Dear Mr Neill

Transforming Rehabilitation, Oral Evidence Session - 17 April 2018

I am writing to you following the evidence that I provided at the oral evidence session held on 17 April 2018 as part of the Justice Select Committee’s inquiry into Transforming Rehabilitation. During that session I provided the Committee with two sets of figures relating to inspection outcomes. Unfortunately, those figures were not entirely accurate, for which I sincerely apologise. The error occurred because some establishments were included which should have been excluded and conversely some were omitted that should have been in scope. Further, more of the prisons referred to were designated resettlement prisons than initially counted. Therefore, the figures did not provide the Committee with a completely accurate picture of the trend of scores from the time at which we would have expected to see the impact of measures introduced as part of Transforming Rehabilitation. I set out below the corrected figures (the figures to be corrected are footnoted).

Of the 73 adult prisons in England and Wales for which inspection reports were published between 26 April 2016 and 20 February 2018, in the area of rehabilitation and release planning (formerly referred to as resettlement):

- 20 prisons received a lower score than at the previous inspection;
- 36 prisons received the same score than at the previous inspection; and
17 prisons received a higher score than at the previous inspection.\(^1\)

Of the 54 designated resettlement prisons from those 73, in the area of rehabilitation and release planning (formerly referred to as resettlement):

12 prisons received a lower score than at the previous inspection;
29 prisons received the same score than at the previous inspection; and
13 prisons received a higher score than at the previous inspection.\(^2\)

The two corrected sets of figures above show that over three quarters of all adult prisons inspected did not improve their scores in rehabilitation and release planning and some of the prison’s scores declined. It is a similar picture for dedicated resettlement prisons. However, it is important to note that our scores for rehabilitation and release planning take into account a range of factors that are additional to those we now expect to see as a result of the introduction of Transforming Rehabilitation.

I hope that this explanation is clear and provides sufficient detail but please do not hesitate to let me know if any further information is required. As always, we welcome the opportunity to be of any assistance to the Committee.

Once again, please accept my apologies for this mistake.

Yours sincerely

PETER CLARKE

\(^1\) The figures provided to the Committee during the session were, from a total of 80: 26 prisons received a lower score than at the previous inspection; 40 prisons received the same score than at the previous inspection; 14 prisons received a higher score than at the previous inspection.

\(^2\) The figures provided to the Committee during the session were, from a total of 40 designated resettlement prisons: 10 prisons received a lower score than at the previous inspection; 21 prisons received the same score than at the previous inspection; 9 prisons received a higher score than at the previous inspection.