

Independent Advisory Panel on non-compliance management (IAPNCM)

23 Sep, 09:00-10:30

Room 525, 5th floor Fry Building SE (F525 SE)

Teleconference minutes

Present

Akash Chand (AC), David Chinn (DC), June-Alison Sealy (JAS), Stephen Shaw (SS), Richard Shepherd (RTS), Mandy Simmons (MS).

1. Apologies

Daniel Albert (DA), Kevin Lockyer (KL).

2. Minutes of 27 August

SS asked whether the minutes were a true reflection of the meeting of 27th August. All agreed that no changes were required and for them to be published on the IAPNCM webpage.

Action 1: AC to publish minutes.

3. Minutes of 2 September

SS asked whether the minutes were a true reflection of the meeting of 2nd September. RTS highlighted a correction regarding consistency and requested this be amended.

Action 2: AC to amend minutes and publish.

4. Matters arising and action log

SS referred the Panel to the action log and requested AC to number the pages for ease of reference.

Action 3: AC to number action log.

SS referred to action point 10 of the 15th July meeting and confirmed that this was still ongoing.

SS advised the Panel that the Minister's target for completion of the package is by Christmas; however, he and Karen Abdel-Hady (KAH) do not think this is likely. KAH has therefore given the deadline of 31st March. SS said that the Panel's timetable should be reviewed regularly before Christmas. If their work went beyond the first week in March, their contracts would need extending.

SS referred to action point 3 of the 29th July meeting and MS mentioned that she and AC attended a meeting with NOMS on 19th September. The use of force form was raised at this meeting and MS and AC were advised that it would be sent together with the revised volume 7. This should be sent to AC on Monday 23rd or Tuesday 24th September (this also covers action point 3 of the 2nd September meeting).

Action 4: AC to send use of force form and Volume 7 to the Panel, when received.

SS highlighted action point 4 of the 27th August meeting. The consensus of the Panel was to thank the agencies concerned for their correspondence, and to forward their contact details to NOMS whom could instigate liaison, or the exchange of information, as appropriate.

Action 5: AC to forward details of use of force agencies to NOMS.

SS referred to action point 5 of the 27th August meeting and as aforementioned, volume 7 should be received on Monday 23rd or Tuesday 24th September. Volume 4 requires signing off by Ian Maconochie and Fenella Wrigley and this has been delayed due to their lack of availability.

SS said that a project plan is required and that this should be shared with the Panel upon its receipt/creation.

SS advised that the Panel had received volume 6 and queried whether the amended volume 5 included a section on handcuffs, which AC confirmed.

SS brought the Panel's attention to action point 5 of the 2nd September meeting, and advised that KL had added timescales to the Panel's draft report outline. SS said that discussion on this topic should be deferred until KL and DA are in attendance.

In relation to action point 8 of the 2nd September meeting, SS said that this could now be closed.

SS highlighted action point 9 of the 2nd September meeting and said that he was confused by this action point. MS clarified that it arose when the Panel were considering the behavioural indicators of volume 2. AC advised that he had attempted contacting Alexis Wilkinson-Jones (Training Co-ordinator at Tascor), regarding Tascor's basic training package, but she was on leave.

5. Comments on Volume 2

SS thanked JAS on behalf of the Panel for her sterling work in collating their views and putting together the papers.

JAS said that the Panel would need to confirm their view regarding volume 2: whether they wish for it to be abandoned completely; whether it should be re-written and presented as a stand-alone volume, using the behavioural standards of Professionalism, Awareness and Compassion; or whether the salient elements should be extracted and amalgamated in to volume 3.

JAS commented that behaviour management and de-escalation tactics were important and had thought that DCOs already received training in them. JAS said that, if DCOs did not receive training in the above, it would make volume 2 critical. JAS further remarked that the Panel needed to be confident that the package does not overburden DCOs yet contains all of the information they require.

KL and RTS commented that the key elements are very valuable; however, these should be covered in the basic training that DCOs receive. RTS said that if NOMS insist on adding the above to the package, much more work was required in order for it to be acceptable.

DC commented that volume 2 is fundamental; however, it should be shorter, aimed at DCOs and stand alone from the package. DC felt that volume 2 sits well with the Coroner's recommendations following the Jimmy Mubenga inquest.

DC said that volume 2 was not fit for purpose. He queried whether Dr Davison had been briefed correctly as the volume was not well-designed for the target audience.

SS said that the majority of the Panel believe the content of volume 2 should be in induction training but some believe it should be in the non-compliance management manual. However, no one thought that, as drafted, volume 2 was remotely acceptable.

SS remarked that volume 2 was wrong on so many different levels and that writing a decent document would take time, and he did not envisage it being amended and returned within a month. DC said that it should not take a major time to amend.

RTS said that the core values of volume 2 need to be embedded deep with the psyche of staff, but they should be reminded of this when they undertake their training. RTS said that he had significant concerns regarding this volume and felt that its position within the package needs to be reassessed, and the Panel should refer it back to the Home Office and NOMS.

JAS said that the core values of Professionalism, Compassion and Awareness should be reiterated throughout the package.

After further discussion, SS said that the introduction to the comments should be amended and then forwarded to NOMS who can decide whether or not it is critical.

Action 6: JAS to re-write intro of volume 2 and send to SS to approve.

6. Comments on Volume 3

SS said he was conscious of the danger of looking more kindly towards volume 3 in reaction to the criticism of volume 2.

JAS said that her initial comments reflected that she was underwhelmed. However, when she fully read through volume 3 she wanted to commend its positive elements and offer words of encouragement to NOMS.

The Panel felt that, with some amendments, volume 3 could be a reasonable document and that it did not present as many issues as volume 2.

The Panel agreed that their comments should be amended and forwarded to NOMS.

Action 7: JAS to amend comments and forward to SS to approve.

7. The Panel's final report

SS said that this would be covered at another time.

8. Volume 6

SS said that the Panel would need to decide whether they felt PPE should form part of the package, and queried how long this element would take to teach new staff with no knowledge. MS commented that NOMS's view is that it should not form part of the package.

DC said that the document is reasonably lengthy and the techniques should only be used in exceptional circumstances.

RTS said that non-compliance and PPE sit together and that it should form part of the package.

JAS said she is unfamiliar with the area of PPE and was concerned that a new person under pressure would resort to extreme measures when panicking.

SS said that the Panel should have another discussion regarding volume 6 when KL and DA were present.

Action 8: Panel to let SS know their comments on volume 6.

9. AOB

AC said that, following a meeting the previous week, NOMS had some questions for the Panel:

1. What should the name of the package be?
2. When volume 4 is received, do the Panel wish to meet with the medical advisers for a discussion?

SS said that a name of the package should be an agenda item for the next meeting, and that the Panel should wait until volume 4 is received before a decision is made to meet with the medical advisers again.

MS commented that NOMS are considering new forms of equipment, such as a stretcher and e-vac chair. SS remarked that, if this is so, the Panel would need to be aware but felt that it was rather late to propose new equipment.

SS said that he had visited Ashworth Hospital to review their restraint techniques and found this very useful. It was not the case that Ashworth had abandoned pain compliance.

RTS said that he would not be present at the next meeting and presented his apologies.

There was no further business and the meeting was closed.

Next meeting: Monday 7 October.