



PRISON SERVICE January 2021 No 252

JOURNAL

**Special edition:
Security in prisons**

'L.A.C.E.S': Introducing a new framework to enhance professional standards around Use of Force

Dr Grant J Bosworth is Use of Force Evaluation Lead, HMPPS, and Sarah Ashcroft, Head of Operational Response and Resilience Unit, HMPPS.

Introduction

Prisons are intense places to live and work, with many residents living with poor mental health, learning disabilities, and addictions. The nature of prison life appears to generate and sustain high levels of violence resulting in prison staff being called upon to maintain safety and security; no easy task in a prison community of almost 80,000 people. The fine balance of managing safety, security and rehabilitative support depends on officers maintaining control and trust, and their ability to promote boundaries to ensure the peaceful co-existence of people with very complex lives and needs. Knowing how to balance the responsibilities of maintaining control and promoting rehabilitation has previously been referred to as a 'prison officer's dilemma'.¹

Difficulties that prisoners may have with relationships, debt or responsibilities, which might be manageable in the community, multiply in intensity and impact for incarcerated people. We know that efforts to convey drugs and contraband into and around prisons generate competition and that this is frequently controlled through violence and other forms of coercive control. Add to this that many prisoners may have suffered various personal traumas, and it is clear why frustrations can run high.² This can result in problems being acted, rather than talked, out. The prison officer must frequently switch hats between mentor, carer and disciplinarian; a varied and demanding professional practice. A good prison officer understands the complex relationship between security and rehabilitation, exhibits consideration and understands the difficulties, frustrations and disappointments that imprisonment can bring.³

This largely descriptive article focuses on the considerations and judgements that officers have to

make when exercising their authority to use force. We start by introducing the evidence base, current operational guidance, and our vision for a new national framework, and go on to discuss the challenges officers face when making decisions about the need to use force. In the article we put forward how we believe Her Majesty's Prison and Probation Service (HMPPS) can ensure all decisions and actions relating to force are carried out to the highest professional standard. We hope to demonstrate balance in our understanding of the challenges and threats associated with the role officers perform, with acknowledgment of the importance of relational approaches to conflict resolution and rehabilitative practice in creating safe and secure environments. For clarity, in this article 'we' refers to the opinions of the authors, and does not necessarily represent the current position of HMPPS.

Use of Force

Prison officer training is heavily focused on the development of skills that are known to be effective in supporting rehabilitative journeys, but significant time is spent in initial training developing practical skills and explaining sources of authority that underpin the professional Use of Force (UoF). HMPPS have developed specific techniques approved for use in adult prisons (Control and Restraint) and in children's custodial environments (Minimising and Managing Physical Restraint). Both are subject to oversight, review, continuous development and evaluation. Prisoners have a right to expect that officers are both competent and confident to use the techniques professionally, and within the boundaries of their authority. The organisation expects that officers will interrupt efforts by prisoners to pursue criminality, and intervene to stop prisoner on prisoner violence. Further, officers are

-
1. Bruhn, Lindberg, & Nylander (2011) Professional Representations among Swedish Prison Officers.
 2. For more on the multitude of challenges officers face see Crawley, E. (2004) *Doing Prison Work: The Public and Private Lives of Prison Officers* Cullompton: Willan.
 3. Crawley, E. and Crawley, P. (2008) *Understanding prison officers: culture, cohesion and conflict* in Bennett, J. Crewe, B. and Wahidin, A. (eds) *Understanding Prison Staff* Cullompton: Willan p.134-152

frequently called upon to defend themselves or colleagues against violence. To put this into context, there were 267 recorded prisoner-on-prisoner assault incidents per 1000 prisoners in the 12 months to March 2020, up from around 150 per 1000 in 2015.⁴ In the same 12 months, the rate of assaults on staff was 118 per 1,000 prisoners. Despite some progress in the last year,⁵ and a welcome reduction in violence during the COVID lockdown period, the cycle of violence in prisons has become endemic to prison environments, with actions and reactions fuelling the problems. It is an imperative that staff have the skills and confidence to apply effective techniques to protect themselves and others should they need to.

However, the increase in violence in prisons in recent years does not alter when force is justified, nor the safeguards that must apply. We acknowledge that the use of force against prisoners will sometimes be necessary, but that it represents an extreme manifestation of the authority vested in prison officers. Even where justified, using physical force causes harm to some degree, and represents a failure to resolve or prevent conflict in the first place. For this reason, it is right that all use of force is subject to scrutiny and that professional practice is underpinned by an effective process for complaint and investigation where appropriate. We believe that professional standards as they apply to the use of force and its governance are objective rather than subjective, and that clear articulation of that standard will drive better practice and safer prison environments. Whether in the context of daily leadership or a disciplinary hearing, there must be a clear standard of professional conduct for staff to work to, and by which Governors can decide whether the use of force was professional as well as legal, however necessary and reasonable the officer believed their actions to be.

...the cycle of
violence in prisons
has become
endemic to prison
environments, with
actions and
reactions fuelling
the problems.

The professional UoF demands this level of attention because of the impact it can have on officers and those in their care. Not much research has been done in prison settings examining the outcomes associated with use of force, but research considering interpersonal violence in other settings, suggests that exposure to violence is related to a range of negative effects on mental health, psychological well-being and behaviour.⁶

We understand that UoF impacts individuals, but it also sets the tone for relationships at a prison level, and we believe this is an important variable in determining the 'culture' of a prison. We can't list all the factors and variables that contribute to individual prison cultures, but it is understood that architectural design and physical state are important,⁷ along with regime stability and the intensity of focus on surveillance and control.⁸

In addition to logistical and physical differences, personal and social factors including the balance between training and governance, and the experience of officers, undoubtedly shape prison cultures.

In a previous edition of this journal Ruth Mann and colleagues argued persuasively the view that everyone plays a role and has the potential to support or undermine rehabilitative outcomes, and in doing so determine the culture of a prison.⁹ It is clear that security

practice can be designed so that it connects or conflicts with rehabilitative efforts, and we suggest that use of force is an area of critical importance, where getting it right matters more so than in any other professional judgement. We also know that in prisons when the boundaries of authority are overstepped, particularly when prisoners perceive that force lacks legitimacy or justification, it makes rehabilitative outcomes less likely. From a prisoner's perspective, the legitimate use of authority helps prison environments to feel safe and regulated, in turn enabling steps towards rehabilitation.¹⁰

4. Safety & Order Statistics, England and Wales to March 2020; see Justice Data on gov.uk.
5. Speeches from the former Lord Chancellor and Justice Secretary, David Gauke, on 'Beyond prison, redefining punishment', 18 February 2019 and 'From sentencing to incentives – how prisons can better protect the public from the effects of crime', 10 July 2018.
6. Meade, B., Steiner, B., & Klahm IV, C. F. (2017). The effect of police use of force on mental health problems of prisoners. *Policing and Society*, 27(2), 229-244.
7. Beijersbergen, K. A., Dirkzwager, A. J. E., van der Laan, P. H., & Nieuwbeerta, P. (2016). A Social Building? Prison Architecture and Staff-Prisoner Relationships. *Crime & Delinquency*, 62, 843-874.
8. See Woolf Report: Woolf, L. J. (1991). *Prison Disturbances. April 1990: Report of an inquiry*. London, England: HMSO. Also see: Johnsen, B. Granheim, P. K., & Helgesen, J. (2011). Exceptional prison conditions and the quality of prison life: Prison size and prison culture in Norwegian close prisons. *European Journal of Criminology*, 8, 515-529.
9. Mann, R. E., Fitzalan Howard, F & Tew, J. (2018). What is a rehabilitative prison culture? *Prison Service Journal* 235, pp3-9.
10. Crewe, B., Liebling, A. & Hulley, S. (2011). 'Staff culture, use of authority and prisoner quality of life in public and private sector prisons'. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 44, 94-115.

Need for a Renewed Focus

We understand that increased oversight may cause anxiety and could be perceived as a lack of trust in an officer's judgement and conduct. We don't seek to present a view of UoF through a singularly negative lens. On the contrary, we are confident that under the right circumstances, using force can save lives and limit harm; and we have seen this first-hand, through experience and in footage of professionally applied practice. Therefore, while lower annual UoF figures would no doubt be welcomed by all, this paper's aim is not to advocate a strategy that simply demands a continuous push for fewer and fewer UoF incidents. Instead, we want to advocate for an approach that ensures that every UoF incident is held to the highest standards so that the public, prisoners and their families can have the greatest confidence that every decision and action has been executed with professionalism and competence. Our vision is a UoF culture in HMPPS characterised by the highest professional standards and rigorous scrutiny that balances the responsibilities to safeguard prisoners and protect staff. We propose the LACES framework as a way forward to achieve this.

LACES: Lawful, Accountable, Considered, Equal, and Setting the Standard.

Lawful.

From a legal perspective, each use of force can only be justified, and therefore considered lawful, if it is necessary, reasonable in the circumstances, proportionate to the seriousness of the circumstances, and the individual(s) uses no more force than is necessary.¹¹ In every instance where force is applied, the circumstances are unique so must be judged on their own merits. This individual approach to scrutiny is imperative if we are serious about establishing a character to our Public Service that is built on the legitimate use of authority by a professional body of prison staff. It is the foundation upon which we will

build a consistent and universal approach that we can have confidence will be upheld by every officer, in every prison, and which is internalised into our culture. We believe that it is this impression that we should aspire to be recognised by, and which the scrutiny bodies that oversee us will describe us in future.

Use of force that falls short of the law, or which does not act as an exemplar for professional standards, can cause severe harm and erode legitimacy. Inappropriate or excessive use of force undermines public trust and confidence in HMPPS, and damages the relationships between prisoners and staff. It perpetuates inequality and disproportionality in experience and outcome. It is squarely at odds with our organisational purpose and values.¹² This pushes us to better lead, train and support prison staff to make decisions about when and how to use force, and to practice with legitimacy and to a standard that goes above and beyond the expectations of law, and reflects their professionalism.

Acting in compliance with law is our bottom line, with no excuses for staff failing to meet this standard. The conditions of UoF being lawful are set out and taught in initial and annual refresher training. We must be confident that prison staff know and understand the lawful basis for their practice. Any use of force must pass the test of being

necessary and reasonable, and decision making about use of force must stem from the honestly held belief that one's self, or another person is at imminent risk should you fail to intervene, having considered and discounted other options. Such harm could include risk to life, or the imminence of another serious impact. We also have protection in law to use force to prevent crime, but not to use this as a means of upholding prison rules. This is a commonly misunderstood point, with widespread belief that it is lawful to use force to gain compliance with a reasonable instruction in the interests of good order or discipline.

Where these minimum standards are not met prison officers can face disciplinary investigation, and potentially criminal enquiry. The Prison and Probation Ombudsman (PPO) also provide independent

...train and support prison staff to make decisions about when and how to use force, and to practice with legitimacy and to a standard that goes above and beyond the expectations of law.

11. See Prison Service Order 1600

12. Values of preventing victims by changing lives and doing this with humanity, openness, and togetherness. See the HMPPS strategy: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/864681/HMPPS_Business_Strategy_Shaping_Our_Future.pdf.

investigations into cases, and act upon any prisoner complaints relating to UoF.¹³ The Ombudsman aims to answer three main questions for each case: Did the use of force constitute an assault? Was the decision to use force justifiable? And was the level of force implemented proportionate to the circumstances? While the 'Lawful' element of the LACES acronym is the minimum standard we expect, the additional components build upon the standards outlined in law to express the professional standards HMPPS strives for.

Accountable.

Quality scrutiny and assurance processes should ensure that officers are accountable for their actions. This is important for those occasions when complaints are made, and also for allowing senior management teams to recognise good practice. An important part of this process is the statement the officer makes following a UoF incident, and the medical report that accompanies this. HMPPS have introduced measures to ensure professional standards are elevated further. For example, every prison must form committees to monitor UoF at their establishment, and for national-level specialist teams (e.g. the National Tactical Response Group [NTRG]) a senior committee meet to ensure accountability at all levels. HMPPS have also ensured they are responsive and flexible to changes in operational demands; for example, during the COVID-19 response additional scrutiny committees were assembled to examine exceptional PAVA use. This was a form of agile response management that ensured that any local-level issues could be escalated to a national cross-profession panel when required.

A key part of accountability is being able to reflect on the scrutiny process and learn from our actions to

One technique that may help aid de-escalation is for officers to ensure they offer calm, rational replies when faced with emotive situations.

better ourselves in the future. One way of doing this is through reviewing Body Worn Video Camera footage.¹⁴ This aids the officer when reflecting on their actions, and also helps committees gather better insight into incidents they are reviewing, and where necessary help the PPO to more quickly resolve complaints.¹⁵ BWVC use may also help as some research has found that officers wearing cameras use force less than those who do not wear them, and that there can be sustained effects on lowering UoF over time.¹⁶ Although research into the use of BWVC has revealed that the degree of discretion that is used in whether and cameras were turned on impacted their effectiveness.¹⁷

Another facet of accountability is that of the officer to both the prisoners and their colleagues. We feel it is worthwhile for an officer to have a meaningful conversation with the individual who has had forced used upon them when it is safe and appropriate to do so. Following procedural justice principles we are keen to ensure an explanation is provided and that prisoners have an opportunity to have a voice as part of a debrief.¹⁸ Another way we feel providing prisoners with a voice may be possible is to have a representative from the prisoners sitting on the UoF committees (for at least some of the meeting). This would go some way in ensuring prisoners can see that reviews and decisions are transparent and fair. This is important as we know that research shows when prisoners are treated in a way they feel is fair, and consistent with the rules in place, they are less likely to engage in acts of indiscipline.¹⁹

Considered

While some UoF may be viewed as *truly* instantaneous because of a spontaneous event, many occasions present opportunities for de-escalation

13. See http://iapdeathsincustody.independent.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/PPO-Learning-Lessons-Bulletin-Complaints-issue-Use-of-Force-PPO_web-final.pdf

14. National Security Management Framework, Security Management, Body Worn Video Cameras. Prison Service Instruction (PSI) 04/2017, issued on 20 March 2017.

15. See <https://www.ppo.gov.uk/blog/prisons-must-improve-their-handling-and-retention-of-video-footage-relating-to-use-of-force-complaints/>

16. Lum, C., Stoltz, M., Koper, C. S., & Scherer, J. A. (2019). Research on body-worn cameras: what we know, what we need to know. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 18, 93-119

17. Ariel, B., Sutherland, A., Henstock, D., Young, J., et al. (2016). Report: increases in police use of force in the presence of body-worn cameras are driven by officer discretion: a protocol-based subgroup analysis of ten randomized experiments. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 12, 453-463.)

18. For more information on procedural justice see: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/771324/prisoner-staff-perceptions-procedural-justice-research.pdf

19. Reisig, M. D. and Masko G. (2009). Procedural justice, legitimacy, and prisoner misconduct. *Psychology, Crime and Law*, 15, 41-59.

before UoF is required. One technique that may help aid de-escalation is for officers to ensure they offer calm, rational replies when faced with emotive situations. We know minimising emotionally driven responses in such moments can help our decision-making ability.²⁰ The evidence tells us that generally people can make less biased decisions (e.g. impulsive decisions influenced by emotion) when they engage in 'system two' rather than 'system one' thinking.²¹ The difference between the two 'systems' is that system one is fast and reflexive (i.e. the system we operate in most of the time which enables effortless, automatic decision-making) whereas system two is slower, conscious and more deliberate. Therefore, to make an informed and well-thought-out decision officers should consider how, in the build up to an incident, they can move from quick, emotional responses to slower, more deliberate reasoning.

Research suggests a number of ways that decision-makers can do this including generating alternatives to their original thinking and by considering why their initial judgement might be mistaken.²²

These techniques may be particularly useful when trying to anticipate if an incident has the potential to escalate. For example, while an intuitive reaction to witnessing a prisoner with contraband may be to immediately approach the individual and attempt to retrieve the item, a more considered approach may be for the officer to consider the support available to them at the time (e.g. are colleagues around them?), and the control the officer is likely to have if the situation escalates (e.g. what is the environment like, are many other prisoners present?). This more deliberate decision making process may ultimately minimise any force required (should the situation escalate) and even if force is used, minimise the length of time and severity of force needed (e.g. if no other prisoners around and if colleagues are in support, compared to if having to deal with the situation alone in a crowded environment).

It is through this more measured decision-making that officers may be able to reassure themselves and their seniors that all potential steps to minimise the chance of the situation escalating had been taken. This does not mean that officers should avoid challenging or avoid difficult conversations and let prisoners 'get away' with inappropriate behaviour, but instead it provides officers an opportunity to consider whether the situation needs an immediate action or whether it may be safer and more appropriate to deal with the incident in a different environment, at a different time, or with more support available.

Equal

Social inequalities are intensified in prison environments; we know that experiences in the criminal justice system from the point of arrest to the point of exit are impacted on by social factors such as wealth, ethnicity, employment status, experience of care, and education achievement level. Custodial environments and prison hierarchies are impacted by the same complexities, with over representation of marginalised groups of individuals, in particular those from black and minority ethnic (BAME) backgrounds. People from BAME communities represent 14 per cent of the population of England and

Wales, but 25 per cent of adult prisoners and 41 per cent of children in custody.²³

In light of this we need be mindful of the impact of our collective 'face of force'. In using this phrase, we mean the impression that is given to and held by those experiencing force, about our wider culture and our system of control. Outside of big cites, our staffing group as a whole remains predominantly white, with fewer women than men at all grades. Indeed, Crawley and Crawley (2008) note that 'prison officers work in an occupation that has been thought to require the traditional male qualities of dominance,

The evidence tells us that generally people can make less biased decisions (e.g. impulsive decisions influenced by emotion) when they engage in 'system two' rather than 'system one' thinking.

20. Soll, J., Milkman, K. L., & Payne, J. W. (2015). The users' guide to debiasing, In G. Keren & G. Wu, (Eds.) *The Wiley-Blackwell Handbook of Judgment and Decision Making*. Chichester, UK; John Wiley & Sons.

21. Kahnemann, D. (2011). *Thinking Fast and Slow*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

22. Milkman, K. L., Chugh, D., & Bazerman, M. H. (2009). How can decision-making be improved? *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 4, 379-383.)

23. Lammy, D. (2017). *The Lammy Review. An Independent review into the Treatment of Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic individuals in the Criminal Justice System*. London, England. Retrieved from https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/643001/lammy-review-final-report.pdf.

authoritativeness and aggressiveness' (p.141). While this is simply not the case, it remains that the face of force in HMPPS is still overwhelmingly white and male, and given that we know BAME prisoners experience more use of force than white prisoners we see this as particularly problematic.

Evidence demonstrates the extent of this disproportionality in the youth estate in particular. A reasonably recent survey of 600 boys found just over half of the BAME respondents (53 per cent) reported experiences of physical restraint (compared to only 36 per cent of white respondents), and also found that Muslim boys were more likely to be physically restrained compared to non-Muslim boys (56 per cent v 41 per cent).²⁴

David Lammy highlighted the need to address the issue of disproportionality in 2017, suggesting that we improve governance to focus attention on the problematic levels of use of force being practiced against BAME prisoners. Since then HMPPS has strengthened governance, scrutiny and safeguarding processes in response to his recommendations, but we need to work with staff on their individual decision-making, and help them to engage in conversations about factors that impact on that, including internal and systemic bias. These are not easy conversations to have, but there is no palatable explanation for the findings of several external scrutiny bodies that BAME prisoners in many UK prisons experience excessive use of force, or that governance arrangements are lacking and fall short of protecting Human Rights.²⁵ We must look hard, honestly and reflectively at our organisational policies, our leadership messages and the behaviours and tolerances that have become embedded in our culture if we are to rise above this challenge. It's uncomfortable

but we must seek to explain how any inequality becomes established and tolerated.

There is a need for a global focus on the disproportionate use of force against BAME people by police in communities and custody. We recognise and validate these charges as equally relevant to the prison environment. Practice which is known to impact in discriminatory ways must be talked about, challenged and repaired. We know that unconscious biases affect us all, and this includes in our professional decision-

making, which can lead to discrimination even when we have good intentions not to think or behave in a biased manner.²⁶ Research has shown that good intentions are simply not enough to remove biases. For example, in other settings research has shown us that including a statement reminding people of their duty not to discriminate on the basis of age makes no difference to actual levels of discrimination when examining hiring decisions.²⁷ Perhaps more surprisingly, research has also found that both unconscious and conscious racial bias can increase when people are presented with a message that emphasises their legal obligation to comply with anti-prejudice policies.²⁸ It may be that people react negatively when they believe their decisions or choices are being censored,

and so how we approach bias in UoF decisions needs careful consideration. As UK police forces have recognised, change may require further investment in dedicated training regarding unconscious bias and how to reduce the influence of negative stereotypes.²⁹

We must look hard,
honestly and
reflectively at our
organisational
policies, our
leadership messages
and the behaviours
and tolerances that
have become
embedded in our
culture if we are to
rise above this
challenge.

Setting the Standard

The final part of the LACES acronym outlines our vision that we must be setting the standard at all levels in the organisation. This means individuals ensuring

24. Barn, R., Felizer, M., & Hardwick, N. (2018). Black and minority ethnic boys and custody in England and Wales: understanding subjective experiences through an analysis of official data. *Social Sciences*, 7, 226-242.

25. The European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CPT), 13 – 23 May 2019

26. Axt, J. R., Ebersole, C. E., & Nosek, B. (2016). An unintentional, robust, and pro-Black bias in social judgement. *Social Cognition*, 34, 1-39.)

27. Lindner, N. M., Graser, A., & Nosek, B. A., (2014). Age-based hiring discrimination as a function of equity norms and self-perceived objectivity. *PLoS ONE* 9: e84752. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0084752.

28. Legault, L., Gutsell, J. N., & Inzlicht, M. (2011). Ironic effects of antiprejudice messages: How motivational interventions can reduce (but also increase) prejudice. *Psychological Science*, 22, 1472-1477. DOI: 10.1177/0956797611427918.)

29. See https://www.policeconduct.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Documents/research-learning/IPCC_Use_Of_Force_Report.pdf

they are up-to-date with training and aware of guidance, supervisors ensuring their staff feel supported, and leaders modelling the behaviours we strive for. We know that managerial controls, training and quality supervision are all ways that have been reported to help prevent unreasonable UoF.³⁰ The study cited shows that everyone can make a difference as it demonstrated that trained supervisors significantly moderated their officers' use of weapons-based UoF (in a police setting). In other words, investing in quality training and education for staff can help control UoF. We know from research that training and education should focus on promoting a professional outlook which means officers should be open and non-defensive, make exceptions when warranted, prefer to gain cooperation through communication, and use force as a last resort.³¹ We know that leadership can go a long way in setting the standard and ensuring officers strive for these qualities by considering some of the following suggestions from the literature:³²

- ❑ Targeting officers with a pattern of poor UoF behaviour, for remedial attention and training — *rather than blame*.
- ❑ Reinforcing training on-the-job (plus refresher training) with close supervision, including being held to account for decisions.
- ❑ Explicit policies of what is required in different situations, which are written down, regularly reviewed and updated where appropriate.
- ❑ Accountability frameworks with written reports that include compulsory justification for UoF, supervisor sign off and discussions between officers and supervisors.
- ❑ In-depth analysis of UoF reports, with essential public reporting on an annual basis.
- ❑ Effective lines of communication so difficulties can be discussed and addressed as they arise.
- ❑ Commitment in leadership to improve UoF practice.

Moving Forward

As we have outlined, the primary aim of this paper is not to issue a rallying call for reducing UoF (although we welcome all reductions in violence in prisons), but it is to share a message of appreciation for the difficult

work our staff do, recognise that the decisions they have to make are incredibly complex, celebrate that a lot of the time we make the right decisions and save lives and limit harm through using force, and acknowledge there are times when additional steps could have been taken to minimise or eliminate the need for force.

Providing we are satisfied of the legality of the force, when mistakes happen we should move away from blame, and try to understand how improvements can be made: do we need more accountability — should we be encouraging more use of BWVC? Were all actions considered — was an opportunity for de-escalation missed? Is our UoF practice equal — are we reviewing incidents for disproportionality? Are we setting the standard — are supervisors providing feedback and identifying training needs? Each prison may find their focus needs to be on different parts of the LACES framework, but we encourage all prison teams to reflect where they are at now and where they want to get to next in their UoF practice.

Centrally, there are efforts to apply an evidence-based approach to policy and practice development, and a commitment to support local leadership teams to develop stronger leadership messaging and extend and promote good UoF practice. Work is ongoing to improve the quality of recording and reporting through greater use of technology. A digital UoF reporting tool is currently being piloted in two establishments with promising results; when widely implemented this will give greater oversight and enable HMPPS to publish national statistics for UoF as part of our commitment to transparency and improvement.

An ambitious programme of evaluation of UoF is currently underway. For the first time HMPPS are systematically reviewing UoF committees across the estate to understand what works and to provide best practice guidance for our establishments. We are undertaking primary research including interviews with staff and prisoners to fill evidence gaps around the impact of using force in prisons and to become world leaders in this field. Overall this is an exciting time to be involved with security in our prisons, there are a raft of changes happening regarding UoF practices, training and policy, and world-leading research plans afoot.

30. Lim, H., & Lee, H. (2015). The effects of supervisor education and training on police use of force. *Criminal Justice Studies*, 28(4), 444-463.)

31. Liebling, A., Price, D. & Shefer, G. (2010). *The Prison Officer*. Routledge.

32. Prenzler, T., Porter, L., & Alpert, G. P. (2013). Reducing police use of force: case studies and prospects. *Aggression and Violent Behaviour*, 18, 343-356.)