 'high five', because of the amount of hours and time it took to formulate a really comprehensive timeline of what was proven.

45. Q. Did you find yourselves going back over all the referrals, to whom it was she was engaging with, and all they all started to ring a few bells for you?

46. A. Yes. And then we looked at a breakdown: it was 48 per cent female and 52 per cent male, so it was not a female that was just targeting Lauren. She is a young girl, very pretty. We looked at the sources and we had 18 different sources, so it wasn't as though it was just one person who was saying 'I don't feel right about this.' We had a number of sources, independent of each other. Obviously, we think our job is to piece it altogether and say what could be substantiated because it is very easy to have a rumour, where people say, 'You know, I've seen her and she was a room', but no one else can verify what is in that room.

47. Q. Do you think she was being groomed to become a carrier of drugs and so on?

48. A. Do I think she was involved in it? Yes. I think potentially, we searched her locker, which smelled fairly substantially of grass but, by the time we got there, it was empty. However, I am saying, 'This is your locker and it really smells strong', and she just said, 'No.' Again, you can't prove it. The gold standard is to say, 'Hey, we've got it!' Do I think it was in there? Yes. Could

I prove it? No. It is a really tough one because, at what point do you say, 'I'm going to allow this to continue, because I don't have enough information.'? Or at what point do you say, 'We need to prevent and, based on everything we have collated over a substantial period with interventions –' – it would be negligent of us to say 'We are terminating your employment now, based on this', when you haven't given the individual the opportunity to understand what that looks like, or to improve or to have some self-awareness.

49. When you look at who she was associating with, it was our nominals. You wouldn't say, 'I was helping this person because they were a real, vulnerable person in detention': these are our guys who are on closed visits, and they are our guys who have been involved in real antisocial behaviour. It forms a picture and you can't neglect what people are telling you. The pressure we had on Security was that here was someone with something to report, and they want something done immediately.
50. My team came to me in December and said, 'Everyone thinks we are rubbish, Michelle. They are putting in reports and nothing is happening.' We said, 'Let's go back. There's an answer for everything at the moment, but you have to balance it in the picture as a whole and keep building, and keep working through.' The risk you face is that, if something goes wrong, then that is my shoulders that I didn't do anything about it at the time, if that makes sense. Also, you can't publish to the workforce, so no-one knows where Lauren Morris is – she is just not on the roster any longer. Again, people ask the question: 'Oh, she's not in today'. I would love everybody to know, but that is then undermining that process as well.
51. **Mr Marsden:** Well, well done.
52. **A.** Thank you. We were delighted.
53. **Q.** It is a triumph.
54. **Ms Lampard:** That was people reporting things through SIRs and you are gathering your own intelligence. I just want to go back to this issue of staff, as it were, raising their concerns about other members of staff. One of the disturbing things that came out of *Panorama* is that people saw things that they didn't report. I just wondered whether they ever use a speaking-up process for that. Do you become involved in that?
55. **A.** Yes. I have done a number of those. Having done them post-*Panorama* – and I think that is just how it has worked out, and we have other resources to pick those up – I have done some, mainly around staffing, being quite short-staffed.
56. **Q.** Where do they get reported into? I thought that was a telephone line.
57. **A.** Yes, it is.
58. **Q.** How does the process work?
59. **A.** You ring up and you don't have to say your name. You can say that you have a concern about X, Y and Z. It is taken down and noted and then it filters through at a very top level. I think it can take a while for it to filter through.
60. **Q.** Does that go into G4S centrally?
61. **A.** Yes.

62. Q. And then it comes out to you?
63. A. Yes. I have had some from Nick Shepherd before - he is our legal adviser. Some I have been given from Ben: it has gone to Ben and then he has given it to me to respond to. I haven't done many of late but I am certainly aware that some have been submitted.
64. Q. When we spoke to Caz, she suggested that there had been a significant increase in workload and reporting since *Panorama*.
65. A. Yes.
66. Q. What sort of thing does that increase represent? What sort of things are you getting? Is it more of what you used to get, or are people reporting different things?
67. A. I think we have had an increase in reporting as a whole and the workload has significantly increased. I have done some analysis of work that we were producing, and then the work that we are now doing: there has been about a 35 to 36 per cent increase over what we were doing before, to what we are doing today. That is through – which I am delighted about – Security information reports and IR reporting, and use of force. Every use of force has to be downloaded by the Security team. We have created the drug and alcohol reduction strategy, which I did in December. There is the LCPM strategy, which we did in August, and the body-worn camera. That was a huge piece of work for my Security team in terms of sourcing cameras and having a number of meetings to make sure that we are adhering to RIPA applications and filming covertly and indirect surveillance and so on. We are educating the workforce about when and how you need to report.
68. Q. Just to interrupt you there, the body-worn cameras, as I understand it, are not being rolled out at the moment, because the person who is meant to be training everybody is now on maternity leave. Is that right?
69. A. I think we have done 88 per cent of the workforce. Dan is our lead on that. I wrote the operating standard for it but Dan is the guru who sets everybody up.
70. Q. Is the plan to have all DCOs with one?
71. A. Yes.
72. Q. I don't see very many of them with them?
73. A. They have all had a talk about, when they come on duty, they should be getting it. It is down to the DCM in that work area to say, 'Where is your camera? Go and get your camera.' Dan was in on Monday. He is on paternity leave, having been blessed with a little girl last week. He came in on Monday to capture more staff and he is due back in on the 11th when he will pick up the rest.
74. Q. So then you are expecting to have everybody with one?
75. A. Absolutely.
76. Mr Marsden: And DCMs should have one.
77. A. Absolutely.
78. Q. Steve mentioned it at the 7.45 briefing, the day we were there. He said to people, 'If you haven't got your body-worn camera, go and get it.' So it is about customising people to wearing it.

79. A. Yes. For me, it is about saying, 'Actually, this is the value it can add to you, and how much it can protect you.' People de-escalate if they see the camera, if it is switched on.
80. Q. Do you mean the detainees?
81. A. For staff to wear them, it is a real deterrent to detainees to escalate.
82. Q. We saw that in Yarlswood, when they introduced it.
83. A. Yes.
84. **Ms Lampard:** The behaviours improved dramatically.
85. A. I have the Yarlswood report. When I contacted Yarlswood and asked them what they used, I went with the same one - Edesix. The one that we had before was Revell. From talking to the security manager there, and asking what was good and not so good about their piece of kit, it was a no-brainer that we had the same. I think it probably saved about £160,000 cost as well, from what we were originally going with. So thank you for that!
86. Q. I can see how you have introduced all of these policies and tightened things up will obviously produce more work, because of monitoring your action plans and so on. That makes sense. There is stretch going on in your team, and you are one collator down, I think.
87. A. We are, yes.
88. Q. That suggests, though, that this means that there is a slightly reactive approach at the moment, because you are just trying to get on top of this bit of work, and that you don't actually have that much time to do some of that trend data analysis, and therefore strategic planning.
89. A. Yes.
90. Q. Is that fair?
91. A. Yes, absolutely. When we have done intelligence meetings, we have had real success. We call it a 'kapow' moment. When we have looked down and pieced together information, we have stopped drugs coming through on visits and we have had arrests for intent to supply. But does that happen? Rarely. A perfect example is to say that I have Nick, who is my collator for today who is covering Brook and Tinsley House, so he is down at Tinsley House at the moment. Nick is fairly new and Nick hasn't done his ?Amnis courses as yet. We have Moore Stephens, auditors, with us today, so Nick will be tasked with leading a lot of that on the IRs, and I am going on an escort this afternoon.
92. Q. I can see the problem.
93. **Mr Marsden:** I went to the detainee of interest meeting yesterday. Would Security usually chair that?
94. A. Yes.
95. Q. Right, because James chaired it.
96. A. Yes. A senior manager chairs it and then Security play into it. It sits within the SMT level.
97. Q. That meeting is the kind of stretch exemplified, isn't it?
98. A. Yes.

99. Q. You don't have enough people to cover meetings like that, although that is probably quite an important one.
100. A. Yes. If everybody plays into it, you get the outcomes. We spend a lot of time having meetings.
101. Q. Yes, I would agree with that.
102. A. However, to get the outcome, sometimes I personally struggle. I like to see a 'do'.
103. Q. I came away from that meeting, thinking exactly that. It wasn't terribly well focused and I am not sure that there were very many decisions made. It might have been different, had Security been there – I don't know. I think you have hit the nail on the head.
104. A. Yesterday, for the Security meeting we have an operational call that we dial into. Every IRC dials into. My collator was dialled into an operational call in the morning and I was in Birmingham yesterday for G4S managers, so we are taken out quite frequently to do really important stuff. It is fascinating and very good to catch up, but –
105. Q. But it means that more basic stuff is left.
106. A. Yes. And then last week, Nick went on an escort. Dan – I think Caz picked up the DCM role. You play into the operational running of the centre. I try to protect them as much as I can but sometimes you can't really be selfish as well, if there is a wider operation that has to be covered. Another one of the difficulties is that no one else picks up Security work, so it is a bit like Safer Community. If they are used to cover the operation, there is no one else who does it and their work remains. Whereas, if you cover an Oscar 1, the Oscar 1 is handed over, so it is ongoing whereas those two areas, which is kind of bread and butter, are the first to be pulled from. However, it still sits there, if that makes sense.
107. Q. Yes, that it is piling up work, rather than operational –
108. A. If there is something that is missed – I went to the convention on Wednesday. It was a 'lessons learned' about crime in prison. My fear is that, if there is this whole host of information that is being missed, that is almost negligent of us that we have not picked it up and followed it through.
109. Ms Lampard: I just wanted to ask you generally, before I go back to the specifics, as we have been going round I suppose we have seen things. We have talked about this with Lee, but it has become more *real* for us as we have spent time talking to people. It is about the lack of ownership by front line managers, by members of staff. In a way, you are in a good position because you are not on the residential detail. If you go into the wings, however, we get a strong sense that you have individuals who are very good and very caring, but much of what they get through is operational. It is just fixing things now. Nobody is actually saying to themselves, 'let's go a bit further and make sure this place is clean; make sure that the table tennis is sorted out; make sure that the office is not total chaos; get out onto the wing and wander around. That is the sense we are getting in this place.
110. A. I agree, yes. I will give an example. Strategically, in terms of a residential, I will be honest with you. I understand where you are sitting and what the long-term aim is. Your basics are decency, and keeping somewhere clean because, if you keep it clean and it remains clean, you have a bit more respect for it. When we were Safer Community, we noticed that there was a

real issue with a younger population causing some real antisocial behaviour and so we went out and did focus groups with them. We said, what's driving this? Why is it your population, your age group, that is causing this antisocial behaviour or this friction here? We got a whole host of ideas from them and Safer Community took it out to residential and said, 'This is what your guys are telling us. They want some board games –'. It was really basic stuff. They wanted activities in their room, they wanted access to cleaning equipment. It just stopped there and so, in the end, Safer Community went out and bought the board games and said, 'There you go' – but the loaning system hasn't gone any further.

111. Q. I spoke to the chap in the library, who said they were bust now.
112. A. Yes, but again, if they are bust, then it is about saying to someone, 'Well, you've broken that. Why have you broken it up? You need to think about the 100 other guys in your unit now who can't use that.' It is not about hitting people with a big stick, but it is about them understanding the impact that their behaviour is having on the other people in their wing. For relationship building, if I was new to the business and I walked in, I think I would be rather overwhelmed by it. It is busy and it is loud and the people who I am working with are not necessarily confident in their own skins. That comes from the top, however, and so it is about leadership and saying, 'Rather than show you how that works today –'
113. Mr Marsden: One of the things I have noticed this week, because we have been here since Monday and we have sat in on meetings, is that Juls, who is head of residential – I have been in meetings where I would have thought he would have said things and led thing but has done nothing.
114. A. It was in August, just before *Panorama*, when there was a conversation about whether he was really struggling. I think the idea was that he was being managed, and I said, 'Is that performance managed, or just managed?' It was clearly not improving. We all sat there and said that, if we rotate, we would just be moving the problem. Would it be fair that you just moved Juls? We all just sat round there and said we didn't think there was another job that he could do. The thought process was going to be that he was away on holiday and he would return back from holiday and Steve would meet with him, with a view that there would be a look at demotion. Sarah certainly didn't want him at Tinsley. I think there was a thought process that he couldn't managed key stakeholders, or hold his own in those kinds of forums. In terms of staffing, audits and compliance, that wouldn't be a strength of Juls to deliver on. It was left that he would potentially be demoted and that was in August. Then we had the *Panorama* programme, and it has just –
115. Ms Lampard: I have a number of questions arising from this. First of all, it strikes me that you demonstrated how frustrated you were. You called a meeting and some people might say it was very heavy-handed to go for an investigation if somebody shuts their eyes in a meeting and is asleep. It suggests to me that your response is because, actually, you have no confidence that he will be properly managed.
116. A. That is right.
117. Q. In a normal case, you would say to somebody, 'Come off it, you fell asleep in your own meeting. Are you alright?' You wouldn't immediately say, 'Right, we're going to investigate you'. That, to me, proves that this has been a longstanding question.

118. A. Absolutely, yes.
119. Q. And that that is the only way you can think of moving this thing on.
120. A. Yes.
121. Q. So that was the same time that Steve was not up to his job.
122. A. Steve. I struggle with Steve. I struggled when he first joined, because he was very prison-based. He is generally a nice guy. Can he have a difficult conversation? No.
123. Q. And you gave us the example of him letting you down before, over the business of Neil Davis.
124. A. Yes, he did, and I reported that.
125. Q. So you don't have a history of confidence -
126. A. Steve's thing to me was, 'Michelle, sometimes you need to let things go.' My response is that -
127. Q. Why does he protect Juls?
128. A. I really don't know.
129. Q. Do they have a history?
130. A. No, there isn't.
131. **Mr Marsden:** There is no sense that Juls has something over Steve?
132. A. No, not as far as I am aware. When I sit in front of Steve, I really pride myself in my work. I said to him, 'The minute I don't do something, Steve, I will be mortified. The minute I don't deliver, I would be embarrassed at that conversation, for me not to deliver on what I should be doing. I am a manager and I have a lot of responsibility. I earn a really good salary and I don't want to be in that position. I cannot comprehend how things that just go disgustingly are unaddressed.
133. In that Security meeting, I sat and talked about C Wing and said that our intelligence was saying to us that there was a lot of action occurring and that we had concerns about some of the people on C Wing. I asked Juls if we could look at C Wings and I said to him, 'What's your plan?', and he said, 'I don't have one'. I asked him if he needed Security to help him - could we give him the information, and what did he need? I pressed him, and asked him what he needed from Security that month. We said that everything was kind of circulating around C Wing. That was in early November, because that was when he fell asleep in my meeting. Then, within a week, two guys should have been moved off the wing but they weren't: they should have been moved the next day but they weren't. Then we sat here until nine o'clock that night, failing to lock the wing down -.
134. Q. Is this the build up to the 28 November incident?
135. A. Yes.
136. Q. So you sort of pre-empted it?
137. A. Yes.
138. **Ms Lampard:** And were the two you wanted to move off, two who subsequently were involved in that incident?

139. A. Yes. I think we had three detainees and they should have been moved off the wing. We flagged it up and said this was what our report was telling us, and this was what we could see happening.
140. **Mr Marsden:** Emerging –
141. A. Yes. We said, 'Juls, look at your wing, because they need talking to. You need some kind of intervention.' They should have been moved and that is a perfect example. We were sitting in a meeting on the Monday – they should have been moved on Sunday but they weren't moved by Juls. We sat in the meeting on Monday and Steve said 'I want them moved today, Juls'. They weren't moved. I picked up on the Tuesday and, by Tuesday morning, we had the first response and all available officers. It was me that sat here until 11 o'clock that night, managing it down at the scene, holding four assertive guys.
142. Q. Where was Juls?
143. A. *[No audible reply]*
144. **Ms Lampard:** What was Steve's response to the fact that he had failed?
145. A. Nothing.
146. Q. I have a last basic question about Lee. We haven't approached him just yet but what does Lee think about Juls?
147. A. I genuinely don't know.
148. Q. Does Lee know about the failure of them to move the two people before 28 November?
149. A. Yes. I don't know what happened thereafter, but yes. I don't know what Lee thinks of Juls. I think he certainly holds him a lot more accountable for taking some ownership of this area.
150. Q. Do you think he lacks a long-term plan to manage him?
151. A. I don't know. It is just that, when we are such a small team, I am really conscious – and I don't have a personal thing against Juls at all.
152. Q. Don't worry – we raised it, you didn't.
153. A. Yes, it is frustrating.
154. **Mr Marsden:** It stands out a mile.
155. A. It's so frustrating. I genuinely care about the people here, the detainees here. If you work so hard, it is undermined to an extent, if that makes sense.
156. Q. In a chance meeting earlier this week, and I am not telling you anything I shouldn't be because there were plenty of other people there, but I think Juls must have said two or three sentences at that.
157. A. He grunts.
158. Q. And that in a meeting about the key activity for residential.
159. A. He will walk out the door at four o'clock. Perhaps I am a little jealous, because he has the ability to just walk out the door, whereas I would sit with a conscience and think, actually my colleague is struggling today.
160. **Ms Lampard:** This isn't personal, but it is about safety.
161. A. Yes, and that is where I struggle sometimes.

162. **Mr Marsden:** If Juls is socialising with his reports, which it sounds from what you are saying as though he is, do you have any sense about the extent of that and what is going hard. 'Partying hard' conjures up all sorts of things.
163. **A.** He goes on stag weekends with them.
164. **Ms Lampard:** Has he done that recently?
165. **A.** I think he went on a stag weekend last year, where – a perfect example – I think 15 or 16 of our managers went on the stag weekend, which left me two on duty. I was working, duty director at the weekend, and I had two managers left.
166. **Mr Marsden:** Was this Steve Loughton's wedding?
167. **A.** Steve Loughton's, yes.
168. **Ms Lampard:** When was that?
169. **A.** May, I think. It may have been May.
170. **Mr Marsden:** And so they went abroad?
171. **A.** Yes, they went to Magaluf. One DCM got a G4S tattooed on his chest.
172. **Ms Lampard:** Well, he'll have to live with that, won't he!
173. **A.** Yes.
174. **Mr Marsden:** Do you know what went on there?
175. **A.** No. Sometimes, I don't want to. It is their stag weekend. They put it on social media and I said, 'Get that down now! You could bring the company into disrepute. If you've got a G4S tattoo on your chest, get it off social media now.' That would look like 15 managers in Magaluf and 'Hey, I've got G4S on my chest.' That is where it is really difficult.
176. **Q.** If he has been on something like that and they got up to –
177. **A.** What goes on tour, stays on tour.
178. **Q.** It will be very difficult.
179. **A.** I learned really quickly. I was a DCM: I joined, and was a DCM, and I went on probably the first two Christmas drinks, but I stopped that very quickly as soon as I thought I would have blurred lines there. If I don't put myself in that situation, I won't be part of it. I am going back eight years, and it was quite difficult then but it puts me in a stronger position now in that I don't have those blurred lines. I am now a manager and so I need to –
180. **Ms Lampard:** Have you investigated Steve?
181. **A.** No.
182. **Q.** Would you like to investigate him? Do you think you should have?
183. **A.** To be fair, I wasn't Security at that point.
184. **Q.** Of course, sorry.
185. **A.** Would I like to have?
186. **Q.** If it happened now?

187. A. I have spoken to someone beforehand about, 'You are still an employee. Think about what happens.' I can't stop people going away on holiday, realistically.
188. Q. I suppose the question is, if it were to happen now under your security watch, if you knew someone was going on holiday in circumstances in which people are probably going to be taking drugs, etc. There are all sorts of reasons why that compromises them, because they know someone will tell them about what you did. I suppose if it were to happen now, it would be a prime example of one of your challenge meetings.
189. A. Absolutely. Yes.
190. Q. Do you think you would use that?
191. A. If I knew it was pre-booked, I would be meeting with every single one of them to make it very, very clear about the parameters beforehand and, certainly when they returned, should something come up, then I would be saying – perfect example – 'I spoke to you beforehand. You are still an employee. I don't want to infringe on your personal and private life but you actually need to appreciate, as much as it is a stag do, that you are associated with work, because you are with work people. You need to think about the impact that has.'
192. Q. I think it makes Juls's position untenable.
193. A. I will be honest with you – I could give you 20 examples, literally 20 examples, of saying 'Where are you at with this? What are we doing? I am concerned about this.', because I have worked with him for so long.
194. **Mr Marsden:** For me, the incident on the 28th is really serious in that we have spoken to staff – experienced staff – who were frightened by that incident.
195. A. Yes.
- 196.
197. **Ms Lampard:** They said they thought the whole place would go.
198. A. To be fair, I was down on C Wing and so, initially, I was deployed down there. I remember thinking that I saw Juls was leaning over the bars, whereas I was going up to them and saying, 'Right, what is happening? Talk to me and help me understand.' I literally held court with 20 of them, or 25. I took all their information. It was very noisy and a pool table went over and there was lots of banging. I can only say, having been in that situation before, was there a concern for me at one point? Yes, but the minute you retreat from that unit, you have lost the unit and you are giving people an open invitation to do what they want. It is really important to have staff presence. I know that one of the findings from HMP Birmingham, with the disturbance over Christmas, was that staff retreated too early, so the prisoners looked around and said, 'Look, there's no staff here!' So some of it is about holding your own. There were no threats to the staff and nothing was directed to officers or managers.
199. Q. But there was obviously a sense that it could happen.
200. A. Yes, it could happen. Things can happen really quickly. It is so unpredictable when you have that number of people. I was down there, and all I was doing was just talking to people. They were queuing up to talk to me. I had a pool table, with them all queuing up. I was saying things like, 'What's happening with you? Talk to me about this and talk to me about that.' They were engaging with staff and they were just frustrated.

201. **Mr Marsden:** Was it frustration about regime issues?
202. **A.** Some of it was about cleanliness, and some of it was about their cases, with a lack of Home Office understanding. We did forums that afternoon and right the way through the evening –
203. **Q.** Four rooms, as in cleaning them?
204. **A.** No, not four rooms, ‘forums’ – it must be my posh Surrey accent. We did forums with them. We got them in forums and asked if they were upset about the food. ‘Let’s talk about this, and about your case, so that you can have a meeting with the Home Office.’ It is not about meeting their demands but it is the very simple stuff. If you look at the detainee consultative meeting, that is a perfect example. Look at the detainee consultative meeting minutes for the last three years: Juls hasn’t been to a single one, but it is his meeting. So what happens is that when I have my Safer Custody meeting, my Safer Community meeting, I have 12, 13 or 14 turning up at mine. At one point, they tried to rush the door in visits to get to my meeting, because they wanted to talk about mops, buckets, cleanliness, paperwork. At Juls’s meetings, I don’t think he has ever attended a meeting.
205. **Q.** Do you have some minutes there?
206. **A.** Of his meetings? I can’t think of the last time I saw them.
207. **Ms Lampard:** We will ask Juls for them, or Lorraine might have them.
208. **A.** I know he had done the wing forums, post-*Panorama*, but, before that, if he went to one in three years, I would say, ‘One! It is *his* meeting!’ For me, this impacts me.
209. **Q.** What does he do all day?
210. **A.** Smokes. Chats. I don’t know. If it was a bit like, ‘Well, I had 10 people at my door’, when I am talking to them about how they are feeling, my team didn’t have their probation reviews from Juls. When they joined me and I said, ‘Probation?’, they said no, it hadn’t been done. It still hasn’t been done. If you inherit someone who has had no probation review and no direction, it just has such an impact. I have said to Steve that sometimes I sit and say, ‘Why do I bother for it to be detrimental, and for it just to impact? Why do I end up picking up many of his problems from his residential staff?’
211. **Q.** Ben, obviously, accepted that there was a problem. What was Ben’s line? What would Ben think about letting this happen?
212. **A.** Ben would say, ‘Yes, we need to look at that’, and it would just fall into oblivion. It wouldn’t be, ‘This is your area. Get this done and I want feedback by such-and-such time.’
213. **Q.** The impression we are getting with Ben, and a lot of staff, and indeed from most of the response we get from outside, was that he was jolly good at managing the G4S afterwards.
214. **A.** Yes.
215. **Q.** He was very good at smoothing the Home Office.
216. **A.** Yes.
217. **Q.** But frankly, he was an operational disaster. Does that sound right?
218. **A.** They needed a lot of educating about what goes on on the floor, on the shop front. Ben would have a very social worker kind of approach. Ben struggled

in managing a team of senior managers, because we have really strong personalities. We all have a point to make, if that makes sense. I think he struggled with that.

219. Q. I am getting the impression that Steve, basically, was left to get on with it in his own way, which was not very effective. The sense I have – but I haven't decided yet – is that Lee has started quietly to expect things to be done slightly differently. Is that fair? Or is he so concentrating on this issue of staffing that the modelling of the team is not quite there yet?
220. A. Lee is a very good operator. He is very good at managing, day to day. He isn't about disciplining people but he is about 'learn from it and move on'. He wouldn't discuss with me his thoughts on Steve or Juls, and I would not expect him to, to be fair. I have worked with Lee previously –
221. **Mr Marsden:** Would he have a hard conversation?
222. A. With Lee?
223. Q. No, would Lee have hard conversations?
224. A. I think he would be really good at that, in how he pitches it.
225. **Ms Lampard:** He would bide his time, would he?
226. A. It is difficult, because Lee is not always going to be here for ever, so we are in a situation where he has made it really clear for six months.
227. **Mr Marsden:** And so he might be thinking, 'I'd better leave this to my successor.'
228. A. Yes, but for the greater good of the team –
229. Q. It is very compromising.
230. A. It is still ongoing, if that makes sense.
231. **Ms Lampard:** Do you get the impression that he doesn't really want to in there?
232. A. No, I don't. I think Lee likes picking up something that is a bit broken, and coming in and making it good. When we sat after Medway – I don't know whether I told you before, but I sat in a meeting with Ben and Steve and said, 'We're going to have a *Panorama* on our hands here, if we don't learn from Medway.' And we did. Lee is more of a coaching person, and he will get you to do what he wants you to do.
233. **Mr Marsden:** A sort of coaching and mentoring, rather than –
234. A. I don't think he would say, 'That's not good enough. Pull your socks up.' I think he would say, 'What I need from you is this', or 'This about this'.
235. Q. Sort of facilitative?
236. A. Yes.
237. **Ms Lampard:** What I am hearing from you, of course, is that you see the benefit of that but experience has told you that that is not going on. There are horses for courses.
238. A. Yes.
239. **Mr Marsden:** It feels to me as though this is something that needs to be tackled – the Juls residential.
240. A. At the moment.

241. Q. It is corrosive.
242. A. I will be honest with you. I think you can chuck as many staff at it as you want to but, because we do not have that engagement right, before you chuck 10 staff at it, they will just become really bad officers or they will leave.
243. Q. Which is what is happening.
244. A. Yes, absolutely, but this isn't new. This is historical and it has been ongoing. We don't look at the why. If we say that it is difficult to work Red, why is it difficult? A perfect example is Steve Dix, who is EDR, hasn't got an objective, so how does he know what needs to be achieved?
245. Q. Do you have anything about the run-up to the 28th?
246. A. I can get the Security meeting minutes.
247. Q. Do we have those?
248. A. Yes, I can get them for you.
249. Q. Have you already sent them to us?
250. A. Not the minutes of the meeting. If you go through SMT minutes, there is stuff that we talked about – changing, informing the committee about Employee of the Month. That has never happened. Things in meetings, just are talked about, if that makes sense. The 28th is a perfect example: we raised it. We raised it the month before, and Juls didn't bother coming to the Security meeting and so I complained. When Juls did come to the Security meeting, Juls came and fell asleep. It's on there – it is an ongoing action. I don't think Juls likes challenge from females. There was a member of staff before – Stacey Dean – who was Security senior manager, and he would kind of grunt at her. He grunts at me. I don't know what conversations Steve has with Juls, because Steve says to me, 'I'm managing him', and I am thinking, '*performance managing* him, or '*managing* him? There is a difference. I genuinely don't know whether we are into that process at all but I suspect that we are not and it is just a conversation in the morning, to say 'You need to look at that.'
251. Ms Lampard: I would say that those are the issues we hear, and one is the one about women. I think, if you had more female DCMs you might have a different culture.
252. A. Absolutely.
253. Q. This business of DCMs going off on the town with Juls – I bet they were all men.
254. A. Yes, they were.
255. Q. That, in itself, is bad for the place, because women staff feel marginalised by that. I notice that Lee has made one more female DCM now, hasn't he?
256. A. Kirsty.
257. Q. Kirsty, who is down in reception.
258. A. Yes.
259. Q. To add to –
260. A. Caz and Hayley.
261. Q. Who are both not operational.

262. A. I have Caz who sits in Security, and there is Hayley Atwater, who sits at Tinsley House.
263. Q. Hayley is at Tinsley? So in fact in Brook House, we only have Caz, and now she is going to be joined by Kirsty.
264. A. Yes. We have Michelle Overton as well, who is off on a career break at the moment.
265. Q. There was the alcohol and drugs action plan, which I was interested in. It refers to an occasion when the police wouldn't help with a request to help on a search plan. What was that about?
266. A. Obviously, we had Steve's stag week, or weekend, and then it was the wedding. We wanted to drug test staff following the wedding.
267. Q. Why did you want to drugs test? Where was the wedding?
268. A. Where? Gosh, I went to the evening. I will be honest with you. I'm not going to sit here and say – do I socialise with staff? Absolutely not. I was invited to a wedding and I have worked with Steve for 10 years, and so I did go. However, I didn't stay very long, because I was a little concerned. I don't want to witness things. Where was it? East Sussex, or West Sussex? I wanted staff to be swabbed when they came into work on the next working day, to see whether there was anything in their system, but the police wouldn't support us in that. Unless they think somebody is under the influence –
269. **Mr Marsden:** Had drugs clearly been used?
270. A. I didn't witness that, but do I think they were? Potentially, yes.
271. Q. As in?
272. A. Cocaine. My ears pricked up initially because they had obviously all gone on the stag do. I am not suggesting that anything was taken – I genuinely don't know. However, my hunch is that, potentially, yes.
273. Q. A lot of people came to the do?
274. A. Yes. I stayed for literally two hours and then I thought, I didn't need to be in that situation any longer. I didn't see anything, but I took myself out of it. I am Head of Security and I don't want to be associated with that. For me, my test would be afterwards, about saying 'Can we test staff?'. I have made lots of enquiries about staff using drugs, and where do we stand. The contract says that they will be drug tested. When you go into it further, it is that they can be drug and alcohol tested if we believe that they are under the influence whilst on duty. So, recreational use doesn't mean that we are entitled to test people. However, what we approached the police for is that we put X amount of intelligence together and went to the police and said, 'Are you able to swab?' They have done it historically, about six or seven years ago. They said that they needed intelligence for justification, so we put loads of information together and sent it over to the police. We said 'This person has lost a lot of weight and their physicality has changed. There could be a possibility. This person has recently attended X, Y, Z.' And all these people were on duty, and it would be a perfect opportunity, but they came back and said no.
275. **Ms Lampard:** Did they give a reason why?

276. A. That they were under-resourced and there was an ongoing operation, so they couldn't justify using the staff for that reason.
277. Q. I don't think Juls was at that wedding throughout, was he?
278. A. No, he wasn't. He went on holiday with Kim. He didn't go to the wedding, no.
279. Mr Marsden: But he was at the stag do?
280. A. Yes. I was invited to the wedding. Again, I was there in the evening and there were lots of people there – some from *Panorama*.
281. Ms Lampard: Were they people who were dismissed.
282. A. I don't think it had happened at that point. I think we knew about it but it hadn't happened. It was in that kind of period. I felt slightly uncomfortable that there were people there who I didn't want to have a difficult conversation with.
283. Mr Marsden: Could I ask you about something I have observed when we have been here this week? Doors, and locking them: given my very limited experience of keys and carrying keys, and key training, I remember that it was drummed into me that, if I opened a door, I should lock it.
284. A. Yes.
285. Q. I would prove to myself that I have locked it in a way that can be visible to CCTV and the like. I have noticed quite a lot of sort of passing of doors: people walk through. Is door opening and locking an issue? I noticed in the security report that there had been incidents where –
286. A. Yes. I think we have increased the reporting on it. There was a bit of a culture of, 'If there's a door, you just lock it.' - and it wasn't recognised as a breach of security. We have a lot of pain with Tascor, which is an electronic door. The escorting people who come in to reception, as they leave, they will think that the electronic door is shut but it is not. I think we had four last month from Tascor and a couple from Healthcare. We have had three from the Home Office. In terms of DCOs and G4S staff, I think we had two.
287. Ms Lampard: Actually, it is not really about you not locking it, but it is about the sloppy way they deal with it. Everybody tailgates here and they hand the door on to each other.
288. A. Yes.
289. Q. When we were at Yarlswood, it was absolutely driven into us: if you open that door, own that door. So Ed and I stand there, saying 'after you', and you've got to shut that door.
290. A. Yes.
291. Q. That is something that people need to know. You have a great deal on your plate –
292. A. But the amount of work that that creates – that one door that is left open, for example, gets reported through the SIR and is recorded by the collator. It is then reported to the duty director, who then has to report that up to the Gold, because it is a breach of security. That then comes to me, if I don't do that. I then commission terms of reference for an investigation and that footage is then downloaded. We then do the investigation and then sit in a potential disciplinary. That is for *one*. In terms of volume of work, we do 'Lock it, prove it.' We have done a piece of work recently with the Home Office: we went to

their team meeting two weeks ago, to say, 'This is how you lock a door'. There are new staff there. We have gone through refresher training with all of the Home Office team there.

293. With regard to Healthcare, they are G4S, but they sit under a different HR director and their take on it is that 'it's just a door', but I say absolutely not: it is still a breach of security. If we are prepared to go through that with our staff, then the expectation is that they go through the same. They are on their third HR partner, so I have sent all the investigations over to the new HR partner last week and said that this is where we are. This is not a threat but I have suggested to Healthcare that, unless we have that same outcome, then I will be withdrawing keys permanently, because I cannot trust people with keys. You show them once, you're bad; do it twice – and I have done the same with Aramark. I have taken keys permanently off a member of staff, so they can't leave the door open.
294. Q. The other thing that has cropped up – this is quite nitty-gritty stuff, so I am sorry to go over it – is about X-raying. Caz has suggested that there are problems, and we have talked before with you about where anything was getting in. Caz, like you, said she thought it was through baggage, mail and visits. She said she thought some of the staff doing the X-raying are perhaps too inexperienced and really don't know what they are looking for. Does that accord with your view?
295. A. Yes. There is a shortage of staff who are generally X-ray trained. Our trainer left about two months ago and we are working on the goodwill of staff who still have the knowledge of that.
296. Q. Is there a plan to get a new trainer?
297. A. That will be subject to our noms of course. I have requested, but whether it comes up –
298. Mr Marsden: Is that an X-ray trainer, in how to use the machine?
299. A. Yes. In terms of post, we are dealing with a new entity here, with liquid spice being sprayed onto paper. It is fairly new to us. If something looks generally suspicious, we have the UV lamps that will go over that. I was at a meeting yesterday where one of the prisons photocopied every single piece of mail that comes in. That would be amazing but, in terms of resources, would that be achievable? No. I am not saying that that is a solution, and that we just leave it by any chance, but that is a fairly new one on us. The drug of choice at the moment seems to be cannabis, in terms of our finds. This is similar to what many of the prisons say.
300. Ms Lampard: What has been shown when you are searching? Since you have taken over, has there been an increase in finds?
301. A. Yes. I can give you the database of what we have. Especially, there has been an increase of finds in general drugs, yes. There have been some fairly significant ones. We have had two intent to supply, where they have been arrested on site and taken into police custody. One of them appeared in court about two weeks ago and we are just in the process of doing a silhouette of the people –
302. Q. A detainee?

303. A. A visitor coming in to a detainee, yes. We are in the process of doing a silhouette and saying 'Visitor A visited and has now been convicted of ...'. It is a bit of a visual of that.
304. In terms of staff, yes, we have had some real good finds, mainly around mobile phones on staff. Again, it was really frustrating because we refer it to the police, but the police aren't interested because of criminality, despite it being under the Immigration and Asylum Act, which I have talked the inspector through. We therefore had to go through a process of asking staff if they were happy to sign a disclaimer that, should we find their mobile phone, that we can interrogate it to see that there was nothing untoward on it. If I find a phone, it is an invasion of someone's privacy if I go straight into it, but then I need to satisfy myself that they haven't got anything untoward on it. That was rather rocky ground to start with. The first protocol is that we reviewed it in a challenge support meeting, in terms of 'Why have you got your phone? Do you understand the implications of it?'. Then we would write to them officially to make them aware of the DSO on having mobile phones with you in the centre.
305. Q. Do you have agreement from staff generally, about –
306. A. We are just starting it on the ITCs.
307. Q. So you will say to them, 'Your phone will be searched, and you're going to have to sign up to that.'?
308. A. Yes.
309. Q. So that is for new staff?
310. A. Yes. We are working through. The staff that I talk to now, I will say that I have a real concern about this: 'How do I know that there is nothing untoward on it?' The response you get back is, 'Well, I need my phone, Michelle. The school called me', and so on. I understand the importance of being reunited with them but it is quite sensitive. At the moment, we are working on the goodwill of someone saying, 'Sure'. I had a contractor that I found with a mobile phone in December and he didn't allow me to have a look at it and so I banned him from site, with a cannabis grinder.
311. Q. What sort of contractor was he?
312. A. He was doing the painting on the wings. I said to him that he shouldn't have it, and he knew he shouldn't have it. He had been briefed about it and I said that I needed to satisfy myself that he hadn't recorded anything on it. He said no. I couldn't keep the phone from him, and so I just said that I would be banning him from site and that he wouldn't be welcome back.
313. Q. The only other specific, I suppose, is the CCTV system. We were down at Tinsley and we saw one of your staff looking at it, and she was very excited about how clear and wonderful it is. She said, 'Gosh, I wish we had this up at Brook House'. Caz told us that you will be getting – I think – new CCTV.
314. A. Yes, on 14 February.
315. Q. Will that be as clear as the Tinsley House one?
316. A. It is the same system, yes.

317. Q. I noticed, for instance, that they were all sitting in the stairwell smoking.

Sensitive/Irrelevant

Sensitive/Irrelevant
318. A. No.

Sensitive/Irrelevant
319. Q. Why not?
320. A.

Sensitive/Irrelevant

Sensitive/Irrelevant
321. Q. Is that financial?
322. A. Yes.
323. Q. Oh dear! I don't have any more questions.
324. A. In terms of the stairwells, I do analysis reporting about where incidents occur, or where there has been any abuse or violence. Smoking does feature, but not necessarily on the stairwells. Our reports do not indicate that we have a problem with them. Would I love CCTV footage? I would like it everywhere. However, in terms of whether it is high on the radar of where things are occurring, not necessarily. I think I had 48 hours' notice about the new system going in, that was intended for January, but I didn't have any staff trained on it.
325. Then they dropped it on me that we would have a CCTV, no electronic doors, with 48 hours' notice. So I pushed back and said that I had created a training programme for the staff here to go down to Tinsley to learn the system, so that they have exposure to what that looks like, and that I had a meeting planned on the 7th, to sit down and talk about our staffing. We would have no footage – there are no cameras – and so I needed to understand the impact on the workers out at night with no CCTV, or what our perimeter checks looked like. Who would be responsible for the doors? The training programme is well underway and will be completed and then I have Tinsley staff coming up to Brook to oversee and hold their hands for the next month. However, I need reassurance about the impact that that will have, because we will be at a vulnerable point for a number of hours through the night. I will probably be on site on the 14th.
326. Q. There are two things that you said you would help us with. One is about getting the figures on improved violence.
327. A. Okay, I'll get that.
328. Q. That would be really helpful. The other is evidence, I think, around what was needed, and what your intelligence was, about keeping that wing on the 28th. It would be quite good to have some concrete evidence of you having said at a meeting. I suspect that it will be minutes of the security meeting.
329. A. Yes, and the detainee of interest meeting. I think it is probably on the handover. I think I have an email that I sent direct, as well.
330. Q. A little file would be helpful.
331. A. I am conscious that, at our last meeting, you wanted some history of the SMT. I have started to do that and I need to think of a better way to present it, because it is so confusing even for me, in terms of –
332. Q. I only want a spread sheet of dates.

333. A. Okay.
334. Q. Put all their dates, and what their job was, and how they left. That is all we need. We don't need a big history, because you have given us the history.
335. A. Yes. I started to go through it and it was really confusing because everyone has swapped around. Do you have a pen, so that I could just make a note of that please.
336. Q Thank you. Ed, do you have any more questions?
337. Mr Marsden: No, I don't think so.

[Interview concluded]