Thank you for your letter of 24 July, setting out the Justice Committee’s further questions following my appearance before you on 26 June, along with Mike Driver and Justin Russell, at the oral evidence session for the Committee’s Inquiry into the Prison Population 2022. I was grateful for the opportunity to appear before the Committee, and found our discussion helpful.

I have set out my responses to your request for further information below.

1. Prison population growth and projection

   a. **Graph of projected prison population**

   I believe that a copy of the chart that I displayed during the evidence session was delivered to the Committee shortly after the hearing. I have attached a further copy of it at Annex A. The next set of prison population projections are due to be published on 23 August, and will be available online at: www.gov.uk/government/statistics/prison-population-projections-ns

   b. **Key factors influencing projected growth**

   Our August 2017 prison population projection forecast an increase of 1,600 places from the level at that time, to 88,000 places by March 2022. The key factor driving the long-term increase is the underlying growth in the determinate sentenced population, of those sentenced to four years or over. This is expected due to trends in recent years in offender case mix, where more serious cases (for example, sexual offences and more serious drug offences) have come before the courts. This results in offenders receiving longer custodial sentence lengths, which in turn places an upward pressure on the prison population. This is a prediction only, and, of course, we have also modelled with considerable uncertainty, for a worse scenario of 89,100 places by June 2022.

   This growth is partially offset by decreases in our indeterminate population, as further prisoners serving existing IPP sentences are released from custody, and declines in court disposals, which are assumed to decrease to match court receipt volumes.
c. **Evidence on how we might achieve steady state for HDC cases**

Home detention curfew (HDC) cases are now approaching a 'business as usual' footing following the changes I described to the Committee. From August 2018 onwards, the process will be supported by a performance metric, against which prisons will be monitored.

Additionally, and importantly, work is being undertaken to further improve the process with a digital platform under development. This will replace the current communication methods (i.e. post, telephone or fax) between the Prison Service and probation providers. Taken together, these measures will ensure that levels of HDC performance will be maintained over the longer term.

d. **Changing social attitudes and growing intolerance of crime**

An example of attitudes tending towards more punitive sentencing can be seen in the responses to the consultation on driving offences and penalties relating to causing death or serious injury (the dangerous driving survey to which I referred during the evidence session). The majority of responses received were in favour of increasing the maximum penalty for causing death by dangerous driving from the current 14 years to life imprisonment. The Government's response to that consultation was published in October 2017, and can be found online at: [www.gov.uk/government/consultations/driving-offences-and-penalties-relating-to-causing-death-or-serious-injury](http://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/driving-offences-and-penalties-relating-to-causing-death-or-serious-injury).

e. **Other offence-based surveys**

Following my reference to the survey about dangerous driving, you enquired whether the Ministry had conducted any other offence-based surveys. We have not conducted any offence-based surveys although all Government public consultations are published online at: [www.gov.uk/government/publications?publication_filter_option=consultations](http://www.gov.uk/government/publications?publication_filter_option=consultations).

f. **Impact of Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act 2012 (LASPO)**

You also requested the Ministry's analysis of the impact of Part 3 of the Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act 2012 (LASPO). As I advised in my letter to you of 15 February, our view is that an assessment of Part 3 (the sentencing provisions of the Act) cannot be made in isolation from an assessment of the legislation governing sentencing and release as a whole. Part 3 of LASPO made a series of amendments to the existing sentencing framework, but very few of its measures are standalone provisions. It would, therefore, be difficult (if not impossible) to extract the impact of the amendments brought in by LASPO from the impact of existing provisions, or to identify a causal link between the specific LASPO changes and wider factors in crime and sentencing.

In addition, some of these provisions have themselves subsequently been amended, or even repealed, under the Crime and Courts Act 2013, the Offender Rehabilitation Act 2014 or the Criminal Justice and Courts Act 2015. It would be difficult to isolate the impacts of the 2012 provisions because of the lack of significant periods between them and subsequent legislation.

Our discussion on the impact of LASPO was set in the broader context of reform to sentencing. During our discussion, I committed to looking at what more we can do to emphasise that short custodial sentences should be viewed as a last resort. There is persuasive evidence to show that short custodial sentences do not help some offenders turn their backs on crime and that community sentences, in certain circumstances, are actually more effective in reducing reoffending and therefore keeping the public safe.

2. **Financial matters**

Mr Driver gave us figures for spending in public sector prisons over the last four years.

a. **Please would you provide the equivalent figure for 2010 and figures for spending in private sector prisons for the same years.**

b. **We also asked for the real terms increase in budget between 2015-2020**
In 2010-11, public prisons spending was £2,267 million and private prisons spending was £340 million. Compared to the 2017-18 figures, this equates to a £128 million increase in private prisons and a £594 million decrease in public prisons.

### Public and private prisons funding from 2010-11 to 2017-18 adjusted for inflation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Prisons</td>
<td>2,267</td>
<td>1,759</td>
<td>1,655</td>
<td>1,657</td>
<td>1,583</td>
<td>1,673</td>
<td>(594)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Prisons</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Public and private prisons funding change from 2014-15 to 2017-18 adjusted for inflation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014-15</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
<th>Variance £m</th>
<th>Variance %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Prisons</td>
<td>1,655</td>
<td>1,673</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Prisons</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The increase in prison service costs from 2015/16 to 2019/20 represents:
- Additional Prison Officers to improve frontline safety, security and rehabilitation; approved by HM Treasury in 2016/17.
- Market supplements to improve recruitment/retention at specific custodial sites.
- The re-role of the Verne from an Immigration Removal Centre to a Category C prison. The decision to re-role the Verne was taken last year when there was a shortage of places and the prison population projections were showing an underlying upward trend. Although this demand pressure has eased since the start of the year (mainly due to improvements in processing HDC applications), the prison estate has continued to suffer from an increasing number of capacity losses - such as the recent loss of 400 places at HMP Liverpool. We continue to look for opportunities to close prisons, subject to operational capacity, in addition to the 5 prisons closed since 2015/16.
- Increases in the front-line operational capability in the new Security, Order and Counter Terrorism Directorate, with a focus on key threats to operational prison security and implementing measures to support national security against extremism, serious organised crime and corruption.

During this period a number of reforms were implemented within the public sector prison estate to drive improved productivity and efficiency this included:
- An efficiency and benchmarking exercise across the whole prison estate.
- A capacity management programme to ensure the most effective use of the prison estate. New low-cost, high efficiency accommodation was provided and low-efficiency, poor value accommodation was closed or reconfigured.

Mr Driver also said that while he was comfortable with the budget allocated to HMPPS for this financial year there was a risk associated with it.

- What is the budget for the current financial year?
- What are the key risks with the budgets for prisons other than potential fluctuations in prisoner numbers?
- What is the projected gap for 2019-20?
- Please would you also set out in writing some of the specific challenges of having to manage an unbalanced budget year on year in the way that the Department has been hitherto.

1 Please note that a number of cross-departmental budget transfers have occurred throughout 2010/11 – 2017/18 which does not allow for a meaningful comparison of funding. June 2018 GDP deflators used for inflation adjustment.
2 This analysis excludes the additional funding received in relation to establishing a government-owned facilities management company, Gov Facility Services Ltd, which has taken on the delivery of the prison Facilities Management services previously provided by Carillion.
The HMPPS budget for 2018-19 is £3,828 million RDEL. The breakdown below is as at the end of July.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAU</th>
<th>£m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal RDEL</td>
<td>3,754.573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>24.293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AME</td>
<td>135.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource RDEL</td>
<td>49.390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>0.300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the effects of potential fluctuations in prisoner numbers, within operational delivery there may be further emerging risks through the year. The current key budget risks for public prisons are in relation to retention and recruitment measures to stabilise the prison workforce, employment law legislative changes and estates maintenance.

We are currently performing a detailed review of our spending plans and working closely with HM Treasury to agree our financial plan for 2019/20. Our plans for 2019/20 will continue to assume flexibility between our capital and resource funding, and flexibility from HM Treasury in areas of emerging risks.

In meeting the challenge of our stretching budgets, the Ministry has undertaken a process of rigorous review of its spend. This has included a bottom-up assessment of the Ministry’s financial commitments and risks, and ensuring that a robust process of prioritisation is undertaken when setting budgets. Managing challenging budgets in-year requires an ongoing focus on prioritisation and driving efficiency within the justice system; this is achieved within our strong financial management regime that ensures we deliver value for money for the taxpayer.

£1.3 billion was originally allocated by the Treasury to the prison building programme. We heard that there had been a £235 million switch from capital to resource in 2017-18, a £292 million switch in 2018-19 and that you were looking to make a transfer of over £100 million in 2019-20.

**g. How much of that funding has been spent on prison modernisation, and what, if any, remains available to the Department?**

At the 2015 Spending Review the Ministry was allocated gross funding of £1.3 billion for the Prison Estate Transformation Programme. To date around £0.2 billion of this has been spent on prison estate transformation/modernisation, including the construction of HMP Berwyn which opened in February 2017. Spend to date includes the cost of new accommodation at HMP Stocken (206 places due to be completed this year), the ongoing reconfiguration of the prison estate (including the installation of Video Conferencing Facilities), and detailed designs for new prisons. While the ambition of the programme has remained the same, the way that we will deliver the programme has changed, and the Ministry is now planning to spend around a further £0.4 billion on prison estate transformation between now and the end of 2020/21.

You explained you that you wished to make a case to the Treasury for the next spending review to provide sufficient funding for the prison system to accommodate the worst-case scenario population projections.

**h. Please would you set out the estimates you have made for the number of prison places required each year over the spending review period (to 2025), how this fits with the timetable for new build places coming onstream, and the capital and resource budgets required for prisons to accommodate and manage the population to the standards you expect.**

Prison population projections have been published annually since 2008. The latest projections published in August 2017 cover the period from 2017-2022. These indicate that, given the agreed set of assumptions, the single most likely population trajectory is:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>March 2019</th>
<th>March 2020</th>
<th>March 2021</th>
<th>March 2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>86,400</td>
<td>86,700</td>
<td>87,200</td>
<td>88,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, as with any projection, there is uncertainty in the projection of the prison population. This includes uncertainty in model parameters as well as future changes in behaviour or policy that are uncertain or unexpected at the time of projection. Reflecting this, the published projections indicate a range of possible outcomes at different confidence levels. In order to determine and plan for the number of places which may be required through to 2022 and beyond the Ministry has decided it is sensible to use the projection which has a 65% confidence level rather than the central scenario illustrated above.

The published 65% data is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>March 2019</th>
<th>March 2020</th>
<th>March 2021</th>
<th>March 2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>87,100</td>
<td>87,600</td>
<td>88,200</td>
<td>89,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To note that published data is not available for the period from 2022 through to 2025.

The proposed new prisons at Wellingborough and Glen Parva which have already been mentioned to the Committee will provide accommodation to the modern and safe standards I expect, and will deliver sufficient new capacity to cover the 65% population trajectory. The estimated capital and operating costs for Wellingborough are included in a business case that is currently being considered by HM Treasury.

We have agreed with HM Treasury that we will explore funding routes, including private finance, for the delivery of the remaining 10,000 places – subject to the usual planning approvals, value for money and affordability tests. Market engagement activities are under way and we are preparing an outline business case for the privately financed prisons to go to HM Treasury towards the end of this year.

**You said that the majority of prison budgets would not be directly in the governor’s gift**

i. How much in financial terms will be available to each governor to arrange to spend at their discretion?

All spend that happens within a prison, except for facilities management and education, is delegated to the Governor, and the education budget will be delegated from next April. This budgetary freedom introduces certain flexibilities for Governors. They can determine how they spend their delegated budget, including the ability to vire between budget categories, and will be held to account over how they spend it. Governors also have the ability to reinvest income generated from commercial activity.

The principle underpinning these freedoms is that funding should follow accountability, so Governors should be able to decide how best to allocate their resources to achieve the performance targets they agree. Budgets and/or decision-making authority is devolved for areas previously determined centrally.

Budgets are delegated to the line managers of Governors, and then on to establishment Governors. The financial limits to Governor authority are set out in their delegation letter; spend should still be in line with MOJ and HMPPS policies, and consistent with wider corporate finance responsibility. Governors are free to spend their budget as they wish, subject to: being lawful; meeting their obligations in line with HMPPS’ policies as an employer; and being able to demonstrate that they are using public money prudently in line with HM Treasury’s ‘Managing Public Money’ requirements. They must also remain within their overall budget envelope.

**We discussed with you and Mr Driver the maintenance backlog which had grown.**

j. Please would you provide us with the volume and value of maintenance backlog, by establishment, by month, for the last year.

k. We would like to be kept appraised of this on an ongoing basis, once a quarter.
MoJ Estates has a pipeline of major maintenance schemes that have been accepted for delivery but still cannot be started without necessary funding. The current pipeline of major maintenance work is estimated at £716 million, of which a further set of priority bids were approved this financial year with a value of £161 million. In 2018/19 MoJ Estates currently has funding of £90 million to deliver major maintenance/investment schemes.

Local Facilities Management maintenance is also completed on an ad-hoc basis at individual prisons. In 2018/19 this equates to around £122 million, although this does not address the pipeline of major maintenance. We have recognised that this is only a partial picture as it is only based on recent bids for work that have been submitted. We are therefore commissioning two surveys, one high-level and one detailed survey, to develop a more accurate and up-to-date picture of the maintenance backlog across the prison estate.

The Ministry will continue to keep the JSC abreast of the prison maintenance backlog on a quarterly basis.

We are keen to understand the cost-benefit analysis upon which you intend to base your argument to the Treasury for additional resources to reduce offending

1. Please would you provide us with more information about this. In particular, we are interested in how you and your colleagues in other Departments have assessed the volume of 'needs' prisoners and those serving community sentences have for rehabilitative activities in terms of mental health treatment, substance misuse treatment, offending behaviour programmes, and education, work and training, for example, and the extent to which what is provided currently meets those needs.

m. Please would you also provide us with an estimate of the costs of investing in such provision which might be necessary to achieve a 7% reduction in reoffending rates and the savings that you estimate would be achieved.

Estimates suggest that reoffending costs society approximately £15 billion a year. We know that we can only successfully reduce reoffending if we work collectively across Government with partners who can support us to improve health outcomes, support offenders into work and ensure everyone has a suitable home to live in. For that reason, we have established the Reducing Reoffending Board, chaired by the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, David Lidington. As part of this work we are working with HM Treasury to understand the costs of reoffending to all government departments and how we might work more effectively across government to reduce reoffending.

Education is a proven route to tackling re-offending. We launched the Education and Employment strategy in May which sets out how we will empower Governors to commission education provision that leads to work and engage and persuade employers to take on ex-prisoners via the New Futures Network (NFN). As part of reforms to prison education, we are empowering our Governors, who will be given the power, budget and commissioning tools to better tailor education and training to the needs of their prisoners. Furthermore, we have consulted on proposals to increase the opportunities available to prisoners to gain experience in real workplaces through Release on Temporary Licence. The former Secretary of State announced our plans to work with MHCLG to develop pilots to support those leaving prison without suitable housing, and further information on this will be announced in the forthcoming rough sleeping strategy.

We also continue to support the rollout of NHS England’s Liaison and Diversion services, which place clinical staff at police stations and courts to provide assessments and referrals to treatment and support. In addition, we are testing a protocol to increase the use of community sentences with mental health, drug and alcohol treatment requirements. This aims to address the underlying causes of offending and keep vulnerable people out of prison. Evidence suggests that community based treatment can have a positive impact on reoffending.

A recently published MoJ study and joint experimental statistics from the MoJ and Public Health England suggest that sentences attached to mental health treatment requirements are associated with significant reductions in reoffending compared with similar cases without such treatment.
3. Staffing

a. Please would you share with us HMPPS’s evaluation of the Offender Management in Custody model to assure us that the 45 minutes to 1 hour a week personal support to be facilitated by the additional recruitment is sufficient to improve prison safety?

The starting point for the key worker element of the Offender Management in Custody (OMiC) model is the strong evidence base that positive staff-prisoner relationships are associated with lower levels of violence and self-harm. This is not just a question of staffing availability, crucial as that is for running full and safe regimes. Months where prisons were above benchmark were associated with lower rates of violence, while months where prisons were below benchmark were associated with higher rates of violence.

Under the model, residential officers will have around six prisoners on their ‘caseload’ and are expected to use their initiative and discretion when deciding how much time they spend with them each week. For example, sometimes an individual prisoner may need more 1:1 time to deal with a particular issue whereas another may only require a few minutes.

Over and above this, however, the time that frontline staff give to prisoners is important. Research repeatedly identifies the problems that arise when prisoners feel staff do not have time to listen to them. Prisoners value respectful communication, fairness, and explanations very highly. When these things are absent, prisoners feel angry and frustrated. By contrast, staff who are physically present and who look for opportunities for greater social interaction on the wings reduce conflicts.

In developing the detail for how the key worker model would operate, HMPPS has sought learning from prisons which were already operating staffing models similar to the key worker scheme. At HMP Warren Hill, for example, set within a context of developing a rehabilitative culture for the whole prison, prison officers were meeting weekly with prisoners resulting in strong relationships and low levels of violence and self-harm.

HMPPS’s judgment, based on this evidence base and learning from prisons already operating similar models, was that a weekly 1-1 session of around 45 minutes would allow time to develop relationships and to take action to address factors that emerge from the evidence base. Examples of different areas where benefits would accrue include addressing a perceived lack of fairness and not being heard. Research has identified both prisoners and staff perceive that feeling disrespected or believing they had been treated unjustly was a significant trigger for assaults. Key work sessions will give officers the time to explain why particular decisions or changes are made, identify where there is perceived unfairness and talk it through, and notify prisoners in advance before a change has to be made.

Similarly, it would help address issues arising from boredom and lack of activity. Research has identified that both staff and prisoners perceive frustration with the regime as a common problem driving prisoner agitation. The frustration arose from boredom or lack of activities as well as failures properly to communicate regime changes or IEP levels. Key work sessions will allow officers to find ways to get prisoners out of their cells and be active, and help prisoners use time in cells to learn and progress.

Low self-control and poor emotional regulation is another such aspect where OMiC would help. These are extremely common characteristics amongst the prison population and are closely linked to offending and reoffending. Problem solving and self-control can be learned as an adult but needs a coaching approach. Key work sessions will allow officers to use skills such as Five Minute Intervention – shown to improve relationships with prisoners, increase prisoners thinking skills, self-efficacy and problem solving. They will allow officers to support prisoners to learn alternatives to unhealthy coping styles to relieve their distress, which includes harm towards themselves and others.

There are also benefits for prisoners new to custody, who are more likely to feel scared, potentially leading them to feel a need to establish a tough reputation to avoid bullying. Key worker sessions will allow officers to make reception and induction less procedural, helping prisoners discuss what they want from their time in prison and how they can achieve it.
A large proportion of the prison population is made up of young adults who are still maturing psychologically and socially. Incarceration has the potential to inhibit or delay maturation, reducing autonomy and limiting opportunities to take responsibility for yourself and others. Problems with perspective-taking and impulse control and susceptibility to peer influence, which are all features of psychosocial immaturity, have all been implicated in violence. Key work sessions will allow officers to coach prisoners to identify opportunities to help others and develop a positive identity, increase their autonomy, and build skills in managing stress and emotions.

Key work sessions will allow officers to engage prisoners to work in roles that help others e.g. peer mentor roles, and give time and support to reinforcing the benefits that can accrue from such activity.

b. Can the MoJ provide a snapshot benchmark of staffing for June 2016. The JSC would like actual numbers of staff in each prison in June 2016, together with numbers of officers on sick leave, training, deployment to other prisons or otherwise unable to work in their ‘home’ prison

c. What are our projections for the volume of ongoing recruitment needs for prison officers annually (presumably up to 2022)?

In June 2016, the total public sector prisons benchmark staffing level for Band 3-5 officers was 18,624 nationally, while the full time equivalent stood at 17,878. It should be noted that this was before increases in establishments to deliver Offender Management in Custody. Details for individual establishments for the quarter ending 30 June 2016 can be found in Table 12 of the Workforce Statistics Bulletin which is available online at www.gov.uk/govemment/statistics/national-offender-management-service-workforce-statistics-june-2016.

Like many operational businesses, Her Majesty's Prison and Probation Service (HMPPS) supports public sector prison establishments in managing the impact of staff in operational bands 2-5 being unavailable to carry out operational duties by building an additional 20 per cent resource into local target staffing figures, above the level required to deliver core duties. Individual providers in the private sector are responsible for managing this across the private estate and have their own approach to addressing the issue. This additional resource is primarily to allow for planned absence such as annual leave or training, but also allows for fluctuations due to sickness, deployment of staff to other prisons or where staff are otherwise unable to work in their ‘home’ prison.

Senior Management Teams in establishments use local management information showing the percentage of staff unavailable to carry out operational duties to support them when managing staffing pressures. This allows them to put in place local arrangements to manage absences and call on regional and national support if required. This local management information is not, however, captured centrally for public or private prisons broken down by establishment.

We have seen the Band 3-5 officer leaving rate rising over the past 12 months, from 9.7 per cent in the year to March 2017 to 10.3 per cent in March 2018 and we have seen a steady increase over a longer time period. It should be noted that this rate covers all reasons for leaving and consequently includes not only resignations but also dismissals, ‘ordinary’ retirements and medical retirement.

The leaving rate broadly remains in the normal range for workforces of this type and nature. By way of comparison, the Chartered Institute of Professional Development (CIPD) Resource and Talent Planning Survey 2017 (the most recent CIPD survey available) found the median rate of labour turnover amongst those organisations who responded to the survey to be 16.5 per cent. The survey does note, however, that 'caution must be applied here as the findings are based on a small number of organisations'.

The leaving rate should also be considered in the context of the pace and scale of recruitment over the past 18 months. We have recruited over 7,000 new prison officers and we know that the leaving rate for staff during their first 12 months in post is normally higher than the average, which will have contributed to
the current position. We have taken action to further support new recruits, including mentoring and we are also looking to learn from this recruitment round and improve training for new Prison Officers.

We do, however, recognise the need to address the issue and would ideally like to reduce the leaving rate back to lower levels, ideally around 7 - 8 per cent, (as in March 2015) providing a healthy turnover but levels which are manageable and stable. We are also ensuring there is a greater consistency where possible across the estate and address issues in those establishments where the impact is felt most acutely. Attrition levels vary across the Service, and the national figure is skewed by a relatively small number of sites which have varying degrees of acute problems which we are actively working to address to improve the overall rate.

Last year we launched the Retention toolkit across the Service. This acknowledged that the issues which affect prisons can be varied, ranging across a number of areas including leadership, pay and reward, the ability to integrate new staff and the prison environment (such as levels of violence). There are, of course, other factors which neither Governors, HMPPS nor the wider Ministry of Justice can influence. The impact of external job markets contributes to attrition at a variety of sites across the prison estate. Given the variability of these factors the toolkit appears to have provided real value in analysing these factors and supporting prisons to take action. We also continue to take steps across the service to retain our valued and hard-working staff, and we remain committed to both filling existing vacancies and recruiting in future years to ensure we also fill in line with attrition rates.

We no longer have a national ‘target’ for recruitment as Governors have been given the freedom within their budget allocations to set the number of Band 3-5 officers in their establishments. This means that they can take account of the local needs of their establishments and adjusting levels at each grade.

The future recruitment need will inevitably decrease as we move to a position of sustained numbers from April 2019. We expect on current assumptions to move to annual rate of recruitment of approximately 2,700 per year in Public Sector Prisons and the Youth Custody Service. This figure of course may be affected by changes which we are proactively monitoring, including fluctuations in the rate of attrition; the impact of any future changes to the estate such as the opening of additional prison accommodation or prison closures (Please see paragraph 4b on page 10 below, which specifically addresses your questions about our review of proposals for the closure and redevelopment of HMPs Rochester and Hindley); the number of those progressing through the expansion of an apprenticeship scheme for Operational Support Grades (this is still at an early stage, but if successful may reduce direct recruitment to Prison Officer); and the impact of changes to working hours by Prison Officers electing to contract for more or fewer hours of work3, subject to local workforce planning.

The current recruitment project for Prison Officers will come to an end in March 2019. It has successfully delivered the increase in Prison Officer staffing by 2,500 and is also filling all existing and projected vacancies to maintain stability over the remaining period. Latest staffing figures can be found online at: www.gov.uk/government/collections/national-offender-management-service-workforce-statistics, and the latest statistics were published on 16 August.

d. Can we give more detail of our training strategies for officers and Governors up to 2022, including the potential staff college? What resources will be required?

HMPPS is currently running a number of leadership and management development programmes to develop our custodial and probation leaders. This includes the continued rollout of the Empowered Senior Leaders Programme, a cohort of our leaders attending a MoD programme at Shrivenham as well as a programme, for experienced and new leaders. This is complemented through accredited learning opportunities and by recruiting new talent through direct entry schemes and our graduate programme.

3 We are introducing new contractual pay arrangements that will allow all Prison Officer grades to contract to individual working hours arrangements between 37 and 43 hours (with 39 being the level around which staff planning and profiling is based). Officers electing to work hours other than 39 may affect the overall requirement.
HMPPS has recently started a programme of work to deliver a refreshed, compelling and comprehensive leadership development offer for all levels of leader and aspiring leader across the organisation. The work to understand the scope and shape of the programme, as well as research into what others do, is taking place now. We will then develop our strategy and plans for delivery in 2019/20.

We will work in partnership with Civil Service Learning to provide a fully-costed strategy which will include the resources needed, including for any potential staff college, and all other training interventions for Governors and managers.

The 'Securing Futures Apprenticeships Programme' provides a programme of learning to support HMPPS staff across all functions and disciplines to develop their skills and capability. It has a clear focus on building capability, improving social mobility and inclusion, ensuring quality experiences and enhancing our business.

We will develop the skills and capabilities of staff to support offenders with complex needs in particular recognising, understanding and interpreting the behaviours of prisoners with mental health or substance misuse difficulties.

We are also revising our POELT training offer for new Prison Officers, and, in particular, looking to make better use of digital opportunities and building on learning from the current round of recruitment which will be the first steps towards introducing prison officer apprenticeships in 2019.

4. Prison building programme

a. Estimated building and running costs for HMPs Glen Parva and Wellingborough.

We are currently finalising the agreed construction costs of the new prison at Wellingborough; these discussions are, as you will understand, commercially confidential. The operating costs for Wellingborough will be determined through the competition to secure an operator to manage and maintain the prison.

We plan to deliver the new prison at Glen Parva through private finance. We will run an open competition for tenders to design, build, finance, operate and maintain the prison for 25 years. We will use the public sector comparator, as well as the construction costs at Wellingborough, to ensure value for money.

b. Closure of HMPs Rochester and Hindley

Although closure of Rochester and Hindley prisons for redevelopment has been postponed, the Ministry is keeping the redevelopment of these prisons under review as part of our prison modernisation programme. In the meantime, we are exploring the potential for alternative locations as a prudent contingency measure. The Government remains committed to keeping staff and stakeholders informed once further decisions are made, and we aim to provide them with a further update on the future of these prisons by January 2019.

c. Wider expectations about further possible prison closures

Having hovered around 83,000 for much of 2018, actual prison population trends have been substantially lower than anticipated in the most recent projection which was published in August 2017. The impact of recent population decreases on long term forecasts is not yet known. Consequently, we will only proceed with prison closures when doing so will not undermine our ability to accommodate all those committed to custody by the courts.

5. What options is the Government considering for prisoners serving indeterminate public protection (IPP) sentences up to 2022?

Our primary objective is to protect the public and it is important that the release of IPP prisoners is considered within that context. Many IPP prisoners currently pose a high risk of committing further serious violent or sexual offences if released. In some instances, it remains the case that prisoners continue to
present too great a risk to public protection for the Parole Board to safely offer a direction for their release. Indeed, even where the Parole Board has directed the release of IPP prisoners on licence, there have been instances of those offenders committing serious further offences.

The Government therefore has no plans to legislate for the automatic release of those prisoners currently serving IPP sentences. We are, however, committed to continuing to provide IPP prisoners with increased opportunities to progress towards release as part of the joint IPP action plan, where this does not compromise public protection. The actions within the Plan aim to improve the progress of individuals, to enhance the efficiency and timeliness of the parole process and to alleviate pressure by reducing the number and type of cases the Parole Board has to deal with. As you are aware, the plan includes a range of approaches, including central case reviews and monitoring by psychologists and lead policy officials of post tariff IPPs who are not progressing satisfactorily to the point of release. We are also increasing the provision of places on new Progression Regimes in prisons, building upon the success experienced at HMP Warren Hill. We are also employing enhanced case management for those IPP prisoners with a complex set of risks and needs, where the co-operation of a number of agencies is needed to give effect to the risk management plan. Meanwhile we are maximising the benefits of Parole Board paper release decisions, in order to facilitate swifter parole reviews, and improving access to relevant interventions and programmes. We are also diverting determinate sentence recall cases away from the Parole Board so that it can focus more of its resources on reviewing IPP prisoners.

We have made significant progress in delivering this work, with two of the three planned new Progression Regimes now in operation, and more than 1,200 reviews completed on the most challenging cases. We also continue to work closely with the Parole Board to process IPP cases as quickly as possible.

The most recent statistics published by the Ministry of Justice show that, at the end of June 2018, the IPP population stood at 2,745. This represents a reduction of 139 from the level of 2,884 at the end of March 2018, and of 284 from the level of at the end of December 2017. At its peak in 2012, the IPP population stood at over 6000 so this is a marked reduction. Those serving the sentence continue to achieve release in high numbers, despite the remaining pool of unreleased IPP prisoners containing proportionally more complex cases. There were 616 first time IPP releases in 2017, which is the highest number for a single year the highest number since the sentence was introduced. The Parole Board recently published its annual report, which shows that during 2017/18, it either progressed to open conditions or released around 3 out of every 4 IPP prisoners who appeared before it. This is positive progress and shows that the work within the joint IPP action plan is bearing fruit.

It is important to remember that many of these prisoners often display extremely challenging behaviour, and have complex needs whose management presents a significant challenge. As I have said, many are also still assessed to pose a high risk of serious harm. Public protection must always be our primary consideration, and the independent Parole Board will not release these individuals unless they are satisfied that the risks they each pose can be safely managed in the community under probation supervision.

6. An update on the Ministry’s progress on implementing the recommendations of the Farmer Review

In October last year, my predecessor Sam Gyimah wrote to you advising you that the Government welcomed the Farmer Review and shared his intention to provide you with an update on progress against the reviews 19 recommendations. Since the Review was published a year ago, we have been continuing to make progress in addressing the recommendations.

In October 2017 we devolved the family budget to prison Governors. This coincided with the awarding of the new Family Services contract and gave Governors the opportunity to provide tailored services that support the prisoners in their establishment and their families.

In April 2018 all prisons delivered a local Family Strategy which sets out how they will support prisoners to improve the level of engagement with family and friends. These will be published through the National
Information Centre on Children of Offenders (NICCO) website and have been made available to prisoners, visitors, family members and staff.

As part of our commitment to improve opportunities for prisoners to strengthen their relationships and to enhance prison safety, the Secretary of State announced in July that we are investing £7 million in a new in-cell telephony system.

We are in the process of developing a new Strengthening Families Policy Framework to be published at the end of the year. The framework will standardise the quality of services provided across all prisons, in line with the principles of the Farmer review. Additionally, it will offer examples of schemes that have been shown to be effective at strengthening the relationships between prisoners and their families, allowing Governors to consider providing similar schemes in their establishments. We are also developing new prison performance measures to encourage delivery of more consistent services to improve relationships between prisoners and their families. These will be piloted at the end of the year, with shadow targets due to be implemented in April 2019.

7. Female offenders strategy: our estimates of the impact of the resources we have allocated to bolster women's centres and to pilot residential provision in terms of both the number of women whom we expect to benefit from this provision and the outcomes we expect for them.

As you know, the Female Offender Strategy, which we published on 27 June, sets out the Government's commitment to a new programme of work for female offenders. The Strategy highlights a shift in focus from custody to the community, and announced £5m investment across government in community provision for female offenders.

This includes a £3.5m Community Investment Fund, to support and enhance existing women's community provision, including women's centres, and multi-agency whole system approaches, and to develop new provision where there are identified gaps. The Fund is currently open to bids from both the statutory and third sector, including women's centres, and will be closing on 12 September 2018. The application form asks bidders to outline the expected number of women who will benefit and outcomes. Until we have evaluated bids and awarded funding to successful bidders, we are unable to provide an estimate of impact. We would expect projects supported by the Fund, in time, to reduce the number of women entering the Criminal Justice System and receiving short custodial sentences, but a direct impact is difficult to determine.

However, with regard to women's centres, an analysis from 2015 by the Justice Data Lab found a reduction in the one year proven reoffending rate of between 1 and 9 percentage points for female offenders who received support provided by 32 women's centres throughout England compared with a matched group of similar offenders. With regard to whole system approaches, whilst we cannot conclude a direct impact, the Greater Manchester Whole-System Approach (GMWSA) has shown a promising reduction in the number of adult women prosecuted and in the number sentenced to custodial sentences in Greater Manchester since 2014.

Emerging evidence from the GMWSA shows a 40 per cent reduction in the number of adult women sentenced to immediate custody since 2014, compared with a 3 per cent reduction for England and Wales. It also shows a 45 per cent reduction in the number of adult women arrested since 2014/15, compared with an 18 per cent reduction for England and Wales.

The aim of the residential women’s centre pilot is to test different models which are centred primarily upon offering an intensive residential-based support service as a diversion from custody. We want to understand their effectiveness, sustainability and scalability. As part of this, we want to see women who would otherwise have served a short custodial sentence, being successfully supported to comply with a robust community order and to begin to address their often complex needs. We would expect to see improvement (where applicable) across a range of areas, such as those outlined in our ‘Achieving better outcomes for women offenders’ guidance.

We are currently undertaking an engagement process with stakeholders and potential partners, providers and investors to refine our thinking around the potential design and delivery of the pilot. This includes work to identify the pilot sites. As part of this process, we will refine our understanding about the specific number of women we would expect to benefit from the pilot and outcomes we would expect. We anticipate that models will vary in design and scope, which will allow us to test which approaches have the greatest impact.

I hope that my response is helpful, but please do let me know if you require any further information.

RORY STEWART MP
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Copy of the fan chart showing the prison population projections from August 2017 until 2022, including the uncertainty bounds around the central forecast.