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Scoping Exercise and Literature Review
Between November 2015 and April 2016, the Research Team at Birmingham City University undertook a scoping exercise and literature review. The purpose of these activities was to identify the aims and objectives of the residency of Edmund Clark, explore the expectations of key stakeholders and draw upon existing research from a range of literature to develop a framework and methodology for the evaluation. The findings of the scoping exercise and literature review were presented to the Trustees of the Marie Louise von Motesiczky (MLVM) Charitable Trust on Friday 20th May 2016.

Evaluation Themes and Concepts
The literature review and scoping exercise led to the identification of key concepts and themes that were important for the evaluation to explore. These concepts and themes are outlined below. Their relevance and importance for the evaluation is explained and questions are posed in relation to each.

- **Uniqueness of HMP Grendon.** As the only prison in the English and Welsh prison estate to operate wholly as a therapeutic community, HMP Grendon is unique; it is an exception to the rule. It is important for the evaluation to explore the extent to which the residency captures this uniqueness. However, HMP Grendon is, nevertheless, still part of the prison estate and, as such, must comply with the institutional policies, rules and procedures that apply to the management of all prisons. Therefore the evaluation should explore the extent to which this tension between uniqueness and conformity emerges within the residency.

- **Narratives of HMP Grendon residents.** We all construct stories, which we use to tell others about our lives and establish our own sense of identity or self-narrative (McAdams, 1993, 2008). At HMP Grendon, residents analyse and confront their stories (Brookes, 2009, 2010). Challenging the narrative identity is a key part of leaving crime behind (Maruna, 2001) and, as such, this is an important premise of the therapeutic approach at HMP Grendon. Photography is similarly about storytelling and the construction of narrative. However, photography has also played a significant role in constructing the criminal body and identifying criminals as deviant, distinct and other (Carney, 2010; Carrabine, 2014; Ferrell & Van de Voorde, 2010; Sekula, 1986). Therefore photography is also about control, decisions and choices.

  Residents at Grendon have been – and many always will be – under some form of monitoring and surveillance. Decisions about them are taken by others and representations of them are produced by others. In relation to the images produced during the residency, this may raise some interesting questions around their control over narratives. For example, what are their views around the narratives in the images? What are their thoughts on the meaning that audiences may attribute to the images – and in turn – the residents’ narratives? To what extent does the residency and the images that emerge from it play a role in the shifting narrative identities of the men? Art is about identity, defining oneself in a particular way through creative expression – how does this have an impact upon the residents’ desistance journeys?

- **HMP Grendon residents and staff as stakeholders in the images.** HMP Grendon is a therapeutic community underpinned by principles such as democratization and communalism (Rapoport,

---

1 Dr Elizabeth Yardley, Dr Martin Glynn, Shona Robinson-Edwards and Morag Kennedy.
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Everyone in the community plays a role in nurturing and maintaining the culture and physical environment. Therefore residents and staff have a significant stake in the images Edmund produces during the residency. HMP Grendon is their home - their space - over which they have a sense of ownership and pride. As such, the evaluation should seek to engage their views about the images produced during the residency.

### Counter-images and counter-narratives

Prisons are often seen as closed and separate entities existing on the edges of mainstream society. This supports the othering of prisoners – if they cannot be seen they are easier to demonise and exclude (Cheliotis, 2010). The public rely heavily upon media representations of prison and ‘official’ images created by the Ministry of Justice, HM Prison Service and their service providers. However, some images have the potential to challenge official discourses. The images created during the residency are an example of the counter image, and in turn the counter narrative (Brown, 2014; Schept, 2014). Through prompting reflection upon lives lived out behind prison walls, the images Edmund is producing have the potential to facilitate a re-humanising of the residents. To what extent is this realised? In addition, the residency may also evoke broader questions around attitudes, beliefs and values in relation to control within society (Deleuze, 1992).

### Victimhood and offending

The residents at Grendon are men who have in the past been labelled as “evil” and “bad”, defined by their crimes. Their experiences at Grendon involve reflecting upon their early lives and childhoods, which often encompass other identities – for example as victims (Stevens, 2012, 2013). Whilst Edmund’s images do not depict the residents or identify them personally, the images are representations of them and their lives and the spaces in which these lives are lived. This is relevant in relation to residents’ narratives as the images will inevitably invite questions about who they are and what they have done. How do residents feel about this and the audiences’ ability to separate the images from the context of their creation?

### Affect and encounter

The images produced during the residency will be seen by audiences. This will include audiences at the annual exhibition and sharing days held at HMP Grendon and Ikon Gallery respectively. In addition, audiences will also be indirect – for instance those who may see coverage of the residency in mainstream or social media. As the aim of the residency is to develop a public discourse about prison, rehabilitation and criminality, the evaluation needs to explore the reception that the images receive from these audiences – essentially the affect that is generated from the encounter with the image (Young, 2005, 2008, 2010, 2014). What affect does an encounter with the image engender in those who attend the exhibition and sharing days? Are the images produced during the residency opening up a more compassionate envisioning of the residents and the spaces in which they are held? Are they showing the impossibility of being able to judge? Beyond the exhibition and sharing days, what affect does an encounter with the image engender among wider audiences? What is the nature of debate taking place in mainstream and social media? Are the counter-images and counter-narratives produced and stimulated by the residency gaining traction in particular media environments?
Evaluation Scope
Having identified key themes and concepts, the proposed scope of the evaluation is presented below. This outlines the key groups with whom the evaluation will seek to engage.

1. Impact of residency upon HMP Grendon residents;
2. Impact of residency upon HMP Grendon staff;
3. Impact of residency upon wider stakeholders3;
4. Impact of residency upon wider debates around prison, rehabilitation and criminality;
   a. Amongst direct audiences – annual exhibitions, annual sharing days, conference delegates.
   b. Amongst indirect audiences – mainstream media, online and social media debates and discussions.

Evaluation Methods
The following sections outline the methods that will be used in collecting and analysing data for the evaluation and explains why they are appropriate. The key methods and techniques planned by the Research Team are: Photo-Elicitation Interviews; Comments Boxes; Participant Observation & Semi-Structured Interviews; Media Content Analysis. Figure 1 outlines the key phases and tasks in fieldwork and analysis. Figure 2 contextualises these activities within the overall evaluation timeline.

Photo-Elicitation Interviews (PEIs)
PEIs present an opportunity to develop insights into several of the key concepts and themes within the evaluation. PEIs are an example of a visual research method (Rose, 2012) and are essentially a way of integrating images into the interview process and, as such, eliciting new layers of data (Gariglio, 2015). One such layer is the visual narrative - stories which are constructed with (and / or about) images that themselves tell a story (Riessman, 2001, 2008). The Research Team want to use PEIs to explore narratives around images created during the residency and official images of Grendon4. Within PEIs, participants have the space and flexibility to explore what the images mean to them. The images are used to inspire dialogue, so as to give the participants more scope and freedom to construct and share their narratives than is possible in semi-structured interviews. The questions posed during the interviews are flexible and should respond to the natural flow of conversation around the image.

Interviews will be led by Dr Yardley or Dr Glynn. In relation to interviews that take place at Grendon, Morag Kennedy or Shona Robinson-Edwards will also be in attendance and will take handwritten notes of the interviews. Interviews outside of Grendon will be recorded using a digital recorder. Handwritten notes will be typed up after the interviews and audio recordings will be transcribed. The data will be
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analysed via qualitative thematic analysis, assisted by NVivo qualitative analysis software (QSR International, 2012). Examples of the type of question that may be included are:

*What is in the photograph?*
*What is the photograph of, what do you think it represents?*
*How is the photo presented?*
*Who do you think will see it?*
*What does the photograph show?*
*What does it conceal?*
*Why do you think particular things are shown or hidden?*
*How does the photograph affect you?*
*What are your thoughts and feelings about it?*
*How do you interpret the image – is it a ‘counter’ image?*
*Does it make you look at the subject in a different way?*
*What do the images from the residency tell us when compared with the official images?*

We plan to carry the following PEIs:

- **Three interviews with the Artist in Residence.** We plan to conduct three interviews with Edmund, one in August/September 2016, another in February 2017 and a final one in June 2017. These interviews will involve exploring official images of the prison and the new images that Edmund has created during the periods in between the interviews.

- **Twelve interviews with Grendon Residents.** Separate interviews will be carried out in the periods January 2017 (four residents), May 2017 (four residents) and September 2017 (four residents). These interviews will involve exploring images that have been created by Edmund during the residency, official images and where possible, images created by the residents themselves (if they have participated in Edmund’s sessions).

  The research team are keen to interview residents who have had varying levels of engagement with the residency. We will liaise with the prison over identifying four residents who have engaged fully (for example participated in all of the sessions Edmund has organised); four residents who have engaged somewhat (those who are interested in the residency and may have attended a few of the sessions but not all); and finally four residents who are not particularly interested in or engaged with the residency at all. In addition to the qualitative thematic analysis that will be applied to other PEIs, the research team will draw upon narrative analysis in analysing the findings from these interviews. Drawing on our previous experience in this area (Yardley, Wilson, Brookes and Kemp, 2015), we will explore the extent to which the images evoke discussion of particular narrative identities amongst the participants, contextualised within their individual journeys of desistance.

- **Up to eight interviews with Grendon staff.** We plan to carry out eight separate interviews with members of Grendon staff - Governor, Head of Clinical Services, Head of Psychotherapy,
Wing Therapists and Officers. These interviews will involve exploring images that have been created during the residency and official images. We plan to carry out these interviews at three points in time to coincide with the data collection points for the residents’ interviews – January 2017, May 2017 and September 2017.

- **Up to six interviews with wider stakeholders.** We plan to carry out up to six separate interviews with representatives of organisations working at the interface of the criminal justice system and the arts and cultural sphere. This will involve exploring images that have been created during the residency and official images. At this stage in our planning we have identified the Koestler Trust, National Alliance for Arts in Criminal Justice and Engage (National Association for Gallery Education) as organisations we would like to engage in PEI interviews. We will utilise the “snowball” technique during interviews to identify other key organisations with whom it will be beneficial for us to engage with. We plan to conduct these interviews between October 2016 and October 2017.

**Comments Boxes at Grendon**
The number of PEI interviews we will be able to conduct with staff and residents at Grendon is limited to the time and resources available within the scope of the evaluation. However, the Research Team believes that it is important to give all stakeholders at Grendon an opportunity to share their thoughts and experiences in relation to the residency. We plan to apply for permission to locate a comments box on each wing and have them in place in December 2016. The Research Team will gather the contents of each comments box on their research visits to the prison in January, May and September 2017. Comments will be analysed using qualitative thematic analysis techniques and where relevant, narrative analysis techniques, as described above.

**Participant Observation and Semi-Structured Interviews**
The events at which the images from the residency are exhibited and discussed represent important opportunities to explore the impact of the residency upon debate about prison, rehabilitation and criminality. Annual exhibitions will be held at the prison in November 2016 and November 2017. During the same time periods, sharing days will also be held at Ikon Gallery. At these events, the Research Team want to engage with the concepts of the *encounter* with the image and the *affect* that the encounter engenders (Young, 2005, 2008, 2010, 2014). As such, three members of the Research Team will attend each event - either Dr Yardley or Dr Glynn, accompanied by Morag Kennedy and Shona Robison-Edwards – and conduct participant observation and semi-structured interviews.

Participant observation will involve being amongst the audience as they are looking at the images and noting particular reactions and key themes within conversations that are taking place during these encounters. This observation will be *overt* in that attendees will be made aware of our presence and that we are there to explore the reactions that the images are eliciting. We will engage
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in semi-structured interviews with attendees who are happy to speak with us for between 5 and 20 minutes about their thoughts and views in relation to the images.

In relation to the exhibitions at the prison, handwritten notes will be taken in relation to the observations and semi-structured interviews and typed up afterwards. Regarding the sharing days at Ikon Gallery, handwritten notes will be taken of the observations and semi-structured interviews will be audio recorded - with the permission of the interviewee - and transcribed afterwards. Analysis will take the form of qualitative thematic analysis as described above. The Research Team will also produce reflective accounts of the events, within which they recall their experiences and reflect upon the events in relation to the key themes and concepts underpinning the evaluation. A list of indicative questions to be explored during the observations and semi-structured interviews are included below:

**Who are the audience?**

*Which particular images are they encountering?*

*What impact is the location of the event having upon the encounter with the image?*

*How are people looking at the images?*

*What affect are the images engendering?*

*What points are emerging in conversations about the images?*

*Are the images causing people to reinforce or challenge particular discourses?*

*Are the images introducing new perspectives on prisons?*

*What are audiences saying about rehabilitation?*

*To what extent are issues of offending and victimhood emerging within conversations around the images?*

**Media Content Analysis**

It is anticipated that the residency will spark considerable debate in mainstream and social media around the themes of prisons, rehabilitation and criminality. Given that the aim of the residency is to develop a public discourse around these themes, it is important to capture the nature and extent of such debates. Dr Yardley was involved in Ikon Gallery’s *Real Birmingham Family* project 2010-2014, in which the artist Gillian Wearing produced a sculpture of a Birmingham family. This family consisted of two sisters – Emma and Roma Jones - and their sons. There was considerable debate in mainstream and social media about this project, which tapped into a wide range of values, attitudes and beliefs around “the family” in contemporary society. Following this experience, the Research Team are keen to capture and analyse such debates in relation to the Grendon residency to explore what themes are being raised around prisons, rehabilitation and criminality and what attitudes, values and beliefs are evident in discussions. This enables the evaluation to consider the impact of the residency beyond the direct and immediate stakeholders.

The Research Team are experienced in analysing mainstream and social media content—indeed Morag Kennedy and Dr Yardley recently published a study exploring debate around a violent crime on Reddit (Yardley, Wilson and Kennedy, 2015). In relation to the residency, we will conduct a structured search for any relevant content through setting up Google alerts using combinations of key search terms such as “Edmund Clark”, “Artist in Residence” and “HMP Grendon”. This means that any when new content is posted online we will be alerted to it via email. We will then be able to ascertain whether it is relevant to the residency before copying the content to a repository and uploading it to the NVivo data analysis software. We plan to use qualitative content analysis to draw meaning from the data—a approach which aims to develop inferences from text and is considered to be particularly appropriate in fields where existing theory or research is limited (Weber, 1990), as is very much the
case with evaluations of prison artistic residencies. Qualitative content analysis enables themes and categories to emerge from the data, as opposed to trying to fit the data into existing prescriptive categories (Krippendorff, 1980). The media content analysis will be carried out by Morag Kennedy and Shona Robinson-Edwards and will begin in July 2016, continuing throughout the residency.
### Fieldwork & Analysis - Phases & Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Briefings, Updates and Research Administration Tasks</th>
<th>Jun-16</th>
<th>Jul-16</th>
<th>Aug-16</th>
<th>Sep-16</th>
<th>Oct-16</th>
<th>Nov-16</th>
<th>Dec-16</th>
<th>Jan-17</th>
<th>Feb-17</th>
<th>Mar-17</th>
<th>Apr-17</th>
<th>May-17</th>
<th>Jun-17</th>
<th>Jul-17</th>
<th>Aug-17</th>
<th>Sep-17</th>
<th>Oct-17</th>
<th>Nov-17</th>
<th>Dec-17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication of Update Report (including research design) to MVLM, Ikon and Governor of HMP Grendon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application for ethical approval from Faculty of Business, Law and Social Sciences at Birmingham City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application for approval for prison-based data collection from National Offender Management Service (NOMS) - submit by end of July for application to be considered by mid-August committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If applicable - Revise NOMS application</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If applicable - Resubmit revised application for approval for prison-based data collection from NOMS - submit by end of September for application to be considered by mid-October committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Photo-Elicitation Interviews (PEI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artist in Residence</th>
<th>Jun-16</th>
<th>Jul-16</th>
<th>Aug-16</th>
<th>Sep-16</th>
<th>Oct-16</th>
<th>Nov-16</th>
<th>Dec-16</th>
<th>Jan-17</th>
<th>Feb-17</th>
<th>Mar-17</th>
<th>Apr-17</th>
<th>May-17</th>
<th>Jun-17</th>
<th>Jul-17</th>
<th>Aug-17</th>
<th>Sep-17</th>
<th>Oct-17</th>
<th>Nov-17</th>
<th>Dec-17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grendon Residents (should NOMS application be approved after first submission, could begin earlier than Jan-17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grendon Staff (should NOMS application be approved after first submission, could begin earlier than Jan-17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Residency Comments Box

("C" indicates collection dates, should NOMS application be approved after first submission, could place earlier than Dec-16)

| C | C | C |

### Participant Observation and Semi-Structured Interviews

| Jun-16 | Jul-16 | Aug-16 | Sep-16 | Oct-16 | Nov-16 | Dec-16 | Jan-17 | Feb-17 | Mar-17 | Apr-17 | May-17 | Jun-17 | Jul-17 | Aug-17 | Sep-17 | Oct-17 | Nov-17 | Dec-17 |
|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

### Media Content Analysis

| Jun-16 | Jul-16 | Aug-16 | Sep-16 | Oct-16 | Nov-16 | Dec-16 | Jan-17 | Feb-17 | Mar-17 | Apr-17 | May-17 | Jun-17 | Jul-17 | Aug-17 | Sep-17 | Oct-17 | Nov-17 | Dec-17 |
|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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**Figure 1.**
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### Figure 2.

#### Overall Project Phases & Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commissioning and Monitoring</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract signing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project initiation meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conceptualisation and Design</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoping exercise and literature review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of outcomes and related concepts, research design draft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalisation of research design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fieldwork and Analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fieldwork design briefings and stakeholder updates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research approval applications - University Ethics and NOMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If applicable - Revisions to NOMS application and resubmission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo-Elicitation Interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency Comments Box</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Observation and Semi-Structured Interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reporting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual sharing days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final report submitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Commissioning and Monitoring**
  - Contract signing
  - Project initiation meeting
- **Conceptualisation and Design**
  - Scoping exercise and literature review
  - Identification of outcomes and related concepts, research design draft
  - Finalisation of research design
- **Fieldwork and Analysis**
  - Fieldwork design briefings and stakeholder updates
  - Research approval applications - University Ethics and NOMS
  - If applicable - Revisions to NOMS application and resubmission
  - Photo-Elicitation Interviews
  - Residency Comments Box
  - Participant Observation and Semi-Structured Interviews
- **Reporting**
  - Annual sharing days
  - Interim reports
  - Final report submitted
Next steps

The next steps in the evaluation are to submit this overview progress report to the MLVM Charitable Trust, Ikon and the Governor of HMP Grendon. The Research Team will invite these stakeholders to identify any key concerns or suggested amendments in relation to the research design.

If all are happy to proceed, the Research Team will submit their application for research approval to NOMS. We will also submit our application for ethical approval to the Faculty of Education, Law and Social Sciences Ethics Committee. We intend to make these submission at the end of June 2016 or in early July 2016.

NOMS approval is needed for the prison-based fieldwork – notably the PEIs with residents and staff, the data collection at the annual exhibition and the comments box. NOMS approval is however not required for all other elements of the fieldwork, which do not involve researching with prisoners or prison staff – notably PEIs with wider stakeholders, data collection at the annual sharing day and media content analysis. Therefore should our NOMS application require revisions and resubmission, we are not prevented from progressing the other elements of the work.
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Appendix
Presentation to MLVM Trustees

Artist in Residence – HMP Grendon

Evaluation - Scoping and Proposed Methodology

Elizabeth Yardley
Associate Professor of Criminology

Overview

- The evaluation team;
- Aims and objectives of the residency;
- Findings of scoping exercise;
  - Interviews with stakeholders
  - Literature review
- Proposed methods;
- Next steps;
- Questions.
About the evaluation team

ELIZABETH YARDLEY  MARTIN GLYNN  SHONA ROBINSON-EDWARDS  MORAG KENNEDY

Aim and Objectives of the Residency

Aim
Develop a public discourse about prison, rehabilitation and criminality.

Objectives
Artist sharing his own practice with long-term residents of HMP Grendon.
Artist producing a new body of work through a process of consultation, dialogue and discussion.

Findings of the Scoping Exercise
Stakeholder Interviews

- HMP Grendon;
- Friends of Grendon;
- Ikon Gallery;
- Edmund Clark;
- Trustees of the Marie Louise von Motesiczky Charitable Trust;
- Koestler Trust.

Key Themes

- HMP Grendon unique in prison estate;
- Challenging existing discourses around prisons and punishment;
- Legacy of previous residency;
- Importance of artistic output;
- Impact in and around HMP Grendon;
- Desistance journeys;
- Bringing people into the prison;
- Policy context of evaluation.

Literature Review

- Understand the context of the residency in relation to the literature;
- Identify important concepts;
- Consider appropriate (and inappropriate) methods;
- Key areas of the literature;
  - ‘Good Lives’ and HMP Grendon;
  - Photography, prisons and prisoners;
  - Visual criminology.
‘Good Lives’ and HMP Grendon

- Good Lives Model (GLM) – everyone seeks similar things from life;
- GLM – adapting the story that offenders tell about their lives and the narrative identities they form;
- HMP Grendon only prison operating wholly as a ‘therapeutic community’;
- Violent and sexual offences;
- Four principles of the TC: permissiveness, reality confrontation, democratisation, communalism;
- Unique community, sensitive dynamics.

Photography, Prisons and Prisoners

- Constructing the criminal body, boundaries between ‘normal’ and ‘deviant’;
- Institutional context;
- Photography done to prisoners vs. photography done with prisoners;
- Counter-image and counter-narrative;
- Ethics of photography in prisons;
  - HMP Grendon as a site of suffering
  - Reactions and receptivity towards images of prison and prisoners
  - Impact upon desistance journeys?

Visual Criminology

- The image as central;
- Unique window into social context of crime and criminal justice;
- Images infused with values, norms, attitudes and beliefs;
- Relationships between photographer, participants and audiences;
- Decisive moment;
- Encounter;
- Affect;
- Visual Research Methods (VRM).
Contemporary Discourses - Prisons, rehabilitation and criminality

- Prisons and the public;
- Mediated representations of prison and prisoners;
- “…there can be no sympathy for a folk devil whose hell one barely sees” (Cheliotis, 2010: 177);
- Older and newer media;
- Counter narratives in newer media.

Evaluation Concepts and Themes

- Stories / narratives of HMP Grendon residents;
- Uniqueness of HMP Grendon;
- HMP Grendon residents and staff as stakeholders in the images;
- Counter-images and counter-narratives;
- Windows into lives;
- Victimhood and offending;
- The affect generated in the encounter with the image.

Proposed Evaluation Scope

1. Impact of residency upon HMP Grendon residents re desistance journeys;
2. Impact of residency upon HMP Grendon staff;
3. Impact of residency upon wider stakeholders;
4. Impact of residency upon debates around prison, rehabilitation and criminality:
   Amongst direct audiences – annual exhibitions, annual sharing days, conference delegates
   Amongst indirect audiences – mass media, online and social media debates and discussions.
Proposed Methods

- Photo-Elicitation Interviews – residents, staff and Edmund Clark;
- Comparative visual narrative analysis – residency story compared to ‘official’ story in images of prison;
- Content analysis – of discussions around the residency in older and newer media;
- Participant observation and short interviews – at key events in which images are shown to external audiences.

Next Steps

- Finalise research design;
- Apply for university ethical approval for all fieldwork;
- Apply to NOMS for approval for prison-based fieldwork;
- Commence data collection and analysis – July 2016.

Questions?